

**UNC Workgroup 0864S Minutes
Update of UNC Code Communication Methods
Thursday 11 April 2024
Via Microsoft Teams**

Attendees		
Mark Cockayne (Chair)	(MC)	Joint Office
Harmandeep Kaur	(HK)	Joint Office
Andy Clasper	(AC)	Cadent
Charlotte Gilbert	(CG)	BU-UK
Ellie Rogers	(ER)	Xoserve
Gavin Williams	(GW)	National Gas Transmission
Josie Lewis	(JL)	Xoserve
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE
Susan Ann Helder	(SH)	Northern Gas Networks
Tim Gwinnell	(TG)	South Hook Gas
Tracey Saunders	(TS)	Northern Gas Networks

This Workgroup meeting will be considered quorate provided at least two Transporter and two Shipper User representatives are present.

The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 16 May 2024.

Please note these minutes do not replicate/include detailed content provided within the presentation slides, therefore it is recommended that the published presentation material is reviewed in conjunction with these minutes. Copies of all papers are available at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0864/110424>.

1.0 Introduction and Status Review

Mark Cockayne (MC) welcomed all parties to the meeting and confirmed that the meeting was not quorate. MC noted that the meeting became quorate with Mark Jones (MJ) joining the meeting, during the discussions of item 2.0.

1.1 Approval of Minutes (14 March 2024)

The minutes from the previous meeting were approved.

Josie Lewis (JL) highlighted that the ‘Next Steps’ in the previous meeting recorded that Xoserve will be presenting the ROM in the next meeting. JL explained that it was agreed that Xoserve would start working on the ROM in time for the next meeting, however, they would not have time to have it completed. JL confirmed that the ROM will be presented in the next Governance Workgroup meeting.

1.2 Approval of late papers

No late papers to approve.

1.3 Review of Outstanding Actions

0203: GW (NGT) to group the instances in the Code where fax is used as a follow-up method to email and test this with control rooms to ensure fax is not being used and consider any alternatives being used instead.

Update: MC noted that the Transporters agreed to go away and check whether fax is still being used in any of their operations and an update on this will be provided as part of Action 0301. MC confirmed that the action can be closed. GW agreed. **Closed.**

0301: The Workgroup to confirm with their control rooms that fax is not being used and confirm what alternatives are being used instead.

Update: Susan Ann Helder (SH) explained that NGN can provide a 98% confirmation that email is being used instead of fax/facsimile while they await a 100% confirmation. Andy Clasper (AC) noted that Cadent has one fax machine which is being used as an emergency backup and telephone and email are being used instead of fax in all normal cases.

MC noted that Tracey Saunders had advised that fax was being used by NGN. SH clarified that similar to Cadent, NGN used a fax machine in the emergency control room as part of the BCM process in case the printer failed. SH confirmed that the team has been advised to get a stand-alone printer to use instead.

MC summarised that the consensus is that email and telephone are being used to replace fax/facsimile and agreed to close the action on that basis. **Closed.**

0302: JO to review the Transitional Arrangement clauses to check whether these are still relevant or in the normal part of the document (if duplicated).

Update: MC provided an update further to the review of the Transitional Arrangement Document confirming that the clauses discussed at last month's session (clauses 4,5,6 and 7 of the Transitional Arrangement Document) are no longer relevant. MC noted that Gavin Williams has proposed that no changes will be made to these clauses. MC confirmed that a separate Modification will be raised to clean up the Transitional Document and remove the irrelevant clauses. **Closed**

0303: CDSP (ER) to review the impact of replacing facsimile with email in GTB 5.2.6 on their Operation Credit process.

Update: Ellie Rogers (ER) provided an update further to an in-house discussion with the expert team confirming that the Termination Notice is issued by the Transporters and Ofgem and CDSP receives a copy of the notice. ER confirmed that the team did not have any concerns about the method of communication being changed from fax and did not envisage any issue with the loss of the 'deemed receipt' factor. **Closed.**

2.0 Amended Modification

Gavin Williams (GW) presented draft Version 2 of the Modification amended to include the changes brought about by discussions in the previous workgroup meetings. GW noted that the initial approach of 'find and replace' has been amended to 'find and delete' and where appropriate, references to fax will be replaced with another method of communication.

MC enquired whether the Offtake Arrangement Documents should have been listed as an associated document. GW explained that he attended the Offtake Workgroup chaired by Eric Fowler and agreed that once Modification 0864S has been implemented, GW will return to the Offtake Committee and recommend changes to the Offtake Arrangement Documents which will be approved by the Committee.

MC queried the reference to 'subsequent facsimile retirement' within the Modification and noted that the term had been deleted in another part of the Modification. GW explained that reference to 'subsequent facsimile retirement' has been removed where decommissioning of PSTN is referenced. GW noted that he will ensure that references are consistent when referring to the decommissioning of Network.

GW noted that references to the REC Modification have been included in the Modification. ER elaborated that GW and Xoserve were assigned an action by the Workgroup to check what other Codes had implemented in response to the PSTN decommissioning. ER confirmed that none of the codes have introduced any new methods of communication apart from telephone and email. Tracey Saunders (TS) noted that one of the points raised during the initial stages of the Modification was to consider the audit trail that fax provides and whether that audit trail is indeed required. TS noted that the work completed so far shows that the point has been discussed. TS highlighted that this point should be noted in the Workgroup Report to provide extra assurance. MC confirmed that the Workgroup Report covers this point.

ER queried the phased approach for Implementation. ER noted that the Workgroup discussions have highlighted that fax is not being used and if any parties still hold fax machines, these are used as the last available option. ER suggested implementing the change all at once with a longer implementation date to allow parties to prepare. GW explained that the phased approach was taken to allow time for parties still using fax to update their process. GW noted that he would be happy to discuss the advantages of a longer implementation. ER pointed out that a phased approach will make the implementation longer and questioned how the legal text will change to accommodate the approach.

MC agreed with ER and noted that there are not many users still using fax and a phased implementation will complicate matters. SH agreed with ER's suggestion of an all-at-once implementation and noted that NGN only has the issue of the BCM process. AC also supported ER's suggestion.

Mark Jones (MJ) agreed with ER's suggestion of a hard implementation rather than a phased approach. MJ noted that from a Shipper point of view, they are required to pass customer information (files that Shippers send to CDSP) and queried whether this had been considered. ER explained that most of the obligations for communication and emergencies are between Shippers and Transporters and CDSP receives emergency contact information through Shippers. ER confirmed that those communications will carry on as normal and when it comes to amending the file, CDSP can remove the reference to fax and replace it with email and telephone or it can leave the reference to fax in but not use it. ER confirmed that this will be part of CDSP's assessment, and they will consider the best approach.

GW considered the suggestions made by the Workgroup regarding implementation and queried whether there is a risk of parties not being compliant with the Code if a hard implementation approach is taken. MC questioned how many parties would fall into the category of only having fax as the method of communication. MC highlighted that there is no timeframe for the transitional table. ER noted that the instances of fax are very few.

GW confirmed that if Workgroup is happy with the hard implementation approach, the phased approach will be removed, and the hard implementation date can be decided upon in due course. GW noted that REC has an implementation date of December 2025.

The workgroup did not raise any further concerns or objections in relation to the amended Modifications. For further information, please refer to the published document.

3.0 Review of Fax References

A line-by-line review of the fax references was completed in the 20 March 2024 Workgroup.

4.0 Legal Text Review

GW presented the Legal Text prepared to implement the changes being made by Modification 0864S. The Workgroup completed a line-by-line review of all 14 amended documents.

While reviewing TPD Section B, Annex B-3 8.4, ER noted that the clause refers to 7.2(f), however, there is no 7.2(f) in the Annex. MC agreed to flag this internally at the Joint Office and find further details about the removal of 7.2(f) in order to understand whether the order of the clauses was changed and 7.2(f) is now under a different reference or whether it was

removed entirely.

Action 0401: JO (MC) to make internal enquiries in relation to TPD Section B, Annex B-3 7.2 (f) to understand whether this clause has been moved under a new reference or removed entirely.

During the review of the GTB General document, ER queried whether clause 5.2.6 needs to remain in the document as the clause containing reference to facsimile in 5.2.5 is being removed entirely and email is already an option. GW explained that 5.2.6 calls out the risk of fax not sending and for the same reason, an email might fail to send, and the party will ask for the email to be sent again. GW agreed to review the clause with the legal team to understand whether 5.2.6 is required and whether removing it will cause any issues.

Action 0402: GW (NGT) to review clause 5.2.6 in the GTB General document with the Legal Team to determine whether the clause needs to remain in the text.

GW noted in the TDIC Transitional Rules document, that no changes have been made to paragraphs 4, 5, 6, or 7 as these paragraphs expired on 1 April 2008, therefore, these are no longer relevant. A separate task is being undertaken to remove these paragraphs from the text.

The Workgroup did not raise any concerns or objections further to a detailed review of the amended code documents. For full details, please refer to the published documents.

5.0 Review Rough Order of Magnitude

The ROM will be reviewed at the next meeting on 9 May 2024.

6.0 Development of Workgroup Report

Mark Cockayne (MC) presented the Workgroup Report. MC noted that the report has been prepared based on the first draft of the Modification and it will be updated and published once the amended Modification is provided by NGT.

The Workgroup considered the report in detail and suggested amendments where needed. Please refer to the published Report for full details.

7.0 Next steps

MC confirmed that the Workgroup Report will be finalised in the next Workgroup meeting before the Modification goes to the UNC Panel in May. MC asked GW to provide the changed marked version of the Modification against the original Modification.

ER confirmed that Xoserve will attempt to provide the ROM at the earliest possible opportunity so that it can be used while preparing the Workgroup Report. The ROM will be reviewed in the next meeting.

8.0 Any Other Business

None.

9.0 Diary Planning

0864S meetings are listed at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0864>

All other Joint Office events are available via: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/events-calendar/month

Time/Date	Meeting Paper Deadline	Venue	Programme
10:00 Monday	5 pm Friday	Microsoft Teams	Standard Agenda

9 May 2024	03 May 2024		
------------	-------------	--	--

0864S Action Table						
Action Ref	Meeting Date	Min Ref	Action	Reporting Month	Owner	Status Update
0203	05/02/24	2.0	GW (NGT) to group the instances in the Code where fax is used as a follow-up method to email and test this with control rooms to ensure fax is not being used and consider any alternatives being used instead.	March 2024	NGT (GW)	Closed
0301	14/03/24	1.4	The Workgroup to confirm with their control rooms that fax is not being used and confirm what alternatives are being used instead.	April 2024	All	Closed
0302	14/03/24	2.0	JO to review the Transitional Arrangement clauses to check whether these are still relevant or in the normal part of the document (if duplicated).	April 2024	GW	Closed
0303	14/03/24	2.0	CDSP to review the impact of replacing facsimile with email in GTB 5.2.6 on their Operation Credit process.	April 2024	CDSP (ER)	Closed
0401	11/04/24	4.0	JO to make internal enquiries in relation to TPD Section B, Annex B-3 7.2 (f) to understand whether this clause has been moved under a new reference or removed entirely.	May 2024	JO (MC)	Pending
0402	11/04/24	4.0	GW to review clause 5.2.6 in the GTB General document with the Legal Team to determine whether the clause needs to remain in the text.	May 2024	GW (NGT)	Pending