

Transmission Workstream Minutes
Thursday 06 August 2009
Elxon, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW

Attendees

John Bradley (Chair)	JB	Joint Office
Tim Davis (Secretary)	TD	Joint Office
Alan Coulson	AC	Interconnector UK
Andrew Fox	AF	National Grid NTS
Andrew Pearce	AP	BP Gas
Bali Dohel	BD	Scotia Gas Networks
Ben Woodside	BW	Ofgem
Bogdan Kowalewicz	BK	Ofgem
Charles Ruffell	CR	RWE npower
Chris Warner	CW	National Grid Distribution
Chris Wright	CW1	Centrica
Clive Woodland	CW2	Centrica
Debra Hawkin	DH	National Grid NTS
Dina Mihsein	DM	National Grid Distribution
Fergus Healy	FH	National Grid NTS
Fraser Ashman	FA	Wingas
Ian Taylor	IT	Northern Gas Networks
Jamie Black	JB1	Ofgem
Jeff Chandler	JC	Scottish & Southern Energy
Joanna Ferguson	JF	Northern Gas Networks
John Baldwin	JB2	CNG Services
John Costa	JC2	EDF Energy
Joy Chadwick	JC1	ExxonMobil
Keith Messenger	KM	Poyry Consulting
Mark Dalton	MD	BG Group
Martin Watson	MW	National Grid NTS
Paul O'Donovan	POD	Ofgem
Phil Broom	PB	GDF Suez
Rekha Patel	RP	Waters Wye Associates
Richard Fairholme	RF	EON UK
Ritchard Hewitt	RH	National Grid NTS
Roddy Monroe	RM	Centrica Storage Ltd
Sarah Trussler	ST	Waters Wye Associates
Shelley Rouse	SR	Statoil UK
Simon Trivella	ST	Wales & West Utilities
Sofia Fernandez Avendano	SFA	Total Gas & Power
Stefan Leedham	SL	EDF Energy
Steven Sherwood	SS	Scotia Gas Networks

1. Introduction

JB welcomed attendees to the meeting.

1.1. Minutes from the previous Workstream Meetings

The minutes of the previous Workstream meetings were approved.

1.2. Review of Outstanding Actions JB

1.2.1. Actions from the Workstream

Action TR1097: Ofgem to consider and report back whether they would wish to encourage the establishment of a group involving all stakeholders, both Government and industry, to look holistically at gas emergency arrangements.

Update: BW reported that Project Discovery was looking at this issue and any action would follow the report which would be produced at the end of this year.

Action carried forward

Action TR0701: Organise GBA Workshops.

JB confirmed this had been arranged. CR requested that papers be circulated in advance of future meetings, which RH agreed. **Action Closed**

Action TR0702: National Grid NTS to advise how, in the event of a deliverability monitor breach but not a space monitor breach, the market would know if an emergency was to be declared.

RH said this was being addressed within the GBA workshops and it was agreed that it should be raised at the next one. **Action carried forward**

Action TR0703: National Grid NTS to finalise Proposal: “Annual NTS Exit (Flat) Capacity Credit Arrangements”.

Proposal 0261 had been raised. **Action Closed**

Action TR0704: National Grid NTS to finalise a Proposal on Treatment of Capacity affected by Force Majeure.

Proposal 0262 had been raised. **Action Closed**

Action TR0705: National Grid NTS to consider whether a gradual population of more years of historical data at reasonable cost is feasible.

National Grid NTS asked for this to be carried forward **Action carried forward**

Action TR0706: Provide dates and organise meeting to further discuss the Assignment of NTS Entry Capacity.

National Grid NTS were discussing with xoserve and the Joint Office potential dates in September 2006 **Action carried forward**

1.2.3 Actions carried over from the Review of Emergency Arrangements Workshop 4 (24 June 2009)

Action EAW005: An overview of the nominations/renomination process in an emergency to be included as an appendix to the Modification Proposal.

Update: This has been included in Proposal.0260 **Action closed**

1.3. Review of Workstream’s Modification Proposals and Topics

1.3.1. Modification Status Report (Modification Proposals Register¹)

JB gave an update on live Modification Proposals. Regarding Modification Proposals 0246, 0246A, and 0246, POD indicated that Ofgem expected to issue an IA within the next month. There would be a six week consultation period.

¹ The Modification Proposals Register is available to view at: <http://www.gasgovernance.com/Code/Modifications/>.

A status report on Proposals awaiting Ofgem’s decision is available to view at: www.ofgem.gov.uk/Pages/MoreInformation.aspx?docid=4&refer=Licensing/IndCodes

1.3.2. Topic Status Report

The Topic Status Report for the Transmission Workstream is located on the Joint Office website at: <http://www.gasgovernance.com/Code/Modifications/>.

On Topic 014TR “Operating Margins Procurement”, RH reported that further action would await the issuing of invoices.

1.4. Related Meetings and Review Groups

Review Group 0251 had met on 30 July 2009 to consider potential shrinkage costs associated with the entry of low CV gas and possible options for reducing them. There had been no meeting of the Operational Forum.

2. UNC Modification Proposals

2.1. Modification Proposal 0260: “Revision of the Post-emergency Claims Arrangements”

RH explained that the Proposal had been amended in order to provide additional clarity in a number of areas. However, the key change was that the proposal to introduce a User Pays Charge had been removed – the additional costs incurred would be met by National Grid NTS in the interests of supporting implementation ahead of this winter. JC1 asked why the Proposal had initially been identified as User Pays, with her understanding being that the concept was to be applied to areas where Shippers could choose whether or not to take services. RH believed this was a misunderstanding and that the User Pays arrangements covered any additional xoserve costs which were not funded through the main price controls.

RF raised the reference in the Proposal to further workshops to aid understanding of the economic price assessment, including the development of supporting guidelines. He asked if this implied a need for further consideration and development. RH explained that the workshop was proposed to help people implement and understand the Proposal – not to add clarity. While he believed the Proposal was clear, running through practical arrangements was felt to be potentially helpful but National Grid NTS would be happy to withdraw this offer if it was not felt to be necessary.

JB asked if attendees felt the Proposal was sufficiently clear to proceed to consultation, and nobody indicated otherwise. JB asked if the Modification Panel should be recommended to ask for legal text to be prepared prior to the Proposal being issued to consultation, but nobody indicated that they felt this was necessary.

2.2. Modification Proposal 0263: “Enabling the Assignment of a Partial Quantity of NTS Exit (Flat) Capacity”

CW1 outlined Proposal 0263 and invited questions. His intention was for the Proposal to go to the August Modification Panel with a view to being issued to consultation.

MW indicated that, while supportive of the principle, National Grid NTS felt further development would be helpful and that it would be useful to work through some examples. He was particularly concerned about user commitment implications and the need to avoid any gaming opportunities. In addition, trading should be taken into account. Further, the interactions with the ExCR would need to be looked at. Finally, MW indicated that implementation could involve considerable costs – recoverable through the User Pays route - and that early implementation would be difficult given other exit developments and may not be practical for a number of years.

RM asked MW to clarify why user commitment may be reduced were this Proposal to be implemented, with others sharing RM’s view that it should not be impacted. MW explained that the interaction with initialised quantities could impact user commitment if there was assignment. CW1 believed this could be addressed through redrafting the Proposal, which he would look to do. CW1 asked if there were other issues within the

Proposal which were unclear as opposed to being either implementation issues or those which National Grid NTS might oppose. MW suggested that trading was the other key issue to address.

CW1 questioned why National Grid NTS believed implementation would need to wait for a number of years. MW indicated that this was being seen as part of a package of changes in phases – as agreed with the UK Link Committee - and on which he would be presenting more later in the meeting. AP argued this was not an enhancement to the service but something which could already be delivered through Unique Sites. MW explained that this element was not included in Modification Proposal 0195AV and hence should be regarded as an enhancement – although other attendees saw this as an omission from 0195AV. CW1 also felt that an offline process would be able to support the proposed process since only shared supply points were likely to be involved. MW explained that the need to transfer information into Gemini, and the driving of User Commitment, meant a systems based approach was the intention.

CW1 said that, contrary to MW’s suggestion, he did not see this as a User Pays service. SL asked Ofgem to confirm whether costs allowed in the price control review for exit reform meant this should not fall to User Pays, which POD agreed to investigate.

ACTION TR0801: Ofgem (POD) to ascertain if Proposal 0263 should fall within the User Pays regime.

ACTION TR0802: Centrica (CW1) to consider amending Proposal 0263 in light of the discussion.

2.3. Modification Proposal 0259: “Removal of Obligations To Install UK Link User Equipment and UK Link User Software for UK Link Users who utilise the services of an UK Link User Agent”

BD asked for consideration of the Proposal to be deferred since Scotia Gas Networks were looking to make some amendments to the Proposal. It would then be considered by the Distribution Workstream before returning to the September Transmission Workstream. This was agreed.

2.4. Modification Proposal 0261: “Annual NTS Exit (Flat) Capacity Credit Arrangements”

RH indicated that the Proposal had been amended to clarify the way in which the envisaged changes would be reflected in the UNC, leaving the purpose of the Proposal unchanged.

JB asked if attendees felt the Proposal was sufficiently clear to proceed to consultation, and nobody indicated otherwise. ST indicated that, while he felt the Proposal was clear, he had a concern about the Value at Risk elements, which WWU do not believe work as described in the Proposal.

2.5. Modification Proposal 0262: “Treatment of Capacity affected by Force Majeure”

FH presented on behalf of National Grid NTS.

FH clarified that the Proposal would apply to DNO Users from October 2012. ST suggested an understanding was needed as to when the arrangement may be used, which MW accepted was a reasonable request.

JC1 asked if the Proposal would apply if a User were to call Force Majeure – the Force Majeure definition in the UNC does not restrict the calling of Force Majeure to National Grid NTS, but the Proposal was restricted. FH agreed to ask for a legal view on this.

Action TR0803: National Grid NTS to consider whether Proposal 0262 should apply irrespective of who calls Force Majeure.

MD questioned the buy-back arrangements if the User did not respond, noting that National Grid NTS had amended the Proposal in this respect. FH explained that the

legal opinion was that the UNC could be drafted such that, in effect, silence could be deemed as acceptance.

SL asked whether the arrangements would apply to any Force Majeure events in place at the time of implementation or only those declared later, and FH explained that it would apply to any event that was in place at the time of implementation as well as future events.

JC1 asked what the incentive would be to resolve force majeure incidents. FH said there was an obligation through the UNC to address the issues and provide information on progress. BK asked who would receive these updates, and FH responded that the obligation was to inform affected parties, although National Grid NTS could elect to issue a wider notice. JC1 suggested that as other Shippers would pick up costs were the Proposal to be implemented, all would effectively become affected parties and should be included in any notifications.

RM asked why the Proposal envisaged using a weighted average capacity price rather than the amount paid. MW said that those affected would not be individual Shippers based on whoever booked capacity latest at the relevant entry or exit point. Any adjustment would be applied to all ASEP Users. Hence using an average price was proposed as a pragmatic and equitable way forward.

JB then ran through the draft Workstream Report and invited views. The Report was approved for submission to the Modification Panel, recommending that it should proceed to consultation, and that formal legal text should not be requested provided suggested text was available in time for consideration at the Modification Panel meeting.

PB asked whether similar arrangements applied within the DNs. ST said this was covered by failure to supply gas arrangements and he was unclear when the Proposal might ever be used at exit. It was confirmed that Force Majeure had not yet been called at exit, but MW felt it was an opportunity to mirror Exit and Entry since an event could occur. However, the proposed arrangements would not apply within the DNs, and ST suggested that in the event that National Grid NTS declared Force Majeure such that it could not honour DN capacity commitments, he would expect there to be a Gas Deficit Emergency and the emergency arrangements would be in place. It would be the emergency arrangements that would drive the DN implications, not this Modification Proposal.

3. Topics

3.1. Topic 003TR Review of NTS Exit Capacity Arrangements

3.1.1. Exit Update

MW Presented on behalf of National Grid NTS and invited views on the inaugural annual invitation process, which National Grid NTS believed had worked well.

JC asked for an update on the suggested Proposal to reduce thresholds, which MW said would be raised in time for the next Annual Application.

SL asked about the change in the net position – did increases and decreases cancel out. MW indicated that analysis on this was being undertaken now, but an increase had been seen. Subject to confidentiality concerns, further information would be provided when the outcome was available, after September.

MW ran through planned systems releases. DM asked which phase incorporated the flexibility and pressure elements, and MW agreed to check this. She also asked about the inclusion of assignment, which MW suggested was being dealt with elsewhere.

Action TR0804: National Grid NTS (MW) to clarify the exit capacity system release phase which incorporates flexibility and pressure elements.

MW explained that the informal Ofgem licence consultation on aggregating baselines was looking at simply aggregating numbers at single points. ST asked if aggregation of DN offtakes might be considered on a similar basis. MW said this was not part of existing proposals but could be considered going forward.

SL suggested these changes should have been included in the earlier consultation on baseline changes. MW said the timing reflected when Users had indicated the change would be beneficial, but recognised that, ideally, this could have occurred earlier.

3.1.2. Future System Flexibility Requirements Workshop Update

RH thanked all for the feedback received. National Grid NTS would be looking at the suggestions received and keep the Workstream updated. He would happily take questions. POD suggested a further specific meeting might be useful following publication of Ofgem’s consultation, which was planned for September.

3.2. Topic 008TR Entry Capacity

3.2.1. Assignment and DRSEC Update

FH presented for National Grid NTS.

In light of the indication (by inviting DRSEC application) that additional capacity may be released on the East Coast, RM asked about the impact of Hatton remodelling and how the work was progressing. MW agreed to take this away, but emphasised that the list of ASEPS for which DRSEC bids were invited were those where capacity was close to being sold out. The intention was to provide an opportunity for Shippers to signal a desire for more capacity and there was no commitment that additional capacity would be forthcoming should the signal emerge – decisions would be based on a risk assessment in light of the bids received. At present, DRSEC had only been requested at Isle of Grain.

RF raised a concern that this approach was creating uncertainty and unpredictable auctions since capacity release was at National Grid’s discretion. The decision to include additional ASEPs was entirely National Grid’s and he would have preferred to see the offer restricted to those ASEPs where a positive request had been received – i.e. only Isle of Grain in this case. MW said he would be happy to look at this going forward.

RM emphasised that his main concern was to ensure that the full capability of the system became embedded in baselines. RF agreed that if discretionary rights could be made available, this should be incorporated in baselines going forward. His preference was for a rules based, predictable, approach. MW accepted this had advantages but also saw the benefit of allowing flexibility to meet customer requirements whenever possible and believed an element of balance was desirable.

4. Any Other Business

None raised at end of morning session.

5. AFTERNOON SESSION

5.1. Entry Capacity Substitution

5.1.1. Actions carried over from Substitution Workshops

Action SUB001: Ofgem to consider producing a document, prior to the first substitution auction, setting out its rationale for approving substitution applications.

Update: BK advised that he position remains that this will be considered in light of the methodology proposed and may be addressed within the Impact Assessment. **Action carried forward**

Action SUB005: Ofgem to consider and report back whether it is able to model the effect on gas prices of various substitution scenarios.

Update: POD confirmed that impacts on gas prices would be considered as part of the Impact Assessment. **Action carried forward**

5.1.2. Entry Capacity Substitution Methodology

AF presented for National Grid NTS, describing the proposed retainer (formerly known as option) approach.

SFA asked about the proposed prorating rules if applications for retained capacity exceeded the available quantity. AF clarified that if excess demand only appeared during the second bid window, then prorating would only apply to bids received in that window and not those received on the first day. If all available capacity had been retained at the end of the first day, none would be offered on the second.

RM asked what information would be available to inform Shippers about the exchange rates which applied at any entry point. MW explained the information expected to be available ahead of the annual QSEC auction, including the level of retained capacity and pipeline distances – which would help to identify the likelihood of substitution - but not exchange rates which were dependent on specific circumstances and network modelling. JB asked if Ofgem had concerns about the suggested 3:1 exchange rate, since this was an arbitrary number. POD felt that the proposal was a pragmatic way forward.

RP referred to previously identified issues which had led to partial substitution being ruled out, and asked how these had been overcome. MW said that he had believed network analysis would not be possible in the time available, but he had been assured this would not be a problem. Hence partial substitution had been allowed for in the proposed methodology.

AF clarified that, at the end of the process, National Grid NTS would submit proposals to Ofgem for the release of incremental capacity and identify whether they would be met through substitution or investment. Ofgem would judge whether or not the proposals were consistent with the IECR and substitution methodology statements.

DH then outlined the proposed retainer charge and associated refund arrangements.

RM suggested that the approach looking at avoided cost did not take account of the temporal issue whereby, rather than being avoided, investment may still be needed but at a different time. SL added that, to be consistent with licence obligations, a cost reflective charge should consider costs incurred, such as network modelling, and not avoided cost. DH agreed that there were issues with the avoided cost methodology and this was why National Grid NTS had looked at other ways in which the charge might be set.

POD suggested that there was a rationale to an approach based on avoided cost and that this may be preferable to creating a charge that was too low, effectively creating a free retainer that would not indicate user commitment. RM argued there are plenty of other ways to demonstrate user commitment beyond entry capacity bookings, particularly when looking from a storage perspective. POD accepted this but felt there was a wider picture that needed to be taken into account. MW also emphasised that there was the prospect of a full refund if capacity was subsequently booked.

RM asked whether the policy would encourage more storage and improved security of supply or the opposite. POD suggested going back to the principle that consumers should be protected from National Grid NTS failing to optimise use of the network, which was in itself a response to concerns' raised by Shippers among others. RM said he was looking to avoid adding costs and risks to the market. BK argued that the commitment should be cost neutral – since the retainer would be refunded, the approach dealt with timing issues and should help developers to keep capacity available until they were ready to commit. JB2 suggested that this missed the point that previously a developer could see a declining terminal and be confident capacity would be available. By contrast, the retainer approach would require some commitment before it was clear projects would be able to proceed and so additional risk and cost was being introduced in some cases.

SFA suggested that the approach penalised those who planned longer term as the refund was tagged to 42 months ahead – those who committed with a view to a project going ahead further into the future would not receive a refund. An alternative would be to provide refunds if capacity were bought at any point in the future. MW responded that National Grid NTS was open to suggestions of this nature and would encourage those who supported this or any other change to make this clear in their consultation response.

JB asked if attendees felt that the results of the second approach to setting the retainer charge (Option B) produced too low a retainer charge. BK said Ofgem would welcome views on this in consultation responses - the issue was achieving the right balance between a user commitment and a free retainer.

JC2 asked if there was a possibility of booking a retainer for further ahead, and AF said this had been specifically raised in the consultation as a means of seeking views. However, National Grid NTS saw some practical issues with this. JC2 argued that it was not efficient to purchase retainers year on year when planning a development due to start in, say, six years time.

CW questioned when refunds would be received and if interest would be paid. National Grid NTS clarified that refunds would be processed after the final AMSEC before the initial retention period, and no interest element was proposed. The intention was to keep the process simple in the expectation that the amounts would be relatively low, and the impact on the TO commodity charge relatively small. However, MW emphasised again that comments in response to the consultation would be welcome.

CW questioned why RMTTSEC was excluded from the refund approach. AF said he was unsure how this could be incorporated. CW suggested it could lead to capacity being transferred and hence sold but no refund being paid. MW questioned whether there should be a refund in these circumstances, and indicated that the National Grid focus had been on long term signals, and it was hard to see RMTTSEC falling into this category.

MW explained that a draft Modification Proposal had been published which sought to introduce the concept of a retainer charge into the UNC. SL suggested that the draft does not clearly specify what is proposed. National Grid NTS agreed to review this with a view to being clear what was proposed.

5.2. Review of Entry Capacity Charging Methodology

MW presented for National Grid NTS.

CW suggested expanding the bullet referring to removing or reducing on the day discounts to also looking at reducing quantities available.

RM asked if National Grid NTS had considered that substitution would reduce flexibility and destroy capacity such that there would be a move to longer term bookings, which

would ameliorate the issues identified. MW said that it would be necessary to look at the outcome once substitution was in place but accepted that this could change behaviours. The degree of change remained to be seen and did not undermine the desirability of reviewing charging principles.

In terms of transit flows, MW explained to JB2 that the issue had been raised as transit flows impact demand at entry points rather than thinking that lower commodity charges could, or should, encourage transit flows. JB2 suggested that encouraging transit could make sense in that it would encourage gas to come to GB, for example Excellerate at Teesside, which would be disincentivised by high commodity charges.

Some surprise was expressed by the St Fergus figures presented, which showed less unsold capacity than might have been expected. JB2 also noted that the level of daily capacity sales showed the impact on trading, which in the absence of a free within day product would be expected to be more prominent.

Having presented some preliminary analysis of capacity sold by ASEP and the associated revenue, MW asked for suggestion as to what further analysis would be helpful.

SL argued that an essential first step would be to identify the problem and what it was that any change was trying to achieve. MW supported this and drew attention to the slide that listed possible objectives.

ACTION TR0805: All to email National Grid NTS with any suggestions for analysis that would be helpful in illuminating issues and identifying a way forward for the entry capacity charging review.

RP asked about timelines for the review. MW said his aspiration would be for implementation from October 2010. While inviting Ofgem to comment, MW suggested that the nature of the issue meant that there must be a possibility of Ofgem undertaking an Impact Assessment, which could impact the timetable. An aspiration of April 2010 implementation would be worth working to, but his opinion was that it would be challenging to achieve. POD agreed with this, thinking that April 2010 looked very close for any fundamental change.

MW invited views on the best process for taking forward a review of entry capacity charges. The general view was that separate workshops should be arranged to consider an issue of this magnitude. MW suggested that an initial meeting be arranged for early September. This should consider what the objective is and how success would be judged.

6. Diary Planning

Transmission Workstreams are due to be held at 10:00 on:

Wednesday 19 August 2009 - Provision of Winter Information Workshop 2, Energy Networks Association; and

Thursday 03 September 2009, Elexon.

Details of all planned meetings are on the Joint Office website at:
www.gasgovernance.com/Diary

Action Log – UNC Transmission Workstream: 02 July 2009

Action Ref	Meeting Date(s)	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
TR 1097	03/07/08	2.2.3	Ofgem to consider and report back whether they would wish to encourage the establishment of a group involving all stakeholders, both Government and industry, to look holistically at gas emergency arrangements.	Ofgem (BW)	To be reconsidered early on 2010 in light of Project Discovery Carried forward
TR 0701	02/07/09	2.1	Organise GBA Workshops.	Joint Office (JB/LD) and National Grid NTS (SP)	Closed
TR 0702	02/07/09	2.1	National Grid NTS to advise how, in the event of a deliverability monitor breach but not a space monitor breach, the market would know if an emergency was to be declared.	National Grid NTS (RH)	To be clarified at GBA Workshop Carried forward
TR 0703	02/07/09	2.3	National Grid NTS to finalise Proposal: "Annual NTS Exit (Flat) Capacity Credit Arrangements".	National Grid NTS (CS)	Proposal 0261 Raised Closed
TR 0704	02/07/09	2.4	National Grid NTS to finalise a Proposal on Treatment of Capacity affected by Force Majeure.	National Grid NTS (FH)	Proposal 0262 Raised Closed
TR 0705	02/07/09	3.3.2	National Grid NTS to consider whether a gradual population of more years of historical data at reasonable cost is feasible.	National Grid NTS (CS)	Carried Forward
TR 0706	02/07/09	3.4.2	Provide dates and organise meeting to further discuss the Assignment of NTS Entry Capacity.	National Grid NTS (FH) and Joint Office (JB/LD)	Carried Forward
TR 0801	06/08/09	2.2	Ascertain if Proposal 0263 should fall within the User Pays regime.	Ofgem (POD)	View requested ahead of August Modification Panel
TR 0802	06/08/09	2.2	Consider amending Proposal 0263 in light of the discussion.	Centrica (CW1)	To be amended ahead of August Modification Panel

Action Ref	Meeting Date(s)	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
TR 0803	06/08/09	2.5	National Grid NTS to consider whether Proposal 0262 should apply irrespective of who calls Force Majeure.	National Grid NTS (FH)	To be considered ahead of August Modification Panel
TR 0804	06/08/09	3.1.1	Clarify the exit capacity system release phase which incorporates flexibility and pressure elements.	National Grid NTS (MW)	Update due at September Workstream
TR 0805	06/08/09	5.2	Email National Grid NTS with any suggestions for analysis that would be helpful in illuminating issues and identifying a way forward for the entry capacity charging review.	All	To be reviewed at initial review meeting

Action Log – Carried Forward from Substitution Workshops: 02 July 2009

Action Ref	Meeting Date(s)	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
SUB 001	08/04/08	3	Ofgem to consider producing a document, prior to the first substitution auction, setting out its rationale for approving substitution applications	Ofgem (BK)	May be addressed in Impact Assessment Carried forward
SUB 005	07/05/08	4	Consider and report back whether it is able to model the effect on gas prices of various substitution scenarios.	Ofgem (BK)	Gas price impacts will be included in the Impact Assessment Carried forward

Action Log – Carried Forward from Review of Emergency Arrangements – Workshop 4: 24 June 2009

Action Ref	Meeting Date(s)	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
EAW 005	02/06/09	2.0	An overview of the nominations/renominations process in an emergency to be included as an appendix to the Modification Proposal.	National Grid NTS (SP/CT)	Included in Proposal 0260 Closed

SP = Steve Pownall; CT = Claire Thorneywork