

User Pays User Group Minutes
Monday 13 July 2009
(via teleconference)

Attendees

Tim Davis (Chair/Secretary)	TD	Joint Office
Lorna Dupont	LD	Joint Office
Alan Raper	AR	National Grid Distribution
Ashley Collins	AC	EDF Energy
Chris Davies	CD	Total Gas and Power
Danielle King	DK	E.ON UK
Lorna Gibb	LG	Scottish Power
Mark Cockayne	MC	xoserve
Mitch Donnelly	MD	British Gas
Nick Reeves	NR	xoserve
Sharon Cole	SC	Scottish and Southern Energy

1.0 Introduction

TD welcomed attendees to the meeting and proposed, since the User Pays User Committee was not quorate, to proceed with an informal meeting of the User Pays User Group.

1.1 Minutes of last meeting

These were accepted.

1.2 Actions arising

Action UPUG05/02: All to send to Joint Office suggestions on how M Number data may be submitted electronically in future; and

Action UPUG05/03: xoserve (MC) to explore options for electronic transfer of M Number data.

Update: NR had liaised with E.ON's IS contacts and reported that options were still under discussion. NR will provide the name of the E.ON IS contact to DK.

Actions carried forward

Action UPUC06/01: xoserve (MC) to publish the revised SAR Fax templates as soon as possible and alert any organisation that uses the outgoing form post-implementation.

Update: The SAR fax templates have been published and affected organisations alerted.

Action closed

Action UPUC06/02: xoserve (MC) to bring forward change proposal seeking to contractualise provision of an IAD Last Accessed Report.

Update: Change proposal raised.

Action closed

Action UPUC06/03: British Gas (MD) to raise change proposal seeking to change the basis of IAD charging.

Update: Change proposal raised.

Action closed

Action UPUC06/04: xoserve (GF) to consider what information they can bring to the next UPC meeting concerning likely cost and charge implications were IAD charging to be on a usage basis.

Update: Discussed under 3, below.

Action carried forward

Action UPUC06/05: All to consider likely IAD demand with usage charges, and the analysis they would wish to see in order to assess the proposed change.

Update: Discussed under 3, below.

Action closed

2.0 Agency Charging Statement (ACS) Update

It was confirmed that, at the Network Operators' request, a revised ACS reflecting Modification Proposal 0224 had been issued to Ofgem recommending an effective date of 17 August 2009. Direction from Ofgem was awaited.

As part of xoserve's commitment to review user pays charges, the ACS is now undergoing an internal review. Requests for indicative customer demand have been made to all Contract Managers seeking responses submitted by Friday 17 July 2009. Following consultation in August it is intended to submit the revised ACS for the Authority's approval by 01 September 2009.

xoserve confirmed that a summary of the review findings and ACS proposals would be circulated at least 5 business days in advance of the next UPUC meeting.

3.0 Change Management

3.1 IAD Screens and SARs Fax Template

NR reported that some minor aesthetic changes had been made to the IAD screens and the Shipper Agreed Reads (SARs) Fax template. The SARs Fax template had been published on xoserve's website. No problems had been experienced.

LG pointed out that the training documentation still required updating; NR believed the updated documentation was to be issued in the next couple of weeks and would check on progress. NR confirmed that any parties continuing to use the old template would be contacted and asked to use the new template. NR reminded users to include a cover sheet to assist the SARs process so that the originator can be checked.

Action UPUG07/01: IAD screen changes/SARs fax templates: NR to check on progress of updating of training documentation and likely issue date.

3.2 Change Orders

MC stated that there two Change Orders required a vote from UPUC prior to proceeding. Members were not convinced that there should be a further vote taken on either Change Order and felt that there was a lack of clarity and understanding relating to the steps in the change process. A discussion followed on the interpretation of the process and the actions that needed to be taken by xoserve.

Various suggestions were made in an attempt to come to a mutual understanding of how the process should operate, including splitting the meeting into open and closed (for voting) sessions, having a further meeting before voting, and relating to the timing of the voting.

LG commented that, although the high level principles involved in the proposed changes were discussed at the previous UPUC meeting, there was very little detail and the proposals themselves had not been issued. As such, it would be incorrect to suggest UPUC had debated the changes. MD understood that the voting at the first part of the process was simply to enable xoserve to gain approval to proceed with doing preliminary work, ie a feasibility study. The vote did not authorise the change to be made and, as such, did not particularly require debate at that stage of the process.

AR reminded the meeting that the ACS was a Licence driven document and voiced concerns from a Transporter's point of view. In particular, he was not clear that the proposed change would be cost reflective and so consistent with licence conditions and able to be reflected in the ACS. If changes consequent to the proposal needed to be made to the ACS, these would need to be considered by the Network Operators based on the Licence requirements.

TD explained that three stages were envisaged in the Contract. Following the initial acceptance of a Change Order, for the second stage xoserve would prepare the more detailed EQR, ie an initial view of what could be implemented and a view on any likely changes necessary. Notwithstanding that the ACS is a Transporter document, the Contract requires xoserve to give a view on the ACS changes which would be necessary to implement a Change Order.

A BER (Business Evaluation Report) would then be produced by xoserve, setting out final cost estimates and an implementation process, again including potential ACS changes. This would be voted upon to approve/reject moving to the final stage and implementing the change as set out in the BER.. MC added that the status of each Change Order would be updated on the xoserve website, making it clear which stage each proposal had reached.

DK asked if the evaluation work was to be charged for, even to those who had not received the proposal and not been able to vote on it. LG indicated that the cost of all evaluation work (budget £25,000) was smeared over all parties. It was recognised that, while the sums involved were not large, the principle of charging parties who were unable to vote could be seen as less than ideal, albeit hopefully temporary. xoserve emphasised that they had not deliberately set out to exclude any parties but rather to follow the change procedure as written, and MC agreed that future communications would go to all contract managers irrespective of whether or not the Contract had been signed.

xoserve was asked if there was any idea of timelines for the second stage (EQR) for BGT's proposal to move IAD charging to a transaction based approach. MC agreed to liaise with the team tasked to do the work and report back to the meeting regarding timescales.

Action UPUG07/02: xoserve to establish timeline for delivering EQR in respect of BGT IAD charging proposal..

AR asked whether the EQR would give a view on whether the proposed change would deliver more cost reflective charges. TD suggested that it would be inappropriate for xoserve to give a view as to whether a proposed change is the right thing to do or not; previous discussions had emphasised xoserve's role as a service provider in this context. AR agreed that the Transporters would need to consider ACS issues with xoserve outside the UPUC arena.

Confusion remained as to what was expected of UPUC in relation to a next step – was the formal vote already taken sufficient for xoserve to proceed with the EQR, or was another formal vote required?

MC offered to circulate a process map with additional commentary to aid interpretation of the process.

Action UPUG07/03: xoserve to circulate a Change Order process map with additional commentary.

TD pointed out that, since the vote had been taken, there was now no opportunity for BGT to amend the IAD charging proposal. MD added that it seemed pragmatic to discuss a potential proposal at a UPUC meeting to enable a Proposer to take on board any comments, identified issues, suggestions for clarity, etc and to give the opportunity for any amendments to be made prior to formal submission. He would support voting only taking place after such a meeting and following prior notification that a vote was to be taken. Notification of the outcome of the voting should also be published. This was supported by others. MC added that a draft proposal should be included within the presentation pack published at least five days in advance of UPUC meetings.

TD then asked if everyone present was comfortable with the interpretation of the process, following these discussions. There were no further questions or comments.

3.2.1 IAD Transactional Charging

NR reported that four User Pays customers had voted to reject this proposal but this did not form 20% in aggregate of the Total Votes, therefore the Change Order was deemed accepted by UPUC.

It was agreed that, in light of the vote, an EQR should be developed by xoserve.

3.2.2 IAD Last Accessed Report

One User Pays customer voted to accept the proposal, and hence the Change Order was deemed accepted by UPUC.

It was agreed that, in light of the vote, an EQR should be developed by xoserve.

3.3 Voting Rights Re-calculation

xoserve had now received new signed copies of the contract and was recalculating the Voting Rights (as obligated under the UPUC Terms of Reference). New Voting Rights would be communicated to all User Pays Customers based on August charges.

4.0 Modification Update

MC briefly ran through the Live UNC Modification Proposals which were identified as being User Pays Proposals (0224, 0229, 0246, 0248, and 0253).

5.0 Operational Updates

MC presented for xoserve. All indicators were green, with all performance targets being achieved. MC gave advance warning that next month the performance for the IAD Service Line would be below target in light of IS incidents in the first half of July.

The June figures relating to Bulk Password Resets, with twice as many completed as requested, were queried and MC agreed to check on these and report back to the next meeting.

Action UPUG07/04: xoserve to check the June figures relating to Bulk Password Resets and report back.

TD took the opportunity to confirm that all users present were happy with their experiences of the IAD service currently received - no adverse comments were received.

6.0 Any Other Business

6.1 IAD Requirements Gathering

Following two meetings held in May and June, NR advised that there was an additional opportunity to respond with any amendments or additions to the summary slides; the submission deadline was 17 July 2009. The intention was to provide indicative ongoing costs of the new system in September 2009. DK asked that a copy of the slides be made available.

It was questioned who would make the final decision regarding the IAD scoping replacement and when. MC said that this was in xoserve's existing change programme and had to be cost reflective. xoserve had presented information and updated SPAA and will continue to report progress to UPUC. xoserve is making the changes independently, and this was likely to be around September time.

6.2 IS Incident (09 July 2009)

MC reported that there had been an IS incident on 09 July 2009 involving a firewall, resulting in the loss of access to web-based services, including IAD. MC apologised for any inconvenience caused. Liabilities will be paid for the loss of IAD, and these would be paid to all customers, not just those who have signed contracts.

The incident had also resulted in increased telephone calls to the data centre, which responded by extending its opening hours to 19:00 on the evening of the incident.

The problem has now been rectified and normal services have been resumed.

LG commented on other service issues whereby the 0845 number had not been available for a week. NR was aware that the customer number had gone down, but understood that the User Pays line was still working. MC added that a fire alarm during the week had had an effect on a telephone line and a technical problem had resulted. This apparently had been experienced on a prior occasion, but appeared to be a random occurrence. It was being investigated and would be rectified.

LG requested that xoserve clarify and reissue the numbers for customer use.

Action UPUG07/05: xoserve to clarify and reissue the telephone numbers for customer use.

7.0 Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for 10:30 on Monday 10 August 2009. TD asked if the teleconference approach had been effective, and it was agreed that it had been. In light of this, the default forum for future meetings was changed to teleconference..

Action Table: User Pays User Group – 13 July 2009

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
UPUG05/02	11/05/09	10.0	Send to Joint Office suggestions on how M number data may be submitted electronically in future.	All	FTP preferred. Awaiting outcome of xoserve deliberations. Carried Forward
UPUG05/03	11/05/09	10.0	Explore options for electronic transfer of M Number data.	xoserve (MC)	xoserve to clarify barriers to providing FTP transfer. Carried Forward
UPUC06/01	08/06/09	3.0	Publish the revised SAR Fax templates as soon as possible and alert any organisation that uses the outgoing form post-implementation.	xoserve (MC)	Complete
UPUC06/02	08/06/09	4.0	Bring forward change proposal seeking to contractualise provision of an IAD Last Accessed Report.	xoserve (MC)	Complete
UPUC06/03	08/06/09	6.0	Raise change proposal seeking to change the basis of IAD charging.	British Gas (MD)	Complete
UPUC06/04	08/06/09	6.0	Consider what information can be provided concerning likely cost and charge implications were IAD charging to be on a usage basis.	xoserve (GF)	Carried forward
UPUC06/05	08/06/09	6.0	Consider likely IAD demand with usage charges, and the analysis needed to assess the proposed change.	All	Carried forward
UPUG07/01	13/07/09	3.1	IAD screens/SARs Fax template changes: NR to check on progress of updating of training documentation and advise of likely issue date.	xoserve (NR)	
UPUG07/02	13/07/09	3.2	Establish timeline for delivering EQR in respect of BGT IAD charging proposal.	xoserve (MC)	
UPUG07/03	13/07/09	3.2	Circulate a Change Order process map with additional commentary	xoserve (MC)	
UPUG07/04	13/07/09	5.0	Check the June figures relating to Bulk Password Resets.	xoserve (MC)	

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
UPUG07/05	13/07/09	6.0	Clarify and reissue the telephone numbers for customer use.	xoserve (MC)	