

UNC Workgroup 0531 Minutes
Provision of an Industry User Test System
Monday 06 June 2016
Consort House, 6 Homer Road, Solihull, B91 3QQ

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Helen Cuin (Secretary)	(HCu)	Joint Office
Andy Clasper	(AC)	National Grid Distribution
David Addison	(DA)	Xoserve
Edd Hunter	(EH)	RWE npower
Emma Lyndon	(EL)	Xoserve
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE
Michele Downes	(MD)	Xoserve
Mike Fensome	(MF)	RWE npower
Naomi Nathanael*	(NN)	Utility Warehouse
Phil Lucas	(PL)	National Grid NTS
Steve Mulinganie*	(SMu)	Gazprom
Sue Cropper	(SC)	British Gas
Tara Gill*	(TG)	EDF Energy

*via teleconference

Copies of all papers are available at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0531/060616>

The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 21 July 2016.

1.0 Introduction and Status Review**1.1. Approval of Minutes (10 May 2016)**

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

1.2. Actions

0501: All parties to review the subsidiary document and feedback to the proposer of any material changes required.

Update: DA confirmed that some comments had been received from National Grid NTS and EDF Energy. These comments have been responded to, and a couple of changes have been made to the subsidiary document. **Closed.**

2.0 Modification Amendments

MJ confirmed that he had submitted a draft amendment to the modification and gave a brief overview of the proposed changes. He aimed to submit a formal amendment once he had confirmed that no further changes were required.

3.0 Subsidiary Document

DA provided an overview of the Subsidiary Document. DA explained that Industry Testing element assumes that each UNC modification will take into account the requirement for industry testing and the costs of the tests required. He explained that there may be a risk that the elements requiring testing may result in a shortfall in cost recovery should there be no take up, however this could be managed through the Class 3 UK Link Modification process. DA suggested the current UNC modification template may need to include a specific sub-heading to ensure testing is considered.

DA posed a question to the Workgroup on whether the test system specification should reside within the Subsidiary document or elsewhere e.g. within the UK Link Manual. It was agreed to leave the test system specification within the subsidiary document with a view this could be moved into the UK Link Manual via a modification if deemed more appropriate. DA expressed a preference for the specification to be within the UK Link manual but asked parties who had any strong views on where the specification should reside to express these in time for the next meeting.

Action 0601: All parties to provide a view on the whether the system specification should be part of the UK Link Manual rather than the subsidiary document prior to the July meeting.

SMu asked if the two separate testing scenarios are clearly outlined i.e. Industry and User Testing. DA explained that the definition is incorporated within the introduction and the document tries to keep the two scenarios distinct through-out.

DA suggested that the usage of the testing environment is reported on at the UK Link committee to monitor how the test environment is being utilised. This report would not detail who is using it but simply how the test environment is being used and if there have been any conflicts between User Testing and Industry Testing requirements. DA also committed to reporting if Xoserve were using the test environment and if this use impacted any User Testing.

SMu asked how Xoserve testing would be funded, if it was not related to or considered to be Industry testing. DA explained Xoserve testing would relate to staged changes of a release and Xoserve would commit to notifying the UK Link committee of their intentions to use the test environment. SMu expressed concern about Xoserve block booking the test environment. He recognised the benefit of not creating a new environment to allow testing if the testing environment is not already in use. DA explained that if the testing environment couldn't be used due to other requirements Xoserve would have to look at alternative solutions.

DA asked parties to provide any further feedback on the subsidiary document as quickly as possible for the next meeting as this will be provided as basis for the services from the service provider.

DA expressed he still had some concerns about the manufacturing of data and whether this was the right approach as an ongoing requirement.

4.0 Cost Estimate

DA confirmed that the high level cost estimate is being worked on. PL believed the inclusion of high level costs within the Workgroup Report would allow a better-informed consultation. SC also expressed a preference of having a high level cost estimate for the consultation, she suggested if the cost base is more significant than anticipated it may impact responses. If costs are too high the modification may need a re-think.

DA suggested there would be some upfront developmental costs and separate ongoing support costs based on utilisation. SMu expressed concern about the socialisation of costs particularly the support costs.

The Workgroup considered the apportionment of costs. DA suggested at the end of a period of time the utilisation would need to be reviewed and any shortfall on the ongoing support costs may need to be socialised.

DA explained that the upfront development costs would be to make the environment an enduring solution. SC and SMu wanted reassurance that the development costs do not include any cost elements related to Project Nexus and RAASP as Shippers should not be expected to fund these.

It was agreed to consider how to capture Project Nexus costs and ensure these would be excluded.

5.0 Legal Text

NN enquired about Section 7 of the legal text and the possible refusal of testing availability. DA had not anticipated that Industry Testing and User testing would be undertaken at the same time. He suggested there may be occasions where the testing environment is not available for valid reasons, for example, if a User testing element was already been used or the scale or the scope of the testing (for example a difference version of code) prevented parallel testing. Where this is encountered this would be identified and reported upon within the monitoring report proposed earlier.

BF asked National Grid to provide supporting Text Commentary to support the Legal Text.

Action 0602: National Grid to provide Legal Text Commentary.

6.0 Workgroup Report

It was agreed with the progress made to conclude the Workgroup Report at the next meeting in July.

7.0 Next Steps

Conclude the Workgroup Report at the next meeting.

8.0 Any Other Business

None.

9.0 Diary Planning

Further details of planned meetings are available at: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Diary

Workgroup meetings will take place as follows:

Time/Date	Venue	Workgroup Programme
Tuesday 12 July 2016	6 Homer Road, Solihull. B91 3QQ.	Amended Modification Consideration of Legal Text Consideration of Cost Estimate and exclusion of Project Nexus costs. Completion of Workgroup Report

Action Table

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
0501	10/05/16	3.0	All parties to review the subsidiary document and feedback to the proposer any material changes required.	All	Closed
0601	07/06/16	3.0	All parties to provide a view on the whether the system specification should be part of the UK Link Manual rather than the subsidiary document prior to the July meeting.	All	Pending
0602	07/06/16	5.0	National Grid to provide Legal Text Commentary.	National Grid (AC)	Pending