

Modification 0440 Project Nexus iGT Single Service Provision

A report provided to the Modification 440 Workgroup for inclusion in the relevant Modification Report.

Deleted: iGT Agency Services pre-modification consultation report¶

¶
A report provided to Ofgem in support of the gas industry iGT Agency Services initiative as defined under modifications iGT 039 and GT 0440.¶

Draft version 17th November 2013 for Mod 0440 Workgroup November 2013.

Deleted: <http://www.igt-unc.co.uk/Modifications/Open+Modifications/iGT039DG>¶

¶
<http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0440>¶

Deleted: 24

Deleted: April

Deleted: iGT 039 meeting 26th

Deleted: April

Deleted: Still to be written.¶

Executive summary

The Shipper and Supplier businesses have set out a positive case for a single agent to provide the “common” services defined in GT and iGT UNC’s e.g. change of supplier, supply point register etc. The GTs and iGTs are committed to establishing this single agent arrangement and GT and iGT UNC modifications have been raised to give effect to this. Xoserve has included the industry requirements in its UK Link replacement programme and is undertaking the systems development work.

The first iGT agency services modification to be presented to a Modification Panel and then on to consultation and submission to Ofgem is Modification 0440. This modification requires the inclusion of a business case. The industry has been consulted on the costs and benefits of the single service provision and this report has been prepared for inclusion in the modification report.

The industry identified benefits of:

- one off £2,140,000 – £3,740,000
- annual £5,610,000 – £6,915,000

Deleted: ¶
Benefits identified:¶

Xoserve has identified costs of:

Systems development £4,000,000 - £8,000,000

Data preparation £400,000 - £650,000

Some qualitative cost areas have been identified by Shippers, and iGTs in the consultation process.

If the costs and benefits are considered over a 5 year recovery there is a positive benefits case of between £25,790,000 and £37,665,000.

This report may be referenced by other related modifications.

Deleted: ¶
Costs identified¶
<#>either insufficient information provided or information not made available to Xoserve ¶

Deleted: iGT

Deleted: Agency Services

Contents

Formatted: Font: Bold

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Overview of the iGT agency services initiative
- 3. iGT overview
- 4. Consultation approach and response summary
- 5. Cost benefit case summary

Deleted: Agency Services

Deleted: Next steps

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Appendix 1 The original consultation document for reference

draft 0440 mtg Nov 13

Deleted: iGT

Deleted: Agency Services

1. Introduction

This report has been prepared to assess the business case in support of the Modification 0440 Project Nexus iGT Single Service Provision.

Deleted: iGT Agency Services initiative.

The industry aspiration is that the iGT services mirror those of the GT services with regards to the scope of services provided by Xoserve. The industry has been developing the requirements for iGT Single Service Provision. Xoserve commenced systems analysis work in February 2013 in anticipation of this (and other) modification being implemented. In order to enable Xoserve (and others) to commit funds and commence systems / process development in a timescale that meets a 2015 delivery, a business case consultation was completed in March 2013 to provide a confidence factor to the eventual outcome of the modification.

Deleted: Agency Services

Deleted: and

Deleted: is expecting to

Deleted: The supporting modifications to the GT UNC and iGT UNC are not expected to be concluded until later in 2013.

Deleted: has been

Deleted: s

A modification to the iGT UNC has also been raised – iGT 039 Use of a single Gas Transporter agency for the common services and systems and processes required by the iGT UNC.

In summary, GT modification 0440 creates the arrangements between the GTs and iGTs to enable Single Service Provision, and iGT modification 039 creates the scope of the work in the iGT UNC to be performed by the Agent (Xoserve). It is expected there will be a licence condition equivalent to the GT Standard Special A15 condition, requiring the iGTs to use an agent for the performance of the common services.

The consultation document for the agency services initiative as a whole (mods 0440 and 039) is shown in Appendix 1.

This report may be referenced by other modifications related to the agency services initiative.

Note: Xoserve has provided (in 2011 based upon the requirements as known at the time) a high level cost estimate of £20m for the suite of Nexus modifications; 0432 - Project Nexus Gas Demand Estimation, Allocation, Settlement and Reconciliation Reform, 0434 – Project Nexus Retrospective Adjustment and 0440 Project Nexus iGT Single Service Provision, for delivery as a single change. However, as requested by Ofgem, Xoserve has provided a “stand alone” cost for each modification for the purpose of completing the modification development. There are a number of economies of scale for the development / implementation of Nexus requirements as a single change over deliver as discreet individual changes. For example, each stand alone cost includes its project management costs. If the suite of functionality is to be delivered as one change the project management costs are more economical. The same principle is true for Shippers for example; they only need to incur one industry testing cost rather than several.

For the iGT agency services initiative as a stand alone delivery, Xoserve provided a cost range of £4m - £8m.

2. Overview of the iGT agency services initiative

Deleted: Agency Services

Xoserve will provide a range of services on behalf of iGTs to the gas industry. This includes the provision of a single supply point register containing all iGT and GT supply points against which Shipper activities with iGTs, GTs and between

Deleted: iGT

Deleted: Agency Services

Shippers can be transacted regardless of GT type, e.g. the change of supplier processes, meter asset updates, meter read submissions etc. Standard file formats will be used for all transactions, modifications will be required to accommodate some additional data needed to support iGT supply points, but from a Shipper perspective there will be a single interface with Xoserve for transactions regardless of GT type.

The iGTs will retain the transportation invoicing activity (calculation and submission to Shippers). There is no change to the GT and iGT transportation charging principles as a result of this modification.

The full scope of the services is shown in [Appendix 1](#).

3. iGT Overview

There are 10 iGT licences in operation with live CSEPs.

Deleted: [

Deleted:]

There are 5iGT organisations under which are operated the 10 iGT licences.

There are approximately 40,000 CSEPs, of which 4,500 are nested.

There are approximately 1,500,000 supply meter points within the 40,000 CSEPs.

Deleted: 491

23 shipper organisations ship to supply meter points on CSEPs.

The shipper respondents to the consultation are responsible for shipping to approximately 98% of the supply meter points on all CSEPs.

4. Consultation approach and response summary

The consultation document was prepared with the industry at the Nexus Workgroup, Mod 0440 and Mod 039 workgroup meetings. Ofgem agreed to support the process and agreed to provide a statement to the industry on its views of the results of the consultation exercise.

Deleted: PN UNC

The consultation document was issued to the industry on 26th November via the Joint Office website distribution lists, with notifications provided at other industry fora of the consultation. Written responses were requested to be provided by 18th January.

The following organisations provided a written response to the consultation:

Shipper organisations:

[British Gas](#)
[EDF Energy*](#)
[Eon](#)
[Npower](#)
[Scottish and Southern Energy](#)
[Scottish Power](#)

iGT organisations
- ESP Pipelines

Deleted: ¶
To be completed¶

Deleted: iGT

Deleted: Agency Services

- Fulcrum Pipelines
- SSE Pipelines
- GTC (also now representing Inexus)*

*responses provided directly to Ofgem, any financial information provided by these organisations has not been provided to Xoserve nor is it included in this report.

In addition, a draft of the report was presented to the iGT 039 and Nexus Workgroups in April 2013 where all Shipper and Transporter organisations present confirmed support for the iGT agency services initiative.

The responses provided have been sufficient to develop the cost benefit case in section 5. In addition a number of shippers provided additional benefit areas to those described in the consultation document.

- Deleted: [
- Deleted: PN UNC
- Deleted: [include link to JO website for minutes] and
- Deleted: ed
- Deleted: Agency Services
- Deleted:]

4.1 Shipper responses summary

All Shipper respondents supported the principle of the iGT agency services arrangements.

Deleted: Agency Services

All Shipper respondents identified overall benefits to the iGT agency services arrangements.

Deleted: Agency Services

Two shipper respondents expressly stated that the iGT agency services arrangements should be in place before or with the other Nexus functionality (settlement products, periodic AQ) is implemented, rather than afterwards, and provided cost and benefit information to support this.

Deleted: Agency Services

4.2 iGT responses summary

All iGT respondents supported the principle of the iGT agency services arrangements.

Deleted: Agency Services

All iGT respondents have been actively involved in the development of the arrangements through the Project Nexus UNC Workgroup, iGT modification 039, GT modification 0440 and meetings with the GTs and Xoserve to develop requirements.

One iGT set out its case around the licence obligations under which iGT operate, particularly that they must operate in an economic and efficient manner.

The consultation document and the BRDs demonstrate that the extent of iGT services would be extended under the iGT agency services arrangements to cater for the requirements of shipper / supplier organisations e.g. to allow the settlement products to apply to the CSEP. All iGT respondents highlighted that the beneficiaries of the iGT Agency services arrangements would be the shipper / supplier organisations.

Deleted: Agency Services

Deleted: Agency Services

Two iGT respondents drew attention to the present funding arrangements of the iGTs and that this did not provide a mechanism to recover additional costs placed upon them by the wider industry.

Deleted: iGT

Deleted: Agency Services

All iGT respondents stated the position that they must remain cost neutral in the iGT agency services arrangements, this would include costs they incur in the following areas:

Deleted: Agency Services

- stranded systems
- development of new systems to allow the interfaces with Xoserve to be effective
- the migration to the new arrangements
- any new requirements for which the beneficiaries are other than iGTs

A number of iGTs referenced the information provided by Xoserve in the consultation document with regards to an illustrative ongoing cost for administering the iGT agency services of £1 per supply point. The consultation document made reference to the issues that the source for this funding is yet to be determined. One iGT respondent considered their operational costs were significantly lower than the illustrative figure provided by Xoserve, again reinforcing the point that if such costs were applied to the iGT, the iGT could not demonstrate operating in an “efficient and economic manner”.

Deleted: Agency Services

A number of iGTs responded that they would still be required to perform a number of services and maintain systems to support these, for example invoicing, shipper registration, query resolution.

One iGT highlighted they would incur additional costs associated with the management of the third party service provider (Xoserve), both in the establishment of arrangements e.g. contract development, and the ongoing relationship management.

A number of iGTs highlighted that an IX communication is required to enable efficient communications with Xoserve. Whilst this may also be used for communications with shippers e.g. invoice submission, it was another area of costs associated with the iGT Agency arrangements for which the iGTs should be cost neutral.

A number of iGTs considered that there must be an acceptable outcome to the Ofgem Funding Governance and Ownership review of Xoserve that does not create additional risks for iGT Agency services arrangements.

Deleted: Agency Services

5. Cost benefit case summary

The information provided in the consultation is set out below in order to provide context to the cost benefit case summary.

From the consultation document:

“Xoserve has provided a high level estimate of the cost of UK Link systems development to deliver the Nexus Programme requirements (which includes the iGT agency services) of circa £20m. There is potential that there may be system impacts beyond UK Link, and costs associated with those systems (for example, Gemini) are not included in this estimate.

Deleted: Agency Services

Ofgem has requested that this overall £20m figure is disaggregated and a value provided for each of the UNC modifications, enabling a business case for each

Deleted: iGT

Deleted: Agency Services

modification to be assessed. This has been done and for the purposes of this iGT agency services consultation the Xoserve developments costs are in the range £4m - £8m.

Deleted: Agency Services

With regard to ongoing costs, to enable the industry to understand the scale of Xoserve ongoing costs for the provision of iGT Agency services Xoserve has assessed the services and broad cost areas for the provision of services on behalf of the Distribution Networks and scaled this accordingly to the services Xoserve will provide on behalf of the iGTs.

Deleted: Agency Services

The assessment has indicated a cost of £1.00 per supply point per annum for the provision of the “common” services that are provided on behalf of the Distribution Networks. Based upon 1,500,000 iGT supply points this would equate to a cost of £1.5m. However, it does not necessarily follow that the addition of 1.5m supply points to a supply point register already holding 21.5m supply points would result in an increase in costs of £1.5m. This is because that, assuming UK Link is replaced with all Nexus requirements incorporated (cost estimate £20m for Nexus) it will be built for 23-24m supply points. However, the current system is being replaced and will cater for a range of new requirements and will be handling more data and processing a greater number of transactions so a like for like comparison is not possible.

It is probably prudent to proceed with an assumed ongoing cost of £1.5m pa for the provision of iGT agency services in order to move forward the benefits case discussion.

Deleted: Agency Services

Please note that the cost figures are provided for the purpose of establishing the industry-wide cost benefit case, how (and from whom) it is funded is still to be determined.”

Shipper respondents were able to provide financial information for some of the areas listed in the consultation. Ofgem hold the details of each shipper’s financial data. For the purpose of this report the Shipper benefits and costs data provided to Xoserve has been aggregated and then an extrapolation exercise has been conducted to establish a total Shipper position. This exercise has only been conducted for the Shippers that responded (not all Shippers provided financial information for all the areas). Any cost benefit for the remaining 17 Shipper organisations has not been assessed, it is considered the benefits described by the respondents apply to all Shippers so there may be more benefits than those described below.

Not all financial information provided by Shippers was used, for example one Shipper described benefits that would be accrued from the new Nexus settlement products, these benefits were attributable to the settlement products not iGT agency services initiative (although it is accepted that iGT agency services better facilitates this for iGT supply points) and were therefore excluded.

Deleted: Agency Services

Deleted: Agency Services

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.63 cm

Deleted: iGT

Deleted: Agency Services

5.1 Benefits

Benefit area from consultation	Benefit range one off £000’s	Benefit range ongoing per annum £000’s
--------------------------------	------------------------------	--

Single interface to Xoserve as the “agent” regardless of GT type.	340 - 640	2,000 – 2,600
Common business rules and processes / processing regardless of GT type.	1,800 – 3,100	3,300 – 3,800
Future change would be a single change to systems regardless of GT type	Included in above figures	Included in above figures
Greater visibility of iGT and GT charges	Included in above figures	Included in above figures
Will more easily support smart metering arrangements	Included in above figures	Included in above figures
Governance of GT and iGT services will be in a single place	Included in above figures	Included in above figures
Other benefit areas identified	E.g. reduced training requirements, reduced time preparing process descriptions, quality control documents etc.	310 - 515
Total	2,140 – 3,740	5,610 – 6,915

5.2 **Costs**

Formatted: Font: Bold

Some areas of costs were identified by Shippers and iGTs although the information was consistent enough to develop an extrapolation.

5.2.1 Shipper observations

Shippers will need to migrate data from existing “offline” systems to “core” systems and decommission “offline” systems. “Core” systems changes would also be required to accommodate the new services.

5.2.2 iGT observations

Deleted: iGT

Deleted: Agency Services

iGTs would incur costs for:

- systems changes to move to the agency services arrangements
- stranded systems development
- IX connection
- implementation costs e.g. development of the commercial regime

5.3 Additional Xoserve costs identified after the draft consultation report presented in April 2013

During the analysis phase Xoserve identified a new requirement to prepare the iGT data to enable the agency services transactions e.g. change of supplier etc. This is an additional cost and funding is being sought from Shippers for this activity. The cost estimate for this work is in the range of £400k - £650k.

5.4 Cost benefit assessment

The industry identified benefits of:

- one off £2,140,000 – £3,740,000
- annual £5,610,000 – £6,915,000

Xoserve has identified costs of:

Systems development £4,000,000 - £8,000,000
Data preparation £400,000 - £650,000

If the costs and benefits are considered over a 5 year recovery there is a positive benefits case of between £25,790,000 and £37,665,000.

The costs were provided in 2010 and the benefits provided in 2013. The time value of the money (2010 – 2013) is not considered material to the business case for this modification.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.63 cm

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.27 cm, Tabs: 1.9 cm, List tab + Not at 1.27 cm

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.63 cm

draft 0420 mtg Nov 13

Deleted: iGT

Deleted: Agency Services

Shipper response commentary summary			
Organisation	Benefit area	Benefit type	Shipper responses
Shipper / Supplier	System / Process	Single interface to Xoserve as the “agent” regardless of GT type.	<p>Shipper respondents suggested the following:</p> <p>Issues with current arrangements regarding interactions with iGTs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bespoke applications, processes and interfaces for each iGT organisation have to be maintained - There is a high degree of manual processes e.g. to attach / detach files to email communications. - These arrangements lead to a high degree of data quality issues, risk to the shipper / supplier business and dissatisfaction for the end consumer. <p>These issues were considered to be resolved as a result of the iGT Agency Services initiative.</p> <p>The iGT Agency Services initiative, with the single interface regardless of GT type, would provide benefits in areas of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reduction in operational costs - standard processes for all supply points (one set of systems, controls etc) leading to more efficient operations - improved data quality, quick data issue resolution - improved service to the end consumer <p><u>It was noted that differences in the M Number Creation process would continue under the iGT Agency Services initiative due to the different nature of the iGT and GT businesses.</u></p> <p>In addition it was noted that without iGT Agency Services the proposed changes and benefits created by modification 432 Project Nexus Gas Settlement Reform, could not be achieved efficiently for iGT supply points e.g. use of the new Class types, rolling AQ etc.</p>

Deleted: iGT

Deleted: Agency Services

		<p>Common business rules and processes / processing regardless of GT type.</p>	<p>Shipper respondents suggested the following:</p> <p>Current arrangements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whilst business rules are already similar the processes for iGT supply points are manually intensive - Shippers reported different performance between Xoserve (on behalf of the GTs) and iGTs for example read submission rejections are higher (in proportion) on iGT supply point than on GT supply points, the same discrepancy occurs in the AQ amendment processes <u>although for 2014 AQ review the iGT processes match the GT processes.</u> - <u>The iGT portfolio does not appear to match the portfolio data provided by the iGTs to the GTs for allocation and GT charging, leading to mis-allocation of costs. <u>The estimated extent of the supply point mis-match between data used for iGT and GT billing is reported at the iGT:GT:Shipper:Xoserve industry meeting and updates are provided to the Gas Forum. The most recent update to the Gas Forum included the following information for supply point mismatch (the figures show the numbers of supply points used by the iGTs for iGT transportation billing are greater than the numbers of supply points provided by the iGT to the GT for GT transportation billing);</u></u> - • <u>Mismatch Nov 2012:- 25,712 (1.72%)</u> • <u>Mismatch Dec 2012:- 25,736 (1.71%)</u> • <u>Mismatch Jan 2013 :- 23,913 (1.58%)</u> <p>Benefit areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - With one organisation managing processes to consistent rules (regardless of GT type) Shippers should receive consistent performance - With Xoserve holding the “master” data set of iGT supply points there will cease to be a discrepancy between supply point numbers that will be used for allocation, iGT and GT charging. - Opening reads will be treated the same regardless of GT type, it is therefore expected that iGTs will not be charging for estimated opening meter readings, in the same way the GT does not charge
--	--	--	---

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Deleted: ¶

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Deleted: iGT

Deleted: Agency Services

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The bespoke processes and systems e.g. spreadsheets, email etc for iGT services would not be required - Numbers of processes are reduced. Process controls and process descriptions are improved and staff training becomes easier and more effective. Fewer “exception” rules to be learnt and applied. - Current GT AQ process is more efficient than iGT process, new post Nexus process expected to be better still. Single AQ process regardless of GT type will bring benefits. - Increased visibility of MPRNs comprised within the CSEP, expected more accurate portfolio match between our records and iGT records. - Common business processes for settlement for example will reduce delays in reconciliation. A central location for data would reduce time for obtaining data for analysis. - The customer is often impacted by the manual and varying nature of iGT processes and Suppliers impacted by reworking errors further increasing costs. <p>In addition it was noted that without iGT Agency Service the processes needed to meet the changes and achieve benefits created by modification 432 Project Nexus Gas Settlement Reform, could not be achieved efficiently for iGT supply points e.g. rolling AQ services etc.</p>
		<p>Future change would be a single change to systems regardless of GT type</p>	<p>Shipper respondents suggested the following:</p> <p>Current arrangements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Shippers systems have to manage both iGT and GT supply points. The business rules for iGT and GT supply points are not consistent leading to Shippers essentially having bespoke systems and processes for each iGT. One change to the iGT UNC leads to multiple system changes for Shippers. - The iGT and GT business rules differ e.g. SSP AQ Amendment tolerances, <u>although in this example the rules are aligned for the 2014 AQ review.</u> - The iGT and GT business rules change independently of each other. <p>Benefit areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reduced cost of system and process change - change is easier / quicker to complete

Deleted: .

Deleted: iGT

Deleted: Agency Services

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process controls are improved and staff training becomes easier. - <u>Process alignment for iGT and GT services.</u>
Wholesale gas market	Greater visibility of iGT and GT charges	<p>Shipper respondents suggested the following:</p> <p>Current arrangements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - iGTs maintain their own supply point register (or similar) as the basis for their transportation billing to shippers - GT charges to the CSEP are calculated using aggregate data provided by the iGT. - There is evidence that the two data sets do not match and no supply point reconciliation is conducted. If the data for the CSEP is not accurate this can lead to misallocated energy amongst Shipper parties. <p>Benefit areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As one data set will be being used for both iGT and GT purposes there will be no further misallocation of energy at the CSEP. <p>In addition it was noted that without iGT Agency Services the processes needed to meet the changes and achieve benefits created by modification 432 Project Nexus Gas Settlement Reform, could not be achieved efficiently for iGT supply points e.g. use of the settlement products etc.</p>
	Will more easily support smart metering arrangements	<p>Shippers considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - with Xoserve holding both iGT and GT supply point registers any tracking / progress reporting to industry parties will be undertaken efficiently - the iGT Agency Services arrangements will provide one interface and common file formats for the millions of asset exchanges to be undertaken, this making the update of smart metering information more efficient. - <u>One Shipper responded that without the use of a single service provider, iGT meter points will not be settled on a daily basis (products 2 and 3 in Nexus). This means demand reduction (estimated at 5%*) made by our customers will not be reflected in our charges for gas consumption until approximately a</u>

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Deleted: Wi

Deleted: iGT

Deleted: Agency Services

			year later. (*Oxford Economics report on ‘The Value of Smart Metering to Great Britain’)
	Customer service		<p>Shippers considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Currently the key touch points of a customer experience have bespoke processes unique to the iGT which can lead to delay and confusion. - the iGT Agency Services arrangements would lead to more efficient internal processes, controls and data accuracy leading to improved customer service, including change of supplier and billing activities - Single systems and processes would reduce the training requirement for staff - Closer tracking on the cost to serve and increased cost reflectivity. <p><u>Ofgem has some information to provide on whether shippers/suppliers apply a surcharge to end consumers to cover the additional administrative costs of operating a supply point on an iGT network.</u></p>
	Other benefit areas		
iGT	Operations	Reduced “front-office” operations. Minimal impact for any future changes in functionality, transaction volumes etc	<p>Shippers considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - should improve iGT processes - <u>The current issues with the larger supply point reconciliation process will cease to exist</u>

Deleted: -
Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Deleted: iGT
Deleted: Agency Services

Xoserve	Operations	Remove current CSEP operations processes	<p>Shippers considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - should improve processes and reduce resource costs <u>e.g. the larger supply point reconciliation process will be automated.</u> - <u>The offline system and associated support will not be required as this will be handled by UK Link systems</u> - <u>The various workgroups and the provision of supporting information will not be required</u>
Industry wide	Governance	Governance of GT and iGT services will be in a single place	Expected reduction in costs for supporting industry meetings and the industry change processes. Effectively there will be one Code document covering the majority of “common” services.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Shippers	Implementation	Cost of systems development	Costs for system development and industry data cleansing.
		Costs if iGT Agency services is delivered before Settlement Reform	<p>The optimum solution is the single service delivery outputs align with settlement reform delivery timescales.</p> <p>There would be a benefit if some iGT processes were able to be delivered before full roll-out, provided these were not further impacted by later changes.</p> <p>We feel it would be more beneficial to have a single service in place before settlement reform takes place</p>
		Costs if iGT Agency services is delivered after Settlement	<p>Less benefit in terms of AQ – shippers will have to run two processes.</p> <p>We anticipate this would generate additional IT change/cost internally</p>

Deleted: iGT

Deleted: Agency Services

		Reform	
	Ongoing costs		
iGTs	Investment	Stranded costs of existing systems development	
	Ongoing costs	System costs to extract key data for Xoserve and maintain core business data	
GTs			
Xoserve	System investment	Part of the £20m Nexus functionality costs	
	Ongoing costs	£1.00 per supply point	
Other comments			

draft 0440 mtg Nov 13

Deleted: iGT
Deleted: Agency Services

draft 0440 mtg Nov 13

Deleted: iGT

Deleted: Agency Services

Scope of iGT Agency Services.

The table below details the scope of services and where differences in iGT and GT processes may exist.

<u>Lifecycle activities</u>	<u>Additional notes</u>
<u>1 iGT lifecycle</u>	
<u>1.1 iGT migration to new arrangements</u>	
<u>1.2 New iGT to new arrangements</u>	
<u>1.3 iGTs merge / de-merger / sell all or some portfolio</u>	
<u>1.4 iGT goes out of business</u>	<u>Planned</u>
	<u>Unplanned</u>
<u>1.5 iGT terminates licence etc</u>	<u>Planned</u>
<u>2.1 Shipper accedes to GT UNC</u>	<u>Shipper can accede to UNC for sub-set of Distribution Networks</u>
<u>2.2 Shipper accedes to iGT UNC</u>	<u>Shipper must have acceded to all Distribution Networks UNC</u> <u>Shipper must accede to relevant iGT short form Network Code</u>
<u>2.3 Shipper breaches GT UNC</u>	<u>GT applies sanctions to stop growth on GT Network</u>
<u>2.4 Shipper breaches iGT UNC</u>	<u>iGT applies sanctions to stop Shipper portfolio growth on all of its CSEPs</u>
<u>2.5 Shipper voluntary withdrawal from iGT UNC</u>	
<u>2.6 Shipper voluntary withdrawal from UNC</u>	<u>Can only happen with accompanying voluntary withdrawal from iGT UNC</u>
<u>2.7 Shipper merger</u>	
<u>2.8 Shipper de-merger</u>	
<u>2.9 Shipper termination triggered by GT or EBCC</u>	<u>Will automatically result in termination to the iGTs as well</u>
<u>2.10 Shipper termination triggered by iGT</u>	<u>Can happen in isolation to any GT termination</u>
<u>3.1 CSEP : GT set up</u>	
<u>3.1 CSEP creation</u>	
<u>3.2 Nested CSEP creation</u>	
<u>3.3 CSEP “sale” between iGTs</u>	
<u>3.4 CSEP Adopted by GT</u>	
<u>3.5 CSEP natural life ends</u>	
<u>3.6 Duplicate CSEP created in error</u>	
<u>3.7 GT “nests” off iGT Network</u>	
<u>4. Supply point register and invoicing</u>	
<u>4.1 MPRN Creation</u>	<u>GT – UIP contacts Xoserve to set MPRN “live” (note process may be subject to change in the future)</u> <u>iGT submits file of expected MPRNs to the CSEP including address, either the AQ or the means for the AQ to be derived, and the nomination confirmed shipper id (or ids (more than one shipper may be signed</u>

Deleted: iGT

Deleted: Agency Services

		<u>up))</u>
<u>4.2 Supply point confirmation</u>		<u>GT</u> <u>LSP - nomination file followed by confirmation file</u> <u>SSP - confirmation file</u>
		<u>iGT</u> <u>Domestic – iGT submits meter install record to Xoserve</u> <u>Xoserve submits “auto confirmation” file (including</u> <u>asset, address and any other supply point updated data)</u> <u>to confirmed CSEP shipper</u>
		<u>iGT</u> <u>I&C site – Shipper obtains MPRN from iGT to arrange</u> <u>meter fit, Shipper submits nomination, confirmation and</u> <u>asset file</u>
		<u>iGT</u> <u>DM</u>
<u>4.3 Supply meter point first asset install</u>		<u>GT</u> <u>Shipper / supplier initiated, Shipper submits ONJOB</u>
		<u>GT</u> <u>Customer / meter worker initiated, Xoserve receive</u> <u>C&D Notification</u>
		<u>iGT</u> <u>Domestic – already done as part of confirmation</u> <u>I&C customer or domestic third party meter install</u> <u>Shipper provides asset details</u>
<u>4.4 Supply meter point asset exchange</u>		<u>Shipper / supplier initiated submits ONJOB</u> <u>Customer initiated via meter worker – C&D notification</u> <u>Gas escape emergency initiated asset exchange (data</u> <u>needed to initiate PEMS arrangements)</u>
<u>4.5 Supply meter point meter asset removal</u>		<u>Shipper / supplier initiated submits ONJOB (sets</u> <u>isolation flag to Y)</u> <u>(Will trigger GSIU visit 12 months after removal date</u> <u>(unless new meter installed in the period))</u> <u>Customer initiated via meter worker – C&D notice</u> <u>Gas emergency initiated asset removal</u>
<u>4.6 Supply meter point meter clamp</u>		<u>Shipper submits ONUPD (sets isolation flag to Y)</u> <u>Triggers Network site visit 12 months after CL status</u> <u>set (unless changed in the period)</u>
<u>4.7 Supply Point Data</u>		<u>Emergency contact information.</u> <u>Update process (shipper data)</u> <u>MAM Id.</u> <u>Update process (shipper data)</u> <u>Gas Act Owner (GAO).</u> <u>Update process (shipper data)</u> <u>Supplier id</u> <u>Update process (shipper data)</u> <u>Market sector code</u> <u>Update process (shipper data)</u> <u>Meter read frequency change</u> <u>Update process (shipper data)</u> <u>Priority Consumer status</u> <u>Update process (shipper data)</u> <u>Vulnerable customer information</u> <u>Update process (shipper data)</u>

Deleted: iGT

Deleted: Agency Services

		<u>Meter location</u>
		<u>Update process (shipper data)</u>
		<u>Address</u>
		<u>Update process (shipper or transporter data)</u>
4.8	<u>Supply point events</u>	<u>Change of supplier</u>
		<u>Capacity increase request (no change to GT process)</u>
		<u>Withdrawal (requires Isolation Flag to be Y)</u>
		<u>Theft of Gas event</u>
		<u>An event (e.g. fire etc) causes service pipe to be removed/ relayed/ repositioned</u>
		<u>GSIU event - Supply point is set to Dead by transporter</u>
		<u>Failure to supply gas event</u>
4.9	<u>Meter reading</u>	
		<u>Opening read (asset install)</u>
		<u>Opening read (CoS event incoming)</u>
		<u>Estimated opening read (CoS event)</u>
		<u>Cyclic read</u>
		<u>Must Read SSP</u>
		<u>Must Read LSP</u>
		<u>Meter inspection</u>
		<u>Shipper Agreed Read</u>
		<u>Closing read (asset removal)</u>
		<u>Closing read (CoS event outgoing)</u>
4.10	<u>AQ event</u>	
4.11	<u>Transportation charging event</u>	<u>GT</u>
		<u>iGT Xoserve will hold the data to either calculate and issue the invoice on behalf of the iGT or pass the relevant data to the iGT for them to calculate and issue the invoice.</u>
		<u>iGT invoice back-up data. Sent by Xoserve over the IX in common format.</u>
4.12	<u>Energy charging event</u>	<u>GT</u>
4.13	<u>Commodity and energy reconciliation event</u>	<u>Same process regardless of transporter type</u>
4.14	<u>Failure to Supply Gas incidents charges</u>	
5.	<u>Query process</u>	
	<u>Duplicate CSEP</u>	<u>iGT only</u>
	<u>Duplicate MPRN</u>	<u>iGT and GT</u>
	<u>Found MPRN</u>	<u>iGT and GT but different process</u>
	<u>M Number creation</u>	<u>iGT and GT but different process</u>
	<u>Consumption adjustment</u>	<u>iGT and GT but different process</u>
	<u>Isolation query</u>	<u>iGT and GT but different process</u>
	<u>Meter asset query</u>	<u>iGT only</u>
	<u>Found CSEP</u>	<u>iGT only</u>
	<u>Crossed meter</u>	<u>iGT only</u>

Deleted: iGT

Deleted: Agency Services

<u>6. Non-Code User Pays services</u>	<u>To be provided on behalf of GT and iGT</u>
<u>7. Services on behalf of GT and iGT e.g. Ofgem request under LC 24</u>	<u>Provided on behalf of both</u>
<u>8. Services to GTs and iGTs</u>	<u>E.g. portfolio reports etc</u>
<u>9. iGT support to services</u>	<u>E.g. assistance with query resolution, meter reading provider, transportation charges etc</u>
<u>10. Maintain iGT transportation charges</u>	<u>iGT only – optional service</u>

draft 0440 mtg Nov 13

Deleted: iGT
Deleted: Agency Services