

Registry Amendments Project Team: Meeting #2

Date: Wednesday 26 February 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
- ❖ Greg Matthews
- ❖ Peter Smith

Apologies

- ❖ Tara Gannon (withdrawn)
- ❖ Melanie Joyce
- ❖ Helen Taylor

In attendance from Gas Industry Co

- ❖ Andrew Walker
- ❖ Ian Dempster
- ❖ Kate Turner
- ❖ Pip Kerfoot

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.

2 Matters arising from last meeting

Members were invited to make comments on the meeting minutes and summary of feedback that was 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, specifically how some considerations are being treated as optional, and some as core, as well as a distinction between those that require rules changes (and the corresponding recommendation process), and those that do not. Jade have structured their cost estimate accordingly.

3a Discussion of desired changes – *Core changes with implementation via Recommendation to the Minister*

- a) Core metering fields and TOU flag
 - Regarding the description on the presentation slide, Andrew M commented that it may be beneficial to amend the definition of “Meter reading digits” to “all moving dials to the left of the decimal point, plus all whole units that are painted or fixed” to avoid the confusion that may arise if a fixed or painted digit is amended to the right of a set of dials that do contain a decimal point
 - Bill queried whether any CNG meters had register multipliers. It was noted that these concerns will be fleshed out in detail at the meeting of meter owners on the 16th of April.
 - Bill passed around a set of photos of different meter types to illustrate what needs to be captured by the definition for “Meter reading digits”. It was suggested that the GIC could produce a guideline for retailers and meter readers.
 - Regarding the use of a TOU and Advanced meter flag, it was noted that “TOU” could denote C&I meters, and “Advanced meter” could denote smart meters (domestic). Bill noted that “TOU” is used to mean “pressure and temperature corrected”.
 - When asked if populating the three metering fields for TOU sites would be possible or reasonable, Bill noted that meter owners would incur a large cost to synchronise their in-house systems with the registry, for a small number of sites. When asked about the benefits of doing so, Andrew M mentioned it would be helpful solely to allow for a data dump for reporting purposes, i.e. low benefit. The suggestion was made to blank out the three metering fields if the TOU flag was

activated. Jade confirmed that this would be possible.

- It was noted that there does exist a nominal meter pressure for TOU sites.
- Non – meter owner members were invited for any further comment, but were happy to leave the detail to this meeting.

b) GTN discrepancy handling

- Andrew W noted that contrary to what was previously understood, the current GTN set up does not validate the data in incoming GTNs with the registry database. GIC suggested removing this consideration from the work to remain consistent with the current approach.
- The majority of the members then expressed support for implementing validation on the GTN fields, noting that it would stop the spread of “bad data” with the expectation that after the initial population and cleansing, the data should be reasonably clean.
- Andrew M noted that this would create a commercial incentive to maintain data, as if a GTN bounces, the losing retailer will have to go and rectify the discrepancy.
- It was noted also that GTNs that fail validation and “bounce back” should not be withdrawn, in order to track issues with the data and/or process.
- For the few sites with multiple meters, the group agreed that these could be dealt with by exception i.e. via email or GIEP. Jade noted that the GTN can still hold multiple values for these fields, but that only one will be validated against the registry database.

c) Reduce total switch timeframe to 10 BDs

- Members were in general agreement with this change.
- The question was asked as to whether this could result in more estimation of final reads. Members were in general agreement that most switch and read dates don't line up anyway; a small increase in estimation may be seen, but nothing significant. It was acknowledged that the main changes would be operational.
- It was also noted that we would not fully line up with the EA regulations (to assist dual fuel switches) unless we decreased the switch time to 5 BDs; however, that this would be an extreme solution to a relatively minor issue.

d) Back-dating of standard switches

- Members generally agreed that a change to the Compliance Regulations would achieve the desired effect, with all back-dated switches being noted in the breach report (with a column labelling

them as a breach or not). This avoids significant changes to the registry.

- The alternate solution of allow back-dated switches only under agreement from both parties was also floated; however members did choose to develop it further as the occurrence of instances that were not under agreement would not be reported.
- Andrew M noted that any rule allowing back-dating should apply to both residential and commercial customers, as contracted residential sites will become more common in the future.
- Members agreed that any rule allowing back-dating should apply to both GNTs and GTNs.
- Process (1) in slides: Members noted that losing retailers should not be able to create a switch date prior to the requested switch date in the GNT.
- Process (2) in slides: Currently this breach is immaterial; the aim is to avoid this type of breach by a rule change.

e) Allow meter owners to input meter information before uplift

- This would occur when the ICP is at the READY stage.
- Members noted that it would merely highlight “vacant consumption”, which happens now anyway, although it is not seen. Retailers often ask meter owners to install meters prior to the customer being added to the registry. This would more accurately portray the actual series of events.

f) Allow edits to ICP parameters during a switch

- One member noted that this would avoid withdrawals of some switches due to changes to ICP statuses (i.e. vacant-disconnected)

g) Audit provisions

- No points to note

Actions:

h) Core metering fields and TOU flag

- Meter owner meeting scheduled with all meter owners for the 16th of April
- Update of cost estimate regarding the blanking out of fields for TOU sites
- GIC to refresh definitions of TOU and Advanced meter and circulate to members

- GIC to draft a guideline for retailers and meter readers to formalise the use of the “Meter reading digits” field
- i) GTN discrepancy handling
- Cost estimate for the validation process
 - GIC to collate list of ICPs with multiple meters/registers against the responsible retailer. This will be sent to the meter owners to confirm/explain.
- j) Reduce total switch timeframe to 10 BDs
- No action
- k) Back-dating of standard switches
- GIC to summarise frequency of breaches due to back-dating
 - Cost estimate for change to breach notice
- l) Allow meter owners to input meter information before uplift
- No action
- m) Allow edits to ICP parameters during a switch
- No action
- n) Audit provisions
- GIC to draft up additional rules

3b

Discussion of desired changes – *Optional changes with implementation via a Recommendation to the Minister*

- a) Other metering fields
- General consensus that these fields should not be in the registry. TOU sites will be flagged and retailers will be triggered to ring the meter owner.

Actions:

- a) Other metering fields
- Further discussion may be had in the meter owner meeting on 16 April.

3c

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

- a) Creation of data hub and sFTP
 - General support for progressing this separate to the rules changes. No issues were raised.
 - Members preferred that FTP was not phased out by end-2014

Actions:

- a) Creation of data hub and sFTP
 - GIC to progress change request process

3d

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

- a) "New" and "old" file versions
 - Members noted that files for which it would be helpful to have this functionality would be all event-based files, and LIS files.
 - Questions were raised around whether or not there would be a deadline for migration to the new file version, and whether or not you could chose different file versions for different file types, or on a manual (individual) basis
- b) Extended web browser time out
 - Jade noted that an extended web browser timeout is possible (current time of 60 minutes) but that alterations to the current functionality are very difficult. Insertion of a pop up notifying users that their session has logged out (before they make an action) is also a significant development.
- c) Reduction in number of location codes
 - Members acknowledged that there was significant repetition of location codes, but that it was not causing a problem and would be onerous to tidy up.
- d) Status code for credit disconnection

- It was agreed that having a 3 day window after which this status code must be updated does not solve the health and safety problem; however, it would help with the switching process if there was a disconnection during a switch (as this should be able to be updated via an earlier change).
- Andrew M also noted that it would help with historical tracking of customers, as cannot currently see if a customer has had credit disconnections occur in the past. He offered to provide data on connection/reconnection percentages and timeframes before the next meeting.
- GIC are in train with gaining legal advice on how or if this can be done

Actions:

- a) "New" and "old" file versions
 - Updated cost estimate to include changes to all event based files, and to allow the file version to be chosen manually in the download request
- b) Extended web browser time out
 - This consideration will be removed from further discussion and not progressed
- c) Reduction in number of location codes
 - This consideration will be removed from further discussion and not progressed
- d) Status code for credit disconnection
 - Andrew M to provide data on connection/reconnection percentages and timeframes
 - GIC to look into GANZ protocols regarding credit disconnections

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 the next RAPT meeting will convene on 21 May.

Meeting closed at 12:30.