

# UNC Workgroup 0564R Minutes

## Review of Annual Read Meter Reading requirements

### Thursday 26 November 2015

### at 31 Homer Road, Solihull, B91 3LT

#### Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(RF)	Joint Office
Helen Cuin (Secretary)	(HCu)	Joint Office
Alex Ross-Shaw	(ARS)	Northern Gas Networks
Andy Clasper	(AC)	National Grid Distribution
Andy Miller	(AM)	Xoserve
Angela Love*	(AL)	Scottish Power
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Colette Baldwin	(CB)	E.ON UK
Colin Blair*	(CBI)	Scottish Power
David Addison	(DA)	Xoserve
David Mitchell	(DM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Gavin Anderson*	(GA)	EDF Energy
Hilary Chapman	(HCh)	Xoserve
Jon Dixon	(JD)	Ofgem
Kirandeep Samra	(KS)	RWE npower
Kirsten Elliott-Smith	(KES)	Cornwall Energy
Lorna Lewin*	(LL)	DONG Energy
Mark Jones*	(MJ)	SSE
Mark Lyndon	(ML)	National Grid NTS
Rachel Hinsley	(RH)	Xoserve
Richard Pomroy*	(RP)	Wales & West Utilities
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	Gazprom
Sue Hilbourne*	(SH)	Scotia Gas Networks

\* via teleconference

Copies of all papers are available at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0564/261115>

The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 17 March 2016.

## 1.0 Outline of Modification

CW advised that the subject of this Request would be to inform the industry of the options available to manage annual meter reading requirements, specifically those related to the provisions of NDM reads, these being predominantly domestic consumers. CW highlighted that the Engage Report, produced for the Performance Assurance Workgroup highlighting a low level risk. However, CMA investigation suggested that the risk was higher and should be investigated.

SM was concerned about modifications being raised ahead of any outcomes/ recommendations from the Performance Assurance Committee (PAC) as an early modification may contradict the preferred approach by the PAC and not fit with its priorities.

AL challenged there shouldn't be a disconnect between the readings submitted and the reconciliation process.

AL suggested the Workgroup need to consider what information can be obtained across the market on the current read provision performance and its likely impact on settlement. DA believed Xoserve have previously provided meter read performance statistics but these had been withdrawn due to concerns about the sensitivity of the data being made available to the industry. It was agreed some statistics on current read performance would be required by the Workgroup to help assess if remedies were required for inclusion in the report.

CB enquired about Meter Reading Performance driver highlighting this is 97% in electricity and for various reasons this is not always achievable – there needs to be some intelligence around any targets to ensure the benefit exceeds the cost. The Workgroup discussed the potential to achieve 100% meter readings for yearly read sites.

**Action 1101: Xoserve to provide a market level summary of current meter read performance**

JD surmised that the Performance Assurance Workgroup had been meeting for 3 years, with no modifications on actual issues completed during that time. He believed it would not be right to close down initiatives based on what might or might not come out of the PAC. JD believed it was an aspiration to provide annual reads in as many cases as possible, particularly as this is already a licence requirement, he recognised that some elements may need to be factored in for particular access difficulties. He felt there was headroom to improve current performance highlighting that a recent presentation had suggested some sites have not been read for 5 years despite a licence requirement to do so. He suggested that the industry also needs to consider the impact of the reconciliation line in the sand when considering meter read submission performance.

JD acknowledged in the past with the RbD regime, having annual reads (although this is a license requirement) wasn't necessary for a settlement. However, he stressed that the market is changing (to individual reconciliation) and there is a greater need to minimise the risk to settlement periods by having meter reads regularly submitted. He highlighted other industries wouldn't want to have longer periods (5 years) of reconciliation/settlement.

CW suggested a number of examples of information that would be helpful to the group, such as the current read performance and the impacts on unidentified gas.

KS enquired if the GTs would be attempting to use this to expand the must read process. CW suggested there is potentially a role for the GTs to extend the current scope of the must read process to domestic annually NDM sites as it would be a charging service and may help improve meter read submission performance.

KS concurred that is better to get more reads for accurate settlement. However, she was concerned what the targets may look like and the costs on shippers to procure reads, which are proving difficult to obtain and may require warrants.

SM suggested applying different standards to smart meters and dumb meters, and that there may be a need to factor in some realistic measures for smart meters. It was suggested there should be a stronger standard associated with smart equipment, but for dumb meters where access problems may still exist, a separate performance standard may need to be considered.

## **2.0 Terms of Reference**

The Workgroup considered if this Request was impacted by the faster switching SCR? JD didn't believe at this stage there was an identified impact on the faster switching SCR. However, this may need to be revisited should recommendations start to influence the development of modifications.

The Workgroup considered the draft Terms of Reference (TOR).

AL suggested, that the context of current performance needs to be understood, i.e. what the steer is for change and understanding the scale of the current problem.

SM wanted the Workgroup to consider the cost of improving current performance and also suggested that advance meter reading should be segregated from physical reads.

The TOR was updated.

### 3.0 Initial Discussion

#### 3.1. Initial Representations

None received.

#### 3.2. Issues and Questions from Panel

None raised.

### 4.0 Next Steps

CW hoped to provide some additional information to assist the Workgroup debate in December.

### 5.0 Any Other Business

None.

### 6.0 Diary Planning

Further details of planned meetings are available at: [www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Diary](http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Diary)

Workgroup meetings will take place as follows:

Time / Date	Venue	Workgroup Programme
Tuesday 22 December 2015	Energy Networks Association, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF	Provision of meter read performance information Current Read Performance Must read process Performance targets: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dumb meters</li> <li>• Smart meters</li> </ul> Workgroup Discussion

**Action Table**

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
1101	26/11/15	1.0	Xoserve to provide a market level summary of current meter read performance.	Xoserve (DA)	Pending