

Workgroup Report		At what stage is this document in the process?
<h2>iGT100:</h2> <h3>Reinstating Asset Query Codes</h3>		<div style="display: flex; flex-direction: column; gap: 5px;"> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 2px; display: flex; align-items: center; gap: 5px;"> <span style="border: 1px solid #ccc; border-radius: 50%; padding: 2px 5px;">01</span> <span style="border: 1px solid #ccc; border-radius: 5px; padding: 2px 5px;">Modification</span> </div> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 2px; display: flex; align-items: center; gap: 5px;"> <span style="border: 1px solid #ccc; border-radius: 50%; padding: 2px 5px;">02</span> <span style="border: 1px solid #ccc; border-radius: 5px; padding: 2px 5px;">Workgroup Report</span> </div> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 2px; display: flex; align-items: center; gap: 5px;"> <span style="border: 1px solid #ccc; border-radius: 50%; padding: 2px 5px;">03</span> <span style="border: 1px solid #ccc; border-radius: 5px; padding: 2px 5px;">Draft Modification Report</span> </div> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 2px; display: flex; align-items: center; gap: 5px;"> <span style="border: 1px solid #ccc; border-radius: 50%; padding: 2px 5px;">04</span> <span style="border: 1px solid #ccc; border-radius: 5px; padding: 2px 5px;">Final Modification Report</span> </div> </div>
<p><b>Purpose of Modification:</b></p> <p>iGT073 removed redundant query codes with the implementation of Single Service Provision through Project Nexus. The queries were streamlined to only include those required by the Pipeline Operator as a Transporter rather than as a Meter Asset Manager (MAM). Queries, where the iGT is also a MAM, cannot be created as there is no alternative process in place. This modification seeks to reinstate query codes which have been identified as still being required.</p>		
	<p>The Workgroup recommends that this modification should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>be subject to self-governance procedures</li> <li>proceed to Consultation</li> </ul> <p>The Panel will consider this Workgroup Report on 19 July 2017. The Panel will consider the recommendations and determine the appropriate next steps.</p>	
	<p>High Impact: NA</p>	
	<p>Medium Impact: NA</p>	
	<p>Low Impact: Pipeline Operators and Pipeline Users</p>	

Contents		 Any questions?												
1	Summary	3												
2	Governance	3												
3	Why Change?	4												
4	Code Specific Matters	4												
5	Solution	4												
6	Impacts & Other Considerations	4												
7	Relevant Objectives	5												
8	Implementation	6												
9	Legal Text	6												
10	Recommendations	6												
<b>Timetable</b>		 020 7090 1044												
<b>The Proposer recommends the following timetable:</b>		Proposer: <b>Kirsty Dudley</b>												
<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>Initial consideration by Workgroup</td> <td>4 July 2017</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Workgroup Report presented to Panel</td> <td>19 July 2017</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Draft Modification Report issued for consultation</td> <td>21 July 2017</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Consultation Close-out for representations</td> <td>11 August 2017</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Final Modification Report available for Panel</td> <td>14 August 2017</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Modification Panel decision</td> <td>16 August 2017</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Initial consideration by Workgroup	4 July 2017	Workgroup Report presented to Panel	19 July 2017	Draft Modification Report issued for consultation	21 July 2017	Consultation Close-out for representations	11 August 2017	Final Modification Report available for Panel	14 August 2017	Modification Panel decision	16 August 2017	 <b>Kirsty.Dudley@eone nergy.com</b>
Initial consideration by Workgroup	4 July 2017													
Workgroup Report presented to Panel	19 July 2017													
Draft Modification Report issued for consultation	21 July 2017													
Consultation Close-out for representations	11 August 2017													
Final Modification Report available for Panel	14 August 2017													
Modification Panel decision	16 August 2017													
		 07816 172 645												

## 1 Summary

### What

Some Pipeline Operators act as a Transporter as well as a Meter Asset Manager (MAM) and any asset queries e.g. crossed meter / incorrect asset were raised via the iGT UNC. iGT073S saw the review of iGT query codes and the removal of codes which would not be required following Single Service Provision (Project Nexus) because the Transporter activities would now be conducted by the Central Data Service Provider (CDSP). The review considered the post Nexus requirements only, it didn't consider any impacts where iGTs were also a MAM e.g. the MAM confirming the details where a crossed meter occurs.

The removal of the MAM specific query codes has thus removed the mechanism to communicate with the iGTs as a MAM to query / resolve anything asset related. Once asset queries have been resolved any amendments would be completed via the post Nexus go-live processes.

### Why

Historically iGTs developed a boilerplate agreement which saw metering incorporated into the iGT UNC where the iGT was the Transporter and the MAM, although now iGTs may be the Transporter but not the MAM. There are however still existing / new connections where the iGT is also the MAM where query management for e.g. crossed meters, faulty meters and other MAM elements which may require investigation or resolution.

Although iGTs could choose to create their own query management process it doesn't address the issue that currently the removal of the MAM codes from the iGT UNC has removed the mechanism for Shippers to raise these queries. The reinstating of the query codes is being put forward by this modification to ensure there is a process for Shippers (on behalf of their Suppliers) to raise the queries, Suppliers can still contact the MAMs to agree their own individual processes but where customer asset information is incorrect or metering requires changing a mechanism to do this is required. This modification does not look to amend any other metering element within the iGT UNC but instead seeks to facilitate the MAM query management process where it is required (which would have been covered by the boiler plate agreements).

Where the iGT is not the MAM or the Transporter only the queries would be managed via the MAMs individual query management process and not via the iGT UNC.

### How

Amend the iGT UNC SoS Query Management Ancillary document to reinstate selected query codes for where the meter is identified as e.g. possibly faulty or crossed with another supply. It is also suggested to link to SPAA MDD to ensure this approach is only followed where the iGT is also the MAM, where independent MAMs are attached to an iGT supply point this process would not be used.

## 2 Governance

### Justification for Self-Governance Procedures

The amendment is to reinstate removed query codes which does not have a material impact on consumers, competition in shipping, matters relating to safety or security of supply but seeks to ensure robust processes and efficient management of the iGT UNC.

## Work Group Comments

The majority of the Workgroup supported the proposers view that this modification should progress as a Self-Governance modification. However, it was highlighted that some Commercial MAMs could see this as detrimental to Competition.

## Requested Next Steps

This modification should:

- be subject to self-governance
- be assessed by a Workgroup

## 3 Why Change?

The scope of iGT073S was to remove query codes which were redundant as part of the Transporter process because the activity would be conducted by the CDSP. The review, however, did not consider the element where the iGT also acts as a MAM and through RPC completes these as a bundled arrangement and therefore needs to be aligned to ensure the information at site is confirmed so it can be subsequently amended via the CDSP.

The reinstating of selected query types enables the clarification of asset information where the iGT is also a MAM as this was not the intention of iGT073S.

## 4 Code Specific Matters

### Technical Skillsets

Knowledge of the iGT UNC and the way the management of metering assets is carried out by the industry.

### Reference Documents

NA

## 5 Solution

The proposed solution is to reinstate the following query types and to update the descriptions so it is clear they are only for use in the circumstance where the iGT is also the MAM. Where the iGT is not the MAM this process would not be applicable.

Queries are to be issued as per the guidance already covered in the ancillary document; this modification does not seek to amend the scope.

The asset query codes to reinstate are:

CMQ

EXQ

MFR

AMD

MRR

## Work Group Comments

The majority of the Workgroup supported the proposer's view that in order to have adequate measures in place, and a clear route of escalation these query codes should be reintroduced and codified. However, it was identified that most queries are currently handled manually via email.

## 6 Impacts & Other Considerations

### Does this modification impact a Significant Code Review (SCR) or other significant industry change projects, if so, how?

NA

### Consumer Impacts

Positive impact as it gives a clear and robust query process where the iGT is also the MAM and should therefore ensure that any potential errors in the meter information at a consumer's premises can be rectified as soon as possible after the error is identified.

### Work Group Comments

The Workgroup supported the proposer's view, however, did acknowledge that there is already a uncodified process for iGT MAM queries.

### Environmental Impacts

NA

## 7 Relevant Objectives

### Impact of the modification on the Relevant Objectives:

Relevant Objective	Identified impact
(A) Efficient and economic operation of the pipe-line system	None
(B) Co-ordinated, efficient and economic operation of (i) the combined pipe-line system; and/or (ii) the pipe-line system of one or more other relevant gas transporters	None
(C) Efficient discharge of the licensee's obligations	None
(D) Securing of effective competition: (i) between relevant shippers; (ii) between relevant suppliers; and/or (iii) between DN operators (who have entered into transportation agreements with other relevant gas transporters) and relevant	None

shippers	
(E) Provision of reasonable economic incentives for relevant suppliers to secure that the domestic customer supply security standards... are satisfied as respects the availability of gas to their domestic customers	None
(F) Promotion of efficiency in the implementation and administration of the Code	Positive
(G) Compliance with the Regulation and any relevant legally binding decisions of the European Commission and/or the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators	None

There is a positive impact for Objective F because the reinstating of the codes allows for a codified process to be used to query asset address details.

### Work Group Comments

The Workgroup was happy that this modification positively impacts Relevant Objective F). However, some parties noted that if this modification is not implemented, the process would still happen, however, this will not be standardised.

## 8 Implementation

November 2017 release.

### Work Group Comments

The Workgroup was happy that there would be no system impacts in the event that this modification was implemented, and therefore, there would be no material impacts and the Workgroup supported the proposer's recommendation.

## 9 Legal Text

### Suggested Text

The following codes and descriptions are to be included within section 6.1 of the Pipeline Operator Standards of Service Query Management ancillary document.

Asset Queries

~~CMQ – Any response to a query where meter asset details were transposed from one property to another~~

Submitted to the Pipeline Operator where they are also the Meter Asset Manager (according to SPAA MDD) to query the asset details where there is a possible crossed meter.

~~EXQ – Any response to a query where the root cause was associated to a meter exchange~~

Submitted to the Pipeline Operator where they are also the Meter Asset Manager (according to SPAA MDD) to query the asset details where there is a possible exchanged meter.

~~MFR – Any response querying receipt of meter asset details via Meter Fit Report~~

Submitted to the Pipeline Operator where they are also the Meter Asset Manager (according to SPAA MDD) to query the asset details where there is a possible mismatch.

~~AMD – Any response to a contact challenging the meter asset details of a property as held on the IGT system~~

Submitted to the Pipeline Operator where they are also the Meter Asset Manager (according to SPAA MDD) to query the meter asset details where there is possible mismatch. Examples of mismatches include the meter serial number, the number of dials and the multiplication factor.

~~MRR – Any response to a query where the meter was removed and supply point no longer at 'live' status~~

Submitted to the Pipeline Operator where they are also the Meter Asset Manager (according to SPAA MDD) to query the asset details where there is a possible removed meter.

## Work Group Comments

The Workgroup was happy with the legal text and noted that this was sufficient to deliver the solution as set out in the modification.

## 10 Recommendations

### Workgroup's Recommendation to Panel

The Workgroup asks Panel to agree that:

- This self-governance modification should proceed to consultation.