

IGT039 Meeting #22
FINAL Minutes

Present:

Colette Baldwin (CB)	E.On	Andy Miller (AM)	Xoserve
Elaine Carr (EC) *	Scottish Power	Trevor Peacock (TP)	FPL
Gethyn Howard (GH) (Chair)	GTC	Adam Pearce (AP)*	ESP
Anne Jackson (AJ)*	SSE	Kristian Pilling (KP)	SSE
Jonathan Kiddle (JK)	EDF Energy	Kiran Samra (KS)	NPower
Steve Ladle (SL)	Gemserv obo. IGT UNC		

*via teleconference

1) Introductions

The meeting attendees introduced themselves. GH confirmed that the intention of the meeting was to review the legal drafting complete since the previous meeting and to discuss any queries that had arisen during the drafting process as well as those raised during the meeting.

2) Review of actions

- 1) JD to undertake further analysis on SSP funding.
*GH confirmed that JD had sent his apologies and that GH had not received an update on this analysis. – **carried over***
- 2) SL to check whether the document to determine whether the current [MPRN allocation] process would still be workable under SSP.
*SL confirmed that the process would be workable under SSP though could have a couple of minor tweaks made which could be reviewed by the shipper workgroup. SL commented that this was not an immediate issue as there were still some 1m IGT MPRNs still left to be used - **complete***
- 3) GH to speak to JD about potential options to progress Xoserve development cost recovery.
*GH confirmed that JD had sent his apologies and that GH had not received an update on this analysis. It was suggested that as this was a fundamental issue that this could be highlighted to the IGT UNC panel in the next Panel update and that the Panel could write to Ofgem in an attempt to progress the issue. GH confirmed he would look to speak to JD ahead of the next Panel update to see if any feedback could be sought. AM agreed to amalgamate the two documents he had produced on this issue for circulation which could also be sent to Ofgem – **carried over***

Action – AM to amalgamate two funding issues documents for future modifications requiring Xoserve cost recovery from IGTs.

3) Review of legal drafting

GH introduced the topic by explaining that the intention was to review the new sections drafted since the last meeting which were CIV, CV, D, E and F. GH explained that some minor changes had been made to CI but that this required further work and being the largest section, did not intend to re-review that particular section at the meeting though this will be reviewed once the next tranche of changes had been made. It was confirmed that since the last IGT039 meeting clarification had been received on the treatment of DM and NDM in terms of UNC drafting and how this fitted in with the new classes of 1 to 4. GH commented that this would be worked into the next iteration of CI and other sections where possible.

GH commented that the intention was that there would be an introductory section at the beginning of the IGT UNC which would provide an overview of the pointing to approach which would assist in reading the document. It was suggested that this may also include a list of definitions that would apply when reading the UNC such as where a supply point referred to under the UNC would apply to an IGT supply point. CB queried whether the new UNC definitions (i.e. IGTS Supply Point) could be referenced in the IGT UNC when pointing across to help with the reading. IGTs agreed to consider this apart of the drafting exercise as the clarification of terminology had not yet been drafted in an agreed method though the lawyers may be able to advise on this matter. SL commented that a joint drafting review with National Grid would be useful for such purpose as the terminology used in the UNC was complex and would ensure that the correct terminology is used in the IGT UNC.

GH provided an overview for Part CIV "Supply Point Withdrawal and Isolation", most of which pointed across to the UNC. Though a number of the definitions within the section had been defined by pointing across to the UNC, it was noted that these would be subject to further review once legal advice had been provided on how to treat such definitions. A question was raised on paragraph 8 "Disablement of Supply" and whether this should also point to the UNC as the content aligned. SL commented that one of the principles that had been taken forwards as part of the drafting exercise was that the pointing to approach had been used where ever possible but only where relevant to SSP.

GH provided an overview of Part CV "New Supply Meter Points and Other Site works", the majority of which had remained in the IGT UNC. It was queried as to whether paragraphs 1 – 3 could point to the UNC. GH commented that this had been left in the IGT UNC as made reference to a contract between the IGT and Shipper. GH added that he would check with GTC's lawyer to see if pointing across would change IGTs' contractual standing if these paragraphs were to point across.

AP summarised Part D "Supply Meter Installation" noting that the section was largely unchanged. AP commented that paragraphs 1.4-1.6 would need amending in line with the class 1 to 4 changes in the UNC and that paragraph 2.7 had been amended to align the communication process with the UNC. The group discussed paragraph 5 "Meter Clamping" and it was noted that the UNC and IGT UNC treat this activity differently. It was suggested

that TPDG3.5 and 3.4.1(c) should be reviewed including "T/PR/GT4".¹ AM confirmed that this process is supported by UK Link and RGMA and it was suggested that references to these will need to be included accordingly. It was acknowledged that paragraph 7 "Updating Meter Information by the Pipeline Operator" would require further review. AM confirmed that the process for the meter install by an IGT MAM in the BRD supported the supplier hub principle with the IGT MAM notifying the Supplier of the install whilst also sending a notification to the C&D store. It was therefore suggested that such communications would be covered by the future SPAA proposal CP12/227 but noted that the UNC was also subject to change in this area under UNC modification 0455 so further changes to the drafting would be required.

AP then summarised Part E. It was explained that the section had only been completed the day before following the last IGT drafting review meeting on 24th April so appreciated parties had not had time to review the changes. AP summarised that Part E was very different to Part D in so much that almost the entire section pointed across to the UNC and that the new headings introduced to the UNC under the NEXUS had also been added to the IGT UNC. AP commented that there were two miscellaneous clauses on meter inspections and the use of last valid meter readings in the monthly portfolio extract and that views would be needed on these paragraphs to determine how to progress. GH asked if parties could review the sections and send through comments within the next 2 weeks (14th May) which will allow for the comments to be reviewed and proposed drafting penned for the next 039 meeting on May 29th.

SL provided a summary of the changes to Part F "Daily and Annual Quantities and Shrinkage". SL noted that references to the new AQ types would be required but these are yet to be set out in Part CI so have not yet been included. The group agreed with the changes to paragraph 7 "NDM Offtake Quantities" on the basis that the terms will no longer exist as individual supply points on the IGT network will be included at the LDZ level. It was noted that the requirements of paragraph 8 "Calculation by the Pipeline Operator in respect of NDM Supply Point Components" would need to be checked against the IGTAD as the IGT UNC obligation may be superseded by the IGTAD requirements and no longer required. The group agreed that the shrinkage sections under paragraphs 12 and 13 would remain in the IGT UNC as changing this section would be outside of the terms of IGT039.

GH also queried as part of the general drafting changes how references to the CSEP NExA table should be made. The group discussed this and agreed that the intention was not to remove the table from the IGT UNC and so the references to the table could continue to be used as they currently are.

SL queried how Shippers would like to feed into the legal drafting exercise. GH commented that one way may be to mirror the approach used under UNCO440 with regular overview meetings. GH added that as the legal drafting progresses, IGTs had a number of calls and meetings with National Grid and their internal and external lawyers to discuss drafting

¹ CB has since confirmed that T/PR/GT4 is now GDN/PM/GT/4.

issues. GH added that IGTs would be able to mirror this process if parties wanted to do so. CB commented that when the IGT UNC was created, Shippers each took a section for legal review and discussed at the Gas Forum. It was noted that not all companies were members but it was suggested that a hybrid approach could be used if desirable.

Action – GH to speak to lawyer to gather a view on whether pointing paragraphs 1 to 3 of CV to UNC will undermine IGT contractual position regarding the “site works contract”.

Action – Parties to review Part E and provide comments to GH by May 14th.

4) Update on Contractual Issues for Future Modifications

GH commented that feedback had not been received from Ofgem on the matter but this was of importance as User Pays may need to be included in the potential licence condition and also included in the legal drafting of the modification.

5) Next Steps and Work Plan Review:

GH commented that he would contact Jon Dixon at Ofgem to see if a steer could be given to allow the contractual issues to be resolved for future Xoserve modifications requiring an IGT contribution so as not to delay the modification. GH also commented that though good progress was being made, a complete draft that had been subject to IGT legal review may not be available for the beginning of June (to allow 4 weeks for Shippers to legally review the document for a walkthrough on 2nd July). GH commented that the drafting will be continue to be progressed as quickly as possible but appreciated that parties will need to be kept informed of progress so that parties can schedule in the legal review with their lawyers. GH therefore agreed to keep the work group informed over the coming weeks of progress.

6) Future Meeting Dates:

29th May - Xoserve

2nd July – Venue tba.

7) AOB:

AM summarised that as part of the IGT data preparation work, LSP reads will not be loaded into the system until after NEXUS go live. AM confirmed that reconciliation will take place once the following read is received following NEXUS go live. AM added that this was for information only and that the approach would be formally presented to the Project Nexus Workgroup.

Actions:

- 1) JD to undertake further analysis on SSP funding.
- 2) GH to speak to JD about potential options to progress Xoserve development cost recovery.
- 3) AM to amalgamate two funding issues documents for future modifications requiring Xoserve cost recovery from IGTs.
- 4) GH to speak to lawyer to gather a view on whether pointing paragraphs 1 to 3 of CV to UNC will undermine IGT contractual position regarding the "site works contract".
- 5) Parties to review Part E and provide comments to GH by May 14th.