

Stage 03: Draft Modification Report

iGT039:

Use of a Single Gas Transporter Agency for the common services and systems and processes required by the IGT UNC

At what stage is this document in the process?

- 01 Modification Proposal
- 02 Workgroup Report
- 03 Draft Modification Report
- 04 Final Modification Report

All iGTs will be required to use the GDNs' agent for the delivery of the common processes as detailed in the iGT UNC and the large transporters Agency Services Agreement.



Responses invited by 21 January 2015



High Impact:
iGTs and Shippers



Medium Impact:
None



Low Impact:
None

Contents

1. Plain English Summary.....	3
2. Rationale for Change?.....	4
3. Solution	5
4. Relevant Objectives	5
5. Impacts and Costs.....	6
6. Likely Impact on Consumers	6
7. Likely Impact on Environment	6
8. Implementation.....	6
9. Legal Text.....	7
10. Recommendation	7
11. Workgroup Report.....	7

About this document:

This document is a Draft Modification Report, which was issued for consultation responses at the request of the Panel, on 19th December 2014. The close-out date for responses is 21st January 2015.

This is an extended consultation window (20 days rather than 15) to take account of both the Christmas period and an Ofgem decision letter on their proposed licence change to introduce an Agency, including Agency Services Funding as well as their minded to position on parallel UNC Modifications UNC440 and UNC467 due to be published on 14th January 2015.

The Panel will consider the responses and agree whether or not it will recommend to the Authority that this modification should be made.



Any questions?

Contact:

Code Administrator



igt-unc@gemserv.com



0207 090 1044

Proposer:

Colette Baldwin



Colette.baldwin@eoneergy.com



02476 181382

Workgroup Chair:

Gethyn Howard



Gethyn.Howard@buk.co.uk



01359 245754

iGT039

Draft Modification Report

19th December 2014

Version 1.0

Page 2 of 20

© 2014 all rights reserved

1. Plain English Summary

Is this a Self-Governance Modification?

No

Rationale for Change

Since the opening of the gas transporter market to competition the number of Independent Gas Transporters (iGTs) that have entered the market has now settled to a more stable number of iGTs. The innovation that was encouraged by the Authority has seen the iGTs become the dominant providers of gas transportation networks for new connections.

During the nascence of these smaller independent organisations, iGTs were not required to build and operate the same systems as the larger mature gas transporters and because of this the organisations have developed different approaches to many of the processes that underpin the competitive gas market.

In 2005 the Gas Forum raised concerns in a paper to Ofgem “iGT issues and Governance” about the fragmented approach to IT systems and processes operated by the iGTs. A number of recommendations were included in that paper which have been addressed by the introduction of a Uniform Network Code for iGTs including issues around service standards, meter reading management and the AQ Review.

However the introduction of a common service provider for iGT processes, particularly around the Supply Point Administration, has not been achieved despite a number of different initiatives led both by Shippers and the iGTs at different times over the past six years.

With the advent of the large transporters’ project Nexus, the industry recognised the opportunity to integrate some of the main areas of contention around Supply Point Administration onto a common platform. Shippers requested that this re-platforming of the large transporters agent system be scoped to include the iGTs as well as the GDNs.

Shippers have been struggling for many years with the manual workarounds that they need to put in place for the management of iGT sites. This has led to higher costs being incurred by the shipper for their iGT customers. Relative Price Control sought to introduce a relationship between the GDN cost basis and that of the iGTs, however a major differentiation between the GDNs and the iGTs is the requirement to use a Single Agency by the GDN.

E.ON believes that the iGT market is now sufficiently mature and has steadied in terms of the number of market participants. Significant benefits could now be achieved by requiring the iGTs to use the same single agency that the large transporters are required to establish for the delivery of supply point administration services.

Solution

The Pipeline Operators shall enter into an agency services agreement (“AS agreement”) with the Large Gas transporters providing for the common provision of services and systems, including the common provision by the “agency” of such services and systems, the scope of which are set out within the uniform network code.

Relevant Objectives

The proposer believes that the change will need to be introduced by a licence change and as such the proposal will facilitate delivery of the iGTs’ future licence condition. Equally improvements in communications between Pipeline Operators and Pipelines Users as well as GDNs will deliver improved processes, increased transparency and improved administration with single processes and files for multiple parties to use. This should result in cost reductions for Pipeline Operators who are managing multiple interfaces for the same processes across multiple Pipeline Users.

Implementation

The modification should be implemented at the Project Nexus Go Live date to coincide with changes being applied to the UNC under Nexus Mods 432, 434 and Mods 440.

2. Rationale for Change?

Since the opening of the gas transporter market to competition the number of Independent Gas Transporters (iGTs) that have entered the market has now settled to a more stable number of iGTs. The innovation that was encouraged by the Authority has seen the iGTs become the dominant providers of gas transportation networks for new connections.

During the nascence of these smaller independent organisations, iGTs were not required to build and operate the same systems as the larger mature gas transporters and because of this the organisations have developed different approaches to many of the processes that underpin the competitive gas market.

In 2005 the Gas Forum raised concerns in a paper to Ofgem “iGT issues and Governance” about the fragmented approach to IT systems and processes operated by the iGTs. A number of recommendations were included in that paper which have been addressed by the introduction of a Uniform Network Code for iGTs including issues around service standards, meter reading management and the AQ Review. However the introduction of a common service provider for iGT processes, particularly around the Supply Point Administration, has not been achieved despite a number of different initiatives led both by Shippers and the iGTs at different times over the past six years.

With the advent of the large transporters’ project Nexus, the industry recognised the opportunity to integrate some of the main areas of contention around Supply Point Administration onto a common platform. Shippers requested that this re-platforming of the large transporters agent system be scoped to include the iGTs as well as the GDNs.

Shippers have been struggling for many years with the manual workarounds that they need to put in place for the management of iGT sites. This has led to higher costs being incurred by the shipper for their iGT customers. Relative Price Control sought to introduce a relationship between the GDN cost basis and that of the iGTs, however a major differentiation between the GDNs and the iGTs is the requirement to use a Single Agency by the GDN.

E.ON believes that the iGT market is now sufficiently mature and has steadied in terms of the number of market participants. Significant benefits could now be achieved by requiring the iGTs to use the same single agency that the large transporters are required to establish for the delivery of supply point administration services.

3. Solution

The Pipeline Operators shall enter into an agency services agreement ("AS agreement") with the Large Gas transporters providing for the common provision of services and systems, including the common provision by the "agency" of such services and systems, the scope of which are set out within the uniform network code.

4. Relevant Objectives

Impact of the modification on the Relevant Objectives:	
Relevant Objective	Identified impact
a) Efficient and economic operation of the pipe-line system.	Positive
b) Coordinated, 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.	Positive
c) Efficient discharge of the licensee's obligations.	Positive
d) Securing of effective competition: (i) between relevant shippers; (ii) between relevant suppliers; and/or (iii) between DN operators (who have entered into transportation arrangements with other relevant gas transporters) and relevant shippers.	Positive
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 Co-operation of Energy Regulators.	None

The Proposer considers that this Modification would facilitate:

Objective A & B

By having a new iGT Arrangements Document to replace the CSEP NExA it will facilitate improvements in the contractual relationship between the iGTs and the GDNs in relation to each CSEP. This will provide new/improved information exchanges between parties to help improve the management of the CSEPs.

Objective C

The change is likely to require a change to the iGT licence conditions to require existing and future iGTs to enter into a common arrangement for common processes under the iGT UNC.

Objective D

Pipeline Users will be able to remove many of the manual processes managing iGT supply points which will strip out surplus costs for manual workarounds. The common UK Link files will enable iGT customers to follow the same customer journey as their non iGT neighbours.

Objective F

As the iGT UNC will largely point to the UNC, this will make the change process for the iGT UNC in common areas much simpler as it will no longer require separate modifications to both codes which may run on different timelines.

5. Impacts and Costs

An assessment of costs and benefits has been conducted and reviewed during the workgroup process. Please see the Workgroup Report for more information.

6. Likely Impact on Consumers

E.ON believes that this change will bring improved servicing for the customer, as there will be greater transparency of their data within central systems, which will lead to a reduction in the number of duplicate meter point reference numbers and their inevitable consequences; query management processes will be consistent with that of the GDNs and should help reduce query management timescales and the customer will have a single point of contact to identify their transporter.

7. Likely Impact on Environment

None are anticipated.

8. Implementation

Implementation of the proposal should coincide with Project Nexus implementation dates under UNC Modifications 432, 434 and 440.

9. Legal Text

Legal Text has been supplied by the iGTs following both an external legal review commissioned by the iGTs. It has also been sent out to all parties for a 4 week review and, subsequent to this, has been agreed by the Workgroup.

[Change-marked version of Legal Text](#)

[Clean version of new Code \(based on v8.3\) incorporating Legal Text](#)

10. Recommendation

All parties are invited to consider whether they wish to submit views regarding this Modification. The close-out date for responses is 21st January 2015. All responses should be sent to the Code Administrator at igt-unc@gemserv.com.

This is an extended consultation window (20 days rather than 15) to take account of both the Christmas period and an Ofgem decision letter on their proposed licence change to introduce an Agency, including Agency Services Funding as well as their minded to position on parallel UNC Modifications UNC440 and UNC467 due to be published on 14th January 2015.

A response template is available for use at <http://www.igt-unc.co.uk/Modifications>.

Parties are asked to include their views on how the proposal satisfies the various relevant objectives as part of their response.

11. Workgroup Report

The final Workgroup Report as drafted by the Workgroup and presented to the iGT UNC Modification Panel meeting on 17th December 2014 follows:

DG039 Report to the Panel December 2014

The 039 development group was established following the raising of IGT039 in August 2011 by E.On. IGT039 sought IGTs to utilise the services of the GDN Agency for the provision of common services and systems, the scope of which are set out within the Uniform Network Code. The purpose and scope and deliverables are outlined below as taken from the development group's terms of reference.

Purpose

The role as set out in the Group's Terms of Reference can be summarised as follows:

- The package of changes that may be necessary to extend the existing GT Agency arrangements to iGTs (including the changes to the iGT UNC and any changes necessary that extend beyond the scope of the iGT UNC);
- To the extent possible, developing the details of these changes;
- To the extent possible, assessing the impacts, cost and benefits to consumers, shippers and iGTs of migration to a single Agent;
- Events/circumstances that may influence the ability for a single service agency to be delivered;
- Specific suggestions for changes to the iGT licence;
- Any impact this change may have on UNC; Assess what changes will be required for the iGTs to use the GDNs' agent for the delivery of the common processes as detailed in the iGT UNC and the large transporters Agency Services Agreement;
- Identify the exact services that may come under Agency;
- Investigate potential funding alternatives to deliver the services;
- Compare proposals against the current iGT UNC to;
 - Identify potential changes to the iGT UNC required to deliver the agency service;
 - Identify what information the GDN's agent will be required to provide to the iGTs and what information the iGTs will need to supply to the agent;
 - Identify what information the GDN's agent will be required to provide to the Shippers and what information the Shippers will need to supply to the agent;
- Agree the file formats that are to be used for the various process communications;
- Assess the costs and benefits to iGT parties (iGTs and Shippers/Suppliers) – will require assistance from Ofgem;

- Assess implementation timing issues and any dependencies on other industry activity.

Scope and Deliverables

1. A scoping document/workplan, expanding on these Terms of Reference and setting an expectation of output and associated timescales where possible.
2. A final report outlining the findings of the Group, including the scope of the Single Service Agency, a cost/benefit section, proposals for Governance of the arrangements, implications for Licences and recommendations on timing for implementation and use of Nexus.
3. Draft modification proposals (iGT UNC and UNC) for any such changes

Limits

Due to the broad scope of the subject matter, it will be for the Group members to determine where discussions have reached the limit of scope. No initial limits are proposed, but some may be added to these Terms of Reference as work progresses

Summary and Discussions

The group met 30 times between November 2011 and December 2014 to discuss the changes required to implement IGT Agency Services. The discussions are summarised in the following topics:

Governance Approach

The group initially assessed a number of governance approaches to implement SSP including the use of different framework solutions as well as differing approaches to drafting the obligations under Code. These included:

- 1) IGT Licence Condition & Thinning out of IGT UNC
- 2) SPAA Requirement for IGT Agency Services
- 3) Single Network Code for IGTs and GDNs.

The favoured approach by the group was the “pointing to” approach under option 1 whereby the IGT UNC would point to sections of the UNC where processes impacted by SSP would be the same for IGTs and GDNs. This was largely on the basis that such approach would reduce dual governance issues by avoiding having to maintain whole parts in the IGT UNC to ensure they mirror the UNC. The group also agreed that the additional benefit of the pointing to approach is that it also ensures it was clear that where pointing across, the IGT and GDN process are the same. The group noted the benefits of a “DCUSA style” single network Code and though potentially a long term aspiration, was deemed to be outside the scope of IGT039.

The group noted that the CSEP NExA would be impacted and much of the early work undertaken by DG039 focused on mapping out and agreement of

the overall contractual framework to support IGT Agency Services which in turn formed the basis for National Grid's UNC0440 modification. The effect of this proposal is to bring IGTs under the governance of the UNC and allow IGT parties to vote on changes to the UNC. The CSEP NExA is also to be replaced with a new agreement under the UNC known as the IGTAD. This modification can be found [here](#).

Scope of Services

The group used the GDN Agency Services Agreement ("ASA") as the basis to determine which activities the IGT Agency Service would provide on behalf of IGTs. It was agreed at this stage of the review that where IGT activities were performed by the IGT Agency Service that the file formats utilised would also mirror those of the GDN. This allowed Xoserve to develop an IGT Agency Services BRD which can be found [here](#). The group also agreed that IGTs would need to develop an IGT Agency Services Agreement with the Agency and though the principles behind this were agreed at the development group, it would be for the IGTs and the SSP to develop and implement this outside of IGT039 and ahead of SSP implementation. Work is underway to develop this agreement between IGTs and Xoserve.

Funding

2 main approaches were reviewed for funding the annual costs of SSP:

1) *Cost Neutrality for IGTs*

A matrix was developed outlining the services the SSP would be conducting based on the activities outlined in the CEPA report on the Agency's Funding Governance and Ownership review ("FGO"). The basis for this approach was that where an IGT experienced a saving for SSP, this saving would form the basis for each IGT's contribution to the annual cost of SSP to ensure that each IGT was no worse off as a result of SSP. Each IGT completed the matrix and sent to Ofgem in confidence.

2) *Revenue Neutrality for IGTs*

The revenue neutral approach was based on the premise that IGTs would contribute the equivalent allowance under RPC that the GDNs are allowed for the relevant services. Ofgem are conducting this analysis though due to other influencing work such as the Agency FGO, this analysis is yet to conclude.

Feedback from Ofgem on the funding approach advised that a cost neutrality approach would not be preferable on the basis that IGT parties would be contributing differing amounts towards the Agency charge. To ensure all IGT parties contributed on an equal basis the revenue neutral approach was developed by Ofgem. This will see the creation of a methodology from which the IGT contribution is derived in line with the IGT allowance for Agency activities under RPC and is being developed by Ofgem outside of IGT039. It is expected that this methodology will be circulated by Ofgem in due course along with the accompanying licence consultation.

In terms of funding future Agency modification costs, it was noted that these would be recovered using existing industry mechanisms i.e. User Pays. As

such, it was agreed that IGTs did not require the User Pays mechanism in their A15 equivalent licence condition due to the Agency Funding, Governance and Ownership review conclusions scheduled for implementation 6 months after SSP go live..

Xoserve were not able to confirm the annual cost for IGT Agency Services though a working assumption of £1 was provided. However, at the time of submitting this report, parties have still not been provided with a final annual cost for IGT Agency Services though this is expected to be substantially lower i.e. in the region of 25-30p per supply point per year. The IGT contribution will be capped at the equivalent RPC allowance with Shippers contributing towards any charge above this allowance should the Agency costs increase under SSP. As such, parties are currently unable to accurately identify the financial impacts on their businesses as a result of IGT Agency Services.

Cost Benefit Analysis

An “iGT Agency Services Pre-modification Consultation Report” was produced by Xoserve during SSP discussions which concluded:

Industry identified benefits of:

- one off £2,140,000 – £3,740,000
- annual £5,610,000 – £6,915,000.

Xoserve has identified costs of:

Systems development £4,000,000 - £8,000,000

Data preparation £400,000 - £650,000

The costs identified above will be recovered under the User Pays mechanisms under UNC modifications 0440 and 0467.

This report has been included as an appendix to this development group report.

Data Preparation

The development group also discussed timeframes and approaches for preparing data in preparation for the Agency Services “go live” of 1st October 2015. Modification UNC0467 “IGT Single Service Provision; data preparation” was raised on 06th June 2014 by National Grid to place obligations on IGTs to participate in the data preparation exercise to enable UNC0440. This modification was approved by the UNC Panel and is currently with Ofgem awaiting approval. The Agency will lead and co-ordinate industry testing in preparation of “go live” which is out of scope of IGT039.

iGT039

Draft Modification Report

19th December 2014

Version 1.0

Page 11 of 20

© 2014 all rights reserved

Licence Amendments

In order to align IGT obligations, the group agreed that there should be an IGT licence condition to use the services of an IGT Agency. The development group agreed that the sensible starting point for an IGT licence condition would be that of the GDN. The development group reviewed a potential A15 licence condition equivalent for IGTs produced by Ofgem in February 2014 which was reviewed and developed during 2014. The formal licence consultation is yet to take place though this is expected to be consulted on shortly..

Legal Drafting

A full redrafting exercise of the IGT UNC has been undertaken by the IGTs and has been presented to the development group as a “work in progress” as well as a legally reviewed draft. The IGT039 legal text has been produced based on v8.3 of the IGT UNC (November 2014) and the references to the UNC have been based on the UNC0440 modification drafting. *The legal text has been subject to an external legal review procured by IGTs and has also been subject to a 4 week review period by Shipper parties with a meeting held on 12th November 2014 to discuss comments and feedback. Where consequential changes have been agreed by the development group, these have been incorporated in the legal drafting.* The development group is in agreement that the drafting can be submitted to the Panel alongside the IGT039 modification. The legal text will be submitted to the Panel along with this report. A future transition modification will be required to include any future IGT UNC release changes beyond v8.3 as well as any relevant UNC amendments which build on the UNC0440 drafting. Such change will be reviewed separately and developed during 2015.

IGTs will separately review and raise modifications where necessary to their short form network codes to remove any drafting which will become redundant under Agency Services.

Implementation

The target date for the implementation of Agency Services is 1st October 2015 though this may be subject to change. To manage this uncertainty, it is recommended that the modification is implemented at the “Project Nexus Implementation Date” as defined in the UNC. This will avoid the modification requiring further amendments to clarify the implementation date should the 1st October 2015 target date change.

Events/circumstances that may influence the ability for a single service agency to be delivered

The group acknowledged that the funding, governance and ownership review of the Agency was running in parallel with the development of IGT Agency Services and the outputs of the FGO review could impact Agency Services. IGT Agency Services work has progressed on the basis that the solutions put in place for IGT Agency Services be fit for purpose, then these

could be incorporated into the Agency FGO arrangements for IGT services. Towards the end of IGT039 development work, Ofgem have stated that the funding solution developed specifically for SSP will be replaced by the output of the Agency FGO which is expected to be implemented 6 months after SSP go live. Should any further changes be required to the IGT UNC to support the output of the FGO, a future IGT UNC modification can be raised to implement any such arrangements if deemed necessary.

Summary and Recommendations

The 039 development group believes that where it has been able to, it has now fulfilled the requirements of the scope and deliverables as set out in the original terms of reference. These are set out in appendix 2:

The panel's attention is drawn to potential future developments under the IGT UNC that will require further review outside of IGT039 that are related to Agency Services. The following areas are being discussed and reviewed under the IGT Shipper Workgroup and consequential changes will be made to the relevant ancillary documents once all the relevant information (i.e. data item formats is available) which will allow the IGT039 modification to progress to consultation without delay:

- ❖ Standards of Service Regime
 - ❖ To identify which query Codes will be managed by the IGT Agent and to map out how the Standards of Service process will operate.
- ❖ AQ Review Procedures Document
 - ❖ To update the document to reflect the changes to the new AQ regime.
- ❖ Portfolio Extract
 - ❖ To review and where necessary, update the portfolio extract with any amended or new relevant data items made available under IGT Agency Services.
- ❖ Invoice Backing Data Content for Transportation Charges backing data.¹
 - ❖ To review and where necessary, update the invoice backing data template with any amended or new relevant data items made available under IGT Agency Services.
- ❖ "IGT047" Smart Ancillary Document
 - ❖ To determine whether the document is required post SSP and if not to raise a change to remove the document.²
- ❖ Fax Forms
 - ❖ To determine whether the fax forms will still be required under SSP and if not to raise a change to remove the documents. If the documents are still deemed to be required, to review the documents to determine whether the current arrangements will be suitable post SSP.
- ❖ Meter Validation Rules
 - ❖ To determine whether the document is required post SSP and if not to raise a change to remove the document.
- ❖ Password Protection Protocols
 - ❖ To determine whether the document is required post SSP and if not to raise a change to remove the document. If the document is still deemed to be required, to review the document to determine whether the current arrangements will be suitable post SSP.
- ❖ Meter Inspection File Formats

¹ Note that the invoice backing data will be sent by IGTs so is technically not dependent on IGT Agency Services. The changes however would look to amend any data items which have changed as a result of Agency Services as well as any relevant new data items which weren't previously available.

² This has now been removed as a result of updating the drafting to v8.3.

- ❖ To determine whether the document is required post SSP and if not to raise a change to remove the document. If the document is still deemed to be required, to review the document to determine whether the current arrangements will be suitable post SSP.

There were also a number of areas discussed during the development of IGT039 which were deemed to be out of scope as were not directly related to Agency Services. Parties may wish to review the following areas in the future:

- ❖ Single PSR format under the IGT UNC
- ❖ Shrinkage Arrangements
- ❖ DM Arrangements
- ❖ Universal IGT Transportation Invoice format
- ❖ Wording of “Current Supply Point” and “New Supply Point” under CI 12.2.
- ❖ Review of meter fit report process covered by existing drafting under D7.4-7.7 to see if this could be automated in the future.

The workgroup also wishes draw the Panel’s attention to SSP related areas that will need to be or are being progressed outside of the IGT UNC:

- ❖ IGT Licence Drafting
- ❖ IGT Agency Services Agreement
- ❖ Funding of SSP
- ❖ Changes to file formats under UK Link
- ❖ Successful implementation of UNC0467

The workgroup has approved the legal text and the panel is asked to accept this report, close the development group and recommends that IGT039 proceeds to consultation.

Development Group 039

Appendix 1



iGT-Agency-Services
-consultation-report-1

Appendix 2

IGT039 Deliverables Review

The group is asked to consider:

Consideration	Status	Comments	Still In Scope?
The package of changes that may be necessary to extend the existing GT Agency arrangements to iGTs (including the changes to the iGT UNC and any changes necessary that extend beyond the scope of the iGT UNC)	Complete	The legal drafting has been developed with v8.3 as a baseline. Further transitional modifications will be required in 2015 to update the text to reflect the IGT UNC and UNC at October 2015.	No
To the extent possible, developing the details of these changes;	Complete	As above	-
To the extent possible, assessing the impacts, cost and benefits to consumers, shippers and iGTs of migration to a single Agent	Complete	Xoserve Premodification consultation outlined costs for development. Funding methodology has been agreed in principle but exact figures are unknown and is being progressed by Ofgem.	Yes – will form basis for achievement of relevant objectives
Events/circumstances that may influence the ability for a single service agency to be delivered	Complete		Yes

Specific suggestions for changes to the iGT licence	Complete	Agree principles in group and develop drafting outside? Principles developed under iGT039 but Ofgem are to deliver drafting to IGTs which will be formally consulted on outside of IGT039.	No
Any impact this change may have on UNC; Assess what changes will be required for the iGTs to use the GDNs' agent for the delivery of the common processes as detailed in the iGT UNC and the large transporters Agency Services Agreement;	Complete	The early 039 work set out the governance framework which UNC0440 has taken forwards including new contractual framework. iASA has been discussed at a high level i.e. to be based on the ASA and though will be referred to in workgroup report will not be delivered by the 039 group.	Yes
Identify the exact services that may come under Agency	Complete	This is set out in the IGT BRD.	Yes
Investigate potential funding alternatives to deliver the services	Complete	Need to agree principles	Yes for WG report but delivery of solution may be outside of IGT UNC.
Compare proposals against the current iGT UNC to; o Identify potential changes to the iGT UNC required to deliver the agency service;	Complete	Pointing to exercise complete but subject to legal review. Transition mods at a later date will be required separately.	Yes

o Identify what information the GDN's agent will be required to provide to the iGTs and what information the iGTs will need to supply to the agent;	N/A	Data items set out in the Migration Database BRD and not 039 deliverable.	To be included in the iASA
o Identify what information the GDN's agent will be required to provide to the Shippers and what information the Shippers will need to supply to the agent.	Complete	Covered under BRD and under approach whereby UK link files will be used for comms between Xoserve and Shippers.	
Agree the file formats that are to be used for the various process communications;	Complete	Agreed that the file formats will follow those of the GDN where the agency performs activities on behalf of the IGT. The pointing to approach will take care of this though the file format changes themselves are being developed under the UK Link Committee which is outside of the remit of the IGT UNC.	Yes
Assess the costs and benefits to iGT parties (iGTs and Shippers/Suppliers) – will require assistance from Ofgem	Complete		Yes
Assess implementation timing issues and any dependencies on other industry activity	Complete		Yes

The Development Group is asked to deliver:

Deliverable	Status	Comments	Still In Scope?
A scoping document/work plan, expanding on these Terms of Reference and setting an expectation of output and associated timescales where possible.	Complete		Yes
A final report outlining the findings of the Group, including the scope of the Single Service Agency, a cost/benefit section, proposals for Governance of the arrangements, implications for Licences and recommendations on timing for implementation and use of Nexus.	Complete	<p>Cost benefits analysis is being covered under the Xoserve pre-modification cost benefit analysis. Ofgem are to complete further analysis on the cost split of the annual SSP charge which will be included in the report once available.</p> <p>We acknowledge as a group that Licence changes will be required but is being taken forwards by Ofgem. This will be subject to licence modification consultation so will be progressed outside of IGT039.</p> <p>We have agreed that SSP should come in at the beginning of NEXUS i.e. Oct 2015 which would be the implementation date for the IGT039 mod.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>Yes</p>

Draft modification proposals (iGT UNC and UNC) for any such changes	Complete	<p>IGT UNC modification drafted by Eon to kick start the development group. This can be resubmitted to the Panel for consultation along with the W.G report and supporting information (legal drafting etc).</p> <p>Legal drafting for the UNC changes is being delivered under the UNC0440 meeting.</p>	<p>IGT UNC drafting yes</p> <p>UNC drafting no</p>
---	----------	--	--