

Review Group 0175 Minutes
Thursday 22 November 2007
Elexon, 350 Euston, London

Attendees

Tim Davis (Chair)	TD	Joint Office of Gas Transporters
Helen Cuin (Secretary)	HC	Joint Office of Gas Transporters
Phil Broom (Proposer)	PB	Gaz de France
Alex Thomason	ATh	National Grid NTS
Alex Travell	AT	E.ON UK
Anna Pechlivanidou	AP	Ofgem
Chris Warner	CW	National Grid Distribution
Guy Hammond	GH	Gaz de France
Joel Martin	JMa	Scotia Gas Networks
Mitch Donnelly	MD	British Gas
Richard Street	RS	Statoil (UK)
Roger Delleman	RD	E.ON UK
Steve Mullinganie	SM	ECO European
Stuart Westerman	SW	Total
Tricia Moody	TM	Xoserve

1.0 Introduction and Status Review

1.1. Minutes from October Review Group Meeting

The Minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

1.2. Review of Actions from previous meetings

None

2.0 Review Group Discussion

2.1 Existing arrangements

CW provided a presentation on the current regime, and TM on the daily meter reading and SPA processes.

SM questioned the need for bespoke BT phone lines at all sites and if there was an alternative that can be used - CW confirmed that GSM technology can be feasible.

SM questioned the charging of services, particularly of those that appear to be for the benefit of the Transporters. RS suggested that an elective DM Service has a different cost benefit case.

CW highlighted the importance of DM Reads and the integrity of the regime. He compared the DM market to the NDM market, and explained that the NDM market regime can tolerate infrequent meter readings. PB suggested that a two tier regime may want to be considered for the DM elective regime and mandatory DM market, for which Transporters have specific requirements. RS highlighted the difference between NTS offtakes and DN offtakes. However, CW believed that the elective DM and contractual DM markets have the same underlying requirements.

2.2 SGN DM Service

JMa provided a presentation which explained the migration plans from National Grid Metering DMSP to SGN DMSP. RS questioned the costing and comparison of charges between service providers, and asked whether a reduced charge would apply. JMa said that no change to the level of charges was envisaged at this stage, although this would be kept under review in light of experience.

TM questioned if the AMR equipment provides more than one channel. MD confirmed that it can generally take up to eight channels.

2.3 Potential Models for Change

PB and GH presented four potential models, two of which had a common theme similar to the electric regime. The presentation explained the current interfaces between the Transporter, Shipper and Meter Asset Manager.

Model 1 – Transporter Obligations

TM highlighted that the current service provider undertakes certain validation processes, and suggested that any DM Service provider should continue with this.

CW suggested that if the Transporter is not responsible for meter maintenance, the liabilities regime will need to be considered.

SM confirmed where there is not an actual read or provided estimated read, Sites and Meters will generate an estimated Meter Read, and a report is produced to identify where this has happened.

Model 2 – Shipper Obligations

PB explained that the Shipper maintains the device in this model.

Model 3 – Competitive Data Collector

PB explained that the Shipper chooses to the Data Collector in this model.

Model 4 – Single Data Collector

PB explained that the Transporter appoints a single Data Collector in this model.

Advantages and Disadvantages

GH highlighted advantages and disadvantages of each model compared to the existing arrangements as opposed to a comparison of the models against each other.

CW highlighted the importance of identifying costs and benefits associated with each model. AP questioned if the costs of each model have been substantiated and it was suggested that this should be examined when the preferred solutions have been selected.

AT questioned what would happen to the emergency arrangements if moving from a Transporter to a Shipper centric model.

It was agreed that none of the models could be ruled out at this stage. However, SM expressed a concern that the AMR market is already set up with multiple service providers and that a model with a single data collector may be limiting the market and so reduce potential benefits. RD suggested there could be further models which merit consideration.

Action 0001: All to consider the models provided, including the advantages and disadvantages, for further discussion at December's Meeting.

Action 0002: All to consider the obligations associated with each model for further discussion at next December's meeting.

Action 0003: Transporters to consider the potential cost of each model.

3.0 Diary Planning for Review Group

It was agreed that a meeting should be arranged in December, preferably to follow the Distribution Workstream. Consequently, the next meetings are:

Tuesday 18 December, Renewal Conference Centre, B91 2JR.

Thursday 24 January 2008, 10:00 31 Homer Road, B91 3LT

4.0 AOB

None.

APPENDIX A.**ACTION LOG - Review Group 0175**

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
RG0175 0001	22/11/2007	2.0	All to consider the models provided, including the advantages and disadvantages, for further discussion at December's Meeting.	All	Action: Pending
RG0175 0002	22/11/2007	2.0	All to consider the obligations associated with each model for further discussion at December's meeting.	All	Action: Pending
RG0175 0003	22/11/2007	2.0	Transporters to consider the potential cost of each model.	Transporters	Action: Pending