

**UNC Workgroup 0518S Minutes**  
**Shipper Verification of meter and address details following system**  
**meter removals**  
**Thursday 26 February 2015**  
**at ENA, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF**

**Attendees**

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Mike Berrisford (Secretary)	(MB)	Joint Office
Alex Ross-Shaw*	(ARS)	Northern Gas Networks
Andy Clasper	(AC)	National Grid Distribution
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Colette Baldwin	(CB)	E.ON UK
Dave Addison	(DA)	Xoserve
David Mitchell	(DM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Gareth Evans	(GE)	WatersWye
Hilary Chapman	(HCh)	Xoserve
Kirandeep Samra*	(KS)	Npower
Kirsten Elliott-Smith	(KES)	Cornwall Energy
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	DONG Energy
Martin Connor	(MC)	National Grid NTS
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE
Richard Pomroy*	(RP)	Wales & West Utilities
Rob Johnson	(RJ)	Wingas UK
Steve Mulinganie*	(SM)	Gazprom

\* via teleconference

Copies of all papers are available at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0518/260215>

The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel on 18 June 2015.

**1.0 Review of Minutes and Actions**

**1.1. Minutes**

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

**1.2. Actions**

No outstanding actions to consider.

**2.0 Workgroup Discussion ninety**

DM provided a brief onscreen review of the recent round of amendments made to the modification (v3.0, dated 19 February 2015), explaining that the title had also changed in response to feedback from the Workgroup.

**2.1. End to End Process**

Parties were asked to note that the existing process remains largely unchanged, although it is subtly different to the diagram that formed part of the earlier High Level Cost (HLC) assessment.

The diagram now reflects the updated process in line with Modification 0518S proposals.

## 2.2. Business Rules

DM advised that changes had been made to the business rules to align better with the previous Workgroup feedback.

BR3 – DM explained the rationale behind utilising existing file flows to update the register.

HC explained that when Xoserve runs the GSR report, where a User has updated the register, it would not evoke a GSR visit. Questions were asked around what would happen under various scenarios such as when a party chooses to ignore the request. Responding, DM reminded everyone present that the modification is simply seeking to introduce a new step into the existing process, asking Users if they are sure that the meter asset information is correct – a new process check point only. DM advised that should a User ignore the request and a subsequent site visit identified a meter on site, existing process put in place by Modifications 0424 and 0425 would be followed.

BR4 – CW pointed out that this business rule refers to the ‘normal’ process and as a consequence would not be expected to be included within the legal text per se.

When asked whether or not the provisions are expected to cover all sites (including iGTs), some parties suggested that it does not, as it is in essence simply a ‘for the avoidance of doubt’ statement. HC advised that the MPRN range would potentially highlight any iGT aspects, although further consideration of post Project Nexus GSR proposals is needed. CB suggested that it might be beneficial to consider how easy or costly it would be to isolate iGTs from the reports now, as the issue could rear up again in future. HC felt it would be straight forward to identify iGTs sites by comparing the MPRN range.

DM provided a quick explanation behind the “*For the avoidance of doubt.....*” Statement.

In considering the User Pays table changes, DM confirmed that the statement “*.....excluding CSEPs and Shared Supply Points*” encapsulates all unique sites. During a brief discussion around ‘unique sites’ CW advised that whilst they are included within Code, it is not specifically as unique sites. He indicated that he would look to define these within the legal text in due course. When asked, he indicated that he was unsure of the iGT Code provisions on this matter. BF advised that consideration of the updated business rules would also be needed when preparing legal text.

Focus then moved on to consider the changes to Section 5 – Implementation, with BF reminding everyone that as this is a self-governance modification it should really include the 16 Business Day reference in the text. Some felt that this would not be appropriate as there are very specific system related considerations to take into account when setting an effective implementation date. BF suggested that in that case, care would be needed to identify wording that would allow Panel to make its decision, without necessarily invoking the 16 Business Day rule.

When asked, HC and DM confirmed that it is envisaged that the report(s) would be provided on a monthly basis.

## 2.3. Scale of Issue

Covered under discussion of items 2.1 and 2.2 above.

## 2.4. Customer Interactions

Covered under discussion of items 2.1 and 2.2 above.

## 3.0 Next Steps

When asked, DM confirmed that he would be looking to provide an amended modification in line with discussions in due course, and also provide legal text in time for consideration at the 26 March meeting.

It was also agreed that the Workgroup would focus on development and completion of the Workgroup Report at the March meeting.

**4.0 Any Other Business**

None.

**5.0 Diary Planning**

Further details of planned meetings are available at: [www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Diary](http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Diary)

Workgroup meetings will take place as follows:

Time/Date	Venue	Workgroup Programme
10:30 Thursday 26 March 2015	31 Homer Road, Solihull, B91 3LT	Standard Workgroup agenda plus: Consideration of Legal Text Development/Completion of Workgroup Report