

iGT UNC Ancillary Document Report to Panel

Date	3 rd February
Reference	iGT047
Title	Inclusion of data items relevant to smart metering into existing industry systems
Proposer	Adam Pearce (ES Pipelines)
iGT UNC / Pipeline Operator <i>Confirm whether the Modification Proposal is to the iGT UNC or an iGT's Individual Network Code.</i>	iGT UNC - Ancillary Document
Modification Proposal Dates	<i>Circulation: 03/02/2104 Panel Consideration:19/02/2014</i>

Urgency

Non-Urgent

Background

iGT047 was raised in June 2012. A number of data items are required for DCC access control. These need to be recorded in the registration systems of iGT UNC parties, and passed between those systems during the registration and change of supplier process. Some of these data items are not currently held or do not currently exist. An obligation will be placed on parties to ensure these data items are recorded and shared.

A further obligation must be introduced to iGT UNC to reflect the requirement for iGTs to provide an extract of the specified data items to the DCC on a daily basis.

The modification proposal was developed by the industry alongside an equivalent modification for the UNC (Modification UNC430). In July 2013) the Authority determined that the developed solution should be implemented and an implementation date of June 2014 was agreed by the iGTS based on the Panel's recommendation.

Alongside the changes to the iGT UNC legal text to introduce the new requirements, it was agreed that the technical aspects required to implement the proposal, such as the data items required, the standard file layouts and communication method(s) to be used between Shipper and iGTs would be managed via an Ancillary document to the iGT UNC. This document was issued in the Final Modification Report as version 1.0 but at that time it was recognised that it may require further development.

Over the last 6 months numerous discussions have been held to try and agree a final document. Concerns have been raised about whether the default communication method should be the IX system as operated by xoserve or email recognising that IX may not be fully in place in all iGTS at the time for live operation for the changes. Differences have also been aired on the file naming conventions and the contents of the headers and detail records for the different file types.

The last version to be issued (version 1.3) was presented to the December panel who asked for the version to be sent out for consultation with a close out of the 16th January, subsequently extended to the 24th January.

iGT UNC Ancillary Document Report to Panel

As part of the general consultation some key observations and questions were also included to try and gauge the industry position. These were:

1. There is a current proposal for the iGT047 Ancillary Document to be modified to allow for the SMU/SMR files to be sent either by email or through IX.
2. There is a risk that IX will not be installed in time for implementation (27 June 2014).
3. Given this risk, some parties have stated a preference to design their systems/process changes to allow for the sending of the SMU/SMR files by email only, on an enduring basis.
4. We are seeking a view from each iGT-UNC party as to how they would prefer to implement this solution:
 - a. To send SMU/SMR files between iGTs and shippers using email only (up until Single Service Provision go-live – October 2015);
 - b. To use email from implementation, until such a time as IX becomes available. At which point, parties have the choice to move over to IX, or;
 - c. To use email as an interim solution, until such a time as IX becomes available. At which point, parties will be mandated to move over to IX.
5. Each party is asked to provide the reasoning behind their company's preference.

Responses to the Ancillary Document consultation

11 responses were received to the Modification Proposal consultation, which can be viewed [here](#).

Respondee	Response Summary
energetics	Support email only to allow early testing. Against any solution that could mean an iGT would have to accept both email and IX communications
SSE Energy Supply	Do not support. All the current proposals require Shippers to use an email solution for a considerable period of time whereas an IX solution would be more efficient. Option b) requires Shippers to run both email and IX for an indefinite period should an iGT choose not to use IX. Option c) requires a target date for installing IX otherwise it is no better than option b). Only viable approach would seem to be to let the implementation time slip to allow all parties to use IX.
Fulcrum	Support email only on the basis that IX will not be ready in time and do not want to do all the necessary testing again once IX is available
SSE Pipelines	Support for email only with an optional move to IX later recognising that for smaller organisations it would not be justifiable to build an email solution first and then have to scrap and build a new IX

iGT UNC Ancillary Document Report to Panel

	solution. Hence move to IX would only be where parties have agreed bi-laterally to use it
Npower	Support for email but only until such time as IX is available
E.ON UK	Reluctant Support for email on the basis that IX could not be delivered for the June implementation. However Shippers would not fund the IX installation costs if only email is available for Shipper/iGT communications
GTC	Support for email only, recognising that IX may not be ready for June. Also a view that IX was not intended at this time for Shipper/iGT communications
Utilita	Support for email as interim solution only with parties being mandated to move to IX to avoid some parties using IX and some email
EDF Energy	Support for email only with a preference to move over to IX where parties choose to do so. EdF would only move to IX when all iGTs agree to use IX
British Gas	Preference is for IX but if this is not possible for June then would suggest email only
xoserve	No preference as the solution is up to iGT parties. However confirmed that if user pays contract are not signed by shippers then IX will not be installed in iGT premises

Further comments

One resposdee queried why the reference to data security and DCC had been removed. The workgroup chair had noted that the reference was removed as it was no longer required.

There was support for a single header containing both Originator and Recipient ids rather than to have different headers according to whether IX or email was being used.

It was suggested that if email were to be used then there should be a maximum file size introduced to avoid the potential for any emails to be rejected.

One party queried the renaming of the records to E49/50/51/52. Again it is the Code Administrator's understanding that this was agreed in order to ensure consistency with the UNC solution and compatibility with Single Service Provision.

Whilst some parties agreed that email should be used in order to meet the June date their view was that the switch to IX should be mandated at the earliest opportunity.

Overall, the majority view appears to be a reluctant support for email only on the basis that it seemed unlikely that mandatory IX would be possible to meet the June deadline and that it would be inefficient to build systems for email and then shortly after to do further changes to implement IX. For shippers the preference would have been for an IX solution had it been feasible to deliver this for the June implementation.

Proposer's suggested way forward

The Proposer recognises the concerns raised by parties and also that the requirement to implement the changes in June has been the driver for a reluctant agreement to use email rather than IX as the solution.

Changes have been made to:

1. Revert back to a single header format, containing both Originator and Recipient IDs. Xoserve have confirmed this is suitable for IX.
2. A maximum file size of 5Mb added, where files are sent via email to ensure they are not blocked by email exchanges.
3. The default method of file transmission has been set to IX, where it is available to both parties.
4. Clarity added to the 2 superscript references for the S49 and S50 record formats.

The Proposer requests that the panel consider two things during the February meeting:

1. To extend the implementation date of iGT047 back to October/November.
2. To consider accepting the proposed changes to the iGT047AD as a finalised Ancillary Document change or whether they feel the changes warrant further industry consultation.



Ancillary Document

Panel discussion