

UNC Workgroup 0565 Minutes

Central Data Service Provider: General framework and obligations

Monday 18 April 2016

Energy UK, Charles House, 5-11 Regent Street, London SW1Y 4LR

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Lorna Dupont (Secretary)	(LD)	Joint Office
Alex Ross-Shaw	(ARS)	Northern Gas Networks
Andrew Margan*	(AMa)	British Gas
Andrew Meaden	(AMe)	Dentons
Andy Miller	(AMi)	Xoserve
Angela Love	(AL)	ScottishPower
Azeem Khan	(AK)	RWE npower
Charles Ruffell	(CR)	RWE
Charles Wood	(CWo)	Dentons
Chris Warner	(CWa)	National Grid Distribution
Colette Baldwin	(CB)	E.ON
David Mitchell	(DM)	Scotia Gas Networks
David Tennant	(DT)	Dentons
Gareth Evans	(GE)	Waters Wye Associates
Gethyn Howard	(GH)	Brookfield Utilities UK
Richard Pomroy	(RP)	Wales & West Utilities
Sean McGoldrick	(SMc)	National Grid NTS
Sue Hilbourne	(SH)	Scotia Gas Networks

* *via teleconference*

Copies of all papers are available at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0565/180416>

The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 20 October 2016.

1.0 Introduction and Status Review

BF welcomed all to the meeting and summarised the objectives of the programme to be covered. Noting the large number of papers delivered to support the crowded agenda and the time constraints, it was agreed that items 4.0 and 5.0 be deferred.

1.1. Approval of Minutes (06 April 2016)

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

2.0 Overview

CWa summarised the current position. The Programme Overview Board (POB) had discussed issues relating to cost allocation and charging, and had proposed that these be encompassed within Workgroup 0565's discussions, perhaps as an additional group to be chaired/administered by the Joint Office (JO) and supported by KPMG. SH added that the

POB's view appeared to be that residual FGO issues should be brought to Workgroup 0565 for consideration. This proposition was discussed, with various views expressed as to what should or should not fall under the auspices of Workgroup 0565. Aspects construed as contractual development might be appropriate.

AL referred to issues/discussions of quoracy and visibility, and the keenness to increase stakeholder engagement, observing that these were some of the reasons for wanting it under the oversight of the JO. It was acknowledged that organisations, particularly smaller ones, may have resourcing issues but that did not obviate the need for Ofgem and the wider industry to engage with these important reforms.

Noting these comments, BF reported that Ofgem attendance, quoracy and engagement issues (in relation to Workgroup 0565 meetings) were to be discussed at the April UNC Modification Panel.

BF also pointed out that the 'additional group' proposed by the POB could not be considered as a 'sub group' of this Workgroup, however discussions might be accommodated under Workgroup 0565 where appropriate to the development of the modification, perhaps as additional meeting days with discrete aspects, e.g. charging, to be clearly defined and consideration confined to these separate days.

BF suggested that Panel could be requested to establish an FGO Workgroup, which could consider issues such as charging which currently reside in the KPMG workgroups.

3.0 Timeline/Workplan Update

See 13.0, below.

4.0 DSC Contract Update – Further Position Papers

4.1 UNC and DSC: Accession and Exit

A paper had been provided by Dentons, setting out the issues and proposals in relation to the linked accession and exit processes and requirements under the UNC and DSC. CWo explained the principles that might be applied, outlining the proposed rules for DSC and the consequential amendments that would then be required to the UNC.

Responding to questions, CWo affirmed that DSC services provided to 'others' (not UNC signatories), would be under a separate contract - a third party customer contract.

Xoserve currently manage the UNC accession/exit processes (customer lifecycle) and it seemed pragmatic to follow the same route/responsibilities for the DSC application/exit processes.

BF queried if iGTs were covered under these proposals, and in particular in relation to terminations. GH explained that discussions were ongoing with Ofgem, and that he intended to provide an update to CWa.

It was suggested that all parties review this paper and submit any further comments to CWa and CWo. The paper will then be redrafted for discussion and approval.

4.2 Review of iGTAD

A paper had been provided by Dentons, setting out the types of information to be provided and received by the "Transporters' Agency" on behalf of the DNOs and the iGTs and the circumstances in which the information is provided and received, for the purpose of

identifying what services the CDSP will be performing for the DNOs and iGTs under the iGTAD. Proposed amendments to the existing provisions iGTAD were also identified.

Drawing attention to outstanding questions relating to Section B1.3 and 2.4.1, CWo affirmed that further clarity was being sought from Xoserve and the DNOs. Responding to comment that these appeared to be communications rather than services, CWo indicated that it would be made clear when the document was updated that these were Agency services performed for both DNOs and iGTs.

4.3 General Terms Section B7 Review

A paper had been provided by Dentons, including a table that commented on how the existing draft of GT Section B7 may need to be revised or replicated in the iGT UNC to reflect the services that the CDSP will (post Modification 0440) provide to the iGTs.

CWo explained the high level principles proposed. It was suggested that all parties review this paper and submit any further comments to CWa and CWo. The paper will then be redrafted for discussion and approval.

5.0 Liabilities

Discussions deferred.

6.0 TPD Section M - First Draft

Discussions deferred.

7.0 Feedback on TPD Section U

Shippers' lawyers were reviewing this; comments would be provided to CWa and CWo.

It was suggested this be added to the agenda for the meeting on 18 May 2016.

8.0 Consider alternative UNC Modification route

8.1 FGO - change management and control for the DSC

A paper had been provided by Dentons, providing a summary of some key issues and options for DSC change control.

CWo outlined the background and the assumptions made, identifying the decisions that a body was likely to be called upon to make (a focus likely to be on a change to services, rather than to the Code), and explained the two approaches (Committee and All Party); other variants could be considered and may work.

A discussion ensued. It was noted that in the 'new world' there will be many more stakeholder parties and there will be a need for a more rigorously defined process; it will need to be very clear what Xoserve is authorised to undertake. It was questioned what might happen if Xoserve declined to do something, for example if it felt what it was asked to undertake would in some way conflict with its interests or views on the best solution. Some example scenarios were outlined and considered. Xoserve may make a recommendation to follow another course, giving reasons for such a view, but it may ultimately have to abide by the outcome of any decision, as there may be desired benefits to other parties, not necessarily economic or pragmatic; service takers would commit to payment.

Appeal mechanisms/routes were discussed; it was believed that any appeals would have to be governed/defined by very exceptional circumstances, and adjudication would most likely fall to an external body (Ofgem).

9.0 Consider suitable options for Code/Non-Code Sub-committee solutions

9.1 MRA Change Management Structure/Governance

AL presented some information for discussion purposes, outlining the roles and responsibilities of the various bodies that governed the MRA change management process. She asked participants to note that this was not necessarily ScottishPower's view on what should be adopted and was provided for comparison purposes only.

The information was discussed. It was observed it seemed to be a fairly small group of representatives, given the size of the code. Shippers expressed differing perceptions on how successful or not these arrangements were in their experience. GH believed the voting arrangements used might be worth investigating further

Noting this was a very high level view, it was suggested that AL seek out and provide further detail on the vires, make up and controls etc, the voting arrangements and how changes were actually agreed and implemented. AL was also asked to establish if the objective of an appeal was to overturn a decision, or to reach a different decision.

CB believed there to be very infrequent appeals under this set up, and suggested there might be certain conditions to meet first, or specific grounds. GE asked what happened for example, if the body did not approve the budget - how would that be appealed? It was suggested that AL also look at this area in more detail to see if it is a 'recommendation' rather than 'approval' of budget, and what happens in respect of disputes/escalation routes.

Action 0404: *MRA change management (structure, governance, process) - AL to provide further detail in relation to the vires, make up and controls etc; the voting arrangements and how changes are agreed and implemented; and establish if the objective of an appeal was to overturn a decision, or to reach a different decision. Also to clarify if it is a 'recommendation' rather than 'approval' of budget, and what happens in respect of disputes/escalation routes.*

9.2 SPAA Changes

GE presented some SPAA Change Proposals that provided examples of various ways to formulate constituency/voting arrangements, when the revision of SPAA voting and funding arrangements was being considered. These variations were briefly explained; they were either withdrawn, or were rejected by Ofgem.

It was observed that any complex voting process/arrangements would always generate concerns regarding the levels of influence that can be attributed to and exerted by the voting parties - 'the power of the vote'. It was important that a party or group of parties do not perceive themselves to be marginalized or disenfranchised by any such arrangements. Observing that it was always difficult to institute a set of arrangements that were deemed by all to be acceptable under every circumstance, and that it could be equally difficult to reach a consensus position, AMi suggested that perhaps what should be aimed for should be the least controversial or objectionable method.

Other concerns were expressed; it was often very difficult to find and appoint appropriate persons in the first place, and then to find acceptable replacements as positions became vacant.

It was also noted that the operating landscape was constantly changing and that any such

arrangements should include an element of flexibility that would enable them to 'move with the times'.

9.3 Non-Code User Pays service change process

AMi presented information outlining the change and approvals process relating to User Pays services. AMi pointed out that at every stage there was a definite decision made to proceed. The voting arrangements were explained; these had been agreed when the User Pays concept had come into force, to counteract any adverse influence (blocking or forcing of a change, through positions of dominance or numbers) by use of square route transformation technique.

These were elective services; a customer can choose to take all, some or none, and pays for what is taken. The voting arrangements have been in place for some years now and seemed to work in practice.

CWo commented that it was possible that different kinds of change methodology might be required for different scenarios, e.g. for bespoke services, and noted the User Pays arrangements for consideration.

9.4 FGO Change and Contract Management

SMc gave a presentation, essentially proposing the extension of the existing change process arrangements that were currently in place under the Agency Services Agreement between the Transporters' Agency and the Transporters.

The current set up was described, and the change processes (ROM raised with Modification, and without) were illustrated and explained. A discussion ensued.

AMi commented that currently a single Network Operator representative must instruct Xoserve. CB observed that going forward it will be a wider group of people and the same level of cooperation may not be possible. AL suggested that the Chair or the group itself be mandated to give the instruction. AMi observed that this would have to be very clear that this was acceptable, appropriate and not open to challenge, and reflected in the contract. RP noted that the obligation to produce legal text will remain with the Transporter(s), and this is generally the person who raises the change request to implement the modification. Concerns were raised regarding control of delivery of implementation of the modification rests between Xoserve and one person, and that this might prove difficult going forward, i.e. who is the accountable party/point of contact for completing the paperwork for the whole industry. CWo believed that a body would fulfil role, it would not be a single party. AL thought that such responsibility might deter small Shippers from raising modifications.

Change arrangements were mutating in the 'new world'; in discussion it was noted that UK Link Committee (UKLC) might no longer operate in the same way and some or all of its responsibilities could sit under the DSC process.

Responding to questions, SMc explained that each party nominates a Change Manager, who can choose to participate in the meeting or not or submit views; or a person can be nominated to represent a group. Voting is by relevant parties (ratios defined in cost allocation). BF reminded that this was not to consider/question the decision if the change was related to a Code modification - that had already been made by the Panel or the Authority - but to address the best way to implement/enact the outcome of the decision.

How a vote might be apportioned across parties was discussed; relative proportions could vary. To have a vote a party must deliberately express a view; silence is not necessarily to be taken as assent. In summary, if a party does not attend then it is bound by the decision of those who do attend.

BF questioned how frequently there might be multiple options to decide upon. AMi indicated there were always two - the first option was to do nothing, and the second (or others) to do something. He believed that 50% of cases might have more than two options. CW observed that the UKLC discusses the technicalities, and CB added that these might have a commercial impact. AMi noted that the Transporters make the decision on when a modification is to be implemented. RP pointed out that there were other sources of change to be considered also. AMi reiterated that Xoserve requires a single clear unchallengeable instruction on which to act.

CWo summed up that responsibilities were important - did the Change Management Steering Group sit above the Contract Management Steering Group, or vice versa? Also prioritisation, rules and an appropriate process - there must be clear awareness that when voting is to take place on certain decisions and when you have proxy voting then the agenda must be fixed - there can be no last minute changes.

9.5 Hybrid Model

AMa gave a brief presentation, commencing with an illustration of a UNC Modification route and a Non-UNC DSC change route; the principles of both routes were explained. Cost drives voting rights. (If the change impacts a party's constituency it would get a vote). The voting outcome would be able to be appealed. AMa concluded there was a need to agree a high-level governance model in principle. This is to allow the focus on the DSC drafting and then to return to the model to work through the detail and stress testing.

A discussion took place. Anything more technical could be sent to the Contract Managers group via the Change Managers group and then out to consultation (15 - 30 days); Contract managers would then vote on it.

It was asked if two solutions would be consulted on. GE believed there should be more technical discussions in advance, i.e. in the modification development period, and this would then shorten the time between post modification approval and the new contract. SMC observed it might be difficult to precisely define Business Rules at such an early stage. CB believed that parties needed to understand the 'what', the 'how', and the approximate cost in advance. GE believed that applying more rigour at the development phase would remove some of the contention at the post decision phase, at which point it was quite clearly too late to remedy anything. Was it better to do more analysis pre or post decision? BF pointed out that this may extend the development time and attracts upfront costs for something that potentially may not be implemented. CB noted that the BSC had a change budget to call upon. SMC observed that the formation of a socialised fund to call upon to enable analysis to be done in advance had been suggested, but Ofgem had not taken this up.

It was concluded this was a similar model to that put forward by SMC, and that it was hard to finalise principles until it was known what was in the DSC.

9.6 Committee approach to DSC governance

A paper had been provided by Dentons, expanding briefly on the proposed 'committee approach' to DSC governance. CWo outlined the various points of note. In his view this approach, although not perfect, was the better one, because most decisions would require a greater degree of formality. It would be very difficult to avoid having Ofgem as the ultimate escalation route and resolution party. For decisions by individual customers in respect of bespoke services a separate framework/set of rules would be needed (and visibility as to how those rules had been complied with).

The exercising of voting rights was discussed. The Transporters may not necessarily feel obliged to vote on matters of no concern to them. It was observed that committee members are charged with acting in the best interests of the community; there may need to be an

option for removing members who do not reflect/fulfil these responsibilities. The aim of having a committee was to have all the decision making in one arena. GE commented that there was a need to understand how parties discharge Licence obligations that have nothing to do with Transporters. It was also suggested there should be a right of appeal. Cost allocation should be identified in advance through the modification process, or perhaps as a methodology.

9.7 Issues on 'all party' governance

A paper had been provided by Dentons, summarising the issues identified with the 'all party approach' to DSC governance. CWo outlined the various points of note, drawing attention to 1.4 in particular. Pragmatically, whilst not perfect, the 'committee approach' appears to be preferable.

9.8 Conclusion

CWa thanked all for their contributions to the discussions. Noting the pressures on delivery timescales, CWa was keen to get consensus views and wider stakeholder engagement with the work of Workgroup 0565. CB believed that trade associations were discussing this but were happy to leave the delivery of any arrangements to this Workgroup.

It was suggested that all parties now consider the range of options presented, to devise the most suitable route and agree some principles. Perhaps the first area to focus on would be the mapping out of a process, and then agree a governing body. It was observed that it would improve transparency and rigour if the process allowed for as much information as possible to be available in advance. Conversely, concerns were expressed that 'over expansion' of information provision at an earlier stage could attract extra cost that may potentially be unnecessary, and could potentially slow the modification process quite significantly. CWa will work with AMi to narrow down the options, and provide information relating to the process side.

Action 0405: *Options for Code/Non-Code Sub-committee solutions* - All parties to assess the options presented, reflect on the approaches and feedback views on the different models as soon as possible to C Warner.

10.0 iGT and iGTAD Position Paper

10.1 Review of iGTAD

A paper had been provided by Dentons, setting out the types of information to be provided and received by the 'Agency Company' on behalf of the DNOs and the iGTs and the circumstances in which the information is provided and received, for the purpose of identifying what services the CDSP will be performing for the DNOs and iGTs under the iGTAD. Proposed amendments to the existing provisions iGTAD were also identified.

Drawing attention to outstanding questions relating to Section B1.3 and 2.4.1, CWo affirmed that further clarity was being sought from Xoserve and the DNOs. Responding to comment that these appeared to be communications rather than services, CWo indicated that it would be made clear when the document was updated that these were Agency services performed for both DNOs and iGTs.

10.2 General Terms Section B7 Review

A paper had been provided by Dentons, including a table that commented on how the existing draft of GT Section B7 may need to be revised or replicated in the iGT UNC to reflect

the services that the CDSP will (post Modification 0440) provide to the iGTs. CWo explained the high level principles proposed.

It was suggested that all parties review this paper and submit any further comments to CWa and CWo. The paper will then be redrafted for discussion and approval.

11.0 Consideration of Risks/Issues Log

11.1 Draft risks for discussion

AMi presented five risks for discussion. Each risk and its potential consequences were defined, with suggested mitigating actions.

Fixed Date

AMi believed this to be a Workgroup risk in trying to achieve a date for the October Panel, and outlined the current position. It was suggested the Transporters might be at risk of being in breach of a Licence condition, and that Shippers need to be aware that changes will be required as User Pays falls away. BF observed that this was a Programme issue in terms of communication.

GE expressed concern that it was being driven by an arbitrary end date rather than a realistic view of an achievable implementation date, and indicated he would be happy to input into any plan. CWa affirmed that the Transporters would present a further refined plan at the next meeting.

Cost allocation and charging methodology (outputs - quality and delivery)

Concerns were expressed that parties were trying to do too much with insufficient granularity of information. SH reported that the FGO group was waiting for Xoserve to provide information before progress can be made, and explained what had been asked for. AMi reiterated that Xoserve did not currently hold information at the level of detail requested. The requirements were discussed.

Action 0406: Risks - Cost allocation and charging methodology (outputs - quality and delivery) - Xoserve to confirm what is feasible and can/cannot be delivered (AMi to liaise with N Salter and M Baker), and all parties to consider what can realistically be done and return to the next meeting with a view.

Cost allocation and charging methodology (inconsistency with contractual arrangements)

It was noted that this was being brought into Modification 0565 and would be progressed.

Industry Engagement

At the POB meeting Xoserve had indicated that it did not see this as its responsibility. SH suggested that KPMG be asked to assist in wider communication.

CW reiterated his disappointment at the lack of Ofgem engagement in the Workgroup. SH noted that the POB was writing to Ofgem. It was also being raised at the April UNC Modification Panel meeting.

Change management governance/processes (failure to achieve industry consensus)

It was agreed this was a risk, but minor in comparison to others raised.

11.2 General

CWa had noted the risks identified for inclusion in the template and confirmed that he will provide a revised document for publication.

12.0 Review of outstanding actions

0201: Ofgem to consider the concept of a multi service provider CDSP.

Update: Deferred to next meeting. **Carried forward**

0303: National Grid Distribution (CWa) to investigate possible UNC Modification related route into a change order process.

Update: CWa will revise the modification to include cost allocation, and additional meetings will be arranged as appropriate to discuss this aspect. **Closed**

0304: National Grid Distribution (CWa) to look to provide some suitable options for the proposed (Code/Non Code sub-committee) solution model(s).

Update: Discussed at this meeting. **Closed**

0305: In relation to action 0304, National Grid NTS (SMc) to look to provide an outline of his preferred option for the proposed (Code / Non Code) management group.

Update: Provided and discussed at this meeting. **Closed**

0401: Participants who have a view on an alternative governance model to submit a presentation in advance of the next meeting to aid consideration. Presentations expected are: MRA model (AL), Proposed SPAA model (SMu), Current (SMc), Sub-committee options (CWa), Provide a list of Questions to be addressed by alternative governance options (CWo).

Update: A number of presentations were provided and discussed at this meeting. **Closed**

0402: Xoserve to identify which areas within UNC allow them to use their discretion and if so is this still appropriate.

Update: AMi confirmed that work had started on this and Xoserve was looking to remove the elements of discretion where appropriate. **Carried forward**

0403: National Grid (CWa) to ensure the Demand Estimation Sub-committee was aware of the proposed changes to UNC TPD Section H and obtain a view.

Update: CWa confirmed that he had made F Cottam (Xoserve) aware of developments, and that he may attend DESC when necessary and provide an update on any proposed changes to UNC TPD Section H. **Closed**

13.0 Next Steps

An action was placed on all parties to review the draft papers presented today and provide comments to Dentons by Tuesday 03 May 2016, to enable redrafting to commence.

Action 0407: *Review and Comment* - All parties to review the draft papers presented today (18 April 2016) and provide comments to Dentons by Tuesday 03 May 2016, to enable redrafting to commence.

The timeline and Workplan were reviewed; it was recognised that there would be a significant workload to address in the next few months to achieve the objectives of the Workgroup and progress the development of the modification. This would entail the scheduling of additional meetings to provide sufficient discussion time for the consideration of all aspects of the modification.

For the meeting already planned for 04 May 2016, the DSC focus will be maintained and it was anticipated that the following would be covered:

- Timeline/Workplan Update
- DSC Contract Update
- Liabilities
- DSC Governance
- Consideration of Risks/Issues Log

It is expected that Dentons will provide a draft of the Terms and Conditions, and Xoserve will provide visibility of the service documents.

Arrangements for additional meetings will be notified when confirmed.

14.0 Any Other Business

None raised.

15.0 Diary Planning

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

Workgroup meetings will take place as follows:

Time/Date	Venue	Workgroup Programme
10:00, Wednesday 04 May 2016	31 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3LT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timeline/Workplan Update • DSC Contract Update • Liabilities • DSC Governance • Consideration of Risks/Issues Log
10:00, Wednesday 18 May 2016	Elaxon, 4 th Floor, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timeline/Workplan Update • DSC Contract Update

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GT B7 (third draft with iGT provisions) • DSC Governance (final position) • TPD G and H (2nd draft) • TPD M (2nd draft) • TPD U (1st draft) • TPD and EID (2nd draft) • iGT and iGTAD (1st draft for iGTAD) • Miscellaneous MR, GT and TD and DSC transition (first draft) • Consideration of Risks/Issues Log
10:00 Wednesday 01 June 2016	Consort House, Prince's Gate Buildings, 6 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3QQ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timeline/Workplan Update • DSC Contract Update • Consideration of Risks/Issues Log
10:00 Monday 20 June 2016	Elaxon, 4 th Floor, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TPD U (2nd draft) • iGT and iGTAD (2nd draft for iGTAD) • Miscellaneous MR, GT and TD and DSC transition (second draft)
10:00 Wednesday 13 July 2016	Consort House, Prince's Gate Buildings, 6 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3QQ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GT B7 (1st consolidated) • TPD G and H (1st consolidated) • TPD M (1st consolidated) • TPD U (1st consolidated) • TPD and EID (1st consolidated) • iGT and iGTAD (1st consolidated) • Miscellaneous MR, GT and TD and DSC transition (consolidated) • Consideration of Risks/Issues Log
10:00 Monday 25 July 2016	Dentons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNC Legal Meeting • DSC Contract Update
10:00 Wednesday 03 August 2016	Consort House, Prince's Gate Buildings, 6 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3QQ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GT B7 (2nd consolidated) • TPD G and H (2nd consolidated) • TPD M (2nd consolidated) • TPD U (2nd consolidated) • TPD and EID (2nd consolidated) • iGT and iGTAD (2nd consolidated) • Miscellaneous MR, GT and TD and

		DSC transition (2 nd consolidated) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of Risks/Issues Log
10:00 Tuesday 23 August 2016	Elaxon, 4 th Floor, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timeline/Workplan Update • DSC Contract Update • Consideration of Risks/Issues Log
10:00 Wednesday 07 September 2016	Consort House, Prince's Gate Buildings, 6 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3QQ	Development of Workgroup Report
10:00 Wednesday 21 September 2016	Elaxon, 4 th Floor, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW	Development of Workgroup Report
10:00 Wednesday 05 October 2016	Consort House, Prince's Gate Buildings, 6 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3QQ	Conclusion of Workgroup Report

Action Table (18 April 2016)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
0201	03/02/16	4.0	Ofgem to consider the concept of a multi service provider CDSP.	Ofgem	Carried forward
0303	21/03/16	4.0	To investigate possible UNC Modification related route into a change order process.	National Grid Distribution (CWA)	Closed
0304	21/03/16	4.0	To look to provide some suitable options for the proposed (Code / Non Code sub-committee) solution model(s).	National Grid Distribution (CWA)	Closed
0305	21/03/16	4.0	In relation to action 0304, to look to provide an outline of his preferred option for the proposed (Code / Non Code) management group.	National Grid NTS (SMc)	Closed
0401	06/04/16	2.0	Participants who have a view on an alternative governance model to submit a presentation in advance of the next meeting to aid consideration.	All	Closed

Action Table (18 April 2016)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
			Presentations expected are: MRA model (AL), Proposed SPAA model (SMu), Current (SMc), Sub-committee options (CWa), Provide a list of Questions to be addressed by alternative governance options (CWo).		
0402	06/04/16	4.0	Xoserve to identify which areas within UNC allow them to use their discretion and if so is this still appropriate.	Xoserve (AMi)	Carried forward
0403	06/04/16	5.0	National Grid (CWa) to ensure the Demand Estimation Sub-committee were aware of the proposed changes to UNC TPD Section H and obtain a view.	National Grid Distribution (CWa)	Closed
0404	18/04/16	9.1	<i>MRA change management (structure, governance, process)</i> - AL to provide further detail in relation to the vires, make up and controls etc; the voting arrangements and how changes are agreed and implemented; and establish if the objective of an appeal was to overturn a decision, or to reach a different decision. Also to clarify if it is a 'recommendation' rather than 'approval' of budget, and what happens in respect of disputes/escalation routes.	ScottishPower (AL)	Pending
0405	18/04/16	9.8	<i>Options for Code/Non-Code Sub-committee solutions</i> - All parties to assess the options presented, reflect on the approaches and feedback views on the different models as soon as possible to C Warner.	ALL Parties	<i>As soon as possible</i> Pending
0406	18/04/16	11.1	<i>Risks - Cost allocation and charging methodology (outputs - quality and delivery)</i> - Xoserve to confirm what is feasible and can/cannot be delivered (AMi to liaise with N Salter and M Baker),	ALL Parties	<i>Due by Tuesday 03 May 2016</i> Pending

Action Table (18 April 2016)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
			and all parties to consider what can realistically be done and return to the next meeting with a view.		
0407	18/04/16	13.0	<i>Review and Comment</i> - All parties to review the draft papers presented today (18 April 2016) and provide comments to Dentons by Tuesday 03 May 2016, to enable redrafting to commence.	ALL Parties	<i>Due by Tuesday 03 May 2016</i> Pending