

Meeting Details

Meeting Description:	Shipperless and Unregistered (S&U) Sites Working Group	
Venue	Conference Rooms 2&3, Lansdowne Gate, 65 New Road, Solihull	
Meeting Date:	27 th July 2016	
	Name	Organisation
<u>Attendees</u>	Lee Jackson (LJ)	Xoserve
	Mark E. Summersmith (MES)	
	Dave Ackers (DA)	
	Richard Cresswell (RC)	
	Geoff Moss (GM)	SSE
	April Maidens (AM)	
	Ian Fitzgerald (IF)	
	Robert A’Hearne (RA)	
	Josephine Lewis (JL)	
	Lee Wileman (LWi)	British Gas
	Steve Coller (SC)	
	Chris Bingham	
	Lisa Warnock (LWar)	Scotia Gas Networks
	Liz Wassall (LWas)	National Grid
	Shiv Singh (SS)	
	Olga Batsari (OB)	Wales and West Utilities
	Helen Armstrong (HA)	Northern Gas Networks
	Debbie Watson (DW)	Gazprom
	Heather Webb (HW)	Total Gas and Power
	Carol Lincoln (CL)	EON
Luke Sanders (LS)	The Renewable Energy Company	
William Tyndall (WT)		
Max Wilkie (MW)		
<u>Apologies</u>	Lee Parkes	British Gas
	Carol Glasier	Scotia Gas Networks

Archived Completed Actions

Ref.	Description	Action	Status
1-168, 170-175	These actions have been completed and archived for future reference.	N/A	Closed

Outstanding actions from previous meetings

Ref.	Date Raised	Description	Owner	Update
169	01/12/2014	Networks to determine a process / procedure to determine responsibility for a Meter at a Shipperless site. Update 09/11/15: Update to be provided. Unified response to Ofgem to be drafted Update 24/03/16: Individual Networks are developing their own processes to deal with this. LWar to check with David Mitchell if SGN has drafted the response to Ofgem on behalf of all Networks. Update 27/07/16: LWar advised that David Mitchell relayed that a joint letter is not being drafted as all Networks have different views. LW agreed to ask David Mitchell to take this to the DN Forum for further discussion.	Networks	Carried Forward
176	24/03/2016	LWar to check with David Mitchell if SGN has drafted the response to Ofgem on behalf of all Networks, regarding process / procedure to determine responsibility for a Meter at a Shipperless site. Update 27/07/16: See Action 169	LWar (SGN)	Closed
177	24/03/2016	Xoserve to find out who the relevant Network contacts are for the Network mis-allocation cleansing activity. Update 27/07/16: Xoserve provided the respective datasets to the Networks' Contract Managers on 12/02/2016	Xoserve	Closed
178	24/03/2016	Xoserve to investigate the feasibility and benefits of producing an age profile of the Legitimately Unregistered dataset. Update 27/07/16: It is feasible to conduct an age analysis on the Legitimately Unregistered pot based on the MPRN Creation Date. However, the benefits of this are unclear as a significant proportion of the LU pot is made up of Shipperless Sites and therefore have had a Confirmation since the creation of the MPRN. A graph to illustrate the ages of the LU MPRNs was presented at the meeting.	Xoserve	Closed
179	24/03/2016	RC to investigate the feasibility of including a communication to the Networks when MPRNs are created as part of the new MNC Creation process. Update 27/07/16: RC gave a full update on the MNC Process (see meeting slides)	Xoserve	Closed
180	24/03/2016	LJ to find out how MPRNs will be created once the creation process reaches "all the nines". Update 27/07/16: LJ investigated and found that we can still create approx. 6m more MPRNs within the "9 series" before we run out. Once we are closer to completely depleting these, we will look to define a new series.	Xoserve	Closed
181	24/03/2016	Attendees to consider future agenda topics and/or presenting initiatives or success stories to the group.	All	Carried Forward

Actions from meeting held on 27/07/16

Ref.	Date Raised	Description	Owner	Status
182	27/07/2016	Xoserve to investigate further, the possibility of passing the shipper feedback from the MAMCoP Portfolio Comparison Exercise back to the MAMs.	Xoserve	Open
183	27/07/2016	Xoserve to share the data from the MAMCoP Portfolio Comparison exercise with the Networks.	Xoserve	Open
184	27/07/2016	Shippers to provide examples of when a response is not received following an MNC Creation request. Post Meeting update: RC received two sets of examples and responded to the Shippers after analysing. If there are still further examples please do not hesitate to provide.	Shippers	Open
185	27/07/2016	RC to investigate the process for Networks to raise address amendments on Shipperless Sites.	Xoserve	Open
186	27/07/2016	MES to instigate an exercise to obtain and distribute more up to date contact information to be used by Shippers and Networks to contact other organisations to resolve issues.	Xoserve	Open
187	27/07/2016	MES to pursue the MAMCoP Portfolio Comparison Project lead to ascertain if information provided by Shippers could be fed back to the MAMs.	Xoserve	Open
188	27/07/2016	Xoserve to confirm if the parties still using the Multi-service Indicator are still being challenged by Xoserve. Post meeting update: This is an activity that hasn't taken place for a while. Now that we have the new process, how we'll action this will be reviewed and a new procedure put in place. We'll be doing some analysis, and with the findings, will determine if a targeted message to those using the service inappropriately is necessary.	Xoserve	Open
189	27/07/2016	Xoserve to look into applying timescales to responding to Shipper Disputes in the 425/455 processes.	Xoserve	Open
190	27/07/2016	Networks and Shippers to consider how Xoserve should progress with scenarios where an impasse has occurred between them.	Shippers and Networks	Open

Minutes

1. Introductions

LJ welcomed the group presented the agenda items and initiated introductions across the group.

LJ advised the group that the MNC (MNumber Creation) Process agenda item would be moved to the top of the agenda.

2. MNC MnCreation Process

RC presented an update on the new MNC MNumber Creation Process (see meeting slides)

A discussion ensued.

LWar asked why Shippers did not pursue the creation of an MPRN following an initial rejection if they believed that a meter existed on site.

DW responded, saying that Shippers do not always receive a response from Xoserve when a request has been rejected.

RC asked for examples of this so that they could be investigated.

Action: Shippers to provide examples of when a response is not received following an MNC Creation request.

One the subject of prioritising requests on the grounds of vulnerability (Elderly/Children etc) LWar advised that Networks would prioritise requests based on the information provided with the request.

LWar advised that providing End User contact details with a request would speed up the process.

LWar asked why it was taking so long to Confirm sites following the creation of the MPRN.

DW stated that sometimes End Users cannot be contacted to enter into a contract.

DA asked for further discussion on the LI/DE checks as part of the process.

LWar and OB clarified that a LI/DE check was not a GTI check. A LI/DE check would check the capacity of the service. A GTI check would check if the service was recorded on Network systems. If there was no MPRN, and the Network believed it was a legitimate service (workmanship and the materials used on the installation would help determine this), they would create an MPRN and pursue the End User to engage with a gas Supplier. If the MPRN was not subsequently confirmed, it would be cut off.

DW asked if all evidence obtained by Networks be passed to Shippers. RC advised that the amount of information that could be passed on via CMS was restricted, but further information could be provided off-line. RC stated that using reference numbers as evidence would help when passing information in both directions.

OB raised the issue that there is no uniform process for Networks to raise address amendments for Shipperless Sites.

RC agreed to take this away to investigate.

Action: RC to investigate the process for Networks to raise address amendments on Shipperless Sites.

DW advised that she was having difficulty contacting people in other organisations to resolve issues as the Shipper/Network Contact List was out of date.

MES advised that Shippers and Networks should be responsible for updating this as necessary, but would instigate an exercise to get more up to date information.

Action: MES to instigate an exercise to obtain and distribute more up to date contact information to be used by Shippers and Networks to contact other organisations to resolve issues.

3. Actions from Previous Meetings

LJ ran through all previous actions. (See updates above)

4. S&U Statistical Information

LJ presented the latest S&U statistical information. (See meeting slides)

5. MAM Portfolio Comparison Exercise

MES presented an update on the MAM Portfolio Comparison Exercise relating to Shipperless and Unregistered Data. (See meeting slides)

DW asked if it was possible to feed the information provided by Shippers back to MAMs, as some of the information provided by MAMs included erroneous records where the responsibility for the meter has passed to alternative MAMs.

MES reported that this had been put to the project lead but was advised that this activity was not in the scope of the project.

Action: MES to pursue the MAMCoP Portfolio Comparison Project lead to ascertain if information provided by Shippers could be fed back to the MAMs.

6. MNC and FOM Data

LJ presented updated statistics on the submission of MNC and FOM MPRN Creation Contacts (See meeting slides). LJ pointed out that the submission of both of the Contact types has remained relatively constant over the last 12 months. LJ showed that the submission percentage of MNC and FOM Contacts where the Multi Service Indicator has been selected has fallen considerably over the past year. Indicating that work conducted by Networks and Shippers to influence this has paid off.

OB asked if the parties still using the Multi-service Indicator are still being challenged by Xoserve.

LJ said Xoserve will confirm if this is still happening.

Action: Xoserve to confirm if the parties still using the Multi-service Indicator are still being challenged by Xoserve.

7. Mod424/425/455 Process Review

LJ opened a discussion on the 424/425/455 processes by presenting some background and highlighting some issues that either Xoserve had encountered, or had been raised by Shippers (see meeting slides).

DW said that information received on some GSR Contacts is insufficient.

LWar said that they include all the mandatory information on the GSR Contact. They can indicate on the GSR Contact if they have extra information available extra information.

DW asked what timescales are applied to responses to Shipper Disputes.

LJ advised that there are no current timescales but this is something that could be considered.

Action: Xoserve to look into applying timescales to responding to Shipper Disputes in the 425/455 processes.

Various Shippers raised the issue that they were not able to attach assets on UK-Link as the meter details provided by the Networks are incomplete. This situation is sometimes compounded as the meter has since been removed.

Networks responded by saying in this situation, the Shippers can either contact them via Xoserve or directly.

Other scenarios were discussed which resulted in an impasse between Shippers and Networks. Xoserve requested that the Industry consider what should be done in these scenarios.

Action: Networks and Shippers to consider how Xoserve should progress with scenarios where an impasse has occurred between them.

8. AOB

None

Next Meeting: December 2016 (Date to be confirmed)