
Project Nexus
AMR 7 Workgroup Minutes
Wednesday 07 July 2010
ENA, 52 Horseferry Road, London

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Anne Jackson	(AJ)	Scottish & Southern Energy
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
Graham Wood	(GW)	British Gas
Jennifer Boraston	(JB)	RWE npower
Lisa Harris	(LH)	Shell Gas Direct
Michele Downes	(MD)	xoserve
Mike Paley	(MP)	xoserve
Richard Street	(RS)	Corona Energy
Sean McGoldrick	(SMG)	National Grid NTS
Shirley Wheeler	(SW)	xoserve
Simon Trivella	(ST)	Wales & West Utilities
Tim Davis (Secretary)	(TD)	Joint Office

* *via teleconference*

1. Review of Minutes & Actions

BF welcomed all to the meeting.

1.1 Review of Minutes

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

1.2 Review of Actions

Action AMR0013: xoserve (SW) to develop requirements for releasing consumption data in support of the Change of Supplier process (in time for the next meeting if possible).

Update: Business Rules had been provided and were discussed (see agenda item 2.1). **Closed**

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). However, it was agreed that further work would be helpful to identify the requirements, as specified in the minutes below. **Carried Forward**

Action AMR0015: Shippers to consider what services, in terms of meter reads, they require from Transporters under Project Nexus and how this impacts the end to end process

Update: Shippers indicated that points would be raised during the discussions.

Closed

2. Scope & Deliverables

2.1 Further Consideration of Meter Reading Arrangements

CW presented views on transporter requirements for meter readings, explaining that the key was meeting UNC obligations, covering settlement processes and meter asset data. He also emphasised that a view from Shippers as to what they wanted would be essential if systems were to meet their aspirations.

AJ asked if what is presently in the UNC is exactly what is required by the Transporters, i.e. Read Frequency etc. CW believed that the current regime is optimal for the current obligations, but accepted AJ's point that the requirements could change in line with any regime change.

BD clarified that the base requirement is energy usage in order to discharge obligations, which CW confirmed. BD drew the distinction with meter readings that, as such, the Transporters do not need.

RS added that the issue had been raised at the last meeting because of the expectation of moving to a new regime and wanting to avoid discovering at the last moment that Transporters need information for different, non-settlement, reasons. CW said that work was ongoing to identify precisely what was needed and for what purposes. RS suggested that, for example, Transporters might only require aggregated figures for energy usage rather than collecting data for individual meter points. He suggested the CVA provides a small-scale example of how aggregation operates, and could be reproduced with the proposed DCC. If the requirements can be specified as before, on and after the day, plus reconciliation, needs, that would help to clarify what needed to be developed. CW was keen to develop a joint solution to meet the Shipper needs rather simply looking at Transporter requirements.

BD questioned what granularity is needed to run the networks. CW suggested Aqs are needed for network purposes, although daily reads were probably not needed to run the network on a daily basis. GW also supported RS's view that the key was identifying if there were any specific Transporter requirements if, for example, settlement was carried out elsewhere or aggregated data was provided – is there an approach that the Transporters could not live with because they need additional data on the demands being made on the network.

ST did not see a position being reached where Transporters did not have a supply point register and meter asset data, since that was fundamental to running a network. However, distinguishing between energy settlement and network balancing, aggregated data was likely to be sufficient for network management purposes, and a means of allocating demand through to supply points was needed for network planning.

CW and ST agreed to return with additional information on their conclusions regarding possible Transporter requirements for non-settlement purposes, although emphasising that this would be a view from a single point in time and could change. CW added that he was very keen to know what Shippers aspirations were since he anticipated that data would be generated and used for settlement purposes and this should be sufficient to meet Transporter requirements provided assurance was available regarding data quality and validation.

FC questioned whether the submission of aggregated data was still on the table as an option. RS clarified that, under the Smart banner, some Suppliers are still arguing that the DCC should offer an aggregation service and any developments should be consistent with whatever emerges from the Smart programme. He was keen to understand the Transporter requirements and consequent implications regarding whichever model was adopted. It was also recognised that substantial definition would also be needed to specify what is meant by aggregation and what the processes would involve.

FC explained that, beyond energy, other data is received which is used to derive energy – such as volume and CV. She felt all options should be kept open as reads, volumes or energy could be provided and any could be made to work.

BD questioned whether new metering approaches and moves to smart grids were expected to change the information needed by the Transporters to continue to manage and plan their networks efficiently. GE suggested that it would be helpful to identify which UNC data is needed to manage and operate the networks – with RS adding that specifying this ahead of, on and after the day would clarify the issues. ST repeated that maintaining a supply point register was needed but the fundamentals of local gas network operation was unlikely to change as a result of smarter meters being installed.

CW said that specifying the Transporter requirements from a physical perspective could be done. However, the settlement requirements would be driven by Shipper aspirations and should be informed by the principles established by the various Nexus groups.

It was agreed that the questions to be addressed were,

What information do Transporters require before the day

What information do Transporters require on the day

What information do Transporters require after the day

What information do Transporters require for reconciliation and billing

For

a) settlement purposes; and

b) network operation purposes.

CW repeated that he wanted to understand Shipper aspirations. RS said that he was not concerned about this but to understand what data he was required to send to whom when. He would hold the data required for his business, but just needed to understand what needed to be sent where, when and how. CW asked what expectations there were for Transporter activity, such as validating whether all parties were providing appropriate, timely and accurate information. BD said he would welcome this comfort, but was not concerned who carried out the role. CW suggested that how to safeguard data accuracy was a key issue and needed to be clear within the UNC regime. GE indicated that the outcome from DECC was a critical next step for the Shippers and would drive the way forward.

MD then ran through the published business rules for the supply point enquiry service that had sought to incorporate the requirements presented by GE at the previous meeting. Points were noted and agreed, and the document was updated on screen during the meeting.

It was agreed that a revised document will be presented for approval at the next meeting.

2.2 Ratchets & Reconciliation

FC ran through the as-is process diagram.

AJ asked what happened to USRVs that remained unresolved after 30 months. FC explained that they would be resolved and re-entered the process diagram as an xoserve responsibility when not resolved by Shippers.

It was confirmed that the ratchet regime is to apply under the DME regime, but that alternative approaches may need to be developed going forward which would operate efficiently across the market as Smart Meters are rolled out. ST indicated that it was likely a proposal to review this, as part of the wider capacity regime, would be raised and taken forward out-with the Nexus considerations.

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

No Project Nexus Workstream is planned prior to the next AMR Workgroup.

4. Workgroup Process

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

It was agreed that the next meeting will continue discussion of the meter reading issues.

5. Diary Planning

The following meetings are scheduled and, while flexibility will be needed, the agreed topics for discussion are indicated below.

Title	Date	Location
AMR 8 (meter read arrangements, ratchets and reconciliation)	20/07/2010	ENA, 52 Horseferry Road, London.
AMR 9 (Market differentiation)	04/08/2010	ENA, 52 Horseferry Road, London.
AMR 10 (Conclusions, draft Modification Proposals)	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
AMR013	22.06.10	2.1	Develop requirements for releasing consumption data in support of the Change of Supplier process (in time for the next meeting if possible).	xoserve (SW)	Complete
AMR014	22.06.10	2.2	Specify the Transporter meter read data requirements going forward	Transporters (All)	Carried forward
AMR015	22.06.10	2.2	Consider what services, in terms of meter reads, Shippers require from Transporters under Project Nexus and how this impacts the end to end process	Shippers	Closed