



Registry Amendments Project Team meeting # 3

21 May 2014

Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Matters arising from last meeting
3. Discussion of changes for Statement of Proposal
 - Follow up of meeting #2 action points / further discussion
 - Revised cost estimates
 - Rule drafting
4. Next steps
5. Wrap up

2 MATTERS ARISING FROM LAST MEETING

Invite comments on

- Meeting minutes
- Feedback received from meter owners and retailers has been incorporated into the following discussions.

Framing of options - update

	Core	Optional
Rule change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core metering fields • TOU/Advanced meter flag • GTN discrepancy handling • Switch timeframes • Back dating standard switches • Meter owner uplift • ICP fields editable during switch • Audit provisions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other metering/TOU fields
No rule change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data hub • sFTP ✓ • Web services ✓ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New & old file versions • Extended web browser timeout • Reduction of location codes • Status code for ACTC temporary disconnections

3 DISCUSSION OF DESIRED CHANGES

(a) Core changes with implementation via a Recommendation to the Minister

Overview *Cost estimates refer to individual registry developments only

ID	Change	Status <small>Notes</small>	Further detail required	*Cost estimate
1a	Core metering fields	Supported. Use of multipliers is minimal but field deemed important. Option for auto-population from network pressure.	Final feedback on proposed definitions sought. Thorough data cleansing and transition plan are paramount	\$90k
1b	TOU/Advanced meter flag	Supported. Contingent on definitions and use.	Final feedback on proposed definitions sought.	Included in the above
2a	GTN discrepancy handling	Supported. Where multiple meters/registers exist in a GTN, the registry will look for a single match. A failed validation will result in the GTN bouncing back.	Thorough data cleansing and transition plan are paramount to avoid GTN rejections Addition to rule 72 required (what GTN must contain)	\$2k
2b	Switching timeframes	Supported. Decrease to a 10BD timeframe	Amendment to drafting of rule 66.1 also required	\$1k

Overview (2)

ID	Change	Status <small>Notes</small>	Further detail required	*Cost estimate
2c	Back-dating standard switches	Supported. Captured with Compliance Threshold. Notified on breach report.	See consultation paper on Compliance Threshold to be released soon. Minor amendment required to rule 72.5	\$3k
3a	Meter owner access before retailer uplift	Supported. When ICP has NEW or READY status.	Rule drafting required	\$39k
3b	ICP edits during switch	Supported. All fields included.		\$10k
4	Audit provisions	Supported. Performance audits only.	Ready for legal referral. Drafted rules supplied for discussion	-

Core metering fields – definitions

- Meter owners supported the following draft definitions for the three fields, which were circulated to members prior to this meeting:

Field	Format	Description
Meter pressure	Decimal (6,2)	The pressure on which the volumetric measurement is based, measured as gauge, not absolute, pressure in kPa. Used to convert the measured volume of gas to the volume of gas at standard pressure.
Meter reading digits	Num 2	The number of moving dials on the meter register index that represent whole units, plus any painted or fixed digits that represent whole units.
Register multiplier	Num 5	The factor by which a quantity taken from a register read is multiplied in order to convert to cubic metres.

Core metering fields – retailer feedback

- Feedback from retailers has been that multipliers are used in billing systems; however, they are generally applied as 1 for domestic sites.
- Only one retailer responded that they had (a few) domestic sites that had multipliers. Most retailers had a few TOU (C&I) sites with an applied multiplier. If multipliers do exist on some non-TOU sites, this would imply that the “meter multiplier” field has value.
- All retailers responded that no multiple mechanical registers existed for domestic sites. This allows a “register reading digits” field to be meaningful.

Core metering fields – meter owner feedback

- It was noticed that the “GTN file creator” tool referenced “Meter pressure” as “outlet pressure”. Does anybody use this tool, or apply meter pressure in this way currently?
- These fields will be mandatory; however, we will propose that these fields not be numerically populated for TOU sites.
- Due to the GTN file validation that will be proposed, the data cleansing prior to implementation will need to be thorough. We will discuss a transition plan in the second part of the meeting.

TOU & Advanced meter flag

- With feedback from meter owners, the proposed definitions to be applied to a TOU and an Advanced meter flag are as follows. The fields will be owned by meter owners:

Field	Description
TOU meter	A meter with an annual consumption over 250GJ which has a discrete volume corrector device with an integral data logger installed to allow register readings or gas consumption to be recorded automatically at pre-determined intervals, (i.e. with any register content code other than "U", uncorrected).
Advanced meter	A meter which has an integral datalogger installed to allow register readings or gas consumption to be recorded automatically at pre-determined intervals, that does not have a corrector (i.e. with the register content code "U")

Note that a meter with annual consumption less than 250GJ with a corrector and datalogger will not be classed as either TOU or Advanced.

GTN discrepancy handling – recap of proposal

- The registry will run validation checks against the registry database for Meter ID, Meter Reading Digits, Meter Pressure and Meter Multiplier.
- For ICPs with multiple M or R rows, the registry will search for one match to the registry database for each parameter.
- Any GTNs that fail this validation will be rejected.
- The sender is obliged to resolve the discrepancy and complete the switch within the required timeframe.

Switching timeframes – recap of proposal

- Rules to be amended to require switches to be completed with 10 business days of GNT delivery date, tightened from the current 23
- Main drivers are better alignment with electricity timeframes and to increase likelihood of dual fuel switches occurring on same day
- Simple from a rule drafting and registry perspective
- Change will go through legal review and is subject to formal submissions to SoP

Switching timeframes – initiation of switch (rule 66.1)

- For large customers, who tender for contracts well in advance of the supply start date, it can be impossible to avoid a breach of rule 66.1 or rule 67.3.

Rule 66.1: Within 2 business days after entering into a contract to supply gas to a consumer at the relevant consumer installation, the new retailer must initiate the switch by giving a gas switching notice to the registry.

Rule 67.3: If the new retailer includes a requested switch date for a standard switch, that date must not pre-date the date the gas switching notice is given to the registry and must not be more than 23 business days after the date the gas switching notice is given to the registry.

- Proposal is to add an exception in cases where supply start date is more than 23+2 (or 10+2) BDs in the future

Back-dating standard switches – recap of proposal

- Back-dating of the requested switch date in a GNT for a standard switch will be allowed as far back as 1st of the month in which the GNT is sent.
- This will be implemented via the Compliance Threshold Regime rather than a change to the Switching Rules. Consultation paper on Threshold Regime to be released shortly
- These breaches of rule 67.3 will still be flagged on the switching breach report, but will be noted as not a breach, for reporting purposes.

Back-dating standard switches – recap of proposal

- Back-dating of the switch date in the GTN will also be permitted if it is to accommodate a back-dated requested switch date
- Back-dating can only be as far back as the requested switch date
- A back-dated switch date in a GTN before a requested switch date will still be a breach.

Back-dating standard switches – amendment to rule 72.5

- Currently no lower bound for the GTN switch date for a standard switch if there is no requested switch date or the requested switch date was non-compliant
- Only an upper bound of 23 bds (in rule 72.5)
- To properly implement the Compliance Threshold an amendment to rule 72.5 is required to introduce a lower bound
- Lower bound = GNT delivery date
- Registry already operates this way

Meter owner access to ICPs before retailer uplift – recap of proposal

- Meter owners will have access to meter owner fields for NEW or READY ICPs, before a responsible retailer has assigned the meter owner. Once one meter owner has claimed the ICP, the responsible meter owner may only be changed by the responsible retailer.
- This is a significant change to the registry architecture (\$39k).
- May require associated change(s) to the rules regarding creation and maintenance of ICPs (rules 51-62)

ICP edits during switch – recap of proposal

- All ICP fields will be accessible by the owners of those fields while a switch is in progress.
- This will assist in any changes to the ICP that occur during a switch, and avoid withdrawal of switches due to this issue.

Audit provisions – recap of proposal

- Only performance audits to be included
- Based on the Reconciliation Rules
- Draft rules circulated

3 DISCUSSION OF DESIRED CHANGES

(b) Core changes with implementation via change request process / changes to determinations

Overview

ID	Change	Status <small>Notes</small>	Further detail required	*Cost estimate
5a	Data Hub	Supported. Further discussion required	Note that cost is not negligible.	\$31k
5b	sFTP	Completed.		\$400
5c	Web Services	In Progress. Jade has advised that lifting the restriction to allow access to all users is relatively simple	\$20k sunk cost. GIC currently arranging to reimburse the parties that funded the initial development	

Data Hub / sFTP – recap of proposal

- Replication of functionality of electricity registry
- Cost of \$31k
- Substantial cost so will invite formal submissions in SoP
- Secure (sFTP) mechanism for information exchange between registry participants
- sFTP changes have been completed by Jade

Web services – recap of proposal

- Four existing web services (address search, meter ID search, ICP details, ICP events) – equivalent to electricity registry
- Access currently restricted to the two retailers that funded the development
- Several retailers have approached GIC interested in using web services so sensible to make it available to all
- GIC will reimburse the retailers that paid the initial development and Jade will then lift the restriction

3 DISCUSSION OF DESIRED CHANGES

(c) Optional changes with implementation via change request process / changes to determinations

Overview

ID	Change	Status <small>Notes</small>	Further detail reqd.	*Cost estimate
1d	"New" / "old" file versions	Further discussion reqd.		\$24k**
5b	Status code for ACTC temporary disconnections	Further discussion reqd.	Legal advice recommends a general "catch-all" connection status.	-

** \$13k for creation of different versions (choice set on supervisor screen), \$11k for the ability to chose at the point of download by user

“New” / “old” file versions – recap of proposal

- Versioning to be applied to Notifications, PR-101 LIS report and PR-030 Events report.
- \$13k for application of this versioning at the Participant level
- An additional \$11k for application at an individual request level.

Status code for ACTC temporary disconnections

- Specific code for credit disconnections considered to be inappropriate.
- Better option: new connection status to indicate where a gas installation has an active consumer (it isn't vacant) but gas is not able to flow.
 - Approach retailer if precise information needed
- Proposal is to add a connection status to ACTC for temporary disconnections (as already provided for in rule 59.4.2)

4 NEXT STEPS

Next steps - timeline

- Statement of Proposal to be released in June
- Submissions to be received early August
- Recommendation to Minister in September
- Response timeframe from Minister unknown (MBIE engaged)
- Transition plan and data cleansing to be discussed, perhaps with a sub-group of the RAPT (this can start as soon as the SoP is released)

Next steps - data cleansing & transition

- Suggestion to engage transition group early, set up transition plan and begin data cleansing before the recommendation to the Minister is sent.
- This is with the aim to complete the pre-transition steps in Q4 of this year, for a Q1 2015 implementation.
- Scope of data cleansing would be all the new proposed fields plus any existing fields that are deemed to require attention

5 WRAP UP

