

## Entry Customer Forum (EnCF)

### MINUTES

Tuesday 31 January at 12.30 – 14.00

### MS Teams Meeting

### ATTENDEES

Name	Initials	Company
Charlotte Marcel	CM	ADBA
Wasundara Doradeniya	WD	ADBA
Matthew Joinson	MJ	Cadent
Stuart Easterbrook (Chair)	SE	Cadent
Alison Cartwright	AC	CNG Services
John Baldwin	JB	CNG Services
Philip Kershaw	PK	CNG Services
Matt Rosenfeld	MR	ENA
Julie Cox	JC	Energy UK
Shane Rafferty	SR	Mutual Energy
Ben Hanley	BH	NGN
Emma Buckton	EB	NGN
Pablo John	PB	REA
Abbie Irvine	AI	SGN
Joel Martin	JM	SGN
Catherine Litster	CL	WWU

## APOLOGIES

Name	Initials	Company
Tina Hawke	TH	Cadent

## MEETING NOTES AND ACTIONS

1. Welcome and Introductions	SE
SE announced that this would be his last meeting as chair, and the role would be taken over by JM (SGN).	

2. Action Log Update	MR
The action log was reviewed; all actions were up-to-date rolling into the new year.	
MR updated that the next Technical Working Group Deep Dive would take place in February, on the topic of propane contamination, followed by one in April, focused on capacity constraints associated with NTS /Offtake Metering.	

3. Review of EnCF Terms of Reference	SE/MR
The EnCF terms of reference were reviewed; there were no objections to the proposed changes:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EnCF described as “A <del>new</del> voluntary framework for entry gas connections”.</li> <li>• Addition of “future developments” to be coordinated and prioritised in the group’s purpose.</li> <li>• Action plan supplemented “by RIIO2 commitments, <del>post Final Determinations in early 2021</del>”.</li> <li>• Networks can provide “appropriate representation” cf. a single representative per organisation.</li> <li>• A line included in the membership to include those who intend to operate gas injection facilities and those with active network inquiries.</li> <li>• The nominated chair updated.</li> <li>• The meeting frequency updated.</li> </ul>	
PK asked if the membership could also be expanded to include IGEM, which was met with no complaints.	
<b>Actions</b>	Invite an IGEM representative to attend the Entry Customer Forum. (TBC)

4. EnCF Action Plan Tracker	SE
The action plan tracker was reviewed, and project updates provided (where the owner was on the call). Workstreams with outdated planned completion dates were asked to supply updated timescales.	

5. Green Gas Support Scheme: Mid-Scheme Review Update		ALL
<p>SE flagged that the (BEIS-led) review of the Green Gas Support Scheme had been launched.</p> <p>The following link was shared in the chat, with JM summarising that the review was mostly about extending the timelines of time scheme – potentially extending the application deadline until the end of March 2026.</p> <p><a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/green-gas-support-scheme-ggss/update-16-december-2022-ggss-mid-scheme-review">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/green-gas-support-scheme-ggss/update-16-december-2022-ggss-mid-scheme-review</a></p>		

6. Biomethane Investor Workshop		EB
<p>EB reported on the interim Biomethane Investor Workshop session (held 30-01), wherein she ran through the discussions at the face-to-face in October, ran through the survey questionnaire to specify focus areas, and outlined events going forwards. The slide pack from the session was distributed.</p>		
<b>Actions</b>	GDNs to review the outcomes of the workshop and form an action plan.	GDNs

7. Standardisation Update: CV Blips		CL
<p>CL and JB reported that there had been a workshop lead by Rusell Brown (Thyson), who had developed a plan on how to approach CV Blips, such that sudden changes in flow rate did not automatically send sites to divert/cause a flair when the site was on track to be over their CV target for the day. RB had proposed some flow diagrams, and was now writing up final versions, which would then be subject to review/GDN acceptance.</p> <p>The group outlined that, <i>once there was an agreed approach</i>, implementation would likely start with rollout in new sites first, aiming for April, and then the retrofits could be dealt with on a site-by-site basis (noting not many companies make grid entry units, and they know which sites were having this issue, so there was less of a rush). Confirmation could be provided at the next EnCF in March.</p> <p>CL also clarified that the HSE's had pushed back on removal of Soot Index (SI) and ICF from the GS(M)R, with the group commenting on the long delay (c. 1 year) without any official government response.</p>		
<b>Actions</b>	MR to chase RB for a timeline of next stages for the CV Blips project.	MR + RB

8. Reverse Compression Update		JM
-------------------------------	--	----

SE recapped on the work being done to support this; the commercial spec was essentially completed by SGN, and the technical spec being finalised, informed by industry engagement by Cadent.

JM updated that he was in conversation with JB, Nick and Tim about the revision to the UNC Mod, due to be submitted to the UNC Review Group with some comments, following Dentons legal text analysis. JB added that the Mod was not especially controversial, and so the work was mostly to do with drafting. He also highlighted that while the Mod facilitates reverse compression, it was also necessary that:

1. The GDN was happy that they can accommodate reverse compression in the specific area, and
2. There was an agreement between the two operators (GDN and Reverse Compressor GT), which would be assisted by the development of a template.

JB also reported that they had applied for a GT licence, which should come back in the next few months.

<b>Actions</b>	Cadent to present a deep dive on the technical specifications, and separately provide an update on the Reverse Compression site at Doncaster to share learnings to the group.	Cadent
----------------	---	--------

<b>9. Live Consultations: Update on Entry-Exit Charging Review</b>	<b>SE</b>
--	-----------

SE updated that following the consultation, there was strong support for a charging change, wherein the majority supported the networks' preferred option; hence the networks were now comfortable that there was backing to put the charging change proposal to Ofgem. (The charging change itself was relatively straightforward, but there were other significant work areas that would need to be completed e.g., reviewing the connections process, and ensuring that necessary funding was in place for CapEx, OpEx, ongoing costs for installing compressors...).

SE also reported that Ofgem knew a reopener will be required, and that a project plan had been agreed across the gas networks (including workstreams and leads), which should be available to share at the next EnCF in March. However, SE was not anticipating to be in a position to kick off the final stages of a Mod until it was known when the re-opener will be completed, which was a few months away at least. JB voiced the importance of balancing socialisation of costs by the GDNs *and* having timely delivery as an output.

<b>10. Review of SGS Issues Dashboard</b>	<b>CL</b>
---	-----------

CL presented the SGS Issues Dashboard, which showed a significant increase in Letter of Approval Deviations from 2021 to 2022; the networks had held a workshop to review these issues, the majority of which were post-maintenance issues (i.e., settings being changed for maintenance but not changed back afterwards).

To support the DFOs, CL was working on a better way to communicate what was required, in the form of a poster/crib sheet/checklist/Microsoft Form etc. (similar to how the issues with cylinder changes were tackled). This was to be looked at by the Technical Working Group, and there would hopefully be an update at the next EnCF.

AC queried whether the GDNs provide training to new sites when they go gas-to-grid, since often issues are solved by trial and error. CL clarified that WWU provide a pack and online training, and MR confirmed that these “teething issues” were not a recurring feature of the Letter of Approval Deviations reported in 2022.

AOB: ADBA Conference Updates		CM
<p>CM provided context on two asks following on from comments by James Richardson (NIC) at the ADBA Conference in December, which suggested the possibility of decommissioning the gas grid by 2050:</p> <p>i) ADBA requested gas grid leakage data, to advocate for the carbon intensity of biomethane.</p> <p>SE responded that these data (leakage and shrinkage) are calculated from a model rather than being measured, and published as part of the networks’ regulatory process. EB provided a link to the Joint Office website, where these data were published, and offered to share some slides on NGN’s leakage and shrinkage models. Link: <a href="https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Shrinkage/Publications">https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Shrinkage/Publications</a></p> <p>Furthermore, SE outlined that biomethane and natural gas were the same with respect to leakage from a greenhouse gas perspective as both were primarily methane, and that leakage gas was at about 0.5% (and coming down with mains replacement), cf. the c. 8% losses the electric network faces; the line that removing gas tackles the issue of leakage did not seem to support any obvious value adding conclusions.</p> <p>ii) ADBA requested support for gas grids having a future in the UK.</p> <p>SE reported that the GDNs do engage with the NIC and try to provide a good knowledge base, as well as, individually, through the ENA and through the Gas Goes Green (GGG) programme of work, we explain that a gas network is necessary to hit net zero targets; given that there is growing realisation that the complete electrification of heat was not credible. In all credible future scenarios there is a requirement for a gas grid and significant decommissioning of the gas grids should not be a concern. However, SE acknowledged that there was still more work to do in making sure, e.g., the NIC, are well-informed.</p> <p>CM reported that, in response to these comments, ADBA wanted to write a paper to the NIC. JB, who also raised concern at some of the misunderstanding shown (e.g., that a gas grid can’t operate unless it’s full of gas, that the operating costs are due to leaks), offered his support, suggesting this could possibly be a joint ADBA-REA effort (and possibly with a draft outline by March).</p>		

AOB: Biomethane Quality Protocol Call for Evidence		MR
<b>Actions</b>	MR to circulate the call for evidence, noting the deadline for comments of February 3rd 2023.	MR