

**Transmission Workstream Minutes**  
**Thursday 04 February 2010**  
**Ellexon, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW**

<b>Attendees</b>		
John Bradley (Chair)	(JB)	Joint Office of Gas Transporters
Lorna Dupont (Secretary)	(LD)	Joint Office of Gas Transporters
Alan Raper	(AR)	National Grid Distribution
Andrew Pearce	(AP)	BP Gas
Benjamin Clair	(BC)	South Hook Gas
Chandima Dutton	(CD)	National Grid NTS
Chris Aldridge	(CA)	National Grid NTS
Chris Shanley	(CS)	National Grid NTS
Chris Wright	(CW)	Centrica
David Turner	(DT)	GassCo
Debra Hawkin	(DH)	National Grid NTS
Fergus Healy	(FH)	National Grid NTS
Graham Jack	(GJ)	Centrica
Ian Taylor	(IT)	Northern Gas Networks
Ian Trickle	(IT1)	ExxonMobil
Jeff Chandler	(JC)	SSE
Joanna Ferguson	(JF)	Northern Gas Networks
John Baldwin	(JB1)	CNG Services
Julie Cox	(JCox)	AEP
Landon Larsen	(LL)	ExxonMobil
Mark Dalton	(MD)	BG Group
Paul O'Donovan	(POD)	Ofgem
Peter Mills-Baker	(PMB)	National Grid NTS
Phil Hobbins	(PH)	National Grid NTS
Rekha Patel	(RP)	Waters Wye
Richard Fairholme	(RF)	EON UK
Richard Jones	(RJ)	xoserve
Richard Miller	(RM)	Ofgem
Richard Sarsfield-Hall	(RSH)	Poyry Energy Consulting
Richard Street	(RS)	Corona Energy
Roddy Munroe	(RM)	Centrica Storage Ltd
Shelley Rouse	(SR)	StatoilHydro
Simon Trivella	(ST)	Wales & West Utilities
Stefan Leedham	(SL)	EDF Energy
Steve Fisher	(SF)	National Grid NTS
Steven Sherwood	(SS)	Scotia Gas Networks

**1. Introduction**

JB welcomed attendees to the meeting.

**1.1 Minutes of the previous Workstream Meeting**

Subject to a few minor amendments to the actions, the minutes of the previous meeting (07 January 2010) were accepted.

## 1.2 Review of Outstanding Actions

**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:** POD reported that the Project Discovery document was published yesterday, and the issue relating to emergency cash out prices was included in this document and would be part of the Ofgem led work. Ofgem will deliver a presentation at the March Workstream. **Action Closed**

**Action TR1202:** All members to provide views on the NTS Exit (Flat) Capacity Charges – Credit Arrangements (UNC TPDV3.3.4).

**Update:** ST reported that feedback had been received and the topic had been discussed at various fora. It was likely that one or two UNC modifications would be raised in March. **Action Closed**

**Action TR1203:** National Grid NTS (FH) to quantify the effect (if any) on customers, of the intended revision of the value of the Design Margin within the long term planning models.

**Update:** Covered under item 3.6.1, below. **Action Closed**

**Action TR 0101:** National Grid NTS (RH) to ensure that questions asked on Gas Day 04 January 2010 at the Transmission Workstream were addressed at the January Gas Operations Forum.

**Update:** JB confirmed that the questions raised had been addressed at the Gas Operations Forum. **Action Closed**

**Action TR0102:** BG Group (MD) to provide a presentation on the way forward for Force Majeure at the February 2010 Workstream.

**Update:** See item 3.1 below. **Action Closed**

**Action TR 0103:** Exit Reform Review/July 2009 Applications: National Grid NTS (SF) to report number of requests related to increases and reductions.

**Update:** SF reported that the numbers of requests related to increases and reductions were 63 and 23 respectively. **Action Closed**

**Action TR 0104:** Exit Reform Review/NTS (DC) Offtake Capacity Position - National Grid NTS (SF) to report on the provision of analysis of total volume versus User Commitment.

**Update:** SF reported that the provisional value was in the region of 1550GWh. **Action Closed**

**Action TR 0105:** Exit Reform Review/Increase in Existing Enduring Obligation - National Grid NTS (SF) to discuss the level of user commitment in the 857GWh/day figure with colleagues and report back findings.

**Update:** It was agreed that this was to be combined with Action TR0104. **Action Closed**

**Action TR 0106:** Exit Reform Review - National Grid NTS (SF) to discuss how the risk profile may have changed based on baseline perception/calculation and report back findings.

**Update:** SF and RM will liaise offline. **Action Closed**

**Action TR 0107:** Exit Reform Review - AEP (JCox) to consider capacity rights and their relationship to the enduring capacity regime prior to discussing with National Grid NTS (SF) in more detail and providing an update in due course.

**Update:** SF reported that this was discussed at an informal Exit meeting following the Exit Substitution Workshop, and a watching brief will be maintained. **Action Closed**

**Action TR 0108:** National Grid NTS (SF) to investigate the feasibility of incorporating discussions on how best to initiate (and subsequently govern) development of any UNC modification proposals within the Exit Substitution Workshop arena and report back findings.

**Update:** SF reported that a meeting was held last week, and that FH will address any immediate concerns in the draft Modification Proposals on today's agenda. Other areas will be considered over the next few months and other Modification Proposals may follow. A Workgroup may need to be formed to consider overdeeming and progress any subsequent conclusions. SF agreed to make the presentation available. **Action Closed**

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

#### **1.3.1 Modification Status Report (Modification Proposals Register)**

*The Modification Proposals Register is available to view at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/mods/>.*

JB gave an update on live and recently closed Modification Proposals.

#### **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.co.uk/mods/>*

JB gave an update by exception only.

014TR: JCox asked about the progress of the Safety Case. POD referred to the letter issued by Ofgem and said that the consultation was not yet closed. POD would check the closeout date. *(POD has since confirmed the consultation closes on 15 February 2010)*

024TR: JB informed members that due to circumstances beyond control, the presenter for item 3 was unable to be present and this topic was deferred until the March meeting. The proposals had been discussed by the EBCC, and it was expected that National Grid NTS would sponsor the Modification Proposal.

### 1.1. **Related Meetings and Review Groups**

JB confirmed that the working of GBAs was discussed at the Ops Forum.

There were no matters arising that required the attention of the Workstream.

## 2. **UNC Modification Proposals**

No new Modification Proposals had been raised since the last meeting that required the attention of the Workstream.

## 3. **Topics**

*Copies of the various presentations are available to view and/or download from the Joint Office web site at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/tx/040210>.*

### 3.1 **Force Majeure (Action TR0102)**

MD gave a brief presentation on potential steps to take and emphasised how the rejection of Tirley by the Tewkesbury Planning Committee was relevant. There were a number of options, each with different impacts and associated timings, and a potential significant impact of £0.5 million a month. Whatever steps were taken, it was critical that adequate protection was available from October 2010 as it was likely that this situation was going to become an enduring issue. MD believed there was a need to pursue this quite quickly with either an urgent Modification Proposal or a commercial solution, and would raise this topic at the next Ops Forum. When asked for views on the approach, RF believed it important to preserve the buyback incentive, and thought the last option might be worth pursuing.

### 3.2 **Topic 003TR Review of NTS Exit Capacity Arrangements**

#### 3.2.1 **Exit Capacity Release Update – National Grid NTS**

SF reported that the review of the Exit Capacity Release Methodology Statement had been undertaken and a number of revisions were under consideration, many of which were clarifications or additional detail.

SF then went on to explain the proposed changes for the Transitional period and then for the Enduring Exit period. Most changes were associated with the latter.

JCox asked if any thought had been given to performing a radical overhaul of the document to address duplications and to make sure that it aligned with the UNC. SF responded that this was under consideration for the next year.

ST asked if the consultation document would also be provided as a change marked version. SF would check/consider making a change marked version available.

**Action TR0201: ExCR Consultation - Check/consider making a change marked version available.**

SF then outlined the consultation timetable, which would commence on 19 February 2010 and close on 19 March 2010.

### 3.2.2 Exit Review Update – National Grid NTS

Referring back to the previous Workstream, at which National Grid NTS' initial views had been put forward, FH then proceeded to introduce 4 draft Modification Proposals for views and comments, pointing out that all four were believed to be User Pays, with the percentage decided purely on the benefits of the change. National Grid NTS would particularly like views of others on who receives the benefits in each case.

**a) Draft Modification Proposal: *To determine the amount of Annual NTS Exit (Flat) Capacity to be released where the quantity of unsold NTS Exit Capacity fluctuates within the Gas Year***

FH outlined the Proposal and described the current process (auctions/ad hoc requests) resulting in a limited varied amount of flat capacity becoming available in any one month. Where capacity cannot be released in the annual process, it will rollover into the daily process.

JCox thought the main benefit of this Proposal to be one of clarity, rather than *who* benefits, as it seems a fairly unique set of circumstances. AR pointed out that it was not really relevant to the DNs, and that no party would want to pay if they cannot see any benefit from it.

**Action TR0202: SF to check if the current issue applies to just ad hoc or to 01 October as well.**

SL agreed with JCox and thought there was no benefit for Shippers apart from clarity. JCox added that it was always good to 'tidy up' but that this was not really of the highest priority. ST suggested that it would be better to have discussions on User Pays elements after the decisions on Modification Proposals 0263 and 0276 were known. SF responded that this was trying to provide some clarity in advance, but did not believe it to be of the same magnitude as 0263 and 0276. DH thought that ExCR might be clearer. JCox pointed out that the two documents are not linked together.

**b) Draft Modification Proposal: *Change System Capacity Transfers Notification Time Limit from 04:00 to 03:00***

FH explained the purpose of the draft Modification Proposal, which was to change two elements to address perceived shortcomings in a particular process. It will apply to both Entry and Exit, and will be binding on both parties, making it difficult to just walk away from it. JB asked what effects there would be from the change to time limits. BC commented that it was never good to have less time. FH pointed out that if the benefits accrued mostly to National Grid NTS then it would bear the cost.

**c) Draft Modification Proposal: *Introduction of a Discretionary Release Mechanism for Non-Obligated Annual NTS Exit (Flat) Capacity***

FH explained the purpose of the draft Modification Proposal, which FH believed to offer benefits to both parties.

ST asked how an applicant would signal that it wanted capacity for a year or wanted enduring capacity? FH noted this point for further consideration. JCox was of the opinion that there should not be a mechanism that enables a party to obtain enduring earlier than Y+4. AR, ST and JCox expressed some doubts on how much this proposed release of Exit Capacity would be used.

**d) Draft Modification Proposal: *Facilitating the Reduction of Enduring Annual NTS Exit (Flat) Capacity by a value less than 100,000kWh***

FH explained the purpose of the draft Modification Proposal, which was to enable Users, with an Enduring Annual NTS Exit (Flat) Capacity quantity that is less than 100,000kWh, to reduce this to zero in future reduction windows or via any other reduction request.

JB questioned the feasibility of timetables proposed before the annual auctions. FH responded that National Grid NTS expected to receive the ROMs from xoserve for consideration, before contemplating raising the Modification Proposals.

### **3.3 System Flexibility Performance Indicators – Final Proposals**

PH outlined the background to the final proposals, and advised that Phase 2 Indicators would require further work, which would be reported on at a later date.

The System Flexibility definition was explained, and PH pointed out the additions made to the text since the last workshop in November. JCox pointed out that supply/demand mismatches frequently occurred and the system was designed to cope with these, and the terminology should reflect this. PH accepted that point but believed the focus turned more towards linepack changes and local pressure variations. Responding to a question from RS relating to the physical measure of closing linepack, PH said that exactly how it is presented is not yet fully established. Both JCox and RS believed that how the measurement was shown was very important; it needs to be clear if actual or forecast information and can show different things. There was a brief discussion on what could actually be shown and it was agreed that both maximum physical and projected closing linepack figures were important. JCox pointed out that predicted close can trigger the calling of a GBA and much caution needed to be exercised in interpreting meaning from the graphs.

PH then gave an overview of the Key Drivers and Influences.

RSH believed that compressors and how these were set up was a key part of flexibility, and appeared to be missing from the Key Drivers and Influences. PH noted this.

'Leading' Indicators – Phase 1 were described, and PH added that there was an obligation to publish hourly zonal linepack from 01 October 2010. ST observed that flex zones and linepack zones do not match, and wondered if there were any changes in progress to address this. Also a better understanding of the interaction between the zones was required, and what triggers changes to locations. National Grid NTS would consider this and report back.

**Action TR0203: National Grid NTS to check if the mismatch between flex zones and linepack zones was being addressed, and consider the interaction between the zones and what triggers changes to locations, and report back.**

RS was unclear as to what hourly zonal linepack would actually tell him. PH responded that part of the challenge going forward was to look at individual pieces of data that taken together would help to indicate the level of flex on the system overall and the underlying causes. It was just a starting point and needed more in depth consideration. DT then asked what was the objective here. PH responded that it was the start of a process to help us understand how the system may need to be developed going forward taking account of the new challenges, and recognising there is potential for increased demand for flex on

the NTS. POD added that part of this was driven by Ofgem's instruction to Grid to look at the 0195 processes.

'Lagging' Indicators – Phase 1 were described, followed by Phase 2 Indicators, which PH advised were still in development. RS asked where substitution would be captured. A holistic picture was required in respect of compressor usage, not a fettered view.

JCox questioned that nothing appeared to be looking at within day flex products – at the November meeting there was mention of analysis by sector, but it was not apparent here. Should this be monitored and data looked at in a different way? It featured in the November presentation and does need to be looked at carefully; it would be very remiss not to include it as it could have an important bearing. PH noted this point.

### 3.4 Topic 008TR Entry Capacity

#### 3.4.1 Entry Charging Review Update

DH presented two draft Modification Proposals.

##### **a) Draft Modification Proposal: *Removal of the Zero Auction Reserve Price for Within-day Daily NTS Entry Capacity (WDDSEC)***

DH outlined the Proposal that the zero auction reserve price for Within-day Daily NTS Entry Capacity be removed from the UNC and that the reserve price be set out in the NTS Transportation Statement and calculated in accordance with the NTS Charging Methodology Statement.

BC supported the idea that to clarify the treatment of Force Majeure would create an incentive. DH added that National Grid NTS would meet clearing obligations by having a zero price; it was not proposing to withhold capacity, but just putting a charge on it. She went on to point out that there might be an issue with the consultation timeframe because of Easter, and the fact that this Proposal would need to be treated in conjunction with the Pricing paper; therefore shortened timescales may be required.

JB advised the Workstream that any further comments should be submitted to the Joint Office by Tuesday 09 February 2010 to enable DH to finalise the Modification Proposal for publication on Wednesday 10 February 2010.

##### **b) Draft Modification Proposal: *"Use it or lose it" (UIOLI) Interruptible Capacity only to be released when firm entry capacity is [90%] sold out***

DH outlined the background and intent of the Proposal, advising that this Modification Proposal was Shipper-driven following requests that National Grid NTS look at this area.

SL pointed out that there may be an issue with the calculations, and that depending on flows this Proposal means that not everything will be released and suggested a solution to this.

SL commented that this seems to reduce security of supply and IT1 thought further debate was required here. SF noted the concerns and will reconsider.

JB advised the Workstream that any further comments should be submitted to the Joint Office by Tuesday 09 February 2010 to enable DH to finalise the Modification Proposal for publication on Wednesday 10 February 2010.

### 3.4.2 Gemini Capacity Buyback Timescales

MD gave a short presentation outlining the current view of National Grid NTS' process and actions, demonstrating the current timings associated with Capacity Buyback. During recent events it was noted that a lack of previous experience and the resultant confusion meant that deadlines were not met. MD suggested extending the current cut off time of 02:00am for Capacity Buyback bids to 03:30am, thereby giving the opportunity to reduce errors.

SF acknowledged that 02:00am might no longer be an appropriate cut off time and did think an extension would present any problems for National Grid NTS, and suggested that it be taken to the Ops Forum to gain their views. FH added that making a change in Gemini would be far simpler if it could be set at 03:00am or 04:00am. A Modification Proposal would be required to effect any change to the current parameters.

### 3.5 Gas Balancing Alerts (within Day, giving National Grid Gas discretion to remove GBA within Day)

Following the recent experiences relating to the calling of Gas Balancing Alerts (GBAs), and in fulfilment of Action TR0102, MD (for BG Group) gave a presentation outlining the background to the suggestion to provide an additional tool to assist National Grid NTS in minimising the costs of balancing the system. It was MD's intention to discuss this topic at the next Ops Forum and then raise an urgent Modification Proposal.

MD wondered if there would be any issues relating to customer contracts. SF had noted parties' concerns relating to the on/off/on positions on the same day, and National Grid NTS would need to give MD's suggestion further consideration.

DT believed it to be important to establish whether there was a need to actively call a GBA in the first place. SF responded that it was his understanding that it had been necessary. DT pointed out that the market had over responded so perhaps the mechanism should be reviewed in light of recent experience. JCox agreed with this view and added that at 13:00 on the day a review of the position by National Grid NTS would have immediately noted that the market response had been sufficient. AR suggested that in such circumstances it might have been sufficient just to announce the event that triggered the GBA (ie a fall off greater than 25 metres), rather than immediately call a full GBA, to give the market time to respond in a controlled manner. SR pointed out that there was now so much more information available to the industry that parties are able to respond far more quickly. Perhaps an 'early warning' mechanism should be available for use, before calling a full GBA. JB noted that these comments reflected the views put forward at the Ops Forum.

DT questioned if the current mechanism was fit for purpose - was GBA called too soon, or could it be avoided through the utilisation of a more gradual approach. He also drew attention to the negative press that surrounded the calling of the GBA, which perhaps could be avoided in the future if a more graduated approach were instigated. ST agreed that the industry should try to avoid unnecessary negative publicity and suggested that perhaps some sort of 'green light' that indicated sufficient industry response had been made might be useful.

DT commented that, even with the prospect of an urgent Modification Proposal in the near future, the current process still needed to be reviewed.



JB suggested that MD might also like to take this forward to the Demand Side Working Group (DSWG).

### **3.6 Topic 021TR Transmission Planning Code**

#### **3.6.1 Design Margin Update (Action TR1203)**

CD gave a presentation and described the Design Margin and how it is used. A review was undertaken in 2008 and the main conclusion was that the transmission component was no longer required. The review confirmed that the Design Margin and the Operating Margin are used for different purposes and therefore do not overlap. The purposes of the Transmission component and the Transient component were then explained and tables were presented to illustrate the proposed reduction in the Design Margin (from 5% to 2%).

RS asked if it would decrease the pressure in the pipes. CD did not think there would be too much effect over the network; it will pressure cover to the extremities and may affect change of pressures locally. DT added that the Norway works on a 2% design margin.

CD reported that modifications to the Safety Case were complete and the consultation will commence in February 2010, with further consultations planned to reflect changes in the Exit regime and Planning legislation, and also changes in Europe.

## **4. Any Other Business**

### **4.1 Retirement**

JB informed members that he would be taking retirement at the end of June but assured the meeting that the Joint Office would ensure an orderly transition over the coming months.

## **5. Diary Planning**

The next Transmission Workstream meeting is due to be held at 10:00 on Thursday 04 March 2010, at Elexon, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW.

Details of all planned meetings are on the Joint Office website at: [www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Diary](http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Diary).

## **6. Modification Proposal 0273 - "Governance of Feasibility Study Requests to Support Changes to the Network Exit Agreements"**

### **6.1 Approval of the Draft Terms of Reference**

The draft Terms of Reference were reviewed and discussed. JCox questioned if a governance procedure was produced for Shippers, would this be to the detriment and disadvantage of non-Shipper parties or should it all be based on NExAs? CS agreed that this required consideration and would hope that developers and other interested parties would be able to submit representations, etc. He was aware of some legacy issues where NExAs did not exist. GJ asked if storage points were also covered; CS responded that as drafted it just covers NExAs, but could well be applied to other areas at a later stage. GJ also asked if the same standards of service would be applied to all requests.

Amendments were agreed and approved and the document will be revised and published on the JO website at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/tx/070110>.

## 6.2 Review current practices and procedures employed by Transporters

and

## 6.3 Examine and record current constraints and problems faced by Transporters

CS explained that his presentation would cover both areas. A brief comparison was made between the existing processes in the electricity and gas industries, where although similarities exist there were major differences. CS gave an overview of the CUSC process, where the Feasibility Study was optional, and described the use of the study and the design stages (connection offer and acceptance. It was commented on, and assumed, that the electricity side was able to employ 40+ engineers to work in this area because of the way National Grid was funded and more defined incentives in the Licence obligations, whereas for gas it was different.).

For the purposes of comparison JCoX was interested to know how many big electricity power stations and how many big gas power stations were included in the number of applications. CS agreed to report back.

**Action TR0204: Establish how many big electricity power stations and how many big gas power stations were included in the number of applications and report back.**

The DNs offered the following statistics:

Wales & West Utilities – 1 new connection and 0 modifications

Northern Gas Networks – 2 enquiries in 3 years

Scotia Gas Networks – 1 new connection and 2 in discussion regarding current NExAs.

It was pointed out that an enquiry can start off with the DN and can end with the NTS. It can also take far longer to obtain planning permission for gas pipeline.

SL then briefly recounted EDF's experience of a long drawn out process in gas (where no investment was required – it was ostensibly a simple connection process) as compared to its experience of electricity. Comparisons of timing of charges were discussed, and CS believed that having all charging upfront as in electricity would be good thing for the gas side. RF referred back to the suggestion of having a standardised application form to help facilitate this. CS noted that there was best practice on the electricity side that could usefully be drawn upon to improve the gas side, for example categorisation of different types of site and different types of charges, that could then be streamlined to an appropriate application form to capture the necessary requirements and information.

CS moved on to explain the gas connections process.

In answer to a question from SS, PMB commented that conceptual design is cheaper, because a new minimum Offtake was a standard design. IT pointed out that there are other service providers that can offer connections, not just DNs and the NTS. PMB observed that old Offtakes require a more detailed study than the new minimum Offtakes; six of those enquiries in the last year are existing legacy sites where changes are required. CS added that the way different facilities are operated is also changing, because markets and consumer behaviours are changing. The types of applications and requirements for feasibility studies do therefore change. IT noted changes to ramp rates parameters in NExAs.

RSH returned to the fact that this is currently a completely undefined process. Future circumstances will force different behaviours and the industry will need to have more certainty as to how these new connections/issues can be handled in a timely fashion. JCoX added that it would be sensible to have a provision that can accommodate any required time extension.

IT observed that the DNs were still struggling to see the issue here as the majority of the customers are connected satisfactorily. SL said that to allow the 0195AV process to follow through the DN process might have to be longer than 3 months. SS suggested that the DNs should perhaps demonstrate what happens on their side.

POD suggested that perhaps JCoX's AEP members could submit their experiences (good and bad) to enable a profile to be built up, and a greater appreciation of the customers' perception of the problem(s). RSH and SL would also ask their customers to contribute their experiences.

**Action TR 0205: Submit customer experiences (good and bad) to enable a profile to be built up, and a greater appreciation of the customers' perception of the problem(s).**

CS then explained the three phase approach offered for new connections. JCoX thought it would be useful to have an overlay of the timelines to do with this process, eg where a party has to commit to the capacity, etc and this would aid understanding.

**Action TR 0206: Produce a timeline to overlay against the three phase gas connection process.**

PMB pointed out that existing older sites present more complexities and are therefore more time consuming as projects than new minimum connects. They often acquire new owners with no real knowledge; the old site information is often lost/no longer available, and new modelling techniques are also employed, etc. JCoX questioned what defined complexity, and commented that it sounded as if a survey should be done of all existing sites to create a sound base level of necessary data.

ST pointed out that the biggest issue for DNs is changes to ramp rates and the potential effects of these on other customers and the network. IT added that there are also resource issues and the availability of specialist service providers.

From the discussions so far, there was clear agreement that communications need improving. It was also suggested that an end date was required, as were standard documents that, for example if three parties were involved, should all be ready at the same time.

CS said that National Grid NTS recognised that positive improvements could be made at the first three stages of a study, and was already reviewing the information provided on its website to see if it remained fit for purpose or required improvements and revision. GJ added that getting the parties together and discussing what is required much earlier in the process and at the various 'pinch' points would be most useful to customers.

#### **6.4 Examine and record problems with the current arrangements from a Shipper's perspective**

Most of the concerns that RF had, had been covered in the discussions at 6.2, above.

### **6.5 Confirmation of tasks for Session 3 (Thursday 04 March 2010)**

It was agreed that the next session would cover:

- (a) Review draft documentation.
- (b) Review draft Workstream Report.
- (c) Examine potential solutions to specific problems identified in Session 2 and the associated costs and benefits, ie:

- DN process
- Examples of customer experiences
- Network Design Expert
- What information is required from applicant and when.

- (d) Identify any necessary UNC changes.

**Action Log – UNC Transmission Workstream: 04 February 2010**

<b>Action Ref</b>	<b>Meeting Date(s)</b>	<b>Minute Ref</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Status Update</b>
TR 1202	03/12/09	3.1	<i>NTS Exit (Flat) Capacity Charges - Credit Arrangements (UNC TPD V3.3.4) - Views to be provided in advance of the next Workstream meeting.</i>	ALL	<b>Closed</b>
TR 1203	03/12/09	3.2.2	Quantify the effect (if any) on customers, of the intended revision of the value of the Design Margin within the long term planning models.	National Grid NTS (FH)	<b>Closed</b>
TR 0101	07/01/10	4.1	Ensure that questions asked on Gas Day 04 January 2010 at the Transmission Workstream are addressed at the January Gas Operations Forum.	National Grid (RH)	<b>Closed</b>
TR 0102	07/01/10	4.2	Provide presentation on the way forward for Force Majeure at the February 2010 Workstream.	BG Group (MD)	<b>Closed</b>
TR 0103	07/01/10	6.	Report number of requests related to increases and reductions.	National Grid (SF)	<b>Closed</b>
TR 0104	07/01/10	6.	Report on the provision of analysis of total volume versus user commitment.	National Grid (SF)	<b>Closed</b>
TR 0105	07/01/10	6.	Discuss the level of user commitment in the 857GWh/day figure with colleagues and report back findings.	National Grid (SF)	<b>Closed</b>
TR 0106	07/01/10	6.	Discuss how the risk profile may have changed based on baseline perception/calculation and report back findings.	National Grid (SF)	<b>Closed</b>
TR 0107	07/01/10	6.	Consider capacity rights and their relationship to the enduring capacity regime prior to discussing with National Grid NTS (SF) in more detail and providing an update in due course.	AEP & National Grid (JC and SF)	<b>Closed</b>

Action Ref	Meeting Date(s)	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
TR 0108	07/01/10	6.	Investigate the feasibility of incorporating discussions on how best to initiate (and subsequently govern) development of any UNC modification proposals within the Exit Substitution Workshop arena and report back findings.	National Grid (SF)	<b>Closed</b>
TR 0201	04/02/10	3.2.1	ExCR consultation – consider making a change marked version available.	National Grid NTS (SF)	
TR 0202	04/02/10	3.2.2	SF to check if the current issue applies to just ad hoc rather or to than 01 October as well	National Grid NTS (SF)	
TR 0203	04/02/10	3.3	National Grid NTS to check if the mismatch between flex zones and linepack zones was being addressed, and consider the interaction between the zones and what triggers changes to locations, and report back.	National Grid NTS (SF)	
TR 0204	04/02/10	6.2	Establish how many big electricity power stations and how many big gas power stations were included in the number of applications and report back.	National Grid NTS (CS)	
TR 0205	04/02/10	6.2	Submit customer experiences (good and bad) to enable a profile to be built up, and a greater appreciation of the customers' perception of the problem(s).	JCox, RSH, & SL	
TR 0206	04/02/10	6.2	Produce a timeline to overlay against the three phase gas connection process.	National Grid NTS (CS)	