

UK LINK Committee Minutes
Thursday 12 August 2010
via teleconference

Attendees

Mike Berrisford (Chair)	(MiB) Joint Office
Helen Cuin (Secretary)	(HC) Joint Office
Ashley Collins	(AC) EDF Energy
Brian Durber	(BD) E.ON UK
Graham Wood	(GW) Centrica
Joel Martin	(JM) Scotia Gas Networks
Lorraine Cave	(LC) xoserve
Louise Williams	(LW) RWE npower
Martin Brandt	(MB) SSE
Sean McGoldrick	(SMc) National Grid NTS
Simon Trivella	(ST) Wales & West Utilities

Apologies

Dave Addison	xoserve
Mark Cockayne	xoserve
Stephanie Shepherd	RWE npower

1. Review of Minutes and Actions

1.1. Minutes

The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted.

1.2. Review of actions

Appendix A contains a tabulated update on actions.

UKL1164: xoserve (LC) explained that no further update was available.

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

Action UKL1164: Carried Forward

UKL1190: SSE (MB) expressed concern that this action has been outstanding for some time. WWU (ST) confirmed that the UK Link documentation referred to is available via the xoserve website through a secure access. MB struggled to see why a secure access was deemed necessary as this is not the case in the electricity market. ST explained that this fulfils the UNC requirement and that Transporters have chosen to keep the documents secure. He explained that a username and password could be provided to allow access for Users who do not currently have access.

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

Action UKL1190: Closed

UKL1192: LC confirmed that some additional requirements need to be confirmed and timescales and costs should be available shortly.

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

Action UKL1192: Closed

UKL1193, 1194, 1195 and 1198: Please refer to item 3.9 below.

2. Other Industry Fora

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

2.1 UNC Workstreams

MiB provided a brief update on the recent UNC modifications that may have UKL system impacts, as follows:

- 0326 “Allocation of unidentified gas following the appointment of the Allocation of Unidentified Gas Expert (AUGE)”. Proposer believes that UK Link system changes will be limited.

2.2 Operational Forum

MiB reported that the next meeting is scheduled to take place on 12/09/10.

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

**Please note: the separate discussions on item 3.9 have been collated together to aid understanding and continuity.*

3.1 COR 962 – Query and Workflow Management

LC confirmed that update testing will take place in Q1 and implementation in Q2 2011, AC asked for further clarification on the implementation and LC agreed to take a new action to investigate.

The next ConQuest User Group meeting is scheduled for 07/09/10.

Action UKL1199: xoserve (LC) to provide an update on the extent of the Query & Workflow Management implementation in Q2 2011.

3.2 COR1360 – NTS Exit Reform Phase 2

LC provided an update for Phase 2 with testing on 02 July progressing. She requested parties provide an early indication of interest.

3.3 CB/999/JT – Administration Changes to ECO. Format

LC explained that a Class 1 change approval was required. When asked, members approved this change request.

3.4 CB/1003/NJ – Update to Code Contingency for Code Contingency Guidelines Document – Revised Proforma

LC provided a brief update. When asked, members approved this change request.

3.5 COR1909 – MIPI European Transparency Project

LC provided an update on the obligations for the transparency of specified data. A further update will be provided in due course.

3.6 COR 962.4 – Q&WM – Change to ADD / UNC – Address Update Request

LC explained that a Class 2 approval was required, and in doing so highlighted that one comment had been received supporting implementation. When asked, members approved this change request.

3.7 COR 962.5 – Q&WM – Isolation Report (ISO) Process

EDF Energy (AC) sought clarification on the demolished flag field requirement. He questioned if there would ever be case whereby it was unclear whether a site has been demolished or not. He was unsure if ConQuest could be used if prior knowledge of site demolition is required. ST believed that the use of the field is confirmation that the site is to be progressed as a demolished site where it is already known to be demolished. AC was happy to accept the change on this provision, however he sought clarification from xoserve and if this was not the case he asked if an unclear flag could be added in. Bearing in mind the previous comments, when asked, members approved this change request.

3.8 COR 962.6 – Q&WM – Removal of QEX File

It was confirmed that the IX weekly summary report would continue as some parties continue to use the information. In light of this fact the change request has been withdrawn.

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

LC confirmed that this change request was on track for a 21/11/10 delivery, although there has been a slight delay on system testing but this due to be completed at the end of this week. An exercise to validate test cases is to be undertaken. There will be a five-week external testing window for which one party has requested participation.

LC suggested that if any others parties wish to participate in the external testing they should submit their requirements to xoserve.

MiB asked if members were ready to vote on the approval of the change request. SGN (JM) explained that the July UNCC Committee had discussed Options 2a and 2b and that a Modification Proposal would be required to progress an alternative solution. JM confirmed that a review of the current legal text and the opening read issue could not find anything in the legal text that would rule out Option 2a or 2b. JM explained that xoserve are hoping to come back with costs for 2a and 2b, and it is expected that this should be available next week. E.ON UK (BD) asked for clarity that the legal text does not rule out Option 2a or 2b when the estimated opening read could be made available. Based on that BD asked why it was perceived a Modification Proposal would need to be raised. JM explained that additional costs charged out on a User Pays basis would be required. Some debate occurred about why a modification would be required if the legal text would allow the use of an alternative solution.

It was recognised that the agreement to the original implementation date was made before the impact was identified at industry meetings.

ST explained that at the UNCC Committee Shippers wanted a commitment from Transporters that a Phase 2 will take place. Transporters could not commit to a phase two as it would require a Modification Proposal and be subject to the usual UNC governance. A number of Shippers expressed concern about implementing the current solution proposed for implementation for November 2010.

ST believed that there would be limited impact but BD challenged the impact and the implication to Shippers' systems and processes.

Despite the UNCC Committee discussions, AC believed that the Shippers at the UK Link Committee were not satisfied with the solution. However Transporters

were keen not delay the implementation of the current solution, which, will provide some benefits to the industry.

Three Shippers voted to accept the Implementation Plan recognising the position and the ability to raise an additional Modification Proposal to address any concerns and two Shippers rejected it.

Therefore, the UK Link Committee did not come to a consensus to approve the Implementation Plan. ST confirmed that the Transporters would now take the Implementation Plan to the August UNC Committee meeting to seek approval.

It was recognised that lessons could be learnt with regard to the development of technical solutions.

JM raised an issue, which had been identified with regard to the current legal text for UNC Modification 0224, whereby TPD Section M3.8.4(b) refers to Business Days left over from the original legal text, where it reads Business Days it should read Calendar Days. It was believed that Calendar Days is referred to within the Business Rules. Concern was expressed about the use of Calendar Days and how this could reduce the window for replacement reads. A discussion took place on read replacement reads, the processing of replacement reads and the window for managing this process. It was accepted that, a 'Consent to Modify' may be required to bring the legal text in line with the Business Rules. It was questioned how quickly xoserve would turnaround replacement reads.

The current legal text M3.8.4(b) referred to Business Days and it was questioned if the current UNC text was incorrect. MD and AC believed that the legal text should say Business Days. Nevertheless AC expressed concern that xoserve would have to process a replacement read within the same day whether or not the legal text should read Business Days or Calendar Days, he questioned xoserve's ability to process a replacement reading on the same day.

The Shipper Agreed Reads process (SARs) was discussed and the practicality of using this to agree opening reads.

LC asked if the process timelines needed to be reissued.

AC expressed his concern for the error made within the legal text and the impact to NDM Users. He believed that a new Modification Proposal is required to address all the concerns associated with replacement read provisions and Options 2a and 2b.

In summarising discussions, MiB asked, and members agreed to close actions 1193, 1194 and 1195 and carry forward 1198.

Actions UKL1193, 1194 & 1195: Closed

Actions UKL1198: Carried forward

Action UKL 1200: xoserve (LC) to confirm the turnaround timescales for processing replacement reads for UNC0224.

Action UKL 1201: Transporters (JM/ST) to prepare a paper on clarifying the Business Rule 69 Business Days issues.

Action UKL 1202: xoserve (LC) to confirm how they handle sites transferring from DM to NDM, specifically the D+5 loose out and how it currently fits with UNC rules and D+5 close out.

3.10 COR 962.1 – Q&WM – Change to MPRN Creation (MNC) Process

In the analysis stage, further information will be provided in due course.

3.11 COR 962.2 – Q&WM – Daily Metered Contact (DMQ) Process Change

In the analysis stage, further information will be provided in due course.

3.12 COR 962.3 – Q&WM – Process to Challenge UKLink Outcomes (FLE)

In the analysis stage, further information will be provided in due course.

3.13 Update to Code Contingency Document to include Exit Capacity processes and forms

LC confirmed that this has been implemented and that no further update is available.

4. Review of Topics Status Report

4.1 xoserve Strategic Initiative Update

Project Nexus – LC provided a brief update, and a copy of the information will be published alongside these minutes.

5. Performance Reporting

LC 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 Continued Provision of UKLink Communications on the Joint Office web site

MiB asked whether or not members feel there is value in continuing to publish copies of the UK Link Communications on the Joint Office website. Members requested that this service is continued.

9. Next Meeting

The September 2010 UK Link Committee meeting will be a teleconference meeting and is scheduled to commence at 10:00 am on Thursday 09 September 2010.

APPENDIX A

ACTION LOG: UK Link Committee 12 August 2010

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref (original ref)	Action	Owner*	Status Update
UKL 1164	09/07/09	1.2 (1.1)	Contact BG Shippers to discuss their specific volume increase requirements for their proposed June 2010 system change (change to the MAM activity).	xoserve (DA)	Update due at September meeting. Carried Forward
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 provided. Closed
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 provided. Closed
UKL 1193	25/05/10	3.9 (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 provided. Closed
UKL 1194	25/05/10	3.9 (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 provided. Closed
UKL 1195	25/05/10	3.9 (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 provided. Closed
UKL 1198	10/06/10	3.9 (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 September meeting. Carried forward

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref (original ref)	Action	Owner*	Status Update
UKL 1199	12/08/10	3.1	Provide an update on the extent of the Query & Workflow Management implementation in Q2 2011.	xoserve (LC)	Update due at the September meeting.
UKL 1200	12/08/10	3.9	Confirm the turnaround timescales for processing replacement reads for UNC0224.	xoserve (LC)	Update due at the September meeting.
UKL 1201	12/08/10	3.9	Prepare a paper on clarifying the Business Rule 69 Business Days issues.	Transporters (JM/ST)	Update due at the September meeting.
UKL 1202	12/08/10	3.9	Confirm how they handle sites transferring from DM to NDM, specifically the D+5 loose out and how it currently fits with UNC rules and D+5 close out.	xoserve (LC)	Update due at the September meeting.

*** Key to action owner**

- DA David Addison, xoserve
 LC Lorraine Cave, xoserve
 JM Joel Martin, Scotia Gas Networks
 ST Simon Trivella, Wales & West Utilities