

iGT UNC Modification Workstream Meeting 16-06

Tuesday 7th June 2016

Gemserv, 8 Fenchurch Place, London EC3M 4AJ

Attendee	Organisation	
Steve Ladle (SL)	Gemserv	Chairman
Gethyn Howard (GH)* ¹	Brookfield Utilities	
Simon Power (SP)*	EDF Energy	
Kirsty Dudley (KD)	E.ON UK	
Katy Binch (KB)	ES Pipelines	
Kishan Nundloll (KN)* ²	ES Pipelines	
Roberta Fernie (RF)* ³	Ofgem	
Ehi Obaye (EO)	Ofgem	
Mark Jones (MJ)	SSE Energy Supply	
Paul Orsler (PO)	Xoserve	
Verity Blake (VB)	Gemserv	

**Attended via teleconference*

1. Welcome and Apologies for Absence

The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting of the iGT UNC Modification Workstream. Apologies were received from Andrew Margan (British Gas), Nicky Rozier and Jenny Rawlinson (Brookfield Utilities), Maria Hesketh (Scottish Power) and Laura Cahill (SSE Energy Supply).

2. Confirmation of Agenda

PO advised that he has an issue that has been identified during the Market Trials that he would like to discuss under AOB. There were no further comments and the agenda was agreed.

3. Approval of the Previous Minutes

The Work Group reviewed the minutes from the Workstream meeting held 3rd May 2016 (16-05). There were no comments received, and the minutes were approved as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

¹ For agenda items 7 and 8.

² From agenda item 7 onwards.

4. Outstanding Actions

Please refer to the table in Appendix 1 at the end of the minutes for updates on actions arising.

5. iGT071 - Amendment to iGT AQ Review Procedures Ancillary Document

This proposal was raised following the decision to implement Modification Proposal iGT039,³ and as part of the review of all Ancillary Documents that was carried out.

The Chair presented the table which has been jointly compiled by the Chair, iGTs and Xoserve, in relation to the criteria for excluding/including Supply Point AQs in the Draft CSEP NExA table.⁴ PO noted that Xoserve had responded to the table, and Xoserve's comments were circulated to all iGTs. PO further noted that Xoserve will not be restricting or excluding any meter point data in the update files they send to the iGTS.

Following review of the table, the Work Group agreed on several items which items are to be excluded and included in the draft CSEP NExA table. Details on what items were agreed are presented in Appendix 2.

The data to be used in the NeXA reports is first sent to iGT's in the NNL file at December-5D in the Supply Meter Point AQ field. KB advised that ES Pipelines do not extract or store the Supply Meter Point AQ therefore additional manipulation of the incoming files would need to be performed for the data to be entered manually into their system. For this reason, ES Pipelines advised that they would not be able to meet the current timescales for the creation of a draft CSEP NeXA table. KB stated preference for the NeXA table to be built as a result of the AQs being sent to iGT's in the Formula Year AQ field at April-5D.

The Work Group further discussed appropriate timing for the implementation of the CSEP NeXA table, and whether it should be reviewed under the current iGT UNC time schedule, or whether it should it be changed to align with the Uniform Network Code (UNC) review period.

KD noted that, from a Shipper perspective, E.ON Energy support the continuation of the annual NExA table review and believe it is important to the industry. However, the timing of the review is not as critical although, there is a need to ensure that the most up to date data is being used. MJ agreed, noting that Shippers would prefer the table to have the best available data used to populate it, rather than using the new CSEP NExA table, but not being able to populate it with real time data. The Work Group were not able to reach a consensus on the timing for the production of the draft CSEP NExA table, and as there was only one iGT representative present in the meeting, KB agreed to take an

³ [iGT039 - Use of a Single Gas Transporter Agency for the common services and systems and processes required by the iGT UNC](#)

⁴ [CSEP NExA Tables](#)

action to liaise with the iGTs, to seek their view on the appropriate implementation date of the draft CSEP NExA table.

Action MWS 16/06-01: Katy Binch (ES Pipelines) to contact iGTs seeking their view on the appropriate implementation date of the draft CSEP NExA table, asking them to confirm when they will have the required data available.

There was discussion in the Work Group about how the new Weather Correction data will be periodically received by Xoserve. MJ advised that there is a review of End User Categories every five years, and although it isn't in the iGT UNC Code, it is a factor to be taken into consideration. PO agreed to take an action to determine how this information is going to be managed by Xoserve and report back to the Work Group.

Action MWS 16/06-02: Paul Orsler (Xoserve) to investigate how Xoserve will be processing data where Annual Quantities have changed, based on the change from the old to new Weather Correction data under Project Nexus.

6. iGT075 - Identification of Supply Meter Point Pressure Tier

The Chair updated the Work Group on the information request that was sent out to all iGT UNC parties following an action from the last iGT UNC Modification Work Group (*Action MWS 16/05-04*).

KD provided the response to the information request responses on behalf of the Proposer; Colette Baldwin, (E.ON Energy). One of the questions asked in the information request was in relation to how iGTs will be populating the pressure tier field, and whether it will be under a very granular level, (i.e. MP35, MP65 etc.), or whether a simple denotation could be used (Low Pressure (LP), Medium Pressure (MP), High Pressure (HP) etc.).

KD advised that an iGT would be able to populate the spreadsheet at which ever level it chose to based on the information it had available, and if this is sufficient information for the Shipper, then no further action will be required. However, if the granular level of information is not known by the iGT, then the simple denotation should be used in the spreadsheet and if the Shipper requires more information, the Shipper can send a GT1. KD noted that although one of the objectives of this Modification was to reduce the level of GT1's sent, the ultimate benefit is still achieved.

The Work Group noted that all responses received to the information request were in favour of the spreadsheet being published on a central website, rather than individually on each iGTs website. The Chair advised that, regardless of where this information is hosted, there are going to be cost implications, as it would require initial development and ongoing maintenance. PO advised that if this information is proposed to be hosted on Xoserve, this proposal will need to be discussed with the Networks, and highlighted that if it was to be implemented before Project Nexus, there would be funding and governance issues. The Work Group noted this point and KD stated that the hosting of the spreadsheet has not been finalised in the Modification yet, and agreed to speak with the Modification's Proposer to confirm their requirements.

The Chair queried if the information was centrally held on the Xoserve site, would it is possible for this information to be shared to both the UNC and iGT UNC parties. PO advised that, provided it is post Project Nexus Implementation Date, this is unlikely to be an issue.

The Chair asked how the spreadsheet is going to be downloaded by UNC parties. PO advised that the information will be held on a SharePoint site, and took and agreed to investigate whether the file will be downloadable in .csv or .xls and confirm back to the Work Group. Moreover, KD reiterated that the hosting of the template has not been finalised in the Modification itself, and agreed to discuss it further with the Proposer and confirm.

Action MWS 16/06-03: Paul Orsler (Xoserve) to confirm with iGT UNC parties whether the pressure tier information in relation to iGT075 will be downloadable from Xoserve in .csv or .xls.

In regards to implementation date, PO noted the proposed implementation date is six months after Ofgem (Authority) approval. PO noted that the potential funding issues above mentioned may be resolved if it is implemented after the Project Nexus Implementation Date, as joint governance arrangements will be in place between the iGTs and Large Gas Transporters (GTs). Moreover, KD stated that a six month implementation period has been agreed to allow for time for system development.

The Work Group discussed whether this Modification met the Self-governance criteria. KD advised that, due to the potential impacts on systems, this Modification may not be Self-governance. KD agreed to refer to the mirror UNC Modification and confirm whether E.ON will propose the iGT UNC modification to be Self-governance or not.

The Chair asked EO if there is anything in particular that Ofgem would need to know in order to make a decision on this Modification, i.e. if information is required for costs or funding issues. EO advised that she would look into this and report back.

Action MWS 16/06-04: Kirsty Dudley (E.ON) to review the Self-governance position of iGT075, discuss the Modification with the Proposer, and if necessary, update the Modification for further consideration by the Work Group.

Action MWS 16/06-05: Katy Binch (ES Pipelines) to discuss with iGTs their preference on where information in relation to iGT075 should be hosted; centrally on Xoserve's website or on the iGT UNC website.

Action MWS 16/06-06: Ehi Obaye (Ofgem) to confirm whether there is any specific funding/costing information in relation to iGT075, that would need to be cited in the Modification in order for Ofgem to make a decision on the Modification.

Action MWS 16/06-07: Code Administrator (Gemserve) to publish summary of responses on the information request of iGT075 on the iGT UNC website.

EO left the meeting.

KN and GH joined the meeting

7. iGT084 – Clarification on iGT RPC Invoice Template

The Chair recapped on the previous Panel meeting, stating that Panel believed that this Modification should only require development at one Work Group, and that Panel were anticipating to make a determination on this Modification at their meeting in June 2016.

This Modification was raised to clarify the Annual Quantity definitions that are to be used on the iGT RPC Invoice Template post Project Nexus Implementation Date.

GH noted that if “Formula Year AQ” field name is used, a new definition will need to be agreed as the current “Formula Year AQ” definition in iGT039 references the UNC, rather than the iGT UNC and the Formula Year for iGTs is different. The Chair proposed for the definition change to be included in the current Modification, to save a separate Modification being raised. KN, the Proposer of the Modification, welcomed this suggestion.

However, PO noted concerns of changing the Formula Year AQ definition in the iGT UNC, as the codes would not be aligned. GH advised that iGTs do not use the AQ Review for the same purposes as the UNC, and the review time frame is currently different between the two codes. This point was noted, however, some Work Group members were concerned about the iGT UNC having a different defined term for a term that is already defined in the UNC.

As the Work Group were not able to reach a consensus about the legal drafting and amending the definition of Formula Year Annual Quantity, the Chair queried whether the iGT039 and Formula Year Annual Quantity definition issue should be addressed in a separate Modification. KD agreed with this point, highlighting that including a revised definition will make iGT084 much more complicated, and without it the Modification can remain as a housekeeping change. KN (as proposer of the Modification) and the Work Group agreed with this approach and agreed the Modification, subject to minor amendments, and agreed for a Work Group Report to be completed for the Panel to consider in June.

Action MWS 16/06-08: Code Administrator (Gemserv) to publish Formula Year Annual Quantity (AQ) legal drafting document written by Steve Ladle (Workstream Chair) and Gethyn Howard (Brookfield Utilities) and circulate this to the iGT UNC parties.

Action MWS 16/06-09: Code Administrator (Gemserv) to produce a Work Group report for iGT085 for consideration by Panel at their meeting on 15th June 2016.

Action MWS 16/06-10: Kish Nundloll (ES Pipelines) to amend the Modification Proposal in line with the discussion and to send this to the Code Administrator in time for consideration by Panel at their meeting on 15th June 2016.

8. Review Group 001: Funding, Governance and Ownership (FGO) implications for the iGT UNC

GH provided a brief update to the Work Group on the progress of the UNC Funding Governance Overview Work Group, who are developing the UNC Modification; UNC Modification 0565 - Central Data Service Provider: General framework and obligations.

The Work Group reviewed the timeline created by GH, which was circulated to the iGT UNC previously. GH advised that the Final Modification Report (FMR) for the iGT UNC equivalent Modification to UNC565 will need to be considered at the Modification Panel in December 2016 in order to meet the April 2017 implementation requirement. GH added, that the maximum review time for Ofgem in relation to approving Modifications is 25 Business Days. This review time has been used in the Modification project plan, allowing time for Ofgem's shutdown over the Christmas period.

PO asked whether there has been change in direction of the iGT UNC Modification, or whether the changes are still relatively small. GH advised that, although changes will require examination, they are still likely to be relatively straight forward. GH added that that project plan is still developing, and a more detailed breakdown will be provided as the UNC Modification progresses.

As the iGT UNC Modification is reliant on the UNC 0565 Modification, KD asked what would be the effect on the iGT UNC Modification if the UNC Modification's progress was delayed. GH noted this point, and agreed that it has the potential to occur. The Work Group agreed to log this issue on the Known Issues Log.

Action MWS 16/06-11: Code Administrator (Gemserv) to include the development of UNC Modification 0565 and potential delay to the development and implementation of the iGT UNC equivalent Modification on the Known Issues Log.

GH advised the Work Group that he has produced a bullet point summary update for iGT UNC parties, and agreed to send the Code Administrator the update for wider circulation to the iGT UNC. The Chair and GH both noted that the iGT UNC equivalent Modification has been raised; *iGT086 – Central Data Service Provider – Implementing iGT UNC changes to support FGO*, and this Modification will be considered at the Modification Panel on 15th June 2016.

Action MWS 16/06-12: Gethyn Howard (Brookfield Utilities) to provide an email update on current progress of Review Group 001: Funding, Governance and Ownership (FGO) implications for the iGT UNC to the Code Administrator (Gemserv) for wider circulation to the iGT UNC.

9. RG002: Code Governance Review 3 (CGR3)

RF and EO joined the meeting

The Chair recapped on how this Review Group has been set up in anticipation of the Code Governance changes being implemented by Ofgem, pursuant to the Code Governance Review 3 (CGR3).

The Chair noted that Ofgem gave a presentation to the Modification Panel in April, and there are some changes to the Code Administrators Code of Practice (CACoP) which are being actioned by all Code Administrators under the CACoP review process.

RF queried whether the iGT UNC is now using the new Modification template, as directed by Ofgem under the CGR3 findings. The Chair responded, advising that the new Modification template was based on the UNC, and the iGT UNC have been using the UNC template for several years, so no changes are required to the current template.

The Chair referred to the paper he drafted in relation to Ofgem's Significant Code Review (SCR) Modification Proposals, and the major changes to be introduced, and their potential impact. The Chair provided a summary of his analysis, indicating that the main areas of change relate to "Significant Code Review".⁵

The Chair asked the Ofgem representatives if they had any thoughts on the paper, and whether they agree with the suggested changes. RF and EO stated that they have not seen the paper before, so have not had an opportunity to read the paper and the Chair's suggestions. RF clarified a question raised by the Chair in relation to clause 12CE of the *Condition 9: Network Code and Uniform Network Code (iGTs)*; advising that Clause 12CE should be a reference to Clause 12 although this will need to be confirmed. RF further advised that focus should be drawn to the Self-governance processes and criteria in the iGT UNC, and requested that the Review Group review the Self-governance processes in regard to the CGR3 findings. The Chair noted this recommendation.

The Chair proposed for Ofgem to take an action to review the paper and to send any comments to the Code Administrator in advance of the next Review Group meeting. Ofgem agreed with this approach.

Action MWS 16/06-13: Ofgem to review the Significant Code Review (SCR) Modification Proposals paper drafted by Steve Ladle (iGT UNC Chair) and to send any comments to the Code Administrator in advance of the next Review Group meeting in 5th July 2016.

Action MWS 16/06-14: iGT UNC to review the Self-governance processes under the Review Group (RG) 002, in respect to the Code Governance Review 3 (CGR3) findings.

RF and EO left the meeting.

⁵ <http://www.igt-unc.co.uk/ewcommon/tools/download.ashx?docId=7374>

10. iGT UNC Known Issues Register

The Work Group reviewed the Known Issues Register and noted that all the items are now closed or being actioned. The Work Group agreed to create a separate tab on the Known Issues Register for closed issues, rather than deleting them, so there is an archive mechanism in place.

Action MWS 16/06-15: Code Administrator (Gemserv) to create an archive tab on the Known Issues Register and move all closed or resolved issues into this section.

PO raised an issue that has been identified by iGTs during Project Nexus Market Trials relating to iGT charge rate effective date data. PO advised that the data validation currently exists to prevent iGT rate data from being accepted where the relevant effective date exists in the past. This validation is based on requirements captured in the Agency Services BRDs for Project Nexus (UNC mod 0440).

Whilst this requirement is valid for annual inflationary uplift of iGT charges, it creates an issues for iGTs in reflecting the appropriate effective dates for those charges that are revised as a result of 'business as usual' activities.

In order to work around the issue, iGTs have been advised to provide a prospective future effective date for charging rate data to be accepted in the Supply Point Register. This should be no less than 1 business day later than the file submission date. Shippers were advised to note this workaround and consider any unintended consequences this may have on validating iGT invoice data.

Action MWS 16/06-16: Code Administrator (Gemserv) to add the issue of Transportation Set-up rates to the Known Issues Register

11. Pre Panel Meetings

The Chair and VB noted that the second Pre-Panel meeting will be held on Monday 13th of June.

1. AOB

MJ cited the Ofgem consultation on the proposed postponement of the Project Nexus Implementation Date, and suggested that a review is undertaken by the iGT UNC to ensure that there are no issues with approved and pending Modifications. For instance, if any Modifications that have been approved by Panel or have Authority consent and have an implementation date scheduled for 1st October 2016, to be changed to “in line with Project Nexus Implementation Date”. The Chair noted that following the previous implementation deferment, the use of Project Nexus Implementation Date rather than the 1st October 2016 was generally adopted. However, there will need to be a further review of any impacts on the modifications that are due to be implemented on the Project Nexus Implementation Date as and when further detail is known about any proposals to further defer the date.

KB advised that Ofgem’s consultation ends at the end of June, so the Work Group may have an indication of next steps in time for the Modification Workstream meeting in July.

Action MWS 16/06-17: Code Administrator (Gemserv) to include Project Nexus Implementation Date and Modification review on the Agenda for the Modification Workstream on 5th July 2016.

There were no further comments and the meeting concluded.

The next iGT UNC Modification Workstream Meeting is on the 5th July 2016.

Appendix 1

MWS 16/05-01	3 rd May 2016	Laura Cahill (SSE) to document any areas related to iGT078 where SSE believed further clarification would be helpful and send this to the Code Administrator for inclusion on the next Workstream agenda.	SSE	Carried forward. MJ will bring SSE's comments to the Modification Workstream meeting in July.
MWS 16/05-02	3 rd May 2016	Code Administrator to circulate Mark Jones's (SSE) low-level transition plan spreadsheet for the non-effective window for Project Nexus to Shippers.	Gemserv	Closed.
MWS 16/05-03	3 rd May 2016	Steve Ladle (iGT UNC Chair) to liaise with iGTs and Xoserve to determine the progress of the data exercise iGTs and Xoserve are undertaking in relation to <i>iGT071 - Amendment to iGT AQ Review Procedures Ancillary Document</i> .	Gemserv, iGTs and Xoserve	Closed. Covered under agenda item 5.
MWS 16/05-04	3 rd May 2016	Code Administrator to circulate an information request to all iGT UNC parties in relation to iGT075, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - asking shippers; if the pressure tier data proposed under iGT075 only consisted of Low Pressure (LP), Medium Pressure (MP), High Pressure (HP) and Intermediate Pressure (IP), would this information be sufficient, or do Shippers further breakdown for Medium Pressure and hence would still need a GT1 form still need to be sent to the relevant iGT where MP was indicated for the Post Code; - asking iGT's whether they can provide the information and at what level – i.e MP only or at the MP35, MP65 etc. level - asking all iGT UNC parties; if they had a preference for where the data proposed under iGT075 should be hosted indicating how each potential hosting option would affect the costs and benefits associated with the proposed solution 	Gemserv	Closed. Information request sent on 10 th May 2016. Discussed under agenda item 6.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - asking all iGT UNC parties whether they would require the pressure information to be downloadable and if so in what format (i.e. .csv, .pdf). - Asking all parties whether they believe the Modification can be progressed under the Self- Governance rules 		
MWS 16/05-05	3 rd May 2016	Proposer of Modification iGT083 (Gethyn Howard), to update iGT083 and submit the revised Modification to the Code Administrator.	Brookfield Utilities	Closed. Revised Modification sent on 3 rd May 2016.
MWS 16/05-06	3 rd May 2016	Code Administrator to produce a Work Group report and circulate it to Work Group attendees for approval prior to circulating it to the Modification Panel in advance of their next meeting on the 18 th June 2016.	Gemserv	Closed. Action complete.
MWS 16/05-07	3 rd May 2016	Gethyn Howard (Brookfield Utilities) to provide an email update on current progress of Review Group 001: Funding, Governance and Ownership (FGO) implications for the iGT UNC to Gemserv for wider circulation to the iGT UNC.	Brookfield Utilities	Closed. Action complete.
MWS 16/05-08	3 rd May 2016	Steve Ladle (iGT UNC Chair) to investigate whether the legal text in iGT039 states what should be populated within the “Current Supply Point AQ in kWh” field under the SSP (i.e. RPC entry, Formula Year AQ or Rolling AQ).	Gemserv	Closed. Discussed under item 7.
MWS 16/05-09	3 rd May 2016	Kishan Nundloll (ES Pipelines) to raise a Modification to confirm the process to be followed for population of the “Current Supply Point AQ in kWh” field post Project Nexus implementation.	ES Pipelines	Closed. Discussed under item 7.
MWS 16/05-10	3 rd May 2016	Code Administrator to add the processing for in-flight queries during the on-effective window before Project Nexus go-live to the Known Issues Log.	Gemserv	Closed. Action Complete.
MWS 16/06-01	7th June 2016	Katy Binch (ES Pipelines) to contact iGTs seeking their view on the appropriate implementation date of the draft CSEP NExA table asking them to confirm when they will have the required data available.	ES Pipelines	New

MWS 16/06-02	7 th June 2016	Paul Orsler (Xoserve) to investigate how Xoserve will be processing data where Annual Quantities have changed, based on the change from the old to new weather correction data under Project Nexus.	Xoserve	New
MWS 16/06-03	7 th June 2016	Paul Orsler (Xoserve) to confirm with iGT UNC parties whether the pressure tier information in relation to iGT075 will be downloadable from Xoserve in .csv or .xls.	Xoserve	New
MWS 16/06-04	7 th June 2016	Kirsty Dudley (E.ON) to review the Self-governance position of iGT075, discuss the Modification with the Proposer, and if necessary, update the Modification for further consideration by the Work Group.	E.ON	New
MWS 16/06-05	7 th June 2016	Katy Binch (ES Pipelines) to discuss with iGTs their preference on where information in relation to iGT075 should be hosted; centrally on Xoserve's website or on the iGT UNC website.	ES Pipelines	New
MWS 16/06-06	7 th June 2016	Ehi Obaye (Ofgem) to confirm whether there is any specific funding/costing information in relation to iGT075, which would need to be cited in the Modification in order for Ofgem to make a decision on the Modification.	Ofgem	New
MWS 16/06-07	7 th June 2016	Code Administrator (Gemserve) to publish summary of responses on the information request of iGT075 on the iGT UNC website.	Gemserve	New
MWS 16/06-08	7 th June 2016	Code Administrator (Gemserve) to publish Formula Year Annual Quantity (AQ) legal drafting document written by Steve Ladle (Workstream Chair) and Gethyn Howard (Brookfield Utilities) and circulate this to the iGT UNC parties.	Gemserve	New
MWS 16/06-09	7 th June 2016	Code Administrator (Gemserve) to produce a Work Group report for iGT085 for consideration by Panel at their meeting on 15 th June 2016.	Gemserve	New

MWS 16/06-10	7 th June 2016	Kish Nundloll (ES Pipelines) to amend the Modification Proposal in line with the discussion and to send this to the Code Administrator in time for consideration by Panel at their meeting on 15 th June 2016.	ES Pipelines	New
MWS 16/06-11	7 th June 2016	Code Administrator (Gemserv) to include the development of UNC Modification 0565 and potential delay to the development and implementation of the iGT UNC equivalent Modification on the Known Issues Log.	Gemserv	New
MWS 16/06-12	7 th June 2016	Gethyn Howard (Brookfield Utilities) to provide an email update on current progress of Review Group 001: Funding, Governance and Ownership (FGO) implications for the iGT UNC to the Code Administrator (Gemserv) for wider circulation to the iGT UNC.	Brookfield Utilities	New
MWS 16/06-13	7 th June 2016	Ofgem to review the Significant Code Review (SCR) Modification Proposals paper drafted by Steve Ladle (iGT UNC Chair) and to send any comments to the Code Administrator in advance of the next Review Group meeting in 5 th July 2016.	Ofgem	New
MWS 16/06-14	7 th June 2016	iGT UNC to review the Self-governance processes under the Review Group (RG) 002, in respect to the Code Governance Review 3 (CGR3) findings.	iGT UNC Workstream	New
MWS 16/06-15	7 th June 2016	Code Administrator (Gemserv) to create an archive tab on the Known Issues Register and move all closed or resolved issues into this section.	Gemserv	New
MWS 16/06-16	7 th June 2016	Code Administrator (Gemserv) to add the issue of Transportation Set-up rates to the Known Issues Register.	Gemserv	New
MWS 16/06-17	7 th June 2016	Code Administrator (Gemserv) to include Project Nexus Implementation Date and Modification review on the Agenda for the Modification Workstream on 5 th July 2016.	Gemserv	New

Appendix 2

Criteria	Question	Work Group consensus
	<i>Exclusion</i>	
Infill domestic property AQs.	Will these be provided with a FYAQ from Xoserve? If yes, this is the responsibility of the iGT's to filter out this data from the final report.	Valid for post SSP process
Non-domestic property AQs.	Will these be provided with a FYAQ from Xoserve? If yes, this is the responsibility of the iGT's to filter out this data from the final report.	Valid for post SSP process
Where an installation read was used in the AQ calculation.	How will iGTs know this from the data received from Xoserve? iGTs solely receive an AQ value.	Remove
There was no AQ change because the site became live less than 26 weeks prior to the cut off read date.	How will iGTs know this from the data received from Xoserve? iGTs solely receive an AQ value, and won't know if this has been carried forward from last year, or re-calculated to the same value using valid years.	Change to: There was no AQ change because the site became live less than 9 months prior to the cut off read date.
There were no reads with which to calculate the AQ.	How will iGTs know this from the data received from Xoserve? iGTs solely receive an AQ value, and won't know if this has been carried forward from last year or re-calculated to the same value using new reads.	Valid for post SSP process

The AQ changed outside the +100% / -50% tolerance and the Calculated AQ is used as it was not challenged, or challenged unsuccessfully.	Do iGTs still need this criteria? The FYAQ is taken from the SMP AQ which has existing controls around the values it can produce.	Remove
AQs changed using the Large Transporter's agent adjustment factors based on the change from the old to new weather correction data.	How will iGTs know this from the data received from Xoserve? iGTs solely receive an AQ value, and won't know if this has been changed due to old to new weather correction data.	Xoserve to do further investigation
Inclusion		
Criteria	Question	
Only properties deemed to be new housing when first connected to a gas connection.	Are there any other exceptions to this rule except for Infill/Commercial properties?	Valid for post SSP process
The AQ changed outside the +100% / -50% tolerance, but the new AQ issued as the shipper successfully challenged the old AQ being used.	Do iGTs still need this criteria? The FYAQ is taken from the SMP AQ which has existing controls around the values it can produce.	Remove
All other AQ values calculated as part of the most recently completed AQ Review using actual meter reads (for clarity it also includes those above the 2,500 therm threshold).	How will iGTs know this from the data received from Xoserve? iGTs solely receive an AQ value, and won't know if this has been carried forward from last year, or re-calculated using valid reads taken from the gas year.	Valid for post SSP process
Only house types that are listed in Section 2 Current Table of the iGT UNC Ancillary Document CSEP NExA Tables.	Is this list still relevant, do values need to be added/removed?	Valid for post SSP process