

## **iGT UNC Modification Panel Meeting 14-06**

**Wednesday 21<sup>st</sup> May 2014**

Gemserv, 10 Fenchurch Street, London EC3M 3BE

<b>Attendee</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Representing</b>	<b>As</b>
Steve Ladle (SL)	Gemserv	Code Administrator	Chairman
Paul Rocke (PR)	Gemserv	Code Administrator	
Cher Harris (CH) *	SSE Pipelines	Pipeline Operators	
Adam Pearce (AP)	ES Pipelines	Pipeline Operators	
Jenny Rawlinson (JR) *	GTC	Pipeline Operators	
Trevor Clark (TC) *	E.ON UK	Pipeline Users	
Andrew Margan (AM) *	British Gas	Pipeline Users	
Kirandeep Samra (KS) *	npower	Pipeline Users	
Kristian Pilling (KP) *	SSE Supply	iGT062 Workgroup Chair	

*\*Attended via teleconference*

### **1. NOTICE OF ALTERNATES AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence had been received from Rory Edwards (Ofgem).

### **2. RECORD OF INVITEES AND OBSERVERS**

The Panel welcomed Kristian Pilling (SSE Supply) to provide an update as chair of the iGT062 Development Group.

### **3. MINUTES FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes from the iGT UNC Panel 14-05 were agreed as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

### **4. ACTIONS ARISING**

**Action 01/14-05:** iGTs to confirm email addresses and header formats for the receipt of third party metering notifications and send to the Code Administrator for circulation to the Shipper community. **Action transferred to Code Administrator to circulate details.**

**Action 02/14-05:** JR to seek clarification from Gethyn Howard as to whether legal text drafting for iGT039 could be circulated in its current state and in advance of the meeting with lawyers on 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2014. **Closed with explanation provided in previous minutes.**

**Action 03/14-05:** AP to draft a proposal for the removal of Ancillary Document governance rules ahead of the next iGT Shipper Standing Work Group meeting. **Closed and on agenda.**

**Action 04/14-05:** RE to consider Ofgem's position on whether Mods similar to iGT060 may fall within self-governance criteria. **Carried forward.**

**Action 05/14-05:** Gemserv to develop a new template for Modification responses in line with the new suite of templates and circulate in advance of the next Panel meeting. **Closed. Panel agreed that the template was appropriate; Code Administrator to upload to Website.**

## 5. SHORT NOTICE BUSINESS

None.

## 6. PANEL DECISIONS

None.

## 7. UPDATE ON DEVELOPMENT GROUPS

### iGT039 - Use of a Single Gas Transporter Agency

JR provided an update from the Development Group activity for iGT039 on behalf of Workgroup Chair Gethyn Howard (GTC). The Group had last met at on 29<sup>th</sup> April 2014 to provide an overview of the drafting completed since the previous meeting and update content in Sections CIV, CV, D, E and F.

JR noted that good progress was being made with the drafting; however a complete draft that has been subject to iGT legal review would not be available for the beginning of June (to allow 4 weeks for Shippers to legally review the document for the proposed walkthrough on 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2014). GH had requested that shippers and iGTs could provide input into the drafting to accelerate the process, but had received no response. SL advised that Colette Baldwin (E.ON) had indicated that shippers may be able to assist with the drafting through the Gas Forum, as this was an approach that had been successfully used in the past for similar large pieces of Code drafting.

JR further noted that the Group has received no feedback from Ofgem on the issues raised around cost recovery for future Xoserve modifications or the analysis on the equivalent GDN

allowance for SSP services. Gethyn had been in contact with Jon Dixon (Ofgem) to provide an update ahead of the next meeting on 29<sup>th</sup> May 2014.

## **iGT056 – UPRN Provision**

JR provided an update from the Development Group activity for iGT056. The joint UNC/iGT UNC workgroup had met for the fifth time on 9<sup>th</sup> May 2014 for the discussion of the draft modification rules. Further to the meeting, the Proposer would be revising the modification and Business Rules to redefine and clarify the requirements. JR advised that the intent of the modification was to introduce a process whereby GTs would hold and provide more accurate address data.

The Proposer had confirmed that it was not envisaged that the modification would be implemented prior to Single Service Provision; rather, the modification would likely be implemented as a staged change six months after Project Nexus go-live. If this approach was confirmed it could be that the iGT UNC mod in its current form would not be required and instead a simpler Mod for the iGT UNC to point across to the UNC UPRN process may be an alternative

JR noted that the next joint Workgroup meeting would be held on 9<sup>th</sup> June 2014.

## **iGT062/A/AA - Independent Secretariat Services for Modification Work Groups**

The Panel welcomed KP to the meeting to provide an update from the Development Group for iGT062 and its alternatives. KP noted that the group had last met as part of the iGT Shipper Standing Work Group meeting on 19<sup>th</sup> April 2014, and had included a review of the original modification, which would now incorporate many aspects of iGT062A.

KP noted that the next Workgroup would also be held as part of the iGT Shipper Standing Work Group on 30<sup>th</sup> June 2014, and proposed that this should be the final workgroup meeting, prior to presentation of the Workgroup Report at the Modification Panel meeting in July 2014.

### **8. URGENT MODIFICATION PROPOSALS RECEIVED**

None.

### **9. NON-URGENT MODIFICATION PROPOSALS RECEIVED**

None.

## 10. FAST TRACK MODIFICATION PROPOSALS RECEIVED

None.

## 11. WORKGROUP REPORTS

None.

## 12. FINAL MODIFICATION REPORTS

### iGT054/A/AA - Alternative Profile for Pre-Payment Meters

SL presented the Final Modification Report for iGT054 and its alternative Modifications iGT054A and iGT054AA, as published on 7<sup>th</sup> May 2014. The Panel was requested to provide comment on the Final Modification Report; CH noted that the statement that there would be no system changes was incorrect and should be amended. The Panel agreed that this should be noted in the Panel discussion on their views on Implementation.

The Panel considered whether the Workgroup's view on the Relevant Objectives facilitated by the Modification were appropriate (i.e. Relevant Objective D). Panel members were concerned that there had been a lack of adequate analysis, with only one supplier having provided data to support the Modification; Xoserve had considered that resultant savings would be significantly less than understood by the Proposer. AP considered that only 30,000 meters on iGT networks would be impacted by the Modification. TC considered that Relevant Objective D was the most appropriate due to the imbalance caused for shippers operating in a niche market.

The Panel considered further concerns around the Modifications, including the potential to open the market up to 'gaming', and the recognition that the benefit case would be diminished by the time needed to implement the Modification together with its limited period of operation due to the understanding that Project Nexus would subsequently provide the required functionality which would make any current iGT/Shipper investment to deliver the iGT solution redundant.

The Panel was asked to vote to recommend each Modification independently. The Panel **DID NOT RECOMMEND** implementation of iGT054, iGT054A or iGT054AA. A full breakdown of votes can be found in the Determinations.

The Panel was asked to provide an indication of their preferred Modification, in the event that a Modification was to be implemented. A majority of the Panel expressed a preference for the implementation of iGT054AA. A full breakdown of the votes can be found in the Determinations.

The Panel was asked to consider the appropriate lead time for Implementation. CH considered that a six month implementation period would be necessary due to system changes necessitated. JR considered that a nine month implementation period would be necessary for iGT054 or iGT054A, and a six month period for iGT054AA. All other Panel members considered that a three month implementation period would suffice. The Panel **AGREED** that a six month implementation period from Authority Decision would be appropriate.

The Panel unanimously **AGREED** that an iGT UNC Modification should not be implemented unless the equivalent UNC Modification (UNC0486) was also approved.

## **13. AUTHORITY UPDATES**

None.

## **14. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

TC queried whether iGT Panel members still considered the 7<sup>th</sup> November 2014 Implementation Date to be feasible for iGT059 Supply Point Registration – Facilitating Faster Switching. No iGTs were aware of any concerns with meeting the agreed Implementation Date.

***The next Modification Panel meeting will be convened at:***

***11:00am on 18<sup>th</sup> June 2014***