

iGT047 Development Group Meeting #3 Minutes

1. Participants

Adam Pearce (ESP)
 Anne Jackson (SSE)
 Ashley Collins (EDF)
 Ashley Foster (SSEPL)
 Chris Spence (EDF)
 Colette Baldwin (Eon)
 Dave Bowles (Fulcrum Pipelines)
 David Speake (British Gas)
 Jenny Rawlinson (GTC)
 Lorna Mallon (Scottish Power)
 Mark Pitchford (npower)
 Steve Nunnington (Xoserve)

Apologies were received from Bridget Morgan (Ofgem) and Gethyn Howard (IPL).

2. Review of actions and minutes from last meeting

- 1.1 Remains open
- 2.1 Remains open
- 2.2 Parties to provide feedback on document produced for next DG
- 2.3 Closed (2.1 duplicate)
- 2.4 Remains open
- 2.5 Remains open - emails with DECC
- 2.6 Closed (document found on iGT-UNC047 webpage)
- 2.7 Remains open

3. File formats and flows

| # | Issue description | Status | Solution/Answer |
|------|---|----------------|--|
| 4.21 | From a systems development/efficiency/cost perspective, would it be better to have: - 1 file flow with validation (to prevent certain parties updating certain information), or; - 3 file flows with no validation? | Closed DG#3 | A Collins put forward a suggestion to have 3 or 4 different records within an SMU file. I.e.: 1. iGT to shipper update 2. iGT to incoming shipper on CoS 3. Shipper to iGT update The suggestion of a forth record type was to split out the shipper to iGT update into the registration and the meter related data items. The group supported this concept and A Pearce agreed to update the Ancillary Document to initially reflect 3 record types. |
| 4.23 | Does an additional field need to be added specifying whether the record has been added as a result of a CoS (so shipper systems can know whether to accept or reject the change sent by the iGT)? | Closed DG#3 | The group agreed that with different record types within the SMU file, this would not be necessary. A Jackson voiced her concerns around the scheduling of data flows and stated that a process map would be needed. S Nunnington commented that Xoserve had mapped out where/when the data will be passed during the various processes. The aspiration will be to have an iGT process map |

| | | | |
|------|--|----------------|--|
| | | | relevant to the transfer of these smart items drawn up before the next development group. |
| 4.24 | At change of supply, is there any overlap where the outbound shipper will be able to update iGT records where they are not the registered shipper? | Open | Future focus groups and a closer look into the process maps may tell us more, but A Jackson commented that similar discussions in previous workgroups had concluded that this would not be an issue. |
| 4.25 | Do additional rejection codes need to be included? For example, is a rejection code required for instances where the updating shipper isn't the registered shipper? Is there a list of standard rejection codes held somewhere? | Open | A Collins and M Pitchford commented that care needs to be taken around setting rejection codes as shippers will be obtaining certain data directly from the meter. iGTs should reject as little as possible as the DCC will be expecting to receive up to date data that, in some cases, may be used for access control. |
| 4.26 | Interface/scheduling will mirror UNC/Xoserve solution – this is being defined in focus groups. When might we understand the UNC interface/scheduling? It will help to have shippers & iGTs provide their schedule of flows where possible. | Open | J Rawlinson & A Pearce to produce a schedule during March for discussion at the next DG. |
| 4.27 | Is the MPRN enough to identify the record? Will there be more than one record per MPRN? | Closed DG#3 | Each record will have a Unique Transaction Reference – this, in addition to the MPRN, will be enough to identify a record. SMR files should contain both the MPRN and UTR. |
| 4.28 | If one value/data item in a record is invalid, will the entire record be rejected or will all the values in the record update with the exception of the invalid data item? | Closed DG#3 | The group agreed that this should follow current industry practice, which is to reject the whole record. |
| 4.29 | "X" in the optional/mandatory column of means conditional? | Closed DG#3 | "X" – do not send "C" - conditional |
| 4.30 | 'DEC' column in table means? All values are '0'... is it necessary? | Closed DG#3 | Decimal column – for numerical values, defines how many decimal places are required. The group agreed that it should remain in the Ancillary Document. |
| 4.31 | What values will be used in the abbreviated entity fields (i.e. supplier, transporter, MAM, SMSO). 3 letter MDD short codes, or are parties free to define? | Closed DG#3 | The group agreed that the SPAA MDD shortcodes should be used in all possible instances. A Pearce agreed to update the Ancillary Document to reflect this. One area of uncertainty is around the SMSO ID field. The industry has yet to decide whether to mirror electricity with a 4 digit code, or keep it consistent across the gas industry with a 3 digit code. |

| | | | |
|------|---|----------------|--|
| 4.32 | Source Registration System ID – why do shippers need to hold this data item? | Closed DG#3 | DCC need to know, but shippers do not. A Pearce to remove from SMU file formats. |
| 4.33 | DCC service flag values – what does each mean? | Closed DG#3 | C Spence confirmed that: Active – where a SMS is enrolled in the DCC Suspended – services suspended (i.e. for security reasons) Withdrawn – where an SMS has been withdrawn from the DCC by a supplier NULL – where an MPRN has yet to have a SMS installed. |
| 4.34 | The network owner EFD – is this the meter install date, service laid date, or MRPN creation date? | Open | S Nunnington suggested that if this was merely being used by the DCC to allow access to the meter by the appropriate network operator, then it wouldn't matter what date was used. He suggested a dummy date could be put in, so long as it was prior to DCC go-live; that would ensure that the current NWO would have access. C Baldwin stated that we should probably seek clarification from DECC around what the date is used for. |
| 4.35 | SMSOs by area or will suppliers only have one SMSO? | Closed DG#3 | Not likely to be a 1 to 1 relationship. |
| 4.36 | Xoserve DCC Day 1 SMIP requirements Workshop - w/c 11th March. | Closed DG#3 | S Nunnington confirmed that there will be an iGT only smart focus group with Xoserve on the 4 th March. There was some confusion that this might be the same meeting as focus group #4, to be held on the w/c 11 th March. S Nunnington has since confirmed that these are two separate meeting. Emails have gone out to parties explaining this. |

4. Retrospective population of data

| | | | |
|------|---|------|--|
| 4.22 | Retrospective population of data. Will a one-time SMU file for each shipper's entire iGT portfolio at implementation do the job or will an alternative be required? | Open | A Collins suggested that the iGT approach should mirror the Xoserve approach where possible, with S Nunnington confirming that on suggestion is for the current supplier to use an UNUPD file flows to provide the retrospective updates. C Spence pointed out that whatever arrangements are put in place, they need to be flexible. The group agreed that this question would need to be carried forward. |
|------|---|------|--|

5. ESI & Foundation solutions

| | | | |
|-----|---|-----|---|
| 2.2 | A party needed to pick up this work - can be developed in conjunction with the 047 mod. See prompt paper. | New | <p>For the Effective Switching changes, the group agreed that no changes to the iGT-UNC would be required. The obligations that fall on iGTs to provide the data for displaying on DES will mean that where the value is made available, the iGT will endeavour to make it available. For Installing Supplier ID for example:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Where the iGT has the supplier ID stored, they will derive the Installing Supplier ID. 2. Where they iGT has the shipper ID, they will use a matrix of shipper/supplier IDs to derive the Supplier ID value and subsequently the Installing Supplier ID. 3. Finally, where the Supplier ID cannot be derived from the Shipper ID, the [Installing] Shipper ID value will be displayed in DES under the Installing Supplier ID field. <p>As far as the additional Foundation data item, SMSO ID, parties could not agree whether obligations should be placed in code prior to April 2014.</p> <p>Some parties were concerned that including an additional obligation on shippers to send and on iGTs to store the SMSO ID from October 2013 into iGT047 would increase the risk of Ofgem rejecting the mod. The suggested risk was that parties would opt to not support or only offer qualified support on the grounds that they would have large enough volumes of smart meters on iGT supply points to justify implementing a solution that will adhere to a new 6-month obligation in code. There was also a concern that iGTs have no obligation tied in to their licences to make the SMSO ID value available prior to April 2014 and that they may withdraw their support for the mod if foundation obligations were included.</p> <p>A Collins suggested a lightweight SMU file could be implemented, containing only the SMSO ID. However, concerns were expressed around timescales. If Ofgem weren't expected to make a decision on iGT047 until August 2013 at the earliest, would 2 months be long enough for all iGT and shipper parties to implement the transmission, capture and storage of the SMSO ID value? A Collins stated that with that in mind, the important aspect would be to get the obligation in code to ensure parties are sharing the SMSO ID values and to develop the method for doing so later.</p> <p>D Speake mentioned that work was on-going under SPAA to place an obligation on GTs to provide the data item to Xoserve for displaying on DES, where it was available – however, a change proposal had yet to be raised.</p> |
|-----|---|-----|---|

6. Governance arrangements

| | | | |
|-----|--|-------------|--|
| 1.8 | Do the UNC and iGT-UNC release dates align? When are we likely to know the UNC430 implementation date? Will the iGT-UNC need a special release to mirror that? | Closed DG#3 | <p>The group commented that the iGT and GT implementation dates will need to align. This should be reflected in the mod.</p> <p>The implementation dates for the UNC have yet to be finalised. As the panel make the decision on implementation, setting a date that mirrors the main UNC wouldn't be a problem. An extraordinary release might be needed.</p> |
| 1.9 | Agreement around relevant objectives needed. | Closed DG#3 | <p>The group agreed that objective G should not be marked as being met, given that it was removed from the UNC430 mod. This was done on the grounds that the European regulation was/is not for all domestic premises to have a gas and electric smart meter installed, but an electricity smart meter only.</p> <p>A Collins suggested that objective A should be marked 'No'. The group felt that in an ideal world, the go-live of smart would align with the go-live for iGT Agency Services, but given that Xoserve has made clear that this is not possible, the solution being put forward was the most efficient and economical.</p> |

7. Review of mod proposal

A Pearce made the point that if the modification proposal was sent to the April panel, the mod wouldn't reach Ofgem for a decision until September. With time being critical, A Pearce asked parties if they were happy to bottom out the modification (the changes required to code) and send it to the panel prior to the Ancillary Document (how parties will go about meeting the new obligations in code) being completed.

Parties agreed that the aspiration should be to send the mod to the March panel and develop the Ancillary Document in parallel.

Action: A Pearce to update mod proposal, including adding the required legal text, and circulate to iGT047DG parties by Wednesday 27th February. If no objections have been raised by 3pm on Monday 4th March, the mod will go forward to be considered at the March panel.

A handful of required minor changes were highlighted as a result of these discussions. These changes will be reflected in the updated mod proposal.

8. AOB

C Spence expressed EDF's concerns around the sub-optimal development of iGT extracts for the DCC (via Xoserve) and the requirement for iGT's to comply with ISO27001 as a data provider to the DCC's access control, in light of the initiative to move iGT's systems onto Xoserve's platforms through Single Service Provision in 2015 which would negate the need for the iGT extracts and compliance to ISO27001. If SSP could be brought in line with DCC testing noting there is a good chance DCC go-live maybe delayed, then development of iGT extracts and compliance with ISO27001 would not be required.

The risks of the current approach include –

- iGT's being unable to comply with ISO27001 within the timescales for the start of mass rollout
- Due to non-compliance iGT data being excluded from DCC access control data and hence negating suppliers from installing smart meters on iGT networks
- A delay to Suppliers rollout targets due to failures / aborts where they have planned a smart installation on an iGT network
- Wasted build and test of iGT changes leading to increased costs which the consumer will ultimately bear and potential delay to DCC go-live where significant faults identified during testing
- A more complex solution for provision of access control data which will incur both higher opex and capex costs for the Industry as a whole and lead to more exceptions for those areas

S Nunnington (Xoserve) confirmed that bringing the implementation of iGT Agency Services forward to DCC Go-live, end 2014 (DCC testing mid 2014), to align with the smart data requirements, was not possible. C Spence advised that input from DECC would be required.

9. Future meeting dates

The next meeting date was set for Friday 5th April, 10.30am. Venue tbc.

10. 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 |
| 2.1 | A Pearce to create a schedule to demonstrate the sequence of data flows between iGTs, shippers, Xoserve and the DCC. | A Pearce | Open |
| 2.2 | Suppliers and iGTs to provide feedback to A Pearce with their individual processes, so that a schedule of processes/flows can be produced. | All parties | Open |
| 2.3 | A Pearce to produce a schedule of daily smart data flows | A Pearce | Closed |
| 2.4 | Shippers/suppliers to speak to STEG reps to determine whether SMU/SMR files will be subject to any particular DCC security standards. | All shipper parties | Open |
| 2.5 | A Pearce to speak to DECC/CESG to determine whether SMU/SMR files will be subject to any particular DCC security standards. | A Pearce | Open |
| 2.6 | A Pearce to produce a summary document, outlining a possible solution for the Effective Switching and Foundation phases. | A Pearce | Closed |
| 2.7 | iGTs to look into the feasibility of adding the additional items to the shipper | All iGT parties | Open |

| | | | |
|------------|--|-----------------|-------------|
| | portfolio extract. | | |
| 3.1 | A Pearce to update mod proposal, including adding the required legal text, and circulate to iGT047DG parties by Wednesday 27th February. | A Pearce | Open |

DRAFT