










IGT UNC Request Workgroup Report	At what stage is this document in the process?
<h1>RG006:</h1> <h2>Review of metering arrangements in the IGT UNC</h2>	<div>01 Modification</div> <div>02 Workgroup Report</div> <div>03 Draft Modification Report</div> <div>04 Final Modification Report</div>
<p>Purpose of Request:</p> <p>This review group is to review the way metering is incorporated into the IGT UNC to assess if the drafting in the IGT UNC and the way it links to the Metering Charges Statements is fit for purpose or requires amendments to deliver consistency and to ensure the IGT UNC remains robust.</p>	
	<p>The Panel will consider this Workgroup Report on 20th September 2019. The Panel will consider the recommendations and determine the appropriate next steps.</p>
	<p>High Impact: None identified</p>
	<p>Medium Impact: Pipeline Operators, Pipeline Users</p>
	<p>Low Impact: None identified</p>

Contents		 Any questions?
1	Request Summary	3
2	Impacts and Costs	3
3	Terms of Reference	11
4	Modification(s)	11
5	Recommendation	14
About this document:		Contact: Code Administrator
<p>This document is a Review Group report which reports that Review Group 006 has now completed its requested action. This will be presented to the Panel on 20th September 2019.</p> <p>The Panel will consider the Review Group's recommendations and conclusions with respect to any subsequent modifications needed in light of the Review Group's findings.</p>		 IGTUNC@Gemserv.com
		 02070901044
		Proposer: Kirsty Dudley
		 email address Kirsty.Dudley@eoneergy.com
		 07816172645

1 Request Summary

Why did the Proposer raise the request?

Back in 2009 E.ON sponsored modification IGT022; this modification was seeking to remove reference to the Metering Charges Statement from the IGT UNC, this was subsequently withdrawn because IGTs had developed a baseline/boilerplate contract approach but there was little or no uptake from Suppliers for metering contracts at that time so no alternative was developed.

Link to IGT022 (<https://www.igt-unc.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/IGT022-Metering-Charges-Statement.pdf>).

The IGT UNC has provisions for metering within the code and since the IGT 022 change was withdrawn we have seen a divergence in the approaches across the IGTs e.g. some have moved away from using the IGT UNC as the baseline/boilerplate opting to enter into commercial agreements, where others have extended the charging statements to cover the same attributes as those with commercial agreements but still see the IGT UNC as the baseline/boilerplate.

These differing approaches are not clearly codified with the IGT and open to differing interpretation leading to it being potentially ambiguous for new entrants and existing parties. We recognise the IGT UNC delivers the starting point and Shippers/Suppliers can choose to utilise this or to enter into bilateral arrangements but the IGT UNC needs to ensure a clear, consistent and deliverable starting point for all.

Entering into commercial agreements has circumnavigated the ambiguous code drafting as it supersedes the baseline/boilerplate. Although it addresses the ambiguity for those parties directly it doesn't address any governance issues which may remain because the ambiguous drafting remains. An example of this is – IGT UNC Section D 3.2(a) lists attributes which are provided in the Metering Charges Statement, this does not explicitly reference early/premature replacement charges, but most charging statements have a section for these. If these charges are recognised to be part of the baseline/boilerplate it needs (as a proposer's view) to be referenced in 3.2(a).

Another example of ambiguous related drafting is the process to be followed where a CoS has occurred and the new Shipper/Supplier no longer wants to work with the current provider, it is clearer in the MAMCoP and RGMA what processes can be followed to remove and return the asset but the IGT UNC doesn't have this rigor which has resulted in different interpretations on what steps parties can follow to either contract for the asset or remove and return but then it is unclear what charges are going to be associated in these scenarios.

When comparing Metering Charges Statements there are different elements within the charging statement and also the way the information is sourced e.g. all IGTs have different templates, different attributes and some are available on their websites where others are upon request only. We see this divergence in approach for Metering Charges Statements which are meant to be codified as inconsistent and something which needs to be reviewed and standardised. As per above attributes listed in 3.2(a) are what are expected to be within the charging statements and as standard each IGT should list these in a consistent way e.g. using the terms as referenced. Should IGTs wish to include more attributes these should be via 3.2(a) then this needs to be transparently cascaded to parties so they can either access the term changes, consider replaying the baseline/boilerplate with contractual arrangements or seeks a new provider.

Currently invoicing for some elements as set out in Metering Charges Statements are directly invoiced via the RPC Invoice Template e.g. pence per day rental, with other elements of the Metering Charges

Statement managed by bespoke invoices outside of the IGT UNC. For those which have contractual agreements this is expected but for those who are using the IGT UNC as the baseline/boilerplate it is inconsistent in approach and is not codified creating a hybrid between approach codified and non-codified. We are not seeking to change the RPC Invoice Template but potentially creation of a clearer approach to what is being invoiced as part of the IGT UNC which could be as simple as an additional paragraph in the current invoicing ancillary document, but we welcome review group discussions on this.

The delivery of Project Nexus and Single Service Provision (SSP) introduced alignment between the processes followed by Large and Small Transporters but it didn't deliver any metering alignments. The evolution of the Retail Gas Metering Arrangements (RGMA) in the Supply Point Administrative Agreement (SPAA), as well as the merging of the Meter Asset Manager Code of Practice (MAMCoP) under SPAA governance has seen significant changes in the landscape of the overall metering model. It is therefore practical to conduct a review of the IGT UNC approach in line with changes which are coming as part of the Retail Energy Code (REC).

The IGT UNC website hosts an RGMA document which is an extract which has been compiled to be the IGTs version of the RGMA deliverables for IGTs who are also a MAM. This is not a recognised codified document and is just hosted on the webpage. It is owned and maintained by the IGTs. This is confusing governance because the RGMA product and is a SPAA deliverable with a document hosted on the IGT UNC webpage (which is not signposted from the SPAA website). This introduces complexities because it is not clear in the IGT UNC what links to this document to confirm it is the baseline/boilerplate. RGMA is clearly a baseline and anything additionally agreed is commercially delivered where the IGT UNC doesn't have this clarity.

Overall this leaves us with the issues to review:

- 1) The IGT UNC doesn't clearly articulate metering obligations which is causing different interpretations of what metering agreements are in code for the baseline/boilerplate
- 2) There are inconsistencies in the items which are included within the Metering Charges Statements and how the information is presented resulting in different approaches between IGTs
- 3) There are no invoicing mechanisms for metering attributes other than pence per day rental where the IGT UNC baseline/boilerplate is followed
- 4) IGTs have created their own RGMA document – should this be included on the IGT UNC website

It would be sensible to ensure that IGT UNC governance relating to metering arrangements including the Meter Charging Statements and the non-codified RGMA document on the IGT UNC website are clearly and robustly articulated with clear codified links to the other arrangements.

Scope

The scope of this review is focussed around the problem statements outlined in the 'why the request is being made' – below questions and point of clarity have been added:

- 1) The IGT UNC doesn't clearly articulate metering obligations which is causing different interpretations of what metering agreements are in code for the baseline/boilerplate
 - a) Do IGTs and Shippers believe that the IGT UNC should contain metering obligations?
 - i. If yes, is the current drafting robust enough

- ii. if no, where should the information be relocated to or is it already covered in existing obligations
 - b) If the obligations remain what do the IGTs expect to be contained within the IGT UNC?
 - c) If the obligations remain what do the Shippers expect to be contained within the IGT UNC?
- 2) There are inconsistencies in the items which are included within the Metering Charges Statements compared to the items listed in Section D 3.2(a) and how the information is presented resulting in inconsistencies between IGTs
 - a) Do the IGTs and Shippers believe that the IGT UNC should contain Metering Charges Statements?
 - b) If the obligations remain what items should be listed in the baseline/boilerplate Metering Charges Statement?
 - c) If the obligations remain should there be a baseline/boilerplate template for the Metering Charges Statement or just a list of attributes which can be included in Section D 3.2(a)?
 - d) If the obligations remain how and when should updates to the Metering Charges Statements be cascaded? E.g. website or email cascading by the IGT
 - e) If the obligations remain where should the Metering Charges Statements be hosted?
- 3) There are no invoicing mechanisms for metering attributes other than pence per day rental for the IGT UNC baseline/boilerplate
 - a) Do the IGTs and Shippers believe that the IGT UNC should invoice all elements of the Metering Charges Statements?
 - b) If the obligations remain how will the invoicing think to the items in the Metering Charges Statement?
 - c) If the obligations remain will the invoicing be incorporated into the RPC template or will a new template be created?
- 4) IGTs have created their own take RGMA – should this be included on the IGT UNC website
 - a) Do the IGTs and Shippers believe that the IGT UNC should host the IGT approach towards RGMA?
- 5) Depending on the outcome to the review of the issues raised make recommendations on next steps.

Proposer's Recommendations

The key objectives are:

- Should the IGT UNC continue to contain metering requirements?

- If yes, review the drafting and ensure it is robust for the current market
- If not recommend option(s) on the way forward via a modification

Additional Information

NA

2 Impacts and Costs

Consideration of Wider Industry Impacts

Initially costs are associated to participating in the review, should the outcome be - there is no requirement for change, then the costs will be relating to the review only.

Should the review outline that changes are to be made then costs will be associated to each recommendation in the sizing of the change as small, medium, large etc. Currently if the governance remains as-is impacts could be none or low, however should it be recognised that new requirements and invoice templates are needed in code this could be medium or large change. Associated costs would differ and can/will be assessed as the workgroup runs, unless the workgroup believes no charges are required then only costs for workgroup related activities e.g. attendance and investigations would apply.

Impacts

Impact on Central Systems and Process	
Central System/Process	Potential impact
UK Link	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No current impact expected as RGMA flows are already rooted to UK Link where applicable and any introduction of new processes or invoicing would be exclusive to the IGT UNC. Unless further analysis provides further information.
Operational Processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No current impact anticipated as no impacts to UK Link expected.

Impact on Users	
Area of Users' business	Potential impact
Administrative and operational	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should the workgroup believe that all drafting is robust and accurate no additional changes to administrative or operational processes would be required. • Should the workgroup identify that drafting is not robust or accurate and amendments are required then changes would be required potentially to legal text, invoice formatting and general working practices. • Should the workgroup identify the removal of the obligations as the recommended action further assessments on the impacts are required.
Development, capital and operating costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should the workgroup believe that all drafting is robust

Impact on Users

	<p>and accurate no additional changes to administrative or operational processes would be required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should the workgroup identify that drafting is not robust or accurate and amendments are required then development and operating costs could be required to deliver things e.g. invoicing amendments and operational process changes to evolve with the chosen solution (subject to mod approval). Should the workgroup identify the removal of the obligations as the recommended action further assessments on the impacts are required.
Contractual risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should the workgroup believe that all drafting is robust and accurate no additional changes to administrative or operational processes would be required. Should the workgroup identify that changes are required it could cause contractual discussions, the IGT UNC Review Group is to focus on the baseline/boilerplate agreement only, anything bespoke would be via bilateral discussions between the IGT (Pipeline Operator) and the Shipper (Pipeline User). Should the workgroup identify the removal of the obligations as the recommended action further assessments on the impacts are required.
Legislative, regulatory and contractual obligations and relationships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should the workgroup believe that all drafting is robust and accurate no additional changes to administrative or operational processes would be required. Should the workgroup identify that changes are required it could cause regulatory changes within the IGT UNC and clearer articulation of the requirements between parties. Should the workgroup identify the removal of the obligations as the recommended action further assessments on the impacts are required.

Impact on Transporters

Area of IGT business	Potential impact
System operation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should the workgroup believe that drafting is robust then there wouldn't be any impact on system operation. Should the workgroup identify that changes are required then system operation maybe impacted for things like invoice generation. Should the workgroup identify the removal of the obligations as the recommended action further assessments on the impacts are required.

Impact on Transporters	
Development, capital and operating costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should the workgroup believe that drafting is robust then there wouldn't be any impact development or operating costs. Should the workgroup identify that drafting is not robust or accurate and amendments are required then development and operating costs could be required to deliver things e.g. invoicing amendments and operational process changes to evolve with the chosen solution (subject to mod approval). Should the workgroup identify the removal of the obligations as the recommended action further assessments on the impacts are required.
Recovery of costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should the workgroup identify/recommend the need for change then any cost recovery will be determined/developed.
Price regulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is not expected that price regulation discussions would be required through this review.
Contractual risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should the workgroup believe that all drafting is robust and accurate no additional changes to administrative or operational processes would be required. Should the workgroup identify that changes are required it could cause contractual discussions, the IGT UNC Review Group is to focus on the baseline/boilerplate agreement only, anything bespoke would be via bilateral discussions between the IGT (Pipeline Operator) and the Shipper (Pipeline User). Should the workgroup identify the removal of the obligations as the recommended action further assessments on the impacts are required.
Legislative, regulatory and contractual obligations and relationships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should the workgroup believe that all drafting is robust and accurate no additional changes to administrative or operational processes would be required. Should the workgroup identify that changes are required it could cause regulatory changes within the IGT UNC and clearer articulation of the requirements between parties. Should the workgroup identify the removal of the obligations as the recommended action further assessments on the impacts are required.
Standards of service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should the workgroup believe that all drafting is robust and accurate no amendments to the standards of service are required. Should the workgroup identify that changes are required then a review of how the changes link to standards of

Impact on Transporters

	<p>service would need to be completed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should the workgroup identify the removal of the obligations as the recommended action further assessments on the impacts are required.
--	--

Impact on Code Administration

Area of Code Administration	Potential impact
Modification Rules	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No impacts anticipated
iGT UNC Panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No impacts anticipated
General administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should the workgroup believe that all drafting is robust and accurate no amendments to general administration are required. Should the workgroup identify that changes are required then a review of how the changes general administration would need to be completed. Should the workgroup identify the removal of the obligations as the recommended action further assessments on the impacts are required.

Impact on Code

Code section	Potential impact
Legal text references to Metering Charges Statements and any metering impacting clauses re invoicing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should the workgroup believe that all drafting is robust and accurate no amendments to code are required. Should the workgroup identify that changes are required then a review of how the changes code would need to be completed. Should the workgroup identify the removal of the obligations as the recommended action further assessments on the impacts are required.

Impact on iGT UNC Related Documents and Other Referenced Documents

Related Document(s)	Potential impact
References to Metering Charges Statement	<p><i>“Metering Charges Statement” means the document if any issued from time to time by the Pipeline Operator which is not the Transportation Statement and which sets out the Pipeline Operator’s charges (if any) for the provision of Supply Meters and other services related to Supply Meters;</i></p> <p><i>“Supply Meter” shall have the meaning in Part D1.2(b);</i></p>

Impact on iGT UNC Related Documents and Other Referenced Documents

	<p><i>the "Supply Meter" is the meter comprised in the Supply Meter Installation;</i></p> <p><i>1.2 For the purposes of the Code, in relation to a Supply Meter Point: (a) the "Supply Meter Installation" is the meter and associated equipment and installations installed or to be installed at a Consumer's premises, including associated pipework, regulator, filters, valves, seals, housings and mountings. A Supply Meter Installation includes any convertor (where installed pursuant to the Gas (Calculation of Thermal Energy) Regulations 1996) and Transporter Daily Read Equipment;</i></p> <p><i>D3.2 (a) – (a) subject to paragraphs (d) and (e) and to Clauses 3.4 and 6.1, the Pipeline Operator will be responsible for securing (at its cost but subject as provided in this paragraph (a)) (on behalf of the Registered User) the installation (in accordance with Clause 2.2), maintenance, repair, exchange and replacement of the Supply Meter Installation or relevant part thereof provided by the Pipeline Operator, within a reasonable time after a request to do so and subject to payment of the charges (if any) in respect of the same provided for in the Transportation Statement or in the Metering Charges Statement;</i></p> <p><i>G6 - Value Added Tax</i></p> <p><i>All amounts expressed as payable by a Pipeline User or the Pipeline Operator pursuant to the Code, and whether the amount thereof is set out in the Code or determined by reference to the Transportation Statement or Metering Charges Statement or otherwise, are exclusive (unless expressly otherwise stated) of any applicable Value Added Tax (and accordingly Value Added Tax shall be paid by the paying party where payable in respect of any such amount).</i></p>
--	--

Other Impacts

Item impacted	Potential impact
---------------	------------------

Security of Supply	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No impacts anticipated
Operation of the Total System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No impacts anticipated
Industry fragmentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No impacts anticipated

3 Terms of Reference

Background

As outlined in the above report this review group request looks to discuss and assess if the drafting of metering in the IGT UNC and the way it links to the Metering Charges Statements is fit for purpose or requires amendments to deliver consistency and to ensure the IGT UNC remains robust.

Topics for Discussion

- Understanding the objective of the review group. This is exclusive to the five areas outlined in the scope of the document;
- Assessment of the most appropriate solution following discussions of the areas of concern;
- Development of Solution (including business rules if appropriate);
- Assessment of potential impacts of the Request on the IGT UNC; and
- Benefit of alignment with UNC.

Outputs

Produce a Review Group Report for submission to the Modification Panel, containing the assessment and recommendations of the Review Group including a draft modification where appropriate.

Composition of Review Group

The Review Group as part of the Workgroup is open to any party that wishes to attend or participate.

A Review Group as part of the Workgroup meeting will be quorate provided at least two Transporter and two User representatives are present.

Meeting Arrangements

Meetings will be administered by Gemserv and conducted in accordance with the Code Administration Code of Practice.

4 Review Group Update

The Workgroup over its meetings discussed the points raised:

- 1) The IGT UNC doesn't clearly articulate metering obligations which is causing different interpretations of what metering agreements are in code for the baseline/boilerplate**

1a) Do IGTs and Shippers believe that the IGT UNC should contain metering obligations?

The review group discussed where metering obligations should be. It was recognised by all that there needed to be backstop metering provisions if there are no commercial agreements in place as an alternative. Some IGTs expressed that they would welcome bilateral metering agreements, but not all IGTs would prefer to offer metering under such agreements. It was recognised that the metering obligations within the code needed to remain as the service provided under the GT Last Resort obligation.

1b) / 1c) If the obligations remain what do the IGTs expect to be contained within the IGT UNC? If the obligations remain what do the Shippers expect to be contained within the IGT UNC?

The review group concluded that no modification is needed to remove the metering obligations from Code. The group instead reviewed what obligations remain and reviewed the attributes listed as part of the “Supply Meter Installation” and “Meter Installation Works” definition and an RFI was issued to IGTs and Shippers to understand the expectations of what was in or out of scope. The group concluded discussions and based on the recommendations of the group, IGT128 has been raised by E.ON to align with these discussions.

2) There are inconsistencies in the items which are included within the Metering Charges Statements compared to the items listed in Section D 3.2(a) and how the information is presented resulting in inconsistencies between IGTs

2a) Do the IGTs and Shippers believe that the IGT UNC should contain Metering Charges Statements?

The group recommended the retention of metering obligations and the requirement for Metering Charges Statements, in line with discussions under question 1a).

2b) / 2c) If the obligations remain what items should be listed in the baseline/boilerplate Metering Charges Statement? If the obligations remain should there be a baseline/boilerplate template for the Metering Charges Statement or just a list of attributes which can be included in Section D 3.2(a)?

The IGTs raised concerns regarding the open forum discussions around the nature and content of the Metering Charges Statement and the commercial nature. They stated that they would be happy to have bilateral discussions with Shippers. Shippers believed that, as the IGT UNC is their contract and contains details of the metering arrangements that link to the Metering Charges Statement the elements within the Metering Charges Statement should be reviewed and discussed (without cost information). Discussions regarding what information from the Metering Charges Statements was needed for the debate reached an impasse that could not be resolved.

However, the review group did carry out an exercise whereby the IGTs shared, and the Code Administrator collated, the attributes that IGTs list within their Metering Charges Statements (please see Appendix 11). There is some consistency over the four IGTs that responded. Individual Shipper(s) have access to the IGT Metering Charges Statements so this analysis could be conducted by Shippers but it was felt more transparent as part of the Review Group to be collated by the Administrator. In addition, the review group members did discuss the inclusion of specific IGT metering services within the IGT UNC to correspond with the Metering Charges Statements but that may have precluded an IGT from offering services that have not been listed within Code. Some members of the group had as part of the review group invited the Proposer to suggest some draft text to address concerns regarding the Metering Charges Statement as it was possible that the text would not be contentious. However, the Proposer agreed that this activity would not be carried out as part of the review group.

As the IGT UNC acts as the contract for Shippers the proposer felt there should be consistency and amendments made to the requirements of the code to align, however, due to the discussions around Metering Charges Statements being unable to progress this element could also not be resolved.

IGTs believed that they had addressed the Proposer's points by providing clarification around User provisions. Changes have been made within two definitions (via IGT128) and an activity was carried out to consider if there was consistency across the Metering Charges Statements, consistency which has not been mandated through any modifications to Code.

Shippers confirmed that the attributes of the Metering Charges Statements are base provisions. Shippers were unable to discuss inconsistencies due to the IGTs deeming the information to be of a commercial nature thus an impasse was reached. Shippers stated that Metering Charges Statements should be consistent but agreed that this has not been mandated through any modification being raised.

2d) /2e) If the obligations remain how and when should updates to the Metering Charges Statements be cascaded? E.g. website or email cascading by the IGT

If the obligations remain where should the Metering Charges Statements be hosted?

2d) /2e) Via the RFI each IGT who responded confirmed how they cascaded their charging statements; whereas some provided it via their website (open source), others chose to provide upon request. In line with the 2b)/2c) discussions, the IGTs felt that the decision was with individual organisations as to how they cascaded updates to their Metering Charges Statements but recognised that Shippers should be made aware of such updates. The group was unable to make recommendations that suited all participants but recommended it was made clear to Shippers how they would be able to obtain a copy from each IGT. The group discussed if the IGT UNC Secretariat could cascade the Metering Charges Statement, but, concluded that the Code Administrator might not have all Shipper contact information and it is not guaranteed that all Shippers work with all IGTs, so from a commercial position each IGT preferred to be responsible for cascading their own statements.

There was no clear preference from the Shippers involved, but it was recognised that it needed to be clear how to obtain the information where necessary.

3) There are no invoicing mechanisms for metering attributes other than pence per day rental for the IGT UNC baseline/boilerplate

3a) / 3b) / 3c) Do the IGTs and Shippers believe that the IGT UNC should invoice all elements of the Metering Charges Statements? If the obligations remain how will the invoicing link to the items in the Metering Charges Statement? If the obligations remain will the invoicing be incorporated into the RPC template or will a new template be created?

Due to the nature of discussions around the Metering Charges Statement the Review Group proposer determined it was difficult to discuss or recommend any changes relating to how attributes of the charging statements were invoiced.

Although there are no issues with how invoices are issued, the Shippers discussed and preferred a common approach to avoid payment delays.

4) IGTs have created their own take RGMA – should this be included on the IGT UNC website

4a) Do the IGTs and Shippers believe that the IGT UNC should host the IGT approach towards RGMA?

The Review Group proposer didn't believe that a shadow RGMA document should be hosted on the IGT UNC website. This is because RGMA is a product of the SPAA and the hosted document is not codified.

IGTs clarified that, as IGT MAMs (rather than providing metering as a supplier MAM), the full suite of RGMA MAM flows were not appropriate for IGT to Shipper metering communication. However, as IGTs voluntarily provide two RGMA-type flows, some Shippers had previously requested a guidance document and for that document to be available on the IGT UNC website. IGTs had facilitated that request and not taken their own approach to RGMA. Although the review group recognised that the document wasn't codified there was no clear preference to either remove or codify the document. The review group determined that, as there was no consensus, they were comfortable for the document to be retained but noted that it should be kept up to date and robust.

Conclusion

Overall the review group in the main concentrated on the definitions which are now being developed as part of IGT128.

Due to commercial concerns raised by the IGTs, some Shippers felt that discussions around the content of the Metering Charges Statement were not concluded, but the Review Group were comfortable that should a Modification be raised it would follow normal change process rules.

Some members of the group had, as part of the review group, invited the proposer to suggest some draft text to address concerns regarding the Metering Charges Statements as it was possible that the text would not be contentious. However, the proposer felt the activity could not be carried out due to the commercial concerns raised as part of discussions (in 2b / 2C) which were raised by the IGTs as part of the Review Group discussions and the challenges posed during the Review Group discussions.

5 Modifications

Potential Modifications needed

The Review Group Proposer submitted modification [IGT128 – Amendments of definitions in D1.2](#) as a result of the findings from the first RG006 review group held on 4th June 2019.

6 Recommendation

Workgroup's Recommendation to Panel

The Workgroup asks Panel to:

Review the outcomes of the Review Group discussions and agree to close the Review Group.

7 Appendix 1

IGT UNC Review of Metering Arrangements:



RFI Reference: RG006

RG006 – Review of metering arrangements in the IGT UNC

Metering Charging Statement – what is included?

1. What is included in your Metering Charging Statement?

Main Category	Category Detail (Y/N and additional comments)
Introduction	3 out of 4
Invoicing Arrangements	4 out of 4
Modification of Gas Metering Charges	3 out of 4
Meter Annual Rental charges pence per day	3 out of 4
Engineer Hire (per day)	3 out of 4
Transactional Charges - Domestic	4 out of 4
Transactional Charges – Larger Diaphragm	3 out of 4
Meter removal by 3 rd party MAM	2 out of 4
Installation of Data Loggers	3 out of 4
Contact Details	3 out of 4
Emergency Service	1 out of 4
Early Termination Charges	3 out of 4
Worked Examples	1 out of 4
How is the Metering Charging Statement made available to Shippers?	Metering Charging Statements (MCS) are made available in different ways by IGTs however the most common answer for this was that (MCS) are available upon request.

Version 1

1