

UNC Workgroup 0467 Minutes
Project Nexus – iGT Single Service Provision; data preparation
Tuesday 28 January 2014
at Consort House, 6 Homer Road, Solihull, B91 3QQ

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Mike Berrisford (Secretary)	(MB)	Joint Office
Adam Pearce*	(AP)	ES Pipelines
Alex Ross-Shaw	(ARS)	Northern Gas Networks
Andy Miller	(AM)	Xoserve
Anne Jackson	(AJ)	SSE
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Colette Baldwin	(CB)	E.ON UK
Dave Mitchell	(DM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Elaine Carr*	(EC)	ScottishPower
James Hill	(JH)	EDF Energy
Jonathan Kiddle	(JK)	EDF Energy
Kristian Pilling	(KP)	SSE
Stephanie Shepherd	(SS)	RWE npower

* via teleconference

A copy of all presentation materials can be found at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0467/280114>

The Workgroup's report is due to be submitted to the UNC Modification Panel on 20 February 2014.

1. Outline of Modification




BF welcomed all to the meeting before handing over to CW / AM to provide an overview of the rationale behind the raising of the modification. AM advised that work with iGTs had been going on in the background to identify missing data and address some field value length issues. The main aim is to place an obligation on each iGT to participate in a data preparation exercise (via CSEP NEXA).

2. Initial Discussion

Responding to a question on whether or not Shippers have a role (direct or indirect) to play in the data preparation event, AM advised that the output from the exercise would take the form of a suite of portfolio reports that would be provided to the Shippers for them to then utilise to prepare their respective databases. He stressed that the modification only seeks to obligate iGTs to take part in the exercise.

Draft Process Model:

iGTs provide data to Xoserve

-  Xoserve provide portfolio report to Shipper
-  Shippers may, or may not choose to validate data
-  Shippers discuss discrepancies with their iGT(s)

In considering the 'Migration activity' diagram in section 9.1 of the iGT Agency Services BRD¹ AM suggested that the testing block aspects have changed somewhat, however the aim remains to build the data preparation system by the end of 2014 and for it to be operational from January 2015. Xoserve will receive data from each iGT and will prepare and transform the data as required, including assigning the new CSEP Id. Shippers will receive portfolio reports throughout the process with a "final" portfolio report being issued to Shippers at cutover.

AM also advised that non effective business days may be required in due course to address potential 'cut-over' related issues.

Moving on, AM indicated that it remains Xoserve's intention to undertake a full AQ review in 2015 and should the industry have a different view, an iGT/UNC modification would need to be raised to prevent this from happening. The expectation at this time is that the new AQs will 'go live' on 01 October 2015.

AM then pointed out that as far as the indicated costs contained within the User Pays table of the modification were concerned, the upper cost prediction has since reduced from the £900k indicated, down to circa £650k. Additionally, a new (non Code User Pays) service schedule would be required in due course and work is ongoing towards this end – it is expected that the schedule would be published for consultation sometime in February.

In briefly discussing how the industry (via Xoserve) would know that the iGTs are NOT meeting their obligation to take part in the data preparation exercise, AP suggested that in his view, it is highly unlikely that the iGTs would not participate. However, concerns remained that the smaller iGTs may find it more difficult to participate in the exercise and therefore meet their obligation. AM then advised that the smaller iGTs had been actively involved in discussions and AP is also liaising with (all) iGTs to ensure 100% participation. AP pointed out that the iGTs are undertaking weekly teleconference meetings to discuss the matter, with an expectation that a project plan would be made available in due course.

As discussions continued, AM confirmed that where there are missing values in the data sample(s), Xoserve would look to input a default (allowable) value, which would be clearly highlighted to the industry as such. He went on to suggest that where there is no MAM (or other types of) data because they are not present in the iGT system(s), then Shippers would be expected to send the missing data to the iGTs for them to input the (missing) values into their system – Shippers can not undertake the updating action of behalf of the iGT(s).

When asked, AM indicated that it is the expectation that the Xoserve portfolio report data extracts should be using the same allowable values as the iGT data source. However, in cases where Xoserve have provided the data item, this will be clearly highlighted. Furthermore, although the portfolio report(s) would not be available until post February time, it is anticipated that an allowable item listing would be provided in due course.

AM went on to explain that some 'key' elements of historical data would be retained for meter read purposes and any functions that utilise historical data would be maintained – it should be noted however, that not all historical data items would be presented within the portfolio reports. When asked how any iGT (historical) data mismatch issues would be addressed, AM suggested that Xoserve propose adopting a 'snapshot' approach at a given point in time, as the expectation is not to retain historical data for the purpose of portfolio reporting per se. He asked parties to note that the iGT Agency Services BRD does not have a reference to holding historical data for portfolio reporting purposes.

¹ A copy of the iGT Agency Services BRD (v2.0) is available to view/download from the Joint Office web site at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/nexus/brd>

Asked whether or not the solution proposes a CND style of historical data retention (especially for market departures), AM was not 100% sure, but did point out that whatever iGT licence obligation for historical data applied, this would be honoured. When asked where she thought this type of retention mechanism might be required, CB suggested it could be needed for retrospective amendment purposes (ref: UNC modification 0434) – AM pointed out that this requirement would only apply to data provided for the Supply Point Register post 01 October 2015.

When asked, AM confirmed that the issue of identifying what file format changes may be required going forward would be undertaken as part of the service schedule development, although it should be noted that this would not include the potential frequencies involved. He went on to advise that an example of the User Pays change would be provided in due course. The business evaluation report had already been published and the next User Pays User Committee (UPUC) meeting is scheduled to take place on Thursday 30 January. In providing a brief explanation of the UPUC processes, he advised that the committee would be required to approve the legal text for the service schedule at some point. He then went on to advise that presently Xoserve are not expecting to utilise the IX for this service schedule, nor would there be any file format created to cover the provision of the portfolio reports – it is expected that this would possibly take the form of an Excel spreadsheet and/or DVD etc (potentially including LMN and CSEP mapping). Furthermore, should a DVD based option be adopted, this would be password protected.

(draft) Legal Text (LDZ CSEP NExA Annex A, Part 14) Review

CW explained the background to the UNC Panel's suggested approach to development and provision of the legal text for the modification.

In considering an actual (extraction) date for submission of the iGT Supply Point Register Data (iGTSPRD) for paragraph 2.1, AM advised that in order to satisfy this initial requirement, there was not one, although extract data dates would be required for subsequent report creation.

Moving on to consider paragraph 2.2, JK suggested that it is highly likely that we would have an Ofgem decision on UNC modifications 0432/0434 before the iGT039 modification was considered by the iGT Panel.

In considering paragraph 2.3, and specifically the proposed [2] day window for the CSO to notify the Transporter Agency of any CSEP transfers, AP agreed to undertake a new action to discuss with the other iGTs and provide a view in time for the next meeting.

CW reminded everyone present that the October 2015 date is 'hardcoded' into UNC modification 0432 legal text and should the implementation slip, a new modification would be needed.

CW then advised that he has some concerns relating to the statement for paragraph 4.1, as it is his view that the true obligation is on the Transporters who then discharge their obligation through their Transporter Agency – he proposes double checking and amending where appropriate.

Concluding, CW advised that if parties indicate that they are happy with the drafting he would seek to either amend the modification (inc. amended legal text if appropriate) once AP (iGTs) provide a view on the proposed [2] business day window in paragraph 2.3.²

² A copy of the legal text for the modification is available to view/download from the Joint Office web site at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0467>

Action 0467 01/01: ESP (AP) to discuss the proposed [2] day window for the CSO to notify the Transporter Agency of any CSEP transfers with the other iGTs and provide a view in time for the next meeting.

Action 0467 01/02: National Grid Distribution (CW) to consider amending the modification (including amended legal text), once feedback from action 0467 01/01 is provided, and also the legal text hopefully in time for consideration at the next meeting.

Draft Workgroup Report Consideration

BF suggested that in recognising that an amended modification (and possibly legal text) is/are required, it might be prudent to consider requesting an extension to the proposed 20 February Panel reporting deadline. The Workgroup agreed to request an extension.

3. Any Other Business

None.

4. Diary Planning

Following a brief discussion it was agreed to add consideration of modification 0467 to the Project Nexus agenda for the 05 February 2014 meeting.

Action 0467 01/03: Joint Office (MB) to ensure that Workgroup 0467 is added to the 05 February 2014 Project Nexus agenda as the 1st Workgroup item for consideration.

Action Table

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
0467 01/01	28/01/14	2.	To discuss the proposed [2] day window for the CSO to notify the Transporter Agency of any CSEP transfers with the other iGTs and provide a view in time for the next meeting.	ESP (AP)	Pending
0467 01/02	28/01/14	2.	To consider amending the modification (including amended legal text), once feedback from action 0467 01/01 is provided, and also the legal text hopefully in time for consideration at the next meeting.	National Grid Distribution (CW)	Pending
0467 01/03	28/01/14	4.	To ensure that Workgroup 0467 is added to the 05 February 2014 Project Nexus agenda as the 1st Workgroup item for consideration.	Joint Office (MB)	Pending