
29th. Technical Panel Meeting, 14 June 2012
Approved Minute

Attendees

James Bream (JB) - Business Stream
Neil Cohen (NC) – CMA
Jessie McLeman (JMCL) - Scottish Water
Rory Monaghan (RM) – Scottish Water
Kevin Ensell (KE) – Osprey
Brian Saunders (BrS) – CMA (Chair)
Amanda Hancock (AH) – CMA (TP Secretary)
Richard Khaldi (RK) - Commission

Apologies

None were received.

1. Minute

The minute of the meeting of 19 April 2012 was approved.

2. Actions and Administrative Update

AH provided an update on the action log:

AH suggested that AP169 could now be removed as this was now a business as usual item; this was agreed by the TP. AH advised that AP202, AP205, AP206, AP207, AP208 and AP212 had all been completed. AH also noted that AP203, AP210 and AP211 were ongoing.

AH noted that the CMA had completed AP204 and identified that the approximate split between maintenance and enhancement costs is 50/50. JB asked what the implication of this split might be regarding the TP's discretion in approving change proposals, for example, if budget provision gets used up before the year end and JMCL noted that this might occur if there was a need for a major CS re-development. AH noted that no such cap had been reached to date and appeared unlikely in the near future and BrS noted that a major redevelopment would be covered by explicit CMA Board consideration. KE suggested that, notwithstanding the above, further transparency in cost/benefit would be appropriate as the TP's processes evolved.

AH also noted that the CMA had completed AP209 and had concluded that a manual step in re-activating user passwords was, to all intents and purposes, unavoidable, given the communications infrastructure adopted for the Market Code. JB suggested that he may wish to discuss this further with the CMA.

JMCL noted that AP167 would be dealt with in discussion and could therefore be deemed to have completed.

AH noted that there had been no Change Proposals withdrawn at or since the last meeting and that MCCC096 (Additional Services and RAs) had been implemented on the 11 June,

2012. AH noted that there were some issues with the CMA's web site currently being dealt with and the implementation of MCCP096 had therefore been effected by e-mailing the Additional Services Schedule to Parties.

AH further noted that there had been no Commission Changes implemented or introduced at or since the last meeting.

AH noted that there had been one bulletin issued since the last Technical Panel meeting; BU088, which noted the implementation of MCCP096 and that manual retrospective amendments would now attract a charge, as identified in the Schedule of Additional Services. AH also noted that there had been no guidance notes issued since the last Technical Panel meeting.

3. Change Proposals in Progress

AH noted that work was ongoing in respect of MCCP101 (Minor Validation and Error Message Improvements) and some updates to the text of MCCP101 had been provided for information. AH noted that a final version would be presented to the TP for approval at the next TP Meeting in August.

4. New Change Proposals

MCCP095 – Trade Effluent Volume and Charging Calculations

JMcL presented MCCP095 and explained that the proposal had been developed following the presentation of a working paper to the MPF. JMcL also identified that SW, with input from the CMA had made some progress with Indicative User Requirements for the proposal and, if practical, it was the intention to present a version of the proposal for TP approval at the August TP.

BrS noted that the proposal included a suggestion that an Impact Assessment was required, but explained that the term Impact Assessment was a CMA defined process, implying a relatively narrow and specific activity whereby time, cost and feasibility could be assessed, based on reasonably well developed User Requirements. Therefore, a solution development activity would be required prior to any IA being undertaken. JB noted that there were a number of aspects of the proposal that perhaps needed further consideration for the development of the solution, such as; who would be responsible for registering bore-hole meters and who would be responsible for submitting reads from such meters and so on and the input of other parties might be appropriate. AH also noted that any such solution development should include the suggested changes that were being proposed; i.e. MC and CSD drafting. JMcL suggested that a working group could be established for this purpose (which was later thought could be the Metering Working Group), perhaps following some further discussions with the CMA.

The Technical Panel agreed that; MCCP095 merited further development, that a working group should be established to develop the Indicative User Requirements and associated CSD drafting (which was later agreed should be the Metering Working Group), and that an Impact Assessment should then be undertaken. If practical, this should be done with a view to a further version of the proposal being brought to the August TP for review.

AP213: SW to contact the CMA and to identify key areas for development of MCCP095.

MCCP102 – CS June 2012 Release CSD Drafting

AH presented MCCP102 and explained that it provided the final refinements to the CSD drafting that are routinely required prior to a Release being implemented. JB identified some minor changes to the proposal and JMCL identified a typographical error.

Subject to these changes being incorporated, the Technical Panel approved MCCP102.

AP214: CMA to update MCCP102, with amendments identified by the TP prior to submission to the Commission.

MCCP103 – Retrospective Amendment of Transactions

JB presented MCCP103 and explained that it had followed from an MPF paper previously submitted by Business Stream. JB explained that the proposal would facilitate the correction of data, such as cyclic meter reads and the deletion of incorrect data in a manner that was more robust than the current retrospective amendment approach and with a reduced administrative burden for both Trading Parties and the CMA.

RK expressed a concern that this facility might interact with the issue of settlement re-runs, particularly if there was no time limit on the submission of such transactions. For example, it was not clear what the implications might be if such a transaction came after an R3 settlement run for the relevant data change. JB accepted that a 'back-stop' date on these transactions would be appropriate.

JMCL also asked if the meter read transactions related only to cyclic reads. JB was of the view that perhaps these transactions could also pertain to Initial and Final reads.

AH noted that, although the proposal identified the T5 (Meter Read) and T12 (SPID Data) transactions as being of higher priority, it was not clear exactly which transactions were included. AH suggested that this proposal needed further development of the required changes (MC and CSD drafting), along with Indicative User Requirements, incorporating such details as those identified above, so that an IA could be undertaken, if supported by the Technical Panel. AH also noted that the CMA could provide some technical support to Business Stream to assist with this further development of the proposal, if required.

The Technical Panel agreed that, if Business Stream were content to undertake such further development, an IA should be undertaken so that the Technical Panel could review the proposal.

AP215: BS to further develop the MC/CSD changes and Indicative User Requirements required for MCCP103.

OCCP038 – Meter Size Data Assessment

JMcL presented this proposal which seeks to modify the Meter Size Data Assessment Sheet. JMCL noted that the proposed changes reflect current practice in the industry and relevant developments across the EU.

JB asked whether, as a general rule, OC changes could be implemented in line with some sort of release calendar, as is done for MC changes. RK suggested that perhaps an explicit date could simply be included in the relevant part of the OCCP itself. JMCL suggested that a 2 month timescale might be appropriate for this change, noting that parties might need this time to accommodate this change, if approved. This suggested that the end of August could be adopted as an implementation date.

The Technical Panel approved OCCP038, subject to the end of August being inserted as the implementation date.

AP216: CMA to submit OCCP038 to the Commission, with end of August added to the implementation section of the proposal.

MCCP104 – Adding LP Meter X,Y Data
and MCCP108 – Adding LP Meter Location Data

JB presented this proposal, noting that this MCCP, along with MCCP105, MCCP106, MCCP107 and MCCP108 had all emerged from the data quality initiative currently underway. JB explained that although SW was appropriately placed to provide meter information at installation, LPs undertook more routine visits to meter locations subsequently. Hence, LPs would be more likely to identify where X,Y data was missing or appeared to be incorrect. By adding LP Meter X,Y data fields, gaps and discrepancies could be identified within the CS, enabling data quality improvements.

RK asked what the implications of this proposal might be for data ownership and whether increasing the amount of data in the CS was advisable. RK also noted that under business as usual, this proposal could simply lead to there being a duplicate set of data fields. KE noted that a comparison of data could be useful, but it would be preferable for there to be one correct set of data, rather than two. RK also noted that one of the principles of the data quality initiative was to ensure that ownership of a data item should, where practical, sit with whoever routinely uses that data item. JB suggested that perhaps one data set could be retained in the CS, but that ownership could change after the initial read.

In so far as discrepancies between the SW and LP perspective on the X,Y data were concerned, AH suggested that these might be the result of process issues, which could create audit difficulties if both datasets were retained in the CS, further supporting the argument that this approach may not be advisable and the process issues should instead be addressed. RK asked how X,Y data could vary. JB and BrS noted that the data can vary, for example, where meter readers using electronic reading devices obtained a signal at different locations. KE noted that locational accuracy was a potentially spurious issue, if location notes were also provided, but that in many cases, the X,Y data was simply erroneous. KE suggested that, since meters were SW assets, perhaps the LP could put such

errors to SW and they could retain data ownership and responsibility for correcting this in the CS. RK considered that this was, effectively, the current position and again stressed the need for data ownership to reside with the routine user.

JMcL noted that these data items were not strictly defined or standardised currently and this should be established to mitigate current ambiguity as to what the X,Y data implied. RK noted that where a discrepancy did arise, operational processes would be more appropriate than using the CS. JMCL suggested that any process requirements regarding this data should be identified in the Operational Code, whilst retaining the data items themselves in the Market Code.

The Technical Panel agreed that SW should be responsible for the initial X,Y data submission and ownership, and that the LP should be responsible for X,Y data submission and ownership following the initial meter read. The Technical Panel also agreed that relevant processes for dealing with X,Y data issues should be incorporated in the Operational Code.

AH asked whether the meter location notes should be dealt with alongside the X,Y data, noting that these were part of the same transaction. JB noted that these were more subjective than the X,Y data and SW may wish to note different things to an LP. JMCL agreed and expressed a concern that LP updates to these notes might involve losing some of the SW information. RK suggested that an LP was incentivised to get this information correct and not to delete SW notes and the free text character of this data item was such that LP data could simply be added to that from SW.

The Technical Panel agreed that the ownership and responsibility for submission of the Meter Location Notes should be commensurate with that for the Meter X,Y Data.

AH noted that suitable MC/CSD drafting and User Requirements were now needed to reflect these views in MCCP104 and that MCCP108 could be withdrawn. JB agreed to update the proposals accordingly, with CMA support if required.

AP217: BS to withdraw MCCP108 and to update MCCP104 to reflect that Meter X,Y Data and Meter Location Notes should be submitted by SW initially and be submitted by an LP following an I read for a Meter.

MCCP105 – Changing Ownership of Drainage Data And MCCP106 – Changing Ownership of the SEES Data

JB presented these proposals and noted that in both cases, SW was responsible for the data items and was the principal user of them. JB did also note that there would be some customer issues if the ownership were to change, but these could be managed.

JMcL and RK agreed that SW ownership of these data items seemed appropriate, but JMCL noted that the Operational Code did not currently include anything on SEES data. RK suggested that this could be left for now, noting that SEES was under review.

AH noted that the proposals did not include any new trigger points or other variations and simply sought to change ownership and on this basis, the proposer needed to develop User Requirements and CSD drafting, so that an IA can be undertaken, if agreed to by the

TP. The TP accepted this approach and JB agreed to do this and to contact the CMA for discussions on these requirements (and others identified above, as appropriate), with a view to submitting updated proposals to the August TP.

AP218: BS to develop MC/CSD drafting and Indicative User Requirements for MCCP105 and for MCCP106, following meetings with the CMA.

MCCP107 – Moving Ownership of the Meter Dial Data

JB presented this proposal and noted that although the dial information affected charging and therefore remained of significance to SW, LPs made more use of the dial data and could therefore spot issues and errors more quickly and update the CS accordingly.

JMcL noted that the dial data formed part of the manufacturer's data that related to SW assets and it was of concern that manufacturer's data might be changed. JMcL also noted that the manufacturer's data was currently uploaded by SW using an automated process, requiring very little manual intervention and JMcL asked whether the issues with dials related only to older meters. JB was of the view that problems with dial data, typically manifesting as spurious rollovers, occurred against hundreds of meters per month and AH noted that a spurious rollover causing an error of 100,000 cubic meters on one meter had been observed by the CMA in settlement recently. RK and BrS also noted that spurious rollovers resulted in charges to LPs, so an LP would be incentivised to get this data correct. AH also noted that the June Release would include improved validation to stop spurious dial changes and that any development to take account of an ownership change should include this new validation. The TP agreed that the MCCP should be further developed with Indicative User Requirements, so that an IA can be undertaken.

AP219: BS to update MCCP107 with Indicative User Requirements and any proposed changes to Market Documentation.

RK also suggested that the Operational Code should be amended to include the aspects of the proposal that described the provision of photographic evidence to SW to support any changes to dial data. SW agreed to draft an OCCP.

AP220: SW to draft an OCCP to set out a process for progressing changes to Meter Dial Data.

5. Forward Plans

AH presented the CMA Issues and Forward Planning Report.

6. Performance Statistics

CMA Business Indicators Report

AH presented the Business Indicators Report.

Participant Performance Report

AH presented the market Level Participant Performance Report.

7. Any Other Business

Vacancy Admin Scheme Reporting

AH presented a note from the CMA that suggested a draft format for the report. JB and JMCL found it difficult to see from the suggested layout exactly where there would be a payment to SW for a vacancy scheme application and where applications had got to in the application lifecycle. AH agreed to discuss this further internally and to propose an alternative report accordingly.

AP221: CMA to discuss the vacancy admin scheme report with parties and amend accordingly.

BrS sought confirmation from the TP as to the status and frequency of the report. The TP agreed that the report should be a TP routine report, provide to each TP.

Summary of Actions

Action	Subject	Update
<i>From the minute of the 28th. meeting (19th April 2012)</i>		
AP203 CMA	Subject to further TP views, CMA to present an initial vacancy scheme report to the October TP.	
AP210 SW	Notify CMA which SW staff should be contacted for a performance standards workshop.	
AP211 CMA	Identify December as the next performance standards review date on TP agendas.	
<i>From the minute of the 29th. meeting (14th June 2012)</i>		
AP213 SW	Contact the CMA and to identify key areas for development of MCCP095.	
AP214 CMA	Update MCCC102, with amendments identified by the TP prior to submission to the Commission	
AP215 BS	Further develop the MC/CSD changes and Indicative User Requirements required for MCCC103	
AP216 CMA	Submit OCCP038 to the Commission, with end of August added to the implementation section of the proposal	
AP217 BS	Withdraw MCCC108 and to update MCCC104 to reflect that Meter X,Y Data and Meter Location Notes should be submitted by SW initially and be submitted by an LP following an I read for a Meter	
AP218 BS	Develop MC/CSD drafting and Indicative User Requirements for MCCC105 and for MCCC106,	

Action	Subject	Update
	following meetings with the CMA	
AP219 BS	Update MCCP107 with Indicative URs	
AP220 SW	Draft an OCCP to set out a process for progressing changes to Meter Dial Data	
AP221 CMA	Discuss the vacancy admin scheme report with parties and amend accordingly	