

Governance Workstream Minutes

Thursday 17 May 2007

350 Euston Road, London

Attendees

Tim Davis (Chair)	(TD)	Joint Office of Gas Transporters
Bali Dohel	(BD)	Scotia Gas Networks
Christiane Sykes	(CS)	Statoil
Chris Warner	(CWa)	National Grid UKD
Chris Wright	(CWr)	British Gas Trading
David Edward	(DE)	Ofgem
John Bradley	(JB)	Joint Office of Gas Transporters
Julian Majdanski	(JM)	Joint Office of Gas Transporters
Liz Spierling	(LS)	Wales & West Utilities
Phil Broome	(PB)	Gaz de France ESS
Robert Cameron-Higgs	(RCH)	Northern Gas Networks
Richard Fairholme	(RF)	E.ON UK
Ritchard Hewitt	(RHe)	National Grid NTS

1.0 Introduction and Status Review

1.1 Minutes from Previous Workstream

Were accepted without amendment.

1.2 Review of Actions

GOV1021: Review whether there is currently sufficient clarity in respect of effective dates where there is a retrospective aspect to a Proposal

The JO suggested that Section 15 of the Modification Report should now have the heading: "Proposed implementation timetable (including timetable for any necessary information systems changes and detailing any potentially retrospective impacts)". This was agreed

Closed

2.0 Modification Proposals

None

3.0 Topics

3.1 011GOV Urgent Proposals

BGT's document "Guidance Note on Best Practice for Urgent Uniform Network Code Modification Proposals" was discussed. One comment had been received - that the JO should publish all Proposals as soon as they are received whether Urgent or not. This would give extra time for respondents to view the Proposal but may also be seen as giving an opportunity to "lobby" Ofgem.

DE stated that Ofgem had, recently, turned round the Proposals quickly and was concerned that parties lobbying Ofgem might delay the decision. He also suggested that if the period of consultation is reduced, the Panel may be more likely to decide to review the area concerned after Ofgem's decision on implementation. However, it was acknowledged that recent Urgent Proposals had been discussed in draft form but this had not led to delays.

RH stated that a Proposer might wish a Proposal to remain confidential if Urgency was rejected. JM, however, pointed out that the Proposal would still need to be published on the website so would not be confidential. It was also pointed out that

any Proposer might wish to discuss any Proposal beforehand with Ofgem informally if it wished to retain confidentiality.

CWa had a few comments which he read out and agreed should be forwarded to CWr. These centred on acknowledgement that a Panel recommendation was a licence condition and he wished to ensure that the guidelines did not appear to contradict this.

Action GOV1025: BGT to consider further comments and if necessary redraft the Urgent Procedures Guidance Note for the June Workstream meeting.

3.2 012GOV Legal Text Aspects of Current Rules

SGN were still engaged in preparing changes to the Modification Rules.

4.0 Any Other Business

CWa referred to the fact that the IGT UNC Panel had been convened. It was concluded that it was not appropriate for the UNC Panel to receive a report from the IGT UNC Panel. It was also concluded that the Modification Reports did not need to refer specifically to impacts on the IGT code.

5.0 Next Meeting

21 June 2007, following the UNC Committee meeting.

Action Log – UNC Governance Workstream 17 May 2007

Action Ref	Meeting Date(s)	Minute Ref	Action	Owner*	Status Update
GOV 1021	15/02/07	4.0	Review whether there is currently sufficient clarity in respect of effective dates where there is a retrospective aspect to a Proposal.	Joint Office (TD)	May meeting agreed to amendment to standard Modification Report proforma proposed by Joint Office. Closed
GOV 1025	17/05/07	3.1	Consider further comments and if necessary redraft the Urgent Procedures Guidance Note for the June Workstream meeting.	BGT (CWr)	

* key to initials of action owners

TD – Tim Davis, CWr – Chris Wright