

## User Pays User Group

### Minutes

Wednesday 19 January 2011

(via teleconference)

#### Attendees

Tim Davis (Chair)	TD	Joint Office
Lorna Dupont (Secretary)	LD	Joint Office
Claire Blythe	CB	Southern Electric Gas Ltd
David McCrone	DM	Scottish Power Energy Management Ltd
Graham Wood	GW	British Gas Trading Ltd
Mark Cockayne	MC	xoserve
Naomi Anderson	NA	EDF Energy Plc
Robert Finch	RF	Npower Ltd
Sandra Dworkin	SD	xoserve

#### 1.0 Introduction

Meeting documentation can be found at [www.gasgovernance.co.uk/up/2011](http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/up/2011)

TD welcomed attendees to the meeting. As only 3 contract signatories were present the meeting was not quorate, and it was agreed the proceeding business would be addressed informally as a User Pays User Group meeting.

##### 1.1. Minutes of last meeting (15 November 2010)

The minutes from the previous meeting were accepted.

##### 1.2. Actions

**UPUC 1101:** xoserve to examine and provide an update on possible IAD Transactional Service charging mechanisms.

**Update:** Covered under 2.1 below. **Closed**

**UPUC 1102:** xoserve to confirm the development costs for UNC0224.

**Update:** When all invoices have been received and considered, MC will confirm.  
**Carried forward**

#### 2.0 Change Management

##### 2.1 UPCO003 – IAD Transactional Charging

All associated documentation is available to view on the xoserve website at: [http://www.xoserve.com/UPS\\_Changes.asp#1](http://www.xoserve.com/UPS_Changes.asp#1).

MC summarised the position to date. The BER had been issued with the intention of seeking formal agreement at this meeting but this was not possible as the meeting was inquorate.

MC briefly outlined the content, and confirmed that estimated development and implementation costs amounted to circa £3,850, to be offset against the change budget. He directed attention to pages 4 and 5 of the BER indicating the outputs. It was recognised that the definition of what constituted a 'hit' could differ.

RF asked if a view on the charging methodology had been arrived at. MC responded that the proposal suggests it should be on a 'per hit' basis. It was not possible to do estimate likely unit charges based on the existing system because of the way it was designed – 'hits' are calculated differently under the

existing and new system. NA suggested it might be sensible to wait until the new system was implemented. xoserve was looking at estimating charges 6 months after implementation. Concerned that every keystroke might be viewed as a 'hit' GW believed that it should be kept as simple as possible (like the telephone service), and suggested that a 'hit' should be construed as a single visit to a MPRN. DM agreed and reiterated his concern that a User moving between screens might attract charge after charge; it would be very complicated to understand and validate invoices based on kilobyte usage. A brief discussion on defining a 'hit' ensued.

MC believed that any retrieval of information from the database was classed as a 'hit'. GW thought that this should just apply to accessing the main MPRN screen, and questioned what would be classed as a download of information – would this also apply if you backtracked to a screen you had already accessed previously in the session. MC referred GW to the examples of dummy screens in the BER that indicated what would be counted as a 'hit'.

TD pointed out that a potential advantage of the kilobytes option was that it did actually show, and was a better guide to, usage, and explained his experience with the Joint Office website. TD could also see the logic of one 'hit' per individual MPRN but pointed out that this was not what had been costed; anything different would have to be re-costed and may need a new change proposal raising.

RF questioned what information was expected to be generated and what were the rules under which charges might be allocated and applied to individual users.

It was also questioned what was the position if the system timed out, or a search was forced to be aborted. MC confirmed that a reasonable time period for system timeout would be introduced. A new search for the same MPRN was likely to be designated as a separate 'hit'.

MC noted the issues raised and would be happy to investigate the feasibility of the suggested definition of a 'hit' as an individual MPRN visit.

**Action UPUG0101: UPCO003 - IAD Transactional Charging: Clarify cost per MPRN accessed, ascertain if any further related steps attract a charge, and what is the cost position for an aborted search.**

MC then clarified the next steps: xoserve intention had been to issue notification to members regarding commencement of official voting, with a 10-day response period. Assuming a favourable response then progression to design and implementation would follow.

GW asked when the new IAD system was likely to come into play. MC responded that issues had been encountered with the Project Q data platform, which was contributing to the delay on the IAD project. Different solutions were being considered but there was no clear view at present. There were believed to be no implications for Users. The issues were being worked on as the highest priority. RF pointed out that Shippers were also trying to manage their internal timetables associated with these changes; whilst recognising their difficulties, as yet MC was unable to confirm a definite commencement date but would engage with the industry when this became known.

TD queried the 6-month time period referred to following implementation, and asked if system implementation took place eg on 01 January, then charges were anticipated to apply from 01 June? Or was xoserve looking to collect data over the first 6 months and then propose any ACS changes. MC clarified that it was the latter - having 6 months' data history for analysis - and added that work would be done with the team to avoid all unnecessary delay. MC emphasised

that the 6-month period was not fixed, but had been assumed to be a reasonable amount of time to consider. It also fitted in with the regular 6 month ACS review. RF observed this sounded a sensible approach. GW was concerned by the timeline and suggested that 3-4 months data history should be valid. MC noted this and, assuming a shorter data collection time can be utilised, will consider devising a reasonable timeline that will not create any unnecessary delay. RF commented that he would like to understand the anticipated timescales for the IAD Project and how it fitted in with those for Project Q.

MC agreed to provide an indicative timeline, including what notice might be provided for the new charging approach.

**Action UPUG 0102: IAD Project and Project Q Anticipated timescales and interactions - Provide an indicative timeline showing how the projects fitted together, and including what notice might be provided for the new charging methodology.**

As this meeting was not quorate and no formal decisions could be taken, MC suggested that a further meeting might be arranged in February to discuss/progress the BER and also review any ACS changes for 01 April. Those present agreed to this suggestion and a teleconference meeting would take place on Tuesday 15 February 2011, commencing at 09:30.

There were no further questions from the on the BER.

TD then pointed out that it would also be pertinent to include in the BER any contract wording that might change, so that parties can see exactly what is being voted on; including tracked changes and setting in context would also be useful. MC noted these points and added that the BER template and processes could be revised to include this.

**Action UPUG 0103: Revise the BER to include any contract wording/legal text that might change (including tracked changes and setting in context).**

**Action UPUG 0104: BER template and process to be revised to accommodate inclusion of changes to contract wording/legal text.**

### **3.0 ACS Review April 2011**

MC confirmed that a revised ACS was submitted to Ofgem on 14 January 2011.

The ACS review for April is underway, and the draft revised ACS and Review Report will be published in mid February for review and comment. TD noted the tight timescale, given that this would be on the agenda for discussion at the proposed meeting on 15 February 2011. MC noted the concern and will report back if he perceived there would be a problem.

### **4.0 Operational Updates**

#### ***Performance***

MC provided a performance update, with all areas on target.

RF enquired whether the introduction of the new service might negate the IAD Service Line. MC responded that the new service would be self-managed. RF then asked if there was any performance related activity that should be put in its place; MC said this could be considered.

In response to a query relating to the Telephone Service Line figures for service availability, MC clarified that the reported statistics were due to the Data Centre being closed for Christmas and New Year.

## **5.0 Modification Update**

The following Live UNC Modification Proposals were identified by MC as being User Pays: Proposals 0353, 0351, 0347V, 0346, 0337, 0336, 0335, 0333, 0331, 0330, 0327, 0326, 0292, 0282, 0277, 0274, 0270, 0231V, and 0209.

## **6.0 Any Other Business**

### **6.1 New Service Desk for IS Related Calls**

MC reported that xoserve was introducing a new service desk at the end of February; full details of the change in telephone number will be communicated shortly. This represents a change to the UK Link Manual and is under formal consideration by the UK Link Committee.

## **7.0 Next Meeting**

As agreed at this meeting, a UPUC meeting will be held on Tuesday 15 February 2011 via teleconference, commencing at 09:30, with the intention of discussing the UPCO003 BER and the draft revised ACS and Review Report.

The next scheduled meeting is due to be held via teleconference at 10:30 on 14 March 2011.

**Action Table: User Pays User Group/Committee – 19 January 2011**

<b>Action Ref</b>	<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>Minute Ref</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Status Update</b>
UPUC 1101	15/11/10	2.1	xoserve to examine and provide an update on possible IAD Transactional Service charging mechanisms.	xoserve (MC/SD)	<b>Closed</b>
UPUC 1102	15/11/10	3.0	xoserve to confirm the development costs for UNC0224	xoserve (MC/SD)	<b>Carried forward</b>
UPUG 0101	19/01/11	2.0	UPCO003 - IAD Transactional Charging: Clarify cost per MPRN accessed, ascertain if any further related steps attract a charge, and what is the cost position for an aborted search.	xoserve (MC/SD)	
UPUG 0102	19/01/11	2.0	IAD Project and Project Q Anticipated timescales and interactions - Provide an indicative timeline showing how the projects fitted together, and including what notice might be provided for the new charging methodology.	xoserve (MC/SD)	
UPUG 0103	19/01/11	2.0	Revise the BER to include any contract wording/legal text that might change (including tracked changes and setting in context).	xoserve (MC/SD)	
UPUG 0104	19/01/11	2.0	BER template and process to be revised to accommodate inclusion of changes to contract wording/legal text.	xoserve (MC/SD)	