

## UNC Workgroup 0526 Minutes Identification of Supply Meter Point pressure tier

**Tuesday 22 December 2015**

**Energy Networks Association, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF**

### Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Lorna Dupont (Secretary)	(LD)	Joint Office
Andrew Margan*	(AM)	British Gas
Andy Clasper	(AC)	National Grid Distribution
Anne Jackson	(AJ)	SSE
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Colette Baldwin*	(CB)	E.ON UK
David Addison*	(DA)	Xoserve
David Mitchell	(DM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Fraser Mathieson	(FM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Hilary Chapman	(HC)	Xoserve
Jon Dixon*	(JD)	Ofgem
Kirandeep Samra	(KS)	RWE npower
Kirsten Elliott-Smith	(KES)	Cornwall Energy
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	DONG Energy
Richard Pomroy	(RP)	Wales & West Utilities
Steve Mulinganie*	(SM)	Gazprom
Sue Hilbourne	(SH)	Scotia Gas Networks

\* via teleconference

Copies of all papers are available at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0526/221215>

The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 17 March 2016.

### 1.0 Review of Minutes (26 November 2015)

DA requested an amendment to the minutes of the previous meeting and the changes were discussed. The minutes will be revised and republished.

### 2.0 Consideration of Solution Options

The Workgroup noted that the proposed offline meeting between the Proposer, Transporters and MAMs to identify a non UNC solution that could be implemented that would satisfy the requirements set out in this modification had not yet taken place.

BF observed that in order to progress the modification it needed to be established how the remaining 15% was to be covered off and at what cost this might be achieved. It was noted the proposed interim solution offered via SPAA would be able to provide pressure tier information for approximately 85% of premises based on the incode of a post code.

The DNs confirmed that they intended to submit the pressure tier information based on post code data to Xoserve.

Referring to Action 1101 (Xoserve to provide a High Level Cost Estimate on option of provided data via the Data Enquiry Service), DA stated that further clarity was necessary in respect of the requirements and benefits case. Data Enquiry was a non Code User Pays service, which could be pursued at the User Pays User group to assist in defining this. It was still unclear if a modification is actually required and therefore a cost estimate may not be needed and he would prefer to see a decision on whether the modification was to proceed before commencing work on the cost estimate. BF reiterated that the modification required further clarity before any cost estimate could be provided, and questioned if the Proposer was considering pursuing the modification or would the proposed SPAA solution be suitable. CB was concerned that the proposed SPAA solution does not offer full coverage of sites and the shortfall of 15% may be significant to MAMs. CB advised that she would discuss the issue in detail with the MAMs representative before deciding whether or not to continue with the modification.

RP referred to the proposed enduring solution in the modification, and asked if it was envisaged that Supply Meter Point data would be provided listed by pressure tiers in central systems or as a separate file. How it was to be provided would dictate the cost, and it was not sufficiently clear enough at present to produce a cost estimate. The DNs need to understand what work is required to provide/publish the information. Would being made available through the enquiry service offer a different solution? What was the preference? When asked, HC thought that theoretically it may be able to sit on the Xoserve website if it was provided as a file.

SM agreed that how it is held and provided to others was the question - how complex and expensive it was to obtain, hold and supply. It was acknowledged that data acquisition would get progressively more expensive the closer it is able to be moved to the 100% figure, as each remaining segment of data in that 15% gap was recognised as being increasingly difficult to acquire. It was important to establish the 'breakpoint' at which it might be acknowledged and agreed that the acquisition of further data was too expensive to pursue - what was an appropriate level of cost/benefit to cover the acquisition, provision and maintenance of data, going forward? It was understood that very large sites would probably require site visits by MAMs prior to commencing work so the existing GT1 process may still be serviceable.

RP suggested publishing the current data (85%) and continuing with the GT1 process, to see what response from the market there is and how it is being used, and then progress and add to the 85% as opportunities arise.

Smart meters were discussed; 2 million had been installed so far with very few problems, but this will ramp up soon and MAMs need to be able to utilise the correct resources against each of the pressure tiers to reduce the potential cancellation of jobs and associated disruption to consumers. It was noted that nearly all meters (including smart) will be installed on low pressure services, and publishing 85% information will support the rollout and indicate to MAMs where pressure tiers are for a significant section of the gas network. AJ observed that it suddenly coming across a medium pressure area when least expected was the problem. DM responded that the DNs could tell parties where the medium pressure areas were, however there is no certainty that the service outlet will be MP as there may be a mid point regulator located on the service pipe.

BF reiterated that it needed to be established what the associated increases in the levels of costs might be to improve the data from for example 85% to 90% or 95%, without a good sense of which it was difficult to make any judgment.

It was queried if the information should be provided at Meter Point level. MAMs had access to DN maps and can establish where the low and medium pressure mains were in

an area. Work tended to get allocated by post code and it should be sufficient to be able to consult the appropriate map; to go down to the MPRN level of detail might be considered as expensive, impractical and inefficient. A reasonably cost effective solution was required, and 85% information at post code level, with access to maps, would probably give a success rate of greater than 85%. If it were not a domestic meter installation then a MAM would be going to site anyway. CB believed this was about the whole portfolio for meter works, not just I&C sites. SM observed that historical information was not necessarily a good basis for an exchange programme.

RP sought further clarity from the Proposer. The DNs were going to publish the information by post code - should the DNs continue to publish the 85% by post code and put their efforts into increasing the percentage published, or did the Proposer prefer the DNs to replace the proposed 85% solution by post code with information by MPRN? How and where should any information be published? CB reiterated the expectations in the Solution in more detail. BF asked what should be better defined within the Solution to enable Xoserve to look at the requirements and produce a high level cost estimate. DA asked must it be in central system, would it not sit better with SPAA as this is a Supplier centric system. DA anticipated that provision of data at a postcode level by the DNs would meet the requirement as it was set out in the 'Why Change?' section. He had hoped to see what it is that Suppliers/Shippers need in terms of access to data and how to access. What this requirement is, and why, needs to be clearly articulated; and why the provision of data as the DNs envisage it would not be sufficient. What would meet the Supplier/Shipper and the MAMs requirement and where should it be provided?

RP observed that if the data were in central systems it would only be available to Shippers (but this may change if Central Registration is introduced); a Shipper could look up the medium pressure tier and tell the Supplier, who then instructs the MAM in that requirement.

DA asked if the DNs provide data at a post code level does it not meet the requirements for any party to be able to do that 'look up'? CB believed it to be a partial solution and is not keen to agree to this option unless there is a commitment to provide information for 100% of sites and at MPRN level if possible; it was not about how data is provided (Data Enquiry or spreadsheet), it was about the level of data that can be provided - looking for the best solution possible.

BF observed that the interim solution offered did not meet the requirements of the modification, and that the Proposer need to take this to MAMs to see if the post code process would work or whether meter point level is a more appropriate solution. DA added there were two aspects to consider - the presentation and the data - and it is understood that the Proposer believes the data to be key. CB noted that Suppliers/Shippers may be appointing meter workers directly and may use the pressure tier information to decide whether to appoint a specialist MAM.

Xoserve needed to understand the two stage implementation approach. The business case is about getting access to data; what is the benefits case in terms of the longer term solution? There will need to be clear justification for the step between the interim and the enduring solution. The interim solution gives access to data, and the second aspect needs to be justified. Once data has been delivered there is no evident benefits case for the second aspect currently in the modification, and further clarity may be required to justify the step change cost to go from the interim to enduring solution.

RP reiterated that the post code information (not in the modification) was being worked on by the DNs, and asked again should the DNs continue to publish the 85% pressure tier information by post code and put their efforts into increasing the percentage published, or

did the Proposer prefer the DNs to consider providing an MPRN solution? What was the Proposer's priority? CB indicated she was expecting the DNs to be looking at increasing to the next level and to have an understanding of costs of doing so. The solution requires the data to be at MPRN level, and this should be explored to see what coverage could be provided.

To summarise the outstanding questions:

- what would be the cost to obtain an incremental step in the proposed 85% coverage up to 100% at post code level and the additional costs for each increment;
- should the percentage of information provided at post code level be extended, or
- should the existing percentage of information provided at post code level be further broken down to MPRN level.

A pragmatic view needs to be taken on what would meet the majority of requirements, i.e. what is the best that can be achieved taking everything into account, or should an alternative solution be considered. A baseline is required from which to start to make an assessment of what proportion of the 15% can be achieved without costs outweighing benefit. Site visits were expensive and it was recognised that a number of these would inevitably be required to reach 100%.

It was suggested that the Proposer speak to the MAMs representative and the DNs offline to establish what was reasonable and acceptable.

**Action 1201: *Providing information at post code level* - Prior to the next meeting (28 January 2016) DNs and Xoserve to assess/establish:**

- a) **What proportion/percentage of the 15% could be achieved through a 'Desk Top' exercise, and at what cost;**
- b) **What additional proportion/percentage of the 15% could be achieved by making Site Visits, and at what cost;**
- c) **What would be the estimated cost to obtain 100% coverage of data at post code level.**

### 3.0 Development of Workgroup Report

Deferred until an appropriate Solution has been identified.

### 4.0 Review of Outstanding Actions

**0201:** Xoserve (DA) to look to provide clarity around possible solutions and a high level view on potential costs (i.e. set out requirements and define possible solutions).

**Update:** Superseded by Action 1201; see item 2.0, above. **Closed**

**1101:** Xoserve to provide a High Level Cost Estimate on option of provided data via the Data Enquiry Service.

**Update:** To be carried forward. **Carried forward**

### 5.0 Next Steps

Consideration of the Solution option(s) and associated costs/benefits.

## 6.0 Diary Planning

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

Workgroup meetings will take place as follows:

Time/Date	Venue	Workgroup Programme
Thursday 28 January 2016	31 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3LT	Consideration of Solution option(s) and associated costs/benefits

Action Table (22 December 2015)					
Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
0201	26/02/15	2.0	To look to provide clarity around possible solutions and a high level view on potential costs (i.e. set out requirements and define possible solutions).	Xoserve (DA)	<b>Closed</b>
1101	26/11/15	2.0	Xoserve to provide a High Level Cost Estimate on option of provided data via the Data Enquiry Service.	Xoserve (DA)	<b>Carried forward</b>
1201	22/12/15	2.0	<p><i>Providing information at post code level</i> - Prior to the next meeting (28 January 2016) DNs and Xoserve to assess/establish:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) what proportion/percentage of the 15% could be achieved through a 'Desk Top' exercise, and at what cost;</li> <li>b) what additional proportion/percentage of the 15% could be achieved by making Site Visits, and at what cost;</li> <li>c) what would be the estimated cost to obtain 100% coverage of data at post code level.</li> </ul>	DNs and Xoserve	<b>Due at 28 Jan 2016 meeting</b> <b>Pending</b>