

**Project Nexus**  
**AMR 4&5 Workgroup Minutes**  
**Wednesday 09 June 2010**  
**ENA, 52 Horseferry Road, London**

**Attendees**

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office of Gas Transporters
Mike Berrisford (Secretary)	(MiB)	Joint Office of Gas Transporters
Alex Travell	(AT)	E.ON UK
Anne Jackson	(AJ)	Scottish & Southern Energy
Bali Dohel	(BD)	Scotia Gas Networks
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Elaine Carr*	(EC)	ScottishPower
Fiona Cottam*	(FC)	xoserve
Gareth Evans	(GE)	Waters Wye
Graham Wood	(GW)	British Gas
Joanna Ferguson	(JF)	Northern Gas Networks
Joel Martin	(JM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Lisa Harris	(LH)	Shell Gas Direct
Michele Downes	(MD)	xoserve
Pete Talbot	(PT)	xoserve
Richard Street	(RS)	Corona
Sean McGoldrick*	(SMG)	National Grid NTS
Shirley Wheeler	(SW)	xoserve
Stefan Leedham	(SL)	EDF Energy
Steve Mullinganie	(SM)	Gazprom

**Apologies**

Chris Hill	First Utility
Peter Thompson	Customer Representative
Simon Trivella	Wales & West Utilities

\* *via a teleconference link*

**1. Review of Minutes & Actions**

BF welcomed everyone to the meeting.

**1.1 Review of Minutes**

Minutes of the 12 May 2010 meeting were accepted.

**1.2 Review of Actions**

**Action AMR010:** Waters Wye (GE) to define data items that could usefully be available at the enquiry stage, together with a view on audit arrangements.

**Update:** GE apologised for having not completed the action and acknowledged that this would delay discussion of the SPA aspects within this meeting. Thereafter, members agreed to defer the action.

**Carried Forward**

## 2. Scope & Deliverables

### 2.1 Change of Supplier Process Considerations

MD suggested, and members agreed to defer further discussion on this item in reflection of outstanding action item AMR010. MD pointed out that the revised 'As-Is' process flows have been published under AMR 4&5.

### 2.2 Meter Reading Arrangements & Processes

#### PNUNC AMR Topic Workgroup – Meter Readings

FC provided a brief overview of the presentation and members discussed the following items by exception.

#### Slide 3 – IRR Consultation Responses – Key Themes

FC pointed out that in some cases, responses could be up to three years old and their relevance changed over the intervening period. In considering the use of a data aggregator (4.2) she believes that this seems at odds with the allocation high-level principles.

#### Slide 4 – Meter Reading Issues Identified (from 1<sup>st</sup> AMR Workgroup)

With regard to calculation and provision of estimated reads, SM suggested that this was more to do with shippers calculation and provision of the estimates. A standard methodology could be defined thereby allowing shippers to calculate their own estimates – why pay a third party to do it. However, this was not a view that was universally supported. AT believed that further consideration of the costs associated with auditing a third party service provider (for the provision of estimated reads) would be required.

In considering the deadline for receipt of daily reads, FC indicated that this could also include the 11:00am DM submissions although RS suggested that there could be problems associated with the schedule and scale of the submissions and that energy balancing issues were separate to daily reads.

FC pointed out that replacement of reads (actual or estimated) could/would overlap the retrospective principles that are being discussed in more detail at the Workstream meeting on Friday 11/06/10.

It was suggested that the limit on volumes could be seen as not being consistent with a daily reading (balancing) and allocation regime for all sites. FC pointed out that at previous Project Nexus Principle Workgroup meetings parties had signed on to the concept of daily energy allocation and balancing as the preferred option and reconciliation/estimation as the 'fallback'.

Some members disagreed on whether or not they could discuss AMR (in the context of the SME Sectors who may wish to use them) before the SMIP has been more clearly defined. However, general agreement that sites with AMR meters should be considered (which could be SME sites), was reached.

One member felt that the 10 days to provide actual reads was irrelevant under the DME regime as an estimate on the transfer day is provided.

When asked about any new items, RS suggested adding consideration of iGT provided data issues (i.e. facilitating window transactions etc.).

#### Slide 5 – List of 'As-Is' Process Flows to Review

Looking at the Primes & Sub Reads, AT informed members that the Authority is reviewing this area as part of their next price control considerations.

When asked, members felt that DME processes should also be included for consideration.

### **Review of the Process Flow Maps**

PT provided a brief overview of the presentation and members discussed the following items by exception.

In opening, FC informed members that the starting point is to baseline the current processes, and then look to identify future requirements.

#### **DM Reads**

When asked, FC confirmed that the receipt and validation of the DM readings time constraint relates to submissions by 10:00hrs with an xoserve response to shippers by 11:00hrs.

When considering the query/estimation rules set out in UNC TPD Section M4.8, FC confirmed that the 'logic' that sit behind the 5 days relates to potential energy balancing positions at this point. RS supported this view suggesting that historical data indicates that most problems are resolved within the 5 business days.

JM pointed out to members that the implementation of UNC modification 0224 "Facilitating the use of AMR in the Daily Metered Elective Regime", will amend TPD Section M3.8.4.

#### **NDM Change of Supplier Transfer Reads**

When asked about the potential impact of customer transfer/point of sale reads, FC suggested that these only work if the incumbent shipper submits a reading, however, they are not shown on this flow map. She then pointed out that estimation processes should get less use under the AMR regime.

#### **Must Reads**

CW pointed out that this process is provided to satisfy UNC commercial requirements and not for safety reasons. Furthermore, he is of the opinion that in the new AMR world, when shippers/suppliers provide daily reads this process potentially becomes redundant. In response, some members felt that whilst predicted volumes (number of occurrences) may be low, having some form of 'backstop' provides reassurance. RS remained concerned about how best to manage his potential energy positions in future.

When asked, SW confirmed that when a must read is submitted following a site visit this does not reset the 2yr Safety Case Inspection Date, only the must read 'trigger' date. BF added that how parties will manage their 2yr safety case (must reads aspects) is outside the scope of this workgroup, although some of the issues will be discussed in more detail when we get to the 'As-Is' process stage.

#### **Primes & Subs Reads**

FC opened by suggesting that problems may arise when you have different suppliers involved (each with different meters) in the same P&S configuration as UNC obligations require that the whole configuration is operated to the same read frequency.

When asked by AJ about whether or not these readings constitute an inspection reading, SW agreed to take a new action to investigate and report back to her in due course.

In considering the timing of the consumption calculation, FC asked members to note that in instances where it may not be possible to obtain

all the readings for all the meters within a (P&S) configuration, the reconciliation cannot be triggered as this can only happen if all readings are obtained within 5 business days of each other.

#### New Process Map for DME

MD pointed out that the process is based upon the business rules defined a few months ago, which JM confirmed as still being valid.

When asked whether or not an erroneous actual reading is none replaceable (as per the DM service), FC thought this was not the case.

RS enquired if there was any validation of the closing v's opening consumptions. In response, FC agreed to take a new action to investigate and report back.

During further discussion, MD confirmed that check reads can be both physical or data logger generated reads. In response to a question regarding annual inspections, FC informed members that the vast majority of readings are 'pulse generated', although some OCR (Optical Character Recognition) readings do exist.

**Action AMR0011: xoserve (SW) to investigate whether or not, P&S readings constitute an inspection reading and report back in due course.**

**Action AMR0012: xoserve (FC) to investigate if there was any validation of the closing v's opening (DME) consumptions and report back in due course.**

### **2.3 Alignment of IRR Requirements**

BF asked, and members agreed that this was not required for today's meeting.

### **2.4 Transitional Arrangements**

Apart from confirming that the DME Change of Supplier (CoS) would be picked up under the 'As-Is' discussions, members agreed that no other issues required discussion at this meeting.

## **3. Workgroup Report**

### **3.1 Preparation of the Monthly/Final Report**

When asked, members requested that BF provide a verbal update on their behalf at the 11/06/10 Project Nexus Workstream.

## **4. Workgroup Process**

### **4.1 Agree actions to be completed ahead of the next meeting.**

Whilst xoserve would undertake their new actions ready for the AMR WG6 meeting scheduled for 22/06/10, SW requested that members also consider what they require in time for the meeting (i.e. issue resolution and 'To-Be' process requirements etc.).

When asked for agenda items for the AMR WG6 meeting, SW suggested CoS & Meter Readings, although it should be noted that discussion &/or consideration of these could well flow into meeting 7 as well.

## **5. Diary Planning**

When asked, members agreed to approve/maintain the following meeting schedule.

---

<b>Title</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Location</b>
AMR 6	22/06/2010	ENA, 52 Horseferry Road, London.
AMR 7	07/07/2010	ENA, 52 Horseferry Road, London.
AMR 8	20/07/2010	ENA, 52 Horseferry Road, London.
AMR 9	04/08/2010	ENA, 52 Horseferry Road, London.
AMR 10	17/08/2010	ENA, 52 Horseferry Road, London.

**6. AOB**

None raised.

## Appendix 1

## Action Table - 09 June 2010

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
AMR010	12.05.10	2.1	Define data items that could usefully be available at the enquiry stage, together with a view on audit arrangements.	Waters Wye (GE)	Update Due at 22 June Meeting.
AMR011	09.06.10	2.2	Investigate whether or not, P&S readings constitute an inspection reading and report back in due course.	xoserve (SW)	Update Due at 22 June Meeting.
AMR012	09.06.10	2.2	Investigate if there was any validation of the closing v's opening (DME) consumptions and report back in due course.	xoserve (FC)	Update Due at 22 June Meeting.