Standing Data Formats Group

M-co
Level 2
10 Brandon Street
WELLINGTON

9 August 2006

Members Present

Tony McGeady (TrustPower)
Peter Smith (Northpower)
Tim Slack (Orion) - via audioconference
Danny McManamon (Contact Energy)
Alex Buckley (Mighty River Power)
Sue Simons (Powerco)
Tracey Cameron (Vector)
Amy Williams (Meridian Energy)
Craig Young (Genesis Energy)

Also In Attendance

Ron Beatty (Electricity Commission)
Jennifer Neeley (M-co)

Introduction

The meeting opened at 9.10 am.

1. Apologies

Sue Simons of Powerco offered her apologies for lateness. Peter Law of EMS was not present at the meeting.

2. Welcome to new members

The Chair welcomed the new members to the meeting and provided a brief outline of the purpose of the group and the format of the group's work. The Standing Data Formats Group (SDFG) primarily does its work by email correspondence, with the occasional audio and in-person meeting when required. The Chair noted the importance of members responding to issues within a day of receiving an email as this helps the flow of work and progress.

Ron Beatty outlined the Commission's expectations from the SDFG and noted that the Commission wants a process to deal with new formats and changes that is transparent, accurate and has input from the industry.

3. Terms of reference

The Chair outlined that the terms of reference were developed under the DRIEPs and requested comments from the SDFG on the terms of reference. A member questioned whether there was a meter owner representative on the group, as this was recommended in the terms of reference as the preferred membership. Vector noted that it was representing both itself and NGC on the group, so in a way was fulfilling this requirement. A member noted that there was also an EMS representative on the group. The SDFG noted that the Chair was not an independent Chair as outlined in the proposed membership of the group. The members did not note any opposition to having Tony McGeady as Chair of the group. It was noted that Tony McGeady had been appointed by the Commission as Chair.

Sue Simons (Powerco) joined the meeting at 9.20 am.

The SDFG agreed to include a further purpose in the terms of reference that reads: *"c. to promote awareness and use of the EIEP protocols within the industry"*.

4. Workplan

The Commission outlined that the basic workplan for the SDFG was included on the Commission website. The website states that the SDFG will:

- Consider suggestions by affected participants for the addition of new, or changes to the Electricity Information Exchange Protocols (EIEPs) made through the EIEP change control process; and
- Progress the development of new protocols or change the existing EIEPs where it is agreed that participants would benefit.

The workplan for the SDFG will include the implementation of part J of the Rules.

The Chair noted that it would be useful to develop a common library for the formats so that there is a centralised place for the industry to access the most recent formats or protocols. The Chair noted that he would provide a copy of the existing library document, which includes EIEP name, version, category, links to formats, guides and samples, etc, as an example to the group.

The Commission requested advice from the SDFG on whether the Commission website was easy to use and whether members had any problems accessing the current EIEP documents posted to the website. Members of the group noted that they have had difficulty using the website but that the search function worked well. A member recommended that the Commission publish the registry standard on its website, as members currently need a Jade login to access the document. The change process, version control and notification of change documents should all be posted on the website.

The Commission noted that the workload of the SDFG would be low until the middle of next year when the reconciliation project is likely to be implemented. The Reconciliation Information Project Team (RIPT) has not yet considered how the project would be managed but that the SDFG might manage the process.

The SDFG agreed that the data format change process should be included in the Commission newsletter, as this would ensure the industry was kept updated with the development of and any changes to the formats. A member noted that there has been some criticism in the industry of the continuing changes to the protocols. The Chair noted that the change process should manage this from now on. A member noted that some industry members are waiting to receive a mandate from the Commission to use the protocols. These industry members are aware of their existence but are not using them at this time. The Chair noted that the DRIEPS promoted the use of the protocols but the use is ‘voluntary’. Use of the protocols by the industry is important to help develop and finalise them. The Commission noted that the use of the protocols is outside the Rules, and therefore the Commission cannot mandate their use.

The group noted that there are problems with EIEP11. Only parts of it are used because it does not work on all networks. The group noted that it would like to standardise its use so that retailers use a common process to create ICPs. The group noted that a recommendation by the Commission to use the protocols would have a big impact on their uptake in the market.

The group agreed to develop an initial workplan document that will include the requirement for structure and priorities. The Chair agreed to prepare the first draft of this document.

Action Points

- **The Chair** to provide a copy of the existing library document, which includes EIEP name, version, category, links to formats, guides and samples etc, as an example to the group.
- **The Chair** to develop an initial workplan document.

5. Change request form

The SDFG discussed the change request form and noted that sometimes new protocols were needed, as well as changes required to existing protocols. A member suggested that a separate process should be created to deal with new protocols. The group discussed this suggestion but agreed that it would be more practical to use the same form for both new and change requests, and request that notes are included when a request for a new protocol is being made. The group agreed to amend the title of the form to encompass both new and change requests. The SDFG also agreed that the request form should be saved as a word document on the Commission website.

The Chair noted that he would circulate a standard format and protocol template for amendment by the group. The SDFG agreed that it would need to advise the industry of effective dates for each version, and including expiry dates were relevant. The group agreed that archived documents should also be made available through the website. It was agreed that version control is paramount for all documents.

The SDFG discussed the process whereby a change request is declined. It was noted that this action would be recorded in the minutes and the change might be re-proposed if other members saw merit in the proposal. The SDFG agree that the change request proposals could be included in the Commission newsletter to ensure the industry was kept updated on any proposals. If a change is proposed, there will be a submission round on the proposed change, unless it is deemed to be minor. The Commission noted that if a change requires system changes, the change would need to be consulted on. The group agreed that the newsletter was a good means of communication and noted that it would reach a large and diversified audience.

Action Points

- **M-co** to ensure that the change request form on the Commission website is in word format and to amend the title of the form to encompass both requests for new protocols and for changes.
- **The Chair** to circulate a standard format and protocol template to the SDFG.

6. Change Process

The SDFG noted that there were some minor differences between the documents on the website and the ones circulated with today's meeting papers. A member noted that the version control process needs to be implemented for these documents also. The Commission noted that the process for updating the version control would need to be discussed with the Commission webmaster. This includes the effective date of documents.

A member noted that number 15. of the change process needs to be reviewed as the intent of the sentence was not clear. The Chair agreed to provide new wording for this section of the change process so that it was in line with the ISO wording.

The Commission has suggested minor changes to the change process. The Chair noted that these changes will be discussed once the final version of the change process and request forms are identified by M-co.

Action Points

- **The Chair** to provide new wording for no. 15 of the change process so that it was in line with the ISO wording.
- **M-co** to determine which change request forms are the final versions and circulate them to the SDFG for discussion.

7. Additional formats and protocols

The Chair noted that there were a number of additional formats and protocols that would benefit from being standardised and from having a formal change process applied to them. The Chair agreed to review what other formats and reports that were used in the industry and include them in a list. The Commission noted that the Rules require the wording of reports to meet the requirements of the Commission Board.

A member requested that EIEP1 include load groups (Distributor Price Category) and register content types. Powerco and Genesis Energy agreed to submit their changes to the EIEPs through the change process.

Action Point	**The Chair** to review what other formats and reports that were used in the industry and include them in a list.

8. General Business

Reconciliation process
The Commission noted that the RIPT approval process would be implemented in early next year and implemented around the middle of next year. No decisions have been made on the implementation team but the SDFG will be kept informed of any decisions.

Version control
The SDFG requested that the protocols and change process documents include a version control and the controlled copy read “Controlled copy, do not duplicate”. The archive documents and any drafts should include a watermark to make it obvious of their status.

Meeting closed: 10.50 am
Next Meeting Date: To be advised.

Action Points

No.	Description	Status
1	**The Chair** to provide a copy of the existing library document, which includes EIEP name, version, category, links to formats, guides and samples etc, as an example to the group.	Chair to email this document to Retail Operations Assistant.
2	**The Chair** to develop an initial workplan document.	On next agenda.
3	**M-co** to ensure that the change request form on the Commission website is in word format and to amend the title of the form to encompass both requests for new protocols and for changes.	Senior Adviser to check.
4	**The Chair** to circulate a standard format and protocol template to the SDFG.	Chair to send to Retail Operations Assistant.
5	**The Chair** to provide new wording for no. 15 of the change process so that it was in line with the ISO wording.	Senior Adviser to confirm.
6	**M-co** to determine which change request forms are the final versions and circulate them to the SDFG for discussion.	These are published on the Commission's website.
7	**The Chair** to review what other formats and reports that were used in the industry and include them in a list.	Senior Adviser to assess and publish on the Commission's website.