

**UNC Workgroup 0430 Minutes**  
**Inclusion of data items relevant to smart metering into existing**  
**industry systems**  
**Friday 12 October 2012**  
**31 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3LT**

**Attendees**

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office of Gas Transporters
Lorna Dupont (Secretary)	(LD)	Joint Office of Gas Transporters
Adam Pearce	(AP)	ES Pipelines
Ashley Collins	(AC)	EDF Energy
Colette Baldwin	(CB)	E.ON UK
Dave Bowles	(DB)	Fulcrum
David Speake	(DS)	British Gas
Gethyn Howard	(GH)	Inexus
Jenny Rawlinson	(JR)	GTC
Joanna Ferguson	(JF)	Northern Gas Networks
Lisa Wong	(LW)	ES Pipelines
Mark Pitchford	(MP)	RWE npower
Mike Jones	(MJ)	SSE
Simon Parkinson*	(SP)	ScottishPower
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	Gazprom
Steve Nunnington	(SN)	Xoserve
Trevor Peacock	(TP)	Fulcrum

\*via teleconference

Copies of all papers are available at: [www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0430/121012](http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0430/121012)

**1. Review of Minutes and Actions from previous meeting**

**1.1. Minutes**

The minutes of the previous meeting (05 September 2012) were accepted.

**1.2. Actions**

**002:** JF to request a DCS at the next UNC Modification Panel.

**Update:** The Panel will request at an appropriate point; Xoserve is working on this.  
**Closed**

**003:** Transporters to request a Change Order and Xoserve to commence the DCA.

**Update:** SN confirmed that Xoserve had commenced work. **Closed**

**2. UNC0430 and iGT047 Solution Discussion**

*UNC Modification 0430 – DCA Timeline and ROM Overview*

SN gave a presentation covering the DCA timeline and explained progress made so far and what still needed to be done. The foundation stage required three data items – one is new, the other two are already within the enduring solution. Two ROMs had been

raised and were available to view on the Joint Office website at: [www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0430](http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0430), and had also been issued to SWIG foundation team members. It was noted that early delivery of the foundation stage was required as soon as possible because of certain obligations that some parties must fulfil in respect of effective switching. Although Modification 0430 delivers for the enduring solution, it may be possible to include a transitional element to cover an early delivery phase.

Responding to questions regarding delivery timescales and costs, SN replied that for delivery the lowest estimate was 22 – 38 weeks, with an upper limit of 59 weeks; the lowest estimate for costs was £42,700, with an upper limit of £282k. SN reiterated the need to deliver something in the interim reasonably quickly and cheaply. The analysis currently being performed will also be valid for the enduring solution, and is likely to take between 3 and 6 months. This will be shared when available.

SM expressed concern regarding the pricing elements and potential apportionment of any User Pays elements in respect of parties that may have no involvement in the foundation phase, and believed this required very careful consideration. Rather than produce another modification SM suggested clearly separating out the costs. JF noted this.

There was a brief discussion on the need to progress iGT047 in parallel, and the collection and management of data through a central registration database. It was suggested that it might be collected and put on SCOGES but this might not provide the best solution, which might be more clearly indicated by the analysis.

SN reiterated the three specified data items and how to approach obtaining and providing these, the block release of data, and potential data protection issues were briefly discussed. JF confirmed that an MDD change has been prepared and was 2 digits long. AC suggested that a SPAA change might be required rather than a 'fast track', however others disagreed with this view and JF was also convinced that it could be raised as a 'fast track'.

SN pointed out that both ROMs were subject to change. There was a brief discussion on what was to be provided, derived and retained (eg Supplier ID), and various flows, and who might be permitted access to the information. All the relevant Suppliers will be required to provide a single contact number; Electralink would be developing this. SP believed that a request for this information had already been issued.

The outline ROM Solution (enduring) assumptions and improved functions were then described. Unique Sites will not be included. It was intended to gather iGT information as well as GT information and send through to DCC, in addition a methodology needs to be developed that requires the iGT information to be passed to Xoserve. SN commented that the significant re-design of Xoserve's interface should mean that it will be easier to define and introduce new industry roles in the future, eg reusability of files in RGMA flows (SMSO in the file flows), to keep costs down.

SN then explained the ROM Analysis. Implementation timescales were estimated to be between 54 and 62 weeks. It was noted that an additional piece of analysis would be required once the DCC has been appointed. The DCC Gateway solution has not yet been defined – it may be the I'X or DTN, or something else (no costs yet as it depends on what route is decided). It is assumed that there will be new flows for data collection. Information which is communicated to the industry as part of CoS will be in new record types within existing flows, ie this will use the current structure but attaché 'child' files. The meter mech code to be utilised was described, and new values will be utilised to capture the meter tech spec (eg ADM, SMETS1, SMETS2 and SMETS3, with the ability to go up to SMETS9). Short versions of the tech spec codes are required due to field size limitations.

Data Item Issues – Details of what would be provided under particular data items were clarified.

- MPRN - This was critical and key to everything
- Supplier – Work needs to be done to sort this out to a satisfactory level
- Supplier EFD – There will be a requirement to pick up these 3 ways of changing Supplier; discussions were currently taking place at the UK Link Committee (UKLC). SN observed that the SUN file was not a very popular method for changing Supplier and was probably surplus to requirements.
- MAM ID and EFD – It was observed that DECC was very keen that a history be developed for these items. DECC's rationale was questioned by SP and MP and it was suggested that clarification should be sought as to why DECC considered it to be necessary. SM believed it might be because the customer might need to get access to their history.
- SMSO and EFD – SN indicated there were many questions around SMSO – who maintains the list, how is it to be validated, will it be registered with SPAA?
- DCC Service Flag – The DCC will be the only entity that can update this flag - DECC is adamant about this even though it means a third party entering Xoserve's systems to do this. Xoserve have a couple of challenges/concerns awaiting response.
- IHD Install Status – This will be held as an attribute of the premise rather than the meter point. There were security issues around IHD. SP observed that the DECC inventory and what has been included has been debated for some time. SN indicated that DECC had been contacted and a definitive list obtained and included in the ROM; the security issue had yet to be resolved but items have been included. SP reiterated that visibility on DECC's decisions was critical and how these might impact the position needs to be understood, as we do not want to have to reverse anything at a later date. SN had asked DECC to sign off a list and will share this with the group once it had been received back. JF confirmed that the modification had been revised to capture the requirements and would proceed on this basis; any new data items would occasion the raising of a new modification. SP observed there had been much discussion about how security trust models are going to work and impacts across access controls and how these will work; there was a need to understand these will be consistent, and to clarify and confirm that data for access control purposes is required for all security models. It was suggested that the security side and the business process side required consideration in tandem to make sure it all fits together. SN was waiting for DECC to confirm it has resolved the security issues;
- UPRN - The cost would double if a fully validated service was required, and Shippers would have to incur significant costs to have it embedded in systems. (This was discussed at SWIG.)

SN asked how many data items do parties want to know and when, ie should it be before ownership of the site is picked up (before D-7) – this might be easiest? MP believed that the foundation change was satisfying the majority of requirements. JF concluded it could be done at D-7.

Cost Factors were considered, with SN confirming what was not included, and indicating where further work or clarity was required. Responding to questions on increased volumes of Meter asset updates and Meter Read submissions and how these might be dealt with, SN indicated that an internal impact assessment and modelling on Xoserve's systems would be carried out. A UK Link replacement system was planned for 2015. The current Meter Read submissions rate will be maintained until Nexus comes in. It was noted that some asset data currently on the system was 'not of the best quality' and this may contribute to rejections when meter exchange data is submitted.

At the conclusion of the presentation SN reiterated that the ROM does not include any changes to iGT systems, or Supplier or Shipper costs.

*UNC Modification 0430 – General Discussion*

A draft, revised modification had been provided for discussion and JF explained the changes made.

*Section 3 Solution* - Data items had been clarified and a new Table had been included to clarify data transfer from between parties. JF indicated she would be happy to include information from an iGT's perspective and it was suggested that an additional pair of columns could be included in the table.

JF and SN confirmed that SWIG and legacy documentation had been considered.

*Section 5 Impacts and Costs - User Pays* – There was a brief discussion on how the split might be better clarified. SM offered to send some information to JF to assist in achieving greater clarity.

The modification will be revised to reflect the discussions and the legal text will be prepared.

It was suggested that in the meantime all parties should review the ROMs and provide feedback on the options as soon as possible to JF and SN.

**Action 004: Review the ROMs and provide feedback on the options as soon as possible to the Proposer (JF) and Xoserve (SN).**

GH asked if the foundation stage would provide one implementation phase to include all data items. JF responded that iGT data might not be fully populated until the enduring phase is reached. Ofgem was driving the foundation stage, and it was suggested that JR should write to Ofgem (with a cc to DECC) to clarify. There were obligations on parties to make the foundation stage work and DS suggested that it might be worth getting a Supplier view on the impacts of not having data available. GH suggested that conditional fields might be an option – JR might need to consider this in the iGT modification/text.

Responding to a question from JR, JF confirmed she had discussed the changes proposed with DECC and had received the impression that foundation data was less of an issue for a variety of reasons. It was noted that iGTs may be a small category but this could still have significant impacts on businesses. It was vital not to be caught out by a raft of changes and inconsistencies.

AC asked if all the extensions could be provided in one go, and populate only what is needed at the time. JF believed that analysis would be required to understand what the impact(s) of providing new fields might be.

#### *Modification 0430 Workgroup Report*

BF reminded the Workgroup that its report was due for submission to the November UNC Modification Panel.

To accommodate publication and consideration of the revised modification it was agreed that that a month's extension should be requested, with the intention of finalising the Workgroup Report at the next meeting (19 November 2012).

#### *iGT047*

JF confirmed that she would continue to liaise with JR in respect of the progress of iGT047. JR will replicate the changes made to UNC Modification 0430.

#### *Other considerations*

AC reported that Modification 0430 was under discussion at UKLC. SM observed that parties needed to be kept aware of any decisions at UKLC to understand any commercial impacts. Depending on the solution it will be either UKLC or SPAA who consider implementation and any associated impacts. JF indicated that she was happy to report back on any developments from UKLC, and that Distribution Workgroup and the iGT Workgroup will be kept abreast of each other's progress.

**3. Terms of Reference**

BF explained the Terms of Reference (ToR) from a UNC Modification perspective. AP and JR confirmed that iGT Modification 047 will be closely aligned to follow the revisions made to Modification 0430.

**4. Any Other Business**

None raised.

**5. Diary Planning for Review Group**

Further details of planned meetings are available at: [www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Diary](http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Diary)

The next meeting will take place on Monday 19 November 2012, starting at 10:00, at 31 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3LT

**Action Table**

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
002	23/08/12	2	Request a DCS at the next UNC Modification Panel.	Northern Gas Networks (JF)	Closed
003	05/09/12	2	Transporters to request a Change Order and Xoserve commence the DCA.	Transporters and Xoserve	Closed
004	12/10/12	2	Review the ROMs and provide feedback on the options as soon as possible to the Proposer (JF) and Xoserve (SN).	ALL Parties	Provide feedback ASAP