

Distribution Workstream Minutes
Thursday 24 September 2009
Elxon, 350 Euston Road, London

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	BF	Joint Office
Helen Cuin (Secretary)	HC	Joint Office
Bali Dohel	BD	Scotia Gas Networks
Beverley Viney	BV	National Grid NTS
Brian Durber	BDu	E.ON UK
Chris Hill	CH	RWE npower
Chris Warner	CW	National Grid Distribution
David Moore	DM	Gas Forum
Gareth Evans	GE	Waters Wye
Jenny Boothe	JB	Ofgem
Joanna Ferguson	JF	Northern Gas Networks
Joel Martin	JM	Scotia Gas Networks
Linda Whitcroft	LS	Xoserve
Phil Broom	PB	GDF Suez
Richard Street	RS	Corona Energy
Stefan Leedham	SL	EDF Energy
Steve Mulinganie	SM	Onshore Consulating

1. Introduction and Status Review

1.1. Minutes from the previous meeting

The minutes from the previous meeting were approved.

1.2. Review of actions from previous Distribution Workstream meetings

Action Dis0403: EDF Energy to revise proposal UNC0248 considering the discussions held at the Distribution Workstream.

Action Update: SL confirmed UNC0248 had been amended. See also item 2.1. **Complete.**

Action Dis0602: UNC0231 - Joint Office to publish the Workstream Report including the amended proposal by Friday 03 July 2009.

Action Update: BF confirmed that a revision to UNC0231 had been made and a Workstream Report had been published however a further revision is expected. **Complete.**

Action Dis0705: GDF Suez (PB) and Corona (RS) to meet with the Transporters to discuss options for transfer of Meter Asset and Read History to New Suppliers.

Action Update: PB confirmed some work has been undertaken and he hoped to arrange a separate meeting with Transporters to discuss. **Complete.**

Action Dis0801: UNC0231 - xoserve to confirm the current verification on Reasonable Endeavours Scheme claims and the likely validations in the future.

Action Update: LW provided a presentation which included the required evidence for each claim type, the current general validation undertaken by xoserve and some examples of some of the rejection reasons used. Within

the presentation LW raised two questions regarding the validation process within UNC0231. **Complete.**

New Action Dis0801a: British Gas to consider and discuss the UNC0231 validation questions raised within xoserve's presentation. **Pending.**

Action 0802: UNC0248 - Transporters to consider the level of information required for the ROM and to request a ROM if adequate data is available.

Action Update: See item 2.1. **Carried Forward.**

Action Dis0803: Topic 0040Dis - National Grid Distribution (AR) to examine the possible timelines for a contracted disconnection service without access to customer premises.

Action Update: CW confirmed a lot of work is being undertaken to construct a response, the intention will be to provide a response at the next Workstream. RS asked if National Grid could contact Corona Energy to discuss the response prior to the next RG0245 meeting scheduled for 12 October 2009. **Carried Forward.**

1.3. Review of Live Modifications

BF outlined the live Modification Proposals and JB provided an update on the modifications with Ofgem.

JM highlighted that Scotia Gas Networks may have an issue with drafting the legal text for UNC0253.

PB highlighted that the suggested implementation date for UNC0224 was optimistic and requested that the Transporters keep the Workstream updated on implementation progress.

Action Dis0901: UNC0224 - Transporters to update Workstream on implementation progress.

2. Modification Proposals

2.1. Proposal 0231/0245: Theft Modifications

RS highlighted that British Gas had raised a SPAA change request in relation to Theft. SM was concerned that this change request was pre-empting the outcome from Review Group 0245.

CW explained the process for SPAA changes and encouraged parties to examine the change request and attend SPAA meetings.

CW believed that DW had raised the SPAA change to plug some safety gaps that had been identified during the theft review.

RS challenged how the SPAA change may impact the Review Group. CW understood that DW was still considering other elements and that further modifications that may still be required had not been dismissed.

2.2. Proposal 0248: Meter Reading Replacement

SL confirmed that UNC0248 had been discussed with xoserve to clarify some interpretations; he confirmed as a result three parts of the modification need to be amended:

1. Clarification to confirm that Shippers can only replace a meter reading during the time they are the current registered Shipper starting with the most recent confirmation and not for periods of time prior to this.
2. The last read utilised as the AQ backstop cannot be amended. The undefined term was discussed; CW suggested that SL review a

modification which utilised a reference to the AQ backstop, without using the defined term.

3. Transporters request for supporting information from xoserve on read changes. xoserve had expressed concern that it will be very hard to determine which reads should need supportive data. The Workstream discussed the report which illustrates the level of changes. RS asked about the cost of such report and if it was right for Transporters to publish data on supplier behaviour.

CW questioned how the Proposer was going to quantify the benefits of the modification. SL confirmed that EDF Energy had identified its own benefits and believed that this could be addressed under the User Pays process by assessing how much it is likely to cost and the usage to determine if such a change should go ahead.

2.3. Proposal 0255: Publication of Objection rates for LSP Supply Points

GE confirmed that discussions had taken place with Transporters however, the Modification Proposal will not be changed.

GE had been provided with an indication of costs and as these costs could be as little as £4,000 he believed that the User Pays Mechanism was not a suitable route to recover the costs. He believed the cost of administering the cost recovery would be more than the actual developmental costs. CW challenged the perceived £4,000 costs and provided a quote from a Wales and West Utilities email that suggested the costs are likely to be between £4,000 and £26,000. CW confirmed the cost will depend on the functionality.

RS suggested that if the Transporters have a concern about the administration and recovery of costs they could raise an alternate. SL suggested that it be better to have a single developed Modification Proposal for the UNC Panel to consider.

RS believed that £4,000 - £26,000 costs were not significant and delaying development may increase the costs as implementation may not be possible with the Information Provision project.

GE was concerned with spending money to raise and consider a ROM which would cost more than the estimated development costs. He was also concerned that by rejecting the costs now and pushing the development back would result in increased costs.

BV suggested that the Workstream Report reflects that the Transporters are concerned about the costs escalating and a User Pays modification may need to be raised.

RS challenged what would be the tipping point for Transporters. The principle of Transporters covering the costs of a development for minimal development costs which incidentally would cost less than producing a ROM was discussed and captured in section 2 of the Workstream Report.

The objection rate report was discussed. GE highlighted that the report would indicate the number of successful and withdrawn objections. The Workstream discussed the report and that it would highlight the appropriateness of a Shipper's actions by illustrating the number of reported withdrawn objections.

LW asked about the delaying of the transfer process and that the report will not indicate the number of successful rejections that are later challenged and have delayed a transfer.

The Supplier License was discussed. It was acknowledged that the License stipulates the circumstances in which an objection can be made and the UNC provides the mechanism for the objections. SL believed that a breach under the UNC would also result in a breach to the Licence. CW provided a quote from the UNC Section G2.8.3. Some parties believed that the UNC provides the mechanism and that the Licence conditions could be breached if not adhered to however, this would not result in a UNC breach.

JM expressed concern about the cut-off date for the Information Provision project and whether this proposal could be included in time. The Workstream believed that the change could coincide with the Information Provision project to keep costs to a minimum. JM advised the scope would need to be finalised to the Information Provision project during October 2009 to meet the current implementation date of April 2010.

2.4. Proposal 0258: Facilitating the Use of Remote Meter Reading Equipment for the Purposes of Demand Estimation Forecasting Techniques

BF confirmed that UNC0258 and UNC0258A are currently out for consultation, no questions were raised.

2.5. Proposal 0259: Removal of Obligations To Install UK Link User Equipment and UK Link User Software for UK Link Users who utilise the services of an UK Link User Agent

BV highlighted that the Proposal refers to Shipper Users and suggested that this may need amending. RS clarified that the first paragraph relates to an application to become a Shipper User and should not need a change as the statement is factual.

BV questioned if there is a cost to removing equipment. SM believed that there are costs for removing and relocating equipment. He asked Transporters to clarify if costs are levied for removal only.

Action 0902: 0259 - Scotia Gas Networks to confirm if costs are charged for the removal of IS equipment.

The Workstream Report was considered. The Workstream did not believe any further amendments were required. It was agreed that the Workstream Report was sufficiently developed to be passed back to the Transmission Workstream and issue to Panel.

3. Topics

3.1. 014Dis, CSEP NExA Agreements

No update or issues to discuss.

3.2. 038Dis, Emergency Contact Details

No update or issues to discuss.

3.3. 039Dis, Transfer of Meter Asset and Read History to New Suppliers

No update or issues to discuss.

3.4. 0040Dis, Disconnection Timescale

SM requested if CW could provide an update on the disconnection process as soon as possible as this will need to be considered as part of the Review Group 0245. The next RG0245 meeting is 12 October 2009.

It was agreed to assign a High priority rating to the topic and await National Grid's response to Action Dis0803.

3.5. New Topic

No new topics raised.

4. AOB

None raised.

5. Diary Planning for Workstream

Thursday 22 October 2009, 10:00, 31 Homer Road, Solihull

Thursday 26 November 2009, 10:00, Elexon, 350 Euston Road, London

Distribution Workstream Action Table (Appendix 1)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
Dis0403	23.04.09	2.2	EDF Energy to revise proposal UNC0248 considering the discussions held at the Distribution Workstream.	EDF Energy (SL)	Complete
Dis0602	25.06.09	2.1	Joint Office to publish a draft Workstream Report for approval by Friday 03 July 2009.	Joint Office (BF/HC)	Complete
Dis0705	23.07.09	3.3.1	Meet with the Transporters to discuss options for transfer of Meter Asset and Read History to New Suppliers.	GDF Suez (PB) and Corona (RS)	Complete
Dis0801	27.08.09	2.1	UNC0231 - xoserve to confirm the current verification on Reasonable Endeavour Scheme claims and the likely validations in the future.	xoserve	Complete
Dis0801a	24.09.09	1.2	British Gas to consider and discuss the UNC0231 validation questions raised within xoserve's presentation.	British Gas (DW)	Pending
Dis0802	27.08.09	2.2	UNC0248 - Transporters to consider the level of information required for the ROM and to request a ROM if adequate data available.	Transporters	Carried Forward
Dis0803	27.08.09	3.4	National Grid Distribution (AR) to examine the possible timelines for a contracted disconnection service without access to customer premises.	National Grid (AR)	Carried Forward
Dis0901	24.09.09	1.3	UNC0244 - Transporters to update Workstream on implementation progress.	Transporters	Pending
Dis0902	24.09.09	2.5	0259 - Scotia Gas Networks to confirm if costs are charged for the removal of IS equipment.	Scotia Gas Networks (JM)	Pending