

UK LINK Committee Minutes
Thursday 10 June 2010
at 31 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3LT

Attendees

Mike Berrisford (Chair)	(MiB) Joint Office of Gas Transporters
Lorna Dupont (Secretary)	(LD) Joint Office of Gas Transporters
Ashley Collins*	(AC) EDF Energy
Danielle King	(DK) E.ON UK
Dave Addison	(DA) xoserve
Dave Watson*	(DW) Centrica
Joel Martin*	(JM) Scotia Gas Networks
John Bradley	(JB) Joint Office of Gas Transporters
Kathryn Whichelo*	(KW) EDF Energy
Lorraine Cave	(LC) xoserve
Mark Cockayne	(MC) xoserve
Martin Brandt	(MB) SSE
Sean McGoldrick	(SMc) National Grid NTS
Stephanie Shepherd	(SS) RWE npower

* via teleconference link

1. Review of Minutes and Actions

1.1. Minutes

JM pointed out that he understood that under Action 1195 he had agreed to provide a legal view on the three options, ie to determine whether the three options 'worked' in relation to the legal text provided.

Thereafter, the minutes of the meetings held on 13 and 25 May 2010 were accepted.

1.2. Review of actions

Appendix A contains a tabulated update on actions.

UKL 1164: xoserve (DA) informed members that no further update was available.

Chair (MiB) asked, and members agreed to carry forward the action.

Action UKL1164: Carried Forward

UKL 1185: xoserve (DA) advised members that the profile would be raised at an appropriate broader group, once a view of potential solutions has begun to crystallise.

Chair (MiB) asked, and members agreed to close the action.

Action UKL1185: Closed

UKL 1190: xoserve (MC) informed members that although it was known that a verbal response had been provided a written response could not be tracked, therefore it would be raised at the Contract Managers' meeting and a formal response would then be provided. MB welcomed this and commented that it was

the only set of industry files not open to general viewing and would be very interested to understand the reason for this.

Chair (MiB) asked, and members agreed to carry forward the action.

Action UKL1190: Carried Forward

UKL 1192 & 1193: Please refer to item 3.3 below.

UKL1194: AC had circulated his findings to the UKL Group, and there was very little difference between the options. The only difference appeared to be at Step 3 – inconsistency between the sending and receiving of reads – and AC had so far been unable to redraft an appropriate step without incurring a problem. The Group was aware of this, and it was understood that Stefan Leedham (EDF Energy) had discussed with various parties in an effort to move forward.

JM requested that this action remain open while discussions relating to the legal text were continuing.

Chair (MiB) asked, and members agreed to carry forward the action.

Action UKL 1194: Carried Forward

UKL 1195: Please refer to item 3.3 below.

UKL 1196: Arrangements for face-to-face meeting completed.

Chair (MiB) asked, and members agreed to close the action.

Action UKL1196: Closed

Thereafter, the following items were considered and discussed out of sequence during the meeting.

2. Other Industry Fora

MiB provided an update (by exception) on the “live” UNC Modifications with a potential impact upon UK Link systems, specifically highlighting the following status changes since the previous meeting:

- 0209 “Rolling AQ”. Allocated to the Project Nexus Workstream, an extension will be requested at the 17/06/10 Panel meeting;
- 0246/0246A/0246B “Quarterly NTS Entry Capacity User Commitment”. All three Proposals were rejected by the Authority.
- 0270 “Aggregated Monthly Reconciliation for Smart Meters“. Potential for significant system impacts. Allocated to a Development Work Group, with a report now due at the 19/08/10 panel meeting. Currently, the Proposer and the Transporters are working on developing the business rules;
- 0271 “Amendment to the SSP – Provisional LSP – SSP Amendment Rules“. Referred to the Distribution Workstream with a report now due at the 19/08/10 Panel meeting;
- 0272 “Mod 640 Validation Arrangements for when a Change of Shipper has occurred“. System impacts unclear at this time. Allocated to a Review Group, with a report due at the 20/05/10 Panel meeting;
- 0274 “Creation of a National Revenue Protection Service“. Allocated to a Development Work Group, with a report now due at the 18/11/10 Panel meeting. However, the Proposer has deferred any further work taking place;
- 0280 “Review of Demand Estimation UNC Section H Processes and Responsibilities“. Allocated to a Review Group, with a report now due at the 18/11/10 panel meeting;

- 0282 “Introduction of a process to manage Long Term Vacant sites”. Allocated to the Distribution Workstream with a report now due at the 19/08/10 Panel meeting. Potential for significant system impacts;
- 0287 “Change System Capacity Transfers Notification Time Limit from 04:00 hours to 03:00 hours”. Now unlikely to have any significant system impacts and the Panel have referred it back to the Transmission workstream for further consideration before reporting back to the 17/06/10 Panel meeting;
- 0291 “NTS Licence Special Condition C27 – Balancing Arrangements”. May require Gemini changes depending upon which option is selected; report due to 16/09/10 Panel meeting.
- 0296 “Facilitating a Supply Point Enquiry Service for Non-Domestic Supply Points”. Report due at the 19/08/10 Panel meeting, and
- 0297 “Extending Rights to Protected Information Provisions for Meter Asset Managers / Registered Metering Applicants”. New modification to be considered at the 17/06/10 Panel meeting.

Moving on, MiB informed members that there was no Gemini presentation at the last Operational Forum meeting.

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

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

3.1 COR 962 and 962.1 – Query and Workflow Management & Q&WM – Change to MPRN Creation (MNC) Process

xoserve (DA) informed members that a notification had been sent out as part of the Change pack. As a departure from the standard formats, this had not been well received by the community who indicated there might be significant impacts upon business function. A revised proposal was submitted last Friday.

As advised in May, DA reiterated that this was the first of possibly nineteen identified processes, although not all of them will impact UKLC members, and then issued a paper matrix illustration to the Group to enhance their understanding.

DA explained that by taking this approach a single consolidated record would not be ready until the processes have been notified; xoserve may not therefore be able to provide UK Link Committee with the formal 6 months’ notice, but this matrix would help to clarify and give a view of the progress of the proposal in the meantime. It was believed that all of the file formats would be available after the August meeting, and xoserve would be seeking final approval at the September meeting. The aim was to carry out implementation over the last week-end in November – this would provide a two and a half month notice period for the single consolidated record.

Users confirmed that two and a half months’ notification (assuming a late November implementation) was not acceptable. MB indicated that a four month notice period should be a reasonable notice period – which was agreed by all members present. DA indicated he would consult with AC and DW (who had both attended part of the meeting due to other commitments) to confirm acceptance of a four month period.

DA also requested that Users review each notification as issued – in particular the new fields within records so that provision of this data could be agreed prior to

formal approval, enabling xoserve to baseline these processes for design as soon as possible. Users acknowledged this point.

DA asked and Users accepted the proposal for 962.1, such that this process may be baselined.

Communications will be sent out in the Change pack this week, so parties will start to see the file format build up.

3.2 COR1360 – NTS Exit Reform Phase 1

xoserve (DA) advised members that this will show as 'implemented' on next month's plan.

3.3 COR 1133 – Facilitating the use of AMR in a DM Elective Regime

The debate continued on the following three proposals.

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 reported that he had provided a document to JM containing various challenges to the legal text. JM had subsequently reviewed this with his lawyers, whose view was that the legal text worked, there was no contradiction, and the xoserve proposal (Option 1) would align with this. It was believed that from the information provided in relation to Options 2a and 2b, these would also work, but more detailed steps would be required to give a more considered opinion.

There was still some disagreement as to the fitness of the legal text and what seemed to be apparent contradictions within the paragraphs, whereby a Shipper appeared able to submit a read by D+7, but the Transporters were precluded from accepting it after D+5, and this was illustrated through a comparison of the statements within UNC TPD Section M3. The apparent intent then was discussed at some length but no consensus was reached on an ultimate resolution. JM suggested that AC ask EDF's lawyers to review it and AC then to respond back to JM. JM will send his lawyer's findings to AC.

In the meantime, a common approach needed to be agreed so the work to implement the Modification could move forward. It was proposed to continue with Option 1 for a November implementation, with a proviso that either Option 2a or 2b should be considered for implementation a little later. A discussion commenced which again revolved around the interpretation of the legal text in an effort to seek further clarity, with parties still unable to reach sufficient agreement in order to favour a particular option.

SMc pointed out that any further discussion relating to the interpretation of the legal text ought to be carried on outside of the UK Link Committee. AC reiterated he was not happy to approve any option without further clarity. JM reiterated that the Modification followed due process and was consulted on in the public domain, and added that the Transporters sympathise with Shipper process impacts and pointed out that Options 2a and 2b had been developed to ameliorate these. JB emphasised that the UK Link Committee has the task of implementing the Modification *as approved by Ofgem*, and there remained the choice of three options.

xoserve could implement Option 1 for November, and then may be able to offer a further solution, subject to more details being provided under Options 2a and 2b. AC offered to work up the Shipper proposals in greater detail and circulate; they were likely to be the same as Option 1, except for the timings relating to the submission of reads.

LC was concerned that there was still no consensus on the options. JM proposed that Option 1 was progressed, and then Options 2a and 2b could be looked at, bearing in mind additional costs would be associated with this. AC pointed out that Option 1 was not ideal for all Shippers. MB questioned how critical was it that this be implemented in November. DW suggested quantifying any costs/benefits associated with a different implementation timescale might help perhaps.

JB reminded the group that at the previous meeting, the Proposer PB had emphasised that the November implementation date was very important. The Proposer was concerned that this is the first of a wide ranging suite of User Pays (DME) related modifications and as such, it is important for the industry to get this one delivered on time without any significant delivery delays. As noted previously, the Proposer is less concerned about which option is selected than whether the Phase 1 timescales are met (i.e. 21/11/10 implementation) and he stated at the previous meeting that if it turns out that the xoserve proposal is the only one, which could deliver the solution to cost and timeframe, then this would be his preference.

Following the last meeting, where xoserve was instructed to continue with the present Option 1, LC reported that current progress was on schedule, but there may be issues with getting in RPA for November. To reduce slippage, consideration was being given to reducing testing periods and to overlapping phases; system testing was ready to start now.

Those present were asked to indicate which option they may support, however the Shippers present were still reluctant to commit to approval, as they felt there was not enough certainty that either Option 2a or 2b would be secured, following assumed implementation of Option 1.

DA reminded the group that JM's lawyers required further detail on Options 2a and 2b before a final opinion could be passed on whether either or both aligned with the Modification, as did xoserve which did not possess sufficient information at present to ascertain the impacts of either option. Formal approval was still required to implement Option 1.

MB and SS felt greater understanding of the implications of the costs/timescales associated with Options 2a and 2b was required before any conclusion could be reached.

MC pointed out that UK Link Committee had an obligation to facilitate the implementation of the Modification.

LC expressed concern that stopping now, and then restarting again would incur significant extra cost, and MC reiterated that the perceived wider industry view via the Ops Forums was that it should be implemented for November.

JB concluded that Shippers were reluctant to say yes to Option 1, unless more certainty could be given on a second option.

AC indicated that EDF would support Option 1 prior to subsequent rollout of the second option.

JB then summarised the proposal being put forward as being: Option 1 for a November implementation, on the basis that the Transporters would put in place a scheme for a second later phase of implementation (either 2a or 2b).

As there were no DNs present at this point in the meeting (JM had left to attend another meeting) DA and SMC would need to discuss this with the other Transporters. xoserve would need to establish marginal costs for Options 2a and 2b and then consult with the Transporters.

DA clarified that what needed to be clearly established was the potential implementation date, the costs, timescales, and a detailed assessment of whether the Modification's text can be satisfied by what is/will be suggested within the Options.

MB commented that a NDM to DM change would cause an estimate to be raised but the following day a live reading would be generated. The second reading may fail validation and asked whether the estimate might be suppressed by xoserve.

LC reiterated her concern that there was still no real consensus on these options.

DW reiterated that he was not agreeing to Option 1 at this point.

DA said that the short term solution was to carry on with Option 1, given both the Proposer's and the wider industry view was to get something in, even though potentially RPA cannot be brought in for 21/11/10. DA asked LC if this was possible for Option 2a. LC responded that RPA could not be brought in, in a consistent UK Link format.

In summary, DA believed that xoserve's position at the end of these deliberations stood as follows:

- xoserve continue to implement Option 1 (or 2a) for 21/11/10;
- xoserve to remain in discussion with the Transporters to assess how any further option may be implemented (costs, timescales, alignment with Modification text);
- xoserve to implement with rejection formats not consistent with standard formats, but to be brought back into line with UK Link standard at a later date;
- recognition that assurances cannot be given on the implementation of any other option until further discussion has taken place with the Transporters, and
- recognition that assurances could not be given of any implementation as this, he expected, would be a User Pays element, and therefore would require sanction from Users before such a guarantee could be given. A further meeting will be arranged after xoserve and the Transporters have concluded

their discussions and xoserve is in possession of indicative costs and timescales. DA will communicate a summary of the discussions with the Transporters.

Finally, SMC questioned if xoserve would need to resubmit the Agency Charging Statement as a consequence of any price or service changes. MC added that any such changes would also have to go before the User Pays User Committee.

In closing, Chair (MiB) asked, and members agreed to carry forward outstanding actions UKL1192, 1193 & 1195.

Actions UKL 1192, 1193 & 1195: Carried Forward

Action UKL 1197: AC to produce detailed versions of Option 2a and Option 2b (including DME to NDM scenario) and circulate.

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

4. Review of Topics Status Report

ConQuest Replacement – Covered under item 3.1 above.

Project Nexus – DA provided a brief overview of meetings that had taken place since the last UK Link Committee meeting and those planned for June/July.

5. Performance Reporting

xoserve (MC) 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

Identification of Error in MBR File

DA reported that an error in the published MBR file had been identified, whereby the footer detail on the front was correct, but the remaining records were incorrect. He requested the Members' permission to correct the fault and this was granted.

9. Next Meeting

The June 2010 UK Link Committee meeting will be a teleconference meeting and is scheduled to commence at 10:00 am on Thursday 08 July 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 BG to discuss their specific volume increase requirements for their proposed June 2010 system change (change to the MAM activity).	xoserve (DA)	Update due at July 2010 meeting. Carried Forward
UKL 1185	11/02/10	1.2 (4.)	Raise the profile of the ConQuest system replacement with the Smart Metering Forum.	xoserve (DA)	Update provided. Closed
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 (DA)	Update due at July meeting. Carried Forward
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 July meeting. Carried Forward
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 July meeting. Carried Forward
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 July meeting. Carried Forward
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 July meeting. Carried Forward

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref (original ref)	Action	Owner*	Status Update
UKL 1196	25/05/10	1.2 (1.)	Organise a suitable venue in which to host a face-to-face UKLC meeting in June.	Joint Office (MiB)	Update provided. Closed
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)	Update due at the July meeting.
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 July meeting.

*** 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