

## Transmission Workstream Minutes

**Thursday 02 August 2007**

**Ellexon, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW**

### Attendees

John Bradley (Chairman)	JB	Joint Office
Lorna Dupont	LD	Joint Office
Alex Barnes	AB	BG Group
Amrik Bal	AB1	Shell
Alison Jennings	AJ	National Grid Distribution
Angela Love	AL	PöyryEnergy Consulting
Andrew Pearce	AP	BP Gas
Adam Sims	AS	National Grid NTS
Bogdan Kowalewicz	BK	Ofgem
Chris Bennett	CB	National Grid NTS
Christiane Sykes	CS	Statoil
Clare Temperley	CT	Gas Forum
Chris Wright	CW	BGT Centrica
David Odling	DO	Oil and Gas UK
Eric Brown	EB	ScottishPower Energy Management
Elaine Calvert	EC	National Grid NTS
Fergus Healy	FH	National Grid NTS
Fiona Riches	FR	Argus Media Group
Horace Wheeler	HW	Centrica Storage
Ian Trickle	IT	ExxonMobil
John Baldwin	JB1	CNG Services
Jeff Chandler	JC	Scottish and Southern energy
Joy Chadwick	JC1	ExxonMobil
John Costa	JC2	EDF Energy
Leigh Bolton	LB	Cornwall Energy Associates
Liz Spierling	LS	Wales & West Utilities
Mark Feather	MF	Ofgem
Matt Golding	MG	National Grid LNG Storage
Mike Piggin	MP	TPA Solutions
Martin Watson	MW	National Grid NTS
Mike Young	MY	BGT Centrica
Nick Wye	NW	Waters Wye Associates
Oliver Wolgast	OW	DONG
Phil Broom	PB	Gaz de France
Richard Fairholme	RF	EON UK
Richard Street	RS	Statoil
Siobhan Carty	SC	Ofgem
Steve Fisher	SF	National Grid NTS
Sofia Fernandez Avendaño	SFA	Total
Steve Gordon	SG	ScottishPower Energy Management
Stephen Rose	SR	RWE Npower
Steve Smith	SS	Ofgem
Stuart Waudby	SW	Centrica Storage
Tim Davis	TD	Joint Office
Tom Jesshop	TJ	ConocoPhillips
Yasmin Sufi	YS	ENI UK

<b>Apologies</b>		
Beverley Grubb		Scotia Gas Networks
Sonia Youd		Centrica Storage

## 1. Introduction and Status Review

JB welcomed all attendees to the meeting.

### 1.1 Minutes from June Workstream Meetings

The minutes for the meetings held on 05 and 19 July 2007 were accepted.

### 1.2 Review of Outstanding Actions

Appendix A provides a tabular summary.

**Action TR1067:** Provide timeline demonstrating the interactions between various auctions. (National Grid NTS)

**Update:** Whilst the Competition Commission Appeal had been concluded, the situation was not sufficiently clear for National Grid NTS to provide this information. **Action Carried Forward.**

**Action TR1068:** Return to the Workstream to present a detailed overview of the interaction of the capacity regimes and the operation of the gas market. (Ofgem)

**Update:** Ofgem had indicated that it would not wish to present this overview pending the resolution of the current legal review into Entry Capacity Baselines. **Action Carried Forward**

**Action TR1071:** Safety Monitors - production of outline proposal, subsequent to closure of the focus group: CW to follow up with MY.

**Update:** MY offered to make a presentation at the September Workstream. **Action Carried Forward**

**Action TR1072:** Transfer and Trade Modification Proposal - National Grid NTS to consider making available worked examples of various scenarios.

**Update:** Completed. **Action closed.**

**Action TR1073:** National Grid NTS to consider the provision of historical Buy Back/TFA information relating to the past 4 – 5 winters (excluding Gas Quality).

**Update:** Buy-back information was presented (6.1 below). SW asked if there had been TFAs without buy-back, which MW agreed to consider. **Action Carried Forward.**

### 1.3 Review of Workstream's Modification Proposals and Topics

#### 1.3.1 Modification Status Report (Modification Proposals Register<sup>1</sup>)

The following Modification had been **appealed** by E.ON UK:

- 0116V "Reform of NTS Exit Arrangements." See item 4.1 below.

Ofgem's decision was awaited on the following Proposals:

- 0104 "3<sup>rd</sup> Party Proposal: Storage Information at LNG Importation Facilities", awaiting decision following Ofgem's letter indicating it was minded to implement.
- 0143 "Reduction of Lapse Periods in respect of Failure Notices issued in respect of Energy Balancing Credit". UNC Modification Panel recommended implementation.

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.gasgovernance.com/Code/Modifications/>

- 0149 “Gas Emergency Cashout Arrangements: Keeping On the Day Commodity Market open during a Gas Deficit Emergency”. UNC Modification Panel did not recommend implementation.
- 0149A “Gas Emergency Cashout Arrangements: Keeping On the Day Commodity Market open during a Gas Deficit Emergency”. UNC Modification Panel recommended implementation.
- 0153 “Amendment of Interconnector UK’s Network Entry Provisions”. UNC Modification Panel recommended implementation.

The following Proposals had been issued for consultation:

- 0154 “Enduring Provisions for LDZ System Entry Points”. Consultation ends 14 August 2007.
- 0159 “National Grid NTS discretionary release of Interruptible NTS Entry Capacity”. Consultation ends 03 August 2007.
- 0163 “Offering Capacity at Donor ASEP in Trades & Transfer Process” – raised by ScottishPower Energy Management on 24 July 2007 and granted Urgent status by Ofgem. Consultation ends 03 August 2007.

The following Proposals had been placed on the agenda for the next Modification Panel:

- 0156 and 0156A “Transfer and Trading of Capacity between ASEPs” – for Panel determination on 02 August 2007. This Panel Meeting was held whilst the Workstream was adjourned and recommended implementation of both Proposals with a preference expressed for 0156A.

The following new Proposal had been raised:

- 0164 “Bi-Directional Connection Point Overrun Charge Calculation”. Raised by Centrica Storage Ltd on 30 July 2007; subject to Panel decision on 16 August 2007.

### **1.3.2 Topic Status Report**

#### **003TR Review of Exit Capacity Arrangements**

See item 4.1 below

#### **008TR Entry Capacity**

See item 3 below.

#### **018TR Information Transparency.**

See 1.3.1 above.

0140: “Review of Information Provision on National Grids Information Exchange.” Minutes from the meetings which took place on 09 and 27 July 2007 were available on the Joint Office website. The next two meetings were provisionally scheduled for 21 August and 18 September 2007 at Elexon Offices, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW.

#### **019TR Emergency Market Arrangements**

See 1.3.1 above.

#### **014TR Operating Margins Procurement**

Status: Remained On Hold.

#### **015TR Constraint Management**

Status: Remained On Hold.

#### **016TR Storage Commodity Charge**

Status: Remained On Hold.

## **020TR Gas Quality**

Status: On Hold.

## **2. Topics**

### **2.1 Draft Modification Proposal: Change to Measurement Provisions Change Process**

JB explained that National Grid NTS had published a revised draft Proposal, reflecting concerns raised at the previous meeting. SW asked for clarity to be added as to what was meant by increases in the Permitted Ranges. AS responded that it was intended to solely address cases where these ranges would be increased to reflect Users' flow requirements. AL suggested that "engagement with relevant Users" should be added. CS suggested having an "or" rather than "and" for the test on acceptability. AS agreed to take these away and redraft the draft Proposal for submission to the Modification Panel, and attendees agreed to recommend that the Panel should agree to issue the Proposal directly to consultation.

## **3. OFGEM Open Letter: Further Consultation on NTS Energy Capacity Baselines**

### **3.1 Ofgem Introduction**

SS introduced a discussion about Ofgem's open letter on a further consultation regarding entry capacity baselines and invited comments. SS accepted that, with hindsight, further consultation on the baselines in the final Proposals would have been helpful and that, despite creating uncertainty, it had been concluded that a further consultation now was the least bad option. However, the baselines for Winter 2008 would not be impacted.

SS emphasised that there should be no presumption that the baselines will or will not change and that other surrounding issues were linked – such as an enduring trade and transfer process, capacity substitution, how to deal with spare capacity on the network in light of the rejection of the pricing proposal GCM06.

Subject to progress and the time needed for National Grid NTS to undertake analysis, Ofgem hoped to consult in November on any revised Proposals and would simultaneously address any change to National Grid's SO scheme. A full impact assessment would be incorporated in the consultation document.

CS asked whether the basis for calculating baselines would be reopened, for example maximum physical capability. SS responded that nothing was ruled out.

SFA asked about substitution and whether National Grid NTS could look beyond capacity sales to gather information, such as through TBE. SS said that the whole driver of the regime should be auctions and that the starting principle would be firm commitments. NW said the problem was that the previous Ofgem position had been to commit that baselines would not be changed and that substitution undermined this. SS said that they wanted to avoid over investment and that available spare capacity should be utilised where so doing can reduce costs. NW said the industry was looking for certainty about the methodology change – would it be different every five years. SS agreed this was undesirable, but Ofgem could not commit that any methodology would prove to be fit for purpose across time. Ofgem was looking to learn from what had worked well and what had not and it was a balance between offering certainty and learning from experience.

SG asked for the arrangements for releasing incremental capacity under various approaches to be included in the review. MF agreed that it should be included.

DO said there was still a fundamental problem about the ability of auctions to signal total demand and questioned why this door remains closed. Markets become more and more short term and the pattern of long term contracted gas has changed. There is less

flexibility offshore than in the past and storage is changing. It will be increasingly difficult to get long term commitments sufficient to justify investment and he was concerned by the rigidity of looking at one signal in isolation. SS argued that, taking the practicalities into account, the alternative would be Ofgem or National Grid making speculative investment; neither had the skills necessary to do this. Past supply forecasts and the implied investment had been proven to be significantly wrong. The NPV test is based on only 50%, so whilst some user commitment was sought, complete commitment was not. This is similar to the "open season" approach used elsewhere in Europe given the fixed price approach.

AB agreed that the long term auction process works for single major investments. However, for substitution it was possible to move capacity for a short period which effectively removed a strip for the long term. The challenge was getting the balance right between major products and substitution, which could constrain-off small sources of supply. SS agreed but said there was a deficit of information. There is an ability to move capacity around the network and parties needed greater understanding to be able to understand the risks they faced, for example if capacity was likely to be substituted away. MF said the 10% held back for short term auctions helped short term players. AB suggested it would be worth thinking if a higher level was appropriate given substitution and other elements of the proposed changes, which need to be seen holistically.

JB referred to security of supply, which had been raised in previous discussions. SS struggled to understand how there may be a conflict with security of supply. The key was that National Grid NTS should have the tools available to accept gas into the system if this was physically possible, consistent with economic and efficient operation of the system. This principle should be paramount with capacity released whenever physically possible.

CW asked about the timing of the capacity substitution methodology and suggested there should be parity between substitution and trades and transfers. SS agreed that developments should run in parallel as far as possible and the interactions be recognised. Similarly, the charging methodology debates on spare capacity are linked to what happens with baselines.

SS encouraged all to make their views clear on the timing of forthcoming long term auctions and whether the planned September 2007 auctions should be delayed. NW asked whether lead times could be squeezed if the auctions are delayed. CB said that no obligation to release capacity in under 42 months would be difficult to accept, but would welcome early signals from all players and endeavour to meet all demands within the required timescale if at all possible, and National Grid was incentivised to do this.

### **3.2 National Grid NTS Presentation**

CB presented a brief response on behalf of National Grid NTS and also asked for views to be expressed on the timing of future QSEC auctions, given that the invitation for the September auctions was due to be issued on 16 August 2007.

JC asked if Ofgem would be supportive of granting urgency if a Modification Proposal were raised seeking to delay the September auction. MF confirmed he would expect such a Proposal to meet the criteria for urgent status to be granted.

IT asked why this was substantially different to the previous year. The September auction was run even though baselines were being considered as part of the TPCR process. If anything, more would be known this year than last.

JB1 suggested there were two types of entry point that may want incremental capacity: new points and expanding ones, and wondered why the former could not approach National Grid NTS on a continuing basis rather than having only one opportunity per year. If these could make a commitment at any time, others wanting to buy long term capacity would be doing so for other reasons, and unbundling the issues to address these separately may help. CB responded that the current UNC rules are there for existing ASEPs, with a single auction each year, but a new entry point auction could be

held at any time. Given this situation, the question had to be asked how to move forward, given this position would continue. MW raised the issue of how different mechanisms interacted and how decisions were brought together at a single time. EC suggested there was also a pricing issue as the QSEC process was based on cleared prices whereas the incremental process could be different. MF said that Ofgem were open to considering options on auction timing.

CB indicated that National Grid NTS did not anticipate raising a Proposal to amend the present QSEC auction timing. However, CB also raised the timing of the AMSEC auctions and whether this should be held in February 2008 or post any increased certainty regarding baselines and the enduring trade and transfer process.

JB1 said that if the September auctions were going ahead, it would help to know what the network would look like post the 2006 auctions – what investment is underway as a result of previous signals. This would help the industry to understand where constraints were likely to arise as flow patterns change going forward – bearing in mind the changes anticipated by 2010 and the investment being delivered by then. CB agreed to provide information on planned investment.

**Action TR1074: National Grid NTS to provide information on planned NTS investment.**

SS suggested that it would be helpful for a projection of the zonal maxima recently published by NTS, to be made available. JB1 agreed this would be helpful, but was also interested in where additional investment might be needed to accommodate any incremental capacity. CB emphasised that this projection of zonal maxima could not be delivered by 16 August but some information on investment plans could be available by then.

AB suggested that the planned workshops should not lose sight of the need to bring all of the strands together and ensure they worked in a cohesive manner. CB agreed that this was the intention. SR asked if the enduring trades and transfers would be covered in the initial workshop. CB responded that this would be dealt with later, potentially in October. MW suggested the intention was embedding trades and transfers within the existing auction processes and so developments should be timed to fit-in with the existing auction timeline, with the timing of AMSEC auctions, for example, being critical to trades and transfers.

AB2 asked for an indication of the timeline for Licence changes, including any changes to SO incentives, in addition to the timeline which National Grid foresaw for developing the UNC and supporting documents.

AB asked whether the usual process applied for any Licence changes, such as acceptance by National Grid and potential appeal to the Competition Commission. This was confirmed.

SG asked whether National Grid NTS's planned workshops on the entry capacity auction process would go ahead. MW agreed to clarify this and issue an update on 03 August 2007. (Post Meeting Note: National Grid NTS confirmed that the workshops will be going ahead)

#### **4. Enduring Offtake Arrangements**

##### **4.1 Draft Review Proposal: Review of necessary reform of NTS Offtake Arrangements**

In respect of the appeal proceedings relating to 0116V, MF said that the decision had been remitted back to Ofgem and Ofgem was therefore reconsidering that decision. However, it was not clear whether any Proposals other than 0116V and 0116A were open for reconsideration. Secondly, Ofgem were considering both the need and the scope of further analysis on the flexibility product. An open letter this week was planned confirming the present Ofgem position. MY said that the formal position was that the

community had received a formal notice of future implementation and that had not been altered. Clarity on this would be helpful.

MY introduced BGT's draft Review Proposal on exit arrangements. This had been put together having taken into account the Competition Commission Appeal outcome. MY felt this was more appropriate than moving immediately to a Modification Proposal, creating an opportunity for all stakeholders to consider the best way forward given the Appeal outcome. The intention was for this to be raised in time for the August Modification Panel. Comments prior to formal submission and the proposed Terms of Reference would be welcome.

NW asked about the interaction between the Review Group and Ofgem's reconsideration given that it was hard to see what could be considered beyond the five previous Proposals. If Ofgem concluded that one of the previous five Proposals could and should be implemented, was a Review Group necessary? MY was concerned that it may not be as simple as implementing a previous Proposal and that something needed to happen which is why the Review Proposal is to be raised, even if that was only to consider whether one of the existing proposals would benefit from some development.

MF said that the Appeal outcome allowed for 0116V to be implemented as it stood, but it was less clear that 0116CVV remained on the table and hence was capable of being implemented should Ofgem conclude this was appropriate. MF also emphasised that it was open, as ever, for Proposals to be raised in this area, which Ofgem would then need to consider as well as any reconsideration of previous Proposals.

LS observed that there may be urgent time constraints, but MW thought there would be enough time to get any Modification Proposals ready for Q1 2008.

MF said that Ofgem Industry Codes and the Joint Office would discuss the 'non-implementation' of 0116V and how/what should appear in the UNC in respect of the Appeal decision.

## 5. Modification Proposals

### 5.1 Modification Proposal 0159: National Grid NTS discretionary release of Interruptible NTS Entry Capacity

Questions were invited on Mod 0159. RF asked if any further Proposals were anticipated in this area. MW explained that no firm proposals were available, but National Grid NTS was looking at whether further steps were possible to release additional interruptible capacity within day. CW asked whether any comfort could be provided about how decisions would be taken to release discretionary capacity above the UIOLI levels. MW invited views on what Shippers would want to see offered to make the process more predictable, and National Grid NTS would try to respond to the ideas raised.

**Action TR1075: All to provide views to National Grid NTS on what Shippers would want to see offered to make the process more predictable.**

CW asked if the baseline had been reduced and no obligated firm capacity was available, could interruptible be released. MW confirmed this was the case. In response to IT, MW also expanded on the differences between this Proposal and Transfers and Trades, with the key being the lack of compensation mechanism since interruptible capacity would be released under Proposal 0159 and Firm under Transfers and Trades.

### 5.2 Modification Proposal 0163: Offering Capacity at Donor ASEP in Trades & Transfer Process

SG presented on behalf of Scottish Power.

AP asked how unsold capacity would be dealt with in the Proposal. SG clarified that the intent was for this to be consistent with National Grid NTS's proposed approach, with unsold offered at the ASEP at which it is unsold. However, at a later point in the meeting, SG clarified that 0163 referred to sold and not unsold capacity.

RF queried Scottish Power's concerns about how capacity could be moved away from where it is required. SG explained that rights could be transferred elsewhere although the potential existed for additional capacity to be used at the point from where it had been reduced – for example, this could happen at a storage site. RF suggested that this should not happen if capacity had been bought – there was no obligation to surrender it. CS suggested it was already possible to trade capacity in this way. SG agreed but said it was inefficient, for example, to move capacity from Easington to Hatfield.

NW asked if this was effectively re-auctioning AMSEC capacity through the Trade and Transfer process, but with more information available. SG agreed this could be the impact, but was not the rationale behind the Proposal. Instead, the Proposal sought to address an outcome of the Trade and Transfer process.

SR asked if a separate auction process would be required for the unsold capacity to be allocated. SG suggested that this was dependent on the legal text and processes adopted but could be achieved in different ways, for example through the merit order stacking process. MW said National Grid NTS were interpreting the Proposal as introducing a separate allocation, to be done prior to Trades and Transfers, rather than a separate auction process.

A question was asked about the price differences that were proposed in 0163 and 0156/A. MW said the difference is that 0163 would give preference at the original ASEP rather than the bids being considered simultaneously. SG explained that SP saw this as stopping capacity, through trades and transfer, becoming an entirely zonal product, keeping preference for nodal sales initially. This would help to avoid the scope for gaming.

SG clarified for CW that the weighted average price to be applied would be that from the AMSEC. CW was concerned that this may mean surrendering capacity at less than the price paid and that the Proposal might usefully be clarified to emphasise the intended price elements. MW asked if the weighted average price would apply to the unsold as well as surrendered capacity, which needed clarifying in the legal text. JB1 said this was a particular problem if no capacity had been sold as there was no weighted average price – e.g. Glenmavis. However, he could see merit in the proposal for the sold as opposed to unsold process. SG initially felt the weighted average approach fitted with the existing process and that was why it had been proposed, but would be happy for the proposal to be for the reserve price to apply where no capacity had been sold. Subsequently, SG clarified that only sold capacity would be captured by this Proposal, so the example raised in respect of Glenmavis would no longer apply.

JB asked if Ofgem would want the Panel to consider the relative merits of 0163 against 0156/A. MF said the Proposals were closely linked and hence views on preferences of all three would be helpful.

SG agreed to issue a revised Q&A to assist in adding clarity to his Proposal.

**Action TR1076: SG to issue a revised Q & A to assist in adding clarity to Modification Proposal 0163.**

## **6. AOB**

### **6.1 Modification Proposal 0164: Bi-Directional Connection Point Overrun Charge Calculation**

SW (Centrica Storage) presented the Proposal, which is due to be considered by the Modification Panel on 16 August 2007.

DO asked how IUK manage this issue. SW had no information on this.

MW suggested that if Users book their intended flow, no overrun would be faced. Allowing this new mechanism would discourage necessary capacity booking, which would concern National Grid NTS. SW responded that the current risk was twice as much capacity being booked as was necessary. The intention was that Users should

not be penalised when no costs were incurred; not that bookings would be disincentivised. NW was not convinced that a disincentive would be created since there would still be uncertainty about what others might do.

JB asked if there would be any objections to this Proposal being issued directly to consultation. MW felt more articulation of the impact, as illustrated in the presentation, would be helpful but, other than this, no concerns were raised.

## 6.2 Transfer and Trades Methodology Statement

MW (National Grid NTS) presented on the Transfer and Trade Methodology Statement, which has been issued in draft form for consultation, and emphasised that it needed to be considered in parallel with the proposed modifications (0156/0156A and 0163).

RF asked about the reference to Summer demand in the draft statement, and its relevance given that the initial Transfer & Trade process is planned for Winter only. MW confirmed that this was to be consistent with the nodal allocation maxima published on 06 July and that the process would be based on reasonably anticipated demand, informed by historical data. Some felt the approach was unduly conservative, but MW believed this was mistaken, bearing in mind that the nodal maxima are based on the (optimistic) assumption that the system would be configured to achieve the highest possible capability at that node for a given flow level.

RF asked what represented “no material increase in risk/costs for NTS” since his reading of the methodology statement suggested there would be no increase in costs. MW responded that, if a constraint occurs, costs quickly become material. Hence the modelling was based on avoiding the system failing and, consequently, constraints occurring.

JC1 asked about capacity surrender and what would be received in exchange. MW responded that this would be the same as for a trade, with liabilities to National Grid NTS remaining unchanged and payment based on the Transfer and Trade auction result – such that National Grid NTS would remain revenue neutral.

In response to AP, MW clarified that time did not allow for a Transfer and Trade allocation in October 2007.

AL asked about the process for registering an interest in an ASEP and whether it would be possible to enter the process later, and also what would happen if you registered but did not bid? MW responded it would not be possible to add additional ASEPs to the process once it had started and if people registered but did not bid, that would need to be looked at going forward.

MW confirmed that no exchange rate cap was proposed in the Transfer and Trade methodology.

SR asked how allocations would be managed if more was offered for surrender than was bid for. MW answered that this would be pro-rated.

MW welcomed suggestions for analysis before the consultation closes on 28 August 2007.

## 6.3 Increased Security at Entry Terminals

MY (BGT Centrica) raised the announcement that physical security was to be increased at Entry Terminals, which creates costs. It had been suggested that the costs would fall on National Grid NTS and MY wondered if this would be passed through to Users, in case it was significant.

**Action TR1077: MW to check any implications for users on increased physical security and report back on level of costs if any.**

**7. Diary Planning**

The next Transmission Workstream meeting has been arranged for 10:00hrs on Thursday 06 September 2007 at Elexon, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW, with workshops (also at Elexon) to consider entry capacity arranged for:

14 August 2007 13:00 – 17:00

17 August 2007 10:00 – 13:00

12 September 2007 10:00 – 12:45

## Appendix A: Action Log – UNC Transmission 02 August 2007

Action Ref	Meeting Date(s)	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
TR 1067	07/06/07	2.1	Provide timeline demonstrating the interactions between various auctions.	National Grid NTS (Martin Watson)	This would be provided after the implications of the 0116 Appeal decision were studied. <b>Carried forward</b>
TR 1068	07/06/07	2.2	Return to the Workstream to present a detailed overview of the interaction of the capacity regimes and the operation of the gas market.	Ofgem (Paul O' Donovan)	To take place after resolution of the Judicial Review. <b>Carried Forward</b>
TR 1071	05/07/07	1.2	Safety Monitors - production of outline proposal, subsequent to closure of the focus group.	BGT (Mike Young)	06 September 2007 <b>Carried forward</b>
TR 1072	05/07/07	2.1	Transfer and Trade Modification Proposal - National Grid NTS to consider making available worked examples of various scenarios.	National Grid NTS (Martin Watson)	13 July 2007 <b>Action Closed</b>
TR 1073	05/07/07	2.1	Revised action: Recent instances of TFAs without no associated buy-backs – MW to consider.	National Grid NTS (Martin Watson)	Carried forward
TR 1074	02/08/07		Provide information on planned NTS investment	National Grid NTS (Chris Bennett)	
TR 1075	02/08/07	5.1	MP0159: All to provide views to National Grid NTS on what Shippers would want to see offered to make the process more predictable.	ALL	
TR 1076	02/08/07	5.2	SG to issue a revised Q & A to assist in adding clarity to Modification Proposal 0163.	Scottish Power (Steve Gordon)	03 August 2007 prior to consultation closeout. <b>Closed</b>
TR 1077	02/08/07	6.2	Increased security at Entry Terminals: MW to check facts and report back on level of costs if any.	National Grid NTS (Martin Watson)	