

**Uniform Network Code Committee**  
**Minutes of the 80<sup>th</sup> Meeting Held on Thursday 21 July 2011**  
**at ENA, 52 Horseferry Road, London**

**Members Present:**

**Transporter Representatives:** R Hewitt (National Grid NTS), C Warner (National Grid Distribution), J Ferguson (Northern Gas Networks), J Martin (Scotia Gas Networks) and S Trivella (Wales & west Utilities)

**User Representatives:** C Wright (British Gas Trading), R Fairholme (E.ON UK), R Street (Corona Energy) and S Leedham (EDF Energy)

**Ofgem Representative:**

**Customer Representative:**

**Supplier Representative:**

**Joint Office:** T Davis (Chair) and B Fletcher (Secretary)

**Observers Present:** D Ianora (Ofgem), A Miller (Xoserve), A Raper (National Grid Distribution), C Shanley (National Grid NTS) and P Lucas (National Grid NTS)

**Record of Alternates:** R Street for A Bal (Shell) and P Broom (GDF Suez) and J Martin for A Gibson (Scotia Gas Networks)

**Apologies for Absence:** A Bal, A Gibson, C Hill, J Dixon and R Hall

**80.3 Matters of Implementation**

TD explained that all modifications awaiting an implementation date had been included on the agenda. It was agreed that this was helpful and should be continued.

- a) Modification 0276 - Alternative User Pays approach to – UNC Modification Proposal 0263 - Enabling the Assignment of a Partial Quantity of Registered NTS Exit (Flat) Capacity

R Hewitt advised that a way forward is still being considered, with a view to effectively reversing the direction to implement.

- b) Modification 0292 - Proposed change to the AQ Review Amendment Tolerance for SSP sites

ST advised implementation was anticipated to be during November 2011. The modification will not be effective until April 2012 and a November implementation date should help to ensure it does not conflict with the current AQ review.

- c) Modification 0333A - Update of the default System Marginal Buy Price and System Marginal Sell Price

R Hewitt confirmed that the modification is on target for implementation, with the revised default values applicable from 01 October 2011. However, an error had been identified in the formula and this will need to be corrected, probably through a consent to modify.

## **80.4 Documents for Approval**

### a) Proposed Amendments to the Measurement Error Guidelines

C Wright explained the proposed changes to the MER guidelines. These were seeking to reinforce the independent nature of the technical experts when more than one has been appointed, and that responses to queries should be in writing.

T Davis suggested that this might imply information not being published in advance of meetings in order to prevent the experts from seeing each other's reports. This would also prevent all parties from reviewing the material in advance and may make the discussions less productive than might otherwise have been the case.

J Martin noted that it would be normal practice to allow experts on a site at the same time when conduct testing. It was accepted that experts are aware of their responsibilities not to collaborate and this should not cause a problem – C Wright confirmed that it was not the intention of the proposed changes that separate testing should be carried out.

S Leedham was concerned that sufficient time had not been allowed to discuss the proposed changes in a workgroup prior to approval, though he noted the amendments had been raised during a teleconference. R Street suggested a more formal process would be helpful, with a report identifying the proposed changes and the justification for making them – this would be moving the change process closer to that used for UNC modifications.

J Ferguson asked if the existing contracts would need to be changed for the Aberdeen error in order to reflect the proposed amendments. J Martin advised the agreements set out the Terms of Reference and should be sufficient as they stand.

The following members voted in favour of the amendments: C Wright, R Fairholme, S Leedham, C Warner, J Martin, J Ferguson, R Hewitt and S Trivella

There were no votes against the amendments, which were therefore approved by the Committee.

## **80.5 Any Other Business**

### a) Draft AUGS Publication Date

A Miller advised that the AUGE has requested an extension to the reporting date for the draft AUGS in order to be able to provide a more comprehensive (accurate) report at a later stage. This delay is in part due to the lack of historical data available, as some of the information required has not been held by Xoserve following its initial reporting. He explained that he has confidence that the AUGE will deliver the final AUGS on time; it is the short term availability of information that is causing the delay.

C Wright asked if any delay might have an impact on the February date and final report deadline. A Miller confirmed it should not affect the

February date - it is only the production of the September report which has problems.

R Street was happy to support the AUGE's request for a delay if this is not prolonged and is expected to lead to a better informed draft for review. Members unanimously supported this.

R Street was concerned that the AUGE had arranged a meeting with British Gas on the same day as the Modification Panel and that the industry was given very little notice if they wanted to attend the same meeting. This does not appear to be in line with the process which is for parties to raise issues and the AUGE to respond. A Miller felt that some of the issues raised were complex and lengthy which justified a meeting. He suggested that the process be reviewed to identify if a similar meeting should be planned into the diary in future years.

#### **80.6 Next Meeting**

The Committee noted the date and time of the next meeting as:

Thursday 18 August 2011, at the ENA, immediately after the Modification Panel meeting.