IGT039 Meeting #8

Present:
Colette Baldwin             Eon
Elaine Carr (tele)               Scottish Power
Cher Harris (tele)              SSEPL
Gethyn Howard (Chair)   IPL
Mark Jones                SSE
Tabish Khan               British Gas
Steve Ladle               Gemserv obo. IGT UNC

Andy Miller               Xoserve
Zoe Murphy               NPower
Nigel Nash               Ofgem
Adam Pearce               ESP
Jenny Rawlinson           GTC
Chris Warner              National Grid

1) Introductions
The group members introduced themselves.

2) Review of Actions from Previous Meeting
   1) IGTs & AM to identify process differences between IGTs and GDNs. [Carried over] GH confirmed this work was ongoing and should be concluded in the coming weeks.
   2) DS to compare IGT and Shipper communications against those set out in the IGT UNC. [Closed – to be covered under action 1] GH confirmed that this action would be covered under the Code review being carried off under action 1.
   3) CW to discuss IAS further with lawyers following discussion on presentation and provide update at next physical meeting. [Closed] CW confirmed that he had met with lawyers and the outcome of this meeting will be covered off in the document to be discussed under agenda item 4.
   4) GH agreed to circulate AM’s documents. [Closed]
   5) GH to send AM timeline of events for review. [Closed]
   6) AM to contact Ofgem regarding information required for CBA. [Closed]

3) NEXUS Update
AM provided an update on NEXUS covering the following areas;
   • IGT SSP BRD – This has now been base lined and signed off by PNUNC. The BRD is still subject to further review and any further changes to this document will require agreement and signoff under PNUNC.
   • During September Xoserve will mainly be conducting internal analysis on NEXUS requirements which may result in further amendments to the BRD in November.

Action: AM to confirm current version of IGT BRD.

4) Update on NG legal view on drafting approach
CW clarified that the IGT BRD has been constructed to set out the systems requirements where as the modification will be raised to achieve a single governance approach.

CW took the group through the IAD governance paper (attached) on a line by line basis. The paper proposed that the IAD consist of 4 sections; Classification and General, Connection and Offtake, Arrangements with Shippers, Transporter Agency. CW stressed it was important to note that some of the processes will sit in the IAD and some in the UNC. CW added that he would be happy to receive any questions and comments on the paper following the meeting. During the overview discussion, it was noted that 1.2(d) would require amending as currently conflicts with the terminology used in the IGT UNC, 2.2.3 would also require further review and 2.4.1(b) would require further discussion. For the project to be successful it was commented that it was important for the IGT039 modification and UNC work stay aligned and not become disjointed. JR also raised concern and stressed that it was important for all
relevant parties to be included when reviewing the NExA replacement. CW agreed to contact Tim Davis of
the Joint Office to suggest Tim and SL discuss how the governance arrangements for their proposal could
work.

SL queried whether the proposed approach to replace the NExA with the IAD was beyond the scope of
achieving the governance required to implement an SSP and whether the concept of a single supply point
register would be achieved under NEXUS anyway. It was also queried whether the IAD approach was
needed and whether a simpler solution could be used whereby the NExA is amended rather than
replaced. CW responded that he believed this approach was fundamental to the project as NExA
processes and data flows will need to be changed.

CW explained that the current Nexus project plan was to commence the phased implementation from
2015 which would require agreement/sign off by April 2013 to allow Xoserve sufficient time to commence
the systems build. CW also commented that GTs had been written to by Ofgem encouraging the relevant
modifications to be processed by the April 2013 timescale. As such, the settlement modification is being
submitted to September Panel with the IGT modification to be sent to the October Panel. IGTs voiced
concern over such timescales as cost allocation had not yet been agreed and further information was
required on potential ongoing service charges before IGTs would be in a position to be able to carry out a
cost benefit analysis. GH commented that without confirmation of such costs and allocation, IPL would
not be able to support the SSP project. AM commented that the funding aspect will be discussed in
further detail at the IGT/Xoserve meeting later in September.

Action: CW to speak to lawyers regarding comments received following review of IAD discussion
document.

Action: CW to contact Tim Davis regarding discussions with SL.

5) Discussion of IGT UNC drafting options
GH provided a high level run through of a change marked Part CI of the IGT UNC which was drafted based
on the review of the IGT UNC and UNC. GH confirmed that this was reference only to give a flavour of
what the IGT UNC may look like should the “pointing” approach to the UNC be used. It was noted that
though difficult to follow, the two Codes did not always match up and consequently a paragraph by
paragraph approach was required.

GH also commented that the progression of IGT039 is very much dependent on work being carried out
both at NEXUS and the potential forthcoming UNC modification. As it is likely that the outcome of the
UNC modification will determine the shape of the IGT UNC modification, it is not expected that the 039
group will meet until the outcome of the UNC modification is known (though this position will be subject
to review and the 039 will meet sooner if required).

6) AOB
AM made the group aware of the Single Supply Point UNC modification (0428) and asked that IGTs make
themselves aware of this as should the UNC modification be successful, this will form the basis for SSP
arrangements.

7) Future Meeting Dates
TBA – though this will be following NG’s meeting with Lawyers to discuss comments to IAD overview
paper. The meeting is likely to be held via teleconference either at the end of September or early October
as the modification would need to be submitted to the UNC Panel by October 5th for discussion on
October 18th.
Actions:

1) IGTs and AM to identify process differences between IGTs and GDNs.
2) CW to speak to Lawyers regarding queries raised on IAD paper at meeting #8.
3) GH to arrange call on closing of action #2.
4) CW to contact Tim Davis regarding discussions with SL.