

Project Nexus
AMR 8 Workgroup Minutes
Tuesday 20 July 2010
ENA, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Brian Durber	(BD)	E.ON UK
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Elaine Carr*	(EC)	Scottish Power
Fiona Cottam	(FC)	xoserve
Gareth Evans	(GE)	Waters Wye
Jennifer Boraston*	(JB)	RWE npower
Lisa Harris	(LH)	Shell Gas Direct
Martin Brandt*	(MB)	Scottish & Southern Energy
Michele Downes	(MD)	xoserve
Richard Street	(RS)	Corona Energy
Sean McGoldrick*	(SMG)	National Grid NTS
Sham Afonja*	(SA)	RWE npower
Shirley Wheeler	(SW)	xoserve
Simon Trivella	(ST)	Wales & West Utilities
Stefan Leedham	(SL)	EDF Energy
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	Gazprom
Steve Nunnington	(SN)	xoserve
Tim Davis (Secretary)	(TD)	Joint Office

* *via teleconference*

1. Review of Minutes & Actions

BF welcomed all to the meeting.

1.1 Review of Minutes

SW noted that Paley should have been spelt Payley. The minutes of the previous meeting were then approved.

1.2 Review of Actions

Action AMR0014: Transporters (CW) to specify the Transporter meter read data requirements going forward.

Update: Material had been provided and was discussed (see agenda item 2.1). **Closed**

2. Scope & Deliverables

2.1 Further Consideration of Meter Reading Arrangements

MD ran through the revised SPA Enquiry Business Rules.

SL asked why NTS sites were in scope when the information is already available. xoserve suspected that excluding NTS sites might increase costs. SL suggested ascertaining whether or not it would, in fact, be cheaper to exclude them. SW emphasised that NTS should be regarded as in scope but the solution is at issue, with the existing publication approach potentially being sufficient. It was also agreed that the scope should be restricted to I&C sites and not cover all NDMs.

RS suggested that the risk regarding requests being made for domestic sites should be reworded to avoid any impression that such requests could be made when the Shippers warrant that the site is I&C and that customer agreement has been obtained.

SL emphasised that he was disappointed that no validation checks were proposed and felt that there would be merit in, at least, monitoring if data was being provided for sites that had a Market Sector Flag of D if this was not used as a validation check prior to information being released. The I&C Shippers felt the warranting approach was sufficient to provide comfort about data release. The consequences of non-compliance were significant such that the warrants could be relied upon. If parties were looking for more information, such as if information had been released for sites with a D Market Sector Flag, they could request a report from xoserve through the User Pays arrangements.

ST questioned the status of the Business Rules and how different views would be captured within the documentation. It was clarified that the intention was to try to reach a consensus set of Business Rules that the group could support, but that, in the absence of consensus, alternative ways forward could be developed. SM suggested that if Ofgem could provide an early steer on areas with different opinions, which could help to narrow down the options and inform which should be taken forward – this would be preferable to Alternative Modification Proposals being raised at the end of the process.

It was agreed that all would reconsider this issue and come back to the next meeting with views on whether xoserve should validate requests and reject any for sites with a MSF of D. CW also offered to obtain a legal view on the acceptability of warrants in the absence of validation checks.

Action AMR0015: All to consider whether there should be a requirement for xoserve to validate information requests and reject any for which the Market Sector Flag is D.

Action AMR0016: Transporters to obtain a legal view on the acceptability of warrants in the absence of validation checks.

It was agreed that the Business rules would be further reviewed and signed off at the 17 August meeting.

ST ran through a presentation prepared to address Action 14 regarding Transporters use of meter asset and read data. It was confirmed that, from an operational perspective, there was no general requirement for within day data for individual sites. However, some large loads were particularly critical to network operation and were likely to be monitored within day, for which systems are already in place.

RS suggested that this implied a business rule which maintained the existing data provision for mandatory DMs would be sufficient for DN system operation purposes, with no need for wider within day information provision at any specific times. ST said that the requirement for within day information extends beyond mandatory DM sites. This would be needed in the event of an emergency but, as such, hourly data is rarely used. FC added that data provision also has implications for energy balancing with the timing and redistribution of unallocated energy being affected by when data is available. RS emphasised that his systems would be developed to meet the requirements, and the costs would be lower if data provision could be spread across a day – this was more important than whether submission was on D or D+1 etc..

The Transporters confirmed that hourly data is required to support network planning and development, but this was not required within day and was largely needed at an aggregated level as well as for DM sites.

For energy balancing, SL suggested that early data was of value to deliver accurate allocations and certainty. CW questioned what the industry requirements were going to be in future and how these requirements were going to be established. RS said that the big issues were the Enquiry Service (as discussed) and the timing of when reads have to be provided. SM added that other problems also needed to be fixed – estimated reads, replacement reads etc. – and he would want to be in a position where he can collect and submit daily reads on a daily basis.

GE suggested that a presentation of requirements could be prepared for the next meeting as a starting point, in the same way as a presentation was used to start the Enquiry Service Business Rules Development. SW suggested that it would be worth reviewing all the issues that have been raised to date rather than generate a fresh presentation. GE agreed to look at this and consider if anything could be added.

Action AMR0017: xoserve to bring a record of all identified issues to future meetings

SW questioned how to get back to looking at the six meter reading processes identified previously and to move forward with identifying future requirements and any differences from the existing processes. FC then skimmed through the presentation from AMR2 that captured the issues raised. It was suggested that the DME process map could be used as a starting point for developing Business Rules and to check if the identified issues were being met.

The meeting then revisited the DME as-is process flow. LH questioned whether it was correct that there was no validation of reads, and MD confirmed this was based on xoserve's existing processes – and no change to this was proposed. SM emphasised again that timing of data flows is central to developments. CW saw this as a potential stepping-stone to a smart metering world. It was accepted that this would be useful to review at the next meeting, as would consumption adjustments and the reconciliation process.

2.2 Ratchets & Reconciliation

SW suggested that nothing further could be progressed until Meter Reading had been clarified.

2.4 Alignment of IRR Requirements

SW reaffirmed that this should remain on the agenda but would need to be considered at the end of the process.

2.5 Transitional Arrangements

SW suggested that this should remain on the agenda but would need to be considered at the end of the process.

3. Workgroup Report

3.1 Preparation of the Monthly/Final Report

There will be no Project Nexus Workstream prior to the next AMR meeting so no report would be produced.

4. Workgroup Process

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

It was agreed that the next meeting would continue discussion of the issues raised and consider the changes needed to the as-is processes.

5. Diary Planning

The following meetings are scheduled and the work plan has been amended to reflect recent discussions.

Title	Date	Location
AMR 9 Meter Reading and Ratchets and Reconciliation	04/08/2010	ENA, 52 Horseferry Road, London.
AMR 10 Meter Reading and Ratchets and Reconciliation	17/08/2010	ENA, 52 Horseferry Road, London.
AMR 11(Market differentiation)	07/09/2010	ENA, 52 Horseferry Road, London.
AMR 12 (Conclusions, draft Modification Proposals)	29/09/2010	ENA, 52 Horseferry Road, London.

6. AOB

None raised.

Appendix 1

Action Table - 20 July 2010

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
AMR014	22.06.10	2.2	Specify the Transporter meter read data requirements going forward	Transporters (All)	Complete
AMR015	20.07.10	2.1	Consider whether there should be a requirement for xoserve to validate information requests and reject any for which the Market Sector Flag is D.	All	Views to be brought to August meetings
AMR016	20.07.10	2.1	Obtain a legal view on the acceptability of warrants in the absence of validation checks.	Transporters (All)	Update due on 04 August
AMR017	20.07.10	2.1	Bring a record of all identified issues to future meetings	xoserve (SW)	Ongoing