

**IGT053 - Introduction of annual updates to the AQ values within the CSEP NExA table –  
Development group #5 Meeting Minutes**

**Attendees:**

Amie Charalambous – Npower (Chair)  
Adam Pearce - ESP  
Mark Jones - SSE  
Maria Hesketh – Scottish Power  
Kiran Samra – Npower

The aim of the meeting was to go through the workgroup report and the legal text, so that it can go for discussion on the 16<sup>th</sup> April at the IGT Modification Panel

**Item 1 – Introductions**

Introductions were done

**Item 2 – Minutes and Actions**

Minutes from the last meeting agreed and signed off

**Item 3 – Development Group Report**

AC stated that she has tried to capture everyone's concerns and views in her report when drafting up the workgroup report. The figures that are present in the workgroup report were obtained from Joint office website. Ofgem had requested the figures to be included within the report, they wanted evidence to be provided of the reduction in values.

***Action: Include today's meeting within workgroup report***

AP commented that within the workgroup report the most important factor was capturing what the issue was, the decision that had been made and how you reached the final conclusion

MJ and AP pointed out that the panel needed to align the modifications and discuss how IGT53 and IGT57 were going to be aligned to each other. AP noted that it was for Gemserv to consider and inform the group how this was going to be done but something that should be discussed at the panel meeting.

AC asked the workgroup if they had any further concerns. The workgroup agreed that they were happy with the progress of the modification and that they needed to agree how to push it forward

AP made some vital points on how the mod panel would take the modification forward:

- Go straight out to consultation or
- Back into development status?
- Needed to figure how best to align IGT53 & IGT57 – subject to both being approved

Once the above points were clarified by the mod panel it would be easy to go forward

**Item 4 - Legal Text**

The next agenda item discussed was the legal text, which had been produced by Gemserv. AC asked the group if they had any views around the legal text? AP was happy with the legal text, and confirmed it was up to the transporters to produce the legal text and that in terms of the proposal it seemed fine but once the modification went to consultation that another review of the legal text would take place.

Gemserv would make any final amendments, However, the legal text would need to be included within the workgroup report. Gemserv will attach It to the consultation when it goes to the industry.

Modification Discussion:

AP made a recommendation with regards to the business rules and the rules to be included within the modification itself. As stakeholders will read the business rules and understand what the modification is trying to achieve and that it should go into the solution section of the modification

**Item 5 - AOB**

AP pointed out that he didn't believe that the modification will go through in time for this years AQ review. MJ stated that his modification would cover the gap while AC's modification was being developed.

MJ asked where the IGT's needed a notice for when to update the AQ values, AC referred the group to the business rules Step 4, which states the IGT's require 6 months notice and that it was also mentioned in Step 4 of the legal text and Step 8 was with regards to the appeal process. Discussion took place with regards to the reference of '6 months notice' and it was agreed to prevent delay the reference should be removed from the workgroup report.

With further discussion around the implementation date the workgroup agreed that the modification should be agreed for implementation no later than October 2014. MJ noted anything later than October then it would be too late, the group agreed with AP stating that it shouldn't need a long implementation process.

AP asked whether anything had been done with regards to the UNC equivalent modification. AC stated that she had put together a draft modification and after the meeting she would send to Joint Office. Ad provided confirmation that the UNC modification contained a section with regards to Nexus.

Discussion took place around Rolling AQ Values and making reference to this point within the IGT modification. Amie stated that she was happy to leave her modification as it was and that if a further modification was needed to be raised at a later date then the panel could discuss. AP suggested making reference to the Rolling AQ's and that it may be worth AC taking a look at the wording to see if something could be done

Meeting concluded