

Date:	14.12.09	
Chair:	Michael Atkinson, NIE Project Team	
Attendees:	<i>RMDS</i> – Conor Garrigan <i>ESB ICT</i> – Tom Ryan, Joe Murphy <i>ESB CS</i> – Gerry McDonald <i>Firmus Energy</i> – Mary O’Kane, Veronika Gallagher <i>BG Energy</i> – Ger Harnett <i>CER</i> – Paul Fuller <i>NIAUR</i> – Michael Campbell	<i>ESB Networks</i> – W Keady, Theresa O’Neill <i>NIE Project Team</i> – Ann Ferguson <i>Energia</i> – Mandy Reid, Thomas Heasley <i>Airtricity</i> – Siobhan Leane, Karen Cahill <i>NIE Energy</i> – Clifford Morrison <i>Gemserv</i> – Malcolm Rowley
Apologies:		
Version Number	1.0	
Change Made		

Slides of the meeting are issued separately

Agenda:		
1.	Minutes from Previous HWG Meeting	Michael Atkinson, NIE
2.	Issues Outstanding from Previous HWG	A Ferguson, NIE
3.	Proposed Agreement on Data Processing	A Ferguson, NIE
4.	Data Aggregation - Messaging	A Ferguson, NIE
5.	Next Meetings	

1. Minutes from Previous HWG Meeting**Participants asked to feed back on minutes**

C Morrison requested correction of a misattribution in the minutes for 11th November.

2. Issues Outstanding from Previous HWG**Slide 1: Issues Outstanding from Previous HWG – to close****Report back on differences in the check digit algorithm****Population of interval timestamps**

C Morrison asked whether a change would be required to allow for the adjustment to Rol format. A Ferguson replied that suppliers would have to register the change, but time information is presented in local time.

Register type code

S Leane asked whether the codes referred to were the only ones that cannot be harmonised. A Ferguson stated that a number of codes represented merged tariff and MPCC values.

Incomplete withdrawn meter reading sets in NI

S Leane asked whether this could be brought in before harmonisation. A Ferguson replied that it would probably require a schema change.

Timing of issue of message 301N by NIE**Slide 2: Issues Outstanding from Previous HWG – carried forward****NIE MPRN website data protection legal review**

K Cahill asked whether the UoS code would be able to notify suppliers of unaccredited meters. A Ferguson stated that it might be better to get a broad legal view of the entire proposal, as the proposal is in line with Rol. M Campbell replied that the understanding was this was just a workaround scenario in the event of legal complications. K Cahill pointed out that there is no way for suppliers to find out whether they are accredited for an MPRN in NI, whereas they can in Rol.

2. Issues Outstanding from Previous HWG

Action – legal opinion to be secured on these issues

CER consultation & CoP on objection & debt

Action – CER to update at next IGG

De-energisation CoP review – to detailed design

Interval metering installation charges in NI

M Campbell stated that this was still going through the SIG. K Cahill asked whether NIAUR had stated they were not necessarily going to update STOD meters. A Ferguson replied that the SIG minutes indicated that concerns were raised about the ES omission of STOD, and that that position stands. K Cahill asked why NIAUR is saying that STOD will not be phased out, when the minutes stated that they will. M Campbell replied that NIAUR is undecided. A Ferguson added that clarification is required on this issue.

Extension of CoS customer read window to D-6

Correct population of MIC start date

3. Proposed Agreement on Data Processing

Slide 3: Proposal Agreement on Data Processing – Unmetered Data Processing – Data Aggregation – DuOS Billing

Slide 4: Proposal Agreement – DP; DA; Billing

Slide as presented.

Slide 5: Customer and MP Data Summary

Key items that have changed since HWG5

Items remaining the same

Outstanding items excluded from agreement

Slide as presented.

3. Proposed Agreement on Data Processing**Slide 6: Data Processing – Messaging**

Messages 303R and 305 were already introduced by ES

NIE will not introduce 308 load factor exceptions

Slide as presented.

Slide 7: Data Processing – NHH Estimation Method

NIE will refine estimating approach

Provisions continuing to apply

Estimating approach more closely aligns to ESB approach

Slide as presented.

Slide 8: Data Processing – Estimation Application

K Cahill asked whether estimation would be used if a former reading were wrong and had to be withdrawn and reissued, and A Ferguson replied in the affirmative.

NIE do not currently propose to use this method to estimate readings

NIE do not estimate in the following circumstances

Slide 9: Data Processing – Meter Read Validation

NIE propose to modify validation routines

NIE will review high limits above which a meter advance must be manually confirmed

K Cahill asked whether this issue had come up because of differences in quarterly as opposed to monthly readings. A Ferguson replied that the issue needs to be reviewed as the meter read schedules are different.

Slide 10: Data Processing – Estimation Application

3. Proposed Agreement on Data Processing**Settlement relevant estimates****Conditions when estimates are settlement relevant in NI and RoI**

C Morrison asked whether both AUF and EUF are calculated, and A Ferguson confirmed this. K Cahill asked whether AUFs are only updated with an actual read. T O'Neill responded that they are updated when they are settlement relevant, and A Ferguson added that the estimate is treated as an actual.

Slide 11: Data Processing – Usage Factors

Calculation method for AUF (ESB) and AAC (NIE) aligns

Calculation method for EUF (ESB) and EAC (NIE) does not align

NIE will retain proposals to set EAC to zero for long term vacant sites as described in ES

Slide as presented.

Slide 12: Data Processing – Usage Factors

NIE proposes removal of usage factors at register level

No suppliers required retention of usage factors at register level

However, two issues raised by suppliers – resolutions

Slide as presented.

Slide 13: Effective Dates

K Cahill asked whether this was purposely different from NI or was a system issue, and that it would be useful from a customer service viewpoint if the rules were the same in NI and RoI. M Rowley agreed that harmonisation should be looked at as an option. G Harnett stated that any differences are simply differences of description.

Action – this issue to be clarified

Slide 14: Effective Dates – CoS and CoLE Reads

3. Proposed Agreement on Data Processing

Change of supplier

Change of legal entity

Slide as presented.

Slide 15: Message 210 Supplier Provided Read Schema

Slide as presented.

Slide 16: Message 303R Rejection of Supplier Provided Read

Message 303R to be used as a rejection of reading submitted using 010, 016 and 210

Conditions when message 303R to be used

NIE will also issue message 303R where ESB do not

S Leane enquired whether a 305 will issue following a meter read rejection, and A Ferguson replied in the negative. K Cahill asked about the time window, as 303Rs have been issued for 210s with valid actuals occurring at the same time as a meter reader was due to read, and stated that the window needs to be as tight as possible. J Murphy recommended that this be followed up with RMDS as separate from harmonisation.

Conditions where available meter ID segment to contain the actual metering details provided when message 303R issued

Slide 17: Message 303R Schema

Slide as presented.

Slide 18: Message 300 Meter Reading Schema (MPRN, Usage Factor and Remarks)

Slide as presented.

Slide 19: Message 300 (Meter and Register Details)

Slide as presented.

3. Proposed Agreement on Data Processing**Slide 20: Message 300S**

Slide as presented.

Slide 21: Message 305 Estimate Schema

K Cahill asked about the settlement relevant estimates, and A Ferguson replied that they come under the series of 300 messages.

Slide 22: Message 306 – De-energisation Schema; Message 307 – Re-energisation Schema (MPRN and Usage Factors)

Slide as presented.

Slide 23: Message 210 CoS

Slide as presented.

Slide 24: Message 320 CoS Opening Read Schema (Meter ID and Register Data)

Slide as presented.

Slide 25: Message 332 Meter Works Schema (MPRN and Usage Factors)

Slide as presented.

Slide 26: Message 332 Meter Works Schema (Removed Meters)

Slide as presented.

Slide 27: Message 332 Meter Works Schema (New Meters)

Slide as presented.

Slide 28: Message 332 Meter Works Schema (Retained Meters)

Slide as presented.

3. Proposed Agreement on Data Processing**Slide 29: Message 300W Withdrawn Reading Schema (MPRN Level)**

Slide as presented.

Slide 30: Message 300W Withdrawn (Meter ID and Register Data)

Slide as presented.

Slide 31: Message 306W Withdrawn De-energisation; 307W Re-energisation Schema (MPRN Level)

Slide as presented.

Slide 32: Message 310W Withdrawn CoS Read Schema

Slide as presented.

Slide 33: Message 320W Withdrawn CoS Read Schema

Slide as presented.

Slide 34: Message 322W Withdrawn Meter Works Schema (MPRN Level)

Slide as presented.

Slide 35: CoS Reading Dispute

NIE to introduce message 208 to allow supplier to submit replacement reading to settle a CoS dispute

NIE to introduce a usage of message 252 to resolve a CoS reading dispute

Proposals match ESB processing and will be reflected to AP102a

K Cahill asked whether there will be a new 310 or 320 if the read is more, and A Ferguson replied that both will issue. K Cahill indicated that the CoS is something wrong, and in that case it needs to be withdrawn and a correct read provided. Where an actual read proves an estimate was incorrect, and if that is withdrawn for one more accurate, the new supplier bill is

3. Proposed Agreement on Data Processing

much smaller. M Rowley responded that if the customer is rebilled, they would probably not pay their bill, and the new supplier has the option to take an actual in every case. K Cahill stated that bad estimates have to be reversed and new estimates issued, and that the customer should not have to be penalised because the old supplier does not want to adjust the final bill. M Rowley stated that there is a variety of options for getting an actual, and it is difficult then to go back to the old supplier for debt recovery. K Cahill said that under the current model the customer meter read raises a question about the validity of the 320, and that if the actual proves the CoS is wrong, the CoS read should also be reversed and replaced. G McDonald indicated that the withdrawal process in RoI initiates if the read is outside expected parameters. T O'Neill said that CoS is never withdrawn without a discussion between the suppliers, but K Cahill responded that Airtricity was receiving 310Ws without consultation.

Action – issue to be raised at IGG

Slide 36: Message 208 Replacement Reading Schema

Slide as presented.

Slide 37: Message 331 Interval Meter – Ex Meter Works & CoS

Slide as presented.

Slide 38: Message 341 Interval Import Schema

Slide as presented.

Slide 39: Message 342 Interval Export Schema

Slide as presented.

Slide 40: Unmetered Supplies

Message 700 already introduced by ES

Slide as presented.

Slide 41: Unmetered Supplies

Decisions on Consumption Remain Open

3. Proposed Agreement on Data Processing

IE will not populate group MPRN

Meter point address is populated with billing address in NI

Slide as presented.

Slide 42: Use of 700 Series Messages

Message 700 inventory

Message 701 consumption

Message 700W inventory withdrawal

Message 701W consumption (billing) withdrawal

C Morrison pointed out that a UoS bill is not produced in NI for a credit meter, whereas a 701 will be sent out for a CoLE under this provision. A Ferguson replied that there would be no readings for unmetered sites.

Action – this point to be confirmed

Slide 43: Message 700 Unmetered Inventory Schema

Slide as presented.

Slide 44: Message 701 Unmetered Consumption Schema

Slide as presented.

Slide 45: Message 700W Withdrawn Inventory Schema

Slide as presented.

Slide 46: Message 701W Withdrawn Inventory Schema

Slide as presented.

4. Data Aggregation – Messaging**Slide 47: Data Aggregation – Messaging**

NIE will provide suppliers with 59x series of aggregation messages

M Rowley asked whether the data is available on the website for suppliers, and A Ferguson responded that it is not currently available, but that it is going into detailed design.

All responding suppliers operating in RoI marked required consistency between RoI and NI and require messaging

At least one supplier preferred retention of NIE secure server files

Potential solution

Consequently NIE also proposes to retain secure server files

Slide 48: Message 591 Non Interval Aggregation (By SU)

Slide as presented.

Slide 49: Message 595 Interval Aggregation (By SU)

G Harnett asked why NIE did not have the information, and A Ferguson responded that it may not have been collected; it is at MPRN level, but they are not planning to collect it. M Rowley said that it was essential to have it to ensure that there is a very small percentage of estimated data. G Harnett added that the numbers will be low in any case.

Action – this issue taken into detailed design

Slide 50: Message 598 Non Participation GU Aggregation

Slide as presented.

Slide 51: Message 596

Slide as presented.

4. Data Aggregation – Messaging**Slide 52: Message 597**

Slide as presented.

Slide 53: DUoS Billing

Processing remaining unchanged in both jurisdictions

NI will not be introducing messages 507 or 507C

K Cahill said that conflicts might arise where, in a DUoS read on CoU, it would come up as part commercial and part domestic, but could be billed by DUoS as fully domestic. A Ferguson responded that where a read is unobtainable the only estimate available is that following the last DUoS billing. K Cahill asked whether an estimate could be done on the day of CoU. A Ferguson replied that NIE were reluctant to do CoU without an actual reading, and the only circumstances would where it was dated back to the previous DUoS billing. S Leane indicated that in the ES workshops most suppliers did not want to provide the reading because the customers would be unlikely to do so.

Slide 54: MCR0165

MCR0165 was approved in RoI for adjustments to estimated bills

NIE will align with the general intent of MCR0165

Slide as presented.

Slide 55: DUoS Billing – Cancel and Rebill

NIE cancel and rebill scenarios will be broadly consistent with ESB

Examples of cancel and rebill

Slide as presented.

Slide 56: DUoS Billing

Previously communicated changes to be implemented by NIE

4. Data Aggregation – Messaging

No further changes proposed

Slide as presented.

Participants indicated agreement with foregoing proposals.

5. Agreements and Exceptions

Slide 57: Agreements and Exceptions

Supplier exceptions to proposals for changes to NI processes

Slide as presented.

Slide 58: Technical Workgroup Issues

Discussions ongoing

S Leane asked whether RoI would be affected if NI started using the last send date on a 602, and stated that there was little point introducing it in NI only to remove it in harmonisation. M Rowley stated that the legal position has to be determined where there is a single supplier with multiple IDs. A Ferguson replied that there are different terms for a single supplier.

Action – NIE to come back to Airtricity on message reconciliation issue

6. AOB

Slide 59: Any Other Business

Message and data fields have been renamed to be independent of interval length
Baseline inclusions

G Harnett asked whether a single update message guide will issue. A Ferguson replied that common documents in the baseline will be a single document, but there will be NI- and RoI-specific guides. T O'Neill added that there is a DR to include common documents as well as jurisdiction specific ones. C Morrison asked whether there is a timeline on the message guides and agreed changes document. M Atkinson responded that the message guides will be

6. AOB

formally signed off on 18 January.

M Atkinson took the opportunity to sum up and to highlight that a synopsis of the outputs of the HWG meetings was being taken to the HSG on 18 December. He noted that the baseline had been bottomed out in accordance with suppliers inputs. Some jurisdictional differences would remain and some ongoing issues were being taken forward – these had been identified at the start of this HWG meeting (14th Dec) and more work would be undertaken in early 2010 to arrive at a position on whether further changes would be made to the baseline. The HSG and HWG would remain in place – actual meeting arrangements were still to be determined.

M Atkinson noted that the entire engagement had been a very professional piece of work and thanked all in the room including suppliers, the regulators, ESB and NIE for their very focused input. He noted that in broad terms the objectives had been met to the satisfaction of all. This view was endorsed by those attending the meeting with positive soundings around the table. M Atkinson concluded the meeting at this point.

7. Next Meetings

Slide 60: Next Meetings

TBA