

Project Nexus
AMR 11 Workgroup Minutes
Friday 03 September 2010

at the National Grid Office, 31 Homer Road, Solihull

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office of Gas Transporters
Mike Berrisford (Secretary)	(MiB)	Joint Office of Gas Transporters
Alan Raper	(AR)	National Grid Distribution
Brian Durber	(BD)	E.ON UK
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Fiona Cottam	(FC)	xoserve
Graham Wood*	(GW)	Centrica
Hazel Ward	(HW)	RWE npower
Joel Martin*	(JM)	Scotland Gas Networks
Lisa Harris	(LH)	Shell
Mark Knight*	(MK)	Scottish & Southern Energy
Michele Downes	(MD)	xoserve
Mike Payley	(MP)	xoserve
Richard Street	(RS)	Corona
Sean McGoldrick	(SMc)	National Grid NTS
Shirley Wheeler	(SW)	xoserve
Simon Trivella*	(ST)	Wales & West Utilities
Steve Mullinganie	(SM)	Gazprom
Steve Nunnington	(SN)	xoserve

* denotes attended via teleconference link

1. Introduction

BF welcomed all to the meeting.

1.1 Review of Minutes

xoserve (FC) requested the following amendments to the AMR 9 & 10 minutes:

Item 2.3 Record of Identified Issues (Action AMR017) – DME Change of Supplier Transfer Reads.

“FC commented there were issues regarding the process for getting reads in on [D D+1](#); this was currently under discussion at the UK Link Committee, as reported by MB earlier. FC then described some potential options for consideration. MB observed that complications arose when changing status. FC responded that AMR sites would not be switching [between DM & NDM](#), and NDM would not exist in the future; this was building a standard product. MB suggested that the Change of Supplier process needed closer examination to be mindful of the effects/actions in relation to different scenarios.”

Item 2.3 Record of Identified Issues (Action AMR017) – xoserve’s Initial Questions – Reads.

“In response to a question from GE referring to meters which go ‘Round the Clock’ (RTC), FC replied that Shippers will still have the present [through the zeroes](#) issues and have to validate these.”

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: BF explained that the next scheduled GCF meeting is 25/10/10. When asked, members agreed to carry forward the action.

Pending

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 for the rationale behind this action, FC suggested that this relates to the ICoSS presentation provided at the AMR9&10 meeting on 17/08/10 by G Evans. RS added that he believes that this relates specifically to a lack of a reason code when issuing a notification of a resynch. There may be a requirement for a central record of resynch reasons to add with industry reporting.

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

xoserve (FC) provided an overview of the 'Business Requirements Document for AMR Meter Reading – xoserve Project Nexus (v0.3 dated 02/09/10)' document.

Looking at the 'Summary of [4] Meter Reading Processes' on page 4 which have been based on the discussions at the previous meeting, FC suggested that broadly speaking options 1&2 align towards DM, whilst 3&4 align more towards the NDM side of things.

Members went on to review the document, suggesting amendments along the way.

In considering the feasibility of Shippers submitting energy values and the lack of availability of CV data prior to close-out, members indicated that they are happy to advocate elimination of energy (and therefore CV) in this context.

Moving on, GW voiced concern at the possibility of needing separate regimes for Smart and AMR, based upon the type of meter on site. However, SM is of the opinion that he would not wish to be 'constrained' by a technological solution, preferring a common solution wherever possible. In acknowledging GW's points, FC suggested that awaiting clarity surrounding the scope and role of the DCC could potentially impact upon moving the AMR discussions forward.

RS added that he would seek to retain the option to have the ability to choose whether or not his I&C sites, are daily balanced or not. Furthermore, ICoSS has argued that they do not want to be forced (mandated) into utilising the DCC, preferring instead to have the option of using them.

Continuing discussion of the four options, RS noted that whilst options 1&2 are seen as being workable for his company, he believes the provision of

further information surrounding the DCC will enable removal of one or more of the options, although it remains beneficial to retain all four options at this time. SW indicated that she believes that retaining options 3&4 could promote DCC Read Scheduling discussions in due course.

When asked about the difference between options 1&2, FC confirmed that option 2 gives a longer time window for submission of daily readings, removing the 10am deadline. SM remained unconvinced of the benefits of option 2, especially aspects relating to the cost associated with the Transporter providing an estimated read. In response, AR pointed out that option 2 works towards supporting market nomination requirements, in NDM terms. Furthermore, the estimation aspects of option 2 are related to protecting the market and thus ensuring that the initial allocations are in place. RS pointed out that as long as information is provided by D+1, then there are no cost impacts associated to a D+5 position. AR reminded members that whilst the estimates/reads maybe submitted (on time) they may not be processed instantaneously and that really it is also about understanding the D+1 (initial provision) to D+5 (final provision) impacts.

FC suggested that provision of estimated reads by 10:00am will need to be retained, and anticipates that the slightly elevated estimation costs may be offset by process efficiency gains delivering cost benefits.

FC went on to acknowledge that further consideration of the provision of replacement reads (within the D+5 window) will be required in due course (i.e. how many & when). SM suggested that the aim at the end of the day is to achieve a 'balanced approach'. CW reminded members that the current DM regime now includes provision for meter failures and their subsequent replacement. RS voiced concern at the potential costs associated with the need for constant checking of information.

AR noted that care will be needed in setting incentives (on Shippers) that supports a level playing field and incentivises adoption of the correct behaviours. FC highlighted the fact that whilst we will need to consider setting appropriate levels and possible 'must read' triggers, these suggestions are not trying to undermine the ICoSS proposals.

In considering option 3, RS voiced concern that invoicing on a monthly basis could lead to invoices that contain a mix of both estimated and actual read data. FC suggested that parties will need to identify a 'line in the sand figure' at some point. Moving on, RS suggested that a safety check read could be utilised for 'back stop' requirements.

In considering option 4, which is more akin to the current NDM process, FC suggested that the estimation process would need enhancing. Additionally, an election for a change of balancing type will be needed 'ahead of the day'.

In examining item 7 of the document more closely, FC suggested that as this strays into the area of reconciliation, its consideration is less critical at present. RS questioned some of the terminology involved in this section suggesting that distinguishing between (actual) volume and reads requires careful consideration.

In examining item 8, FC acknowledged that this paper may not directly align with previously agreed High Level Principles, especially for allocation. i.e. it could be argued that option 3 'stretches' the high level principles previously agreed, whilst option 4 does not align with them at all. HW suggested that this is not a problem as the H/L principles were only ever a starting point anyway.

Supply Point Enquiry Service Business Rules

In discussion on the BRD, BF made reference to the following email from P Thompson, suggesting that it would be preferable to consider this in more detail once Peter was present. Members agreed to this approach.

“Following the meeting AMR 9 &10 and my outlining of the customer position I subsequently wrote to each of the customer reps who recently attended the GCF.

The purpose of me writing was two fold; 1) to outline what I had further gleaned from the ICOSSE reps and to ensure that, taking into account the further information, the customer reps were still wanting me to portray the sustained position and that they had not changed their view. 2) As I am unable to attend the AMR 11 meeting on Friday 3rd Sept, I felt it important that these thoughts are passed on so that any challenge or attempted change to the business rules in my absence can again be balanced with the customer representative’s current views.

I am pleased to say that the corporate customer reps position still holds and the following are the key points to be re-emphasised:

1) The read / consumption information is the customers and they choose to whom it should be made available.

2) The customer wishes to remain in the driving seat when seeking quotations for energy.

3) As the original read / consumption data is the customers, the customer must be able to obtain all the read / consumption information for the current and previous years without charge and in a uniform format which allows the customer to seek quotations from Suppliers.

4) Customers do not wish to receive unsolicited requests for “Letters of Authority” from Suppliers.

I trust that if necessary these 4 points will be used to restate the position in my absence.

The above points my will also be made in response to the “Ofgem Smart Metering Implementation Programme – Prospectus”.

Many regards and thanks.

Peter Thompson”

When asked, BF agreed to forward a copy to G Evans, of Waters Wye Associates.

Extract from Smart Metering licence amendments

An extract from the Smart Metering licence amendments had been published on the Joint Office website. Briefly discussing the issue of licence changes, LH advised that these relate to AMR ‘wake up’ requirements. However, RS did not think that these should impact upon this workgroup’s deliberations.

2.2 Ratchets & Reconciliation

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

2.3 Market Differentiation

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

2.4 Alignment of IRR Requirements

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

2.5 Transitional Arrangements

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

3. Workgroup Report

3.1 Preparation of Monthly/Final Report

BF 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

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

5. Diary Planning

Members agreed to the arranging of a new AMR WG13 face-to-face meeting on or around Friday 15/10/10, followed by an AMR WG14 possibly on Monday 01/11/10, both at locations to be decided.

Finally, members agreed to a possible combined Workstream and AMR WG15 meeting on Tuesday 16/11/10, again at a location to be decided.

The following meetings are scheduled to take place during September through to November 2010:

Title	Date	Location
AMR WG12	29/09/2010	ENA
Workstream	05/10/2010	Cancelled.
Workstream & AMR WG13	15/10/2010	Location to be decided.
AMR WG14	01/11/2010	Location to be decided.
Workstream & AMR WG15	16/11/2010	Location to be decided.

6. Any Other Business

None.

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)	Pending.
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.