UNC Workgroup 0450 Agenda
Monthly revision of erroneous SSP AQs outside the User AQ Review Period
Thursday 23 May 2013
at ENA, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office of Gas Transporters
Mike Berrisford (Secretary)	(MB)	Joint Office of Gas Transporters
Alan Raper	(AR)	National Grid Distribution
Alex Ross-Shaw	(ARS)	Northern Gas Networks
Andrew Margan	(AM)	British Gas
Andrea Varkonyi*	(AV)	First Utility
Chris Hill	(CH)	Cornwall Energy
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Colette Baldwin	(CB)	E.ON UK
David Addison	(DA)	Xoserve
Dave Corby*	(DC)	National Grid Transmission
David Mitchell	(DM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Edward Hunter	(EH)	RWE npower
Erika Melén	(EM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Gareth Evans*	(GE)	WatersWye Associates
Hilary Chapman	(HCh)	Xoserve
Huw Comerford*	(HC)	Utilita
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE
Robert Cameron-Higgs*	(RCH)	Wales & West Utilities
Tom Breckwoldt	(TB)	Gazprom Energy

via teleconference

Copies of all papers are available at: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0450/230513

The Workgroup Report is due to the UNC Modification Panel on 19 September 2013.

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 for review.

2.0 Discussion

Opening, BF explained that following the 09 April meeting, Xoserve had provided an update on progress being made on the provision of the ROM – lead-time is expected to be 4 – 6 weeks. DA advised that he did not have a (draft) copy of the ROM available for consideration today as it is still undergoing development.

A new action was placed against Xosere (DA) to provide a copy of the ROM in time for consideration at the next meeting.

3.0 Workgroup Report

The Workgroup Report (v0.1) was reviewed onscreen with the key following points being discussed.

Section 2 – Why Change

In considering the 400 SSP AQs / month quoted, it was briefly debated whether this should refer to the percentage of a Shippers portfolio – consensus was to leave as-is.

Concerns were voiced around the apparent lack of supporting evidence behind the quoted figures especially when it is anticipated that Ofgem would require background and justification before being able to make an informed decision on the modification.

Section 3 – Solution

When asked where the 400 figure came from, AV indicated that it was based on their portfolio and reflected the fact that it is a sufficiently small number as to avoid allow the development of a manageable cost effective solution, but large enough to be a reasonably representative (material) value, in particular for smaller Shippers.

On a more general note it was suggested that the modification appears to be a get out of not undertaking a thorough review in the 1st instance during their AQ Review period.

DA advised that he would be concerned if the proposed threshold limit were to be removed.

In considering how the modification would/could cater for erroneous (low or high) AQs it was noted that the UNC currently defines how parties amend their AQs and provision of business rules for this modification would be beneficial. Responding, AV indicated that she would consider providing some business rules for the modification in light of the points raised and confirmed that she (the modification) is not proposing anything other than utilising the current Code AQ rules. Drawing attention to UNC TPD Section G paragraph 1.6, CW suggested that care is needed to avoid overlapping the current Code AQ amendment rules.

When asked whether or not Xoserve's ROM would 'cover' both a system or manual workaround solution(s), including any potential impact upon Project Nexus, DA confirmed both types of solution were being considered and that a system solution would be more likely to impact Project Nexus delivery.

Discussion then moved on to briefly debate the merit of the modification and whether or not it is warranted in light of the forthcoming Project Nexus delivery which should provide some, if not all, of this modifications proposed solution(s) – concerns were voiced that this modification could have a direct bearing on the Project Nexus delivery timeline. It was also noted that the two previous UNC Modifications looking at the Rolling AQ area had recently been withdrawn, as the 'industry' perceives that the Project Nexus solution delivery takes precedence. When asked where the evidence resides within the modification to support the fact that implementation of this modification prior to Project Nexus would deliver any true benefits, AV felt that the ROM should / could help identify the benefits. DA took the opportunity to advise that Xoserve would be proposing a 'liberal' approach to the solution for this modification. Moving on, parties indicated that they were happy with the suggested text as provided within the modification.

In closing, it was noted that business rules are required to support the solution (and sit alongside the ROM) for the modification and that these should take into account the current Code provisions as defined within TPDG 1.6. CW suggested that National Grid Distribution would not provide draft legal text until the ROM was provided and solution clearly defined.

4.0 Any Other Business

None.

5.0   Workgroup Process

5.1   Agree actions to be completed ahead of the next meeting

New Action 0450 05/01: Xoserve (DA) to provide a copy of the ROM in time for consideration at the next meeting.

6.0   Diary Planning

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

The next meeting will take place within the business proceedings of the Distribution Workgroup on:

Thursday 27 June 2013, at 10:30 ENA, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF.

Thursday 25 July 2013 at 10:30, Consort House, 6 Homer Road, Solihull, B91 3QQ.

Action Table

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
0450 05/01	23/05/13	2.0	To provide a copy of the ROM in time for consideration at the next meeting.	Xoserve (DA)	Update to be provided in due course.