

CODE MODIFICATION PROPOSAL No 0324
Code Governance Review: Significant Code Reviews
Version 2.0

Date: 11/08/2010
Proposed Implementation Date: 31 December 2010
Urgency: Non Urgent

1 The Modification Proposal

a) Nature and Purpose of this Proposal

Where capitalised words and phrases are used within this Modification Proposal, those words and phrases shall usually have the meaning given within the Uniform Network Code (unless they are otherwise defined in this Modification Proposal). Key UNC defined terms used in this Modification Proposal are highlighted by an asterisk (*) when first used.

This Modification Proposal*, as with all Modification Proposals, should be read in conjunction with the prevailing Uniform Network Code* (UNC).

Background

In November 2007, Ofgem announced the Review of Industry Code Governance, which concluded at the end of March 2010 when Ofgem published their Final Proposals for the Code Governance Review (CGR). The Final Proposals covered the following work strands:

- Significant Code Review and Self Governance proposals;
- Proposals on the governance of network charging methodologies;
- Proposed approach to environmental assessment within the code objectives;
- Proposals on the role of code administrators and small participant and consumer initiatives; and
- The Code Administration Code of Practice (subset of the above code administrator's proposals).

The licence modifications necessary to implement the Final Proposals for the Code Governance Review and the Code Administration Code of Practice were published on 3 June 2010 and become effective on the 31 December 2010.

This Modification Proposal* aims to implement the Code Governance Review Final Proposals with regards to the management of Modification Proposals raised during a Significant Codes Review (SCR).

The purpose of reviewing the SCR process within the CGR was to ensure

that changes recommended as a result of an SCR can be facilitated quickly and effectively. The speed and efficiency of implementing SCR recommendations will be particularly important given the need for the industry to rise to the challenge of the Government's social and environmental energy goals and possible changes required as a result of European legislation.

The current UNC Modification Rules* allow for any Transporter*, User* or Third Party Participant* to raise a Modification Proposal irrespective of whether an SCR has been initiated to consider the same topics raised within a proposal. The Code Governance Review considered whether the current process remained suitable or whether permitting such Modification Proposals to be raised and pursued in parallel to an SCR could be detrimental to the efficient administration of the code and generate undue confusion on the changes being pursued.

A brief overview of the key recommendations regarding a SCR and the UNC can be found below. It is important to note that the following points provide a summary of the CGR Final Proposals and not necessarily the views of the proposer;

- Prior to the commencement of a SCR Ofgem will, at the earliest opportunity, signal to the industry its intention to conduct a SCR. This notification will detail the commencement date of the SCR and the matters within the scope of the review.
- A SCR will be deemed to have been completed via one of the following methods;
 - (a) The Authority issues a statement deeming that no further action is required
 - (b) The licensee has, following a direction from the Authority, raised a proposal containing the recommendations of the SCR, or
 - (c) In the absence of either (a) or (b), 28 (twenty-eight) calendar days following the Authority's publication of its SCR conclusions
- The period between the commencement date and completion date of the SCR is deemed to be the SCR Phase.
- A SCR related proposal may be raised and pursued via the relevant code development process prior to the commencement of a SCR. However the Authority will not necessarily approve such proposals where they overlap with an imminent SCR, and nor will such proposals delay the commencement of an SCR.
- For the avoidance of doubt, if a proposal has been raised prior to an SCR and issued to the Authority for determination but is subsequently sent

back into the code development process, that proposal will not be subject to the SCR.

- If during an SCR Phase an urgent proposal has been raised concerning the topic being covered within the SCR, only the Authority* can decide whether the proposal can proceed via the usual code development processes with decisions judged on a case-by-case basis.
- For any non-urgent proposals raised in relation to a SCR topic, the relevant code panel, with the assistance of the Code Administrator, should assess whether a proposal falls within a SCR.
- If the relevant code panel determines that the non-urgent proposal relates to an ongoing SCR then the code panel will provide this assessment in a written statement to the Authority. The code development process for the proposal will be temporarily suspended until the Authority has made a determination.
- If the Authority agree with a panel assessment that a non-urgent proposal relates to a commenced SCR then the proposal will be subsumed by the SCR and the code development procedure for the particular Modification Proposal will continue to be suspended until the SCR is complete.
- Once the SCR is complete, the code development procedure for each suspended proposals will recommence with proposers able to withdraw their proposal if they deem that the proposal is no longer valid.
- If the Authority decides that a non-urgent proposal is not related to an ongoing SCR the proposal will continue as per the relevant code development process.
- If the SCR is completed via method (b) above, the proposal raised by the licensee and containing conclusions of the SCR will then pursue the relevant code development procedures and may only be withdrawn upon agreement of the Authority.
- Finally, once the SCR has ended via one of the above methods the 'barring' of raising proposals in relation to the relevant SCR will be lifted. Specifically, relevant parties will be able to raise alternate proposals if they believe improvements can be made to the original SCR proposal raised as per method (b) above.

Nature

To implement the above recommendations from the Code Governance Review Final Proposals into the UNC it is proposed that the UNC Modification Rules be amended to reflect the required amendments to the assessment and progression of Modification Proposals during a SCR.

First, it is proposed that 'Significant Code Review' be included as a defined

term with the meaning given in Standard Special Condition A11.

Preventing a SCR related non-urgent Modification Proposal being raised during an associated SCR period

Section 6.1 'Relevant Persons' within the UNC Modification Rules describes the parties that can raise a Modification Proposal from time to time. To implement the Code Governance Review Final Proposals it is proposed that this section be amended to state that 'Relevant Persons' may not, unless the Authority determines otherwise and informs the Secretary of its determination, raise a non-urgent Modification Proposal to amend either the UNC or an Individual Network Code if the Modification Proposal relates to the area of the UNC already under analysis via a commenced SCR.

Section 7.2 'Discussion of Modification Proposals' within the UNC Modification Rules states the discussion of a recently raised Modification Proposal by the Modification Panel to determine whether the Modification Proposal should be pursued via Development Phase or the Consultation Phase. It is proposed that this section 7.2.3 (a) be amended to state that the Modification Panel will in the first instance assess whether a Modification Proposal relates to a commenced SCR.

Treatment of Modification Proposals determined as relating to a SCR

It is proposed that section 7.2 is also amended to state that, should a non-urgent Modification Proposal be raised during an SCR, the Modification Panel shall determine whether the proposal may be related to the commenced SCR. If the Modification Panel determine in favour of the above, the Panel shall submit to the Authority a written assessment (as described below) reflecting the determination, along with a copy of the Modification Proposal. The code development process for the proposal will be suspended until the Authority indicates whether they agree with the Panel determination or not.

The written assessment will seek an Authority view as to whether they agree that the proposal is related to the commenced SCR. If the Authority agrees the Panel determination was correct, the proposal shall become a 'Significant Code Review Modification Proposal' and continue to be suspended until the Authority informs the Secretary that the SCR has finished.

It is also proposed that section 7.2 of the Modification Rules be amended to oblige the Secretary* to inform the proposer and other interested parties if the proposal has become a Significant Code Review Modification Proposal and the proposal shall be suspended until Authority informs the Secretary that the SCR has finished.

Once Authority informs the Secretary that the SCR has finished,

the suspension on any Significant Code Review Modification Proposals shall be lifted and the Modification Procedures for the proposals shall continue. As such the proposer does not propose an amendment to the Modification Rules to cater for this process. The proposer will be able to withdraw their Proposal, during the period of suspension, if they deem that the proposal is no longer valid.

It is further proposed that, if the Authority does not agree with the Panel determination, the proposal does not become a Significant Code Review Modification Proposal and the proposal shall be considered at the next Modification Panel meeting in accordance with Section 7.2.4 of the Rules.

Withdrawal or variation of SCR driven Modification Proposals'

Section 6.5 'Withdrawal or variation of Modification Proposals' of the UNC Modification Rules states that the proposer of a Modification Proposal may withdraw or vary the proposal at any time prior to the proposal being submitted to the Authority for determination. It is proposed that this section be amended to reflect that where a Gas Transporter has been directed to raise a Modification Proposal by the Authority following the completion of a SCR, a request by the relevant Transporter to withdraw or vary the proposal must be accompanied by written notice by the Authority agreeing to such a request.

The proposer believes that the current process for raising Urgent Modification Procedures satisfies the requirements identified as part of the Code Governance Review Final Proposals.

Further, the proposer believes section 11.8 'View' of the UNC Modification Rules provides the opportunity for the Transporters* to seek a view of the Authority on matters relating to possible SCR related Modification Proposals should clarity be required.

It is also proposed that where the Authority reconsiders its previous determination regarding whether a Proposal is an SCR related proposal it shall inform the Secretary of its revised determination and the proposal shall be treated in line with the revised determination.

It is proposed that if implemented the following transition arrangements are used;

All modification proposals that have been allocated a number by the JO at the time of implementation will continue on the arrangements prior to implementation of this proposal, however from the date of implementation any new modifications will progress using the new arrangements

b) Justification for Urgency and recommendation on the procedure and timetable to be followed (if applicable)

Not applicable.

c) Recommendation on whether this Proposal should proceed to the review procedures, the Development Phase, the Consultation Phase or be referred to a Workstream for discussion.

The proposer believes that this Modification Proposal is sufficiently clear to proceed directly to consultation

2 User Pays

a) Classification of the Proposal as User Pays or not and justification for classification

This Modification Proposal does not affect xoserve systems or procedures and therefore it is not affected by User Pays governance arrangements.

b) Identification of Users, proposed split of the recovery between Gas Transporters and Users for User Pays costs and justification

Not applicable.

c) Proposed charge(s) for application of Users Pays charges to Shippers

Not applicable.

d) Proposed charge for inclusion in ACS – to be completed upon receipt of cost estimate from xoserve

Not applicable.

3 Extent to which implementation of this Modification Proposal would better facilitate the achievement (for the purposes of each Transporter's Licence) of the Relevant Objectives

This proposal is raised in accordance with paragraph 1c of Standard Special Condition A11 Network Code and Uniform Network Code. The Proposer feels that the proposal better facilitates the efficient discharge by the licensee of the obligations imposed upon it following the Ofgem Code Governance Review, under paragraph 15 of Standard Special Condition A11. Network Code and Uniform Network Code, of the Gas Transporters' Licence as provided below:

Significant code reviews

15A. The network code modification procedures shall provide that proposals for modification of the uniform network code falling within the scope of a significant code review may not be made by the parties listed in paragraph 10(a)(i-iv) and

10(ab) during the significant code review phase, except where:

- a. the Authority determines that the modification proposal may be made, having taken into account (among other things) the urgency of the subject matter of the proposal; or*
- b. the modification proposal is made by the licensee in accordance with paragraphs 10(aa) and 15C.*

15B. The network code modification procedures shall provide that where a modification proposal is made during the significant code review phase, unless otherwise exempted by the Authority, the panel shall:

- a. comply with the steps in paragraph 9; and*
- b. as soon as practicable notify the Authority of:*
 - (i) any representations received in relation to the suitability of the significant code review route; and*
 - (ii) the panel's assessment of whether the proposal falls within the scope of a significant code review and the applicability of the exceptions under paragraph 15A(a) or (b), and its reasons for that assessment; and*
- c. not proceed with the modification proposal without the Authority's prior consent.*

15C. The network code modification procedures shall provide that if within twenty-eight(28) days after the Authority has published its significant code review conclusions, the Authority issues to the licensee:

- a. directions, the licensee shall comply with those directions;*
- b. a statement that no directions under sub-paragraph (a) will be issued in relation to the uniform network code, the licensee shall treat the significant code review phase as ended;*
- c. neither directions under sub-paragraph (a), or a statement under subparagraph (b), the significant code review phase will be deemed to have ended. The Authority's published conclusions and directions to the licensee/relevant gas transporter(s), shall not fetter the voting rights of the members of the panel or the procedures informing the recommendation described at paragraph 15(a)(iv).*

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

Not applicable.

5 The implications for Transporters and each Transporter of implementing this Modification Proposal, including:

a) The implications for operation of the System:

Not applicable.

b) The development and capital cost and operating cost implications:

Not applicable.

c) Whether it is appropriate to recover all or any of the costs and, if so, a proposal for the most appropriate way for these costs to be recovered:

Not applicable.

d) The consequence (if any) on the level of contractual risk of each Transporter under the Uniform Network Code of the Individual Network Codes proposed to be modified by this Modification Proposal

6 The extent to which the implementation is required to enable each Transporter to facilitate compliance with a safety notice from the Health and Safety Executive pursuant to Standard Condition A11 (14) (Transporters Only)

Not applicable.

7 The development implications and other implications for the UK Link System of the Transporter, related computer systems of each Transporter and related computer systems of Users

Not applicable.

8 The implications for Users of implementing the Modification Proposal, including:

a) The administrative and operational implications (including impact upon manual processes and procedures)

Not applicable.

b) The development and capital cost and operating cost implications

Not applicable.

c) The consequence (if any) on the level of contractual risk of Users under the Uniform Network Code of the Individual Network Codes proposed to be modified by this Modification Proposal

Not applicable.

9 The implications of the implementation for other relevant persons (including, but without limitation, Users, Connected System Operators, Consumers, Terminal Operators, Storage Operators, Suppliers and producers and, to the extent not so otherwise addressed, any Non-Code Party)

Not applicable.

10 Consequences on the legislative and regulatory obligations and contractual relationships of the Transporters

Implementation of the proposal would allow the new licence obligation effective on 31 December 2010 to be met.

11 Analysis of any advantages or disadvantages of implementation of the Modification Proposal not otherwise identified in paragraphs 2 to 10 above

Advantages

Disadvantages

12 Summary of representations received as a result of consultation by the Proposer (to the extent that the import of those representations are not reflected elsewhere in this Proposal)

13 Detail of all other representations received and considered by the Proposer

14 Any other matter the Proposer considers needs to be addressed

15 Recommendations on the time scale for the implementation of the whole or any part of this Modification Proposal

It is recommended that this be implemented the next working day after Authority decision.

16 Comments on Suggested Text

17 Suggested Text

Code Concerned, sections and paragraphs

UNC Modification Rules

Uniform Network Code

Transportation Principal Document

Section(s)

Proposer's Representative

Nick Reeves, National Grid NTS

Proposer

National Grid NTS