

**UNC Workgroup 0864S Minutes
Update of UNC Code Communication Methods
Monday 08 January 2024
Via Microsoft Teams**

Attendees		
Kate Elleman (Chair)	(KE)	Joint Office
Nikita Bagga (Secretary)	(HK)	Joint Office
Andy Clasper	(AC)	Cadent
Charlotte Gilbert	(CG)	BU-UK
David Mitchell	(DM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Edward Allard	(EA)	Cadent
Ellie Rogers	(ER)	Xoserve
Gavin Williams	(GW)	Northern Gas Networks
Gregory Edwards	(GE)	Centrica
James Rigby	(JR)	Xoserve (CDSP)
Jayne McGlone	(JM)	Xoserve (CDSP)
Kirsty Ingham	(KI)	Centrica
Marina Papatoma	(MP)	Wales & West Utilities
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE
Matthew Brown	(MB)	Ofgem
Oorlagh Chapman	(OC)	Centrica
Sally Hardman	(SHa)	SGN
Susan Helder	(SH)	Northern Gas Networks

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

The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 16 May 2024.

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/0864/041223>.

1.0 Introduction and Status Review

Kate Elleman (KE) welcomed all parties to the meeting and confirmed the meeting to be quorate.

1.1 Approval of Minutes (04 December 2023)

The minutes from the previous meeting were approved.

1.2 Approval of late papers

No late papers to approve.

1.3 Review of Outstanding Actions

1201: NGT (GW) Joint Office (KE) to draft a communication asking if write to the industry still use fax. to ask whether fax is still used. If yes, is email the most appropriate alternative to fax

or are there any other better-suited alternatives. JO to issue communication on behalf of NGT once received.

Update: Gavin Williams (GW) provided an update on the responses received following the communication sent. This action has been completed. **Closed.**

1202: Joint Office (KE) to raise a question with the cross-code steering group to confirm what work has been done ahead of the PTSN networks being decommissioned and what alternatives are being used by them.

Update: KE provided an update advising that this had been raised with the Cross Code Steering Group (CCSG) to ensure that there is a coordinated approach. Ellie Rogers (ER) stated that the REC had raised a Change (0157). KE will be able to provide further information following the CCSG meeting on 15 January 2024. **Closed.**

1203: CDSP (ER) to check whether there are any other more appropriate alternatives to fax and consider which industry Workgroup is the most appropriate to discuss the technical aspects.

Update: ER advised the Workgroup that upon reflection and discussion internally, CDSP will need to understand the requirements of specific communications before being able to consider appropriate alternatives. Requirements for specific communications, particularly in relation to emergency situations such as the requirement of read receipts, will need to be considered. Once this information has been obtained, the alternatives can be considered. It was decided that this action would be closed with a new action being created. **Closed.**

2.0 Modification

GW provided an update on the responses obtained in response to the 4 questions sent out by the Joint Office.

1. *Please identify if you are a transporter/shipper/trader/other*
2. *What processes, if any, do you/your organisation still use fax for?*
3. *What are the impacts, if any (positive/negative), of replacing facsimile with email?*
4. *Can you consider other alternative methods of communication to replace facsimile and in what context could they be used?*

GW confirmed the majority of responses were obtained from Shipper Members.

In relation to the second question, the majority of responses suggested that fax is not being used. For those who have still retained fax, the responses state that this has been retained in the event of an emergency. KE stated it would be useful to identify who provided this response and to understand if they continue to use fax for emergency process. Furthermore, it would be useful to understand from these respondents what they intend to use when the PTSN system has been removed. GW confirmed he would obtain this information.

In relation to question 3, a lot of the responses remained blank and for those who did provide a response, this was a mix of negative and positive. The negative responses discussed the instances where emails may be caught by quarantine or spam. Although not in a position to comfortably provide a solution, GW did discuss the option of adding email addresses as an organisation to an approved white list to ensure they are not captured in spam or quarantine. This would need to be the responsibility of the individual(s) as opposed to defining as a solution.

The last question related to alternative means of communication however Xoserve are waiting until further information has been obtained relating to specific communications before providing appropriate alternatives.

<p>New Action 0101: Following a review of the examples, CDSP (ER) to check whether there are any other more appropriate alternatives to fax and consider which industry Workgroup is the most appropriate to discuss the technical aspects.</p>
--

Further, in relation to the last question, GW advised that all responses mentioned email with half of the responses stating exclusively email. The other half contained a combination of email and text messages or email and telephone.

GW also provided the Workgroup with an overview of the annual gas emergency exercise which involves around 400 participants incl. NGT, distribution networks and shippers and confirmed at no point during the exercise was fax used as a means of communication.

KE raised that if email is the predominant solution, which it sounds like it might be from the responses obtained, GW will need to consider responses to situations where, for example, there may be internet issues. This may also provide an indication of alternative communication methods and to consider the urgency of the situation.

GW discussed in relation to Action 0101 (CDSP’s alternative response action), it may be useful to review each individual reference to fax and apply a RAG rating. Those identified as green would be quick fixes and amended without the need for much discussion. The Workgroup can then focus on the red and amber examples. The intention is to produce a RAG analysis and present this at the next 0864 Workgroup meeting to consider the individual references. The discussions will inform the Legal Text and solution.

KE stated this work would be valuable and would help to show considerations regarding alternative communication methods. KE also highlighted that it would be useful to understand what other Codes are doing and the alternatives they are considering.

KE provided an update on the Workgroup’s focus over the next few months.

Month	Activity
February	Work through individual Fax references (RAG rating) / Review CCSG Feedback
March	Workgroup Report Development / Legal Text Review
April	Finalise Workgroup Report / Review Final Legal Text

KE highlighted that the responses received are positive in that fax does not appear to be used for most respondents however, it appears that it is still being retained in the event of emergencies. This is where the Workgroup will need to be comfortable in relation to providing alternative communication arrangements.

3.0 Development of Workgroup Report

KE provided an update to the Workgroup on the position of the workgroup report and the plan for the coming months. The intention is to begin populating the report in March and finalise in April to ensure everyone is comfortable with the Legal Text. Following the finalisation, the intention is to then report to Panel in May.

Providing that all individual Fax references can be reviewed, the timeline should work.

4.0 Next Steps

GW is to collate an analysis of the 80 individual Fax references along with a RAG rating which will be reviewed at the next Governance Workgroup meeting. KE requested for this to be available to the Workgroup 5 business days before the next meeting to allow the Workgroup sufficient time to review.

5.0 Any Other Business

None.

6.0 Diary Planning

0864S meetings are listed at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0864>

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

Time/Date	Meeting Paper Deadline	Venue	Programme
10:00 Monday 05 February 2024	5pm Friday 26 January 2024	Microsoft Teams	Standard Agenda

0841 Action Table						
Action Ref	Meeting Date	Min Ref	Action	Reporting Month	Owner	Status Update
1201	04/12/23	2.1	NGT (GW) Joint Office (KE) to draft a communication asking if write to the industry still use fax. to ask whether fax is still used. If yes, is email the most appropriate alternative to fax or are there any other better-suited alternatives. JO to issue communication on behalf of NGT once received.	January 2024	NGT (GW)	Closed
1202	04/12/23	2.1	Joint Office (KE) to raise a question with the cross-code steering group to confirm what work has been done ahead of the PTSN networks being decommissioned and what alternatives are being used by them.	January 2024	JO (KE)	Closed
1203	04/12/23	2.1	CDSP (ER) to check whether there are any other more appropriate alternatives to fax and consider which industry Workgroup is the most appropriate to discuss the technical aspects.	January 2024	NGT (GW)	Closed
0101	08/01/24	2.0	Following a review of the examples, CDSP (ER) to check whether there are any other more appropriate alternatives to fax and consider which industry Workgroup is the most appropriate to discuss the technical aspects.	TBC	CDSP (ER)	New Action