

Form A – IGG Design Discussion Request

Discussion Request Number	Title	Priority
DR 154	Increasing the threshold for connection agreements in CoS process	<i>High</i>

Name of Requesting Organisation	RMDS
Contact Name	Jessica Gregory
Date Request sent to RMDS	13 March 2008

Date	Version	Reason for Change
26th March 2008	0.1	First draft
23 April	0.2	<i>Cormac Madden review. Changes added</i>

Detail of Discussion Request
<p><u>Background:</u></p> <p><u>DR122</u> DR 154 is closely linked with the requirement in DR 122 to remove the requirement for a signed connection agreement in the case of a change of supplier with no CoLE. This requirement was required by CER decision made in 2006 CER06143 (see link below).</p> <p>http://www.cer.ie/CERDocs/cer06143.pdf</p> <p>The decision in DR122 allowed for the connection agreement requirement to remain where</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the MIC was 100 kVA or greater and where the CoS is combined with a CoLE • the MIC was greater than or equal to 100 kVA and a CoLE had previously taken place without the signed connection agreement being returned by the customer.

Detail of Discussion Request

Further analysis of DR122 revealed that it may not have been the best option available. This DR essentially involved the removal of the connection agreement requirement for all CoS requests with no CoLE.

Analysis of this DR determined that the change would produce limited short-term value and left issues for the longer term:

- All existing MPRNs with MIC \geq 100 kVA were updated in 2006 with a 'deemed' agreement on foot of the CER decision.
- CoLEs still require a CA. Over time an increasing number of MPRNs would experience a CoLE. While a CoLE automatically triggers the issue of a new connection agreement to the customer, there is a risk a number of these will not be returned as the customer has no immediate incentive to do so. If the connection agreement is not signed and returned by the customer, a subsequent CoS will require a connection agreement return before it can complete.

DR 154

This DR (154) proposes a change to the threshold for returning signed Connection agreements (for existing sites).

Advantages of this option:

- The scale of the overall issue (delay in processing due to connection agreements not returned) into the future will be permanently reduced
- A smaller number of agreements will require follow up

DR 154 develops the concept of reducing the number of instances where a signed connection agreement is required for CoS completion. The suggestion is to apply the signed connection agreement requirement only to sites with a connection voltage of medium voltage (MV) and higher. This follows the approach taken in Northern Ireland.

There are 2 main connection agreement relevant scenarios for a change of supplier.

1. A change of supplier for a site >100 kVA where no change of legal entity is requested or inferred from the data on the CoS : A check is performed to see if a signed connection agreement is in place. If the agreement exists, the process continues. If there is **no signed connection agreement, this will usually mean there has been a previous CoLE without return of the connection agreement. In this event, the process will wait until the CA is returned.** A message 102P is sent to supplier

Detail of Discussion Request

indicating provisional acceptance.

2. A change of supplier for a site > 100 kVA where a CoLE is requested or inferred from the data on the message.: A Connection agreement is issued. The process then **waits on the return of the signed connection agreement** in order to complete the CoS. A 102P is sent to the supplier indicating provisional acceptance.

Proposed Change

The change proposes a change across the market processes in the threshold for the requirement of a signed connection agreement for existing MPRNs. This DR proposes to replace the MIC threshold of 100 kVA for this market requirement with a connection voltage threshold of Medium Voltage and higher.

This means that, for an existing meter point, a CoLE would lead to the requirement for a signed connection agreement with the new customer only where the connection voltage was medium voltage and higher. It would also mean that a CoS could proceed for all LV connection points even where the data on the CoS message implied a CoLE.

Advantages

- This would greatly reduce the number of MPRNs and processes requiring a CA returned.
- MPRNs where there is a heightened level of safety awareness required would still fall within the scope of the new requirement.
- The majority of new connections within a commercial complex would not need a connection agreement prior to connecting the new tenant. (A supplier registration would still be required.)
- This is compatible with the retail market design in Northern Ireland. That is it is consistent with retail market harmonisation which is a regulatory and government objective
- Delays in the majority of CoS processes will be removed.

Disadvantages

- This change involves complex and significant development and testing to all processes that involve the connection agreement for ESN.

Detail of Discussion Request	
Reason for Discussion Request	
To reduce any unnecessary delays in processing Change of Suppliers.	
Market Design Documents impacted by Request	
Date of IGG where discussed	
Change Request xref (if applicable)	

PART 2 MARKET ASSURANCE:				
Applicability				
ESB Networks	Suppliers	TSO	SSA	Generators
X	X			
Scope of Test				
Connectivity	DTT	MSA	IPT	Other
			No. Of Scenarios	

Scope of Discussion Request							
Correction to Documentation	Business Process	Market & MP Systems	MPCC	Readings Processor	Market Gateway	Schema	Web Forms
X	X						

