

MEMORANDUM

TO: Pipeline Users

FROM: First Gas

DATE: 23 November 2017

RE: GTAC November Workshops: Actions List

Remaining design choices for code design – sections to be released before 8 December

| | Item | Responsibility |
|---|--|----------------|
| A | Provisions dealing with the relationship between the GTAC and interconnection agreements (e.g. providing fair and reasonable terms of interconnection, evolving ICAs in line with the GTAC, etc) | First Gas |
| В | Provisions setting out the criteria for approving an Agreed Hourly Profile (AHPs) (including the reasons why an AHP may be declined), streamlining AHP process where possible, whether AHPs should be offered via standard nominations process, whether AHPs should have a tolerance, and the relationships between MHQ, AHPs, and DNC | First Gas |
| С | Provisions relating to ability to change overrun/underrun charges and ERM charges (i.e. use of specific values, ranges, limits on change) | First Gas |
| D | Liability provisions (and related ICA liability provisions) that enable the recovery of losses from events involving interconnected parties (such as the injection of non-spec gas) | First Gas |
| E | Provisions giving effect to D+1 allocations and providing for default allocation if shippers no longer use D+1 allocations or daily information is not available | First Gas |

Actions from Friday, 10 November 2017

| # | Item | Responsibility |
|---|---|-------------------------|
| 1 | Look at separating section 3.18 into two parts – with a clear PR product definition (in the code) and a clear process for establishing PR auction terms and conditions (outside the code) | First Gas |
| 2 | Consider whether governance process for finalising PR auction terms and conditions is adequate – and whether GIC approval should be required prior to adoption. Also consider how any compliance roles might be defined | First Gas |
| 3 | Consider adding objectives, principles and process for setting parameters such as upper and lower line pack limits, running mismatch tolerance (for shippers and OBA parties), and specific HQ/DQs | First Gas |
| 4 | Request further details for how particular supplementary agreements will be re-negotiated, where greater certainty is required prior to GTAC finalisation | Shippers / First Gas |



| # | Item | Responsibility |
|----|---|----------------|
| 5 | Consider change to ability for parties to dispute transmission invoices (and relationship with GTPM) to retain rights afforded under existing codes | First Gas |
| 6 | Consider inserting an obligation to provide an estimate of ongoing operating and maintenance costs prior to discontinuing service to uneconomic delivery points (sections 2.10 and 2.11) | First Gas |
| 7 | Reconsider ability to change receipt zone without consultation, given the impact on counterparties and the implications on other parts of the GTAC (section 3.2) | First Gas |
| 8 | Amend to "and/or" (section 3.4) | First Gas |
| 9 | Consider how PR auction terms and conditions will deal with the question of whether to offer all available operational capacity as PRs (section 3.13) | First Gas |
| 10 | Consider providing greater clarity on criteria for approving an Agreed Hourly Profile (AHP), including the reasons why an AHP may be declined (section 3.26). Reasons may include adverse impacts on other parties. | First Gas |
| 11 | Add "or other parties" to section 3.26 | First Gas |
| 12 | Consider how to streamline AHP process where possible, and any implications of AHPs on PRs | First Gas |
| 13 | Add "subject to DRRs" (or equivalent effect) to section 5.2 | First Gas |
| 14 | Consider use of "and" or "as applicable" in section 7.1 | First Gas |
| 15 | Consider whether actions in response to breach of line pack limits should be specified as a firm hierarchy (section 8.6). Also consider removing section 8.6(a), since line pack limits will apply across the system as a whole. Also consider consistent wording in definition of High and Low Line Pack notices | First Gas |
| 16 | Consider whether range/limits should apply to Excess Running Mismatch charges to give parties more certainty, and/or whether these charges should only be changed via an urgent change request (section 8.14) | First Gas |
| 17 | Consider whether ability to offer park and loan should be subject to not adversely affecting other parties (as with AHPs). Also consider relationship with section 8.22 | First Gas |
| 18 | Consider deleting (e)(i) from the definition of emergency in section 9.1 | First Gas |
| 19 | Consider if consultation timeframes should restart if First Gas does not proceed with maintenance (section 9.2) | First Gas |
| 20 | Consider party best placed to receive and act on an OFO – which may be the interconnected party at a dedicated delivery point and Shippers at a network delivery point (sections 9.5 and 9.6) | First Gas |
| 21 | Consider the "best endeavours" obligations on Shippers and consider describing the steps in a process of issuing and responding to an OFO (sections 9.5 and 9.6) | First Gas |



| # | Item | Responsibility |
|----|--|----------------|
| 22 | Reconsider notification and curtailment following an OFO in light of any changes to sections 9.5 and 9.6 (sections 9.7, 9.8 and 9.11) | First Gas |
| 23 | Consider whether range/limits should apply to overrun / underrun charges to give parties more certainty, and/or whether these charges should only be changed via an urgent change request (sections 11.4 and 11.5) | First Gas |
| 24 | Consider whether First Gas should be required to disclose the likely cost impacts of any proposed change to the GTAC, or exercise its veto, early in the change process (section 17.14) | First Gas |
| 25 | Consider issuing a guideline on how change requests will be evaluated, including urgent changes made by First Gas and subsequently considered by the GIC (section 17.19) | GIC |

Actions from Friday, 17 November 2017

| # | Item | Responsibility |
|----|---|----------------|
| 26 | Consider whether AHPs should be offered via standard nominations process (Genesis preference) | First Gas |
| 27 | Consider whether AHPs should have a tolerance | First Gas |
| 28 | Check relationships between MHQ, AHPs, and DNC for consistency. Consider whether sum of AHP must equal DNC | First Gas |
| 29 | Provide further feedback on GTAC peaking provisions | Greymouth Gas |
| 30 | Review liability provisions in GTAC to provide link with Interconnected Parties (as per MPOC incentives pool) for losses such as the injection of non-spec gas | First Gas |
| 31 | Review RPO standard between ICA and GTAC re non-spec gas (can a producer be an RPO if it has the processes in place but nevertheless injects non-spec gas) | First Gas |
| 32 | Review use of intra-day nomination cycles at receipt points and ability for gas producers to provide hourly NQ at receipt points | First Gas |
| 33 | Consider whether First Gas obligation to control linepack should be extended to also controlling pressure, particularly in parts of the system where pressure has known impacts (such as TTP) | First Gas |
| 34 | Consider relationship between shipper mismatch and TTP, and whether obligation to meet TTP should be suspended due to issues with shipper mismatch | First Gas |
| 35 | Review nominations processes for OBA Parties (intra-Day changes seem to use deemed flows of gas even if the actual flows have exceeded those amounts - sections 4.12-13) | First Gas |
| 36 | Consider setting standards on the information parties must provide about planned and unplanned outages (section 7.13(g)) | GIC |



| # | Item | Responsibility |
|----|---|----------------|
| 37 | Consider how Interconnected Parties can be assured of non-discriminatory access (and whether an equivalent to section 2.7 is appropriate) | First Gas |
| 38 | Consider how ICAs can change as GTAC changes, e.g. by requiring updates when relevant provisions of GTAC change | First Gas |
| 39 | Publish an example GTA (or refer to examples already in public domain). | First Gas |
| 40 | Consider publishing a standard form allocation agreement or principles in section 7 | First Gas |
| 41 | Consider whether basing RM tolerances on previous day DQs is appropriate – particularly on unusual days | First Gas |
| 42 | Clarify adoption of D+1 allocations - consider incorporating D+1 by reference (or adding principles), and confirm that GTAC will abide by any industry allocation agreement | First Gas |
| 42 | Incorporate a fallback allocation into the GTAC (e.g. pro-rata allocations on nominations) to take effect if shippers no longer use D+1 allocations or daily information is not available | First Gas |
| 43 | Investigate 7 day a week D+1 information provision (or only apply incentives on business days) | First Gas |
| 44 | Consider GIC mandate to carry out D+1 allocation tasks | GIC / DAWG |
| 45 | Consider how wash-ups affect positions at the start of each Day? Do these affect every calculation – financial, gas quantities (or hybrid as per the status quo) | First Gas |
| 46 | Consider possible mathematical issue with PRs that it may be impossible to supply full PRs because of deemed flows that have been used by non-PRs. Proposed outcome: PRs can be curtailed pro rata to each other (but DNC not backed by PRs can't be reduced below deemed flow) | First Gas |
| 47 | Consider application of extra nominations cycle (section 4.19) – whether to allow more than one in any Day. Also consider application at receipt points | First Gas |
| 48 | Consider what actions First Gas will take in the event of IT systems failure | First Gas |
| 49 | Provide further information on credit/rebate of transmission incentive fees (underruns / underruns) | First Gas |
| 50 | Consider removing references to multiple receipt zones in section 3.2. | First Gas |
| 51 | Review definition of mismatch, running mismatch and other definitions to ensure that trades are accounted for. | First Gas |
| 52 | Publish Terms of Reference for Sapere GTAC cost benefit analysis | First Gas |
| 53 | Consider how the GIC will take into account any additional commentary it receives on commercial matters during the consultation period it will hold on its assessment of the GTAC | GIC |
| 54 | Consider relationship between non-OBA allocation agreements and interconnection agreements at dedicated delivery points. | First Gas |