

Stage 03: Draft Modification Report

iGT075:

Identification of Supply Meter Point pressure tier

To improve communication of the Supply Meter Point Pressure Tier by the iGT to Shipper/Supplier/MAM



Responses invited by 29 September 2016



High Impact:



Medium Impact:
Pipeline Operators



Low Impact:
Pipeline Users, Suppliers, MAMs

At what stage is this document in the process?

01

Modification Proposal

02

Workgroup Report

03

Draft Modification Report

04

Final Modification Report



Contents

1. Plain English Summary	3
2. Rationale for Change?	4
3. Solution	5
4. Relevant Objectives	7
5. Impacts and Costs	8
6. Likely Impact on Consumers	8
7. Likely Impact on Environment.....	8
8. Implementation	8
9. Legal Text.....	9
10. Recommendation.....	10

About this document:

This document is a Draft Modification Report, which was issued for consultation responses, at the request of the Panel on 17th August 2016. The close-out date for responses is 29th September 2016. The Panel will consider the responses and agree whether or not this modification should be made.



Any questions?

Contact:
Code Administrator



igt-unc@gemserv.com



0207 090 1044

Proposer:
Colette Baldwin



Colette.baldwin@eonenergy.com



Telephone
02476 181382

Workgroup Chair:
Code Administrator



igtunc@gemserv.com



0207 090 1044

iGT075

Draft Modification Report

8th September 2016

Version 1.0

Page 2 of 10

© 2016 all rights reserved

1. Plain English Summary

This section should mirror the current wording within the Proposal, including any changes that the Proposer has agreed to make as a result of Workgroup discussions.

Is this a Self-Governance Modification?

It is proposed that this modification meets the self-governance criteria, as there are no material impacts on commercial activities connected with the shipping, transportation or supply of gas conveyed through pipes.

If so, will this be progressed as a Fast Track Modification?

No.

Rationale for Change

Shippers/Suppliers/MAMs require knowledge of the Pressure Tier applicable to a specific MPRN to ensure they send the appropriate skilled staff with the correct metering equipment. Currently, this information can be obtained by specific enquiry of the Pipeline Operator using the GT1 procedures¹. The GT1 procedure is manual and time-consuming for both parties.

Solution

The Pipeline Operator will be required to publish an electronic list of the relevant pressure tier applicable to the MPRNs (including those without a meter attached); where there is a service laid, on their network by postcode and to make it available to relevant industry parties, shippers/suppliers/MAMs. The list should be refreshed on a quarterly basis.

Relevant Objectives

It is considered that Relevant Objectives a), c), and d) will be better facilitated

Implementation

The workgroup recommended that this change should be implemented no sooner than six months following a decision to implement.

¹ www.energynetworks.org/gas/regulation/gas-transporter-procedures.html

2. Rationale for Change?

The Supply Meter Point Pressure Tier is not currently stored and communicated in industry data flows. On specific request of the Pipeline Operator, using forms defined by GT procedures, the Supply Meter Point pressure tier will be provided for a MPRN. The MAM requires knowledge of the Supply Meter Point pressure so that they can send appropriately trained staff, with the appropriate equipment, to complete the intended metering work. Sending inappropriately qualified meter workers may result in abortive work, frustrated customers and in the worst case inappropriate work.

It is impractical for the MAM to send, or for the Pipeline Operator to respond to multiple requests using the current forms. In theory the MAM could submit a request in advance of every metering task, although this is more likely on sites where the MAM anticipates an elevated pressure. Historically, whether to submit a GT1 request may have been based on local knowledge. This local knowledge has effectively been lost as companies operate on a national basis. Dependent on the risk that the parties wish to take, in the extreme, this could lead to the submission of a GT1 in advance of all meter work, with the resulting administrative burden on Pipeline Operators and industry parties. The forthcoming roll-out of smart metering will require visits to ~20m premises. In principle a GT1 could be submitted in advance of work at each of these sites which would be unsustainable.

AMO members have indicated that in the domestic sector the aborted visits are in the order of 1 in 1000 visits, which over the life of the smart meter roll-out could equate to 25,000 aborted calls, with the associated cost and customer frustration. These are whole market figures irrespective of network operator, and iGT pipelines will have significantly less, but to understand the impact solely on iGT networks, it may not be directly proportional to the number meter points considered, but rather relative to the likelihood of higher pressure tier networks built. In the I&C sector this figure is higher, a member operating in this sector has aborted 5% of their meter exchange visits when they attended site to find the installation to be MP or IP.

Sending a meter operator with the incorrect training and equipment for the Supply Meter Point Pressure Tier will generally lead to an aborted visit, a frustrated customer, wasted costs, customer compensation and delayed completion of the planned work. In the worst scenario, it could lead to inappropriate work which would lead to a safety incident with all the consequential impact on iGT, Shipper, Supplier, MAM, Customer and members of the public. The HSE have highlighted at MAMCOP situations where inappropriate work has been performed.

The Gas Safety (Management) Regulations 1996, Regulation 6(8) state:

“...A person who conveys gas in a network shall, where he is requested to do so by a person proposing to carry out work in relation to a gas fitting, provide him with information about the operating pressures of the gas at the outlet of a service pipe. ...”

“gas fittings” means gas pipework, valves, regulators and meters, and fittings, apparatus and appliances...

UNC modification 0526 was raised to introduce the same requirements on GDNs as this modification. However, GDNs chose to implement the solution without the obligation being introduced into the UNC, therefore the UNC Panel determined that the modification was unnecessary. Since the GDNs have agreed to provide the quarterly data and make it available via their Agent’s website, the proposer was happy to accept this approach.

This modification is required to oblige the Pipeline Operators to publish an equivalent set of data of meter point pressure tier at post code level.

There is a perception that all iGTs networks are low pressure networks, however we do not believe this is the case, and we believe there are numerous medium pressure networks built by iGTs over the years, so this modification will give Shippers, Suppliers and MAMs greater transparency and allow appropriate qualified meter workers to attend site.

The Work Group noted that the parallel UNC modification 0526 had been rejected, and no appeal had been lodged. Regardless, the proposer of iGT075 was keen that the iGT UNC change should proceed through the change process.

One Work Group party noted that the data gathered by the AMO (see above) was irrelevant for the change, as it did not distinguish the iGT sector from the large transporter statistics. The Work Group generally considered that it was likely that aborted calls would be lower for iGTs

3. Solution

There is currently no specific data item on the central systems to store the pressure level. The modification proposes that the Pipeline Operator create a centrally accessible register of the mains pressure tier by post code. This mirrored the approach, set out in UNC Mod 0526, which was subsequently rejected and was instead implemented as a solution without the obligation being formally introduced into the UNC. Access to the register will be made available to iGT UNC parties as well as to Suppliers and Meter Asset Managers, by an appropriate mechanism.

The Pipeline Operator will publish the information quarterly using a file extract:

File: Post code data only. The file will contain the following data items:

- Post code – in and out code
- Pipeline Operator
- Relevant Pressure Tier (where suspected mixed or unknown pressures, the pressure tier should be mark as 'GT1' – indicating that Users should revert to the GT1 process)

It is proposed that, at post code level, the Pressure Tier' will be defined with the following valid set (as extracted from the GT1 form):

- LP
- MP
- MP35
- MP65
- MP105
- MP180
- MP270
- IP
- Mixed
- Unknown

It is acknowledged that some Pipeline Operators may not have perfect historic records and so the GT1 process will still be required where the GT has mixed pressure tiers

within a postcode, or the historical records require verification by GTs desktop exercise or site visits.

We believe that Pipeline operators are as keen as other stakeholders to ensure the records are correct, so by making the data more easily accessible it will reduce the opportunity for error, reduce paperwork exchanges of GT1 forms, and reduce duplicate work as a result of subsequent GT1 requests. The Pipeline Operator will replicate the postcode solution implemented by the GTs and the data is to be published in a centrally accessible web based location, for clarity this will see all Pipeline Operators data being on the same web location.

The GT1 procedure can also be used, as now, to gain any additional information for those sites where it is of value.

Any genuine engineered changes of the 'Supply Meter Point Pressure Tier' at a site will require dialog between the Pipeline Operator & meter worker in advance of the work being undertaken to ensure the work to change the pressures are co-ordinated at site. It is not envisaged that updating the central systems will be an appropriate communication for this infrequent operational activity.

Nothing in this proposal would remove the parties' obligation to check the actual pressure at site prior to commencing work. The existing safety practices, procedures and industry safety standards to which the parties subscribe would be unaffected, together with any relevant safety legislation to which the parties are subject.

If a MAM believed that the information provided was incorrect, then they should report this to the Pipeline Operator with any supporting evidence, and the Pipeline Operator should review its records, advise the MAM and update the central records.

As part of any data gathering activity MAMs have indicated that they may be willing to provide their records of pressure tier to the Pipeline Operators to assist them to review and ensure their records are as complete as possible.

Pipeline Users would be encouraged to refer in the first instance, to the data extract before initiating the GT1 enquiry to reduce the operational burden of the GT1 process on Pipeline Operators.

The Work Group considered several iterations of the solution before agreeing the final Work Group report. The Proposer has amended the solution to include a data item of Medium Pressure (MP) in the valid set, to allow for postcode areas where the medium pressure rate could not be determined. There was some discussion with respect to the inclusion of post code areas with a dummy in-code (for instance on new developments without a confirmed post code). The Work Group agreed that iGTs should include dummy post codes and, in the event of any confusion, Shippers could use the GT1 process to clarify.

The Proposer confirmed the expectation that the information from all iGTs would be hosted in a central location, but did not determine where that location should be.

The Work Group generally agreed that the solution met the requirements for the change.

4. Relevant Objectives

Impact of the modification on the Relevant Objectives:	
Relevant Objective	Identified impact
a) Efficient and economic operation of the pipe-line system.	Positive
b) Coordinated, efficient and economic operation of (i) the combined pipe-line system, and/ or (ii) the pipe-line system of one or more other relevant gas transporters.	None
c) Efficient discharge of the licensee's obligations.	Positive
d) Securing of effective competition: (i) between relevant shippers; (ii) between relevant suppliers; and/or (iii) between DN operators (who have entered into transportation arrangements with other relevant gas transporters) and relevant shippers.	Positive
e) Provision of reasonable economic incentives for relevant suppliers to secure that the domestic customer supply security standards... are satisfied as respects the availability of gas to their domestic customers.	None
f) Promotion of efficiency in the implementation and administration of the Code.	None
g) Compliance with the Regulation and any relevant legally binding decisions of the European Commission and/or the Agency for the Co-operation of Energy Regulators.	None

The Work Group agreed that this Modification would facilitate:

Objective a), c) The existing GT1 procedure is manual and labour intensive. Recording the information centrally so that relevant stakeholders can obtain the data directly will reduce on-going operational costs for Pipeline Operators. Pipeline Operators have an existing duty to respond to all requests from parties, historically these requests have been made only where applicants suspect the site may not be low pressure, based on local knowledge. This should lead to a reduction in overall costs for resourcing the existing process, based on a more economic and efficient service delivery but this will also depend on the costs that the iGTS will incur in providing the requested functionality and the extent to which it actually reduces the numbers of GT1 requests.

Objective d) Historically, the Shipper/Supplier/MAM may only make a GT1 request when they suspect the connection is not low pressure, this request may have been based on local knowledge, which is increasingly lost as companies operate nationally. Dependent on the risk that the parties wish to assume, in the extreme this could lead to every MAM submitting a GT1 in advance of all meter work, with the resulting administrative burden on iGT & Shipper/Supplier/MAM.

Sending a meter operative with the incorrect training and equipment will generally lead to an aborted visit, a frustrated customer, wasted costs, including customer compensation and delayed completion of the planned work. In the worst case scenario, it could lead to inappropriate work which would lead to a safety incident with all the consequential impact on iGT, Shipper, Supplier, MAM, Customer and members of the public.

5. Impacts and Costs

The Proposer states the understanding that this change will lead to efficiency savings by the Pipeline Operator in the long term, as a move to a more self-service approach by Users will reduce the administrative burden on Pipeline Operators resourcing this process, and whilst there will be initial costs to build and publish the data that will be incurred by the Pipeline Operators, the anticipated reduction in manual work by Pipeline Operators should result in a net benefit to them.

Additionally Pipeline Users, Suppliers and Meter Workers will also benefit from a faster turn-around time in getting the information, which will assist them in planning smart rollout activities, dealing with urgent metering issues at site, and ensuring a right first time visit experience for the customer.

One Workgroup attendee noted that there would be costs incurred by iGTs for the gathering, hosting and maintenance of this information.

6. Likely Impact on Consumers

The Work Group agreed the change could result in fewer abortive visits, thus reducing costs and frustration for customers with successful visit outcomes first time.

7. Likely Impact on Environment

The Work Group agree that there are no likely impacts on the environment.

8. Implementation

The Work Group notes that system changes will be required by iGTs and recommends an implementation in the first release six months following a decision to implement.

9. Legal Text

As prepared by the iGTs following the conclusion of the Work Group (note: was presented to the Modification Workstream on 6th September 2016 and received no challenge).

iGT UNC SECTION K – GENERAL

Add new Paragraph 45

45.1 The Pipeline Operator shall on a quarterly basis publish, by postcode, details of the Relevant Pressure Tiers, subject to Clause 45.2(b), operating within its gas distribution network together with the name of the Pipeline Operator. All the Pipeline Operators will publish their information in Microsoft Excel spreadsheet format as set out in Appendix K-4 and all the Pipeline Operators will use a common website, access to which will be available to all Pipeline Users, Suppliers and Meter Asset Managers.

45.2 (a) For the purposes of this paragraph “**Relevant Pressure Tier**” shall mean the low, medium and intermediate pressure tiers of the gas distribution network more particularly identified from time to time within the Energy Networks Association published document GDN/PM/GT/1; and

(b) Where the Relevant Pressure Tier cannot be specifically identified as per Clause 45.2(a) for a post code, one of the following designations shall instead be published as the Relevant Pressure Tier for that particular postcode:

- (i) MP (where the pressure tier is known to be medium pressure but cannot be more specifically identified); or
- (ii) GT1 (where within a post code the pressure tiers are mixed or unknown).

Appendix K-4

Field Name	Data Item Definition	Mandatory/ Optional/ Conditional	Domain T = Text, N = Numeric, D = Date	Field Length	Decimal	Comments/Format
Post Outcode	Standard PAF outcode as defined in the PAF digest. Note validation requirements between outcode and incode.	M	T	4	0	
Post Incode	Standard PAF incode as defined in the PAF digest. Note validation requirements between incode and outcode.	M	T	4	0	Where an Incode has not yet been setup e.g. for a new build property then the default value should be ZZZZ

Gas Transporter id	Gas Transporter short code identifying the Gas Transporter, per MDD.	M	T	3	0	
Pressure Tier	The factor which converts the metered volume into units of 100cu ft or cubic meters	M	T	5	0	As per GT1 definitions: e.g. (LP, MP35, MP65, MP105, MP180, MP270,IP) with the following additional conditions (i) Use MP (where the pressure tier is known to be medium pressure but cannot be more specifically identified); or (ii) Use GT1 (where within a post code the pressure tiers are mixed or unknown).

10. Recommendation

All parties are invited to consider whether they wish to submit views regarding this Modification. The close-out date for responses is 29 September 2016. All responses should be sent to the Code Administrator at igt-unc@gemserv.com.

A response template is available for use at <http://www.igt-unc.co.uk/Modifications>.