

UNC Review Group 0334 Minutes Post Implementation Review of Central Systems Funding and Governance Arrangements

Wednesday 29 June 2011
via Teleconference

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Helen Cuin (Secretary)	(HC)	Joint Office
Alan Raper	(AR)	National Grid
Andy Miller	(AR)	Xoserve
David Addison	(DA)	Xoserve
David McCrone	(DM)	ScottishPower
Elaine Carr	(EC)	ScottishPower
Gareth Evans	(GE)	WatersWye
Joanna Ferguson	(JF)	Northern Gas Networks
Joel Martin	(JM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Jon Wisdom	(JW)	RWE npower
Simon Trivella	(ST)	Wales & West Utilities
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	Gazprom
Tim Davis	(TD)	Joint Office

1. Introduction

All materials related to this meeting are available at www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0334/290611.

1.1. Minutes from the previous meeting

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

1.2. Review of Action from the previous meeting

RG0334 018: ST to coordinate drafting the outline of a modification seeking to bring ACS methodology changes within UNC governance.

Update: ST confirmed that two separate modifications would need to be raised but these would not be in time to include within the report. **Closed.**

RG0334 019: Xoserve to produce a draft action plan to support the matrix.

Update: BF confirmed that the action plan had been published. **Complete.**

2. Review Group Discussions

2.1. Solution Matrix

BF confirmed that the Issue Log has been approved and will be appended to the Review Group Report to assist parties to understand the issues.

2.2. Action Plan

AM ran through the industry action plan, covering the pre modification, modification and post modification process, explaining that it may not be applicable to all modifications that get raised.

He believed changes within the guidance section of the new modification template could help to encourage contact with Xoserve prior to modifications being raised,

while recognising that there may be insufficient time to allow this e.g. urgent modifications. He confirmed a number of contacts have already taken place prior to modifications being raised – GE confirmed that in a recent case this had proved helpful and was very welcome.

AM reported that a guidance note on ROMs is being produced and will be made available on the Xoserve website, and possibly the Joint Office website.

AM confirmed that Xoserve have considered their involvement within the modification process and acknowledged the request for Xoserve to be more involved and proactive in suggesting alternative solutions that may wish to be considered, and closer management of the modification process to provide an input.

AM explained that any information provided should be regarded as being within the public domain and would be made available to all - it is not the intention to have exchanges behind closed doors.

Xoserve will continue to support the Modification process including the provision of ACS, ROMs etc. He explained that a Change Account Management role is being developed to support regular engagement within the Workgroup process; this will include the proactive approach whereby Xoserve will aim to provide alternative solutions, which may be more cost effective but achieve the same end result. They will also look to advise where developments overlap or have any dependency on other industry changes.

AM explained the intent of the Post Modification Review, which could apply to implemented and non-implemented modifications. He suggested this would need clear terms of reference and should not be a re-run on the viability of a modification but solely how the process worked.

GE asked if there would be a review on modification's committal to ensure the industry really want it. AM believed this ought to be considered during the development and consultation stage, but a final check before any material amount is spent could be worthwhile in some cases.

SM asked about the schedule of meetings for any review of modification processes - it was unclear if every modification should be considered. SM was keen to have a formal group that meets on an ad-hoc or six monthly basis, without it being entangled within an existing Workgroup, in order to ensure appropriate focus on any process review. It was suggested this could be run under the UNC Committee banner, but would need to be highlighted as a specific meeting in order to ensure appropriate attendance and visibility.

2.3. Draft Report

The Workgroup considered the report. BF briefly explained the recent changes made to the report, it was agreed to update the recommendations. It was agreed to include the issues log and the action plan within the Review Group Report and include a recommendation that the action plan is managed by the Governance Workgroup and the post implementation review process be considered by the UNC Committee.

SM asked for a comment to be captured within the report regarding the wider changes, including the price control review or other industry change.

It was agreed to finalise the report and circulate it for sign off by email, with an aim of completion for submission to the July Panel meeting.

3. Any Other Business

None raised.

4. Diary Planning for Review Group

No further meetings were planned.

ACTION LOG – Review Group 0334

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
RG0334/018	30/03/11	2.1	Coordinate drafting the outline of a modification seeking to bring ACS methodology changes within UNC governance	WWU (ST)	Closed
RG0224/019	15/05/11	2.1	Xoserve to produce a draft action plan to support the matrix.	Xoserve (AM)	Complete