

Notes of iGT RP009

Monday 29 November 2010

Present:

David Speake (chair)	ESP
Dan Simons	EDF
Gethyn Howard	IPL
Tabish Khan	Ofgem
Colette Baldwin	Eon
Trevor Peacock	Fulcrum Pipelines
Dave Bowles	Fulcrum Pipelines
Kevin Woollard	British Gas
Mark Jones	SSE
Lorraine Kerr	Scottish Power (telecon)

Apologies: Paul Edwards (GTC), Sham Afonja, (Npower)

Summary of discussions

A number of desired outcomes were put forward:

1. More robust terms and conditions for metering, including further detail on standards of service etc.
2. The removal of RPC meters from network code
3. Making installation of own meters on new build sites easier
4. Bundled metering charges (legacy) back into transportation statements where change governance and Ofgem oversight is agreed to exist

Splitting of legacy and RPC meters in code

The group discussed and confirmed that in using the term 'legacy', the reference was to the transportation charging arrangements under which a meter was installed. This provided the ability to split meters into 'legacy' and RPC meters, all of which were currently governed under iGT UNC.

Generally it was the shipper view that 'legacy' meters had a place in network code, as their charges were governed in line with transportation arrangements. Conversely, shippers believed that RPC meters had no place in code since their charges were separate to transportation arrangements.

It was noted then that the 'legacy' issue was really confined to two iGTs from January 2011. However, DS explained that it may not simply be a case of 'legacy versus RPC' meters, rather it could be considered that the important factor going forward would be the contractual arrangements under which the meter was installed. This could mean that the important distinction will be whether a meter was installed under network code or under a commercial contract.

It was suggested that it may be an idea to draft two (or more) alternative sections of code for metering; each anticipating the various scenarios. These alternatives could then be switched on or off via shortform code. Some of this work has begun, with the shippers having proposed some text in early 2010. The group agreed that this existing document should be revisited.

New housing connections

It was highlighted by shippers that developers are being told that they will receive less money where the supplier rather than the iGT is to arrange the meter fit at a new connection. iGTs pointed out that this is quite correct and in no way discriminatory. iGTs pay an asset value which includes a component to reflect ownership of the meter. This component is withdrawn from the asset value where the meter is arranged by the supplier.

It was noted that iGTs had carried out a piece of work in early 2010 which explored potential changes to the PSR process in light of unbundled metering. At the time this work was not discussed in any detail by this group. The group agreed that it would be worthwhile giving this work further consideration. The document would be re-circulated and all parties would look at it before the next meeting.

Notification of new asset details

One shipper expressed concern that where they are providing details of a new meter (where the iGT meter was removed), iGTs are refusing to record the details of that new asset on their system. iGTs present were not aware of this happening and urged the shipper to contact the iGT(s) concerned directly to discuss this.

The group discussed whether there needs to be some reinforcement in network code that the GT must record details passed to it by the shipper. No conclusions were made, but it was noted that this was part of the SPAA flows already, and so suppliers (via shippers) should already be sending flows to the GT, although this is generally not being done even though there are third party MAMs already operating on iGT networks. This should be explored further in a discussion of the role of the GT in metering flows. Dan Simons took an action to consider GT interactions with shipper/MAM.

It was also noted that when developing the MAM manual, iGTs had removed a number of sections which dealt with GT interactions on the advice that the MAM manual should not contain GT processes. iGTs agreed to look back at this work to identify what had been removed from the MAM manual.

Potential modifications

It was agreed that it remained difficult to agree potential modifications to code. The only one that has so far been identified would be to allow iGTs to back charge transportation charges where they had not been made aware of the fitting of a third party meter and gas had been passing. iGTs will proceed with this if appropriate.

There may be potential for a reinforcement of obligations where a GT receives third party meter information from a shipper (e.g. handshake file). This area will be discussed further to understand whether this is necessary, and whether it sits best in iGT UNC or elsewhere. Related to this, it may be wise to agree a set of baseline flows which could end up in code.

.....

It was clear from all discussion that a lot will depend on whether network code continues to govern meters at all. This cannot yet be answered and will depend on each iGT's approach to offering metering under a commercial contract.

Actions and further discussion points

1. Dan Simons to document GT interactions in the existing metering flows to aid discussion on whether these need to be reflected in network code (or elsewhere)
2. DS to re-circulate the PSR work carried out by iGTs.
3. All to consider PSR document in preparation for further discussion.
4. DS to re-circulate the redrafting of sections D and E carried out by shippers.
5. All to review iGT UNC redrafting work in preparation for further discussion.

It was felt that at the next meeting it would be useful to discuss:

- Existing data handoff processes between shippers and GTs for non-iGT meters
- Areas that were discarded during development of the MAM manual due to being GT-related
- The redrafting work undertaken by shippers to understand whether it is still appropriate
- Whether iGT UNC provides sufficient detail around a last resort metering provision in its current form