

iGT075: Identification of Pressure Tiers

## Summary of Responses

<u>Questions for all iGT UNC parties:</u>	<u>ES Pipelines</u>	<u>Indigo Pipelines</u>	<u>E.ON Energy</u>	<u>Brookfield Utilities</u>	<u>Energetics UK</u>	<u>British Gas</u>	<u>Scottish power</u>
If they had a preference for where the data proposed under iGT075 should be hosted, (i.e. on a central website or iGT UNC website) and how each potential hosting option would affect the costs and benefits associated with the proposed solution.	This depends on how often we're expected to update, I believe it was suggested quarterly but this may need to take into account the fluidity of the New Connections Market. ESP believes a frequent update would be preferred by all, however this may impact costs if a 3rd party is expected to maintain it. ESP does believe that holding it one system(Xoserve) is useful and pragmatic and would always seek to follow the most sensible solution, but would also comment that it's another cost for iGTs.	It would need to be an existing industry web-site, I have no strong preference but we would need to understand if there were any additional costs involved.	It would be beneficial if it was in one place, in the interim maybe on the iGT UNC website with the view to move it Xoserve (to join the GTs) at a later date	Brookfield can see a benefit to Shippers by holding the data on a central website and therefore would support this but would not expect to incur any costs as we would have the ability to provide it via our own website and the iGT UNC without incurring costs.	The logical place to hold this would be on Xoserve's data enquiry service, if this is not an option then a central website would suffice.	We request the data is centrally held with the main GT data	n/a

	Whether they would require the pressure tier information to be downloadable and, if so, in what format (i.e. .csv, .pdf)?	CSV upload would be preferred.	We would not be downloading it so no preference	Excel or capable to be downloaded to CSV.	We do not necessarily require the data to be downloadable but see this as a useful tool to the Shippers if in either a pdf/csv format.	Searching for an MPRN on the webpage would be preferable to downloading an entire file, however if this is to keep the costs down then csv would be preferable to pdf. Searching for an MPRN on the webpage would be preferable to downloading an entire file, however if this is to keep the costs down then csv would be preferable to pdf.	We support downloadable csv data. Following the development of FGO and CGR3, where codes can work together, we believe this should be an option.	n/a
Whether they believe the Modification can be progressed under the Self-governance rules.	ESP believe this to be unlikely as this modification would require specific implementation and therefore system changes.	Yes, it could be progressed under Self-governance.	It has been determined as self-governance for the UNC so we would be happy for it to be self-governance in the iGT UNC also.	We believe there to be no adverse impact on customers therefore support the progression of a Self-governance modification.			We believe publication of pressure tier information is a cost to shippers, but has a direct benefit to MAM and MAPs. As benefits to MAM and MAPs are not passed aligned to shipper costs and this can cause a distortion in the market, we believe Ofgem should arbitrate on the decision,	n/a

						therefore we don't believe this is a self governance proposal.	
Question for all iGTs:							
Whether they can provide the information regarding pressure tiers and at what level – i.e. MP only or at the MP35, MP65 etc.	ESP are only able to split between LP, MP, HP and IP.	We could only provide the information as LP/MP/IP.		Brookfield would prefer the table to consist of low, medium, intermediate, high, mixed and unknown as difficult to break down into the different classifications of medium pressure.	Energetics would only be able to provide pressure tiers at the higher level i.e. MP.	British Gas' preferred option for Pressure Tier data is option 2.	n/a
<b><u>Questions for all Shippers:</u></b>							

If the pressure tier data proposed under iGT075 only consisted of Low Pressure (LP), Medium Pressure (MP), High Pressure (HP) and Intermediate Pressure (IP), would this information be sufficient, or do Shippers require a further breakdown for MP and hence would still need a GT1 form still need to be sent to the relevant iGT where MP was indicated for the Post Code?				It would be our preference that information is provided at the lower level detail as it matches the criteria on the GT1 and avoids subsequent forms being required.			low/med/high/intermediate banding is believed to be sufficient and no further breakdown is required
---	--	--	--	---	--	--	---

#### Additional Comments

##### SSE

I have additional concerns about how this will work for:

- (1) mixed site, where for example you might have several domestic properties that are metered at low pressure but a commercial on the same development that is at medium pressure. These would all be on the same postcode so would we report it as Low or Medium pressure?



(2) Because we work in the New Connection market, we have a lot of dummy postcode incodes, e.g. 1XX, whilst we are awaiting confirmation of the actual postal addresses. This could likely lead to several different projects being amalgamated under the same postcode. How should these be reported if for example there was a mix of low and medium pressure?

(3) We see a benefit to Suppliers in progressing this proposal for domestic properties, as this could potentially assist Smart Roll Out, but I would not want to see this proposal include I&C sites. The GT1 process is important to us for managing third party connections to I&C sites on our network. The GT1 request is often the only notice we get that a Supplier has instructed a MAM to install a meter, as I&C Suppliers are generally poor at registering the MPRN prior to meter installation. We would not be happy to provide data publically that makes it even easier for Suppliers to install meters without registering.

#### **E.ON**

Version number or last updated date could be incorporated into the formatting for awareness if required but it has not been proposed in the UNC.

#### **Brookfield utilities**

As an additional point we would like to highlight should this modification be implemented it would require Brookfield to complete a large manual exercise and therefore we would require sufficient timeframes to complete this.