

# UNC Workgroup 0763R

## Review of Gas Meter By-Pass Arrangements

Dan Simons / Claire Louise Roberts



**Gemserve**

# REVIEW QUESTIONS PROGRESS

---

- As part of the slide pack presented at the May DWG, the proposer set out a series of questions that the Meter By-Pass Review should seek to answer
- The following slides provide a summary of progress against each of these questions along with a view from both the proposer and where relevant, the CDSP on the potential next steps to be taken

# REVIEW QUESTIONS PROGRESS

## 1. **Is installation of a Meter By-Pass being notified to the CDSP in a timely manner?**

- Investigation by CDSP so far would indicate potentially not
- The CDSP have undertaken a further piece of analysis of by-passes installed during 2021 and pre 2021 to compare the date the by-pass was installed to the date the update was received by CDSP systems (slide 5)
- This profiling should help to better answer the question. I.e. is notification typically received within a few days, a week, 2 weeks, longer?
- While the timing of updates on installation or status changes for by-passes do not appear particularly concerning based on the analysis to date, it should be noted this is only on the by-passes that the CDSP are aware of
- From the data presented at the June DWG, it is where updates are not being received that would be more of a concern

# REVIEW QUESTIONS PROGRESS

## 2. **Are changes in Meter By-Pass status (i.e. 'open' to 'closed') being notified to the CDSP within 2 Supply Point Systems Business Days as per the UNC requirement?**

- Investigation by the CDSP so far would indicate probably not
- The CDSP have undertaken a further piece of analysis of by-pass status updates received during 2021 and pre 2021 to compare the date the by-pass status changed to the date the update was received by CDSP systems
- This profiling would help to better answer the question. I.e. is notification typically received within the 2 business days defined in the UNC
- As with Question 1, while the timing of updates by-pass status changes do not appear particularly concerning based on the analysis to date, it should be noted this is only on the by-passes that the CDSP is aware of. It is the updates that seemingly aren't being received that are more of a concern



# ONJOB / ONUPD ANALYSIS

	ONJOB	ONUPD
Number of Updates	21.00	70.00
Average Update Time (Days)	3.00	34.00
Standard Deviation (Smaller Values mean less variability)	3.84	99.46
Number of Updates (Pre-2021)	17.00	56.00
Average Update Time (Pre-2021)	3.18	7.98
Standard Dev (Pre-2021)	4.11	17.20

# REVIEW QUESTIONS PROGRESS

## **3. Following notification that a By-Pass has been closed, are subsequent consumption adjustments being notified to the CDSP within 15 Supply Point Systems Business Days as per the UNC requirement?**

- Again, investigation by the CDSP so far would indicate probably not
- Worrying that based on the figures presented at the June DWG, only 2 out of 43 needed a consumption adjustment and even then this needed chasing by Xoserve as the Shipper had not responded within 15 business days
- Also worrying that where a Consumption Adjustment was not required, in the majority of cases this was because there wasn't a by-pass physically present on site despite a bypass being present in UK Link (i.e. indication that no update being sent by the Shipper to UK Link to say that the by-Pass had been closed and/or removed)

# REVIEW QUESTIONS PROGRESS

## 4. Are MAMs seeking the appropriate permissions from the Transporter before a Meter By-Pass is installed?

- Based on the data from Cadent presented by Andy Clasper at the June DWG, it looks like permissions are being sought by MAM's
- To help verify whether this is happening in all instances, a further exercise could be undertaken to compare the number of by-passes installed on a given GT's network on UK Link to the number of requests approved by that GT for the same time period
- This would be a relatively straightforward thing for the CDSP to facilitate by extracting all sites on a given GT's network with a meter by-pass in UK Link
- The GT could then undertake a check against these sites (or a sample of these sites) to confirm whether a request had been received by a MAM or not



# REVIEW QUESTIONS PROGRESS

## 5. **Are Meter By-Passes being installed as intended; i.e. only in the type of premises detailed in GDN/PM/GT2 and the MAMCoP?**

- Initial indications from analysis would indicate potentially not
- Some of the definitions for the type of properties a by-pass can be installed at are pretty broad though (multiple occupancy, complex metering, etc)
- Might need further analysis to flag those sites that do look like the 'right' type vs those with a question mark – then a potential follow up activity for Shippers to investigate whether a by-pass is actually installed and whether it is appropriate? Also potential question for a MAM expert contact?
- If the CDSP were required to focus on particular sites they would need that instruction/definition from industry parties
- Would also need to consider how to oblige Shippers to do this?



# REVIEW QUESTIONS PROGRESS

---

## **6. How is the existence of a Meter By-Pass notified during a switch / change of Shipper?**

- The existence of a by-pass is notified during change of supplier on a U06 / N90 Record within the MRI. Post CSS implementation it will be notified on a U06 / N90 Record within the on the TMC

# REVIEW QUESTIONS PROGRESS

**7. In what circumstances are Meter By-Pass removals processed in industry systems? I.e. is it only upon notification via ONJOB of a physical removal or are there other circumstances in which a by-pass is removed?**

- Either on notification on an ONJOB that a bypass has been removed or when another ONJOB/ONUPD is sent without the By-Pass record present

~~**8. What degree of confidence is there that Meter By-Passes that exist in industry systems with a status of 'closed' are correctly sealed to prevent misuse?**~~

- Removed as question is poorly worded and probably covered by question 11 in any case



# REVIEW QUESTIONS PROGRESS

## 9. Are the existing UNC governance arrangements for Meter By-Passes clear and fit for purpose?

- Clear, yes, albeit Shippers may not be particularly aware of their obligations based on CDSP data analysis and lack of industry focus on By-Passes previously
- Fit for purpose, perhaps not. Potential for a Mod to consider:
  - a) An additional step in the process for Shippers to advise whether a By-pass is still in place if it has already been open for a defined time – indication from a MAM expert has indicated a bypass would unlikely to be open past 2 weeks and usually significantly less
  - b) A new requirement (in addition to sending a consumption adjustment within 15 days where it is required) to also send a notification where a consumption adjustment isn't required. At present, there is nothing to close the loop. I.e. if a consumption adjustment hasn't been sent in 15 days, is this because it genuinely isn't required or is it because a Shipper just hasn't made the assessment or sent the update?



# REVIEW QUESTIONS PROGRESS

## **10. Are the wider end to end process for Meter By-Passes clear and fit for purpose?**

- Unclear. We likely need more data on whether MAM's are making GT requests and whether premises types look valid in order to answer this properly (referenced in questions 4 and 5)
- Should the length of time a bypass remains open be timebound? MAM expert advice has indicated this would not normally be more than 2 weeks albeit there may be exceptional circumstances where it is longer?

# REVIEW QUESTIONS PROGRESS

## **11. Is the existing Meter By-Pass data held in industry systems accurate? I.e. what degree of confidence do we have that the status of a Meter By-Pass has remained as declared?**

- Low confidence based on CDSP analysis to date
- A data cleanse exercise is likely to be required albeit the CDSP would likely need to be instructed by industry via a DSC change proposal.
- Data cleanse likely to be prioritised based on:
  - Open bypass present where a site is also recording consumption
  - Open bypasses that have been open greater than 2 weeks
  - Closed bypasses that have been in situ for greater than [1 year?]
  - Closed bypasses for sites apparently falling outside of the defined property types
  - General cleanse/investigation by Shippers for bypasses recorded on their portfolio in UK Link to determine whether or not a bypass is actually still physically present?

# Thank you for listening

---



**INVESTORS IN PEOPLE®**  
We invest in people Gold



*The material in this [presentation/webinar] is prepared by Gemserv Limited ("Gemserv") **and** for information purposes only. Gemserv is not responsible for any errors or omissions in the content of this [presentation/webinar]. Information is provided "as/is" with no guarantees of completeness, accuracy, reliability, usefulness or timeliness and without any warranties of any kind, express or implied. The contents of this [presentation/webinar] should not be construed as professional advice or the provision of professional services of any kind. Any reliance you place on such information is strictly at your own risk and the user of this [presentation/webinar] should not act or fail to act based upon this information without seeking the services of a competent professional. In no event will Gemserv be liable for any claims, losses or damages whatsoever arising out of, or in connection with, your use of the information provided within this [presentation/webinar].*