1) **Introductions**

The group members introduced themselves.

2) **Review of Actions from Previous Meeting**

   i) CW to speak to NG lawyers about concept of pointing one Code to another and to provide feedback when available. Prior to the meeting, CW had circulated a presentation which was to be discussed as an agenda item. [action closed]

   ii) GH to develop an option 1a and option 1b for further discussion at the next meeting. Prior to the meeting, GH had circulated a presentation which was to be discussed as an agenda item. [action closed]

   iii) GH, DS, AM identify process differences between IGTs and GDNs. Work on this has not yet started though IGTs will progress with Xoserve. [action carried over]

3) **NEXUS Update**

The group also discussed the timing of the development and implementation of governance arrangements that would be required ahead of the implementation of project NEXUS. It is currently expected that NEXUS will be implemented from 2015 onwards and it was agreed that it would be useful to work backwards from this date in order to identify milestones and the dates that they need to be achieved.

   Action: GH to review timeline of events.

4) **Discussion of Legal View on Drafting Approach**

CW presented an option for the governance of the IGT UNC and UNC which centred on the concept of an IGT Arrangements Schedule “IAS”. It was explained that the presentation was pulled together following the discussions with an external law firm who had been heavily involved in the original drafting of the UNC. The IAS would ensure that IGTs and GDNs provide particular services in a uniform way whilst ensuring their provision by a single agent. It was also noted that the relevant parts of annex A of the CSEP NExA could also sit under the IAS. The IAS would also have a framework agreement that both IGTs and GDNs would sign up onto to obligate the provision of common “agency services” through the GTs’ agent. It was suggested that the Joint Governance Arrangement Agreement “JGAA” could provide a flavour of how such a document could look.

   It was acknowledged that there were a number of variations and options that an IAS approach could take; 
   - Thick/thinness of the IAS i.e. detailed services set our in IAS v high level services referenced from UNC.
   - IAS as an integrated UNC document v Standalone "3rd network code"
   - Governance under UNC change process v own governance arrangements
   - IGTs and GDNs sign up v shipper inclusion
Action: CW to discuss IAS further with lawyers following discussion on presentation and provide update at next physical meeting.

5) Development of “Option 1” (Presentation and Discussion)
Following the presentation at meeting #5 of the various governance approaches, GH presented "Development of Option 1" which built on the option approach of an IGT “A15” Licence condition coupled with a pointing approach of the IGT UNC to the UNC. 3 options were presented with examples of how the text may look under each approach;
- Option 1a – IGT UNC points to UNC along with Agency Services Schedule in IGT UNC
- Option 1b - IGT UNC points to UNC and no Agency Services Schedule in IGT UNC
- Option 1c – IGT UNC text replaced with UNC text.

It was clear from the examples provided that a line by line review of the IGT UNC would be required whichever option was developed as the IGT UNC and UNC do not wholly align at a paragraph level. It was noted that this would be a future piece of work pending the outcome of the approach taken to the IGT UNC drafting (pointing v replication of UNC text). AM commented that prior to Christmas 2011, he had reviewed the GDN ASA and colour co-ordinated this against potential IGT service provision. AM agreed to review this document in light of current discussions and update with corresponding IGT UNC section references.

Action: AM to review the Agency Services Agreement and update with IGT UNC references.

It was noted that the IAS model could fit in with the drafting approaches explored in the "Development of Option 1" presentation.

6) AOB
There was no additional business.

7) Future Meeting Dates
The next meeting will be held via teleconference on 27th July.

Actions:

1) GH, DS, AM identify process differences between IGTs and GDNs.
2) DS to compare IGT and Shipper communications against those set out in the IGT UNC.
3) CW to discuss IAS further with lawyers following discussion on presentation and provide update at next physical meeting.
4) AM to review the Agency Services Agreement and update with UNC references.
5) GH to review timeline of events.