

Governance Workstream Minutes

Thursday 19 March 2009

350 Euston Road, London

Attendees

Tim Davis (Chair)	(TD)	Joint Office
Bob Fletcher (Secretary)	(BF)	Joint Office
Alan Raper	(AR)	National Grid Distribution
Amrik Bal	(AB)	BG Group
Bali Dohel	(BD)	Scotia Gas Networks
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Chris Wright	(CW _r)	British Gas Trading
Joel Martin	(JM)	Scotia Gas Networks
John Bradley	(JB)	Joint Office
Jon Dixon	(JD)	Ofgem
Mark Sutton	(MS)	TPA Solutions
Richard Fairholme	(RH)	EON UK
Richard Street	(RS)	Corona Energy
Ritchard Hewitt	(RH)	National Grid Transmission
Simon Trivella	(ST)	Wales & West Utilities
Stefan Leedham	(SL)	EDF Energy

1.0 Introduction and Status Review

1.1. Minutes from Previous Workstream

Accepted without amendment.

1.2. Review of Actions

GOV1040 Provide further summary examples.

TD confirmed a summary had been produced for each proposal discussed at the Panel held earlier today - these have been published in the Governance Workstream section of the Joint Office website **Action Update: Completed.**

1.3. Review of Live Modifications Proposals and Topics

None

2.0 Modifications

No Modifications to review.

3.0 Topics 013GOV - Industry Codes Governance Review

JD advised Ofgem is likely to provide its initial thoughts on the responses it received to the consultation documents around July with a more formal response expected in November. All responses have been published on Ofgem's website.

4.0 Any Other Business

4.1 Self Governance of Modification Proposals similar to UNC0219 Publication of UK Wholesale Gas Market Liquidity Data

JD requested views on the merits of self governance for proposals similar to UNC0219 – which could have been pursued under the UNC Related document change process

rather than the full modification process. It was confirmed that approval of a revised NCORM document by the UNCC had been debated, but the proposer had no comfort that the suggested changes would be made in the way requested, and hence the Modification Proposal route had been preferred.

JD thought the governance review offered an opportunity to consider alternatives particularly in circumstances where agreement may not be reached at UNCC. RH thought that using the UNCC route for UNC0219 may have quickened the process. He also thought that the provision of information and ratification of documents through specific NCORM, IGMS or Gemini groups may be more pertinent as they would have the required expertise to fully review and understand the documents.

RS thought using the UNCC route meant a number of issues could be by-passed that needed to be explored and that the Modification proposal route left open the question as to whether MIPI was the correct solution. SL thought it is inconsistent to have different documents managed by different groups and all should be ratified by a central group, be that either the Modification Panel or UNCC. JD questioned if the UNCC is a suitable group for managing changes with such a wide scope, especially if self governance is expanded in future.

4.2 Summarising Proposals

TD advised that a number of Proposal Summaries has been published on the Joint Office website under the Governance Workstream location and asked if the group thought the summaries would be helpful to small or non code parties. Attendees were supportive of the draft summaries. RS suggested we check how many people visit the location to gauge its worth. JD suggested the experiment feeds into the governance review to influence debate as the idea was first mooted through the review. TD suggested the proposer writes the summary in future to ensure the key facts are represented to their satisfaction. It was agreed that no further summaries would be provided by Joint Office at this stage but that further development of the approach would sit under the Governance Review.

4.3 User Pays Guidance Document

JM advised that the latest version of the guidance document has been published on the Joint Office Website and will need to be authorised at some stage in the future, subject to implementation of UNC0231V. SL thought the matrix identifying the % apportionment of costs should be reviewed and how the guidance notes align to the relevant objectives, though the document was a good step forward.

SL added that 0213V will need to be implemented first, and TD thought it would be sensible if this was a Panel day. JM asked the group to provide any comments they may have on the guidance notes as soon as possible.

5.0 Next Meeting

16 April 2009, following the UNC Committee meeting.

Action Log – UNC Governance Workstream 19 March 2009

Action Ref	Meeting Date(s)	Minute Ref	Action	Owner*	Status Update
GOV1040	19/02/09	4.1	Provide further summary examples.	Joint Office (TD)	Completed