

Registry Amendments Implementation Group: Meeting #1



Date: Thursday 23 October 2014

Time: 14:00 – 17:00

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

Minutes

Present

Members

- ❖ Nigel Gallagher
- ❖ Andrew Maseyk
- ❖ Mike de Kort
- ❖ Jules Meredith
- In attendance from Gas Industry Co**
- ❖ Campbell Wilson
- ❖ Andrew Walker
- ❖ Bill Miller
- ❖ Kate Turner
- ❖ Helen Taylor
- ❖ Kyrn Savage (via phone)

1 Welcome and introduction

14:00

The meeting opened at 14:00.

Gas Industry Co staff welcomed members of the Registry Amendments Implementation Group.

2 Project overview

14:05

Gas Industry Co staff went through the key tasks of the group, and an indicative timeline of the work, emphasising that data quality would be of the most importance prior to go-live.

The possibility of employing an external project manager was introduced; members commented that whether this would be necessary would depend on the extent to which

discrepancies existed in the data. As the size of the data cleansing project is still unknown, the decision around a project manager was delayed until the first comparison of data is completed.

Gas Industry Co discussed the structure of group communications, noting that email would be used for the majority of communications and that there may be a need for an online platform to manage an ongoing issues register, upload documents etc. It was noted that perhaps Jade's platform Jira could be used. Andrew M suggested that the website be used as a repository of information, with google drive as a method to share and edit documents.

Comments were invited on the draft Terms of Reference; none were received.

Action items

- Finalise Terms of Reference and upload to website
- Follow up with Jade on Jira

3 Issues arising from SOP submissions

14:25

Core fields

Updated definitions were discussed, as detailed in the meeting presentation. Members still had concerns that the meter pressure definition could be ambiguous regarding at what point the pressure was to be measured. Suggestions were that the name be changed to "nominal meter pressure" or that the words "at the meter" could be added to the definition. Bill noted that these definitions would be revisited in a working group being convened to focus on updates to the NZS 5259 gas measurement standard. It was seen as useful to standardise the definition across these codes. It was agreed that due to the timeframe of the meeting occurring before the expected release of the Recommendation, Gas Industry Co would wait for feedback from this group before making a decision on the meter pressure definition.

Nigel suggested the inclusion of a meter type/model field in the registry. It was noted that this field had already been discussed during the RAPT meetings, and for various reasons had been discarded. Bill mentioned that AMS may be developing the ability for retailers to view ICPs in their system, which would provide an alternate way to access this information.

The TOU and advanced meter definitions as circulated prior to the meeting and detailed in the meeting presentation, though accepted as not being perfect, were as good as could be possible for the present time. Members accepted that they could be revisited if there proved to be improvements in the future. Members also agreed on the circulated business rules for population of these fields.

Gas Industry Co noted that in the investigation around these fields, it was discovered that the advanced meter owner and advanced meter flag were missing from Part C of the Rules, which details the list of meter owner parameters. Members agreed that the changes are minor and technical and were happy to add them to the recommended changes.

File versioning

Gas Industry Co noted the general consensus around implementing participant-level file versioning as indicated by submissions to the SOP, though that there was a need to be able to download the full data set that included the new metering fields on an ad hoc basis. Members discussed how a file of this form compared to the current available downloads such as the LIS file and the snapshot file, and agreed that none of these formats would be suitable. Members were interested in adding the file format that will be used for the data cleansing work to the registry, and allow this to be downloaded in the old or new version on an ad hoc basis. It was agreed that it would not be workable to have this level of versioning available through the FTP client, only via the user interface.

Members were interested in only having a 12 month transition period over which file versioning would be available.

Audit provisions

Gas Industry Co discussed the concerns around the drafting of the audit provisions as indicated through submissions. Specifically:

- Material changes only will be notified to the GIC for potential audits; though the term "material change" is not used, it is implied by the wording "...could reasonably be considered to be likely to have a major impact..."
- It was not deemed appropriate to restrict draft and final audit reports to participants with a material interest in the reports, as it is only once participants see that the reports that they can assess the level of their interest. Members noted that the summaries supplied by the EA of participant audits did not give adequate detail around the results of any audit. The choice to make audit reports available to all participants is in line with the Gas Industry Co intention of transparency in the industry.
- "Baseline" audits conducted in the 24 months post go-live are intended to be a comprehensive check-up of participants' compliance with the new rules. They may be slightly longer than subsequent audits, though because the reconciliation audits are occurring this year it might transpire that some reconciliation and switching audits could be conducted simultaneously.
- The timeframe around subsequent audits is limited only by the clause that states that they should occur no more than five years apart.

- The scope of audits is merely each participant's obligations under the rules.

GTN validation

Andrew M noted that it would be wise to ensure the GTN fields were reconciled 100% during the data cleansing process.

Members noted that if there were to be a grace period, notification of data errors in the GTN could not be done by an automated error message from the registry, as this would automatically disrupt the switch in their systems. Participants were generally in favour of a 6 month grace period.

Reduction in switch timeframe

Concerns raised in the SOP centred on how breach data discrepancies would be managed, taking into account the reduced timeframe, and the addition of GTN validation. Gas Industry Co noted that by following through with any breaches, there will be transparency (to GIC) around how often data discrepancies are causing breaches, who is responsible etc.

Bill expressed concern that there will be added work for meter owners to check data discrepancies by doing site visits during the switch process. Members acknowledged this concern, and a thorough data cleansing process was noted as the primary way to avoid this impact to meter owners. It was also noted that the reconciliation audits have shown that in most cases (~90%) it is the meter owner's data that is correct. This will be taken into account when the group discusses how to deal with data discrepancies.

It was also mentioned that switching rules would benefit from a rule, like what is present in the reconciliation rules, which states that retailers would be able to pass on breaches to the culpable party when the breach was due to using incorrect data in the registry. As we are too far down the process at this stage, this suggestion will be added to the rules register for the switching rules.

Temporary disconnection status

In discussing what code would be suitable for this connection status, it was decided that the code must be something that is not currently used in the GANZ disconnection and reconnection protocol. The suggestion of "GTD" was discussed, and deemed to be a pragmatic solution.

One member expressed a preference for the code to sit at the ICP status level rather than the connection status level. Though being defined as a connection status may not be technically correct, the ability for Gas Industry Co to determine the code outside of the rules was seen to reasonably justify the choice.

Action items

- Add the additional file format to the list of changes for Jade to be quoted and developed
- Note to Jade the issue regarding the notification of GTN validation errors (during grace period)

4 Data cleansing approach and methodology

15:30

Scope

With regards to the scope detailed in the draft Terms of Reference and presentation, it was decided:

- TOU ICPs are in scope, though will be dealt with separately to non-TOU ICPs
- Distributor fields will be checked independently by Gas Industry Co (gas gate code and address will be error checked – though low priority, and load shedding category compared against GIC records and CCM band data supplied by retailers)
- Logger owner and corrector owner codes are in scope
- ICP status is not a field that will be checked, but a condition: All ICPs will be checked except those with the ICP status of DECR
- A small amount of non-TOU ICPs with multiple meters exist, but they will be dealt with on a case by case basis

Stages

The group decided that the first three stages (ownership, metering fields and TOU vs non-TOU) would be deemed high priority. Stage four, ICP status has been removed as noted above, and the last two stages of CCM band and address would be low priority. (Referencing the stages detailed in the draft Terms of Reference and meeting presentation).

The ownership stage will be managed by the GIC once the first cut of the data is sent through.

Information flow between participants

It was decided that GIC would manage the first step of reconciling the ownership of ICPs. Participants would then communicate between themselves the data for ICPs they own. After the first set of data is communicated only discrepancies would be sent between parties to minimise complexity.

Participants will periodically update GIC on progress.

Information exchange

It was decided that GIC would circulate a file format that would then become a standard report in the registry.

Members were happy to use the data hub to exchange data, once it was running (which doubles as UAT testing).

Acceptance criteria

Members felt it was important to ensure a 100% completion for reconciling data in the first three stages (ownership, metering fields and TOU vs non-TOU). The final two stages would be completed as lower priorities and therefore have lower acceptable thresholds of accuracy. It was agreed that this work would be a good chance to reconcile the CCM band data, due to the expiry of designations on 1 December.

Data cleansing approach

As the extent of discrepancies is yet unknown, members were happy to wait to settle on a method to approach discrepancies. It was agreed that large discrepancies (e.g. 350kPa compared to 3.7kPa) would be dealt with differently to small discrepancies (e.g. 1.5 c.f. 1.7) as the errors most likely have different origins, and it may be more obvious where the mistake may be for one than the other.

Members stressed that customer impact needs to be taken into account when changing data, as this will ultimately affect what they are billed. Timeframes will need to take into account time for this communication.

Action points

- GIC to draft up and send out a file format for information exchange
- Participants to supply the first set of data to GIC on 3 November, with data effective 31 October. (With emphasis on the ownership data over other fields)
- GIC to finalise and circulate Terms of Reference, and update data cleansing methodology paper