

**UNC Distribution Workgroup Minutes**  
**10:00 Thursday 23 November 2023**  
**via Microsoft Teams**

<b>Attendees</b>		
Rebecca Hailes (Chair)	(RHa)	Joint Office
Ben Mulcahy (Secretary)	(HB)	Joint Office
Alison Wiggett	(AW)	Corona Energy
Andy Clasper	(AC)	Cadent
Charlotte Gilbert	(CG)	BU-UK
Colin Wainwright	(CW)	SGN
David Mitchell	(DMi)	SGN
David Morley	(DMo)	Ovo
Edward Allard	(EA)	Cadent
Ellie Rogers	(ER)	CDSP (Xoserve)
Fiona Cottam	(FC)	CDSP
James Lomax	(JLo)	Cornwall Insight
Josie Lewis	(JLe)	CDSP (Xoserve)
Kathryn Adeseye	(KA)	CDSP (Xoserve)
Kevin Clark	(KC)	Utilita
Lee Greenwood	(LG)	Centrica
Louise Hellyer	(LH)	TotalEnergies Gas & Power
Marina Papathoma	(MP)	Wales & West Utilities
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE Energy Supply
Nick King	(NK)	Barrow Shipping /CNG Services
Paul O'Toole	(PO)	Northern Gas Networks
Richard Pomroy	(RP)	Wales & West Utilities
Slama Akhtar	(SA)	Northern Gas Networks
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	SEFE Energy Limited
Tracey Saunders	(TS)	Northern Gas Networks

*Please note these minutes do not replicate/include detailed content provided within the presentation slides, therefore, it is recommended that the published presentation material is reviewed in conjunction with these minutes. Copies of all papers are available at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Dist/231123>*

**1. Introduction and Status Review**

Rebecca Hailes (RHa) welcomed everyone to the meeting.

**1.1. Approval of Minutes (26 October 2023)**

The minutes from 26 October 2023 were reviewed and Nick King requested an amendment to list the organisation he represented as Barrow Shipping. With this amendment agreed the minutes were approved and have now been republished.

**1.2 Approval of late papers**

RHa advised that no papers for the meeting had been submitted late.

**1.3. Review Outstanding Actions**

RHa confirmed that no Actions had been carried forward from the October meeting.

#### **1.4. Modifications with Ofgem**

The Chair advised that a report was available on the Ofgem website at <https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/publications/code-modificationmodification-proposals-ofgem-decision-expected-publication-dates-timetable> dated 14 November 2023 and shows the expected decision dates for all Modifications currently awaiting Ofgem decision.

The Chair requested an update on Modification Implementation decisions that had occurred since the October Distribution Workgroup which is provided below:-

- Notice was issued that Modification 0770FT - Amendments to legal text numbering for UNC Modification 0701 was to be implemented on 04 November 2023.
- Notice was issued on 14 November 2023 that the Joint Office had received Ofgem's Decision Letter to implement Modification 0825 - Removal of the remaining Retrospective Asset, Address and Supply Point (RAASP) elements of the Retrospective Adjustment arrangements put in place under Modification 0434
- Notice was issued on 14 November 2023 that as a result of the Ofgem decision to implement Modification 0825 that Modification 0651- Changes to the Retrospective Data Update provisions would not be implemented into Code.
- A UNC Panel Determination was issued that Modification 0858S - Amendment to Network Entry Provision at Shell St Fergus Terminal would be implemented on 08 December 2023
- Notice was issued on 22 November that the Joint Office had received Ofgem's Decision Letter to implement Modification 0847 - Introduction of a Minimum General Non-Transmission Services Charge and that an implementation date had been requested from the Transporters.

#### **1.5. Pre-Modification discussions**

##### **1.5.1. Permitting DNOs to charge Shippers negative SoLR unit rates**

Richard Pomroy (RP) provided the Workgroup with a synopsis of the rationale behind this proposed Modification, stating that DNOs in previous years had recovered monies to fund SoLR (Shipper of Last Resort) events under clause SSC A48 of the Transporter licence. He advised that Ofgem had recently produced a 'Minded to' statement related to claims made in 2023 that there was likely to be a need for a net repayment for SoLR repayments.

This Modification would allow Transporters to levy negative SoLR charges by amending the related TPD Section Y text introduced by Modification 0687 - *Creation of new charge to recover Last Resort Supply Payments*.

RP informed the Workgroup that WWU has discussed the subject with the CDSP, who advised that the industry systems could facilitate negative SoLR unit rates, though would require this Modification to change the UNC to enable them to do so. The only impact RP could perceive was the possibility that some Shipper systems could not cope with negative SoLR rates, and therefore asked if Shippers would check internally if that was to be an issue. If this was the case, he requested that this be fed back as it may prove to affect the Modification's prospective implementation date. He noted the need for the 2023/2024 invoices to be issued in May 2024.

RP added that he has already produced the Legal Text for the Modification, denoting text changes in red. He shared the intention to raise the Modification proposal in the December meeting of the UNC Modification Panel and, noting that the next Distribution Workgroup meeting was to be held beforehand, asked Shippers to feedback on any issues in that earlier meeting, where a second Pre-Mod discussion was on the agenda. This would ensure any such issues could be considered at the same time as the Proposal in the UNC Modification Panel and thereby help ensure the ambition to have a single Workgroup meeting assigned to the Modification and thus meet the timings required.

Steve Mulinganie (SM) asked if the Modification was proposed to be Self-Governance, querying if the impact was likely material. RP advised that in terms of the sums of money involved, it was likely to result in a small net repayment, acknowledging that the necessity depended on Ofgem's final decision when it was published, adding that the sums were not going to be tens of millions and were in fact near net zero, with a number of positives and one major repayment from one supplier.

RHa asked if the Proposer could provide any indication of the figures in the Modification, to which RP noted that he had already provided a link to the Ofgem-minded decision but committed to adding the aggregate position as well.

Ellie Rogers (ER) asked if it could be clarified if the target was for the Modification to be implemented in May 2024 or if it needed to be in place to enable invoice charging in May 2024. RP confirmed that the first invoices for FY24/25 would be issued in May, and these would need to be able to facilitate the negative rates, providing this is Ofgem's eventual decision.

RHa asked if there was any indication as to when Ofgem was likely to turn their minded-to statement into a decision. RP commented that he understood it was likely to be around 14 December 2023, noting that this was the same day as the December UNC Modification Panel and sharing that it seemed prudent to get the Modification underway rather than leave it until after the decision was confirmed and potentially necessitate an Urgent Modification as such was a route best avoided whenever possible.

RHa asked if the Modification would be withdrawn if it proved not needed. RP replied that he saw no harm in progressing it in that scenario anyway, having done all the legwork already and may prove to be a sensible precaution for the future. When asked if Ofgem were aware of the Modification RP confirmed that he had referenced it in a response to their consultation issued when the minded to position was announced. RHa suggested that contacting Matt Brown at Ofgem regarding the issue may prove of value.

This concluded the pre-Modification discussion.

### **1.5.2. Linked Distribution Entry and Exit Points**

Nick King (NK) advised that he had been asked to present this Pre-Modification on behalf CNG Services and directed the Workgroup's attention to Section 3 'Why Change?' of the Modification to explain its intention. He commented that Anaerobic Digestion (AD) plant requires heat and electricity to work and when such sites start up, they do not then have their own gas available and require stability of supply, thus the Modification is intended to allow sites to source gas from the main grid for start-up.

NK explained that the idea was that the entry point would be where the site goes into the grid, with the exit, not exclusively, but largely, where the site requires gas, with the exit and entry linked it would not have to be a Firm connection. He shared that as he understood it all new connections had to be Firm, not interruptible, with interruptible processes available as separate processes.

In reviewing the Business rules, NK noted that they introduced a means to allow initial connections to be interruptible, adding that stipulations and protections were also present, including that linked exit points would not have compensation available to any party for supply interruptions.

NK shared that under these circumstances customers would be able to have an interruptible supply contract from the outset, explaining his understanding that the current rules meant new connections had to be Firm and therefore would likely trigger reinforcement requirements as the area DNO would have to consider the demand on the network on the 1 in 20 model and associated UNC requirements and thus find the firm load requirements would prove unlikely to be met without reinforcement.

RP confirmed that this was accurate, as DNOs must model under the worst-case scenarios as the load requirement is Firm. He added that Class 1 sites can be connected as interruptible supplies from the outset but as the AQs of such sites were so very high it was unlikely to be a factor in the scenario raised.

RHa asked if this Modification was introducing a new product. NK replied that he did not think that this was the case as interruptible supplies exist, as the earlier commentary on Class 1 sites had highlighted. He emphasised that he was standing in for the Proposer and as such had not looked into the matter in great detail himself, adding that the change was probably not significant. He continued that the Modification was worded in full sympathy with the requirements of network planning and looked to put protection in place to ensure the relevant DNO had a lot of control.

RP explained that ten years ago the mechanism was changed to align with the view at the time that there were a growing number of sites that opted to make their supplies interruptible in the knowledge that they were extremely unlikely to be interrupted at their locations, effectively getting an interruptible price for a firm supply. SM agreed, noting that some were even hospitals and other protected sites that could not be interrupted. Because of this interruption was removed, as was aggregation, adding that this Modification looked likely to reintroduce both.

Dave Mitchell (DMi) asked how DNOs would be able to monitor the Entry and Exit points, as some form of dynamic modelling would be required, meaning that telemetry would be needed as the sites could be, for example, 10 miles apart, and it seemed unclear how this would work.

NK acknowledged that this was a fair point, adding that the anaerobic digestion site would be registered as an Entry point anyway so would have the telemetry in place with data going back to the DN control centre, before postulating that a variant of an Exit Agreement could be used to enable the modelling.

RHa suggested that the Proposer consider what this new type of Exit agreement would look like.

SM observed that this proposal would introduce a major change in the market and have considerable implications beyond anaerobic digestion. He expected a lot of other sites would want to be able to access the same flexibilities this provided, citing that if it was the case that shared capacity was made an option, he would want it for all his customers where they are producing and could thereby avoid the reinforcement charges they would otherwise face. He suggested a significant development period be proposed when it was presented to the UNC Modification Panel, recommending that the JO should suggest an initial six-month Workgroup allocation at least, which would of course require agreement from the Proposer, so that the UNC Modification Panel could take a view.

RP added that, although acknowledging that this was primarily a commercial arrangement, there were the physical considerations of being on the same part of the network which were also a challenge, as it makes an Exit on a linked supply point, parties could expand this to make Entry conditional on there being an Exit demand. Whilst he did not think the Proposal was suggesting this it would be useful to understand it. NK agreed that this was an interesting point that he would take back to the Proposer.

DMi added that these were all good points for consideration that should be captured in the Modification as well as the Workgroup minutes to enable discussions to move forward.

SM suggested that they be proposed as questions that could be taken forward to the UNC Modification Panel as potential Panel Questions and thus avoid the likelihood of a repeat of the same discussion.

RP asked if it was envisaged that the Interruptible status would be conditional on having an Exit Point or on having both.

SM asked that if it was the case that this meant that some customers would be able to avoid reinforcement costs using this proposed mechanism how would it be equitable to other customers that are unable to avoid reinforcement costs, in effect how would it avoid undue discrimination?

NK advised that using the example of anaerobic digestion in his introduction may have given the Workgroup the wrong impression as the Modification was not intended solely in regard to anaerobic digestion sites. SM suggested that it would therefore be more of a 'buddy system' akin to that that was proposed under previous shared capacity proposals that had led to a lot of questions in the industry. He suggested that whilst the idea of introducing shared capacity across a network was interesting, it was a very big piece of work.

DMi commented that this would all need to be considered in the Modifications' Business Rules.

RP shared his impression that the Modification was intended to consider linked one-to-one capacity rather than sharing out the capacity across a wider grouping, so it was possible to carve out this distinction if so desired.

NK added that the Modification envisioned that the DNO would have a lot of say in the process, and that he understood that where the DNO has a Network Exit was conditional to a Network Agreement being in place and that this was where a lot of the details raised could be resolved, as is was the case in NExAs and NEAs, which have both physical and commercial dimensions, adding that the Modification was certainly intended to include protections to prevent 'gaming'.

SM indicated that, at its heart, the Modification was stating that 'I want to avoid reinforcement because I will accept interruption' which meant that every other customer in the same circumstances needed the same rights to avoid discrimination. He observed that all of his customers who could have made use of this option were denied it as they had to have Firm supplies and were thus charged reinforcement costs. He stressed the significance of this and evoked the potential scenario the Modification could introduce the possibility of those customers who were charged reinforcement seeking legal claims.

NK replied that he appreciated the point adding that it also brought into the spotlight the industry considerations of 'efficient and economic' requirements when considering works to avoid unnecessary reinforcement. He added that the feedback was helpful and acknowledged that there were a lot of aspects to cover.

RP commented that the Proposer might be able to argue that it was a commercial alternative to reinforcement but would need to make sure the rules were robust without discrimination or loopholes.

The Workgroup agreed that the Modification would likely not meet the criteria for Self-Governance.

SM asked if an initial Review group would be more suitable given all the questions that had been raised, which RHa advised was for the Proposer to consider, adding that initial Representations would be welcome.

This concluded the pre-Modification discussion.

## **2. CSS REC Consequential Changes Update**

ER advised the Workgroup that a CSS REC Consequential Changes update was not available for this meeting but that the CDSP would make sure that one was provided in the December 2023 Distribution Workgroup meeting, ensuring that anything substantial was reviewed in full.

## **3. Workgroups**

### **3.1. 0842 –Gas Entry onto the Total system via an Independent Gas Transporter**

*(Report to Panel 14 December 2023)*

<https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0842>

### **3.2. 0850 - Amendments to Allocation of Unidentified Gas Expert (AUGE) arrangements to introduce a new Residual Upstream Contributor**

*(Report to Panel 18 July 2024)*

<https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0850>

### **3.3. 0851R - Extending the Annually Read PC4 Supply Meter Point (SMP) read submission window**

*(Report to Panel 18 July 2024)*

<https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0851>

### **3.4. 0862 – Amendments to the current Unidentified Gas Reconciliation Period arrangements**

*(Report to Panel 16 May 2024)*

<https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0862>

### **3.5. 0863 – Erroneous Transfers Exception Process**

*(Report to Panel 16 May 2024)*

<https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0863>

#### **4. Distribution Workgroup Change Horizon**

Please note that the specifics of this report can be reviewed at <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Dist/231123>; as such, they are not replicated here.

Josie Lewis (JL) brought a number of recent changes within the report to the Workgroup's attention, including noting that Modifications 0701- *Aligning Capacity booking under the UNC and arrangements set out in relevant NExAs*, 0770FT-*Amendments to legal text numbering for UNC Modification* and 0853- *CDSP permissions to facilitate implementation of UNC0701* had been delivered and that they would accordingly be removed from future reports accordingly.

JL noted that Ofgem's approval of Modification 0825 - *Removal of the remaining Retrospective Asset, Address and Supply Point (RAASP) elements of the Retrospective Adjustment arrangements put in place under Modification 0434* included the instruction to close Modification 0651 - *Changes to the Retrospective Data Update provisions* and thus this Modification would also be removed from future reports.

ER added that she understood that the implementation of Modification 0825 - *Removal of the remaining Retrospective Asset, Address and Supply Point (RAASP) elements of the Retrospective Adjustment arrangements put in place under Modification 0434* could be set promptly as there were no system requirements to the Modification.

JL also commented on the delivery of Modification 0836S - *Resolution of Missing Messages following Central Switching Service implementation and integration with REC Change R0067* noting it had previously been indicated as an early December 2023 delivery but advised that there was a dependency on Modification 0855 - *Settlement Adjustments for Supply Meter Points impacted by the Central Switching System P1 Incident* which was awaiting approval from Ofgem and as such the intention was for these to be implemented together. She informed the Workgroup that an update had been received since the report had been issued and that there was now an indicative date for Modification 0836S of 18 December 2023.

ER added that Dave Addison (DA) had confirmed that Modification 0836S - *Resolution of Missing Messages following Central Switching Service implementation and integration with REC Change R0067* was in alignment with the IGT Modification IGT 170 and that she intended to provide an email to both Andy Clasper (AC) at Cadent as Legal Text provider and the Joint Office to request confirmation of the implementation date.

JL noted that page 2 of the Change Horizon report provided the rationale for the current number of weeks for delivery of each Modification.

#### **5. Product Class Capacity**

Ellie Rogers (ER) provided an update that the CDSP was still working on this issue and were intending to provide the industry with feedback soon.

#### **6. Issues**

No issues were presented by the Workgroup.

#### **7. Any Other Business**

##### **7.1. Priority Customers Update**

This AOB item was deferred to the December 2023 meeting.

**7.2. 0864 – Update of UNC Code Communication methods (Governance)**

The Chair advised that this Modification was to be developed through the UNC Governance Workgroup, the next meeting of which was on 04 December 2023.

There was some discussion as to whether there would be sufficient industry exposure in the Workgroup as opposed to the Distribution Workgroup but it was agreed that any joint coverage between the two would likely generate duplication and confusion.

**8. Diary Planning**

*Further details of planned meetings are available at:*

<https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Dist>

Time / Date	Paper Publication Deadline	Venue	Programme
Monday 10:00 11 December 2023	5 pm 01 December 2023	Microsoft Teams	Standard Agenda including any Modification Workgroups relating to Distribution Workgroup

Distribution Workgroup Action Table						
Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Reporting Month	Owner	Status Update

## UNC Workgroup 0842 Minutes Gas Entry onto the Total system via an Independent Gas Transporter

**Thursday 23 November 2023**

**via Microsoft Teams**

<b>Attendees</b>		
Rebecca Hailes (Chair)	(RHa)	Joint Office
Ben Mulcahy (Secretary)	(HB)	Joint Office
David Mitchell (Proposer)	(DMi)	SGN
Alison Wiggett	(AW)	Corona Energy
Andy Clasper	(AC)	Cadent
Charlotte Gilbert	(CG)	BU-UK
Colin Wainwright	(CW)	SGN
David Mitchell	(DM)	SGN
Edward Allard	(EA)	Cadent
Ellie Rogers	(ER)	CDSP (Xoserve)
James Lomax	(JLo)	Cornwall Insight
Josie Lewis	(JLe)	CDSP (Xoserve)
Kathryn Adeseye	(KA)	CDSP (Xoserve)
Kevin Clark	(KC)	Utilita
Lee Greenwood	(LG)	Centrica
Louise Hellyer	(LH)	TotalEnergies Gas & Power
Marina Papathoma	(MP)	Wales & West Utilities
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE Energy Supply
Nick King	(NK)	Barrow Shipping
Paul O'Toole	(PO)	Northern Gas Networks
Richard Pomroy	(RP)	Wales & West Utilities
Slama Akhtar	(SA)	Northern Gas Networks
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	SEFE Energy Limited
Tracey Saunders	(TS)	Northern Gas Networks

*This Workgroup meeting will be considered quorate provided at least two Transporter and two Shipper User representatives are present.*

*Please note these minutes do not replicate/include detailed content provided within the presentation slides, therefore it is recommended that the published presentation material is reviewed in conjunction with these minutes. Copies of all papers are available at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0842/231123>*

*The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 14 December 2023*

### **1.0 Introduction and Status Review**

Rebecca Hailes (RHa) welcomed everyone to the meeting and gave a brief overview of the scheduled items for discussion.

#### **1.1. Approval of Minutes (26 October 2023)**

The minutes from the meetings held on 26 October 2023 were reviewed.

Nick King (NK) asked that his entry on the attendees list be amended to show that he had represented Barrow Shipping in the meeting. With this amendment agreed the minutes were approved.



## 1.2. Approval of Late Papers

RHA noted that the provision of all papers had been timely with the exception of the diagram provided by the Proposer as a late paper but as it was intended to aid the discussion of the other papers it was seen as beneficial to accept for the meeting.

## 1.3. Review of Outstanding Actions

RHA noted that there were no outstanding actions for this Workgroup.

## 2.0 Review of Amended Modification

The Proposer David Mitchell (DMi) provided an overview of changes that had been made to the Modification in response to the feedback from the last meeting with the aim of making its aim and approach more specific and clear.

The Modification was now recorded as being Authority Directed under Section 2: Governance. Links had been added to Reference Documents under Section 4 Code Specific Matters and the Solution had changes made in the Business Rules in response to feedback received. These included specifying the gas flow into the Total System would be from a DNO network in BR1, and confirming the agreement referenced in BR3, BR4, BR6 and BR9 was a tripartite agreement.

DMi also highlighted that clarification points had been added in the Solution section to assist those parties who had not been in the Modification's Workgroup.

He advised that the wording of Positive Relevant Objectives in Section 7 had been updated for the Positives under Relevant Objectives a) *Efficient and economic operation of the pipe-line system.* and b) *Coordinated, efficient and economic operation of (i) the combined pipe-line system, and/ or (ii) the pipe-line system of one or more other relevant gas transporters.*

Previous entries under the Transporters Relevant Charging Methodology Objectives had been withdrawn and to this end that entire table had been removed for tidiness.

Finally, DMI advised that there was a small change to Section 8 Implementation due to the Modification now being for Authority Direction, as well as the recognition that a new IGT UNC Modification was required.

## 3.0 Review of Legal Text

DMi confirmed that the only change to the proposed Legal Text since it was last reviewed in a Workgroup was that '*IGT LDZ System Entry Point*' in 3.12.1 of TPD Section 1 Entry Requirements was now emboldened as a defined term.

## 4.0 Completion of Workgroup Report

During an onscreen review of the draft Workgroup Report (WGR) which was published on the webpage for this meeting ([www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0842/23112](http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0842/23112)) participants discussed and agreed on the final report wording.

The Consultation period required was discussed, as Proposer, DMi suggested that it seemed sensible to consult for 20 days to allow for the likely seasonal leave considerations and that the IGT Modification was being developed in the background. He did not think restricting the period to 15 days achieved anything beneficial, so a 20-day consultation that reported to the February 2024 UNC Modification Panel seemed the best approach.

Workgroup discussion points in this review included noting the CDSP commentary in the WGR and that the Modification would use BAU processes, and as such would not need system development work, as well as the arrangements required between an IGT and the relevant DNO outside of the UNC to manage and operate, as detailed in clarification point 5.

The Workgroup agreed on the final changes to complete the WGR.

**5.0 Next Steps**

RHa confirmed the next step for this Modification, now that the WGR was complete, was to report to the December 2023 UNC Modification Panel.

**6.0 Any Other Business**

No other business was raised.

**7.0 Diary Planning**

No further Workgroup meetings for this Modification are planned.

0842 Workgroup Action Table						
Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Reporting Month	Owner	Status Update

**UNC Workgroup 0850 Minutes**  
**Amendments to Allocation of Unidentified Gas Expert (AUGE)**  
**arrangements to introduce a new Residual Upstream Contributor**  
**Thursday 23 November 2023**  
**via Microsoft Teams**

**Attendees**

Rebecca Hailes (Chair)	(RHa)	Joint Office
Ben Mulcahy (Secretary)	(BM)	Joint Office
Steve Mulinganie (Proposer)	(SM)	SEFE Energy
Alison Wiggett	(AW)	Corona Energy
Andy Clasper	(AC)	Cadent
Charlotte Gilbert	(CG)	BU-UK
Colin Wainwright	(CW)	SGN
David Mitchell	(DMi)	SGN
Ellie Rogers	(ER)	CDSP (Xoserve)
Edward Allard	(EA)	Cadent
James Lomax	(JL)	Cornwall Insight
Josie Lewis	(JLe)	CDSP (Xoserve)
Kathryn Adeseye	(KA)	CDSP (Xoserve)
Kevin Clark	(KC)	Utilita
Louise Hellyer	(LH)	TotalEnergies Gas & Power
Lee Greenwood	(LG)	British Gas
Marina Papathoma	(MP)	Wales & West Utilities
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE Energy Supply
Nick King	(NK)	Barrow Shipping
Paul O'Toole	(PO)	Northern Gas Networks
Richard Pomroy	(RP)	Wales & West Utilities
Slama Akhtar	(SA)	Northern Gas Networks
Tracey Saunders	(TS)	Northern Gas Networks

*This Workgroup meeting will be considered quorate provided at least two Transporter and two Shipper User representatives are present.*

*Please note these minutes do not replicate/include detailed content provided within the presentation slides, therefore it is recommended that the published presentation material is reviewed in conjunction with these minutes. Copies of all papers are available at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0850/231123>*

*The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 18 July 2024*

## **1.0 Introduction and Status Review**

Rebecca Hailes (RHa) welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked the Proposer to give a brief overview of the Modification to be discussed.

Steve Mulinganie (SM) advised that his expectations were that Modification 0850 was likely to be withdrawn in the following weeks in deference to the progression of Modification 0862 - *Amendments to the current Unidentified Gas Reconciliation Period arrangements*. On this basis, he suggested that this Workgroup be deferred to the December 2023 Distribution Workgroup if it was not withdrawn beforehand.

RHa acknowledged the Proposer's commentary and on that understanding closed this Workgroup, advising all items on the agenda were accordingly deferred to the December meeting.

### **1.1. Approval of Minutes (24 August and 28 September 2023)**

This item was deferred until the 11 December meeting.

### **1.2. Approval of Late Papers**

There were no late papers for this meeting.

### **1.3. Review of Outstanding Actions**

**Action 0701:** DNOs (JS) to provide insight into the DNO Pricing Calendar as an aid to WG consideration of when the Residual Upstream Contributor (RUC) could be issued.

**Update:** None

**Action** This item was deferred until the 11 December meeting.

## **2.0 Consider Initial Representations**

This item was deferred until the 11 December meeting.

## **3.0 Consider Panel Questions**

This item was deferred until the 11 December meeting.

## **4.0 Review Business Rules**

This item was deferred until the 11 December meeting.

## **5.0 Next Steps**

RHa confirmed the next steps are:

- Consider any initial Representations and outstanding Panel questions.
- Review of the Business Rules

## **6.0 Any Other Business**

No other business was raised.

## **7.0 Diary Planning**

Further details of planned meetings are available at: [www.gasgovernance.co.uk/events-calendar/month](http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/events-calendar/month)

Workgroup meetings will take place as follows:

Time / Date	Paper Publication Deadline	Venue	Workgroup Programme
10:00 Monday 11 December 2023	5 pm 01 December 2023	Microsoft Teams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider any Initial Representations received and Panel Questions.</li> <li>Review Business Rules.</li> </ul>

**0850 Workgroup Action Table**

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Reporting Month	Owner	Status Update
0701	28/07/23	1	DNOs (JS) to provide insight into the DNO Pricing Calendar as an aid to WG consideration of when the Residual Upstream Contributor (RUC) could be issued.	August 2023 September 2023	NGN (JS)	Deferred

**UNC Workgroup 0851R Minutes  
Extending the Annually Read PC4 Supply Meter Point (SMP) read  
submission window**

**Thursday 23 November 2023**

**via Microsoft Teams**

**Attendees**

Rebecca Hailes (Chair)	(RHa)	Joint Office
Ben Mulcahy (Secretary)	(BM)	Joint Office
David Morley (Proposer)	(DMo)	Ovo
Alison Wiggett	(AW)	Corona Energy
Andy Clasper	(AC)	Cadent
Anne Jackson	(AJ)	PAFA/Gemserv
Charlotte Gilbert	(CG)	BU-UK
Colin Wainwright	(CW)	SGN
David Mitchell	(DMi)	SGN
Ellie Rogers	(ER)	CDSP (Xoserve)
Edward Allard	(EA)	Cadent
Fiona Cottam	(FC)	CDSP (Xoserve)
James Lomax	(JL)	Cornwall Insight
Josie Lewis	(JLe)	CDSP (Xoserve)
Kathryn Adeseye	(KA)	CDSP (Xoserve)
Kevin Clark	(KC)	Utilita
Louise Hellyer	(LH)	TotalEnergies Gas & Power
Lee Greenwood	(LG)	British Gas
Marina Papathoma	(MP)	Wales & West Utilities
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE Energy Supply
Martin Attwood	(MA)	CDSP (Xoserve)
Nick King	(NK)	Barrow Shipping
Paul O'Toole	(PO)	Northern Gas Networks
Richard Pomroy	(RP)	Wales & West Utilities
Slama Akhtar	(SA)	Northern Gas Networks
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	SEFE Energy Limited
Tracey Saunders	(TS)	Northern Gas Networks

*This Workgroup meeting will be considered quorate provided at least two Transporter and two Shipper User representatives are present.*

*Please note these minutes do not replicate/include detailed content provided within the presentation slides, therefore it is recommended that the published presentation material is reviewed in conjunction with these minutes. Copies of all papers are available at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0851/261023>*

*The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 18 July 2024*

## 1.0 Outline of Request

Rebecca Hailes (RHa) invited the Proposer to explain the aim of the Review. David Morley (DMo) accordingly presented a series of slides to the Review Group, a copy of which can be found at <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0851/231123> and as such their content is not replicated here.

DMo advised that the intention was to get more reads into Settlement as this would further the objective of improving settlement accuracy. He explained that for Product Class 4 (PC4) annually read meters, the window for meter read submission for Settlement was set at D+ 25 Supply Point System Business Days (SPSBD), with meter reads provided outside of this time window rejected, thus restricting settlement accuracy. He explained that the main causes for such rejected reads were either being outside of set tolerances or metering issues, such as crossed meters.

Kathryn Adeseye (KA) asked for a clarification of the term 'unaccounted for gas' used on **Slide 1**. DMo commented that he felt Unidentified Gas (UIG) was a very specifically defined term which he wanted to avoid in an endeavour to capture a broader range. Fiona Cottam (FC) advised that there was already a specific 'Unaccounted for Gas' concept that was solely used with the National Transmission Service (NTS), which she did not think would be affected by the subject under consideration in this Review group. DMo acknowledged the feedback and resolved to use the term UIG going forward.

Lee Greenwood (LG) asked if addressing the PC4 Annually read provision criteria would also impact the provision of PC4 Monthly reads. DMo responded that read submissions for monthly read meters were different, and that it was more likely that annually read sites would incur the biggest detriment should a read fail to be submitted. LG acknowledged this, noting that Parties could not submit a read when another read is chronologically due to be submitted.

The Review Group touched upon the read criteria set in UNC under TPD Section M Clause 5.9.2. (a) which defines the valid dates for both monthly and annually read meters and contrasted these with the read criteria set in Clause 5.9.4 (b). LG advised that sites with AQs of 293,000 kWh (10,000 therms) are required to be monthly read but this did not necessarily mean that AMR or Smart metering was in place.

DMo confirmed that one of the proposals to be considered by the Review group was to amend TPD M 5.9.4 (b) to cover both annual and monthly read supplies, adding that as his organisation, Ovo, was predominately domestic his focus was on the annually read supplies but that he was happy to consider monthly supplies in the review if it was thought required.

Possible solutions, DMo suggested, could include extending the current 25 SPSBD window to 60, though this period was just an initial suggestion and he was keen to understand the potential impacts and possible parameters available as scope for changes in this time window. Another alternative detailed in the presentation was to implement a mechanism to enable failed reads to be resubmitted with a reason code. Finally, DMo suggested a third option being a combination of the two, being an extension of the time window to accept reads and the mechanism to enable resubmissions.

DMo added that he anticipated that introducing an extended time window for read acceptance would see a 12% increase in reads accepted on the Ovo portfolio, noting that he understood Ovo was very proactive in seeking to get reads accepted, so the percentage increase could be even higher for other Parties that were not so active.

KA added that the current read volumes seen by the CDSP account for around 8% of the capacity available in the system, and whilst a more detailed impact assessment would be required, she did think it was a fair first impression that there was lots of wriggle room available. DMo asked if there was an understanding of any particularly peaking periods of use, which KA advised would require a detailed impact assessment to ascertain.

Anne Jackson (AJ) commented that the Performance Assurance Committee (PAC) were conscious of the timeliness of the data that they reviewed, so would likely note that longer time windows for read submission could add to such considerations. RHa asked if the proposals up for consideration in this Review Group could thereby exacerbate an existing issue. Steve Mulinganie (SM) suggested that 'exacerbate' was not necessarily the right word, as PAC did not have to wait to see a trend to address a concern, adding that even if an action did prove to create a challenge for PAC, it might nonetheless still be the right thing to do. Louise Hellyer (LH) agreed stating that the PAC requirements could be considered in any Modification that arose from this Review Group.

AJ advised that there was a Performance Assurance Reports Register (PARR) review underway that this Review Group's output could be considered within. DMo asked if PAC considered the requirements of TPD Section M Clause 5.9.4. (a), which Fiona Cottam (FC) confirmed they did not.

SM suggested that if a Modification improved the number of reads accepted into Settlement, it would mean PAC would be working in an improved environment, noting however that an unintended consequence could be Parties moving back their read delivery dates.

AJ noted that the data PAC sees was tied into the calendar month and asked how important the calendar month was, suggesting that it may be more important to see the intervals between the reads, and committed to taking this question back to PAC. She asked if the Review Group intended to explore the issue completely or to explore the Proposer's solutions. DMo confirmed the intention was both, with SM adding that as a Review group, it was within the scope to consider alternate options.

AJ advised that the PAFA was looking at the PARR reports and the timeliness of the reporting but did not think they were yet ready to be able to make suggestions. She committed to seeking PAC views on potential actions and contributions to the Review.

<p><b>NEW ACTION 0111:</b> PAFA (AJ) to obtain PAC views on possible actions related to this 0851R Review and on what they would wish to contribute.</p>
--

DMo noted that historically the window for meter read provision was originally 15 SPSBD which was then later moved to 25 SPSBD and asked if the rationale of the 25-day figure was known and if this would prevent moving to the suggested 60-day period. Ellie Rogers (ER) commented that she did not think there was any system rationale based behind the 25-day figure and believed it was collectively landed on in Nexus. SM asked if it was perhaps the outer tolerance window for rolling AQs.

FC advised that she had looked back through Nexus minutes and found that the submission window was going to be 25 Calendar Days but Xoserve at the time reviewed the volumes and proposed instead 25 Business Days with an understanding that there was an industry desire for flexibility.

DMo asked if there was any rationale behind the figure '25', to which FC responded that the Business Days proposal just provided a larger time window, and highlighted the likely trade-off and diminishing returns between the date the reads were taken and the end of the time window, with considerations such as loss of site, meter exchanges (with reads or estimates if none), and other events increasingly likely to complicate matters the longer the window was.



She added that Meter Exchanges (MEX) do not count towards read performance but would in themselves resolve a settlement position.

SM shared that the perspective that Shippers may hold might be to get meter reads in as soon as possible, with the principle being that you avoid risk by acting quickly, as such the 25 Business Day capacity was set as a system constraint.

FC advised that should a Party hold a meter read until the 25th Business Day they would miss an amendment invoice, as for meter reads to be used in the AQ processes it would need to be in by day 10 or 11. She stated that 25 Business Days was not set because of UK Link restrictions.

SM added that the industry could decide to upscale systems as required, to which FC agreed, stating that it was an industry system so changes can be made under industry direction, and would just require the lead times necessary for any new requirements to be configured. ER agreed, noting that this was the purpose of Rough Orders of Magnitude (ROMs) enabling the industry to decide.

**NEW ACTION 0211:** Xoserve (FC) to ensure nothing fundamentally tied to the 25 SPSBD window stop.

RHa observed that the question would be more about what changes to CDSP systems would be required and noted that the Presentation mentioned an allowance of 14 months for electricity settlement.

FC asked if the impression this gave her was correct in that within the electricity market Parties could delay submitting a meter read for such a long period. LH added that whilst she understood extending the period to solve problems, it seemed excessive to take 14 months to do so, especially when reads are supposed to be annual, as this would fail other read requirements and muddy the water further.

DMo explained that such long delays in electricity meter read submission are related mainly to read disputes and amendments, with scenarios such as wrong reads. LH asked if this was a window available to change submitted reads rather than to submit a meter read.

DMo explained that within electricity Parties can withdraw reads and amend reads, with a whole process focused on Parties having their settlement reads with incentive mechanisms for each window, differing for domestic or commercial supplies, on top of which targets in NHH reads exist. For example, a requirement to provide 97% of reads, and credits or debits available as an incentive/disincentive if a party achieves/does not achieve this. Parties may also be required to attend discussions with the Retail Energy Code Performance Assurance Board (REC PAB), which was similar to the PAC in its role.

LG voiced that it seemed there were two parts to the considerations, being does the Industry extend the time window for read submission and if so to what? He asked if the CDSP should do some analysis on the reads received outside of the current window and then overlay if they had been accepted due to a longer time window and what it would do to the Line in the Sand position. He added that the Review Group needed to consider that some Shippers may have elected not to submit meter reads they obtained after 25 days anyway, meaning that the CDSP would not have visibility of these in their analysis.

Martin Attwood (MA) asked if this would be meter reads that have been submitted and rejected or for reads that need more work before submission. DMo responded that it would ideally be for both and might also mean Shippers stop holding reads back and enable them back into the Settlement.

MA advised that he had looked at read rejection reasons and had not seen any huge volumes, with the largest constituency being those reads that had breached the submission read frequency by providing too many reads. In comparison, read rejections did not appear to have

large volumes, adding that the CDSP would need to better understand what rejections they were to look at.

FC suggested that maybe the reads were not coming to the CDSP, as if Parties were vetting their reads before they were submitted then the CDSP would not have details of them, noting that they are only seeing tens of thousands of reads each month. DMO confirmed that he was aware that Ovo holds back volumes of reads.

SM observed that the indicated 12% increase in accepted reads figure from the Proposer was a substantial improvement at no cost. He suggested that there was a question that could be asked of other Parties to ascertain if they validate reads and put them aside, noting that if there was a visible value and there is no cost involved, Industry should extend the window anyway, and whilst he did not agree with a 14-month extension, moving from 25 days to 60 days at no cost it seemed an obvious improvement to deliver.

**ACTION 0311:** (Shippers) To confirm if they hold back meter reads that they anticipate won't meet the valid read criteria.

DMO proposed it was possible to add stepped benchmarks for the benefit of PAC, which they were welcome to feed into. SM noted that PAC needs to benchmark and see if parties are backloading their reads but observed that if Parties did backload meter reads they were taking an increased risk.

LH added that the challenge was to ensure that any new steps improved the situation. SM agreed though observed that Class 4 read performance was currently poor, so adding a potential 12% performance improvement in an area that was challenging had to be a good thing.

ER contributed in response to the earlier discussion as to whether a previous read being added into a read history was of value and thereby justified an exception process to make it possible. She commented that, should the window be stretched to 6 months and there were lots of reads already in place, adding a previous read back in the supply history was of limited value, whereas for a meter where there are few or no reads, then the additional read in question would be of real value.

LH suggested that if the missing reads were an indication of a problem at the meter, which fails again and again the issue would be different.

DMO asked if he was recalling correctly that PAC did a Request For Information (RFI) on the subject recently. AJ confirmed that there was an RFI about PC3 and PC4 meters in which PAC was interested in valid reads potentially being submitted but falling foul of UNC requirements and falling aside, in effect good reads being dumped. She shared that beyond that aspect the issue was not explored, though it was noted. She did not know if there was sufficient information in the RFI responses to assist the Review Group in exploring this, and she would review and feedback on the results. SM advised that PAC had experienced a strong response to the RFI from over 30 parties.

**ACTION 0411:** PAFA (AJ) to review PAC RFI data and ascertain if there was sufficient detail for Review purposes. If not ask if PAC would issue an RFI on behalf of the Review Group.

RHa asked that if TPD Section M Clause 5.9.4. was to be revisited, was there a case to consider financial incentives for the widened window. SM replied that whilst the Review Group could consider penalising Parties for non-performance it probably did not make the considerations more attractive and was more likely to prove a tangent, especially as there was already a discussion underway in PAC where it is most appropriate. DMO agreed, expressing

concern about the Review Group being slowed and citing Modification 0674V - *Performance Assurance Techniques and Controls* as an example of such considerations taking the industry a very long time to resolve, though he recognised it was positive that the idea had been considered within the Review Group's deliberations.

The Review Group returned to considering potential impacts and what reporting existed to measure such. FC noted that PAC owns the PARR, and thus proposals for changes in reporting granularity and the like would go to the PAC for review rather than the UNC Modification Panel.

ER added that there was a good process within PAC to track PARR impacts, so as long as a request or suggestion is given in a Modification it could be considered, adding that Modifications should not attempt to propose mandatory changes as PAC retains discretion over all PARR processes. DMO acknowledged this, suggesting that this could be phrased as more of a 'for the avoidance of doubt' suggestion that PAC might wish to consider. SM countered that he did not think it necessary to think greatly on the details as this was a Review group and the PAFA on behalf of PAC was in the Review group to provide that input. He suggested that the Review Group Report could include commentary that recommended PAC awareness.

KA felt that more defined BRs were required to understand the impacts on the processes, as any analysis as to why the CDSP was not getting the reads would need an understanding of the volumes they might be seeing, adding that at the moment they could not comment with any certainty. DMO shared that his thought process was more about establishing the existence of any fundamental parameters first.

SM added that it did not matter if appropriate standards were set, all the CDSP would be getting is additional reads. He felt the key questions to be if the current 25-day window limit was linked to anything fundamental at the CDSP, as per Action 0211.

FC shared that the only linkage to TPD Section M Clause 5.9.4 that she could think of was NDM Sampling (UNC TPD H 1.6) used in Demand Estimation Modelling, adding that it was not impacted and there was no facility to change this consideration as the CDSP had to balance the data as being recent. The NDM Sampling Process kick-off is on 10 April and uses the previous 12 months' data to the end of March, with the whole process running on a timeline set out in Code which the CDSP can't delay. She felt it was worth considering but it was not an issue.

The Review Group considered the option of maintaining the 25 SPSBD and introducing a mechanism to allow valid reads to be entered into settlement instead.

ER asked if this effectively limited considerations to certain scenarios rather than just any rejected read, which DMO confirmed, citing meter issues and out of tolerances, suggesting a mechanism similar to the reason codes for AQ corrections already in use.

RHa asked if this would be complimenting something that exists or if it was a new mechanism. ER replied that it would be new, with the only thing anything near the idea currently in existence being the inner tolerance override flag which could be used in the first case, not after a rejection. SM asked why any Party would send in an initial read without the override flag. He argued that if there is no good reason to consider this option then the industry did not need to build an exception process to send reads back in. He proposed that if there was a fundamental link to 25 SPSBD and there proved to be a consequence to moving it then this option could be revisited, but that otherwise, in his opinion, it was an additional layer of governance with no added value.

DMO agreed, deciding to delay consideration until a response from CDSP on **Action 0511**. For the same reason he suggested deferring consideration of Option 3 which was a combination of Options 1 and 2, so would also benefit from the same action response.

RHa noted that the December meeting was before the December UNC Modification Panel and was to take place sooner after this meeting than usual, and as such asked if the CDSP were

comfortable with reporting in a foreshortened timespan. ER replied that they could bring a response as a late paper.

AJ observed that the December DWG was scheduled before the next PAC meeting so she would not be able to feedback on her actions in the December meeting.

RHA concluded that a December Workgroup would have some responses to consider which DMO agreed meant that holding the next meeting in December was worthwhile.

## 2.0 Next Steps

RHa confirmed the next steps are:

- Review Group to further consider potential Options in December after CDSP feedback on whether the 25-day SPSBD window was tied to anything fundamental.

## 3.0 Any Other Business

No other business was raised.

## 4.0 Diary Planning

Further details of planned meetings are available at: [www.gasgovernance.co.uk/events-calendar/month](http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/events-calendar/month)

Workgroup meetings will take place as follows:

Time / Date	Paper Publication Deadline	Venue	Workgroup Programme
10:00 Monday 11 December 2023	5 pm 01 December 2023	Microsoft Teams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider options presented in light of CDSP feedback</li> </ul>

**0851R Workgroup Action Table**

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Reporting Month	Owner	Status Update
0111	23-Nov-23	1	PAFA (AJ) to obtain PAC views on possible actions related to this Review group and on what they would wish to contribute.	January 24	PAFA (AJ)	Pending
0211	23-Nov-23	1	Xoserve (FC/ER) to ensure nothing is fundamentally tied to the 25 SPSBD window stop	December 23	CDSP (FC/ER)	Pending
0311	23-Nov-23	1	(Shippers) To confirm if they hold back meter reads that they anticipate won't meet the valid read criteria.	December 23	Shippers	Pending
0411	23-Nov-23	1	PAFA (AJ) to review PAC RFI data and ascertain if there was sufficient detail for Review purposes. If not ask if PAC would	January 24	PAFA (AJ)	Pending

<b>0851R Workgroup Action Table</b>						
<b>Action Ref</b>	<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>Minute Ref</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Reporting Month</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Status Update</b>
			issue an RFI on behalf of the Review Group.			

**UNC Workgroup 0862 Minutes**  
**Amendments to the current Unidentified Gas Reconciliation Period**  
**arrangements**  
**Thursday 23 November 2023**  
**via Microsoft Teams**

**Attendees**

Rebecca Hailes (Chair)	(RHa)	Joint Office
Ben Mulcahy (Secretary)	(BM)	Joint Office
Steve Mulinganie (Proposer)	(DMo)	SEFE Energy
Andy Clasper	(AC)	Cadent
Charlotte Gilbert	(CG)	BU-UK
David Mitchell	(DMi)	SGN
Edward Allard	(EA)	Cadent
Ellie Rogers	(ER)	CDSP (Xoserve)
Fiona Cottam	(FC)	CDSP (Xoserve)
James Lomax	(JL)	Cornwall Insight
Josie Lewis	(JLe)	CDSP (Xoserve)
Kathryn Adeseye	(KA)	CDSP (Xoserve)
Louise Hellyer	(LH)	TotalEnergies Gas & Power
Lee Greenwood	(LG)	British Gas
Marina Papatoma	(MP)	Wales & West Utilities
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE Energy Supply
Paul O'Toole	(PO)	Northern Gas Networks
Slama Akhtar	(SA)	Northern Gas Networks

*This Workgroup meeting will be considered quorate provided at least two Transporter and two Shipper User representatives are present.*

*Please note these minutes do not replicate/include detailed content provided within the presentation slides, therefore it is recommended that the published presentation material is reviewed in conjunction with these minutes. Copies of all papers are available at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0862/231123>*

*The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 16 May 2024*

## 1.0 Outline of Request

Rebecca Hailes (RHa) invited the Proposer to explain the intent of the Modification. Steve Mulinganie (SM) stated it was simple in concept and just had the one Business Rule (BR) to correct the UIG Reconciliation Period. He believes this was a legacy of the arrangements from Nexus with the complexity at the time likely to be one of the reasons why this route was taken, which smears the UIG charge over the last 12 months.

The Modification proposes that the UIG be applied to the same months that the energy originated from, SM explained that the execution was likely to be complex in the details.

Kathryn Adeseye (KA) asked if it was fair to assume that the monthly reconciliation would be across the whole month and not just the week/day of the event. SM confirmed it was but added that if the current solution proves to add complexity, then he was open to better ways to address the issue, as he wanted it to be easy to achieve.

SM added that he had invited CDSP to add commentary on the BR1 and the appending notes in the Solution section were a result of this. He also acknowledged that questions had been raised from Pre-Panel discussion regarding transition requirements and UIG reconciliation.

Ellie Rogers (ER) commented that at some point a discussion of the implementation type would be needed, would it be a 'big bang' or more of a dual-running implementation. She advised that the CDSP was looking at this and did not yet have an answer, adding that previously a 12-month parallel approach was taken in UIG Process change, but it was not yet clear if that is suitable in this case.

SM agreed that there was logic to having a 12-month process and advised that he was open to that, adding that it led him to think that there was a lot of analysis work to be undertaken by the CDSP for this, for which the next Workgroup in December would be too early to be able to report in and asked if January would also be too early for the CDSP to come back.

ER agreed that the CDSP would consider the likely issues with the central systems and how best to implement such a change, including what the consequence of delivery of this Modification would be and what the best route and delivery would be.

She also confirmed that a December response on this was not possible, suggesting that they instead aimed for January as a firm commitment and would provide what they had at that point.

**ACTION 1101** - CDSP (ER) to consider the best delivery path for this Modification and any transitional arrangements likely required.

The Workgroup considered if there would be impacts resulting in additional costs for the DNOs to be passed on to Shippers and suppliers. Fiona Cottam (FC) noted that UIG is an energy-only cost, without Transportation elements and the same amount of UIG would be attributed, so any costs would be just central system expenditure.

SM observed that there appeared to be some consideration of shrinkage commentary in the Modification that related to Modification 0850 – *Amendments to Allocation of Unidentified Gas Expert (AUGE) arrangements to introduce a new Residual Upstream Contributor* which could be removed from the consideration of this Modification.

ER suggested that the CDSP may need to feedback options for the Workgroup to consider, which SM acknowledged, stating that if other Parties did not agree with the Solution landed upon, they could raise an Alternative Modification using the thinking already explored in this Workgroup, though his preference was a consensus-based Solution.

Mark Jones (MJ) asked if the approach was still planned to be on consolidating by market share in regard to the energy allocation within the month. SM advised it was not but if a feasible solution was suggested he'd be happy to consider it.

FC explained that this was throughput and so in using January through to June on a mainly domestic portfolio, a Party's allocation for January will be some ten times as much as for June as opposed to a low flat process load. NDM was putting more energy into allocation already and whilst she was not saying it was built, the CDSP already does this for large LDZ

measurement errors which are applied back over the previous month. She highlighted that whenever there were two lines for EUCs on Party invoices, it is indicative that there has been some form of reconciliation. She continued that the energy is already ‘chunked up’ to apply to calendar months for transportation which may be flat or skewed towards the higher months, whereas currently, a twelfth is split out for each month of the annual total.

SM responded that this meant that there was no need to contemplate any clever weighting for the months as it would effectively be allocated as it was now. He added that as a first Workgroup look at this Modification, he requested that should anyone have any other points or clarification requests to reach out to him in the intervening period.

It was noted that the suggested Panel questions were not specific and were to be removed, whereas those that the Proposer suggested would be kept.

**ACTION 0111:** JO (RHA) to remove generalised Panel questions in the WGR.

## 2.0 Next Steps

RHa confirmed the next steps are:

- Consider any industry feedback.
- Review CDSP response to Action 0111 and best reflection in Business Rules development

## 3.0 Any Other Business

No other business was raised.

## 4.0 Diary Planning

Further details of planned meetings are available at: [www.gasgovernance.co.uk/events-calendar/month](http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/events-calendar/month)

Workgroup meetings will take place as follows:

Time / Date	Paper Publication Deadline	Venue	Workgroup Programme
10:00 Monday 11 December 2023	5 pm 01 December 2023	Microsoft Teams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider impacts of Modification</li> <li>• Review Business Rules.</li> </ul>

**0862 Workgroup Action Table**

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Reporting Month	Owner	Status Update
0111	23-Nov-23	1	CDSP (ER) to consider the best delivery path for this Modification and any transitional arrangements likely required.	January 2024	CDSP (ER)	Pending



<b>0862 Workgroup Action Table</b>						
<b>Action Ref</b>	<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>Minute Ref</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Reporting Month</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Status Update</b>
<b>0211</b>	23-Nov-23	1	JO (RHa) to remove generalised Panel questions in the WGR	January 2024	JO (RHa)	<b>Pending</b>

**UNC Workgroup 0863 Minutes**  
**Erroneous Transfers Exception Process**  
**Thursday 23 November 2023**  
**via Microsoft Teams**

**Attendees**

Rebecca Hailes (Chair)	(RHa)	Joint Office
Ben Mulcahy (Secretary)	(BM)	Joint Office
Steve Mulinganie (Proposer)	(DMo)	SEFE Energy
Andy Clasper	(AC)	Cadent
Charlotte Gilbert	(CG)	BU-UK
David Mitchell	(DMi)	SGN
Edward Allard	(EA)	Cadent
Ellie Rogers	(ER)	CDSP (Xoserve)
Fiona Cottam	(FC)	CDSP (Xoserve)
James Lomax	(JL)	Cornwall Insight
Josie Lewis	(JLe)	CDSP (Xoserve)
Kathryn Adeseye	(KA)	CDSP (Xoserve)
Louise Hellyer	(LH)	TotalEnergies Gas & Power
Lee Greenwood	(LG)	British Gas
Marina Papathoma	(MP)	Wales & West Utilities
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE Energy Supply
Paul O'Toole	(PO)	Northern Gas Networks

*This Workgroup meeting will be considered quorate provided at least two Transporter and two Shipper User representatives are present.*

*Please note these minutes do not replicate/include detailed content provided within the presentation slides, therefore it is recommended that the published presentation material is reviewed in conjunction with these minutes. Copies of all papers are available at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0863/231123>*

*The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 16 May 2024*

## **1.0 Outline of Request**

Rebecca Hailes (RHa) invited the Proposer to explain the proposal of this Modification. Steve Mulinganie explained that there was a question as to which industry Code the objective best sat with and engagement was underway with the Retail Energy Code (REC) to understand if that was a better fit to carry the objective forward. On this basis he asked if discussion of the Modification could be deferred to December.

RHa agreed and this Workgroup was accordingly deferred.

## **2.0 Initial Discussion**

### **2.1. Issues and Questions from Panel**

The meeting was deferred to December.

**2.2. Initial Representations**

The meeting was deferred to December.

**2.3. Terms of Reference**

The meeting was deferred to December.

**3.0 Next Steps**

The meeting was deferred to December.

**4.0 Any Other Business**

No other business was raised.

**5.0 Diary Planning**

Further details of planned meetings are available at: [www.gasgovernance.co.uk/events-calendar/month](http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/events-calendar/month)

Workgroup meetings will take place as follows:

Time / Date	Paper Publication Deadline	Venue	Workgroup Programme
10:00 Monday 11 December 2023	5 pm 01 December 2023	Microsoft Teams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider any Initial Representations received and Panel Questions.</li> <li>Review Business Rules.</li> </ul>

**0862 Workgroup Action Table**

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Reporting Month	Owner	Status Update