UK LINK Committee Meeting Minutes
Thursday 09 July 2015
at 31 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3LT

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Mike Berrisford (Secretary)	(MB)	Joint Office
Alan Gregory*	(AG)	E.ON
Alison Neild*	(AN)	Gazprom Energy
Alistair Manson*	(AM)	Total Gas & Power
Bobbi Gallagher*	(BG)	ScottishPower
Bryan Hale*	(BH)	EDF Energy
Dave Addison	(DA)	Xoserve
Debbie Mulinganie*	(DM)	BP Gas
Emma Smith	(ES)	Xoserve
Graham Wood	(GW)	British Gas
Kirandeep Samra*	(KS)	RWE npower
Kirsty Dudley	(KD)	E.ON Energy
Lee Harrison	(LH)	Xoserve
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	DONG Energy
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE
Naomi Nathanael*	(NN)	Plus Shipping
Rachel Hinsley	(RH)	Xoserve
Sean Cooper	(SC)	RWE npower
Steve Nunnington	(SN)	Xoserve

via teleconference

Copies of meeting papers are available at: http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/uklc/090715

1. Introduction

BF welcomed all to the meeting and pointed out that one of the main focuses for this meeting is the approval of the proposed file format changes.

2. Review of Minutes and Actions

2.1. Minutes

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

2.2. Actions

UKL0403: Xoserve (SN) to confirm any meter read submission limit changes within Project Nexus.

Update: SN advised that this matter is due to be discussed at the next PNUNC meeting on 24 July. Whilst it is expected that the limit would rise, the actual level is unknown at this time and a progress update would be provided in due course. **Carried Forward**

UKL0502: *Reference COR1154.15.13* - Xoserve (SN) to ascertain when the LSO portal screens could be expected to be included in the market trials.

Update: SN explained that this is awaiting the outcome of the Market Trials re-planning exercise and an update would be provided in due course. **Carried Forward**

UKL0503: Joint Office (MB) & Xoserve (SN) to ensure a new item is added to the September 2015 UKLC meeting agenda to ensure that Xoserve (SN) provides a progress update on the lessons learnt rectification actions.

Update: Ongoing. **Carried Forward**

UKL0601: *Reference Glossary Document / UK Link Standards Guide -* Xoserve (DA) to investigate whether or not the 'normal' 10 business days consultation window can be extended and to provide a view in due course.

Update: DA explained that a communication relating to this matter was included within the Change Pack issued after the June meeting. Whilst informing parties that the extended consultation window closed yesterday, he also pointed out that the Glossary Document (that forms part of the Standards Guide) had previously been issued for approval anyway. He then informed the Committee that NO representation had been received, and as a consequence, UKLC approval would be sought during consideration of item 5.1 below. **Closed**

3. **Overview of Modifications Impacting UK Link Systems**

    DA provided a brief summary of the UNC Modifications raised since the June meeting as follows:

    3.1. **0543 'Ex-post removal of uncontrollable UNC charges at ASEPs which include sub-terminals operating on a 06.00 to 06.00 Gas Day'**

    A modification with potential UK Link (Gemini) impacts with more details to follow in due course.

    3.2. **0542 'Ex-ante removal of uncontrollable UNC charges at ASEPs which include sub-terminals operating on a 06.00 to 06.00 Gas Day'**

    A modification with potential UK Link (Gemini) impacts with more details to follow in due course.

    3.3. **0541 'Removal of uncontrollable UNC charges at ASEPs which include sub-terminals operating on a 06.00 to 06.00 Gas Day via an ex-ante quality adjustment'**

    A modification with potential UK Link (Gemini) impacts with more details to follow in due course.

4. **Issues Referred from UKLIEF for a Decision**

    DA explained there are no specific referrals to consider at this time from UKLIEF.

    4.1. **Approval of Proposed File Format Changes**

    UKLP FF Master Control Sheet v11.1A External 20150707

    DA commenced an onscreen review of the document focusing attention only on those hierarchy / file format / individual record level decisions that are required as a result of feedback received during the consultation period and anomalies identified by Xoserve during the ongoing development work.[1]

    In order to avoid unnecessary duplication, it is not proposed to undertake a line-by-line comparison with the supporting representation matrices or to provide a detailed summary of the individual discussions / decisions on the various file formats / records as

---

[1] Please note: that in certain circumstances where a file format / record has had a previous decision made during earlier phases of development, a further decision at this point may or may not be required.

these are captured on the revised *'UKLP FF Master Control Sheet v11.1A External 20150707 – Post Meeting'* version of the document available on the Joint Office web site after the meeting.

During a brief discussion around concerns voiced on the proposed compression (zipping) of file formats going forwards, AG explained that where the compression is done for functional deficiency purposes, he would have little reason to reject such an approach. However, where compression is undertaken in order to support (and protect) potential bandwidth related issues he would feel less inclined to support this type of approach. Responding, DA pointed out that Xoserve remains of the view that a move away from the previous approved file approach to an approach with reduced records in addition to compression would be beneficial. However, in recognition of the fact that a universal view was not forthcoming from the consultation responses (some parties agree that files should be compressed, whilst some would prefer to retain the approach within the approved formats). DA suggested that a decision on any proposed hierarchies or record changes that are impacted by this matter should be deferred at this meeting in order to allow Users time to assess additional information to be provided by Xoserve.

Xoserve asked the Committee for views regarding the notation of UKLP changes. The latest issue showed changes associated with release of products in a number of Change Packs by way of highlighting in the formats. This was outside of the UK Link Standards approach but had been done to help Users. A representation had been received that preferred that the use of highlighting was discontinued. Some members felt that highlighting was helpful, but agreed that should products be released in the future only the latest change would be highlighted, and all changes would continue to be marked up against the current live version in line with the UK Link Standards.

Xoserve propose continuing discussions with impacted parties on a one-to-one basis in due course following a communication being issued in the following week.

A high-level summary of discussions / decisions is provided, as follows[2]:

AES (lines 1 – 3) – no hierarchy change.

   C71 – in response to representations, no approval is being sought.

   Q44 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**;

AML (lines 4 & 5) – related to the compression issue, so hierarchy **approval deferred**.

   K43 – UKLC asked to note functional change to the K43 record as changes are recommended regardless of the fat / thin file solution. UKLC noted this change, but formal **approval deferred**.

   K92 - related to the compression issue, so record change **approval deferred**;

AQR (lines 6 to 9) – no hierarchy change.

   Q44 – no objections to approving the record change[3] – **approved**;

ASP (lines 10 to 21) – no objection to approving hierarchy change – **approved**.

   J13 – discussion revealed that this is not simply an administration related change as first imagined, and could involve some 'knock on' functionality changes, and will now be the subject of a re-consultation exercise therefore no approval is being sought at this meeting – **approval deferred**.

   K42 - UKLC asked to note[4] that whilst no issues were raised during the walk through exercise, no approval is being sought at this meeting - **approval deferred**.

---

[2] Please note that where a record appears for consideration in more than one file format, the initial decision is deemed to apply to all instances, unless otherwise stated.

[3] Please note that all other instances of the Q44 record thereafter are deemed to be approved by default.

      K88 - now the subject of a re-issue exercise therefore no approval is being sought at this meeting – **approval deferred**.

      K89 - UKLC asked to note the change required and that no approval is being sought at this meeting - **approval deferred**.

      K90 - no approval is being sought at this meeting – **approval deferred**.

      K91 - no approval is being sought at this meeting – **approval deferred**.

      K93 - no approval is being sought at this meeting – **approval deferred**.

      Q28 - UKLC asked to note the change required and that no approval is being sought at this meeting - **approval deferred**;

CDN (lines 22 to 28) - no hierarchy change.

      M82 - no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

      M80 - no objections to approving the record change – **approved**;

CFR (lines 29 to 54) – discussions centred around the K12 / K14 parent to child relationship and whether or not it is appropriate to make the K14 record mandatory (it was noted that previously the K14 record was added to TRF in order to facilitate file switching of additional meter details etc.) – in essence could / should the K14 record be optional.

      Following further discussion later in the meeting around utilising blank fields, the matter was revisited and no objections to approving hierarchy change were voiced – **approved**.

      Q44 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

      S07 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

      S10 - whilst no specific objections to approving the record change were raised, BH highlighted some issues around the definitions. Thereafter there were no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

      S75 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

CNF (lines 55 to 63) – no objection to approving hierarchy change – **approved**;

CNR (lines 64 to 70) – no objection to approving hierarchy change – **approved**;

COI (lines 71 & 72) - related to the compression issue, so hierarchy **approval deferred**.

      K43 - related to the compression issue, so record change **approval deferred**.

      K44 - related to the compression issue, so record change **approval deferred**;

COM (lines 73 to 78) - no objection to approving hierarchy change – **approved**.

      K78 - no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

      K79 - no objections to approving the record change – **approved**;

CRF (lines 79 to 85) - no hierarchy change.

      Q44 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

      Q46 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**;

CTR (lines 86 to 89) - no objection to approving hierarchy change – **approved**;

---

[4] Please note in instances where the UKLC have been asked 'to note', these will be considered as a 'soft approval' for the purpose of formally approving the (file format) change at a later date.

CZI (lines 90 & 91) - related to the compression issue, so hierarchy **approval deferred**.

> **K43** - related to the compression issue, so record change **approval deferred**.

> **K47** - related to the compression issue, so record change **approval deferred**;

DNE (lines 92 to 95) - no hierarchy change.

> **E91** – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

DMR (lines 96 & 97) - no hierarchy change.

> **E88** – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

EOI (lines 98 to 103) - no objection to approving hierarchy change – **approved**.

> **Q30** – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

> **Q31** – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

> **Q32** – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

> **Q33** – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**;

EUC (line 104) - no hierarchy change.

> **T67** – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**;

EXZ (lines 105 to 109) - no hierarchy change.

> **M15** – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

> **S75** – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**;

FSI (lines 110 to 115) - no objection to approving hierarchy change – **approved**.

> **K29** – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

> **K30** – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**;

IIS (lines 116 to 119) - no objection to approving hierarchy change – **approved**.

> **K76** – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**;

INV (lines 120 to 125) – discussions centred around a representation submitted to Xoserve which highlighted an out of sequence issue with I57 and I58 during which DA indicated that an update would be provided in the following day's Change Pack.

> It was also noted that the invoicing file format had been issued in the latest elements on Tuesday and that there were no explicit changes to I56 involved with the only change being limited to the control document, therefore no approval is being sought at this meeting – **approval deferred**.

> **I56** – no approval is being sought at this meeting – **approval deferred**.

> **I59** – no approval is being sought at this meeting – **approval deferred**;

LIA (lines 126 to 131) - no objection to approving hierarchy change – **approved**[5].

> **K46** – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**;

LPA (line 132) - no hierarchy change.

> **I68** – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**;

MBR (line 133) - no hierarchy change.

---

[5] Please note: confirmation of this approval would be highlighted within the following Change Pack.

M03 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**;

MDR (line 134) - no hierarchy change.

M00 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**;

MIF (lines 135 to 138) - no objection to approving hierarchy change – **approved.**

K50 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**;

MPD (lines 139 to 144) - no hierarchy change.

S88 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**;

MPE (lines 145 to 149) - no hierarchy change.

S88 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**;

MRI (lines 150 to 153) - no hierarchy change.

N90 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

U06 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**;

NMR (lines 154 to 174) - no objection to approving hierarchy change – **approved.**

Q44 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

S64 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

S75 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**;

NMS (line 175) - no hierarchy change.

N99 – subject of a brief discussion during which DA explained that this status code update had attracted NO representations as it was simply reissued due to a description change from 'clapped' to 'clamped', thereafter there were no objections to approving the record change – **approved**;

NOM (lines 176 to 181) - no hierarchy change.

S48 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**;

NRF (lines 182 to 199) - no objection to approving hierarchy change – **approved.**

Q44 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

Q46 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

S64 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

S75 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**;

NRL (lines 200 to 205) - related to the compression issue, so hierarchy approval not sought.

S91 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

T04 – DA advised that further to earlier discussions and previous concerns voiced around a lack of consistency in naming conventions (i.e. current, fixed and/or rolling AQ aspects), so no approval is being sought at this meeting – **approval deferred**.

T50 – As per TS04 above, so no approval is being sought at this meeting – **approval deferred**.

T98 – whilst no specific objections to approving the record change, it was noted that this a caveated approval on condition that rejection codes are removed from file format due to warnings being issued as separate notifications – **caveated approval**;

NSC (lines 206 to 208) - no objection to approving hierarchy change – **approved.**

K57 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

Q28 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

Q29 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**;

OSG (lines 209 to 211) - no objection to approving hierarchy change – **approved.**

Q28 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**;

PAC (lines 212 to 215) - no hierarchy change.

N90 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

U06 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**;

PNS (lines 216 to 219) - no objection to approving hierarchy change – **approved.**

K86 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

K87 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

Q28 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

Q29 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**;

RAT (lines 220 to 222) - no hierarchy change.

M12 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**;

RTO (lines 223 to 230) – during a brief discussion DA highlighted that this relates to a significant change to mirror standard RGMA hierarchies and noted that some parties still have issues around commonality aspects (i.e. all circumstances and multiple register related aspects etc.) – expect a communication in the following Change Pack, therefore no approval is being sought at this meeting - **approval deferred**;

SCR (lines 231 to 242) - no hierarchy change.

Q44 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

X09 – when asked why a supply point might not have a category assigned to it, DA suggested that this possibly relates to circumstances where a 1st class change is cancelled and therefore resulted in a lack of a category. Thereafter, there were no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

X10 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**;

SPC (lines 243 to 250) - no hierarchy change.

S35 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**;

TDS (lines 251 to 253) - no objection to approving hierarchy change – **approved.**

T92 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**;

TKN (line 254) - related to the compression issue, so hierarchy **approval deferred**.

B50 – issued previously so no approval is being sought at this meeting;

TRF (lines 255 to 274) - no objection to approving hierarchy change – **approved.**

Q44 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

S15 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

S75 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

S88 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**;

UPD (lines 275 to 285) - no hierarchy change.

MTPNT – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**;

UPI (lines 286 to 292) - no objection to approving hierarchy change – **approved.**

K73 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

K74 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

K75 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

K76 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

Q28 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**.

Q29 – no objections to approving the record change – **approved**;

URN (line 293) - no hierarchy change.

U04 – brief discussion around optional/mandatory aspects and change to include a value in due course, thereafter there were no objections to approving the record change – **approved**[6];

ZCS (lines 294 to 300) – subject of a brief discussion around the previous CZI concerns relating to multiple files / records issue and a lack of a consistent approach should we move to a thin model. DA suggested that this would be subject to further debate on the thin / fat model move. Thereafter there were no objections to approving the hierarchy change – **approved.**

K42 – no approval is being sought at this meeting - **approval deferred**.

K80 – no approval is being sought at this meeting - **approval deferred**.

K81 – BH highlighted that his colleagues had some concerns relating to the 'C' type in the K54 record. Acknowledging these points, DA advised that further correspondence on this matter would be included in the forthcoming Change Pack (including file format changes) and that subsequent resolution of any outstanding issues would be on a one to one basis with parties. On this basis, no approval is being sought at this meeting - **approval deferred**.

Summarising progress to date, DA advised that 'walk through' summary data would be included, where appropriate, in due course and that any approvals from today's meeting would now be moved into the appropriate zip file summary (Zip17). As far as previous discussions around how best to track and highlight where changes to previous changes occur (i.e. later changes layered over previous changes), DA suggested leaving 'as-is' in order to avoid unnecessary confusion – an approach supported by those in attendance.[7]

5. Xoserve Reporting Updates

5.1. UK Link Modification Implementation Plan

SN provided an overview of the implementation plan, as follows:

5.1.1. Current UK Link Changes Awaiting Scheduling – Not Implemented

COR1154.17.2 – UKLP CMS Consequential Change
This change request remains 'In Analysis' and a communication is expected to be issued as part of the August/September Change Pack.

COR1154.15.12 – UKLP Including Nexus Requirements – Shipper Templates

---

[6] Please note: confirmation of this approval would be highlighted within the following Change Pack.

[7] Post meeting note: an updated copy of the Master Control sheet has been published alongside these minutes on the Joint Office web site at: http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/uklc/090715

This change request remains 'In Analysis' and a communication is expected to be issued as part of the August Change Pack. Expectation is that this change will now be split into 3 sub-packs.

COR1154.15.13 – UKLP Including Nexus requirement – LSO Portal Screens
This change request remains 'In Analysis' and a communication is expected to be issued as part of the August Change Pack.

COR1154.15.14 – UKLP Including Nexus requirement – Amendments to Base-lined File Formats
DA explained that once all the outstanding file format approvals are completed (as per item 4.1 above), it is expected that this change would disappear from the implementation plan.

COR3187 – Notification of UK Link Manual Change in order to facilitate compliance with the requirements of the EU Network Code
DA explained that NO representations had been received in relation to this change. In drawing attention to appendix 5B in the UK Link Manual, DA explained that Xoserve are currently reviewing and updating the appendix with an update to the UKLC in due course.

When asked there were no objections to the approval of the change request.

The committee therefore approved the change request.

Amendment of UK Link Manual Standards Guide and Incorporation of Approved 'Glossary' Document
SN explained that NO representations had been received in relation to this change.

When asked there were no objections to the approval of the change request.

The committee therefore approved the change request.

COR3496 – Transporter Gas Safety Visit Reporting
This change request remains 'In Analysis' and a communication is expected to be issued as part of the 10 July Change Pack.

Daily Meter Reading Simplification (with improved within day data provision)
DA explained that whilst this change request remains 'In Analysis', it does include within day reading aspects that might necessitate changes to the UK Link File Transfer Guide (possibly the addition of a new appendix to reflect delivery of formats using the method established by the iGT to Shipper Smart Meter Read (SMR / SMU) Files)) in due course.

5.1.2. **Current UK Link Changes - Approved – Scheduled For Implementation**

August 2015

COR3312.1 – Security of Supply SCR – GDE Cashout and Compensation Arrangements – Phase 1
This change remains on track for implementation on 01 August 2015.

COR3413 – Removal of 'Automatic' Creation of Meter Models on Receipt of RGMA Transactions – Revised Implementation Date
DA explained that Xoserve would like to apologise for the fact that this is now the fifth iteration of the change. Furthermore, due to a recent loss of the test environment and resources potentially being allocated to other urgent work, the date could slip back again (to the tune of 2 to 3 weeks). A communication relating to this matter would be issued in due course.

September 2015

COR3187.1 – EU Code Change Phase 2 Delivery
This change remains on track for implementation on 06 September 2015. The multiple implementation dates in brackets were to reflect potential contingency dates.

COR3187.1 – COR3187 EU Code Change Phase 2 Delivery – Revised File Formats
This change remains on track for implementation on 06 September 2015. The multiple implementation dates in brackets were to reflect potential contingency dates.

COR3187.2 – EU Code Change Phase 2 Delivery - Screenshots
This change remains on track for implementation on 06 September 2015. The multiple implementation dates in brackets were to reflect potential contingency dates.

COR1154.16.1.1 – UKLP Gemini Consequential Change – API Changes – Code Not ~~in~~ Enabled
DA explained that the title for this change is wrong and the word 'in' should be removed. This change remains on track for implementation on 06 September 2015.

COR1154.16.2.1 – UKLP Gemini Consequential Change – External Screen Pack – Code Not ~~in~~ Enabled
DA explained that the title for this change is wrong and the word 'in' should be removed. This change remains on track for implementation on 06 September 2015.

Parties were then asked to note that the previous five change orders (COR3187 suite) would not be utilised until the EU related changes go live circa November 2015.

COR3538 – Changes to the EFT Audit File Frequency
This change remains on track for implementation on 01 September 2015.

Project Nexus Implementation Date

COR1154.16.1.2 – UKLP Gemini Consequential Change – API Changes – Code Enabled
This change remains on track for implementation on the Project Nexus Implementation Date.

COR1154.15 – UKLP Including Nexus Requirements – Phase 1
This change remains on track for implementation on the Project Nexus Implementation Date.

COR1154.15 – UKLP Including Nexus Requirements – Phase 2
This change remains on track for implementation on the Project Nexus Implementation Date.

COR1154.15 – UKLP Including Nexus Requirements – Phase 3
This change remains on track for implementation on the Project Nexus Implementation Date.

COR1154.16.2.2 – UKLP Gemini Consequential Change – External Screen Pack – Code Enabled
This change remains on track for implementation on the Project Nexus Implementation Date.

COR1154.15.4 – UKLP Including Nexus Requirements – Shared Supply Meter Point Templates
This change remains on track for implementation on the Project Nexus Implementation Date.

COR1154.15.5 – UKLP Including Nexus Requirements – RGMA Rejection Codes
This change remains on track for implementation on the Project Nexus Implementation Date.

COR1154.15.6 – UKLP Including Nexus Requirements – Shipper Rejection Codes
This change remains on track for implementation on the Project Nexus Implementation Date.

COR1154.18 – UKLP Data Enquiry Service Consequential Change – Screen Amendments
This change remains on track for implementation on the Project Nexus Implementation Date.

COR1154.15.10 – UKLP Including Nexus requirement – General Portal Screens
This change remains on track for implementation on the Project Nexus Implementation Date.

Parties were then asked to note that the three change orders earmarked as 1154.15 would be merged into a single entry going forwards.

December 2015

COR3312.2 – Security of Supply – GDE Cashout and Compensation Arrangements – Phase 2
This change remains in development with the aim of implementation on 02 December 2015.

5.1.3. Current UK Link Changes – Implemented since the last UK Link Committee Meeting

COR1154.15.7 – UKLP Including Nexus Requirements – Glossary Document
Implemented on 12 June 2015.

5.2. Xoserve Report

SN provided an overview of the Xoserve Report, by exception, as follows:

All KPIs had been achieved and there were no exceptions to report. No comments were received on Reports A, B, C or D. SN explained that following the June report, there are no new forthcoming outages within Report E.

Thereafter, reports A, B, C, D and E were accepted[8].

6. Any Other Business

6.1. Plot Number Usage Issues

SN explained that a number of iGTs and Shippers had voiced concerns around anomalies relating to the utilisation of plot numbers. The main issue being that currently the plot number does not 'flow' in the AES file (the solution whereby a plot number is passed to the Shipper).

Xoserve will be undertaking some further analysis with the aim of providing a view in due course. It is expected that a teleconference meeting will be convened in order to discuss the matter in more detail with industry parties. To date, the 'industry' has proposed

---

[8] Post meeting note: an updated Xoserve Report has been published highlighting a change within Report C, Mod 565 Monthly Liabilities Report, specifically item TSB12b – System Recovery, whereby it should read as *'Throughout the period of "June" 2015 there was one occurrences under this category'* due to an unscheduled system outage for Gemini, between the hours of 01:46 – 09:00".

different solutions, one of which impacts UK Link and IX and the other UK Link and SPAA. DA pointed out that an SPAA change may be required going forward.

Xoserve expect to bring this matter back to the UKLC for approval of the solution at the September meeting.

6.2. CACoP Cross Code Administrators Impacts Initiative

BF pointed out that any party is able to 'flag' an impact to one of the respective Code Administrator for each of the Codes.

7. Diary Planning

Details of all meetings can be found at www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Diary

Time/Date	Venue	Programme
10:00 Thursday 13 August 2015	Teleconference.	Standard agenda.

Action Table

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status
UKL 0403	09/04/15	5.2	Xoserve to confirm any meter read submission limit changes within Project Nexus.	Xoserve (SN)	**Carried Forward**
UKL 0502	14/05/15	5.1.1	*Reference COR1154.15.13* - Xoserve (SN) to ascertain when the LSO portal screens could be expected to be included in the market trials.	Xoserve (SN)	**Carried Forward**
UKL 0503	14/05/15	6.2	To ensure a new item is added to the September 2015 UKLC meeting agenda to ensure that Xoserve (SN) provides a progress update on the lessons learnt rectification actions.	Joint Office (MB) & Xoserve (SN)	**Carried Forward**
UKL 0601	11/06/15	5.1	*Reference Glossary Document / UK Link Standards Guide* - Xoserve (DA) to investigate whether or not the 'normal' 10 business days consultation window can be extended and to provide a view in due course.	Xoserve (DA)	Update provided. **Closed**