

## TOTAL GAS & POWER LIMITED

Mr. Julian Majdanski  
Joint Office of Gas Transporters  
Ground Floor Red  
51 Homer Road  
Solihull  
West Midlands  
B91 3QJ  
[enquiries@gasgovernance.com](mailto:enquiries@gasgovernance.com)

02 November 2006

Dear Julian,

### **Modification Proposals 0109 "Acceptable Security Tools available to Users for Transportation Credit Arrangements"**

Total Gas & Power Limited supports the implementation of Modification Proposal 0109.

#### **Our comments are as follows:**

At present each Transporter determines individually what form of credit may be utilised in securing any financial exposure a Shipper may incur whilst operating on the network. Though each Transporter currently accepts broadly similar types of credit, they may diverge in the future. It therefore seems appropriate that a consolidated list of acceptable types of securitisation should be incorporated within the UNC.

With regard to the types of credit that are detailed within the modification, we agree that those listed cover all appropriate types of security. We furthermore agree with the proposer's assertion that bilateral credit insurance is not as robust as other forms of credit and so should be excluded.

#### **Extent to which implementation of the proposed modification would better facilitate the relevant objectives**

##### ***Gas Transporter Licence Standard Special Condition A11.1***

- (a) *the efficient and economic operation of the pipe-line system to which this licence relates;*

Does not apply to this objective.

- (b) *so far as is consistent with sub-paragraph (a), the coordinated, efficient and economical operation of (i) the combined pipe-line system, and/ or (ii) the pipe-line system of one or more other relevant gas transporters;*

Does not apply to this objective.

- (c) *so far as is consistent with sub-paragraphs (a) and (b), the efficient discharge of the licensee's obligations under this licence;*

Does not apply to this objective.

- (d) *so far as is consistent with sub-paragraphs (a) to (c) the securing of effective competition:(i) between relevant shippers;(ii) between relevant suppliers; and/or*



*(iii) between DN operators (who have entered into transportation arrangements with other relevant gas transporters) and relevant shippers;*

Creating a consistent set of security tools available to Users when lodging credit with Transporters will help simplify the current arrangements, and so help encourage competition between Shippers.

- (e) *so far as is consistent with sub-paragraphs (a) to (d), the provision of reasonable economic incentives for relevant suppliers to secure that the domestic customer supply security standards (within the meaning of paragraph 4 of standard condition 32A (Security of Supply – Domestic Customers) of the standard conditions of Gas Suppliers’ licences) are satisfied as respects the availability of gas to their domestic customers; and*

Does not apply to this objective

- (f) *so far as is consistent with sub-paragraphs (a) to (e), the promotion of efficiency in the implementation and administration of the network code and/or the uniform network code.*

Does not apply to this objective.

### **The implications of implementing the Modification Proposal on security of supply, operation of the Total System and industry fragmentation**

Consolidating acceptable security tools into the UNC will help prevent future industry fragmentation.

### **The implications for Transporters and each Transporter of implementing the Modification Proposal, including**

#### **a) implications for operation of the System:**

No implications identified for Transporter Networks.

#### **b) development and capital cost and operating cost implications:**

We do not anticipate that any significant development, capital or operating cost implications will be incurred.

#### **c) extent to which it is appropriate to recover the costs, and proposal for the most appropriate way to recover the costs:**

Do not anticipate any costs requiring recovery outside of allowed revenue

#### **d) analysis of the consequences (if any) this proposal would have on price regulation:**

No consequences identified.

### **The consequence of implementing the Modification Proposal on the level of contractual risk of each Transporter under the Code as modified by the Modification Proposal**

As we not anticipate there to be a significant changes in the types and level of credit currently lodged with Transporters due to this modification, we do not expect any change in contractual risk.



**The high level indication of the areas of the UK Link System likely to be affected, together with the development implications and other implications for the UK Link Systems and related computer systems of each Transporter and Users**

No changes are anticipated.

**The implications of implementing the Modification Proposal for Users, including administrative and operational costs and level of contractual risk**

This modification is consolidating the current forms of credit accepted by each Transporter individually within the UNC. Only Users with a type of securitisation that is offered by a Transporter, but which will not be detailed within the UNC, will be affected by this change. We do not anticipate there to be significant numbers of Users so affected.

**The implications of implementing the Modification Proposal for Terminal Operators, Consumers, Connected System Operators, Suppliers, producers and, any Non Code Party**

No implications identified.

**Consequences on the legislative and regulatory obligations and contractual relationships of each Transporter and each User and Non Code Party of implementing the Modification Proposal**

Specifying what forms of credit may be utilised by Shippers, clarifies the nature of the contractual relationship between Transporters and Shippers with regard to securitisation.

**Analysis of any advantages or disadvantages of implementation of the Modification Proposal**

**We have identified the following advantages:**

- Codifies current practice, preventing industry fragmentation.
- Provides clarity on acceptable forms of security.

**We have identified the following disadvantages:**

- None identified.

**The extent to which the implementation is required to enable each Transporter to facilitate compliance with safety or other legislation**

Not required for this purpose

**The extent to which the implementation is required having regard to any proposed change in the methodology established under paragraph 5 of Condition A4 or the statement furnished by each Transporter under paragraph 1 of Condition 4 of the Transporter's Licence**



Not required for this purpose

**Programme for works required as a consequence of implementing the Modification Proposal**

The modification only requires minimal changes to be undertaken for implementation.

**Proposed implementation timetable (including timetable for any necessary information systems changes)**

We concur with the proposer that the straightforward nature of this modification facilitates immediate implementation.

**Implications of implementing this Modification Proposal upon existing Code Standards of Service**

No implications identified

***Further Comments***

None

Should you wish to discuss our response further, please feel free to contact me.

Yours faithfully

Gareth Evans  
Regulation Analyst  
Total Gas & Power Limited

Direct: +44 (0) 20 7718 6081  
E-mail: [gareth.evans@total.com](mailto:gareth.evans@total.com)



Registered Office: 33 Cavendish Square, London W1G 0PW  
Tel: 0870 5275 215, Fax: 0870 5275 213  
Registered in England No. 2172239