

UNC Workgroup 0520 Minutes Performance Assurance Reporting

Tuesday 13 January 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
Andrew Margan	(AMa)	British Gas
Angela Love	(AL)	ScottishPower
Carl Whitehouse*	(CWh)	first:utility
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Edward Hunter	(EH)	npower
Emma Lyndon	(EL)	Xoserve
Erika Melen	(EM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Jon Dixon	(JD)	Ofgem
Jonathan Kiddle	(JK)	EDF Energy
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	DONG Energy
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE
Matt Jackson	(MJa)	British Gas
Rachel Hinsley	(RH)	Xoserve
Sean McGoldrick	(SMc)	National Grid NTS

* via teleconference

Copies of all papers are available at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0520/130115>

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

1.0 Outline of Modification

AM introduced the modification and explained the background to it. In short this modification seeks to address the last of three broad Performance Assurance Framework areas, namely low level reporting (post Project Nexus go live). In order to achieve this the modification aims to put in place obligations to ensure that Transporters provide the information.

During a brief onscreen review of the modification, AM explained that it is intended that the Guidance Document would reside outside of the UNC and that reporting is not expected to start on Project Nexus go live date, but would rather follow on at a suitable time following transition from current systems to new systems to ensure processes were bedded down. He remarked that his previous Modification 0469S 'Transporter Gas Safety Visit Reporting' also excluded a specific reporting date.

AL suggested that the Workgroup would also need to consider how any rolling reporting aspects would be expected to work. AM pointed out that whilst Modification 0483 is expected to report on the Performance Assurance incentive aspects, 0520 would focus more on the low-level information provision.

When asked whether or not Xoserve would be able to retrospectively compile information and report on a monthly basis and what reporting 'triggers' might be employed, EL explained that Xoserve are currently considering what reporting provisions are required,

but their initial thoughts are that as soon as the information is provided the reports could be generated. It is unclear at this time whether or not the Data Warehouse would address some of the issues surrounding reporting requirements in future.

SMc advised those present that National Grid NTS do not believe that there is a need for a reporting requirement to be placed upon them, and especially any Code related obligation – as a result, unless deemed necessary, National Grid NTS expects to be excluded from Modifications 0483 and 0520 reporting requirements. In accepting that there has been a degree of uncertainty involved, AM suggested that the forthcoming Engage report might provide some additional clarity.

Moving on, SMc suggested that FGO delivery 2016 would/could potentially impact upon the development of the modification. AM confirmed that any reference to ‘Transporters’ within the modification could mean ‘Transporters Agent’ and believes that as the modification is developed, the question of how information is provided and by whom will be clarified. Whilst he could try to second guess the future, he would need to develop the modification based on who the parties are now.

SMc also pointed out that the Workgroup would need to take into account Xoserve’s possible future industry role and the impacts from not only FGO but the central data service provisions going forward (i.e. any obligations would move to Shippers), as Shippers would have direct control over Xoserve in the future – AM accepted that there are areas relating to obligations that need to be flushed out in due course.

Some parties wondered why this modification is needed in the first place, to which CW responded by explaining that it is needed to carve out Section V5 confidentiality aspects, plus naming of Code parties is a significant departure from the Modification 0509 provisions. AM advised that as he sits on the Green Deal Panel he has observed their different processes for reporting and naming and shaming approach and seen at first hand how this has improved industry performance.

When asked if there could be a potential issues relating to the publication of non anomalous reports (i.e. should the naming and shaming information provision be restricted to UNCC etc.), AM indicated that he does not perceive there to be a problem, but would be happy for the Workgroup to consider further and suggested that one option might be that the Performance Assurance reporting is ‘restricted’ to industry parties only.

In briefly considering the draft PAW Report spreadsheet, AM advised that this is based on ScottishPower’s guidelines.

AM went on to suggest that should the modification be implemented, any additional reporting requirements would/could be via UNCC approval of the guidance document changes which should avoid the need to raise a UNC modification. AL enquired whether there could/would be any potential UNCC workload issues – the consensus at this time being no. AL then suggested that there may be a need for some form of appeals mechanism, especially around the release of commercially sensitive information provisions to which AM suggested that perhaps something along the lines of the UNC modifications consultation process might prove beneficial. BF advised that some sub-committees (i.e. DESC etc.) already have a consultation facility/mechanism.

AM suggested that consideration of some form of rules around protecting the voting aspects of the Performance Assurance (sub) Committee (i.e. similar to the AUG) might also be needed.

BF briefly explained that the UNCC has no clearly defined set of rules (i.e. Code gives them the authority, but how it discharges its responsibilities in practise is not always 100% clear and procedures should be developed) – AM explained that he is looking for the UNCC to have a ‘check role’ that follows on after Performance Assurance Committee involvement. AL voiced her concerns relating to parties having a vote without potentially

being commercially involved in the regime – she believes that Modification 0506 addresses this matter better.

BF advised that he thinks the Performance Assurance Committee could be set up as a group of ‘experts’ (similar to the AUGE process) and the UNCC only becomes involved should a particular matter get escalated up the line to them for consideration.

Closing, AM indicated that he would consider the points identified during the discussion, especially how the UNCC and Performance Assurance (sub) Committee interface would/could work. He also pointed out that whilst the modification is currently written to identify reports within the guidance document, he would now also consider how any additional reports would be managed going forwards.

2.0 Initial Discussion

2.1. Initial Representations

None.

2.2. Issues and Questions from Panel

None.

3.0 Next Steps

AM to provide an update on how best to develop the modification at the 04 February 2015 meeting.

4.0 Any Other Business

None.

5.0 Diary Planning

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

Workgroup meetings will take place as follows:

Time/Date	Venue	Workgroup Programme
10:30 24 February 2015	Energy Networks Association (Room 4)	Consideration of Workgroups 0483 and 0520.

Action Table

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update