

UNC Transmission Workgroup Minutes
Thursday 05 September 024
Via Microsoft Teams

| Attendees | | |
|--------------------------|--------|---------------------------------|
| Rebecca Hailes (Chair) | (RHa) | Joint Office |
| Nikita Bagga (Secretary) | (NB) | Joint Office |
| Adam Bates | (AB) | SEFE Marketing & Trading |
| Alex Nield | (AN) | Storengy |
| Amy Howarth | (AH) | Storengy |
| Anna Shrigley | (AS) | ENI Global & Energy Markets |
| Brian McGlinchey | (BMc) | Vermillion Energy Ireland |
| Carlos Aguirre | (CA) | Pavilion Energy |
| Chris Wright | (CWrr) | Exxon Mobil |
| Conor McClarin | (CM) | National Gas Transmission (NGT) |
| David Mitchell | (DMi) | Southern Gas Networks (SGN) |
| Edward Allard | (EA) | Cadent |
| Fiona Cottam | (FC) | Corella on behalf of Xoserve |
| Gavin Williams | (GW) | National Gas Transmission (NGT) |
| Hannah Reddy | (HR) | Corella on behalf of Xoserve |
| Josie Lewis | (JLe) | Xoserve |
| Jeff Chandler | (JC) | SSE Group |
| Julie Cox | (JCo) | Energy UK |
| Lauren Jauss | (LJ) | RWE |
| Lucinda Willis | (LW) | Ofgem |
| Malcolm Montgomery | (MM) | National Gas Transmission (NGT) |
| Marion Joste | (MJ) | ENI |
| Matthew Brown | (MB) | Ofgem |
| Michael Crowley | (MC) | Gas Networks Ireland |
| Nicola Lond | (NL) | National Gas Transmission (NGT) |
| Nick Wye | (NW) | Waters Wye Associates |
| Nigel Sisman | (NS) | Sisman Energy Consultancy Ltd |
| Ofordi Nabokei | (ON) | National Gas Transmission (NGT) |
| Paul Mckie | (PM) | Joint Office |
| Phil Hobbins | (PH) | National Gas Transmission (NGT) |
| Richard Fairholme | (RF) | Uniper |
| Shiv Singh | (SS) | Cadent |
| Tim Davis | (TD) | Barrow Gas Shipping |
| Tim Gwinnell | (TG) | South Hook Gas |

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

Please note these minutes do not replicate 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 papers are available at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/TX/050924>.

1. Introduction and Status Review

Rebecca Hailes (RHa) welcomed all parties to the meeting.

1.1. Approval of minutes (01 August 2024)

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

1.2. Approval of Late Papers

There were no Late Papers.

1.3. Review of Outstanding Actions

1002: Mercury Content - NGT (KA) to provide an update following further sampling and risk assessment.

Update: As Kirsty Appleby was not present during the meeting, it was decided to carry forward this action for a further update to be provided at the next meeting.

Carried Forward

1.4. Industry Update from Ofgem

Matthew Brown (MB) provided an update advising that the new Expected Decision Dates (EDD) register was published on Monday 9 September 2024:

<https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/publications/code-modificationmodification-proposals-ofgem-decision-expected-publication-dates-timetable> .

The following updates were provided by MB:

- [Modification 0873](#): The decision was published on 30 August 2024;
- [Modification 0878](#): The decision was published 02 September 2024.

In relation to the Strategic Direction Statement (SDS), Ofgem has recently completed a series of Workshops with Panel Members and the Code Administrators. The insights obtained will assist in shaping the development with the next opportunity being the Winter consultation.

The [Ofgem consultation was published on 22 August 2024](#) which confirms the approach and the upcoming next steps. MB explained that the SOLO Consultation is the one that only Ofgem produce on the Code Governance Reform. [There is then a JOINT consultation published later in March with the Department of Energy Security and Net Zero \(DESNZ\). It is expected that the governance response is due to be published in the Autumn.](#)

MB advised he will provide further information to RHa following the meeting.

If Workgroup has any questions, these should be directed to industrycodes@ofgem.co.uk .

2. Pre-Modification Discussions

There were no Pre-Modification Discussions.

3. Transmission Change Horizon Plan

This can be found here: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/horizon-planning>

Gavin Williams (GW) provided an update on the National Gas Transmission Change Horizon and Gemini Sustain Plus, noting that a decision has been made to postpone the Gemini Sustain Plus programme to Sunday 23 March 2025 with the contingency date planned as early April 2025.

The deadline for the API gateway (5 August 2024) has now passed. GW confirmed that all Shippers who were previously using the legacy gateway have now transferred and Correla are dealing with any queries. If there are any Workgroup Participants who have not met the deadline to transfer to the new gateway, they should contact Correla.

Market Trials have been extended by a week so will continue until 4 October 2024 as opposed to 27 September 2024.

GW discussed the Market Trials Process Calendar. Should Workgroup wish to consider this calendar, they should use the link at the bottom of slide 2 and click the “Helpful material: market trials” link.

Training modules will be made available prior to the proposed go-live date of 23 March 2025.

GW provided an overview of the National Gas Transmission Change Horizon 2024 – 2025. The next Focus Group for the Gemini Sustain Plus Programme will include a review of the market trial period. A further session will follow in January 2025.

The only In-Flight Modification to highlight is Modification 0864 which is in relation to the Code communication and the removal of reference to Facsimile. This has now been approved by Panel and the implementation date needs to be confirmed between NGT and the CDSP. This will need to coincide with the Major Release data and the switch off of the PTSN Networks which has been delayed by Ofcom. This will cause a delay to the implementation date.

RHa highlighted the Legal Text for this Modification, advising that this will need to be considered to avoid any amendments being required as the Legal Text ages

GW provided an overview of the potential projects, highlighting that the consultation period for [Modification 0872S](#) is due to close on 6 September 2024 and the implementation date will need to coincide with the go-live date for the Gemini Sustain Plus Programme.

As Modification 0878 has been approved, this will be moved to the In-Flight Programme next month. RHa queried what the implementation date is for this Modification and GW advised that he did not have this information to hand. RHa flagged this due to the National Energy System Operator (NESO)/ISOP Modification which will affect implementation dates. The NESO/ISOP Modification is expected to be implemented on 1 October 2024 by the Joint Office. Between 9 September 2024 and 1 October 2024, there will be no Code updates in order to prioritise and implement the NESO/ISOP Modification work. As this Modification will be implemented via an Ofgem Directive, it takes precedence.

Hannah Reddy (HR) discussed the approval of [Modification 0878](#), highlighting that the next cycle will not be until October 2024. HR explained that the operational processes would have commenced at the end of September 2024 to be considered within the October 2024 Gas Month however, this window was missed. It will therefore likely be the November 2024 Gas Month now.

RHa suggested discussing implementation dates offline with GW and HR.

Phil Hobbins (PH) highlighted the previous iterations of Modification 0878 and whether this would be done by a monthly adjustment process. HR confirmed that it would only be a data fix, there would be no actual system change. PH suggested amending the slides as this position is not clear and could be misleading. RHa highlighted that Industry should seek to implement this as soon as possible however, consideration will need to be given to the NESO/ISOP Modification.

Anna Shrigley (AS) discussed the Ofgem Website and position regarding Modification 0878. It was discussed and clarified that it is for National Gas to set the implementation date for this Modification.

Please see the published slides for further information.

4. **Statutory Consultation for the Codes Change Programme (CCP)**

RHa provided an update on the Statutory Consultation for the CCP, advising that Ofgem published a response on 29 August 2024. This consultation is in relation to the setting up of the Independent System Operator and Planner (ISOP). The Modification has been supported by Ofgem and a decision is expected around mid-September 2024. The Joint Office have been conducting work ahead of the (internal expected) go live date for 01 October 2024 (though please note this has not been confirmed by Ofgem, and the Joint Office does not wish to fetter the discretion of the Regulator). Work is being conducted to prepare the text for the UNC to allow ISOP to function and integrate with the UNC.

5. Issues

None.

6. Workgroups

6.1. 0871 – Facilitating IGTs with NTS Entry

(Report to Panel 17 October 2024)

<https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0871>

6.2. 0887 – Facilitating Bi-Directional Connections Between IGT Pipelines and the NTS

(Report to Panel 16 January 2025)

<https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0887>

6.3. 0894 – Facilitating Biomethane entry into the GDN by exporting methane from the GDN into the NTS via Compression

(Report to Panel 20 February 2025)

<https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0894>

7. Any Other Business

Julie Cox (JCo) highlighted the late submission of the Workgroup minutes for Modification 0880S, advising that this Modification has gone out to Consultation which is due to close on 06 September 2024.

RHa provided apologies on behalf of the Joint Office and advised that the amendments suggested by JCo in relation to the Gas Quality Data, can be discussed further in the TWG meeting on 10 September 2024.

8. Diary Planning

RHa advised that the second part of the September Transmission Workgroup meeting is scheduled for 10 September 2024.

Transmission meetings are listed at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/TX>

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

| Time / Date | Paper Publication Deadline | Venue | Programme |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|
| 10:00 Thursday 02 October 2024 | 5 pm Wednesday 24 September 2024 | Solihull/ Microsoft Teams | Standard Transmission Workgroup Agenda |
| 10:00 Friday 03 October 2024 | 5 pm Thursday 24 September 2024 | Solihull/ Microsoft Teams | Standard Transmission Workgroup Agenda |
| 10:00 Thursday 07 November 2024 | 5 pm Wednesday 30 October 2024 | Solihull/ Microsoft Teams | Standard Transmission Workgroup Agenda |
| 10:00 Friday 08 November 2024 | 5 pm Thursday 31 October 2024 | Solihull/ Microsoft Teams | Standard Transmission Workgroup Agenda |
| 10:00 Thursday 05 December 2024 | 5 pm Wednesday 27 November 2024 | Solihull/ Microsoft Teams | Standard Transmission Workgroup Agenda |

| Transmission Workgroup Action Table | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|------------|---|-----------------|----------|------------------------|
| Action Ref | Meeting Date | Minute Ref | Action | Reporting Month | Owner | Status Update |
| 1002 | 05/10/23 | 5.1 | <i>Mercury Content</i> - NGT (KA) to provide an update following further sampling and risk assessment | September 2024 | NGT (KA) | Carried Forward |

**UNC Workgroup 0871 Minutes
Facilitating IGTs with NTS Entry
Thursday 05 September 2024
via Microsoft Teams**

| Attendees | | |
|---|-------|---------------------------------|
| Rebecca Hailes (Chair) | (RHa) | Joint Office |
| Nikita Bagga (Secretary) | (NB) | Joint Office |
| Adam Bates | (AB) | SEFE Marketing & Trading |
| Alex Nield | (AN) | Storenergy |
| Amy Howarth | (AH) | Storenergy |
| Anna Shrigley | (AS) | ENI Global & Energy Markets |
| Brian McGlinchey | (BMc) | Vermillion Energy Ireland |
| Carlos Aguirre | (CA) | Pavilion Energy |
| Chris Wright | (CWt) | Exxon Mobil |
| Conor McClarin | (CM) | National Gas Transmission (NGT) |
| David Mitchell | (DMi) | Southern Gas Networks (SGN) |
| Edward Allard | (EA) | Cadent |
| Fiona Cottam | (FC) | Corella on behalf of Xoserve |
| Gavin Williams | (GW) | National Gas Transmission (NGT) |
| Hannah Reddy | (HR) | Corella on behalf of Xoserve |
| Josie Lewis | (JLe) | Xoserve |
| Jeff Chandler | (JC) | SSE Group |
| Julie Cox | (JCo) | Energy UK |
| Lauren Jauss | (LJ) | RWE |
| Lucinda Willis | (LW) | Ofgem |
| Malcolm Montgomery | (MM) | National Gas Transmission (NGT) |
| Marion Joste | (MJ) | ENI |
| Matthew Brown | (MB) | Ofgem |
| Michael Crowley | (MC) | Gas Networks Ireland |
| Nicola Lond | (NL) | National Gas Transmission (NGT) |
| Nick Wye | (NW) | Waters Wye Associates |
| Nigel Sisman | (NS) | Sisman Energy Consultancy Ltd |
| Ofordi Nabokei | (ON) | National Gas Transmission (NGT) |
| Paul Mckie | (PM) | Joint Office |
| Phil Hobbins | (PH) | National Gas Transmission (NGT) |
| Richard Fairholme | (RF) | Uniper |
| Shiv Singh | (SS) | Cadent |
| Tim Davis | (TD) | Barrow Gas Shipping |
| Tim Gwinnell | (TG) | South Hook Gas |
| <p><i>The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 17 October 2024. This Workgroup meeting will be considered quorate provided at least two Transporter and two Shipper User representatives are present.</i></p> | | |

Please note these minutes do not replicate 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 papers are available at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0871/050924>.

1. Introduction and Status Review

Rebecca Hailes (RHa) welcomed all parties to the meeting.

1.1. Approval of minutes (01 August 2024)

The minutes from the previous meeting were approved.

1.2. Approval of Late Papers

RHa advised that the Legal Text from National Gas Transmission (NGT) was considered a Late Paper however, this was welcomed.

Tim Davis (TD) asked whether it would be possible to not consider the Legal Text as a Late Paper as it had been published late and there had not been sufficient time to consider the papers or make useful progress given the timetable.

RHa highlighted the delay to the progression of the Modification. Furthermore, RHa stated that the Legal Text was considered a Late Paper. RHa requested the views of the Workgroup as to whether they wished to review and discuss the Legal Text or whether they were happy to delay for discussion until next month.

Phil Hobbins (PH) advised that he would be guided by the Proposer however, he had prepared brief commentary on the approach of the Legal Text.

RHa highlighted that both the Legal Text and Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) had been published. There appeared to be aspects of the Legal Text that do not appear in the Modification, so RHa queried whether version 2 of the Modification will be presented at the next Workgroup in October 2024 to align with the Legal Text. TD advised that he was not sure in relation to this point raised by RHa, adding that the Legal Text published this month appeared to be completely different to that published last month. Barrow Gas Shipping are therefore unsure of how the Modification will progress.

Hannah Reddy (HR) confirmed that the ROM had been submitted on Friday and was also therefore to be considered a Late Paper.

In light of the discussions, RHa advised that she would be requesting a 6 month extension from Panel on 19 September 2024.

New Action 0901: Barrow Gas Shipper (Proposer), NGT and the CDSP to work offline to ensure that the Legal Text and Modification are aligned and to ensure that the Legal Text meets the intent of the solution.

RHa queried whether Ofgem had any comments in relation to Modification 0871 or the progress, however, Matthew Brown (MB) confirmed he did not wish to make comments at this time.

1.3. Review of Outstanding Actions

There were no outstanding Actions to review.

2. Consideration of ROM

Deferred until October 2024.

3. Re-consideration of Legal Text

Deferred until October 2024.

4. Completion of Workgroup Report

Deferred until October 2024.

5. Next Steps

None.

6. Any Other Business

None.

7. Diary Planning

0871 meetings are listed at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0871>

Transmission meetings are listed at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/TX>

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

| Time / Date | Paper Publication Deadline | Venue | Programme |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------|
| 10:00 Thursday 03 October 2024 | 5 pm Wednesday 25 September 2024 | Solihull/ Microsoft Teams | TBC |
| 10:00 Thursday 05 December 2024 | 5 pm Wednesday 27 November 2024 | Solihull/ Microsoft Teams | TBC |

Modification 0871 Action Table

| Action Ref | Meeting Date | Minute Ref | Action | Reporting Month | Owner | Status Update |
|------------|--------------|------------|--|-----------------|---|---------------|
| 0901 | 05/09/24 | 1.2 | Barrow Gas Shipper (Proposer), NGT and the CDSP to work offline to ensure that the Legal Text and Modification are aligned and to ensure that the Legal Text meets the intent of the solution. | October 2024 | Barrow Gas Shipper (Proposer), NGT and the CDSP | Pending |

UNC Transmission Workgroup 0887 Minutes Facilitating Bi-Directional Connections Between IGT Pipelines and the NTS

Thursday 05 September 2024

via Microsoft Teams

| Attendees | | |
|--|-------|---------------------------------|
| Rebecca Hailes (Chair) | (RHa) | Joint Office |
| Nikita Bagga (Secretary) | (NB) | Joint Office |
| Adam Bates | (AB) | SEFE Marketing & Trading |
| Alex Nield | (AN) | Storenergy |
| Amy Howarth | (AH) | Storenergy |
| Anna Shrigley | (AS) | ENI Global & Energy Markets |
| Brian McGlinchey | (BMc) | Vermillion Energy Ireland |
| Carlos Aguirre | (CA) | Pavilion Energy |
| Chris Wright | (CWr) | Exxon Mobil |
| Conor McClarin | (CM) | National Gas Transmission (NGT) |
| David Mitchell | (DMi) | Southern Gas Networks (SGN) |
| Edward Allard | (EA) | Cadent |
| Fiona Cottam | (FC) | Corella on behalf of Xoserve |
| Gavin Williams | (GW) | National Gas Transmission (NGT) |
| Hannah Reddy | (HR) | Corella on behalf of Xoserve |
| Josie Lewis | (JLe) | Xoserve |
| Jeff Chandler | (JC) | SSE Group |
| Julie Cox | (JCo) | Energy UK |
| Lauren Jauss | (LJ) | RWE |
| Lucinda Willis | (LW) | Ofgem |
| Malcolm Montgomery | (MM) | National Gas Transmission (NGT) |
| Marion Joste | (MJ) | ENI |
| Matthew Brown | (MB) | Ofgem |
| Michael Crowley | (MC) | Gas Networks Ireland |
| Nicola Lond | (NL) | National Gas Transmission (NGT) |
| Nick Wye | (NW) | Waters Wye Associates |
| Nigel Sisman | (NS) | Sisman Energy Consultancy Ltd |
| Ofordi Nabokei | (ON) | National Gas Transmission (NGT) |
| Paul Mckie | (PM) | Joint Office |
| Phil Hobbins | (PH) | National Gas Transmission (NGT) |
| Richard Fairholme | (RF) | Uniper |
| Shiv Singh | (SS) | Cadent |
| Tim Davis | (TD) | Barrow Gas Shipping |
| Tim Gwinnell | (TG) | South Hook Gas |
| <i>The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 16 January 2025.</i> | | |

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

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/0887/050924>.

1. Introduction and Status Review

Rebecca Hailes (RHa) welcomed all parties to the meeting.

1.1. Approval of minutes (01 August 2024)

The minutes from the previous meeting were approved.

1.2. Approval of Late Papers

There were no Late Papers to approve.

2. Modification Assessment

Phil Hobbins (PH) provided an overview of the Modification, advising that this was initially proposed as an alternative to Modification 0871, however Panel did not agree with this assessment.

RHa presented the Modification to the Workgroup who considered the diagram on page 4. PH explained the proposal is to have a Bi-Directional connection to the NTS and the connecting pipeline is owned by the Independent Gas Transporter (IGT). There could be several sources of Entry and several Exit points. NGT is considering how this type of connection could be defined under Code and what the UNC should state about Capacity Balancing and Nominations.

One of the issues in relation to Capacity Holding and Charging is whether this role should be conducted by Shippers or whether it should be an IGT Operator.

The proposal from NGT is that this should be by IGT however, consideration will need to be given to the capability of this. PH highlighted the existing precedent post-exit reform as a rationale for this suggestion. In conclusion, it is possible for one Transporter to purchase Capacity from another.

Reserve Prices

PH provided additional information to provide clarity that prices for each and every GDN Offtake is published.

Discussion Point 2

“NK questioned whether it was legal, under the Gas Act, to charge parties other than Shippers. PL advised that this was being looked into.”

As part of Nick King’s (NK) disagreement, he queried whether legally, under the Gas Act 1986, whether it is possible to Charge parties other than Shippers. Details were provided to demonstrate how this is possible.

PH discussed this point, explaining that the Code states that when Gas leaves the NTS and enters the Distribution Network (DN), it is treated as being Offtaken by Shippers. Physically, Gas is being transferred from one Transporter’s Network to another by a Shipper User who makes an arrangement, albeit it is the DNOs booking the Capacity. Section 4.1.1 of the document presented demonstrates how compliance is maintained.

Overview of Capacity & Charging Model Options (Slide 3)

PH provided an overview of the Capacity & Charging Model Options, explaining that BioMethane is a driver for the Modification but it is not specific to the Modification itself. The slide presented seeks to provide examples and consider a Model where the Shipper is holding the Capacity.

If a Shipper Capacity Charging Model is adopted, the Shipper would be incentivised to procure Capacity at the IGT/NTS connection point to cover the Gas Allocations it would receive in respect of that point. If an IGT Capacity Charging Model is adopted, the IGT would be a user of the NTS and the IGT would be booking the Capacity.

In relation to the Utilisation Measure, if a Shipper is booking Capacity, they would need to book a sufficient amount to cover allocations at Points of Entry onto the IGT Pipeline and equally for Exit Points. The Shipper would receive a daily allocation at each Exit Point on the Network. In an IGT Model, the IGT would be booking the Capacity and would have to book sufficient Capacity for Entry and Exit Points to cover the net position based on the NTS Connection Point.

In relation to Precedent, this has been included to inform of the correct approach. In relation to the 2 scenarios, PH provided a summary and concluded that there appears to be sufficient arguments for both.

Julie Cox (JCo) highlighted the IGT Model and the possibility of wanting to enter Gas into the Transmission system. JCo queried whether there is a risk of arrangements for different Transporters in different ways, given that IGTs are Transporters. PH highlighted that this is a consideration to be discussed for Modification 0894. Tim Davis (TD) agreed with JCo's point, adding that he does not understand the difference as to where the Gas comes from. It doesn't matter whether it is an IGT Entry or a DN Entry, the principal remains simple. PH confirmed this interpretation by TD was correct.

The Workgroup discussed the Charges to be paid. Gavin Williams (GW) stated that he is unsure if an IGT Bi-Direction System Point exists currently, there appears to only be Bi-Directional points for Storage and Interconnectors. Therefore, this Modification will seek to introduce a new Connection type. Malcolm Montgomery (MM) advised this interpretation was correct. For IGTs the booking will be based on the physical flow. Furthermore, RHa added that this is because IGTs do not have commercial allocation.

Nick Wye (NW) discussed Interconnectors (IPs) and Storage and why they utilise the Shipper Model. NW believes this is due to not having sight of what Shippers are doing or an understanding of where Capacity is put on a daily basis to accommodate the needs of Customers. Unless these arguments prevail which state that the IGT approach is more suitable, NW advised he was struggling to see the difference between Interconnectors and Storage.

TD explained that it is difficult when there are not specific examples, however the principle of Gas going into the NTS needs to be considered, it is difficult to allocate to a specific Shipper. The position would be considered as reverse Flow Offtake.

PH considered the NTS/DN arrangement, advising that the precedent here is Shippers downstream of the NTS do not book NTS Capacity as this is done by Transporters and the costs pass through the process. This would suffice as an argument for the IGT Model as it aligns with the precedent. This position supports the NGT's preference for the IGT Model in the Modification.

Where the model is mirrored and DNs are booking capacity, IGT users would have sight of the Shipper Daily Entry and Exit Nominations from the Anaerobic Digester Plant. The Net position would then need to be booked based on those Entries and Exits. NW stated that DNs do not do this. There is an obligation to book, however, Workgroup are discussing smaller flows of Gas and how to make the process more economical, which is why the IGT model may be preferred. The level of Capacity booked should align with the flow. NW suggested the use of Allocation Agents to monitor the flow of Gas to and from the NTS. NW further highlighted the potential for IGTs incurring additional responsibilities and costs and it is important to ensure that there is sufficient resource, i.e. is it feasible for IGTs to do this?.

Anna Shrigley (AS) agreed with this point, highlighting that the presentation slides don't cover the allocation process. AS further highlighted the consideration of day to day activities and post day activities. Therefore, Workgroup requested for further information to be provided at the next meeting to detail how the allocation process would work.

Scenario A - Shipper Capacity Charging Model

PH provided an overview of Scenario A in further detail. This scenario would involve 2 Shippers and 2 Entry and Exit points. PH provided an explanation for the diagram and the table, advising that if a Shipper is booking Capacity, the Shipper would need to book at least 100 units (in the scenario provided) to avoid an overrun. There is also likely to be Flow Based Charges incurred. Where the Shipper is booking the Capacity, Flow Based Charges will not apply for IGTs. Where IGTs are responsible in booking Capacity, Shippers would not incur Charges, however, they would need to book a sufficient amount of Capacity to avoid Charges to IGTs. Following this review, PH raised the question as to why IGTs would not incur any charges.

NW explained that Flow Based Charges are based on allocation against the Shipper and is done by a party, usually IGTs as they are best placed to be an Allocation Agent as they understand what happens downstream. Careful consideration will need to be given to the incremental task that will need to be undertaken by IGTs. TD confirmed that Barrow Gas Shipping are now IGTs, however, in terms of the Flow Based Charges and who is charging who, this position is not fully understood. PH clarified that it would be the NTS charging the Shippers.

In light of this, Workgroup discussed these Charges and why the Commodity Charges may apply to Entry Points and not Exit Points. TD highlighted that NTS is connected to only Entry Points and therefore does not need to pay. NW added that if DNs are entering gas into the NTS, the general principle is that they will need to pay the Entry General Non-Transmission Services Charge. Workgroup discussed the position with Gas physically entering the system via NTS. GW clarified that IGTs will pay the Transmission Service Entry Capacity Charge and Shippers will pay the General Non-Transmission Service Charge.

Scenario B - IGT Capacity Charging Model

PH provided an overview of Scenario B in further detail. In the event that IGTs are booking Capacity, Shippers would not need to buy anything as IGTs would need to purchase a sufficient amount of Exit Capacity to avoid Overrun. NW did not agree with this position, explaining that the Flow from the Entry Shipper is taken and no Gas enters the NTS and no Gas is therefore ascribed to the Shippers. There should therefore be no Flow Based Charges for the initial Shipper. Workgroup continued to discuss this point further, advising that the allocation of Charges will be dependent on Gas entering the NTS.

NGT's rationale was that the flow into the total system is notational at the intersection and is deemed to flow into the NTS and the connection. This is based on Commercial Flows at the Entry Points themselves. NW highlighted his confusion, explaining that this did not appear to make sense to him as NTS charges should apply on flows to the NTS and not to flows on another pipeline. MM advised he would take this point away to check the position.

The Workgroup discussed the position of allocating Gas to a Shipper and when this process is likely to take place. NW highlighted that it makes sense to issue IGTs for booking Capacity for economic benefits, however, again the issue of whether this is viable will need to be considered further.

The proposed model connection NTS is unmetered. Entry to IGT is Offtaken from IGT. The understanding of NGT is that volume is deemed to have Entered or Exited the total system at the IGT interface based on UDQI at Entry to IGT and UDQO for Offtake from IGT. Page 9 of the Modification discusses the Measurement and Energy Balancing and Workgroup conducted a review of this during the meeting.

PH highlighted that the discussions of Workgroup are leading to a position where there could be potentially different rules and treatments applied to Flow Based Charges, Commodity Charges and Capacity. PH concluded NW's comments in that there should not be NTS Flow Based Charges applicable where molecules do not physically enter the NTS. However, under the Shipper model, it may be appropriate for these Charges to apply for a Shipper entering Gas, regardless of the net physical position. Gas entering the system means that the Commodity Charge has already been paid and the Gas is being held temporarily.

RHa highlighted that there may not be knowledge of where the Gas is going and where it is assumed that it is entering the NTS, the Flow Based Charge will need to be paid. IGTs will not have this information either. PH highlighted that it may be possible for IGT to have sight of this information and the increased burden on IGTs to ensure that sufficient units of Capacity are being booked. The current debate is in relation to deeming flows.

NW highlighted in relation to allocations occurring the day after, to determine who is flowing Gas onto the NTS, this will be calculable from the Entered Offtake points. The issue identified by NW is in relation to paying Transporter Charges and ensuring this is relative to the pipeline being used.

AS explained that this arrangement applies for inter connection Bi-Directional supply interconnection points which Shippers do pay Commodity Charges for, regardless of the Net Flow. Shippers who submit Exit Nominations at the time of the Pipeline direction being Entry Flow, will still have to pay Entry and Exit Commodity Charges. AS explained her understanding is that the example presented to Workgroup is based on DN arrangements. Where the Biomethane Sites connect to the DN, DNs are booking less Exit Capacity as they will have Entry Flows connected directly to the system. They can therefore purchase less gas from the NTS as they have their own supply. In light of this, AS queried why payments would be made for Commodity Charges for Entry and then for Exit on all sites. AS's understanding is that Entry and Exit Commodity Charges are paid regardless of the net interconnector pipeline flow. MM agreed with this.

If the Shipper method is adopted, PH explained that Shippers would be incentivised to purchase Capacity to cover their allocation (to avoid overrun charges).

NW advised that his preference would be the IGT model as it appears to be the most efficient route. If IGTs are unable to do this, then the Shipper model would need to be used.

Parallels to Storage and Interconnectors had been identified. At Interconnectors, the Capacity Commodity Charge applies and is linked to the allocation which is clearly noted on the system. The Model presented is off-system reporting to make the Charge. How the system can be deemed to consider what the appropriate means of accounting and charging are is the challenge NGT are considering.

Fiona Cottam (FC) queried whether the sites will be on the DN or NTS, from a Balancing, Charging or UIG point of view. PH clarified that DNs are not involved as it is an IGT connection. The expectation is that the source of Entry is likely to be Biomethane. In relation to the Offtake, FC queried whether it would become an LDZ Meter Point or an NTS Meter Point from a Charging and Allocation point of view.

MM advised that there are many combinations where connected IGTs could also be connected to DNs elsewhere but this Modification seeks to clarify that IGTs are connected only to the NTS.

Due to the discussions regarding whether the Meter Point would be considered as LDZ or NTS, PH clarified that it is unlikely to be an LDZ Meter Point as it will not be connected to a Meter Point. It is likely that the Entry point will be a Biomethane point and the Offtake will be the consumption of Gas on the farm. In Gemini, this will need to be set up as an NTS Meter Point.

RHa queried whether an IGT Modification would be required alongside this Modification in the event that the IGT Model is adopted. PH confirmed he does not believe so as the drafted Legal Text for Modification 0871 is likely to be utilised for this Modification and that no changes are required to the IGT Network Code. Changes will only need to be made to the IGT Arrangements Document (IGTAD).

From a review of the Modification, it was highlighted that there is a high impact on IGTs, however, PH clarified that this does necessarily mean changes will be required to the IGT Network Code.

New Action 0901: Joint Office (RHa) to contact the IGT UNC to ask them to consider Modification 0887 and the implications for IGTs.

Please refer to the presentation slides published for further details.

3. Solution Review

Please refer to the discussion under agenda item 2.

4. Next Steps

NGT to prepare further details for the following questions:

- To consider what arrangements will need to be put in place for IGTs in the event that the IGT Capacity Charging Model is adopted. Would they be providing Nominations to Flow Allocations to allow for Capacity to be booked?
- To consider whether it is right that NGT can earn revenue from Gas which is not physically entering the system.
- To revisit the Shipper Model vs. the IGT Model and collate pros and cons for both.
- Consider whether there is a case for Charging Shipper Capacity but not Commodity Charges.

5. Any Other Business

None.

6. Diary Planning

0887 meetings are listed at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0887/050924>

Transmission meetings are listed at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/TX>

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

| Time / Date | Paper Publication Deadline | Venue | Workgroup Programme |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| 10:00 Tuesday 3 October 2024 | 5pm Thursday 25 September 2024 | Microsoft Teams | Standard Workgroup Agenda |
| 10:00 Thursday 07 November 2024 | 5pm Thursday 29 October 2024 | Microsoft Teams | Standard Workgroup Agenda |
| 10:00 Thursday 05 December 2024 | 5pm Thursday 27 November 2024 | Microsoft Teams | Standard Workgroup Agenda |

| Modification 0887 Action Table | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------|------------|---|-----------------|---------------------------------|---------------|
| Action Ref | Meeting Date | Minute Ref | Action | Reporting Month | Owner | Status Update |
| 0901 | 05/09/24 | 2 | Joint Office (RH _a) to contact the IGT UNC to ask them to consider Modification 0887 and the implications for IGTs. | October 2024 | Joint Office (RH _a) | Pending |

UNC Transmission Workgroup 0894 Minutes
Facilitating Biomethane entry into the GDN by exporting methane
from the GDN into the NTS via Compression

Thursday 05 September 2024

via Microsoft Teams

| Attendees | | |
|---|-------|---------------------------------|
| Rebecca Hailes (Chair) | (RHa) | Joint Office |
| Nikita Bagga (Secretary) | (NB) | Joint Office |
| Adam Bates | (AB) | SEFE Marketing & Trading |
| Alex Nield | (AN) | Storenergy |
| Amy Howarth | (AH) | Storenergy |
| Anna Shrigley | (AS) | ENI Global & Energy Markets |
| Brian McGlinchey | (BMc) | Vermillion Energy Ireland |
| Carlos Aguirre | (CA) | Pavilion Energy |
| Chris Wright | (CWr) | Exxon Mobil |
| Conor McClarin | (CM) | National Gas Transmission (NGT) |
| David Mitchell | (DMi) | Southern Gas Networks |
| Edward Allard | (EA) | Cadent |
| Fiona Cottam | (FC) | Xoserve |
| Gavin Williams | (GW) | National Gas Transmission (NGT) |
| Hannah Reddy | (HR) | Corella on behalf of Xoserve |
| Josie Lewis | (JLe) | Xoserve |
| Jeff Chandler | (JC) | SSE Group |
| Julie Cox | (JCo) | Energy UK |
| Lauren Jauss | (LJ) | RWE |
| Lucinda Willis | (LW) | Ofgem |
| Malcolm Montgomery | (MM) | National Gas Transmission (NGT) |
| Marion Joste | (MJ) | ENI |
| Matthew Brown | (MB) | Ofgem |
| Michael Crowley | (MC) | Gas Networks Ireland |
| Nicola Lond | (NL) | National Gas Transmission (NGT) |
| Nick Wye | (NW) | Waters Wye Associates |
| Nigel Sisman | (NS) | Sisman Energy Consultancy Ltd |
| Ofordi Nabokei | (ON) | National Gas Transmission (NGT) |
| Paul Mckie | (PM) | Joint Office |
| Phil Hobbins | (PH) | National Gas Transmission (NGT) |
| Richard Fairholme | (RF) | Uniper |
| Shiv Singh | (SS) | Cadent |
| Tim Davis | (TD) | Barrow Gas Shipping |
| Tim Gwinnell | (TG) | South Hook Gas |
| <i>The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 20 February 2025.</i> | | |

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

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/0894/050924>.

1.0 Outline of Modification

Shiv Singh (SS) introduced the modification and explained the purpose of the modification is to introduce new criteria of Offtake where Gas flows into the National Transmission System (NTS) from the Gas Distribution Network (GDN), and to clarify the treatment of the associated energy.

The Modification has stemmed from discussions with Biomethane Plants. There are specific areas on the DN Network where a Biomethane Plant may be unable to deliver the required volume onto the network. Cadent's Network Analysis team discussed several options and this Modification involves the transport of Biomethane via the use of a compressor back into the NTS. The Compressing Unit would be connected to the DN Network which would feed gas into the NTS.

SS provided an overview of the Solution and Business Rules. SS advised in relation to the presentation slides, where the Pre-Modification Question is noted as "TBC", this is still being considered by Cadent.

Gas Quality (slide 3)

Cadent's main concern is regarding the existence of odorant within the NTS and Cadent's obligations regarding the same. GSMR has been considered and only applies if the odorant is above 7 Barg. Where the odorant is below, GSMR is silent. SS therefore put to the Workgroup to consider what the concerns may be regarding the risk of odorised Gas entering the NTS. The level of Gas being discussed is a small quantity with the volumes being in the range of between 1 and 5000 cubic meter per hour.

SS clarified that it would only be Methane being injected. SS highlighted whether it would be a cause for concern for National Transmission if Biomethane as a mix with Methane were to enter the NTS. This was concluded as not being an issue.

Julie Cox (JCo) queried whether Cadent had considered Oxygen and SS advised that this was raised in the Pre-Modification discussions and had been raised with Cadent's Integrity Team to understand the oxygen limits. If the consultation or recommendation is approved, there should be no issue as both DNs and NTS will be working to the same limits. JCo highlighted that this position is currently not the case as there is a different limit for lower pressures. The expectation for Transmission is being considered on a case-by-case basis.

RHa requested the details and link of this consultation for details to be included in the Modification and in the event that the details are not yet publicly available, Cadent should inform the Joint Office.

Anna Shrigley (AS) highlighted the Government's decision to blend Gas on a case-by-case basis. Therefore, a standard set of rules, when GSMR is updated, could be expected. RHa highlighted that if this is an issue for this Modification, it will also be an issue for Modification 0887 and Modification 0871.

Gavin Williams (GW) highlighted that there could be an issue regarding odorant as the GSMR obliges pressure below 7 Barg to have odorant. From the perspective of NTS, there is no odorant in the Network and there are key drivers for Gas being exported to the interconnectors which operate a system without odorant. Further to AS's point, there could be a greater risk where the reverse compressors are situated near the Offtakes.

In relation to Gas coming onto the NTS which has been odorised through a separate connection point and has been immediately Offtaken, GW advised he is unsure of what the risk may be of

odorised Gas being re-odorised leading to elevated levels of odorised Gas in the Networks. Workgroup will need to consider how likely this is.

RHa concluded the question to consider is *“Is there a greater risk of elevated levels of odorised Gas where the Gas has been Offtaken near sites with legacy or odourisation processes and is the process automated?”*.

Nick Wye (NW) raised the issue of oxygen for storage sites. Kirsty Appleby (KA) is in the process of collating evidence to take to the HSE regarding oxygen. Odorant may be an issue to be considered in relation to storage however, this will come down to the concentrations of the odorant.

Edward Allard (EA) queried whether IGTs transporting Gas below 7 Barg should also be odorised in relation to Modification 0887. This Modification (0894) is similar to Modification 0887 where the intention would be for DNs and National Gas to enter into an Entry Agreement where volumes and flows would be stipulated to assist in assessing the materiality and the rate at which DN Gas enters into the NTS at a specific location. The application of the GSMR will also need to be considered. RHa highlighted that this will need to be a consideration for the proposers of Modification 0887 and Modification 0871.

Tim Davis (TD) highlighted that the issue of odorant has been considered. If below 7 Barg, the Gas will be odorised and he confirmed that removing odour from the Gas is not a difficult process.

The key difference between this Modification and Modification 0887 is specifically on the point of odourisation. RHa queried for Modification 0894, whether the Gas entering the Network is general DN Gas as opposed to Biomethane.

GW confirmed it is general DN Gas. Modification 0887 allows Biomethane to flow to IGTs and Biomethane then enters into the NTS. This Modification (0894) seeks to create Capacity in the Distribution Network to allow Biomethane to flow. This could be either Biomethane or odorised Methane Gas originating from the NTS. PH queried how likely this is in practice and whether IGT pipelines operating at below 7 Barg would be recompressed.

EA advised that Gas quality should be treated the same. This is due to the fact that “Gas” under the GSMR is not specified.

RHa highlighted the diagram in the Solution on page 5 of the Modification. If the Gas in the yellow pipeline (GDN) is odorised and the Gas in the green pipeline (AD) is not, RHa queried whether the Gas becomes odorised at the point that the green pipeline meets the yellow. Workgroup considered this point and concluded that both pipes are odorised. Furthermore, the Gas is going to be odorised before the blue pipeline (GDN) meets the purple pipeline (NTS).

SS advised that that the concerns are around why the Gas needs to be odorised. Cadent’s Capital Delivery Teams considered this and concluded that this could involve significant costs.

Workgroup continued to discuss the risks of over-odorisation and the potential consequences as a result of odours leading to potential GSMR breaches. Cadent agreed to take this away and consider further with the Integrity Team.

PH highlighted the proposal KA is considering taking to the HSE, advising that in the event the HSE reject the proposal, this could cause issues. The proposal is to allow the NTS and the Network above 38 Barg, this is unlikely to be granted until 2025 due to the nature of the processes.

RHa queried how the 1-5000 cubic meter per hour compares to the general flow and whether there is any fortuitous co-mingling.

Lauren Jauss (LJ) highlighted the Wobbe Index and the variability of this as a consideration in relation to the Modification. Although the Gas quality changes are being considered in relation to the GSMR, it is not sufficient to just be within the GSMR from a security and supply perspective in relation to power stations. GSMR does not take into consideration the rate of

change of the Wobbe Index. In light of the fact that Reverse Flows are more likely to occur when demand is low, LJ queried whether changes on the Wobbe Index are going to be seen throughout the day and night.

EA explained that the intention for designing the model is for it to have an enduring solution. If the Modification is implemented, it would provide for a site location-based assessment to consider the impacts to NTS Gas Quality. A small compressor operating for a few hours each night is different to operating across a longer time frame. Therefore, it is difficult to design a Modification which deals with particular flow ranges or volumes. EA further confirmed that the Wobbe Index can be considered as part of the review of the Modification. RHa queried whether an additional Business Rule would be required. EA advised he would look into this.

PH advised that he does not believe there will be an impact on the Wobbe Index as the range on the DN is the same as that on the NTS. However, oxygen levels may change in the future. PH added that this Modification should recognise that a Network Entry Agreement would be required between the GDN and National Gas. In light of this, RHa suggested that a “for the avoidance of doubt” rule may be more appropriate than an additional Business Rule.

Workgroup considered the application of the case-by-case basis point and how the Modification might apply in the future as providing a generic solution. SS advised that he was not sure whether the range of 1-5000 cubic meter per hour is included in the Modification, however this will be taken away to be considered internally by Cadent.

Impact on NTS Pressure (slide 4)

Workgroup considered the Impact on NTS Pressure with SS highlighting that a few questions had been raised in the Pre-Modification discussions.

Delivery Flow Notification does not currently exist between DNs, however DNs would inform National Gas of the intention of flows. This is similar to what is being done with the Offtake Profile Notice but in reverse. This is why an additional Business Rule has been included as it sets out what communications would need to be in place.

RHa queried what the trigger is for the compressor to run. This is being considered by Cadent internally, however, Cadent intends to suggest the option of running the compressor to be linked to the AD Plant. If the AD Plant is off, it would be very undesirable for the compressor to be triggered by the pressure from the LDZ. A further update will be provided to Workgroup on this point.

Paul McKie (PMc) queried the circumstance where both the NTS and Distribution Zones are full and queried which takes priority. EA explained that there is an obligation on the DNs to agree with the Biomethane Plant to account for this potential scenario. There is no reason to accept Gas from a producer in the event that both Networks are full.

If the NTS is performing at the maximum pressure it is operating to and the additional pressure exceeds the limit, the compressor unit would slam shut.

LDZ UIG / NG Unaccounted for Gas (slide 5)

In this example, NTS has gained several unaccounted for units and the DN has lost units which need to be accounted for. This represents UIG on the DN and Unaccounted for Gas on National Gas NTS. Internally, 3 options are being considered. Please refer to the presentation slides for further information relating to the 3 proposed options.

The preference for Cadent, is the third option, Monthly Reconciliation.

EA queried whether the high-level overview provided to Workgroup is sufficient, advising that further information can be provided if necessary. Fiona Cottam (FC) explained that no further action would be required from Shippers as the proposal is just an additional accounting transaction each month. This option (Monthly Reconciliation) creates an initial amount of UIG in the LDZ. Upon discussions with Cadent, it was concluded that this proposal was an efficient way

of dealing with UIG/Unaccounted for Gas instead of requiring a transaction every day. The energy is processed and returned to Shippers through the UIG Reconciliation process.

FC clarified that for options 1 and 3, the actual SAP for the day would be applied, therefore the same prices would be used. RHa called out that it would be worth making this position clearer.

AS discussed the Biomethane Gas and plans for Decarbonisation. In relation to option 3, AS requested further clarification on how this would interact with the existing process for upstream production. AS provided an example with figures and requested further reassurance from Cadent. SS advised this would be taken away to be considered, with further information being provided next month. PH advised that he doesn't believe Entry Beach Allocations would be impacted.

TD queried whether NTS will be making a separate proposal in relation to Entry Charges or purchase of Entry Capacity. SS clarified that Cadent are not considering a proposal in relation to Entry Charges as the Gas is already in the system and will not be moving out/into the system. There is therefore no requirement for an Entry or Exit Point. TD queried whether NTS agreed with this, calling out that it seemed strange to implement Charges from IGT (in Modification 0887) and this proposal appears discriminatory.

SS highlighted that it may relate to the definition but TD did not agree with this.

Workgroup discussed the proposal and that there does not appear to be any new Gas into the system, it appears to be a matter of Gas being recycled. TD added that both are being injected into the Network, including in the case of IGT.

PH referred to Modification 0894 where the Gas is to be booked on to the DN Network. In light of this, PH interpreted that Cadent are trying to explain the lack of Charges being applied due to the potential of reverse compression double counting.

TD highlighted that he believes the proposal appears discriminatory and anti-competitive, however RHa clarified that this is not what is being proposed. Gas goes into the NTS regardless of its origin and should therefore be treated the same. PH agreed, adding that there needs to be consistency.

SS clarified that Cadent are working to an existing Framework. The definition of the total system is set out in the OAD and this Modification is being developed around those provisions.

SS informed Workgroup that although Cadent have 5 LDZs, this issue appears to be concentrated in the East Anglia area which is not built up and is largely agricultural. Cadent envisage similar issues in certain parts of Wales and Scotland. PH highlighted that it would be good to get a sense of how wide spread the deployment and solution could be, in the event that the Modification is approved.

TS highlighted a particular case which had not been discussed by SS.

In response to AS's comments regarding LDZ demands being lower, RHa clarified that the reason for compression is due to a lack of Capacity.

AS discussed Capacity and Demand and how units injected into the Network may be due to different locations within the LDZ. AS considered circumstances where the principle may be breached.

EA explained that currently DNs are obligated by license to purchase NTS LDZ Exit Capacity. Gas is therefore being taken from LDZ to meet demands. Due to local demand being lower, there are some strains in relation to the placing of the Gas.

Workgroup considered the potential effect on the Wobbe Index, where PH advised he does not believe this to be an issue for this Modification as there is no difference in the Wobbe Range applying on the DN Network, however, the position is different for Oxygen. In light of the discussions, LJ requested for further data to be provided, particularly in relation to East Anglia to ensure that the detail of the Modification is being captured.

EA suggested providing hypothetical locations and demands for NTS to conduct an Impact Assessment on. This would be based on projects that Cadent believe could benefit from the application of this Modification. However, support from National Gas would be required.

LJ clarified that her question is “*what is the impact on the Wobbe Range in the NTS and the rate of Change of Wobbe Index dependent on the prevailing Wobbe Index of Gas in the location*”. JCo highlighted that the rate of change of the Wobbe Index could appear problematic. In terms of the tipping point for the rate of Wobbe Change, this is likely to vary according to each Power Station. In light of the discussions, Cadent agreed to take away this point to consider further. Cadent and SGN may consider to have an offline session to discuss this further.

GW suggested an action for all DNs to provide information where constraints are likely to be, such as in East Anglia as advised by SS. It would be useful to understand this position on a national scale. As not all representatives of all DNs were present, this was not captured as formal action.

Please refer to the presentation slides for further details.

2.0 Initial Discussion

2.1. Issues and Questions from Panel

This item was deferred until October 2024.

2.2. Initial Representations

None received.

2.3. Terms of Reference

As matters have been referred from Panel, a specific Terms of Reference will be published alongside the Modification at www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0894

3.0 Next Steps

The following next steps were confirmed:

- To consider the question regarding Oxygen content where the current principle is on a case-by-case base. Consider the work being conducted by KA in relation to the HSE.
- Consider the potential for de-odorisation or double odorization concern.
- Consider NTS Pressures and avoiding the scenario of the Compressor being triggered to operate.
- Consider the rate of change of the Wobbe Index.
- Consider the Pre Modification questions which still remain outstanding for discussion.

4.0 Any Other Business

None.

5.0 Diary Planning

Transmission meetings are listed at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/TX>

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

| Time / Date | Paper Publication Deadline | Venue | Workgroup Programme |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| 10:00 Tuesday 3 October 2024 | 5pm Thursday 25 September 2024 | Microsoft Teams | Standard Workgroup Agenda |

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| 10:00 Thursday 07 November 2024 | 5pm Thursday 29 October 2024 | Microsoft Teams | Standard Workgroup Agenda |
| 10:00 Thursday 05 December 2024 | 5pm Thursday 27 November 2024 | Microsoft Teams | Standard Workgroup Agenda |