UNC Workgroup 0624R Minutes Review of arrangements for Retrospective Adjustment of Meter Information, Meter Point/Supply Point and Address data

10:30 Monday 02 February 2018

at The St Johns Hotel, 651 Warwick Road, Solihull, B91 1AT

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Helen Bennett	(HB)	Joint Office
Andy Clasper	(AC)	Cadent
Andy Knowles	(AK)	Utilita
Andrew Margan*	(AM)	British Gas
Beverley Viney	(BV)	National Grid
Chris Warner	(CW)	Cadent
Emma Lyndon	(EL)	Xoserve
John Cooper*	(JC)	BUUK
John Welch	(JW)	npower
Kirsty Dudley*	(KD)	E.ON
Mark Jones*	(MJ)	SSE
Paul Orsler	(PO)	Xoserve
Richard Pomroy*	(RP)	Wales & West Utilities
Shane Preston	(SP)	ScottishPower
Shanna Key*	(SK)	Northern Gas Networks

* via teleconference

Copies of papers are available at: https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0624/020218

1.0 Introduction and Status Review

BF welcomed all to the meeting

1.1 Approval of Minutes (08 January 2018)

The minutes from the 08 January 2018 meeting were approved.

2.0 Completion of Request Workgroup Report

Before updating the Request Workgroup Report, the Workgroup went through and onscreen review of the change marked update to the **RAASP Consultation Summary of consultation responses** document.

The change marked version can be found here: https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0624/020218

AK asked about enduring costs in Table 3 on page 10, suggesting that a note needs to be added underneath this table explaining exactly what costs are being portrayed.

PO advised that a table could be created to show benefits, but this is reliant on the information that has been provided by the industry and the number of responses received. Which may only show one Organisations response.

JW said that it is worth mentioning that the original Request for Information (RFI) may have been a little confusing seeing as it appears the responses have not been submitted as was expected.

AK said that raising a Modification should incentivise a response for some of the missing information from the industry.

BF added that a Modification can be raised in draft status and attached to this Request Workgroup Report and while this is in development a further request for information could be circulated.

CW is in favour of using the data that is available to the Workgroup and move forward.

JW thinks it feels like a missed opportunity if the financial benefit is not asked for, it seems to be the only subject that is missing.

SP said that dependant on which option will depend on the financial benefit and each option goes back to a different date.

AK asked if Xoserve could contact the Organisations and ask if they are able to provide the additional information relating to financial benefit and how quickly they can provide it?

PO advised that it would be possible to contact the 7 organisations that provided information and ask for their Y1 and Y2 financial benefit for each solution.

The Workgroup looked at the original RFI where it became clear that the financial benefit was not originally requested.

AM asked if the Workgroup, should be focussing on redoing the RFI to get the required information or accept what is available.

The Review Group agreed to accept the information that it has and move on to complete the Request Workgroup Report.

Request Workgroup Report

The Review Group followed an onscreen update of the Request Workgroup Report making amendments and additions to the Impact and Recommendations section.

3.0 Review of Outstanding Actions

1002: Xoserve (EL) to map each of the 5 Options against the 68 scenarios in a table format to be including in the Report as an appendix.

Update: EL explained that all 68 scenarios have been analysed and that the analysis will be published early next week. Due to the differing options the data may be shown in a slightly different way, the only scenario that won't be covered is read replacements which is being looked at outside of RAASP.

EL explained that once available, Xoserve will need to undertake a Detailed Design which will probably be at Delivery Sub Group (DSG) to see if all the options are still valid.

PO clarified the need for Detailed Design to go ahead as there will be a need for detailed analysis to see what the solution looks like from a technical perspective.

EL clarified that, as a high-level principle, all of the 68 scenarios are able to be delivered but in a very slightly different way depending on the option. Also, once the preferred option is identified it is worth going through at DSG a Detailed Design activity.

With the current understanding that this meeting would be the last one, BF advised that any follow up for this action, the Workgroup may not see it.

AM said that he was expecting some sort of cost benefit analysis, and that no conclusion section has yet been provided. PO responded saying that Xoserve have tried to provide that as an impartial view.

CW advised that in their view this Workgroup was considering which option to take forward. It is worth going through and trying to understand exactly what is going to be recommended and that Cadent are likely to proceed with a modification.

BF confirmed that this Action 1002 will be transferred to the Distribution Workgroup for further discussion. **Carried forward**

1201: *Reference the Option 3 solution -* Xoserve (EL) to look to provide a 'ballpark' figure for the market trials related costs, and an indication of when any missing costs would be provided, for consideration at the January 2018 Workgroup meeting.

Update: EL showed the Review Group the material provided for this action titled **'RAASP Options – 12 Week Market Trials indicative costs'** and advised the review group of the information on the material provided for the costing of a 12-week market trial which covered the following considerations: Scope; Timescales; Assumption; Dependencies; Constraints; Additional Factors.

This information can be viewed here: https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0624/020218 CW need that clear and set out in the report that the overall costs have been shared by Xoserve, but also the ongoing costs for Design and Build and running process on an enduring process. **Closed**

0101: Xoserve to update the tables to identify how many responses were received for each option to help quantify any industry costs for any of the solutions **Update**: Included in the update report. **Closed**

0102: Xoserve to write out to all Shippers to seek clarity on their benefits against perceived costs and materiality – further clarity from the Shippers that have responded.

Update: Included in the update report. Closed

4.0 Next Steps

To conclude that there will be no further meetings for this Workgroup and that the Workgroup Report will go to the February 2018 UNC Panel.

5.0 Any Other Business

None.

6.0 Diary Planning

No diary planning was necessary as there will be no further meetings.

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
1002	24/10/17	2.0	Xoserve (EL) to map each of the 5 Options against the 68 scenarios in a table format to be including in the Report as an appendix. **this action will now move to Distribution Workgroup (DWG) to be concluded**	Xoserve (EL)	Carried Forward to DWG
1201	08/12/17	2.0	Reference the Option 3 solution - Xoserve (EL) to look to provide a 'ballpark' figure for the market trials related costs, and an indication of when any missing costs would be provided, for consideration at the January 2018 Workgroup meeting.	Xoserve (EL)	Closed
0101	08/01/18		Xoserve to update the tables to identify how many responses were received for each option to help quantify any industry costs for any of the solutions	Xoserve (EL/PO)	Closed
0102	08/01/18		Xoserve to write out to all Shippers to seek clarity on their benefits against perceived costs and materiality – further clarity from the shippers that have responded.	Xoserve (EL/PO)	Closed

Action Table (as at 02 February 2018)