1.0 Background

DNs are required to report 'measurement accuracy' to Ofgem. This has been defined by Ofgem to be a ratio of total error volume versus total throughput per Network.

National Grid Gas Distribution (NGGD) is keen to report this using publically available information in order to demonstrate traceability and so that others can check our work.

NGGD therefore wishes, wherever possible, to create extracts from this information by electronic means. In order for this to function, the Extract for Register needs to contain sufficient information and the structure of it should ideally remain static once agreed.

2.0 Summary of Proposed Changes and Rationale

2.1.1 Notification Sheet Changes

- Inclusion of 'DN Reference'
- Inclusion of 'LDZ'
- Use of 'First Gas Day Where Error Present' and 'Last Gas Day Where Error Present'
- Removal of 'Estimated volume of error (MSCM)'
- Change of 'Estimated volume of error (MCM)' to 'Declared volume of error (MCM)'
- Deletion of 'Systematic Bias'
- Increased width of column D

2.1.2 Rationale

- We require a static box (in Extract for Register) containing the latest declaration of the volume.
- We recognise that the GWh is indeed an estimate in the MER since generally the mathematics used by the DN will include the CV at the offtake as opposed to the FWACV. The Upstream Party will use the volume data in the MER together with the FWACV to declare a GWh figure for billing purposes (along with spot prices of course).
- The volume box (in Extract for Register) should contain the latest figure – whether estimated or not. Leaving the box with the title 'Estimated' is misleading since at the conclusion of the MER it will contain the precise and final agreed declaration. We will know that it has got to this stage upon inspection of the N and O columns in Extract for Register.
- We have never been a fan of the 'System Bias' field since the whole reason for undertaking an MER is if you have a bias. Also, is it a bias in the one direction for the duration of the error or can a plus and minus be construed as not being a bias? It is average bias, instantaneous or what. In short, we are arguing that it has no value whatsoever and should therefore be deleted.

2.2.1 Extract for Register Changes

- Inclusion of 'DN Reference'
- Removal of 'Estimated volume of error (MSCM)'
- Insertion of 'Declared volume of error (MCM)'
- 'Started (or last good read)' changed to 'First Gas Day where error was present'
- Insertion of 'Last Gas Day where error was present'
- Correction of some cell mapping problems
- Addition of logic to column P to determine whether a MER/SMER is Live or Closed (deduced from the words 'Invoiced' or 'Closed / No Rec Required' in column O)

2.2.2 Rationale

- We need to cross-reference to our own MER/SMER references.
- We do not need two fields to declare the volume (see also above).
- We need clarity surrounding the dates when the error was present.

On assumes that as and when MERs become superseded with later revisions, any previous entry gets replaced (ie the Extract for Register always shows the latest known position).

2.3.1 Look Up Data

For Offtakes which comprise multiple meters, another option should be included at site level to accommodate common site-related problems. This will bring about clarity concerning the nature of the fault and avoid superfluous work (and associated confusion) when trying to fictitiously apportion percentages of the error to each meter. For example, Alrewas WM has two meters MTA and MTB, something could affect both systems (eg common integrator, data handling etc), in which case it makes more sense to tackle reconciliation at site level and not per meter. In which case, an additional option, 'Alrewas WM MTA/MTB Combined' would be a particularly sensible assignment. We have also proposed the use of 'System' in the Meter Type field to show that the data relates to the system as a whole and not just one meter.

Inter-LDZ installations should probably not be referred to as Inter LDZ Offtakes. we have re-named them as 'Inter LDZ Transfer'.

Some MTx/MRx entries for NGGD installations were incorrect on the published sheets. They have been corrected to agree with meter IDs on the sites in question.

2.3.2 Rationale

- To correctly accommodate the nature of the fault and to avoid superfluous work which adds no value.
- To avoid site type confusion.
- To ensure correct meter ID is used.

3.0 General

Assumption - the Extract for Register always shows the latest known position.
Question – does the information remain present for up to 5 years?
Question – Is it possible to reinstate the historic spreadsheet (but with the extra headings described here) so that people can look at the history? Does this still exist?

4.0 Conclusion

NGGD seeks support for these changes since it is believed that they enhance the process to the benefit of all.