Minutes of iGT039 Meeting #4

Wednesday 21st March, Gemserv, London

Present

Gethyn Howard (Chair)	IPL
Elaine Carr	Scottish Power
Cher Harris (tele)	SSEPL
Anne Jackson	SSE
Steve Ladle	Gemserv
David McCrone	Scottish Power
Andy Miller	Xoserve
Nigel Nash	Ofgem
Trevor Peacock (tele)	Fulcrum Pipelines
Dan Simons	EDF Energy
David Speake	ESP
Chris Warner (tele)	National Grid
Kevin Woollard	British Gas

Apologies

Paul Edwards	GTC

1. Update since last meeting

GH provided an update summarising the lifecycle work that IGTs and Xoserve had completed at a meeting on March 12th, the detail of which would be discussed later during the meeting. DS also confirmed that the lifecycle document had been presented at PNUNC on March 13th. The group agreed it would be useful to have PNUNC updates as a standing agenda item for the work group.

2. Review of actions

All actions from the previous meeting had been completed with the exception of action 3 *"DS to compare IGT and Shipper communications against those set out in the IGT UNC".* This action will be picked up at a later date following completion of other areas of work.

3. Review of Straw man Governance Options

GH presented a slide show (circulated with minutes) setting out a number of options which could be taken forwards;

Option 1 – IGT Licence Condition & Thinning out of IGT UNC

There was support for the concept of option 1 as the arrangements would largely mirror those currently in place and through an A15 equivalent licence condition, would allow for an IGT Agency Charging Statement. It was agreed that this option would be further developed with an option 1a which would look at developing a schedule that sits outside of the IGT UNC. It was queried if this approach was feasible but it was noted that this approach is currently already used for the AQ calculation process. CW confirmed that NG's lawyers were to look at whether an approach of pointing one Code to another was feasible and took an action to report back when this view has been made. GH also took an action for IPL's lawyers to form a view on this. CW also commented that NG and Xoserve would also be meeting at the end of April/early May. It was also suggested that an option 1b was

developed which would essentially preserve the IGT UNC in its current format but add greater clarity to the roles parties will take.

Action: CW to speak to NG lawyers about concept of pointing one Code to another and to provide feedback when available.

Action: GH to speak to IPL lawyers about concept of pointing one Code to another and to provide feedback when available.

Action: GH to develop an option 1a and option 1b for further discussion at the next meeting.

Option 2 – SPAA Requirement for IGT SSP

Option 2 was dismissed on the basis that it did not reflect the arrangements currently in place for an SSP for GDNs and would add further complexity to governance arrangements. It was also noted that Suppliers and not Shippers were SPAA signatories and that not all I&C Suppliers were signed up to the Code.

Option 3 – Single Network Code for IGTs & GDNs

Option 3 was dismissed as though a DCUSA style single Network Code was desirable, there was some uncertainty as to what areas would be covered by the Smart Energy Code. It was also agreed that this option would be a far larger project than what is currently being reviewed and may not be compatible with the industry timescales. It was noted however that as this may a long term aspiration, it may be possible to review this position in the future (post 2017).

4. Review of Lifecycles

AM took the group through the work completed to date on the various life cycle processes. There was concern from the Shippers that where iGTs and GDNs operate different processes there will be additional cost from Xoserve developing two ways of working. IGTs stressed that as part of this work, it was anticipated that the operational differences could be minimised. AM also confirmed that the level of detail to identify such differences will become evident at “the next level down” in the Xoserve analysis. The also group noted that the new connections market was mainly driven by IGTs and that these arrangements largely couldn’t be changed as were based on commercial arrangements between IGTs and their clients. GH, DS & AM agreed to take an action to start to identify processes that differ between IGTs and GDNs. AM also commented that some Shippers at the UNC level had only signed up to a subset of Network Codes and so this would need to be managed for IGT networks who have national coverage. Though this was noted as a “current” issue, AM took an action to have a look into this in order to determine how big an impact this may have.

Action: GH, DS, AM identify process differences between IGTs and GDNs.

Action: AM to identify those Shippers who have only signed a subset of GDN Network Codes.

5. Comparison of IGT and Shipper communications to the ASA.

This action has been rolled over to the next meeting held in person. It was confirmed that the action is to review the ACS and list all IGT and Shipper communications in order to review whether there are any communications currently sent that are not captured in the document. It was also noted that some file formats (i.e. opening meter reads) are not currently set out in the IGT UNC.

Action: DS to compare IGT and Shipper communications against those set out in the IGT UNC.

6. Review of Work Plan

The group reviewed the work plan noting that the though an extra two meetings had been added to the work plan, the headings for each meeting were essentially topics that may last more than one meeting.

7. AOB

There was general discussion on the BER. AM confirmed it was likely to start in August 2012 and take 12 months to produce. Shippers asked that that it was made clear what they would be paying for and how costs would be allocated.[1] AM also confirmed that the cost for the BER may be available at the end of April 2012 but this was dependent on the overall timescales for NEXUS itself. The group also noted that discussion in other forums had suggested that the roll out of NEXUS may not be until 2017 rather than 2015.

8. Future Meeting Dates

It was also felt that to some extent completion of work in other areas may be required before the group meets again (i.e. legal view on whether IGT UNC and UNC can "interact" and BER document completion). The next meeting will therefore be held via teleconference on 25th April starting at 10am.

Actions:

1) **CW to speak to NG lawyers about concept of pointing one Code to another and to provide feedback when available.**
2) **GH to speak to IPL lawyers about concept of pointing one Code to another and to provide feedback when available.**
3) **GH to develop an option 1a and option 1b for further discussion at the next meeting.**
4) **GH, DS, AM identify process differences between IGTs and GDNs.**
5) **AM to identify those Shippers who have only signed a subset of GDN Network Codes.**
6) **DS to compare IGT and Shipper communications against those set out in the IGT UNC.**

[1] Note that this work is to take place outside of the IGT 039 work group.