

UNC Workgroup 0477 Minutes
Supply Point Registration - Facilitation of Faster Switching
Tuesday 04 February 2014
Consort House, 6 Homer Road, Solihull, B91 3QQ

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Helen Cuin (Secretary)	(HCu)	Joint Office
Andy Baugh	(AB)	RWE npower
Andy Simpson	(AS)	Xoserve
Andrew Wallace*	(AW)	Ofgem
Anne Jackson*	(AJ)	SSE
Colette Baldwin	(CB)	E.ON UK
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Dan Simons	(DS)	EDF Energy
David Mitchell	(DM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Graham Wood	(GW)	British Gas
Hilary Chapman	(HCh)	Xoserve
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	DONG Energy
Marie Clark	(MC)	Scottish Power
Raymond Adams*	(RA)	SSE
Rob Cameron-Higgs	(RCH)	First Utility
Steve Nunnington	(SN)	Xoserve

* via teleconference

Copies of all papers are available at: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0477/040214

The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 17 April 2014.

1.0 Review of Minutes and Actions

1.1 Minutes

The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted.

1.2 Actions

0101: Xoserve to provide an assessment of potential system impacts.

Update: SN expected to provide an update on the potential impacts on 26 February.
Carried Forward.

0102: Xoserve to provide a timeline and timing of file runs.

Update: See item 2.0, additional scenarios to be provided. **Carried Forward.**

0103: Xoserve to consider the extension of the D+10 read window.

Update: AS explained that a functional change within UK Link could cater for a change in the read window. He explained a couple of options; D-5 to D+8 or D-2 to D+8 and moving D+10 to D+13. The Workgroup considered the possibility that a transfer could still be objected to at D-5. The new functionality was considered a relatively minor change and could be delivered within the year. AW enquired about the feasibility of leaving the D-5 in place and extending this window to D+8. RCH wished to understand the risks of extending

to window to D+8 and whether this would meet Shipper requirements without incurring undue risks. The Workgroup considered point of sale readings and how the process timeline could work. GW was keen to understand the justification for changing the read window and agreed to meet with parties' offline. **Carried Forward.**

0104: Xoserve to consider the impacts of the iGT CSEP Gemini updates.

Update: SN explained that the iGT LMN updates were undertaken once a week. This updates the number of supply points for each CSEP and the AQ values. He explained the inherent delays and misalignment of data due to weekly updates when compared to daily. Xoserve believed the interim solution would be to obtain updates every two days.

Complete.

0105: Xoserve to consider the 2 business day processing.

Update: AS explained that Xoserve typically process files within 20 minutes of receipt. However, Xoserve will need to look at the current SLAs and contingency arrangements where 2 business days may be required for system outages. He confirmed Xoserve are looking into the possibility of starting file runs at midnight on D-3 and responding before 6am on D-2, this would allow a two day notice period. **Carried Forward.**

0106: Shippers to consider Shipper system implications.

Update: MC and GW explained there was an ongoing requirement for Shippers to consider system changes to accommodate modifications. LL was not able to provide feedback at this current stage. SN was keen to establish the business requirements and avoid last minutes changes to ensure the system changes can be managed. CW asked about building the system for D-2 confirmation and future proofing for further initiatives in light of Smart Meters. SN reassured that NEXUS would have a much more flexibility and parameterisation than the current UK Link. AJ expressed it would be difficult to understand if the solution would work for SSE without first understanding the full extent of system impacts, business rules and legal drafting. It was recognised that the business rules were imperative for a decision to be made on the read windows. **Complete.**

0107: Shippers to consider commercial contract implications.

Update: Consideration deferred. **Carried Forward.**

2.0 Business Rules

GW was keen to understand the read window timelines to drive any required changes to the modification and allow the business rules to be drafted. SN provided a timeline of the registration process with a two-day confirmation window and how Xoserve anticipated the process working. The timeline illustrated the cooling off period, the confirmation window and the file notifications.

GW enquired what the minimum period was for the Supplier Start Date (SSD). The Workgroup considered the process; from the point of submission; the period for objections and the flexing objection window. The Workgroup also considered the 14-day cooling off period. It was recognised that when the cooling off period finished after the objection window the file transfer could not be retracted. SN explained, Shippers need to provide Xoserve 3 clear days after the cooling off period. If this is not provided the transfer cannot be stopped. GW explained that at the moment British Gas do not start the transfer process until after the 14-day cooling of period. However, the transfer process could started whilst in the cooling off period.

GW asked about the early issuing of TRF files. AS explained this would require Xoserve unpicking the entire supply point process, however a new file could be allowed to flow for the early provision of the required data.

RCH asked Xoserve to provide an explanation of the assumptions to accompany the process timeline.

AJ believed that the objection/withdrawal process overlapped the proposed transfer process where the Shipper/Supplier can withdraw an objection. She explained if there was an objection Shippers/Suppliers would need to wait for the possibility of an objection withdrawal at D-2. CW referred to UNC TPD G.2.8.5 and G2.8.6. It was recognised that Xoserve do not currently have to notify that a confirmation has lapsed and this may not be notified until 2 days before the actual transfer. In essence the Shipper could be in a position where they think the transfer will not take place, to later discover that it will go through only allowing them 2 days notice to react.

GW asked about the number of confirmations, objections and failed confirmations. SN believed there was between 1,000 and 2,500 lapsed confirmations per month. However this equated to around 0.5% to 1% of confirmations.

It was recognised that the consequence of the shortened transfer window could be that some erroneous transfers may occur and these would have to be unpicked through the TRF process. The Workgroup asked Xoserve to provide a high level indication of the cost impacts of unpicking the transfer.

CW suggested looking at the current legal text and timelines and how the process could be altered. AW enquired about the minimum time for the transfer and whether this would keep the flexible objection. GW believed that the drive was to keep system changes to a minimum and keeping the flexible window would require less system changes rather than reverting back to a fixed objection window. Xoserve agreed to update the process to illustrate the flexible objection window (i.e. the submission date +15 and submission date +20). Xoserve agreed to map scenarios to consider the worse case scenario and everyday scenarios for the next meeting 26 Feb.

The Workgroup reviewed UNC TPD Section G and the sections that would need amending. The days quoted i.e., not more than 30 business days, not less than 20 were considered within G2.5.8 and whether the maximum quoted days should be reduced down or left as they are.

The Workgroup considered sites that had already been withdrawn which could transfer in 3 instead of 8 days and a change in site usage. It was agreed that unique sites and shared supply points would be excluded from the scope for the modification and this would be clarified in an amended version. MC suggested consideration is also give to the auto registration process.

AJ asked about the scenario where the cooling off period ends on the Thursday before Good Friday and wanting the process to start on the Saturday, i.e. submitting a file and allowing the system to date stamp the submission and for the process to start from this date stamp rather than the next business day.

The Workgroup reconsidered the 2 day business processing and that the text may need to reflect that Xoserve need to utilise the 2 business days processing window. SN asked for support from the Transporters in how the legal text could be amended to reflect processing would be as early as possible within the window but may on exception need a 2 day processing window for system outages or to accommodate processes during the AQ review.

The Workgroup considered the use of the objection window, the confirmation lapsing and the lapse notifications sent to Shipper where the objection window has completed. The Workgroup considered whether it would be worth cancelling the confirmation when an objection is made late in the process as the window would close before the objection could be resolved. This would require engagement with the customer to restart the process. The Workgroup was mindful there was a modification considering the number of confirmation attempts nevertheless it would be better to restart the process where the process lapses.

SN wanted to understand the expectation of what models/scenarios would be required for the next meeting. The Workgroup believed the timeline needed to be mapped to the legal text and likely scenarios explored. Xoserve agreed to map the legal text to drive the business rules, plus the best and worse case scenarios (D+15 and D+30).

The Workgroup considered the political pressure to move this change forward as soon as possible, ideally with implementation by October this year. To do this Xoserve would need the requirements by end of March. AW was mindful of the complex changes required and the need for a speedy implementation.

It was recognised that to achieve the tight timeline the draft legal text, business rules and high level cost estimate would be required for consideration on 26 February to allow the Workgroup Report to be completed by 06 March 2014.

The Workgroup also considered the ability for Xoserve to manage changes required with inflight modifications and the prioritisation for changes.

AS provided a scenario day count. The Workgroup discussed the timeline taking into account the cooling off period. When the cooling off period ends the transfer process can begin. In the worse case scenario when there are three weekends and four bank holidays, if the transfer is commenced after the cooling off period, this would allow a 4 business day objection window and completion of the transfer within 16 calendar days. If the process was started before the cooling off period the objection window could increase to 7 days.

GW agreed to work with Xoserve to illustrate additional scenarios.

3.0 Workgroup Report

Consideration deferred until 26 February.

4.0 Any Other Business

None.

5.0 Diary Planning

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

The next meetings will take place within the Distribution Workgroup on:

Wednesday 26 February 2014, at 10:30, Consort House, 6 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3QQ

Thursday 06 March 2014 at 10:30, Solihull

Action Table

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
0101	23/01/14	2.0	Xoserve to provide an assessment of potential system impacts.	Xoserve (SN)	Carried Forward
0102	23/01/14	2.0	Xoserve to provide a timeline and timing of file runs.	Xoserve (SN)	Carried Forward
0103	23/01/14	2.0	Xoserve to consider the extension of the D+10 read window.	Xoserve (SN)	Carried Forward

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
0104	23/01/14	2.0	Xoserve to consider the impacts of the iGT CSEP Gemini updates.	Xoserve (SN)	Complete
0105	23/01/14	2.0	Xoserve to consider the 2 business day processing.	Xoserve (SN)	Carried Forward
0106	23/01/14	2.0	Shippers to consider Shipper system implications.	All Shippers	Complete
0107	23/01/14	2.0	Shippers to consider commercial contract implications.	All Shippers	Carried Forward