

iGT047 Development Group Meeting #4 Minutes

1. Participants

Adam Pearce (ESP) (Chair)
Andy Miller (Xoserve)
Anne Jackson (SSE)
Ashley Foster (SSEPL)*
Colette Baldwin (Eon)
David Speake (British Gas)
Gethyn Howard (IPL)
Jenny Rawlinson (GTC)
Jon Dixon (Ofgem)*
Lisa Wong (ESP)
Mark Pitchford (npower)
Paul Saker (EDF)*
Steve Ladle (Gemserv)

Apologies were received from Bridget Morgan (Ofgem) and Gethyn Howard (IPL).

2. Review of actions and minutes from last meeting

- 1.1 Closed (SMU & existing flows where appropriate)
- 2.1 Remains open
- 2.2 Remains open
- 2.4 Remains open
- 2.5 Remains open - emails with DECC
- 2.7 Closed (can be done, but the group's current position is that it isn't necessary)
- 3.1 Closed (mod proposal sent out on 27th February)

3. File formats and flows

The group carried out a page turn of the Ancillary Document v0.3. The following comments were made:

- a. The MDD (or in some instances, the Xoserve) shortcodes for the licenced entity should be used, not the names of the organisation – this needed clarifying in the document
- b. Supplier ID will be sent on the PSR and in the CoS flows, therefore it shouldn't be included in the SMU file flow
- c. It was confirmed that the proposed shipper will want to see the SMSO ID in the SMU file
- d. UPRN needed to be taken out of the 003 record format
- e. DCC service flag EFD needed its description changed to reflect its purpose
- f. Clarification would need to be sought around the format and allowable values for both the IHD Install Status and the DCC Service Flag data items
- g. SMR record needed to have a Record Identifier of '004'
- h. Rejection Code set as 'conditional' and Text
- i. An explicit reference added to clarify the obligations on parties to keep the Supply Point Register as accurate as reasonably possible
- j. A change history would need to be added once the ancillary document was baselined
- k. 002 record would be sent to the proposed shipper on the day that the iGT returns the Confirmation Acceptance, rather than on D-6.

- I. The examples need to change in light on the above suggestions

A Pearce agreed to make the changes and circulate an updated Ancillary Document to group members for any further comments.

The group agreed that the rejection codes should be consistent with those used by Xoserve. A Pearce agreed to speak to Steve Nunnington in order to obtain a list of relevant codes.

The question of file security and password protection was raised. A Miller confirmed that the IX connections could be used to send and receive SMU/SMR files, which should alleviate many concerns around the security of these files. The group still has an outstanding action to understand DECC's expectations with regards to protecting the data within these files.

4. Retrospective population of data

The group highlighted a number of data items that would require back population into iGT systems, and in many cases, at different times. The distinct instances are:

- (a) Installing Supplier ID & Meter Mechanism Code (prior to June 2013)
- (b) SMSO ID (prior to October 2013)
- (c) Remaining new data items (for example, IHD Install Status – prior to April 2014)
- (d) Supplier ID (as soon as possible)

For (a), shippers agreed that the vast majority of smart meters on iGT networks will have been installed by the iGT in collaboration with no more than 2 shipper parties. Given this, the group agreed that iGTs would be able to derive the Meter Mechanism Code from the meter model. For the Installing Supplier ID, iGTs could provide the respective shipper with a list of MPRNs with smart meters installed and the shipper could return the list with the respective Installing Supplier IDs.

The group recommended that (b), (c) and (d) be picked up through the iGT-Shipper Workgroup. S Ladle agreed to add this as an agenda item at the next iGT-Shipper Workgroup.

5. Funding

A Pearce opened the discussions by reviewing the slides provided ahead of the meeting, outlining the need for a mechanism to fund the costs associated with each iGT's IX connection.

A Miller confirmed the costs as circa. £20,000 per installation, in addition to £7,000 annual costs. Certain costs associated with manually running the current SCOGES file would fall away, given that this data would be delivered through the IX (suggested as being roughly £20,000 across all iGTs).

The funding solutions explored in more detail were:

1. Incorporating costs in to the existing cost of the Data Enquiry Service

Both Eon and Npower had concerns that this could lead to skewed costs, as those shippers who operated through multiple licences would bear a disproportionate (larger) portion of the costs.

2. Each iGT adding an additional line in the transportation statement

It was accepted that this solution was better for allocating the costs to shipper parties (i.e. it could take account of the number of iGT supply points only), but Ofgem had concerns that some of the costs could not be classed as being incurred as a result of carrying out Transportation Business activities.

3. Introducing a new line into the GDN's Agency Charging Statement, allocating the cost to shippers based on the number iGT supply points.

A Miller put forward this suggestion as an alternative, but stressed that this solution would need agreement from the GDNs, Xoserve and the User Pays User Committee before it could be progressed.

The group favoured the 3rd approach and A Miller took away an action to discuss it with the affected parties and if appropriate, raise a modification at the next User Pays User Committee. A Miller confirmed that with the introduction of Single Service Provision, this funding arrangement would fall away, with the Single Service Provision arrangements taking its place.

A Jackson made the point that given the fact that shippers agreed to the principle of User Pays for the GDN changes (UNC430), that they agree to the same principle for the iGT changes. The other shipper parties present agreed. Given this, iGTs stated that they were comfortable with the modification proposal going to the next panel with the recommendation that it is sent out to consultation.

The possibility of using an alternative gateway was raised – for example, DTN. A Miller took away an action to speak to Electralink and carry out some analysis around the viability and costs of incorporating DTN into Xoserve's system.

6. Review of mod proposal

It was decided that the modification proposal and the workgroup report would need to be updated to reflect the discussions around funding and retrospective population, had within this meeting.

7. AOB

None.

8. Future meeting dates

The next meeting date was set for Wednesday 15th May, 1.30pm. Teleconference only, unless the need for a physical meeting arises.

9. Actions

	Action	Owner	Status
1.1	AP & other iGTs to review and propose potential methods for transferring data items between iGT and shipper parties	A Pearce	Open
2.1	A Pearce to create a schedule to demonstrate the sequence of data flows between iGTs, shippers, Xoserve and the DCC.	A Pearce	Open
2.2	Suppliers and iGTs to provide feedback to A Pearce with their individual processes, so that a schedule of processes/flows can be produced.	All parties	Open
2.3	A Pearce to produce a schedule of daily smart data flows	A Pearce	Closed
2.4	Shippers/suppliers to speak to STEG reps to determine whether SMU/SMR files will be subject to any particular DCC security standards.	All shipper parties	Open
2.5	A Pearce to speak to DECC/CESG to determine whether SMU/SMR files will be subject to any particular DCC security standards.	A Pearce	Open
2.6	A Pearce to produce a summary document, outlining a possible solution for the Effective Switching and Foundation phases.	A Pearce	Closed
2.7	iGTs to look into the feasibility of adding the additional items to the shipper portfolio extract.	All iGT parties	Open
3.1	A Pearce to update mod proposal, including adding the required legal text, and circulate to iGT047DG parties by Wednesday 27 th February.	A Pearce	Open
4.1	To discuss the possibility of adding a line into the GDN's ACS with the affected parties and if appropriate, raise a modification for consideration at the next User Pays User Committee.	A Miller	Open
4.2	To speak to Electralink and carry out analysis on the viability and costs involved with integrating DTN into Xoserve's solution	A Miller	Open
4.3	To speak to S Nunnington in order to obtain a list of Xoserve's rejection codes	A Pearce	Open
4.4	S Ladle to add a "Retrospective population of Smart data" item to the next iGT-shipper WG.	S Ladle	Open