

Registry Amendments Project Team: Meeting #3

Date: Wednesday 21 May 2014

Time: 10:00 – 12:30

Venue: Gas Industry Co, Level 8, the Todd Building, 95 Customhouse Quay, Wellington

Minutes

Present

Members

- ❖ Jo Iggulden
- ❖ Andrew Maseyk
- ❖ Mark Hermann
- ❖ Campbell Wilson
- ❖ Bill Miller
- ❖ Helen Taylor

Apologies

- ❖ Melanie Joyce

In attendance from Gas Industry Co

- ❖ Andrew Walker
- ❖ Ian Dempster
- ❖ Kate Turner
- ❖ Patrick Wilson

1 Welcome and introduction

The meeting opened at 10:00.

Gas Industry Co staff welcomed members of the Registry Amendments Project Team (RAPT) and noted apologies (Melanie Joyce).

2 Matters arising from last meeting

Members were invited to make comments on the meeting minutes that were circulated, as well as note to reinstate any considerations that had been removed from further discussion. No comments were made.

The framing of options was noted to the group, as well as the addition of a rule 66.1 change and the expansion of web services to the discussion.

a) Core metering fields

- Andrew W highlighted to members that in some cases it might be more useful to use the network pressure as a substitute for meter pressure, and that this could be auto-populated using a tick field. Members were comfortable with this, as long as the meter pressure was updated whenever the corresponding network pressure was changed.
- Members responded when asked that they did not use the GTN file creator to write GTNs.
- Members were generally agreed that blanking out the fields for TOU sites would be useful.
- Members agreed with the definitions put forward
- Andrew W noted that in the future the Reconciliation Rules could be amended to introduce an obligation on retailers to use the registry fields (in the absence of better information) when calculating an ICP's consumption for billing/reconciliation

b) TOU and Advanced meter flag

- Members discussed the proposed definitions, feeling that the reference to "integral" data loggers was misleading, and to register content codes, unnecessary.
- It was further agreed that the volume threshold in the TOU definition, which tied to the definition in the Reconciliation Rules, didn't serve any useful purpose and didn't reflect a physical attribute of the meter, so should be removed
- Andrew M noted that it is possible to have uncorrected TOU although Bill proposed the definition that TOU sites were always pressure and temperature corrected. There was discussion around the fact that a GMS could be *capable* of correction without that information necessarily being used for reconciliation purposes. There was a strong consensus that the registry should reflect the physical setup rather than how the ICP is billed/reconciled.
- Members generally agreed that if issues were found, the definitions could be improved over time. Especially for advanced meters, that do not yet exist in the field.
- The edited definitions put forward were:
 - i. TOU meter: A meter which has a discrete volume corrector device with a data logger installed to allow register readings or gas consumption to be recorded automatically at pre-

determined intervals.

- ii. Advanced meter: A meter which has a data logger installed to allow register readings or gas consumption to be recorded automatically or at pre-determined intervals.

- It was agreed that these fields should be owned by meter owners.

c) GTN discrepancy handling

- Kate and Andrew W discussed the proposal and explained the validations that would be included. It was noted that for TOU sites, this validation will not take place. It was also highlighted to members that an alteration may be required to rule 72 to accommodate this.

d) Reduce total switch timeframe to 10 BDs

- A recap of the proposal was gone through. Members had no further comments.
- Kate highlighted a change to rule 66.1 that has been recently proposed, to avoid switching breaches for customers who tendered for their contracts well in advance of the gas supply date.
- Members were in favour of an exception to the rule ("66.1.1"), rather than alteration of the rule itself.

e) Back-dating of standard switches

- Members were directed towards the upcoming Compliance Amendments paper for formal consultation on this point. Members had no more further comments.
- Kate highlighted a change to rule 72.5 that would be put forward as a "tidy-up" change: to implement a lower bound on switch dates for switches that didn't have a requested switch date in the GNT, or had a non-compliant (back-dated) switch date. This would make the rule consistent with registry functionality.
- Any breaches of this rule, due to compliance with a back dated switch date would be waived under the Compliance Threshold regime also.

f) Allow meter owners to input meter information before uplift

- A recap of the proposal was gone through. Members had no further comments.

g) Allow edits to ICP parameters during a switch

- Members highlighted an issue that occurred with the electricity registry when a similar change was made; that changes could be made but would not take effect until after the switch was completed, due to the processing order of the registry. This meant that switches frequently

had to be withdrawn due to metering issues. It was suggested that the solution to this issue is to make the changes event date driven rather than send date driven. This issue will be followed up by GIC with Jade.

h) Audit provisions

- Members were shown a set of draft audit rules. It was highlighted that audits would occur of all participants within 24 months of the changes going live, and repeated no more than five years apart. It was noted that the purpose of the audit rules is to allow GIC to run performance audits on registry maintenance, and is not intended to be a huge regulatory burden on participants. Nevertheless, members suggested that it would be sensible to allow the scope of audits to cover all obligations under the Switching Rules.
- One member noted that for audits of major system changes, it may be better to audit the participant after the change is in effect, rather than before, to ensure that the changes did not have any effect on output, rather than audit what the expected effect would have been.

Actions – prior to SOP:

a) Core metering fields

- No further action

b) TOU and Advanced meter flag

- No further action

c) GTN discrepancy handling

- GIC to draft changes to rule 72

d) Reduce total switch timeframe to 10 BDs

- GIC to draft rule changes

e) Back-dating of standard switches

- GIC to release Compliance Threshold consultation paper and draft changes to rule 72.5

f) Allow meter owners to input meter information before uplift

- No further action

g) Allow edits to ICP parameters during a switch

- GIC to follow up with Jade regarding members' concerns

h) Audit provisions

- GIC finalise proposed rule draft

Members have been asked for any comments on the supplied rule drafts by 8 June, in order to incorporate them into the Statement of Proposal.

3b

Discussion of desired changes – *Core changes with implementation via change request process*

a) Data hub/sFTP

- Members noted it would be helpful for the GIC to outline efficiencies created by the data hub in the SOP, to help them assess the costs against the benefits. It was noted that other methods of secure file transfer exist.
- sFTP process has been completed.

b) Web services

- GIC noted that the opening up of web services will not be consulted on in the SOP as the cost has essentially already been borne.

Actions – prior to SOP:

a) Data hub/sFTP

- No further action.

b) Web services

- Progress buy back and notify participants when available.

3c

Discussion of desired changes – *Optional changes with implementation via change request process / changes to determinations*

a) "New"/"Old" file versions

- Kate indicated that the cost of the extension of file versioning to an individual request level was a significant proportion of the overall cost.
- Members were supportive of the file versioning at a participant level; further discussion on extending the versioning to an individual request level will be shaped in submissions to the SOP.

b) Status code for ACTC temporary disconnections

- Andrew noted that a code that denoted that gas could not flow at an active ICP would activate clause 59.4.2 that is not currently represented by a connection status.

- Members commented that any process/code addition would need to take into account that the temporary disconnection may sometimes lead to a complete disconnection (INACT). They would prefer that the change to INACT have the same event date as the change from ACTC-GAS to ACTC-(gas not flowing), in order to record the effective mapping of events. GIC will investigate with Jade whether this is possible.

Actions – prior to SOP:

- a) "New"/"Old" file versions
 - No further action
- b) Status code for ACTC temporary disconnections
 - GIC to follow up with Jade to ensure the two changes as described above may be recorded with the same event date.

4 Next steps

- a) Timeline
 - An SOP is expected to be released at the end of June. From there, data cleansing will commence, with an expected wrap up of the regulatory process in October.
 - Implementation is expected to be completed by Q2 2015.
 - On the SOP – members noted that they would appreciate clear outlines in the SOP on how retailers, meter owners and other parties could/would be affected by each change.
- b) Data cleansing and transition
 - Andrew noted that lessons would be gleaned from the recent Part 10 change in electricity, and the report that reviewed the process.
 - It was noted that a data clean up would include any existing fields that are deemed to require attention; but that they would be prioritised from the outset to ensure the most important are covered before implementation, if any serious setbacks are encountered.
 - Members agreed that data cleansing would start after the June SOP, beginning in July with the appointment of a new working group and agreement on its terms of reference.
 - Members also stressed that any updates regarding readiness to implement must contain "substance" to avoid false updates.

Actions – prior to SOP:

a) Timeline

- No further action

b) Data cleansing and transition

- GIC to request nominations for a transition team when these minutes are released.

4

Wrap up

Minutes will be circulated amongst members for comments. Observers will be sent copies to view.

Next steps are detailed in Actions above, and a Statement of Proposal is planned for June.

Meeting closed at 12:30.