



## iGT071 - Amendment to the iGT AQ Review Procedures Ancillary Document

Code Administrator's paper for discussion at the iGT071 Work Group 2nd August 2016  
This paper is a revision of one initially discussed at the 7<sup>th</sup> June Work Group.

This Modification was raised to ensure that the above mentioned Ancillary Document was changed so that it is fully compatible with the new arrangements for the industry which will be delivered under Single Service Provision (SSP). The bulk of the current Ancillary Document relates to the process behind an annual review of Annual Quantities (AQs) for Supply Points (AQ Review) and it is generally agreed that this will no longer be required separately within the iGT UNC as Nexus/SSP will introduce a "Rolling AQ" process for the review of these, which will include iGT Supply Points.

However, the Ancillary Document also contains the rules that apply to the revision of the CSEP NExA table. The Work Group has already agreed that this review will need to continue, but whilst this is currently dependent on the results of the Annual AQ review, it will now need to reference summarised data from the "Rolling AQ" process, in addition to other relevant information held by the iGTs.

Further work has been carried out by the iGTs and Xoserve to identify any issues relating to the production of a draft CSEP NExA table. The following table sets out a number of areas that still need to be fully agreed:

Exclusion		
Criteria	Question	Subsequent workgroup consideration
Infill domestic property AQs.	Will these be provided with a FYAQ from Xoserve? If yes, this is the responsibility of the iGT's to filter out this data from the final report.	Agreed that this exclusion should continue
Non-domestic property AQs.	Will these be provided with a FYAQ from Xoserve? If yes, this is the responsibility of the iGT's to filter out this data from the final report.	Agreed that this exclusion should continue
Where an installation read was used in the AQ calculation.	How will iGTs know this from the data received from Xoserve? iGTs solely receive an AQ value.	<u>Believe that this exclusion should be removed but waiting response from Xoserve</u>
There was no AQ change because the site became live less than 26 weeks prior to the cut off read date.	How will iGTs know this from the data received from Xoserve? iGTs solely receive an AQ value, and won't know if this has been carried forward from last year, or re-calculated to the same value using valid years.	Agreed to change "less than 26 weeks" to "less than 9 months"
There were no reads with which	How will iGTs know this from the	<u>Agreed-Believe that this</u>

**Commented [KB1]:** I don't know if this was agreed, there was an action on Xoserve to confirm whether these calculations could be identified so that the exclusion could continue. I don't think this action has been closed.

# IGT | UNC

to calculate the AQ.	data received from Xoserve? iGTs solely receive an AQ value, and won't know if this has been carried forward from last year or re-calculated to the same value using new reads.	exclusion should continue <u>but waiting for a response from Xoserve</u>
The AQ changed outside the +100% / -50% tolerance and the Calculated AQ is used as it was not challenged, or challenged unsuccessfully.	Do iGTs still need this criteria? The FYAQ is taken from the SMP AQ which has existing controls around the values it can produce.	Agreed to remove this exclusion
AQs changed using the Large Transporter's agent adjustment factors based on the change from the old to new weather correction data.	How will iGTs know this from the data received from Xoserve? iGTs solely receive an AQ value, and won't know if this has been changed due to old to new weather correction data.	Agreed to remove this exclusion

**Commented [KB2]:** Again, outstanding action with Xoserve. Xoserve currently plan to send a value regardless of whether the AQ has been recalculated or carried forward. iGT's will not be able to tell the difference to apply the exclusion criteria.

Inclusion		
Criteria	Question	Party
Only properties deemed to be new housing when first connected to a gas connection.	Are there any other exceptions to this rule except for Infill/Commercial properties?	Agreed that this inclusion should continue
The AQ changed outside the +100% / -50% tolerance, but the new AQ issued as the shipper successfully challenged the old AQ being used.	Do iGTs still need this criteria? The FYAQ is taken from the SMP AQ which has existing controls around the values it can produce.	Agreed to remove this inclusion
All other AQ values calculated as part of the most recently completed AQ Review using actual meter reads (for clarity it also includes those above the 2,500 therm threshold).	How will iGTs know this from the data received from Xoserve? iGTs solely receive an AQ value, and won't know if this has been carried forward from last year, or re-calculated using valid reads taken from the gas year.	Agreed that this inclusion should continue
Only house types that are listed in Section 2 Current Table of the iGT UNC Ancillary Document CSEP NExA Tables.	Is this list still relevant, do values need to be added/removed?	Agreed that this inclusion should continue

Once the above areas have been agreed it will then be necessary to look at the timing for the production of the consolidated draft CSEP NExA table by the iGTs.



The current document has a date of the 30<sup>th</sup> November for circulation to Code parties, but this needs to be reviewed depending on the above, and together with any knock-on impacts for the remainder of the process set out in the Ancillary Document.

Appendix 1 sets out the Ancillary document with a proposed timetable for review by the Modification Work Group.

Following further review it has also been identified that a couple of small changes will be required to the iGT039 Legal text:

Part M

“~~AQ Review Work Group~~”CSEP NExA Table Review Work Group” shall have the meaning as set out in Section ~~40-2~~ of the iGT UNC Ancillary Document entitled the iGT AQ Review Procedures;

“**Proposed CSEP NExA Table**” shall have the meaning as set out in Section ~~9-1~~ of the iGT UNC Ancillary Document entitled the iGT AQ Review Procedures;

Finally it is the view of the Code Administrator that the NExA Table Reporting Template C1 also needs revision as it is out of date.



Appendix 1

# iGT AQ Review Procedures Document

An ancillary document to the iGT UNC

**Version 1.5**



## Contents

Change History .....	5
1. Reporting .....	6
2. Annual updates to the AQ values within the CSEP NExA Table .....	<del>776</del>

## Change History

Version	Change	Date
1.0	First Issue	July 2007
1.1	Designation as an iGT UNC Ancillary Document	November 2011
1.2	Change in line with iGT051ANC	June 2013
1.3	Change in line with iGT049	November 2013
1.4	Change in line with iGT053	October 2014
1.5	Change in line with iGT039	TBC

## 1. Reporting

The following report is generated for Industry analysis and debate as part of the process to conduct an Annual review of the values held within the CSEP NExA Table.

### a) IGT data collation

IGTs will individually collate AQ data using template C1 using the following rules set out within the template.

- Use one tab per licence held, inputting the average AQ per property type for each of the three geographic areas. Next to this value, input the number of individual supply points used to derive that average.
- IGTs should be reporting from the Formula Year Annual Quantity review output files provided by the Pipeline Operator Agency, not from the overall portfolio. If an AQ has not been reviewed, it should not be part of the dataset.
- The AQ used should only be the final AQ Formula Year Annual Quantity (FYAAQ) that was taken as the revised AQ Formula Year Annual Quantity for application from the 1<sup>st</sup> April of the year in which the CSEP NExA table is being reviewed.
- Where an iGT has no values for a type of property the cell AQ and NUMBER must be left BLANK.
- The following should be **EXCLUDED** from the AQ data:
  - Infill domestic property AQs.
  - Non-domestic property AQs.
  - ~~Where an installation read was used in the AQ calculation.~~
  - There was no AQ change because the site became live less than 26 weeks 9 months prior to the cut off read date for the potential revision of the FYAAQ.
  - There were no reads with which to calculate the AQ.
  - ~~The AQ changed outside the +100% / -50% tolerance and the Calculated AQ is used as it was not challenged, or challenged unsuccessfully.~~
  - ~~AQs changed using the Large Transporter's agent adjustment factors based on the change from the old to new weather correction data.~~
- The following should be **INCLUDED** in the AQ data:
  - Only properties deemed to be new housing when first connected to a gas connection.
  - ~~The AQ changed outside the +100% / -50% tolerance, but the new AQ issued as the shipper successfully challenged the old AQ being used.~~
  - All other AQ values calculated as part of the most recently completed AQ revision of the Formula Year Annual Quantity
  - ~~Review~~ Using actual meter reads (for clarity it also includes those above the 2,500 therm threshold).
  - Only house types that are listed in Section 2 Current Table of the iGT UNC Ancillary Document CSEP NExA Tables.

IGTs will collate the results of each IGT AQ review to create the Proposed CSEP NExA Table using template C2 by November 30<sup>th</sup> [31<sup>st</sup> May]

[iGT AQ Review Procedures](#)

**Commented [S3]:** This is one of the exclusion rules. Do we need to specifically state it here?

**Commented [KB4]:** Two outstanding actions above with Xoserve

**Commented [S5]:** Subject to confirmation from Xoserve

**Commented [S6]:** Subject to confirmation from xoserve

**Commented [S7]:** Workgroup felt that this date was appropriate - comments requested from the iGTs

**Commented [KB8R7]:** Dependent on how much internal analysis iGTs have to complete should comparisons have to be made against new exclusion reports (pending close of previous Xoserve actions). Cannot confirm whether this date is acceptable until the action output is known.

**Commented [S9]:** This is the link to template C1 which will also need to be changed as it has a section repeating the above criteria for inclusion and exclusion

## IGT AQ Review Procedures

### 2. Annual updates to the AQ values within the CSEP NExA Table

#### Step 1

Within 5 Business Days of the collation by the iGTs of the results of the iGT ~~AQ review data collation~~ as in Section 19 above, the Pipeline Operators will arrange and thereafter request the Code Administrator to notify Pipeline Users of the date of ~~an AQa CSEP NExA Table Review Work Group~~. This meeting will be scheduled to take place ~~within the first fifteen (15) Business Days of the following January/July workstream~~. At the meeting the Pipeline Operators will present the outputs of the ~~AQ review iGT~~ data collation exercise including the Proposed CSEP NExA Table.

Papers and presentations to be discussed at the meeting should be submitted to the Code Administrator at least seven (7) Business Days ahead of the meeting in order to allow attendees sufficient time to review and consider proposals prior to the meeting.

**Commented [S10]:** Currently December. Workgroup suggested changing this to January/July

**Commented [KB11R10]:** Dependent on above KB8R7

#### Step 2

At the ~~CSEP NExA Table~~AQ Review Work Group meeting the outputs of the AQ ~~review~~ data collation exercise including the Proposed CSEP NExA Table will be reviewed and considered. At the meeting, Pipeline Operators and Pipeline Users will be afforded the opportunity to present any evidence or data which challenges the Proposed CSEP NExA Table.

For the avoidance of doubt, any Party who wishes to raise a valid challenge to the Proposed CSEP NExA Table must provide sufficient evidence to do so and must state how this evidence has been produced.

#### Step 3

The Pipeline Operators will produce a Work Group report for the following ~~February/July~~ iGT UNC Modification Panel. The report will include the views of the Work Group on whether or not to automatically update the current CSEP NExA Table with the values contained in the Proposed CSEP NExA Table and will include details of any valid challenges that were raised and whether such challenges were withdrawn during the meeting. Following the production of the report a challenge can be withdrawn prior to the consideration of the Work Group report by the Panel, by notice to the Code Administrator.

**Commented [S12]:** Currently January. Workgroup suggested changing this to February/July

#### Step 4

At the ~~February/July~~ Panel, the Panel will review the ~~CSEP NExA Table~~AQ Review Work Group report together with any outstanding challenges that have been raised and not withdrawn. The Panel will consider ~~whether the AQ review reports produced by the Pipeline Operators in accordance with Section 9 demonstrate that there are no significant errors and whether the data is largely accurate and reflective of annual consumption patterns~~. Following such discussion the Panel will be asked to vote on whether there are sufficient concerns for the Proposed CSEP NExA Table not to be implemented. Subject to Step 8, unless there is a Panel Majority against implementation, the Proposed CSEP NExA table will be implemented as a replacement of the current CSEP NExA table in Section 2 Current Table of the iGT UNC Ancillary Document CSEP NExA Tables, in the following ~~June~~

**Commented [S13]:** Currently January. Workgroup suggested changing this to February/July

**Commented [S14]:** Will no longer have these reports although parties should have their own reports??

**Commented [KB15R14]:** Shippers receive the new values in their portfolio reports from Xoserve so can compare data in there

# iGT | UNC

~~[February]~~ release of the iGT UNC and the Panel will instruct the Code Administrator to circulate an implementation notice to each iGT UNC Operator, each Pipeline User, each Member, each Third Party Participant, each Affected Person (if any) and the Authority within five (5) Business Days of the Panel decision. Such implementation notice will include a copy of the Proposed CSEP NExA Table.

**Commented [S16]:** Could implement at end of December based on current agreed lead times but there is no scheduled release at this time

## Step 5

(Explanatory Note - Steps 5, 6 and 7 will only need to be followed where the ~~February~~ ~~[July]~~ Panel cannot agree implementation.)

**Commented [S17]:** Currently January. Workgroup suggested changing this to February

Where the ~~February~~ ~~[July]~~ Panel does not agree to implement the Proposed NExA, the concerns raised by the Panel will be documented by the Code Administrator within two (2) Business Days and the Panel will request that the Proposed CSEP NExA Table shall proceed to Consultation in accordance with Clause 23.1 of Part L of the iGT UNC on the basis that the Proposed CSEP NExA Table will be considered to be a Self-Governance Modification Proposal where the Panel has agreed that Legal text does not need to be provided.

**Commented [S18]:** Currently January. Workgroup suggested changing this to February

## Step 6

The normal procedures for a Self-Governance Modification Proposal as per the iGT UNC Modification Rules Clause 23 will be applied and the resulting Final Modification Report will be considered by the ~~April~~ ~~[September]~~ iGT UNC Panel. Subject to Step 8, where there is a Panel Majority for implementation, the Proposed CSEP NExA table will be implemented as a replacement of the current CSEP NExA table in Section 2 Current Table of the iGT UNC Ancillary Document CSEP NExA Tables, in the following ~~November~~ ~~[February/June]~~ release of the iGT UNC and the Panel will instruct the Code Administrator to circulate an implementation notice to each iGT UNC Operator, each Pipeline User, each Member, each Third Party Participant, each Affected Person (if any) and the Authority within three (3) Business Days of the Panel decision. Such implementation notice will include a copy of the Proposed CSEP NExA Table.

**Commented [S19]:** Currently March Panel suggested changing this to April/September

**Commented [S20]:** Possibly still able to make the February release;

## Step 7

Subject to Step 8, where the Panel is unable to reach a decision at the ~~April~~ ~~[September]~~ Panel to implement the Proposed CSEP NExA Table, the Table would not be updated for that year and the Panel will instruct the Code Administrator to circulate a non-implementation notice to each iGT UNC Operator, each Pipeline User, each Member, each Third Party Participant, each Affected Person (if any) and the Authority within three (3) Business Days of the Panel decision.

**Commented [S21]:** AS above

## Step 8 (Appeal Procedures)

Any decision taken by the Panel with regard to the implementation or non-implementation of the Proposed CSEP NExA Table will be subject to Clause 30 of Part L of the iGT UNC (Self-Governance Appeal Procedures). For the purposes of the said paragraph 30, the Proposed CSEP NExA Table change will be considered in an exact same manner as though it were a Self-Governance Modification Proposal and the Self-Governance Modification Proposal Determination Date will be the date of the Panel meeting at which the implementation or non-implementation of the Proposed CSEP NExA Table was agreed.



