

Project Nexus AMR 18 Workgroup Minutes

Tuesday 22 February 2011

at the ENA, 52 Horseferry Road, London.

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office of Gas Transporters
Mike Berrisford (Secretary)	(MiB)	Joint Office of Gas Transporters
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Fiona Cottam	(FC)	Xoserve
Gareth Evans	(GE)	Waters Wye Associates
Jonathan Wisdom	(JW)	npower
Lisa Harris	(LH)	Shell
Martin Brandt	(MB)	SSE
Michael Payley	(MP)	Xoserve
Michele Downes	(MD)	Xoserve
Peter Thompson*	(PT)	Customer Representative
Sean McGoldrick	(SMc)	National Grid NTS
Simon Trivella	(ST)	Wales & West Utilities

* denotes via a teleconference link

1. Introduction

BF welcomed all to the meeting.

1.1 Review of Minutes

In the absence of S Mulliganie, FC questioned what was really meant by the following statement taken from item 2.1.2, Process 1 Flow Chart on page 3, before indicating that she will discuss with SM in due course:

“For clarity, SM added that in his view any reading where he has derived it by the use of a calculation is an estimate and any read he has obtained by any other means is an actual read.”

Referring to the typographical errors mentioned in item 2.1.3, FC had subsequently amended the presentation.

Thereafter, the minutes of the previous meeting were accepted.

1.2 Review of actions

Action AMR029: National Grid Distribution (CW) Investigate the provision of drift related information (DM resynch frequencies and volume data).

Update: CW confirmed that this matter is ‘parked’ for the time being and the action remains for visibility purposes only but could possibly be discussed at the AMR19 meeting on 14/03/11.

Carried Forward

Action AMR033: Shippers to consider any additional read items (based on existing File Formats) for the shipper to GT read communications.

Update: FC explained that this matter would be covered in the various presentations to follow later in this meeting.

Closed

Action AMR035: Shippers to examine their sites where validation failures have taken place and consider if the 'strawman' validation proposals would/could work.

Update: LH confirmed that she had provided a suitable response and a presentation of her finding would follow later in the meeting (please see item 2.1.3 below). In the absence of SM, who had previously advised that Gazprom had commenced analysis of their portfolio (with either a U6 or U16 meter) for the last 12 months it was decided to carry forward this action.

Carried Forward

Action AMR040: Xoserve (MP) to revise the flowchart maps for processes 1 through to 4 in line with comments provided.

Update: MD advised that a presentation incorporating revised process flow maps would be considered later in this meeting (please see item 2.1.2 below).

Closed

Action AMR041: All to consider the options for meter reading validation (information & analysis) and provide suitable feedback.

Update: MD advised that NO responses had been received to date. However, a presentation relating to this matter would follow later in the meeting (please see item 2.1.4 below).

Closed

Action AMR042: Xoserve and EDF Energy (MD/FC/SL) to discuss supplier read issues and ascertain what is required in terms of BRD rule 5.8.

Update: MD advised that this would also be covered in a presentation to follow later in the meeting (please see item 2.1.7 below).

Closed

Action AMR043: Xoserve (MD/FC) to give further consideration to check reads and transfer reads.

Update: MD advised that this would also be covered in a presentation and business rules to follow later in the meeting (please see item 2.1.5 below).

Closed

Action AMR044: Xoserve (MD/FC) to update the Business Rules Document in line with suggested amendments in time for consideration at a future meeting.

Update: MD advised that the BRD had been updated inline with discussions at the previous meeting and would also be covered in a presentation to follow later in the meeting (please see item 2.1.7 below).

Closed

Action AMR045: Gazprom (SM) to obtain a copy of the Codes of Practice 'covering' Drift and provide to the Joint Office for timely publication prior to the next meeting.

Update: BF suggested that in the absence of SM, this action should be deferred until the next meeting.

Carried Forward

2. Scope and Deliverables

Copies 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/220211>.

2.1 Further Consideration of Meter Reading Arrangements

On a more general theme, GE advised those present that he had discussed the reads v's energy issue with his respective contacts, their preference being for a read based solution. At the same time, FC acknowledged that there are potential close-out issues associated with an energy based (Calorific Value (CV)) solution for the SMART world.

2.1.1 PNUNC AMR Topic Workgroup Meeting 18 – Meter Reading presentation

Xoserve (MD), provided a brief overview of the presentation. In looking at the 'Objectives for Today's Meeting' slide, MD advised that all outstanding areas would be covered in the presentation material except Check Read requirements.

Moving on to the 'Questions / Issues Log' slide, everything in red is for discussion at today's meeting, if possible.

2.1.2 AMR Meter Reading Draft To-Be Process Maps v0.6 presentation

xoserve (MP), provided a brief overview of the presentation. Those present discussed the four proposed process maps with the following key points being discussed:

Guide to Process Mapping Symbols

MP provided a brief description of the various symbols, explaining how each is utilised in the following maps. The approach complies with the Business Process Modelling Notation (BPMN) convention, although a recognised standard for production of process flow maps such as these, it is not necessarily utilised in all parts of the energy industry.

Process 1 Flow Chart

Focusing on just the changes undertaken since the last meeting, when asked about step 1.6, FC confirmed that this is really a sense check of the basic information. Whilst MP pointed out that step 1.8 would include a logic check within Xoserve's system.

In considering the notation assigned to step 1.12, MP confirmed that this relates to the last read available at D+5.

Process 2 Flow Chart

When asked why utilise 10:00am as a cut off time, FC advised that not only does this satisfy the interim allocation run requirements but is in response to previous requests for provision of an easy daily balancing solution based around receipt of reads within 24hr which will also continue to support the current NDM processes in the interim period.

When asked if step 2.9 utilises current standard methodology, MP confirmed it does. In considering the narrative feeding into this step, FC confirmed that actual reads could be utilised, however this would need further consideration during the detailed design stages. One option would be to run an estimation process, supplemented by a check for receipt of an actual read which would override the estimated energy. GE indicated that he would support any incentive for shippers that requires them to submit their reads on time, especially as they are the best positioned to do so.

Examining step 2.13, ST enquired as to why have 10:00am on D+1 when a replacement reading is sent within D+5 anyway. FC

responded by advising that once again this provision responds to a request to maintain current DM provisions. Additionally, it provides 'knock on' benefits within the NDM arena by utilising more actual "DM" energy in determining NDM allocations and goes some way towards reducing potential traffic (volume) surges – it should incentivise good behaviours.

Process 3 Flow Chart

Asked if step 3.9 followed the current standard methodology, FC pointed out that the BRD states that it is subject to the allocation process (i.e. profile based). GE wondered if this was not simply a re-estimation of an original estimation to which FC advised that this had been discussed at the last meeting and furthermore, takes reconciliation energy into account.

In revisiting the issue of missing reads and how best to resolve the 'gaps', FC suggested that this really strays into the reconciliation area. She went on to suggest that 'gaps' between the end of one batch submission and the start of the next would / could be difficult to manage.

Process 4 Flow Chart

When asked, FC suggested that the 'Perform Interim Allocation' statement could simply be revised to read as 'Perform Allocation'.

2.1.3 Shell Validation Rules – Analysis of daily consumption data for Project Nexus AMR workgroup presentation

LH provided a brief overview of her presentation. In looking at the first slide, LH suggested that the data possibly suggests that a D-7 solution is crude. When asked if the site sample was typical of Shell's portfolio, LH confirmed it was and was based on a random sample.

In considering the 'Average daily consumption' slide, those present debated whether or not to adopt different business rules for winter and summer – no clear consensus was reached.

Moving on to discuss the thorny issue of validation, ST wondered if, and when, validation becomes a shipper obligation, Xoserve should also build in to their systems a form of back-stop validation. Two key aspects are at play here, namely validation should protect the whole industry including the shippers themselves and also Code obligations should support this. GE suggested that a system that allows parties to NOT pay their invoices should be avoided.

In discussing the setting of appropriate validation tolerances, GE supported an arbitrary figure based solution. JW also suggested utilising a 'hard coded' number linked to SOQs (or EUC banding). However, ST felt this was risky preferring a solution based on a (max) potential consumption figure, especially as the current validation rules are already in Code. In the end, it was agreed that it would be extremely difficult to have a set of rules to cover all eventualities. FC pointed out that the aspiration is to move validation closer to the read provision time which may still need supporting with some form of filter (failure) factor.

ST remarked that any validation rules should seek to allow values outside of the 'normal' validation tolerances (set on energy values) to proceed through, and be processed by the system, when the read is deemed as accurate by the shipper. MD remained concerned about

the potential erroneous values that could still be accepted & processed & picked up by Filter failures.

The debate then jumped to midway through the item 2.1.4 presentation below.

2.1.4 PNUNC AMR Topic Workgroup Meeting 18: Option for Meter Reading Validation presentation

During consideration of the 'Strawman Alternative GT Validations to Replace/Reduce Filter Failures' table some felt that reducing the number of bands maybe beneficial. FC reminded those present that it is not about rejecting reads per se, but rather triggering referral requests to check the accuracy of a read, since Shippers will need to be able to load unusual values if they are correct.

When asked whether or not the whole batch would be rejected where a tolerance for either a single or multiple reads fails validation in process 3, FC responded that Xoserve was looking to gather requirements here and acknowledged that it maybe necessary to utilise separate tolerance checks for each read within a batch.

FC envisages a possible two-stage process for referring erroneous reads back for resolution, but whatever solution is adopted it needs to be realistic and incentivise shippers to react appropriately. GE suggested that the reads should be loaded onto the system regardless (subject to a 'bankruptcy' sense check) and the shipper invoiced accordingly – an incentive in itself surely. ST suggested that any solution should be based on validating the read against the SOQ/AQ rather than on previous consumption (e.g D-7) – not necessarily a unanimous view. Furthermore, ST questioned the value of retaining a manifest errors process. GE remained concerned at this suggestion. FC reminded parties that in the NDM arena there are often + or – large charges on invoices relating to erroneous reads which require adjustments (£ millions) which ultimately cancel each other out.

In attempting to summarise the debate so far, FC wondered if we had not reached a proposed model for Shipper (SOQ based) validation followed by submission to the system, supported by 'flags' where appropriate, to highlight extraordinary reads that could/would fail tolerance checks, ultimately supported by a GT back-stop (AQ based) validation process. Asked if this met with the universal support of those present, JW voiced concern around the GTs utilising an AQ based validation process. In the end it was agreed to examine in more detail the individual banding requirements at the next meeting and Xoserve agreed to take a new action to produce a revised table with fewer bands and displaying kWh's.

2.1.5 PNUNC AMR Topic Workgroup Meeting 18 – Transfer Scenarios presentation

MD provided a brief overview of the presentation, with the following items of interest noted:

Existing Process: Transfer Read's process for Change in Shipper & Regime slide

The information provided is based on concerns raised by EDF Energy (SL) and E.ON (BD) representatives at previous meetings.

In looking at the NDM aspects, the 10 business days refers to 5 days before and 5 after the transfer date (D).

ST advised that with regard to the first bullet in the DME regime (GT estimate generated for the transfer date), this is a known issue that does not affect take up of the DME service.

Existing Change of Shipper Transfer Read Timeline – all Regimes slide

MD apologised, pointing out that the green 'GT estimate where no read rec'd' should really read as 'Close-out D+5' on the example.

Proposals from AMR17 Workgroup slide

When asked, those present indicated that they were happy with these. GE also confirmed that the responsibility lies with the Outgoing Shipper to submit the final read was clearly agreed at the previous meeting.

Issues with current rules? slide

Looking at the first bullet under the 'Options to resolve?' item, GE believes this is onerous and should be the responsibility of the outgoing shipper. FC pointed out that for AMR to NDM transfers this could be an issue.

Scenario for AMR Processes 1 & 2 Change in Shipper, no change in Regime slide

LH wondered if allowing shipper B to submit a read before D+5 would be the preferred option. FC remained concerned about possible 'ping pong' effects if both the outgoing and incoming Shippers could amend the read. GE still felt that the Outgoing Shipper provided read was best.

Scenario for change in Regime (& Shipper) – NDM to AMR slide

When asked if this proposes that AMR equipment is in place at the time of the changeover, FC confirmed it does.

FC voiced her concern surrounding outgoing / incoming reads overlapping and wondered if utilising the incoming shipper's opening read from AMR was the preferred option, especially as this maximises the use of the available technology. MB remained concerned about having different rules for different scenarios.

Concluding, the consensus was to utilise the incoming shipper's read whilst acknowledging that in all cases the 'back stop' position is utilisation of a GT estimated read.

Scenario for Change in Regime & Shipper – AMR to NDM slide

MD believes that an outgoing shipper read works well here because of the technological advantage that AMR provides in this scenario.

In summarising discussions so far, a new action was placed on all parties to consider the issue of utilisation of either the outgoing or incoming Shipper reading for all transfer scenarios in time for further consideration at the next meeting.

2.1.6 PNUNC AMR Topic Workgroup Meeting 18 – Suggestion for Read Communication Content presentation

MD provided a brief overview of the presentation. FC explained that some items had been lifted straight from the current file formats and the BRD will require amending in due course.

Agreed that Shippers should consider for the next meeting.

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

In light of the detailed discussions elsewhere in the meeting, it was agreed to defer consideration of this item.

2.2 Alignment of IRR requirements

Not considered.

2.3 Transitional Arrangements

Not considered.

3. Progress Tracker (workplan)

3.1 Review of progress to date

Parties debated the possible timeline 'tensions' associated with the knock on effect of the continued discussions on the meter reading area. Suggestions for clawing back the lost time included rolling up reconciliation into the Settlement Workgroup discussions. FC highlighted that Resynchronisations were unique to certain classes of AMR equipment and would not be relevant for discussion in the Settlement Workgroup. Another suggestion centred on discussing the settlement aspects of AMR within the Settlement Workgroup – this was not a universally supported view. It was also acknowledged that the various assumptions surrounding the future smart world (and daily metering regime) would be better discussed within the settlement arena. However, the issue of potential AMR/Settlement overlap was also recognised.

Concluding, FC advised that any decision to combine topic workgroups or address issues relating to work area overlaps was really a Project Nexus Workgroup matter which could be discussed at the next scheduled meeting on 14/03/2011. Joint Office (MiB) to ensure that consideration of the possible combining of topic workgroups &/or potential work area overlaps is added to the agenda of the next Project Nexus Workgroup meeting.

4. Workgroup Report

4.1 Preparation of Monthly/Final Report

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

5. Workgroup Process

5.1 Agree actions to be completed ahead of the next meeting

The following new actions were discussed and assigned:

New Action AMR046: Xoserve (FC/MD) to prepare a revised Strawman Alternative GT Validations table with fewer bands and displaying kWh values.

New Action AMR047: All parties to consider the issue of utilisation of either the outgoing or incoming Shipper reading for all transfer scenarios in time for further consideration at the next meeting and read communication content.

New Action AMR048: Joint Office (MiB) to ensure that consideration of the possible combining of topic workgroups &/or potential work area overlaps is added to the agenda of the next Project Nexus Workgroup meeting.

6. Diary Planning

The following meetings are scheduled to take place during Feb/Mar/Apr 2011:

Title	Date	Location
SET2	02/03/2011	NG Office, 31 Homer Road, Solihull.
Workgroup & AMR19	14/03/2011	NG Office, 31 Homer Road, Solihull.
SET3	23/03/2011	NG Office, 31 Homer Road, Solihull.
AMR20	05/04/2011	ENA, 52 Horseferry Road, London.
Workgroup & SET4	19/04/2011	NG Office, 31 Homer Road, Solihull.

7. Any Other Business

None.

Appendix 1

Action Table

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
AMR029	16.11.10	2.1.2	Investigate the provision of drift related information (DM resynch frequencies and volume data).	National Grid Distribution (CW)	Update to be provided in due course. Pending
AMR033	14.01.11	2.1.2	Consider any additional read items (based on existing File Formats) for the shipper to GT read communications.	Shippers	Update provided. Closed
AMR035	14.01.11	2.1.2	Examine their sites where validation failures have taken place and consider if the 'strawman' validation proposals would/could work.	Shippers	Update to be provided in due course. Pending
AMR040	02.02.11	2.1.2	Revise the flowchart maps for processes 1 through to 4 in line with comments provided.	xoserve (MP)	Update provided. Closed
AMR041	02.02.11	2.1.5	Consider the options for meter reading validation (information & analysis) and provide suitable feedback.	All	Update provided. Closed
AMR042	02.02.11	2.1.6	Discuss supplier read issues and ascertain what is required in terms of BRD rule 5.8.	xoserve (MD/FC) & EDF Energy (SL)	Update provided. Closed
AMR043	02.02.11	2.1.6	To give further consideration to check reads and transfer reads.	xoserve (MD/FC)	Update provided. Closed
AMR044	02.02.11	2.1.6	Update the Business Rules Document in line with suggested amendments in time for consideration at a future meeting.	xoserve (MD/FC)	Update provided. Closed
AMR045	02.02.11	2.1.6	Obtain a copy of the Codes of Practice 'covering' Drift and provide to the Joint Office for timely publication prior to the next meeting.	Gazprom (SM)	Update to be provided in due course. Pending
AMR046	22.02.11	2.1.4	Prepare a revised Strawman Alternative GT Validations	Xoserve (FC/MD)	Update to be provided in

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
			table with fewer bands and displaying kWh values.		due course.
AMR047	22.02.11	2.1.5	Consider the issue of utilisation of either the outgoing or incoming Shipper reading for all transfer scenarios in time for further consideration at the next meeting.	All	Update to be provided in due course.
AMR048	22.02.11	3.1	Ensure that consideration of the possible combining of topic workgroups &/or potential work area overlaps is added to the agenda of the next Project Nexus Workgroup meeting.	Joint Office (MiB)	Update to be provided in due course.