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, N_2 & CO_2)

ON noted that Option 2 is essentially the same as Option 1 but would include relative density, nitrogen and CO_2 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 CO_2 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 DNs.

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.

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

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.

OF 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.

OF 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. OF noted that it would be helpful for DFOs to take this away and provide responses to NGT. OF 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. OF advised that in the last column of the table provided notes whether an option can be future proofed, OF 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.

OF 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. OF 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.

OF 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

OF explained this may not provide the meaningful data participants require and the consent for data would be required as with the other options. OF 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.

OF 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. OF 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

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.

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

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**