



Registry Amendments Implementation Group meeting # 2

26 November 2014

Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Data cleansing discrepancies
3. Data cleansing process going forward
4. Outstanding notes from the Recommendation

1 WELCOME

2 DATA DISCREPANCIES

Summary (1)

Total number of ICPs (submitted by meter owners) = 289,514

Many ICPs were submitted for by more than one retailer.

No. of retailers submitted	Frequency
0	8,386
1	244,738
2	35,186
3	1,195
4	9

Summary (2)

Worksheet tab	Issue	Before simple cleansing	After simple cleansing*
Unclaimed ICPs	ICPs that were not in the responsible retailer's data set	2.6%	
Meter Owner discrepancy	ICPs where the responsible retailer noted a different responsible meter owner	0.5%	
Meter ID discrepancy	ICPs where the responsible retailer noted a different meter ID	41.6%	2.4%

*After removing many of the issues with single suffixes and prefixes (cleanse did not account for meter IDs that had suffixes/prefixes applied by both the meter owner and retailer).

Unclaimed ICPs (no retailer or the wrong retailer has submitted)

Possible causes for discrepancies:

- ICP was in the middle of a switch or switch withdrawal
- ICP has recently been through a switch and systems have not been updated (either RET or MO)
- Status issue: Retailer is not submitting for inactive ICPs (or active-vacant?), or meter owner has no responsible retailer
- ICP is NEW or READY and has no responsible retailer
- Any retailer feedback? How many were accounted for in first comparison?

Meter Owner discrepancy

Possible causes for discrepancies:

- Meter Owner inheritance of assets – mass edit of ICP parameters not possible / not completed
- Errors in account set up that have never been spotted/rectified
- Any retailer feedback? How many were accounted for in first comparison?

Meter ID discrepancy

Possible causes for discrepancies (examples to follow):

- Common prefix or suffix (or both) applied by retailer and/or meter owner – **94%** of discrepancies originally identified have been accounted for in this way (not including where both a prefix and suffix has been applied)
- Some meter IDs have been exported into Excel with Excel converting “E” to an exponential
- Obvious transcription errors
- Leading zeros
- Any further feedback?

Meter ID discrepancies - examples

	RET record	Difference
12 EG5675	13 EG5675	Leading digits differ
09L 184015	80 184015	Leading digits differ (prefix?)
306992 CTCT1	80826 306992	Both suffix and prefix applied
151694_	8080 151694	Underscore suff. and prefix applied
14EG0189	14EG 6 0189	Additional 6 in RET record
2394 38-CD	2394 78	Differing end digits
91 E 0226	9.1 E+227	Excel creating exponential (?)
13 P0 290	89888 13 P0 290	Prefix applied and 0/O disc.
G1064130	N1 G1064130	Prefix applied
13 9 0818	13 P 0818	Transcription error

Meter ID discrepancies – cleansing

It is clear some of the issues are systematic (e.g. addition of prefixes, Excel creating exponentials) and some are not (e.g. transcription errors).

As a first step, we want to remove all systematic errors; by:

- Understanding why the discrepancy has occurred (e.g. why have the prefixes / suffixes been applied?, is what is being submitted what is uploaded to the registry?)
- Deciding which ID will be propagated through the system
- Updating the respective systems

Once this is done we can move on to addressing the remaining errors.

2 DATA CLEANSING PROCESS

Cleansing process going forward (1)

- Use of Data Hub (GIEP exchange) for file transfer

The screenshot displays the 'GIEP Transfer' web application interface. At the top left is the 'GAS INDUSTRY COMPANY LIMITED' logo. The title 'GIEP Transfer' is centered at the top, with the current user 'GICX - supGICX / GICX Default supervisor' on the right. The interface includes a file upload section with a 'Choose File' button (showing 'No file chosen') and an 'Upload' button. Below this is a search section with a 'GIEP inbox' tab, a 'Select a file to download.' label, a 'Start Date' input field, a 'Select a sender.' dropdown menu (set to 'All'), and a 'Search' button. A table with five columns is shown: 'From', 'File name', 'Size in bytes', 'Created', and 'Modified'. The table is currently empty. At the bottom, there are navigation controls ('<<', '<', '>', '>>'), a 'Results: none' status, and 'Download' and 'Close' buttons.

Cleansing process going forward (2)

- Use of Data Hub (GIEP exchange) for file transfer
- ONLY AVAILABLE IN UAT (for now)
<https://www.testregistry.co.nz>
- Access via gas registry web portal or via FTP client
- SFTP only if accessing via FTP client
- Web portal: supervisor has to assign user access to GIEP screens
- Refer to User Manual in Gas Registry>Help>Downloads
- Same functionality as EIEP exchange

Cleansing process going forward (3)

- Process
 - Reports received monthly on 3rd business day of month, with data effective on the last day of the previous month (note 1 January)
 - One report to GIC; GIC to distribute
 - Meter owners to conduct initial checks; notify retailers of discrepancies
- GIC can provide a template of good initial checks (with Excel formulas) if this would be useful
- Decide on a deadline for fixing simple errors (in retailer, meter owner and meter ID fields)

3 OUSTANDING ISSUES FROM RECOMMENDATION

Outstanding notes from Recommendation (1)

- Meter pressure definition – any outcome from NZS5259 meeting?
 - meter pressure** means the gauge pressure [at the meter] on which the volumetric measurement is based, expressed in kilopascals
- GTN Validation
 - Six month grace period drafted in Rules for GTN validation
 - During this period, validation will still take place but failure will not cause GTN rejection
 - Monitoring will be via a transitional monthly report which compares GTN values with registry values for each switch completed during the previous month

Outstanding notes from Recommendation (2)

- System change audits – confirm drafting (pre / post audits)

Upon notification of a proposed change under rule 88.5, the industry body may arrange a performance audit of the registry participant to be completed up to 90 days after the change is to take effect.

Load shedding category vs allocation group

	0	1a	1b	2	2M	3	3M	4	5	6	7	DOM
AG1		2	2	5		83	7	17	27	5	4	49
AG2				2		185	4	61	43	15	10	6
AG3									1			
AG4				1	1	221	1	3259	137	1619	101	1953
AG5												2
AG6	1			10		513		582	90	14954	33	291857