

**UNC Workgroup 0466/0466A Minutes
Daily Meter Reading Simplification
Thursday 22 January 2015
at 31 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3LT**

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Helen Cuin (Secretary)	(HCu)	Joint Office
Alex Ross-Shaw	(ARS)	Northern Gas Networks
Andrew Margan*	(AM)	British Gas
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Colette Baldwin	(CB)	E.ON UK
David Mitchell	(DM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Gareth Evans*	(GE)	WatersWye
Hayley Burden	(HB)	National Grid NTS
Hilary Chapman	(HCh)	Xoserve
Kirandeep Samra	(KS)	Npower
Kirsten Elliott-Smith	(KES)	Cornwall Energy
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	DONG Energy
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE
Olivia Powis*	(OP)	Ofgem
Rob Johnson	(RJ)	Wingas
Shiv Singh	(SS)	National Grid Distribution
Steve Mulinganie*	(SM)	Gazprom

* via teleconference

Copies of all papers are available at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0466/220115>

The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 19 February 2015.

1.0 Review of Minutes and Actions

1.1. Minutes

Minutes approved.

1.2. Actions

1201: MC to provide a definitive view of the granularity and frequency of the provision of within day meter read data that was available.

Update: HB confirmed an update and exit data had been provided to Gazprom. HB confirmed that the aggregate offtake flows (D+1) were available on the National Grid website under the reporting section, this included the site type and daily CV Volume.

RJ clarified there is no within day data and this should be made available for Users to allow them to comply with their licence requirements. He therefore was considering amending the modification to ensure/allow the provision of within day data for telemetered sites.

The Workgroup further considered the possibility of a varying Modification 0466A. See item 2.1. **Complete.**

2.0 Panel Request

2.1. Consideration of whether or not NTS telemetry equipment is considered to be Daily Read Equipment and therefore impacted by IX communications

BF confirmed a formal variation request would need to be considered by the UNC Panel if the modification's solution was to be amended. The Panel would then need to consider if the variation was material or immaterial. If the variation is considered immaterial the process would continue from the point reached ie the UNC Panel would make a recommendation on implementation. If however the variation was deemed material the Panel may consider whether to re-consult or send the modification back to workgroup.

CW believed that a change to clarify that telemetered sites would be included would be material as further consideration would need to be taken about procuring and providing the data as there are no systems in place at present.

HB highlighted that if telemetered equipment was included within the scope of the modification, NExA confidentiality issues would also need to be considered.

The Workgroup also considered the method of data provision. The Workgroup discussed the use of email where IX communication was not possible; and that email is not currently recognised for Code communications.

CB suggested that the communication method could be agreed between parties and the modification could avoid being specific about how the information is provided. CW was concerned that if the modification relies on the use of current communication methods, Panel may wish to see to understand how this would be managed and the potential costs of managing different methods. CB highlighted that this is not a mandated service; it is optional and could be managed through bilateral arrangements without impacting Code. The Workgroup agreed any such inclusion of email would need to be considered within the legal text.

SM was concerned that varying the modification would re-open other ancillary issues. BF reiterated the variation process and the UNC Panel potentially returning the modification back to the Workgroup to consider the impacts of the variation should it be considered material. SM remained concerned that the Workgroup would re-open past considerations rather than concentrating on the elements of the variation.

SM was keen to progress with the current modification, excluding telemetered sites, which would provide a service for at least 99% of the remaining sites. He suggested that an additional modification could be raised to progress telemetered sites at a later date on to assess and establish a process for a smaller proportion of sites, rather than delaying implementation of this modification.

The Workgroup agreed that taking out telemetered sites from the scope of Modification 0466A would be an immaterial change. It addressed the concern raised by National Grid NTS in representations and would allow the modification to move forward for at least 99% of sites.

RJ agreed to consider the discussions today and decide whether to submit a variation request to include or exclude telemetered sites. He recognised that excluding would be considered an immaterial variation, whereas including would be considered a material change and that this is more likely to delay the process. He also agreed to consider the merits of raising an additional modification to provide a service for telemetered sites.

3.0 Final Modification Report

Participants agreed that the Final Modification Report should be submitted to Panel should telemetered sites be taken out of scope by submission of a variation and to recommend that the variation is considered immaterial. Should the variation request include telemetered sites then the recommendation is it should be considered a material change.

4.0 Next Steps

Wingas to submit a variation request following consideration of Workgroup discussion.

5.0 Any Other Business

None.

6.0 Diary Planning

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

No further meetings were planned.

Action Table

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
1201	12/12/14	2.1	MC to provide a definitive view of the granularity and frequency of the provision of within day meter read data that was available.	National Grid NTS (MC)	Complete