

Final Modification Report	At what stage is this document in the process?
<h2>iGT105:</h2> <h3>Creating permissions for the CDSP to release data to Meter Asset Providers</h3>	<div style="display: flex; flex-direction: column; gap: 5px;"> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 2px; display: flex; align-items: center; gap: 5px;">01 Modification</div> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 2px; display: flex; align-items: center; gap: 5px;">02 Workgroup Report</div> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 2px; display: flex; align-items: center; gap: 5px;">03 Draft Modification Report</div> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 2px; display: flex; align-items: center; gap: 5px; background-color: #f4a460;">04 Final Modification Report</div> </div>
<p>Purpose of Modification:</p> <p>This modification seeks to create the permissions for supply point data to be provided to Meter Asset Provider (MAP) organisations via the Central Data Services Provider (CDSP) mirroring the obligations introduced into the UNC via modification 0422 and further refined via modification 0637S.</p>	
	<p>Panel consideration is due on 21st February 2018.</p> <p><i>(delete as appropriate following Panel's decision)</i></p> <p>The Panel determined that this fast track self-governance modification be implemented.</p>
	<p><i>(delete as appropriate following Panel's decision)</i></p> <p>The Panel determined that this fast-track self-governance modification should not be implemented.</p>
	<p>High Impact: None</p>
	<p>Medium Impact: None</p>
	<p>Low Impact: Pipeline Operators / Pipeline Users</p>

Contents	
1 Summary	3
2 Governance	3
3 Why Change?	4
4 Code Specific Matters	4
5 Solution	4
6 Impacts & Other Considerations	4
7 Relevant Objectives	5
8 Implementation	6
9 Legal Text	6
10 Consultation	6
11 Panel Discussions	9
12 Recommendations	9

 **Any questions?**

Contact:
Code Administrator

 **igtunc@gemse
rv.com**

 **020 7090 1044**

Proposer:
Kirsty Dudley

 **kirsty.dudley@eonen
ergy.com**

 **07816 172645**

Timeline

The Proposer recommends the following timetable:

Initial consideration by Workgroup	dd month year
Amended Modification considered by Workgroup	dd month year
Workgroup Report presented to Panel	dd month year
Draft Modification Report issued for consultation	22 nd December 2017
Consultation Close-out for representations	17 th January 2018
Variation Request presented to Panel	dd month year
Final Modification Report available for Panel	7 th February 2018
Modification Panel decision	21 st February 2018

1 Summary

What

Currently the Uniform Network Code (UNC) permits the release of certain data items to Meter Asset Providers (MAP) where they provide the Meter Point Reference Number (MPRN) Meter Serial Number (MSN) and meter model to the CDSP. The CDSP conducts a validation check and where the details have a positive match the CDSP releases Supply Point information to the enquiring MAP. This modification seeks to introduce the permissions into the iGT UNC for the occasions where the Pipeline Operator is not also the MAP.

Why

There are an increasing number of meter installations which are being completed by Pipeline Users where the Pipeline Operator is not the MAP. To ensure the actual MAP is able to identify which Pipeline User the asset is with there is a requirement for the iGT UNC to introduce the permissions for the CDSP to share information. Without this the CDSP will only have the permissions to share information relating to UNC supply points.

How

To mirror the solution and validation rules in the UNC (recently refined via modification 0637S) and to share only the following data items with the MAP:

- Asset data
 - o Meter serial number
 - o Meter model
 - o MAM id
 - o Meter installation date
 - o Meter removal date
- Supply meter point data
 - o Meter point status
 - o GT id
- Supply data
 - o Supplier id and full name
 - o Confirmation effective date

Where the request from the MAP does not meet the validation rules the data will not be shared.

2 Governance

Justification for Self-Governance Procedures

The proposed change does not have any material impact on the future of gas consumers, competition, operation of the pipe-line system, matters of supply security or iGT UNC governance. It is therefore recommended this modification is subject to the Self-Governance procedures.

Requested Next Steps

This modification should:

- be subject to self-governance
- proceed to Consultation

3 Why Change?

There are an increasing number of assets which are being installed by MAPs who are not the Pipeline Operator; there may be occasions where flows between relevant parties (Suppliers and MAMs to the MAPs) are not received which results in the MAP having outdated information and can lead to incorrectly invoicing parties.

This solution is proposed to introduce a mechanism for the MAP to confirm with the CDSP the supply point information, currently these provisions are only in place for supplies which are under the UNC meaning where a supply is with an iGT the permissions are not there and therefore the data cannot be shared.

This proposal is only acting as an enabling modification to allow the permissions and utilise the process already in place for the UNC, it doesn't guarantee there will a large quantity of requests, but, where they do occur the CDSP will have the permissions to share the information.

It is possible that with smart meter rollout and increased volumes in switching there will be increased requests for this information (due to an increased volume of missing/incorrect flows), although not quantified it is a further reason to include this provision now rather than in the future when the MAPs are facing further challenges to invoicing.

4 Code Specific Matters

Technical Skillsets

NA

Reference Documents

UNC Modifications 0422 and 0637S

5 Solution

This proposal seeks to introduce the permissions and solution outlined in UNC modification 0422 which were further refined in modification 0637S.

The solution will see MAPs submitting a request to the CDSP including the MPR, MSN and meter model, the validation rules will ensure that either a full match will result in returned data but where meters have a capacity up to and including 11m3 and the MPR and the MSN match but the model doesn't the information will still be returned. This validation is the refinement approved by 0637S.

The solution proposed does not seek to introduce any other validation for supplies with the Pipeline Operators but seeks to mirror the permissions already in place for the UNC.

6 Impacts & Other Considerations

This change does not impact the UNC, it does however seek to mirror obligations already in place in the iGT UNC.

Does this modification impact a Significant Code Review (SCR) or other significant industry change projects, if so, how?

No impact

Consumer Impacts

No impact

Environmental Impacts

No impact

7 Relevant Objectives

Impact of the modification on the Relevant Objectives:

Relevant Objective	Identified impact
(A) Efficient and economic operation of the pipe-line system	None
(B) Co-ordinated, efficient and economic operation of (i) the combined pipe-line system; and/or (ii) the pipe-line system of one or more other relevant gas transporters	None
(C) Efficient discharge of the licensee's obligations	None
(D) Securing of effective competition: (i) between relevant shippers; (ii) between relevant suppliers; and/or (iii) between DN operators (who have entered into transportation agreements with other relevant gas transporters) and relevant shippers	Positive
(E) Provision of reasonable economic incentives for relevant suppliers to secure that the domestic customer supply security standards... are satisfied as respects the availability of gas to their domestic customers	None
(F) Promotion of efficiency in the implementation and administration of the Code	Positive

There may be positive impacts as it may improve competition between Shippers/Suppliers by the provision of timely data to the MAP organisation as it may reduce, in some circumstances, unknown or potentially misallocated costs being incurred by Suppliers. Improved efficiency of meter provision arrangements should lead to lower overall metering costs. Whilst not directly benefitting iGT UNC parties, this modification may improve the efficiency of the operation of the wider gas industry and thereby

reducing industry costs and improving services to consumers which pay design also improves the efficiency of the code. Additionally, maintaining consistency between the Codes (UNC and iGT UNC) should assist parties who operate under both Codes.

8 Implementation

The next release following approval.

9 Legal Text

It is suggested to insert a clause within Section K of the iGT UNC which links between the iGT UNC and the UNC to deliver the solution.

The following is suggested subject to iGT Pipeline Operator consent.

Section K

23.8 Disclosure of Meter Asset Provider Information

23.8.1 For the purposes of this Clause 23.8 the Pipeline Operators are authorised to disclose such data as is set out within Annex V-9 of the UNC to a Meter Asset Provider subject to the provisions of Section V5.16 of the UNC.

Part M

“Meter Asset Provider” shall have the meaning ascribed thereto in the UNC;

10 Consultation

Panel invited representations from interested parties with a close out date of 17th January 2018. The summaries in the following table are provided for reference on a reasonable endeavours basis only. We recommend that all representations are read in full when considering this Report. Representations are published alongside this Final Modification Report.

Representations were received from the following parties:

Organisation	Response	Relevant Objectives	Key Points
NPower	Support	D - positive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We support the implementation of this modification as well, as we have supported the related UNC Modification 0637S previously.
E.ON	Support	D - positive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We support this modification because it introduces a mechanism into the iGT UNC to allow MAPs to clarify with the CDSP where their asset is, this then ensures charges are issued to the correct parties thus reducing query volumes across the industry. We don't anticipate large volumes of requests for

			<p>the iGTs initially because in a lot of instances the MAP is also the iGT, however, we believe with smart rollout and a more competitive metering market this may not always be the case and MAPs need a way to check where their meter is, just like they can in the UNC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As this change does not have any material impact on the future of gas consumers, competition, operation of the pipe-line system, matters of supply security or iGT UNC governance, we are happy it us subject to Self-Governance procedures. We believe costs to be minimal as the CDSP already holds the data and the reports can already be run, they just aren't due to permissions. Data would only be released when a formal request is submitted which brings no additional costs. Shippers nor iGTs need to (in our view) make any system changes so costs are minimal.
BU-UK	Support	D – neutral B - positive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst we agree with the reasoning behind the facilitation of the relevant objectives identified by the proposer and working group, we believe the wrong objective has been chosen. There would be no positive impact on competition through the implementation of IGT105, unless it has been identified that suppliers and/or MAPs have been deliberately submitting incorrect charges. If this was the issue, then IGT105 is not the solution. We would argue that the relevant objective that is better facilitated by IGT105 is objective B, on the proviso that the combined pipeline system includes the metering equipment. If IGT105 leads to more accurate rental charges from the MAP then we would consider this to be more efficient and economic operation of the combined system. BUUK support the implementation of IGT105 for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cross-code alignment of the UNC/IGT UNC - Reduction of misallocated charges leading to more efficient and economic operation of combined pipeline system
ESP	Support	D – positive F - positive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ESP supports implementation of this Modification as we consider this mod as a positive step in

			<p>order to improve the data accessible by MAPs who have metering assets installed on IGT Networks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This permissions Modification allows the release of this data while ensuring IGTs remain compliant with legal obligations to safeguard data. • ESP agrees that there could be a beneficial impact to competition (Objective D) between Shippers/Suppliers by the provision of timely data to the MAP organisation as it could have a reductive effect on incorrect asset data that can lead to misallocated costs being incurred by Suppliers. • ESP also agrees that Objective F is positively impacted as it will bring the two codes into closer alignment which will benefit parties who participate in both regulatory frameworks. • As soon as practical in following a decision to implement.
--	--	--	---

In summary:

- Four responses were received to the consultation for iGT105, incorporating two responses from Pipeline Users and two responses from Pipeline Operators.
- All respondents offered support to this modification.
- All bar one respondent agreed that the Modifications better facilitated Relevant Objectives D) Securing of effective competition. One respondent felt that this modification better facilitated Relevant Objective B) Co-ordinated, efficient and economic operation of the combined pipe-line system.
- All respondents agreed that the Modification did meet the criteria for Self-Governance.
- All respondents agreed that the proposed Legal Text supported the requirements of the solution.
- Views on implementation timing were all in agreement that this modification should be implemented as soon as reasonably practical.

Code Administrator Observations

The Code Administrator has noted the unanimous support for an early implementation of the Modification including one respondent who has suggested that the proposal should be implemented as soon as the Self-Governance Appeal window has closed. Whilst the iGT UNC Modification Rules generally only allow for an earliest implementation date in a scheduled release at least 2 months following a Panel decision to implement, Paragraph 27.2 of Part L allows the potential for deviation from this. As such the Code Administrator has written out to all parties on the 18th January 2018 to seek their views on whether implementation should take place after the appeal window has closed, subject to a Panel

recommendation to implement. The Code Administrator will report back to the Panel on the outcome of this.

11 Panel Discussions

The Code Administrator will provide a summary of the Panel discussions that inform any decisions taken. This will include a record of Panel's views on the representations, the outcome of any votes and, where alternates exist, Panel's preference.

Discussion

Insert text here

Consideration of the Relevant Objectives

Insert text here

Determinations

Insert text here

12 Recommendations

Panel Determination Self-Governance

Members agreed:

- that Modification 105 should [not] be implemented