

**UK LINK Committee Minutes**  
**Thursday 08 July 2010**  
**via teleconference**

**Attendees**

Tim Davis (Chair)	(TD)	Joint Office
Lorna Dupont (Secretary)	(LD)	Joint Office
Ashley Collins	(AC)	EDF Energy
Bali Dohel	(BD)	Scotia Gas Networks
Danielle King	(DK)	E.ON UK
Dave Addison	(DA)	xoserve
Dave Watson	(DW)	Centrica
Jennifer Mountford	(JM)	Statoil UK
Joel Martin	(JM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Karen Healy	(KH)	xoserve
Kathryn Whichelo	(KW)	EDF Energy
Lorraine Cave	(LC)	xoserve
Lewis Plummer	(LP)	xoserve
Martin Brandt	(MB)	SSE
Sean McGoldrick	(SMc)	National Grid NTS
Simon Trivella	(ST)	Wales & West Utilities
Stephanie Shepherd	(SS)	RWE npower

**1. Review of Minutes and Actions**

**1.1. Minutes**

The minutes of the previous meeting (11 June 2010) were accepted.

**1.2. Review of actions**

Appendix A contains a tabulated update on actions.

**UKL 1164:** DA explained that no further update was available. Following a brief discussion, it was agreed this action should be expanded to encompass all Shippers, rather than just British Gas, and would be reworded accordingly.

DA requested that Shippers notify him if they were aware that a large volume was to be involved, so that he could arrange for sufficient resources to be put in place.

**Action UKL1164: Carried Forward**

**UKL 1190:** MB had not received an update from MC since the previous meeting. DA agreed to follow up and report back.

**Action UKL1190: Carried Forward**

**UKL 1192, 1193, 1194, and 1195:** Please refer to item 3.4 below.

**Actions: Carried Forward**

**UKL 1197:** AC had produced detailed versions of Option 2a and Option 2b (including DME to NDM scenario) and circulated.

**Action UKL1197: Closed**

**Action UKL 1198:** DA/LC to issue a note clarifying the NDM to DME scenario in respect of opening and closing reads.

**Action UKL 1198: Carried forward**

## 2. Other Industry Fora

*Please note: Interested parties can access Operational Forum related information at: <http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/Gas/OperationalInfo/operationsforum/>*

No updates were provided.

## 3. UK Link Modification Implementation Plan (and review of UK Link Modification Status Report)

### 3.1 COR 962 – Query and Workflow Management

**(including 962.1 Q&WM – Change to MPRN Creation (MNC) Process; 962.2 – Daily Metered Contact (DMQ) Process Change; and 962.3 – Process to challenge UK Link Outcomes (FLE))**

DA said that Change Request 962 was the parent change for ConQuest replacement changes, and that it was proposed to move 962.1 into the main body for approved scheduling.

962.2 and 962.3 – these involved changes to the DM Query Contact code and were explained in Communications Ref CB/984/DA and CB/983/DA (11 June 2010). DA reported that a single representation had been received and this was in support.

DA asked for approval, and Shippers agreed in principle.

### 3.2 COR1360 – NTS Exit Reform Phase 2

KH reported that implementation was expected to be April/May 2011; an update will be given at the next meeting. System testing will start on Monday, and the screen pack (new screens and amendments to Phase 1 screens) for this phase will be formally issued at the next UKLC meeting. There will be a period for User trials (dates will be notified) and KH added that xoserve would like to encourage as many participants as possible.

The implementation of Phase 1 on 06 June 2010 had been a success, with the first Application Window opening on 01 July 2010 (a number of applications have already been placed by Users); post implementation activities are ongoing and expected to be completed in early August. The contingency procedures were available on the National Grid website and due to be issued for formal representations imminently.

High level planning has commenced on Phase 3, with a view to a 2012 implementation.

KH then drew attention to a Gemini outage planned for 24/25 July 2010 to enable testing of Gemini Disaster Recovery. It was noted that the Application Window is not open at the weekend so Exit business processes are not affected during this testing period.

### **3.3 Communication Ref: CB/987/NF – Update to Code Contingency Document to include Exit Capacity Processes and Forms (Class 1 change)**

The document is currently available in draft form on the JO website.

Noting that this change should have gone through the normal review cycle and had not done so, DA reported that National Grid NTS had written out (on 30 June 2010) asking for Users to give consideration to the updates that were required within these documents. DA then briefly explained the changes and requested that the review/notice periods be waived and that this be accepted as a Class 1 change. Comments were invited, but no responses were made.

There was no dissent, and this update to the Code Contingency Document was therefore approved by the UKLC. The document will be formally updated and made available for immediate use.

### **3.4 COR 1133 – Facilitating the use of AMR in a DM Elective Regime**

The debate continued on the following three proposals and a way forward.

#### **Option 1 – xoserve proposal**

Following Shipper Transfer, the Estimate OPNT Read is produced and loaded into the system and is provided to the incoming/outgoing Shippers on the day of transfer. The incoming Shipper can replace this Estimate read by submitting an Actual read as a replacement read by D+5. Following submission and acceptance of this Actual OPNT read this would be issued to the outgoing Shipper.

#### **Option 2a – Shipper proposal**

Following Shipper Transfer, the Estimate OPNT Read is produced and loaded into the system, this is held and not issued to the incoming/outgoing Shipper on the day of transfer. The incoming Shipper can replace this Estimate read by submitting an Actual read as a replacement read by D+5. Following submission and acceptance of this Actual OPNT read this would be issued to the outgoing Shipper. If an Actual read is not provided by the D+5 closeout the Estimate read will be issued to the incoming/outgoing Shippers.

#### **Option 2b – Shipper proposal**

Following Shipper Transfer, the Estimate OPNT Read is produced and loaded into the system, this is held and not issued to the incoming/outgoing Shipper on the day of transfer. The incoming Shipper can replace this Estimate read by submitting an Actual read (not required to be flagged as a replacement) by D+5. Following submission and acceptance of this Actual OPNT read this would be issued to the outgoing Shipper. If an Actual read is not provided by the D+5 closeout the Estimate read will be issued to the incoming/outgoing Shippers.

AC had provided expanded documentation (in response to Action UKL1197) that had been circulated in advance of the meeting. JM confirmed that SGN's lawyer

had reviewed the position and the lawyer's comments on EDF's points would be made available post meeting. Following the provision of the extra details, JM reported that subsequent discussions now indicated that Options 2a and 2b may not be consistent with the UNC, and this was still under review. JM has asked the lawyer to provide an explanation as to why this is the view. AC evinced concerns that if an agreement could not be reached on the interpretation of the legal text, then the current options could not be progressed. JM pointed out that a firm conclusion had yet to be reached.

LP stated that xoserve would continue with the scope as is, with the potential to move on to a DME Phase 2. LC added that xoserve was not in a position to deliver anything else for November. It was noted that, as stated at the last meeting, DA was not able to give assurance on a Phase 2 and neither DW nor AC were willing to accept the position on Phase 1.

ST said that even though there was no formally agreed implementation plan, xoserve would continue to work towards delivering Option 1 for November, while awaiting the outcome of legal opinion on Options 2a and 2b. AC believed that this uncertainty created a very difficult position for all parties concerned.

LP reiterated that there was no guarantee of Phase 2, and pointed out that Options 2a and 2b did not fit with every industry party's position. There would still be a need to get an acceptable Phase 2 approach agreed with the wider industry, and there may still be no consensus.

AC and DW agreed there was a risk and that's why they felt that the meeting had agreed it wouldn't do anything, and would not sign off Phase 1.

ST said that Phase 1 had not been signed off, but the Transporters would not instruct xoserve to cease work on this. JM pointed out that even if Options 2a and 2b cannot be fitted to the legal text and if the Shippers were not willing to fund the cost, we still have a Modification that the Authority has determined should be implemented. LC added that Phil Broom's view (as Proposer) was that xoserve should go ahead and implement for November, and in the meantime consider workable alternative options. xoserve's remit is to deliver the current scope for implementation in November.

Phase 2 may be a non-starter, and this was a major concern for the Shippers, given problems with the legal text and potential costs. LP reported that the developers were unable to provide a costing because there were many questions over the exact requirements. More clarity was required, and LP would send out an email seeking further information.

MB observed that the discussions still appeared to be going round in circles. The Committee had not been able to agree Option 1, but from a pragmatic viewpoint acknowledged that xoserve will carry on working on this, while continuing to seek clarification on the feasibility of Options 2a and 2b. DA added that as previously stated neither 2a nor 2b could be implemented for November anyway, so Option 1 needs to be continued with for November. MB repeated that Option 1 was not a formally signed off solution.

LP believed that to take either Option any further forward a defined view on the legal text was required, and this should be done in conjunction with seeking a consensus view from the wider Shipper community. DA added that UKLC must be mindful that it does have to implement something. AC believed xoserve could continue to work on Phase 1 as long as a landing could be reached fairly quickly on Phase 2; legal opinion was therefore required very soon.

In order to move forward DW and AC were again asked to agree Phase 1, but withheld their approval. MB added that he was not happy for Option 1 to be

construed as an enduring solution, and needed assurance regarding a second phase. ST reiterated that no assurances could be given in respect of a second phase, but pointed out that the Shipper Proposer had been keen to get this moving and the Transporters were supporting this through xoserve continuing to work on implementation in November; the Transporters had no obligation to support a second phase but were trying to accommodate this.

When asked by TD, DA's preferred option was to seek approval and understanding what caveats, if any, might be appropriate, as xoserve will be reaching a point where it has to schedule in certain activities.

SMc pointed out that it was not the role of the Committee to challenge the Authority's determination; the Committee should be reviewing the implementation plan and assessing whether it was appropriate to achieve implementation of Modification 0224.

JM believed that Business Rule 69 and its interpretation was the main issue for Shippers. However, Ofgem approved the Modification and that was what should be implemented.

TD then asked those present to vote for approval of the implementation plan, and it was formally noted that no Shippers voted in favour.

LP said that if JM was able to obtain a view on the legal text, xoserve should be able to seek further clarity from the community in order to establish further information to give the developers something to work on.

SMc asked if a legal view should be awaited prior to further work on Phase 2. ST responded that analysis still needed to be done, and the sooner the better. The Transporters are keen to implement something for November and at present the xoserve solution seems the only pragmatic way forward.

Concluding these discussions, xoserve will commence analysis in expectation of a potential future Modification Proposal, and (bearing in mind that the Transporters may be regarded as in breach of the UNC if they do not implement). The Transporters will need to decide whether to implement anyway or escalate the approval process to the UNCC.

### **DME UK Link Implementation Summary**

LP reported xoserve had submitted File Formats for DME for representation; no responses had been received. Approval was now sought from UKLC, and unanimous approval was given.

## **4. Review of Topics Status Report**

### **4.1 xoserve Strategic Initiative Update**

ConQuest Replacement – Covered under item 3.1 above.

In response to a question regarding the Change Pack, DA indicated that a number of ConQuest Replacement Communications will be issued shortly, but he was not aware of anything else.

Project Nexus – DA provided a document to accompany these Minutes.

ConQuest - DA reported that xoserve had been notifying Users of changes to process and also attending business forums to ensure a wide spread of communication. The feedback received had been positive. A number of communications will be issued regarding further contract codes.

## **5. Performance Reporting**

DA reviewed the xoserve Report Pack by exception.

### **5.1 IS Faults logged by Shippers (xoserve Report A).**

This report was accepted.

### **5.2 UK-Link Business Support Agreement (xoserve Report B)**

This report was accepted.

### **5.3 Liabilities Report (xoserve Report C)**

This report was accepted.

### **5.4 Report on Performance Problems**

This report was accepted.

## **6. File Format and Urgent Communications (xoserve Report D)**

This report was accepted.

## **7. Planned Outages (xoserve Report E)**

This report was accepted.

## **8. AOB**

### **8.1 Identification of Minor Errors in the File Formats and Urgent Communications Index Page**

LP reported that some minor errors had been noted on the index page (old file names). These will be corrected and updated and a revised copy will be issued.

## **9. Next Meeting**

The August 2010 UK Link Committee meeting will be a teleconference meeting and is scheduled to commence at 10:00 am on Thursday 12 August 2010.

## APPENDIX A

## ACTION LOG: UK Link Committee 10 June 2010

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref (original ref)	Action	Owner*	Status Update
UKL 1164	09/07/09	1.2 (1.1)	Contact <del>BG</del> <u>Shippers</u> to discuss their specific volume increase requirements for their proposed June 2010 system change (change to the MAM activity).	xoserve (DA)	Action reworded. Update due at August 2010 meeting. <b>Carried Forward</b>
UKL 1190	08/04/10	1.2 (1.2)	Provide a formal response explaining why the response to the request to provide open access to UK Link File Formats had been in the negative.	xoserve (MC/DA)	Update due at August meeting. <b>Carried Forward</b>
UKL 1192	13/05/10	3.3 (3.3)	Obtain costs and revised project delivery schedule for incorporating the (RPA file) scope change.	xoserve (LP)	Update due at the August meeting. <b>Carried Forward</b>
UKL 1193	25/05/10	3.3 (1.)	Liaise with SGN (JM) to develop a suitable definition document for their proposed solution with which to seek a legal view/interpretation of whether it aligns with intent (and legal text) of UNC Modification 0224. Thereafter, provide a copy to EDF Energy (AC).	xoserve (LP)	Update due at the August meeting. <b>Carried Forward</b>
UKL 1194	25/05/10	1.2 (1.)	Develop a suitable definition document for the two proposed shipper solutions (2a & 2b) with which to seek a legal view/interpretation of whether they align with intent (and legal text) of UNC Modification 0224.	EDF Energy (AC)	Update due at the August meeting. <b>Carried Forward</b>
UKL 1195	25/05/10	3.3 (1.)	Liaise with his legal team, to seek a view/interpretation on whether or not, or how, any of the three proposed options align with intent (and legal text) of UNC Modification.	Scotia Gas Networks (JM)	Update due at the August meeting. <b>Carried Forward</b>
UKL 1197	10/06/10	3.3	Produce detailed versions of Option 2a and Option 2b (including DME to NDM scenario) and circulate.	EDF Energy (AC)	Produced and circulated. <b>Closed</b>

<b>Action Ref</b>	<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>Minute Ref</b> (original ref)	<b>Action</b>	<b>Owner*</b>	<b>Status Update</b>
UKL 1198	10/06/10	3.3	Issue a note clarifying the NDM to DME scenario in respect of opening and closing reads.	xoserve (DA/LC)	Update due at the August meeting. <b>Carried forward</b>

**\* Key to action owner**

- DA David Addison, xoserve
- LC Lorraine Cave, xoserve
- LP Lewis Plummer, xoserve
- AC Ashley Collins, EDF Energy
- JM Joel Martin, Scotia Gas Networks