

Review Group 0157 Minutes
Wednesday 30 January 2008
31 Homer Road, Solihull

Attendees

Julian Majdanski (Chair)	JM	Joint Office of Gas Transporters
Helen Cuin (Secretary)	HC	Joint Office of Gas Transporters
Alison Jennings	AJ	Xoserve
Chris Warner	CW	National Grid Distribution
David Speake	DS	ESP Pipelines
James Crosland	JC	Corona Energy
Jenny Rawlingson	JR	GTC
Karen Kennedy	KK	Scottish Power
Marie Clarke	MC	Scottish Power
Paul Edwards	PE	GTC
Phil Lucas	PL	National Grid Distribution
Sarah Westrup	SW	GTC
Savita Shaunak	SS	EDF Energy
Simon Trivella	ST	Scotia Gas Networks
Tracey Walker	TW	E.ON UK
Zoë Titchener	ZT	Xoserve

Apologies

Abid Sheikh	AS	energywatch
Alex Travell	AT	E.ON UK
Mark Jones	MJ	SSE

1. Introduction

1.1. Minutes of previous meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 December 2007 were accepted.

1.2. Review of actions from previous meeting

Action RG0157 0008: iGTs and DNs to provide current end to end process.

Action Update: PL confirmed a high level diagram has been produced with how the current interface works; this will be issued along side the work plan once it has been ratified.

Action Carried Forward.

Action RG0157 0009: All to consider timescales that could be used within an end to end process.

Action Update: See Action RG0157 0008 update.

Action Carried Forward

Action RG0157 0013: iGTs and DNs to produce a draft work plan.

Action Update: see agenda item 2.1 below.

Action: Complete.

Action RG0157 0021: iGTs to provide list of LMNs with associated MPRNs where available to the relevant Shipper by 30 November.

Action Update: PE confirmed that this is now complete.

Action: Complete

Action RG0157 0023: Shippers to provide iGTs with meter reads to enable site reconciliations.

Action Update: see agenda item 2.3 below

Action: Carried Forward

Action RG0157 0025: All to provide feedback to xoserve's proposals (available on Joint Office Website, under RG0157 Meeting 09 October 2007 (www.gasgovernance.com/Code/Reviews/RG0157/09Oct07/)).

Action Update: No feedback had been received.

Action: Closed

Action RG0157 0027: Shippers to provide reads or confirm the requirement for a neutral reconciliation for all live LMNs

Action Update: see agenda item 2.3 below.

Action Carried Forward

Action RG0157 029: iGTs to review processes for updating the effective and deemed field record and report back to the Review Group.

Action Update: PE confirmed the GTC process for updating the deemed date. DS to provide ESP update.

Action Carried Forward

Action RG0157 030: Shippers and iGTs to develop solutions short of xoserve holding individual iGT meter point data that would improve the visibility of LMN data.

Action Update: KK confirmed that she had looked at the invoicing file formats and had produced some information on existing file formats. She explained the difficulties with the current process, and provided a possible solution whereby files are separated into transactions which would allow easier extraction of information. KK also provided a paper which outlined the possible benefits for Transporters and Shippers. MC suggested that the costs of supporting the functionality could be considered within the xoserve administration charge.

KK explained the difficulties of validating the CSEP invoice, highlighting areas where Shippers lack confidence particularly where there is little transparency in the calculation of charges. ZT questioned if the suggested changes to the invoice structure would need to be changed whether or not xoserve hold the MPRNs for CSEPs. KK acknowledged that not all parties may be supportive of such a change. AJ confirmed that xoserve would need to understand the level of support and agreed to investigate this further.

AJ encouraged discussion about xoserve holding CSEP MPRN details, highlighting that development would be required for an online CSEP MPRN system. AJ suggested that xoserve's initial investigation into this would cost in the region of £150,000. She questioned if the Transporters would actually want to fund a system holding such downstream information. ST explained the level of data the Transporters would require to operate the system, he confirmed that Transporters do not require individual CSEP MPRNs.

MC believed that a fundamental regime change is required to improve on the issues identified. She recognised that this may not happen overnight, but

believed the industry needed an enduring solution and that it could be included in the UK Link rewrite. MC confirmed she was open-minded about funding and would like to enter into a debate on possible solutions.

ST believed that the Transporters would be able to achieve the advantages suggested in KK's paper from the current process. He supported the provision of I&C MPRNs for validation purposes, but was concerned about expensive solutions for the registration of CSEP MPRNs. CW acknowledged an online system would give Shippers many advantages but did not believe that the proposal was an enduring solution. PE reminded the group of the identified data provision issues which were currently being addressed.

KK suggested that xoserve may not be aware of further developments within a CSEP which could exceed the AQ maximum. ZT confirmed that xoserve monitor the maximum AQs. ST explained that the DNs would not be overly concerned on the number of sites or individual AQs downstream as long as the maximum AQ is not breached. MC highlighted that CSEP configurations do not always correspond. She provided a typical example where the Transporters may hold a record of 38 individual sites but the Shippers have been told by the iGT that there are only 30, this typically creates a mismatch, and subsequently lack of confidence in data. ZT explained the correction of such a scenario should be driven by the iGT. She explained that xoserve will only record the number of sites connected to a CSEP that has been advised by the iGT.

A debate occurred about the provision of iGT data and the invoices produced with the provision of this data. AJ confirmed that xoserve can only invoice Shippers with that information provided by the iGT.

PE confirmed that iGTs have made system changes to improve the situation. AJ concurred that this work should see a reduction in CSP01s and will result in improvements.

AJ suggested that the iGT data provision for I&C supply points would be a quick win. KK acknowledged that this would improve the degree of visibility. However AJ explained that xoserve would only be able to issue the data provided and that the data would not be subject to any validation.

KK concluded the debate by expressing a preference for Meter Point information to enable better visibility and avoid the aggregation of charges. She expressed concern that any mismatch is impacting on allocation and RbD. She explained that there is a high degree of confidence for commodity and capacity charges but that there is not this level of confidence for CSEP charges.

ZT suggested that Shippers would have a greater confidence if the number of sites and the AQs matched within the current regime.

JM highlighted that if Shippers want a solution to be considered within the UK Link rewrite then representation would need to be made within that forum.

It was agreed to carry forward the Action for further consideration by other parties.

Action Carried Forward.

New Action RG0157 031: iGTs, xoserve and Transporters to examine which field could be used for the provision of I&C MPRNs

2. Review Group Discussion

2.1. Work Plan

CW introduced a draft Work Plan provided by Beverley Grubb. PL explained in detail the different business processes and the planned completion dates.

MC asked if the connection process will be formalised. PL confirmed that there is a suggestion to document the process but it has not been decided where this should reside.

MC questioned if all the iGTs including those outside the group have been consulted on the work plan. DS confirmed that the work plan had only been circulated to the members on the iGT/DN workgroup and this would need to be circulated to smaller iGTs not represented.

CW and ST confirmed that the draft Work Plan could be published on the Joint Office website.

2.2. End to End Process / Timescales

PL reiterated that a high level diagram has been produced. MC asked when the end to end process would be completed. PL explained that this is dependent on the work plan which has an end of February aspiration for connections. JM suggested it may be possible to have an end to end process with timescales by March.

2.3. LMN Reconciliation

ZT provided a spreadsheet detailing the CSEP Reconciliation statistics as at 28 January 2008. She explained from the 5453 reconciliations required, 4420 had not had a request for either an actual or a neutral reconciliation.

MC highlighted that since November 2007 there appeared to have only been 12 reconciliations requested. PE confirmed that information has been requested and that they are waiting for a response.

MC enquired about the 12 reconciliations and whether these were recent reconciliations.

Action RG0157 032: xoserve to investigate the reconciliation period of the 12 reconciliations.

CW asked if xoserve have been rejecting large numbers of reconciliation requests. ZT confirmed that only a small number of reconciliation requests have been rejected.

DS expressed that he is minded to re-circulate the request for information to enable LMN reconciliation.

AJ expressed the importance of providing reconciliation requests as soon as possible due to the 01 April 2008 implementation date of UNC0152.

Action RG0157 033: xoserve to issue the 0152 Portfolio to Shippers.

MC suggested that other meetings are used to highlight the importance of the LMN reconciliation, such as the Gas Forum and Billing Ops Forum.

PL introduced a draft Modification Proposal entitled: "Introduction of a Date Tolerance to Facilitate the Processing of Individual Meter Point Reconciliation at LDZ CSEPs"

DS enquired what would happen if a file submission was not on a Wednesday. PL explained that weekly updates are required and that an update need not be on a Wednesday.

PL confirmed that the draft Modification Proposal would be raised in time for the UNC Panel meeting on 21 February 2008.

ZT presented current CSEP rejection Statistics.

ZT confirmed approximately 35% (650 projects) have had a CSP01 rejection since June. iGTs will be contacted about these projects in attempt to resolve the rejections.

ZT explained the problems xoserve have when matching projects and that the provision of DN References will assist. ZT estimated that approximately 300 projects are taken on every month. It was questioned whether nested CSEPs could be included with the mismatch of projects. PE suggested that a small number may be included.

PE asked if xoserve could report on the success of providing the DN reference to assist with the resolution of CSP01 rejections.

Action RG0157 034: xoserve to provide some statistics on the DN Reference Provision.

iGTs explained that the CSP01s are reported on a cumulative basis and that more than one rejection could be created for a project due to re-attempts by the iGT to complete a project confirmation.

Action RG157 035: xoserve to estimate the supply point count for CSP01 rejections.

ZT confirmed that the estimated 650 projects that have had CSP01 rejections have been communicated to the appropriate iGTs to try and resolve the rejection with the provision of more information.

ZT highlighted that the AQ04 (maximum CSEP AQ exceeded) statistics can be a result of incorrect AQ values. DS confirmed that there is not currently a procedure whereby CSEP AQs can be amended; this can result in subsequent provisions of the correct AQ being rejected. A discussion evolved about an iGT UNC Modification Proposal to introduce a solution for erroneous AQs. ZT confirmed that DNs will be contacted with regards to nominations that are in excess of the AQ to assess if a capacity increase has been requested via the DN.

2.4. Update to UNC0167 Implementation

No further update was provided to that of the statistics above.

3. Diary Planning for Review Group

A provisional date will be set with Ofgem to coincide with the Ofgem CSEP NeXA Meeting.

4. AOB

None

APPENDIX A.

ACTION LOG - Review Group 0157

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
RG0157 0008	11/09/2007	2.2	iGTS and DNs to provide current end to end process	iGTS and Transporters	Carried Forward
RG0157 0009	11/09/2007	2.2	All to consider timescales that could be used within an end to end process.	All	Carried Forward
RG0157 0013	09/10/2007	2.0	iGTS and DNs to produce a draft work-plan.	iGTS and DNs	Complete
RG0157 0021	12/11/2007	2.0	iGTS to provide list of LMNs with associated MPRNs to the relevant Shipper by 30 November.	All iGTS	Complete
RG0157 0023	12/11/2007	4.0	Shippers to provide iGTS with meter volumes to enable site reconciliations.	All Shippers	Carried Forward
RG0157 0025	12/11/2007	4.0	All to provide feedback to xoserve's proposals.	All	Closed
RG0157 0027	12/11/2007	4.0	Shippers to provide reads or confirm the requirement for a neutral reconciliation for all live LMNs	All Shippers	Carried Forward
RG0157 0029	11/12/2007	1.2	iGTS to review processes for updating the effective and deemed field record and report back to the Review Group.	iGTS	Carried Forward
RG0157 030	11/12/2007	1.2	Shippers and iGTS to develop solutions short of xoserve holding individual iGT meter point data that would improve the visibility of LMN data.	iGTS (PE) and Shippers (KK)	Carried Forward
RG0157 031	30/01/2008	1.2	iGts, xoserve and Transporters to examine which field could be used for the provision of I&C MPRNs	All	Pending

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
RG0157 032	30/01/2008	2.3	xoserve to investigate the reconciliation period of the 12 reconciliations.	xoserve (ZT)	Pending
RG0157 033	30/01/2008	2.3	xoserve to issue the 0152 Portfolio to Shippers.	xoserve (ZT)	Pending
RG0157 034	30/01/2008	2.3	xoserve to provide some statistics on the DN Reference Provision.	xoserve (ZT)	Pending
RG0157 035	30/01/2008	2.3	xoserve to estimate the supply point count for CSP01 rejections.	xoserve (ZT)	Pending