

**Operational Metering Communications Meeting (5)****Date Of Meeting: 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2011****Time of Meeting: 10.00am****Location: ESP's Offices Leatherhead**

<b>Present:</b>	Jenny Rawlinson (Chair)	JR	GTC
	Tracy Goymer	TG	GTC
	Sham Afonja	SA	NPower
	Lisa Wong	LW	ESP
	Ashley Collins	AC	EDF
	Gethyn Howard	GH	IPL (Teleconference)
	Colette Baldwin	CB	Eon
	David McCrone	DM	SCP(Teleconference)
	Billy Giannini	BG	SCP (Teleconference)
	Andy Smith	AS	NPower

**1. Admin and Introductions**

JR advised that there were no fire alarm tests due.

**2. Minutes of Previous Meeting**

Agreed by all.

**3. Actions**

Actions were discussed and Action Log table has been updated, please see below.

**4. Review of Revised Files produced by Ash**

It was agreed by all that this was not necessary as these have only been amended to reflect the groups suggestions from the last meeting.

It was decided that although the MAM ID is used for Supplier to MAM flows, it was also be used for this process on Shipper-GT Flows to be consistent with RGMA the group highlighted that ALL Parties not part of this work group would need to be notified.

**Action: All parties to be notified of the use of the MAM ID and provide to the group**

**Action: AC to provide JR with email regarding MAM ID.**

**Action: ALL to review User Guide Questions and feed back to group.**

**Action: TG to "bullet point" user guide and circulate.**

## 5. Consideration for appropriate file(s) for PEMs scenarios and communications

Discussions were held as to how the PEM's process would/should work. The Group identified 3 scenarios and process flows were drawn up- see attached. It was agreed that further discussions surrounding PEMs should be held at a future meeting.

**Action: TG to draw up process flows and circulate.**

**Action: CB to email AC PEMs Example Files**

**Action: AC to send PEMs Validation Rules**

**Action: AC to ask XOSERVE if Shipper ID could be included in PEMs file**

## 6. Review of technical comments and feedback

Only GTC had IT feedback and that was around padding. It was agreed that the group would consider this at the next meeting on 20<sup>th</sup> October when IT representation would be present.

**Action: All parties to work with internal IT Teams to gather feedback**

**Action: TG to request room availability at Gemserv**

**Action@ DM to circulate initial technical assessment**

## 7. Review of Work Plan

A revised version of the Work Plan is attached.

## 8. AOB

There was no AOB

### Action Log

<b>1</b>	AS	To look at Reading (M) and read date (O) on .UPD File	Carried Forward
<b>2</b>	AS	To compare .Job with ONJOB	Carried Forward
<b>3</b>	SA	continue compiling the User Guide	Ongoing
<b>4</b>	AC	To find email and send to JR regarding MAM ID	Closed
<b>5</b>	ALL	To check how validation is carried out	Closed
<b>6</b>	ALL	Work with Internal IT Teams	Pending

		in preparation of next meeting	
<b>7</b>	IGT's	To provide MAM ID's for next meeting	Not required. Closed
<b>8</b>	IGTs	To confirm whether populating meters as F – freestanding rather than P - primary will be an issue.	Pending
<b>9</b>	TG	To draw up PEMs scenario's and circulate	Pending
<b>10</b>	AC	To send PEMs Validation Rules to the group	Pending
<b>11</b>	ALL	Review User Guide and feedback responses to the questions	Pending
<b>12</b>	TG	To "bullet point" User Guide and circulate with minutes so that the responses can be built into a Matrix and circulated prior to the next meeting.	Pending
<b>13</b>	DM	To circulate initial technical assessment to the group	Pending
<b>14</b>	AC	Ask XOSERVE if there would be any issues with including the Shipper ID in the PEMs file	Pending
<b>15</b>	TG	To request room availability from Gemserv for next Meeting	Pending

### **Log of potential concerns**

<b>1</b>	MAM ID on CoS flow to New Shipper to be included/mandated on the appropriate CoS Files.
<b>2</b>	Transportation charges to continue where no meter shown, where appropriate
<b>3</b>	Re-charge to Shippers for 3 <sup>rd</sup> Party Meters Emergency Provision Charge
<b>4</b>	British Gas's removal of Meters on IGT Networks. (Kay Houghtons email)
<b>5</b>	Consider the possibility of an instance where subsequent to de-appointment, the shipper may wish to re appoint the iGT without the request of a new meter installation, for example, where a meter has been previously removed and subsequently (but in the absence of a commercial contract, the shipper wishes to appoint the iGT for the metering point.

<b>6</b>	IGT's passing on information regarding New MAM's for assets that are no longer IGT's responsibility.
<b>7</b>	Validation issues regarding the timescales of receiving files