

Project Nexus
AMR 6 Workgroup Minutes
Tuesday 22 June 2010
ENA, 52 Horseferry Road, London

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Anne Jackson	(AJ)	Scottish & Southern Energy
Bali Dohel	(BD)	Scotia Gas Networks
Brian Durber	(BD)	E.ON UK
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Fiona Cottam	(FC)	xoserve
Gareth Evans	(GE)	Waters Wye
Graham Wood	(GW)	British Gas
Lisa Harris	(LH)	Shell Gas Direct
Michele Downes	(MD)	xoserve
Sean McGoldrick*	(SMG)	National Grid NTS
Shirley Wheeler	(SW)	xoserve
Simon Trivella*	(ST)	Wales & West Utilities
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

It was noted that Fiona Cottam was present at the 09 June 2010 meeting.

BD noted that the minutes suggested both physical and remote readings would be accepted as check reads and it was agreed that Page 4 New Process Map for DME, paragraph 4 should be corrected to "During further discussion, MD confirmed that check reads need to be physical reads". The minutes of the meeting were then accepted.

1.2 Review of Actions

Action AMR010: Waters Wye (GE) to define data items that could usefully be available at the enquiry stage, together with a view on audit arrangements.

Update: GE presented a view during the meeting.

Closed

Action AMR0011: xoserve (SW) to investigate whether or not, P&S readings constitute an inspection reading and report back in due course.

Update: MD reported that P&S readings would not satisfy the requirements for an inspection reading.

Closed

Action AMR0012: xoserve (FC) to investigate if there was any validation of the closing v's opening (DME) consumptions and report back in due course.

Update: FC confirmed the reads are validated to ensure the closing read is the next day's opening read. **Closed**

2. Scope & Deliverables

2.1 Change of Supplier Process Considerations

GE presented an ICOSS view on possibilities for enhancing the SPA enquiry process in support of the change of supplier process.

GE suggested that the key issue for ICOSS members was obtaining information that enabled them to assess the impact on their portfolio of taking on a site – especially the peakiness of demand. SN asked whether providing consumption over a period would suffice. GE indicated that, if a profile could not be provided, daily reads would be needed in order to identify the profile of a site and assess what drives demand variations – for example, the degree of weather sensitivity. This information would be available to the incumbent and providing the equivalent to the market was the ambition.

GE indicated that, given the likely costs, his initial preference was for consumption history rather than profile information to be provided, although he was relaxed about the mechanism by which the information was delivered. He believed this would provide access to information that already existed and is held by xoserve, which was why it was assumed to be available at lower cost than a profile.

CW questioned whether this should be a Nexus requirement or could be progressed separately; bearing in mind that Proposal 0279 was looking to introduce a similar principle. GE suggested the issues were around systems developments to add functionality, such as confirming warrants that the information was being collected to support quoting for a specific site at the customer's request. He also felt the data quantities could be significant. However, if a solution could be progressed earlier at reasonable cost, he would welcome that.

AJ added that 0279 was more of a sledgehammer approach, whereas GE was looking for a more targeted approach to data release. AJ then asked if there was an alternative - to oblige Shippers (Suppliers) to provide information to customers and then customers would have the opportunity and, presumably, incentive to release information. GE could see this working for the larger sites, but was concerned it may be more problematic for smaller customers who would not be expected to undertake a formal tender. While accepting this, AJ raised a concern about timing when all Shippers sought the same information at the same time – ie September and April when most contracts were renegotiated. BD added that the electricity market provided an example of an approach whereby it was accepted that customers hold half hourly data that they can provide to potential Suppliers. The gas market may well develop similarly with customers demanding that they receive all available data about their own consumption from their current Supplier which they could then share as they saw fit.

GW questioned which sites GE was envisaged would be covered - was it AMR sites or the wider Smart Metering market. GE indicated that, ideally, the service would apply to all I&C sites. However, his immediate focus was on AMR, consistent with the Group's remit.

SW suggested that, to be able to cost this requirement, an indication of likely demand would be helpful. GE suggested that every I&C site with

AMR equipment would be quoted each year by, say, five Shippers. This would be the current level of demand, although GW emphasised this could be much higher with the roll out of AMR. It was also recognised that use of the service would be peaky rather than quotes being sought evenly across the year.

FC suggested consideration be given as to whether it was the symptom or the cause that was being addressed – i.e. was it customers unwilling to provide data that was the issue and, if so, did it need addressing through Nexus? AJ explained that some customers were well organised but others not and it could not be assumed that all would provide information. BD suggested that the question might be whether the market is working in support of competition or not and, if not, the UNC provided a means of supporting competition. GE argued that, subject to clear controls, universal access to consistent data was important to create a level playing field with no advantage for the incumbent through access to historic consumption.

It was agreed that xoserve should work the requirement into business rules that could subsequently be costed. Initially this would be based on the consumption approach, with profiles to be revisited as an alternative if necessary.

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).

2.2 Meter Reading Arrangements & Processes

FC ran through the process diagram, explaining the changes made since the previous meeting.

For DM Reads, FC agreed to clarify the timings and data flows for provision of reads to control centres, which ST said was hourly reads, provided every four hours.

FC indicated that a number of points had been raised on the existing process surrounding NDM reads at the time of change of supplier. It was agreed that xoserve would provide, for publication with these minutes, a post meeting note addressing the queries and confirming the existing arrangements.

SW sought confirmation that the Workgroup approach adopted of providing process maps for the existing arrangements was working effectively, and all confirmed that these were very useful and welcome.

Having baselined the existing process, FC said the next step would be to incorporate potential process changes into the diagrams to move towards identifying Project Nexus requirements. Views were invited on which process to consider initially. GW cautioned against establishing AMR rules which in reality could apply to all technologies – which was accepted. It was also recognised that any conversion of principles into requirements should bear in mind wider DCC developments. AJ and CW suggested looking at who needs the data, and for what purpose, as a necessary starting point.

The Transporters were asked to specify their meter read data requirements going forward, which CW believed would be well worth looking at and he would be happy to provide thoughts for the next meeting.

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

SW requested that the Shippers consider what they saw as Transporter requirements from a new system for the provision and retention of meter reads – what is it important for Transporters to manage. GE was not clear this should be considered in an AMR context.

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**

It was hoped that this should generate some principles that could be developed and built on towards defining requirements across the market but specifically identifying AMR requirements and how this impacts the end to end process.

2.3 Meter Read Replacements - Erroneous Actual Reads

It was agreed to revisit this issue once wider meter read requirements have been specified. GE clarified that the issue related to when it was discovered, before D+5 closeout, that an error had occurred in a meter read and the suggested requirement was to provide some flexibility to replace erroneous reads.

2.4 Alignment of IRR Requirements

SW suggested 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

It was agreed that BF provide a verbal update at the Project Nexus Workstream.

4. Workgroup Process

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

Views on future meter reading arrangements are to be presented at the next meeting.

5. Diary Planning

SW raised plans for meetings going forward, being conscious of the changed approach discussed during the meeting for identifying meter read requirements. This was likely to mean the booked AMR meetings extending beyond the planned 17 August end date. It was agreed that 7 and 29 September be pencilled in as AMR meeting dates.

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

Title	Date	Location
AMR 7 (meter read arrangements, ratchets and reconciliation)	07/07/2010	ENA, 52 Horseferry Road, London.

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
AMR010	12.05.10	2.1	Define data items that could usefully be available at the enquiry stage, together with a view on audit arrangements.	Waters Wye (GE)	Complete. Closed
AMR011	09.06.10	2.2	Investigate whether or not, P&S readings constitute an inspection reading and report back in due course.	xoserve (SW)	Complete. Closed
AMR012	09.06.10	2.2	Investigate if there was any validation of the closing v's opening (DME) consumptions and report back in due course.	xoserve (FC)	Complete. Closed
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)	Update due on 7 July
AMR014	22.06.10	2.2	Specify the Transporter meter read data requirements going forward	Transporters (CW)	To be presented on 7 July
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	For discussion on 7 July