

**MEMORANDUM**

TO: Pipeline Users

FROM: First Gas Limited

DATE: 27 February 2018

RE: GTAC TMS - Presentation Follow up and Consultation Items

At the GTAC TMS presentation on 12 February 2018, First Gas identified a number of areas where stakeholder input is required during the process. First Gas believe that stakeholder input to this project is essential to a successful implementation of both the GTAC and the supporting IT system.

The following items have been identified by First Gas for consultation with stakeholders, followed by its responses.

1. Do shippers want the ability to provide nominations to a delivery point that is within a delivery zone?	
<b>Genesis Energy</b>	Yes, but also allowing delivery zone nominations.
<b>Nova Energy</b>	Nova is only interested in proving DNC nominations by Zone. Any mix between Zones and DPs is only likely to create confusion.
<b>Shell</b>	Not relevant to use as producers.
<b>Vector</b>	Vector would like the ability to nominate at either Delivery Zone, or at the Delivery Point and the new system to aggregate to the Delivery Zone. We believe it will add complexity to the system if parties were able to partially nominate at Delivery Point and also at the Delivery Zone that the Delivery Point is part of. As a DP can go in and out of a Delivery Zone, First Gas also needs to keep in mind that historical data on nominations for a DP could be disjointed. It is highly likely that Shippers will be storing data at the DP level as this is the level that DRR data is allocated at, we invoice our customers at specific DPs and to enable a DP to enter or leave a Delivery Zone.

2. Do shippers require the ability to distinguish nomination between the same TSA (multiple contract IDs under the same TSA)?	
<b>Genesis Energy</b>	It seems possible that this would be required if a shipper is supplying an interruptible load or load with PR rights.
<b>Nova Energy</b>	No.
<b>Shell</b>	Producers need to be able to distinguish nominations made under different contracts but potentially under the same TSA, particularly relevant when

## 2. Do shippers require the ability to distinguish nomination between the same TSA (multiple contract IDs under the same TSA)?

	managing nominations for multiple Joint Venture Parties and multiple fields. So yes, this is an absolute “must” for us.
<b>Vector</b>	Vector would appreciate this functionality being available and being able to manage the multiple IDs ourselves rather than having to enter into additional TSAs to enable this to occur.

## 3. Do shippers require the ability to assign a priority to be assigned to nominations?

<b>Genesis Energy</b>	Yes
<b>Nova Energy</b>	Yes, Nova supports having the ability to prioritise nominations.
<b>Shell</b>	This would be useful to us, if it simplifies how curtailments (extra ID cycles) get processed (although using our understanding that we will have a fine level of control over that process), then this would be a useful addition. Provided that it does not have a significant cost to the industry.
<b>Vector</b>	At present Vector does not envisage different priorities assigned to nominations but could see Interconnected Parties being interested in being able to assign priorities associated with specific Shipper’s nominations (which would need to be visible to Shippers).

## 4. What data should be made available to Shippers, for example, Hrly GJ, Temp, Press, CV, UCTOT, CTOT, CORR etc. alongside information that must be provided under the GTAC?

<b>Genesis Energy</b>	Still confirming requirements within our business, at this stage Hrly GJ, Prior Day GJ by gas gate total, CV
<b>Nova Energy</b>	Nova supports making all forms of raw data available to Shippers. This will assist in developing forecasting tools and exception reports as well as possible development of innovative services.
<b>Shell</b>	Directionally, depends on the report. Same as current for the delivery reports. Main thing missing (or turned-off) from current web service queries is the imbalance, peaking, deemed flow.
<b>Vector</b>	All non-confidential transactional data should be available to Shippers.

5. How many decimal places should reports to shippers contain?	
<b>Genesis Energy</b>	Minimum of 3 DP.
<b>Nova Energy</b>	We invoice customers to three decimal places, which is roughly equivalent to the nearest 1c per GJ. We propose three decimal places as appropriate.
<b>Shell</b>	Current OATIS Web Service data is “Decimal” data type, which (according to the specification, provides 28-29 significant digits). On the assumption that transactional data will be available with this full level of precision and the question is more about the number of decimal points displayed in reports, then 2 DP for gas volumes, 3 for gas properties (GHVs) etc is fine. No firm view. One thing that we’d like is ability to choose units – could we get reports in MJ or TJ instead of GJ for example?
<b>Vector</b>	As the DRR states that allocated data is to 3 decimal places it would seem appropriate that the new system provides data to the same level for all consumption data, as this will be used for overrun and underrun charges. It would also be appropriate that Shippers are able to nominate to the same level but obviously can choose to nominate only at whole GJs. For all monetary values, this should be to 2 decimal places.