

## Stage 01: Proposal

# 0392:

Proposal to amend Annex A of the CSEP NExA table, by replacing the current version of the AQ table.

Update the NExA table in CSEP NExA, Annex A Part 8, and UNC TPD Section G Annex G---3 to reflect more up to date information



The Proposer recommends that the Workgroup assess this amended modification.



Medium Impact:  
Users (Shippers), iGTs and DNOs.

What stage is this document in the process?

01

Proposal

02

Workgroup Report

03

Draft Modification Report

04

Final Modification Report

0392

Modification

14 September 2011

Version 3

Page 1 of 16

© 2011 all rights reserved

## Contents

- 1 Summary
- 2 Why Change?
- 3 Solution
- 4 Relevant Objectives
- 5 Impacts and Costs
- 6 Implementation
- 7 The Case for Change
- 8 Legal Text
- 9 Recommendation

## About this document:

This document is an amended modification, which is to be assessed by the Workgroup on 22 September 2011.



3 **Any questions?**

5 Contact:

7 **Joint Office**



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

10



13 **0121 623 2115**

14 Proposer:

15 **Karen Kennedy**  
**ScottishPower**

16



[karen.kennedy@dataserve-uk.com](mailto:karen.kennedy@dataserve-uk.com)



**01415683266**

Transporter:

**Insert name**



**...@...**



**0000 000 000**

Xoserve:

**Insert name**



[commercial.enquiries@xoserve.com](mailto:commercial.enquiries@xoserve.com)



**0000 000 000**

0392

Modification

14 September 2011

Version 3

Page 2 of 16

© 2011 all rights reserved

# 1 Summary

## Is this a Self-Governance Modification

Since this proposal relates to the update of the CSEP NExA table contained in Annexe A, and will have a direct bearing on IGT transportation charges we do not believe that it is suitable to be considered as a self governance modification..

## Why Change?

There has been no change to the CSEP nexa table values since 2006. Analysis from the workgroup demonstrates that the AQ values have moved to such a level that the current table requires update with more accurate and up to date information.

The CSEP nexa values are fixed, and are the basis of the Transportation charges issued by the IGT. The IGT transportation charges are not affected by changes in the AQ following the review process. It is therefore imperative that these values reflect and change in the market.

## Solution

It is proposed that the current CSEP nexa Table is updated with up to date values, as agreed in Workgroup IGT030, and detailed in section 2.

## Impacts & Costs

There have been no costs identified to the Large Transporters.

## Implementation

- A date TBC to coincide with the implementation of the IGT equivalent Modification (IGT040)
- If no decision has been received by 30 September 2011, an implementation date of 14 business days after an authority decision is received.

The timescales for this change are to align with the price change for IGT's scheduled for October 2011.

## The Case for Change

### ***This proposal is raised to align with the IGT Mod 040***

The purpose of this Modification is to:

1. Facilitate an amendment to the CSEP nexa, Annex A Part 8 by replacing the current published version of the AQ Table with the version inserted below.
2. To update the table published in UNC TPD Section G Annex G--3 with the AQ values within the proposed Table inserted below.

It was recognised and agreed at the iGT030 Workgroup that the new proposed CSEP nexa Table is more reflective of the current market and the existing values should be amended to reflect this.

0392  
Modification  
14 September 2011

Version 3

Page 3 of 16

© 2011 all rights reserved

## Recommendations

The Proposer invites the Workgroup to recommend that Modification 0392 progress to consultation.

0392

Modification

---

14 September 2011

---

Version 3

---

Page 4 of 16

---

© 2011 all rights reserved

## 2 Why Change?

IGTs are required to adopt the AQ values present within the nexa AQ Table for the purpose of calculating domestic transportation charges through the Relative Price Control (RPC) Charging Methodology.

Under Annex A, Part 1 of the nexa, iGTs are required to undertake an AQ Review for all Large and Small Supply Points, the procedure following the same process and timescales as those applied by Large Gas Transporters in accordance with the Uniform Network Code. However the movement in any AQ'S following a review do not change the IGT charging (as this is set on the basis of the CSEP nexa table).

Annually, following the completion of an AQ Review, analysis of the AQ values present within the AQ Table is performed to ensure that they remain fit for purpose and a reasonable estimate of the value of gas consumed in accordance with house type and geographical location.

### Work group IGT030

A review of the present AQ values was undertaken by the Review Group (IGT030) and as a consequence of this review; a revised AQ Table has been produced. General consensus has been reached between iGTs and Shippers that Annex A, Part 8 of the nexa should be amended and that the current AQ Table should be replaced with the revised version. A copy of the AQ Table which it is proposed should replace that presently within the nexa is provided in section 3.

The methodology used by all iGTs in the calculation of the revised AQ is detailed as follows:

IGTs individually collated AQ data using a standard template (C1) using the following rules This is a format that they have utilised on other forms of data collation for Ofgem. One tab was used per licence held, inputting the average AQ per property type for each of the three geographic areas and the number of individual supply points used to derive that average.

IGTs reported from the AQ review output files, not from the overall portfolio.

If an AQ had not been reviewed, it was not included in the dataset.

The AQ used was the final AQ that was taken as the revised AQ value. Where an iGT has no values for a type of property the cell AQ and number were left blank

#### **The following were excluded from the AQ data:**

- o Infill domestic property AQs.
- o Non-domestic property AQs.
- o Where an installation read was used in the AQ calculation.
- o There was no AQ change because the site became live less than 26 weeks prior to the cut off read date.
- o There were no reads with which to calculate the AQ.
- o The AQ changed outside the +100% / -50% tolerance and the Calculated AQ is used as it was not challenged, or challenged unsuccessfully.
- o AQs changed using the Large Transporter's agent adjustment factors based on the change from the old to new weather correction data.

#### **The following were included in the AQ data:**

- o Only properties deemed to be new housing when first connected to a gas connection.
- o The AQ changed outside the +100% / -50% tolerance, but the new AQ is

used as the shipper successfully challenged the old AQ being used.

- o All other AQ values calculated as part of the most recently completed AQ

0392

Modification

14 September 2011

Version 3

Page 5 of 16

© 2011 all rights reserved

Review using meter reads (for clarity it also includes those above the 2,500 therm threshold).

o Only house types that are listed in Table 1 in Appendix CI-1 of the Code.

In terms of the volume of mprns included in the calculation, this is included in the table below

Band	House Type	South SW, NT, WS, SO		Average WN, SE, NW, EA, EM, WM, NE		North NO, SC	
		AQ (kWh)	Number	AQ (kWh)	Number	AQ (kWh)	Number
A	1 Bed	6,473	12,167	7,022	14,210	7,718	3,167
B	2BF, 2BT	7,989	54,965	8,383	82,049	8,684	32,705
C	2BS, 2BD, 3BT, 3BF	10,776	37,236	11,304	76,964	11,372	17,821
D	3BS, 2BB	11,748	39,182	12,221	93,752	12,596	21,069
E	3BD, 3BB	13,429	20,549	14,468	51,950	16,276	24,883
F	4BD, 4BT, 4BS, 4BB	16,256	60,393	17,655	158,584	19,296	53,089
G	5BD, 5BS, 6BD	22,644	8,799	24,423	23,175	25,606	6,169

**In summary**

The purpose of this Modification is to:

1. Facilitate an amendment to the CSEP nexa, Annex A Part 8 by replacing the current published version of the AQ Table with the version inserted below.
2. To update the table published in UNC TPD Section G Annex G---3 with the AQ values within the proposed Table inserted below.

### 3 Solution

This Modification proposes to bring the UNC in line with the CSEP nexa table agreed under modification IGT040

Replace existing CSEP nexa Table:

Band	House Type	South SW, NT, WS, SO		Average WN, SE, NW, EA, EM, WM, NE		North NO, SC	
		AQ (kWh)		AQ (kWh)		AQ (kWh)	
A	1 Bed	8,815		9,585		10,127	
B	2BF, 2BT	10,639		11,270		11,659	
C	2BS, 2BD, 3BT, 3BF	13,120		13,530		14,255	
D	3BS, 2BB	14,348		14,611		15,871	
E	3BD, 3BB	16,180		17,303		19,758	
F	4BD, 4BT, 4BS, 4BB	19,823		21,195		22,690	
G	5BD, 5BS, 6BD	28,077		30,035		31,176	

with Revised version below

Band	House Type	South SW, NT, WS, SO		Average WN, SE, NW, EA, EM, WM, NE		North NO, SC	
		AQ (kWh)		AQ (kWh)		AQ (kWh)	
A	1 Bed	6,473		7,022		7,718	
B	2BF, 2BT	7,989		8,383		8,684	
C	2BS, 2BD, 3BT, 3BF	10,776		11,304		11,372	
D	3BS, 2BB	11,748		12,221		12,596	
E	3BD, 3BB	13,429		14,468		16,276	
F	4BD, 4BT, 4BS, 4BB	16,256		17,655		19,296	
G	5BD, 5BS, 6BD	22,644		24,423		25,606	

## 4 Relevant Objectives

Implementation is expected to better facilitate the achievement of **Relevant Objectives a, b, and d**

Proposer's view of the benefits against the Code Relevant Objectives	
Description of Relevant Objective	Identified impact
a) Efficient and economic operation of the pipe-line system.	Yes
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.	Yes
c) Efficient discharge of the licensee's obligations.	None identified
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.	Yes
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 identified
f) Promotion of efficiency in the implementation and administration of the Code	None identified

a) Efficient and economic operation of the pipe-line system.

Increased accuracy in the AQ values contained within the CSEP nexa AQ Table will improve the estimation of the amount of gas which is offtaken at the CSEP and subsequent energy allocation to Shippers over the gas pipeline.

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.

Increased accuracy within the AQ values contained within the CSEP nexa AQ Table will improve the estimation of off-take quantities at the CSEP.

0392

Modification

14 September 2011

Version 3

Page 8 of 16

© 2011 all rights reserved

- 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.

Increased accuracy of AQ values will result in improved allocation of energy and costs between Shippers.

## 5 Impacts and Costs

### Consideration of Wider Industry Impacts

The wider industry impacts have been discussed as part of the IGT Review group (IGT030).

The impacts identified have been discussed, and the groups agreed that the revised table is more reflective of the current AQ consumption across the market.

### Costs

Indicative industry costs – User Pays	
Classification of the proposal as User Pays or not and justification for classification	
This Proposal is not User Pays	
Identification of Users, proposed split of the recovery between Gas Transporters and Users for User Pays costs and justification	
N/A	
Proposed charge(s) for application of Users Pays charges to Shippers	
N/A	
Proposed charge for inclusion in ACS – to be completed upon receipt of cost estimate from Xoserve	
N/A	

### Impacts

Impact on Transporters' Systems and Process	
Transporters' System/Process	Potential impact
UK Link	• N/A
Operational Processes	• N/A
User Pays implications	• This proposal is not user pays

Impact on Users	
Area of Users' business	Potential impact
Administrative and operational	• N/A
Development, capital and operating costs	• N/A
Contractual risks	• N/A
Legislative, regulatory and contractual obligations and relationships	• N/A

0392  
Modification

14 September 2011

Version 3

Page 10 of 16

© 2011 all rights reserved



---

**Where can I find details of the UNC Standards of Service?**

---

In the Revised FMR for Transco's Network Code Modification

**0565 Transco Proposal for Revision of Network Code Standards of Service** at the following location:

[www.gasgovernance.co.uk/sites/default/files/0565.zip](http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/sites/default/files/0565.zip)

Impact on Transporters	
Area of Transporters' business	Potential impact
System operation	• N/A
Development, capital and operating costs	• N/A
Recovery of costs	• N/A
Price regulation	• N/A
Contractual risks	• N/A
Legislative, regulatory and contractual obligations and relationships	• N/A
Standards of service	• N/A

Impact on Code Administration	
Area of Code Administration	Potential impact
Modification Rules	• N/A
UNC Committees	• N/A
General administration	• N/A

Impact on Code	
Code section	Potential impact
N/A	•
	•

Impact on UNC Related Documents and Other Referenced Documents	
Related Document	Potential impact
Network Entry Agreement (TPD I1.3)	• N/A
Network Exit Agreement (Including Connected System Exit Points) (TPD J1.5.4)	• CSEP nexa, Annex A Part 8 • UNC TPD Section G Annex G---3
Storage Connection Agreement (TPD R1.3.1)	• N/A
UK Link Manual (TPD U1.4)	• N/A
Network Code Operations Reporting Manual (TPD V12)	• N/A

0392

Modification

14 September 2011

Version 3

Page 11 of 16

© 2011 all rights reserved

Impact on UNC Related Documents and Other Referenced Documents	
Network Code Validation Rules (TPD V12)	•
ECQ Methodology (TPD V12)	• N/A
Measurement Error Notification Guidelines (TPD V12)	• N/A
Energy Balancing Credit Rules (TPD X2.1)	• N/A
Uniform Network Code Standards of Service (Various)	• N/A

Impact on Core Industry Documents and other documents	
Document	Potential impact
Safety Case or other document under Gas Safety (Management) Regulations	• N/A
Gas Transporter Licence	• N/A

Other Impacts	
Item impacted	Potential impact
Security of Supply	• N/A
Operation of the Total System	• N/A
Industry fragmentation	• N/A
Terminal operators, consumers, connected system operators, suppliers, producers and other non code parties	• IGT's would need to make the necessary change to IUNC to allow alignment of process (this is being addressed under Mod 040).

## 6 Implementation

Since IGTs calculated and developed the revised CSEP nexa table, with input from Shippers, and the intention was clear at the workgroup that the output was the development a modification to amend the current table, the proposer has assumed that IGTs will be in a position to accommodate the revised table in their charge calculations on a forward looking basis.

It is suggested that implementation dates area as follows:

- A date TBC to coincide with the implementation of the IGT equivalent Modification (IGT040)
- If no decision has been received by 30 September 2011, an implementation date of 14 business days after an authority decision is received.

The timescales for this change are to align with the price change for IGT's scheduled for October 2011.

## 7 The Case for Change

In addition to that identified the above, the Proposer has identified the following:

### Advantages

- Increased accuracy of AQ at the point of Connection
- Increased accuracy in determining gas offtaken
- Increased accuracy of Gas Allocation
- Increase accuracy of costs

### Disadvantages

No disadvantages have been identified

## 8 Legal Text

The legal text is essentially the revised CSEP nexa Table provided in Section 3 above.

0392

Modification

---

14 September 2011

---

Version 3

---

Page 15 of 16

---

© 2011 all rights reserved

## 9 Recommendation

The Proposer invites the Workgroup to:

- recommend that the modification progresses to Consultation
-