

Date:	20.10.09	
Chair:	Michael Atkinson NIE	
Attendees:	<i>RMDS</i> – Conor Garrigan <i>ESB CS</i> – Brid Finnegan <i>ESB ICT</i> – Ian Myles, Colette McEvoy, Joseph Murphy <i>BG Energy</i> – Mark Speers, Ger Harnett <i>NIE Energy</i> – Clifford Morrison <i>Firmus Energy</i> – Veronika Gallagher, Mary O’Kane <i>CER</i> – Paul Fuller	<i>Airtricity</i> – Siobhhan Leane, Karen Cahill <i>Energia</i> – Mandy Reid, N McGee, Thomas Heasley <i>ESB ICT</i> – Colette McEvoy <i>ESBN</i> – Theresa O’Neill, Walter Keady <i>ESB IE</i> – Robert O’Brien <i>NIE</i> – Nigel Wray, Micheal Atkinson <i>IBM</i> – Paul Merkens
Apologies:		
Version Number		
Change Made		

Slides of the meeting are issued separately

Agenda:		
1.	Introduction	Michael Atkinson, NIE
2.	Matters Arising from 6 October	Paul Merkens, IBM
3.	General Issues	Paul Merkens, IBM
4.	Registration	Paul Merkens, IBM
5.	Supplier Unit Changes	Paul Merkens, IBM
6.	Objection and Cancellation	Paul Merkens, IBM

7.	Deregistration	Paul Merkens, IBM
8.	AOB	
9.	Next Meeting	

1. Introduction

M Atkinson introduced the meeting, stating that the main focus would be registration and change of supply, and that the aim would be to establish an action plan. Participants were asked whether they had concerns over the previous meeting's minutes, and none were raised.

Minutes approved by participants.

2. Matters Arising from 6 October

Slide 3: Matters Arising

Additional meetings on 11 and 27 November

Meeting on 11 November to discuss comments from today, fieldwork.

Slide as circulated.

Slide 4: Comments on Today's Proposals

Comments by close of 27 October

Slide as circulated.

3. General Issues

Slide 5: General Issues

Message Header – Additional supplier ID removed

Supplier ID values remain different – harmonisation would create major data migration challenge

MPRN Address Processing – NIE to adopt county codes with English/Gaelic equivalent for RoI countries. Postcode remains in NIE address validation.

3. General Issues

A participant asked whether fuzzy matching would not be introduced in NI. P Merkens replied that that was not on the agenda.

Other Common Data Segments

Rejection Reason Codes – Same rejection code for both markets

Slide 6: MPRN Address

Schema broadly the same, with some detailed differences – MPRN address harmonised

K Cahill inquired whether NI postcodes allowed for alphanumeric. P Merkens replied that it was almost certainly alphanumeric.

Action – ESB to verify this point

Slide 7: Customer Name to be Harmonised

A participant asked whether RoI would adopt NI's first and last name requirements, and P Merkens responded that there was no plan to do so. Validations will be provided in the message guide issued after 11 November, and comments on these will be responded to. N McGee asked whether the RoI address scoring applies to NI, and P Merkens stated that NIE validation is postcode based.

Slide 8: Customer Contact Details – Harmonising length of email address

Slide 9: Notification Address

Slide 10: Technical Contact: Street name, street address, to be introduced in NI

Slides as circulated.

4. Registration

Slide 11: Registration Message Use

Registration Messages to be Aligned – Message 102 to confirm CoS acceptance

4. Registration

Message 102P will always be sent for site visit

K Cahill asked whether some 102Ps gave a reason code and some did not. P Merkens answered that a reason would be given if an energisation agreement was needed. The question is whether suppliers want to see a difference in the messaging, though there is no difference in the market. K Cahill indicated that suppliers expected the 102P field to be populated, and that it would not be anymore. C McEvoy replied that that the message will not be sent, not that the field will not be populated.

Message 140 to be included in schema, but not used in RoI

A participant asked whether there is any point in introducing an optional message into the schema if it has never been used in RoI. P Merkens said that this should be considered in future discussions. N McGee added that there was a difficulty in technical contact, because people on the ground do not necessarily receive that information. J Murphy responded that the technical contact data is generally used for larger sites. N McGee stated that information needed to be updated when there was movement in the market, particularly concerning the group sites.

Message 010 no longer used for change of supplier unit – replaced by 015, 115, 115R**Slide 12: MPRN Website****NIE to provide MPRN lookups for new connections and connected meter points, metered and unmetered – Data protection issues**

G Harnett asked whether the data protection issues have been identified. P Merkens answered that it had to be determined whether there were any in either market. G Harnett enquired whether partial segmentation will be considered for sole traders. P Merkens stated that it was a grey area, and NIE does not always know the status of a customer.

Action – NIE to consult on data protection issues**Equivalent data provided by NIE, excepting non domestic customer, medical and special needs**

A participant asked whether the data protection review process was lengthy, and P Merkens

4. Registration

stated that he was not familiar with the NI route, but approval had been swift in RoI. S Leane enquired whether the issue would go directly before the Data Protection Commission. K Cahill added that a result should emerge quickly from the process.

Meter location, category and register digits, type not provided in NI for new connections; meter configuration not provided

NIE does not hold meter point addresses for unmetered points, billing address displayed

M Reid pointed out that an MPRN removed request cannot be done in NI because there is no individual MPRNs. P Merkens indicated that it was unlikely for NI to move to group MPRNs with underlying technical MPRNs.

Load profile and meter multiplier will be provided

J Murphy added that there were two separate MCRs.

NIE not proposing market message lookups through MPRN website

K Cahill enquired there would be whether bulk download for NHH sites. P Merkens answered that no downloads are being proposed. K Cahill responded that NQH commercial was available, so the NI equivalent seemed to be viable. P Merkens replied a request for this would have to be referred back to NIAUR. G Harnett asked whether they would be provided on CD, and P Merkens stated that NIE would do so only if approved by NIAUR. S Leane asked whether transaction reference numbers for MM lookups are to be used in NI. P Merkens replied that in NI there were only lookups for received messages in EMMA rather than messages sent.

Action – NIE to follow up the issue of MM lookups

NIE need to review provision of address search with NIAUR and Consumer Council – concerns on erroneous registrations

Action – NIE to examine data issues

S Leane enquired whether the MPRN algorithm would be harmonised in both markets, and P Merkens answered that this was unlikely, given the changes to MPRNs involved. M Reid

4. Registration

asked how often updates would take place. P Merkens responded that NIE updates will continue taking place overnight.

Slide 13: Registration Request 010 MPRN Level

Schema to be brought into line

M Atkinson enquired whether this would involve significant changes, and P Merkens stated that a range of changes on both sides would be involved.

Market participant business reference to be mandatory in NI – supplier unit ID harmonised on nine-character field – SSAC retained

S Leane asked what the calling pattern meant. P Merkens replied that it meant pattern matching in a field. S Leane also asked what WS meant. P Merkens responded that it meant white space.

CoT LE flag – if this flag is not set then ESB infer a change whereas NIE reject.

CoS estimate flag – broad view that NIE accept flag set to yes in similar circumstances to ESB

Tariff configuration code required in NI only

Usage type required in NI – slight change to validation

Medical equipment and customer service remain one value – code list remains separate

K Cahill stated that many customers have multiple medical equipment, but since only one can be indicated, they have to be prioritised. J Murphy answered that multiple 013 messages can be sent.

Appointment ID introduced as part of online fieldwork in NI only

C Morrison enquired whether subsequent 013s can only be sent after receiving a 105, and P Merkens confirmed this.

4. Registration

Slide 14: Registration Request 010 CoT History**Will be retained for NI debt tracking, segment optional, not used for NI**

K Cahill asked how it can be present if it is not used in RoI. P Merkens said that the debt tracking regimes are unique to NI, and the segment will be present in both schema but not used in RoI. K Cahill sought clarification on whether the request would be ignored, and P Merkens confirmed this.

Slide 15: Registration Request 010 Meter Readings**Data required to identify registers will differ as NI does not support register type code**

K Cahill asked whether there would be harmonisation in this area, and P Merkens replied that that was unlikely.

Slide 16: Registration Issues 1 – CoS Estimates**CoS Estimates Permitted in RoI – Proposed to permit in NI**

A participant enquired whether NIE will pick up the cost. P Merkens answered that there are various rules, and that consideration of special reads will begin on 1 December. K Cahill asked whether the timeout rules will accommodate NIE's quarterly read, and P Merkens responded that that is likely.

Slide 17: Registration Issues 2 – Required Date**Mandatory for NI CoS when not using required read****Minor differences in rules for specifying required date****Handling of required date when a reading is obtained****Action – suppliers to comment on options: harmonisation on RoI approach, keeping current arrangement, allowing NI decision driven by lowest implementation cost**

M Atkinson asked how significant the differences are. P Merkens replied that the supplier will have a contract with the customer, and that the dates for energy volume purchase may not

4. Registration

align. K Cahill added that it was different for each type of customer. M Atkinson enquired whether the key point was the suppliers' perceived value add in terms of alignment. G Harnett stated that the second option seemed to conflict with the cooling off period.

Slide 18: Registration 3 - Cooling Off Period

Cooling off period is feature of NI market for domestic customers

Two options – First is metering reading on message 010 or 210

Second option - Retrospective CoS at start of CoP

Slide 19: Registration Issues 3b – Cooling Off Period

Retrospective CoS requires considering: scheduled read within cooling off period; NIE and suppliers would have to suppress or reverse billing during cooling off; initial aggregation for settlement against the old supplier at D+4

G Harnett said that lack of a scheduled read will not hinder CoS. P Merkens replied that a scheduled read would override the customer read, and that the CoS would go through regardless. K Cahill asked how accurate the NI estimates are. P Merkens said that the estimate would be accurate if the initial read was accurate. An EAC is calculated from the customer read on the basis of consumption the previous year, and a 10-day profile is unlikely to be wildly inaccurate. A participant enquired whether there is some form of validation, and P Merkens indicated that NIE and ESB validate all reads according to similar rules. K Cahill asked when the 110 goes out, and P Merkens confirmed that it was at the start.

K Cahill then stated that Airtricity could bill within the cooling off period, and that it is unclear whether the measure will dispense with the option of reversing bills. P Merkens answered that each supplier has a different billing practice, that there is no regulatory guidance on stopping billing when a 110 is received, but that suppliers would want to avoid reverse billing where possible. A participant asked whether the required date or the read date will be used, and P Merkens replied that following the read date would be tidier. K Cahill pointed out that a customer's read is being ignored by the industry, and P Merkens responded that a scheduled read already overrides a customer read in both markets. A participant asked who bears the cost between the two dates. P Merkens answered that the supplier bears the cost.

4. Registration

S Leane said that under the EU Third Energy Package, CoS has to complete in 21 days, which is a reduction of the time frame. P Merkens responded that NIAUR had not had sight of the Package, and indicated that the cooling off period fell within 21 days. K Cahill stated that there might not always be a read. P Merkens replied that there is the option of providing an estimate, though scheduled read would be an issue. P Fuller said that CER will try to get information on the Package before the next meeting.

Retrospective CoS not possible for keypad

K Cahill asked whether smart meters in NI still came under domestic, and P Merkens indicated that it was difficult to say without proposals for what it would look like. K Cahill asked whether there was a different role for retrospective. P Merkens stated that that depends on what the smart metering is doing. The retrospective CoS could be done in the cooling off period for RoI and NI.

Action – comments by 27 October

Slide 20: Registration Issues 4 – General Data

Usage Type – Not in RoI, proposed to remain in NI as optional field

EAI code – Regulations require different code sets

Medical equipment and customer special needs codes

Appointment ID

Slide as circulated.

Slide 21: Registration Issue 5 – Meter Data and Changes

Serial number and timeslot proposals in NI

Change to interval metering – Not currently allowed in RoI, no change proposed

A participant asked whether other changes were allowed, such as keypad to credit, and P Merkens stated that they were.

4. Registration**Slide 22: New Connection Registration**

New Connection Energisation – registration required for NI domestic customer, not in Rol. NIE propose to retain ES rule

G Harnett stated that the additional supplier ID is proposed to be removed, and asked what will happen in an emergency situation if the supplier cannot be contacted. P Merkens replied that there will be an absolute rule which is that suppliers must send in a registration. G Harnett asked why there is no intention to harmonise in this area. J Murphy stated that any change to the model goes through the existing change procedure. G Harnett asked whether a change request would be accommodated. J Murphy replied that it will be impacted like every other MCR, but a timeline has not been finalised. Suppliers can raise a change request as a prerequisite for energisation, but it has to go through the normal process. P Merkens added that any change requests would be considered on a joint governance basis. M Atkinson indicated that the aim was to have as much as possible agreed by December in order to make any substantial modifications to the ES, but that the current proposals would not disturb the joint schema. G Harnett stated a preference for the proposed NI arrangements. S Leane stated that the advantage of the Rol schema was in giving customers five days to shop around. G Harnett responded that customers in NI were being forced to look at suppliers. P Merkens said that customers were given a supplier list, and to S Leane's question whether this would be maintained, P Merkens stated it would.

Registrations can be superseded prior to energisation.

Slide 23: Registration Response Issues

Issues variously impacting messages 101, 101P, 102, 102P, 105 - Load profile, load factor, transformer loss factor

Customer contact harmonised

Effective from date on message 101P to be removed; Read cycle code appear on Rol and NI MMs

Rejection reason codes to be aligned

Slide as circulated.

4. Registration

Slide 24: N/C Registration Response Message 101P

K Cahill asked whether the Market Participant Business Reference Number would still relate to the 010 and P Merkens said that was the general principle

Slide 25: N/C Registration Response Message 101

Slide as circulated.

Slide 26: Response Message 101R

S Leane asked whether MMs on behalf of generators would remain visible, and a participant stated they would.

Slide 27: CoS Registration Response Message 102P

Slide as circulated.

Slide 28: CoS Registration Response Message 102

J Murphy explained that in MCR 0169, it is proposed that where special needs flags would be deleted from the customer on completion of a CoS, notification on a 102 mm would allow the new supplier to provide an update after CoS completion.

Slide 29: CoS Registration Response Message 102R

K Cahill asked whether the number of days would match, and P Merkens responded that it was 20 days in both markets.

Slide 30: Notification of CoS 110

Slide as circulated.

Slide 31: CoS Confirmation Issues

Old and New Supplier ID

Slide as circulated.

4. Registration**Slide 32: CoS Confirmation 105**

Slide as circulated.

Slide 33: CoS Loss Confirmation 105L

A participant asked whether 310W and 320W messages will continue. P Merkens answered that readings messages will continue, but there will be withdrawals if CoS is withdrawn. This topic will be dealt with on 1 December. The 300 message in NI will be replaced by the Rol messages.

5. Supplier Unit Changes**Slide 34: Change of Supplier Unit**

Slide as circulated.

Slide 35: Change of Supplier Unit Messages

Slide as circulated.

6. Objection and Cancellation**Slide 36: Objection Issues****Erroneous Transfer Objections****Differences in rules for suspending completion and fieldwork**

G Harnett stated that supplier support for arbitration in Rol is universal, and that the CER might bring their adjudications forward. I Myles answered that this would be premature. In answer to K guarantees could not be given. P Merkens stated that the process remains open until December. P Merkens agreed with G Harnett that a contingency meeting should be left open so that this can be discussed further, and there is still a change request process in default of agreement. K Cahill asked whether December's schema change is the last before harmonisation. R O'Brien replied that a joint governance was needed to keep the schemas aligned and to take account of changes. P Merkens added that there was a limit beyond which

6. Objection and Cancellation

the procurement could not be delayed. M Atkinson said that there was no plan to delay implementation past the date already set. K Cahill pointed out that a lot of issues were competing with harmonisation. P Merkens responded that some of the issues might not impact on implementation. G Harnett added that debt could be harmonised, but not FEA, so harmonisation should be done where possible.

Slide 37: Objection Messages 012 and 112

Slide 38: Objection Message 112R

Slide 39: Objection Messages 012W and 112W

Slides as circulated.

Slide 40: Cancellation

Cancellation reasons to be extended to include RoI values

NIE to implement RoI process that new supplier can cancel CoS following completion for any reason

Slide as circulated.

Slide 41: Cancellation Issues

Slight difference on rules for automated cancellation – Proposed harmonisation on 20 day rule after scheduled read

K Cahill asked whether cancellation referred to the supplier, and P Merkens answered that it was automatic CoS cancellation. NIE cancel for not allowing access as well. S Leane enquired whether these rules were existing or proposed. P Merkens replied that they were proposed. S Leane stated that in NI there was a timeout if the next scheduled read was not received, unlike in RoI. N McGee pointed out that timeouts were a problem because of access issues. P Merkens indicated that the proposed changes would hopefully give more time to deal with these issues, and as part of ES the NIE took an action to devise a policy by Christmas for hard to read metering. S Leane asked whether the ESB had a similar policy, and C McEvoy replied that there were no current proposals, and said that arrangements were in place to transfer to an estimate. A participant added that even this was proving to be impossible in certain cases. P Merkens said that the existing provision in RoI is that sites are not covered by the estimate unless there has been a read within 12 months.

6. Objection and Cancellation

Slide 42: Cancellation Messages 011, 111, 111L

Slight difference in effective from date

Slide as circulated.

Slide 43: Cancellation Messages 111R

Slide as circulated.

Slide 44: Cancellation Messages 011A, 111A

Slide as circulated.

7. Deregistration

Slide 45: Deregistration Issues

Suppliers must request deregistration in Rol using message 021

Suppliers cannot currently request deregistration in NI

NIE require additional time to consider implications for revenue protection, reregistration, connection processes

K Cahill said that suppliers are stuck with the DuoS and capacity charges until deregistration in Rol, whereas debt hopping is not possible in NI. G Harnett added that in NI as part of the ES, the supplier can apply to be deregistered if site access is not possible. J Murphy responded that a deregistered energised site is a new concept, and someone has to pay. G Harnett said that there cannot continue to be a situation where disconnection is impossible, so the charging system has to be terminated. P Merkens stated that suppliers have to cost the inherent risk, and that deregistration is not necessarily the best solution. G Harnett pointed out that most parties apart from NIE T&D were in favour of deenergisation without disconnection, and that that might be included in the proposed solution. W Keady said that this process has to go through the IGG.

Action – Suppliers to come back on value of deregistration process in NI. NIE also need

7. Deregistration

to consider implications for revenue protection.

8. AOB

M Atkinson asked for feedback as to the format which had been pursued is the correct one to continue on. S Leane said that it would be useful to see the validation rules. K Cahill indicated that it would be useful to have the slides three days in advance so that comments could be prepared, as well as a list of messages. P Merkens replied that this was one reason why the agreement meeting has been deferred from 2 November to 11. M Atkinson stated that the alignment of messages and schema should not prevent a subsequent discussion in terms of moving Rol closer to NI.

Actions – SG members to explain principles more clearly following the next SG meeting.

NIE to examine issue of time restriction with regard to MMs issuance.

9. Next Meeting

The next meeting is on 2 November from 11.00 to 15.00.