

Representation

Draft Modification Report

0314 - The provision of a "Data Update" to Non Code Parties

Consultation close out date: 25 February 2011

Organisation: Association of Meter Operators

Representative: Tom Chevalier, AMO Consultant

Date of Representation: 21 Jan 2011

Do you support or oppose implementation?

Support/Qualified Support/Neutral/Not in Support/Comments* *delete as appropriate*

Please summarise (in one paragraph) the key reason(s) for your support/opposition.

The AMO members are keen that the ESTA AMR database is populated with consistent industry data. Sourcing this data from any other route will cost effort & development costs and will lead to inconsistencies which in turn will lead to extra operational effort for participants to resolve 'apparent' differences.

Are there any new or additional issues that you believe should be recorded in the Modification Report?

No

Relevant Objectives:

How would implementation of this modification impact the relevant objectives?

Improve competition in metering and AMR services

Impacts and Costs:

What analysis, development and ongoing costs would you face if this modification were implemented?

The MAMs anticipate being able to view the data in the ESTA database for free. This will enable them to save retaining a specific database of which AMR device is connected to each of their meters. It will improve the accuracy and speed of updates. It will also give the ability to confirm if the data (MAM ID, meter serial number, install date) held on the GT databases feeding the ESTA database is consistent with the MAMs own records.

0314

Representation

04 February 2011

Version 1.0

Page 1 of 2

© 2011 all rights reserved

Implementation:

What lead-time would you wish to see prior to this modification being implemented, and why?

ASAP

Legal Text:

Are you satisfied that the legal text will deliver the intent of the modification?

NB: while formal legal text has not been provided, the Transporters have indicated that draft text will be published alongside this Report during the consultation period. Comments on this will be helpful when the text is finalised.

Would like to see MAMs specifically referenced in (k), although they will be recognised as 'third parties'.

Is there anything further you wish to be taken into account?

Please provide any additional comments, supporting analysis, or other information that that you believe should be taken into account or you wish to emphasise.