Joint Office of Gas Transporters

Uniform Network Code Committee

Minutes of the 122th Meeting held on Thursday 19 June 2014
at ENA, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF

Attendees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shipper Representatives</th>
<th>Transporter Representatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S Mulinganie (SM), Gazprom</td>
<td>C Warner (CWa), National Grid Distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Green (AG), Total</td>
<td>E Melen (EM), Scotia Gas Networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Margan (AM), British Gas</td>
<td>J Edwards (JE), Wales &amp; West Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P Broom (PB), GDF Suez</td>
<td>J Ferguson (JF), Northern Gas Networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Fairholme (RF), E.ON UK</td>
<td>R Hewitt (RH), National Grid NTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-Voting Members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chairman</th>
<th>Ofgem Representative</th>
<th>Consumer Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L Jenkins (LJ), Joint Office</td>
<td>A Rooney (AR), Ofgem</td>
<td>C Alexander (CA), Consumer Futures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also in Attendance:

A Raper (AR), National Grid Distribution; H Chapman (HC), Xoserve; K Elliott-Smith (KES), Cornwall Energy and R Fletcher (RF), Secretary.
122.1 **Note of any alternates attending meeting**

A M Bagenal for C Wright (British Gas)
E Melen for A Musgrave (Scotia Gas Networks)
J Edwards for S Edwards (Wales & West Utilities)
S Mulinganie for A Barnes (Gazprom)

122.2 **Apologies for Absence**

A Barnes, A Musgrave, C Wright and S Edwards.

122.3 **Minutes and Actions from the previous meeting**

The Minutes from the previous meeting were approved.

122.4 **Matters for the Committee’s Attention**

a) **Creation of an AUGS sub-committee**

RF explained that he was concerned that at times the UNCC (AUGE) meetings were not very well supported by UNCC members due to the nature of the topic. Devolving responsibility to a sub-committee may satisfy this issue. LJ suggested that terms of reference should be developed so the members could consider the options available.

RH felt it was worth consideration for aspects of the process, which was mainly concerned with providing briefings about the statement content or considering consultation responses.

AR did not think it was a procedural process issue as most of the problems related to conflicts between UNC and the guidelines and therefore a subcommittee may not add much value.

Members considered quoracy and it was suggested that meetings which did not require votes to be held by UNCC should be re-labeled as AUGE Workgroup meetings to remove the requirements for members attendance.

122.5 **AUGS Process Update**

The next meeting is planned to discuss consultation responses on 30 June by teleconference.

122.6 **Any Other Business**

a) **Decision Letter for Modification 0491**

SM wanted to understand the process for challenging or reviewing a modification implementation date by the UNCC. He noted that this was referred to in Ofgems decision letter for Modification 0491 and at recent industry meetings. SM wanted to understand how this could be enacted, how would the vote be taken and evidence identified. What needs to be provided, what the process is and how it would be decided.

SM asked what evidence is required to establish there is a risk to the implementation date, which would require an implementation date change. AM wanted to see a detailed project plan with milestones and that the project would identify risks and progress against milestones which should inform the decision to go live.
AR asked members to note that Modification 0491 was rejected based on the level of evidence provided as there was not enough provided to confirm an implementation date change was required.

CW explained that the implementation date for Project Nexus is hard wired into code and though the UNCC could change this date, it would be more inclusive if a modification was developed for this purpose.

AG wanted other issues to be considered such as contract renewal dates and the commencement of the winter period, which adds further complexity to implementation.

LJ asked if it would be worth holding a consultation to seek views on implementation and whether this would inform the debate and evidence required for challenging implementation.

RH would like to see impacts based on licence obligations, customer and consequential impacts and not just how the system build can/cannot be managed.

AR noted the concerns raised and that Ofgem would be responding once they have considered the issues raised.

RH pointed out that the conjoined approach for delivery needs to be considered as the date may soon be reached where it may not be possible to decouple the delivery of Project Nexus and European system changes.

SM agreed to consider the scope of a consultation and the questions required.

122.7 **Next Meeting**

Monday 30 June 2014, 11.00am by teleconference

Thursday 17 July 2014, at the ENA, immediately after the UNC Modification Panel meeting.

**Action Table – UNCC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Ref</th>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Minute Ref</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Status Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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