

UNC Workgroup 0487S Minutes

Introduction of Advanced Meter Indicator and Advanced Meter Reader (AMR) Service Provider Identifier

Thursday 27 March 2014

at ENA, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Lorna Dupont (Secretary)	(LD)	Joint Office
Adam Pearce*	(AP)	ES Pipelines
Alan Raper	(AR)	National Grid Distribution
Alex Ross-Shaw*	(ARS)	Northern Gas Networks
Andrew Margan	(AM)	British Gas
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Colette Baldwin	(CB)	E.ON UK
David Addison*	(DA)	Xoserve
Dave Mitchell	(DM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Ed Hunter	(EH)	RWE npower
Eleanor Laurence*	(EL)	EDF Energy
Hilary Chapman	(HCh)	Xoserve
Huw Comerford	(HCo)	Utilita
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	Gazprom

* via teleconference

Copies of all papers are available at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0487/270314>

The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 19 June 2014.

1.0 Outline of Modification

SM introduced the modification and explained the rationale. The aim was to enable easy identification in respect of Advanced Meter details, given that a lot more meters will be changing to 'advanced' over the next year or so.

2.0 Initial Discussion

Observing that he would prefer to keep it simple and not alter file formats but rather use existing fields and add appropriate identifiers, SM indicated that he would be happy to revise the modification if a better solution could be put forward.

AR asked what would make parties populate the data. SM responded that it would be picked up contractually with a party's service provider in its commercial relationships. It would be to the Shipper's benefit to populate it. There was then a short discussion on how SPAA might make changes, and it was suggested that a concurrent change might need to be raised at SPAA. DA offered to assist with any SPAA changes (see *Next Steps*, below).

DA requested views on the proposed Solution; codes already introduced for smart meters may have to be amended or others be introduced. DA referred to Modification 0430, which introduced the role of SMSO, explaining his understanding of this (mutually exclusive relationships) and suggesting reviewing the definition of SMSO so that it could

include Advanced Meter Service Provider. It would be simple to do this; SPAA would accept the definition and can register the entity with Xoserve. It would be purely administrative solution.

CB expressed concern that some entities may not interact with Xoserve or SPAA. AM thought that DA had offered an economic and workable solution, and questioned if that needed to apply in the electricity market as well. SM indicated that he would follow that up internally, but would not want that to slow down or delay progressing a solution to the problem in the gas market.

Post Meeting Note: SM had discussed internally whether it would be necessary to raise a comparable change in the power market, and had spoken to Elexon regarding the process in electricity for identifying meters. Noting that he had been unable to verify this, as Gazprom does not have access to ECOES - SM provided the following information:

“The ECOES service (run by the MRA) contains information on whether a meter is smart/dumb or AMR (<https://www.ecoes.co.uk/>). Prior to a change of supplier occurring the gaining supplier can check ECOES prior to agreeing terms provided the customer gives their permission. This should allow the supplier to identify meters in the customer portfolio and appoint agents (and price contracts) accordingly. When the Change of Supplier (CoS) process is initiated the dataflows between the old and new supplier will include information on the meter technical details (thought to be D150?). It therefore looks as if suppliers have the ability to check metering status prior to agreeing a new contract and then at the point of the change of supplier such that appropriate agents can be appointed.”

DA referred to two data items in the Solution. The Meter Mechanism code is quite complicated and would need changes, which DA explained. He would advocate the simpler solution put forward above to register the entity with Xoserve to identify an Advanced Meter Provider. SM believed there might be a slight disconnect between the roles of various service providers, explaining that the provider who deployed the equipment can be different to the service provider. A flag was required to indicate that the equipment was capable of being advanced but that it may not necessarily have a service provider allocated; the flag should be a signifier of the meter being capable of being advanced. This was why two flags were required rather than reliance on one data item. The meter capability would signify an additional piece of equipment that can be provided by a number of different parties under different commercial arrangements; there were a number of technical solutions and the asset provider may not be the reader, etc.

DA thought there might be concerns regarding the systems and how it would necessarily relate to existing items when considering the extension/use of existing fields. SM said that a smart meter had an inherent capability to switch statuses, but to be ‘advanced’ it required an additional piece of equipment, and a different flag would be required to identify this.

DA referred to new allowable volumes, the creation of which was not a big task but would need robust testing to validate. A better understanding of the physical set up would be required. SM indicated that the asset should support these options and the flags should support identification of any opt out (smart, advanced, DCC).

Responding to BF, SM indicated that the modification should be implemented as soon as possible (before Project Nexus). It does not exist as a concept in Project Nexus at present, but it will need to have its principles enshrined so that Project Nexus can support it going forward. A minimum impact on systems is anticipated.

BF observed that if this is to be acknowledged as an enduring solution, it would be carried over into Project Nexus and any legal text would need to reflect appropriate changes, assuming any impact is identified, verified and understood.

Next Steps

The Workgroup considered the next steps.

SM will discuss with Xoserve the easiest implementable solution and will revise the modification as appropriate. Whilst pointing out that it was not fully worked up yet, DA agreed to provide an initial analysis paper for publication alongside these minutes, following which any cost implications will need to be understood. DA also observed that Xoserve would need to understand the Meter Mechanism code and to assess it for pre- and post-Project Nexus implications.

The business rules will also need to be completed and the legal text to be drafted.

Action 0301: DA to provide an initial analysis paper for publication alongside the minutes.

Action 0302: Consider the Meter Mechanism code and submit comments to SM and DA before the next meeting (24 April 2014).

Action 0303: DA to table an agenda item at the next SPAA Expert Group meeting and seek views on any concurrent changes that may be required.

3.0 Diary Planning

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

The next meeting will take place within the Distribution Workgroup on Thursday 24 April 2014 at 31 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3LT.

Action Table

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
0301	27/03/14	2.0	DA to provide an initial analysis paper for publication alongside the minutes.	Xoserve (DA)	Pending
0302	27/03/14	2.0	Consider the Meter Mechanism code and submit comments to SM and DA before the next meeting (24 April 2014).	ALL Parties	Pending
0303	27/03/14	2.0	DA to table an agenda item at the next SPAA Expert Group meeting and seek views on any concurrent changes that may be required.	Xoserve (DA)	Pending