

## Minutes of iGT039 Meeting #3



Wednesday 15<sup>th</sup> February, Gemserv, London

### Present

Gethyn Howard (Chair)	IPL
Colette Baldwin	Eon
David Bowles (tele)	Fulcrum Pipelines
Elaine Carr (tele)	Scottish Power
Cher Harris	SSEPL
Mark Jones (tele)	SSE
Anne Jackson	SSE
Andy Miller	Xoserve
Nigel Nash	Ofgem
Dan Simons	EDF Energy
David Speake	ESP
Simon Trivella (tele)	Wales & West
Chris Warner (tele)	National Grid
Kevin Woollard (tele)	British Gas

### Apologies

Paul Edwards	GTC
Trevor Peacock	Fulcrum Pipelines

### 1. Update since last meeting

GH provided an update summarising the scoping work for an IGT single service provider moving across to Project Nexus under PNAG and PNUNC. The group noted that it was still responsible for reviewing governance changes as well as reviewing potential funding arrangements.

It was also noted that since the group had last met, Ofgem had concluded their review of Xoserve and concluded that option C (“co-operative model”) would be taken forwards with an aim to make the necessary changes early to mid 2013. The group noted that it was unclear at this stage how this will impact the work being carried out under IGT039 but will be closely monitored and the work under 039 would carry on as originally planned.

### 2. Review of actions

All actions from the previous meeting had been completed with the exception of action 3 “IGTs to consider an exercise to redline IGT UNC, highlight all areas which could instead be governed under UNC only where a single agent is in use”. This action will be picked up at a later date following completion of other areas of work.

### 3. Comments on Progress Paper

AM asked that “Migration” is added as a header to the paper. The group noted that systems changes would be required by Shippers as well as IGTs and that this would have an impact on implementation timescales and possibly drive the governance transition. AM welcomed any comments on this matter.

#### 4. Review of Network Code

GH provided a summary of the work carried out to review the IGT UNC. It was noted that though “dual governance” is not desirable, the IGT UNC may not be “thinned out” as much as originally anticipated as on cross referencing the IGT to UNC, there are sections of the UNC which differed to the IGT UNC in their drafting. It was suggested that a high level straw man would be required for current contractual arrangements and potential future arrangements which may help clarify what changes may be required. Essentially, the IGT UNC drafting could be amended to remove references to processes and leave the “contractual” parts. It was noted that the actual redlining of the Code will take place outside of the IGT039 meetings.

**Action: GH to draw up contractual arrangements diagrams.**

It was also noted that an IGT equivalent to UNC section V6.5 would be required and that this was currently being drafted.

**Action: GH to finish drafting of equivalent V6.5 for next meeting.**

It was also noted that under the Single Service Provider model, Xoserve would manage the IGT communications flows that IGTs are currently working on (K08, .ONJOB etc) though as this project is not yet complete, the requirements are currently not in the IGT UNC. DS agreed to review 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.

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

It was commented that parties will need to think about how to manage communications for existing meters on IGT networks as the single service provider is for GT services only.

AM confirmed that Xoserve were in the process of mapping out life cycles for various processes under the IGT UNC. With the aid of the IGTs it was anticipated that these can be compared to the UNC processes and the differences identified.

**Action: AM to complete life cycle review for next meeting.**

**Action: AM to contact IGTs to feed into life cycle review.**

#### 5. Project Progression

The group discussed timescales for a potential single service provider. It was noted that ultimately the service would ideally be in place for 2014 which would fall in line with the roll out of NEXUS but also the start of the mandated smart meter roll out. AM provided an overview of the process used by Xoserve to review, design and build any systems developments. It was noted that the window of opportunity for the requirements gathering phase needed to be concluded by May. Following further discussion it was noted that Xoserve would require funding to take the project through to the Business Evaluation Report phase though at this stage an accurate figure could not be provided. Shippers voiced concern that should they fund this, there is a risk the single service agent may not be implemented whilst IGTs stated they could not commit to use a single service provider until a full CBA could be carried out. The group noted that individual companies’ CBAs may differ and ultimately funding and cost recovery would be implicit in the success of the project. AM agreed to draft a funding proposal to amend the Agency Charging Statement.

**Action: AM to draft amendment to ACS.**

#### 6. Other Governance Areas for Review

The group also noted that the CSEP NEXA would also require reviewing at a later date (it was commented for instance that the weekly CSEP update flows would no longer be required). This will be on until the group knows what can be removed.

It was suggested that SPAA could be used as a vehicle to deliver any IGT metering activities. This will be looked at in greater detail in due course.

The group noted that it was likely an A15 equivalent License condition would be need adding to the IGT License as any new GT entering the market would also require this obligation.

## **7. AOB**

There was no AOB.

## **8. Future Meeting Dates**

The next meeting will be held following the next IGT UNC Panel meeting at 12pm.

---

### **Actions:**

- 1) GH to finish drafting of equivalent V6.5 for next meeting.**
- 2) GH to draw up straw man contractual arrangements diagrams.**
- 3) DS to compare IGT and Shipper communications against those set out in the IGT UNC.**
- 4) AM to complete life cycle review for next meeting.**
- 5) AM to contact IGTs to feed into life cycle review.**
- 6) AM to draft amendment to ACS.**