

**Review Group 0131 Minutes**  
**Wednesday 04 April 2007**  
**Holiday Inn Solihull, 61 Homer Road, B91 3QD**

**Attendees**

Julian Majdanski (Chair)	JM	Joint Office of Gas Transporters
Helen Cuin (Secretary)	HC	Joint Office of Gas Transporters
Stefan Leedham (Proposer)	SL	EDF Energy
Alison Jennings	AJ	National Grid Distribution
Brian Durber	BD	E.ON UK
Christian Hill	CH	RWE npower
Joel Martin	JMa	Scotia Gas Networks
Karen Kennedy	KK	Scottish Power
Linda Whitcroft	LW	xoserve
Mark Cockayne	MC	xoserve
Richard Hall	RHa	Ofgem
Richard Wilson	RW	National Grid
Rochelle Hudson	RH	Centrica
Simon Trivella	ST	WWU
Steve Pownall	SP	National Grid NTS

**Apologies**

Alan Raper	AP	National Grid Distribution
Graham Wood	GW	British Gas Trading
Claire Thorneywork	CT	National Grid NTS

**1. Review of Minutes and Action**

**1.1. Review of Minutes**

The Minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

**1.2. Review of Action**

**Action 0001:** CT to establish what the NExA and Ancillary Agreements process is and update the Review Group at the next meeting.

**Action Update:** SP confirmed that 8 agreements have been identified and that these will be provided to the Joint Office for publishing on the website

**Action: Pending**

**Action 0002:** ST to assess what level of information could be provided for meter errors and at what possible timescales.

**Action Update:** ST provided a presentation highlighting the background to the action, WWU's view of what level of information could be provided and the way forward.

RH requested if the normal gas flow could be included on the potential list. ST will provide the presentation to the Joint Office for publishing on the website.

**Action: Complete**

**Action 0003:** SL to produce a 'Straw man', which outlines the elements that he believes need to be considered.

**Action Update:** SL provided straw man see item 2.0

**Action: Complete**

## 2. Review Group Process

### 2.1. What should trigger the notification process and Who should participate in the process

SL provided a presentation, which summarised the straw man. The presentation covered the current Notification Arrangements, the rationale behind the straw man, the current UNC requirements, the Notification Trigger, participants and a work plan.

SL suggested a 3-stage notification process with regular updates at appropriate forums, targeting communications for errors greater than 10 GWh. SL suggested the likely financial values involved using the 10GWh trigger, however RW suggested that the £6m figure quoted by SL may need to be re-calculated as it more likely to be £600k. SL asked for views from the review group if the suggested 10GWh was a suitable trigger or if existing 50GWh trigger was more preferable. No preference was expressed.

SP suggested that stage 2 within the presentation could be a more appropriate trigger for notification. He suggested the group consider bringing forward the trigger to stage 2 and consider any issues with doing this.

**Action 0004:** All to consider the trigger for notification, at what stage and any issues.

RHa (Ofgem) asked if the Notification Group could be outside the existing Billing Operational Forum (BOF).

SP suggested that is it more appropriate with the new structure that the responsible DN provides the notification.

ST highlighted that the 0643 process illustrated within the presentation at Notification Trigger Stage 3 is not in the remit of the Review Group. AJ concurred that this group should not cover the reconciliation process.

A debate occurred regarding the commercial and operational issues and identifying the appropriate forum and expertise to examine the 0643 process. SP suggested that the Offtake Committee and Offtake Workstream would be an appropriate forum.

ST suggested that the Offtake Committee is planning to meet mid May. JM confirmed that the Offtake Committee and Offtake Workstream had not met in a while and that the UNC Panel and Committee would have to discuss the re-convening of the respective meetings.

JMa provided clarification that the Farningham issue had not been discussed at the Offtake Committee, and any such change would need to be agreed.

AJ suggested that the Offtake Committee, Offtake Workstream and Billing Operational Forum would all need to be involved. AJ indicated that the technical side could be discussed at the Offtake Committee and Offtake Workstream, with the subsequent information flows communicated through the existing Billing Operational Forum.

SL challenged why both the Committee and Workstream needed to be involved. He suggested discussions could take place at the Offtake Workstream, if its scope was expanded to include Shippers.

**Action 0005:** JM to ensure UNC Committee consider the re-convening of the Offtake Committee.

**Action 0006:** JM to request the UNC Panel that the Offtake Workstream meetings are conducted following the Offtake Committee Meetings.

SL asked for clarification whether the Review Group want to include a review of the Transportation Offtake Arrangements Documents (OAD).

SL acknowledged that financial information might not be available until the final meter error report had been produced. He confirmed that the commercial and financial process could not commence until the meter error report is available.

SL suggested that the meter error report needed to be defined. Members agreed that there is ambiguity within the report and that there would be benefit in reviewing the Offtake Arrangements Document (OAD).

SL asked for clarification regarding the submission of the meter error report and whether there can be an initial report or simply the final report. He also asked who produces it, when, and what stage could these reports be released.

SP suggested that participants ought not be restricted to the RbD Shippers impacted. He suggested that either all RbD Shippers or all Shippers needed to be provided updates. This would allow the Shippers to assess if they will be affected or not.

SP suggested that it is not appropriate for a Transporter to provide information on a Shipper-by-Shipper basis.

ST explained if a Transporter issued a notification to all Shippers then Shippers would be able to identify if they are affected or not. RH suggested that Shippers would want to know who else is impacted by an error as this enables participants to better understand the voting rights.

SL Summarised the work plan required.

LW asked for clarification whether the notification team would be responsible for the 0643 process. LW suggested that the 0643 process would have a different audience to the Billing Ops Forum participants. SP clarified that the 0643 process is separate to the dispute process.

SL clarified the intention would be to incorporate the notification process into the 0643 process along with technical disputes however the UNC dispute process would be left separate.

**Action 0007:** All to consider if there should be two processes or a single process in terms of the UNC.

SL asked the Transporters how they could involve Shippers at an earlier stage.

BD questioned why a third party validation report, as it exists in code, could not be a trigger. ST explained that any action required from a validation report might not have an impact on RbD.

A discussion evolved on the validation report process managed by Transporters. SP confirmed that validation reports provide notification of an error, however SP pointed out that further investigation would be required to understand what the actual error was. SP confirmed that equipment would need to be calibrated before they could understand the extent of an error.

The Review Group further discussed the validation report, the meter error report and the incident at Farningham. KK asked what triggers a DN to progress to the next stage having received a validation report. Shipper members expressed a keen interest in understanding in more detail the Transporters process and timescales.

RHa (Ofgem) asked if there is a timeline for the production of a meter error report following a validation report.

It was unclear to Shippers at what stage Transporters would be aware of meter errors. Shippers wanted to know what work is involved when a validation report is produced.

Transporters agreed to find out what information can be provided and at what stage consistently from the production of a validation report and meter error report.

**Action 0008:** Transporters to provide a summary of the end-to-end process from the production of a validation report to the production of a meter error report.

SL asked for views on whether there should be a limitation to RbD Offtake. No views were expressed.

**Action 0009:** JM to request an extension at the April UNC Panel, to enable the Offtake Committee and Offtake Workstream to meet before the next Review Group meeting.

### **3. Diary Planning for Review Group**

Wednesday, 30 May 2007, at a Solihull venue to be confirmed

### **4. AOB**

None.

**APPENDIX A.****ACTION LOG - Review Group 0131**

<b>Action Ref</b>	<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>Minute Ref</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Status Update</b>
RG0131 0001	14/03/2007	2.0	CT to establish what the NExA and Ancillary Agreements process is and update the Review Group at the next meeting.	National Grid NTS (CT)	Action: Pending
RG0131 0002	14/03/2007	2.0	ST to assess what level of information could be provided for meter errors and at what possible timescales.	WWU (ST)	Action: Complete
RG0131 0003	14/03/2007	2.0	SL to produce a 'Straw-man', which outlines the elements that he believes need to be considered.	EDF Energy (SL)	Action: Complete
RG0131 0004	04/04/2007	2.0	All to consider the trigger for notification, at what stage and any issues.	All	Action: Due 30 May 2007
RG0131 0005	04/04/2007	2.0	JM to ensure UNC Committee consider the re-convening of the Offtake Committee.	Joint Office (JM)	Action: Due 30 May 2007
RG0131 0006	04/04/2007	2.0	JM to request the UNC Panel that the Offtake Workstream meetings are conducted following the Offtake Committee Meetings.	Joint Office (JM)	Action: Due 30 May 2007
RG0131 0007	04/04/2007	2.0	All to consider if there should be two processes or a single process in terms of the UNC.	All	Action: Due 30 May 2007
RG0131 0008	04/04/2007	2.0	Transporters to provide a summary of the end-to-end process from the production of a validation report to the production of a meter error report.	Transporters	Action: Due 30 May 2007
RG0131 0009	04/04/2007	2.0	JM to request an extension at the April UNC Panel, to enable the Offtake Committee and Offtake Workstream to meet	Joint Office (JM)	Action: Due 30 May 2007

<b>Action Ref</b>	<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>Minute Ref</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Status Update</b>
			before the next Review Group meeting.		