

UNC 0836S Workgroup Minutes

Resolution of Missing Messages following Central Switching Service implementation and integration with REC Change R0067

10:00 Thursday 27 July 2023

via Microsoft Teams

Attendees		
Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Ben Mulcahy (Secretary)	(BM)	Joint Office
Andy Clasper	(AC)	Cadent
Andy Eisenberg	(AE)	EON Next
Charlotte Gilbert	(CG)	BU-UK
Daniel Wilkinson	(DW)	EDF
David Addison	(DA)	CDSP (Xoserve)
David Mitchell	(DM)	SGN
Edd Green	(EG)	EON Next
Gurv Dosanjh	(GD)	Cadent
Harry Hailwood	(HH)	Brook Green Trading
James Lomax	(JL)	Cornwall Insight
Jenny Rawlinson	(JR)	BU-UK
Kathryn Adeseye	(KA)	CDSP (Xoserve)
Kevin Clark	(KC)	Utilita
Lee Greenwood	(LG)	British Gas
Louise Hellyer	(LH)	Total Energies Gas & Power
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE Energy Supply
Slama Akhtar	(SA)	Northern Gas Networks
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	SEFE
Tom Stuart	(TSt)	Wales & West Utilities
Tracey Saunders	(TS)	Northern Gas Networks

Copies of all papers are available at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0836>

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 presentation slides, therefore it is recommended that the published presentation material is reviewed in conjunction with these minutes. Copies of all papers are available at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0836/270723>

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

It was noted that the Legal Text Explanatory table had been provided late, although all other documentation for review by the Workgroup had been received by the Joint Office before the papers due date.

1.3 Review of Outstanding Actions

Action 0503: CDSP (ER/DA) to produce a ROM for the July 2023 Workgroup.

Update: David Addison (DA) confirmed that a ROM had been provided to the Joint Office and was available for review by the Workgroup.

Action Closed

Action 0601: Proposer to add REC Portal access guidance and the related R0067 REC Change Request as an Appendix to Modification. Proposer also to remove any square brackets in the document.

Update: DA confirmed the action had been completed and that the REC-related documentation now formed an appendix to the Modification.

Action Closed

Action 0602: Proposer to discuss potential IGT Impact with Anne Jackson

Update: DA advised the Workgroup that this discussion was being progressed, but had not been completed, stating that he had recently provided a paper to Anne Jackson (AJ) but not had an opportunity to discuss it with her.

AJ confirmed receipt of the paper but stated she had not had the time to read it in full yet. She noted that as DA had clarified the intent of the Modification, she was able to verify that if any alterations were to be made at a supply point level it was very likely that an IGT UNC Modification would be required to ensure the references that point to the UNC were kept correct.

DA explained that there were two core elements within the Modification, with the UNC Section G components enabling the CDSP to act in the case of a missing registration and the insertion of the CSS meter readings. He commented that, in reviewing the references across from the IGT UNC to the UNC he thought there were enough references between them for the purposes of the Modification but would defer to AJ's view.

AJ stated that in terms of registration and how supply points are managed the difference was extremely minor, in that IGT sites are treated in the same way as those on DNO networks, but that there was more of a challenge around specific clauses where they point to specific areas, making it very likely an IGT UNC Modification was required.

DA observed that if there was a need for an IGT UNC Modification a Proposer would be required.

AJ ruminated on the recent P1 incident and observed that it was not known how IGTs would respond to the matter as they would be billing on the dates they have been provided. She stated she had no knowledge of the details but advised that Shippers needed to be aware that an IGT issue may arise out of the matter yet.

Steve Mulinganie (SM) suggested that Shippers would need to understand what that pending issue was likely to be, suggesting putting an Action on the IGTs to explain the issue and associated actions.

AJ advised that such an explanation was likely to come up through the IGT UNC forums to the industry, rather than a UNC Workgroup. She expanded that the IGTs obtain their supply dates from the UK Link (UKL) and subsequently produce their own invoicing. Because of the P1 incident some of that information was incorrect and, under the UNC, the situation is being corrected under this Modification. Currently, the industry is unaware of the consequences of this situation for the IGTs, but it is a potential risk which she had no current knowledge as to how it will manifest.

BF summarised his understanding was that a potential IGT UNC Modification was required and that the workgroup will need to understand any alignment requirements. He asked if a joint UNC / IGT UNC workgroup was needed.

AJ did not think a joint workgroup was necessary as the UNC Modification delivers the necessary functionality up to and inclusive of the Connected System Exit Point (CSEP) so all billing to that point had been addressed in Modification 0836S, observing that the issue was specific to the IGT UNC billing from that point forward.

DA commented that this was a helpful conclusion and that he had just completed reviewing the current population of the previous issue that the Modification had first been raised to address (i.e. before the current P1 event) and looked for any affected IGT sites. He advised that there were 17 to date and that every one of them had been cancelled so would not require any consideration of settlement consequences. He added that there would probably be IGT sites where settlement consequences are an issue because of the P1 incident.

AJ commented that this suggested that, in the case of IGTs, UNC Modification 0836S is really for future proofing as there was not an immediate need yet, in that there are no IGT sites currently in the pot for settlement adjustment.

DA agreed, advising that the registrations from CSS that were missing were either because a cancellation was forgotten to be sent as one supplier had cancelled or due to a known issue with first registrations where a gap exists in the process within the CSS systems, which results in a switch being cancelled because the losing supplier has withdrawn before the switch becomes active. The CSS response was to cancel that original registration, meaning no subsequent settlement issue. He added that a REC Change was needed to close this gap.

Action Closed

Action 0603: Panel question response

Update: DA confirmed that response to the Panel Questions were provided in the Modification.

Action Closed

Action 0604: Joint Office (RH) to request Legal Text for 0836S at July Panel.

Update: BF noted that an extension had not been requested which prompted DA to advise the Workgroup that Legal Text had now been provided and an extension requested as a retrospective element was under consideration, though a separate Modification, sponsored by SM was now the route decided upon to address this issue.

Action Closed

2.0 Amended Modification

Note the documentation discussed below is available to review at www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0836S/270723

BF shared a screen view of the draft amended Modification, which DA talked the Workgroup through, stating that there had been no major changes and the amendments had been more of a tidying/housekeeping exercise, addressing issues such as square bracketing.

DA shared that some text had been added to the discussion of the Materiality Test description to address the Modification Panel question on that subject. The text now advised how the Workgroup had developed the Materiality Test to determine if an adjustment was required and now included the table discussed in Workgroup.

Under Code Specific Matters a link had been added to the REC Change 0067, noting that REC Portal access was required to view this and that the REC Change document itself had been added as an Appendix to the Modification.

DA also highlighted that Relevant Objectives had also been updated in light that the Workgroup had agreed that the Materiality Test added a further efficiency proponent to support objective f) *Promotion of efficiency in the implementation and administration of the Code.*

Review of Legal Text

DA talked the Workgroup through the legal text as it was shared onscreen. He noted that Definitive Registration Notifications (DRNs) was the UNC term for Secured Active Messages and the text defined the circumstances under which a DRN was considered a 'Missing DRN', being either where the CSS Provider fails to send it or it is either not received by the CDSP or is received but proves unable to progress. The latter was the case in the instances where server time mismatches suggested receipt of future-dated files, which DA confirmed was an issue that the CDSP has subsequently addressed.

DA then explained that clause 5.92. detailed the actions CDSP would then subsequently take, and was dependent upon REC Change R0067 being implemented under the REC.

ROM Highlights presentation

DA introduced this presentation as something he had produced to address the more unusual components of the ROM and advised that several XRN's have already been approved by the DSC Change Management Committee that considered the work required by this Modification.

XRN5535A '*Processing of CSS Switch Requests Received in 'Time Period 5'*' was created to enable the CDSP to register the missing messages on UKL and advised that teams had been setup to monitor the process, with two set up from February 2023, the long-term prospects of which he would need to be assessed in the future.

XRN5567 Implementation of Resend Functionality for Messages from CSS to GRDA has had a BER approved for delivery though a Detailed design had yet to be conducted, but DA shared that it was expected to automatically generate a resend message within day to avoid settlement issues but may need an adjustment, though with no more than two days impact they were unlikely to trigger a concern from the Materiality Test but did acknowledge that any UK site could be impacted including the large ones.

XRN5535B will be the delivery mechanism delivery of the activities developed in the ROM for UNC Modification 0836S.

The costs detailed gave a range for implementation between £28k to £34k, with the intention of scheduling a separate small implementation rather than being part of a Major Release. Ongoing operational costs were listed as between £5k and £8k per annum.

SM asked if these things were happening in parallel and if the ROM for the P1 Solution Modification was going to be similar solution for P1 or was this dealing with very small volumes and the work addressing the P1 going to be a different scenario dealt with very quickly.

DA explained that UNC 0836 and its ROM initiate the process in order to get the meter readings onto the system and into Change management, requiring about four weeks for implementation. Where the distinctions for the P1 related Modification come into play are more related to the ongoing Operational costs. He noted that the P1 was certainly an incident that needed to be sorted, and that £5k to £8k would not cover the P1 considerations as this issue was materially larger in scale. He shared that it was not yet know if the intention is to pay third party costs and that this consideration will potentially need to be returned to. The priority has shifted its focus to the P1, and that he did not know if customers will see an invoice for this work but would probably see a potential costs for use in future DCC and REC discussions.

DA added that wherever possible the CDSP will look to use the functionality already proposed, such as, presuming the Materiality Test remains at 12,000 kWh, taking a two-tier approach and performing a fully assessed detailed process for anything that appears to be at risk of hitting that threshold, as opposed to a simpler baseline test to identify those that require that more detailed approach.

DA drew the Workgroup's attention to the fact that the Modification retained the proposal of processing 15 messages a month, noting that, outside of incidents, that at the current rates the CDSP were aware of 14 such messages in four months, with the majority being ones the CDSP cancelled anyway. Accordingly, the logic was to size the team to this figure and excluded incidents, which he suggested the industry would not want the CDSP to resource a team for.

ROM

DA explained how the ROM provides a lot of detail about the solution and the proposed approach. He also walked through the Overview of impacts, noting in particular that: -

A3 confirms that the solution would not seek a retrospective registration date, with an exception for Greenfield sites where the CDSP will make separate assessment.

A4 verifies that UNC and IGT UNC sites will be dealt with in the same manner.

DA commented that they were seeking to clarify responsibility for the Supply Point if ever CSS and UK Link systems are misaligned. He highlighted that this is about generating invoicing which is reliant on switching and hence on the operator service desk, stating that he was hoping for more scrutiny on the provision of this, stating that, in fairness, the CDSP were now not waiting six or seven months for developments and recently had feedback within a few days confirming that registrations can be cancelled.

Part 2 XRN5545 Part B is detailed as including an updated manual process and the description is important as to what should be done.

The section on the Insertion of a meter reading for the CSS Registration Effective Date is detailed in recognition that it is important as to keep the costs down, and DA shared how most meter read related system Changes cost £300k+ due to the many considerations and ramifications. He explained that the process in the ROM was created as cost effectively as they could using existing reads that have the characteristics needed, in that they will generate reconciliation and can be used for AQ calculations. Shipper B will get the resultant meter read value via by email rather than another file format, so through a manual process but DA stated that this felt to be correct of this right process, acknowledging it would not be great for parties that may get large volumes of them, but stressed opening up the meter reading process would have huge cost considerations.

DA warned that once an adjustment had been performed the CDSP would not open it again, even if, for example, it was a duplicate, as there are separate processes that already exist to address these scenarios.

SM asked if the solution for UNC0836S excluded incidents on the basis that the P1 Modification he was to sponsor would deal with them, or if UNC 0836 does deal with incidents but costs and related measures are to be in the second Modification.

DA replied that he thought the CDSP will need to go to the DSC Change Management Managers Committee to ask if the CDSP can spend the agreed funds now to develop this solution. On this basis he advised parties not to expect any more development costs relating to the P1. However, he highlighted that operational costs for incidents were excluded for UNC 0836S, adding that Parties had hopefully noticed the CDSP acting on incidents through BAU processes using resources sourced through reallocation of work. He added that if incidents started happening regularly then clearly this approach could not be sustained long term, but currently, there was no expectation for a cost for this incident.

SM asked that if there were P1 related operational costs that could not be considered within the scope of UNC 0836S as it is expressly dealing with small volumes, is it possible those costs may surface in the P1 related Modification.

DA said that this was possible, although he did not see that scenario occurring, with the only real variable to consider likely being any third-party cost that the CDSP needed to pick up, in which case they would have to come back to industry with that cost.

3.0 Development of Workgroup Report

BF shared a view of the Workgroup Report (WGR) and discussed looking to use this version of the Modification, currently in draft, to submit the WGR report, and asked if any participants had any objections as the Workgroup had talked through the changes with objections raised.

BF noted that the timetables will be amended to August and that the Workgroup were supportive of the Modification being considered for Self-Governance. There were no views as to adding consumer impacts and the appendixes would be updated to include the REC Change documents.

AJ confirmed that IGT impact did exist and advised that consideration would need to be given in the IGT UNC regarding meter reads and the supply point components in section G, because they had been broken down to sperate clauses. She added that UNC and IGT UNC Implementation may not need to be simultaneous as DA has confirmed that, at this stage, no IGT sites have been affected by the issue UNC 0836S is set to address but suggested that this be reviewed at the Implementation date.

SM asked if the later P1 related Modification relies upon UNC 0836S would it change the IGT element.

DA felt this should not be an issue as the Materiality Test was a core mechanism perceived to be used in both.

AJ advised that she had added this on the risk register for PAC in her PAFA role as the P1 incident affects significant volumes.

Implementation was agreed to require the standard 16-day notification period and did not require alignment with REC R0067.

BF confirmed that the WGR would be concluded and would be published with the Amended Modification, Legal Text, and ROM.

3.0 Next Steps

The WGR will be presented at the August Modification Panel

4.0 Any Other Business

None raised.

5.0 Diary Planning

No further Workgroups are planned.

0836S Workgroup Action Table						
Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Reporting Month	Owner	Status Update
0503	25/05/23	2.0	CDSP (ER/DA) to produce a ROM for the June 2023 Workgroup.	June 2023 July 2023	CDSP (DA)	Closed
0601	22/06/23	2.0	Proposer to add REC Portal access guidance and REC Change Request as an Appendix to Modification. Proposer also to remove any square brackets in the document.	July 2023	Proposer (GD/DA)	Closed
0602	22/06/23	3.0	Proposer to discuss potential IGT Impact with Anne Jackson	July 2023	Proposer (GD/DA)	Closed
0604	22/06/23	3.0	Joint Office (RH) to request Legal Text for 0836S at July Panel.	July 2023	Joint Office (RH)	Closed