

Uniform Network Code Committee
Minutes of the 166th Meeting held on Thursday 16th November 2017
at Elexon, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW

Attendees

Attendees

Voting Members:

Shipper Representatives	Transporter Representatives
A Green* (AG), Total	C Warner (CW), Cadent Gas
A Love (AL), ScottishPower	D Lond (DL), National Grid NTS
A Margan (AM), British Gas	H Chapman (HC), SGN
J Price (JP), Corona	J Ferguson (JF), Northern Gas Networks
R Fairholme (RF), Uniper	R Pomroy (RP), Wales & West Utilities
S Mulinganie* (SM), Gazprom	N Rozier (NR), BUUK Infrastructure

Non-Voting Members:

Chairman	Ofgem Representative	Consumer Representatives	Independent Supplier Representative
A Plant (AP), Chair	R Elliott (RH)	S Horne (SH)	N Anderson (NA)

Also in Attendance:

F Cottam (FC), Xoserve; K Jones (KJ), Joint Office; P Garner (PG), Joint Office; R Fletcher (RFI), Secretary; R Hailes (RHa), Joint Office; R Hinsley (RHi), Xoserve and S Britton (SB), Cornwall Insight.

** by teleconference*

166.1 Note of any alternates attending meeting

J Price for E Wells (Corona Energy)

166.2 Apologies for Absence

E Proffitt

E Wells

166.3 Minutes and Actions from the previous meeting

The Minutes from 19 October 2017 and 09 November 2017 meetings were approved.

166.4 Matters for the Committee's Attention

a) AUG Year Review 2017 – suggested next steps

FC provided a presentation on the AUG process review for 2017.

FC asked Members to note that should they want to consider another procurement event, there would need to be a revised framework produced to inform the tender process, otherwise the existing framework would apply – which following the recent comments might not be suitable.

FC presented a number of potential changes to the framework.

AL suggested that Ofgem should attend the Shrinkage Forum and that perhaps additional attendance by Shippers would help to highlight concerns around the process. However, clarity on the AUGE Scope and process interactions with Shrinkage would be useful.

AM wanted further clarity on individuals who should be noted as being available to support the process both directly and indirectly and what their role is to ensure there are no conflicts of interest. FC agreed, however noting there should be for example an existing general conflict of interest clause to cover Xoserve employees. SM wanted a wider clause to ensure that conflicts of interest are managed effectively.

SM suggested a wider review was needed to ensure the process can be as effective as possible. AL wanted more clarity on the individuals involved and their specific roles and responsibilities.

AM wanted to ensure the UNC drives the framework, as there appear to be conflicts which require clarification and it is not clear which is the main driver – UNC or framework. FC provided examples of potential conflicts and suggested that these be addressed so that the deliverables are clearly defined, this would aid the AUG process.

SM suggested a review group is established sooner rather than later to take these points and others which might impact the framework and UNC.

AL suggested the following two steps:

1. What needs to change for the incumbent AUGE;
2. What needs to change for a future AUGE.

These would then be used to inform the procurement process going forward.

FC advised that some parties had requested the information should be centralised on the Joint Office Website. PG challenged if it was commercially sensitive data and should remain on the Xoserve website. FC advised that there is a similarity to charging statements in that the information is for Transporters/Shippers but available to all.

AL asked if the AUGE would have a view on the proposed changes. FC agreed to confirm any views provided. NA supported a view for wider transparency as independent suppliers might not have access to the Xoserve website or be knowledgeable enough to find it.

FC advised that notice would need to be issued by 01 May should the industry wish to change the current arrangements. However, the first AUG deliverable is due in January therefore work would need to continue for the next AUGS as it is a Year + 2 scenario.

SM felt 01 May would be a useful date to target for a review of the process end date. FC noted that if the existing AUG scope changed significantly, it might require a re-tender so this should be considered as part of the review.

AM requested that the 2017/18 AUG review and responses be published on the AUG statement page on the Joint Office Website. PG advised that the information is currently published on the 19 October UNCC meeting page. AM wanted to understand what the learning points were for Xoserve. FC advised that these formed parts of the suggested changes contained within this presentation but were mainly around management of the AUGE.

AM wanted to understand how much discretion the AUGE has in terms of considering other issues and attending unrelated industry meetings. He wanted to understand how it was being funded. FC advised that the AUGE had attended related meetings and at other times attended as DNV GL which was not being funded through the AUG process. However, noting that other parties had suggested that the AUGE should be more proactive.

166.5 Any Other Business

- a) Implementation of Modification 0593 - consistency between both UNC and IGT UNC

AM noted that the implementation decision letter from Ofgem had advised that the date would be set by the DSC Change Management Committee. RE advised that he felt the date of implementation should be set by the DSC Committees as they had a good view as to when the services could be provided and when the appropriate systems would be available. However, JF felt this is a permissions Modification and therefore implementation should be by Transporter direction, as the Modification doesn't directly offer the service.

AM noted that the iGT UNC is leaning on direction from DSC Change Management Committee and there should be consistency. JF disagreed with this view and noted that where an implementation date or direction is not provided by Ofgem, then Transporters should set the implementation date.

JF agreed that there would be coordination on implementation between Transporters, DSC Change Management Committee and iGT UNC administrator to ensure implementation runs smoothly and is coordinated.

166.6 Next Meeting

Thursday 21 December 2017, immediately after the UNC Modification Panel meeting.

Action Table (16 November 2017)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update