

# Representation - Draft Modification Report 0565 0565A 0565B

## Central Data Service Provider: General framework and obligations

Responses invited by: **5pm 08 December 2016**

To: [enquiries@gasgovernance.co.uk](mailto:enquiries@gasgovernance.co.uk)

<b>Representative:</b>	Stuart Crossey
<b>Organisation:</b>	Energetics Gas
<b>Date of Representation:</b>	7/12/16
<b>Support or oppose implementation?</b>	<p>0565 - Oppose</p> <p>0565A - Support</p> <p>0565B – Oppose</p>
<b>Alternate preference:</b>	<p><i>If either 0565, 0565A or 0565B were to be implemented, which would be your preference?</i></p> <p>0565/0565A/0565B* <i>delete as appropriate</i></p>
<b>Relevant Objective:</b>	<p>Energetics believes that UNC0565A has a positive impact on the following objectives:</p> <p><b>c)</b> Energetics believes that UNC0565A has a positive impact on objective C as it will allow iGTs to have a greater voice in Data Services Contract related matters, particularly around the area of restricted class change. Furthermore it could be argued UNC0565 and UNC0565B do not support the requirements of condition A15A of non RGT Users “the opportunity to participate in the decision making process in respect of matters that will have an effect on the appointment and ongoing operation of the CDS”</p> <p><b>d)</b> Energetics believe the voting model associated with UNC0565A will promote more competition between parties thereby fulfilling objective D, whereas under UNC0565 and UNC0565B the GDNS have the ability to impose change under the Data Service’s Contract thereby stifling competition</p> <p><b>f)</b> Energetics believe that under UNC0565A a potential increase in the use of self-governance will naturally lead to a reduction on the appeals process, thereby fulfilling objective F. It is believed that potentially relying on an appeals process as highlighted in UNC0565 and UNC0565B will lead to inefficiencies in code administration and as a result does not facilitate objective F.</p>

**Reason for support/opposition: Please summarise (in one paragraph) the key reason(s) for each modification**

Energetics believes that UNC0565A is the best model for iGTs as it does not exclude them from the decision making process governed by DSC and the various committees and workgroups which will oversee its governance.

The major concern is that under restricted class changes, which only has an impact on iGTs and GDNs, under the voting models proposed by UNC0565 and UNC0565B, regardless if the iGT position, the GDNs by having superior voting rights and will therefore always have an advantage in any proposed change.

Energetics therefore supports UNC0565A as is the only voting model that does not allow decisions to be imposed on IGTs, furthermore it is the only model which promotes the use of self-governance thereby potentially reducing the need to enforce the appeals process and subsequently making the change process far more efficient for all industry parties.

**Self-Governance Statement: Please provide your views on the self-governance statement.**

These modifications should not be subject to self-governance as any changes will impact many areas of the utilities industry.

**Implementation: What lead-time do you wish to see prior to implementation and why?**

Energetics agrees that UNC0565 (or variant) must be implemented for 1<sup>st</sup> April 2016 although iGTs will not be a UNC signatory until NEXUS go-live date.

**Impacts and Costs: What analysis, development and ongoing costs would you face?**

Funding Governance and Ownership brings an uncertainty around costs which have gradually increased over the development process, this uncertainty would be enhanced by the implementation of UNC565 or UNC0565B whereas UNC0565A would allow iGTs to have some control over any potential changes to cost allocation.

**Legal Text: Are you satisfied that the legal text will deliver the intent of the Solution?**

iGTs have worked with the UNC0565 work group throughout the legal drafting and are happy that the legal text will deliver the intent of the solution.

**Are there any errors or omissions in this Modification Report that you think should be taken into account? Include details of any impacts/costs to your organisation that are directly related to this.**

None identified.

**Please provide below any additional analysis or information to support your representation**

N/A