

**Operational Metering Communications Meeting- (9)****Date of Meeting: 20<sup>th</sup> April 2012****Time of Meeting: 10.00 am****Location: EDF-Crawley**

<b>Present:</b>	Jenny Rawlinson (Chair)	JR	GTC
	Tracy Goymer	TG	GTC
	Lisa Wong	LW	ESP
	Gethyn Howard	GH	IPL (Teleconference)
	Stefano Tiani-Tanzi	STT	IPL (Teleconference)
	Colette Baldwin	CB	Eon
	Andy Smith	AS	NPower
	Trevor Peacock	TP	Fulcrum (Teleconference)
	Ashley Collins	AC	EDF
	Aimee Charalambous	ACH	NPower

**1. Admin and Introductions**

AC advised that there were no fire alarm tests due.

**2. Minutes from Previous Meeting**

The minutes were agreed by the group.

**3. Actions from Previous Meeting**

See Actions Log for update.

CB confirmed that EON do not receive FRJ's or ERR's, but were still waiting on XOSERVE for final confirmation.

Most IGT's confirmed that they do not use "fuzzy matching" although ESP and Fulcrum are currently looking into introducing this to their systems.

AC had also looked into validation of CSV files and clarified that there was no validation regarding comma's, dates or numbers, therefore nothing needed to be added to the Operational Metering Document regarding this.

CB clarified that where 3<sup>rd</sup> Party Meters are found, this would be sent into the IGT via the SOS, Asset Query Process, a K08 and .UPD would follow.

CB also clarified that the "total" at the bottom of the S72 could be removed.

AC spoke about padding and has agreed to email XOSERVE and send documents through for IGT's to comment on.

#### 4. Review Ancillary Document

It was agreed that within the General Validation section of the document, where an .UPD is included, the shipper will be expecting an amendment to the GT Records, whereas a "Report" should not hold any different information.

The Group discussed IL's emails and all agreed that, whilst there was no need for the files to be numbered consecutively, they should be sequential.

The S72 error codes were discussed further to IL's email, it was agreed that IGT's would review and filter out any codes not necessary for this process.

TP has requested that examples are included as to where a K08, .JOB and .UPD will be used. It was agreed that AC would send through previously provided validation rules for iGTs to review and feed back any questions to shippers for clarification.

The group discussed the receiving by iGTs of a K08 without a .JOB or .UPD file and it was agreed that a statement should be added to the existing document at Section 2.3.1; "It is recognised within this document that, in order to complete the process, a shipper organisation should send to the iGT a K08 plus a .JOB or a .UPD file. The exceptions to this would be where the shipper is informing of a change of third party MAM or on change of supply where the new shipper is advising of the continued third party MAM ID.

2.8.1 would be amended to read ".....The .UPD flow notifies the iGT of an Update *of meter asset data* at the supply point.....".

GH had raised a point regarding Governance, it was agreed that changes would be made on an as and when basis and in conjunction with appropriate changes to other governance areas i.e. UNC.

DM had requested we discuss maximum file size, it was agreed that there would be no maximum file size added to the Document as it is organisation specific.

The group also discussed email validation. All parties agreed that there should be no mixing of files on the email attachments.

**ACTION: AC to send previously provided validation documents from XOSERVE to TG**

**ACTION: All IGT's to review AC's XOSERVE Document and provide comments**

**ACTION: IGT's to review S72 error codes with a view to ruling out superfluous codes.**

**ACTION: TG to update Document and circulate**

## 5. Review Draft Mod

The IGT/Shipper needed to be standardised throughout the Mod to Pipeline Operator and Pipeline User.

CB is to clarify the use of the word "Ancillary Document", but it was proposed that the Document be named "IGT and Shipper Metering Communications Ancillary Document" unless Gemserv confirm that this is misleading.

At Section "Implementation issues including impact on systems", include a comment stating that UAT testing is required prior to agreed implementation date.

**ACTION: CB to speak to Gemserv**

## 6. Review of Work Plan and Next Steps

Agreement to the Final "Document" and Modification proposal would be invited from all appropriate parties via feed back and outside of any further meeting.

A meeting would be needed to consider any PEMs impact. In preparation of this, questions would be circulated and feed back to them requested prior to the next meeting in order that they could be discussed on the day.

A revised work plan to reflect this would be distributed with the minutes.

## 7. AOB

No AOB

## 8. Next Meeting

AC has offered to host the next Meeting at EDF's Crawley office. Date confirmed as 8<sup>th</sup> May 2012.

### Action Log

<b>1</b>	AC	To look into relevance of FRJ or ERR	Pending
<b>2</b>	AC	To clarify 2.7.3 and 2.9.3 whether this is just record level rejections	Pending
<b>3</b>	IGT's	Review Padding guidelines from AC and feedback any comments to Shippers	Pending
<b>4</b>	IGT's	Review S72 error codes	Pending
<b>5</b>	TG	To update document and circulate	Pending

<b>6</b>	CB	To clarify use of "Ancillary Document" with Gemserv	Pending
----------	----	---	---------

**Closed Actions**

<b>1</b>	AS	To look at Reading (M) and read date (O) on .UPD File	Closed
<b>2</b>	AS	To compare .Job with ONJOB	Closed
<b>3</b>	SA	continue compiling the User Guide	Closed
<b>4</b>	ALL	To continue to work with Internal IT Teams in preparation of next meeting	Closed
<b>5</b>	IGTs	To confirm whether populating meters as F – freestanding rather than P - primary will be an issue.	Closed
<b>6</b>	TG	To draw up PEMs scenario's and circulate	Closed
<b>7</b>	AC	To send PEMs Validation Rules to the group	Closed
<b>8</b>	IGT's	Check cyclical read header & trailer to see if contains Shipper ID	Closed
<b>9</b>	TG	Circulate File Naming Convention	Closed
<b>10</b>	ALL	Review User Guide and feedback responses to the questions	Closed
<b>11</b>	DM	To circulate initial technical assessment to the group	Closed
<b>12</b>	IGTs	To review rejection codes and see if more are required	Closed
<b>13</b>	IGTs	Check when rejecting K09 does the IGT respond with the details held or details given by shipper	Closed
<b>14</b>	IGTs	To review minimum example files for validation purposes	Closed
<b>15</b>	ALL	To review surplus requirements to check all covered	Closed
<b>16</b>	IGTs	To look at minimum example files	Closed

<b>17</b>	TG	To include example on Validation Document	Closed
<b>18</b>	IL	To provide definition of field lengths	Closed
<b>19</b>	AC	To ask XOSERVE if there would any issues with including the Shipper ID in the PEMS file	Closed
<b>20</b>	TG	To provide example S72 file	Closed
<b>21</b>	CB	To provide S72 rejection codes	Closed
<b>22</b>	IGTs	To check F215 MAM ID Text field length	Closed
<b>23</b>	TG	To review rejection codes and include all those relevant to the processes	Closed
<b>24</b>	IL	To produce full .JOB fields	Closed
<b>25</b>	IL	To start on file validation and rules for .JOB	Closed
<b>26</b>	AC	To clarify with the FRJ is incorrect	Closed
<b>27</b>	ALL	Check Organisation ID character/TXT	Closed
<b>28</b>	ALL	To review Questions Document and feedback comments to TG	Closed
<b>29</b>	ALL	To review and feedback to Ancillary Document by next meeting	Closed
<b>30</b>	JR	To update and circulate Work Plan	Closed
<b>31</b>	CB	To circulate draft modification	Closed
<b>32</b>	ALL	To check venue availability for next meeting	Closed
<b>33</b>	AC	To provide ASCII Characters	Closed
<b>34</b>	IGT's	To clarify fuzzy matching	Closed
<b>35</b>	CB	To check S72 "total"	Closed
<b>36</b>	AC	To check padding of fields	Closed

<b>37</b>	CB	To clarify files used where 3rd Party meters are found	Closed
<b>38</b>	AC	Send XOSERVE Doc to TG for inclusion in Document re Padding	Closed

### **Log of potential concerns**

<b>1</b>	MAM ID on CoS flow to New Shipper to be included/mandated on the appropriate CoS Files.
<b>2</b>	Transportation charges to continue where no meter shown, where appropriate
<b>3</b>	Re-charge to Shippers for 3 <sup>rd</sup> Party Meters Emergency Provision Charge
<b>4</b>	British Gas's removal of Meters on IGT Networks. (Kay Houghtons email)
<b>5</b>	Consider the possibility of an instance where subsequent to de-appointment, the shipper may wish to re appoint the iGT without the request of a new meter installation, for example, where a meter has been previously removed and subsequently (but in the absence of a commercial contract, the shipper wishes to appoint the iGT for the metering point.
<b>6</b>	IGT's passing on information regarding New MAM's for assets that are no longer IGT's responsibility.
<b>7</b>	Validation issues regarding the timescales of receiving files
<b>8</b>	IGTs to think about file transmission and format i.e. email/DTN/IX and xml/csv.