

DFG Discussion Paper

Electricity Information Exchange Protocols (EIEP) EIEP Correction Process

March 2011

1. Introduction and purpose of this paper

1.1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 Errors are inevitable and unintentional. When the recommendation is made to mandate some EIEPS, the SDFG should also include recommended processes that can be included in the consultation to ensure participants are fully informed of requirements.
- 1.1.2 Most errors are identified on receipt of file or on loading into a system. Other errors may not be found until sometime after the file was originally submitted.
- 1.1.3 The error can be one of three types;
 - a) A field or fields with incorrectly placed information, e.g. during processing information has been entered in the wrong field; and/or
 - b) The information included is incorrect. e.g. incorrect codes, the receiving party disputes the information.
 - c) Reversal information due to correction of switching and/or metering errors.
- 1.1.4 Any of these may only be minor or a noticeably larger problem. From discussions with retailers it appears that corrections are handled in a number of ways and can result in some difficulty due to system configurations.
- 1.1.5 The purpose of this paper is to open discussion on how to address EIEP files that are found to be incorrect.

2. Background

2.1 Retailer correction

- 2.1.1 If a Retailer sends a Distributor a file which turns out to be incorrect, then the practice would be for the Retailer to send through a corrected file (i.e. in its entirety). This will provide for a full audit-trail as is often required under ISO and other certifications.
- 2.1.2 If the problem is a significant one which could result in distributor billing delays then there are generally provisions in the commercial agreements (UoSA) which will spell out the process for rectification. This usually involves the Retailer re-submitting data, with the Distributor retaining the right to estimate consumption if the data arrives later than a defined period.
- 2.1.3 If the issue is relatively minor and is not picked up until after distribution invoicing has been completed then there are generally wash-up provisions which will capture the corrections moving forward

2.2 Distributor correction

- 2.2.1 Generally speaking Retailers will pick up major invoicing issues in the physical invoices when they are received i.e. the supporting file is just that, a supporting document. So if the issue is a major one then the trader would contact the Distributor immediately and ask for a correction, or look to dispute the invoice as per the provisions in the UoSA. This would then result in a credit note.
- 2.2.2 If the issue is small and the Retailer notices it after the invoice is paid then the wash-up processes will correct these moving forwards. Again these are provided for in the commercial agreements.

2.3 Other considerations

- 2.3.1 This subject of corrections has raised another area that the SDFG may like to take into consideration. This is how advanced meter data will be accounted for in the EIEP files, whilst not a correction issue, this is more a structure issue.
- 2.3.2 For instance, there will be functionality for a meter to be re-programmed mid month e.g. to go from a UN to a D / N configuration. In these cases there will be a row of data under one configuration and another row for the new configuration. Both will have the associated number of days attached.
- 2.3.3 This may not be an issue as in some 'as-Billed' files, multiple rows for one ICP is acceptable.

2.4 Considerations for the group

- 2.4.1 Taking into account the brief above the Authority would like to put the following questions to the SDFG for consideration at their meeting on the 7 April 2011.
- 1) Is there a requirement to recommend processes for correction of EIEP files?
 - 2) What files are more likely to require a recommended correction process?
 - 3) In the case of mandatory files, where correction is required, is a replacement file to be provided or a partial file depending on error size? For EIEP 1 and 2 this could be the same as the expectation for RM files.
 - 4) Should there be some timeframes included in the functional specs for corrections?
 - 5) What other considerations need to be taken into account relating to the correction process of EIEPs?
 - 6) With regards to the AMI metering consideration, is this perceived as an issue and what needs to be taken into account in relation to the existing formats for consultation?