
UK LINK Committee Meeting Minutes
Tuesday 19 March 2013
via teleconference

Attendees

Mike Berrisford (Chair)	(MiB)	Joint Office of Gas Transporters
Lorna Dupont (Secretary)	(LD)	Joint Office of Gas Transporters
Ashley Collins	(AC)	EDF Energy
David Addison	(DA)	Xoserve
Graham Wood	(GW)	British Gas
Martin Brandt	(MB)	SSE
Trevor Clark	(TC)	E.ON UK

Copies of all papers are available at: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/uklc/190313

1. Introduction

Welcoming participants and declaring it to be quorate, MiB then explained the purpose of the meeting.

At the previous meeting concerns were raised in respect of the perceived incomplete resolution of a caveat (regarding erroneous confirmation letters) previously imposed by Members when providing approval for COR962. The apparent failure to address and resolve this caveat was of sufficient importance to Members that approval had been rescinded pending the outcome of further discussions. The objective of this meeting was to review the position and establish an appropriate way forward acceptable to all parties.

2. Discussion of Change Request 962

2.1 Update on UKLC Members positions re: ECO Process and Warranty Letter

MiB asked Members if they continued to hold the same views as expressed at the previous meeting or whether these had changed in the intervening period.

AC confirmed that in the interim (in the period between the 14 March meeting and this one) constructive discussions had taken place with Xoserve and changes were being made to the legal text. Subject to sight of version 3.0 of the Warranty Letter (and any other minor changes being effected) he believed that EDF would probably be in a position to accept, but until that was verified he was not able to offer approval at this meeting. TC and MB concurred with AC's position. GW indicated that whilst he would be happy to continue to approve the change, it does depend on the materiality of the changes involved. MB asked when version 3.0 of the Warranty Letter was to be made available for review.

2.2 Decision on Approval of UK Link Implementation Summary (Change Request) 962.16

In looking to find a suitable way forward, DA confirmed that positive discussions had been held with various parties. He was concerned to avoid what could become a potentially protracted process of continual review/change/review, etc, in respect of the Warranty Letter involving multiple parties.

He anticipated that an appropriate and acceptable approach might be agreed at this meeting to implement the system code, while discussions on the Warranty

Letter moved ahead. To this end he had prepared a presentation proposing what he considered might be a pragmatic way forward for all parties.

DA outlined the current 'Mod 517' process, and the changes identified as being required to the existing Warranty Letter as a result of system changes. It was noted that a number of parties had raised concerns regarding the value of the indemnity, and that both version 2 and version 3 of the Warranty Letter provide a less onerous indemnity than exists under the current process.

Modification 517 "Removal of MPRNs where no physical asset has been fitted" was formally withdrawn by the proposer British Gas Trading on 20 February 2004. The process which was subsequently referred to and became known as the 'Mod 517' process and which developed and existed in lieu of that formal proposal, is shortly to be renamed to more appropriately reflect its purpose, which is to deal with "Erroneous Confirmation".

At the last meeting Xoserve was asked by Members to consider a manual workaround. DA illustrated and explained the existing process flow, advising that it is only loaded onto the ConQuest system once it is known that an adjustment is required. Degradation of the process by any workaround was hoped to be avoided.

The revised process, without a workaround, was illustrated and explained. DA then verified his understanding of the position following the last meeting before moving on to explain what was proposed to be implemented.

Mindful of the Committee's decisions, it was proposed to implement CMS Phase 2 – including the system code associated with the ECO Process (it would be very inefficient for Xoserve not to do this and would jeopardise other aspects of the implementation). DA believed it had been the intention of the Committee to raise its concerns regarding the legal wording of the documents, rather than the implementation plan itself.

Signatures from some parties had already been received, but submissions of ECO contacts will not be accepted following implementation of CMS. This could be dealt with by not allowing any users to submit ECO Process contacts, either through temporary withdrawal of the ECO Allowable Value, or through use of the manual process check. The effect is the same as it suppresses the ECO process.

Bearing in mind implementation was to be on 05 April 2013, Xoserve proposed to work with users of the CMS system to agree a single version of the Warranty Letter and Statement and hoped to achieve a final outcome before the implementation date. Not all parties use the process and the intention was to work with those parties who have used it over the last 9 months or who have contacted Xoserve in connection with it.

If the Committee were happy with this approach then a report on the position of these discussions would be made to the April meeting. At the April meeting the Committee will need to agree an approach to the process. Maintenance of the workaround for any 'finite period' would need to be discussed and agreed (it was anticipated that any such period would be measured in months, not years), and it would also need to be agreed by the Committee that if any party was recognised to have been dilatory in setting itself in order then the manual workaround could be rightly withdrawn from use.

DA asked for views at this point. AC asked if any party would be left exposed or in breach under UNC if not participating in the process. DA believed not. Erroneously Created Meter Point was a different process and did not put any party in breach. Xoserve would not be able to refund monies relating to Erroneous Confirmations to non-participants.

AC was concerned that a month and a half would pass with the process not being in place. Responding to GW who questioned the materiality of the process, DA confirmed that over the last 9 months Xoserve had received 500 valid contacts. GW then observed that it would cost more to argue than to get it sorted. DA added that 16 parties had raised those 500 contacts, some of which had only raised one in that period. DA offered to report against the materiality position, so the 'industry' would not be held up by one party not agreeing to the revised Warranty.

AC was happy with this approach – 500 was not a big issue – but felt confirmation was needed that this would not cause a problem for other parties. DA agreed to check the position in regard to UNC obligations to make sure, and would review Mod 517 to see what had been agreed. MiB confirmed the website location of papers relating to Modification 517 (www.gasgovernance.co.uk/NCMP/525).

New Action UKL0304: COR962.16 - Xoserve (DA) to double check the position in regard to UNC obligations to make sure, and would review Mod 517 to see what had been agreed.

Members will be expected to consider, with a view to confirming their approval of, implementation of the system code but not make the process available until such time as agreed.

DA then illustrated and explained the ECO Workaround process flow and how it would be overlaid onto the existing 'Mod 517' process. It was highlighted to the Committee that this workaround would be applied to the existing 'Mod 517' in the run up to implementation in instances that an organisation had indicated that they were unable to accept the new Warranty letter, given that – in Xoserve's opinion – it was a less onerous obligation than the existing arrangements, as this might place undue obligations onto an individual submitting such contacts.

If, at the Committee in April, the Committee sanctioned enabling the ECO process this workaround would not be required by those parties who have agreed the revised Warranty. For those parties not agreeing, or if UKLC do not sanction enabling the process, the workaround would be enacted. As such with the current CMS Phase 2 implementation date, no contacts would be allowed in during the period between 08 to 11 April 2013. DA confirmed that either the workaround or the ECO system process could be introduced immediately following the Committee's approval at the April meeting dependent upon the solution adopted by Xoserve to withdraw the system process.

If the ECO process was disabled by virtue of temporary withdrawal of the allowable value, it would be reenabled using the next maintenance window available.

DA explained the workaround process and how it could be made to operate and ensure that appropriate approvals were in place to maintain the flow.

DA confirmed that version 3.0 of the Warranty Letter (reflecting the position reached so far in discussions) could be issued the next day. It was suggested that a change marked copy would be useful, to easily track where amendments had been made.

New Action UKL0305: COR962.16 - Xoserve (DA) to issue (change marked) Warranty Letter version 3.0 for review.

AC asked whether all parties who commented had raised concerns regarding the same area/text, or had evinced a number of different concerns. Referring to versions 1 and 2, DA believed the concerns to be related to unlimited indemnity. There appeared to be nothing particularly different between version 2 and version 3; this had been challenged in relation to reference to code liabilities (this

had been responded to), and concerns regarding legal drafting. There had also been questions around individuals being held responsible.

DA felt it was relevant to plan for parties who may not be willing to sign a Warranty Letter. AC believed there was no harm in saying 'No process if the Warranty Letter is not signed' assuming this does not create a breach of UNC position.

Xoserve proposed to allow a period for organisations to review the Warranty arrangements, and therefore had designed the workaround, DA indicated that if parties sign up, there is no need to invoke it and if in constructive discussions with an organisation this should be able to be accommodated through the normal processes.

DA confirmed that once the process was fully implemented refunds will be made (if valid) regardless of the workaround. Furthermore, If the principal contact approves it will only be for that single instance and not deemed to cover several occasions.

Describing a scenario whereby the legal text was not agreed and nothing was signed - TC questioned if the position could be blocked by a single party and prevent everyone else from using the process. DA responded that it could happen. The Committee has effectively vetoed implementation of the process by not enabling everyone to use the process, which could happen again due to the need for consensus through the Committee. If the majority are happy to sign up they may need to consider how to influence a change of attitude within the participating organisations.

Following this discussion, it was agreed that the proposed approach was acceptable as a practical means of moving forward.

2.3 Next Steps

DA confirmed that a communication would be issued to summarise the position, and Xoserve would report on discussions and progress/outcomes at the April meeting.

In conclusion, MiB thanked Members for their positive contributions to the discussions and commitment to establish a sensible way forward.

3. Any Other Business

None.

4. Diary Planning

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

10:00, 11 April 2013, Teleconference

10:00, 09 May 2013, Teleconference

10:00, 13 June 2013, Teleconference

10:00, 11 July 2013, Teleconference

10:00, 08 August 2013, Teleconference

10:00, 12 September 2013, Teleconference

10:00, 10 October 2013, Teleconference

10:00, 14 November 2013, Teleconference

10:00, 12 December 2013, Teleconference

ACTION TABLE

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status
UKL 0411	08/11/12	2.1.1	Modification 0403 – 21 day switching: Xoserve to consider the management and receipt of files received on a working day that were preceded by a non-working day.	Xoserve (DA)	Update provided. Closed
UKL 0201	13/02/13	3.0	To assess file handling capability, and determine whether they wished to receive all relevant test files.	All	Update provided. Closed
UKL 0202	13/02/13	4.0	To obtain view on the availability of data items within the confirmation transfer process.	Xoserve (DA)	Update provided. Closed
UKL 0203	13/02/13	4.0	To review the European Developments presentation on the Transmission Workgroup 07 February 2013 meeting documentation and consider impacts.	All	Update to be provided in due course. Carried Forward
UKL 0301	14/03/13	1.2	To review possible reporting functionality as an alternative to Smart Meter System Operator (SMSO) data enquiries.	Xoserve (DA)	Update to be provided.
UKL 0302	14/03/13	3.0	To provide clarity on whether or not, non SMETS actually constitute implementation of a Smart meter (including consideration of how we may possible solution this) – the issue being what is the 1 st SMETS installation date, and therefore the derivation of 'IHD Install Status Date'.	Xoserve (DA)	Update to be provided.
UKL 0303	14/03/13	4.0	To investigate the possible improvement of the Extranet Communications search functionality.	Xoserve (DA)	Update to be provided.
UKL 0304	19/03/13 (extra)	2.2	<i>Ref: COR962.16</i> - To double check the position in regard to UNC obligations to make sure, and would review Mod 517 to see what had been agreed.	Xoserve (DA)	Update to be provided.
UKL 0305	19/03/13 (extra)	2.2	<i>Ref: COR962.16</i> - To issue (change marked) Warranty Letter version 3.0 for review.	Xoserve (DA)	Update to be provided.