

**Development Work Group 0227 Minutes**  
**Thursday 27 November 2008**  
**Elxon, 350 Euston Road, London**

**Attendees**

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	BF	Joint Office
Andy Miller	AM	xoserve
Chris Hill	CH	RWE Npower
Chris Warner	CW	National Grid Distribution
Claire Rozyn	CR	Ofgem
Gareth Evans	GE	Waterswye
Jemma Woolston	JW	Shell Gas Direct
Martin Brandt	MB	SSE
Mitch Donnelly	MD	British Gas
Phil Broom	PB	Gaz de France
Richard Street	RS	Corona Energy
Sara Bea	SB	EDF Energy
Simon Trivella	ST	Wales & West Utilities
Stefan Leedham	SL	EDF Energy

**Apologies**

**1. Introduction and Development Work Group Operation**

BF introduced the meeting and the main objectives.

**2. Outline of Proposal**

RS introduced the Proposal, explaining that it resulted from discussions held at Ofgem's interoperability group which was looking at three main areas:

AMR provision, SPAA data flows and a centralised database.

RS had agreed to raise a Modification Proposal to consider if data could be held in sites and meters and provided to non code parties such as MAMs, Suppliers and AMR providers to benefit competition in the supply of AMR services. RS is willing to amend the proposal if the members agree an alternative process which facilitates the main objectives for the provision of information from a central point.

RS added experience with MAMs and AMR companies had highlighted problems with information and process consistency which made a centralised database desirable.

CW asked what is required from sites and meters as there is a significant difference to the provision of a flag indicating AMR is installed to the provision of full asset details.

RS thought it was essential to provide commercial information such as contracting parties and less desirable for asset details as it would be possible for a Supplier to ask the asset owner once they know who they are.

MB advised SPAA were currently reviewing options for dataflows and systems, with the possibility of using SCOGES and there is a similar model in the electricity market that could be considered.

RS agreed that there were still a number of options to be reviewed though this would be a non code service but still require changes to code to facilitate the provision of information.

ST thought that SCOGES was mainly a domestic enquiry service and MB agreed but thought it could be adapted.

MD asked if the process is to be passive requiring Suppliers/non code parties to ask for the data if required rather than it being sent automatically. RS thought this unlikely as incoming Suppliers for example are not likely to be aware if AMR is already fitted during change of Supplier scenarios.

PB asked what data items have been considered by SPAA, those that are essential compared to nice to haves. MB confirmed SPAA were currently investigating these data items. CW asked if GTs should have a concern about these data items, MB advised that SPAA was currently looking at AMR provider/MAM/Supplier data flows and would consider other parties as a next step to get a better understanding of the end to end process.

AM agreed to draw an impromptu diagram of a potential solution, explaining relationships such as:

Consumer/ AMR provider

Consumer/ Supplier/ AMR Provider

**Action DWG0227 001: AM to provide diagram of potential information flows based on the model discussed during the meeting.**

AM advised these relationships generate issues on change of Supplier as data is not always exchanged as there are currently no processes to facilitate these requirements.

AM advised a simple option would be to make an amendment to UNC to allow the provision of information to defined non code parties on change of Supplier. This would allow a file to be generated to an offline service provider who could notify interested parties where AMR is installed at sites where there is a change of Supplier. This would be manageable as an offline service for smaller volumes though would need to be reviewed in line with increasing volumes of AMR equipment. It could also be managed by any service provider and need not be offered by Gas Transporters.

MB asked if the service would be a dataflow or web browser, AM thought either option was possible at this stage and would be subject to agreeing a suitable format.

RS thought this was a reasonable way forward AMR providers may be willing to pay to be notified if there had been a change of Supplier to ensure continuity of service provision and payments.

SL asked if this was likely to offered as a non code service and CW was sure this would be the case.

MD expressed concerns over confidentiality and how non code parties could be defined and is likely to require a change to UNC.

**Action DWG0227 002: RS to develop a draft proposal based on a limited change to UNC to allow the provision of change of Supplier data to non code parties.**

### 3. Diary Planning for Development Work Group

Tuesday 06 January 2009, Elexon, 350 Euston Road, London (following Distribution Workstream and Development Work Group 0224).

- 4. AOB**  
None.

**ACTION LOG – Development Work Group 0227**

<b>Action Ref</b>	<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>Minute Ref</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Status Update</b>
DWG022 7 001	27/11/08	2	Provide diagram of potential information flows based on the model discussed during the meeting.	xoserve (AM)	Pending
DWG022 7 002	27/11/08	2	Develop a draft proposal based on a limited change to UNC to allow the provision of change of Supplier data to non code parties.	Corona (RS)	Pending