

UNC Workgroup 0576 Minutes
Generation of an estimated Meter Reading at the Code Cut Off
Date in the absence of an actual Meter Reading
Tuesday 12 April 2016
31 Homer Road, Solihull, B91 3LT

Attendees

Les Jenkins (Chair)	(LG)	Joint Office
Helen Cuin (Secretary)	(HCu)	Joint Office
Andy Clasper	(AC)	National Grid Distribution
Brendan Cooper*	(BC)	Engie
Chris Warner	(CWA)	National Grid Distribution
David Addison	(DA)	Xoserve
Ed Hunter	(EH)	RWE npower
Emma Lyndon	(EL)	Xoserve
Fiona Cottam	(FC)	Xoserve
Huw Comerford	(HCo)	Utilita
Jon Dixon*	(JD)	Ofgem
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	DONG Energy
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE
Michele Downes	(MD)	Xoserve
Paul Carmen*	(PC)	Scottish Power
Phil Lucas	(PL)	National Grid NTS
Rachel Duke*	(RD)	EDF Energy
Rob Cameron-Higgs	(RCH)	Good Energy
Steve Mulinganie*	(SM)	Gazprom
Sue Cropper	(SC)	British Gas
Sue Hillbourne*	(SH)	Scotia Gas Networks

*via teleconference

Copies of all papers are available at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0576/120416>

The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 19 May 2016.

1.0 Outline of Modification

AC confirmed that the modification had been proposed to provide the Transporters with the ability to create an estimated meter reading where no meter reading has been received within the previous seven years. DA explained there is a population of meter points where a meter reading has not been provided for a considerable amount of time and there are around 46,000 meter points at present that need to be considered.

DA provided the background to the debate that this modification introduces a transitional and enduring change and there was challenge on whether the transition issue should be addressed separately to the enduring arrangements. CWA suggested the Workgroup ought to consider what the justification would be for splitting the modification into a transitional and enduring solution.

SC enquired for the enduring part, what was needed on an ongoing to enable sites to reconcile, and what the difference was on current LSP and futures. DA confirmed the need to insert an estimate to allow reconciliation. He explained the data archiving

approach on the old UK Link LSP systems and that the new environment changes the archiving approach.

It was proposed the estimated read would be inserted at “the line of the sand date” that is the prevailing Project Nexus Implementation date i.e. 01 April 2013. Each year when there is a need to apply a code cut off date a reading will need to be inserted. DA explained that the use of the code cut off date allows parties to replace the read up until the next code cut off date.

CWa believed that the legal text would help tease out the clarity around the enduring solution with a one off arrangement for the first year of implementation where the transition will be based upon the Project Nexus Implementation date.

FC provided a presentation to explain the options for calculating estimates, these were:

Option 1: Current NDM Read Estimation UNC H2.2.2;

Option 2: Future NDM Read Estimation from Project Nexus Implementation (revised UNC H2.2.1);

Alternative Approach 1: Where available use the next UK Link read and apportion the difference between reads using a Weather Adjusted Annual Load Profile (WAALP) which mirrors demand estimation; and

Alternative Approach 2: Where no later read visible in UK Link, check for later Shipper reads submitted in the AQ amendment window (however this may not be available in all scenarios).

SC suggested Alternative Approach 2 should be used first followed by other options. BC agreed that where reads are available these options ought to be considered first followed by the options where reads are not available in succession.

The Xoserve recommendation was to first use Alternative Approach 1 (using core UK Link data), followed by Alternative Approach 2 (using reads sourced from non UK Link systems ie. AQ readings), then use the estimation routines for calculating an estimate from the last available read, and as a last resort where there is no read history insert a zero read.

The Workgroup expressed a preference for using Alternative Approach 2 as the primary method as the reads used for calculating the AQ would be valid reads and potentially closer together to those available in Alternative Approach 1. MD explained that there maybe some mismatch in the UK Link system asset data when using AQ calculation reads.

LL asked if parties could have some time to consider the options.

SC enquired what the Shipper notification process would be for estimated reads to ensure Shippers are provided with an opportunity to submit a replacement read. DA suggested the read estimation notification process could be used and that the loading of the read would trigger a notification to the Shipper.

MJ asked about the weather correction variable changes which take place every 5 years and that some estimates may span over two weather correction periods. It was agreed to make this clear within the modification or Report as appropriate.

SC suggested that the modification should be explicitly clear that if the Transporter provides a read Shippers can replace these reads.

DA explained there is a need to assess whether the Shipper re-confirmation scenario fits into Modification 0576 or if a separate modification would be required. He explained Modification 0576 deals with the “line in the sand” but there is a distinct scenario for re-confirmations and whether all missing meter reads should be included within scope.

It was asked if Shipper Agreed reads could be used within the process. DA explained that reconfirmations would ultimately be undertaken by the same Shipper and in effect the

Shipper Agreed read would be an agreement with the same party. He explained that there might not be an actual reading available on the exact date.

SC confirmed that Shippers cannot submit estimated reads. It was clarified that Shippers will not be able to replace an estimate with another estimate it can only be replaced with an actual read. It was recognised the possibility of having an actual read within the read window would be very slim but must be accounted for.

SC asked about the validation of Transporter reads, highlighting that during the transition and go live period there will be no AQ review period to validate reads.

RD enquired if the modification would apply to all meter points. It was confirmed this would apply to all meter points including iGTs post go live, regardless of the AQ on the meter points.

The Workgroup considered the significance of the modification and whether this modification could be considered as self-governance or not. EH suggested the Workgroup would need a clear understanding of the number of meter points involved before it could be considered significant or not. LJ suggested some broad-brush considerations could be made in terms of through-put. EL explained, as there is an opportunity to submit reads the initial estimate of 46,000 meter points could significantly reduce.

Summarising, LJ believed that the way the solution was explained only propagated the question about a two-stage process. From today's discussions it appeared that it was in fact a single process with special treatment for the kick-off point. An amended modification, also picking up the other points discussed and with a wider scope than initially thought, would be required. AC agreed that he would take this away.

2.0 Initial Discussion

2.1. Initial Representations

None received.

2.2. Issues and Questions from Panel

The Workgroup had been asked to consider whether the transition issue should be addressed separately to the enduring arrangements. See item 1.0.

3.0 Next Steps

The intention will be to conclude the Workgroup Report at the next meeting.

4.0 Any Other Business

None.

5.0 Diary Planning

Further details of planned meetings are available at: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Diary

Workgroup meetings will take place as follows:

Time / Date	Venue	Workgroup Programme
10:30 Tuesday 10 May 2016	31 Homer Road, Solihull, B91 3LT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amended Modification • Consideration of Text and Text commentary • Conclusion of Workgroup Report