

UNC Workgroup 0395 0398 Minutes
Limitation on Retrospective Invoicing and Invoice Correction
Wednesday 08 August 2012
31 Homer Road, Solihull, B91 3LT

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office of Gas Transporters
Mike Berrisford (Secretary)	(MiB)	Joint Office of Gas Transporters
Andy Clasper	(AC)	National Grid Distribution
Alex Ross	(ARo)	Northern Gas Networks
Alison Chamberlain	(ACh)	National Grid Distribution
Anne Jackson	(AJ)	SSE
Andrew Margan	(AM)	British Gas
Brendan Murphy	(BM)	Waters Wye Associates
Brian Durber	(BD)	E.ON UK
Cesar Coehlo*	(CC)	Ofgem
Darren Lond	(DL)	National Grid NTS
David Addison	(DA)	Xoserve
David Mitchell	(DM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Edward Hunter	(EH)	RWE npower
Elaine Carr	(EC)	ScottishPower
Erika Melèn	(EM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Joanna Ferguson	(JF)	Northern Gas Networks
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	DONG
Marie Clark	(MC)	ScottishPower
Robert Cameron-Higgs	(RCH)	Wales & West Utilities
Stefan Leedham	(SL)	EDF Energy
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	Gazprom

*via teleconference

Copies of all papers are available at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/03950398>

1. Introduction and Status Review

BF opened by explaining that the July modification panel members had requested further consideration of the two Final Modification Reports, extract of the minutes as follows:

“Members were concerned that additional information and issues were raised during, and subsequent to, consultation and that these would benefit from further assessment by a Workgroup. DI agreed that the FMR should be reconsidered before Members reconsider their recommendation at the August Panel meeting.”

For Modification 0395 Members determined that consideration of the modification should be deferred.”

and

“Members were concerned that additional information and issues were raised during, and subsequent to, consultation and that these would benefit from further assessment by a Workgroup. DI agreed that the FMR should be reconsidered before Members reconsider their recommendation at the August Panel meeting.”

For Modification 0398 Members determined that consideration of the modification should be deferred.”

1.1. Minutes from the previous meeting(s)

No new minutes to consider.

1.2. Review of actions from previous meeting(s)

No new actions to consider.

2. Discussion

Waters Wye Associates (ICOSS) Report presentation

In the absence of G Evans (Waters Wye) who collated the information and prepared the report, BM provided a brief review of the document with the support of SM.

In considering the Executive Summary, questions were asked relating to the accuracy and robustness of the analysis undertaken and a request was made for supporting information and explanation of the methodology adopted.

When asked whether or not the data was demonstrable, SM advised that as Gazprom had been directly involved in the provision of information and that ICoSS collectively constitute 75% of the market (by volume), he was confident in both the integrity of the information and the method of analysis. Some parties remained unconvinced that the organisations involved in providing the information truly represented all of the participants in the market sector concerned. BD noted that if Xoserve analysis could 'match' the reports recommendations then this may go some way to providing some comfort to those who remain concerned about its validity.

A brief discussion around the potential impacts upon reconciliations (a potential to increase these) and how best to mitigate respective parties risks followed – it was agreed that it is the larger catastrophic instances that cause the most concern.

In coming to a conclusion, BF advised that the Panel had voiced their concern as to whether or not this report would/could influence parties 'original' views as expressed in their respective representations, and sought a view as to the benefits of undertaking a further consultation. Having said that, he noted Gazproms concerns with providing additional detail as it relates to commercially sensitive information.

SM requested that should parties have any questions they would like answered with regard to the report, he would be willing to respond in writing, subject to commercial confidentiality not being compromised – in the end it was agreed that questions should be directed to Ofgem in the first instance and copies may be provided to the Joint Office should parties want the questions published.

Those present concluded that based on the evidence presented within this report, they had no desire to amend their original representations and furthermore, they felt it would not be necessary for the Workgroup(s) to amend either Final Modification Report.

3. Any Other Business

None.

4. Diary Planning

Further details of planned meetings are available at: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Diary

Following a brief discussion it was agreed that no further meetings would be required, subject to the UNC Modification Panel accepting the latest Workgroup recommendation.