
UNC Workgroup 0636 0636A Minutes
Updating the parameters for the NTS Optional Commodity Charge
Friday 19 January 2018
at Elexon, 4th Floor, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW

Attendees

Chris Shanley (Chair)	(CS)	Joint Office
Mike Berrisford	(MB)	Joint Office
Andrew Pearce	(AP)	BP
Debra Hawkin	(DH)	TPA Solutions
Duncan Macintyre	(DM)	Axpo UK Ltd
Graham Jack	(GJ)	Centrica
Henk Kreuze	(HK)	Vermillion Energy
Jag Basi	(JB)	ESB
Jeff Chandler*	(JCh)	SSE
Julie Cox*	(JCo)	Energy UK
John Costa	(JC)	EDF Energy
Matthew Hatch	(MH)	National Grid NTS
Mike Ronan	(MR)	Aughinish Alumina Ltd
Nahed Cherfa	(NC)	Statoil
Nick Wye	(NW)	Waters Wye Associates
Nick Tyler*	(NT)	National Grid NTS – <i>0636 only</i>
Nigel Sisman	(NS)	Sisman Energy Consulting Ltd
Robert Wiggington	(RW)	Wales & West Utilities
Sean Hayward	(SH)	Ofgem
Steve Britton*	(SB)	Cornwall Energy
Steve Pownall	(SP)	Xoserve

* *via teleconference*

Copies of all papers are available at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0636/190118>

The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 15 March 2018.

1.0 Introduction and Status Review

In welcoming everyone to the meeting, CS provided a brief explanation of the proposed approach to the meeting highlighting the fact that the National Grid NTS lawyer would be dialling into the meeting for a 'limited' period at around 11:00am, at which point the Workgroup would stop whatever current discussions were underway to focus on item 4.0 below.

1.1. Approval of Minutes (04 January 2018)

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

2.0 Pre Modification Discussion

2.1. 0636B Updating the parameters for the NTS Optional Commodity Charge

JCh provided a brief overview of the SSE 0636B introductory presentation before focusing attention on the draft (change marked against 0636) Modification Proposal.

When asked, JCh confirmed that part of the intention behind the modification is to include the methodology that sits behind the formula within the Uniform Network Code (UNC), and as a consequence, he would welcome National Grid NTS input in how best to undertake this. MH noted that this would be heavily dependant upon the level of detail involved – if simply a high-level methodology then this could be easy to develop but a more detailed methodology may take some time to construct.

In suggesting that 0636B appears to lean heavily on the 0621 provisions, especially in regard to the RPI (minus the distance cap) aspects, NW suggested that the ‘industry’ expectation is that National Grid NTS would be developing the associated methodology, so there could be some synergies that this Workgroup can benefit from. When asked, JCh confirmed that the formula has been lifted straight from National Grid NTS’s GCD11 (circa 2015). However, he accepts that further consideration of these aspects is needed, including possibly utilising the 0621 RPI provisions in order to save time and duplication.

New Action 0104: SSE (JCh) to discuss with National Grid NTS (MH) how the RPI formula provisions could be updated to include the indexation from 2015 and what supporting analysis could be provided to quantify the impact on charges/parties of the suggested approach.

CS reminded everyone that the 0636 0636A Workgroup Reporting deadline had been extended at the 18 January 2018 Panel meeting, out to 15 March 2018, although if possible, the Workgroup could report sooner. He recommended that the proposer of Modification 0636B kept this in mind when deciding what level of methodology to include in the proposal.

DH confirmed that she was still not looking to add the requirement for the methodology to be included in the UNC in her proposal (0636). NW confirmed he may consider doing so but would wait to see what was provided for 0636B.

New Action 0105: SSE (JCh) to discuss with National Grid NTS (MH) the best approach to develop the methodology to be included in the UNC and consequently consider the appropriate level of methodology detail and associated timelines to include in Modification 0636B.

When asked, JCh confirmed that 0636B proposes an enduring solution until some other modification comes along to change things, such as any of the 0621 related modification(s).

When some parties suggested that the commodity charge changes due to take effect in October 2019 would potentially impact on any 0636 enduring solutions, CS suggested that the (draft) Workgroup Report already covers this potential concern.

Some parties suggested that care is needed to ensure the Workgroup Report clearly outlines what impacts the forthcoming EU Law changes could have on any 0636 solution, especially when bearing in mind that currently there are no provisions within the proposed solutions. However, some felt that this is unreasonable as it is impossible to cover all eventualities under the suite of 0636 modifications whilst keeping to the proposed timelines.

At this point a lengthy debate ensued around what could be perceived as discriminatory aspects of the proposed 0636 (and potentially the alternative(s)) enduring solutions and the soon to be implemented EU Tariff Code requirements. In short, some parties question the wisdom of implementing a solution that they believe would not be compliant with aspects of the EU Law changes due in 2019.

However, this was a view strongly contested by some members of the Workgroup on the grounds that they believe that the proposed 0636 solution places the ‘industry’ in a better position than it currently occupies – whilst both camps clearly remained divided on the matter, it was noted that all Workgroup views would be captured within the Workgroup

Report to ensure that industry parties are able to provide their views as part of the formal consultation process in due course.

When challenged over his views around the potential discrimination concerns, NW elaborated by explaining that it's the fact that the 2019 EU Law changes are a 'known, known' which concern him the most and that these concerns relate to all the suite of 0636 related modifications, and not simply 0636 itself.

In recognising the concerns being debated, SH advised that at this point in time he does not have a crystallised view on the matter. However, he was able to advise that Ofgem are currently considering undertaking a Regulatory Impact Assessment (RIA) for the 0636 suite of modifications in due course.

New Action 0106: Ofgem (SH) to discuss with his Ofgem colleagues in order to look to provide guidance around the whether the suite of 0636 modifications need to be compliant with the EU law changes from the outset.

In continuing on the discussion of members concerns around any potential discriminatory aspects to the 0636 (enduring) solutions, DH and NS challenged the other members to explain their real concerns around the matter, as in their opinion, these concerns are largely unfounded. Responding, GJ outlined his concern which relates to the commodity charge at IPs that will come into effect when the EU TAR Code changes are implemented in October 2019 (i.e. TO Commodity Charges would still apply at Non IPs involving a potentially different treatment when compared to the IPs), as he believes that none of the proposed 0636 (and 0636A and 0636B) enduring solutions address his concerns, as currently drafted – in short its about equitable treatment. It was pointed out by some parties that this is potentially also related to 0621 deliberations and outcomes.

GJ advised that should none of the current 0636 (0636A and 0636B) related modifications address his concerns, he would expect another alternative might be raised in due course to ensure the matter is duly debated. DH voiced her grave concerns that the late submission of more alternative modifications could / would potentially impact completion of her 'original' 0636 modification, a concern she would look to discuss formally with Ofgem, if the need arose.

When asked about the potential timescales for an Ofgem RIA, SH explained that whilst a final decision on whether or not Ofgem would undertake a RIA is yet to be made, he believes that it is highly likely one would be undertaken. He then outlined the basic timeframe for the RIA as being circa 8 weeks for a non-urgent modification, or modifications (circa 4 weeks for urgent modifications), with Ofgem consideration commencing when the Draft Modification Report is formally issued to consultation (for no less than 15 business days) by Panel which is then followed up by an 8 week RIA consultation following publication of the Final Modification Report.

When asked why SSE's proposed alternative (0636B) does not include a 'distance cap' element, JCh confirmed that this fact reflects SSE's (commercial) position.

Concluding the discussions, CS provided a brief recap.

3.0 Consideration of Alternative Modification 0636A

In opening discussions on alternative 0636A, CS advised that at the January 2018 Panel meeting, members had requested that the Workgroup considers how the level of the distance cap was decided and how many supply points are impacted.¹ When NW indicated that he is unsure at this stage of the answer to the Panel question on the grounds that some of the information behind the cap is commercially sensitive information.

Focusing attention on page 4 of the modification proposal, NW explained that the proposal is to use the current methodology (not that proposed by Modification 0636) but simply introduces

¹ A copy of the 18 January 2018 Panel meeting minutes are available to view and/or download from the Joint Office web site at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/panel/180118>

² Post meeting note: Ofgem (SH) provided the following link to the Ofgem Impact Assessment guidance document following the

a distance cap of 115km that was included in GCD11. He explained that he would need to request additional 'distance cap' related information from National Grid NTS to be able to provide further justification for this value. When asked whether or not the proposals relate to the top 25% of users or flows, NW advised that it is flows and that he would double check with National Grid NTS (Colin Williams) as to how many of the 49 sites currently utilising OCC were effected.

New Action 0107: Reference UNC Modification 0636A – Waters Wye Associates (NW) to discuss with National Grid NTS (CW) what information could be provided to support of the 18 January 2018 Panel questions (i.e. Workgroup is asked to consider how the level of the distance cap was decided and how many supply points are affected).

JCo noted that the Workgroup would need to consider the impact on the OCC and standard commodity rates. It was suggested that it would be highly beneficial to look to 'mirror' the 0636 data (figures) on the grounds that this would ensure a consistent approach is followed across all 0636 modifications. Whilst this suggestion met with the support of the majority of Workgroup participants, JCo added that the Workgroup should also look to assess the revenue change impacts that come into effect in April 2018 (i.e. allowed revenue will reduce significantly from a commodity perspective). Whilst NW agreed to include an assumption on this matter, other parties questioned whether these changes would actually have a significant impact anyway.

New Action 0108: Reference UNC Modifications 0636A – Waters Wye Associated (NW) to discuss with National Grid NTS (CW) whether analysis could be provided (similar to that provided for 0636) on the impacts of 0636A and provide a view on the potential implications of the April 2018 revenue changes (i.e. allowed revenue drop) and how these might impact upon the 0636 and 0636A proposals.

GJ referred to a mothballed 200km bypass route and suggested that the modification (0636A) appears to lack a clear rationale for the proposed 115km cap. GJ also suggested that the 60km distance cap proposals within modification 0621 have not been clearly justified either – it was noted that the 0621 cap was decided upon after preparatory work on 0636A was already underway. Responding, NW advised that the 115km distance cap had been chosen based on availability of historical information and that the modification is in essence a transitional (i.e. 'sticking plaster' type of) modification until 2019.

When asked whether it is intended to include a methodology aspect within the modification, NW advised that at this moment in time he does not have a view either way and he would discuss the possibility with his clients, although he does recognise that the 0621 proposals could be incorporated within 0636A, if deemed appropriate. CS observed that 0636A could always 'piggy back' on some, or all of the methodology provisions of 0636B once this modification is formally raised/revised. NW explained that in essence the only change to Code relates to the distance for 'D'.

Moving on, CS pointed out that not only has the 18 January 2018 Panel requested provision of legal text for 0636A, we already have a Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) for 0636, so need to consider provision of a ROM to cater for 0636A (and potentially 0636B) in due course. SP explained that in order to provide a meaningful ROM that fully considers 0636A, the 0636 ROM already provided by Xoserve would not be considered, as it is significantly different to 0636A. Furthermore, Xoserve would like to better understand the impacts of the proposed 115km distance cap and how to address the requirement for 'triggering' a renomination.

SP then went on to explain that there are transitional issues with all three modifications (0636, 0636A and 0636B), however all three proposals were silent on transition. Notwithstanding which is implemented (should Ofgem direct), in the case of 0636/0636B, it will require those Users already availing of the shorthaul tariff to renominate their NTS shorthaul sites so that the updated NTS shorthaul tariffs are applied; or, in the case of 0636A (those over 115km distance) to be excluded from the NTS shorthaul tariff arrangements. DH commented that the 0636 legal text was robust in that the NTS shorthaul tariffs would be applied. However, SP considered this and suggested there was nothing in the 0636 (nor 0636A/0636B) modification proposal(s) that obliged existing Users to

renominate their sites for the updated NTS shorthaul tariffs. The simple solution would be for the proposers to include mod 'transition' business rules to oblige Users to renominate their NTS shorthaul sites once the updated shorthaul tariffs (or distance cap) had been implemented; within a set timescale.

Some workgroup members believe that the transitional issues are more complex still, as they also involve the three/five month notification for charges changes and contract aspects.

SP went on to explain that as far as 'D' is concerned it is now an automated process in the post Nexus system, where as previously it was an offline system. Shippers are able to access the system and request NTS shorthaul tariffs without any distance cap validation taking place. It was agreed that the Workgroup would need to also consider the distance cap validation requirements going forward. SP also explained that where a User requests a shorthaul tariff that has no associated distance, UK Link will automatically refer the shorthaul request to the Transporter in order for the distance data to be calculated and updated into UK Link. Once the distance data is loaded, UK Link automatically makes an NTS shorthaul offer to the requesting User.

SP pointed out that under the current DSC Change Management processes, there is a 6 month lead time for 'reason codes', at which point NW suggested that perhaps a more realistic solution is a contractual based solution, rather than a system based one. It was noted that the supporting communications to the Shippers would need to be considered. HK wondered whether having a different formula involving a different rate would potentially avoid a need for system changes – a point to be possibly investigated further should time allow.

New Action 0109: Reference UNC Modifications 0636A – Waters Wye Associates (NW) to discuss with Xoserve (SP) how to best address the potential system issues, and whether it would be more appropriate to 'cover off' requirements via contractual changes. NW to include National Grid NTS (MH) in the loop with regards to any charging or notification related aspects.

SP suggested that whilst Xoserve could (informally at this time) consider the 0636A ROM requirements, it would be better if the Proposer could work with National Grid NTS and Xoserve to consider all potential options including system and manual, to ensure a robust 0636A ROM is produced.

MH pointed out that the ROM is expected to 'cover' both the system and manual workaround requirements, where appropriate. CS suggested that there is nothing preventing the raising of the ROM sooner, rather than later, in order that it could potentially feed into development of the modification(s) or visa versa, whichever is the best approach.

When JB pointed out that Shippers had already voiced their concerns around the proposed timelines and proposed notification periods etc. for the modifications, DH responded by indicating that she does not perceive this being a problem at this time. However, GJ strongly disagreed with this statement explaining that as the OCC Shippers are clearly impacted he feels he cannot agree and believes that it is an issue that needs to be addressed. NW also suggested that the Workgroup would also need to consider the potential short haul trading related impacts and how parties would be managed when coming off short haul.

New Action 0110: Reference UNC Modification 0636 0636A - Waters Wye Associates (NW) to discuss the proposals with Traders and thereafter provide feedback to the Workgroup of any potential impacts.

When asked, CS confirmed that following the 18 January 2018 Panel formal request for legal text, text would need to be provided by no later than 17:00 on 08 February 2018.

4.0 Consideration of Legal Text

When MH provided a brief background to the proposed legal text changes, DH confirmed that she is happy that the Legal Text satisfies the intent of her Modification 0636.

TPD Section B

NT then provided a brief explanation behind the proposed legal text changes before confirming that he would look to consider the impacts of any alternative modifications (i.e. 0636A and 0636B etc.) in due course.

NT explained that in short the changes proposed to paragraph 3.12.10 aim to make understanding easier, whereby 3.12.10(a) is changed to better reflect the provisions contained in sub-paragraph (b) (i.e. adoption of consistent language), whilst he believes that the changes prescribed for (b) are self explanatory and better reflect 0636 proposals.

It was suggested that the use of 'Specified Exit Point' is wrong, as it is not the capacity of the Exit point (i.e. a deemed peak flow capacity related value), which MH agreed to reconsider with NT after the meeting.

Moving on, NT explained that paragraph 3.12.10(b)(i) looks to define a full years history requirement, otherwise it 'defaults' to the 24x provision.

TPD Section Y

In considering the statement for 'D', NT explained that by referring to TPD Section B3.12.11 he is trying to avoid the (inadvertent) creation of two definitions for distance.

Some parties questioned the value of retaining the 'M' statement on the grounds that the formula is laid out before it anyway. Responding, NT agreed to double check the UNC in order to ensure we adopt a consistent approach.

It was also suggested that care is needed to ensure that we are not potentially re-specifying how capacity is determined.

Signing off, NT advised that he does not believe that the supporting commentary requires a great deal of amendment at this time. A revised version of the Legal Text will be provided prior to the next meeting if any resulting changes are made.

5.0 Development of Workgroup Report

An onscreen review of the draft Workgroup Report (v1.1, dated 11 January 2018) was undertaken by the Workgroup, during which CS made changes in response to views being expressed and concerns being raised, as follows.

CS explained that the document had been updated following feedback at the 04 January 2018 meeting that also incorporates an initial view around potential 'winners' and 'losers' aspects.

Focusing attention on Section 6, questions were asked in relation to the supporting information provided for the 'What costs or benefit will pass through to them?' item. In reiterating his concerns that the 0636 suite of modifications would impact on all OCC contracts, especially bearing in mind that short haul involves both Entry and Exit points, GJ felt that further clarity around the figures of potentially impacted parties involved would be beneficial. However, it should be noted that this is not a universally supported concern. When asked whether or not Ofgem would look to consider all potential GB market related impacts, SH indicated that they would. In trying to provide a clearer understanding of the impacted parties MH explained that there are three main categories involved, namely 10x Industrial & Commercial, 32x Power Stations and 3x Interconnector sites totalling 45 sites – the actual details would be confirmed at the 02 February 2018 Workgroup meeting.

DB then requested some changes to the wording in the 'Extent of Impact' statement for the 'What costs or benefit will pass through to them?' item which CS completed onscreen. When challenged as to whether the information is actually accurate, DH explained that whilst there are several potential routes, there are 62 Shipper routes which could be added – again CS undertook onscreen amendments to better align with the discussions.

New Action 0111: *Reference development of the Workgroup Report – National Grid NTS (MH) to look to double check and clarify the 49 sites / 62 shipper routes (short haul contracts) relationship figures (i.e. how many of each).*

CS went on to explain that he would update the Workgroup Report to include that Panel question in due course.

When asked whether the latest draft iteration of the Workgroup Report captures the electricity consumer impacts aspects, CS confirmed that it does, but that he would also be looking to discuss the matter in more detail with Richard Fairholme in due course.

Moving on to page 12 and the 'Governance around the current methodology for the OCC' statements, CS explained that this would be expanded to take into account 0636B aspects in due course.

When GJ suggested that the Workgroup would also need to consider gas that can potentially avoid gas that bypasses Bacton (and the NTS), as this potentially impacts on costs, an extensive debate took place with various (and sometime opposing) views being highlighted.

NW explained that in short the issue relates to 'swapped at the beach gas' that encourages trading to optimise use of the OCC, the impacts of which need to be fully explored. However, he acknowledges that the actual figures involved might be difficult to obtain. Some parties believe that any Workgroup views around this concern needs to be justified and noted that there are two sides to this matter and that their concerns stem from the fact that the focus is on only the negative aspects.

Some parties then voiced their concerns that in breaking down the trading elements we run the very real risk of bringing beach trading issues back into play, which in their view is potentially discriminatory in nature. Furthermore, they pointed out that a two tier trading process would not only be non compliant, but would also raise concerns around potential 'money flows'. Responding, NW once again reiterated that whilst it is difficult to quantify the trading impacts, he remains confident that there will be some.

In pointing out that this action remains open, CS welcomed feedback from all quarters so that everyone's views (opposing or otherwise) can be captured within the Workgroup Report. When asked, CS agreed to 'track change' any new amendments in order to make assessing the changes easier for the reader going forwards.

Moving on to consider item 2 'Consider the links, relationship and impacts.....Charging Regime', GJ explained that this brings into question his concerns around when any proposed interim period might end. He also pointed out that with regards to the 'TO' and 'SO' standard commodity charges, these end in October 2019 from an IP perspective.

CS pointed out that as far as the 0621 references are concerned, these reflect the current level of understanding, although he expects these to be developed and expanded in future iterations of the Workgroup Report.

It was suggested that whole of the second paragraph at the top of page 16 would benefit from a rethink, especially any funding aspects, which CS agreed to undertake after the meeting.

CS explained that the statements relating to the impacts on OCC Users on page 21 would be expanded in due course, to better reflect Workgroup views, whilst legal text would be added in item 7 on page 22 once provided by National Grid NTS.

Moving on to briefly consider the Relevant Objectives, GJ pointed out that there is no charging methodology for the OCC that in his opinion means that the Workgroup should consider whether the current 0636 justification(s) hold true. CS suggested that the Workgroup would need to 'tease out' any potential difference in the 0636 and 0636B proposals, especially with regards to the OCC methodology related aspects and impacts. At this juncture, RW also suggested that the Workgroup would need to be mindful of the UNC 0563S 'Moving the NTS Optional Commodity Charge Formula into the UNC' provisions, regardless of whether it was an effective implementation or not, and observed that perhaps the methodology should have been placed into Code at that time. It was recognised that at the time the 'industry expectation' was that this matter would be addressed at a later date, which is where modification 0621 comes in. CS advised that he would look to better reflect these points of view in the next iteration of the draft Workgroup Report.

New Action 0112: Reference UNC Modification 0636 Relevant Objectives – TPA Solutions (DH) to discuss with the National Grid NTS Charging Team in order to

ascertain whether it is appropriate to enhance/change the relevant objectives wording to reflect 0636.

A brief discussion took place that focused on the 'exponent' and 'multiplier values' supporting the two graphs on page 30 whereupon DH confirmed that the figures are correct. It was noted that whilst the spreadsheet published on the Joint Office web site displays slightly different data, this reflects the fact that National Grid NTS is not able to provide some elements of their more (commercially) sensitive information. DH then explained that she is happy with the level of information provided by National Grid NTS up to this point in proceedings.

When asked, MH confirmed that the figures highlighted within this Workgroup Report match up to National Grid NTS's figures, except for any revelation of pipe size aspects.

6.0 Review of Outstanding Actions

Action 1209: National Grid NTS (MH) to advise the National Grid NTS team that legal text will be required by 4 January 2018 for review by the workgroup.

Update: Please refer to the discussions under item 4.0 above for more details. **Closed**

Action 0101: Joint Office (CSh) to add the wording in respect of the Ofgem Impact Assessment to provide clarity.

Update: When asked, SH agreed to provide a link to the Ofgem Impact Assessment guidance document for inclusion within the minutes.² **Carried Forward**

Action 0102: All parties to send any additions or alterations to Chris Shanley for inclusion in the Workgroup Report at their earliest convenience.

Update: CS explained that the table within the (draft) Workgroup Report had been updated following feedback received after the 04 January 2018 meeting.

When it was suggested that in its current form the table appears to focus more on the user rather than the end user, CS explained that he has every intention of capturing end user (consumer) aspects / impacts during further refinement and development of the (draft) Workgroup Report going forwards. **Closed**

Action 0103: National Grid NTS (MH) to investigate how the OCC and Standard Commodity charges would change following implementation and any notice periods.

Update: It was noted that National Grid NTS (MH) had provided a presentation relating to this outstanding action item.

During a brief overview of the presentation, CS noted that the information would also be included within a future iteration of the (draft) Workgroup Report. GJ suggested that we should also include aspects relating to the 150 business day indicative notice period, as he believes that unwinding any contractual aspects might prove extremely difficult. Responding, MH pointed out that the 150 business days notification requirement is discharged on a 'reasonable endeavours' basis.

In highlighting that when parties opt for the OCC and distance option, the associated Xoserve processes take just three (3) weeks, DH questioned whether or not the Workgroup really needs to consider these concerns. In clarifying his concerns, GJ reminded everyone that when a party applies to the OCC, the 'option' to take up the offer, remains open for 6 months and therefore he strongly believes that parties will need sufficient time in which to review their respective contractual impacts. **Closed**

7.0 Next Steps

CS highlighted that a number of useful actions had been noted and he expected that they would lead to further development of the workgroup report.

² Post meeting note: Ofgem (SH) provided the following link to the Ofgem Impact Assessment guidance document following the meeting, as follows: <https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/publications-and-updates/impact-assessment-guidance>

8.0 Any Other Business

None.

9.0 Diary Planning

Further details of planned meetings are available at: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Diary

Workgroup meetings will take place as follows:

Time / Date	Venue	Workgroup Programme
10.00 to 15.30 Friday 02 February 2018	Elexon, 4 th Floor, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW	Standard agenda items plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of Alternate Modification(s) • Consideration of Legal Text • Development / Completion of Workgroup Report 0636 0636A
10.00 to 15.30 Monday 19 February 2018	Joint Office at Pure Offices, Lake View House, Tournament Fields, Warwick CV34 6RG + teleconference	Standard agenda items plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of Alternate Modification(s) (0636B) • Consideration of Legal Text • Development / Completion of Workgroup Report 0636 0636A
10.00 to 15.30 Wednesday 28 February 2018	Elexon, 4 th Floor, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW – <i>to be confirmed in due course</i>	Standard agenda items plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of Alternate Modification(s) • Completion of Workgroup Report 0636 0636A

Action table as at 19 January 2018

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
1209	18/12/17	4.0	To advise the National Grid NTS team that legal text will be required by 4 January 2018 for review by the workgroup.	National Grid NTS (MH)	Update provided. Closed
0101	04/01/18	2.0	To add the wording in respect of the Ofgem Impact Assessment to provide clarity.	Joint Office (CSh)	Carried Forward
0102 0201	04/01/18	2.0	All to send any additions or alterations to Chris Shanley for inclusion in the Workgroup Report at their earliest convenience.	ALL	Update provided. Closed
0103 0301	04/01/18	2.0	To investigate how the OCC and Standard Commodity charges would change following implementation and any notice periods.	National Grid NTS (MH)	Update provided. Closed
0104	19/01/18	2.1	SSE (JCh) to discuss with National Grid NTS (MH) how the RPI formula provisions could be updated to include the indexation from 2015 and what supporting analysis could be provided to quantify the impact on charges/parties of the suggested approach.	SSE (JCh) & National Grid NTS (MH)	Pending
0105	19/01/18	2.1	SSE (JCh) to discuss with National Grid NTS (MH) the best approach to develop the methodology to be included in the UNC and consequently consider the appropriate level of methodology detail and associated timelines to include in Modification 0636B.	SSE (JCh) & National Grid NTS (MH)	Pending
0106	19/01/18	2.1	Ofgem (SH) to discuss with his Ofgem colleagues in order to look to provide guidance around the whether the suite of 0636 modifications need to be compliant with the EU law changes from the outset.	Ofgem (SH)	Pending
0107	19/01/18	3.0	<i>Reference UNC Modification 0636A</i> – Waters Wye Associates (NW) to discuss with National Grid NTS (CW) what information could be provided to	Waters Wye Associates (NW) &	Pending

			support of the 18 January 2018 Panel questions (i.e. Workgroup is asked to consider how the level of the distance cap was decided and how many supply points are affected).	National Grid NTS (MH)	
0108	19/01/18	3.0	<i>Reference UNC Modifications 0636A</i> – Waters Wye Associates (NW) to discuss with National Grid NTS (CW) whether analysis could be provided (similar to that provided for 0636) on the impacts of 0636A and provide a view on the potential implications of the April 2018 revenue changes (i.e. allowed revenue drop) and how these might impact upon the 0636 and 0636A proposals.	Waters Wye Associates (NW) & National Grid NTS (CW)	Pending
0109	19/01/18	3.0	<i>Reference UNC Modifications 0636A</i> – Waters Wye Associates (NW) to discuss with Xoserve (SP) how to best address the potential system issues, and whether it would be more appropriate to 'cover off' requirements via contractual changes. NW to include National Grid NTS (MH) in the loop with regards to any charging or notification related aspects.	Waters Wye Associates (NW) & Xoserve (SP) & National Grid NTS (MH)	Pending
0110	19/01/18	3.0	<i>Reference UNC Modification 0636 0636A</i> - Waters Wye Associates (NW) to discuss the proposals with Traders and thereafter provide feedback to the Workgroup of any potential impacts.	Waters Wye Associates (NW)	Pending
0111	19/01/18	5.0	<i>Reference development of the Workgroup Report</i> – National Grid NTS (MH) to look to double check and clarify the 49 sites / 62 shipper routes (short haul contracts) relationship figures (i.e. how many of each).	National Grid NTS (MH)	Pending
0112	19/01/18	5.0	<i>Reference UNC Modification 0636 Relevant Objectives</i> – TPA Solutions (DH) to discuss with the National Grid NTS Charging Team in order to ascertain whether it is appropriate to enhance/change the relevant objectives wording to reflect 0636.	TPA Solutions (DH)	Pending

--	--	--	--	--	--