

iGT UNC / iGT INC Modification Proposal

Date	9 March 2009
Urgency	Non-urgent
Reference	iGT024
Status	For Information
Title	Inspection Notification File Format and Response File - Clarification of File Naming Convention - Consecutive
Proposer	Lorraine McGregor - ScottishPower Energy Management Limited
iGT UNC / Pipeline Operator <i>Confirm whether the Modification Proposal is to the iGT UNC or an iGT's Individual Network Code.</i>	iGT UNC
Modification Proposal Dates	<i>Circulation: dd/mm/yyyy</i> <i>Response: dd/mm/yyyy</i> <i>Circulation of DMR: dd/mm/yyyy</i> <i>Response to DMR: dd/mm/yyyy</i> <i>FMR sent to authority: dd/mm/yyyy</i> <i>Circulate Authority's determination: dd/mm/yyyy</i> <i>Suggested Implementation date: dd/mm/yyyy</i>

Urgency

Non urgent

Background

Modifications iGT013VV, iGT014, iGT015VV and iGT016 were directed to be made by the Authority on 1st July 2008. This suite of Modifications mandates the use of the unbundled meter reading file formats for the submission by Shippers of Meter Inspections and cyclical reads and for the acknowledgement of acceptance/rejection by iGTs within prescribed timescales.

Since direction from the Authority some inconsistencies relating to file naming conventions have been identified. As currently written it is unclear whether the numbering within the file naming convention should be submitted with numbers running sequentially (number higher than previous) or consecutively (1, 2, 3 etc).

There has been industry debate surrounding the pros and cons of each numbering convention. However, Parties were unable to unanimously agree to one numbering convention over the other. To move this forward two modifications have been raised - this one proposing consecutive numbering and an Alternative proposing sequential numbering.

Given the dependency of this modification on the already approved modifications (iGT013-016) it is proposed that there is a shortened timescales for the modification as follows:

- Modification considered at Panel: 18th March
- Modification Issued for Consultation: 20th March
- Consultation Closes: 3rd April
- DMR Issued: 13th April

iGT UNC / iGT INC Modification Proposal

- DMR Consultation Closes: 27th April
- DFMR Published: 6th May
- DFMR to Panel: 20th May

Since this has been debated prior to the raising of the modification ScottishPower consider all Parties should be able to adhere to the shortened timescales.

The Proposal

This Modification seeks to mandate that the generation number must always be consecutive, per file type and per recipient. For example, Shipper sends file, generation number xxxx(x).file type (an example of a file naming convention being; GUK02.PN000001.WAO), the next file of the same type for the same recipient must therefore be consecutive.

For the avoidance of doubt consecutive means that the file number must be in numerical order with no gaps (e.g. 1,2,3,4,5,6 etc), per recipient.

The use of consecutive numbering would ensure any errors in file sequencing was readily identified by the iGT. For example, files 1-4 have been sent and accepted; if an error was made and the next file (5) was not sent from the Shipper this would soon be obvious as the next file (6) would be rejected and all files thereafter. In order to resolve this the missing file (5) and all subsequent files would be required to be resubmitted.

Suggested timescale for implementation

Due to the dependency on iGT013 the implementation date should align. Therefore, proposed implementation is November 2009 Release.

How will the proposal operate?

Shippers will be mandated to use sequential file numbering for the unbundled meter reading file formats for the submission of cyclical reads and meter inspection notifications to iGTs.

Facilitation of the relevant objectives

ScottishPower believe that implementation of this Modification will further the following code relevant objectives:

Standard Condition 9 (d): so far as is consistent with sub-paragraphs (a) to (c) the securing of effective competition between relevant shippers and between relevant suppliers

Standard Condition 9 (f): so far as is consistent with sub-paragraphs (a) to (e), the promotion of efficiency in the implementation and administration of the network code and/or the uniform network code;



iGT UNC / iGT INC Modification Proposal

Section(s) of the Code Concerned

Section E

Proposed Legal Text

Wherever possible, a proposal should contain proposed draft legal text to reflect how the Network Code would change if the proposal were implemented.

Completed forms should be returned to the iGT UNC Representative, Gemserv Ltd at iGT-UNC@gemserv.com or faxed to 020 7090 1001