

|                       |   |   |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| <b>Date:</b>          | <b>11.11.09</b>   |   |
| <b>Chair:</b>         | Michael Atkinson, NIE   |   |
| <b>Attendees:</b>     | <p><i>RMDS</i> – Conor Garrigan</p> <p><i>ESB CS</i> – Bridget Finnegan, Gerry McDonald</p> <p><i>ESB ICT</i> – Tom Ryan, Colette McEvoy, Joe Murphy</p> <p><i>Firmus Energy</i> – Mary O’Kane, Veronika Gallagher</p> <p><i>CER</i> – Paul Fuller</p> <p><i>NIAUR</i> – Michael Campbell</p> <p><i>Gemserv</i> – Malcolm Rowley</p> <p><i>ESB Networks</i> – Walter Keady, Theresa O’Neill</p> | <p><i>NIE</i> – Paul Merkens, Helen Mounsey, Ann Ferguson</p> <p><i>Energia</i> – Thomas Heasley, Mandy Reid</p> <p><i>NIE Energy</i> – Clifford Morrison</p> <p><i>BG Energy</i> – Deirdre Lee, Ger Harnett</p> <p><i>ESB IE</i> – B Jennings</p> <p><i>Airtricity</i> – Siobhan Leane, Karen Cahill</p> |
| <b>Apologies:</b>     |   |   |
| <b>Version Number</b> | 2.0   |   |
| <b>Change Made</b>    | Page 2, reference to "C Morrison" changed to "A participant" as Clifford was referenced incorrectly.  |   |

Slides of the meeting are issued separately

|                |                                   |                |
|----------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|
| <b>Agenda:</b> |                                   |                |
| <b>1.</b>      | Minutes from Previous HWG Meeting | P Merkens, NIE |
| <b>2.</b>      | Matters Arising from 2 November   | P Merkens, NIE |

|    |                                     |                |
|----|-------------------------------------|----------------|
| 3. | Proposal Agreement - Registration   | P Merkens, NIE |
| 4. | Proposal Agreement – CoS Unit       | P Merkens, NIE |
| 5. | Clarification of Fieldwork Comments | P Merkens, NIE |
| 6. | AOB                                 | P Merkens, NIE |
| 7. | Next Meeting                        | P Merkens, NIE |

### 1. Minutes from Previous HWG Meeting

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p><b>Slide 2: Agenda</b></p> <p><b>No feedback on minutes.</b></p> |
|--|---|

### 2. Matters Arising from 2 November

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p><b>Slides 3 &amp; 4: Matters Arising from Previous HWG – Resolved</b></p> <p><b>Areas where MM 261 is not sent in response to MM 260</b></p> <p><b>NIE MPRN website data publication</b></p> <p>G Harnett asked whether progress has been made on the timing of the legal advice. A participant replied that a way has been devised for the ES to go forward, with this being configured later in line with legal opinion. K Cahill added that the GB legal team have advised that data protection issues can be taken out. A participant stated that this approach was probably about discovering what is useful as a minimum and supplementing it if possible.</p> <p><b>CER consultation on objection and debt – CER still working on issue</b></p> <p><b>Messaging technical workstream</b></p> <p><b>EAC effective date available in aggregation audit trail</b></p> <p><b>ESB, NIE to investigate possible differences in check digit algorithm and report back</b></p> <p><b>De-energisation CoP review</b></p> |
|--|---|

**3. Proposal Agreement - Registration****Slide 5: Proposal Agreement – Registration**

**Brief review – proposal prescribed for 22 October**

**Proposal changes made as result of comments made, clarifications discussed on 2 November - highlighted**

K Cahill asked whether the ESB document will have MCRs going through in June next year. K Cahill further queried whether the HWG is taking into account changes made in May, so the ESB document might not reflect subsequent MCRs. T O'Neill responded that the Harmonised Rol Market Message Guides will include the Q2, 2010 changes and that the MCRs for the Q2 2010 release will stand. P Merkens added that CDA changes will probably be documented separately as CRs, whereas the document concerns the HWG alone.

**Slide 6: Registration Summary of Key Issues****Significant changes and additions since HWG 2**

P Merkens asked whether CER have issued anything on the Third Package. P Fuller said that a communication was issued to the SG, not yet to the WG, but there was not much in it.

**Remaining issues****Outstanding issues excluded from agreement**

**Slide as presented.**

**Slide 7: General Issues**

**Supplier IDs remain different**

**MPRN address publishing**

**Different common data segments**

**Rejection reason codes**

T O'Neill stated that, on foot of an ESB action item from the HWG meeting held on 22nd October, that we are changing the postcode to alphanumeric in the Rol schema. A participant

**3. Proposal Agreement - Registration**

asked whether there is one code per county. P Merkens replied that there are two codes in Rol, a code for English and a code for Gaelic, and further answered that there will be a unified list, and that there will be 52 codes for the 26 Counties.

**Slide 8: MPRN Address**

Slide as presented.

**Slide 9: Customer Name**

Slide as presented.

**Slide 10: Customer Contact Details**

Slide as presented.

**Slide 11: Notification Address**

Slide as presented.

**Slide 12: Technical Contact**

Slide as presented.

**Slide 13: Registration Message Use**

Registration messages aligned

Introduce MM 102, 015, 115, 115R to align with NI – 140 remains in NI, introduced in Rol schema but not being used

**MM 102P**

Slide as presented.

**Slide 14: MPRN Website 1**

NIE will provide MPRN lookups

**3. Proposal Agreement - Registration****Equivalent data to ESB with exceptions**

**Local profile and meter multiplier provided by NIE, ESB**

**Slide as presented.**

**Slide 15: MPRN Website 2**

**NIE proposals for downloads**

**NIE to include procurement and design facilities**

**Items remain subject to legal, NIAUR, Consumer Council and Data Protection review, may be modified or not implemented**

K Cahill indicated that legal advice is also being sought on domestic meter points, because a DUoS code is required to validate whether meters are keypad or non-keypad. P Merkens replied that the information will be on the MPRN download as a single download. K Cahill stated that this information was for bulk customers signing up online. P Merkens asked whether NIE are including that in the procurement. M Rowley said that the ES will have full MPRNs for every supply point in NI. K Cahill stated that domestic might also be needed in the full solution. P Merkens pointed out that NIE needs to give guidance on whether domestic is being included. M Rowley indicated that all customer information for every MPRN will be available on the website, and it will be configured to limit the information if legally required. K Cahill stated that it was not available on the MPRN website and had to be requested. T O'Neill replied that there is a DR in RoI IGG forum on this issue. M Rowley reiterated that NIAUR is agreeing to make the data available with a facility to constrict the data if legally obliged. K Cahill further said that if a bulk domestic download becomes available in RoI it should be available in NI subject to legal advice.

**Slide 16: Registration Request 010 MPRN Level**

A participant queried whether appointment ID is being phased out. P Merkens explained that only appointment IDs will be used on 010s, because there is already a required date.

**Slide 17: Registration Request 010 CoT History**

**Slide as presented.**

**3. Proposal Agreement - Registration****Slide 18: Registration Request 010 Meter Readings**

S Leane asked why NIE is considering making serial numbers mandatory. P Merkens replied that it is already mandatory in NI, and if it is mandatory in ESB back end systems, it should be mandatory on the schema. ESB are currently investigating, and feedback is to follow.

**Slide 19: Registration Request – CoS Estimates****CoS estimates are currently permitted in RoI****CoS estimates will be permitted in NI**

M Rowley requested an explanation of the profiling decision, as the EAC reflects the latest estimate, as the meter reading can be projected more accurately, and should be used. P Merkens stated that there already is a procedure in NI and RoI for disputed readings, as last year's read period, rather than EACs, is used for reading validation. T O'Neill outlined that based on the RoI figures presented at the last HWG, there was general consensus at the meeting that the use of estimates for CoS in RoI was not causing any problems and clarified that those estimates were based on previous read history. K Cahill commented that profiles tend to make individual customer data inaccurate, so Airtricity generated its own system estimates, leading to more accurate reads and fewer complaints.

**Action – Proposal provisionally taken offline**

A participant asked whether this action is provisional, pending agreement during ES design phase. P Merkens explained that NIE have not made their procurement decision and their chosen system might not support same period last year estimates, though this is unlikely.

**Not be permitted if no read history in last 12 months**

K Cahill asked whether the reason code on a 102R will be a general time out or will state the reason. P Merkens replied that the registration should provide a customer read and special read, and if a customer read cannot be provided, detail should be provided as to why, so the reason codes need to be looked at. K Cahill said that in NI there will be more timeouts because of the meter reading schedule, so better region codes are needed.

**Action – Reason codes to be clarified**

S Leane queried whether the next scheduled read date can be provided. P Merkens replied

**3. Proposal Agreement - Registration**

that it will be on the website, and that regardless of the Third Package, a scheduled read outside or between windows will be regarded as a legitimate exception.

**NIE due to provide policy on hard to read meters in December**

**Slide 20 – CoS Required Date**

**NIE proposal on harmonising registration required date with ESB**

**Action – CER to check on supplier request for extension to D minus five**

S Leane asked whether removed STOD meters had been agreed by NIAUR. P Merkens responded that NIAUR are not allowing for STOD meters in procurement, and meters over 70 kVA will be replaced by half-hourly (HH) meters. S Leane further inquired whether the charge for moving to HH is to be dropped.

**Action – Issue of HH migration charges to be clarified**

**Slide 21: CoS – Cooling Off Period**

**10-day cooling off period remains in NI for domestic customers, except for change of tenancy**

**Retrospective approach to registration will be permitted**

**Retrospective CoS not possible for keypad**

A participant asked whether the scheduled read estimate takes precedence. P Merkens answered that only an actual read takes precedence, and a reading provided on an 010 or 210 will be used. K Cahill asked whether the priority applies to NI or RoI, C McEvoy responded that special read has the next priority after customer reads in RoI. K Cahill enquired whether priorities should be harmonised, and P Merkens replied it has to be clarified that the same issues are being prioritised in both markets. K Cahill further queried whether the priority is for all reads. C McEvoy stated that it is only for CoS.

**Action – This issue to be confirmed**

**Slide 22: CoS – Meter Data and Changes**

**3. Proposal Agreement - Registration**

**Serial number and timeslot proposals in NI**

**Change to internal metering**

**Slide as presented.**

**Slide 23: New Connection Registration**

**New connection energisation**

**Usage type is optional and will be inferred for CoS if not provided**

S Leane asked whether there is validation between usage type for DUoS group and profile. P Merkens stated that they have to match up if specified, and that there is no DUoS group with a new connection, just a usage. The meter and usage type will drive the DUoS group and the profile.

**Slide 24: Registration – General Data**

**Usage type**

**Slide as presented.**

**Slide 25: Registration – General Data**

**EAI code**

**Medical equipment and customer special needs codes**

**Appointment ID**

**Slide as presented.**

**Slide 26: Registration Responses**

**Slide as presented.**

**Slide 27: N/C Registration Response 101**

**3. Proposal Agreement - Registration**

Slide as presented.

**Slide 28: N/C Registration Response 101R**

Slide as presented.

**Slide 29: CoS Registration Response 102**

K Cahill enquired whether the supplier is relied on to update ESNB on special needs. C McEvoy replied that after the market release in 2010, a 102 will be used to notify removed special needs data when a CoS takes place. S Leane asked how the supplier can then inform ESNB that the customer is special needs, and what the implications of the delay might be. C McEvoy responded that an 013 is used for this purpose, and that the data will only be removed when the 105 goes out. K Cahill said that a lot of customers registered online and so bear much of the responsibility for providing information on special needs, and J Murphy responded that Networks cannot second guess the supplier, who is responsible for providing this information. P Merkens added that the issue is an agreed MCR, and that the flag is a safety net.

**Slide 30: CoS Registration Response Message 102R**

Slide as presented.

**Slide 31: Notification of CoS 100**

Slide as presented.

**Slide 32: CoS Confirmation Issues**

Slide as presented.

**Slide 33: CoS Confirmation 105**

Slide as presented.

**Slide 34: CoS Loss Confirmation 105L**

Slide as presented.

**4. Proposal Agreement – CoS Unit****Slide 35: CoS Unit**

Slide as presented.

**Slides 37 & 38: Change of Supplier Unit Messages**

Slides as presented.

**Slide 39: Objection issues**

**Objections for debt and contract**

**One supplier requests code of practice for objections**

V Gallagher stated, regarding this request, that it needed to be ensured that the objection is only used where it applies, and also that the rules around exchange of supplier information may need clarification. P Merkens responded that it is a matter for suppliers and regulators to decide on this, and that a discussion on a code of practice should await completion of the CER consultation.

**Proposals agreement deferred until CER objection and debt consultation completed**

**Slide 40: Cancellation**

**Cancellation reasons to be extended to include RoI values**

**Implementing RoI process that a new supplier can cancel a Cos**

Slide as presented.

**Slide 41: Cancellation Issues**

**Rules for automated cancellation applying to a non-completed CoS**

**Action – CER to come back on changes as a result of EU 3P**

**4. Proposal Agreement – CoS Unit**

S Leane queried whether a 303R will issue in response to customer readings on a 010 message. P Merkens replied that this is done on CoT, so there is no reason it should not be done on CoS.

**Action – NIE to come back if a problem arises on this issue**

S Leane stated that it would be better to hear at once if the CoS will not happen because of no read history, so a new reject reason is desirable.

**Action – Review rejection messages around registration**

C McEvoy clarified that currently there is no rejection reason on a 102R, and a 111L indicates timeout, so a 111L with timeout (T/O) specifically indicates the absence of a previous read. K Cahill responded that the scheduled read time in NI is 90 days, and the issue is inability to read before this time rather than absence of a read history. P Merkens replied that a T/O will not be incurred because of this. K Cahill stated that it will T/O eventually, and asked how suppliers will know what kind of T/O it is, as this information is already available in Rol. S Leane added that it would be beneficial to know whether there has been a read as soon as possible rather than waiting for T/O.

**Action – 102R reasons and T/O reasons to be discussed further – Airtricity to raise a DR**

**Slide 42: Cancellation Messages 011, 111, 111L**

**Slide as presented.**

**Slides 43 & 44: Cancellation Message 011A, 111A & 111R**

**Slides as presented.**

**Slide 45: De-registration**

**Changes to DUoS charging arrangements for de-energised sites not envisaged in NI or Rol**

**DUoS charges stopped by NIE after de-energisation**

**NIE does not propose changing current de-registration arrangements, MPRN, and/or**

**4. Proposal Agreement – CoS Unit****service removal**

G Harnett stated that the current arrangements will stay in place until 14th December, but de-registration in RoI might then be examined with a view to harmonising with NI. P Merkens accepted this clarification, though NIE do not propose changes in the meantime.

**NIE proposals**

**Actions - NIE unable to de-energise following supplier request**

**Slide 46: Agreements and exceptions**

**Participants agreed to proceed on current basis.**

**5. Clarification of Fieldwork Comments****Slide 47: Fieldwork Clarifications – Appointments**

S Leane asked whether the exceptions will be given in the design documents, and P Merkens replied in the affirmative.

**NI – appointment date should not be used when appointment made on time**

**Appointment exception 137R only sent due to failure to receive network message for online appointment**

**NIE unable to fulfil appointment, 131R used**

**Slide 48: Fieldwork Clarifications – Message 017**

**Unmetered site**

**Required date on message 017 is for CoT only**

**De-energisation rules in NI**

A participant asked what the response message would be in the case of an unregistered tenant. P Merkens stated that it would probably be a 131, and J Murphy added that the code

**5. Clarification of Fieldwork Comments**

would be C2. A participant stated that another field would probably be required to indicate lack of a supply agreement. Regarding supplier impact, G Harnett said that once the de-energised message is received, the DUoS will stop after a reasonable period. K Cahill asked whether the site is still registered to the supplier, and if so whether DUoS is no longer being paid. G Harnett replied that this will be the case, and that de-energisation will be effective from a payments perspective. K Cahill asked whether there will be a definition of the supply agreement in the code of practice. P Merkens responded that the supply agreement effectively binds the customer to the terms and conditions for NIE connection, that the main issues are whether the customer is still there and whether they comply with the terms and conditions, and that there is no reference to whether the customer pays the supplier or not. K Cahill queried whether the connection agreement and the supply agreement are the same. P Merkens answered that they are different documents, but by signing the supply agreement the customer is also bound under the terms and conditions. K Cahill responded that the interpretation of the no supply agreement flag at the previous meeting was that the customer has fallen outside the terms and conditions of the contract with the supplier. P Merkens replied that if the supplier agreement is broken, the customer no longer falls under the terms and conditions of the connection, and there is a right to de-energise under that scenario. A participant asked whether this applied also to non-domestic, and A Ferguson answered that the arrangement was the same for small non-domestic customers. P Merkens added that the rule for de-energisation not being allowed for non-payment is domestic specific. K Cahill asked whether domestic sites are de-energised only if there is no supply agreement, and A Ferguson confirmed this, stating also that NIE will however take an instruction to de-energise a non-domestic site.

**Slide 49: Fieldwork Clarifications – Miscellaneous****Meter faults and problems**

K Cahill asked whether a 261 and 130R are sent together when a meter cannot be read for a specific reason, and J Murphy replied that only a 261 is sent, as it indicates an observation of a problem.

**Call complete, work not complete – 131 status C2****Call complete, supplier to reschedule – 131 status S, NI only**

A participant asked if the appointment ID was the same, and P Merkens said that this is the case, because the work is ongoing, and a C2 will issue if NIE do not reschedule. The

**5. Clarification of Fieldwork Comments**

participant further enquired whether additional meter types are being considered for included, and A Ferguson responded that further discussion might be needed as to how 260s or 030s are to be used instead of the website. G Harnett queried whether de-energisation and disconnection are being included as part of the rescheduled fieldworks. P Merkens confirmed this was the case, and that customer appointments are not made for de-energisation. This comes under the CoP, so it probably falls outside the process.

**6. AOB**

**Slide 50: AOB**

**Not applicable**

**Slide 44: Comments on Today's Proposals**

**Not applicable**

**7. Next Meeting**

**Slide 52: Next Meeting**

**Monday 16 November 2009**

**Agenda – Customer and meter point characterisation, proposal agreement on fieldwork**