

Standing Data Formats Group

17 July 2012

**Electricity Authority
Meeting Room 1**

MINUTES

Members present

Nick Bennetts	Chair
Danny McManamon	Contact Energy
Jason Christini-Crawford	Genesis Energy
Helen Youngman	Meridian Energy
Stefan Kirkwood	Powershop NZ Ltd
Blair Jones	Unison
Joan Purdie	Vector
Zane Khan	Mighty River Power
David Hill	Powerco

Apologies

Alex Nisbet	Orion New Zealand Limited
Peter Smith	Northpower

Also in attendance

Ron Beatty	Manager Market Operations, Electricity Authority
Chrissy Burrows	Consultant, Momentous Consulting Ltd

The meeting opened at 10.00 am.

1. Welcome

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed the group and outlined the objective of the meeting; to discuss outstanding areas relative to EIEPs 1, 2 and 3 taking into account regulation. Ensure that the group is comfortable with the other voluntary EIEPs and look at the requirements for transition.
- 1.2 The SDFG was advised of changes to the agenda: Item 8 consumption volume reporting methods was moved to the earlier time slot of 1.00pm with items 6 & 7 functional specifications moved to the later time slot of 2.30pm.

2. Minutes from previous meeting

- 2.1 Group members approved the minutes from the meeting of 13 April 2012.

- 2.2 The minutes were approved by the Contact member and seconded by the Vector member.

3. Action items

- 3.1 The closure of item 7 of the action points was questioned. A group member considered this item to still be open with the Vector member yet to set up a conference call to discuss the requirements of EIEP4.
- 3.2 The Contact member advised that there is still a requirement to have the intended telephone discussion and strawman from the Vector member. The consultation paper (Electricity Information Exchange Protocols – Proposed amendments January 2012) incorrectly discussed EIEP4 and EIEP13. This may need to be included in the next consultation paper on the EIEPs.
- 3.3 *Note: Item 7 was closed as this was an action point on the Manager of Market Operations that was completed. The action point that remains open is related to the point documented in Appendix C “SDFG recommendations as a result of submissions”. Time constraints had prevented this document from being reviewed at the meeting. The action item from the meeting of 13/4/12 will be carried across to the “SDFG action points” table as a new entry.*
- 3.4 Item 10: Closed. Submissions as a result of the letter were to be discussed later in the meeting.
- 3.5 Items 55 & 59: The group requested that the time line and work plan be forwarded to them by the end of the month.
- 3.6 Item 67: Closed. Minutes completed.
- 3.7 Item 68: Group closed this item; *Table was created and presented for meeting, however the action points were not addressed at this meeting.*

Action points

- Assistant Adviser to organise the completion of the work plan and timeline and forward to members.
 - Consultant to merge submission action points with meeting action points.
 - Action point remains for Vector member to organise telephone meeting with discussed persons and draft strawman for presentation at next meeting.
-

4. Review of submissions on proposed new register content codes

- 4.1 The Authority tabled submission responses to new register content codes and meter location codes as a result of a notification sent out to participants dated 17/04/12. The group reviewed the comments provided and made recommendations as follows:

- (a) NELS - As NELS will not be a MEP there should be no impact for them. It is assumed that MEPs will be responsible for these changes. However clarification is required from the Authority before responding. The suggested response will then be that this will not impact NELS as it is the responsibility of the MEP.
- (b) ORON - The group agrees that the definition as stated in paragraph 5 of the memo¹ does not reflect the information fully. Response to participant to be that there is further work to be done in relation to the registry content codes (on SDFG work plan) and ORON's comments will be taken into account for this work.
- (c) VECT - Meridian still requires the codes requested. This was followed by some further discussion on the "DWD" and "NWD" in relation to the use of similar codes and the portion of a "day" or "night" that these codes reflect. The Contact member is going to follow up and provide clarification. In response to the "FG" code suggested by VECT, this is already in use and has a separate meaning.
- (d) Energy Direct – As mentioned above further clarification required on the "DWD" and "NWD". All other points will contain the response "noted".
- (e) CTCT - Contact member to further clarify Contacts submission on the "DWD" and "NWD" codes. All other points will contain the response "noted".
- (f) TRUS - Move the suggestion to the work on register content codes. Respond that comments will be taken into account in the work that is to be done on register content codes.

4.2 The above comments will also be noted against the tabled document (item 4) "results on proposed register and meter codes in registry".

4.3 The group approved all codes pending the completion of some minor clarification.

-
- | | |
|----------------------|--|
| Action points | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authority to confirm MEPs role in relation to meter location codes use. • Authority to review and consider comments from submitters to be taken into account in work on register content codes and assign to responsible party/project for work in this area. • Contact member to clarify the period relating to the use of "DWD" and "NWD". |
|----------------------|--|
-

5. EIEP Discussion paper

5.1 The group proceeded to work through the discussion paper that contained various topics. The first two points were decisions made by the Authority. Firstly the use of "Trader" would replace "Retailer" in all documents. The second that terminology in relation to "wash-up" and "revision" must be used in the correct context. The group agreed with both points.

¹ Electricity Authority Memo to participants dated 17 April 2012 – "Proposed new register content codes and meter location codes in the registry".

5.2 The remaining topics are discussed in the following sections.

6. Net position or flow direct use

- 6.1 The issues associated with “netting off” generation and consumption, in EIEP2, where there is only one tariff were discussed by the Authority in the discussion paper. The Authority advised that the only option is for the flow direction flag to be used to show values as positive numbers.
- 6.2 The group disagreed with this option as the impact to alter systems poses some costly changes. This is considered the norm and only occurs where the same tariff is used and mainly affects smaller generation. The information contained in the file is purely for lines' company invoicing, the group could not see the benefit associated with the costs to change.
- 6.3 On the flip side, times are changing and the netting off option could become redundant with time as more appropriate tariffs become available. The group recommends that distributors should be encouraged to come up with separate tariff codes and in the meantime agreement should be made between parties as to how the information in the file will be treated.
- 6.4 The group recommends that wording that accounts for export/import volumes to be included in the business rules of the EIEP functional specification.

Action point	• Authority to review and consider the recommendation made by the group that distributors should be encouraged to come up with separate tariff codes and in the interim agreement should be made between parties as to how the information in the file will be treated.
---------------------	---

7. Submission points

- 7.1 Nine submission responses parked or outstanding from the last meeting were addressed. The discussion outcomes were as follows:
- (a) Q39, Unit of Measure (EIEP1) – The Contact member had attempted to sort this by email earlier in the month. An email conversation relating to the question of “Days” (Nov 2011) was made available at this meeting to assist with understanding what is required. The request is that clarity be given to Chargeable Days and Days (as a unit of measure), the requirement being which field is populated for daily fixed charges and that this should be made more explicit in the preamble of EIEP1. The MRPL member has agreed to email the group examples of the recommendation made by him and answer the Contact member's most recent email on this issue. All members are expected to include their input.
- (b) Q45, EIEP1 – clarification of the preamble requested by Contact – Contact member advised that this related to the billing methodologies. The group agreed that this would be addressed with the revised wording to be discussed later in the meeting.

- (c) Q50, EIEP3 – consideration needs to be given to accommodate the bi-directional nature of the reactive energy on a consumption site under the proposed part 10 changes. The group ask that the Authority contact EMS to clarify the requirements in relation to their submission request. It was also noted that the Authority has an action point remaining to provide an update of the relationship and impact of Part 10 on the EIEPs.
- (d) Q44, EIEP4 – request for inclusion of location notes and meter number – suggested response is that this can be obtained from registry. Leave additional field for mobile number in EIEP4.
- (e) Q44, EIEP5 – *“request for clarification of multiple versus single service interruptions and the use of “days” to define the type. This may fit unplanned interruptions, but planned interruptions don’t seem to fit the categories well, specifically stage restoration scenarios spanning days.”* The Powerco member was asked to provide a sample and clarification on their submission response.
- (f) Q53, EIEP5 – *“There should be provision made in the file for rescheduled dates and times (and retaining a reference to the originally advised dates and times) if the planned outage type is PLR”.* This request resulted in a discussion relating to the issues of rescheduling and cancelling of outage notifications. The following two amendments to the EIEP functional specification resulted:
 - (i) Remove the distributor event number from the header. The distributor event field in the detail will then allow for more than one entry.
 - (ii) Update business rules (insert under number 9) to state that the distributor event number must include the original event number in the distributor event number field if rescheduling or cancelling a file. There is to be one file per change which the “communication type” code will determine what that change is.
- (g) Q41, EIEP6 – *“Fault Duration will have to be replaced by two fields: one field, named Date of Fault Logged by File Initiator, indicating the date when the fault was logged; and the other, named the Time of Fault Logged by File Initiator, indicating the time the fault was logged.”* The group agreed there was a need for two new fields in EIEP6 rather than replacing the existing fields, these to be:
 - (i) Customer advised date; and
 - (ii) Customer advised time.
- (h) Q45, EIEP6B – *“Should have provision to specify whether the service request is metering or network.”* The group response is that the “Job Type” Code should reflect this information.
- (i) Q65, All EIEPs – *“The EIEP change process and communications/notice board for suggested, pending or proposed changes to file formats or creation of new formats should be made more transparent for participants.”* The group reviewed the process as published on the Authority's website. It was agreed that the process as it stands is adequate for notification of changes but request the following:

- (i) The document on the Authority's website needs updating as it still refers to the Electricity Commission and provides the Commission email address for responses;
- (ii) The process be made more visible by creating a webpage that links from the EIEP webpage and contains all the relevant information on it;
- (iii) Any requests for change be published on the Authority's website so that pending changes are visible to all participants. In order for these requests to be published, the Authority will update the aforementioned form to ensure that the participant requesting the change is aware that the form will be published and to mark information confidential; and
- (iv) Consider making the request for changes form an online form

7.2 Where appropriate, SDFG responses are to be documented against the submission responses document that may be published by the Authority in certain circumstances.

- | | |
|----------------------|--|
| Action points | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MRPL member to email the group examples of the recommendation made by him and answer the Contact member's most recent email on the unit of measure issue. Group to comment so agreement can be made by 27/07/12. • Authority to obtain clarification from EMS on request for inclusion of reactive energy in EIEP3. • Powerco member to provide a sample and clarification on their submission request which refers to the request for clarification of multiple versus single service interruptions and the use of "days" to define the type. • Authority to update the EIEP change request documentation on its website to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – ensure any references to the Commission are removed; – ensure the process is more visible by creating a webpage for change requests; – ensure that all change requests are published; and – consider creating an online form. • Consultant to update EIEP functional specifications. |
|----------------------|--|

8. Disconnection codes

8.1 The consultant advised the group that the consultation paper discussed disconnection codes that were slightly different to those documented in the EIEP functional specifications. The consultant advised that it was the intent of the Authority to make the codes in the EIEP functional specification consistent with those that are published in the registry functional specification and the group needed to ensure that the codes fit the purpose.

- 8.2 There was some confusion as to whether the draft V19 of the part 10 registry functional specification had taken the new codes into consideration. The consultant is to clarify this with the Authority.
- 8.3 The group reviewed the disconnection codes and agreed to the addition of two further three letter codes in EIEP6B for the next round of consultation:
- (i) REM = Remote disconnection; and
 - (ii) MSW = Mainswitch.
- 8.4 The group agreed that the table of disconnection codes can be those as published in the draft part 10 registry functional specification if they are as portrayed in the EIEP consultation document². The last four codes (de-energised as main switch/remotely by AMI meter/at meter enclosure/ at pole/pillar fuse given in the proposed list are required for EIEP6.

Action points	• Authority to clarify whether the latest draft of the part 10 registry functional specifications has taken the new codes into consideration. • Authority to review the SDFG recommendation to include two disconnection codes (REM and MSW) and include in EIEP6B in the next round of consultation of the EIEP functional specification. • Authority to consider the removal of the table of disconnection codes from the EIEP functional specification, based on the inclusion of like fields in the disconnection table in the draft part 10 registry functional specifications. .
----------------------	--

The Manager Market Operations joined the meeting at 1pm.

9. Consumption volume reporting methods

- 9.1 The group discussed the submission comments against the proposed volume reporting methods that were parked at the last meeting. These volume reporting methods were noted in the document accompanying the meeting papers, "Consumption volume reporting methods, Standing Data Formats Group, Discussion paper, 17 July 2012".
- 9.2 The consultant reminded the group that the purpose of this part of the meeting was to ensure the wording is correct so all participants understand the methodology and are using consistent approaches. The majority of submissions were in support of the four proposed reports.
- 9.3 The Contact member pointed out that the disadvantage noted for traders in the first table line was also an advantage as noted by Genesis in the table for incremental normalised. This had been discussed at the meeting of 13/04/12.

² Consultation Paper – Electricity Information Exchange Protocols – Proposed amendments dated 17 January 2012.

- 9.4 The chair advised that only 25 percent of distributors responded to the consultation. The Vector member advised that in relation to the volume reporting method distributors “*do not care how it is done, they will make it fit for their purposes*”.
- 9.5 With the advancement of AMI meters there is the possibility that the requirements for some of the files will be removed. It is anticipated that estimations will be for lesser periods and data more accurate. A member stated that we do not want to build something now only not to need it when technology provides other solutions.
- 9.6 The consultant reminded the group that the decision is not whether we need these reporting methods but that they are correctly written in the EIEP functional specifications. The decision has been made by the Authority that the four reporting methods will be included in the EIEP functional specifications. These reporting methods will still be required until replaced by technology.
- 9.7 The MRPL member advised that he had been asked to explain what the four reporting methods were. This raised the question as to the need to explain meaning that the reporting methods were overly complicated. The group, following discussion, agreed that the reporting methods could not be made simpler.
- 9.8 The group discussed all the comments in the table³ disagreeing with TrustPower’s considerations that vacant consumption should remain as billed to the trader.
- 9.9 Vacant consumption was one of the main points raised in the submissions. The group agreed that as billed files will not include vacant consumption (this does not relate to other unbilled which is shown as UB). The contracts between parties will determine if vacant consumption is required to be included in the file. This is a methodology that suits the level of risk required.
- 9.10 The delta versus full disclosure option was the other topic that was of main consideration in the submissions. The group considered Vector’s comments in relation to the delta option not being the method that they support. The group agreed that the issues raised by Vector would be resolved with the use of the Incremental Replacement methodology.
- 9.11 A majority decision by the group was that the full disclosure method is to be used for the incremental normalised files. The use of the full disclosure method is to be further discussed in the next consultation of the EIEPs.
- 9.12 Working through the comments noted under ref 1.6⁴ “Other comments for consideration include” the group responded as follows:
- (a) Clarification on prior corrections – Prior corrections are already noted in the business rules and no time limitation is required.
 - (b) A retailer using their own tariffs is an issue. This can be addressed through contractual arrangements. Mandating of files will require the price category code as per the registry and network tariff code as per the distributor’s schedules. This must be made clear in the business rules of the EIEP functional specification.

³ Consumption volume reporting methods” SDFG discussion document, 17 July 2012, ref 1.5.

⁴ Consumption volume reporting methods” SDFG discussion document, 17 July 2012.

- (c) Clarification for revision adjustments - It is noted that this is only an observation and discussion resulted in no required action.
- (d) As with (c) above.
- (e) There are some inconsistencies in text. Noted.
- (f) Request for “best practice” guidelines. Noted.
- (g) Discrepancy of volumes and application under different tariffs. Refer back to UoSA as they may want to enforce tariff requirement.
- (h) Proposal does not make sense in relation to description of Incremental Normalised reporting. Noted
- (i) Possible conflict between the phasing out of the “VA” code and required inclusion of vacant connected ICPs in the incremental files. No there is no conflict.

9.13 The suggested rewrites of the reporting methods were discussed and resulted in the following (note full wording at end of minutes):

- (i) As billed – retain original wording.
- (ii) Incremental Normalised – retain original wording.
- (iii) Replacement normalised – replace with suggested wording.
- (iv) Incremental replacement normalised – replace with suggested wording (note alter wash-up to revision).

9.14 Final agreed reporting methods are attached as Appendix A of these minutes.

9.15 Where appropriate SDFG responses are to be documented against the submission responses document to be published by the Authority.

Action points Authority to review the SDFG’s recommendation based on their analysis of the submitters responses, which are attached in Appendix A.

Consultant to update EIEP consultation submission responses with comments proposed by the SDFG during this session.

10. Optional and mandatory fields

10.1 A submitter had raised concern in relation to the optional and mandatory fields. Samples in the EIEP functional specification were reviewed and it was noted that there are some that need attention.

10.2 As EIEP1, 2 and 3 will be consulted on for possible regulation the group is to review all O/M (optional/mandatory) fields in these files to ensure they are appropriate.

10.3 The consultant asked that all members respond by email that this had been done and what if any changes were required.

-
- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| Action point | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• All SDFG members to review EIEP1, 2 and 3 in relation to optional and mandatory fields and email consultant by end of month with responses. |
|---------------------|---|
-

11. EIEP functional specifications

- 11.1 The group worked through V8B of the EIEP functional specifications to agree to changes made and address anomalies.
- 11.2 The consultant advised that bolding could not be used to identify terms in the Reference of Standard Terms. The group suggested Italics be used.
- 11.3 The use of "Consumption" in the title of EIEP2 is to be altered to "Volume" to reflect the true content. This is to further be made consistent throughout EIEP2.
- 11.4 Due to time constraints the group did not review changes from EIEP6B onwards. It has been agreed to continue this offline by email or telephone conference.
- 11.5 All points from beginning of document to EIEP6B are to be amended as agreed.

-
- | | |
|----------------------|--|
| Action points | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Authority to consider using italics to identify terms in the Reference of Standard Terms (as bolding cannot be used).• Consultant to update EIEP functional specifications as per the SDFG's recommendations during meeting.• Consultant and SDFG to continue to review the EIEP functional specification either by email or telephone conference. |
|----------------------|--|
-

12. Next meeting:

- 12.1 The next meeting is to be either August or September 2012, the exact date to be agreed by email.

Meeting closed at 4pm.

Appendix A: Consumption volume reporting methods

The following consumption volume reporting methods are the agreed revised definitions by the SDFG at its meeting on 17 July 2012, as a result of the documented comments from submissions. All changes will be released for consultation for comment by interested parties.

1. As billed

- 1.1 Retain wording with some minor amendments as noted in paragraph 13(a) of EIEP 1 to read:
- 1.2 ICPs which were Active on the Registry for which the trader was responsible for any part of the month but not billed by ~~a~~ the trader during the month being reported are represented by a single line per ICP with UB (unbilled) as the "Read Status"; for these all other mandatory fields are to be left blank.
- 1.3 Amend paragraph 13(c) of EIEP 1 to read: As-Billed volumes will include actual and estimated reads.

2. Incremental normalised

- 2.1 Retain wording in paragraph 14 of EIEP 1 to read:
- 2.2 Is a methodology that estimates consumption and line charges that would have occurred had the trader invoiced the consumer on a calendar month basis by calculating unbilled accruals, and includes
 - (a) All ICPs that have had the Registry status of active against the trader at any point during the relative month.
 - (b) Consumption information for all ICPs by network tariff code regardless if Billed, Vacant, or Unbilled.
 - (c) Meter read status indicating that consumption is calculated on actual read (ie accrual based on actual read during the month) or an estimated read.
 - (d) Incremental in approach, i.e. any prior period corrections are included in the current period being reported.
 - (e) For each meter register have added the current month's accrued consumption calculated to end of month less the previous months calculated accrual

3. Replacement Normalised

- 3.1 For clarity, it is suggested that paragraph 18(b) of EIEP 1 is amended to:
- 3.2 Consumption reported at the meter register level must align in aggregate with the consumption submitted to the RM for the relevant initial reconciliation (month 0), revision reconciliations (months 1, 3, 7, 14), and any other special reconciliations if directed by the Authority under the Code.
~~volumes are normalised into calendar months by applying the RM seasonal adjustment shapes in the same manner that the shapes are applied to submission information provided to the RM for any reconciliation period, and further 'washed-up' per the RM revision cycle over 14 months.~~
- 3.3 The change to the wording is recommended because it ensures that the consumption reported for network billing purposes aligns with that submitted to the RM.

4. Incremental Replacement Normalised

4.1 The following amendments to paragraph 20 of EIEP1 are suggested:

4.2 Incremental Replacement Normalised is a methodology that reflects what the trader (as the customer of the distributor) should be billed for line charges for each calendar month taking into account the trader's responsibility for each ICP with an active status in the registry, and consumption submitted to the RM with each initial submission file (month 0) to include incremental changes in consumption submitted for the latest reconciliation revision cycles. ICP ownership (ICP days) and volumes are calculated as for RM submissions and include as follows;

- (i) fixed charges and consumption charges by tariff type are applied as per the network tariffs,
- (ii) consumption reported at the meter register level must align in aggregate with the consumption submitted to the RM for the relevant initial reconciliation (month 0), and in addition reflect incremental changes in consumption submitted for the latest reconciliation revision cycle (months 1, 3, 7 and 14) and any other special reconciliations if directed by the Electricity Authority. volumes are normalised into calendar months by applying the RM seasonal adjustment shape, with the impact of changes affecting prior months volume reflected on the volume being reported in the current month.