

UNC Transmission Workgroup Minutes

Thursday 02 May 2024

at Radcliffe House, Blenheim Court, Warwick Road, Solihull B91 2AA

Attendees		
Eric Fowler (Chair)	(EF)	Joint Office
Niamh Holden (Secretary)	(NH)	Joint Office
Adam Lane	(AL)	Spirit Energy
Alex Nield	(AN)	Storengy
Anna Shrigley	(AS)	ENI
Ash Adams	(AA)	National Gas Transmission (NGT)
Ben Stodel	(BS)	Perenco
Ben Hanley	(BH)	Northern Gas Networks
Bethan Winter	(BW)	Wales & West Utilities
Christiane Sykes	(CS)	Shell Energy
Chris Wright	(CWr)	Exxon Mobil
Conor McClarin*	(CM)	National Gas Transmission (NGT)
David Mitchell	(DM)	Scotia Gas Networks
David Rubini	(DR)	Vitol Group
Hannah Reddy*	(HR)	Corella on behalf of Xoserve
Gavin Williams*	(GW)	National Gas Transmission (NGT)
Jackie Atterton	(JA)	PX Limited
James Lomax	(JLo)	Cornwall Insight
Julie Cox*	(JCo)	Energy UK
Joseph Leggott	(JL)	Interconnector
Lauren Jauss	(LJ)	RWE
Marion Joste	(MJ)	ENI
Mark Field	(MF)	Sembcorp
Matthew Brown	(MB)	Ofgem
Michael Crowley	(MC)	Gas Networks Ireland
Nick Wye	(NW)	Waters Wye
Nicola Lond	(NL)	National Gas Transmission (NGT)
Ofordi Nabokei	(ON)	National Gas Transmission (NGT)
Phil Hobbins*	(PH)	National Gas Transmission (NGT)
Phil Lucas	(PH)	National Gas Transmission (NGT)
Richard Fairholme	(RF)	Uniper
Ritchard Hewitt	(RH)	Hewitt Home and Energy Solutions
Samantha Wilson	(SW)	Spirit Energy
Shiv Singh	(SS)	Cadent
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	SEFE Energy
Tim Gwinnell	(TG)	South Hook Gas
*at Radcliffe House, Solihull		
<i>This Workgroup meeting will be considered quorate provided at least two Transporter and two Shipper User representatives are present.</i>		

Please note these minutes do not replicate 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 papers are available at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/TX/020524>.

1. Introduction and Status Review

Eric Fowler (EF) welcomed all parties to the meeting and highlighted that the agenda would be shuffled so that the modification workgroups would be timed to fit with availability of relevant participants.

1.1. Approval of minutes (04 April 2024)

Alex Nield (AN) noted that Storengy has been incorrectly spelt on the attendees list on the minutes for April 2024. EF advised that this would be corrected, and a new version of the minutes would be published on the Joint Office website. No further amendments were requested by the Workgroup.

1.2. Approval of Late Papers

There were no late papers to record.

1.3. Review of Outstanding Actions

1002: Mercury Content - NGT (KA) to provide an update following further sampling and risk assessment.

Update: Carried Forward.

1.4. Industry Update from Ofgem

Matthew Brown (MB) provided an update from the latest Ofgem Expected Decision Dates (EDD) publication timetable at <https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/publications/code-modificationmodification-proposals-ofgem-decision-expected-publication-dates-timetable>:

Modification	Estimated Decision Date
0841 - Introduction of cost efficiency and transparency requirements for the CDSP Budget	17 May 2024
0842 - Gas Entry onto the Total system via an Independent Gas Transporter	TBC
0852 - Shipper notification in relation to option exercise for Customer Demand Side Response	Decision Received
0854 - Revision of Virtual Last Resort User and Contingent Procurement of Supplier Demand Event Triggers	10 May 2024
0857 - Revision to the Determination of Non-Transmission Services Gas Year Target Revenue	Decision Received 19 April 2024

MB provided the following updates:

Our joint consultation with DESNZ on code manager selection regulations and code manager licence conditions, remains open until 5 May.

*Our consultation on the implementation of Energy Code Reform closed on 23 April 2024. We are reviewing and analysing all responses received **and** will publish our decision in due course.*

We're grateful to industry colleagues who volunteered to join our Modification Process Workgroup (MPW). To ensure visibility for wider stakeholders we have published a list of members on our website: [Energy code reform: implementation consultation | Ofgem](#). We

held an introductory meeting with members of the MPW on 17 April. It was an opportunity for the group to meet, agree ways of working and discuss content and sequencing for future sessions. We expect there will be 5 meetings of the MPW between May – July this year. The outputs from the meetings will help inform our policy development ahead of our next consultation on implementing energy code reform. We'll provide updates from each of the sessions at panel meetings.'

Phil Lucas (PL) noted that impeding consequential changes to NESO won't be following a traditional Code Modification process, but that Ofgem are required to consult. PL believed that this was to be led by Ofgem on or after 17 May 2024.

Modification 0867

PL provided an update on Modification 0867. PL advised that Modification 0867 had been withdrawn. In the previous workgroup for Modification 0867, PL noted they had been working with a number of consumer associations in an attempt to quantify the DSR volume which may be released through the new aggregator mechanism. Receipt of feedback, following engagement with these consumer groups, revealed that there was insufficient demand and therefore NGT believed it was appropriate to withdraw the Modification. A Withdrawal Statement had been submitted with the rationale.

Please see the [Withdrawal Statement](#) for more information.

1.5. Pre-Modification Discussions

No Pre-Modifications were raised.

2. Transmission Change Horizon Plan

Gavin Williams (GW) provided an update on the National Gas Transmission Change Horizon and Gemini Sustain Plus, noting that going forward Sustain Plus Focus Groups will occur monthly, with the next focus group scheduled for 20 May 2024.

GW explained that the current focus is on programme engagement, noting that this is largely in the development and testing stage now. GW advised that anyone who is a user of Gemini to expect more regular focus groups, market trials and new user ID's.

GW encouraged participants to register for Market Trials via the link on the slides, noting the deadline of 13 May 2024.

GW advised that there is a new training package with different modules for participants to choose from, GW advised that this is due to go live two weeks prior to the commencement of Market Trials.

GW added that there are surgery slots being offered by the team which can be booked via the following link: <https://www.eventbrite.co.uk/e/gemini-sustain-plus-technical-surgeries-tickets-863804712147?aff=oddtcreator>.

Please refer to the [presentation slides](#) published for further information.

3. Workgroups

3.1. 0860S – Clarify impact of exit capacity holdings on offtake rights (Report to Panel 19 September 2024)

<https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0860>

3.2. 0867 – Gas Demand Side Responses (DSR) Aggregation Arrangements (Report to Panel 19 September 2024)

<https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0867>

3.3. 0870 – Amendments to Wobbe Index and Calorific Value Lower Limits at NTS

System Entry Points

(Report to Panel 19 September 2024)

<https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0870>

3.4. 0871 – Facilitating IGTs with NTS Entry

(Report to Panel 18 July 2024)

<https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0871>

3.5. 0872S – Single-sided Nominations for clearing houses of gas exchanges

(Report to Panel 15 August 2024)

<https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0872>

3.6. 0874S – Amendments to UNC to align with Gas Demand Forecasting Methodology

(Report to Panel 18 July 2024)

<https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0874>

4. Issues

None.

5. Any Other Business

CAM Network Code Provision

Conor McClarin (CM) advised the Workgroup that the CAM Network Code Provision for Europe is due for consultation on 8 May 2024 and it running for just over a month. CM advised that it would be focused on maximising capacity.

Julie Cox (JC) asked what participants could expect with the introduction of the Provision. CM advised that it had not formally been discussed as it had only been a week since the Madrid Forum had ended. CM advised that more detail would be provided within the next Workgroup.

System Update – NGT email addresses

Phil Hobbins (PH) advised that there was an IT project in place to separate IT systems completely from National Grid. PH highlighted that from 6 May 2024 any email sent to an NGT but addressed via their old National Grid address will not be auto-forwarded. PH asked that participants email NGT employees using their national gas email addresses as apposed to national grid.

6. Diary Planning

Transmission meetings are listed at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/TX>

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

Time / Date	Paper Publication Deadline	Venue	Programme
10:00 Thursday 06 June 2024	5 pm Tuesday 28 May 2024	Solihull/ Microsoft Teams	Standard Transmission Workgroup Agenda
10:00 Thursday 04 July 2024	5 pm Wednesday 26 June 2024	Solihull/ Microsoft Teams	Standard Transmission Workgroup Agenda
10:00 Thursday 01 August 2024	5 pm Wednesday 24 July 2024	Solihull/ Microsoft Teams	Standard Transmission Workgroup Agenda
10:00 Thursday 05 September 2024	5 pm Wednesday 28 August 2024	Solihull/ Microsoft Teams	Standard Transmission Workgroup Agenda

10:00 Thursday 02 October 2024	5 pm Wednesday 24 September 2024	Solihull/ Microsoft Teams	Standard Transmission Workgroup Agenda
10:00 Thursday 07 November 2024	5 pm Wednesday 30 October 2024	Solihull/ Microsoft Teams	Standard Transmission Workgroup Agenda
10:00 Thursday 05 December 2024	5 pm Wednesday 27 November 2024	Solihull/ Microsoft Teams	Standard Transmission Workgroup Agenda

Transmission Workgroup Action Table						
Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Reporting Month	Owner	Status Update
1002	05/10/23	5.1	<i>Mercury Content</i> - NGT (KA) to provide an update following further sampling and risk assessment	June 2024	NGT (KA)	Carried Forward

UNC Workgroup 0860S Minutes
Clarify impact of exit capacity holdings on offtake rights

Thursday 02 May 2024

at Radcliffe House, Blenheim Court, Warwick Road, Solihull B91 2AA

Attendees		
Eric Fowler (Chair)	(EF)	Joint Office
Niamh Holden (Secretary)	(NH)	Joint Office
Adam Lane	(AL)	Spirit Energy
Alex Nield	(AN)	Storengy
Anna Shrigley	(AS)	ENI
Ash Adams	(AA)	National Gas Transmission (NGT)
Ben Stodel	(BS)	Perenco
Ben Hanley	(BH)	Northern Gas Networks
Bethan Winter	(BW)	Wales & West Utilities
Christiane Sykes	(CS)	Shell Energy
Chris Wright	(CWr)	Exxon Mobil
Conor McClarin*	(CM)	National Gas Transmission
David Mitchell	(DM)	Scotia Gas Networks
David Rubini	(DR)	Vitol Group
Francis Gonsior	(FG)	European Commodity Clearing AG
Gavin Williams*	(GW)	National Gas Transmission
Hannah Reddy*	(HR)	Corella on behalf of Xoserve
Jackie Atterton	(JA)	PX Limited
James Lomax	(JLo)	Cornwall Insight
Julie Cox*	(JCo)	Energy UK
Joseph Leggett	(JL)	Interconnector
Lauren Jauss	(LJ)	RWE
Marion Joste	(MJ)	ENI
Mark Field	(MF)	Sembcorp
Matthew Brown	(MB)	Ofgem
Michael Crowley	(MC)	Gas Networks Ireland
Nick Wye	(NW)	Waters Wye
Nicola Lond	(NL)	National Gas Transmission
Ofordi Nabokei	(ON)	National Gas Transmission
Phil Hobbins*	(PH)	National Gas Transmission
Phil Lucas	(PH)	National Gas Transmission
Richard Fairholme	(RF)	Uniper
Ritchard Hewitt	(RH)	Hewitt Home and Energy Solutions
Samantha Wilson	(SW)	Spirit Energy
Shiv Singh	(SS)	Cadent
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	SEFE Energy
Tim Gwinnell	(TG)	South Hook Gas

**at Radcliffe House, Solihull*

The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 20 June 2024.

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

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/0860/020524>

1. Introduction and Status Review

Eric Fowler (EF) welcomed all parties to the meeting and pointed out that there had been some time since the last meeting and therefore invited the Proposer to refamiliarise the Workgroup with the Modification. .

The Proposer, Lauren Jaus (LJ) provided a brief overview of the Modification, explaining that its purpose is to remove the redundant text that implies that Users, who do not hold Exit Capacity, might have an increased risk of not being able to offtake gas in the short term. LJ explained that it is currently not clear what the offtake rights are compared to capacity holdings. LJ advised that the Modification has been raised for clarification of the rights of Users to offtake gas from the System.

1.1 Approval of Minutes (7 March 2024)

The minutes from the previous meeting were approved.

1.2 Approval of Late Papers

There were no late papers to record.

1.3 Review of Outstanding Actions

0101: NGT (PL) to clarify the difference between the Maximum permitted rate in accordance with paragraphs 3.10.2 and 3.10.3 and how is it different from the capitalised Maximum Permitted Offtake and whether they should be the same.

Update: Phil Lucas (PL) advised that this action had been completed and an action update in relation to the Maximum permitted rate and Maximum Permitted Offtake had been published on the Joint Office Website.

Please see the published [action update](#) for further information.

LJ advised that when looking into the terms within the UNC, it appears to vary depending on the context and the scenario it is describing. LJ noted that at first glance, they appear to be a defined terms, when they are not.

EF advised that the intention would be to discuss these terms within the Workgroup Report and requested clarification on whether the use of the terms is context specific. PL clarified that they are point type specific. **Action: Closed.**

2. Legal Text Review

Legal text is not yet available so LJ took the Workgroup through the Proposed Business Rules for the Modification.

The Workgroup reviewed the Proposed Business Rules and discussed the principles and their impact. Julie Cox (JC) noted that there appears to be some inconsistency within Section B. PL advised that these discussions had already been had and NGT's position was clear.

EF drew attention to this point advising that it had been outlined in an initial response which would be a relevant point for consideration in the Workgroup Report.

Business Rule 2

LJ explained that TPD Section J 3, clause 4.5.2. says a user 'shall not exceed' their capacity holding. Business Rule 2 would allow for submission of an Offtake Profile Notice that allows a user to exceed their capacity holding. LJ noted that, having spoken to PL she understands that NGT's intention under BAU is to accept an OPN but in times of system stress they may invoke the clause and decide that it is not valid and reject the OPN if they deem appropriate.

PL advised that they normally allow OPNs but wish to obtain the right to object but noted that NGT may support a softening of the wording used in 4.5.2 to something like "NGT is not obliged to accept".

LJ explained that by retaining the potential right to object, there are significant concerns for variable users who may not be able to secure capacity day-ahead at times of system stress. LJ noted that all of this can happen before a stage 1 network gas supply emergency and therefore it appears that flows are curtailed prematurely,

JC argued that at the time these decisions are being made on D-1 NGT hasn't got entry nominations. JC accepted that NGT needs to manage the system but the mechanism doesn't work. EF questioned what the consequence would be of ignoring an OPN. JC explained that it is never going to be completely accurate, that some OPNs are submitted at very short notice and gas may have already flowed by the time it is rejected, JC added that if gas generators can't participate in the balancing mechanism with confidence this would be an issue with the electricity market.

JC argued that you don't have to hold capacity to flow, when looking at the sections added since the Code was created it doesn't appear to knit together. JC added that the only time there is a right to require curtailment of flow is in network gas supply emergencies.

PL asked how this would be managed close to an emergency. JC advised that users could look to buy gas back as an offtake point, JC argued that the Code needs to be kept under review as the gas market has changed.

PH queried whether there is a timing issue, noting that it wouldn't make sense to release capacity when NGT are aware a constraint is coming. PH questioned if the timing was amended whether this would address the issue.

Business Rule 3

LJ explained that this refers to the points within the proposal and places an obligation on the transporter as there is currently no obligation on NGT to make gas available. LJ explained that there are no material implications of Business Rule.

Business Rule 4

LJ explained that Business Rule 4 is linked to Action 0101.

The Workgroup discussed the materiality of Business Rule 3 and 4 and whether they can be removed. LJ agreed that Business Rule 3 and 4 could be removed.

EF noted, from an administrative process point, that the face of the Modification would need to be amended to reflect this removal before they are able to instruct SGN to draft any Legal Text.

New Action 0501: Lauren Jauss (LJ) to provide JO with an amended version of the Modification.
--

PL questioned whether it was worth drafting some suggestive text for Business Rule 1 and 2 for David Mitchell (DM) to use when drafting the Legal Text. DM agreed that this would be helpful.

LJ agreed to draft some suggestive text, realising that Business Rule 1 and 2 are not very specific. LJ was of the view that the softened wording suggested by NGT would not work for the reasons discussed. PL argued that the current wording does not work for NGT in terms of system constraints. NGT believe that they should have the ability to reject OPNs and manage the system, PL noted that this message was given at the September 2022 webinar, NGT wish to remain consistent with the responses provided in that session.

JC questioned whether there was an issue with rejecting a constraint and was of the view that you can't restrict flow outside of an emergency.

SM agreed with the Modification approach but argued that the Business Rules require more clarity. SM suggested the drafting of a pre-emptive statement which drives the rationale of the Modification.

EF questioned whether the Modification was on course or whether a further extension would need to be requested from Panel. PL suggested that it would be better to seek an extension in the likely event that it is needed. SM agreed with PL, arguing it is better to request and not need it than to fail to deliver on time.

Conclusion of Workgroup Report

3. Next Steps

- Request extension from Panel until July
- Legal Text

4. Any Other Business

None.

5. Diary Planning

0860 meetings are listed at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0860>

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

Time / Date	Paper Publication Deadline	Venue	Workgroup Programme
10:00 Thursday 06 June 2024	5 pm Tuesday 28 May 2024	Solihull/ Microsoft Teams	Review of Legal Text

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Reporting Month	Owner	Status Update
0101	29/02/24	2.0	NGT (PL) to clarify the difference between the Maximum permitted rate in accordance with paragraphs 3.10.2 and 3.10.3 and how is it different from the capitalised Maximum Permitted Offtake and whether they should be the same.	March 2024	NGT (PL)	Closed
0501	02/05/24	2.0	Lauren Jauss (LJ) to provide JO with an amended version of the Modification	June 2024	LJ	Pending

**UNC Workgroup 0870 Minutes
Amendments to Wobbe Index and Calorific Value Lower Limits at
NTS System Entry Points**

Thursday 02 May 2024

at Radcliffe House, Blenheim Court, Warwick Road, Solihull B91 2AA

Attendees		
Eric Fowler (Chair)	(EF)	Joint Office
Niamh Holden (Secretary)	(NH)	Joint Office
Adam Lane	(AL)	Spirit Energy
Alex Nield	(AN)	Storengy
Anna Shrigley	(AS)	ENI
Ash Adams	(AA)	National Gas Transmission (NGT)
Ben Stodel	(BS)	Perenco
Ben Hanley	(BH)	Northern Gas Networks
Bethan Winter	(BW)	Wales & West Utilities
Christiane Sykes	(CS)	Shell Energy
Chris Wright	(CWr)	Exxon Mobil
Conor McClarin*	(CM)	National Gas Transmission
David Mitchell	(DM)	Scotia Gas Networks
David Rubini	(DR)	Vitol Group
Eleanor Kavanagh	(EC)	Ofgem
Hannah Reddy*	(HR)	Corella on behalf of Xoserve
Gavin Williams*	(GW)	National Gas Transmission
Jackie Atterton	(JA)	PX Limited
James Lomax	(JLo)	Cornwall Insight
Julie Cox*	(JCo)	Energy UK
Joseph Leggott	(JL)	Interconnector
Lauren Jauss	(LJ)	RWE
Marion Joste	(MJ)	ENI
Mark Field	(MF)	Sembcorp
Matthew Brown	(MB)	Ofgem
Michael Crowley	(MC)	Gas Networks Ireland
Nick Wye	(NW)	Waters Wye
Nicola Lond	(NL)	National Gas Transmission
Ofordi Nabokei	(ON)	National Gas Transmission
Phil Hobbins*	(PH)	National Gas Transmission
Phil Lucas	(PH)	National Gas Transmission
Richard Fairholme	(RF)	Uniper
Ritchard Hewitt	(RH)	Hewitt Home and Energy Solutions
Samantha Wilson	(SW)	Spirit Energy
Shiv Singh	(SS)	Cadent

Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	SEFE Energy
Tim Gwinnell	(TG)	

**at Radcliffe House*

The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 19 September 2024.

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

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/0870/020524>

1. Introduction and Status Review

Eric Fowler (EF) welcomed all parties to the meeting.

1.1 Approval of Minutes (04 April 2024)

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

0401: NGT (PH/ON) to discuss and make an initial assessment on options to implement more transparency of Gas quantity information, to be discussed within the next Workgroup.

Update: Ofordi Nabokei (ON) took the Workgroup through the following GSMR Data Provision Options:

Option 1: Publish CV and Wobbe data measured at GDN offtake points.

ON explained that in order to implement this option, consent would be required from Gas Distribution Networks, as there are issues around confidentiality of gas quality data. Should consent be granted, NGT believe that the maximum refresh of data would be 14 minutes.

ON explained that this option is beneficial to all parties, but NGT are currently unsure as to how many parties would use the data and how useful it would be.

Option 2: Publish all parameters that are currently measured at GDN offtake points (CV, RD, Wobbe, N₂ & CO₂)

ON noted that Option 2 is essentially the same as Option 1 but would include relative density, nitrogen and CO₂ data would also be published.

Steve Mulinganie (SM) questioned whether Option 2 is significantly more work than Option 1, noting that the more information published the better. Ash Adams (AA) advised that the system delivery team are currently working on the figures required to feed into the amount of data points, AA confirmed that it may be marginally more work when compared to Option 1.

Michael Crowley (MC) thanked NGT for providing options for Data Provision and noted that Gas Networks Ireland tend to receive queries in relation to CO₂ content and therefore they would prefer for Option 2 to be implemented. MC added that this implementation would go some way to meeting Gas Networks Ireland's requirements.

Jeff Chandler (JC) questioned whether the data published would include direct connect offtake points. AA advised that DN offtake points would be included as this is telemetered, AA explained that there is a small number of NTS pressure stations, and they would look to publish this data from these stations but that these options would not include direct connect and the data at NTS entry points.

ON added that NGT's sees its role as looking to facilitate the publication and there is scope to look into additional options in the future.

Adam Lane (AL) asked whether the data to be published is already available to NGT or would need to be telemetered. AA confirmed that NGT already have access to this data and the only issue that remains is the consent required from GDNs.

Lauren Jauss (LJ) noted that the options provided are a step in the right direction, adding that Option 2 would add value as parties would not only be able to see the CV on the network, but it may also provide insight as to why the CV is as it is.

Julie Cox (JC) asked whether consent has been sought from GDNs. ON confirmed that both Option 1 and Option 2 had been shared with GDNs, but a response had not yet been received, ON asked whether any GDN's would like to raise any concerns in relation to consent.

Shiv Singh (SS) advised that Cadent had invested to secure this data and it seemed that industry now require it to be published at further cost. JC argued that if the data is already provided to NGT, they just need consent to publish it, JC noted that there doesn't appear to be any issue in relation to cost in this respect.

BW advised that WWU had no issue with providing consent. BW noted that it would be helpful for GDNs to be provided with forecast gas quality data because that would help them inform their bio-methane sites on required blending to accept gas into the system.

Ben Hanley (BH) noted that NGT already have this data from NGN and they have no problem with providing consent.

JC asked whether the data, when published, would be available in MIPI so that it can be queried, and the data can be monitored. ON advised that it parties would have to go into MIPI to access the data, and that a table would be available with the information. ON noted that if parties would like to be able to run reports or if a graph is more helpful then this is the time to discuss these needs.

PH advised that the purpose of the Workgroup today is to provide participants with the potential options available and there could then be a follow up discussion. PH asked for Workgroup participants to provide NGT with a written statement on how Option 2 would be beneficial to their business as this could then be used to evaluate the cost/benefit.

New Action 0501: Workgroup participants to write to NGT explaining how Option 2 would be of benefit to their business.

JC observed that 14 minutes for a refresh of data seemed quite a long time. AA advised that the 14 minutes is comprised of the time in the SCADA system, which is updated every few minutes which is added onto the refresh time of the gas data portal. AA advised that if they wanted to reduce this time a new system would be needed, which would come at considerably more cost but would take this point away and discuss this with systems team. JC noted that it may be helpful for participants to understand more about this timing.

MC echoed JC's comment, noting that it may also be helpful to understand whether this would be an automatic feed of data as they would not want for someone to have to manually refresh it 24/7. JC added that these options may not be useful for those who do not have GDN offtake points upstream.

Option 3: Publish Wobbe Index, Calorific Value at entry points (incomers vs feeders)

ON advised that there were potentially different places where data can be measured, either from DFOs, on NGT feeders or at consumers close to entry points. Gas quality can be measured when comingled and then there would likely be no issue with confidentiality. ON noted that there would be a concern where there is only a single source of gas including occasions where a normally co-mingled stream is affected by outages so there is only one supply.

JC noted that the data from GDNs may be better for some sites, JC suggested that parties could carry out their own modelling if they have the raw data. JC argued that if the data is available to NGT then they should have no issue with publishing it.

ON advised that in the entry agreements DFOs have with NGT there are usually confidentiality clauses. PH explained that it is difficult to achieve this change through a Code Modification as facility operators are not party to the code but have bilateral contracts. PH noted that this is one of the reasons why NGT believe publishing GDN data is the preferred option as there are relatively few people who need to consent to the publication.

JC noted that it may be useful to have a discussion with Ofgem and DESNZ in order to raise the issue to a higher level, arguing that it should not be an issue to publish real time flow information.

ON asked DFOs within the meeting whether they had any views. No comments were received from the Workgroup. Christiane Sykes (CS) advised that silence should not be taken as confirmation that DFOs are happy with the option. ON noted that it would be helpful for DFOs to take this away and provide responses to NGT. ON noted that in order for NGT to progress any of these options, they require evidence from participants as to why they believe each option would be beneficial.

Option 4: Publish Wobbe Index, Calorific Value, only at entry points downstream of which there are sensitive customers e.g., CCGTs.

PH advised that Option 4 is a subset of Option 3 and is useful for data for sensitive parties to spot and take action on gas quality fluctuations.

JC suggested that it would be useful to have a definition of what a sensitive customer is, arguing that there should be some customers may need some support. PH agreed that a criterion for what a sensitive customer is needed and to what extent they are sensitive.

BW questioned whether any of the options could be future proofed for hydrogen. ON advised that in the last column of the table provided notes whether an option can be future proofed, ON advised that in principle the majority of the options can.

Jackie Atterton (JA) noted that Option 3 is preferable to Option 4 as it creates a more level level playing field for investment by DFOs.

Option 5: Produce 'heat maps' of where low Wobbe Gas might feature.

ON advised that this would provide forward looking data from relevant DFOs, however this would not account for excursions and assumes there is a steady state of flow. PH added that when the Modification was raised, it was believed that this option would be essential but when considering excursions, the question needs to be asked as to whether these 'heat maps' would be useful.

JC noted that this would depend on what is included within the 'heat maps', adding that they may have some value.

PH suggested that NGT could carry out analysis to be brought to Workgroup, to include the best view of the worst-case scenario and asked if Modification 0870 is implemented, would there be any value of 'heat maps' provided on an annual basis? MC advised that this would be helpful, especially in relation to St Fergus, noting that it could help address concerns in respect of the number of days in which a low Wobbe limit could be expected.

PH added that this might also involve parties having to be in the process who don't have the limit and delivery operators can consider what they would be happy to provide and meet the expectations. PH questioned how DFOs feel about this.

Steve Mulinganie (SM) asked whether more than one option could be implement, adding that it would be helpful to be provided with the potential costs of these options. ON advised that it is not one or the other, but NGT need to know the best options and why and then should be able to provide a ROM.

JA noted, in respect of the forward-looking aspect of heat maps, that it does not mitigate unexpected events, suggesting that there might be something that can be done in respect of outages.

Option 6: Automated email alert of real time change in Wobbe Index & CV due to gas change.

ON advised that this is not something NGT currently do, and they are currently unclear how this can be delivered at present as there is a degree of resource intensiveness.

JC argued that it depends on variability of the other options, the cost and time of implementation, noting that it depends on what can be done, if this is the only option which can be implemented that it is worth doing. AA advised that there would not be a scenario in which this option could be done, and the others could not, explaining that the measurement that would trigger this alert would rely on the data published and therefore the confidentially barriers would remain.

Option 7: Forecast Service of Gas Quality Data – CV & Wobbe Index

ON explained this may not provide the meaningful data participants require and the consent for data would be required as with the other options. ON explained that the forecast would likely only be able to be a few hours ahead at most, the shorter the timeline, the more accurate the forecast.

ON advised that NGT would first look into Option 2 and the cost and time needed to implement this. JC advised that this would be a good place to start as entry data is more helpful to more people. ON added that NGT wanted a steer from the Workgroup so that they can work on a plan, noting that further discussion is needed at a later date.

Action: Closed

<p>New Action 0502: NGT to follow up with Heating and Hot Water Industry Council on the potential benefits of gas quality data publication for domestic gas engineers, and with industrial consumer associations.</p>
--

<p>New Action 0503: NGT to provide indicative cost and time of delivering Option 1 and 2</p>

New Action 0504: GDNs to advise if they are willing to give consent for NGT to publish gas quality data measured at DN offtakes.

New Action 0505: Delivery Facility Operators that have requested the lower wobbe limit to consider if they would be willing / able to share a forward look on outages / indicative wobbe range that could be published in respect of their NTS entry point.

2. Workgroup Discussion

No further discussion.

3. Next Steps

- Review of indicative cost and time of delivering Option 1 and 2.

4. Any Other Business

None raised.

5. Diary Planning

Transmission meetings are listed at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/TX>

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

Time / Date	Paper Publication Deadline	Venue	Workgroup Programme
10:00 Thursday 06 June 2024	5 pm Tuesday 28 May 2024	Solihull/ Microsoft Teams	TBC
10:00 Thursday 04 July 2024	5 pm Wednesday 26 June 2024	Solihull/ Microsoft Teams	TBC
10:00 Thursday 01 August 2024	5 pm Wednesday 24 July 2024	Solihull/ Microsoft Teams	TBC
10:00 Thursday 05 September 2024	5 pm Wednesday 28 August 2024	Solihull/ Microsoft Teams	TBC

0870 Workgroup Action Table

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Reporting Month	Owner	Status Update
0401	04/04/24	1.0	NGT (PH/ON) to discuss and make an initial assessment on options to implement more transparency of Gas quantity information, to be	May 2024	National Gas (PH)	Closed

0870 Workgroup Action Table						
Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Reporting Month	Owner	Status Update
			discussed within the next Workgroup.			
0501	02/05/24	1.3	Workgroup participants to write to NGT explaining how Option 2 would be of benefit to their business	June 2024	Workgroup	Pending
0502	02/05/24	1.3	NGT to follow up with Heating and Hot Water Industry Council on the potential benefits of gas quality data publication for domestic gas engineers, and with industrial consumer associations	June 2024	National Gas	Pending
0503	02/05/24	1.3	NGT to provide indicative cost and time of delivering Option 1 and 2	July 2024	National Gas	Pending
0504	02/05/24	1.3	GDNs to advise if they are willing to give consent for NGT to publish gas quality data measured at DN offtakes.	June 2024	GDNs	Pending
0505	02/05/24	1.3	Delivery Facility Operators that have requested the lower wobbe limit to consider if they would be willing / able to share a forward look on outages / indicative wobbe range that could be published in respect of their NTS entry point.	June 2024	DFOs	Pending

**Workgroup 0871 Minutes
Facilitating IGTs with NTS Entry
Thursday 02 May 2024**

at Radcliffe House, Blenheim Court, Warwick Road, Solihull B91 2AA

Attendees		
Eric Fowler (Chair)	(EF)	Joint Office
Niamh Holden (Secretary)	(NH)	Joint Office
Adam Lane	(AL)	Spirit Energy
Alex Nield	(AN)	Storengy
Anna Shrigley	(AS)	ENI
Amy Howarth	(AH)	Storengy
Ash Adams	(AA)	National Gas Transmission (NGT)
Ben Stodel	(BS)	Perenco
Ben Hanley	(BH)	Northern Gas Networks
Bethan Winter	(BW)	Wales & West Utilities
Christiane Sykes	(CS)	Shell Energy
Chris Wright	(CW)	Exxon Mobil
Conor McClarin*	(CM)	National Gas Transmission
David Mitchell	(DM)	Scotia Gas Networks
David Rubini	(DR)	Vitol Group
Eleanor Cavanagh	(EC)	Ofgem
Ellie Rodgers	(ER)	Xoserve
Hannah Reddy*	(HR)	Corella on behalf of Xoserve
Gavin Williams*	(GW)	National Gas Transmission
Jackie Atterton	(JA)	PX Limited
James Lomax	(JLo)	Cornwall Insight
Julie Cox*	(JCo)	Energy UK
Joseph Leggett	(JLo)	Interconnector
Josie Lewis	(JLe)	Xoserve
Lauren Jauss	(LJ)	RWE
Marion Joste	(MJ)	ENI
Mark Field	(MF)	Sembcorp
Matthew Brown	(MB)	Ofgem
Michael Crowley	(MC)	Gas Networks Ireland
Nick Wye	(NW)	Waters Wye
Nicola Lond	(NL)	National Gas Transmission
Ofordi Nabokei	(ON)	National Gas Transmission
Phil Hobbins*	(PH)	National Gas Transmission
Phil Lucas	(PH)	National Gas Transmission
Richard Fairholme	(RF)	Uniper
Ritchard Hewitt	(RH)	Hewitt Home and Energy Solutions
Samantha Wilson	(SW)	Spirit Energy

Shiv Singh	(SS)	Cadent
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	SEFE Energy
Steve Pownall	(SP)	Xoserve
Tim Davis	(TD)	Barrow Gas Shipping
Tim Gwinnell	(TG)	South Hook Gas

**at Radcliffe House, Solihull*

The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 18 July 2024.

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

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/0871/020524>

1.0 Outline of Modification

Eric Fowler (EF) welcomed all parties to the meeting.

Tim Davis (TD) introduced the modification and explained that its purpose is to clarify the treatment of energy entering the NTS if it has entered an IGT Network. TD explained that the proposal was simple and that a number of developers are looking at injecting biomethane which could flow to the NTS but under current rules they might not be paid for all their gas.

TD provided an overview of the definitional problem of biomethane flowing to NTS. TD explained gas enters from an anaerobic digester (AD) plant, it then goes into compressors and may then go into the NTS.

TD explained that when the concept of the Total System was introduced, it matched what was Transco. When gas enters the GB pipeline system, it is metered. However, under the prevailing UNC terms if there is a point of delivery to the NTS that would be treated as a new Aggregate System Entry Point (ASEP) and there is therefore potential for the gas to be counted twice, once where it enters from the AD and once at the NTS.

The solution proposed is to account for gas when it enters and exits the GB gas network as having entered the Total System. If this is done, no ASEP would be created, and no gas would be double counted. TD confirmed that the Modification has no intention to deal with the NTS issues and should participants want to discuss this, then he suggested a review group be set up.

The Workgroup discussed the process of Biomethane being injected into the network and whether a DN is informed when gas enters the total system via an iGT network. Richard Fairholme (RF) advised that the gas is metered and then entered into Gemini but there is no nomination of entry capacity. Anna Shrigley (AS) echoed RF’s confusion of the double counting element of the justification for the Modification.

Nick Wye (NW) understood that if there is a shipper on the pipeline, ownership of the gas at the IGT entry point is not considered to be allocated but requested clarification on whether this is recognised on Gemini as if not, it would be the wrong reference point and would not be double counted. TD explained that in this case there is potential for half counting rather than double counting.

Steve Mulinganie (SM) thought that the Modification would be helpful as shippers want to be treated as a DN would be treated but suggested that TD provide some examples of potential scenarios to address any confusion felt by other participants. TD agreed that examples could be provided.

New Action 0501: Tim Davis (TD) to provide a walkthrough of different scenarios to ensure common level of understanding of Modification.

Phil Hobbins (PH) asked whether the Modification can be delivered without addressing the wider issues and questioned whether there would be precedent if 0842 is implemented. PH added that this may deliver a helpful precedent for what TD is hoping to achieve.

AS noted, that any examples that could demonstrate how this Modification would work, would be appreciated. AS asked if code consolidation might resolve the problem and invited TD to think about the broader consequences of the Modification for hydrogen injection

TD advised that the urgency is that there are currently investors who want to spend millions of pounds on plants but who are unable to wait five years for code consolidation to happen.

SM highlighted that the questions raised by panel show the confusion replicated in this meeting, suggesting that TD must lead everyone else through the Modification and explain why it is a simple solution. SM added that it didn't seem beneficial to discuss the Panel questions at this stage. TD agreed and explained that the questions raised by Panel do not apply as the scope of the Modification is limited.

TD questioned whether Legal Text could be drafted for the next Workgroup. PH advised that they most likely wait to be informed by the text for Modification 0842, noting that it might be too soon to consider drafting Legal Text considering the questions which have been raised.

2.0 Initial Discussion

2.1. Issues and Questions from Panel

2.1.1. What commercial process applies at the interface between the IGT exit and NTS entry?

TD confirmed that this is not affected by the Modification.

2.1.2. Consider potential impacts on Shippers, for example metering tolerance error.

TD advised that the impacts on Shippers happen with and without the Modification.

2.1.3. Consider whether there are consequential impacts of this Modification.

Not considered.

2.1.4. Does the flow of gas from an IGT into the NTS comply with the existing UNC principles of "upstream" and "downstream" systems and parties?

Not considered.

2.2. Initial Representations

None received.

2.3. Terms of Reference

As matters have been referred from Panel a specific Terms of Reference will be published alongside the Modification at www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0871

3.0 Next Steps

None.

4.0 Any Other Business

None.

5.0 Diary Planning

0871 meetings are listed at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0871>

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

Time / Date	Paper Publication Deadline	Venue	Workgroup Programme
10:00 Wednesday 06 June 2024	5 pm Tuesday 28 May 2024	Microsoft Teams	TBC
10:00 Thursday 04 July 2024	5 pm Wednesday 26 June 2024	Solihull/ Microsoft Teams	TBC

0871 Workgroup Action Table						
Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Reporting Month	Owner	Status Update
0501	02/05/24	1.0	Tim Davis (TD) to provide a walkthrough of different scenarios to ensure common level of understanding of Modification	June 2024	TD	Pending

Workgroup 0872S Minutes
Single-sided Nominations for clearing houses of gas exchanges
Thursday 02 May 2024

at Radcliffe House, Blenheim Court, Warwick Road, Solihull B91 2AA

Attendees		
Eric Fowler (Chair)	(EF)	Joint Office
Niamh Holden (Secretary)	(NH)	Joint Office
Adam Lane	(AL)	Spirit Energy
Alex Nield	(AN)	Storengy
Anna Shrigley	(AS)	ENI
Ash Adams	(AA)	National Gas Transmission (NGT)
Ben Stodel	(BS)	Perenco
Ben Hanley	(BH)	Northern Gas Networks
Bethan Winter	(BW)	Wales & West Utilities
Christiane Sykes	(CS)	Shell Energy
Chris Wright	(CWr)	Exxon Mobil
Conor McClarin*	(CM)	National Gas Transmission
David Mitchell	(DM)	Scotia Gas Networks
David Rubini	(DR)	Vitol Group
Francis Gonsior	(FG)	European Commodity Clearing AG
Gavin Williams*	(GW)	National Gas Transmission
Hannah Reddy*	(HR)	Corella on behalf of Xoserve
Jackie Atterton	(JA)	PX Limited
James Lomax	(JLo)	Cornwall Insight
Julie Cox*	(JCo)	Energy UK
Joseph Leggott	(JL)	Interconnector
Lauren Jauss	(LJ)	RWE
Marion Joste	(MJ)	ENI
Mark Field	(MF)	Sembcorp
Matthew Brown	(MB)	Ofgem
Michael Crowley	(MC)	Gas Networks Ireland
Nick Wye	(NW)	Waters Wye
Nicola Lond	(NL)	National Gas Transmission
Ofordi Nabokei	(ON)	National Gas Transmission
Phil Hobbins*	(PH)	National Gas Transmission
Phil Lucas	(PH)	National Gas Transmission
Richard Fairholme	(RF)	Uniper
Ritchard Hewitt	(RH)	Hewitt Home and Energy Solutions
Samantha Wilson	(SW)	Spirit Energy
Shiv Singh	(SS)	Cadent
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	SEFE Energy
Tim Gwinnell	(TG)	South Hook

**at Radcliffe House, Solihull*

The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 18 July 2024.

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

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/0872/020524>

1.0 Outline of Modification

Francois Gonsior (FG) introduced the modification, explaining that its purpose is to improve the security and effectiveness of the gas market by enabling clearing houses to clear trades with single-sided trade nominations.

FG explained that European Commodity Clearing AG (ECC) is responsible for making the nominations for trades that are done on the exchange. FG explained that clearing houses other than ICE cannot currently make use of single side nominations. This creates an operationally problematic situation.

A solution had previously been formulated in which customers provide clearing houses with their system logins, so that they can enter nominations on their behalf. FG noted that the current process provides a cybersecurity issue and explained that the proposed Modification would help move away from the current process.

FG questioned how ICE clear trades with single-sided trade nominations. Eric Fowler (EF) identified that there were no ICE representatives in the meeting. FG suggested that it may be due to them being the OCM operator and having special facilities. JC queried whether the ability to perform single side nominations for shipper trades was an activity beyond the scope of the OCM.

Anna Shrigley (AS) added that Shippers automatically see the transactions which are automatically posted on Gemini. AS supported the Modification, explaining that it would be an improvement over shippers handing over their log-in details.

FG explained that the solution of the Modification would include a change in the Code and potentially a change to the Gemini system so that clearing houses don't have to do a counter nomination on behalf of the customer.

Julie Cox (JC) queried whether the Modification intended to create a new role entity. FG believed that it would require a new role and this role would help facilitate single-side nominations. JC questioned what would happen if a party was no longer a OCM operator. FG advised that ICE would then face this problem, adding that the Modification would set a level playing field for all exchanges.

Gavin Williams (GW) questioned whether the current workaround by ECC is to use a Shipper's logins. FG confirmed that Gemini logins currently have an IGSM role which only allows clearing houses to do nominations or renominations and that is currently what is being used.

GW advised that the term clearing house is mentioned in TPD section V but noted that he was unsure whether this was a defined term. GW queried whether a solution could be ringfenced if clearing house was a defined term. FG advised that ECC were not experts on the UNC so was unable to advise.

AS advised that all UNC users are currently required to sign/submit a form to Xoserve which says that a shipper has appointed a clearing house to deal with these types of nominations as their agent.

JC noted that it appears that there could be a functionality there which isn't discussed in the solution. FG advised that the functionality is currently tied to OCM trades.

The Workgroup discussed the drafting of a ROM and the potential costs that could be incurred for the Modification if there is a need for changes to systems. Hannah Reddy (HR) advised that they had started looking at the system, looking into the directory to see what roles currently exist. HR confirmed that there is sufficient information to start enquiries.

New Action 0501: Hannah Reddy (HR) to provide the Workgroup with further insight into what the system is doing and the potential for extension of the functionality.

FG questioned whether participants agreed that the Modification would be self-governance. EF advised that this is evaluated against a set of criteria. SM was of the view that the Modification would be material and therefore would need Ofgem approval.

AS argued that it was a non-material change and there was no impact on other parties, AS noted that a Shipper would still have to provide Xoserve with an appointment form so that clearing houses could submit these nominations on behalf of Shippers. PH agreed but noted that materiality may depend on the cost required for implementation.

SM suggested that this information be included within the final Modification report and then Panel would be able to consider it.

NGT members and FG agreed to liaise offline to determine whether the current Code drafting can be used as is and the information required for the drafting of the ROM.

New Action 0502: Gavin Williams (GW) to liaise with FG help with the mentions of clearing houses within the UNC and to determine whether the drafting of the Modification can be used as-is or whether amendment is required.

2.0 Initial Discussion

2.1. Issues and Questions from Panel

None raised.

2.2. Initial Representations

None raised.

2.3. Terms of Reference

The standard UNC Workgroup Terms of Reference will apply and is available at www.gasgovernance.co.uk/mods

3.0 Next Steps

The following next steps were confirmed:

- Review of Amended Modification

4.0 Any Other Business

None.

5.0 Diary Planning

Transmission meetings are listed at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/TX>

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

Time / Date	Paper Publication Deadline	Venue	Workgroup Programme
-------------	----------------------------	-------	---------------------

10:00 Thursday 06 June 2024	5 pm Tuesday 28 May 2024	Solihull/ Microsoft Teams	Review of Amended Modification
10:00 Thursday 04 July 2024	5 pm Wednesday 26 June 2024	Solihull/ Microsoft Teams	TBC

0872 Workgroup Action Table						
Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Reporting Month	Owner	Status Update
0501	02/05/24	1.0	Hannah Reddy (HR) to provide the Workgroup with further insight into what the system is doing and the potential for extension of the functionality.	June 2024	HR	Pending
0502	02/05/24	1.0	Gavin Williams (GW) to liaise with FG to help with the mentions of clearing houses within the UNC and determine whether the drafting of the Modification can be used as is or further amendment is required.	June 2024	GW (NGT)	Pending

**Workgroup 0874S Minutes
Amendments to UNC to align with Gas Demand Forecasting
Methodology**

Thursday 02 May 2024

at Radcliffe House, Blenheim Court, Warwick Road, Solihull B91 2AA

Attendees		
Eric Fowler (Chair)	(EF)	Joint Office
Niamh Holden (Secretary)	(NH)	Joint Office
Adam Lane	(AL)	Spirit Energy
Alex Nield	(AN)	Storengy
Anna Shrigley	(AS)	ENI
Ash Adams	(AA)	National Gas Transmission (NGT)
Ben Stodel	(BS)	Perenco
Ben Hanley	(BH)	Northern Gas Networks
Bethan Winter	(BW)	Wales & West Utilities
Christiane Sykes	(CS)	Shell Energy
Chris Wright	(CWr)	Exxon Mobil
Conor McClarin*	(CM)	National Gas Transmission
David Mitchell	(DM)	Scotia Gas Networks
David Rubini	(DR)	Vitol Group
Hannah Reddy*	(HR)	Corella on behalf of Xoserve
Gavin Williams*	(GW)	National Gas Transmission
Jackie Atterton	(JA)	PX Limited
James Lomax	(JLo)	Cornwall Insight
Julie Cox*	(JCo)	Energy UK
Joseph Leggott	(JL)	Interconnector
Lauren Jauss	(LJ)	RWE
Marion Joste	(MJ)	ENI
Mark Field	(MF)	Sembcorp
Matthew Brown	(MB)	Ofgem
Michael Crowley	(MCr)	Gas Networks Ireland
Nick Wye	(NW)	Waters Wye
Nicola Lond	(NL)	National Gas Transmission
Ofordi Nabokei	(ON)	National Gas Transmission
Phil Hobbins*	(PH)	National Gas Transmission
Phil Lucas	(PH)	National Gas Transmission
Richard Fairholme	(RF)	Uniper
Ritchard Hewitt	(RH)	Hewitt Home and Energy Solutions
Samantha Wilson	(SW)	Spirit Energy
Shiv Singh	(SS)	Cadent
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	SEFE Energy
Tim Gwinnell	(TG)	South Hook

**at Radcliffe House, Solihull*

The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 18 July 2024.

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

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/0874/020524>

1.0 Outline of Modification

Conor McClarin (CM) introduced Modification 0874 and explained that the purpose of the Modification is to update and align the Uniform Network Code (UNC) with National Gas Transmission's (NGT) terminology for forecasting gas demand.

CM explained that following a review of the UNC by a third-party consultant, it was evident that there were out of date references within, which were misaligned with NGT's license, and the Modification proposes to update these references. CM confirmed that the proposed changes do not affect the methodologies used.

Julie Cox (JC) questioned whether these changes would also be made to distribution. CM confirmed that he would take this query away.

New Action 0105: CM to confirm whether the proposed changes affect Distribution Network forecasts.

CM provided the Workgroup with an overview of what sections are to be changed within the UNC and showed a side-by-side comparison of the legal text – see published Appendix A at [Workgroup 0874S 02 May 2024 | Joint Office of Gas Transporters \(gasgovernance.co.uk\)](#)

- Section N, 1.2.1 e) of the Offtake Arrangements Document
- Section C, 2.6 of General Terms
- Section H, 1.3 of Offtake Arrangements Document
- Section H, Part 1 and 2 of Forecast information to be provided by DNO, of Offtake Arrangements Document
- Section O, 1.1 of Transportation Principal Document
- Section O, 1.2 of Transportation Principal Document
- Section O, 1.3 of Transportation Principal Document
- Section O, 3.3.3 of Transportation Principal Document
- Section O, 4 of Transportation Principal Document

In reference to the changes proposed to Section O, 1.2, 1.3 and 4 of the Transportation Principal Document, JC questioned whether the term “Long Term Development Statement”, would continue to be used due to impending changes to the UNC process. CM advised that the proposal as drafted does not anticipate other future changes in the UNC.

Phil Hobbins (PH) suggested that CM discuss the potential impact of the impending changes with Phil Lucas (PL) and what impact this could have on the wording used. CM confirmed he would discuss this with PL.

CM advised that the changes to the documents are minor and only seek to correct or remove terms that are not correctly aligned or are now irrelevant. CM noted that more detail would be provided within the next Workgroup meeting.

2.0 Initial Discussion

2.1. Issues and Questions from Panel

None received.

2.2. Initial Representations

None received.

2.3. Terms of Reference

The standard UNC Workgroup Terms of Reference will apply and is available at www.gasgovernance.co.uk/mods

Workgroup Participants agreed that the changes appeared to be minor and non-controversial. EF suggested that a draft Workgroup Report could be reviewed at the next meeting.

3.0 Next Steps

The following next steps were confirmed:

Drafting of Workgroup Report.

4.0 Any Other Business

None.

5.0 Diary Planning

0874 meetings are listed at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0874>

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

Time / Date	Paper Publication Deadline	Venue	Workgroup Programme
10:00 Thursday 06 June 2024	5 pm Tuesday 28 May 2024	Solihull/ Microsoft Teams	TBC
10:00 Thursday 04 July 2024	5 pm Wednesday 26 June 2024	Solihull/ Microsoft Teams	TBC

0874 Workgroup Action Table						
Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Reporting Month	Owner	Status Update
0105	2/5/24	1.0	CM to confirm whether the proposed changes affect Distribution Network forecasts.	June	CM (NGT)	Pending