

**DEMAND SIDE WORKING GROUP MEETING
MEETING NOTES**

Venue: Ofgem, 9 Millbank, London

Date: 2 August 2006

Attendees

Chairpersons: Sonia Brown (SB) Ofgem

Alistair Martin(AM)	Martin Energy Limited
Shelley Rouse(SR)	Statoil
John Perkins(JP)	NG
Helen Bray(HB)	CIA
Paul Savage(PS)	energywatch
Christiane Sykes(CS)	E.on
Clare Temperley(CT)	Centrica
Hugh Mortimer(HM)	BOC
Alison Meldrum(AMe)	Corus
Sharif Islam(SI)	Total
Paul Gallagher(PG)	National Grid
Martin Rawlings(MR)	EnergyTrak
Sebastian Eyre(SE)	John Hall Associates
Dennis Rachwal(DR)	Joint Office
Peter Zeng(PZ)	National Grid
Chris Logue(CL)	National Grid
Phil Broom(PB)	Gaz de France
Alan Raper(AR)	National Grid
Andrew Pearce(AP)	BP
Fiona Lewis(FL)	BP
Mette Hansvik(MH)	Sempra trading
Bob Spears(BS)	Utility Consumers Consortium
Eddie Profitt(EP)	MEUC
Jeremy Nicholson(JN)	EIUG
Stefan Leedham(SL)	EDF
Nigel Cornwall(NC)	Cornwall energy
David Roberts(DR)	Centrica Energy
Amrik Bal (AB)	Shell Energy Europe
Jo Witters (JW)	Ofgem
Tim Dewhurst (TD)	Ofgem
Sophie Tremolet (ST)	Ofgem
Hannah Cook (HC)	Ofgem
Anne-Marie Segbedzi (AMS)	Ofgem

1. Introduction

SB opened by acknowledging the big turn out and thanking those present for attending the meeting.

2. Review of

a) meeting notes from last meeting 20/6/06

There were no comments on the minutes from the previous meeting of the DSWG

b) actions from DSWG meeting 20/6/06

- *NG to provide IT information to end users to allow them to prepare their IT systems to take advantage of the information that will be available post 3/10/2006.* CL outlined that National Grid had circulated an information leaflet containing details of the way in which the API services will work once information required under Modification 006 is made available.
- *NG to confirm and circulate the dates of the 006 information workshop to the DSWG.* CL stated that the workshop regarding Modification 006 would be held at Elexon's offices in Euston on 11 September 2006. He set out that this date had only recently been confirmed and that this was why it had not been circulated prior to the meeting. He explained that further details, including registration information, would be circulated shortly.
- *All end users to feed their views on NG's operational data website to NG as soon as possible.* CL stated that they had not received any comments from users regarding their website.
- *NG to present at the next DSWG about forecast development, and how forecasts are calculated generally.* CL outlined that Peter Zeng would be presenting to the group regarding these issues at the meeting.
- *Ofgem to circulate details of the Met Office's workshop on energy issues to the DSWG.* SB confirmed that these had been circulated

3. Demand forecast development – Peter Zeng – National Grid [presentation available from the DSWG area of work on the Ofgem website]

PZ gave a presentation to the group regarding the demand forecasting methodology that is currently used by National Grid.

In relation to the provision of details regarding the average forecasting error, HM asked what the range of error was in terms of individual forecasts. PZ stated that for the day ahead forecasts the range of error was in the region of 0 - 5/6% and highlighted that on extreme days the forecast could be up to 13mcm out.

SB questioned whether the forecasting method took account of the difference between difficult system days such as NISM days and normal days and, if this was the case she asked whether there was a correlation between days when harsh weather was experienced and poor forecasts were made. SB also asked if there was a price term in the model. PZ stated that there was not any correlation between days of harsh weather and days of poor forecasting but that on days where the system was tight it was logical that the demand forecast may be inaccurate due to observed demand side response. PZ explained that NG hopes to include a price term in the model in the future but currently the NTS is sensitive to spot prices and thus the model responds to price changes but not to any significant extent.

SB also asked whether NG has done any work to compare forecast methods from other countries in Europe or the US. PZ stated that this was something that NG would be interested in carrying out and that they would look into comparing their methods with international benchmarks. He outlined that NG had compared the forecast in gas with the forecast in electricity but that it was difficult to draw any conclusions from this given the inherent differences between the two in terms of the nature of the product and the balancing rules.

BS asked whether NG carried out a routine check to try to better understand why their gas demand forecasting is sometimes wrong. PZ noted that NG monitors its forecasting performance and routinely picks up difficult days as a check. PZ also noted that it was difficult to accurately predict demand because of the difficulty of forecasting prices in relation to storage. BS asked how much the demand forecast at the week ahead stage is influenced by the weather. PZ responded that the majority of the variability of the demand forecast is related to the observed weather conditions and that in this respect temperature accounts for half of the variability and uncertainty for the other half.

SB asked whether some shippers were more efficient at providing demand forecasts to NG, both in terms of accuracy and timeliness. PZ stated that it was inevitable that some shippers would provide a more accurate forecast than others. CL highlighted that NG had raised a modification proposal to bring forward the submission time for OPNs from 17.00 to 12.00 in order that the OPNs would inform the demand forecast that NG put forward at 13.00.

SI noted that this would not necessarily address the issue of predicting demand for peaking plant. SB stated that NG were looking at this issue in the context of the new SO incentives and that evidence from last winter had highlighted that, on tight demand days, NG's demand forecasts had been key in pushing up observed prices. She said that the information gap that currently exists, between NG and shippers is not helping the situation.

EP stated that he was surprised that it was necessary to calculate NTS direct loads daily given that these were unlikely to be temperature sensitive and in this regard, asked whether DN loads would be more temperature sensitive and therefore whether demand forecasting of these loads should be carried out by DNs. SB stated that this was an issue that had been discussed in depth during the DN sales process and stressed that DNs have responsibility for managing their networks not managing energy in the system. However, she outlined that there was no reason why NG could not contract with DNs for forecasting services.

4. Performance of the information Exchange (IE3 & UNC 006) NG rolling item

PG noted that arrangements for 006 are going according to plan and that an updated document on the process can be made available. In relation to the website NG stated that plans for development are ongoing for Winter 2006/07.

Action: National Grid to circulate documents regarding the way in which Modification 006 will work, from 3 October 2006, when the information is made available [these documents were circulated after the meeting].

5. New SO quality of information incentives: Final proposal and proposed licence amendments.- Tim Dewhurst, Ofgem [presentation available from the DSWG area of work on the Ofgem website]

SB noted that the new SO incentives had come out of the work of the DSWG and thanked all the participants for identifying issues. SB mentioned that the incentives should be in place for Winter and that this would hopefully address the problems that large users experienced last winter.

6. UNC Modifications 086 'Introduction of Gas Demand Management reserve arrangements'. –Tim Dewhurst, Ofgem [*presentation available from the DSWG area of work on the Ofgem website*]

TD gave a presentation to the group regarding modification proposal 086 and Ofgem's reasons for rejection of the proposal. SB noted that Ofgem welcomed the raising of this modification by GDF as it had enabled a discussion of the key issues regarding gas safety reserve to take place well in advance of the winter.

PB thanked Ofgem for sharing their views regarding Modification Proposal 086 with the DSWG. He stated that he hoped that the modification had at least alerted shippers to the types of commercial contracts that they could enter into in terms of demand side response and gas safety reserve. He noted that Ofgem's rejection of the modification would likely reduce the level of transparency in relation to NG's procurement of reserve and stated that the issues identified by Ofgem in terms of implications for cash out were not as significant as Ofgem considered.

SB stated that even if Ofgem were to discount all of the other issues associated with the modification proposal, the treatment of cash out in the modification would not reach the bar of better facilitating achievement of the relevant objectives. She highlighted that the modification would have dampened signals provided to market participants in terms of the use of demand side response and may have led to the use of demand-side response at a lower level in the merit order and therefore prior to the use of other supply sources e.g. imports and storage. She agreed with the points that PB had highlighted in relation to transparency but stated that implementation of this modification was not the only way of achieving transparency.

NC noted that Ofgem would not even have got to the point of considering some of the other issues associated with the modification proposal due to the deficiencies associated with the way that the use of this product would have fed into the calculation of cash out. NC stated that he had been delighted when modification proposal 086 had been raised by GDF but that he was disappointed that respondents had not been more forthcoming in terms of highlighting the key issues that they considered needed to be addressed in terms of encouraging additional demand side response. While he acknowledged that some parties had expressed their views on these issues he stated that many had not. He highlighted the system-to-system impacts that resulted from the GBA that was announced by NG on 13 March and stated that even if an extra 500MW had been made available on the day, this would have significantly reduced costs observed.

SB stated that Ofgem shared the disappointment about the lack of analytical research in this consultation, as well as in other consultations. SB explained that responses which provided evidence to support their argument would more clearly demonstrate why the proposal better facilitated the relevant proposals and outlined that this had not been forthcoming during the assessment process. She stated that she hoped that parties would be able to concentrate on the important issues going forward and raised the point that shippers need to focus on the services that they are offering their customers this winter.

NC noted that while the debate regarding these issues had taken place against the background of two harsh winters the fundamental rationale behind the need to address gas safety reserve issues was to facilitate the development of efficient markets. He outlined that developing analytical tools to demonstrate the way in which flexibility should be sold back to the market is crucial.

JN welcomed the raising of this modification by GDF and stated that he hoped that the work done in this area would inform the development of further modifications in the future. He noted that Ofgem had highlighted accurate concerns about the mod in its decision letter and that there was a lack of evidence to support approval. JN suggested that if another modification of this nature were to be raised it would be interesting to understand how many offers had not been finalised as respondents had alleged that they had been held up from entering into deals, through Ofgem's consideration of the modification.

BS expressed surprise at the revelation that National Grid currently has the option to enter into these types of contracts for reserve with end users and questioned why if NG is of the opinion that this type of contracting is undesirable in gas, the market should find it necessary to have similar arrangements in Electricity. He suggested that tenders should be run for contracts.

CL clarified that National Grid cannot contract directly with end users for gas reserve as this would place them in direct breach of the Gas Act. He explained that where National Grid had stated that it had the option to enter into these types of contracts it simply meant that it would be possible to bring forward a similar modification to allow them to contract with shippers for reserve contracts with end users. SB noted that this was a slight shift in National Grid's position and stated that she was pleased that National Grid now recognised that these options were available to them.

BS asked whether National Grid were considering withdrawing reserve in electricity in light of its position in gas and asked what the arguments were for having reserve contracts in electricity and not in gas. CL responded that the use of reserve in electricity could be considered to be more akin to the use of OM's in gas and highlighted that alternative ways of procuring these services in gas were currently being explored.

SB stated that she welcomed these positive indications from National Grid in relation to the procurement of reserve in gas. She highlighted however that while some reserve in electricity could be considered to be equivalent to OM's in gas, National Grid does also hold reserve in terms of contingency margin in electricity. She outlined that National Grid could contract for this type of contingency margin through the demand side.

EP highlighted that as a result of modification 006 the industry would be going into the winter with far better information. He outlined that while no new modification proposals in relation to gas safety reserve had come forward for this winter it was possible that they may come forward for winter 2007/08. He stated however, that if a problem were to occur in relation to gas safety reserve this winter the DSWG could be criticised for not having come forward with any solutions in this regard.

SB responded by stating that the discussion regarding gas safety reserve had begun in January of this year through the Gas Safety Reserve Working Group and that this workgroup had identified that there was disagreement within the industry regarding the most appropriate way to take these issues forward. She outlined that the last meeting of this group had taken place in April when the attendees had been asked to go away and consider any modifications that they considered appropriate to raise in this area prior to the winter. She stated that this had led GDF to raise Modification Proposal 086. She noted that as no new modifications had been raised in this area it was safe to assume that shippers/suppliers consider the current arrangements appropriate and that they

have been seeking to strike the required contracts with customers themselves. HB pointed out that some customers had stated that this was not currently happening.

SB stated that the industry had engaged in discussion and debate regarding Modification Proposal 086 and it had not been demonstrated that this modification would better facilitate the relevant objectives. She highlighted that those responsible for balancing supply and demand on the system, namely shippers, must be confident that they can respond to any conditions that may be observed this winter and noted that if they could not, they would have to face the commercial consequences which could be extreme given the prices observed last winter. She stated that she assumed that the management at these companies were doing all they could to ensure that they protected themselves against these potential outcomes.

SB highlighted that at the Options for energy buyers seminar that had been held in Manchester in the previous week a number of suppliers, including GDF, E.ON and Hydrowingas, had spoken about the range of contracting arrangements that they were making available to their customers. She outlined that some of the other suppliers in the industry had not been participating as actively within these seminars and outlined that although the CIA had stated that there didn't appear to be many contract options available, the feedback from suppliers was contrary to this. She stated that if parties wanted to become more involved in these seminars they should contact Ofgem.

7. Modification proposal 0088 "Extension of DM service to enable Consumer Demand Side Management" – Sharif Islam, Total

SI outlined that, at a high level, the intention of mod 88 was to share the benefits associated with AMR among a wide range of consumers. He indicated that Total hoped that the mod would introduce novel contracting, promote demand side response and provide better information to National Grid. He explained that the mod would create a new category of pseudo DM customers and could be rolled out to customers above the limit of 75,000 therms. He suggested that this would benefit shippers by allowing them to reflect the demand side response of their customers within their imbalance positions which is not currently possible under the existing NDM profiling algorithms. He emphasised that the qualification criteria for this mod was that sites would need to have an existing smart meter and would need to use more than 75,000 therms/annum. He outlined that there were a number of areas open for discussion with respect to this modification and highlighted that there had been push back on the modification from certain groups e.g. Xoserve. He noted that Xoserve were of the opinion that a whole new set of profiles would be required but that Total did not think that this would be necessary and emphasised that this modification was all about getting better information regarding demand side response.

AM asked how large sites could go about getting smart meters installed. SI explained that mod 88 will apply to sites that already have smart meters.

SB stated that the intention of the mod was a good idea as it would allow greater levels of demand side response to be accessed and noted that this was in an area that was not currently attractive to shippers due to the way that the system operates. She set out that the detail of the modification still needed to be refined but that, in terms of a proposition for system change this appeared to be a good one.

AM asked whether Total's retail team was aware of the modification and SI confirmed that they were. AM suggested that it might be helpful to inform end users of the modification as these are the people who are likely to support it. SB clarified that Total's retail team were definitely aware of the modification as Ofgem had spoken to their Sales Director about it.

EP asked why the scope of the modification should not be increased to require that every site over 75,000 therms should be daily metered. He stated that this highlighted the differences in metering practices between gas and electricity whereby in electricity sites of above 1200MW are moved to half-hourly metering whereas in gas customers would need to be above 2 million therms. He noted that daily metering had previously been installed at a number of large industrial and commercial sites (around 25,000) but that the number that actually uses this daily metering equipment is less than 2000.

AR stated that shippers are allowed to elect this daily metering equipment to be used at certain sites. EP noted that this was the way that half hourly metering used to operate in electricity and that there should be a modification to require all sites with the relevant equipment to be daily metered. SI stated that metering has become more competitive this option may no longer be available.

PS highlighted that from a consumer point of view, anything that would permit them to engage in consumption management would be welcomed.

SB stated that this was an alternative way of looking at the issues but that the discussion was outside the scope of the group. She noted that while she could see the attractions of a modification of this nature, the modification raised by Total was intended to address, more immediately, the way in which metering arrangements for demand side participants currently work. She highlighted that the modification needed to be progressed fairly rapidly and stated that if the scope were to be increased this may cause the modification to get bogged down. SB noted that the work required to assess this modification overlapped with work that Ofgem's retail team were involved in, with respect to smart metering initiatives, and that this would link into Ofgem's assessment of the modification.

JN noted that if the modification is achievable and capable of bringing more demand side then it should be go forward.

SI explained that the modification is currently with the development workgroup. PB highlighted that the workgroup should receive the implementation costs from Xoserve at the next session and that possible implementation could take place next spring.

Action: Total to provide an update regarding modification 088 at the next meeting.

**8. Modification proposal 0097 "modification to release aggregated ex-post information for pipeline interconnector offtake flows" –
Christianne Sykes, E.ON UK [*presentation available from the DSWG area of work on the Ofgem website*]**

CS gave a presentation to the group regarding modification proposal 0097 which seeks to release additional information regarding system offtakes to the market.

SB asked what the logic was behind placing the information that would be released on the Gemini system. CS responded that this would keep down system and implementation costs. EP asked why the information would not be put on

National Grid's website noting that customers do not have access to Gemini and thus the information that would be released would not be beneficial to them. CS stated that the daily summary report is intended to be a summary and that this would create additional information which would be greater than one page. She also explained that the information to be released is aimed to help shippers to better forecast and if more information is out on the website for customers it may not be on a daily basis. AM asked whether it would be possible for customers to determine where the information was displayed and CS responded that it parties could raise an alternative proposal.

SB stated that customers feel that they should have equal access to the information and that under the modification this would not be the case as Gemini system information is made available to shippers more quickly than other parties. SB recognised that the daily summary report is only intended to provide a summary of key data to users but highlighted that a significant volume of additional data is also made available on National Grid's website with which information of this nature could be placed. SB highlighted that there would be a lot of value behind the data and thus there should be a level playing field for all participants interested in using the information. She emphasised that the availability of this information only to shippers would serve to widen the information gap between shippers and customers that currently exists and set out that this would provide a further competitive advantage to shippers. CS responded saying that they would look into the possibility of providing the information for all. CS explained that the decision about where the information would be released would be discussed at the transmission workstream on 3 August 2006 and also at the mod panel at the end of August.

SB asked whether National Grid would be able to look into the system costs associated with placing this information on its website. CL said that they would.

Action: National Grid to consider and report back to the DSWG on the system costs associated with putting the information proposed for release under Modification O97 on its daily summary page.

9. Electricity Reserve Review – John Perkins, National Grid
[presentation available from the DSWG area of work on the Ofgem website]

JP gave a presentation to the group regarding the outcome of National Grid's reserve review outlining the new short term operating product that would be available as a result as well as the new opportunities for demand side participation.

NC questioned whether there were any numbers on the percentage take up of demand side response and how this has changed in recent years. JP stated that indicative figures were available from the demand turndown trial. SB asked whether National Grid had any figures that would show, against all of their balancing services, the amount that has been sourced through demand side response and whether this has increased/decreased. She asked whether it would be possible for National Grid to bring this information to the next DSWG. JP said numbers were available for the last two years and agreed to bring some figures to the next meeting.

Action: National Grid to report back to the group on levels of demand side response observed in electricity and how this compares to previous years as well as providing information regarding the percentage of their balancing services met by demand side response.

SB highlighted the very tight situation that had been observed on the electricity system over the summer. She asked whether there were any lessons to be learnt from the experience of this summer in terms of increased or decreased demand side response especially in light of the recent imminent demand control notice issued on 18 July and the role played by demand side response on this day.

Action: National Grid to report back to the DSWG on the role demand side response played on 18 July when the IDC notice was issued.

HM asked when the new short term operating product would be available. JP answered that it would start on the 1 April 2007 however there would be a tender for supplementary standing reserve from October 2006 until end of March 2007.

10. Revised Grain 1 UIoLI arrangements – Sophie Tremolet, Ofgem
[presentation available from the DSWG area of work on the Ofgem website]

ST gave a presentation to the group outlining Ofgem's concerns regarding the use of the Grain terminal last winter and the new UIoLI arrangements that would be put in place in time for this winter to try and address these concerns.

SB noted that there have been substantial improvements in the UIoLI arrangements at Grain. She stated that the notice period for an available berthing slot would be longer in order to allow more diverse sources of LNG to be used at Grain. She outlined that there had been tensions between balancing the rights of the primary capacity holders and implementing arrangements that would facilitate anti-hoarding practices. SB highlighted that BP and Sonatrach had done a great deal to bring the new arrangements forward. She stated however that Ofgem were looking to achieve more transparency with respect to the derivation of the reserve price.

SB noted that last winter a number of parties has highlighted to Ofgem that the arrangements at Grain had not worked effectively and stated that if people had similar concerns again this winter they would have to give evidence of this to Ofgem. In this respect she pointed out that such evidence would need to clearly provide an example of a situation where a cargo had wanted to gain access to the terminal and this had not been possible and clearly state the reasons why. SB stated that, on the basis of credible evidence Ofgem would be prepared to review the exemption for TPA and look into a number of potential options, such as removal of RTPA or the imposition of conditions on operation.

JN stated that this was an important message that he would relay back to customers. However, he questioned the need for a reserve price stating that if BP/Sonatrach were not using the facility there was not be any reason why it should not be available to others at a lower price than this.

SB noted that Ofgem did not know what the methodology was underpinning the setting of the reserve price by BP/Sonatrach and highlighted that Ofgem were seeking to obtain greater clarity on this. She suggested that one reason for the setting of a reserve price may be associated with the value of the commodity rather than the value of the capacity at Grain. She stated that the reserve price would likely be based on the value of the commodity in the sense that BP/Sonatrach will have to send out gas on behalf of another party and noted this may be clearer once transparency with respect to the reserve price was achieved.

EP asked what would trigger an auction of capacity at Grain. Sonia stated that, despite the implementation of these new arrangements it would still not be possible to guarantee full utilisation of Grain this winter as this would depend upon the relative prices of LNG observed. She noted that current indications were that GB would be supplied with LNG given where prices currently are. She highlighted that the issues identified at Grain had been solved to the extent that the new arrangements would allow a cargo of gas to be docked where BP/Sonatrach was not using a berthing slot, while preserving their optionality to use this gas for future periods.

FL stated that a successful bidder would be able to enter their gas into the Grain tanks once an auction had been triggered. She outlined that if BP/Sonatrach decided not to utilise a berthing slot on D-10, they would issue an announcement on their website that a slot was available and qualified shippers would be given the option to bid for the slot up until D-7.

ST outlined that this information would be available for a 90 day schedule. HB stated that this information was only available 60 days out at the moment. FL stated that she would check this.

Action: BP to check what is currently available on the Grain website in terms of scheduling information.

SI asked whether the reserve price would be known in advance. SB stated that this was an area on which Ofgem was seeking more transparency. She outlined that she hoped that the joint shippers would consider this and decide it was an area of the arrangements on which they would like to publish full information. FL stated that these details were currently confidential but that BP/Sonatrach were currently in discussions with Ofgem.

SB highlighted that the current arrangements may not be fit for purpose in the future and highlighted that the onus was on those granted TPA exemptions to keep the arrangements at Grain under review. She emphasised that it was for these parties to satisfy themselves that Grain continued to comply with the conditions of the exemption. She stated that it was important that third parties highlighted any problems to Ofgem so that they could potentially look to review the process and ensure the consistent application of TPA exemptions.

AB questioned whether Ofgem had looked at the utilisation of Grain in comparison to other LNG terminals. SB explained that there weren't many comparators to Grain in terms of size but stated that Ofgem had looked at what prices indicated should be happening in the market and spoken to others about what they would expect to be happening. She outlined that this was at the root of Ofgem's concerns last November when the price differential suggested that LNG should be flowing to the GB market through Grain but it was not. She clarified that Ofgem did not consider that LNG should flow to GB at any price but highlighted that it should flow when the differential suggests this.

AB asked whether the UIoLI arrangements at the Isle of Grain would set a benchmark for UIoLI arrangements at other LNG import terminals. SB responded that there is a requirement upon National Grid Grain, under the terms of its exemption, to ensure that there are effective UIoLI arrangements in place at the Isle of Grain. She outlined that the changing nature of the market may mean that the current arrangements at the Isle of Grain may no longer be effective in the future but emphasised that the onus was on the operators of this, and any similar terminals in the future, to keep these arrangements under review and ensure that remain effective.

SI asked what arrangements Ofgem had last winter in terms of offshore information and SB responded that information sharing arrangements were in place with the DTI.

AOB

EP questioned what the current arrangements are for emergencies. SB suggested that it would be useful to organise a further industry workshop regarding contingency arrangements ahead of the winter, potentially involving National Grid and the HSE. She stated that this would allow parties to better understand the arrangements going into the winter to ensure that they are prepared for any outcome. EP pointed out that as National Grid is no longer permitted to interrupt market participants for supply reasons, following implementation of Modification 13a, the UNC and emergency procedures appeared to be at loggerheads. SB explained that the Emergency side of the interruptible arrangements did not change when the interruption arrangements changed. SI supported Ofgem's suggestion of a workshop stating that shippers are concerned about how they are expected to operate through an emergency and outlined that it would be particularly helpful for the application of the ECO methodology and SOQ to be explained.

Action: Ofgem to organise a workshop in conjunction with National Grid, regarding the way that the contingency arrangements would operate in the event that an emergency was called.

HB stated that she supported the running of an emergencies workshop to ensure that all industry parties were fully aware of the relevant arrangements prior to the winter. SB stated that if parties had views regarding the topics that they would like to be covered at an emergencies workshop these would be welcomed. HB and SI offered to collate the views of customers and shippers respectively.

Action: Total to coordinate and report back to the DSWG on the views of shippers in relation to emergencies and the issues they would like to be discussed at the seminar regarding contingency arrangements. CIA to coordinate customer views regarding the issues that they would like clarity on in this regard. Ofgem to arrange a meeting to discuss these issues.

SB highlighted that the Institute of Gas Engineers and Managers had also been doing some work in this area and that they had presented on these issues at the last Options for energy buyers seminar.

Action: Ofgem to circulate a copy of the presentation that IGEM gave to the last Options for energy buyers seminar, regarding contingency arrangements [*this document was circulated after the meeting*].