

Transmission Workgroup Minutes

Thursday 04 April 2013

Energy Networks Association, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF

Attendees

Tim Davis (Chair)	(TD)	Joint Office
Lorna Dupont (Secretary)	(LD)	Joint Office
Charles Ruffell	(CR)	RWE Npower
Chris Wright	(CW)	Centrica
Claire Thorneywork	(CT)	National Grid NTS
Clement Perry	(CP)	Ofgem
Colin Williams	(CW1)	National Grid NTS
Erika Melen	(EM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Ewan Thorburn	(ET)	Ofgem
Fergus Healy	(FH)	National Grid NTS
Gerry Hoggan	(GH)	ScottishPower
Graham Jack	(GJ)	Centrica
James Thomson	(JT)	Ofgem
Jane Butterfield	(JB)	Gemserv
Jeff Chandler	(JC)	SSE
Julie Cox	(JCx)	Energy UK
Mark Cockayne	(MC)	Xoserve
Mike Wassell	(MW)	National Grid NTS
Peter Bolitho	(PB)	Waters Wye Associates
Phil Broom	(PB1)	GDF Suez
Richard Griffiths	(RG)	National Grid NTS
Richard Lea	(RL)	Gazprom
Ritchard Hewitt	(RH)	National Grid NTS
Sean McGoldrick	(SM)	National Grid NTS
Steve Pownall	(SP)	National Grid NTS
Tom Farmer	(TF)	Ofgem

Copies of all papers are available at www.gasgovernance.co.uk/tx/040413

1. Introduction and Status Review

TD welcomed all to the meeting.

1.1 Review of Minutes and Actions

1.1.1 Minutes (07 March 2013)

The minutes of the meeting were accepted.

1.1.2 Actions

TR0903: Capacity and Connections - Produce an expanded document (based on a modification proposal template) to clearly demonstrate the need for change, how this might be achieved, and giving consideration to wide ranging industry impacts.

Update: MW confirmed this was being pursued internally, and was looking at consulting on the whole area. **Closed.**

TR1101: *Long term non-firm capacity:* Draft a new modification.

Update: Under development. **Carried forward.**

TR1201: Establish the specifications, eg size and delivery capabilities, of available pipes, and any associated caveats relating to potential multi-party use.

Update: Information provided for publication. **Closed.**

TR0101: *PARCA - Example 1:* Produce a Table comparing the impacts on allowed revenue and security requirements of Options 1 and 3.

Update: A comparison table was presented under 3.1 below. CW1 confirmed the modification had been written utilising the first (top) option. **Closed.**

TR0102: *PARCA* – Confirm which instruments of security will be required for participation in this process.

Update: These will be those currently utilised within UNC TPD Section V. TD pointed out that it should be borne in mind that UNC TPD V is subject to change depending on future credit experiences. **Closed**

TR0103: *PARCA – Demonstration Information:* Shippers to consider what demonstration information is required and how it might be validated. (JCx to coordinate Shipper response).

Update: Being progressed. **Carried forward.**

TR0201: *Changing the Gas Day* - Raise awareness of a potential change to the Gas Day at the next UK Link Committee meeting and gather views on how this might be approached and what timescales might be necessary.

Update: MC confirmed this had been raised. **Closed**

TR0203: *PARCA Contract Overview* - National Grid NTS to consider the requirement for security.

Update: This had been considered. **Closed.**

TR0204: *PARCA Contract Overview* - National Grid NTS to confirm the rules around how flow rates link back to exit capacity.

Update: Update to be provided at next meeting. **Carried forward.**

TR0205: *PARCA Incentive Schemes* - National Grid NTS to consider how incentives work where capacity is already available.

Update: Update to be provided at next meeting. **Carried forward.**

TR0206: *PARCA Incentive Schemes* - National Grid NTS to consider the incentive trigger points, at what point does the measure get set and how National Grid NTS earns the incentive.

Update: Update to be provided at next meeting. **Carried forward.**

TR0301: Scalebacks – Provide an update on any recent events.

Update: FH reported there had been scalebacks in early March; the information was being collated and will be provided when ready. JT requested that information on 2 scalebacks that occurred on 13 March 2013 also be included. **Closed.**

1.2 Review of Live Modifications not covered elsewhere on the agenda

The Modifications Register is at: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/mods

0376S – Implementation for June 2013 is being progressed with Xoserve; implementation date to be confirmed. FH reported that the Gemini System Development had now been fully tested and signed off and that functionality will be available for the July 2013 Enduring Annual NTS Exit (Flat) Capacity Application Window. JCx expressed her delight at the progress made.

0439 – Consultation closes on 15 April 2013.

0446S – Implementation on 16 April 2013.

0447S - Consultation closes on 15 April 2013.

1.3 Ofgem Update

JT provided an industry update:

- **Network Model Statement of Procedures Approval.** The decision letter approves the “statement of procedures” for modifying or updating relevant data for NGG’s Network Model. The decision letter can be found at the following location on the Ofgem website: <http://www.ofgem.gov.uk/Networks/Trans/GasTransPolicy/Pages/GasTransmissionPolicy.aspx>
- **Continuation of cross-subsidy arrangements for the Statutory Independent Undertakings (National Grid Gas).** A Licence direction, which enables the cross-subsidy arrangements for the Statutory Independent Undertakings to continue. A copy of the direction can be found at the following location on the Ofgem website: <http://www.ofgem.gov.uk/Networks/Trans/GasTransPolicy/Pages/GasTransmissionPolicy.aspx>
- **Open letter: Next Steps for GB implementation of the first EU network code for gas on Congestion Management Procedures (CMPs).** An open letter that outlines the next steps for the implementation of the network code for CMP on NGG and gas interconnectors. A copy of the letter can be found at the following location on the Ofgem website: <http://www.ofgem.gov.uk/Europe/Pages/Europe.aspx>
- **The Retail Market Review – Final non-domestic proposals.** The document contains Ofgem’s final proposals for the non-domestic RMR and also includes a statutory consultation on the effect of the policy proposals and licence condition drafting. The consultation closes on 01 May 2013. A copy of the document can be found at the following location on the Ofgem website: <http://www.ofgem.gov.uk/Markets/RetMkts/rmr/Pages/rmr.aspx>

European Issues Update Table

Workstream	Status
<i>Capacity Allocation</i>	The first comitology meeting was held on 24 January 2013. The main focus of discussion was on the 20% quota of incremental capacity to be held back for short-term auctions, mandatory bundling and bundling of existing contracts. The Commission want to vote on agreeing text at the next meeting on 15 April 2013.
<i>Tariffs</i>	ACER aimed to finalise the Framework Guideline and submit to the Commission before 31 March 2013. However, the Commission made comments, particularly on the cost allocation section, which will require further work. This has delayed the completion of the Framework Guideline. ACER considering how to take forward.
<i>Congestion Management</i>	Ofgem issued an Open Letter in early March. The two continental interconnectors (IUK and BBL) are to consult shortly, and Ofgem is currently holding discussions with both interconnectors about making the necessary changes to their access rules in order to comply with the CMP Guidelines. NGG proposed a Uniform Network Code modification in March, covering the changes necessary to bring the current regimes into compliance with the CMP Guidelines. Changes will also be required at Moffat, where the GB and Irish/Northern Irish systems connect. We are currently holding implementation discussions with the relevant National Regulatory Authorities.
<i>Gas Balancing</i>	ACER recommended adoption of network code. Comitology procedure to take place in May and July 2013.
<i>Interoperability</i>	ENTSOG published a consultation on the draft Interoperability Network Code in February 2013. They also held a workshop on 20 March 2013 to get feedback on the Network Code. Interested parties can respond to the consultation until 26 April 2013. ENTSOG must submit final Network Code to ACER by 11 September.
<i>Incremental Capacity</i>	French co-chair of CEER GIF TF will present update at the Madrid Forum in April 2013, and work continues to finalise a draft of the 'Blueprint' for publication in April/May. Following the publication of the Blueprint in April/May, CEER and ACER will hold a joint public workshop to discuss how to translate the policy blueprint into binding rules (possibly as amendment to Network Codes).

1.4 European Developments

National Grid NTS presented on the following areas.

1.4.1 EU Balancing Code - Overview

The timeline illustrating the stages for proposed implementation (February 2015 or 2016) was displayed, (RH confirmed that National Grid NTS was considering requesting an extension), together with a high level overview of the contents of the 11 Chapters. RH directed attention to the actual document at <http://www.entsog.eu/publications/balancing> for further detail, and would welcome feedback from any party regarding this.

Chapter 4: Operational Balancing – RH explained the various markets. A temporal market was not currently operating in the UK but could be introduced at a later point. Merit Order was likened to the SMPS. There was a TSO requirement to follow this order. Responding to various questions, RH indicated that consideration was not being given to developing Balancing Services at present. TFAs are part of the CAM process (not Balancing). RH did not believe the SMPS would require to be rewritten.

Over the next few months National Grid NTS will provide updates on the its Impact Assessment and to further understanding of key aspects of any impacts to the GB Regime (in May), National Grid NTS” Comitology position and to enable stakeholders to understand our views on any potential changes required to the EU code (in June).

Chapter 5: Nominations – It was noted this was all based on Central European Time, ie 05:00 - 04:59. Asked if the Nomination procedure was not required to be extended to other points and if National Grid NTS expected to extend this, RH responded that it was not really under consideration at present. It required a great deal of discussion to understand this and whether it would be appropriate for customers. PB believed this to be a strategic question and should involve Ofgem; he suggested the Regulator should help to facilitate these strategic debates involving these key decisions. RH agreed that a much wider debate was needed to establish if more than minimum compliance was required, with a view to considering perceptions/issues of undue discrimination. EU codes should be looked at holistically.

JCx reminded that she had raised similar questions many times but still the industry seemed to be reluctant to be debating/addressing the issues. The importance of such long term strategic decisions needs to be highlighted. RH added that the potential effects on customers needs to be investigated when considering the operations requirements of both sides. Debates on due/undue discrimination can take much time and need to be commenced. JT indicated that Ofgem would be happy to be involved, but did not see itself as being able to make decisions in isolation. JCx observed there has been a general reluctance to think about impacts in isolation and suggested that the thinking needed to start now – the ‘big issues’ are recognised and should be being proactively tackled to avoid potentially disastrous consequences. PB suggested that the Regulator should be making a positive decision on whether points should be relevantly different or not. It was perfectly reasonable to treat points differently if that was the case, but it needs the case to be made - perhaps the Regulator and the industry could put a case together for extending or limiting, having thought through the implications.

RH indicated that the primary need was to meet the minimum legislative requirements and then look to see what can be done to apply other options/improvements for the UK and customers. Some things may be able to be done at the same time (and looking at the most cost efficient ways), without putting into breach. JCx suggested that this should be raised at the DECC EU Stakeholder meeting on 22 April requesting a steer on how to take forward.

RH reiterated that National Grid NTS intended to present on implications, to the Transmission Workgroup. GJ indicated that it would be useful to also include and highlight any important areas to focus on other than compliance. CP commented that Ofgem was discussing some of the broader strategic questions internally and that he would be happy to assist further industry engagement in these areas. PB referred to some work carried out for National Grid NTS (by a Dutch intern) that NTS might consider sharing; RH gave a brief overview of this, and believed that a legal view was required on due/undue discrimination.

Chapter 6: Daily Imbalance Charges – RH explained the position. It was believed the UK was already compliant.

Chapter 11: Final Provisions – Implementation Timeline - RH commented that the vast majority is the model we have already in existence. It was questioned whether the legal requirement to have the Gas Day was already in place or not. RH agreed to check. A post meeting note was issued to clarify the position: *“The requirement originates from the Framework Guidelines produced by ACER under the 715/2009 legislation but the requirement itself did not appear in the legislation. Therefore the requirement to move to a harmonised Gas Day (determined in the Framework Guidelines as 5 to 5) will “come into effect” via the EU codes themselves. It is currently looking like the CAM code will be the first to do this and is currently projected to be implemented in March 2015.”*

All were encouraged to respond to Ofgem’s consultation on the Gas Day.

1.4.2 EU CAM Network Code Update and CMP Potential UNC Changes

CAM Network Code

The first Comitology meeting took place in January 2013. Discussions have continued between Member States on the changes to the current draft version of the CAM Network Code (Regulation) and a number of potential drafting changes have been proposed (but not confirmed). The key proposals were summarised and FH indicated that either he or Matthew Hatch (National Grid NTS) would be happy to discuss any questions or concerns.

The Second Comitology meeting is to take place on 15 April 2013 and the Commission is pushing for Comitology completion at this meeting, with 3 – 4 months for transposition into Member States’ languages, etc. This approach may ‘indicate’ a March 2015 start date for the first Long Term CAM Auctions (effective 01 October 2015).

All were strongly encouraged to respond to the consultations to help present and form the GB view/position; National Grid is only one industry participant and the active expression of the views of parties other than National Grid will also carry weight.

Congestion Management Procedures

National Grid NTS had raised Modification 0449, and a timeline to meet a 01 October 2013 implementation date has been proposed; this was a challenging timeframe. It has been raised as an interim measure before CAM comes in.

Ofgem has published an open letter entitled **‘Next steps for Great Britain’s (GB’s) implementation of the first European Union (EU) network code for gas on Congestion Management Procedures (CMPs)’** the purpose of which is to “outline the next steps for the implementation of the European Network Code for Congestion Management Procedures on National Grid Gas and GB Gas Interconnectors. Ofgem have invited responses by 29 April 2013 (www.ofgem.gov.uk/Pages/MoreInformation.aspx?docid=174&refer=Europe), and all were strongly encouraged to respond to the consultation.

1.4.3 European Updates Timetable

A Gas Codes timeline was provided for information, together with a Table indicating the current status of each Code and its estimated implementation date. Tariff Framework Guidelines might be delayed (no new date as yet).

EU Updates Programme

The programme of updates to be given to the Transmission Workgroup over the next few months is detailed below:

Topic	Workgroup Date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Balancing Code - National Grid NTS' Impact Assessment (to enable an understanding of the impacts to the GB Regime) 	02 May 2013
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Balancing Code - Comitology Position (to enable an understanding of National Grid NTS' views on any potential changes (if any) required to the EU code) Interoperability Code – key outcomes of the public consultation 	06 June 2013

1.4.4 General Observations

Any developments, concerns, and options will be brought to the attention of the industry and the Workgroup for discussion and the seeking of views. Conversely, if the Workgroup has any concerns or views, National Grid NTS would welcome these.

FH noted for consideration, JCx's suggestion that National Grid NTS come to the Workgroup to elucidate the position on its thinking on various points, rather than wait for the Comitology outcomes. JCx expressed her concern that rather than present options almost fully formed and with a 'clear preference', the National Grid NTS needs to develop options together with industry.

Recognising that the industry has significant issues with certain areas, FH and RH urged parties to bring their ideas and suggestions to National Grid; one-to-one meetings could then be arranged to discuss further.

Commenting on the implementation JCx observed it seemed to be very prescriptive with no flexible leeway to respond to circumstances. She felt it unfortunate that discussions had not taken place earlier regarding the effect of CAM and any consequences. RH noted that parts of the CAM code do not fit with the UK code and requested parties to submit views to underline this. Following Comitology this will have to be addressed to minimise the impacts, because we shall have to comply. Aspects of CAM may need changing and this needs to be fielded to a wider audience.

Commenting on the splitting out of Bacton, JCx noted there seemed to have been a reluctance to share information across the industry and develop its understanding. She pointed out that discussion of position, implications and impacts needed to take place much earlier.

Acknowledging and recognising JCx's frustrations and concerns, RH pointed out codes need to be in an 'approved state' to consider, however JCx believed that debates were needed prior to that point, and went on to suggest that Tariffs might be an area that the industry could work through with discussion and dialogue to assist understanding and flush out potential issues and concerns at an earlier stage.

RH commented that National Grid NTS had persistently encouraged all parties to get involved in the EU stakeholder forums; National Grid was just one voice and more GB voices were needed in those meetings.

CW asked for Ofgem's view on the splitting of Bacton. CP responded that although he believed it was being looked at and he would endeavour to provide an update to the meeting.

Action TR0401: EU Developments - Bacton Split: Ofgem to provide a view.

2. Workgroups

The following Workgroup meetings took place:

2.1 0435 – Arrangements to better secure firm gas supplies for GB customers

Minutes for this meeting are at: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0435/040413

2.2 0448 – UNC alignment with Transporters' licence requirements for "Network Code and Uniform Network Code" relating to European Regulatory change

Minutes for this meeting are at: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0448/040413

2.3 0449 – Introduction of Interconnection Points and new processes and transparency requirements to facilitate compliance with the EU Congestion Management Procedures

Minutes for this meeting are at: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0449/040413

3. Issues

3.1 Aligning the connections and capacity processes

3.1.1 Financial Commitment for Incremental Capacity

JCx (Energy UK) gave a brief presentation, describing three Options to demonstrate commitment where no investment is required (Reservation Fee, 'Just book it', and 'Just book it with additional rules'). The pros and cons of each were then explained and discussed.

GJ commented on the lead-time being potentially huge and that expensive financial commitments are not to be taken lightly. JCX agreed that 'as cheap as possible' would be good. GJ reiterated that it was very difficult to make a decision 2 years ahead let alone 12 years ahead. JCx pointed out that it was paying for the holding of capacity back from the market, but at what point should a party be expected to pay – at the beginning or at a later point. MW responded that allowing a length of time was problematic for a number of reasons. National Grid NTS agreed with all the points JCx had raised, and the Reservation Fee being less costly, ie economic and efficient. The 'Just book it' facility is there anyway, and MW did not really see this as an 'option'.

JCx believed the big issue was the relative level of costs for parties; less money was available at the start of a project when various options are being considered. There seems to be more project costs/commitment being 'frontloaded'. JC pointed out that securitising the cost keeps parties 'honest' about their commitment. PB suggested that the amount of spare capacity in the location should perhaps have a bearing on the cost of the fee demanded – the most economic solution for all parties should be sought. GJ observed that commitment 8 or 9 years in advance of when capacity will be in place could potentially present a barrier to entry to parties, because of the cost of credit. Paying to reserve capacity that no one wants at the moment is a difficult concept. PB suggested looking at similar arrangements within the electricity industry. MW reiterated that a reservation fee is really to demonstrate serious intent.

3.1.2 PARCA Reservation Fee

CW1 gave a presentation outlining the background and principles, and potential options under consideration. Payment of an Application Fee will be required for Phase 1 PARCA works, and a Reservation Fee will be required if progression is made to Phase 2.

Providing security could cover the Reservation Fee; CW1 described three potential methods by which a Reservation Fee could be applied and sought. Examples were modelled, noting that it seems more logical to do it on duration of capacity. It was confirmed it would be a one-off fee to reserve the capacity.

Referring to the figures (for Exit) on Slide 9 TD commented that 25% of the project costs looked to be quite a lot. This was discussed and JCx suggested it would be better to make it 10% for both Entry and Exit – a fixed percentage? PB suggested starting low and ramping up as the project progresses, however JCx pointed out that this would increase a party's credit costs each time, and that previous discussions had discounted that because of issues of uncertainty and complexity. The pros and cons of each option were then compared.

MW concluded that a non-discriminatory percentage (10%) consistent across Exit and Entry seemed to be favoured.

3.1.3 Draft PARCA Application Form

SP had provided a draft document for review and discussion, and explained that the information relating to ramp rate and pressure had been included. It was confirmed that a party would not have to complete a Connections Application Form and also this one.

SP indicated that any comments on the Application Form would be welcomed.

3.1.4 Draft Modification: Introduction of the Planning and Advanced Reservation Capacity Agreement

A draft modification had been provided for review and discussion. It did not include the ad hoc processes, and had been structured in a similar way to the Modification 0373 format. Methodology statements will also need to change. A ROM had been requested from Xoserve and information was expected back shortly; National Grid NTS is looking at how it can use existing functionality and minimise any system changes as far as is possible.

MW confirmed that the draft modification would be revised to take account of comments and suggestions received in today's discussions, and a formal modification will be submitted to the April UNC Modification Panel. It can then be further developed and revised on its formal return to Workgroup.

3.2 Changing the Gas Day

RG (on behalf of National Grid NTS) provided an update, giving an overview of references within UNC and a high level illustration of the complex interrelationships between various UNC obligations. It is recognised that changing the Gas Day will require a coordinated industry review due to the high level of complexity involved. The NDMA process may require changing and the support processes; interrelationships and reliance upon the timeliness of the availability/provision/purpose of use of certain data also needs to be considered to understand and identify any wider implications.

Attention was then drawn to Ofgem's open letter inviting views from industry participants as to how they might be impacted by this proposed change, and the submission of responses (close out 29 April 2013) was encouraged. In the meantime National Grid NTS will continue to analyse process and systems impacts.

JCx observed it was quite early to identify all the impacts at this stage, knowing what must move, and then all the parts that hang off/support. Some might be 'optional' changes. RG pointed out that moving everything by an hour may not be the optimum solution – it is a physical regime and some items may have to remain in situ/unchanged and be worked around. There

are other process changes under consideration, eg the provision of certain data that might have to be requested earlier, with a consequential outward ripple effect; the availability of Gemini/outages/processes run at 06:00, renominations, etc. There was a general view expressed that the community would want this system available for renominations from the start of the gas day, but that this was something for wider discussion.

There is a need to understand what should be a logical change for each affected process/data item. TD suggested that meant finding the 'absolutes' first, and then working 'backwards'. When the gas demand kicks in should also be borne in mind. Xoserve should be looking at its activities quite closely to identify impacts for consideration. PB suggested it would be useful to consider future proofing this against coming or potential events, eg if there was ever a move to Central European Time.

RH asked if those present were aware at this time of any particular or specific 'showstopper' that sat outside of National Grid's activities/systems/equipment/experience that would be affected. If so it would be helpful if these could be explained to promote an understanding of any such instances and how these might be potentially impacted by changes that National Grid may have to make. JCx suggested that this could also be raised at other industry forums/groups. Organisations have different representatives attending various groups and these might have different views to feed into any decisions. RH encouraged parties to disseminate this potentially wide-ranging change to their related parties/service providers/suppliers, etc, both up and downstream, to gather any concerns and issues that might need to be taken into consideration.

RG said that he was now starting to look at and assess potential changes that might be required to National Grid NTS IT systems, and encouraged other parties to assess their own systems. Constructing a modification to implement the change will be challenging. GJ pointed out that non UNC parties are going to be affected and we cannot just say 'move'.

TD pointed out that systems/processes etc do undergo a time change in the UK twice a year, but this may be of greater significance and having to reprogramme could be 'resource hungry'. Ofgem's consultation should be picked up on by all relevant parties. Responding to a question from TD, JT indicated that Ofgem's plans following its consultation would depend on the level and content of responses received. He would discuss internally and see if he might be in a position to bring an initial view to the next meeting.

Next Steps

National Grid NTS will update the Workgroup from time to time with progress, developments, and any concerns. When asked, RH reiterated the most obvious date to work towards is the CAM date, ie 01 March 2015, but this would depend on the outcome of the Comitology process.

3.3 Gas Security of Supply Significant Code Review (SCR) Proposals: Credit Implications for the GB Gas Market

Awaiting developments; no further update.

3.4 New Issues

None raised.

4. Any Other Business

None raised.

5. Diary Planning

The next Transmission Workgroup will take place at 10:30, on Thursday 02 May 2013, at ENA, 6th Floor, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF.

The following Transmission Workgroup meetings are scheduled for 2013:

Date	Time	Location
Thursday 02 May 2013	10:30	ENA, 6 th Floor, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF
Thursday 06 June 2013	10:30	ENA, 6 th Floor, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF
Thursday 04 July 2013	10:30	ENA, 6 th Floor, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF
Thursday 01 August 2013	10:30	ENA, 6 th Floor, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF
Thursday 05 September 2013	10:30	ENA, 6 th Floor, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF
Thursday 03 October 2013	10:30	ENA, 6 th Floor, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF
Thursday 07 November 2013	10:30	ENA, 6 th Floor, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF
Thursday 05 December 2013	10:30	Energy UK, Charles House, 5 - 11 Regent Street, London SW1Y 4LR

Action Log – UNC Transmission Workgroup: 04 April 2013

Action Ref	Meeting Date(s)	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
TR0903	18/09/12	2.1.4	<i>Capacity and Connections:</i> Produce an expanded document (based on a modification proposal template) to clearly demonstrate the need for change, how this might be achieved, and giving consideration to wide ranging industry impacts.	National Grid NTS (MW/SP)	Closed
TR1101	01/11/12	3.1.1	<i>Long term non-firm capacity:</i> Draft a new modification.	National Grid NTS (MW)	Carried forward
TR1201	19/12/12	3.1.1	Establish the specifications, eg size and	National Grid NTS	Closed

Action Ref	Meeting Date(s)	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
			delivery capabilities, of available pipes, and any associated caveats relating to potential multi-party use.	(MW)	
TR0101	31/01/13	3.1.1	<i>PARCA - Example 1:</i> Produce a Table comparing the impacts on allowed revenue and security requirements of Options 1 and 3.	National Grid NTS (CW1)	Closed
TR0102	31/01/13	3.1.1	<i>PARCA – Credit:</i> Confirm which instruments of security will be required for participation in this process.	National Grid NTS (MW)	Closed
TR0103	31/01/13	3.1.3	<i>PARCA – Demonstration Information:</i> Shippers to consider what demonstration information is required and how it might be validated.	All Shippers (JCx to coordinate Shipper response)	Carried forward
TR0201	07/02/13	3.2	<i>Changing the Gas Day -</i> Raise awareness of a potential change to the Gas Day at the next UK Link Committee meeting and gather views on how this might be approached and what timescales might be necessary.	Xoserve (MC)	Closed
TR0203	27/02/13	2.1.1	<i>PARCA - National Grid NTS</i> to consider the requirement for security	National Grid NTS (SP/MW)	Closed
TR0204	27/02/13	2.1.1	<i>PARCA - National Grid NTS</i> to confirm the rules around how flow rates link back to exit capacity.	National Grid NTS (SP/MW)	Carried forward
TR0205	27/02/13	2.1.2	<i>PARCA - National Grid NTS</i> to consider how incentives work where capacity is already available.	National Grid NTS (SP/MW)	Carried forward
TR0206	27/02/13	2.1.2	<i>PARCA - National Grid NTS</i> to consider the incentive trigger points, at	National Grid NTS (SP/MW)	Carried forward

Action Ref	Meeting Date(s)	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
			what point does the measure get set and how National Grid earns the incentive.		
TR0301	07/03/13	3.3	<i>Scalebacks</i> – Provide an update on any recent events.	National Grid NTS (FH/PH)	Closed
TR0401	04/04/13	1.4.4	<i>EU Developments - Bacton Split</i> : Ofgem to provide a view.	Ofgem (CP)	Pending