

Project Nexus
AMR 12 Workgroup Minutes
Wednesday 29 September 2010

at the ENA, 6th Floor, Dean Bradley House, Horseferry Road, London

Attendees

Tim Davis (Chair)	(TD)	Joint Office of Gas Transporters
Mike Berrisford (Secretary)	(MiB)	Joint Office of Gas Transporters
Anne Jackson	(AJ)	SSE
Brian Durber	(BD)	E.ON UK
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
David Harries	(DH)	Total Gas & Power
Fiona Cottam	(FC)	xoserve
Gareth Evans	(GE)	Waters Wye Associates Ltd
Graham Wood	(GW)	Centrica
Joanna Ferguson	(JF)	Northern Gas Networks
Michele Downes	(MD)	xoserve
Mike Payley	(MP)	xoserve
Shirley Wheeler	(SW)	xoserve

Apologies

Joel Martin	Scotland Gas Networks
Peter Thompson	Customer Representative
Simon Trivella	Wales & West Utilities

* denotes attended via teleconference link

1. Introduction

TD welcomed all to the meeting.

1.1 Review of Minutes

E.ON UK (BD) raised a general issue with item 2.1, paragraph 4 on page 2 whereby he indicated that he is unable to support the statement as currently worded, believing that in the longer term, energy submissions (rather than meter readings or volumes) may well be the preferred option because E.ON do not wish to distinguish between Smart and AMR within their systems.

Following discussion, it was agreed that whatever system solution was developed it should be flexible enough to cope eventually with provision of either a meter reading, a volume reading, or an energy reading. However, it was noted that there are potential cost implications relating to the level of system complexity. The final decision would be reviewed once the DCC design in this area is known.

Thereafter, the minutes of the previous meeting were accepted.

1.2 Review of actions

Action AMR018: Joint Office (MiB) to Invite RS & GE to attend the next Gas Customer Forum meeting to present the AMR Supply Point Enquiry Service.

Update: TD explained that the next scheduled GCF meeting is 25/10/10 and members agreed that the action could therefore be closed.

Closed

Action AMR019: All Shippers to provide a view on which party should be tasked with collecting/holding data relating to reasons for resynchs.

Update: When asked, members agreed to carry forward the action until the group talks in more detail about resynchs.

Pending

2. Scope and Deliverables

A copy of the various presentation materials are available to view &/or download from the Joint Office of Gas Transporters web site at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/nexus/030910>.

2.1 Further Consideration of Meter Reading Arrangements

2.1.1 PNUNC AMR Topic Workgroup Meeting 12 – Meter Reading presentation

xoserve (FC), provided a brief overview of the presentation. Members identified the following points of interest:

(please note: that at the same time as these discussions, TD made on screen changes to the appropriate paragraph within the Business Requirements Document)

Business Requirements document slide

In light of the previous discussion on the potential for future energy submissions in item 1.1 above, the first ‘Key changes.....’ sub bullet will require amendment.

When considering the replacement of reads (actual or estimated) frequency, FC pointed out that provision of functionality to enable more than one (replacement) read per day has both system complexity and therefore cost implications along with raising issues relating to maintaining market segmentation. As a consequence, further consideration will be required in due course.

Areas Out of Scope slide

When asked what definition had been utilised for ‘domestic sites’, FC responded by stating that it was taken from the SMIP Prospectus.

SSE (AJ) voiced her concern that current technology appears unable to support the larger domestic meters in the new Smart world. Furthermore, she would be unhappy to support a system solution that included validation for self-excluding domestic sites.

xoserve (SW) suggested that further discussion on these matters could be beneficial, once the DCC definition is clearer.

When asked, members approved the removal of the reference to ‘domestic’ to be replaced by ‘Non AMR’.

2.1.2 Business Requirements Document for AMR Meter Reading document discussions and review

xoserve (FC) provided an overview of the ‘Business Requirements Document for AMR Meter Reading (v0.5 dated 21/09/10)’ document.

When considering the potential impact on ICOSS of any future (draft) modification proposals raised following the work of this group, SW reminded members that the high level principles discussions and outcomes have been acknowledged and considered by the SMIP. CW suggested that any (draft) modification proposals would form the basis of future costing considerations. It was felt that the PNUNC would need to consider how and when such proposals would/could be raised and by whom.

Members continued to discuss various highlighted aspects of the document whilst TD made on-screen changes in response to the

points raised. During the consideration of item 2.1 'Scope', SW advised members that D Speake had provided an email outlining recent AIGT discussions on related matters, as follows:

"I refer to PNAG action 1404-02. This was discussed at a recent meeting of the AIGT (whose membership is all iGT except Fulcrum Pipelines), I can provide the following report of the consensus view expressed at that meeting.

In relation to whether iGTs would be interested in participating in a single gas transporter service and, if so, how it would be funded by IGTs, IGTs did not feel they were currently in a position to answer this question without knowledge of what the benefits and cost to them would be. It was noted that Suppliers would receive many of the benefits from a single gas transporter service and there should therefore be an appropriate sharing of the costs involved.

At the same time, it was acknowledged that it should be an aspiration of the iGTs to be part of a single gas transporter service. After all, no iGT believes that there is any competitive advantage to be gained by running systems that are different. So, this is not a question of whether iGTs believe this is the right thing to do in the medium to long term. In the short term, however, the same uncertainty that smart metering brought to the Nexus project last year continues to make it difficult to commit to Nexus as a final overall solution for iGTs. In addition, most iGTs made the point during the original consultation that we would expect any service provision to be decided by competitive tender.

But we do understand that a number of elements have been identified that are not impacted by the smart metering industry developments. We also understand that there is a strong pull from suppliers to see no distinction in process and service provider between iGT and DN supply points. iGTs do not disagree with this, and would also expect that including iGTs in those Nexus processes that are under development should be the least cost solution to industry. Whilst transporters may currently 'own' these processes, it is clear that shippers are driving requirements, and we can't ignore this fact. A shipper requirement for full inclusion of iGTs must be given as serious consideration as any other specification they make.

For my own part, and as a way forward, I propose iGTs taking a closer look at the processes identified by Nexus as unaffected by smart metering (and so not 'parked'), then scheduling a discussion with shippers around how or indeed whether any of this development work ongoing under UNC governance would be affected by the assumed inclusion of iGTs. I will be raising this as an agenda item at a shipper-iGT operational workgroup next month and will be happy to report back to subsequent PNAG. There is certainly further engagement that can be undertaken without being tripped up by discussion of who pays. Hopefully, working with shippers, we'll be able to arrive at a sensible engagement plan and/or a final view on iGT inclusion in Nexus."

In considering the adoption of a designated sites based option within process 1 (paragraph 5.1.1), TD warned that the Authority may view this approach as being somewhat discriminatory. In considering retaining the AQ threshold reference (>58.6m kWh), members agreed to keep this and supplement the statement by inclusion of the

option for DNs or Shippers to elect which additional sites should be included.

FC confirmed the source of the statistics provided in the following paragraphs as being:-

- 5.1.11 are a direct 'lift' from the current UNC rules (M5.2);
- 5.2.13 are a direct 'lift' from the existing 'must reads' (M3.6);
- 5.3.17 are 'lifted' out of the current 'must reads' rules;
- 5.3.19 are 'lifted' from UNC rules (M3.4), and
- 5.4.15 are 'lifted' from the current 'must reads' rules.

It was also agreed to make the following changes to the document:

- 3.5 – additional assumption that these requirements are dependent on DM Unbundling;
- 5.8 – additional requirement to validate the identity of a submitting party to ensure that they are authorised to submit a read for site;
- 5.1.8 – maximum number of read replacements is 24 per day up to D+5 for process 1;
- 5.2.9 – maximum number of read replacements is 24 per day up to D+5 for process 2;
- 5.2.13 – target of 90% actual reads per day for process 2;
- 5.3.5 – add fortnightly as an available read frequency for process 3
- 5.3.17 – must reads after 4 months for all process 3 sites, and
- 5.4.5 – add quarterly as an available read frequency for process 4.

In concluding discussions, FC agreed to take an action to revise the document in light of the various points raised and discussed in time for the timely publication (on the JO web site) prior to the next AMR WG meeting scheduled for 15/10/10.

Action AMR020: xoserve (FC) to prepare a revised Business Requirements Document for AMR Meter Reading document in time for the timely publication prior to the AMR13 meeting.

2.2 Ratchets & Reconciliation

TD advised that this item is to be discussed in due course.

2.3 Market Differentiation

TD advised that this item is to be discussed in due course.

2.4 Alignment of IRR Requirements

TD advised that this item is to be discussed in due course.

2.5 Transitional Arrangements

TD advised that this item is to be discussed in due course.

3. Workgroup Report

3.1 Preparation of Monthly/Final Report

TD advised that he would provide a verbal report in due course.

4. Workgroup Process

4.1 Agree actions to be completed ahead of the next meeting

TD provided a brief summary of the action items, as follows:

AMR019 – still pending, and

New AMR020 – update required at 15/10/10 meeting.

5. Diary Planning

The following meetings are scheduled to take place during October and November 2010:

Title	Date	Location
Workstream	05/10/2010	Cancelled.
Workstream & AMR WG13	15/10/2010	The Holiday Inn, Solihull.
AMR WG14	01/11/2010	National Grid, 31 Homer Road, Solihull.
Workstream & AMR WG15	16/11/2010	National Grid, 31 Homer Road, Solihull.

6. Any Other Business

Retirement Announcement

S Wheeler announced that she would be retiring and that this meeting would be her last before handing over the reins to her xoserve colleague, F Cottam. Members thanked Shirley for all her hard work and contributions to date.

Appendix 1

Action Table

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
AMR018	17.08.10	2.1	Invite RS & GE to attend the next Gas Customer Forum meeting to present the AMR Supply Point Enquiry Service.	Joint Office (MiB)	Update provided. Closed
AMR019	17.08.10	2.1	Shippers to provide a view on which party should be tasked with collecting/holding data relating to reasons for resynchs.	All Shippers	Pending.
AMR020	29.09.10	2.1	Prepare a revised Business Requirements Document for AMR Meter Reading document in time for the timely publication prior to the AMR13 meeting.	xoserve (FC)	Update due at 15/10/10 meeting.