

**Attendees:**

Adam Pearce (AP) – ESP  
Aleksandra Cebo (AC) - EDF  
Andrew Margan (AM) – British Gas  
Bryan Hale (BH) – EDF Energy  
David Bowles – Fulcrum\*  
Gethyn Howard (GH) – GTC\*  
Katy Binch (KB) – ESP  
Kay Mackey – GTC\*  
Kiran Samra (KS) – Npower  
Kristian Pilling (KP) – SSE *Chair*  
Maria Hesketh (MH) – Scottish Power  
Rory Edwards (RH) – Ofgem  
Trevor Clark (TC) – E.ON  
*\*via teleconference*

Note – Gemserv were not present at any stage of this meeting.

**1) Update on iGT062/A/AA**

**iGT062A:** AP provided advised that Igt62A would remain active till the modifications reach the iGT UNC Modification Panel.

**iGT062AA:**GH confirmed Igt062AA is also remaining active. GH put forward two cost recovery mechanisms that would allow iGTs to pass on the costs of the Modification Workstreams to Shippers,

1. Place an additional line in the Transportation Charging Statements.
2. A three way contract between Shippers, iGTs and the Code Administrator.

Drawing upon recent industry experience, AM advised a three way contract would be difficult because (a) a three way contract is difficult to agree, citing the high number of parties that would be represented, and (b) the cost of administering an invoicing scheme could easily outstrip the costs that need to be recovered. TC drew attention to the potential requirement of setting up a Special Purpose Vehicle and the associated costs in doing do, in order to satisfy a joint agreement with all three parties. Other parties agreed with the direction and outcome of this debate and there a level of consensus that a three-way contract could be problematic.

TC noted that placing an additional line in the Transportation Charging Statement may not be required and was of the view that the price control already allows for administration of the code. KP (as SSE) supported this view. AP noted this is an additional cost, KP offered the alternative view that iGTs have made a saving over the years that secretariat services have not been provided in the development of modifications. RE questioned the outcome of GHs meeting with a colleague at Ofgem, GH confirmed it had been discussed at a high level but Ofgem did not commit to a view on whether iGTs can pass on the costs to Shippers.

GH further advised that in support of passing on charges to Shippers, analysis showed that transportation is around £10 cheaper than GT Supply Points. TC stated this was not correct.

There was also a general discussion on the longevity of these plans. TC noted that it was anticipated there will be fewer Modifications as a result of Single Service Provision. KP concurred, advising the operational aspects of the code appear to be reduced by approximately two thirds. Shippers sought to establish whether the transportation costs would be reduced in the event that there was a reduction in meetings.

KP questioned what the costs for 12 Workstream meetings would be, on the basis that it would be helpful for all parties to know what the cost recovery mechanism would be looking to recover. IGTs stated this was commercially sensitive and could not be disclosed.

**Action:** GH to provide a paper detailing the cost recovery options (transportation/ three way contract)

**iGT062:** KP referenced the amended modification and that it had formally incorporated the iGT062A Workstream concept as a number of the points of other consensus the work group reached at the previous meeting. The following sections of the Solution had been amended,

#### Notice of Meetings

As per work group consensus, this now references fixed meeting dates. AM noted it would be beneficial for Gemserv to assist in agreeing a set day for the meeting, e.g. for illustration, the 2<sup>nd</sup> Monday of each month. KP agreed this would be worthwhile, and noted iGT062 proposes Panel and the Code Administrator would agree a suitable day.

#### Circulation of Meeting Papers

KP confirmed this had been developed to ensure there is flexibility for Ex-Committee meetings. The Workgroup noted the timescales iGT062 are in line with current practice under the iGT UNC (and other codes). Again it was noted it would be beneficial for Gemserv to be aware of these timescales.

**Action:** KP to discuss with Gemserv to ensure the timescales remain achievable.

#### Minutes

While there is redlining, this was for readability purposes. Minutes timescales now fall under Circulation of Meeting Papers.

#### Consensus

It was agreed at the WG that Consensus is not required on account of different parties having different views. KP agreed to remove this section.

#### Vacation of Office

KP noted this section is catering for a very unlikely scenario, though noted it was standard for code to reference this situation. The WG agreed that it was unlikely, AP and AM noting that Gemserv would arrange necessary cover. TC was not comfortable with the line, 'Their performance will be bound by these rules' and KP agreed it will be removed.

#### The Cost Recovery Mechanism, Meeting Venue

KP noted these sections had been removed, as per consensus view at the previous meeting. Previous meeting KP suggested the Cost Recovery Mechanism could be removed as this is a contractual issue between iGTs and the Code Administrator and does not require Shipper input.

#### Modification Workstream

KP confirmed this has been incorporated from iGT062A as discussed at the previous meeting.

#### Urgent Modifications

KP explained the path he saw Urgent Modifications would be,

1. Add to the agenda for the next Modification Workstream.
2. If the modification requires more urgent attention, it could be incorporated into the next iGT Shipper Work Group.
3. If the Urgent Modification is sufficiently urgent that neither of the above is appropriate, an Ex-Committee Work Group could be set up where a Panel majority exists. This Ex-Committee Work Group, if continuing beyond one meeting, should then be incorporated into Modification Work streams or iGT Shipper WGs.

AP questioned whether an Urgent Modification required an independent chair or secretariat services. KP advised that Urgent Mods should not be subject to a lesser process, especially given this scenario addressing a modification of such import that it requires particularly urgent attention from the industry.

#### Ex-Committee Work Group

KP explained this had been added not simply to address very urgent Urgent Modification, but also urgent Non-Urgent Modifications, such as iGT059 (Facilitating Faster Switching). This was not registered as an Urgent Modification but did require urgent meetings over a short period of time. Again, KP advised this is a rare circumstance but provisions need to be made to ensure iGT062 is applicable to the progression of all modifications to code.

#### Sub Groups

As agreed at the previous group, KP has introduced this element as it allows Modification Work Groups to assign work to a Sub Group. An independent chair and secretariat services would not be required. It would be for the Modification Work Group to assess the benefit of setting up a Sub Group, defining its objectives (as part of Terms of Reference) and to agree the chair for the Sub Group. Appendix B details a proposed Terms of Reference and Sub Group Report.

**Action:** All Shippers and iGTs to comment on Appendix B.

#### Sufficient Work stream Business

Some discussion on the fact it is desirable for the Code Administrator to be able to cancel a meeting if there is little to be discussed, or for it to be moved to a telcon in the event few industry parties can physically attend. There was a risk that the option in the modification was over-engineered and may not provide the flexibility required. There was consensus that it would be sufficient for the Code Administrator to use their best judgement and manage the meetings accordingly. It was also noted that under current arrangements there is no cost saving for transferring the meeting to a teleconference, even so, the majority of costs are for the chair and secretariat services and not for the meeting room.

#### Existing Modification Work Groups

TC raised the issue of iGT039 and AP considered it may be considered as a Sub Group. There was some discussion and KP confirmed the Modification notes iGT039 is expected to be concluded by the time the 62 (and alternatives) would go live.

It was agreed that due to several amendments due to be made to iGT062 it would be the best use of the Work Groups time not to review the Business Rules at this stage.

Next Meeting: June iGT Shipper WG.

**Action:** GH to provide a paper detailing the cost recovery options (transportation/ three way contract)

**Action:** KP to discuss with Gemserv to ensure the timescales remain achievable.

**Action:** All Shippers and iGTs to comment on Appendix B.

#### **Post Meeting note:**

At the iGT UNC Modification Panel on 21 May, the Panel suggested KP updated the Modification and Business Rules and issues a copy to the Code Administrator and the proposer of iGT062AA (Gethyn Howard). This would enable to the Code Administrator to complete the legal drafting with the view to consider both the business rules and the legal drafting at the next iGT062/062A/62AA meeting.