



**GAS FORUM**  
**Draft Minutes from the NRPS Workgroup 11/02**  
**7<sup>th</sup> February 2011**

**E.ON, Westwood Business Park**  
**Coventry, CV4 8LG**

**Attendees:**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Company</b>
Colette Baldwin (CB) (Chair)	E.ON
Andrew Wallace (AW)	Ofgem
Cesar Coelho (CC)	Ofgem
David Watson (DW)	British Gas
Sasha Pearce (SP)	RWE npower
Dan McMillan (DM)	Detica
Rob Wallis (RW)	Revenue Assurance
Steve Mulinganie (SM)	Gazprom
Michael Spencer (MS)	Experian
Andy Harper (AH)	We Do Technologies
Lorraine Kerr (LK)	ScottishPower
Dan Simons (DS)	EDF Energy
Will Siddall (WS)	IBM
Andy Tanner (AT)	Revenue Assurance
Gareth Evans (GE)	ICOSS
Malcolm Wright (MW)	G4S Utility Services (UK) Ltd
Geoffrey Sekyere-Afriyie (GSA)	Gas Forum

## **Apologies:**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Company</b>
Brett Robinson	Tibco
Neil McKeown	Electralink

## **1. Introduction**

Colette Baldwin (Chair) welcomed everyone to the meeting and gave a brief overview of the plan for the meeting.

CB explained to the Workgroup that the minutes from NRPS 11-01 held on 24<sup>th</sup> January 2011 will be sent out after this meeting. CB went on to say that the work of the Group was going to plan and also confirmed that the main issue for this meeting was the examination of the strawman of the Data Catalogue that DS had taken for further updates.

CB explained to the Group that it would be beneficial to establish consensus on the following:

- the use of the data catalogue;
- security of the information; and the
- process to update the Data Catalogue.

The workgroup agreed that it was important to consider the data that will feed into the NRPS, as opposed to solely focusing on output.

## **2. NRPS Data Catalogue**

The workgroup examined the Data Catalogue replete with the changes from DS.

CB asked that DS walk through a list of the data items that had been compiled to date and requested that members identify any changes to the additional data items that had been added to the main data catalogue.

A number of data items were suggested as potentially beneficial to the NRPS service going forward and CB added them to the main spreadsheet along with the data sources that these items would be drawn from.

Of these data items there were discussions over the following:

- Standardisation of format;
- Where to source the data extracts e.g. from the GT or Supplier system to help with shipperless sites
- Catering for shipperless sites

- Provision of historical data (and the necessary business justification)

Regarding the legal parameters, DW felt that workgroup members would need to examine their respective Privacy Notices, to show what data they entitled to hold and how they can use it.

**ACTION 11-02-01:** DW to share privacy notices with the Gas Forum in order to provide a better idea of how data should be shared.

### Quality of data

Further discussion also focused on the division of separate types of QA, i.e. a split between Supplier and generic QA.

The workgroup felt that the best way to move forward on these issues was to determine the commercial incentive and looked at two scenarios:

1. Does the NRPS take the risk on data quality;
2. NRPS does not have any incentive for the outcome or output, but a contractual obligation.

The Group examined the provision of certain data items *vis-à-vis* the DPA (1998). The Group explored the issue of future proofing the Data Catalogue to take into account smart meters. Such a change may give rise to cyber fraud, and information 'gaps'. The assumed basic smart functionality which would enable remote switching from credit to prepay meters could form part of a picture in terms of highlighting risk indicators and tampering with the meter.

### Issue Resolution

A member of the Group asked how it would work if a change was proposed. Who would have the final say? CB explained that a collegiate approach would be taken, and that it would be a discussion between the NRPS and Suppliers.

CB explained to the group that the smart metering roll out would also have a significant impact on the NRPS, due to the role of the Data Communications Company (DCC), although this would have more of an impact on NRPS phase 2. It was essential to make sure that the right information was put in the right phases, and thus any proposed 'future proofing' would not take place until Phase 2 at the earliest.

Some members of the Group considered that the shipperless sites issue was as big an issue as theft. It was considered that Suppliers found it difficult to identify them

currently, and this gave rise to independents using multiple sources of information to avoid their competitors seeing it.

### 3. NRPS Data Outputs

SP presented the spreadsheet, and invited the Group to examine and build upon the strawman for data outputs. This had been constructed in conjunction with Anne Jackson of SSE. The outputs had been pulled together from the NRPS and Suppliers, and the relevant items compiled.

It was suggested that the material for the strawman be 'converted' into a high-level process map with the relevant outputs, i.e. standard desk analysis, with interventions. Examples should be added taking into account scale and costs. This would enable the introduction of when certain steps were taking place, who they were carried out by, with the relevant SLAs and KPIs. The Group agreed that when this process is being worked, they would need to provide Ofgem with some of the costs.

CB explained that SPAA/ DCUSA CoP would be used as the basis for this process map, and impressed upon the Group the urgency of completing this before the procurement process begins. CB considered this would better enable the NRPS to highlight the level of risk being taken forward.

#### Business requirements

Group members felt that in order to better reach this objective, it would need to be made clear what the *raison d'être* of the NRPS is. If it is a question of revenue recovery, then this may well be doomed to failure due to the fact that the very people being pursued by the courts are the very people who cannot pay.

The following questions were posed to the Group:

1. Does the NRPS advocate a punitive or recovery-based style; or
2. Does the NRPS wish to operate a risk share or paid for incentive?

There was concern that they would not be able to get a feel for cost-based assumptions, and therefore this does not help with the theft Impact Assessment.

Some members of the Group felt that the NRPS needed to consider the following:

- What am I as a Service Provider incentivised to do?
- What are the various commercial models at our disposal?

There were concerns that the RFI did not include (or could not) information on the kind of behaviour they are trying to achieve.

CB took these points on board and stated that the NRPS mandate needed to have some element of deterrent. The Group saw this need, but advised caution, due to the fact that the more complex the solution, the more that the cost will increase. This will be borne by 'bad' customers and 'good' customers alike.

The Group felt that the NRPS could have what it requires, provided it provides firmer proposals. This would be helped by further 'brainstorming' sessions.

It was also agreed that services levels would also need to be examined in order to strengthen the NRPS. CB explained that this Group needs to deliver the Ofgem report, and gave the following high-level plan:

1. RFI (with a clearer remit) – this will need to be done to include electricity in any future solution;
2. OJEU;
3. More extensive preparatory work.

This will transition the document from an RFI to an ITT.

The Group agreed with the extra focus on the scope and looked and certain members suggested the following process:

1. OJEU
2. PQQ/RFI
3. ITT – which will either categorically state the requirements, or have a 'speculative' approach, i.e. do not know what I want, but I have a goal/aspiration.
4. Competitive dialogue process whereby individual meetings take place with the Suppliers. The output of this would be a document to all Suppliers with that information, which one could then price against.

The average time for this would be four weeks. The Group felt that the competitive dialogue was a crucial step, as this is how the tender would be discharged

It was also suggested that the Utilities Vendor Database (UVDB) could be used, as it could provide an open tender list selection process. The potential drawback with such a scheme is that those that have not registered with the scheme would not be able to access the tender selection process.

SP explained that the updated document would be sent round to everyone for comments, as soon as possible.

CB explained that the next meeting will take place on 15<sup>th</sup> February, and that it will be a closed session. The report is scheduled for the end of February.

AW confirmed that the Ofgem consultation will be shared.

## **Close**

CB closed the meeting and thanked all the attendees, CB confirmed that the draft spreadsheet and data catalogue would be circulated to the Group for review. GSA confirmed that the draft minutes would be circulated within 5 Working Days.