

iGT UNC Modification Panel Meeting 17-06

Wednesday 21st June 2017

Gemserv, 8 Fenchurch Place, London EC3M 4AJ

Attendee	Organisation	Representing	As
Steve Ladle (SL)	Gemserv	Code Administrator	Chairman
Andrew Margan (AM)*	British Gas	Pipeline Users	
Mark Jones (MJ)*	SSE Energy Supply	Pipeline Users	
Kirsty Dudley (KD)*	E.ON	Pipeline Users	
Jenny Rawlinson (JR)*	BU-UK	Pipeline Operator	
Cher Harris (CH)*	Indigo Pipelines	Pipeline Operator	
Roberta Fernie (RF)*	Ofgem	Authority	
Rory Edwards (RE)*	Ofgem	Authority	Presenter
Győző Pintér (GP)*	Ofgem	Authority	Presenter
Rachel Bird (RB)	Gemserv	Code Administrator	Secretariat

**Attended via teleconference*

1. Alternates, observers and apologies

The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting of the iGT UNC Modification Panel meeting. The Chair welcomed Rory Edwards and Győző Pintér (Ofgem) who will be presenting the findings of the CGR3 consultation responses to the Panel.

2. Confirmation of Agenda

The Chair asked the Panel if they had any additional items to add to the agenda for this meeting. The Panel was happy with the agenda and did not have any additional items to add. The Chair added that a UNC modification could impact on the iGT UNC Legal Text and added this discussion as AOB.

3. Approval of the previous minutes

RB informed the Panel that no comments had been received regarding the May Panel meeting minutes. The minutes from the previous Modification Panel meeting (17th May 2017) were approved as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

4. Outstanding actions

17/05-01	Panel members to send comments and feedback to the Code Administrator with regards to the FWP paper by 25 th May 2017.	Completed. Closed.
----------	---	--------------------

RB concluded that all action points from the last meeting are now closed.

5. Ofgem Presentation – Implementation of the CMA code governance remedies

Ofgem Presentation

Ofgem presented initial consultation responses on the code governance remedies. GP noted that Ofgem received 41 responses and respondents ranged from Code Administrators (CA) and Code Panels to DNOs and small Suppliers. GP outlined the scope of the consultation which consisted of scope of the new regime, licencing and competition, strategic direction, the Consultative Board and moving to the new arrangements. GP noted that the majority of respondents did not support licencing and felt that providing joint licences to code administrator and delivery bodies could restrict competition.

GP noted that Ofgem did not receive a large number of responses to the issue of which licensing model would fit which code, and this could be interpreted that parties did not support competition in this area.

Ofgem outlined a number of areas the strategic direction should cover and a plan for developing it. Most respondents supported these areas although stressed that industry consultation on these areas is key.

RE noted that most respondents generally supported the creation of a Consultative Board. Although informed the Panel that there is work going on to identify how to Consultative Board can add value to the industry without duplicating efforts or administration. Respondents also noted that it was important to have balanced representation on the Consultative Board.

The Chair requested an example of an issue which would go in front of a Consultative Board. RE explained that the Consultative Board could be involved in translating the strategic direction to a Forward Work Plan (FWP) for the industry. There may also be the possibility that the Consultative Board could hold people accountable for the FWP failing to meet targets but pointing out that it is unlikely to have any formal powers. RE noted that this could be as a constant entity or on an ad hoc basis.

RE concluded the presentation by noting that an open letter will be published by the end of July and this will include a summary of responses as well as an update on Ofgem's next steps in terms of workshops and bilateral consultation.

The Chair invited any questions from the Panel, RB questioned whether any resources had been identified for the Consultative Board. RE noted that some respondents identified that a Secretariat would be needed to facilitate the Board, however, the current focus is about recognising what benefit the board could add to the industry, this will then form the amount of resource needed.

The Chair inquired what the likelihood of licencing CAs would be in light of the current situation in Government. RE responded that licencing is still on the agenda, however, Ofgem are not in a position

to progress this as any decision on legislation is ultimately for Government. The Chair thanked RE & GP for their time and concluded the presentation.

6. Short Notice Business

None.

7. Panel decisions

None.

8. Update on Modification Workgroups

[iGT095 - Provision of access to Domestic Consumer data for Price Comparison Websites and Third Party Intermediaries](#)

The Chair updated the Panel on the Joint Distribution Workgroup meeting which is to be held on 22nd June 2017 at Elexon's offices to discuss iGT095 and UNC593. The Chair noted that an updated draft of the Privacy impact assessment (PIA) had been circulated to parties prior to the meeting. A varied Modification has now been submitted to reflect the change in the CMA investigation report to allow Xoserve deliver an alternative solution to the Data Enquiry Service (DES) system, and this varied modification will be circulated prior to the meeting. The Chair gave the Workgroup an overview of the potential route the Modification can take. Both the PIA and varied modification will be developed at the Workgroup and a Workgroup report produced. This would then go to the July Panel meeting to be sent out for consultation, assuming the Panel considered the variation to be material. An FMR would then be produced to send to Ofgem and a letter would be requested from the Panel to go to Ofgem to address the initial response.

The Chair added that the July iGT UNC Workstream meeting has been provisionally booked to complete the work progressed at the meeting on 22nd June. AM noted that shippers still have reservations with the modification progressing without a technical solution defined as there will still be concerns around Data Protection (DPA) and these will not have been addressed in the varied modification. The Chair suggested that these concerns should be voiced and addressed at the next joint workgroup meeting as there may be a possibility that this modification could go through the process and again not be supported because a technical solution has not been developed prior to the permissions given.

JR offered that to overcome this possibility there be a section added to the legal text which gives strict parameters for permission to a solution which would give shippers some assurance. The Chair supported this suggestion and noted to bring this to the workgroups attention at the meeting.

The Panel noted the update.

9. Update on Review groups

None.

10. Withdrawn Modifications

[iGT099 - Transitional AQ arrangements for iGTs as a result of a delay in Nexus implementation](#)

The Chair informed the Panel that iGT099 has been subsequently withdrawn Post Nexus implementation as the intention of the Modification was no longer applicable.

AM enquired whether the iGTs had had to enact the principals of iGT097 after Nexus implementation. JR noted that BU-UK does not envision that they will need to enact consecutive estimated billing within the immediate future as current invoicing is based on accurate data (pre-Nexus).

KD noted that as parties have 18 months to query invoices and it may be useful to add a discussion to the next Workstream agenda on who to contact in the first instant if parties have an invoice query.

Action 17/06-01: CA to add Invoice query procedures to the July Workstream meeting.

11. Urgent Modification Proposal review

None.

12. Non-urgent Modification Proposals received

[iGT100 – Reinstating Asset Query Codes](#)

KD introduced the Modification to the Panel explaining that this has been raised to re-introduce asset query codes taken out by iGT073. KD explained that at the time of iGT073s development this was approached and developed from the point of view of a Transporter without taking into account that an iGT can also be a MAM. Therefore, codes were removed without a codified alternative approach to raising queries, although CH pointed out that this is currently being facilitated via email.

JR noted that BU-UK does not feel that address queries should be included in this Modification and KD agreed to remove this as that code was a late addition after the last Workstream meeting.

The Panel was happy to send this modification to a Workgroup for further development, although KD noted that she would not be able to attend, however, an EON representative will attend as KDs alternate.

AM added that there has been concern voiced over this Modifications material implications and that its proposed Self-governance status should be discussed as the modification could be facilitating an advantage in competition towards iGTs as MAMs. KD acknowledged the concerns and noted that this should be discussed at the Workgroup.

Action 17/06-02: CA to add iGT100 to the July Workstream meeting for further development.

13. Fast-Track Modification Proposals received

None.

14. Workgroup Reports

None.

15. Final Modification Reports

None.

16. CACoP update – Horizon scanning

RB updated the Panel on the outcomes of the recent CACoP meeting with regards the Forward work plan (FWP). Most Panels feedback into the CACoP meeting was that the FWP had gone further than the initial scope and that it contained too much detail for parties to interpret easily. The Code Administrators (CA) decided to carry forward the most useful sections of the current FWP which are the Headlines, Horizon scanning and Commentary.

CAs each took an action to bring the current Horizon scanning back to Panels for comment on the issues contained within it and to feedback, any additions they feel should be included.

RB noted that the list of current issues and potential additions to the Panel for comment and requested that any comments be sent back by 7th July 2017 to take to the next CACoP meeting to be held on 18th July 2017.

Action 17/05-03: Panel members to send comments and feedback to the Code Administrator with regards to the Horizon scanning paper by 7th July 2017.

17. Authority Updates- Ofgem Presentation

None.

18. AOB

The Chair noted that a UNC modification (UNC570) that is currently being progressed could potentially impact the iGT UNC Code as the Code points across to a UNC section which has been renumbered in the UNC proposed legal text. Therefore, a Fast-track modification will need to be raised to amend the iGT UNC legal text to take this into consideration. The Chair also asked for any ideas from the Panel on how to predict and manage this process as it is believed that this will be a regular occurrence.

KD suggested that a short agenda item be added to the Workstream meetings to discuss and identify and potential implications to the iGT UNC based on current UNC modifications being processed. The Panel was supportive of this idea with the caveat that this is only a short use of the workgroups time.

The Chair noted that a tracker has been developed and is being maintained by the CA which shows any reference in the Code which points across to the UNC and noted this could be used by both Gemserv and the Joint Office to identify areas of concern.

Action 17/06-04: CA to add cross-code modification implications to the July Workstream meeting for discussion.

The next Modification Panel meeting will be convened on 19th July 2017.

Summary of Actions

Action Reference	Date	Action	Owner	Status
17/06-01	21 st June 2017	CA to add Invoice query procedures to the July Workstream meeting.	CA	New
17/06-02	21 st June 2017	CA to add iGT100 to the July Workstream meeting for further development.	CA	New
17/06-03	21 st June 2017	Panel members to send comments and feedback to the Code Administrator with regards to the Horizon scanning paper by 7 th July 2017.	Panel	New
17/06-04	21 st June 2017	CA to add cross-code modification implications to the July Workstream meeting for discussion.	CA	New