

Governance Workstream Minutes

Thursday 20 October 2005

10 Old Bailey, London

Attendees

Tim Davis (Chair)	(TD)	Joint Office
John Bradley	(JB)	Joint Office
Julian Majdanski	(JM)	Joint Office
Mike Berrisford	(MB)	Joint Office
Beverley Grubb	(BG)	Scotia Gas Networks
Christiane Sykes	(CS)	E.ON
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid UKD
Jonathan Dixon	(JD)	Ofgem
Keith Sanderson	(KS)	BGT
Mick Curtis	(MC)	$e=mc^2$
Phil Broom	(PB)	GDF
Robert Cameron Higgs	(RCH)	Northern Gas Networks
Ritchard Hewitt	(RH)	National Grid NTS
Stephanie Gott	(SG)	Gemserv
Shelley Jones	(SJ)	Statoil
Steve Ladle	(SL)	Total

1. Minutes from Previous Workstream

SL had identified, prior to the September meeting, that there was an inaccuracy in the actions allocated to Mick Curtis and Sharif Islam in the August 2005 minutes. This, however, had not been reflected in the September 2005 minutes. TD suggested that this action had essentially been superseded by the Joint Office's publication of flow diagrams. This was agreed and the relevant actions closed.

With this exception and an incorrect date for the October meeting, the minutes from 15 September 2005 were accepted.

2. Review of Actions

Change Coordination: an action had been placed on the Joint Office to raise this aspect as a Workstream Topic. This would be done by the next meeting. **Action Closed**

Modification Proposal details on Joint Office Web Site TD stated that the Joint Office had now concluded that it was not practicable to have all the Modification Proposal details on its public web site. Such details are already on the more restricted access GTIS Web Site so that interested parties can have access. This was agreed as being acceptable. **Action Closed**

This prompted CS to request that an update of the UNC should be placed on the public Joint Office Web Site. MB responded that there were some outstanding issues to agree with the Transporters' lawyers related to certain Modification Proposals approved in the latter months of Transco's Network Code. He did, however, expect these to be resolved and an update to be on the Web Site by 10 November 2005. **Action MB**

Modification Timeline The Joint Office had produced a modification timeline. **Action Closed**

Shrinkage Forum The Joint Office has agreed to administer the Shrinkage Forum. **Action Closed**

Variation of a Modification Proposal RH requested that the action to bring a proposal on this aspect be carried forward. This was agreed. **Action Carried Forward**

Urgent Modification Proposals – This was an action on all members to consider how the process might be improved. TD asked whether the recent process followed on 0052 had been helpful and allayed some of the concerns that had been raised. SL still wished to maintain that a Panel recommendation was inappropriate in the context of an Urgent Proposal. The Workstream did not feel it was worth pursuing a review of the Urgent Modification Process any further at this stage.

Action Closed

Clarification of Voting Rules BG and AR had discussed this and asked to carry this action forward. This was agreed

Action Carried Forward

Late Withdrawal JM explained that the Modification Rules allow for withdrawal of a Proposal up to Final Modification Report stage. This would be when the Panel recommendation had been incorporated prior to its submission to Ofgem. TD suggested that Workstream Members, ideally, may prefer withdrawal to be prevented when the Panel had made its decision. This was agreed but it was not felt that the problem was large enough to justify raising a Modification Proposal.

3. **Review of Modifications and Topics Log**

3.1. **Modifications**

004 ‘Changes to the Network Code to Facilitate the Sale of Gas Distribution Networks’ The Proposer agreed to withdraw this Proposal and would be writing to confirm this.

Action CS

The following Modification Proposals had been referred to the Workstream that morning:

0053 ‘Extending established Uniform Network Code governance arrangements to include the Network Code Operations Reporting Manual referenced in Section V9.4’

0055 ‘Extending established Unified Network Code governance arrangements to include the System Management Principles’

0056 ‘Extending established Unified Network Code governance arrangements to include the Code Credit Rules referenced in section V3.1.2’

0057 ‘Extending established Unified Network Code governance arrangements to include the Incremental Entry Capacity Release Methodology Statement (IECR)’

0059 ‘Extending established Unified Network Code governance arrangements to include the Network Code Validation Rules document referenced in Section M1.5.3’

These would be discussed at the next meeting.

4. **004Gov ‘Panel Processes and Timing’**

005Gov ‘SME Roles and Responsibilities’

TD reviewed the process flow diagram that had been prepared by the Joint Office. He particularly pointed out the sections where the input from the SME would no longer be required so that the role could be dispensed with. The meeting agreed that it reflected and built on the discussions at the previous meeting.

A concern was expressed that the Workstream may delay the process if it was required to reach a view on the draft Final Modification Report. There are occasions where the consultation responses are straightforward.

SL suggested that box 15 could be made more explicit to take into account reconsultation.

JD stated that pro-forma comments were always helpful. TD pointed out that whilst this was not compulsory, respondents had increasingly used this option. CS repeated the position that she did not favour the use of a mandatory pro-forma.

TD indicated that a change to the Modification Rules was required if the revisions suggested in the flow diagram were to be implemented. TD agreed to draft a Modification Proposal for a Transporter or Shipper to raise. SL and BG expressed a willingness to work with the Joint Office if necessary on a Proposal.

5. Any Other Business**Governance Modifications**

CW agreed to bring forward views on whether the recent Governance related Modification Proposals could be subject to the proposed process, and whether a review of the documents themselves was necessary as part of the considerations of the Proposals. **Action CW**

The Presenters of these Modification Proposals were asked to come prepared to discuss these at the next Workstream meeting. SL indicated that Shippers would have an opportunity to review them and would revise the drafting as necessary. **Action Proposers**

At the Panel Meeting that morning, the Transporters had agreed to request a view from Ofgem on two of the Proposals. (0055 'Extending established Unified Network Code governance arrangements to include the System Management Principles' and 0057 'Extending established Unified Network Code governance arrangements to include the Incremental Entry Capacity Release Methodology Statement (IECR)'). These procedures are referenced in the Transporter's licence.

6. Next Meeting

17 November 2005 following the UNC Committee meeting