

UNC Workgroup 0565 Minutes
Central Data Service Provider: General framework and obligations
Wednesday 18 May 2016
Elexon, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Lorna Dupont (Secretary)	(LD)	Joint Office
Andrew Margan	(AM)	British Gas
Andy Miller	(AMi)	Xoserve
Azeem Khan	(AK)	RWE npower
Charles Ruffell	(CR)	RWE
Charles Wood	(CWo)	Dentons
Chris Warner	(CWa)	National Grid Distribution
Colette Baldwin	(CB)	E.ON
Colin Blair*	(CBI)	ScottishPower
David Mitchell	(DM)	Scotia gas Networks
David Tennant	(DT)	Dentons
Gareth Evans	(GE)	Waters Wye Associates
Gavin Anderson	(GA)	EDF Energy
Gethyn Howard	(GH)	Brookfield Utilities
Michael Walls	(MW)	ESP Pipelines
Neil Copeland	(NC)	Ofgem
Richard Pomroy	(RP)	Wales & West Utilities
Sean McGoldrick	(SMc)	National Grid NTS
Sue Hilbourne*	(SH)	Scotia Gas Networks

**via teleconference*

Copies of all papers are available at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0565/180516>

The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 20 October 2016.

1.0 Introduction and Status Review**1.1. Approval of Minutes (04 May 2016)**

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

2.0 Timeline/Workplan Update

The Workgroup reviewed the draft Workplan provided by CWa. The tables identified the different topics comprised in the UNC Change and DSC Development work streams and the timetable for discussing the different topics (including related position papers, legal drafting and meeting dates).

CWa explained this was a 'first draft'; the work plan was based on a fortnightly cycle of meetings (to be held in Solihull and London), alternating between the two workstreams, and should give participants a good idea of what elements to expect and when, to enable opportunities for review and comment in advance. It was anticipated that discussion on

individual topics will be based around a position paper where currently there is no consensus on the approach to be taken, which will be developed into legal drafting once position and approach to the required UNC changes or DSC content has been agreed by Workgroup 0565; and in other cases the discussion can be based on legal drafting (i.e. changes to specific sections of the UNC). The aim is to circulate the relevant discussion paper or legal text drafting at least 5 business days before the meeting (earlier if possible).

SMc commented that KPMG needed to be encouraged to provide papers earlier than currently was the case.

GH observed that the iGTs cannot start any real drafting for their code until the output from these FGO meetings is received and understood. It was possible to raise the IGT modifications in the meantime but any development would be on hold until there was a clearer position on the iGT requirements; it would be appreciated if this were reached as soon as possible.

CWa believed this proposed Workplan covered all impacts from a UNC perspective. Work on the DSC elements would be led by Xoserve (contract development), but the FGO Workgroup will expect to have to cover some elements. BF asked when the combined Workplan, which includes Charging, would be presented to ensure the approach is consistent.

GH asked if there existed a 'whole project on a page' document that could provide a holistic view of interdependencies etc; CB believed there was one provided to the Programme Overview Board (POB) - this might be used as a comparison as KPMG had been involved in the shaping of that.

It was noted that the main legal review was to take place on 25 July 2016 (Dentons, London). This was discussed. CWo reiterated that the focus of that meeting would be on whether the words were 'fit for purpose' and properly reflected what was trying to be achieved, i.e. had the intent of the principle documents been correctly translated into the legal text, and could be confirmed as appropriate. It was expected that all other major discussions and agreements would have taken place in advance of this to assess the requirements/approaches required.

Action 0565/0503: Draft Workplan/timeline - All to review plan and provide comments (omissions, focus, etc) to CWa as soon as possible, to enable early refocusing of workplan/timeline (if necessary).

3.0 DSC Contract Update

AMi reported that all was progressing well; more detailed information (e.g. populated service lines, etc) will be available for the next meeting (01 June 2016). CWo added that papers on liabilities and data are anticipated for the meeting on 01 June 2016. Recognising that some parties may wish to bring their lawyers to the meeting, AMi will aim to issue the documents as early as possible.

4.0 Outline of New Section GTB7 (third draft with iGT provisions)

CWo explained that this paper was a third draft of the new UNC provisions that will govern the DSC and CDSP services. The new provision is intended to be located in the General Terms (GT) document in the UNC, and will replace the existing TPD Section V6.5 (which will be deleted). It addresses the enduring position from April 2017 (and not the transition to that). CWo then briefly outlined the assumptions and factors on which the draft had been based, and explained the various changes made.

Review of certain changes led to questions and further discussion.

7.1.2(d) - AMa referred to the Licence, observing it was not clear what is meant by 'CDSP Services'; was the Workgroup comfortable with defining that in this forum or should it be referred back to Ofgem? Noting this point, CWo indicated a check would be made on

regarding that used in the Licence and any definition and, if necessary, will reconsider what term should be used in the UNC.

7.4.5 - AMa commented it was not clear on what grounds an appeal could be raised, and where that detail might sit. CWo believed there would be a clear procedure and it would be left to Ofgem to decide, based on what was put in the Licence. The Licence cannot be interpreted through the UNC or the DSC. Parties need to comment to Ofgem on the Licence conditions, if they feel this is of concern.

NC referred to an iteration of the Licences that referred to budget being appealed ('fit for purpose'); AMa suggested that perhaps Ofgem needed to clarify this term. CWo observed that the Licence says an appeal process/timeline is required. If a party raises an appeal it should set out the grounds for so doing and the CDSP should be able to respond. It needs to be clarified what happens once a decision has been made, i.e. depending on the outcome (upheld or rejected), and something needs to be written to address this at the back end of an appeal process.

NC advised that Shippers should take a view on what their interpretation(s) would be and include this in their consultation responses.

7.5.4 - SMC asked if European requirements should be included here, and how these might be considered/prioritised. CWo noted this for further consideration.

7.7.3 and 7.7.6 - AMa was concerned that this was overriding UNC Modification Panel's powers regarding recommendations and decisions. AMi believed it only affected the DSC terms and conditions, not other aspects of UNC. AMa observed that CDSP having a 'veto' did not feel right. CWo agreed that further thought should be given to the role of the CDSP in any decision-making, and what limits are imposed on various powers. CWo noted this for further consideration.

7.8.3(b) - CWo pointed out that the Licence includes this phrase 'or otherwise procure' and it is not sure what is meant by it. Various procurement scenarios were discussed; AMa had greater concern regarding the use of 'otherwise'. It was agreed further clarity was required; CWo noted this for further consideration.

Reaching this point in the review of the document, CWo indicated that once the Service documents have been developed these later sections of GTB7 could be revisited with a better understanding. CWo also commented that it might be that certain sections of UNC TPD U will need to move in the 'new world' and apply to iGTAD, and that a GT Section D might be required to cover the CDSP and the DSC.

5.0 DSC Governance (updated paper)

CWo introduced a paper that set out for discussion an expanded version of the 'committee approach' to the DSC governing body, and a proposal for CDSP service changes associated with Code Modifications. It was noted that the Committee would technically be a Sub-committee of the UNC Committee, but with largely distinct governance. It may need to be considered in parallel with the UK Link (UKLC) and Uniform Network Code (UNCC) Committees, and then be refined into one committee to cover the future requirements.

CWa added that there may be alternatives to this approach, and these would be welcomed.

Certain points regarding role, constitution, and appeal generated a number of concerns that surfaced in deeper discussion.

2.3 - SMC remarked that in not defining what the extra process is, the circle was not seen to be completed, and suggested defining a bespoke route and a prevalent route. CWo responded these differences should become clearer as Services details develop, e.g. where there are certain elements of confidentiality to be maintained in respect of certain services. Visibility regarding the application of bespoke rules will be important.

Responding to questions, CWo observed that a customer representative body was needed to make the decisions around the DSC; the processes need to be in the DSC, the creation of the governing body needs to be in the UNC. Were the two groups required - are they involving different skill sets and audiences? CB and GA believed a better understanding of the Terms of Reference of each was required to determine whether one or two groups were needed. SMc explained that the two groups had different purposes (Contract = operational, and Change = evolutionary), and described the differences in more detail. They could be run on the same day, or consecutive days.

There were concerns as to how this might fit with the current UKLC/UNCC – as there may be three forums relating to change? CWo sees the UKLC/UNCC disappearing, with its current role passing to one of the other forums (Change Management group). SMc believed that the Contract and Change groups should be treated separately as they will be focusing on different areas.

3.2 - CWa indicated there were no pre-conceived ideas as to who might chair the committee. The Joint Office (JO) currently chairs all UNC Sub-committees, and this could be the same for consistency, but it could also be the CDSP. SMc was concerned that CDSP had a vote, feeling that to be inappropriate; CWa and CWo agreed and this will be removed.

3.4 – The number of committee posts was of concern as there were fewer proposed than Panel/UNCC (5/6 Shippers) and UKLC (9 Shippers), and other suggestions were made. At this stage, it was not clear if Trader Users needed to be involved, and this had yet to be confirmed. BF explained that the JO would run an election process under the current rules inherited from the Gas Forum. Constituencies (and their compositions) need to be defined. This was discussed. It was asked if Ofgem had any views on inclusion/breadth. NC reiterated that there was a strong view that Shippers should be engaging in this process, and that any contrary views should be identified earlier on in this process, rather than appearing unexpectedly in the consultation phase. Work was being done to try and increase stakeholder engagement.

SH indicated that she would like to see a more inclusive approach adopted. SMc cautioned that the balance of representation needed to be closely considered, and reflect the levels of investment in the various services and systems operated by Xoserve. CWa indicated he was open to re-balancing.

Decision-making was discussed and various scenarios put forward. A governing body should be in place to instruct the development of change ahead of a code modification being approved. There were concerns that this body would be expending money on behalf of others, and that some might deem that to be unnecessary, and not all parties might be happy to acquiesce. There may be scenarios where the DSC has to be able to initiate in advance and this may need consultation. BF explained what happened currently where analysis is considered to be required prior to a modification being approved; it may be required in order to form a holistically view, and without which no decision can be made.

SMc suggested that perhaps there was a role for Ofgem to agree there is a need for something to be done at an earlier point; the industry would want to avoid holding up necessary change because of fears of exceeding a budget. AMi explained that Xoserve only has to notify Ofgem that its charges have increased, and that Xoserve had often had to address/develop change earlier to get ahead of the game; examples were given of how these instances were agreed/funded. From a practical perspective there has to be recognition that systems changes have to be developed/funded and often undertaken weeks/months ahead of any potential implementation of a modification on 'a just in case' basis.

Other concerns centred on the levels of risk of poorly developed solutions and the precipitant investments that these might incur, potentially unnecessarily. It was reiterated that not all modifications are approved and implemented at the end of the day (development of all solutions is speculative until the modification is approved), but Xoserve must assume and

prudently plan for potential implementation, and it needs to be formally instructed by an agreed party to undertake a 'speculative' solution.

NC observed that Ofgem did not see itself as arbiter or assuming this role.

4.3 - AMa believed that exclusive voting might be controversial. SMc explained the context and scenario in which this might be applied/limited, e.g. controlled implementation of the Gemini system by National Grid NTS. GE raised concerns regarding the perceived 'exclusive use/priority booking' of Xoserve resources to fulfil the described changes, to the apparent detriment/prevention of other changes, noting that this would be outside of other parties' control. CWo believed these to be prioritisation issues that could be assessed and agreed, and noted the points raised for further consideration as to how certain scenarios may impact more widely (the exclusive consumption of finite/expert resources at certain times). GH added concerns that parties who were not exposed to risks/liable for costs might adversely influence proceedings and whose actions may impose consequentially unacceptable conditions on others.

SMc clarified that National Grid NTS had dedicated resources that looked after Gemini and any change is actively supported by NTS personnel, in addition there were also Xoserve staff who were ring-fenced to support Gemini; there was no constraint on 'available resources' in the sense referred to by GE. Measures were in place to avoid impact, constraint and involvement in UK Link work. However, it should be recognised for the reasons explained by SMc, that if National Grid NTS was not permitted to continue to maintain total control over Gemini (which was not an Xoserve system), then it was unlikely to continue to accept the whole risk/liabilities.

It was also noted that conversely, National Grid NTS would be happy to be excluded from voting on issues that were not its concern/of no interest, e.g. faster switching, etc.

5 - NC reiterated that Ofgem did not see itself as having the role of arbiter in respect of detailed contract agreements such as DSC. CWo explained why he was of the view that Ofgem could not absolve itself from any role, given that the arrangements were predicated on Licence arrangements. AMa added that there was a general consensus that this role was required of Ofgem, noting that it was likely to be very infrequent in terms of exercise. Potential example scenarios were discussed; in some instances an arbiter would be required. NC noted these views for further consideration.

6 - CWo explained that at some point a body/party needs to raise a Change Order for Xoserve, and that he believes it should be the committee and not, for example, the Proposer or as now a Transporter. There should be some explicit connections/process to make clear how/when that happens. SMc reiterated his previous point regarding the spending of money unnecessarily. CB countered this, pointing out there was a need to evaluate and understand the costs of making a change and that having this information should improve the quality of modifications. CWo noted that controls could be built in at Panel or Workgroup level; in the 'new world' the CDSP would be asked to provide a cost analysis.

Concluding discussions on this area, CWa thanked parties for their contributions to the debate and affirmed that the points and concerns raised would be considered. Other feedback would be welcomed.

CB confirmed that her lawyers were looking at the papers provided and were working up responses. She believed that this model did not adequately address concerns regarding risk and responsibilities, an 'all party' constituency model works better. CWa reiterated he was keen to understand how parties envisage how various solutions might work, bearing in mind whatever is agreed has to be capable of being drafted. CB suggested there was a need to align risk and responsibilities to the appropriate parties and avoid the exercise of adverse influence/dominant position that would disadvantage other parties.

There has to be an acceptable mechanism for achieving a decision. There were commercial considerations because Xoserve has an impact on businesses and will not want to leave it to

others to decide. A committee approach was acceptable for easy, non-contentious decisions, but a different model might be required for what were recognised early on to be more difficult, contentious decisions.

SH pointed out that not all changes would be modification changes, and this should be borne in mind. SMC added that legislative changes (e.g. EU) also need to be considered.

BF suggested it would be useful to have a high level diagram illustrating how the contracts and process interact, and work this up into a process that indicates where/who makes the decision(s) and how these interact/react, i.e. that clearly identifies the responsibilities at each level.

Parties were encouraged to review this approach and consider any viable alternatives. CWO observed it would be helpful if parties' responses could contain any alternative models so that these can be reviewed at the next meeting on 20 June 2016.

Action 0565/0504: DSC Change Management: Committee Composition - Shippers to consider and provide views (on this approach and any potentially viable alternatives) to CWa (well) before 20 June 2016.

Action 0565/0505: NC to establish if Ofgem will accept/perform a role as arbiter.

6.0 UNC TPD Section G (second draft) and DESC feedback on UNC TPD Section H

UNC TPD Section G

DT explained that the proposed changes to UNC TPD Section G are shown against a version of this Section G, which was updated to reflect Modification 0432. Other changes have been made since then and it will need to be revisited and compared against the most up to date version then in force.

Most of the changes had been annotated, and text has been added to reflect the data flows in the 'new world'.

It was anticipated that this section would be reviewed again on 20 June 2016. Parties were encouraged to review the proposed changes and provide any comments as soon as possible to CWa and DT.

UNC TPD Section H

CWa reported that he had explained the proposed changes to TPD Section H to the Demand Estimation Sub-committee (DESC) and had been provided with some useful feedback, which will be addressed within the next iteration of TPD Section H. This will be brought back to this Workgroup for review.

7.0 UNC TPD Section M (second draft)

DT explained the proposed changes to UNC TPD Section M. There were some compensation rules to be considered.

It was anticipated that this section would be reviewed again on 20 June 2016. Parties were encouraged to review the proposed changes and provide any comments as soon as possible to CWa and DT.

8.0 UNC TPD Section U (first draft)

Anything between the CDSP and its customers will be removed from this section and relocated to the DSC. AMa observed that it needs to be understood and be transparent that any removals have been clearly mapped to the DSC, and suggested a log/table could be

provided. CWo believed that the service description should make that very clear, but would consider AMa's suggestion.

SMc pointed out that the GT Licence now refers to the CDSP as "the Provider", and should this term be reflected in the UNC. CWO noted this for consideration.

CWo then explained the proposed changes to UNC TPD Section U, advising that the term 'Non User UK Link User' definition/description was to be addressed with Xoserve.

GH pointed out that the IGT code does not have an explicit Section U; CWo noted this for consideration as to how any requirements can be reflected in the iGT code.

Referring to Section U3 (UK LINK COMMUNICATION), CWo advised there was a need to discuss what communications were still relevant, who were the parties concerned, and how this can then be best reflected. Some may now fit more easily into the UK Link Manual than UNC. AMi confirmed the UK Link Manual was being revised.

Referring to U3.1.1(d) and U3.6, it was questioned if the Active Notification Service (ANS) still existed/was in scope, and if so how did that feature in CDSP services.

Action 0565/0506: UK Link Communications (ANS) - Transporters and Xoserve to clarify if Active Notification Service (ANS) still exists/remains in scope, and if so how does that feature in CDSP services.

CWo explained why certain parts of TPD Section U were no longer relevant and had been removed.

Parties were then encouraged to review this first draft and provide any comments as soon as possible to CWa and CWo.

9.0 UNC TPD - Miscellaneous Sections (second draft)

DT introduced the paper, which set out the proposed changes to UNC TPD Sections B, C, E, F, Q, S, V, and X.

Attention was drawn to TPD V2 and TPD V4. Changes were expected to V2 User Admissions (page 8); some provisions will be removed and the DSC requirements will be set out in V2.1.2(i). Changes were also expected to V4 Voluntary Discontinuance and to Termination (pages 12 and 15); the DSC requirements will be set out in V4.2.2(g) and 4.3.1(h).

Similar changes will be required for the iGTAD Section F Admission and Withdrawal (at F3.2.2(d) and F4.1.1(e)).

No changes were required to the EID.

CWo briefly explained the proposed changes to UNC OAD Sections M and N. In OAD N the DSC requirements will be set out in N4.2.2(e).

10.0 iGT and iGTAD (first draft for iGTAD)

CWo explained the proposed changes to UNC iGTAD Sections A, D, E and F. Changes had been made across each of the sections to reflect the new arrangements and make consistent.

Referring to iGTAD Section F3.2.2(d), AMa queried if it should state 'shall' or 'must'? CWo believed that either was acceptable here.

Parties were encouraged to review the proposed changes and provide any comments as soon as possible to CWa and CWo.

RP then asked should a GT have the right to prevent the formation of a CSEP; should this be reflected in the drafting? DM briefly outlined the process whereby a new Supply Point is set up; the iGT sends in data to Xoserve, which generates a reference number (DN and iGT reference number for the site). An Xoserve reference number is also generated. There are therefore 3 reference numbers? Files are checked for consistency/alignment and then validated.

A number of questions were raised. Does the drafting reflect registration despite inconsistency of data? Is there a 'hidden' data flow? Does it reflect the current world or not (post Modification 0440, but pre FGO)? How would it work in the period October - April?

Registration and data flows were discussed. GH described the iGT process, and had concerns that this appeared to have been discussed without any iGT engagement - this needs to be discussed with all parties, including Xoserve. It was questioned, was this an FGO issue, a Nexus design issue, a post Nexus issue, or what? GH indicated that he would raise awareness internally.

11.0 DSC Transition (first draft)

Introducing the paper, CWo explained that it provided an outline of the transition provisions required in relation to the UNC and the DSC, and noted that separate transition provisions were required for the iGT UNC. The most important aspect was to require parties to sign the DSC. (It assumes that Ofgem's approval of Modification 0565 (including the initial DSC) will be followed by the DSC signature.)

The terms used were defined. The 'DSC Implementation Date' (DSCID) was assumed to be 01 April 2017 (the date when the DSC becomes operative). 'FY Budget' meant the budget for the CDSP under the DSC for the first year, commencing on DSCID (and assumed to be a full year). The 'Modification Date' was the date when the UNC is modified by Modification 0565 (immediately following Ofgem approval of the modification).

CWo observed that consideration needed to be given to what should be done if a party does not sign the DSC; what commercial impacts might there be on others; and what sanctions should there be to address bad debts.

It was questioned what would happen to non Code User Pays contract arrangements and what other changes might be required.

Referring to 2.5, AMa asked how do you reach an endpoint with liability that may stem from historical activities outside a party's control; there were concerns regarding exposure. What happens if there is not to be a clean cutover? CB had concerns regarding potential breaches of data protection, which may flow through to Shippers, and any other potential liabilities.

CWo agreed it was important to consider and address these concerns, and would welcome thoughts on all these aspects prior to a further draft being produced.

12.0 Consideration of Risks/Issues Log

Discussions deferred.

13.0 Review of Actions Outstanding

0402: Xoserve to identify which areas within UNC allow them to use their discretion and if so is this still appropriate.

Update: Reflected in the draftings; action agreed closed. **Closed**

0404: *MRA change management (structure, governance, process)* - AL to provide further detail in relation to the vires, make up and controls etc; the voting arrangements and how changes are agreed and implemented; and establish if the objective of an appeal was to overturn a decision, or to reach a different decision. Also to clarify if it is a 'recommendation' rather than 'approval' of budget, and what happens in respect of disputes/escalation routes.

Update: Completed at previous meeting; action agreed closed. **Closed**

0405: *Options for Code/Non-Code Sub-committee solutions* - All parties to assess the options presented, reflect on the approaches and feedback views on the different models as soon as possible to C Warner.

Update: Completed. **Closed**

0501: DSC summary explanatory document to be produced.

Update: Responsibility for this action was deemed to lie with Xoserve and not National Grid Distribution; amended. **Carried forward**

0502: KMPG draft Workplan to be provided to Ofgem

Update: NC confirmed Ofgem had received this. **Closed**

14.0 Next Steps

It was reiterated that parties should review of the different sections discussed today and submit any comments as soon as possible to CWa, CWo and DT for consideration in any redrafting.

Action 0565/0507: All parties to review the proposed changes and provide any comments as soon as possible to CWa, CWo and DT, prior to the next meeting (20 June 2016) in relation to the following: GTB7; UNC TPD G, M, and U; iGTAD sections; and DSC Transition.

15.0 Any Other Business

None raised.

16.0 Diary Planning

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

Please note the venue of the next FGO meeting - Consort House, 6 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3QQ.

Workgroup meetings will take place as follows:

Time/Date	Venue	Workgroup Programme
10:00, Friday 27 May 2016	Consort House, 6 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3QQ	FGO Workgroup – Charging
10:00, Wednesday 01 June 2016	Consort House, 6 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3QQ	FGO Workgroup - Workgroup 0565 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timeline/Workplan Update • DSC Contract Update • Consideration of Risks/Issues Log
10:00, Monday 13 June 2016	Elexon, 4 th Floor, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW	FGO Workgroup – Charging
10:00, Monday 20 June 2016	Elexon, 4 th Floor, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW	FGO Workgroup - Workgroup 0565 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TPD U (2nd draft) • iGT and iGTAD (2nd draft for iGTAD) • Miscellaneous MR, GT and TD and DSC transition (second draft)
10:00, Thursday 30 June 2016	Consort House, 6 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3QQ	FGO Workgroup – Charging
10:00, Monday 11 July 2016	Elexon, 4 th Floor, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW	FGO Workgroup – Charging
10:00, Wednesday 13 July 2016	Consort House, 6 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3QQ	FGO Workgroup - Workgroup 0565 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GT B7 (1st consolidated) • TPD G and H (1st consolidated) • TPD M (1st consolidated) • TPD U (1st consolidated) • TPD and EID (1st consolidated) • iGT and iGTAD (1st consolidated) • Miscellaneous MR, GT and TD and DSC transition (consolidated) • Consideration of Risks/Issues Log
10:00, Monday 25 July 2016	Dentons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNC Legal Meeting • DSC Contract Update
10:00, Friday 29	Consort House, 6 Homer Road,	FGO Workgroup – Charging

July	Solihull B91 3QQ	
10:00, Wednesday 03 August 2016	Consort House, 6 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3QQ	FGO Workgroup - Workgroup 0565 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GT B7 (2nd consolidated) • TPD G and H (2nd consolidated) • TPD M (2nd consolidated) • TPD U (2nd consolidated) • TPD and EID (2nd consolidated) • iGT and iGTAD (2nd consolidated) • Miscellaneous MR, GT and TD and DSC transition (2nd consolidated) • Consideration of Risks/Issues Log
10:00, Monday 08 August	Elexon, 4 th Floor, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW	FGO Workgroup – Charging
10:00, Monday 22 August 2016	Elexon, 4 th Floor, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW	FGO Workgroup – Charging
10:00, Tuesday 23 August 2016	Elexon, 4 th Floor, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW	FGO Workgroup - Workgroup 0565 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timeline/Workplan Update • DSC Contract Update • Consideration of Risks/Issues Log
10:00, Wednesday 07 September 2016	Consort House, 6 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3QQ	FGO Workgroup - Workgroup 0565 - Development of Workgroup Report
10:00, Wednesday 21 September 2016	Elexon, 4 th Floor, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW	FGO Workgroup - Workgroup 0565 - Development of Workgroup Report
10:00, Wednesday 05 October 2016	Consort House, 6 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3QQ	FGO Workgroup - Workgroup 0565 - Conclusion of Workgroup Report

Workgroup 0565 Actions (as at 18 May 2016)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
0565/0402	06/04/16	4.0	Xoserve to identify which areas within UNC allow them to use their discretion and if so	Xoserve (AMi)	Closed

			is this still appropriate.		
0565/0404	18/04/16	9.1	<i>MRA change management (structure, governance, process)</i> - AL to provide further detail in relation to the vires, make up and controls etc; the voting arrangements and how changes are agreed and implemented; and establish if the objective of an appeal was to overturn a decision, or to reach a different decision. Also to clarify if it is a 'recommendation' rather than 'approval' of budget, and what happens in respect of disputes/escalation routes.	ScottishPower (AL)	Closed
0565/0405	18/04/16	9.8	<i>Options for Code/Non-Code Sub-committee solutions</i> - All parties to assess the options presented, reflect on the approaches and feedback views on the different models as soon as possible to C Warner.	ALL Parties	Closed
0565/0501	04/05/16	3.0	DSC summary explanatory document to be produced.	Xoserve (AMi)	Carried forward
0565/0502	04/05/16	3.0	KMPG draft Workplan to be provided to Ofgem.	National Grid (CWa)	Closed
0565/0503	18/05/16	2.0	<i>Draft Workplan/timeline</i> - All to review plan and provide comments (omissions, focus, etc) to CWa as soon as possible, to enable early refocusing of workplan/timeline (if necessary).	ALL Parties	As soon as possible Pending
0565/0504	18/05/16	5.0	<i>DSC Change Management: Committee Composition</i> - Shippers to consider and provide views (on this approach and any potentially viable alternatives) to CWa (well) before 20 June 2016.	ALL Shippers	As soon as possible prior to meeting on 20 June 2016 Pending
0565/0505	18/05/16	5.0	NC to establish if Ofgem will accept/perform a role as arbiter.	Ofgem (NC)	Pending

0565/0506	18/05/16	8.0	<i>UK Link Communications (ANS)</i> - Transporters and Xoserve to clarify if Active Notification Service (ANS) still exists/remains in scope, and if so how does that feature in CDSP services.	Transporters and Xoserve	Pending
0565/0507	18/05/16		ALL Parties to review the proposed changes and provide any comments as soon as possible to CWa, CWo and DT, prior to the next meeting (20 June 2016), in relation to the following: GTB7; UNC TPD G, M and U; iGTAD sections; and DSC Transition.	ALL Parties	<i>As soon as possible prior to meeting on 20 June 2016</i> Pending