

**UNC Workgroup 0479S Minutes
Inclusion of email as a valid UNC communication
Thursday 24 July 2014
at 31 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3LT**

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Lorna Dupont (Secretary)	(LD)	Joint Office
Alex Ross-Shaw	(ARS)	Northern Gas Networks
Amie Charalambous	(AC)	RWE npower
Andrew Margan*	(AM)	British Gas
Anne Jackson*	(AJ)	SSE
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Colette Baldwin	(CB)	E.ON UK
Darren Lond	(DL)	National Grid NTS
David Addison	(DA)	Xoserve
Dave Mitchell	(DM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Gareth Evans	(GE)	Waters Wye Associates
Huw Comerford	(HC)	Utilita
Ian Hollington	(IH)	Joint Office
Kirsten Elliott-Smith	(KES)	Cornwall Energy
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	DONG Energy
Rob Johnson	(RJ)	Wingas
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	Gazprom

* *via teleconference*

Copies of all papers are available at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0479/240714>

The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 21 August 2014.

1.0 Review of Minutes and Actions

1.1. Minutes

The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted.

1.2. Actions

None outstanding.

2.0 Workgroup Report

2.1. Amended Modification

ARS gave a brief explanation of the amendments made. BF questioned if the implementation date was still achievable. The implications for the UK Link Committee and the revised Manual were discussed. ARS noted concerns and would consider an appropriate implementation date and revise the modification accordingly.

It was observed that there were still concerns regarding the management of rejections, and also the self-governance status applied to this modification.

DA commented that there might be some circumstances where this communication method may not be used and gave some examples. CB observed that for a general communication it might be fine, but when it cuts across commercial obligations it was naturally of more concern. SM added that his initial impression was that this modification does not preclude the use of current communications but should essentially offer a choice, however it now appears to mandate email in certain circumstances. Parties should not be forced to change their existing arrangements. It needs to be very clear that parties will not be adversely affected by this change, but that it is provided as an additional and potentially more efficient way to communicate in addition to those that are currently available. The conventional view of response/non-response was briefly discussed (where silence was taken as assent); it was noted that consensus was very different to consent. Should the status quo apply unless a party individually and actively consents to change, having established there would be no adverse effects?

There were questions and concerns regarding the maintenance and updating of email information. SM asked again for confirmation that parties would not be affected by the actions of others; and reiterated that he was still not convinced that it should remain a self-governance modification. There were potential commercial and legal issues, and SM saw this primarily as a bi-lateral discussion about changing any individual communications routes, with the individual party making the selection. DA questioned how consent might work. SM stated it was not for an IT group to assess the impacts and make these decisions; it should be a bi-lateral agreement, allowing a party to elect to a change and not have it foisted upon them.

2.2. Reconsideration of Self-Governance Status

Some participants continued to voice their concerns in respect of the self-governance status.

2.3. UK Link Manual Section 5B

DA explained his thoughts on the removal of Section 5B from the UK Link Manual. Governance should still reside with the UK Link Committee but this section should be separated from the main Manual. ARS pointed out that draft Terms of Reference had been provided to require the UK Link Committee to seek approval from the UNCC should communications methods be changed. If an alternate modification was to be considered, should there be another body reviewing and governing this potentially separate document?

2.4. Legal Text

The legal text for this modification is to be provided by Northern Gas Networks. ARS did not envisage any changes to the legal text.

However, CB believed there to be deficiencies in the text as currently provided, and this may require the raising of an alternate.

2.5. Next Steps

Timelines for the raising of an alternate were considered and BF confirmed that the deadline for this would be Friday 08 August 2014.

If no alternate had been received by that time it was agreed that the Workgroup Report would be produced without further delay and would be concluded at the meeting on 15 August 2014; self-governance status would also be re-examined at the same time and any views for inclusion in the Workgroup Report would be agreed. It was suggested that parties should review the attachments before the next meeting.

3.0 Any Other Business

None.

4.0 Diary Planning

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

The next meeting will take place within the Distribution Workgroup on Friday 15 August 2014 at 31 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3LT.

Action Table

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
-			-		