

Gemini Housekeeping Window (GHKW)

National Grid NTS Consultation

Gas Transmission Operational Forum 10th December 2014

Background

- NTS provided the background to this issue at the September 2014 EU WG meeting:
 - European Network Codes of CAM, BAL, INT introduces new arrangements for Noms and Renoms at Interconnection Points (IPs)
 - UNC Mod 493 raised in April 2014 to introduce these new arrangements
 - Existing UNC terms provide for “Planned UK Link Downtime”
 - Interoperability Code permits outages and views were sought on various options identified by NTS to manage the GHKW going forwards

- This Consultation seeks views from all interested parties on these Options

Options Analysis

Option	Pros	Cons	Estimated Costs
Option 1: Do nothing (NGG NTS Favoured Option)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No additional cost Consistent with existing GB regime - Renomination process is reduced by daily outage INT Code recognises outages 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renomination Process at IPs availability reduced by daily outage Whether a daily outage should keep downtime “to a minimum” is open to interpretation 	£0
Option 2a: Routine outage (e.g.monthly) and non-routine outages as required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renomination Process availability increased (relative to option 1) Less frequent non routine outages (relative to option 2b) INT Code recognises outages Improved visibility and planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Routine outages still required (but less than in the case of Option 1) There will be a need to manage the outage schedule whilst fixing operational system issues 	£1 million
Option 2b: Non-routine outages as required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renomination process availability increased (relative to option 1) No routine outages INT Code recognises outages 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More frequent non-routine outages (relative to option 2a) Outages less predictable for planning and greater amount of governance required 	£1 million
Option 3: 24/7 availability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maximum flexibility for Users No planned outages No constraints on nomination activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most expensive option Not mandated by Interoperability Code and therefore this option could be considered as above what is required for compliance 	£2million +

Consultation Questions

1. Do you agree with the pros and cons of each option? If not please explain.
2. Are there any additional costs or benefits associated with any of the options identified?
3. Do you believe that there are any other options that should be considered? If so, please provide details.
4. Which option or options do you believe comply with the Interoperability Code requirement to minimise system downtime in the context of the Renominations process at IP points?
5. Which Option would you prefer to be implemented?
6. If you support option 2A, 2B or 3, would you consider User Pays to be the appropriate funding mechanism?
7. Are there any other issues that you would like to highlight that have not been addressed within this Consultation document?

Consultation Timescales

Task	Deadline
Consultation Window – 4 weeks	26/11/14 – 24/12/14
EU Industry Workgroup	04/12/14
Gas Ops Forum	10/12/14
NG to Review Representations	24/12/14 – 20/01/15
Internal NG Approval of Consultation Decision Document	20/01/15
NG to Publish Decision Document	23/01/15

Details

- The consultation document can be found on the following link:
<http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/NTSPublications>
- We'd like to hear your views on the consultation documents. Please contact us by 24th December
phil.lucas@nationalgrid.com