

UNC Workgroup 0518S Minutes
Shipper Verification of meter and address details following
system meter removals
Thursday 26 March 2015
at 31 Homer Road, Solihull, B91 3LT

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Mike Berrisford (Secretary)	(MB)	Joint Office
Alex Ross-Shaw	(ARS)	Northern Gas Networks
Dave Addison	(DA)	Xoserve
David Mitchell	(DM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Gareth Davies	(GD)	National Grid NTS
Hilary Chapman	(HC)	Xoserve
Karen Visgarda	(KV)	Joint Office
Kirandeep Samra	(KS)	Npower
Kirsten Elliott-Smith	(KES)	Cornwall Energy
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	DONG Energy
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE
Mark Lyndon	(ML)	National Grid NTS
Steve Mulinganie*	(SM)	Gazprom

* via teleconference

Copies of all papers are available at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0518/260315>

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

1. 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. Workgroup Discussion

2.1 Amended Modification

During an onscreen review of the amended modification, DM focused attention on the recent changes.

Section 3 – Solution

In considering the changes to Business Rule 5, HC advised that this is consistent with the Single Service Provisions.

Moving on to consider the changes made to the User Pays table text, DM advised that the latest changes now better reflect the previous Unique Sites discussions undertaken at the previous meeting.

When asked, HC pointed out that costs would be apportioned based on an annual snapshot undertaken circa April each year and confirmed that the apportionment of the User Pays costs is commensurate with the standard process.

2.2 Consideration of Legal Text

During consideration of the draft Workgroup Report under item 2.3 below, DM provided a brief overview of the legal text commentary. DA advised that he anticipates that the legal text would be changing in accordance with previous Workgroup discussions.

BF pointed out that presently, the UNC Panel had not formally requested provision of legal text, although this would not prevent the Workgroup Report progressing as Suggested Text had been provided.

2.3 Completion of Workgroup Report

Opening the onscreen review of the draft Workgroup Report (WGR) (v0.2 dated 24 March 2015), BF advised that the document had been amended to reflect the latest changes to the modification.

A summary of the discussions on the WGR are captured, as follows:

About this document – proposed Workgroup timetable

DM explained that he intends to provide a further amended modification (in line with this meetings discussions) to the Joint Office by close of play on Friday 27 March 2015. He suggested that if anyone was unhappy with the amendments to the modification they could always request the withholding of the release of the WGR until such a time as further discussions have taken place.¹

Section 3 – Solution

In considering the use of the term 'notification' in the final sentence for Business Rule 3, DA pointed out previous industry debates around 'effective' and 'notification' date discrepancies. As this is a non material change, DA suggested changing this to read as the 'effective' date, as in essence it is simply related to the effective date of the notification and also relates to the running off of the GSR Report – it is the 'effective' date that drives its inclusion on the GSR Report.

DA went on to point out that this proposed change is already reflected within the legal text anyway, and simply serves to better align BR3 to the legal text as drafted and there are no ulterior motives involved in suggesting the change. The change was agreed and made onscreen.

When asked, DA confirmed that as far as the User Pays table text was concerned, the provision of the monthly report is consistent with BR1.

Section 4 – Relevant Objectives

In referring to the current statement sitting below the table, BF questioned whether or not this is correct. Responding DA and DM both confirmed that in essence this modification seeks to prompt parties to double check their site confirmation status. In short it triggers the incoming Supplier to undertake (several) possible actions (i.e. part of the Change of Supplier (CoS) and accuracy of data problem). DA went on to suggest that it is almost acting as a pre-notification trigger for GSR requirements, as it potentially reduces costs as it avoids incurring an unnecessary Engineers site visit (for GSR purposes). It also reduces the unnecessary complications around the CoS process. The changes were agreed and made onscreen.

¹ Post Meeting note: An amended modification was provided after the meeting and the WGR was published as no additional comments were made.

Section 5 – Implementation

During a brief discussion where HC believed that it had been previously agreed that the implementation date would be subject to Transporter approval, BF made some onscreen changes to the text to add clarity.

In considering whether or not any notification (post Project Nexus go-live) should go through the UNCC to allow industry parties to challenge and to also ensure suitable notification mechanisms are adopted, DA suggested that as this is fundamentally a central system UK Link change, it would normally follow the UK Link Class 2 process and therefore invoke a 6 month notification period. He went on to suggest that alternatively it could be aligned to a user process change, which would then only invoke a 4 month notification period. However, DA did acknowledge that under UNC Modification 0479 'Inclusion of email as a valid UNC communication' proposals, any governance would have to be via the UNCC route.

It was noted that should the Project Nexus go-live date slip, the modification implementation date would need to be amended as this modification is expected to go live at the same time as project Nexus.

Section 6 – Impacts

BF amended the statements onscreen.

Section 8 – Recommendation

When asked, those present indicated that they were happy for the Workgroup Report to be submitted to the April UNC Panel, subject to no adverse comments being received on the soon to amended modification. Furthermore, there were no specific questions for the Panel to consider asking for responses to.

3. Next Steps

None.

4. Any Other Business

None.

5. Diary Planning

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

At this time there are no further Workgroup meeting planned.