

Transmission Workstream Minutes
Provision of Winter Information - Workshop 2
Wednesday 19 August 2009
Energy Networks Association, Dean Bradley House,
52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF

Attendees

John Bradley (Chair)	JB	Joint Office
Lorna Dupont (Secretary)	LD	Joint Office
Andrew Pearce	AP	BP Gas
Chris Wright	CW	Centrica
Jenny Phillips	JP	National Grid NTS
Julie Cox	JC	AEP
Mark Rixon	MR	EDF Energy
Michael Doherty	MD	Centrica
Peter Parsons	PP	National Grid NTS
Steve Iredale	SI	National Grid NTS
Steve Rose	SR	RWE npower

1. Introduction

JB welcomed attendees to the meeting.

1.1 Minutes of the previous meeting (29 July 2009)

The minutes were approved.

1.2 Review of action

The action generated at the previous meeting was reviewed:

Action PWI/001: Following suggested amendments make the graphs available in advance of the next meeting.

Update: The revised graphs were made available. **Action closed.**

2. Review of Options

For the benefit of those attendees who were not present at the previous meeting, JP gave an overview of the previous presentation which had been based on National Grid NTS' experience of last winter, and briefly reviewed the current winter data provision, the new safety monitor methodology, and the suggested model for improvements in the winter data provision.

A distinction was made between breaches of Safety Monitor volume and Safety Monitor deliverability; a breach in the former was more likely than a breach in the latter. The Safety Case allows for an assessment to be made and National Grid NTS aimed to take a pragmatic approach not to declare a Network Gas Supply Emergency (NGSE) unless it had no other option.

Following this presentation, SR commented that there now appeared to be an element of uncertainty on what action may be taken in certain circumstances whereas before there had seemed to be certainty. PP responded that the Safety Case had always provided National Grid NTS with some leeway in respect of calculations and what action to take. The presentation had the effect of making the potential actions and reasoning more visible to the industry. Providing this information in a clearer and more accessible

form would enable the market to take better informed decisions when a market response was required.

JP then presented the revised graphs which had been based on feedback from the previous meeting. The graphs and definitions were to remain the same but the information they contained was to be presented differently. Hyperlinks could be added if further clarity was deemed to be required.

MR pointed out that there were some concerns with regard to definitions as these often appeared to be inconsistent when looked at for comparison, eg Total Demand. There was briefly discussed and noted by JP and PP.

Slide 1: It was suggested that lines might be extended to give better context. It was questioned whether it should be 'deliverable stock'. PP responded that notes could be placed on the system to give clarity.

Slide 3: JP commented that this graph now showed a lot of information in response to last meeting's feedback. CW suggested that it may require a 'hover' facility that provided the extra explanations that may be needed to make sense of its complexities. JP responded that because it was spreadsheet based it may be very difficult to provide such functionality, however it may be possible to include hyperlinks, or explanatory notes at the side. Individual components of the graph could also be separated out and presented underneath.

It was confirmed that the tolerance band was always fixed at the same percentage.

There was a brief discussion on the value of including or excluding the history component, and mixed views were expressed.

JP noted that any assumptions made need to be made clearer; better titles were needed to describe what the two sides of the graph provided; the minimum use of storage needed to be properly defined.

Slide 4: JP explained that this gave exactly the same information as the previous slide but presented in a different way. There was a unanimous preference for the way the information was presented on Slide 3.

Slides 5 and 6 were presented; no further comments were received.

JP then asked if including the history was found to be useful. SR and MD agreed that it was valuable and should be retained.

Slide 7 was presented. JC suggested it might be better to show the whole winter period to provide context. SR commented that inconsistent use of colours across the graphs could cause some confusion, and more concise wording would be appreciated.

Using the dynamic model (displaying the 4 graphs on the single screen as they were proposed to be published) PP then demonstrated how the information on the graphs would change and build up a picture giving signals leading to assessments and actions. The conditions relating to last winter and the resulting decisions were briefly discussed.

SR pointed out a concern in respect of the GBA trigger level apparently being based on a 2 day storage monitor. This may be at variance with Modification 0257. This may need clarification.

PP returned to the demonstration of the model and explained the different effects on storage and deliverability and the actions that would be taken in response to the information/signals that became apparent. JP reiterated that National Grid NTS would be publishing the factual information only; it would not provide 'hints' as to what response was expected from the market at any given point. It was up to the market to make its own decisions and balance/take action accordingly. The information was most likely to be published in the GBA section of National Grid's website.

JC pointed out that timing may prove to be an issue, what was issued first – published information on the website or a text alert to customers?

PP observed that commercial storage facilities can be quite dynamic so the picture can change fairly rapidly and accelerate or decelerate a perceived potential crisis point.

From mid February onwards, it was less likely that a peak day would occur. It was pointed out that there may be some confusion over what constituted a peak day and could range from 450 - 550 million standard m³/day depending on the purpose for which the definition was to be used. PP explained the difference between diversified and undiversified definitions of peak load. The latter assumes that even on a peak day not all loads are at the peak level, the former assumes that they are. For NTS planning, undiversified is assumed because on a local basis this would be realistic. However, for gas supplies planning, which is on a national basis, diversified is assumed. In addition Users would be expected to interrupt loads on the peak day for commercial reasons. The meeting concluded that the 450 million standard m³/day was consistent with the threshold for interruption of Off-peak Daily NTS Exit (Flat) Capacity which is 80% of the undiversified peak day demand. PP talked through examples of different sets of circumstances that could trigger a GBA.

The key point was that this information was a tool for customers to use in their own assessment - it will not dictate the action expected from customers.

PP confirmed that the Storage Monitor Methodology will be updated following the winter consultation paper and an Ofgem seminar was likely to be held after that time. SR asked if Storage monitor delivery should be expected to be 55; PP responded that radical changes were not expected but would depend on the feedback from the winter consultation.

JP then displayed a revised view of what might be published, and added that a table would be included as well as the graphs. Some adjustments were likely to be made to the labelling following today's discussions. Acknowledging SR's concerns, JB reiterated that any labelling should demonstrate consistency with the UNC terms and add clarity. This principle was agreed by National Grid NTS.

The preferred frequency of updating the information was discussed. A daily update was preferred, with publication as near as possible to 13:00 on the GBA section of National Grid's website.

3. Next Steps

JP and PP had noted the various comments and concerns as the meeting had progressed, and appropriate revisions would be made.

On the first graph forecast demand would be looked at to make it clearer, and the purple line would be made thinner. Assumptions would be made clearer; the use of colours would be made consistent across the graphs, and black and white printouts would also be reviewed in the interests of clarity and consistency. On the other graphs, consistency in the use of max/min storage would be addressed, and the history would be expanded up to the beginning of October.

It was intended to ask for feedback at the Ops Forum in October, after the revised formats had been on the website for a few weeks, and seek opinions thereafter on a regular basis to make sure the new presentation was continuing to meet industry requirements. Presentations may also be made at Transmission Workstream, DSWG and GCF.

A revised set of graphs will be provided to the Joint Office for publication and further comments would be welcomed before final publication on National Grid's website in October.

4. Any Other Business

None raised.

5. Diary Planning

It was agreed that no further meeting was required.

**Action Log – UNC Transmission Workstream
Provision of Winter Information – Workshop 2: 19 August 2009**

Action Ref	Meeting Date(s)	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
PWI 001	29/07/09	4.0	Following suggested amendments, make the graphs available in advance of the next meeting.	National Grid NTS (JP/PP)	Provided. Closed

JP = Jenny Phillips; PP = Peter Parsons.