

Meeting Details

Meeting Description:	Shipperless and Unregistered (S&U) Sites Working Group	
Venue	Conference Rooms 5&6, 31 Homer Road, Solihull	
Meeting Date:	1 st December 2014 (10:30am)	
	Name	Organisation
<u>Attendees</u>	Suzanne Cullen (SC)	Xoserve
	Mark E. Summersmith (MES)	
	Dave Turpin (DT)	
	Katherine Towlson (KT)	
	Dave Ackers (DA)	
	Thomas Brine (TB)	
	Tahera Choudrey (TC)	
	Hilary Chapman (HC)	
	Alex Ross-Shaw (ARS)	Northern Gas Networks
	Chris Warner (CW)	National Grid Gas
	Andy Clasper (AC)	
	Nigel Winnan (NW)	Wales and West Utilities
	Erika Melen (EM)	Scotia Gas Networks
	Lisa Warnock (LW)	
	Lee Wileman (LWi)	British Gas
	Richard Beatson (RB)	
	Sue Cropper (SCr)	
	Jessica Yuen (JY)	SSE
	Geoff Moss (GM)	
	Debbie Watson (DW)	Gazprom
Azeem Khan (AK)	NPower	
Graham Smilie (GS)	SCP	
Cherelle Mclean (CM)	TGP	
<u>Apologies</u>	Anne Jackson	SSE
	Kate Loveridge	E.ON
	Colin Dooley	
	Mark Donaldson	
	Colette Baldwin	
	Carol Lincoln	
	Methab Azan	NGN
	Chris Bingham	British Gas
	Elaine Carr	SCP
	Aiyasha Andrade	Dong
	Andrew Archibald	
	Richard Vernon	Npower

Archived Completed Actions

Ref.	Description	Action	Status
1-162	These actions have been completed and archived for future reference.		

Recently Closed Actions

Ref.	Date Raised	Description	Action	Status
163	17/09/14	Xoserve to provide explanation for increase in 'No Activity' figures in reference to the jump from 815 for January 2014 to 4152 for February-July 2014. Update 01/12/14 Xoserve advised that the recently produced figures concur with the figures produced in September. There is no apparent explanation other than the numbers have increased. This will be monitored.	Xoserve	Closed
167	17/09/14	Xoserve to provide feedback on the results of MOD 431. Update 01/12/14. Xoserve presented an update of the project at the SUWG meeting. (See meeting slides)	Xoserve	Closed

Outstanding actions from previous meetings

Ref.	Date Raised	Description	Action	Status
164	17/09/14	Xoserve to complete an exercise every two weeks to identify MNCs and FOMs being raised for same premises, monitor instances of 'Multi Service' being selected to identify Users using this incorrectly and continue with project to amend Plot to postal addresses.	Xoserve	Ongoing
165	17/09/14	Shippers to perform the fullest of checks / enquiries before submitting MNCs. Request that incorrectly created MPRN records are set to EX at the earliest opportunity. Review Internal Process Guidelines for M Number Creation procedures. Not to select 'Multi Service' if this is not correct.	Shippers	Ongoing
166	17/09/14	Networks to influence the UIPs about the timely submission of FOM contacts. Influence UIPs to not select 'Multi Service' unless it is truly an additional service entering a property. Re-affirm the importance of 'Tagging' the meter point.	Networks	Ongoing

Actions from meeting held on 01/12/2014

Ref.	Date Raised	Description	Action	Status
168	01/12/2014	Xoserve to present MNC and FOM contact data in the next Workgroup	Xoserve	Open
169	01/12/2014	Networks to determine a process / procedure to determine responsibility for a Meter at a Shipperless site.	Networks	Open

Minutes

1. Introductions

SC welcomed the group presented the agenda items. Introductions across the group were carried out. SC provided an update about new Xoserve staff, KT and TB, and advised the group that KT and TB will be hosting future workgroups, in conjunction with support from SC and MES.

2. Actions from Previous Meetings

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

Action 163 - In the previous meeting in September SCr asked about the increase in 'No Activity' figures in reference to the jump from 815 for January 2014 to 4152 for February-July 2014. The previous explanation suggested that the increase was due to cumulative records piling up. There was no new explanation, and figures will be monitored going forward.

Action 164 – It was advised a report is currently being built to manage this process, and will be sent out to the relevant parties.

Action 165 – There has been little response from Shippers. DA advised this would be discussed in more detail later on during the workgroup.

3. Update on MOD 431

TC and HC deliver a presentation on Mod 431, to address Action 167. (See Meeting Slides).

It was confirmed that the extension period came to an end on the 27/11/2014.

NW noted an increase in GSR contacts over a 12 month period, and queried whether Mod 431 has had an impact on this. MES confirmed yes. NW asked if addresses were being updated. TC confirmed we do not have full addresses as part of this Mod and process.

4. Statistical Information – Update on S&U Reports

SC presented statistical information to the group. (See Meeting Slides).

SC advised that reports had been sent out. Some of the group advised that they had not yet seen the reports sent out by Xoserve the week previously.

A comparison between last year and 2014 was discussed and there has been a reduction in most of the pots, with an increase in legitimately unregistered sites and meter points created in less than 12 months.

CW expressed that the increases are seen to be normal and SCr was not surprised as there have been three to four Mods that will have driven this increase.

5. MPRN Creation

There were remaining actions from the previous meeting, off the back of DA's presentation. (See previous Meeting Slides).

MES recaps on the Shipper and Network actions regarding MPRN creation. (See Meeting Slides).

SCr advised it takes a while to change behaviour.

Some figures on the amount of MNC and FOM contacts were presented. (See Meeting Slides). The amount of contacts received has increased which suggests there has not been a change in behaviour.

MES asked the group what action has been taken since the last meeting in September 2014.

NW explained that the UIPs have been contacted and the asset management team is being pushed. MES observed that the amount of multi-service requests has not changed and there are concerns around how this is being used.

DA explained to the group that Multi Service requests have had a wider impact, leading to linked addresses. If a number of addresses are linked by the same premise ID, if a PAF update takes place and one linked address is updated, all linked addresses are changed which has led to a distortion.

FOM contacts are responded to within a day, so if UIPs are delaying their requests, we do not have intelligence as to when Meter Points are being created.

LWi asks if these are all individual requests. MES confirms the answer to this is yes.

DW queried if the Shipper is notified if an address is being updated. There used to be a code which let Shippers know a linked address was being updated however this may be going back a considerable length of time. DA confirmed that what DW was referencing is an old, different concern.

SCr suggested that there should be Shipper reports with live MNC data so each Shipper can see how many MNCs are being created by their organisation which can then be actioned. MES advised that everyone can do something in order to reduce the amount of MNCs and FOMs.

DA explained that some recent MNCs have been for illegal connections and referenced a recent example, as well as outlining the 4 day turnaround on MN creation could be creating a dangerous situation.

DW asked, when networks complete GT1 (capacity) checks, do they check the validity of the meter? NW explained that if there is a site visit, relevant checks are made. There were 5000 LI/DE checks last year.

MES summarised that actions are ongoing, and agreed to keep the actions open (Actions 164, 165, 166), and present further MNC and FOM figures in future Workgroup Meetings. **(Action 168)**.

Xoserve have nearly completed their S&U actions.

It was agreed that this topic will be discussed in further meetings.

6. GDN Response to Ofgem's Open letter to Gas Distribution Networks on Tackling Unregistered Sites

EM presented the GDN letter response to Ofgem. (See Meeting Slides).
EM confirmed the letter can be published.

DA queried the 38% success rate and what we can do to address the remaining 62%. It was confirmed that the work has not stopped; members of the group expressed the opinion that they wanted all sites resolved. LW explained there is a team at SGN which are working on this issue.

7. Mod 424 and Mod 410a

MES provided an update on Mods 424 and 410a GSR and MUS contact codes, namely the current workarounds relevant to each Mod that the Shippers / Networks need to be aware of. (See Meeting Slides).

MES provided some feedback on the implementation from the 22/11/2014.

SC provided an update on the MUS backlog. SC confirmed that the majority of GSRs are almost all uploaded. The volume of MUS contacts is high, and there will be a controlled upload over the course of this week.

SC advised that an email will be sent to everyone this week regarding CMS Advanced Find and noted an issue regarding QCL emails which are sending duplicates. This is currently being investigated for resolution as soon as possible.

LW and NW explained they have been logging contacts with no issues or specific feedback.

8. Responsibility for a Meter at a Shipperless Site

Xoserve was contacted by Ofgem following an enquiry from an End User who was having difficulty getting the meter and service removed from their property. This was discussed during the previous Workgroup on

17/09/2014. MES returned to this discussion topic as Ofgem have very recently been in touch with Xoserve chasing a solution.

The previous solution suggested was that current procedures dictate that the solution is for the End User to obtain a supply contract with a gas supplier and ask them to remove the supply; and then for them to contact the GDN to ask for the service to be removed. MES put it to the group to discuss further or confirm this is the relevant course of action.

NW outlined that the existing suggestion is shocking.

MES questioned what happens to the asset.

EM explained there has been Network discussion about this topic. SGN have their own process; they take the meter away. They haven't got the budget for it however it is something they have been doing.

EM referenced a SPAR meeting during which it was discussed; when a meter is removed, what does that party do with the asset?

MES queried whether we would expect the previous supplier to take responsibility. SCr confirmed they cannot.

NW discussed that the only obvious solution is for the Network to remove the asset and then attempt to establish who the asset belongs to.

NW outlined that the Networks should take responsibility as a "last resort."

MES identified that this particular issue cannot be agreed during the Workgroup and requires further analysis and discussion.

MES confirmed an action to take away: a procedure is to be agreed across the board as to how to address the removal of an asset at the request of an End User. Is it a joint effort? **(Action 169)**.

9. Group Discussion

- **Withdrawn Sites with Live MPRNs with No Meter Attached**
- **Legitimately Unregistered**

It was discussed how we need to move forward with Legitimately Unregistered sites, alongside Withdrawn Sites with Live MPRNs with No Meter Attached.

MES presented some slides which outlined figures for the amount of both Legitimately Unregistered Sites and Withdrawn Sites with Live MPRNs with No Meter Attached. (See Meeting Slides).

CW explained that he cannot see a problem at the moment. SCr questioned how many of the 392,000 Withdrawn Sites are safe. DT suggested there might not be an issue.

MES advised that part of the discussion would be to confirm what is to be done.

DA confirmed that we have cleansed data through the Plot to Postal Project from 65,000 Plot Addresses to 35,000 Plot Addresses. Spreadsheets have been sent to Shippers who have had Plot Addresses created in the last month, requesting a better address and requesting them to submit an ADD.

The Workgroup attendees were split into two groups to discuss a topic each. Each group focussed on the following:

- What is wrong?
- Who is responsible?
- What can be done to correct it?
- Actions and outcomes to address root causes.

The results of the Group Discussion are as follows:

Withdrawn Sites with Live MPRNs with No Meter Attached

Group Discussion Group 1

EM, as the spokesperson for the group, presented the group discussion, noting that it was brief. When GSR visits are completed, sites are determined as safe and legitimately shipperless. It is unlikely that any of these will be carrying gas.

The statistics MES presented suggested there are approximately 400,000 of these sites.

Discussion within the group led to the opinion that there wasn't any evidence that these sites were dangerous.

EM discussed that there are certain actions taking place that will have an impact on Withdrawn Sites with Live MPRNs with No Meter Attached, including the MAMCop change which is going through.

Some sites should get picked up through Mod 410a and the Innovation Project will make a difference.

It was discussed how no action will be taken on the backlog of sites however to bear them in mind, including them in reporting.

EM suggested they could be looked at every five years however it may be that cost benefit allowance would not agree with this.

MES confirmed actions from this discussion:

- Check the labelling for GDNs.
- Reporting to keep them in mind.

Legitimately Unregistered

Please see below a table and summary outlining the discussion around Legitimately Unregistered sites.

Issue	What's Wrong?	Who is Responsible?	What can be done?	Actions and Outcomes
45,000 Legitimately unregistered sites	Legacy. Vacant properties. Visibility of why specific sites have ended up in the LU pot.	Xoserve reporting.	Timestamp Domestic vs Business sites. Additional Xoserve reporting.	Collate outcomes from GDN / Supplier investigations.
MPRN Creation Process		Supplier to undertake full searches before creating MPRNs. GDNs to ensure MPRNs cancelled.	Xoserve to run data cleansing to identify duplication.	MNC practice. Plot to Postal Reconciliation. Cleansing cancelled jobs.
Labelling of Supply		GDNs	Further brief direct labour, contractors and UIPs.	
Ongoing process	Build a B.A.U process.		Risk based approach developed.	
Identifying Shipperless sites through other means.		GDNs	Check for system flag for Shipperless Sites, e.g. gas escapes.	

Group Discussion Group 2 –

NW as the spokesperson from the group presented the outcomes from the group discussion. It was confirmed that there are 45,000 Legitimately Unregistered sites at present.

It was suggested that additional reporting could take place in order to establish why sites have ended up in this specific pot. It would also be prudent to consider the age profile of sites.

It was confirmed that British Gas and Wales and West Utilities have completed some work in this specific area.

The key points to emerge from this discussion were as follows:

- What is the risk?
- What drives the risk?
- Approach taken is risk based.

Data cleansing has and will continue to take place.

It is important to ensure UIPs label supplies properly.

MES discussed whether the 45,000 pot can be split into Network groups.
Do Xoserve send figures to Shippers including M Number creation date and AQ?
Xoserve can potentially issue a report for all to look at.

MES also discussed the option of a report being sent to UIPs on the anniversary of the MPR creation date.

EM noted that it was important to prioritise reports for relevant resource to be allocated.

The priority at this point is for details from investigations into Legitimately Unregistered sites be gathered and risks analysed. Results to be sent to MES / SPA Management in time for the next Workgroup.

10. A.O.B.

There was no specific AOB discussed as the Workgroup came to a close. It was noted that the next Workgroup would be in March 2015.

Next Meeting – Monday 9th MARCH 2015

Proposed Agenda: Review Minutes from Last Meeting (01/12/2014)
S&U Statistics
MPRN Creation
Withdrawn sites with no Live MPRN
Legitimately Unregistered Sites