

**UNC Workgroup 0487S Minutes  
Introduction of Advanced Meter Indicator and Advanced Meter  
Reader (AMR) Service Provider Identifier**

**Thursday 22 May 2014**

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

**Attendees**

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Lorna Dupont (Secretary)	(LD)	Joint Office
Alan Raper	(AR)	National Grid Distribution
Andrew Margan	(AM)	British Gas
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Colette Baldwin	(CB)	E.ON UK
Dave Addison	(DA)	Xoserve
Dave Mitchell	(DM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Ed Hunter*	(EH)	RWE npower
Erika Melen	(EM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Gareth Evans	(GE)	Waters Wye Associates
Hilary Chapman	(HC)	Xoserve
Huw Comerford	(HCo)	Utilita
Joanna Ferguson	(JF)	Northern Gas Networks
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	DONG Energy
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE
Rob Johnson	(RJ)	Wingas
Steve Mulinganie*	(SM)	Gazprom

\* via teleconference

Copies of all papers are available at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0487/220514>

The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 21 August 2014.

**1.0 Review of Minutes and Actions**

**1.1. Minutes**

The minutes were accepted.

**1.2. Actions**

**0401:** Xoserve to provide a view on the solution options including implementation timelines.

**Update:** Presentation provided. **Closed**

**2.0 Discussion**

**2.1. Solution Options Assessment**

DA gave a presentation, noting that the Part B paper will be provided to the SPAA Expert Group for progression on 11 June 2014. All the options will require a SPAA change, and JF indicated that Northern Gas Networks were happy to sponsor the change when agreed.

Setting out the background, DA reiterated that the purpose of the modification was to ensure that sufficient Advanced Meter Reading Equipment information is required to be available at the Change of Supplier event, with additional data items proposed as: Advanced Meter Asset Indicator, and Advanced Meter Reader (AMR) Service Provider Identifier – “ASP”. The optimum solution is one that minimises changes to system and file flows, with a preference being that the data should be ‘pushed’ to the incoming Shipper. Based on the volume it was believed there would have to be some sort of system file flow, and a systematised solution would therefore be required.

*Option 0 - Re-use SMSO Organisation Type in S96 record/SMSO\_ID displayed on Data Enquiry*

This was to do nothing from a system perspective. DA explained the details; there would be no impact on Project Nexus and it was relatively quick to do. SM indicated he was not in favour of this option and summarised some recent discussions with Ofgem, concluding that the view was this should go much further and provide additional information to other parties in the supply chain. However he was not minded to change the modification to add more complexity. DA commented that Xoserve had had a similar conversation, ie that two data items were insufficient and that five or six items should be conveyed (these were not able to be defined at present, but this Workgroup may be expected to consider whether it is feasible to deliver additional items). DA indicated that it might fall to Option C (yet to be discussed at this point), because of the scale of changes required, ie similar to SMART changes (it would be a new asset class for AMR). Option C would be ‘nice to have’ if no other changes were going on. This would accommodate multiple devices. DA explained what data would be held on the system and its source. SM concurred with DA’s view, and that a quicker solution was required now.

AM asked if Option C, with Ofgem’s additional requirements included, could be implemented at a subsequent date. SM responded this would require further exploration, as Ofgem’s aspirations were not currently in line with how the market operates.

*Option A - Re-use SMSO Organisation Type in S96 record/SMSO\_ID field S98*

DA gave a brief explanation of this option.

*Option B - Meter mechanism via RGMA, SMSO Organisation Type via the S96 record/TRF file - Meter mechanism via the S75, SMSO\_ID via the S98 record*

DA gave a brief explanation of this option. He believes this to be the most appropriate solution for the current position and explained his view in more detail. Xoserve was looking at the scale of impact to UK Link and legacy systems. A scope definition was in place in the UK Link Programme and this was being discussed at present. AM observed that care should be taken to ensure that there should be no unintended consequences, and that Xoserve should make a very close assessment. DA indicated this might take four weeks.

SM commented that this option offered a very good approach. DA was conscious of the need consider Ofgem’s requirements and whether these could be met through a software release. SM referred to the ASP code of practice, adding that he was awaiting views on common data items to assess the feasibility. In the meantime, SM would like to continue moving the modification forward while the industry clarifies what its requirements are. A subsequent modification could be raised if necessary. SM added that Ofgem does not want to be seen to be preventing the market from functioning, so he feels comfortable with proceeding.

*Option C - Equipment details via new RGMA Asset Class, new ASP Organisation Type via the GEA/ New asset class via S75 record, ASP\_ID via the GEA*

DA explained this option. This would require phased implementation. SM asked if this should be raised a new issue for Distribution Workgroup to keep sight of and give further consideration.

*Options Matrix*

The criteria were matched across each option. Option B may be possible with a 3-6 months leadtime but it may have to be pushed into the UK Link Replacement Programme. (It was noted that the high-level cost estimate/indicative timescales had been misplaced in the wrong columns. DA will provide corrected information.)

When asked if there were any other options, MJ suggested that AMR Service Providers provide data directly to Xoserve. DA responded that this had been looked at in the past, and would have to be considered in a post Nexus environment. SM observed that Option B would support Option C being addressed at a later date, whereas if a totally different solution was implemented this might not be the case.

There was a brief discussion of the requirements under Modification 0430; JF was not sure how we obligate for getting the data into the system for this. CB suggested facilitating through SPAA might be appropriate. Retrospective updating was discussed (back populate through SPAA). DA observed that the last two experiences of doing this were very poorly supported. Internal business cases were very difficult to demonstrate unless there was a formal obligation.

**2.2. Next Steps**

BF summarised that:

- DA would provide a view of the impacts and costs of Option B
- DA would raise a SPAA CP against Option B
- SM would consider appropriate revisions to the modification
- JF would facilitate the preparation of legal text once the solution had been finalised.

**3.0 Diary Planning**

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 within the Distribution Workgroup on Thursday 26 June 2015 at the Energy Networks Association, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF.

**Action Table**

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
0401	24/04/14	1.2	Xoserve to provide a view on the solution options including implementation timelines.	Xoserve (DA)	Closed