

## iGT047 Development Group Meeting 1 Minutes

### 1. Participants

Adam Pearce (ESP)  
Andrew Margan (British Gas)\*  
Anne Jackson (SSE)\*  
Cher Harris (SSEPL)\*  
Chris Spence (EDF)\*  
Colette Baldwin (Eon)  
Dave Bowles (Fulcrum Pipelines)  
Gethyn Howard (IPL)  
Jenny Rawlinson (GTC)  
Mark Pitchford (npower)  
Simon Parkinson (Scottish Power)\*  
Steve Nunnington (Xoserve)

Apologies were received from David Speake (British Gas), Steve Ladle (Gemserve) and Bridget Morgan (Ofgem).

### 2. Xoserve's proposed solution

S Nunnington summarised a proposed solution for the iGT047. For both the effective switching and foundation stages, iGTs will add the respective data items to the DES file that is currently sent to Xoserve and the data will be displayed on DES. iGTs will increase the frequency that the file is sent from weekly to daily on a best endeavours basis. The target implementation date for the effective switching stage will be February or March 2013, and October 2013 for the foundation stage.

S Parkinson asked if the SMSO value (i.e. the foundation stage) would be added before October. S Nunnington confirmed that it would, but was reliant on other issues such as system development and SPAA producing a list of SMSO values, on which, the validation will be based. The governance for the SMSO entity's deployment would need to be in place. This was envisaged as being within the remit of SPAA.

S Nunnington confirmed that the changes to DES through SPAA were put in by the UK Link Committee. J Rawlinson confirmed that it will be the job of the iGT047 DG to take any further changes necessary for the iGT047 to SPAA.

M Pitchford asked how data population would be handled where an ADM is installed. It was suggested that the meter type could be derived from the meter model, although M Pitchford confirmed that this was not the case where a meter could be upgraded using a firmware update - the iGT would need the shipper to confirm the meter type. M Pitchford held the view that all meters installed during the effective switching and foundation phases would be classified as 'NS'.

J Rawlinson confirmed that the installing supplier could be derived from the supplier at the time of the meter install date, but there would be a need for a cleansing exercise with shippers to record an accurate account of shipper and associated supplier IDs.

A Pearce added that the enduring phase had an implementation deadline of April 2014. iGTs would continue to provide data to Xoserve, but through an IX connection, and this data would be used for two purposes; it would be displayed on DES and added to a daily data extract that would be sent to

the DCC. S Nunnington added that the files/data items will flow naturally between iGT/shipper SPA/CoS flows.

Both S Parkinson and A Jackson stated that they were reluctant to implement any foundation stage functionality before the sign off of both UNC430 and iGT047 but there were also concerns expressed around tight timescales. S Nunnington mentioned that the UNC430 mod will be signed off in April 2013 and that both the UNC & iGT-UNC DGs should work to ensure that the industry is not in a position where the functionality has been developed in time but the governance is not in place for it to be implemented.

C Spence questioned whether Single Service Provision be could be brought forward in line with smart, thus negating the need for an enduring solution and potentially the need for iGTs to gain the ISO27001 accreditation. SN confirmed that SSP would not be brought in any earlier than 2015 and A Pearce added that the group would have to take on the working assumption that the DCC go-live and SSP implementation dates would not align.

A Pearce also stated that he didn't believe that aligning SSP with the requirement to pass data to the DCC would prevent iGTs from needing the ISO27001 accreditation, if the requirement was placed on sources of the information sent to the DCC.

### 3. File formats and flows

Shipper parties agreed that a single, standardised new file used to transfer data between iGTs and shippers would be preferable. Changes to existing flows would cause problems for shippers where file/data formats are unique to each iGT.

**Action: A Pearce & other iGTs to review and propose potential methods for transferring data items between iGT and shipper parties ready for next DG.**

M Pitchford asked the group to consider how the DCC service flag would be updated on iGTs' systems with S Nunnington confirming that the DCC will send the updated service flag to Xoserve, and Xoserve will send on to the relevant iGT.

S Nunnington confirmed that large transporters do not and are not required to hold the payment method field. C Spence asked if iGTs could confirm whether or not they were required to hold payment method.

**Action: iGTs to go back to their businesses and confirm whether the 'Payment Method' field is required.**

There was concern around how the meter mechanism code would be updated when a meter was upgraded from a NS to S1 meter by an upgrade to the firmware only (i.e. no change in meter serial/details). S Nunnington confirmed that Xoserve would allow the meter mech code field to be updated. Shippers will be obligated to provide the updated meter mech code data to iGTs. J Rawlinson added that iGT050/050A will give shippers the mechanism to update this value where necessary through a standardised process.

C Spence asked how the data would be validated, highlighting that cross meters will be a problem. S Nunnington confirmed that Xoserve would carry out validation on the data and that if shippers were worried about rejections, then the shipper should send only the minimum amount of data (i.e. meter serial number).

C Harris added that shippers should already be checking their data and raising any concerns with the relevant iGTs on an on-going basis. C Harris added that all parties should be conducting their own data cleansing. M Pitchford added that shippers have an obligation to ensure that transporter data is correct and that processes shouldn't need to change.

#### **4. Permissions**

A Pearce asked for the groups views on how the permissions for the transfer of data between shippers and iGTs, and iGTs and Xoserve/DCC need to be presented in the iGT-UNC.

Both J Rawlinson and C Baldwin agreed that only an update to the file flows was required and an obligation put in code that the relevant data needs to be passed from one party to another.

#### **5. Funding options**

G Howard stated that iGTs shared the same concerns as large transporters and indeed shippers/suppliers – that obligations were being placed on parties with no direction on how system/process changes are to be funded. G Howard noted that with the UNC430 equivalent mod falling under the user-pays principle, iGTs are keen to explore ways to fund the iGT047 mod for smart implementation.

C Baldwin noted that this was an issue for Ofgem and that the issue was wider than the iGT047 mod alone. C Baldwin suggested that discussions take place between iGTs and shippers, separate from the iGT047 DG, in order to discuss potential funding solutions and that it was the responsibility of the iGTs to take the proposals to Ofgem for discussion.

Both J Rawlinson and M Pitchford made it clear that they felt it was an important issue in the progression of the mod. G Howard pointed out the synergies with iGT039/Single Service Provision and J Rawlinson agreed that a meeting should be had, preferably sooner rather than later, between shippers, iGTs and Ofgem to discuss any/all possible funding solutions, whatever they may be.

#### **6. Discussion of drafting approach**

G Howard suggested that a prudent approach would be to insert a high level obligation in the iGT-UNC to transfer data and develop an ancillary document to hold the detail of the file formats, permissions and other obligations. M Pitchford agreed that the 047 mod shouldn't look to put the specific data items into code.

#### **7. iGT-Xoserve commercial arrangements**

A Pearce asked the group if there were any elements of the iGT-Xoserve/third party agent arrangements that need to be considered as part of the iGT047 mod.

The group agreed that all commercial arrangements between iGTs and Xoserve were outside the scope of iGT047.

#### **8. Smart issues log**

A number of issues were raised at the meeting that the group decided were out of scope of the iGT047 mod. The smart issues log was opened to ensure these issues are not raised at future iGT047

development groups and to give any party wishing to raise the issue at the correct forum or workgroup an indication of where it should be raised.

#	Smart Issue	An issue for...
1	What is the process to assure that a meter is NS, S1 or S2 compliant?	WG4/DECC
2	Will iGTs need to be compliant with ISO 27001?	Individual iGTs to raise with DECC
3	High volumes of rejections due to poor/incorrect data.	Individual shippers
4	Arrange a funding meeting between iGTs, transporters & Ofgem.	iGTs
5	Gas safe issues and problems with service where a new meter it is taking place	Shipper CERG reps to follow up/ENA
6	Provision of temperature correction through more accurate conversion factors.	Ofgem/DECC need to provide direction

## 9. AOB

J Rawlinson had noticed that the list of registration items to be provided to the DCC was shorter than the list contained within the UNC430 and iGT047 modification proposals. S Nunnington confirmed that the surplus items found in the UNC and iGT-UNC mods weren't necessarily items required by the DCC and that they were items required for change of supply.

C Spence asked whether there would be a co-ordinated approach to data cleansing and that the validation was in place to ensure that data was accurate. G Howard confirmed that shippers should be using the monthly portfolio extract to reconcile any issues in addition to the standard of service/QTI queries.

## 10. Future meeting dates

The next meeting date was set for Friday 25<sup>th</sup> January. Venue is to be confirmed.

**Action: A Pearce to speak with Joanna Ferguson (NGN) to discuss whether there is a need for the UNC430 teleconference on 3<sup>rd</sup> January to include iGT047DG participation.**

## 11. Actions

	Action	Owner	Status
1.1	AP & other iGTs to review and propose potential methods for transferring data items between iGT and shipper parties	A Pearce	Open
1.2	iGTs to go back to their businesses and confirm whether the 'Payment Method' field is required	All iGTs	Open
1.3	A Pearce to speak with Joanna Ferguson (NGN) to discuss whether there is a need for the UNC430 teleconference on 3 <sup>rd</sup> January to include iGT047DG participation.	A Pearce	Open