

iGT Single Service Provision Mod 440 Sub Group

Teleconference – 21st May 2013

Meeting Minutes

Attendees

Andy Miller (Xoserve)	Anne Jackson (SSE Supply)
Michael Payley (Xoserve)	Elaine Carr (Scottish Power)
Paul Orsler (Xoserve)	Andrea Bruce (Scottish Power)
Ruth Burden (National Grid)	Trevor Peacock (Fulcrum Pipelines Ltd)
Grahame Neale (National Grid)	Gethyn Howard (GTC)
Tabish Khan (British Gas)	Adam Pearce (ESP Pipelines)
Andrew Rowcliffe (British Gas)	

Minutes

1. Introductions

- 1.1 Opening the meeting MP explained the purpose was to provide updates and agree resolutions to outstanding issues before baselining the process maps and the updated version of the IGT Agency Services BRD at the next available MOD440 / IGT MOD 39 meeting, allowing these changes to be presented back to the industry at PNUNC.

2. Review of Actions and Issues

- 2.1 MP explained that Xoserve has now placed all of the agreed assumptions in either the assumption section of the BRD or in the requirements section, wherever the assumption is most appropriate. MP also stated that 1 action remained outstanding regarding the process of effectively cancelling an incorrectly set up CSEP. It was noted that the requirements in the BRD are at a sufficient level to allow for the process and the detail will be developed (with the industry) in the lower level processes.
- 2.2 An action for GH was reviewed regarding the changing of a market sector code (MSC) during the change of shipper (COS) process. GH expressed the view of GTC which again confirmed that they were unhappy to allow the change as they have had examples of this in the past and the property usage has been found to be incorrect. GH proposed that it would be preferable to allow the COS to go through 'as-is' and then retrospectively change the MSC. However there was strong opposition to this from the workgroup, in particular it was noted that license agreements would prevent a shipper from obtaining sites that were of a different MSC to that which their license allowed. The debate continued where AP and CH stated that they are aware of only 1 incident of the MSC change during COS process occurring in the past and therefore they felt it would be prudent to adopt the same process as GT's. On the matter AM stated that an exception report could be provided to an IGT, which would provide the information they required to challenge any MSC that did not match what they had previously held against a property. A mop-up process could then be used between the IGT and the Shipper to clarify the property MSC.

- 2.3 Following this discussion MP confirmed that the requirements for the change of MSC had been captured in the latest version of the BRD.
- 2.4 MP then went on to ask if any of the attendees had any other business. GH raised the question as to what the benefits of sending a pre notification of meter install ahead of the confirmation process. From an IGT perspective, there appears to be no benefit of this notification. It was felt that by better controls on any variations on CSEP developments in terms of changes to shippers or changes to number of MPRN's would ensure meters were only fitted with shipper/supplier knowledge.
- 2.5 Shippers felt uncomfortable with there being no pre notification of meter installation (between the PSR being agreed and the meter install occurring). They felt that it removed the ability to object to any meters being assigned to a shipper incorrectly. A Possible solution was proposed by AM which would provide a pre notification ahead of auto confirmation of a meter point to the assigned shipper.
- 2.6 A discussion arose regarding the responsibilities of various organisations in terms of selling part of a development to a new shipper, how PSR's are updated and how information on the progress of developments can be obtained. It was agreed that these matters needed to be discussed between the relevant organisations and were not matters that should be discussed during these workshops.
- 2.7 Concerns were raised by shippers that the auto confirmation process would not allow them time to object if they were incorrectly assigned to a meter point. AM again stated that the pre notification of auto confirmation would allow shippers a period of time [15 days] to prevent the confirmation from going live, a query could be raised with the IGT and Xoserve would wait for a relevant update before progressing the confirmation, alternatively the meter point could be created again and the PSR would be updated to reflect a new shipper assigned to the meter point. It was felt that this process was ultimately the most appropriate for all parties.
- 2.8 MP took an action to update the process maps where necessary.
- 2.9 Another matter raised by AJ was that there is confusion as to what the flows from Xoserve to the Shipper / Xoserve to the Supplier represented (Step 19 on the iGT MAM process model). After some discussion it was confirmed that the requirement was for these two flows to be sent simultaneously to the shipper and the supplier, and that both flows should be in RGMA ONJOB format.
- 2.10 A further point was raised that not all Distribution Networks (DNs) had not been present at this meeting and they needed to be aware of the changes to the DN processes and systems. AM stated that the purpose of this sub workgroup was to gather the appropriate detail to accurately capture requirements ahead of a latest version being baselined and issued to the industry including the DNs. MP went on to say that following the T-Con, changes would be made to the process maps and BRD (where necessary). The latest version (1.3) would be issued in advance of the forthcoming Mod 440 and IGT Mod 039 workgroup meetings, with the aspiration of getting baseline approval. The BRD and process maps will be shared with all of the attendees in the workgroup, will be made available in the public domain (Joint Office website) and will be sent to DNs.
- 2.11 No further points were raised.