

UNC Workgroup 0630R Minutes

Review of the consequential changes required in UNC as a result of the Ofgem Switching Programme

Monday 17 December 2018

at Elexon, 350 Euston Road, London, NW1 3AW

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Kully Jones (Secretary)	(KJ)	Joint Office
Alsarif Satti*	(AS)	Ofgem
Andy Clasper	(AC)	Cadent
Chris Warner	(CW)	Cadent
Dave Addison	(DA)	Xoserve
David Mitchell	(DM)	SGN
Ellie Rogers	(ER)	Xoserve
Gareth Evans	(GE)	Waters Wye Associates Ltd
John Cooper*	(JC)	BUUK
Kirsty Dudley*	(KD)	E.ON UK
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	Orsted
Lindsay Biginton*	(LB)	Utilitia
Louise Hellyer*	(LH)	Total Gas & Power
Mark Jones*	(MJ)	SSE
Megan Coventry*	(MC)	SSE
Michelle Whittington*	(MW)	EDF Energy
Oorlagh Chapman*	(OC)	Centrica
Rachel Clarke*	(RC)	Gemserv Ltd
Richard Pomroy	(RP)	Wales & West Utilities
Shanna Key*	(SK)	Northern Gas Networks
Steve Britton*	(SB)	Cornwall Insight
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	Gazprom
Tracey Saunders*	(TS)	Northern Gas Networks

*via teleconference

Copies of all papers are available at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0630/171218>

1. Introduction and Status Review

1.1. Approval of Minutes (25 October 2018)

The minutes from the previous meeting were approved.

2. Update of Potential Switching Programme Impacts

Bob Fletcher (BF) introduced this Workgroup asking Chris Warner (CW) and Dave Addison (DA) if there were any updates. DA stated that he had some information to share via a presentation. Workgroup had a brief discussion and agreed to accept the late paper.

DA provided a detailed walkthrough of the presentation titled *0630R Update*. In terms of background he stated that following the Central Switching Service (CSS) implementation registration will be 'mastered via CSS for in-scope Supply Meter Points. NTS Meter Points are not in scope. Slide 2 provides details of the different types of Registration Requests.

A pictorial representation of the Registration Requests was provided (Slide 3) showing how a request progresses through a number of defined stages from submitted to completed:

Submitted → Validated → Confirmed → Secured → Completed

DA said that *Secured* will be at 17:00 hours on D-1 calendar days and that a consideration will be whether there is some data which is protected and where the timing of 17:00 is too close. In real terms this allowed 7 hours for industry parties to consider the request.

A brief discussion took place around alignment of terminology as new terms were being introduced that had the potential to add confusion because the same word had different meanings. One example of this was the use of the word '*Complete*'. CW confirmed that there will be some new defined terms as a result of this new process, however the intent is not to redefine all the references in UNC.

DA then described the standard process for a Switch Request stating that the diagram showing on slide 4 was not to scale. It was noted that the maximum validity for a Registration Request is 28 days.

A lengthy discussion then took place on *Settlement Detail Notification (side 5)*. DS explained that this term will be used to describe any detail not provided in the switch request that is currently provided through the Nomination/Confirmation processes. Workgroup participants considered the terminology of settlement detail to be confusing when it is actually referring to registration data. DA agreed to review the terminology and consider a new term although there was limited scope to change terminology that was being introduced through faster switching.

DA explained that the following data items are the basic data

- Class
- SOQ
- SHQ
- Meter Read Frequency
- Meter Read Batch Frequency
- Shipper Short Code
- Supplier Short Code
- Registration Effective Date
- Supplier Generated reference
- Customer/Contact Details.

and additional data items such as emergency contact, seasonal site indicator are to be confirmed in the future.

The Settlement Detail Notification will in the main provide the above information, but some information may be necessary prior to this and there may be an opportunity to pre-register. He explained that the key challenge is creating association with the CSS Registration Requests.

He explained that Xoserve are working on a 'default rules' and more information will be provided at the next meeting. The current thinking is that it will be a mixture of default information such that in the absence of communication the system will default to a legally binding position to indicate the Class type. He indicated that some feedback had been received from industry to challenge this position – some feedback has indicated that everything currently in Class 2 should remain as Class 2.

For SOH and SHQ the intention is that for Class 1 and 2 sites the current value would be carried forward. Steve Mulinganie (SM) challenged this approach explaining that this is the commercial property of the Shipper and that the default position should be to avoid passing on any commercially sensitive information which was previously owned by the Shipper, then passing to a new Shipper unless this was approved consumer data.

Workgroup participant concerns in relation to the confidentiality of information were noted by DA.

DA then took Workgroup participants through slide 6 illustrating the Switch Request and the Settlement Detail Notification (SDN). He explained that the SDN by the incoming Shipper can be made prior to the Registration Request via CSS but the SDN association must happen by a given deadline which the current working assumption is set at 15:00 on CD-1. This is to ensure that priority is given to getting data to Gemini. DA suggested that as the design develops the deadline could become 20:00 on CD-1 but currently it is set prior to the Secured stage.

SM raised a concern about pre-submitting large volumes of data that might not be needed subsequently and how long these would "sit on the shelf".

Lorna Lewin (LL) sought clarification of what time will be included in the UNC emphasising that this needs to be explicit. Currently in relation to Class 2 deadlines there is a difference between the times specified in the UNC and working practices.

DA described the Network Appraisal Request process stating that the existing Nomination process fulfils three functions (slide 7):

- Setting 'Settlement Details' for Large Supply Points
- Transportation Offer
- Enabling Network Assessment/Referral

SM sought assurances in relation to the offer following a question from DA on whether the offer should provide all the settlement data. Shippers indicated that they want to receive the data currently provided and do not want any data items to be removed that might be needed later and which would then be charged to get it back. A 'lift and shift' model was preferred to minimise the risk to Shippers.

CW indicated that it was his understanding that there will be the ability to get a snapshot of information for every Supply Point.

DA reported that discussions at DSG had indicated a view to consider an Automated Programmable Interface (API) service which is considered to be more flexible than standard file formats. SM challenged that this technology would be possible as the industry has struggled to move from CSV to XML in recent times.

Slide 8 – DA presented the proposed timeline for a Switch Request/Network Appraisal Request and Settlement Detail Notification. He indicated that there was a concern about the number of potential referral requests that might be received. The following questions arose in discussion:

- a. SM suggested that it was not clear at what point action would be taken. In response, DA said that at the moment there is the ability to ask to see the basis of the nomination request in other words to see the relationship with the Shipper.
- b. LL asked how often referrals occur.
- c. SM asked how a Shipper knows to put in a Network Appraisal Request on behalf of a Supplier.

A brief discussion also took place about the objection process which can occur between the validated and confirmed statuses.

CW stated that the appraisal request and the settlement detail are two separate requests.

SM suggested a preference for a notification at validated and when the confirmed status has been achieved.

DA agreed to discuss this further at DSG and provide feedback to the Workgroup.

New Action 1201: Xoserve (DA) to request DSG to consider Network Appraisal Requests process and how it would be managed for multiple requests.

DA provided a brief overview of other SPA impacts (slide 9) highlighting the change of tenancy indicator contained in CSS flows but not passed to UKLink.

In relation to slide 10 setting out the Supply Point Amendment, DA explained that UNC Section G defines data items that can be amended outside a Confirmation. He highlighted that the *Meter Point Location Address* will be using a specific meter point location.

DA concluded his presentation with a brief summary of the next areas for consideration which focus on settlement details, Change of Supplier only and Output flows.

In relation, to Change of Supplier flows, SM emphasised that both a Supply Point Amendment and Same Shipper Reconfirmation should be supported as there is the potential of fundamental systems consequences for Shippers if both options are not adopted.

DA thanked Workgroup participants for their input saying that the discussion had helped to validate a number of key principles.

3. Development of Request Workgroup Report

This agenda item was deferred.

4. Next Steps

CW asked Workgroup participants to note that the DSG is meeting regularly to discuss the implications for system changes encouraging Shippers to attend meetings to provide their views on the proposed developments.

In addition, he stated that Ofgem have requested 2 meeting dates. The first on 18 February 2019 to provide a full walkthrough of the UNC rules and the second on 25 March 2019 to consider the legal text. These meetings are in response to feedback to provide more opportunities for commercial feedback.

BF suggested that Request 0630R Workgroup needs to be held as a separate meeting to allow more time for discussion. SM reiterated the need to provide papers/presentations in sufficient time ahead of meetings to allow participants to circulate them and receive feedback from within their organisations and thus ensure a high-quality discussion.

SM was concerned that formal Workgroup meetings were not be allowed due to the constraints of the SCR and that a solution might be delivered which meets the need of domestic Shippers but not non domestic Shippers.

It was agreed that the next meeting would be held on 07 January 2019.

5. Any Other Business

None.

6. Review of Outstanding Actions

Action 0202: 1. Shippers to provide views on the proposed solution and discussion points set out in slide 6 of the presentation. 2. Xoserve (DA) to discuss the feedback provided by Shippers at the DSC Change Management Committee meeting to be held on ~~07 March~~ 09 May 2018.

Update: DA and CW agreed that this action could now be closed as it was now out of date.
Closed.

Action 0203: Xoserve (RH) to add a separate topic area to the BRD in relation to iGT transportation charges.

Update: DA and CW agreed that this action could now be closed as it was now out of date.
Closed.

Action 0401: Xoserve (AM) to provide an update for iGT's on the Impact Assessment prior to the next meeting to be held on 29 June 2018.

Update: DA and CW agreed that this action could now be closed as it was now out of date.
Closed.

7. Any Other Business

None.

8. Diary Planning

Further details of planned meetings are available at:

<https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/events-calendar/month>

Time / Date	Venue	Workgroup Programme
10.30, Monday 07 January 2019	Radcliffe House, Blenheim Court, Warwick Road, Solihull B91 2AA	Update on the SCR progress and potential consequential UNC changes

Action Table (as at 17 December 2018)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
1201	17/12/18	2.0	Xoserve (DA) to request DSG to consider Network Appraisal Requests process and how it would be managed for multiple requests.	Xoserve (DA)	Pending