

**UNC Workgroup 0455S Minutes
Updating of Meter Information by the Transporter**

Thursday 22 August 2013

ENA, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Lorna Dupont (Secretary)	(LD)	Joint Office
Alex Ross-Shaw	(ARS)	Northern Gas Networks
Andrew Margan	(AM)	British Gas
Andy Clasper	(AC)	National Grid Distribution
Chris Hill	(CH)	Cornwall Energy
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Colette Baldwin	(CB)	E.ON UK
David Addison	(DA)	Xoserve
David Mitchell	(DM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Edward Hunter	(EH)	RWE npower
Erika Melén	(EM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Gareth Evans	(GE)	Waters Wye
Hilary Chapman	(HCh)	Xoserve
Huw Comerford	(HW)	Utilita
Joel Martin	(JM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Jon Dixon	(JD)	Ofgem
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	DONG Energy
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE
Steve Deery *	(SD)	Xoserve
Steve Mulinganie*	(SM)	Gazprom
Tom Chevalier	(TC)	Association of Meter Operators

**via teleconference*

Copies of all papers are available at: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0455/220813

The Workgroup Report is due to the UNC Modification Panel on 17 October 2013.

1.0 Review of Minutes and Actions from previous meeting

1.1. Minutes

The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted.

1.2. Actions

None outstanding.

2.0 Discussion

Organisational Process Flow Diagram

DA explained the changes made to the process flow following discussions at the previous meeting.

Modification

TC indicated that the MAMs were interested in this modification, querying whether the root cause had yet to be established, and if other processes should be examined to see if the problem was actually being generated through a different source and then filtering through to have an adverse effect on data. SM pointed out Transporters were not in control of meter asset data, maintaining the accuracy of which was the Shippers' responsibility. It should be obvious if this was not being done properly. CW reiterated what was currently in place and why the modification had been raised; the instances identified (200,000 – 300,000 asset errors) were 'occasional' occurrences and this was an effort to improve the quality of the data. TC wondered if other solutions had been considered, eg improving the communications routes. CW responded that the proposed solution was believed to be readily achievable and did not preclude improvements being made in other areas. It was an incremental improvement, with checks/balances; there was no evidence to support that the problems related to any one particular party or system failure.

TC suggested that perhaps if the Shipper was unable to correct the data the MAMs could assist in improving the data quality. Data flow to MAMs was a controversial area; CW saw consideration of this as a complementary approach, which could be discussed outside of this modification that was trying to offer a backstop position to improve the current process.

TC observed that if a Shipper cannot update the information and continues not to do so then the process was failing; that the Shipper was not taking action to update data was of concern. SM commented that modification of files between parties could be a contributing factor. Whose view of the data was correct/should be accepted as correct was also under discussion. CW explained that an active notification was sent/received to establish the Shipper's view when data accuracy was under question. DA gave examples. SM gave a further explanation of the treatment/modification of files when progressing through RGMA flows; this may be where some data errors are occurring. Was there any systemic failure that could be readily identified? DA explained various scenarios under UNC Modifications 0424 and 0425 and how assets may be attached if the situation was found to be 'unexpected'. Scenarios and responsibilities were discussed. A GSR visit assumes a specific set of circumstances exists. CW explained the narrow circumstances in which a Transporter may update asset information. It indirectly encourages the Shipper to engage with the MAM and establish the correct information to confirm to the Transporter.

Presentation by Xoserve

DA gave a brief presentation. Particular attention was focused on the examples in the GSR Table on slide 5. The GTs' actions under UNC Modifications 0424 and 0425 were discussed. CW observed that this Modification 0455S might be seen as complementary to Modification 0425. DA commented that ancillary data often helps Xoserve to verify and update the data.

Responding to questions regarding potential implications for Smart meters, CW confirmed that as the UNC has yet to be modified to take account of Smart meters it was difficult to frame legal text to address something that had yet to be contemplated, so Smart remained out of the scope of this modification.

Next Steps

The legal text will be reviewed at the next meeting (26 September 2013); associated timelines might also be provided to clarify action points.

It was recognised that root causes, if established, might need further discussion outside of this Workgroup. Xoserve will consider arranging a specific workshop (outside of this Workgroup) to explore root causes.

DA suggested gaining an understanding of the flows in terms of the data items, when recognising the future world, to identify any other impacts might be useful.

3.0 Any Other Business

None.

4.0 Diary Planning for Review Group

Further details of planned meetings are available at: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Diary

The next meeting will take place within the business proceedings of the Distribution Workgroup on Thursday 26 September 2013, at ENA, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF.

Action Table

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update