

Standing Data Formats Group

15 February 2011

**Electricity Authority
Level 7, 2 Hunter Street**

MINUTES

Members present

Nick Bennetts ñ Chair
Tony Ahern ñ Arc Innovations
Danny McManamon ñ Contact Energy
Jason Christini-Crawford ñ Genesis Energy
Helen Youngman ñ Meridian Energy
Zane Khan ñ Mighty River Power
Peter Smith ñ Northpower
Alex Nisbet ñ Orion New Zealand Limited
Joan Purdie ñ Vector
Stefan Kirkwood ñ Energy Market Services

Also in attendance

Ron Beatty, Senior Adviser Retail Operations, Electricity Authority (Authority)
Chrissy Burrows, Consultant, Momentum Consulting
Michal Henderson, Electricity Authority

The meeting opened at 10:10am.

1. Apologies

1.1 There were no apologies recorded.

2. Welcome

2.1 The Chair welcomed the group and went over the purpose of the meeting. He introduced Chrissy Burrows to the group, and she gave a brief description of her background and work that is relevant to the EIEP consultation paper.

3. Minutes from previous meeting

3.1 The Contact Energy member queried whether, under paragraph 7.2 of the minutes, bullet point 6 was necessary as it may create confusion. The group agreed to delete that bullet point.

3.2 It was proposed by the Northpower member, and seconded by the Vector member, that the group accept the minutes of the previous meeting as a true and accurate record,

subject to this minor change.

4. Workplan

- 4.1 Chrissy Burrows went through the items on the Workplan. She noted that some of the timeframe arises from the 1 November target set by the Minister, so she wants to have the papers out for consultation by 1 September.
- 4.2 The Senior Adviser confirmed that the FTP services will go ahead because they are cost effective. The Senior Adviser noted that it would be consistent for these to be integrated also within the gas industry.
- 4.3 The registry is being updated, and the data hub is part of FTP and SFTP (not FTPS) and relies on budgeting. The use of it will be voluntary. If EIEPs are mandated, members noted that they may suggest that the method of transfer is also mandated.
- 4.4 The advantages of the data hub include better security, a notification system, audit trail and required minor changes to an existing system.
- 4.5 It was noted that the project surrounding outages found no real problem but the SDFG may disagree with that.

Action point Consultant/Senior Adviser will add to the Workplan:

- under 7.2, address mandating the use of transfer method;
 - under 8, add wording in relation to distributor GXP EIEP
-

- 4.6 Chrissy queried what stage the EIEPs are at and what changes may occur to them in the future. It was noted that EIEP11 may change with part 10 implementation. EIEP2A will become just EIEP2.
- 4.7 The Senior Adviser asked the group to what level they would like to be involved in the project around standardising tariff naming conventions and billing systems. The project is related to areas of which the SDFG has knowledge and expertise. Involvement would involve more meetings, but there is the option to create a sub-group for dealing with this.

Action point • Assistant Adviser will ask Scott Harnett when a strawman will be available and let members know. The group will set aside time at the next meeting to discuss.

- 4.8 Chrissy continued to look at the Workplan. The Arc member noted for item 12 that outages are very important to consumers. The group noted that it is difficult to know how many minutes each individual ICP has lost. The group agreed to keep item 12 on the list.
- 4.9 The group discussed priorities. They noted that items 8 and 9 are the most important; however consultation needs to occur for the EIEPs and data dictionary simultaneously.

-
- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| Action point | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Chrissy and the Senior Adviser will work out a timeline and discuss this with the Chair. |
|---------------------|--|
-

5. Action Items

- 5.1 The Chair noted that the group had done well with their individual action items from the previous meeting.
- 5.2 It was noted that the part 10 rules are under final legal drafting. They will be submitted to the Board for approval in April.
- 5.3 The group discussed the action point on the Authority to consult with an expert around the benefits of xml. It was considered that this is necessary to confirm it is beneficial and provide a schema, however budget may prevent this being possible. The group would like xml to be an option for the industry, but not mandated.

-
- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| Action point | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Chrissy will add to the Workplan the options around xml and invite feedback from consultation. |
|---------------------|--|
-

- 5.4 It was suggested that the Authority ask Chrissy to align the EIEPs and data dictionary, however this was dependent on available budget.
- 5.5 The Senior Adviser distributed the extended inactive status code definitions proposed for implementation in the proposed Part 10 amongst the members. The group agreed to put the document out for consultation regarding timeframes for implementation as soon as possible.

6. Proposed Registry Codes

- 6.1 The Meridian member requested that the group recommend to the Board that they be allowed to use alternative registry content codes in the registry. These are not the same as profile codes and can be used by any participant, which is a benefit.
- 6.2 The group noted that previous analogous requests had been declined because they did not want codes added haphazardly. However, the group decided to approve the request, alongside the Contact request in 2008, as time delays in implementing the proposed Part 10 and any proposed change to registry content codes that may come from the Authority's standardisation project may be detrimental.

-
- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| Action point | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Senior Adviser will draft a letter for industry consultation around proposed registry codes. |
|---------------------|--|
-

Lunch was at 12:15 pm, the meeting resumed at 1:00 pm.

7. EIEPs

7.1 The group developed a plan for progress from this point as follows:

- (a) Consolidate data dictionaries ñ registry, RM, EIEP, AMI;
- (b) Prioritisation of information;
- (c) Data dictionaries to inform the EIEPs; and
- (d) EIEP consultation.

Action points	• Senior Adviser to send AMI data formats to the EMS member • The EMS member will consolidate the registry, RM, EIEP and AMI data dictionaries. • Northpower member will check data dictionary against part 10 (in a similar way to the registry review) and pass this on to the EMS member.
----------------------	--

7.2 It was noted that the data dictionary will require a significant part of another meeting. One member pointed out the potential benefit of having a consultant do an initial review before it is seen by the SDFG, to speed up the process. This will depend on Authority budget.

Action point	• Chrissy will amend the EIEPs and preambles, then send these to the group to check before consultation.
---------------------	--

7.3 *EIEP1* ñ will be recommended to be mandated.

7.4 *EIEP2* - will be recommended to be mandated. The EIEPs will be reformatted with notes regarding which fields are optional or mandatory.

7.5 *EIEP3* – will be recommended to be mandated.

7.6 *EIEP4* ñ In consultation document

7.7 *EIEP5* – there was discussion regarding whether or not to mandate this EIEP. Chrissy will state the arguments for making it mandatory (i.e. it is important for consumers) in the consultation document. It was noted that if too many are made mandatory there may be a backlash from the industry. Also, some participants do not have the technology to provide information on each individual ICP so parts of this EIEP cannot be made mandatory.

7.8 Chrissy asked for the reasons behind making EIEPs 1, 2, and 3 mandatory. The group explained that they are used frequently, so it is a matter of industry efficiency and reducing barriers to entry.

7.9 *EIEP6* – The Contact member has created a new straw man for this EIEP. A question will be included in the consultation paper regarding whether fault and service requests should be separated. A revised standard will also go out with the consultation papers.

- 7.10 *EIEP7* – this has been finished and published. No further changes, apart from formatting after the data dictionary has been created.
- 7.11 *EIEP8 and EIEP9* – No changes.
- 7.12 *EIEP10* – Keeping this to show that it has been considered, and to keep numbering.
- 7.13 *EIEP11* – awaiting functional specifications to be finalised. No changes.
- 7.14 *EIEP12* – Genesis member to give this to the EMS member, who will consolidate the EIEPs and pass on to Chrissy.
- 7.15 L and G will be changed for X and I to align with rules on submission information.

8. Next meeting: First week of April

- 8.1 For next meeting, the group:
 - (a) Will have reviewed the EIEP preambles; and
 - (b) Will focus on the data dictionary.

Meeting closed at 3:00pm.