

UNC Workgroup 0734S Minutes
Reporting Valid Confirmed Theft of Gas into Central Systems
Thursday 24 September 2020
via Microsoft Teams

Attendees		
Kate Elleman (Chair)	(KE)	Joint Office
Helen Bennett (Secretary)	(HB)	Joint Office
Andy Clasper	(AC)	Cadent
Carl Whitehouse	(CW)	Shell Energy
Chris Hooper	(CH)	E.ON Energy
David Addison	(DA)	Xoserve
David Mitchell	(DM)	SGN
David O'Neill	(DON)	Ofgem
Ellie Rogers	(ER)	Xoserve
Fiona Cottam	(FC)	Xoserve
Fraser Mathieson	(FM)	SPAA/Electralink
Gareth Evans	(GE)	ICoSS
Guv Dosanjh	(GD)	Cadent
Heather Ward	(HW)	Energy Assets
Kirsty Dudley	(KD)	E.ON
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	Orsted
Max Lambert	(ML)	Ofgem
Oorlagh Chapman	(OC)	Centrica
Phil Lucas	(PL)	National Grid
Richard Pomroy	(RP)	Wales & West Utilities
Rose Kimber	(RK)	CNG Ltd
Steve Britton	(SBr)	Cornwall Insights
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	Gazprom Energy
Tracey Saunders	(TS)	Northern Gas Networks

Copies of all papers are available at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0734/240920>

The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 17 December 2020.

1.0 Introduction

1.1. Approval of Minutes

Ellie Rogers provided a small change to the published minutes. The minutes will be updated and re-published including a new consolidated set of minutes on the main Distribution Workgroup meeting page.

On this basis, the minutes from 27 August 2020 were agreed.

1.2. Approval of Late Papers

There were no late papers for approval.

1.3. Review of Outstanding Actions

No outstanding actions.

2.0 Consideration of Modification

Fraser Mathieson (FM) introduced the modification and confirmed the intent of this Modification is to introduce a new process to help ensure that valid confirmed theft data, received from Suppliers, is appropriately reported into central systems.

FM went on to explain that there is a lack of provision in UNC to ensure that when Suppliers report a theft, the communication to the Transporters needs to be reviewed. FM advised that a change has been implemented in SPAA to support certain minimum data items being provided when reporting theft.

When asked if the focus is to identify what is missing from the Contact Management Service system (CMS) or the Theft Risk Advisory Service (TRAS) system, FM confirmed that getting theft of gas into Settlement is the main aim of this modification.

It was agreed that there may be reasons why in some instances Theft of Gas (ToG) is recorded within CMS and not in TRAS, this is an area that may need a bit more looking at.

The key focus is to improve theft reporting to make sure confirmed theft is getting through to Settlement.

FM went on to highlight the key points in the modification:

Solution:

It is recommended that there is an obligation to create an automated process that will update CMS.

FM advised that Schedule 33 states that Suppliers should inform of all suspected theft, whether it is confirmed theft or not and asked Workgroup to consider what it is that the System would really need, confirmed theft or suspected theft.

KD highlighted that SPAA refers to just confirmed theft, whereas this modification is referring to all theft and suggested this inconsistency needs to be looked at.

FM suggested that CMS is possibly less interested in suspected theft, ER clarified the route that is required for a theft and where a theft is deemed valid and requires to be pursued, that is when the theft will be grouped to go into Settlement.

FM clarified that the Joint Theft Reporting Review Group (JTRR) concluded it is better to change CMS when a suspected theft is raised rather than when the theft is confirmed.

It was agreed that KD will liaise with FM regarding any changes to SPAA.

New Action 0901: KD and FM to discuss what needs to be implemented in SPAA to ensure it remains consistent with UNC.

Dave Addison (DA) asked if any conclusion has been reached as to why there is a discrepancy between Shipper and Supplier data. FM clarified it appears to be because there is no communication link. KD added that the CMS system is sometimes difficult to navigate and Users struggle with the system.

KE if the issue is with people finding the system hard to navigate, will a change to UNC make a difference and resolve this issue?

DA clarified that the Supplier has an obligation in SPAA to notify the Shipper of a confirmed theft; TRAS, acts as agent of the Supplier, CDSP acts as agent of the Shipper. The Shipper has the opportunity to challenge and close the theft down if they do not think it is a valid theft.

FM confirmed that the Supplier has the obligation to report the theft, they use TRAS to provide the confirmed theft and TRAS is the central repository for holding that data.

KD confirmed that the schedule allows a User to confirm a theft but then the User can withdraw it at a later date for which there is no time limit. FM suggested the withdrawal process should just sit in the CDSP process and not be documented in UNC.

It was confirmed that a change to the systems and UNC was necessary to resolve this issue.

New Action 0902: CDSP (DA) CDSP to review the process to understand whether it can deliver the solution based on the Business Rules as defined in the Modification:

what is already in place;

what is easy to implement; and

what is considered more a fundamental change.

It was agreed there is a need to consider if there is a requirement for a reversal and what the process would be if the reversal is not accounted for within the code.

FM concluded that the solution should be placed in to UNC at a high level and then a guidance document for CDSP as to what needs to happen.

The solution needs a combination of UNC change, an obligation placed on the right parties and a solution to make it easier for Users to navigate through the process

KD advised there is a need to really understand what the business rules are and how the solution will deliver the business rules.

New Action 0902: SPAA (FM) to provide more clarity to cover the requirements for SPAA.

New Action 0903: SPAA (FM) to investigate on what basis can a Shipper object to what is coming from the Supplier.

DA highlighted his concern that a theft could get all way through to settlement and then there could be a withdrawal. The process needs to be explicit.

2.1. Issues and Questions from Panel

KE advised that the UNC Modification Panel has asked the Workgroup to consider two specific questions:

2.1.1. Workgroup to consider whether self-governance status is/remains applicable

This will be discussed at the next Workgroup.

2.1.2. Workgroup to consider any potential cross Code impacts and implementation timelines

This will be discussed at the next Workgroup.

3.0 Review of Business Rules

This will be discussed at the next Workgroup.

4.0 Consideration of Draft Legal Text

This will be discussed at the next Workgroup.

5.0 Development of Workgroup Report

This will be discussed at the next Workgroup.

6.0 Next Steps

KE summarised the initial discussion, stating that the Workgroup has three months development time. The key areas discussed and agreed by Workgroup include the need to:

1. Review the Business rules within the Modification to determine whether the definition of 'Not Valid' needs to be expanded or included.
2. CDSP to review the process to understand whether it can deliver the solution based on the Business Rules as defined in the Modification
 - a. what is already in place;
 - b. what is easy to implement; and
 - c. what is considered more a fundamental change.
3. Consideration of what needs to be included in UNC and what goes into the DSC.

7.0 Any Other Business

None.

8.0 Diary Planning

Further details of planned meetings are available at: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/events-calendar/month

Workgroup meetings will take place as follows:

Time / Date	Venue	Workgroup Programme
Thursday 22 October 2020	Teleconference	Distribution Workgroup standard Agenda
Thursday 26 November 2020	Teleconference	Distribution Workgroup standard Agenda
Monday 14 December 2020	Teleconference	Distribution Workgroup standard Agenda

Action Table (as at 24 September 2020)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
0901	24/09/20	2.0	KD and FM to discuss what needs to be implemented in SPAA to ensure it remains consistent with UNC.	E.ON (KD) and SPAA (FM)	Pending
0902	24/09/20		CDSP (DA) CDSP to review the process to understand whether it can deliver the solution based on the Business Rules as defined in the Modification: What is already in place; What is easy to implement; and What is considered more a fundamental change	CDSP (DA)	Pending
0903	24/09/20	2.0	SPAA (FM) to provide more clarity to cover the requirements for SPAA	SPAA (FM)	Pending

0904	24/09/20	2.0	SPAA (FM) to investigate on what basis can a Shipper object to what is coming from the Supplier.	SPAA (FM)	Pending
-------------	----------	-----	--	-----------	----------------