

CODE MODIFICATION PROPOSAL No 0335A
Significant Offtake Metering Error – Small Shipper Payment Timescales
Version 1.0

Date: 22/09/2011

Proposed Implementation Date: As soon as possible following Authority consent

Urgency: Non Urgent

1 The Modification Proposal

a) Nature and Purpose of this Proposal

Introduction

Scotland Gas Networks (SGN) have raised this UNC Modification as an alternative Proposal to UNC Modification 0335. The SGN Modification Proposal includes elements of Npower's original Proposal in relation to the deferment of Shipper invoices; however it removes the retrospective element of the original Modification Proposal which would currently encompass any pre-existing Significant Offtake Metering Error. This Proposal also limits the extent of the obligations introduced into the UNC to Shippers with a national portfolio size of less than or equal to 100,000 Small Supply Points and where the Shipper organisation's credit limit with the respective Distribution Network is less than or equal to £500,000.

Retrospectively:

Currently UNC MOD 0335, upon implementation, would require the Downstream Transporter to pay Shipper charges associated with the energy and transportation charges incurred as a result of a Significant Offtake Meter Error upfront to National Grid Transmission. Subsequently the DN would invoice LDZ Shippers across the same period that the original error occurred to recover the amounts.

The original Modification Proposal does not differentiate between Significant Offtake Metering Errors identified and notified to the industry prior to and post any potential implementation date of the Proposal. The business rules outlined in Modification Proposal 0335 stipulate that upon the publication of a final Significant Meter Error Report the rules requiring the Distribution Network to pay charges associated with the offtake meter error would apply, however there is no recognition that errors notified prior to implementation of the Modification may still be progressing through the process and may not have reached publication of the final error report. The effect of this business rule is to introduce a retrospective application of a new obligation into the UNC, covering events which commenced prior to the Modification even being raised, let alone implemented. Specifically, there are two Significant Offtake Meter Errors (Aberdeen and Horndon) currently progressing through the UNC process which may be covered by the business rules defined in Modification Proposal 0335.

The Proposer of the original Modification argues that Modification 0335 is designed to place a “commercial incentive” on the Downstream Transporter to manage offtake metering effectively. SGN does not agree that the elements of UNC Modification 335 could effectively place an incentive on the Transporter to prevent offtake errors occurring prior to the implementation date of the Modification Proposal, as the new obligations MOD 335 would introduce were not in place at the time of the original error. It is also the case that implementation of MOD 335 would apply to events occurring prior to the date the Modification Proposal was actually raised. Therefore this alternative Modification Proposal seeks to restrict new obligations to Significant Meter Errors notified to the industry after implementation of the proposal.

Incentives:

SGN does not agree that the obligations MOD 335 would introduce into the UNC specify the correct mechanism to improve Transporter performance in this area. SGN, in conjunction with the other Transporters have instigated improved offtake metering processes and quality monitoring procedures following the occurrence of the significant offtake metering errors at Braishfield and Aberdeen. SGN have also tabled several proposals to be included within the RIIO-GD1 outputs to increase investment to facilitate installation of ultra sonic metering equipment at targeted LDZ offtake locations to increase the accuracy of measurements and reduce the potential for significant errors occurring in the future. Therefore SGN does not consider an incentive in the form described in the original Proposal is required to develop standards associated with offtake metering (and SGN have not based the better facilitation of the relevant objectives within this alternative Proposal on this element).

Under current UNC arrangements, where a Significant Offtake Meter Error occurs the costs borne by the Downstream Transporter in relation to the Independent Technical Expert charges are significant. Combined with costs linked to the operational requirements to facilitate on site inspections, it is likely that each error will cost the Downstream Transporter circa £100K. The costs associated with the Aberdeen Offtake Meter Error, even prior to the finalisation of the ITEs’ reports, are in excess of this amount. Under Proposal 0335 the likely financing costs to SGN of subsidising Shipper and Supplier energy and transportation costs totaling approximately £65M would be in the region of an additional £3M.

This Alternative Modification Proposal restricts the obligations introduced into the UNC to qualifying small Shipper organisations with a national portfolio of 100,000 Small Supply Points or less and a combined organisational credit limit of less than or equal to £500,000. SGN accepts that the impact large offtake meter errors may have on these smaller organisations will be comparatively greater in magnitude due to their restricted access to funds and credit to finance such payments. SGN do not consider the impact on larger Shippers to be significant enough to justify a regime which requires a Distribution Network to subsidise larger Shipper /

Supplier organisations for the costs associated with gas offtaken which has subsequently been sold at profit to their own domestic customers. SGN considers that notice periods provided to Shippers under the current UNC process to be sufficient to allow larger Shipper organisations sufficient time to accrue for and manage the cash flow impacts of large offtake errors.

Proposal

This part of the proposal mirrors Npower's original proposal apart from changes highlighted in red and underlined.

Currently a significant metering error once identified and quantified by the appointed ITE or ITEs (Independent Technical Expert) is incorporated within a single monthly invoice. It is proposed instead that the outstanding amount would be invoiced over the same timescales that the error occurred across for qualifying smaller shipper organisations only. Please note for the avoidance of doubt this applies to metering errors that are Significant (ie >50GWh) and which incur a debit i.e. a rebate to the NTS Shrinkage Manager only. It also does not intend to change the current UNC rules regarding the “line in the sand” date brought in under UNC modification proposal 0152V implemented in April 2008. However, if the Downstream Transporter has already been invoiced by the Upstream Transporter for an error then they are able to recover these costs from the qualifying Shippers involved whether or not they have crossed the Retrospective invoicing threshold.

For example in the case of the Braishfield B meter error if the error had not occurred the gas would have been invoiced to qualifying Shippers across 3 months, therefore under this proposal the cost of the error would be invoiced over 3 months after identification and quantification. This will allow qualifying Shippers to more easily absorb the cost within their cash flow and protects smaller Shippers from large unexpected debits which they cannot budget or allow for. The amounts should be invoiced in line with the principles established in UNC Modification 171 ie profiled into monthly amounts and invoiced in line with each qualifying Shipper's market share in the months of the error.

It is proposed that the interim shortfall be picked up by the appropriate Downstream Transporter who shall cover both Transportation and Energy costs. This will involve a re-imburement of the NTS Shrinkage Manager in the case of the energy cost. We do not expect the Downstream Transporter to purchase gas but simply be responsible for the cashflow in the short term.

To ensure that cash flows across the industry are aligned as far as possible, the System Operator Commodity charge should continue to take account of the rebate received by the NTS Shrinkage manager as soon as is practicable.

Non-implementation of this proposal may result in continued cash flow impacts to qualifying smaller Shippers, which may introduce a barrier to competition in relation to this specific group of Shippers.

Business Rules

1. Following the publication of an Independent Technical Expert's (ITE) final report of the Significant Offtake Metering Error (where the original Significant Offtake Meter Error was notified to the Industry by the Downstream Transporter on a date after the implementation date of this Modification Proposal) the relevant Transporter shall:

- a. Re-allocate volume based on the ITE report.
- b. Calculate the outstanding amount owed to the NTS Shrinkage Manager using the current significant metering error tool.
- c. Invoice qualifying Shippers for each month in the error period in separate invoices at the rate of one invoice a month using the volume and value for each from the Significant metering error template. E.g. an error from January to March invoiced for the first amount in October would be invoiced in October for January, November for February and December for March.
- d. A qualifying Shipper in respect of rule 1 (c) is a Shipper with a national portfolio of less than or equal to 100,000 Small Supply Points and whose combined organisational Shipper Code Credit limit is less than or equal to £500,000 with the relevant Downstream Transporter at the date the Downstream Transporter is invoiced for the relevant amount by National Grid Transmission.
- e. For the avoidance of doubt Shippers with a national portfolio of greater than 100,000 Small Supply Points and / or where the combined organisational Shipper Code Credit limit is greater than £500,000 will continue to be invoiced under the existing rules, i.e. a single invoice from both the Downstream Transporter and NTS for the energy and transportation charges associated with the offtake metering error.

2. National Grid NTS shall

- a. Invoice the Downstream Transporter for the outstanding amount due to the Significant Metering Error restricted to the volume relating to the qualifying Shippers' share of the outstanding amount.
- b. update the shrinkage account to reflect the invoiced debit/credit.
- c. consider changes in costs/revenues and consider setting the SO Commodity charge to meet allowed costs/revenue

3. The Downstream Transporter shall:

- a. Pay NTS Shrinkage Manager as invoiced in 2(a)
- b. Recoup the amount by invoicing qualifying Shippers as defined in 1(c)

4. The **qualifying** Shipper shall:
 - a. Pay the Downstream Transporter as described in 3 (b).
5. If a Shipper Termination occurs any outstanding amounts shall be subject to the current UNC rules.
6. If any amount is uncollectable from a **qualifying** Shipper the outstanding amounts shall be re-calculated and smeared across all Shippers. This may apply in cases of Shipper Termination where a Shipper has Terminated prior to the identification and invoicing of an error that was in a period before it Terminated.
7. However, where a Shipper voluntarily exits the market (a case of voluntary discontinuance) the Shipper will request to be billed in full for any outstanding amounts owed to the Transporters for these errors.
8. If the period over which the Downstream Transporter is recovering charges from a **qualifying** Shipper results in the Retrospective Invoicing threshold being passed then any costs the Downstream Transporter has paid to the Upstream Transporter in relation to the Significant Metering Error will still be recoverable from the relevant **qualifying** Shipper.

For the avoidance of doubt the current UNC rules contained within Section X4.3, V4.3 and S1.7 are not intended to be changed by this modification.

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.

As this proposal is an alternative proposal to UNC Modification 335 it is suggested that this proposal follows MOD 335 to the consultation phase.

2 User Pays

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

Not User Pays.

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

No User Pays charges applicable.

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

N/A.

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

N/A.

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

Standard Special Condition A11.1 (a): The efficient and economic operation of the pipe-line system to which this licence relates

Implementation would not be expected to better facilitate this relevant objective.

Standard Special Condition A11.1 (b): So far as is consistent with sub-paragraph (a), the coordinated, efficient and economic operation of:

(i) The combined pipeline system, and/or

(ii) The pipeline system of one or more other relevant gas transporters.

Implementation would not be expected to better facilitate this relevant objective.

Standard Special Condition A11.1 (c): So far as is consistent with sub-paragraphs (a) and (b) the efficient discharge of the licensee’s obligations under this licence

Implementation would not be expected to better facilitate this relevant objective.

Standard Special Condition A11.1 (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.

Implementation would be expected to better facilitate Standard Special Condition A11.1 (d) (i) & (ii):-

Although significant notice periods are provided to all Shippers (and their Suppliers) under the current UNC arrangements (specified in the UNC Related Document – “Meter Error Notification Guidelines v4.0”) which allow Shippers to accrue within their accounts for amounts owing, we understand that smaller Shipper / Supplier organisations may face difficulty in obtaining access to funds and credit to facilitate payments associated with significant offtake meter errors. The implementation of this Proposal would reduce the risk associated with large offtake error invoices for smaller Shippers who may not have the ability to easily access additional funds thus promoting the securing of competition between relevant Shippers, in this case smaller and larger Shippers.

Standard Special Condition A11.1 (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 are satisfied as respects the availability of gas to their domestic customers.

Implementation would not be expected to better facilitate this relevant objective

Standard Special Condition A11.1 (f): So far as is consistent with subparagraphs (a) to (e) the promotion of efficiency in the implementation and administration of the network code and/or the uniform network code.

Implementation would not be expected to better facilitate this relevant objective

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

None.

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

a) The implications for operation of the System:

There are no implications for the operation of the system.

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

Any additional costs associated with implementing systems or process changes to accommodate the proposal would be funded by the Distribution Networks. Xoserve have indicated that system requirements to facilitate implementation of the original proposal would be in the region of £45K to £85K. It is expected that the added complexity of this alternative Proposal, which only encompasses a sub set of Shippers, would add a small marginal cost to the billing tool required to manage the process.

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:

Costs associated with the implementation of the Proposal would be funded by the Distribution Networks.

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

Contractual risk for the relevant Downstream Transporter would be increased in relation to the potential of default of payment by a qualifying Shipper, although the risk would be less than obligations introduced by the original Proposal which covers all Shippers and greatly increased sums.

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)

N/A.

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

New invoice types and file formats may be required. Relevant notification periods and file format approval via the UK-Link Committee would also be required following the stipulated notice periods. This is in line with the original Proposal.

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

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

Additional administrative procedures associated with the receipt of multiple invoices would be required for qualifying Shippers although these are not envisaged to be overly burdensome.

b) The development and capital cost and operating cost implications

None envisaged.

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

All Users would be subject to increased contractual risk associated with the potential for a qualifying Shipper to default on payments with the uncollected amounts being smeared, although the level of risk may be reduced in comparison to the original proposal as the associated financial amounts would also be reduced.

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)

No implications have been identified.

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

None identified.

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

Advantages

No additional advantages.

Disadvantages

None.

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)

None received.

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

None received.

14 Any other matter the Proposer considers needs to be addressed

None.

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

Xoserve have indicated within a Rough Order of Magnitude document that analysis, design and system implementation timescales will be in the order of 31 weeks. Implementation of the proposal could follow direction from Ofgem although any significant offtake errors notified to the industry after the implementation date would require to be processed in line with the required systems' implementation date.

16 Comments on Suggested Text

N/A.

17 Suggested Text

See separate document.

Code Concerned, sections and paragraphs

Uniform Network Code See separate document.

Transportation Principal Document See separate document.

Section(s)

Proposer's Representative

Joel Martin (Scotland Gas Networks)

Proposer

Joel Martin (Scotland Gas Networks)