

iGT047 Development Group Meeting #2 Minutes

1. Participants

Adam Pearce (ESP)
 Anne Jackson (SSE)
 Bridgit Morgan (Ofgem)*
 Cher Harris (SSEPL)*
 Chris Spence (EDF)
 Dave Bowles (Fulcrum Pipelines)
 David Speake (British Gas)
 Gethyn Howard (IPL)
 Mark Pitchford (npower)*
 Steve Nunnington (Xoserve)
 Trevor Clark (Eon)

*By teleconference only

Apologies were received from Jenny Rawlinson (GTC) and Colette Baldwin (Eon).

2. Review of actions and minutes from last meeting

- 1.1 remains open
- 1.2 iGTs confirmed that they had no need to hold payment method (as did Xoserve)
- 1.3 iGT047 parties received details for UNC430 teleconference

3. File formats and flows

#	Issue description	Status	Solution/Answer
4.1	Will it help to understand the UK Link solution? Are they bundling the data items into the ONJOB/UNUPD flows only, or are they creating new flows?	Open	S Nunnington confirmed his understanding was that the data would be added to existing flows where possible.
4.2	Is the ancillary document heading along the right lines? What are people's general views?	Closed DG#2	The group agreed that whilst just a skeleton, the ancillary document's approach of using one file flow to send the data in both directions was the way forwards.
4.3	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?	Closed DG#2	It was agreed that, subject to the appropriate validation (i.e. iGT's rejecting DCC Service Flag updates from shippers) that the presented solution is feasible.
4.4	A review of the data items included in the files - what needs to be added & what is handled elsewhere in existing flows?	Closed DG#2	The group concluded that no items needed to be removed from Appendix 2 of the ancillary document, in spite of cases where a data item may be included in existing flows. C Spence asked whether Source Registration System ID needed to be included in the ancillary document. Post-meeting note: it wouldn't be, as shippers wouldn't require this data; it is transporter owned and required by the DCC.
4.5	Is the shipper the owner of all new data items besides the DCC Service Flag and the DCC Service Flag EFD?	Closed DG#2	The transporter is the 'owner' of a number of the other data items. The ancillary document will be updated to reflect this. It was highlighted that the UPRN data item didn't fall

			under the ownership of either shipper or GT. S Nunnington confirmed that this wasn't necessarily an issue – iGTs/GDNs will not populate this field themselves, but will populate it if the shipper provides a value.
4.6	Recipient/Originator Role in the headers – what are the allowable values here?	Open	A Pearce to liaise with Xoserve and other industry parties in order to move the work on the ancillary document along.
4.7	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?	Closed DG#2	The group confirmed that the formats for headers and trailers can be the same; it'll be the content that distinguishes the SMS from the SMR.
4.8	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?	Closed DG#2	Both iGT and shipper parties agreed that this is what they're used to and therefore, for this solution, a .csv file would be a workable approach.
4.9	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)?	Open	The conclusion of the group's discussion was that the ancillary document should be written based on the assumption that parties' systems will send one daily SMU file at a predetermined time. The daily file should include all the data items within the SMU for any records that have changed since the preceding SMU file was sent. Action: A Pearce to create a schedule to demonstrate the sequence of data flows between iGTs, shippers, Xoserve and the DCC. Action: Suppliers and iGTs to provide feedback to A Pearce with their individual processes, so that a schedule of processes/flows can be produced.
4.10	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?	Closed DG#2	The SMU file will contain all the data items for a record that has changed, including the data items that have not changed.
4.11	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.	Closed DG#2	For the enduring phase, all 'effective from' data items should be provided by the relevant parties (and not derived). Xoserve will derive the Supplier Effective To date from the Effective From date of the incoming shipper for GDNs – iGTs will need to do the same. A Jackson confirmed that the Effective To date of the existing supplier would need to remain blank, rather than being populated with a rolling date, in order for the incumbent supplier to have access to the smart meter.
4.12	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.	Closed DG#2	All data items will be included in the SMU file. Appendix 2 in the ancillary document will reflect this.
4.13	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)?	Open	Shippers will still require the Installing Supplier ID to be displayed on DES as 'NS' and 'S1' meters might not be incorporated into the DCC. The question still stands as to whether this item can be derived or whether the shipper should send it as part of the SMU file flow.

4.14	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?	Closed DG#2	The group supported file names.
4.15	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?	Closed DG#2	S Nunnington confirmed that the Environment referred to whether the file was sent in a production or test environment. The for enduring will therefore be the short code relating to production.
4.16	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?	Closed DG#2	M Pitchford stated that this was necessary to ensure compatibility between parties' systems. The group agreed that this should remain in appendix 1.
4.17	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')?	Closed DG#2	The 'File Type refers to the type of flow (i.e. SMU or SMR).
4.18	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?	Closed DG#2	<p>The group advised that the validation would be derived from the rejection codes that would be developed and sit in the ancillary document.</p> <p>S Nunnington raised his concerns that by including validation on the SMU file flow, the iGT047 mod would deviate away from the UNC430 mod where Xoserve will not be validating any of the data a shipper sends to them – simply forwarding on the relevant data to the DCC.</p> <p>A Pearce clarified that the validation would be needed only to prevent one party from updating a data item that they weren't responsible for, given the single file format approach being taken.</p>
4.19	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	<p>C Spence reiterated the need for a schedule to be put together to clearly lay out the processes. The group agreed this would be helpful – and that the target was a 24 hour turnaround. C Harris mentioned that SSEPL would need 2 days for this process.</p> <p>S Nunnington mentioned that Xoserve will be putting a group together to discuss these processes. iGTs will be invited to participate.</p>
4.20	Are the new files to be classified as requiring Password Protection?	Open	<p>G Howard commented that the file flows contained no personal data, and therefore shouldn't need password protecting.</p> <p>M Pitchford expressed concerns around the fact that the file contained the Supplier ID – the data item that permitted access to a particular meter. A Pearce commented that the DCC will be expecting to conduct an audit on iGT system processes. It was unclear whether this audit would extend to the potential SMU/SMR files & the security around them.</p> <p>Action: Shippers/suppliers to speak to STEG reps to determine whether SMU/SMR files will be subject to any particular DCC security standards.</p> <p>Action: A Pearce to speak to DECC/CESG to determine whether SMU/SMR files will be subject to any particular DCC security standards.</p>

4. ESI & Foundation solutions

#	Issue description	Status	Solution/Answer
2.1	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 fulfil 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).	Open	<p>iGTs tended to agree that they would make the required data available on DES on a best endeavours basis (whilst aiming for a June Effective Switching date and an October date for the Foundation/SMSO data item).</p> <p>Questions were raised around how iGTs would obtain the Supplier ID and SMSO ID values. It was suggested that both could be derived, but not for all cases. For 100% accurate data, additional mods would need to be raised in order to place an obligation on shippers to provide the two values to iGTs.</p>

5. Governance arrangements

#	Issue description	Status	Solution/Answer
1.1	Must the current proposed solution of delivering this information via Xoserve must be explicitly reflected in code (or other governance such as NEXA)?	Closed DG#2	A Jackson suggested that the code referenced a 'Third Party Agent'. G Howard agreed, confirming that the obligation will sit in the body of the iGT-UNC, not the ancillary document.
1.2	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?	Open	<p>D Speake suggested that the iGT047 should mirror what is in UNC430, but with the iGT additions necessary to facilitate the ancillary document.</p> <p>Additional obligations were discussed and will be included on the updated mod proposal and ancillary document, ready for discussion at the 3rd 047DG.</p>
1.3	In order to move the modification along, are parties happy to agree to the principle of an ancillary document and develop it whilst the modification (detailing the changes to the code itself) goes through the consultation process?	Open	<p>Shipper parties weren't comfortable with supporting a modification without understanding the impacts on their systems. Timescales around the mod were discussed, and the groups were happy to continue developing the mod, not sending it back to the panel until the ancillary document was at least near completion.</p> <p>B Morgan stated that Ofgem were most concerned about the effects the mod has on the code; she considered how the industry carries out the obligations under the code to be a matter for the industry to decide.</p> <p>A Pearce mentioned that the urgency of moving the mod along was to keep it in line with UNC430 and not necessarily because of the April 2014 implementation date.</p> <p>The target is for the mod & ancillary document to go to the March panel with the recommendation to send out to consultation.</p>
1.4	Phased approach for ESI/Foundation - how can this work? Can the obligations be placed in the ancillary document? What obligations need to be placed on parties and at what point?	Open	Action: A Pearce to produce a summary document, outlining a possible solution for the Effective Switching and Foundation phases.
1.5	The new data items will also need to become part of the Supply Point Register – should we say that in this document and refer to this document	Open	The consensus was that the group would like to see the new data items included in the code. The mod proposal will reflect this.

	in Para 2.2 in Section CI of the iGT UNC?		A Jackson stated her preference for two separate annex's to the iGT-UNC, one for smart related items and the other for data items related to SPA, if this is where the new items are to be documented.
1.6	Will we also be adding these new data items into the Portfolio extract?	Open	Action: iGTs to look into the feasibility of adding the additional items to the shipper portfolio extract.
1.7	Whilst currently the iGT UNC requires parties, both iGTs and Shippers, to notify changes to any data items on the Supply Point Register, should the Ancillary document reinforce this, including time limits?	Closed DG#2	The rule in the code should be at least referenced in the Ancillary document.

6. Review of mod proposal

#	Issue description	Status	Solution/Answer
3.1	Will amendments need to be made to the relevant fax forms?	Open	The relevant fax forms will need to be amended.
3.2	What's the situation on validation of data sent by shippers? The mod says that there will be none but what happens if the data sent is clearly wrong? Do we just send it to DCC via Xoserve regardless? Will Xoserve have any validation which may reject an iGT file?	Closed DG#2	S Nunnington confirmed that Xoserve wouldn't be validating the data during the Effective Switching and Foundation phases. Where the data is shipper owned, the iGT will not carry out any validation. Validation will only be applied in the form of a rejection code in the SMR where the shipper attempts to update an iGT/DCC owned data item, or similarly, where the iGT attempts to update a shipper with a shipper owned data item.

A number of changes to the mod-proposal were put forward, mainly focused towards aligning iGT047 with UNC430. These changes will be reflected in the updated mod proposal.

7. AOB

The question of how the retrospective population of the new data items would take place was raised. Parties were asked to consider the question ready for the next 047 meeting.

Similarly, the point was raised around an April implementation date. The iGT-UNC has a February or a June release. Parties were asked to consider whether February was a viable implementation date or whether the development group would need to ask the panel to consider exceptional April release.

8. Future meeting dates

The next meeting date was set for Thursday 21st February, 10.00am. Currently, this is scheduled as a teleconference and webinar.

If it becomes apparent that a physical meeting is required, a meeting room will be sought.

9. Actions

	Action	Owner	Status
1.1	AP & other iGTs to review and propose potential methods for transferring data items between iGT and shipper parties	A Pearce	Open
1.2	iGTs to go back to their businesses and confirm whether the 'Payment Method' field is required	All iGTs	Closed
1.3	A Pearce to speak with Joanna Ferguson (NGN) to discuss whether there is a need for the UNC430 teleconference on 3 rd January to include iGT047DG participation.	A Pearce	Closed
2.1	A Pearce to create a schedule to demonstrate the sequence of data flows between iGTs, shippers, Xoserve and the DCC.	A Pearce	Open
2.2	Suppliers and iGTs to provide feedback to A Pearce with their individual processes, so that a schedule of processes/flows can be produced.	All parties	Open
2.3	A Pearce to produce a schedule of daily smart data flows	A Pearce	Open
2.4	Shippers/suppliers to speak to STEG reps to determine whether SMU/SMR files will be subject to any particular DCC security standards.	All shipper parties	Open
2.5	A Pearce to speak to DECC/CESG to determine whether SMU/SMR files will be subject to any particular DCC security standards.	A Pearce	Open
2.6	A Pearce to produce a summary document, outlining a possible solution for the Effective Switching and Foundation phases.	A Pearce	Open
2.7	iGTs to look into the feasibility of adding the additional items to the shipper portfolio extract.	All iGT parties	Open