

Governance Workstream Minutes

Thursday 16 February 2006

350 Euston Road, London

Attendees

Tim Davis (Chair)	(TD)	Joint Office
Alison Jennings	(AJ)	National Grid UKD
Alan Raper	(AR)	National Grid UKD
John Bradley	(JB)	Joint Office
Mike Berrisford	(MB)	Joint Office
Mike Young	(MY)	BGT
Phil Broom	(PB)	Gaz de France
Robert Cameron Higgs	(RCH)	Northern Gas Networks
Ritchard Hewitt	(RH)	National Grid NTS
Steve Ladle	(SL)	Total
Sam McEwen	(SM)	Ofgem
Shelley Rouse	(SR)	Statoil

1. Minutes from Previous Workstream

Were accepted with a minor amendment. SL pointed out that whilst the minutes reflected the discussion, it was agreed that UKD would raise the Proposal in respect of variation and withdrawal of Modification Proposals.

2. Review of Actions

It was agreed all outstanding actions had either been discharged or would be discussed under the relevant agenda items.

3. Modifications

3.1. No specific discussion was held other than on Modification Proposal 0070.

3.2. 0070 'Removal of the SME Role and Streamlining the Modification Rules'

RH reported that he had reduced the scope of this Proposal so that it solely covered the SME removal and the consequent implications on legal text. National Grid NTS was developing the legal text after which he believed it would be ready to proceed to consultation. It was suggested that the Proposal would be sufficiently developed for the next Panel Meeting.

4. Topics

004Gov Panel Processes and Timings

The Workstream discussed a National Grid UKD presentation that had previously been circulated.

On the aspect of variations, AJ suggested a materiality test. If the Panel decided that the variation was not material, a unanimous vote would be required to permit the variation. If the change were considered by one or more Panel members to be material, additional consultation would be required although it was recognised that the length of the consultation could reflect the degree of materiality. It was clarified that no change was suggested in the ability for a Proposer to make a variation prior to the onset of consultation. This Proposal would refer to the period after the decision had been made to go to consultation. AR agreed to consider whether a formal notice of variation was required or whether instead a requirement could be introduced for informing the Panel of any proposed variation.

Action AR

It was agreed that the requirement for unanimity was a suitable safeguard. It was also agreed that a tied vote at Panel should be sufficient to require consultation.

On withdrawal of a Proposal, it was suggested that the Proposer should be able to withdraw even after the Panel vote but it could be re-adopted by any UNC party – not just Transporters.

Additionally, automatic withdrawal would take place if the Proposer had a licence withdrawn, was terminated under the UNC, or voluntarily discontinued. The right of adoption would be provided in this case as well. The Workstream agreed that this provision was sensible.

5. Any Other Business

SL suggested that a more practical solution could be adopted for raising a Class 3 Modification. His proposal was that a topic group discuss the process. RH supported the need for some review, as he believed that it was unsatisfactory for the Transporters to raise the UNC Proposal, where the original change request had been raised by a User and may not even be supported by the Transporter. The rules on voting versus consensus was also believed to be worth considering. It was agreed that the Joint Office should bring a presentation to the next meeting. **Action JB**

TD suggested that the rules on alternates should be re-examined. TD to consider bringing a presentation to the next meeting. **Action TD**

6. Next Meeting

16 March 2005 following the UNC Committee meeting.

Action Log – UNC Governance Workstream 16 February 2006

GOV 1005	15/12/05	2	Ofgem to consider concerns regarding Urgent timetables particularly that if the Panel was expected to make a recommendation, additional time should be built into the timetable.	Ofgem (SM)	Action Carried Forward
GOV 1007	19/01/06	3.4	Proposer of Proposal 0070 to consider limiting its proposal to the SME aspect.	National Grid NTS (RH)	Revised Proposal Issued Action Closed
GOV 1007	19/01/06	3.4	Parties to consider raising the variance and withdrawal aspects of Proposal 0070	Total (SL) and National Grid UKD (AR)	UKD circulated presentation Action Closed
GOV 1008	19/01/06	3.4	SGN to consider raising “housekeeping” aspect of Proposal 0070 assisted by National Grid NTS and UKD	Scotia Gas Networks (BG) National Grid UKD (AR) and NTS (RH)	Action Carried Forward.
GOV 1009	16/02/06	4	National Grid UKD to issue proposal reflecting discussion, including revision to its suggestions in respect of notice of variation.	National Grid UKD (AR)	
GOV 1010	16/02/06	5	Joint Office to consider current UK Link Processes and bring suggestions for improvements to the March Workstream	Joint Office (JB)	
GOV 1011	16/02/06	5	Joint Office to consider current Modification Rules in respect of alternate Proposals and bring suggestions for improvements to the March Workstream	Joint Office (TD)	

* key to initials of action owners

JB – John Bradley, RH – Ritchard Hewitt, AR – Alan Raper, BG – Beverley Grubb, TD – Tim Davis