DCC SSSG 1: Scope & Services Workstream

DRAFT Minutes of Meeting 5 of the SSSG	From:	Ofgem	11 October 2010
	Date and time of Meeting:	7 Oct 2010, 10am	
	Location:	Ofgem	

1.   Present

Dora Guzeleva (Chair)	OFGEM
Rosie McGlynn	British Gas
Dave Crookes	EDF Energy
Ben Nicaudie	ElectraLink Ltd
Jon Spence	Elexon
Dave Shattock	ENA - DNO
Simon Trivella	ENA - GT
Jeff Studholme	AMO
Alex Travell	Eon-UK
Jill Ashby	Gemserv/MRA
Richard Street	ICoSS
Alex Hurcombe	RWE Npower
Jamie Dunnett/Iain Matthews	Scottish Power
Martyn Edwards	SSE
Alastair Manson	ERA
Prashant Sharma	Utilita
Steve Nunnington	Xoserve
Andy Evason	OFGEM
Colin Sawyer	OFGEM
Ted Hopcroft	OFGEM

2.   Agenda Item 1: Introductions, Context and Workplan

2.1. All members present introduced themselves and the agenda was explained.

3.   Agenda Item 2: Minutes of SSSG1 and actions arising

3.1. The following comments were received on the minutes of the 4th SSSG1 meeting and the associated actions:

a. Action 4.1 was closed with the issue of the updated DCC Scope Options to the SSSG1 members prior to the meeting.

b. Action 4.2 was for SSSG1 members to review the updated option definitions and provide feedback prior to the meeting, including details of any systems that they think will no longer be needed for each option. Part (c) was for any organisation that operates or uses a registration system to identify each of the data items held in the registration system, where it comes from, what it is used for and who uses it. Part (c) of the action is still ongoing as the information is still needed.

c. Action 4.3 stated that: '*Xoserve is to provide details of the current gas settlement processes and information flows'.* Xoserve had understood that the acion was to identify the optimum interface between DCC processes and Xoserve settlement processes for Option 3 and had responded in this way. It was agreed that the action was closed.

d. Action 4.4 was closed by the agreement that the meeting to discuss As-Is and To-Be prepayment processes will be held on 14 October at the Electralink offices starting at 10am.

e. On Action 4.5, the ENA had engaged with its members as whether any additional WAN requirements were required to support Smart Grid capabilities beyond those already taken into account in the WAN Services Information Requirement. The feedback was that the Information Request already broadly addressed the needs of Smart Grids, but that a general question should be added '*Please explain how your communications infrastructure could be utilised to facilitate further smart grid applications, such as substation monitoring.'.* The Information Request had been updated accordingly and the action was closed.

4. Agenda Item 3: DCC Scope

Review of option defintions

4.1. The following comments were made in the discussion of the updated option definitions:

a. With Options 2 and 3, the introduction of registration must include the full range of registration and change of supplier activities and processes, including the provision of help desk services, rather than just information systems used for registration.

b. The vision for DCC based registration should be described, to enable the benefits to be understood. For example, what was envisaged for registration might include:

- optimised support for change of supplier processes, with systems capable of same day (subject to constraints around objections, etc.) change of supplier processes covering single and dual fuel customers;

- full access for DNOs and other authorised bodies, with service level agreements for 'DB' flows that are currently internal to a DNO (currently these flows typically have a next day service level).

c. The benefits of any improved processes will only be achieved if the governance arrangements are updated in accordance with new processes and relationships.

d. It was noted that the 'Gas Agency Service Agreement' provided a detailed breakdown of the services undertaken by different entities within the gas market that could be used to define the services to be undertaken by the DCC in the various options.

e. Option 3 will provide greater benefits than Option 2 in terms of speed of CoS because with Option 2 external parties will still need to turn the meter reads into energy values, requiring time, whereas in Option 3 these processes will be internal to the DCC. Option 1 will not provide these CoS benefits.

f. It was questioned whether it would be acceptable to have different SLAs for smart and dumb meters when changing supplier. The counter argument is that the differences in SLA are an incentive for customers to want to have a smart meter.

g. It was noted that the assumption had been made that smart meters would be treated as Non-Half-Hourly (NHH) as opposed to Half-Hourly (HH), since the processes were different, as were the charges for settlement. It was thought that a new category could be defined (e.g. Smart Half-Hourly (SHH)) and that in any case, the price difference for settlement may change as the respective volumes of HH and NHH (and possibly SHH) changes.

  h. With Option 3 for electricity, the DCC could aggregate the Smart Meter reads and provide them to a supplier for merging with the supplier's aggregated data from traditional meters, with the supplier passing on the information to settlement.

  i. With Option 3 for gas, Xoserve had prepared a paper that recommended that the DCC should process the meter reads to identify and reconcile energy used. The information should then be passed to Xoserve for balancing, settlement and invoicing. Xoserve was asked to confirm that they would be happy for Ofgem to circulate this paper to other SSSG1 members. (**Action 5.1, Xoserve**).

  j. With Option 3 it was noted that DCC would need to be able to support HH and NHH processes and also processes for unmetered supplies if the associated meter point was registered via the DCC.

4.2. For non-domestic customers / agents it was noted that:

  a. For Options 2 and 3, when all meter registration falls within the scope of the DCC, it would be mandatory for them to be registered via the DCC;

  b. For all options they have the option to elect to use DCC communications services or not;

  c. For Option 3, they will be able to chose whether or not to use DCC data processing services;

  d. DCC would need to be sized (or rapidly scalable) to support 100% of non-domestic customers, in case they decide to opt-in to all DCC services, but it cannot be assumed that all, or indeed any, will do so.

Benefits

4.3. It was commented that:

  a. Independent Gas Transporter (IGT) customers often have difficulty obtaining quotations for gas supply and may not benefit currently from the same range of tariffs and billing options that are available to domestic consumers. They may obtain these benefits if IGT registration is transferred to DCC.

  b. One of the benefits of the DCC, particularly with the options 2 or 3, may be lower barriers for entry for new suppliers and agents. It may be useful to seek information from recent entrants to the market to identify whether it would have been easier for them to enter if centralised registration or data processing had been in place.

  c. Meter Asset Providers (MAPs) and Meter Operators (MOPs) may both achieve savings once DCC is in place, in terms of easier access to information about meters. Information should therefore be sought from them as part of the DCC Scope Information Request process.

5. Agenda Item 6: Date of next meeting

5.1. The next DCC WAN services meeting will be held on **28 October** to discuss the responses to the DCC WAN Services information request, which are due in on 22nd October. **Please note this is a change to the date of this meeting**, which was previously planned for 4 November. The change is to enable any feedback from this meeting to be taken into account in the information sent to the DCG meeting in the following week. The meeting will start at 10am. The location will be advised closer to the time.

6.   Actions

6.1. **Action 4.2c (ongoing from 4ᵗʰ SSSG1 meeting)**: Subgroup members that operate or use a registration system will identify:

   a.   each of the data items held in its registration system, where it comes from, what it is used for and who uses it;

   b.   who owns the IPR in the system, who owns the system itself and who has responsibility for system support.

6.2. **Action 5.1**: Xoserve to confirm that they would be happy for Ofgem to circulate the paper on the proposed interface between DCC and Xoserve for Option 3 to other SSSG1 members.

6.3. Please send responses to these actions to DCG@ofgem.gov.uk.