

**Distribution Workstream Minutes**  
**Thursday 23 September 2010**  
**Elxon, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW**

**Attendees**

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	BF	Joint Office
Lorna Dupont (Secretary)	LD	Joint Office
Alan Raper	ARa	National Grid Distribution
Alex Ross	ARo	Northern Gas Networks
Andy Miller	AM	xoserve
Beverley Viney	BV	National Grid NTS
Brian Durber	BD	E.ON UK
Chris Warner	CW	National Grid Distribution
David Watson	DW	British Gas
Gareth Evans	GE	Waters Wye Associates
Jemma Woolston	JWo	Shell
Joanna Ferguson	JF	Northern Gas Networks
Joel Martin	JM	Scotia Gas Networks
Jonathan Wisdom	JWi	RWE npower
Karen Kennedy	KK	ScottishPower
Linda Whitcroft	LW	xoserve
Mark Jones	MJ	SSE
Mo Rezvani	MR	SSE
Sallyann Blackett	SB	E.ON UK
Simon Trivella	ST	Wales & West Utilities
Stefan Leedham	SL	EDF Energy
Steve Mulinganie	SM	Gazprom
Tabish Khan	TK	Ofgem

**1. Introduction and Status Review****1.1. Minutes from the previous meeting**

Following publication of the minutes, xoserve (AM) had provided a written statement (published on the Joint Office website) as a post meeting update to add context and clarification from xoserve's point of view (see previous Minutes section '3.6 0050Dis, DM Unbundling').

The minutes of the previous meeting were then approved.

**1.2. Review of actions from previous Distribution Workstream meetings**

**Action Dis0603:** UNC0292/3 - xoserve to review the AQ Amendment validation filters and consideration given to refining the parameters/rules and the impact this would have.

**Update:** Covered under agenda. **Closed**

**Action Dis0607:** UNC 0296 - update the proposal to reflect discussions.

**Update:** Completed. **Closed**

**Action Dis0610:** UNC0313 - DW to update the proposal to reflect discussions during the Workstream.

**Update:** This Proposal has now been withdrawn. **Closed.**

**Action Dis0612:** Topic 0047Dis - SL to identify possible options for reducing the current transfer timescales.

**Update:** SL believed this to have been covered at a previous Workstream. **Closed.**

**Action Dis0801:** For UNC0317/0317A and UNC0327 - additional data references should be provided to the Joint Office for publication so that responding parties can give this further consideration before finalising their responses for the end of the consultation periods.

**Post Meeting Update 1:** DW confirmed that the source data used in Modification 0327 was taken in entirety from the xoserve Modification 081 AQ Review Report.

**Post Meeting Update 2:** GE confirmed that all of the information used in the compilation of the report was provided by xoserve and British Gas during the development of Modification 0194 and 0194a, or was provided to Ofgem by xoserve in order for them to undertake the impact assessment (this data is detailed in appendix four of the Ofgem Impact Assessment). **Complete.**

**Action Dis0802:** UNC 0292/0293 - Shippers to submit data for zero, 5%, 10% and 15% on banding to xoserve as soon as possible. xoserve to understand/assess data and undertake further analysis in terms of the information received in terms of banding width provided (zero, 5%, 10% and 15%).

**Update:** Presentation made at this meeting; further information required from all Shippers, see below. DW added that he hoped to provide relevant information to xoserve shortly. Ongoing. **Carried Forward.**

**Action Dis0803:** UNC0292/0293 - xoserve to 1) clarify what the cap would have to be to cope with continuous submissions over the assumed period; and 2) assess the cost of doubling the existing capacity of the system.

**Update:** LW gave a presentation relating to point (1); point (2) to be carried forward. Ongoing. **Carried Forward (point 2)**

**Action Dis0804:** UNC0292/0293 - The Proposer to assess ramifications of profile amendments and consider addressing within the Proposal(s) 0292/0293.

**Update:** Ongoing. **Carried Forward.**

**Action Dis0805:** UNC0313 - The Proposer to amend the Proposal and bring back to the next Workstream. The Joint Office to seek an extension at the next UNC Modification Panel meeting.

**Update:** This Proposal has now been withdrawn. **Closed.**

**Action Dis0806:** Compile a matrix setting out how the billing arrangements for each of the AUG Proposals were envisaged to work, and what the differences are.

**Update:** See 3.2 below. Completed. **Closed.**

**Action Dis0807:** UNC0326 – The Proposer to amend the Proposal to reflect the discussions and speak to xoserve to clarify future requirements.

**Update:** Discussions ongoing. **Carried Forward.**

**Action Dis0808:** 0045Dis, Handling of Emergency Situations at Priority Customer Sites – Provide a statement of the actions/approach to be taken by Transporters when attending commercial that should be considered a priority.

**Update:** ST reported that DN discussions were ongoing. **Carried Forward.**

**Action Dis0809:** 0047Dis, Third Energy Package - Ofgem to consider 'ownership', the appropriateness of separate meetings, and the provision of some guidelines in respect of DECC's expectations.

**Update:** TK reported that meetings with Suppliers were being arranged. **Carried Forward.**

**Action Dis0810:** 0049Dis - Confirm if this applies just to the sites in scope.

**Update:** Ongoing. **Carried Forward.**

**Action Dis0811:** 0049Dis - Transporters to give further consideration to: Opening reads – how should these be addressed on 01/10 (for transfers only); duplicate confirmations; customers who transfer to another Supplier on 01/10; delayed appeals; referrals process; objections – what happens when these occur; and what are the consequences of retaining an Interruptible flag?

**Update:** Under consideration. **Carried Forward.**

**Action Dis0812:** Confirm likely numbers of stranded sites following proposed removal of DMV.

**Update:** Likely numbers were presented last month and parties were reflecting on information; any further questions would be directed to ST as appropriate. **Closed.**

### **1.3. Review of Live Modification Proposals**

BF briefly ran through the live Modification Proposals that were not on the agenda for discussion; of particular note were:

0274: Creation of a National Revenue Protection Service (update) – BF reported that a lot of work was being done in relation to this outside of the UNC arena. A progress report was awaited from the Proposer, which could then be submitted to the UNC Modification Panel for consideration of next steps as an extension past 12 months was required..

0297: Extending Rights to Protected Information Provisions for Meter Asset Managers/Registered Metering Applicants – the Authority had decided that this should be implemented, and the implementation date has been confirmed as 24 September 2010.

## **2. Modification Proposals**

### **2.1. Proposal 0292: Proposed change to the AQ Review Amendment Tolerance for SSP sites**

LW gave a presentation addressing previous actions (Dis0603, Dis0802, Dis0803(1)) and explained the figures, confirming that 200,000 amendments per day was the current capacity. SL questioned the analysis of 2009 figures when he had provided xoserve with 2010 figures. LW responded that 2009 figures were more readily available rather than those for 2010, which were not yet published. SL evinced his concerns regarding comparisons, and assumed that using 2010 would have been better. LW

responded that this was just a snapshot and was likely to change year by year. The 2009 window of 55 days had been used.

DW observed that the question was how to schedule/allocate capacity over the window, because it is never going to be a perfectly flat profile. JWi believed it was very important to consider the magnitude of the volume of energy. A large number of MPRNs does not necessarily equate to a large volume of energy.

LW pointed out that there was still a risk (if Shipper systems do not validate upfront) that high volumes of traffic may be received and it may not be possible to process them, depending on Shipper behaviour and how a Shipper's individual processes operate. DW believed that major Shippers would have that level of validation in place, but conceded it would still have to be an assumption on xoserve's part. KK asked if there was any sense of what happened currently that xoserve could provide, ie was it likely some shippers fail to validate up front.

LW believed that it might be possible to stretch the current capacity to 250,000 per day through various movements but explained that it would require a detailed cost/impacts analysis to fully understand and provide answers to the other two questions as part of the ROM.

Views on the best way forward were briefly discussed, and it was concluded that there appeared to be more incentive to do it early. SL questioned if there was spare capacity on a particular day, could it be allocated to others who wished to submit additional files. JWi observed that peak volume on the last day is generally composed of the more difficult ones that a Shipper has been working on throughout the period; easier ones tend to go through earlier.

Concluding her presentation, LW displayed potential AQ amendments based on AQ2009 and Shippers' anticipated volumes, and explained the graph in more detail, ie there was very little in the first half, then it ramps up, with various peaks, until a final peak towards the end (which could breach the capacity if the 20% rule was relaxed). LW asked for more information from Shippers. DW responded that he would send further information by the end of the week and asked if xoserve could analyse another couple of years' profiles to give more comfort on the likely profile. LW thought this could be considered but each year might give a very different position; it might be possible to do 2008 and 2010 but more Shipper responses would be required to facilitate this.

SL commented that LSPs were included, perhaps unnecessarily; the system needs to be able to differentiate between LSPs and SSPs.

Responding to a question from MR, LW said that the process was not fully automated.

KK noted that the vast majority were seen to be in the last 6 weeks of the window, and that perhaps Shippers would like to give serious consideration to this and make suggestions on scheduling and trying to smooth out peaks. MJ observed that it is a problem at the end where you cannot catch up, whereas earlier submissions means that there is a chance that you can rollover and catch up. LW confirmed that weekends were out of scope because of other system activities running at that time. DW observed that phasing (based on 0 or 5%) might give a value that xoserve still could not process. KK suggested that a different percentage could be utilised if Shippers could agree to scheduling, without requiring system enhancements. JW considered the key question to be what is the energy change between 5-10% and 10-15% and believed that a greater

understanding of this was required – Shippers need to work this out and recognise where the benefit lies.

SL was of the opinion that Shippers not doing the analysis should not be permitted to slow down the process, and thought a decision should be made on whether or not a DCA was required. BD believed it should be relatively simple to establish where an appropriate cut off point might lie and what the benefits were.

**Action Dis0901: UNC0292/0293 – Shippers to provide an estimate regarding 5-15% banding and potential energy saving within each band**

**Action Dis0902: UNC0292/0293 – xoserve to establish the cost of a DCA and associated timescales for provision.**

**Action Dis0903: UNC0292/0293 – Shippers to send suggestions regarding scheduling of SSPs within the window to KK, together with any identified related issues.**

**Action Dis0904: UNC0292/0293 – xoserve to provide submission profiles for at least 2008, 2009 and 2010.**

KK commented that 2011 was a tight timescale now, given how long this proposal has been under development and this was disappointing. Pointing out that decisions need to be made regarding any preferred solutions so that xoserve can produce a DCA looking at the options, BF also indicated that the Workstream should also be focusing on concluding its Report. AM added that a DCA was only required to account for a doubling of the capacity or the risk of a ‘horrendous’ profile; for any other solution a ROM could be commenced fairly quickly. SM observed that a phased approach might require a different type of rejection process. LW believed that the rules need clarification first in order to understand how the system might work. DW reiterated that the Workstream still needed to decide what exactly the options were, then think about whether or not a DCA was required. MJ suggested that an interim meeting might be beneficial to focus on and agree potential solutions. Following a brief discussion a teleconference meeting was planned for Tuesday 12 October 2010 starting at 10:00 ([www.gasgovernance.co.uk/dist/121010](http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/dist/121010)) and AM asked the Shippers to consider the question “Can you profile or not? If you can, how would you do it?” - the answers to this would help xoserve establish what the next steps might be.

## **2.2. Proposal 0293: Proposed removal of the AQ Review Amendment Tolerance for SSP sites**

See 2.1, above.

## **2.3. Proposal 0296: Facilitating a Supply Point Enquiry Service for Non-Domestic Supply Points**

DW reported that he had submitted an amended Proposal, and explained that the changes had been made to address the concerns noted at previous meetings.

ST suggested amending the paragraph in the UNC where the reference to ‘contemplating’ occurred to make the meaning clearer.

DW confirmed that the Proposal did not preclude bilateral discussion with xoserve, and that there were no identified impacts on xoserve’s systems.

There was a brief discussion on whether the focus of the Proposal had now changed. DW pointed out that it had been discussed with Ofgem; there appeared to be restrictions in relation to Transporters, so an enabling modification was required to deal with this. In response to other questions, DW said that many of the data items are available in real time but some are missing and these are needed. AM suggested that there may be other solutions and it should not be limited by the current position. DW required everything already available on a current SP enquiry but in real time through an online portal. He confirmed that the modification was based on customer permissions (and Transporters can audit this as in other areas) entirely consistent with discussions taking place relating to SMART metering. Customers have full control over their data. (The modification has to go through before a party can go to UPUG to request a service.)

TK agreed to check that DW had addressed each of Ofgem's concerns put forward in relation to UNC0253.

**Action Dis0905: UNC0296 - Check that the amended Proposal has addressed each of Ofgem's concerns put forward in relation to UNC0253.**

The Workstream Report was then reviewed, discussed, amended in light of comments made, and completed onscreen. It will be published and submitted to the October UNC Modification Panel for consideration.

**2.4. Proposal 0314: The provision of a "Data Update" to Non Code Parties**

SM explained the changes made to the Proposal. The Workstream Report was then reviewed and various points were discussed.

DW asked what constraints were placed on ESTA regarding confidentiality. SM responded that this would be covered under a bilateral contract between Transporters and ESTA. DW was concerned that a third party not subject to the UNC would be in control of data. SM said that ESTA would have obligations relating to the use of the data; this was an enabling modification relating to the 8 data items, none of which specifically identified a consumer. DW countered that contracts could be renegotiated in the future and there is no control over a non- Code party. The industry has no way of influencing of that contract as it sits outside of Code governance. SM believed that the Transporter who places the contract should devise appropriate terms. ST did not see how this could be done apart from stating what the data was and what it could be used for. DW asked why ESTA could not be made a Code party. GE commented that MAMs were non- Code parties who have access to data, and there is no UNC contract.

DW asked who would carry responsibility for ESTA? SM was confident that the Transporters' would have in place reasonable protection. DW remained concerned that the contract would sit outside of the UNC and there was no overt control over such a contract.

SM believed that the key point was, what is the commercial risk in such an event of data being used outside of its original purpose. AR observed that he believed the Transporters would be ultimately responsible. DW asked if something could be put in the modification proposal to restrict how Transporters might be permitted to vary the contract. ST and AR pointed out that the Transporters could be in breach of the UNC and the Utilities Act if a contract was amended so that data could be used for other purposes. A variance would require a modification proposal to change it. DW felt more satisfied with this assurance that there was some control in place.

Moving on, SL referred to page 4 (2), which seemed to indicate unlimited liabilities; he pointed out that this may give rise to issues for ESTA. SM noted this point for further consideration and potential discussion with ESTA.

The Workstream Report was amended in light of comments made, and completed onscreen. It will be published and submitted to the October UNC Modification Panel for consideration.

**Action Dis0906: SM to consider comments received and amend the Proposal prior to the October Panel.**

**2.5. Proposal 0326: Allocation of unidentified gas following the appointment of the Allocation of Unidentified Gas Expert (AUGE)**

Due to time constraints discussion of this item was deferred to the next meeting (teleconference) planned for Tuesday 12 October 2010 starting at 10:00 ([www.gasgovernance.co.uk/dist/121010](http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/dist/121010)).

**2.6 Proposal 0330: Delivery of additional analysis and derivation of Seasonal normal weather**

MR gave a presentation, outlining the background to the issues identified and referring to the discussions at DESC and Review Group 0280 during the past year. The proposed new update analysis was described. SB pointed out that it was not unusual to gap fill weather history, but it was necessary to know how such gaps had been filled. There was a lack of clarity associated with the historical data in this respect.

MR was obtaining an update on costs going forward – probably not more than £5k per year.

ST asked if there were to be any restrictions on data use, and MR responded that he believed there would be a contract, which might set out who could use it and for what purposes. SB added that it was recognised that parties should behave appropriately in respect of the data and use it for demand estimation purposes.

SB pointed out that it was previously recognised that data was not available at the right level for xoserve to implement EP2 and this would ensure that it would be available.

In response to a question from DW, SB confirmed that the cost differential between market sectors is £8m and so potentially a cost borne between hedging arrangements and costs on consumers. Misallocation means that all Shippers have an issue, ie to minimise the risks.

Seasonal Normal was going 'live' in a couple of weeks; it was pointed out that nearly all Shippers were not satisfied with the values going in, and this gives an opportunity to review in the future.

Responding to questions on the User Pays aspects, SB noted that the benefits were being shared therefore 50/50 split on costs seemed appropriate. It would provide a robust methodology rather than continuing to use an inappropriate methodology, but without imposing an obligation to use the outputs of the new methodology if common sense dictated that these were not appropriate. ST added that the Transporters do carry out their obligations under the UNC and that all parties were looking at improving the process; the 50/50 split seemed appropriate at present but if costs could swing then this might need further discussion. Contracted

issues may need resolving before progressing and the Transporters and xoserve would need some comfort that costs would be kept to a reasonable level. MR believed the Proposal to be quite specific and addresses potential costs.

SL stated that the main intent was to avoid issues that had arose with EP2, and to engage all parties at a much earlier point in the process.

GE asked what xoserve system changes might be required. MR commented that xoserve does not necessarily need to do the 5 year review itself. SB observed that there may be an impact on AQ values if rolling in another change within the 5 years, but benefits might outweigh the costs.

In response to a question from SM, SB said that until the analysis is performed it could not be assessed as to whether an outcome would be 'better', but there was the choice not to use it; it would give a consistent methodology but does not obligate the use of any results if not deemed to be an agreed improvement. In effect this would provide a better methodology but is not forcing the Transporters to change the Seasonal Normal faster than their normal review.

MR acknowledged that statistical problems existed currently, and this had the potential to improve the position. This satisfies the quest for 'a better fit', and would give a view of Seasonal Normal that could be rolled in earlier than the 5 years if you chose to. The intention is to correct last minute issues that arose from EP2. At the next UNC Modification Panel meeting it was MR's intention to request that the Proposal be issued direct to consultation.

BF summarised views so far, and questioned if the Workstream believed it required further development before submission to UNC Modification Panel.

ST suggested that there needed to be some cap for everyone's benefit. The Transporters were concerned that caps and collars needed to be developed more clearly within the Proposal to give greater assurance.

GE believed there needed to be a greater understanding as to the magnitude of any costs and where they might sit (there were wider issues with the User Pays concept and he was concerned regarding the potential setting of a significant precedent for future modification proposals).

CW observed that there might be a problem with the legal drafting as proposed, and believed that it would benefit from the production of a Workstream Report so that all parties were clear on how the process would be conducted. The Transporters needed to clearly understand what their obligations might be under this Proposal. ST commented that he saw no issues with the technical aspects, but that contractually there may be issues in sourcing the work.

It was suggested that further comments be provided to MR as soon as possible so that an amended Proposal could be produced by 13 October 2010.

**Action Dis0907: UNC0330 - All to provide further comments/ suggestions to MR by 07 October 2010 for consideration/inclusion in the Proposal; MR to revise Proposal as appropriate.**

## **2.7 Proposal 0331: Demand Estimation Section H Changes to Processes and Responsibilities**



SB gave a presentation outlining the background to the work carried out by Review Group 0280 resulting in the culmination of this Proposal, together with a brief overview of the intent and purpose of the Proposal, which was looking to improve the modelling that underpins the calculations, to remove unnecessary restrictions and to add back fluidity and the ability to respond to changes more quickly.

Various questions were asked and SB responded. It was confirmed that the Expert Group could undertake the creation of a new EUC. The 1-in-20 Peak Day demand was determined by the demand models and if flexed it would affect this.

JM queried if all the proposed changes to the UNC text were actually reflected in the Proposal itself (this would help to avoid drafting issues). SB recognised that there were a lot of changes to the UNC text and would be happy to discuss further. ST reiterated that it needed to be ensured that every single change pointed back to the Proposal and was captured. The new text may have to be provided for the consultation so that all parties are clear what is actually being changed. It may also be necessary to explain what the 'status quo' is and how to manage any transition phase that may be required to cover the period while the Expert Group is being formed.

BV asked how an Expert Group would work, and had concerns regarding a return to the SME concept. SB responded, explaining that demand estimation was very much a 'niche' area and would benefit greatly from Expert experience, knowledge, input and contribution, while also having the flexibility to address any issues with analysis much earlier in the process, and deciding on the appropriateness of including/excluding data, etc. LW added that xoserve would be the party first approached to do the work and carry on, but the Expert Group would assess and be able to suggest alternative analysis/methods and could assist in providing resource to produce any 'extras' required. It could make recommendations to DESC, but would not be able to contract (no funding mechanism).

SM questioned the 'independence' of analysis by Expert Group members. SB said that the Expert Group would be able to examine and challenge analysis, and thought there might be some opportunities for User Pays funding, but this would require another Modification Proposal. She did not want to put in 'uncontrolled costs', and appropriate governance would be followed if funding was deemed to be required. SL pointed out that all parties would be engaged earlier in the process and this would help to address any timing, resource, and complexity issues, so any disagreements/areas of contention should be lessened because the source of the data will be better understood.

DW questioned the need for an Expert Group and potentially extra costs, when DESC was available to oversee this area. BF responded that the Expert Group was seen as more of an ad hoc group that could convene and address and respond to issues and needs more quickly than the DESC. SB pointed out that this did not replicate PEG on the electricity side.

SB and JM will review the suggested text and make sure it mirrors the changes proposed, with a view to completing the draft Report at next month's meeting.

**Action Dis0908: UNC0331 - Review the suggested text and make sure it mirrors the changes proposed, with a view to completing the draft Report at next month's meeting.**

### 3. Topics

#### 3.1. 0045Dis, Handling of Emergency Situations at Priority Customer Sites

Due to time constraints this item was deferred to a future meeting.

#### 3.2. 0046Dis, Mechanism for Correct Apportionment of Unidentified Gas Guidelines Document

In response to Action Dis0806 LW presented a comparison of the potential billing arrangements of all outstanding AUG Modification Proposals associated with Modification 0229 and briefly explained the differences. LW pointed out that LSP market shares would need to be collected from April onwards.

DW questioned the billing solution, and asked what did it entail that could not be done now – once you have a market share surely it was a simple calculation? LW responded that it would involve additional processing, work, and tools.

#### 3.3. 0047Dis, Third Energy Package

Pointing out that this was not an xoserve view or proposal, but simply an overview, AM proceeded to give a presentation.

There was some debate as to the length of transfer period; AM had spoken to DECC who had confirmed it was 3 weeks, however DW had also discussed this with DECC who had not been clear when it should start and had indicated that all options remained open as far as DECC was concerned.

AM then gave a brief description of 7 options and demonstrated how these might work with the aid of individual diagrams. SL pointed out that alignment is required with the current UNC, and added that a minimum margin might also be required to account for potential system issues within any option. He also drew attention to the fact that Bank Holidays were not the only Non Business Days.

Concluding the presentation, AM explained he had devised a table to help capture industry views and provide an initial comparison of the 7 options that might be useful to Ofgem and DECC as something to consider in relation to flexing the EU Directive. DW asked if there was any idea of the cost and time of implementation. AM responded that there was no formal view as yet.

AM then sought industry views on the level of complexity and suggested that scores might be sent to xoserve for compilation, followed by publication on the Joint Office website.

SL pointed out that there are some fundamental issues that completing this table as it stands would not bring out, and this should not be seen as indicating the preferred solution to go to DECC – DECC might assume this to be the case on sight of such a table. AM understood SL's concerns, and responded that this was to be perceived as a starting point to help sift out what was not an option, rather than going round in circles. SL reiterated his concern that if it was submitted to DECC, their conclusion might be the industry's final decision, and conclusions could not be drawn at this point that any top rating was indicative of the 'preferred' solution. He added that EDF Energy were taking up their concerns individually with DECC.

Whilst acknowledging SL's concerns, ST pointed out that the Transporters and xoserve were conscious that the industry needed to be doing something to address this EU Directive. DW added that DECC want to achieve compliance in March, whichever option is chosen; neither the objection window nor background administration should be used as 'an excuse'. DW agreed it would be prudent to prepare and continue the dialogue in the meantime.

SL believed it was too tight to work at the moment because there was no leeway for potential system failure, etc; it would be too easy to become in breach of Licence requirements and a party cannot cover for this.

TK suggested that if something could be produced along the lines of this table then Ofgem could call upon it to clarify a position. AM agreed to review the table and add extra lines for individual comments and suggestions, etc and provide to the JO for publication. This could then be used by Shippers to complete and send to xoserve and Ofgem for initial consideration.

**Action Dis0909: 0047Dis Third Energy Package – 1) Revise table and make available to Shippers for completion, via Joint Office website. 2) Shippers to complete and return to xoserve and Ofgem for initial consideration.**

**Post Meeting Note:** Revised table was provided and published to Joint Office website and is available for Shippers to download, complete, and return to xoserve and Ofgem. The topic has been added to the agenda for further review/discussion at the teleconference meeting planned for Tuesday 12 October 2010 starting at 10:00 ([www.gasgovernance.co.uk/dist/121010](http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/dist/121010)).

**3.4. 0048Dis, Management of Domestic EUCs**

Due to time constraints this item was deferred to a future meeting.

**3.5. 0049Dis, DN Interruption Phase 2 ("Oct 2011 implementation")**

Due to time constraints this item was deferred to a future meeting.

**3.6. 0050Dis, DM Unbundling**

Due to time constraints this item was deferred to a future meeting.

**3.7. 0051Dis, Procurement of NDM Profiling Data**

Due to time constraints this item was deferred to a future meeting.

**3.8. New Topics**

None raised.

#### **4.0 Any Other Business**

None raised.

#### **5.0 Diary Planning for Workstream**

The next meetings are scheduled as follows:

- Tuesday 12 October 2010 ([www.gasgovernance.co.uk/dist/121010](http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/dist/121010)) 10:00, via teleconference
- Thursday 28 October 2010, 10:00, 31 Homer Road, Solihull
- Thursday 25 November 2010, 10:00, Elexon, 350 Euston Road, London

### Distribution Workstream Action Table

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
Dis0603	24/06/10	2.1	UNC 0292/3 - xoserve to review the AQ Amendment validation filters and consideration given to refining the parameters/rules and the impact this would have.	xoserve (LW)	Closed
Dis0607	24/06/10	2.3	UNC 0296 - update the proposal to reflect discussions	British Gas (DW)	Closed
Dis0610	24/06/10	2.5	UNC 0313 - update the proposal to reflect discussions during the workstream	British Gas (DW)	Closed
Dis0612	24/06/10	3.4	Topic 0047Dis - SL to identify possible options for reducing the current transfer timescales.	EDF Energy (SL)	Closed
Dis0801	26/08/10	1.3	For 0317/0317A and 0327 - additional data references should be provided to the Joint Office for publication so that responding parties can give this further consideration before finalising their responses for the end of the consultation periods.	British Gas (DW) and Shell (?GE)	Post meeting notes provided.  Closed
Dis0802	26/08/10	2.1	UNC 0292/0293 - Shippers to submit data for zero, 5%, 10% and 15% on banding to xoserve as soon as possible. xoserve to understand/assess data and undertake further analysis in terms of the information received in terms of banding width provided (zero, 5%, 10% and 15%).	ALL Shippers and xoserve (AM)	Carried forward
Dis0803	26/08/10	2.1	<del>xoserve to 1) clarify what the cap would have to be to cope with continuous submissions over the assumed period; and 2) assess the cost of doubling the existing capacity of the system.</del>	xoserve (AM)	Part 1- Completed Part 2 –Carried forward
Dis0804	26/08/10	2.1	The Proposer to assess ramifications of profile amendments and consider addressing within the Proposal(s) 0292/0293	Scottish Power (LK)	Carried forward

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
Dis0805	26/08/10		0313 - The Proposer to amend the Proposal and bring back to the next Workstream. The Joint Office to seek an extension at the next UNC Modification Panel meeting.	British Gas (DW) and Joint Office (BF)	Closed
Dis0806	26/08/10	2.5	Compile a matrix setting out how the billing arrangements for each of the AUG Proposals were envisaged to work, and what the differences are.	All Proposers and xoserve (AM)	Closed
Dis0807	26/08/10	2.5	0326 - Amend the Proposal to reflect the discussions and speak to xoserve to clarify future requirements.	Scottish Power (LK)	Carried forward
Dis0808	26/08/10	3.1	0045Dis, Handling of Emergency Situations at Priority Customer Sites – Provide a statement of the actions/approach to be taken by Transporters when attending commercial that should be considered a priority.	Wales & West Utilities (ST)	Carried forward
Dis0809	26/08/10	3.3	Action Dis0806: 0047Dis, Third Energy Package - Ofgem to consider 'ownership', the appropriateness of separate meetings, and the provision of some guidelines in respect of DECC's expectations.	Ofgem (AW)	Carried forward
Dis0810	26/08/10	3.5	0049Dis - ST to confirm if this applies just to the sites in scope.	Wales & West Utilities (ST)	Carried forward
Dis0811	26/08/10	3.5	0049Dis - Transporters to give further consideration to: Opening reads – how should these be addressed on 01/10 (for transfers only); duplicate confirmations; customers who transfer to another Supplier on 01/10; delayed appeals; referrals process; objections – what happens when these occur; and what are the consequences of retaining an Interruptible flag?	Transporters	Carried forward

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
Dis0812	26/08/10	3.6	Confirm likely numbers of stranded sites following proposed removal of DME.	Wales & West Utilities (ST)	Closed
Dis0901	23/09/10	2.1	UNC0292/0293 – Shippers to provide an estimate to xoserve regarding 5-15% banding and potential energy saving in each band	ALL Shippers	Pending
Dis0902	23/09/10	2.1	UNC0292/0293 – xoserve to establish the cost of a DCA and associated timescales for provision.	xoserve (LW/AM)	Pending
Dis0903	23/09/10	2.1	UNC0292/0293 – Shippers to send suggestions regarding scheduling of SSPs within the window to KK, together with any identified related issues.	ALL Shippers	Pending
Dis0904	23/09/10	2.1	UNC0292/0293 – xoserve to provide submission profiles for at least 2008, 2009 and 2010.	Xoserve (LW)	Pending
Dis0905	23/09/10	2.3	UNC0296 - Check that the amended Proposal has addressed each of Ofgem's concerns put forward in relation to UNC0253.	Ofgem (TK)	Pending
Dis0906	23/09/10	2.4	UNC0314 – Consider comments received and amend the Proposal prior to the October Panel.	Gazprom (SM)	Pending
Dis0907	23/09/10	2.6	UNC0330 - All to provide further comments/ suggestions to MR by 07 October 2010 for consideration/inclusion in the Proposal; MR to revise Proposal as appropriate.	ALL and SSE (MR)	Pending
Dis0908	23/09/10	2.7	UNC0331 - Review the suggested text and make sure it mirrors the changes proposed, with a view to completing the draft Report at next month's meeting.	E.ON (SB) and SGN (JM)	Pending

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
Dis0909	23/09/10	3.3	0047Dis Third Energy Package – 1) <del>Revise table and make available to Shippers for completion, via Joint Office website.</del> 2) Shippers to complete and return to xoserve and Ofgem for initial consideration.	xoserve (AM) and ALL Shippers	<b>Part 1 - completed.</b> Part 2 - pending