

UNC Modification		At what stage is this document in the process?
<h1>UNC 0XXX:</h1> <h2>Recovery of Shipper Losses incurred in Supplier of Last Resort events</h2>		<div style="display: flex; flex-direction: column; gap: 5px;"> <div style="border: 1px solid green; background-color: #28a745; color: white; padding: 5px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> <span style="font-weight: bold; font-size: 1.2em; margin-right: 5px;">01</span> Modification         </div> <div style="border: 1px solid #17a2b8; padding: 5px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> <span style="font-weight: bold; font-size: 1.2em; margin-right: 5px;">02</span> Workgroup Report         </div> <div style="border: 1px solid #9b59b6; padding: 5px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> <span style="font-weight: bold; font-size: 1.2em; margin-right: 5px;">03</span> Draft Modification Report         </div> <div style="border: 1px solid #f39c12; padding: 5px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> <span style="font-weight: bold; font-size: 1.2em; margin-right: 5px;">04</span> Final Modification Report         </div> </div>
<p><b>A change is proposed to allow shippers that have incurred unrecoverable costs from shipping for sites who supplier is subject to a Supplier of Last Resort event via Balancing Neutrality Charges</b></p>		
	<p>The Proposer recommends that this modification should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>subject to self-governance; and</li> <li>assessed by a Workgroup</li> </ul> <p>This modification will be presented by the Proposer to the Panel on <b>dd mmm yyyy</b>. The Panel will consider the Proposer's recommendation and determine the appropriate route.</p>	
	<p>High Impact: None</p>	
	<p>Medium Impact: Shippers</p>	
	<p>Low Impact: None</p>	

Contents		
1	Summary	3
2	Governance	3
3	Why Change?	4
4	Code Specific Matters	4
5	Solution	4
6	Impacts & Other Considerations	5
7	Relevant Objectives	5
8	Implementation	6
9	Legal Text	6
10	Recommendations	6
Timetable		
<b>The Proposer recommends the following timetable: <i>(amend as appropriate)</i></b>		
Initial consideration by Workgroup	dd month year	
Amended Modification considered by Workgroup	dd month year	
Workgroup Report presented to Panel	dd month year	
Draft Modification Report issued for consultation	dd month year	
Consultation Close-out for representations	dd month year	
Variation Request presented to Panel	dd month year	
Final Modification Report available for Panel	dd month year	
Modification Panel decision	dd month year	

 Any questions?

Contact:  
Joint Office of Gas Transporters

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

 0121 288 2107

Proposer:  
Lian Tooley  
Contract Natural Gas Limited

 [ltooley@cngltd.co.uk](mailto:ltooley@cngltd.co.uk)

 07793240145

Transporter:  
Insert name

 email address

 telephone

Systems Provider:  
Xoserve

 [UKLink@xoserve.com](mailto:UKLink@xoserve.com)

Other:  
Gareth Evans

 [gareth@waterswye.co.uk](mailto:gareth@waterswye.co.uk)

 07500 964447

## 1 Summary

### What

Currently, when a supplier is in financial failure, Ofgem will carry out various checks and look to appoint a Supplier of Last Resort (SoLR), who will be assign the affected customers. The SoLR supplier is able under the supplier licence to claim for the costs it has incurred from taking on these customers, including the outstanding credit balances.

In the period between the failure and the relevant meter points transferring to the new supplier under SoLR, the shipper registered for the supply points is still liable for all the costs of supplying them, including, but not limited to, the gas, transportation and settlement costs. There is currently no avenue of protection through legislation and the shipper has no control over the timescales involved in the process. Shippers must comply with any relevant directions given to them by Ofgem to facilitate the SoLR supplying gas or to make arrangements to convey gas to the premises regardless of the fact that the costs being incurred are unlikely to be recovered.

### Why

This position is leading to increased pressures on shippers which could ultimately have a negative impact on the gas markets as a whole. If this situation is not rectified it is likely that:

- shippers will be unwilling/unable to offer shipping services to suppliers;
- less new suppliers will be able to enter the market; and
- there will be less competition for end consumers.

In addition to the above, this situation is putting existing shippers in an untenable position and could ultimately lead to shipper failure. If this were to be the case, there is currently no statutory or licence provision to appoint a "Shipper of Last Resort" regardless of whether or not the supplier remains solvent. We feel that the potential consequences of an event such as this would have huge ramifications for the whole of the industry and could have serious impacts on the end customer not to mention the potential costs involved to all.

### How

In the absence of any relevant license process for recovering costs as a shipper, it is proposed that shippers are able to claim any costs incurred as part of a SoLR event via Balancing Neutrality Charges. The amount to be recovered will be calculated in accordance with a guidance document to be developed.

## 2 Governance

### Justification for Self-Governance

The impact on a particular shipper from these costs is potentially significant, but the total costs incurred by the market via the Balancing Neutrality Charges as whole is not likely to be considered material as the claims will be relatively infrequent and across the whole industry. In light of this, it is considered that the proposal is not a material change and therefore should be subject to self-governance.

## Requested Next Steps

This modification should:

- be considered a non-material change and subject to self-governance
- be assessed by a Workgroup

## 3 Why Change?

When a gas or electricity supplier has its licence revoked (primarily due to going into administration), Ofgem is required to reallocate those customers to another licence holder. This is termed the Supplier of Last Resort (SoLR) process. The powers to do so sit in the Gas Act 1986 and Electricity Act 1989 (as amended). An SoLR supplier can claim the additional costs for the supply of the customer over and above what it expects to recover. This can include credit balances outstanding. Once the amounts have been agreed, Ofgem then directs the gas transporters to pay the SoLR supplier and then recover the same amount from the industry via transportation charges.

By contrast, there is currently no process for the costs that a shipper would incur during a SoLR event to be recovered. The registered shipper of the supply points of the now defunct supplier is unable to switch the customers away until the SoLR process is completed. So in a situation where the shipper is different to the supplier, shippers are left carrying the financial burden of supplying the sites until the sites have been switched to the SoLR shipper (the timescale of which can vary owing to the circumstances of the event) and have no realistic means of recovering the costs.

Realistically it is not practical for a shipper to protect itself from these costs via normal routes for dealing with a counterparty, which is through credit cover or margin. Shippers cannot simply abandon customers of suppliers who are struggling; any form of credit cover would have to be excessive to cover for the period of time in which a supplier fails to pay its bills as it goes into default and then additional costs when the supplier's customers are being transferred. In addition during an SoLR event, the supplier is invariably in administration and so it is debatable as to whether credit cover lodged by the supplier with its shipper can be used to cover shipping to the defunct supplier's customers.

Under the current arrangements therefore shipper does not have any control over the costs being incurred during the SoLR event, the time period they will be incurred for and are very likely to recover costs if a supplier fails. This increases the risk of shipper failure and discourages shippers from engaging with smaller suppliers.

There is a general acceptance that the ultimate costs of supplier failure is borne by the industry to facilitate competition. To not restrict competition in shipping services for smaller suppliers there seems to be a need to develop a similar process for shippers.

## 4 Code Specific Matters

### Reference Documents

None identified.

## 5 Solution

Shippers will be able to claim costs from the industry in the event they are exposed to unrecoverable costs from a Supplier of Last Resort Event.

### Business Rules

1. Shippers may submit a claim for the UNC-related costs incurred during an SoLR event, termed an “SoLR cost claim”.
2. An SoLR cost claim may comprise of the period between the supplier formally going into administration and the SoLR transfer
  - a. Wholesale gas costs for supplying SoLR customers (volumes supplied to customers multiplied by the System Average Price).
  - b. Any associated UIG costs.
  - c. Transportation Charges.
3. The SoLR cost claim will be submitted to the CDSP who will verify the accuracy of the calculation against the information it holds. The CDSP may amend the claim and will have final say over the value.
4. Once approved by the CDSP the SoLR cost claim will be included as an Aggregate System Payment which is then included in neutrality balancing charges.

## 6 Impacts & Other Considerations

**Does this modification impact a Significant Code Review (SCR) or other significant industry change projects, if so, how?**

None.

### Consumer Impacts

None.

### Cross Code Impacts

None.

### EU Code Impacts

None.

### Central Systems Impacts

None as the amount will simply be an additional amount recovered via neutrality.

## 7 Relevant Objectives

Impact of the modification on the Relevant Objectives:

Relevant Objective	Identified impact
--------------------	-------------------

a) Efficient and economic operation of the pipe-line system.	None
b) Coordinated, efficient and economic operation of (i) the combined pipe-line system, and/ or (ii) the pipe-line system of one or more other relevant gas transporters.	None
c) Efficient discharge of the licensee's obligations.	None
d) 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.	Positive
e) Provision of reasonable economic incentives for relevant suppliers to secure that the domestic customer supply security standards... are satisfied as respects the availability of gas to their domestic customers.	None
f) Promotion of efficiency in the implementation and administration of the Code.	None
g) Compliance with the Regulation and any relevant legally binding decisions of the European Commission and/or the Agency for the Co-operation of Energy Regulators.	None

## 8 Implementation

As self-governance procedures are proposed, implementation could be sixteen business days after a Modification Panel decision to implement, subject to no Appeal being raised.

## 9 Legal Text

To be provided

## 10 Recommendations

### Proposer's Recommendation to Panel

Panel is asked to:

- Agree that self-governance procedures should apply
- Refer this proposal to a Workgroup for assessment.