

User Pays User Group Minutes
Monday 26 October 2009
(via teleconference)

Attendees

Tim Davis (Chair)	TD	Joint Office
Lorna Dupont (Secretary)	LD	Joint Office
Alan Raper*	AR	National Grid Distribution
Bob Fletcher	BF	Joint Office
Danielle King	DK	E.ON UK
Graham Wood*	GW	British Gas
Jemma Woolston	JW	Shell
Joel Martin	JM	Scotia Gas Networks
Lorna Gibb	LG	Scottish Power
Mark Cockayne	MC	xoserve
Richard Phillips*	RP	RWE npower
Richard Street*	RS	Corona Energy
Rosie Macklin	RM	EDF Energy
Sandra Dworkin	SD	xoserve
Sharon Cole	SC	SSE

**joined after meeting had commenced*

1.0 Introduction

TD welcomed attendees to the meeting and confirmed that, as the meeting was not quorate, it would be deemed to be an informal meeting of the User Pays User Group.

1.1. Minutes of last meeting (12 October 2009)

These were accepted by those present.

1.2. Actions

Action UPUG10/01: Add DK to circulation list for future Change Order documentation.

Update: Completed. **Action closed.**

Action UPUG10/02: UPCO001 - Clarify and define what constitutes a valid "hit" for the purposes of IAD Transactional charging.

Update: Documentation including screenshots had been issued in advance of the meeting. Covered under 2.1.1 below. **Action closed.**

2.0 Change Management

2.1 Change Orders

All associated documentation will be available to view on the xoserve website at: http://www.xoserve.com/UPS_Changes.asp#1 for the following Change Orders:

UPCO001 – IAD Transactional Charging

UPCO002 – IAD Last Access Report.

MC reiterated that Evaluation Quotation Reports (EQRs) had been developed for both Change Orders and had been issued on Friday 09 October 2009.

At present all was at an investigative stage; no contracts had been engaged with any external parties; and an indication of what level of costs might be incurred had been given to UPUG.

In terms of providing additional information, MC confirmed that the estimated costs covered the costs associated with producing the BER and also the appropriate infrastructure and development costs (financial, legal, operational procedure changes) but were subject to change.

2.1.1 UPCO001 – IAD Transactional Charging

The Evaluation Quotation Report (EQR) was briefly reviewed and MC reiterated the key points and proposed benefits.

At the previous meeting there were concerns as to what constituted a valid 'hit', and whether leaving a screen and going back to it would generate a further charge to revisit the same information. MC had provided example screenshots to clarify the position and indicate which items would be chargeable. Where data was retrieved from the system it is regarded as a 'hit'. DK questioned what was meant by the term 'deselected' on page 7 of the presentation. MC agreed to clarify this point.

Action UPUG10/03: Clarify what is meant by the term 'deselected'.

LG was keen to understand the rationale for a double hit - everyone was going to select the more data option, and with no idea of how much the charge for a 'hit' was going to be, it could be potentially doubling the cost.

As indicated at the last meeting MC pointed out that support costs were associated with the infrastructure and account set up and deletion and user support; these were to likely to increase in proportion to the number of users on the system. RM added that the system was not built to support charges of this nature and was therefore constrained and limited in how it could be appropriately configured to accommodate these proposed new requirements.

TD reminded the meeting that the proposal was for a charge per 'hit', and that the voting was to decide whether or not to proceed to the next stage, which in turn would provide more detail.

RM observed that no user other than GW (British Gas) had expressed strong support for this change. It increases the costs to users across the board; because of system constraints it will not deliver the cost targeting benefits that British Gas first envisaged. RM did not consider it prudent to go forward at this stage and would expect to vote not to proceed.

JM commented that from a Transporter perspective, it was important whether the change to charging methodology is cost reflective since this is the Licence requirement. More analysis would be required to demonstrate this. RS said that this point had been discussed at earlier UPUG meetings. xoserve had argued that the most cost reflective mechanism was by account, and the industry had consequently focused resource on making reductions in the number of accounts. MC responded that there could be a combination of account based and transactional charges.

TD emphasised that he believed the group was keen not to block changes. The Transporters would be required under this process to facilitate changes to the ACS irrespective of their view on cost reflectivity, and the final decision on

ay ACS change would lie with Ofgem. The voting, if positive, would commit to spending around £4,000 to go to the next stage (BER). Responding to various questions relating to the voting process, TD confirmed that failure to vote would be construed as a 'positive'. The number of votes/percentage voting share opposed to proceeding would determine the outcome. The Proposer did not need to be present at this meeting in order to proceed to the next stage.

MC confirmed that the BER would include costs and timescales of both options put forward within the EQR. In response to various questions on the availability of information to the wider voting audience, MC pointed out that costs were included in the previous minutes and presentations, and added that he was happy to make reference to this in the documentation that would be sent out. He also pointed out that if a positive vote was received a BEO would need to be completed (it would be published on the website) and this makes reference to funding and from where costs are to be recovered.

TD asked if all present were happy with the information provided so far and with the proposal that it should now go out to the wider vote. It was unanimously agreed that xoserve should issue it to the wider audience and commence the voting process. MC had noted all comments made and confirmed that xoserve would issue the voting documentation (and would include all non signatories in the communication); the voting period of 10 Business Days would commence from 27 October 2009.

2.1.2 UPCO002 – IAD Last Access Report

The Evaluation Quotation Report (EQR) was briefly discussed. The estimated cost for producing the BER was circa £1,700.

It was unanimously agreed that xoserve should issue the proposal to the wider audience and start the voting process. MC had noted all comments made and confirmed that xoserve would issue the voting documentation (and would include all non signatories in the communication); the voting period of 10 Business Days would commence from 27 October 2009.

3.0 Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held via teleconference at 10:30 on Monday 09 November 2009. The conference contact numbers will be made available on the agenda.

Noting that recent meetings had failed to achieve the status of quoracy required under the ToR, and this may in part be caused by the occasional conflict of priorities with other industry meetings, as well as recognition that there may be little business of immediate priority/importance to discuss, MC suggested that reducing the frequency of meetings to bimonthly may be beneficial.

It was agreed by those present to cancel the meeting planned for 14 December 2009 and to reschedule the meetings for 2010 to a bimonthly programme, starting in January (10:30 on Monday 11 January 2010). If necessary additional meetings could be convened should business needs dictate.

Action UPUG10/04: Cancel the meeting planned for 14 December 2009 and reschedule the meetings for 2010 to a bimonthly programme, starting in January (10:30 on Monday 11 January 2010).

Meeting Dates 2010

Date	Time	Venue
Monday 11 January 2010	10:30	via teleconference
Monday 15 March 2010	10:30	via teleconference
Monday 10 May 2010	10:30	via teleconference
Monday 12 July 2010	10:30	via teleconference
Monday 13 September 2010	10:30	via teleconference
Monday 15 November 2010	10:30	via teleconference

Action Table: User Pays User Group – 26 October 2009

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
UPUG10/01	12/10/09	3.1	Add DK to the circulation list for future Change Order documentation.	xoserve (MC)	Closed
UPUG10/02	12/10/09	3.1.1	UPCO001: Clarify and define what constitutes a valid "hit" for the purposes of IAD Transactional charging.	xoserve (MC)	Closed
UPUG10/03	26/10/09	2.1.1	Validation of 'hit' presentation - page 7: Clarify what is meant by the term 'deselected'.	xoserve (MC)	
UPUG10/04	26/10/09	3.0	Cancel the meeting planned for 14 December 2009 and reschedule the meetings for 2010 to a bimonthly programme, starting in January (10:30 on Monday 11 January 2010).	JO (LD)	See timetable of meetings for 2010 at 3.0 above. Closed