

Uniform Network Code Committee
Minutes of the 185 Meeting held on Thursday 18 April 2019
at Elexon, 4th Floor, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW

Attendees

Voting Members:

Shipper Representatives	Transporter Representatives
D Fittock* (DF), Corona Energy G Jack (GJ), British Gas M Bellman (MB), ScottishPower R Fairholme (RFa), Uniper	D Lond (DL), National Grid NTS G Dosanjh (GD), Cadent H Chapman* (HC), SGN R Pomroy (RP), Wales & West Utilities T Saunders (TS), Northern Gas Networks J Cooper* (JC), BUUK

Non-Voting Members:

Chairperson	Ofgem Representative	Consumer Representatives	Independent Supplier Representative
M Shurmer (MS)	L King* (LG)	E Proffitt (EP)	

Also in Attendance:

E Rogers (ER), Xoserve; F Cottam* (FC), Xoserve; G Anderson* (GA), EDF; K Tait* (KT), Fulcrum; R Fletcher (BF), Secretary; R Hailes (RH), Joint Office; R Kealley (RK), British Gas; S Britton* (SBr), Cornwall Insight.

** by teleconference*

185.1 Note of any alternates attending meeting

E Proffitt for A Green, Total and S Mulinganie, Gazprom

G Jack for G Wood, British Gas

185.2 Apologies for Absence

A Green, Total

G Wood, British Gas

J Atherton, Citizens Advice

P Garner, Joint Office

S Mulinganie, Gazprom

185.3 Minutes and Actions from the previous meeting

Members approved the minutes from 21 March 2019 meeting.

185.4 Matters for the Committee's Attention

a) Consideration of the final AUG Table for 2019/20

FC provided an overview of the next steps in terms of approval of the AUG Table and what options were available to the UNCC at this time:

The UNCC unanimously agree changes to Final AUG Table published 29 March (<https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/augenex/1920>).

Final Table is included in the AUG Statement – Section 8 (Page 108 of the PDF)

Does any party propose any changes?

Or:

Unanimously agree a further iteration of one or more steps in the AUG Framework document.

Does any party propose any such re-work?

Otherwise the AUG Table is approved and becomes effective from 01 October 2019.

GJ proposed a short notice presentation to be presented by RK. Members unanimously agreed to consider the presentation at short notice.

RK provided a view on the recent changes to the AUG Table and the new methodology being proposed. These were originally discussed through the AUG process at the recent AUG Subcommittee meeting. However, the new AUG table and methodology should not be adopted as it was based on analysis which was incomplete, it would be preferable if the current table was rolled forward.

This new AUG table has been impacted by the provision of incomplete theft data from TRAS and therefore leads to a weighted bias in the factors which would be less accurate than those from the previous year.

RP questioned why the data at domestic level is more successful, why is address matching at commercial premises more difficult and therefore less successful, is this due to the nature of naming conventions and that domestic premises identifications rarely change. RK agreed and confirmed this created the bias, as it doesn't provide an accurate picture of theft in the non-domestic sector.

MS asked Members what they wished to consider in terms of options and possible votes that could be taken based on the rules established in the UNC and the Framework for the Appointment of an Allocation of Unidentified Gas Expert document.

EP advised that he had been given clear instructions by the Members he was alternate for and that this might limit his voting options.

MB still wanted to go through the process so that the vote is recorded and understood.

RK advised that there still around 6 main issues that remain open in terms of AUG discussions and that these should be resolved as they could influence the outcome of the AUG Table in future. In addition there were a number of other issues which could impact the AUG Table including availability of data.

Members noted that the last AUG Subcommittee meeting was held on 12 April and that in future years, this final meeting should be held sufficiently in advance of the following UNCC meeting to allow sufficient representation to be made by parties seeking to influence the UNCC decision.

Members noted that presentation by RK recommended that the current AUG Table should be rolled forward and the new AUG Table should not be adopted.

RF would like to see a further consultation process adopted coupled with a recommendation on implementation by an informed Sub-committee as he was concerned that this subject should be backed up by informed views.

MB agreed and as the process is still new there should be a review to ensure the process is managed correctly going forward.

MB asked UNCC Members to consider the views presented in their voting, suggesting that incomplete analysis has led to a flawed AUG Table proposal, particularly as the AUG Table would not be effective until 01 October.

EP noted the concerns but would support the adoption of the proposed AUG Table as this is what the AUG could do in the time available for this year, any other issues should be rolled forward to the next AUG Year and resolved then.

MS asked for Members to vote and confirm if they were in favour of proposing changes to the AUG Table by rolling forward the previous year AUG Table?

With 2 Votes in favours (MB and GJ) the Committee was not in favour of changing the AUG Table (unanimous vote in favour of a change is required).

MS asked for Members to vote and confirm if they were in favour of requesting a further iteration of the AUG Table?

With 7 vote in favour (MB, GJ, RP ,DL , GD, RF and TS) the Committee was not in favour of requesting a further iteration of the Final AUG Table (unanimous vote in favour of a further iteration is required).

The Final AUG Table is approved and becomes effective from 01 October 2019.

b) AUG Procurement Process

FC advised that the AUG procurement process is continuing and further update would be provided at a future meeting.

c) EDF Energy supply IDs

GA provided a presentation seeking permission or views from the UNCC on the use of additional Shipper IDs.

It was noted that previously this activity would have been managed through a Transporter/Xoserve interface meeting. However, changes due to FGO had changed this relationship. BF questioned if this is this a Transporter vote only, if so should this issue be considered by the UNCC?

RP challenged the view that Shippers can have more than one ID and that this could impact existing Shipper arrangements such as credit and settlement. DL agreed with this view.

GA divided that they were aware that one Shipper had an additional Shipper ID and that the system could support this approach. ER advised that from an Xoserve point of view, the system can support the use of more than one Shipper ID by a Shipper, however Transporters might have other issues that would make this a difficult change to undertake.

RP noted that as this is a Transporter matter, it should not be a UNCC decision. Both RP and TS noted that there could be issues to do with credit and energy balancing when operating different IDs across one group and that they would like to see further analysis presented by Xoserve so that they could understand the wider impacts.

GA wanted to understand why one party has already been allowed to make similar changes, why is EDF being prevented from operating this way. GA couldn't understand the credit issue as the parent company guarantee would apply. The other option of applying for a new Shipper licence seems onerous when this is simply an administrative process which the system can support.

TS felt the consistent should be one shipper one code.

RF suggested a Modification might be required to facilitate this process and clarify the process that should be adopted as he was unclear as to what UNCC is being asked and why.

RP advised that Transporters are considering EDFs request and following clarification from Xoserve they would continue the discussions directly with EDF.

d) Sharing IX Equipment

KT advised that Fulcrum were seeking permission from the UNCC to allow Fulcrum MAM to utilise IX equipment currently installed for Fulcrum IGT. This would be efficient as currently the IGT only flows a limited number of files via IX. Allowing the MAM to use the same IX connection would reduce costs and use the some of the existing spare capacity which would be more efficient.

TS challenged why this is a UNCC issue, this should be managed by DSC Contract Management Committee. There were general concerns that this was the second request of this nature in a short period of time and that Xoserve should have a process in place to manage such requests.

ER advised that Xoserve will look to establish criteria for a new gate keeper role which would then make an informed recommendation to UNCC if it were needed.

Members were then requested clarify if they have any concerns. None were raised and permission would not be withheld for this request to allow the Sharing of IX

equipment.

e) PAC Election Recommendation

This item was deferred to the May meeting.

f) PAC Terms of Reference/PAC Election Changes

This item was deferred to the May meeting.

g) UNC User Representative Appointment Process

This item was deferred to the May meeting.

185.5 AOB

a) None raised.

185.6 Next Meeting

The next meeting is:

16 May 2019, immediately after the UNC Modification Panel meeting.

Action Table (18 April 2019)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
					Pending