

iGT UNC Modification Workstream 16-02

Tuesday 2nd February 2016 at 10.00am

Gemserv, 8 Fenchurch Place, London EC3M 4AJ

Attendee	Initials	Organisation
Steve Ladle (Chair)	SL	Gemserv
Katy Binch*	KB	ESP Pipelines
David Bowles*	DB	Fulcrum
Kirsty Dudley*	KD	E.ON
Bryan Hale*	BH	EDF Energy
Cher Harris*	CH	Indigo Pipelines
Maria Hesketh *	MH	Scottish Power
Anne Jackson	AJ	SSE Supply
Mark Jones*	MJ	SSE Supply
Andrew Margan	AM	British Gas
Paul Orsler	PO	Xoserve
Jenny Rawlinson *	JR	Brookfield Utilities
Nicky Rozier	NR	Brookfield Utilities
Kirandeep Samra	KS	npower
Verity Blake	VB	Gemserv

**Attended via teleconference.*

1. Welcome and Apologies for Absence

SL welcomed attendees to the meeting. Apologies were noted from Laura Cahill (SSE Supply) and Kishan Nundloll (ES Pipelines).

2. Confirmation of Agenda

The Chair invited any further items for discussion, noting that three items of business have been previously requested;

1. RGMA Guidance Document Update by KN;
2. The Elected Shipper issue (CSEP) by Xoserve; and
3. The allocation/reallocation of MPRN numbers by SL.

AM advised that he had had some questions in relation to iGT078 and iGT079 and SL proposed that iGT078 be brought forward, to be discussed following iGT075 and prior to iGT079 as they use similar file formats. The group agreed with this suggestion.

3. Confirmation of Minutes

The minutes of the iGT UNC Modification Workstream meeting held on 5th January 2016 were agreed as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

4. Outstanding Actions

Please refer to the table at the end of the minutes for further actions arising and updates.

5. [iGT075: Identification of Pressure Tiers](#)

KD advised the group that no formal update was available and, that at present, the Modification is under review. The Workgroup were advised that the progress of the Modification depends on what solution is developed and although a cost – benefit analysis has not been formally been produced, it is currently estimated that the implementation cost for the Large Transporters (in connection with the UNC equivalent modification UNC0526) is approximately £18-19 million.

KD stated that once more information is available, she will update the Workgroup accordingly. The group noted the update.

6. [iGT078: Ancillary Document for the New Connections process](#)

In December, the Panel agreed to submit the Draft Modification Report (DMR) for iGT078 to the iGTUNC for Consultation, with a close out of the 15th January 2016. Noting that the Consultation responses highlighted a number of issues mainly with the File Formats (PS1 and PS2) the January Panel requested that these be separately reviewed by KS, KD and KB and any required changes drafted for discussion at this workgroup.

Further comments were submitted subsequent to the Panel (and consultation close out) which highlighted further concerns over the proposed PSR file formats. KS advised the group that she had taken on board all comments previously received, and acknowledged that late comments had been submitted by BH. The comments submitted by BH were shared with the Workgroup, and it was agreed that further discussion was required.

SL proposed that the Workgroup review the late responses and determine whether they should be taken on board, as they will allow the Workgroup to be in a better position to agree on the status and next steps of the Modification. It was noted that it would be very difficult to achieve consensus on every suggestion however, it was important to hear all perspectives regardless.

AJ advised that she does not believe the Modification meets the Self-governance criteria. AJ stated that she believes there to be a competition issue, as in the current procedure if the iGT pre-populates the PSR with their own MAM id, in order for the Supplier to insert their own MAM, the flow needs to be

rejected and resent. This creates a further process level that would introduce a delay to the meter install where an independent MAM is used. SL noted this issue on Self-governance has been significantly reviewed in previous Workgroups and reiterated that a majority agree that the Modification is Self-governance. KS stated that the objective of the Modification is to provide a standard for iGTs and Shippers to comply with, and the intention has always been for the Modification to be amended in the future, if the commercial operation of the process identifies issues.

The group then proceeded to discuss the comments submitted by BH, with KS incorporating his suggestions into the PSR Templates, where agreed, during the discussion. A majority of the comments provided were accepted and incorporated into the Draft Modification and Ancillary Document.

AM requested clarification in regards to what happens in the transition periods in relation to PSR's. CH acknowledged that once the system changes had been implemented, Indigo Pipelines would not be able to reissue all the old PSRs in the new file formats. The Workgroup noted this comment and agreed that it was the general understanding that old PSRs would only need to be converted to the new formats if circumstances changed such that a revised PSR needed to be issued.

SL asked the Workgroup whether the changes incorporated have materially impacted on parties understanding of the proposal, and whether it was necessary to send out the Modification proposal for a further Consultation.

The Workgroup were of consensus that it would be good governance to send the Modification proposal for a further consultation, noting that a number of consultees who had provided qualified support because of the errors in the formats may wish to change their view to full support. Moreover, the Workgroup agreed that a supplementary Workgroup Report should be provided to Panel, with the recommendation that the Modification is sent out for a shortened Consultation, so that a revised Final Modification report can be discussed at the Panel in March.

ACTION MWS16/02-01: KS to send revised Draft Modification Proposal for iGT078 together with a revised Ancillary document and related File Format changes to the Code Administrator by Friday 5th of February.

ACTION MWS16/02-02: Code Administrator to produce a revised Workgroup Report for iGT078 including the workgroup's recommendation for a shortened re-Consultation, circulate it to parties and add it to the agenda for the February Panel.

7. [iGT079 Non-domestic New Connections Framework Ancillary Document](#)

AM lead the discussion, advising the Workgroup that he had not received any further comments on the Draft Modification and, informed the group of the changes made to the Draft Modification.

AM advised that the term “non-domestic” should be used over “commercial” to avoid causing problems with the use of common file formats to iGT078, and AM proposed to make this change in the Modification where applicable.

Also, for the avoidance of doubt, AM proposed for a note should be added to the introduction confirming that a Commercial PSR will not contain any domestic sites. SL was of the opinion that this was not required, as it is covered in the legal text. AM noted this point however, wanted it to be included so, that when a new party was using the template, this is clearly brought to their attention. The group agreed that this note would not materially change the principle or content of the Modification and was accepted.

The Workgroup discussed how the progression of iGT079 is dependent on the outcome and finalisation iGT078, as the revised templates proposed in iGT078, are to be used in iGT079 as well. To that end, the Workgroup agreed that the new sections of “file name convention” will be duplicated from iGT078, to provide consistency in files name conventions. The Workgroup agreed that there is overlap between iGT078 and iGT079 and that as long as the revisions in the file formats requested in iGT078 are incorporated, there should not be any issues in this duplication. The group noted that changes in the Ancillary document for iGT078 should also be included in iGT079, where appropriate.

CH questioned why a new PSR needed to be established for the non-domestic new connections process and CH and MJ advised that they did not believe that this Modification would deliver an additional efficiency. Some Workgroup members are of the opinion that they do not believe the process is required, as it adds complexity to the processes already in place. Conversely, some parties think that this would be a useful mechanism to register commercial sites by allowing a common approach for both domestic and non-domestic new connections. AJ advised that she was not able to provide a comment from SSE in regards to iGT079.

There was discussions in the group about tracking PSR's following the change, and how the old and new PSR's can be tracked and recognised. If the PSR sent is an old file format, parties will receive an amended PSR in the new format, which means there will not be a way to track the PSR. JR noted that there will be a Network Code Number, which is the Project Number, and this can be used as the unique reference for the PSR form.

As previously noted, a full six month implementation lead time would be required for iGT079, and therefore AM proposed for the Draft Modification Report to be considered at the February Panel, with the recommendation that it is send out for Consultation. The Workgroup confirmed that they were happy for the Modification to be sent to Panel for consideration.

ACTION MWS16/02-03: AM to send through an updated version of the Ancillary Document for iGT079 to the Code Administrator.

ACTION MWS16/02-04: Code Administrator to prepare a Final Workgroup Report for iGT079 and include it on the Agenda for the February Panel.

8. RGMA ONJOB Address String Structure

The iGT RGMA Guidance Document was published in July 2015. At the time of its publication, it was anticipated that future updates to the document may be required following Project Nexus Market Trials. This item was requested to be discussed by KN, who was unable to attend the meeting. However, AM provided brief comments; advocating for there to be greater structure around the address elements, as this is crucial in order to allow Suppliers to systematically interpret and exploit the address data passed within the ONJOB. A further example was provided, which suggested including a “~” tilde symbol as the field delimiter, to avoid any formatting issues with comma separated values. JR supported this suggestion, and mentioned that this is possible however, this would then be the same process used for all Suppliers.

As the document needs to be updated in advance of the implementation of Project Nexus on 1st October 2016, the group agreed that comments should be requested by the Code Administrator, so that the RGMA Guidance document can be update as required.

ACTION MWS16/02-05: Code Administrator to send note to parties requesting feedback and comments in regards to the RGMA Guidance Document, to allow for the document to be updated in advance in the implementation of Project Nexus.

9. Transfer of MPRNs between licences

This item was raised following a note that was sent out to the iGT UNC, in regards to MPRN allocations. AM has previously raised this item for discussion, where it was agreed for parties to send through their MPRN requests or, to state whether they would require additional MPRN allocations before the implementation of Project Nexus. The majority of parties indicated they are unlikely to need further allocations until October.

JR queried whether it would be possible to reallocate their existing MPRN numbers from an old licence to a current licence, and if this would cause issues for other members. There was a brief discussion on the system costs incurred by parties following additional MPRN requests. This is why parties have agreed to coordinate them, so there is only one system change, opposed to multiple, required.

JR stated that she is proposing to re-allocate the MPRN range ‘76543215 – 76753605’ from IPL to GPL, noting that this is a full and unbroken range. JR asserted that this un-broken allocation to another iGT

could be done without causing any material impact to parties. JR further advised that, it is unlikely that they will require any further MPRNs prior to 1st October 2016.

10. Date of Next Meeting

The date of the next meeting is 1st March 2016.

iGT UNC Modification Workstream Action Table

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Action	Owner	Status Update
MWS15/03-05	7th April 2015	KD to investigate the proportion of aborted visits for iGT sites only, to assist with the cost-benefit analysis for iGT075.	KD	Carried Forward. Analysis has been completed for the Large Transporter Networks however, may need to be carried out for iGTs.
MWS15/08-07	1st September 2015	Xoserve (PO/SN) to refine options for Provision of Plot Summaries and parties to submit any further proposals over the next two months, in time for the 3rd November Modification Workstream meeting.	Xoserve	Closed. Now being picked up internally by Xoserve as part of the Impact Assessment. Change request is being progressed by developers, and options will be brought to the April 2016 Workgroup.
MWS15/11-02	1st December 2015	PO to confirm Xoserve's capability to provide to iGTs the data items deemed necessary to complete the annual AQ Review process under iGT071.	PO	Carried Forward Deferred to Start of March. A proposal will be discussed with the iGT's prior to

				the March workgroup.
MWS15/11-10	1 st December 2015	AI to propose a structure for the concatenated address data in field A0056 of the RGMA baseline for iGT meter works.	AI	Closed. Discussed under item 8.
MWS16/01-01	4th January 2016	PO to consider the framework of the suggested focus group with a paper to be fed back for discussion at the next Modification Workstream on 2nd February 2016.	PO	Carried Forward. A paper provided to the February Workstream at short notice was unable to be discussed due to lack of time and will be discussed at the Workgroup in March.
MWS16/01-02	4 th January 2016	AM to reconsider Ancillary document wording under paragraph 2.3 and contact Kish regarding this.	AM	Closed
MWS16/01-03	4 th January 2016	Code Administrator to publish the AQ Review Workgroup Report ahead of consideration at the Modification Panel meeting in January 2016.	Gemserv	Closed
MWS16/01-04	4 th January 2016	iGTs to confirm their compliance status with GSOS guidelines to KS ahead of the next Modification Workstream.	iGTs	Closed.
MWS16/02-01:	2nd February 2016	KS to send revised Draft Modification Proposal for iGT078 together with a revised Ancillary document and related File Format changes to the Code Administrator by Friday 5th of February.	KS	New
MWS16/02-02:	2nd February 2016	Code Administrator to produce a revised Workgroup Report for	Gemserv	New

		iGT078 including the workgroup's recommendation for a shortened re-Consultation, circulate it to parties and add it to the agenda for the February Panel.		
MWS16/02-03:	2 nd February 2016	AM to send through an updated version of the Ancillary Document for iGT079 to the Code Administrator.	AM	New
MWS16/02-04:	2 nd February 2016	Code Administrator to prepare a Final Workgroup Report for iGT079 and include it on the Agenda for the February Panel.	Gemserv	New
MWS16/02-05:	2 nd February 2016	Code Administrator to send note to parties requesting feedback and comments in regards to the RGMA Guidance Document, to allow for the document to be updated in advance in the implementation of Project Nexus.	Gemserv	New