Notes from iGT DG 035 development discussion

18 April 2011

Attendees

David Speake	ESP (chair)
Lisa Wong	ESP
George Glen	Scottish Power
Paul Gore	First Utility
Dan Simons	EDF
Tabish Khan	Ofgem
Gethyn Howard	IPL
Gemma Kemmery	IPL
Jenny Rawlinson	GTC *Telecon* (part)
Kay Mackey	GTC *Telecon* (part)
Trevor Peacock	Fulcrum *Telecon*
Dave Bowles	Fulcrum *Telecon*

Discussion 1: What would the mod achieve if implemented?

Group members summarised their understanding of the modification proposal. Much of this understanding also came from the UNC mod which had recently been approved by Ofgem. It was relatively clear what the mod was seeking to do, however iGTs expressed reservations about the business case for the change, and felt they would like to understand this better. A key question was:

> *How does providing the full date data that the iGT uses to calculate an AQ to the shipper actually help the shipper, on the assumption that the iGT will in any case have selected the most appropriate date pairs for its calculation, in line with the rules for doing so?*

The impression that the proposal gave was that shippers needed the ability to question what pair of dates had been chosen for the AQ calculation, and without a history of reads would not be able to do so.

Reference was made to the British Gas response to the UNC modification, which raises further doubts as to the business case for bringing a mod to iGT UNC forward.

Shippers were able to explain that they are only able to challenge proposed AQs where they know enough about the supply point to do so. There may be a number of supply points that have only been in their portfolio for a short time. Without a read history, these will not be challenged.

So the main purpose for the proposed report was to allow the shipper to challenge at supply points which they have recently acquired. Currently they are not in a position to challenge because they have no visibility of previous reads. The expected use of this additional data would therefore be to expand the pool of proposed AQs that the shipper is in a position to challenge, rather than to allow shippers to audit the iGTs' choice of date pairs in the AQ calculation.

Discussion 2: What might be the cost to iGTs?

The iGTs' principal concern about this proposal was the clear cost implications, taken against the current uncertainty as to the benefits (to industry, to iGTs). There was also a concern that judging by the response to the UNC mod, there was not unanimity among shippers about the requirement for this change.

It was noted that under UNC, this mod was implemented as User Pays, and that no such concept exists under iGT UNC. It was suggested that one of the reasons why Ofgem's decision on the UNC proposal was not particularly difficult was that the funding arrangements were clear, and the cost would fall where the benefit lay.

Despite the lack of user pays for iGTs, iGTs felt that they would be more likely to support a modification that gave them the ability to charge for providing reports. Otherwise, it would be difficult to support the modification since the extent of the benefits to shippers is still not fully clear.

The group did not go on to discuss ways of funding the potential systems changes, but Ofgem requested that iGTs give the group an idea of what kind of costs they thought the change might involve. The group agreed that once this had been done, the proposer would be in a better position to decide whether they wished to continue development to understand funding options (in the absence of user pays), or to cease development and take the modification in its current form (or something like it) to the panel for consultation.

ACTION: IGTs agreed to investigate potential costs – Ofgem agreed to collate this information to bring an 'order of magnitude' figure back to the group.*

ACTION: George Glen to forward data requirements as soon as shippers get sight of those developed by xoserve.*^

Discussion 3: Taking this work forward

It was agreed that there would be a further discussion (date to be agreed) once the potential costs were available. Potential future work of the group could include developing options to allow iGTs to charge for the reports, but the group would be led by the proposer and/or panel as to when and whether to proceed with this.

* Both actions are now complete.
^ Datafields included in these notes for information – no further discussion has taken place on these

Data fields in use for xoserve report:

Meter Point Reference, Shipper Short Code, Meter Read, Meter Read Date, Read Type, Corrector Read, Un-Corrected Read, Meter Make, Meter Model, Meter Serial Number, Nº of Dials, Nº of Corrector Dials, Times Through Zero, Corrector Times Through Zero, Imperial Indicator, Reading Factor, Reading Units, Correction Factor, Exchange Meter Serial Number, Exchange Correction Factor, Exchange Imperial Indicator, Exchange Reading Factor, Exchange Reading Units, Exchange Nº of Dials, Exchange Times Through Zero, Meter Exchange Start Read, Meter

Exchange Start Read Date, Meter Exchange End Read, Meter Exchange End Read Date, *Converter Exchange Start Read, Converter Exchange Start Read Date, Converter Exchange End Read, Converter Exchange End Read Date, Filter Failure Triggered Indicator.*