

**UNC Workgroup 0422 Minutes
Creating the permission to release data to Meter Asset Provider
organisations**

Thursday 23 August 2012

ENA, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office of Gas Transporters
Lorna Dupont (Secretary)	(LD)	Joint Office of Gas Transporters
Alan Raper	(AR)	National Grid Distribution
Alex Ross	(ARo)	Northern Gas Networks
Andrew Margan	(AMa)	British Gas
Andy Miller*	(AMi)	Xoserve
Anne Jackson	(AJ)	SSE
Brian Durber	(BD)	E.ON UK
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Darren Lond*	(DL)	National Grid NTS*
David Addison	(DA)	Xoserve
David Mitchell	(DM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Elaine Carr	(EC)	ScottishPower
Erika Melèn	(EM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Fergus Healy*	(FH)	National Grid NTS
Gareth Evans	(GE)	Waters Wye Associates
Joanna Ferguson	(JF)	Northern Gas Networks
Kathryn Heard*	(KH)	National Grid NTS
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	DONG
Marie Clark	(MC)	ScottishPower
Richard Vernon*	(RV)	RWE npower
Rob Cameron-Higgs	(RCH)	Wales & West Utilities

**via teleconference*

Copies of all papers are available at: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0422/230812

1.0 Review of Minutes and Actions from previous meeting

1.1. Minutes

The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted.

1.2. Actions

No outstanding actions to review.

2.0 Discussion, Draft Legal Text, and Workgroup Report

The Workgroup is due to report to the UNC Modification Panel on 20 September 2012.

DA explained that the modification has been revised to reflect discussions in the previous meetings regarding MAP provisions, and draft legal text had been provided for review.

The draft was discussed and it was agreed that what had been provided matched the intent of the modification as proposed in its current form.

AJ then sought to clarify some points in the draft legal text, relating to checking off/verifying the MSN. She was concerned that there should be some test on the MAP's request to verify that the MAP had a legitimate interest in the MPRN. She felt that MAP's should not be able to access data for a site without evidence of an association, particularly as the MAP could learn additional 'accurate' information to the information it already had. This it was felt raised issues of confidentiality, commercial sensitivity, and potentially very open opportunities for data mining or 'phishing'. A further identified issue was that of maintenance of the data and the responsibility for keeping it up-to-date so that it remains contemporary.

BD summarised that the draft legal text did not make clear what protections would exist to prevent the use of spurious data to obtain further valid information. GE added that this might particularly be relevant once in the SMART world where identifying whether a SMART meter was an SMET1 or SMET2 would become commercially valuable information.

Responding to these concerns AMi confirmed there would be a Confidentiality Agreement in place between the Transporters and the MAPs, and this would be in the public domain. There would also be a contract between Xoserve and the MAPs, which would define the service. BD expressed the Shippers' concern that these contracts could reflect all manner of things that would not in turn be reflected within the UNC. The industry needed to have visibility of both the Confidentiality Agreement and any other contracts and their respective contents to allay these concerns. AMi explained how these Agreements/contracts were expected to work. The contracts would be non-variable, and the list of signatories would be placed in the public domain.

AJ questioned that if a 'user' is giving their permission, what the impact might be on a User if a MAP behaved inappropriately. BD queried if that was placing a heavy reliance on Xoserve's judgement and how that might be reflected in the UNC.

GE stated he would prefer to see more obligations and greater clarity included in the UNC rather than be reliant on third party contracts over which Users had no real control; sight of examples of both the Confidentiality Agreement (Transporters and MAPS) and the contract (Xoserve and MAPs) would be welcomed by Shippers.

MC pointed out that contracts can change at any time in the future and it would be helpful to understand what protections might be in place for Users who are indirectly affected by these.

AJ commented that there was the potential for the creation of a mass of duplicate claims, where different MAM's / MAP's claim that the same assets are within their portfolios. This risk does not seem to be mitigated in the current drafting of the legal text.

New Action 0422/001: Provide examples of the Confidentiality Agreement (Transporters and MAPS) and the contract (Xoserve and MAPs) for review.

BF commented that it was clear from these discussions that the Workgroup required more time for consideration of this modification.

Noting that the Workgroup Report must be submitted to the September UNC Modification Panel for its consideration, the Workgroup agreed with BF's suggestion that it be completed with the recommendation to the Panel that it be referred back to the Workgroup for further development.

3.0 Any Other Business

None raised.

4.0 Diary Planning

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

If the Panel agree with the recommendation that this modification be returned to the Workgroup for further development then it is anticipated that the next meeting will take place within the business proceedings of the Distribution Workgroup on:

Thursday 27 September 2012, at 10:30, at ENA, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF.

Workgroup 0422 – Action Table

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
0001	23/08/12	2.0	Provide examples of the Confidentiality Agreement (Transporters and MAPS) and the contract (Xoserve and MAPs) for review.	Xoserve (AMi)	Pending