

**UNC 0630R Workgroup Minutes**  
**Wednesday 21 February 2018**  
**at Xoserve, Lansdowne Gate, 65 New Road, Solihull B91 3DL**

<b>Attendees</b>		
Chris Shanley (Chair)	(CS)	Joint Office
Kully Jones (Secretary)	(KJ)	Joint Office
Alan Raper	(AR)	AGR Gas Consulting
Alison Nield*	(AN)	Gazprom
Andy Miller	(AM)	Xoserve
Chris Warner	(CW)	Cadent
David Addison	(DA)	Xoserve
Derek Clark*	(DC)	Contract Natural Gas
Gareth Evans	(GE)	Waters Wye
Helen Bevan	(HB)	Scottish Power
Hilary Chapman	(HC)	SGN
James Crosland	(JC)	Orsted
Mark Jones*	(MJ)	SSE
Matthew Cleveland*	(MC)	SGN
Mike Payley	(MP)	Xoserve
Nicky Rozier*	(NR)	BUUK
Rachel Hinsley	(RH)	Xoserve
Sarah Jones*	(SJ)	Electrolink
Shane Preston	(SP)	Scottish Power
Steve Britton*	(SB)	Cornwall Insight
<b>Apologies</b>		
Kirsty Dudley	(KD)	E.ON
* <i>via teleconference</i>		

Copies of all papers are available <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0630/210218>

The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 17 May 2018.

## 1. Introduction and Status Review

### 1.1. Approval of Minutes (26 January 2018)

The minutes from the previous meeting were accepted subject to the amendment of a couple of minor typos.

## 2. Review of Outstanding Actions

**0101:** Xoserve (AM) to update Table on page 4 of the BRD to reflect the discussions in the meeting.

**Update:** AM confirmed that this has been actioned and is included in the paper for the meeting, so this action can be closed. **Closed**

**0102:** Xoserve (RH) to review paragraph 1.6 and update based on feedback provided at the meeting.

**Update:** RH confirmed that this has been actioned and is included in the paper for the meeting, so this action can be closed. **Closed**

**0103:** Xoserve (RH) to a) add a key to the draft heat map and b) cross reference the topics table with the individual value chain reference.

**Update:** RH reported that this has been actioned and is included in the paper for the meeting, so this action can be closed. **Closed**

**0104:** AM to consider the use of an appendix/spreadsheet to capture the level 1 and 2 information to help Workgroup members filter the information as required.

**Update:** AM reported that this has been actioned and is included in the paper for the meeting, so this action can be closed. **Closed**

### 3. Updates on Level 1 and 2 Developments of the OSP

#### 3.1. OSP Design Update

AM provided a brief update advising that Ofgem have published the Switching Programme Outline Business Case on 12 February 2018. The document can be accessed via this link:

[https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/system/files/docs/2018/02/switching\\_programme\\_outline\\_business\\_case\\_and\\_blueprint\\_phase\\_decision.pdf](https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/system/files/docs/2018/02/switching_programme_outline_business_case_and_blueprint_phase_decision.pdf)

Ofgem's aspirations are still for a 2020 implementation, although there is a commitment for some "left to right" planning for the design build and test phase. The Data Communications Company (DCC) are expected to commence the tender activity for the Centralised Switching Service (CSS) in summer 2018. Ofgem has developed governance structures for the enactment and design build and test phases.

Ofgem also published a set of end to end design documents on 15 February 2018; Operational Choreography, Solution Architecture, Non-Functional Requirements, Service Management Strategy. These have been produced following industry review and comments in late 2017. The Ofgem Switching Programme has moved from the blueprint to the design phase.

<https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/publications-and-updates/e2e-design-products>

A further document, the User Requirements Specification, is expected to be published by the DCC shortly.

### 4. Update on MIS

AM provided a brief update on the Market Intelligence Service(MIS) which is being delivered under a joint gas and electricity working group. He reported that Ofgem are concerned about the reliability of switching data services to industry participants and want to ensure correct switching between customers. Xoserve are working with Gemserve on this and the MIS Project Board is due to meet on 01 March 2018 and will be looking at solution options.

In response to a question from CW, AM confirmed that 25 responses had been received to the consultation and that there is good participation at the meetings, although he could not comment on the representation of the group in terms of how they are split between gas and electricity.

### 5. Development of Business Rules(BRD) – key topics for discussion:

A brief discussion on the BRD took place reiterating that the actions in relation to updating the document had been done. RH informed the Workgroup that the Business Requirements Templates have also been updated to reflect where the change is not a key interest for the Workgroup, i.e. where the change is indicated as Level 1 or 2. She quoted topic area 3.6 Supplier/Shipper Relationship Table – Level 1 Change as an example.

## 5.1. Change of Supplier required information

AM talked through the presentation titled *Settlement Data Topic* which had been provided for the meeting. He explained that the information provided on the Central Switching System (CSS) processes is an extract for the purpose of providing background to the 0630R Workgroup topics to be discussed. The information provided in the presentation does not, therefore, represent the full extent of the CSS processes or business rules.

AM briefly described the data items that would be provided when a supplier initiates a switch request (in relation to gas and those relevant to this Workgroup).

He then took the Workgroup through a schematic diagram to illustrate the phases of a switch request. He emphasised that the objection period of 1 or 2 days is determined by the prevailing Registered Meter Point (RMP) market sector codes of 'D' or 'I' held in CSS and not the market sector code provided by the gaining Supplier in the switch request.

AM confirmed that the switch will commence at 12.00 midnight but the UNC gas day start remains unchanged as 05:00 am. He also clarified in response to a question from CW that all sites are covered apart from a few exceptions (unique sites and twin streams). A discussion was had on the robustness of the process on situations where the switch is incorrectly entered as domestic/I&C.

In relation to slide 4 – notifications issued by CSS during a switch request. AM indicated that a validated switch notice would be sent to UK Link – this was confirmed recently and is not reflected in the slide. There are also other notices that are sent to other parties which are not included in this presentation.

A brief discussion took place in relation to slide 6 – phases of a switch request objection. Where an incumbent Supplier objects to a switch the request, is cancelled which differs to the current UNC process. In response to a question from JC, AM confirmed that there is no time window before a switch request can be resubmitted.

AM then took the Workgroup through slides 10 and 11, particularly focusing on the shaded boxes which confirm the data not to be provided by CSS. For example, information on the meter point Class will not be provided neither will customer/supply point data e.g. emergency contact details. AM confirmed that post code or address data will also not be provided. DA said that CSS and the address service are distinct services. Enhanced address data will be made available via ECCOES and DES. Distinct addresses will not be held within CSS. This may impact on next day switching so Shippers are encouraged to a) maintain accurate address details for their customers and b) to check these details prior to a switch.

AM invited the Workgroup to discuss the solution options which are either to have a default rule so that information contained on UK Link is transferred to the incoming Shipper. Alternatively, a "shell" record could be created by the incoming Shipper which would then update UK Link. After a discussion on the merits of both options it was agreed that it would be appropriate to use the default and "shell" record in certain circumstances. AM suggested that for 28 day switches the CDSP could share the TRF and MRI files but this would not work for next day switching as there would be no turnaround time. The Workgroup asked Xoserve to investigate and clarify the use of the "shell" record and default rules. The next steps are to consider what changes are required in UK Link to implement this change. This topic area will be further developed and a new Modification may be required in the future.

**New Action 0201: Xoserve (AM) to investigate the development of the "shell" record and default rules and clarify the circumstances they would be used. This should include consideration of the timing of sending the current TRF and MRI files.**

## 5.2. UK Link file format considerations

DA provided a presentation in advance of the meeting titled *Discussion Topic: Post Switch Administration – Provision of information to Shippers* which can be accessed on the website page for this meeting.

DS briefly described the existing process in relation to the provision of data in support of Change of Shipper. He highlighted that these files have remained largely unchanged since the creation of the UNC with incremental changes being implemented to achieve the existing position. The existing process has 3 events – nomination, confirmation and MRI/TRF.

DA then took the Workgroup through slides 3-5 which show the data for Nomination Response, Confirmation Response and Files issued at D-2 BDs. The tables show that there is a mix of lots of data including asset and settlement details.

In relation to the Confirmation Response, DA stated that some data in the accepted confirmation file will not be provided by the Shipper and will be provided in future by the CSS. In addition, the generic organisation notification is designed to be able to be re-used and extracted as necessary but the existing/evolved file structure could lead to 6/7 organisation notifications.

Slide 6 – DA provided some discussion points for the Requirement Definition. Changes will be needed to the existing record and hierarchy formats. He reminded the Workgroup that one of the principles of Project Nexus was to implement minimum change to file formats. He asked if this approach should be adopted in this case or should the change be fundamentally re-designed?

JC suggested that a blank slate would be ideal but he would need to consult with his technical colleagues. DA agreed that feedback was needed from the large Shippers in particular.

GE asked which forum would be the most appropriate to discuss and review the feedback received. DA confirmed that a specific steer was needed from Workgroup 0630R before the potential change could be discussed with the DSC Change Committee and/or DSG.

**New Action 0202: 1. Shippers to provide views on the proposed solution and discussion points set out in slide 6 of the presentation. 2. Xoserve (DA) to discuss the feedback provided by Shippers at the DSC Change Management Committee meeting to be held on 07 March 2018.**

## 5.3. Isolation and Withdrawal

AM provided a short discussion topic on isolation and withdrawal – UNC rules. The slides can be found on pages 14 onwards of the presentation titled *Settlement Data Topic*.

These are the rules that need to be met in order for the Registered User to withdraw from a Supply Point. With the implementation of the CSS rules, rules need to be established to ensure that Supplier registration/withdrawal to a RMP and Shipper registration/withdrawal to a Supply point are consistent. For example, it cannot be the case that a Shipper is registered to a Supply Point without a Supplier being registered to a RMP – so a Supplier cannot withdraw from a RMP without the rules in the UNC being met.

AM took the Workgroup through the table on slide 16 which illustrates the various isolation and withdrawal statuses for the RMP (as held by CSS) and the MPRN (as held on UKL).

Slide 17 – REC/UNC Rules – AM confirmed that for a Supplier to withdraw from a RMP the Isolation Status is Y. The Supplier withdrawal from the RMP automatically results in the Shipper withdrawal from the Supply Point. AM confirmed that the UNC rules are being mirrored in REC.

AR confirmed that the forced registration process can be initiated by the Gas Transporter if an RPM had not been registered by the Supplier. In addition, AM confirmed that a Shipper cannot independently withdraw from a Supply Point. A Shipper withdrawal from a Supply Point can only be initiated by a Supplier withdrawal for the RMP.

CW suggested that joined up thinking was needed between the REC and UNC to avoid restricting the efficiency of Shippers. The process is Supplier driven in relation to the supply point creation with Shippers not responsible for creating registrations.

AR sought clarification of what information is sent to CSS in relation to the statuses in REC, for example is the operational code sent to REC? AM was unsure of who would do the translation at this stage but he suggested that it would be easier for Xoserve to maintain the RMP status as well and the working assumption is therefore that Xoserve would undertake the translation.

AM summarised the discussion to confirm that as this is a REC code change it would be managed through the Ofgem governance. No elective changes have been identified as a result of this rule change so there is no consequential impact for the Workgroup to consider.

## **6. Consideration of Wider Industry Impacts and Communications**

Discussed as part of the other agenda items.

## **7. Next Steps**

CS confirmed that the focus of the next meeting on 23 March 2018 is to consider Topic area 3.4 Gemini Updates which impacts National Grid NTS and Shippers.

## **8. Any Other Business**

The Workgroup considered Topic area 3.2 Transportation Charges in the context of large supply points. AM suggested that in the case of next day switching there may not be sufficient time to provide this information and there is now an opportunity to do so in a different way or through a different mechanism.

AM suggested that the transportation charging information for the 250,000 LSPs could be made available in a similar way to the SSPs.

JC stated that he had not discussed this change with his technical colleagues and would like the opportunity to consult with them. GE acknowledged that in principle he supported a change but any decision would be dependent on the cost which Shippers would have to bear.

AM asked shippers if there was a commercial reason why large supply point information cannot be provided in the same way as SSPs. He clarified that individual transportation charges would be made available by supply point. GE responded to say that whilst that this would make things easier for Shippers, some customers may not wish to have this degree of transparency in the system where knowledge of site flow was available or could be determined. AM confirmed that this information was already obtainable prompting a suggestion that there should be an audit trail available to indicate who has asked for supply point information and how often.

The Workgroup then had a brief discussion on the solution options. API capability can limit access to organisations and any disproportionate enquiries could be followed up. Any breaches under the UNC could also be highlighted.

It was considered that putting the information on a API platform was a better platform, as it would limit access, whereas holding the information on a website may mean it would be available for anyone to view.

The consensus of opinion was to investigate the API solution. The internet option would not be taken forward as it was not regarded to be in best interests of the gas industry. However, the BRD would reflect that this option had been considered and then dis-regarded.

MP suggested that a slightly different approach may be needed for the provision of iGT transportation data and, therefore, a separate topic may be needed.

**New Action 0203: Xoserve (RH) to add a separate topic area to the BRD in relation to iGT transportation charges.**

## 9. 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 Friday 23 March 2018	Pure Offices, Wilton Drive, Warwick, CV34 6RA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of Outstanding Actions</li> <li>• Updates on Level 1 and 2 developments of the OSP</li> <li>• Development of Business Rules/BRD – key topic for discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Gemini Updates</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Consideration of Wider Industry Impacts and Communications</li> </ul>
10:30 Friday 27 April 2018	Lansdowne Gate, 65 New Road, Solihull B91 3DL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of Outstanding Actions</li> <li>• Updates on Level 1 and 2 developments of the OSP</li> <li>• Development of Business Rules/BRD; review of impacts and costs of topic areas.</li> <li>• Consideration of Wider Industry Impacts and Communications</li> </ul>

---

**Action Table (as at 21 February 2018)**

<b>Action Ref</b>	<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>Minute Ref</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Status Update</b>
0101	26/01/18	3.1	Xoserve (AM) to update Table on page 4 of the BRD to reflect the discussions in the meeting.	Xoserve (AM)	<b>Closed</b>
0102	26/01/18	4.1	Xoserve (RH) to review paragraph 1.6 and update based on feedback provided at the meeting.	Xoserve (RH)	<b>Closed</b>
0103	26/01/18	4.1	Xoserve (RH) to a) add a key to the draft heat map and b) cross reference the topics table with the individual value chain reference.	Xoserve (RH)	<b>Closed</b>
0104	26/01/18	4.1	AM to consider the use of an appendix/spreadsheet to capture the level 1 and 2 information to help Workgroup members filter the information as required.	Xoserve (AM)	<b>Closed</b>
0201	21/02/18	5.1	Xoserve (AM) to investigate the development of the "shell" record and default rules and clarify the circumstances they would be used. This should include consideration of the timing of sending the current TRF and MRI files.	Xoserve (AM)	<b>Pending</b>
0202	21/02/18	5.2	1. Shippers to provide views on the proposed solution and discussion points set out in slide 6 of the presentation.  2. Xoserve (DA) to discuss the feedback provided by Shippers at the DSC Change Management Committee meeting to be held on 07 March 2018.	Shippers  Xoserve (DA)	<b>Pending</b>
0203	21/02/18	8.0	Xoserve (RH) to add a separate topic area to the BRD in relation to iGT transportation charges.	Xoserve (RH)	<b>Pending</b>