

iGT047 Discussion Points		
#	Area	Issue Description
1	Governance	Must the current proposed solution of delivering this information via Xoserve must be explicitly reflected in code (or other governance such as NExA)?
2	Governance	Should the new obligations all sit in the ancillary document (in addition to the file flow definitions) and have a single reference in the code that times out if/when single service is introduced?
3	ESI / Foundation	DECC / Ofgem have both stated that changes to iGT systems/the iGT provision of data is not required prior to the implementation of the enduring solution (i.e. go live, April 2014). iGTs need to determine whether they are able to deliver a solution to help suppliers fulfill their Effective Switching obligations, and if so, whether these changes/obligations need to be captured in the iGT-UNC or whether the governance lies entirely elsewhere (i.e. SPAA, NeXA, commercial arrangements).
4	Review of mod	Will amendments need to be made to the relevant fax forms?
5	File formats/flows	Is the ancillary document heading along the right lines? What are people's general views?
6	File formats/flows	Is the idea of having a single flow capturing all data items with a single response file for data flows going between shipper-iGT and iGT-shipper feasible?
7	File formats/flows	A review of the data items included in the files - what needs to be added & what is handled elsewhere in existing flows?
8	File formats/flows	Is the shipper the owner of all new data items besides the DCC Service Flag and the DCC Service Flag EFD?
9	File formats/flows	Recipient/Originator Role in the headers – what are the allowable values here?
10	File formats/flows	I've made an assumption that the header and trailer formats for both the original file and the response file can be the same (I figure it'll be the Transaction Type that'll differentiate the two). Is this right?
11	File formats/flows	Presumably this flow will be sent as an attachment (.csv) by email to a predetermined mailbox. Parties will then have the choice whether to manually process the flow or leave it to their system to pick it up automatically. Have I got this right?
12	File formats/flows	I've noted that this file will trigger when a shipper makes a change to any one of the relevant data items. If this is the case, then would there be the following two scenarios: a. where a shipper system updates/saves a data item at a time. b. where a shipper system updates/saves a record once the user clicks 'save record' (having updated multiple data items). Is this how a trigger would be set, or would the data be sent on a schedule (i.e. an hourly/daily flow)?
13	File formats/flows	Will each SMU file flowing to an iGT contain all the data items held on a shipper's system or just those items that the shipper has updated?
14	File formats/flows	Should iGT/Shipper systems be expected to derive EFDs/ETDs? i.e. The shipper changes the SMSO ID, sends the iGT the SMU flow, the iGT system updates the SMSO and derives the SMSO EFD based on the date the flow was sent... I expect the shipper will need to populate the EFD and update the iGT with it in the flow.
15	File formats/flows	Will Meter Mech Code continue to be sent through its current means or will it need to be included in the SMU file/agree flow(s)? I suppose this applies to all data items.
16	File formats/flows	Will Installing Supplier ID continue to be derived on iGT systems (as it would during foundation, based on the Supplier ID at the date the meter was installed)?
17	File formats/flows	At the moment, there's a stop name in there of "Smart Meter Update" (SMU) and "Smart Meter Response" (SMR). Is there a flow naming standard? Are these (in/)/sufficient?
18	File formats/flows	On the File Naming Convention for RGMA flows, what is the 'Environment' element of the file name? Is it necessary here? If so, what would be an appropriate value?

19	File formats/flows	At the end of Appendix 1, there is a line included stating that systems need to be able to handle with DOS/UNIX formats... is this necessary here? Does it belong at the end of Appendix 1?
20	File formats/flows	On the topic of File Naming again, the final three characters are 'File Type'. Should this be taken to mean the format of the file (i.e. '.csv', '.xls') or does it define the type of flow (i.e. '.SMU', '.SMR')?
21	File formats/flows	What needs to be considered in terms of validation (as will be defined in the ancillary document)? Does there need to be validation in place to stop a shipper from updating the iGT with DCC Service Flag/Network Owner info? Is validation needed to prevent iGTs updating a shipper on shipper owned data items where a change of supply hasn't taken place? Or is this reason enough to have more than one file flow type for the different scenarios where this new data will need to be sent?
22	File formats/flows	If the DCC require daily updates, does this put pressure on parties to update their systems and return an SMR file in real time, so that the DCC are receiving up to date data at the end of each day?

Open	
Open	
Open	
Open	