

Project Nexus
AMR 20 & 21 Workgroup Minutes
Wednesday 04 May 2011

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
Brian Durber	(BD)	E.ON UK
Cesar Coelho	(CC)	Ofgem
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Fiona Cottam	(FC)	Xoserve
Gareth Evans	(GE)	Waters Wye Associates
Graham Wood	(GW)	British Gas
Joanna Ferguson	(JF)	Northern Gas Networks
Jonathan Wisdom	(JW)	RWE npower
Karen Kennedy	(KK)	ScottishPower
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	Shell
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE
Michael Payley	(MP)	Xoserve
Michele Downes	(MD)	Xoserve
Peter Thompson	(PT)	Customer Representative
Robin Johnson	(RJ)	Wingas UK
Sean McGoldrick	(SMc)	National Grid NTS
Simon Trivella	(ST)	Wales & West Utilities
Steve Mullinganie	(SM)	Gazprom

1. Introduction

BF welcomed all to the meeting.

1.1 Review of Minutes

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: BF advised that a copy of the information had been published on the Joint Office web site prior to the meeting. CW advised that the information related to approximately 3258 site visits. Focusing on the 61.05% Pulse issue value, SM suggested that this could be associated with a known fundamental pulse (converter) problem that could be potentially 'skewing' the data. CW agreed to consider the two main parameters (extent & tolerance) and provide feedback at a later date.

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: When asked, Shippers confirmed that no further investigations had taken place. SM enquired if tolerances could be a negative value. In

response, FC indicated that if required, they could be, and that perhaps the group also need to consider retrospective corrections at some point.

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: Some of those present wondered if drift related information would actually be available within the ESTA Code of Practice (CoP), whilst a reference to the Ofgem Meter Reading CoP as a suitable source of information was also provided. It was acknowledged that the group would still need to consider 'drift' and perhaps also resynchronisation in service in due course. FC reminded those present that whilst valuable, this strays into the resynch area and it maybe more beneficial to consider the requirements within that arena.

It was suggested that the group should be looking to develop a set of rules to cover all eventualities, although care will be needed to avoid a solution/rule(s) that may incur significant costs. From a customer perspective, they (the customers) would prefer to have a reconciliation based solution rather than incurring big hits (costs) associated with drift related impacts.

Thereafter, BF advised that SM had provided a link to the (ESTA) Codes of Practice to the Joint Office and this would be published within these minutes. Please refer to: <http://www.esta.org.uk/RESOURCES/ASPCoP/>

Closed

Action AMR049: Xoserve (MP) to revise the Draft To-Be Process maps to reflect the discussions.

Update: Please refer to item 2.1.2 below.

Carried Forward

Action AMR050: Xoserve (MD) to amend the Transfer Scenario presentation in line with the discussions.

Update: BF advised that this information had been provided.

Closed

Action AMR051: Xoserve (FC/MD) to revise the BRD in-line with discussions in time for the next meeting.

Update: BF advised that this information had been provided.

Closed

Action AMR052: Xoserve (FC/MD) to prepare revised daily read table(s) to provide to parties for consideration in time for the next meeting.

Update: BF advised that this information had been provided.

Closed

Action AMR053: All to consider the style and content of the revised daily read table(s), as per AMR052, in time to present their views at the next meeting.

Update: When asked, those present confirmed that no further investigations had taken place.

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/140311>.

2.1 Further Consideration of Meter Reading Arrangements

2.1.1 Proposed Merger of AMR/Settlement Material

Xoserve (FC) provided a brief overview of the presentation and opened discussions by suggesting that it has been acknowledged that merging the two subject areas maybe the best way forward.

Comparison of AMR Meter Reading Processes slide

When thinking about the timings involved, SMC enquired if consideration of the potential impacts of moving to a single European Gas Day had been included, to which FC indicated that they had not at this stage.

Looking at the initial settlement requirements processes, FC suggested that there are some challenges to be addressed.

Additional Items from Settlement Workgroup slide

FC suggested that items such as the smearing arrangements should be considered when developing additional process maps.

In concluding her presentation, FC suggested that this naturally leads on to the assumptions section of the BRD as the next port of call.

2.1.2 Business Requirements Document for Interim Settlement Arrangements for All Gas Meter Points document discussions and review (please note: that discussions on some items was taken out of sequence)

FC opened by explaining that the document presented merges both the previous AMR and Settlement BRD's and areas of discrepancy between the two are highlighted in yellow.

3.5 Assumptions – page 9

Looking at the NDM Allocation processes bullet, debate centred around the definition of 'interim' (dependent upon which of the 4 process options selected) and the need to avoid business rules that could potentially 'morph' over time. Additionally, it was pointed out that the proposed EU Gas Day changes would also need to be considered ie the day commencing at 05.00hrs.

Moving on, ST suggested that moving to a full daily read settlement solution for all sites in future was not a consistent view across all fora at this time. In the end, it was agreed to remove this bullet and add a new goal to 'cover' this matter under item 2.2.2 'Goals' on page 4.

2.2.2 Goals – page 4

Parties debated changing the term 'desire is' with 'may wish', although SM pointed out that he was happy with the wording as presented as he remains concerned that both I&C and domestic views should be fairly represented, especially when ICoSS are seeking to move towards a daily read regime.

GE reminded parties that the 'goals' of this document could now be different to the 'goals' of the project (Nexus).

Before returning to consider 3.5, FC suggested that perhaps trying to develop one all encompassing BRD for all topic areas maybe unrealistic, and looking to agree and sign off on a settlement BRD

before moving on to examine reconciliation maybe the preferable option.

3.5 Assumptions – page 9

Looking at the Shipper obligation to submit reading data bullet, following a brief discussion it was agreed to remove everything after the word 'data'.

In considering if the Gas Transporter charges bullet still applied, FC suggested that this could be seen as reflecting the differing maintenance aspects associated to each of the 4 process options (i.e. low or high maintenance). It was agreed that LSP reconciliation industry benefits could also be added to the statement.

The use of the term 'mandatory' in the DM sites bullet was discussed and its removal agreed.

Moving on to discuss the transitional period bullet, it was agreed to delete this bullet altogether.

FC pointed out that the re-synchronisation bullet would be best removed and placed within the reconciliation BRD which was agreed by those present.

When asked, no further changes were identified for 3.5 before moving on to consider the process diagrams on pages 12 to 14.

Process Flow Map Presentation

Xoserve (MP) provided a brief review of the proposed process maps for options 1 to 4, highlighting that the (merged) processes 3 & 4 would look very similar to the settlement ones previously discussed at various meetings. He went on to remind those present that the main difference between processes 1 & 2 is the generation of an estimate at 10:00am and the replacement of the 10:00am deadline with a 5:59pm one in process 2.

Discussions then refocused on the main BRD.

2.4 Summary of the 4 Meter Reading Processes – page 5

FC pointed out that the issue of nominations would be considered in due course.

Asked what would happen in the event that a party did not nominate, FC referred to paragraph 5.1 on page 16 for more detail before also suggesting that this could potentially invoke scheduling charges.

SMc pointed out that any changes could also impact upon Gemini change management requirements.

2.6 Benefits – page 6

Maybe subject to one-to-one discussions due to confidentiality issues and would need 'beefing up' in due course. BF reminded those present that any identified benefits would need to be demonstrated.

2.9 UNC Process Impacts – page 8

In considering the demand estimation aspects, it was acknowledged that if we are proposing moving to an industry wide unallocated gas regime, this needs enhancing to include items such as what parameters would be utilised.

3.2 Dependencies – page 9

Linked to DM mandatory aspects but requires rewording.

3.3 Risk & Issues – page 9

MD confirmed that these originated from the proposed settlement changes.

3.6 Design Considerations – page 10

It was agreed that the first bullet covering electing AMR sites could be removed along with removal of the reference to 'AMR' in the process 2 bullet.

5.1 Gas Nominations (before the day) – page 16

FC reminded parties that this matter would need further consideration in the future especially the Gemini aspects.

5.5.6 Logic Checks – page 17

Questioning the response file content and whether rejected and accepted read responses should be issued from the 'Logic Checks' and would apply across all (4) processes, a new action was placed against all parties to consider if this was the case.

5.6.3 Valid & Estimated Reads – page 18

Asked if the utilisation of an estimated read (as described in paragraph 5.6.2) was correct, FC pointed out that this provision is retained to avoid closing any design doors.

5.6.6 Valid Readings (actual or estimate) – page 19

As agreed at last meeting.

5.6.10 Notifications from the GT – page 19

Aligns to the new action assigned under 5.5.6 above.

5.7.3 Read Frequencies – page 19

When asked what the impact of opting for a weekly frequency but sending in the weekly data once a fortnight, FC suggested that this has 'system traffic design' issues.

When asked, FC confirmed that fortnightly refers to every two (2) weeks.

5.7.5 Batch Submissions – page 19

MD suggested that this should really be highlighted in yellow, as there are subtle settlement impacts associated with the proposal that estimates could not be submitted and believes that this has standard methodology impacts as well.

Whilst acknowledging that this could boil down to cost differences between batch or single read notifications, parties were happy to leave the statement as-is (regardless of must read obligations).

5.7.14 Calculated Energy for Reconciliation – page 20

FC pointed out that this would need further consideration in due course.

5.8.4 Minimum Read Frequencies – page 21

FC suggested that this links to the current monthly read frequency threshold for dumb world requirements as it aids system planning assumptions.

5.8.7 Notifications from the GT – page 21

Once again this aligns to the new action assigned under 5.5.6 above.

5.10.1 Shipper Transfers – page 22

Remove reference to NDM.

5.10.12 Batch & Periodic Reads – page 23

It was suggested that opening reads may well require separating out from within a batch of reads and that the system may prefer to process batches/individual reads in date order.

5.11.2 Regime Changes – page 23

Makes reference to changes such as from a periodic to daily regime, whilst also highlighting differences in the approaches proposed by both AMR and settlement.

FC pointed out that Xoserve would need to design the system to cater for supply point transfers to satisfy outgoing / incoming shipper obligations.

5.12 Site transfers to or from the NDM regime – page 23

Section would disappear in a whole world approach where NDM no longer exists.

5.13 Read Communication Content

FC reminded parties that the aim is not to define actual detailed file format content, only what type of information would be required.

5.13.1 Information Exchange Items

After a great deal of debate including data items sent to the GT and responses from the GT, it was agreed to place a new action on all parties to consider what items should be included in the information exchange from the Shipper to the GT list and whether they (the various items) apply across all 4 processes.

Discussions on the BRD were concluded at this point (bottom of page 24) due to time constraints and the fact that further read validation analysis is being undertaken at this time.

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

Not considered.

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 AMR054: National Grid Distribution (CW) to consider drift information parameters (extent & tolerance).

New Action AMR055: All parties to consider if a response detailing read acceptance following GT 'logic checks' is required and whether or not this should apply across all 4 proposed processes.

New Action AMR056: All parties to consider what items of data should be included in the information exchange list (passed from Shipper to the GT).

6. Diary Planning

Following a brief discussion on the best way forward, FC suggested, and those present agreed to go ahead with the meetings scheduled for 24/05/11 and 01/06/11 with a view to introducing reconciliation meetings in due course.

When asked, those present requested the adoption of two-day sessions at the same location. These will be arranged and a draft timetable notified shortly with all future meetings being simply referred to as 'Project Nexus Workgroup' meetings.

The following meetings are scheduled to take place during May 2011:

Title	Date	Location
Workgroup & AMR22	24/05/2011	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 and analysis of current data (DM resynch frequencies and volume data).	National Grid Distribution (CW)	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 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 provided. Closed
AMR049	14.03.11	2.1.2	To revise the Draft To-Be Process maps to reflect the discussions and the adoption of the incoming shipper reading.	Xoserve (MP)	Update to be provided in due course. Carried Forward
AMR050	14.03.11	2.1.3	To amend the Transfer Scenario presentation in line with the discussions.	Xoserve (MD)	Update provided. Closed
AMR051	14.03.11	2.1.4	To revise the BRD in-line with discussions in time for the next meeting.	Xoserve (FC/MD)	Update provided. Closed
AMR052	14.03.11	2.1.4	To prepare revised daily read table(s) to provide to parties for consideration in time for the next meeting.	Xoserve (FC/MD)	Update provided. Closed
AMR053	14.03.11	2.1.4	To consider the style and content of the revised daily read table(s), as per AMR052, in time to present their views at the next meeting.	All	Update to be provided in due course. Carried Forward
AMR054	04.05.11	1.2	Consider drift information parameters (extent & tolerance).	National Grid Distribution (CW)	Update to be provided in due course.

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
AMR055	04.05.11	2.1.2	Parties to consider if a response detailing read acceptance following GT 'logic checks' is required and whether or not this should apply across all 4 proposed processes.	All	Update to be provided in due course.
AMR056	04.05.11	2.1.2	Parties to consider what items of data should be included in the information exchange list (passed from Shipper to the GT).	All	Update to be provided in due course.