CODE MODIFICATION PROPOSAL No 0292
Proposed change to the AQ Review Amendment Tolerance for SSP sites

Version 7.0

Date: 07/12/2010

Proposed Implementation Date: 01 July 2010

Urgency: Non-Urgent

1 The Modification Proposal

a) Nature and Purpose of this Proposal

Background

The current Network Code rules in relation to the allowed amendment activity relates back to the early years of the SSP AQ Review Process. In the initial years of the AQ Review, there was some Shipper behavior where the process was used to "shave" AQs to provide volume and cost allocation benefits to their portfolio. This introduced additional costs to other Shippers operating in the SSP market, through the Reconciliation by Difference process.

With this in mind a modification proposal (Transco Network Code Modification No. 624) was implemented to put in place a tolerance for amendment activity, whereby a Shipper could only propose a Small Supply Point amendment, where they could demonstrate that the AQ was materially incorrect, based on meter reading history. The modification proposed that only amendments where the AQ would change by not less than 20%, in an either upward or downward direction, would be accepted.

Coupled with this it was proposed that the Shipper must use and be able to demonstrate a consistent amendment methodology, in both an upward and downward direction.

The modification was accepted and the rules were put in place to stop Shippers gaming. ScottishPower fully supported the introduction of the rules, at the time, as the best means of addressing gaming opportunities. Modification 81 which was implemented on 1/10/06 enhanced the AQ review reporting information published by Transporters by providing an overview of Users' performance at various stages within the AQ review process in an anonymous format. Should Modification 292 be implemented, the transparency of Industry behaviour within the AQ review process would be retained through Mod 81 reporting. The AQ value assigned to SSP supply points is key to the charges faced by Shippers in relation to their portfolio, for both gas and transportation charges. In addition it plays into the tariffs offered to domestic customers and the profitability of a domestic gas portfolio.

However since the introduction of DNPC003 the effect of the AQ has become ever more pronounced in determining the amount of transportation

costs allocated to individual supply points.

It therefore no longer seems appropriate that there should be such a restriction on the Shippers ability to alter Small Supply Point AQs and their ability to manage the costs associated with them. In addition, it would appear inefficient to continually keep SSP AQ values at a level of 20% over/under statement against potential amendment values, when these are also used by the Transporters to assess available network capacity and investment needs.

At the same time information from Xoserve suggests that AQs are going down by 5% per annum and as such, the restriction on the amendment activity of Shippers limits the ability for the market to recognise this reduction at meter point level.

If a more practical amendment process were therefore adopted it would address all of these issues and bring some of the benefits outlined in the Rolling AQ modification, which has stalled due to the Project Nexus discussions.

In support of the proposal, it is worth noting that Xoserve do not apply any tolerance to the proposed AQs that they put forward, prior to the amendment period, and therefore it would seem in equitable that such a restriction is placed on Supplier proposed amendment values.

Proposal

Overstated AQs have the potential to significantly impact on the profitability of a Supply business, however this impact has become much more pronounced since the distribution transportation charging changed to be more capacity (AQ/SOQ) focused. In past the capacity charges were 50% of the transportation bill whereas now they represent 95% of it. This means that Suppliers face transportation charges that are much more fixed in nature and are determined by the AQ value set for the site. The resultant issue is that if there is not sufficient throughput by the customer, to reflect the AQ value there is potentially not enough units to bill to recover the fixed (capacity based) transportation charges, thus impacting Supplier profitability.

For this reason this proposal seeks to reduce the SSP AQ amendment tolerance to 5%. This change will allow more cost reflective values to be applied and also aid in the Transporters understanding of network capacity needs.

Although this proposal will open up the amount of amendments that can be lodged for the SSP market, we believe that this is something that can be managed by Xoserve, as in the initial phases of the SSP AQ process an amendment could be lodged for any change to an AQ value. In addition as Xoserve charge for using the speculative calculator, a pre-cursor to amendment, they will be able to recover any additional administrative costs seen.

In addition, it is proposed to extend the current provisions within the UNC Section G 1.6.4 to provide that prior to the start of the AQ Review amendment window (31 May) that the Transporters will issue to each User a volume cap for the number of AQ Amendments that can be submitted in each Business Day during the window (up to 13 August), together with the total number of Industry amendments that can be submitted per Day. This volume cap will be calculated by Transporters based on a Shippers meter point count as at 1st April in each Gas Year, subject to a de minimus level of 500 amendments per Shipper per day or to a value equal to the meter point count of the Shipper portfolio if less than the de-minimus level. For the avoidance of doubt the volume cap calculated for each User will apply in each Business Day for the duration of the AQ amendment window, but will have the de minimus level set, so as not to place an unnecessary operational burden on small suppliers. Users may submit AQ amendments in a manner that exceeds their volume cap on any day throughout the period of amendment phase of the AQ review process but there would be no obligation for more than the volume cap to be processed if in doing so the industry cap would also be breached.. This requirement is intended to reduce any potential impact on xoserve systems and to mitigate the risks associated with Users submitting the majority of AQ amendments towards the end of the amendment window. The Transporter will be entitled to reject AQ amendments, which are non-compliant with any of the requirements of UNC (and the applicable xoserve guidance document) including manual referrals which fall out of validation. The Transporters Agent will be required, following consultation with Users, to produce and publish as guidance document which will set out how amendments should be submitted and how they will be processed. This will include how amendments submitted in excess of the volume cap will be processed.

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

We request that this proposal is issued for consultation.

2 User Pays

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

User Pays – implementation of this proposal would incur costs for the Transporters' Agency as their systems would need to be modified.

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

Development costs: £31k to £71k

Operational Costs: It is not clear whether any incremental operational costs will be incurred. However should this be the case, the current User Pays charge applied for use of the speculative calculator would be adjusted accordingly.

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

User Pays charges applicable to Shippers: allocated based on each User's share of Supply Point could (SSP only) on 1 April 2011.

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

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 would ensure more accurate allocation of costs, with AQs being set that are more reflective of customer usage. This would have the benefit of meeting the Relevant Objective of securing effective competition between Shippers and Suppliers.

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

No such implications have been identified.

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

a) The implications for operation of the System:

No such implications have been identified at this time.

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

No costs have been identified other that those to be recovered through User Pays.

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:

Additional costs would be recovered through User Pays as detailed above.

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

No consequences have been identified.

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)

Implementation is not required to facilitate such compliance.

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

It is envisaged that there will be system impacts for Transporters, however it has not been possible to confirm the extent of these at this time. The impact on Users systems is unknown.

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

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

Users would have the ability to facilitate the opportunities presented by the proposal. However there will be no requirement for them to do so. Therefore the extent of the impact on individual Users is unknown to the proposer and would very much depend on their own decisions.

b) The development and capital cost and operating cost implications

The Proposer is not aware of such implications.

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

The level of a User's contractual risk will be reduced by the introduction of this proposal, as Users will be able to amend AQs to be more accurate in relation to customer usage.

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)

None identified.

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

The cost reflectivity would be improved.

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

Advantages

- Addresses the inequitable nature of the AQ Review process, where an LSP can be amended by any value, whereas a SSP has a 20% tolerance (UNC Section G 1.6.4).

Disadvantages

- No disadvantages have been identified.

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)

No representations have been received.

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

No such matters have been identified.

14 Any other matter the Proposer considers needs to be addressed

No such matters have been identified.

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

It is recommended that this proposal be implemented on 01 July 2010.

16 Comments on Suggested Text

17 Suggested Text

Code Concerned, sections and paragraphs

Uniform Network Code

Transportation Principal Document

Section(s) Transition Document Part II

Proposer's Representative

Karen Kennedy ScottishPower

Proposer

Karen Kennedy ScottishPower

