

UNC Workgroup 0522 Minutes
Inclusion of email as a valid UNC Communication
Thursday 29 October 2015
via teleconference

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(RF)	Joint Office
Lorna Dupont (Secretary)	(LD)	Joint Office
Alex Ross-Shaw	(ARS)	Northern Gas Networks
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Colette Baldwin	(CB)	E.ON UK
David Addison	(DA)	Xoserve
Gareth Davies	(GD)	National Grid NTS
Hilary Chapman	(HC)	Xoserve
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE
Mark Lyndon	(ML)	National Grid NTS

Copies of all papers are available at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0522/291015>

The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 19 November 2015.

1.0 Introduction

BF welcomed all participants to the meeting.

2.0 Review of Minutes (22 October 2015)

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

3.0 Workgroup Discussion

2.1 Amended Modification

BF drew attention to the changes made to the modification following the last meeting; no comments were received.

2.2 Review of Relevant Objectives

f) Promotion of efficiency in the implementation and administration of the Code.

The Workgroup considered this and agreed that the modification facilitated this relevant objective.

2.3 Review of Legal Text

Legal Text Commentary

ARS gave an explanation of the legal text commentary, and how the text provided had been drafted to meet the Business Rules.

BR4 - Concerns were expressed that the legal text did not fully encompass the intent.
BR7 - It was questioned if the definitions for business day or day were clear from the text as they had different meanings in Code, and ARS indicated he would review this. In

addition CB was concerned that parties would not be able to update email address before 20 days should they have an urgent need to do so. DA advised that they would be able to facilitate urgent requests.

Legal Text

The draft of the legal text was reviewed.

UNC General GT B5.2.5(d) - DA noted that this cross-referred to another part of Code but that this might not be appropriate.

Other participants queried whether a Registered User (as referred to in the Business Rules) was the same as a UK Link User (referred to in the draft text); did this cover all Transporters, or might it exclude National Grid NTS in certain circumstances? ARS agreed to clarify the definition(s) and to whom any obligations would apply.

'Deemed receipt' was discussed; concerns were expressed that there was no legal precedent in respect of what was deemed to be delivery (successful) of an email.

It was suggested that ARS clarify what the phrase 'as far as possible' meant, in GT B5.2.5(d), as this seems to suggest the application of a lesser standard. It was also suggested that the ultimate word 'e-mail' be replaced by 'communication'.

CB reiterated that it needed to be clear what 'delivery' means, i.e. must reach the addressee, and also how a sending party would know that it had reached the addressee. Recognising that a non-delivery notification or delivery failure might be received by the sender, DA questioned by what other means would a sending party be aware that an email had not been received by the addressee. A discussion ensued regarding incorrectly keyed email addresses, 'common/multiple same surname' addresses within the same organisation, and emails addressed such that they reached the server of the recipient but travelled no further because of a slight inaccuracy, and that the recognitions that these instances would not necessarily result in the generation of a delivery failure/non-delivery notification.

There were further discussions about out of office notifications and what actions would be taken if they were received and how deemed receipt would work for users who had forgotten to set an out of office email.

It was suggested that it would be prudent to make sure that an initial testing and confirmation of validity/accuracy of the nominated email address should be part of the process, and a further step to check if no response is received. It was also noted that communications would be issued from/to various parties and this should be addressed in the Business Rules and the legal text.

Inconsistencies in the expression of certain words (Sender/sender, email/e-mail) were also noted for review.

2.4 Completion of Workgroup Report

The draft Workgroup Report was reviewed and recommendations considered.

Self Governance Statement

This was briefly discussed and the Workgroup agreed to recommend that the UNC Modification Panel review the current status with a view to re-designating as a Self Governance modification.

Implementation

It was questioned whether system changes might be required. DA explained what was happening in the background in relation to Modification 0479; certain central functions will need to be in place.

If re-designated as a Self Governance modification, then implementation was likely to take place later than 16 days.

The Workgroup Report was then completed, with recommendations that Panel review whether the modification should be re-designated as Self-Governance, and that the modification be issued for Consultation.

4.0 Next Steps

CB will provide an amended modification, and ARS will review the drafted text in light of Workgroup discussions and provide a revised draft.

The Workgroup Report will be submitted to the November UNC Modification Panel for its consideration.

5.0 Diary Planning

No further meetings were required.