

**Review Group 0157 Minutes**  
**Tuesday 09 October 2007**  
**Ofgem, 9 Millbank, London, SW1P 3GE**

**Attendees**

Julian Majdanski (Chair)	JM	Joint Office of Gas Transporters
Helen Cuin (Secretary)	HC	Joint Office of Gas Transporters
Abid Sheikh	AS	energywatch
Alison Jennings	AJ	xoserve
Beverley Grubb	BG	Scotia Gas Networks
Chris Warner	CW	National Grid Distribution
David Speake	DS	ESP Pipelines
Jaime Sorrell	JS	Total Gas & Power
James Boraston	JB	RWE
James Crosland	JC	Corona Energy
Jon Dixon	JD	Ofgem
Marie Clarke	MC	Scottish Power
Mark Jones	MJ	SSE
Mitch Donnelly	MD	British Gas Trading
Paul Edwards	PE	GTC
Phil Lucas	PL	National Grid Distribution
Savita Shaunak	SS	EDF Energy
Simon Trivella	ST	WWU
Thomas Cox	TC	IPL / QPL / envoy
Zoë Titchener	ZT	xoserve

**Apologies**

Francesca Dixon	FD	IPL / QPL / envoy
Ndidi Njoku	NN	Ofgem

**1. Introduction**

1.1. Minutes of last meeting

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved

1.2. Actions Arising

**Action 0004:** BG to investigate the provision of Completion Packs and system updates

**Action Update:** See Review Group Discussion

**Action:** Complete

**Action 0005:** BG to confirm the Completion Pack process

**Action Update:** See Review Group Discussion

**Action:** Complete

**Action 0006:** DN's to consider receiving a copy of CSP01 rejections from xoserve.

**Action Update:** See Review Group Discussion

**Action:** Complete

**Action 0007:** xoserve to provide CSP01 rejection figures.

**Action Update:** See Review Group Discussion

**Action:** Complete

**Action 0008:** iGTS and DNs to provide current end to end process

**Action Update:** iGTs provided process

**Action:** Ongoing. Carried Forward

**Action 0009:** All to consider timescales that could be used within an end to end process.

**Action Update:** Further discussion required

**Action:** Ongoing. Carried Forward

**Action 0010:** xoserve to provide details of CSEP flow rejections rates and reasons.

**Action Update:** See Review Group Discussion

**Action:** Complete

**Action 0011:** All to consider future reconciliation if UNC0167 were to be implemented.

**Action Update:** See Review Group Discussion

**Action:** Complete

**Action 0012:** xoserve to produce the timings of Meter Reads and the reconciliation period.

**Action Update:** See Review Group Discussion

**Action:** Complete

## 2. Review Group Discussion

BG introduced the CSEP SPA Rejections data which had been provided by xoserve, and explained that whilst high level processes are in place it is evident that DNs and iGTs are operating to different time frames. BG gave an example of this: SGN had been batching completion notifications and sending to xoserve every two weeks, however these are now being processed as and when they arrive and SGN have no backlog.

BG confirmed that she had taken an action from the inter-Transporter CSEP NExA workgroup to produce some initial time frames, to assist with aligning processes. MC expressed an interest in having these outlined within the CSEP NExA.

MC expressed a concern about gas being offtaken before DNs have provided a project completion confirmation. BG confirmed that SGN's view is that gas should not flow until the iGT have received a completion pack confirmation.

AS enquired if there was a safety issue with gas flowing without the consent of the DN. ST confirmed that this is a Network integrity concern which may have safety implications.

CW highlighted that the inter-Transporter CSEP NExA workgroup will be focusing initially on rejections with the highest percentages and explained that some of the meter point mismatch can be overcome by addressing the process time frames.

MC questioned whether an AQ04 rejection prevents an iGT from providing gas nominations where the total CSEP AQ would be breached. PE confirmed that this is the case. DS noted that there are about 100 AQ04 rejections and they had been discussed at the inter-Transporter CSEP NExA workgroup in relation to the use of project reference numbers. Different reference numbers are provided for CSEP load increases and if the iGT uses the original reference then a failure will be generated.

PE suggested that Shippers may need to become involved in investigating the AQ04 rejections.

JS reiterated the concern she raised last month relating to LMN and MPRN mismatches. PE highlighted that by concentrating on CSP01 rejections this will help reduce this problem as it will enable xoserve to provide Logical Meter Numbers.

MC believed there could be an alternative solution to the provision of LMNs. It was suggested that a batch of LMNs could be provided to iGTs to allocate to projects.

PE confirmed that iGTs update xoserve of fitted meters on Wednesdays and that xoserve will provide LMNs within 2 days. JS highlighted that some of the LMNs she is unable to match are dated back to 1999. MC highlighted that any mismatch impacts RbD.

TC suggested that it may be possible for the CSEP portfolio data to be held by xoserve. AJ and BG expressed concern that the industry could not currently support individual Meter Point registration.

JD suggested the Review Group had the option to consider short term “quick win” solutions as well as more radical long term solutions. AS concurred and stressed the need for good data quality.

SS asked if further data analysis will be undertaken. AJ confirmed that xoserve have taken an action to examine what statistical reports could be produced, but highlighted the difficulty of producing statistics by DN due the provision of address information only at a later stage within the process.

MC and JS expressed a keen interest for Shippers to be actively engaged.

MC questioned if iGTs and DNs will be reconciling data to ensure data quality. AJ confirmed xoserve would be able to provide the portfolio information xoserve hold for iGTs but only at LMN level. BG suggested that this could be done towards the end of the process once the rejections have been investigated more thoroughly as this would simplify any reconciliation.

JS suggested that Shippers should undertake a portfolio reconciliation as this is the only way to validate charges being invoiced.

MC requested that DNs and iGTs provide a work plan with timelines and projected reductions, to monitor and focus the resolution of identified issues.

BG expressed a concern with placing projected reductions as it is not yet clear if the issues addressed will have the desired effect on rejection rates.

CW acknowledged MC's request for a work plan but highlighted that problems have been identified and are being addressed. BG acknowledged that reconciling the portfolio will not overcome some of the problems identified at the inter-Transporter CSEP NExA workgroup and that looking at the end to end process will assist in identifying the root cause.

**Action 0013:** iGTs and DNs to produce a draft work-plan.

JD highlighted that the group need to decide what course of action is required and whether they want to address the process and the data items required, or concentrate on reconciling the CSEP portfolio information.

It was agreed that the Review Group ought to concentrate on process flows and that the inter-Transporter CSEP NExA workgroup ought to concentrate on reviewing the operational processes and identifying quick wins.

### UNC 0167 Discussion

ZT provided a presentation suggesting an alternative method which would assume an opening read of zero to enable CSEP reconciliation. ZT also suggested a solution for Shipper Transfers where a Transfer Read is estimated using either the AQ or a flat profile.

PE expressed a concern with the provided solutions due to the perceived amount of work required by the iGTs especially when this may not be a one-off exercise.

PE suggested that Shippers may wish to assist with the provision of meter reads to enable reconciliation, explaining that iGTs could invite Shippers to provide reads for LMNs they wish to be reconciled. However he was concerned that read dates do not match the LMN date.

The mechanism surrounding the implementation of UNC0167 was discussed. It was agreed that xoserve could provide iGTs with LMNs that have not been reconciled. The iGT would then need to add the MPRNs to enable the Shippers to provide Meter Reads.

Neutral Reconciliation was then discussed for the sites that reads were not provided for.

MC expressed concern that the exercise is open to gaming.

JD suggested that Ofgem would want to understand why Shippers would not be able to provide Meter Reads for some 5,000 sites especially in light of the Must Read process.

TC expressed concern as he believed that iGTs were being led into undertaking an exercise for the provision of reads when this obligation already exists and if Meter Readings were available to iGTs, then these would have been provided. He did not wish to embark on a labour intensive exercise until a decision is made on UNC0167.

ZT provided a further presentation on a CSEP Reconciliation "Read Window" Proposal.

An issue was raised with regards to the provision of start dates matching iGT start dates and whether a past date could be provided. AJ explained that past dates cannot be entered due to Gemini processes.

MC considered that the proposals provided by xoserve would need to be raised as a UNC Modification Proposal. ZT explained that the presentation had been produced to gauge reaction to the suggestions. PE enquired what information xoserve would need to enable reconciliation. AJ suggested that such an arrangement would be a change to current commercial arrangements and that consideration would need to be given to the framework required and funding.

JD asked if xoserve could examine the possibility and potential cost of retaining MPRNs for LMNS and for Shippers to identify the benefits of retaining this information.

**Action 0014:** xoserve to examine the possibility and potential cost of maintaining CSEP MPRNs

**Action 0015:** Shippers to identify the benefits of retaining MPRNs for CSEP LMNs

### **3. Diary Planning for Review group**

12:00, 12 November 2007, Ofgem, Millbank, London.

### **4. AOB**

None.

**APPENDIX A.**

**ACTION LOG - Review Group 0157**

<b>Action Ref</b>	<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>Minute Ref</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Status Update</b>
RG0157 0004	11/09/2007	2.2	BG to investigate the provision of Completion Packs and system updates	Transporters (BG)	Action: Complete
RG0157 0005	11/09/2007	2.2	BG to confirm the Completion Pack process	Transporters (BG)	Action: Complete
RG0157 0006	11/09/2007	2.2	DNs to consider receiving a copy of CSP01 rejections from xoserve.	All Transporters	Action: Complete
RG0157 0007	11/09/2007	2.2	xoserve to provide CSP01 rejection figures.	xoserve (SN)	Action: Complete
RG0157 0008	11/09/2007	2.2	iGTS and DN's to provide current end to end process	iGTS and Transporters	Action: Carried Forward
RG0157 0009	11/09/2007	2.2	All to consider timescales that could be used within an end to end process.	All	Action: Carried Forward
RG0157 0010	11/09/2007	2.2	xoserve to provide details of CSEP flow rejections rates and reasons.	xoserve (SN)	Action: Complete
RG0157 0011	11/09/2007	2.2	All to consider future reconciliation if UNC0167 were to be implemented.	All	Action: Complete
RG0157 0012	11/09/2007	2.2	xoserve to produce the timings of Meter Reads and the reconciliation period.	xoserve (SN)	Action: Complete
RG0157 0013	09/10/2007	2.0	iGTS and DN's to produce a draft work-plan.	iGTS and DN's	Action: Pending
RG0157 0014	09/10/2007	2.0	xoserve to examine the possibility and potential cost of maintaining CSEP MPRNs	xoserve (AJ)	Action: Pending

<b>Action Ref</b>	<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>Minute Ref</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Status Update</b>
RG0157 0015	09/10/207	2.0	Shippers to identify the benefits of retaining MPRNs for CSEP LMNs	Shippers	Action: Pending