

## DCG Subgroup 1 Meeting 11 Minutes

Minutes of the 11th meeting of  
DCG Subgroup 1.

From DCG\_SG1\_SS  
Date and time of Meeting 24 February 2011  
Location 10am  
Ofgem

25 February 2011

**1. Present**

Name	Company
Alex Travell	E.ON
Alastair Manson	ERA
Ben Nicaudie	Electralink UK
Colin Sawyer	Ofgem
Dave Crookes	EDF energy
Dave Mountford / Liz Kenny	nPower
Iain Matthews	Scottish Power
Prashant Sharma	Utilita
Jill Ashby / Sarah Gratte	Gemserv
Steve Francis	Elexon
Claire Hemmens	SSE
Rosie McGlynn	British Gas
Michael Payley	Xoserve
Jeff Studholme	AMO
Joe Hancock	Ofgem
Lisa Woolas	ICoSS

1.1. Apologies were received from Dave Shattock (ENA) and Simon Trivella (ENA)

**2. SSSG Meetings 10: Minutes and actions arising**

2.1. The minutes were accepted.

**3. Business process definition***Meter reading*

3.1. Elexon summarised the process models on Meter Reading (circulated prior to the meeting). The following points arose in discussion:

- The term 'meter read' is used generically to cover all types of read – single register reads or retrieval of full interval data
- Meter readings should be sent to the supplier. Under the 'initial scope' the supplier will forward appropriate data to other parties (as currently) – e.g. network operators for DUoS billing purposes and DC/DA and settlement agents for data processing, aggregation and settlement
- DCC should send readings to suppliers in a stream – there is no particular requirement from suppliers to have readings batched.

3.2. There was significant discussion around the question of whether DCC should be expected to identify missing scheduled reads. At the previous meeting an explicit assumption was made that suppliers would be responsible for identifying missing reads and, as appropriate, generating ad hoc read requests to fill in missing data. In discussion suppliers proposed that DCC should perform a meter reading service – delivering readings in line with a pre-set schedule to agreed service levels. It was recognised that this would require DCC to check completeness of the reading schedule. The identification of missing reads would allow DCC to identify any availability or performance issues on the network and take corrective actions promptly. **The previous assumption will be reversed and the working assumption is now that DCC will identify missing reads from a schedule.**

3.3. Other issues / assumptions will be included in the Issues Log.

#### *Product Management*

3.4. SP led a discussion on this topic which can be described at a high level as “configuring the meter to match features of the product sold to the customer”.

3.5. Points discussed were as follows:

- All product updates will be sent from the supplier to the meter via DCC – a confirmation message will be sent to the supplier to show the new configuration that has been installed on the meter
- Retrospective changes (i.e. to correct erroneous data) may not always be possible (e.g. if the supplier had set the date for a tariff to start operating as 1 March but should have been 1 Feb it may not be possible to re-apply the tariff to the earlier date)
- Bulk updates (e.g. change of tariff for a large group of customers) may need to be scheduled with DCC in advance in order to ensure all updates can be performed by the due date
- Final / initial reads will be required for all changes to product type
- Suppliers will be responsible for notifying meter agents of product / meter configurations
- All product configuration commands will be submitted to DCC by suppliers – there is some issue as to whether local updates may be required to cater for exceptional circumstances
- For FIT metering there may be a need to check against the FIT register to ensure that meter readings are distributed to the correct supplier (which may not be the same as the import supplier)

#### *Change of tenancy*

3.6. nPower led a discussion on this topic and the following points were covered:

- ESCO relationships with the customer should lapse at CoT
- The issue of whether customer data should be physically erased at CoT or a marker set on the earliest date that the customer can access was discussed. There were queries as to whether the supplier may need to access data prior to

CoT to support billing enquiries (or network operators get data for network modelling) – this needs to be discussed with the data privacy group

- If the old customer was on a prepay product then any outstanding balance will be settled with that customer and the balance reset to zero for the new tenant
- In the event of a non-continuous tenancy there may be merit in ensuring that meters are always left in an agreed state (e.g. load limited for lighting / security with message on IHD to tell incoming tenant who the supplier is)
- FIT on CoT will need further consideration
- Could an outgoing customer authorise the incoming tenant to have access to their data (e.g. if it is a relative)?

### *Payments*

3.7. EDF Energy led a discussion on this topic and the following points were covered:

- For prepayments there is a need to uniquely identify the supplier, customer and meter point so the payment can be directed to the correct meter (or if there is a problem the correct supplier for that meter can be identified)
- Payments made in advance of CoT may be accepted and diarised (within a given window of the CoT date)
- Process models should show the preparation of UTRNs in the DCC 'swimlane' with an annotation to explain that this may be done by suppliers, subject to deliberations on the security framework
- For credit customers further analysis is required to determine whether the balance should be downloaded periodically (e.g. monthly) or whether a running balance should be calculated (as for PPM) with updates when payments are received from the customer
- It was noted that consumer research is being undertaken to determine the information to be displayed on the IHD

## **4. Timetable for business process modelling**

4.1. The proposed timetable as circulated prior to the meeting was agreed

## **5. Date of next meetings**

- Thursday, 10 March 2011
  - Change of supplier (discussion led by central bodies)
  - SM fleet management (discussion led by E.ON?)
- Thursday, 24 March 2011