IGT039 Meeting #10
Minutes

Present:
Naomi Anderson (NA)*  EDF Energy
Colette Baldwin (CB)   Eon
Ashley Collins (AC)    EDF Energy
Cher Harris (CH)*      SSEPL
Gethyn Howard (GH) (Chair)  IPL
Anne Jackson (AJ)  SSE
Tabish Khan (TK)*    BG
Steve Ladle (SL)   Gemserv obo. IGT UNC
Andy Miller (AM)    Xoserve
Zoe Murphy (ZM)    NPower
Trevor Peacock (TP)  FPL
Adam Pearce (AP)    ESP
Jenny Rawlinson (JR) GTC

*via teleconference

1) Introductions
The group members introduced themselves.

2) Review of Actions from Previous Meeting
GH ran through the actions which are updated as follows;
   1) IGTs and AM to identify process differences between IGTs and GDNs. Ongoing
   2) Parties to confirm views on whether IAD framework is acceptable. Closed.
   3) Parties to consider approaches for new connections process for next 039 meeting. Closed.

3) NEXUS Update
AM summarised that the project Nexus work group continues to meet with the main areas of work being UNC0432 covering settlement and UNC0434 covering retrospective updates. AM also made the group aware that the closing date for the IGT Agency Services premodification consultation was 18\textsuperscript{th} January and encouraged parties to respond.

4) Review of Process Diagrams
AM stressed to the group that the flow diagrams were in draft form and were subject to change.

IGT MAM
The group reviewed the process diagram and agreed on some minor changes to ensure the process reflected that of the GDNs as close of possible.

The group noted that the new connections process review provided a good opportunity to standardise the PSR format and increase visibility around the governance of the PSR process. GH commented that some work had been carried out previously on the PSR template and will dig this out for future discussion.

AJ noted that there may be contractual issues between the Shipper and Supplier if the supplier hasn’t agreed a contract with the Shipper and the Shipper is therefore liable to Transportation charges but unable to back these off to the Supplier.
   o The group noted that this may be an isolated issue as generally Shippers wouldn’t sign off a PSR until a contract is in place between the developer and the nominated Supplier.
   o It was noted that this is a contractual issue between Shippers and Suppliers to resolve.
   o It was also suggested that to aid smart processes a standardised PSR document could also include the nominated Supplier. GH commented that previously a piece of work had been carried out to standardise the PSR process and it would be useful to dig this out to see how far the work had been taken.

Action: GH to circulate previous work carried out on PSR process.
**Shipper MAM**

AM queried the process where meter updates are sent by a different Shipper or MAM to those registered on the industry system. GH believed the current IGT UNC process to only accept updates from the registered Shipper or proposing Shipper. Where received by other parties, the IGT was to record rather than update their system and contact the relevant Shipper for investigation. AM believed this different from how such occurrences are treated on GDN networks. It was agreed the differences may be due to Code drafting. GH agreed to look into this.

SL asked where the business rules for the process diagrams would sit. GH commented that he believed the IGT UINC would be the home for process requirements as the obligations still sit with the IGT though Xoserve is undertaking the systems side as the IGT agent. This would be backed off with a contract between IGTs and Xoserve for the Agency Services and a schedule in the IGT UNC which will set out which of the activities under the IGT UNC will be carried out by the IGT Agent.

**Action:** GH to review meter information update requirements.

**CSEP Creation and CSEP Maintenance**

AM ran the group through the CSEP set up and amendment process. The group also discussed how sales of land from one to developer to another are managed in terms of data accuracy. IGTs commented that this would be covered off under the current site variation/amendment process whereby a revised PSR is sent to the Shipper with the amended details. CB questioned how this translates where the original developer has contracted with a Shipper prior to selling the land to another developer. It was commented that the contracts signed between the Shippers and developers should be binding though this was out of scope of the group. It was suggested that Shippers should review their contracts.

The group also discussed the approach to data cleansing, population and migration. It was noted that preparation work had already started at Xoserve for this and AM confirmed that the migration database has a target date of early 2014. It was noted that the approach to data requirements would be developed through the industry i.e. there would need to be some new IGT and Shipper data items. The group noted that consumption and billing data will be key and SL also questioned whether there needed to be an agreed level of data quality before cutover to single service could be given the go ahead. AM commented that a parallel testing approach will be used.

5) **AOB**

There was no AOB.

6) **Next Steps**

The group asked what timeframe the project was running to and when were the critical dates for a successful implementation. GH commented that he had a project plan which when updated could be circulated to the group.

**Action:** GH to update and circulate project plan.

7) **Future Meeting Dates**

The group noted that the next meeting on the 31st would be a joint IGT039/UNC0440 meeting and is likely to be held at 31 Homer Road.
**Actions:**

1) IGTs and AM to identify process differences between IGTs and GDNs.
2) GH to circulate previous work carried out on PSR process.
3) GH to review meter information update requirements.
4) GH to update and circulate project plan.