

Report on Issue 45 'Introduction of Change of Supply Agreed Read Principle to correct all errors in Settlements'

Meeting Name	BSC Panel
Meeting Date	15 January 2013
Purpose of paper	For Information
Summary	This paper summarises the conclusions of the Issue 45 Workgroup. We invite you to note the Group's views and that Issue 45 is now closed.

1. Background

- 1.1 The Change of Supplier (CoS) process takes place whenever a Meter is transferred from one Supplier to another. As part of this, the two Suppliers are required to agree a Meter reading, to ensure that the respective closing and opening Meter readings are derived from the same reading so that the customer is not charged twice in respect of their consumption. The process for obtaining and agreeing this CoS reading is defined in BSCP504¹ and the resolution of any disputes is governed under the Master Registration Agreement (MRA) through MRA Agreed Principle (MAP) 08².
- 1.2 MAP CP 0135 was approved by the MRA Development Board (MDB) in June 2012, with an implementation date of February 2013. This change will introduce new principles into MAP 08 in relation to the CoS Agreed Reads. Under the current arrangements, should a dispute be raised following agreement between two Suppliers of a CoS read and the proposed read is to the benefit of the new Supplier, there is no incentive for the old Supplier to accept the new Supplier's revised read. This essentially places any responsibility for the error on the new Supplier to pick up. However, under MAP CP 0135, there would be an obligation for the old Supplier to accept the revised read, as they would have an obligation to use reasonable steps to correct any error in Settlement, which would make them liable for any errors.

2. What is the issue highlighted by the Proposer?

- 2.1 British Gas has identified a potential issue relating to a dispute between Suppliers where the incorrect number of dials was used for calculating energy used for Settlement purposes. For example, consider the scenario where the old Supplier was reading a 6-dial Meter as though it was a 5-dial Meter, giving readings that were too small by a factor of 10. At the point when the Meter was transferred to a new Supplier, the CoS read was agreed on the basis that the Meter Technical Details (MTDs) state that the Meter is a 5-dial Meter. The new Supplier subsequently discovered that the Meter is in fact a 6-dial Meter and raised a dispute with the old Supplier. Under the current arrangements, it is likely that the new

¹ Non-half Hourly Data Collection for SVA Metering Systems Registered in SMRS

² The Procedure for Agreement of Change of Supplier Readings and Resolution of Disputed Change of Supplier Readings

Supplier would have to pick up the subsequent error in Settlement, but under MAP CP 0135, it will likely be the old Supplier that becomes liable for this error.

- 2.2 British Gas believes that there are currently no mechanisms that exist within the BSC to allow Suppliers and their Agents to correct Settlement data as required by these new principles. They raised Issue 45 to discuss this issue with the Industry, and to agree a potential solution that could then be raised.
- 2.3 An Issue Workgroup's purpose is to help the Proposer define their concern and/or develop a solution so they can (if they wish) raise a Modification or Change Proposal. It is a forum for free-flowing discussion, an opportunity to give input into a solution, and an environment for potential innovation. Taking this into consideration, British Gas's main aim was to ask the Workgroup to consider the following:
- The implications for Suppliers and their agents of implementing MAP CP 0135; and
 - Potential solutions that would enable Suppliers to meet their obligations under MAP 08.
- 2.4 British Gas had identified that there were two main impacts on the BSC:

1) Exchange of Meter Technical Details

Where there has been a concurrent change of Supplier and Meter Operator Agent (MOA) and the new MOA identifies an error in the MTDs from the old MOA, the old MOA will need to provide corrected MTDs to the (old) Non Half Hourly Data Collector (NHHDC) to allow the NHHDC to process the agreed Change of Supplier reading(s). Processes for the exchange of this data (i.e. from the new MOA to the old MOA) are not currently defined in BSCP514³.

2) Liability – who should be responsible for historical error?

If, as in the example above, the old Supplier accepts a new six digit Change of Supplier reading, but has previously submitted five digit readings, then, under MAP CP 0135, the old Supplier would be liable for the subsequent error between their penultimate five-digit read and the six-digit read subsequently agreed as a revised CoS read. This would be the case even if they were the Supplier for only a short time (and picking up the erroneous MTDs from the Supplier before them) or the Meter had been re-conditioned and installed with a non-zero initial reading during their supply period. It should be noted that, in the former situation, the old Supplier would be picking up the error from all previous Suppliers as well as from their own period of supply. In addition, under the current arrangements, it is more likely that the new Supplier would be liable for the error if a revised CoS read could not be agreed.

3. Why this issue and why now?

- 3.1 The Proposer highlights that MAP CP 0135 is to go live in February 2013, and that there are currently no processes within the BSC to allow Suppliers and their agents to correct Settlement data as required by these new principles.
- 3.2 The Proposer notes that this situation has been on-going since 1998, but considers that there is now the opportunity for a solution. Although the Proposer was not completely aware of the size of the issue, they

³ SVA Meter Operations for Metering Systems Registered in SMRS

noted that in the previous six months before raising the Issue they had seen 10-12 instances of this error from just one Supplier.

4. Summary of Issue 45 Discussions

- 4.1 The Issue 45 Workgroup considered the issue that had been raised, and agreed that it was an issue. However, they were unsure of the extent of the issue, or what the best solution to put in place to resolve it would be.
- 4.2 The Group considered the issues around the MTDs, and agreed that there needed to be a mechanism whereby new Meter Operators would be required to send D0149⁴ and D0150⁵ Flows to prove whether the meter was 5-dial or 6-dial.
- 4.3 The Group discussed the principles which were being introduced into MAP 08. They agreed that there needed to be a communication method between the old and new Supplier for resolving these disputes, but felt that this did not necessarily need to be a flow. The Group discussed the idea of the new Supplier sending the required revisions to the MTDs to the old Supplier via email, and the old Supplier could then get their agents to update the MTDs and reissue them to the new Supplier and their agents. However, the Group agreed there would be a risk of the data being corrected and manipulated rather than just being used to inform.
- 4.4 The Group discussed whether the Trading Disputes Committee (TDC) could be involved to correct the errors in Settlement. The majority of the Group agreed that this route would be useful if it could be proven that everything reasonable had been done to identify the error. Although there would be instances where the error was evident straight away, if there was an exception and a decision was taken for the error itself to not be managed, there would then be an element of risk.
- 4.5 The Group considered what type of evidence could be used to identify the issues and confirm the number of dials that a Meter actually has. For photographic evidence, the Group thought that there needed to be some form of criteria, and considered some form of time constraint on which to deliver such evidence. However, it was highlighted that it would be difficult to put a timescale on an agreement, and that it would be better to have clear guidance from the outset. It was thought that a sufficient and legible photograph agreed between both Parties was the key requirement, and that the process is dramatically slowed down if there is disagreement. The Group discussed what they considered to be substantial evidence, taking into account quality, geo-tagging and time stamping. However, it was ultimately decided not to further consider this as part of these discussions, feeling that this matter would be better left to be developed as part of any relevant changes arising from this Issue.
- 4.6 The Group also considered what impact smart metering could have on this issue. There was an agreement that smart meters would help to resolve the issue, but that it would also likely identify a lot more underlying issues. However, one of the members of the Group commented that a lot of the older meters will be discarded once they have been replaced with smart meters, and so Suppliers would be unable to obtain any photographic evidence they may require for a dispute relating to the old meter.

⁴ Notification of Mapping Details

⁵ Non Half-hourly Meter Technical Details

- 4.7 It was also highlighted that smaller Suppliers may struggle to obtain this proof because of costs. Smaller Suppliers may lack the resources required to check meters as regularly as a larger Supplier could, and so would be unlikely to pick up on any issues such as those highlighted under Issue 45 until it is too late to do anything about it. They may also be unable to afford to go out and photograph any disputed meters to the quality that may be required by the old Supplier.
- 4.8 Following these discussions, the Group looked at the various issues, scenarios, practicalities and liabilities surrounding this issue. The Group came up with six scenarios that related to the highlighted issue, and considered various options for each, deciding in each case what their preferred option would be. Details on each of the six Scenarios and their various options can be found in Attachment A. A table listing the scenarios and options and the various views and comments made by Group members for and against each option can be found in Appendix 1. The Group came to the following conclusions for each scenario:
- 4.9 Scenario 1 '5 Dial /6 Dial'
- 4.9.1 Overall the Group agreed that this scenario was not necessarily the most frequent but could potentially have the biggest impact.
- 4.9.2 The Group looked in detail at one example of this particular scenario and noted that the issue was created within a Supplier period. This example highlighted that an error may not originate from market start and that it may be introduced at any point within the history of a MPANs life cycle.
- 4.9.3 The Group agreed that options A and B resulted in the new or old Supplier respectively having to accept liabilities that were either wrong or 'unfair'. The Group opted to rule out option A '*Status Quo (MAP CP 0135 not yet implemented)*' as there was no support from the Group to take this option any further. The Group also agreed to rule option B '*Old Supplier accepts revised CoS*' out as a possible option (although option B would currently apply when MAP 0135 goes live in February 2013), although one member of the Group expressed a preference for an option B/option C solution.
- 4.9.4 A large number of the Group expressed a preference for option C '*Old Supplier liable for own Registration*', considering it to be one of the fairest options as Suppliers would only be picking up the proportion of the error that they were liable for. However, the Group was concerned that option C resulted in error being 'written off' and picked up all Suppliers of Non Half Hourly Metering Systems through GSP Group Correction.
- 4.9.5 The majority of the Group agreed that option D '*Liability limited to crystallised period*' was better placed as the proposed solution to the Issue. This option is better aligned to the principle that errors outside Final Reconciliation timescales can only be corrected via an approved Trading Dispute.
- 4.9.6 The Group agreed to rule out option E '*Old Supplier closes on 5-dial, New Supplier opens on 6-dial*' and option F '*Suppliers agree 5-dial CoS read and new Supplier performs Dummy Meter Exchange*' as possible options, although a couple of members of the Group expressed a preference for option F, as these would both write off more error than options A-D. Under these options, the entire error would be picked up by all Suppliers through GSP Group Correction.

- 4.9.7 It is important to note that that all of solutions C-F have limitations around correctly apportioning Settlement and include an element of 'writing off' error, but are potentially practical solutions to the issue.
- 4.9.8 Overall, Option D '*Old Supplier pays for non-crystallised error*' was the favourable option that the Group felt could be raised as a potential solution.
- 4.10 **Scenario 2 'Transposed Registers'**
- 4.10.1 There was a broad consensus amongst the Group that option C '*Old Supplier performs Dummy Meter Exchange*' was the best option as the error would be corrected as far back as possible and, as the volumes would therefore be correct, there would be less of an issue for the old Supplier. However there was no strong feeling to do anything about this scenario as it appeared that this issue was already being addressed. The use of 'dummy meter exchanges' ensures that the aggregate volume across both registers is correct, albeit the volumes on the individual registers are incorrect. The Group agreed that no change was required in this area.
- 4.11 **Scenario 3 'Missed Meter Exchange'**
- 4.11.1 There was minimal support for option A '*Old Supplier hub corrects error*' among the Group except for the fact that it would provide more accurate billing for the customer. However it would be difficult to establish the installation/read date and the exchange date, so the old Supplier would need to be able to compile this information and evidence in order to correct the error. The Group noted that this could include requiring the old Supplier having to visit the site for confirmation.
- 4.11.2 Although not included as one of the original options for this scenario, the Group identified option B '*New Supplier performs exchange when discovered (at site visit)*' as an alternative option to A and was viewed as the quickest resolution for this scenario. The Group noted that one of the benefits of option B is that it can be used whether or not RF has taken place and would avoid the problem of unknown Meter Exchange dates as well as multiple Supplier issues. However there would be an onus on the new Supplier to resolve any error caused by the previous Supplier, there could be duplicate Meter Serial Numbers, Meter Asset Provisions (MAPs) would be impacted and a manual audit trail would also be required.
- 4.11.3 Overall the Group agreed that no further action should be taken.
- 4.12 **Scenario 4 'Pre-Payment Vend Readings'**
- 4.12.1 There was a general consensus amongst the Group for option C '*Dummy Meter Exchange at D+1*' which had been introduced as an option during the discussion session as an alternative option to A '*Suppliers use different readings*' and B '*New Supplier must accept total register reading*'. The Group agreed that this option was the most realistic despite there being a lack of evidence to show how commonly these errors occur. The Group noted that taking option C forward would only require a documentation change for clarification purposes, and so it could be raised as a potential Change Proposal if necessary.

4.13 Scenario 5 'Revised CoS reading after meter exchange and change of NHHDC'

4.13.1 The majority of the Group agreed that option B '*Place new obligation on old NHHDC*' was preferable for this scenario although it would still require BSCP changes and more than likely require contractual changes over and above the BSCP changes. A couple of members of the Group expressed a preference for option A '*Current workaround*' and option D '*Introduce Settlement day NHHDC appointments*'. The Group noted that option D was an extension of option B as it increases the scope. The Group agreed that although B is the preferable option, and could be raised as a Change Proposal, option D could be raised as an additional Change Proposal if it was felt that option B should be taken further.

4.14 Scenario 6 'Exchanges of Meter Technical Details'

4.14.1 The Group had a lengthy discussion on this scenario in relation to volumes, what could be considered substantial evidence and how common dummy meter exchanges are in Industry today. The Group ruled out option A '*Requirement to transfer corrected MTD via DTN*' due to the number of cons identified, and also considered that this scenario could be rendered redundant by what comes out of scenario 1, particularly in relation to evidence.

4.14.2 Once option D had been identified as the preferable option for Scenario 1, the Group subsequently concluded not to make a final recommendation on this scenario, believing that it should instead be considered as part of the development of the proposed solution to Scenario 1.

4.15 Overall, the Group agreed that Scenarios 2-5 were self-contained to an extent, and that potential Change Proposals could be raised in response to Scenarios 4 and 5. The Group felt that a potential change could be raised from Scenario 1, and that Scenario 6 should be considered further as part of the development of the solution for this change.

4.16 Having looked at the materiality of the issue as part of their discussions, the Group agreed for ELEXON to consult with their EAC/AA contacts in order to obtain a rough figure for this.

4.17 Four Suppliers responded to ELEXON's request for information on the materiality associated with dial mismatches across the last calendar year. Two Suppliers (accounting for approximately 11% NHH Market Share) noted no significant issues with dial mismatches. The remaining two Suppliers (accounting for approximately 40% of NHH market share) noted significant levels of materiality associated with dial mismatches. The total energy volume identified was 276GWh, which at the current Credit Assessment Price of £51/MWh amounts to £14.1m. To place this figure in context, the total energy volume associated with a Settlement year worth of gross Large EAC/AA error in December 2012 was 86.5GWh (or £4.4m). Large EAC/AAs are currently considered a top Settlement Risk and are closely monitored by the Performance Assurance Board. Given that the figure of £14.1m given above represents only 40% of the NHH market, it would seem reasonable to conclude that the issue is of significant materiality, regardless of the very polarised responses on the extent of the issue for specific Suppliers.

4.18 ELEXON identified a recent example where the materiality amounted to £500k (£15k a day) on a small Supplier ID. Even once the small Supplier had resolved the initial misallocation of Settlement volumes

through the use of Gross Volume Correction (GVC), the resulting and very large negative AA impacted on their performance against SP08a⁶, which resulted in them incurring Supplier Charges.

- 4.19 This example identifies that the market level materiality does not need to be very high for this to be a significant issue for competition in the electricity market. It should be highlighted that there could be potential problems for small Suppliers in that £500k of unexpected charges could have devastating impacts for them, and that all it would take is for one of these dial mismatches to 'slip through the net' for a small Supplier to become liable for such a charge.
- 4.20 It was also noted by the Group that under the previous approach taken by Ofgem to Distribution Price Control, there were strong incentives to ensure a *de minimis* quantity of Distribution Losses, which would have made dial mismatches a significant source of lost revenue for Distribution Network Operators (DNOs). However, revisions to Distribution Price Control Review 5, made in December 2012, scaled back the Distribution Loss Incentive significantly, meaning dial mismatches are likely to be of less financial concern to DNOs going forward.

5. Next Steps

- 5.1 The Proposer will look to raise option D of Scenario 1 as a potential solution to the Issue.

6. Recommendations

- 6.1 We invite you to:
- a) **NOTE** the Issue 45 Group's discussions and conclusions;
 - b) **NOTE** the Group's recommendation that Changes could potentially be raised; and
 - c) **NOTE** that Issue 45 is now closed.

List of Appendices:

Appendix 1 – Summary of Discussions for each Scenario for Issue 45
Appendix 2 – Workgroup Membership and Attendance

List of Attachments:

Attachment A – Issue 45 Scenarios

For more information, please contact:

Claire Anthony

Change Analyst, BSC Operations

claire.anthony@elexon.co.uk

020 7380 4293

⁶ 97% of NHH energy volume settled to actuals by the RF Run

Appendix 1 – Summary of Discussions for each Scenario for Issue 45

SCENARIO 1: 5 dial/6 dial	
Benefits	Disadvantages
OPTION A: Status Quo (MAP CP 0135 not yet implemented)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Simplest option Does not require new Meter Technical Details (MTDs) for the old hub. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unfair on the new Supplier having to pick up the liability Anti-competitive and unsustainable No incentive for the old Supplier to get the read correct, but instead creates an incentive to carry out a D+1 Dummy Meter Exchange (effectively carrying out Option F) Not compliant with MAP CP0135 (approved by the MRA Development Board due to be implemented in February 2013).
OPTION B: Old Supplier accepts revised Change of Supply (CoS) (MAP CP 0135)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Simple option Compliant with MAP CP 0135 and will be the new 'status quo' once MAP CP 0135 is implemented, unless further changes are made. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Randomness to the liability of the old Supplier depending on CoS/RF dates Places the biggest onus on the old Supplier to do something, otherwise this could potentially lead to being unable to bill the customer Questions how far back Suppliers should go to correct the error There needs to be a transfer of the Meter Technical Details in this case.
OPTION C: Old Supplier liable for error during own registration period	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fairer to the old Supplier than option B Suppliers would be more likely look to do a Dummy Meter Exchange (i.e. to avoid being faced with huge costs), than under options D, E and F Incentive to ensure that the MTD are correct is greater under option C than it is under options D, E and F. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Harder to implement than both options A and B Old Supplier could be subject to a large liability, which could be a disincentive to sorting out the revised MTD required to close their account and agree the disputed CoS reading Different opening and closing D0086s 'Notification of Change of Supplier Readings' Potentially skews Settlements Potential that this could lead to being unable to bill the customer Would not correct the entire error Does not fit into the BSC principles.



SCENARIO 1: 5 dial/6 dial

Benefits

Disadvantages

OPTION D: Old Supplier pays for non-crystallised error only

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Most sensible solution• Limited impact on the customer• Only one of options C - F that would correct the error in the "fluid" period prior to the RF Run, whilst limiting the old Supplier's liability for crystallised error. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Harder to implement than options A or B• New Meter Technical Details would be needed for the old Supplier• Different opening and closing D0086s• Hard for the old NHHDC to process• Would not correct the entire error. |
|--|---|

OPTION E: Error is 'smeared' via GSP Group Correction factor

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Does not penalise the correcting Supplier (or give an incentive for the old Supplier to correct the error) but makes everyone pay for the error. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Hard to audit as there would be different opening and closing reads• Anti-competitive as it disproportionately impacts new entrants. |
|--|---|

OPTION F: Dummy Meter Exchange in new Supplier period

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Simpler than options C and D• No requirement to transfer Meter Technical Details from the new to the old Supplier Hub• Dummy Meter Exchange is applied by a single applier and the opening and closing readings are the same. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• None identified by the Group. |
|---|---|



SCENARIO 2: Transposed Registers

Benefits

Disadvantages

OPTION A: Old Supplier closes on correct reads

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• More of an incentive for the new Supplier to arrange a site visit within the initial six month period to ensure that the read is correct. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Biggest imbalance and overall impact on the Supplier as although the old and new D0086s are the same, the reads would essentially be “flipped”, rather than a Dummy Meter Exchange taking place, as would occur in options B-D. |
|---|---|

OPTION B: Old Supplier closes on incorrect reads

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clean and cheap solution. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Old Supplier may overpay/underpay, depending on whether they pay for more units on the higher day rate or on the lower night rate• Different opening and closing D0086s• No incentive given to correct the error• Potential for more error could be ‘smeared’ across the market• Could be a losses impact on distribution• Option presented “swings and roundabouts”. |
|---|--|

OPTION C: Old Supplier performs Dummy Meter Exchange

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Error would be corrected as far back as possible and, as the volumes would therefore be correct, there would be less of an issue for the old Supplier• Same opening and closing D0086s. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Potentially a distribution impact across Settlement Days. |
|--|---|

OPTION D: Dummy Meter Exchange by New Supplier D+1

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Simple and easier to implement than option C. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Impact in distribution charges is bigger in this option than in option C as it writes off all the error• Energy costs would not be corrected. |
|---|--|



SCENARIO 3: Transposed Registers

Benefits

Disadvantages

OPTION A: Old Supplier hub corrects error

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Would provide more accurate billing for the customer. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Difficult to establish the installation read/date and the exchange date, so the old Supplier would need to be able to compile this information and evidence in order to correct the error• May require the old Supplier to visit the site for confirmation• Meter Operators' (MOPs) history is unreliable as when the MOP has moved on, they do not tend to give all their asset details. |
|---|---|

OPTION B: New Supplier performs exchange when discovered (at site visit)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Can be used whether or not RF has taken place• Would avoid the problem of unknown Meter Exchange dates as well as multiple Supplier issues. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Onus on the new Supplier to resolve any error caused by the previous Supplier• There could be duplicate Meter Serial Numbers• Meter Asset Provisions (MAPs) would be impacted• A manual audit trail would be required. |
|--|---|



SCENARIO 4: Pre-payment vend readings

Benefits

Disadvantages

OPTION A: Suppliers use different readings

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Workable as it would be a mandated, singular, uniform process. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Presents a risk for new agents as, with potentially different opening and closing reads, there could be an increase in the number of customer queries generated. |
|--|--|

OPTION B: New Supplier must accept total register reading

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Most logical solution. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• New Supplier being forced to accept the total register could cause subsequent system issues for the new Supplier• Suppliers may receive vend readings rather than total register readings from PPMIP systems or, where all readings are sent, the total register may not be readily identifiable. |
|--|--|

OPTION C: Dummy Meter Exchange at D+1

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Simplest option.• Settlement would be correct• No distribution impact• No re-bill or new Meter Technical Details required for the old Supplier• Same opening and closing D0086s• Most realistic option• Taking this option forward would only require a documentation change for clarification purposes. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Could be delays in identifying the issue• Could be a Change of Supply reset issue i.e. when a customer vends on the new Supplier's key/card before officially transferring• Could slow down the Meter CoS process• Could be difficult to resolve as there will be two Suppliers disagreeing. |
|--|---|

SCENARIO 5: Revised CoS reading after Meter Exchange and Change of NHHDC

Benefits	Disadvantages
OPTION A: Current workaround	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Simplest and cheapest option. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manually intensive No clear process on what should happen Harder for small Suppliers to negotiate System constraints on getting the previous MTD history No obligation on the Agent to send data or MTDs.
OPTION B: Place new obligations on old NHHDC	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most favourable option amongst the Group Clearer responsibility and ownership placed on the old NHHDC Good for any Supplier who mass de-appoints. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More than likely require contractual changes over and above the BSCP changes All the information would be in one place Potential system changes required to the current NHHDC role/operating model, which would inevitably lead to more costs than in option A.
OPTION C: Amend the requirements for transferring the MTD and reading histories on change of NHHDC and change of NHHMOA	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified by the Group. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Group strongly disagreed with this option Volumes do not justify the change that would be required.
OPTION D: Introduce Settlement Day by NHHDC appointments	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Goes further than option B as it increases the scope Option could be raised as an additional Change Proposal if it was agreed by the Group to take option B further. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NHHDCs in the Group had little support for this option.
OPTION E: Underpin	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified by the Group. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Messy option NHHDC charges could increase.



SCENARIO 6: Exchanges of Meter Technical Details

Benefits	Disadvantages
OPTION A: Requirement to transfer corrected MTD via DTN	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Suitable for high volumes as there would then be a higher level of control• Auditable trail.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• High costs• Added costs to process outside of the Agents window• Long lead time• Only a short/medium term solution• System/process implications and constraints on both Agents and Suppliers• Questionable as to who would send the Meter Technical details to whom.
OPTION B: Requirement to transfer corrected MTD	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Easier and cheaper method than option A• Ability to add a commentary• Strengthens the obligations by placing the onus on the new Supplier hub to notify revised Meter Technical Details to the old Supplier's Meter Operator agent• High level of control• Auditable trail.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Email interface - messages don't always reach the correct recipient• Element of risk• Potential for the Meter Technical Details exchange to be carried out without the Supplier's knowledge, which could lead to an impact on the customer(s).
OPTION C: Do nothing	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Flexible solution• Quick resolution for small numbers that could be implemented straight away• Greater clarification of responsibility for agents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No obligation on anyone to do anything• Less auditable for large volumes• Supplier hub may not actually be able to resolve the problem.

Appendix 2 – Workgroup Membership and Attendance

Name	Organisation	22/08/12	25/09/12	15/11/12
David Kemp	ELEXON (<i>Chair</i>)	✓	✓	✓
Claire Anthony	ELEXON (<i>Lead Analyst</i>)	✓	✓	✓
Jon Spence	ELEXON	✓	✓	✓
Max O'Connor	ELEXON	✗	✓	✓
Mitch Donnelly	British Gas (<i>Proposer</i>)	✓	✓	✓
Lee Eltherington	British Gas	✓	✗	✗
Andy Smith	British Gas	✗	✗	✓
Colette Baldwin	E.ON	✓	✗	✓
Terry Carr	E.ON	✗	✓	✗
Sunny Vara	First Utility	✓	✓	✓
Rawinder Rehal	First Utility	✓	✗	✗
Darren Eldred	First Utility	✗	✓	✗
Jade Thomas	EDF Energy	✓	✓	✓
James Evans	EDW Technology Ltd	✓	✓	✓
Andrew Knowles	Gemserv	✓	✓	✓
Walter Hood	IBM	✓	✓	✓
Lorraine Smith	IMServ	✓	✗	✓
Stephen Johnson	IMServ	✗	✓	✓
Matt Keen	npower	✓	✓	✓
Sam Pearson	OVOE	✓	✓	✓
Tom Connolly	Scottish Power	✗	✓	✗
Andrew Mather	Siemens	✓	✗	✗
Paul McClennan	Siemens	✓	✓	✗
Pete Butcher	SSE	✓	✗	✗
Nik Willis	STARK	✓	✓	✓
Andreea Zaman	STARK	✗	✓	✓
Amanda Dainty	Total Gas and Power	✓	✓	✓