

DAWG for D+1 Rule Changes Meeting #2

Date: Tuesday 28 September 2021

Time: 1:00pm – 3:00pm

Venue: GIC offices and online - Teams



Minutes

Present

- Edward Oosterbaan, ems
- Jim Raybould, Vector
- Pam Caird, Firstgas
- Sharon Wray, Contact
- Dave Weaver, Concept
- Jonathan Brough, Nova
- Tim Kerr, GIC
- Sam Grace, Nova
- Hayden Snell, Nova
- Greg Redshaw, Genesis Energy
- Andrew Walker, GIC
- Grace Burtin, GIC
- Evelise Campozana de Favari, Mercury
- Shane Haswell, Firstgas
- Gerry Hughes, GIC
- Meenu Daniel, Vector
- Andrew Green, Firstgas
- Lucas MacNeil, GIC

1	D+1 project update
	Gas Industry Co (GIC) reiterated that it has transitioned the current D+1 to be run by ems as an interim solution. This solution enables a greater level of support to the running of D+1 while a final solution is being built. This rebuild has commenced and remains on track for a go-live by the end of the year.
2	Daily process
	<p>GIC gave an overview of the current daily process for D+1 and sought feedback from the group on what run times would like to be seen in the future. GIC also discussed that its preference would be to keep the specific timings out of the DR Rules and pursue a 'determinations' approach, that is, the rules would allow GIC to determine (within certain bounds and following consultation) the times and frequency of the daily allocation runs. This would allow flexibility for future changes.</p> <p>There was discussion around when the information needed for D+1 could be validated. It was thought that validated TOU metering data could be made available by 12:30pm (not earlier because of the availability of gas composition data). Firstgas noted that they contractually need to have validated gas gate data available by 2pm. They often have it ready earlier but can't guarantee anything before 2pm. Validation may move earlier with the metering system upgrade currently underway, but Firstgas are not yet in a position to guarantee this. It was discussed that unvalidated data though, both TOU and gas gate, is often available around 8:30am.</p> <p>Shippers were of the view that a run using validated data in time for ID3 (2pm) would be beneficial when possible. It was also thought that a morning run (9am) using whatever unvalidated data is available would also be helpful. It was understood that an early report might be considerably less</p>

	<p>accurate and so it would be beneficial for shippers to also receive an indication of the amount of missing data (similar to the run report currently produced internally for GIC/ems).</p> <p>It was agreed that GIC would investigate the feasibility of a 9am run and a method of communicating the quality of the results to shippers.</p> <p>There was general support for a determinations approach for setting the specific run times.</p>
3	Business days/non-business days
	<p>GIC gave an overview of how the current D+1 model treats business days and non-business days and sought feedback from the group about whether non-business days should be recorded in the DR Rules. GIC also highlighted that there would need to be some flexibility in the drafting to allow the transition from 5-day to 7-day D+1 as not all parties are ready for a 7-day operation. It was agreed that the determinations approach previously discussed may be useful for this issue.</p> <p>There was general agreement that the DR Rules may need to provide for D+1 non-business days that are distinct from existing non-business days for when things go wrong (to avoid cash-outs using poor data).</p> <p>Vector Metering gave an update about how 7 days would work for them. On non-business days they would work on an on-call system and would only investigate issues if missing data goes above a certain threshold. They would therefore need an indication from GIC what that threshold for materiality is.</p> <p>GIC noted that there were various business rules that relate to this and as we go through the D+1 rebuild project they will need to be agreed. GIC noted it will come up with a list of business rules we're currently operating under and an indication of what we think we should change to.</p>
4	Wash-ups
	<p>GIC gave an overview of the timings of the D+1, initial, interim and final allocations. Because the initial allocations are currently overwritten by D+1 allocations (using the special allocation process) for transmission billing, GIC also sought feedback on whether there is any appetite in moving the timings of the initial and interim allocations, or merging the two to allow an earlier wash-up than the current interim.</p> <p>It was noted that, although the initials are ignored for transmission billing, they are a significant input into the D+1 regression models, they are used to create seasonal adjustment daily shape values (SADSV) for profiling mass market meter read volumes and they may be used for network billing.</p> <p>It was noted that you can use interim allocations as an input into D+1 but it does make the accuracy slightly worse. However, if interim was to be moved forward then this inaccuracy might be lessened. It's going to be an issue of trading off accuracy verse the hassle of doing the initial.</p> <p>It was also noted the SADSV could still be provided without the initial allocation as it does not use mass market submissions.</p> <p>There was feedback that currently the initial is only useful for the creation of the SADSV and so if there is no other purpose that parties would be open to removing the initial and bringing the interim allocation forward.</p> <p>GIC noted it would do a wider consultation to understand the impacts of changing the initial allocation.</p>

5	TOU threshold
	<p>GIC provided some analysis to suggest that introducing a requirement for telemetry on ICPs that use greater than 20TJ per annum would move approximately 61% of AG2 volume to AG1 but would only impact about 65 ICPS. GIC noted it thought this makes sense and intends to make this a requirement.</p> <p>There was general agreement that the threshold made sense but some thought that eventually they'd like to see all TOU customers with telemetry.</p> <p>There was advice that if this was going to go ahead then GIC should make its intentions clear early on so operators can make appropriate plans for the coming years.</p> <p>GIC noted it would create a list of all ICPS affected for each retailer and send to retailers to get a greater understanding of feasibility.</p>
6	Participant obligations
	GIC provided an overview of some of the obligations GIC sees would be written into the DR Rules.
7	Firstgas update
	Firstgas provided an update on its D+1 model and the beginnings of its scoping phase to identify automation opportunities.
8	D+1 rebuild project update
	<p>Finally, GIC gave an update on the D+1 rebuild project.</p> <p>GIC discussed some of the proposed changes and the tolerances that are currently built into the model. As discussed above in 'Business days/non-business days' it was noted GIC would populate a document of business rules to ensure the rebuild is consistent with what shippers are expecting.</p> <p>There was also a discussion around the difficulties with the inability to make changes to an ICP mid-month and how there was preference for this to change.</p>
9	Summary of actions
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Investigate feasibility of a 9am run (GIC) 2. List of business rules we're currently operating under and an indication of what we think we should change to (GIC) 3. Wider consultation to understand the impacts of changing or removing the initial allocation (GIC) 4. Send a list of ICPs affected by the intended telemetry threshold to get a greater understanding of feasibility (GIC)