

UNC Workgroup 0812R Minutes
Review of Alternatives to “Must Read” Arrangements
Thursday 27 July 2023
via Microsoft Teams

Attendees		
Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Ben Mulcahy (Secretary)	(BM)	Joint Office
Andy Clasper	(AC)	Cadent
Anne Jackson	(AJ)	PAFA (Gemserve)
Charlotte Gilbert	(CG)	BU-UK
David Mitchell	(DM)	SGN
Edd Green	(EG)	Eon Next
Fiona Cottam	(FC)	CDSP (Xoserve)
James Lomax	(JL)	Cornwall Insight
Jenny Rawlinson	(JR)	BU-UK
Kathryn Adeseye	(KA)	CDSP (Xoserve)
Kevin Clark	(KC)	Utilita
Louise Hellyer	(LH)	TotalEnergies Gas & Power
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE Energy Supply
Richard Pomroy	(RP)	Wales & West Utilities
Slama Akhtar	(SA)	Northern Gas Networks
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	SEFE

The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 21 September 2023.

Please note these minutes do not replicate/include detailed content provided within the material published, therefore it is recommended that the published material is reviewed in conjunction with these minutes.

Copies of all papers are available at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0812/270723>

1.0 Introduction and Status Review

Bob Fletcher (BF) welcomed everyone to the meeting and gave a brief overview of the scheduled items for discussion.

1.1. Approval of Minutes (22 June 2023)

The minutes from the meeting held on 22 June 2023 were approved.

1.2. Approval of Late Papers

There were no late papers.

1.3. Review of Outstanding Actions

Action 0601: Joint Office (RH) to communicate Workgroup concern about the disparity between PAC Chair Statement and PAC minutes to PAC for consideration and response.

Update: BF advised the Workgroup that the PAC Chair had followed up on the initial response and outlined PAC’s current position in that PAC did not believe they have the vires to answer the question.

Richard Pomroy (RP) asked if the PAC had changed their view and was their position recorded in the first meeting invalid.

Steve Mulinganie (SM) shared that he thought it was the case that the initial position had been invalid as the PAC did not have the jurisdiction to take it and, in effect, was not authorised to comment.

RP suggested that the moral of the story was that any future Modification Workgroup on the matter should not ask PAC for their opinion as they cannot comment.

SM countered that whilst PAC was not prepared to 'die in a ditch' over the subject, they might be able to at least 'sit in the ditch' to talk an issue through to understand if there is a risk to settlement.

Anne Jackson (AJ) said that speaking as PAFA, it was simply the case that PAC is interested in Settlement accuracy, and 'Must reads' impacts one aspect of Settlement risk. PAC interest is only in the mitigation of Settlement risk, as to the existence of the 'Must read' Service or who provides it is only of interest to a PAC if it potentially affects the risk.

Jenny Rawlinson (JR) noted that she had challenged the PAC statement that Transporters should not be responsible for 'Must reads', and as a PAC member had stated that she did not think she could make that decision. It was then agreed to go back to PAC for clarification and at the last PAC meeting it was agreed that the response would be about the approach to Settlement and not make any comment about who the right party to perform the work should be.

AJ concurred, asserting that PAC was agnostic as to who would perform the work and did not make any call about the 'Must reads' service, other than to recognise it mitigated a risk to settlement.

RP commented that PAC had not quantified how much the risk was mitigated.

SM suggested that it was not if Transporters or the CDSP or whoever else performs the service, it was just a question for PAC as to whether it is done to the suitable standard.

RP asked what commentary should be used in terms of finalising the Workgroup Report (WGR).

SM suggested adding the comment that who is best placed to carry out the role is not a matter for PAC to comment upon.

AJ countered that it does impact settlement risk which PAC is interested in. It was who performs it PAC were agnostic to who, adding that the standard was determined and dictated through code.

JR asked if it was worth revisiting the reason why the question went to PAC originally to help get the Workgroup back on track.

AJ agreed that she thought it would help, noting there was concern that PAC had been asked to clarify on, which they had done.

SM commented that as this was a review group anyway, PAC's opinion was not essential.

RP stated that he was asked to get PACs view and was also asked to attend PAC which he resisted thinking the Review Group was where it was best discussed. He added that now an answer had been received the report could be finalised and closed.

SM agreed, summarising that text to the effect that it was not PACs place to comment on this could be used to complete the report.

RP suggested that it was not necessary to ask for a PAC view if a Modification was raised on the subject.

AJ responded that she thought that if the Modification was to propose a different provider, PAC would be agnostic, but if the Modification was to remove the service completely then PAC would be interested to understand potential impacts and risks to settlement. She added that other routes and alternatives were of course possible considerations for any such Modifications.

Action closed.

2.0 Finalise Workgroup Report

BF confirmed that the Workgroup Report was now closed and ready to submit to the Modification Panel.

3.0 Next Steps

The Review Group agreed to have concluded its work with no further steps required.

4.0 Any Other Business

No additional business was raised.

5.0 Diary Planning

No further meetings of this Review Group are planned.

0812R Workgroup Action Table					
Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
0601	22/06/23	2	Joint Office (RH) to communicate Workgroup concern about the disparity between PAC Chair Statement and PAC minutes to PAC for consideration and response.	Joint Office (RH)	Closed