

PROJECT NEXUS DOCUMENT REVIEW FORM

DELIVERABLE DETAILS			
PROJECT NAME: Project Nexus		DOCUMENT NAME: BRD: iGT Agency	
DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION: Business Requirements Document			
DATE: 21 st November 2011		VERSION: 0.4	
AUTHOR: Xoserve		WORKGROUP: PN UNC – iGT Agency Services	
REVIEWER NAME: Various		DATE OF REVIEW: 03/07/2012 – 24/07/2012	
REVIEW DETAILS			
REVIEW MEETING DETAILS: 7 th August 2012			
COMMENTS DUE BACK BY DATE: 24 th July 2012			

No.	Raised By	Document Ref	Comments Received	Workgroup Comments
1	npower	Assumptions 6.1.8	The iGT's take up of this optional service will have a significant impact on realising the benefits of Nexus. This assumption therefore requires a more detailed discussion.	
2	npower	Assumptions 6.1.11	The flexibility required to support multiple iGT charging methodologies will be costly. Xoserve has clearly set the expectations of their stakeholders regarding the costs of flexibility within system developments. Further clarity is required in order to identify relevant costs.	
3	e-on	Section 4 Benefits	We believe an additional Industry Benefit is to provide Shippers with an increased confidence in the accuracy of their Xoserve produced invoices. In particular these changes will provide increased transparency of the makeup of the invoices allowing	

No.	Raised By	Document Ref	Comments Received	Workgroup Comments
			a higher degree of validation.	
4	e-on	Assumptions 6.1.9	For this assumption to be included there must have been data items considered to be held on the GT Sites and Meters database that aren't held on the iGTs database, as it isn't clear to us what these may be, we therefore request that more details are provided.	
5	e-on	General Requirements 8.1.2	<p>We believe it would be beneficial to have a consistent MPRN creation process across the board, continuing with two distinct methods will introduce an increased level of complexity and costs to be borne by Xoserve, and passed through to Shippers. Given the ongoing review of the GT MPRN creation process within the Shipperless and Unregistered Workgroup we feel an opportunity exists to take elements from both existing processes to create a single harmonised and more efficient process.</p> <p>One of the main drivers for the Single Service Provider is to develop consistent processes that reduce industry costs and improve efficiency in administering iGT Supply Meter Points. The current intention to retain these two distinct processes does not facilitate this aim.</p>	
6	e-on	MPRN Set Up – Domestic 8.5	Under current iGT UNC rules the Pipeline Operator is obligated to provide details of any meter installation works within a Meter Fit Report to the Registered User, should this report be provided more than 14	

No.	Raised By	Document Ref	Comments Received	Workgroup Comments
			business days after the installation works were carried out the Transportation Charges will only take effect from the date the Meter Fit Report is received. Given the circumstances of continued meter provision by iGTs, we would expect this rule to continue for iGT provided metering.	
7	e-on	Must Reads 8.9	We would expect to receive the same reports giving the same advanced notice for this process as currently provided by the GTs to notify a Pipeline User of their impending Must Read requirements. This notice period is sufficient for a Supplier to use its own appointed Meter Reading Agency to fulfil its Supply Licence obligations and submit their readings to Xoserve.	
8	e-on	Portfolio Information 8.17.2	Under the current iGT arrangements the cost of Portfolio Reports is recovered through the iGT Transportation Charges, under the existing Xoserve arrangements this cost is recovered through the User Pays charges. We therefore seek assurance that should iGT reporting be incorporated into the existing Xoserve User Pays framework a corresponding cost reduction will be applied to the iGT Transportation Charges.	
9	e-on	Migration Activity 9.1	During the period of data migration from iGT to Xoserve systems it will be necessary for a detailed migration plan to be agreed between all parties. This should include the management of “in-flight work” and provide clear detail on the impact to Change of Supplier activity which we accept may need to be	

No.	Raised By	Document Ref	Comments Received	Workgroup Comments
			halted for a period of time.	
10	EDF Energy	6.1.2.4	There can be more than 1 developer per site. Therefore each developer could choose a different supplier.	
11	EDF Energy	6.1.3 & 8.1.3	The transportation charges can only be charged from installation date on a site where the IGT is also the MAM if the IGT has provided the meter details within 15 working days. If this has not been provided then the charges can only apply from the date of the second meter fit report if the first meter fit report is rejected.	
12	EDF Energy	8.3.5	What happens with these reports? Is there any incentive for them to be worked? What happens when the AQ goes above 100%? Will the site be charged at the actual AQ?	
13	EDF Energy	8.5.2 & 8.5.3	this seems like a very long winded process which could break down if a party doesn't communicate quickly enough. Wouldn't it be easier for all information to flow through the xoserve?	
14	EDF Energy	8.5.5	How will the appointment of the MAM take place?	
15	EDF Energy	8.10.4	This method cannot be adopted for all sites. It can only be adopted if the prices were originally set up with the date of meter installation. If the date of connection is used the prices have to be the same each banded property on the site. Otherwise this can be considered a nest and charged differently.	

No.	Raised By	Document Ref	Comments Received	Workgroup Comments
16	EDF Energy	8.14	Will EOMRs be charged for in the new system? As the same system is used the current reason of system costs is no longer valid for EOMR charges.	
17	British Gas	Benefits	Note: Version 0.2 of BRD. Include the following benefits: significant cost savings (operational and system) from having a single interface for various industry processes, consistency in service levels across all meter points, centralised data storage should result in increased data accuracy and quality.	
18	British Gas	Risks & Issues	Note: Version 0.2 of BRD. 6.3.3 A ratchet charge type arrangement could be used. 6.3.6 Use of the NEXA table would ensure consistency across the market 6.3.9 Reliant on the output from the MPRN creation workgroup review of the current process	
19	British Gas	Supply Point Register	Note: Version 0.2 of BRD. 8.3.6 Apply a Ratchet charge arrangement with subsequent ability for CSEP to have an "AQ Appeal" to amend the maximum AQ going forward. 8.3.18 Preference that this is provided by Xoserve to ensure consistency.	
20	IPL	Must Reads	Don't currently provide a Must Read service	
21	IPL	8.5.2	This would imply the IGT via Xoserve needs to inform the shipper of when the planned gas offtake is to take place. I do not believe we (IPL) currently do this and	

No.	Raised By	Document Ref	Comments Received	Workgroup Comments
			<p>this is not something we are set up to provide as would involve the passing on of UIP job details. We receive weekly where abouts but I can't at present see how this would fit in with our operational processes so don't believe we could support this being included in the BRD.</p> <p>I would also query whether the bulk confirmation for new sites should be something that Xoserve should do on our behalf as is intrinsically linked to the project set up phase. For IPL, meter fit jobs etc are all linked to this confirmation and we all too often have to chase up shippers for the PSR confirmation so the jobs can be raised and fitted that same day – if we were having a daily update file from Xoserve, this could cause delays/issues in this area. It may be that we need to discuss/map out in more detail the cut over point from project set up within the IGT to where Xoserve start operational procedures so we can come to a collective decision on this.</p>	
22	GTC	8.5.2	<p>I would agree with Gethyn's comments. I think that the initial/bulk registration should be an activity carried out by the iGTs. I believed that we had agreed this at the workshops and that the projects would be transferred to Xoserve after that point. Otherwise we are in danger of losing control of an efficient process and having meters installed on shipper-less sites.</p>	

No.	Raised By	Document Ref	Comments Received	Workgroup Comments
23	GTC	6.1.2	The assumption is around the developer contracting with a UIP. Is this solely included because it is a concern around the mis-match concerning the UIP requesting the CSEP connection and the iGT eventually owning the CSEP. The issue being that the reference numbers do not tie up and the subsequent iGT nominations are rejected, or should we include that the developer can also contract directly with the iGT for the gas connection?	Response from Xoserve: 6.1.2. is just setting out the arrangements, it would be better if it was in a "background" section or similar. The comment is not driving requirements its just to give the wider picture.