

**UNC Workgroup 0526 Minutes**  
**Identification of Supply Meter Point pressure tier**  
**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
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
Tom Chevalier*	(TC)	AMO

\* via teleconference

Copies of all papers are available at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0526/260215>

The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel on 20 August 2015.

**1.0 Outline of Modification**

In providing an onscreen review and summary of the modification, CB explained that the modification seeks to improve communication of the gas service pressure tier information from the Gas Transporter to the Shipper/Supplier/MAM.

**2.0 Initial Discussion**

During discussions, parties debated whether or not it would be preferable to raise a SPAA change rather than a UNC modification to address these matters, as the real benefits appear to be for the MAMs working on behalf of Suppliers. In acknowledging that this was a possibility, CB advised that she had not thought of that option, as she initially believed it to be a Supply Point Register related matter.

DA advised that Xoserve had also looked at who might utilise the data, with MAMs and Suppliers certainly involved. Furthermore, he believes that any solution would include UK Link system implications. He suggested that perhaps the question could be put to Suppliers as to where they see the true benefits.

TC pointed out that the benefits are identified within the modification and felt that regardless of whether it is an SPAA change or UNC modification, the information needs to be captured within the core system in order to feed into the Data Centre.

CW advised that whilst the data enquiry provision resides in SPAA, he is not 100% certain on the Code aspects. CB accepted that it might be better to pursue the matter through the

SPAA change route whilst DM suggested engaging with the MAMs might prove beneficial in understanding in which camp the matter better sits – engaging with more MAMs was acknowledged as potentially beneficial by TC.

When asked, CB confirmed that the modification did envisage that the pressure tier information would reside within the Sites & Meters database. She then pointed out that discussion with Xoserve, suggests progression of a quick interim solution, followed later by a more enduring (post Project Nexus world) solution.

DA suggested that the key issue relates to who wants the information and who would actually utilise it. He also pointed out that recent Panel discussions had looked at potential information sensitivity concerns along with the possible 'customer cherry picking' worries. However, he does not believe that the latter concern is a real issue. In accepting that the question around which is the best forum in which to develop a solution remains uncertain at this time, DA felt that if the information is to be provided simply for the MAMs to utilise, then a report based solution might suffice. However, if it is envisaged that Shippers/Suppliers also wish to utilise the information, then there are potential UK Link information flow related impacts, and as a consequence it could/would fall under the auspices of a Code change.

TC suggested that there should not be a 'battle ground' about which is the preferred fora in which to develop a solution, as the important bit is actually identifying potential solutions and associated costs – this would then assist parties in considering the best forum in which to progress matters. DA reminded those present that the pressure at a site does not always provide a robust indication of the size of that site, so mitigating any potential customer conflicts of interest.

TC went on to suggest that the MAM appointment cycle also needs considering and should be part of any proposed solution. In considering previous (customer) issues relating to the incorrect regulator/meter installations, RP pointed out that sending an appropriately trained party to site would have mitigated the risk of a repeat issue in future. Furthermore, he believes that any information should be provided on a 'reasonable endeavours' basis.

BF advised that it has been suggested elsewhere, that this matter would be better served being discussed outside the Distribution Workgroup arena – one suggestion being through the MAMCoP. At this point TC advised that in previous discussions, MAMCoP had been broadly supportive of the proposal.

DA suggested that setting out the potential solutions feels a relatively easy exercise and Xoserve could look to set up some offline discussions with CB/TC (and possibly some other MAMs), with the aim being to provide feedback at a future meeting.

CW suggested that in his view, if the MAMs are potentially benefiting from these proposals, then they should pay for the service provision, and not Transporters who have little or no benefit associated with these changes. CB on the other hand, believed that automating the GT1 process could potentially introduce efficiency gains.

BF pointed out that the Transporters would also need to consider how they would provide the information which would involve some assumptions around the desktop, and potentially site visits being made, to identify the pressure at the emergency control valve. In short he sees the modification process aspects as relatively simple, it boils down to how Transporters would facilitate requirements that needs careful consideration.

BF advised that he has had some initial discussions with the iGT Panel Chair regarding the possible establishment of a joint Workgroup. The iGTs do not believe that there is any real benefit in setting up such a Workgroup, on the grounds that only the interim solution requires consideration by an iGT workgroup, and any enduring solution would require amendment to the IGTAD which would be a UNC matter.

**New Action 0526 0201: Xoserve (DA) to look to provide clarity around possible solutions and a high level view on potential costs (i.e. set out requirements and define possible solutions).**

## **2.1. Initial Representations**

There were no initial representations to consider.

**2.2. Issues and Questions from Panel**

In noting that there were no specific questions posed by the February Panel members for the Workgroup to consider.

**3.0 Next Steps**

During a brief discussion, it was agreed that consideration by the 0526 Workgroup should not be added to the 26 March 2015 Distribution Workgroup agenda, but should instead be highlighted as a 'AOB update'.

**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 possible solution options and appropriate forum for progression.

**Action Table**

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
0526 0201	26/02/2015	2.0	To look to provide clarity around possible solutions and a high level view on potential costs (i.e. set out requirements and define possible solutions).	Xoserve (DA)	<b>Pending</b>