

Stage 01: Modification

At what stage is this document in the process?

0XXX: *(Code Administrator to insert number)*

Mod Title: Project Nexus – iGT Single Service Provision.

- 01 Modification
- 02 Workgroup Report
- 03 Draft Modification Report
- 04 Final Modification Report

This Modification Proposal is one of [6] complementary Proposals seeking to implement the requirements identified under Project Nexus. This Proposal identifies changes to the UNC to enable Independent Gas Transporters to utilise the services of the Transporters Agent Xoserve to administer relevant Supply Points downstream of the Connected Systems Exit Point (LDZ CSEP).



The Proposer recommends that this modification should be sent to the Project Nexus Workgroup for development



High Impact:
Insert name(s) of impact: Users and Transporters

0xxx

Modification

Day Month Year

Version 1.0

Page 1 of 20

© 2012 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



3 **Any questions?**

5 Contact:

Joint Office

6



12 enquiries@gasgovernance.co.uk

14



17 **0121 623 2115**

18 Proposer:

Chris Warner

19



20 chris.warner@nationalgrid.com



07778 150668

Transporter:

**National Grid
Distribution**

Xoserve:

Andy Miller



commercial.enquiries@xoserve.com



0121 623 2348

About this document:

This document is a modification, which will be presented by the Proposer to the Panel on XX XXXX 200X. The Panel will consider the Proposer's recommendation, and agree whether this [self-governance] modification should proceed to consultation or be referred to a Workgroup for assessment.

This is a modification template. The Proposer is asked to complete at least Sections 1 to 4 (setting out what is proposed and the justification for the change). If it is proposed that the modification is issued directly to consultation, all parts of the template must be completed. If all parts are not completed these will be refined by the Workgroup process.

As Ofgem is currently conducting a Significant Code Review (SCR), a modification proposal may not be made if the subject matter of such proposal relates to a matter that is the subject of the SCR, unless Ofgem directs otherwise. Please do not, therefore, raise modifications that relate to the SCR.

If the impact of the modification on greenhouse gas emissions is likely to be material, please assess the quantifiable impact in accordance with the Carbon Costs Guidance (published by Ofgem).

The Joint Office will be available to help and support the drafting of any modifications, including guidance on completion of this template and the wider modification process. Contact: enquiries@gasgovernance.co.uk or 0121 623 2115.

Please contact Xoserve when drafting any modification that impacts central systems. Xoserve will be available to help and support the drafting of any modifications that impact central systems, including guidance on potential systems impacts and the drafting of business rules, which reflect system capabilities. Contact: commercial.enquiries@xoserve.com.

0xxx

Modification

Day Month Year

Version 1.0

Page 2 of 20

© 2012 all rights reserved

1 Summary

Is this a Self-Governance Modification

Self Governance procedures are not proposed. This is on the basis that the Modification Proposal, if implemented would have a material effect on relevant commercial activities as set out in the Uniform Network Code (UNC), these being connected with shipping arrangements and the transportation of gas.

Why Change?

As part of the outcome of the last Gas Distribution price control review, it was agreed that funding should be available to support a major IT systems investment programme by the Transporters agent, Xoserve. This major systems investment for UK-Link Replacement provides an opportunity to consider whether the existing UNC requirements remain appropriate. Rather than asking Xoserve to procure replacement systems that deliver the existing functionality, there is an expectation that introducing regime enhancements at this stage would be the most economic time to implement any such change. This is particularly opportune since it is coincident with the development of smart metering, such that requirements can be specified that recognise changes to metering arrangements rather than any changes to accommodate smart metering being retrofitted in due course. The requirements gathering exercise for the enhancements is entitled Project Nexus. This Modification Proposal is one of [6] which reflects the requirements. Complementary Modification Proposals have been or are anticipated to be raised shortly in the following areas:

- Settlement
- Retrospective adjustment
- Demand estimation
- Non functional
- Implementation (including non-business/non effective days)

Solution

In August 2011, under iGT UNC governance E.ON raised iGT Modification Proposal iGT039 'Use of a Single Gas Transporter Agency for the common services and systems and processes required by the IGT UNC'. The iGT UNC Modification Panel subsequently established a Workgroup to identify and develop the requirements.

The output in terms of systems requirements have been published as a Business Requirement Document (BRD)¹. Subsequent to this, a suitable contractual regime has been identified and discussed within the iGT 039 group. The proposed arrangements require modification of the UNC and iGT UNC.

0xxx

Modification

Day Month Year

Version 1.0

Page 3 of 20

© 2012 all rights reserved

¹ <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/nexus/brd>

Impacts & Costs

Xoserve has provided a high level best estimate of the cost of UK Link systems development to deliver the requirements of Project Nexus in the region £20m. It is emphasised that this estimate should not be relied upon as representing the final costs which would be incurred as a consequence of implementation of this Modification Proposal.

Implementation

No implementation date for the solution identified within this Modification Proposal is identified at this stage.

The Case for Change

Ofgem stated with its Gas Distribution Price Control (GDPCR1) Final Proposals that GDNs' allowed revenues for 2008-13 include funding for the replacement of UK LINK on a like for like basis. The Proposals anticipated that:

- Replacement of the UK-LINK system towards the end of the GDPCR1 period would provide a cost effective opportunity for the industry to rationalise and put in place revised systems that are fit for purpose: and
- Xoserve's planned consultation with stakeholders on the potential scope and design of revised systems would provide opportunity to consider future 'user driven' developments, and cited the specific examples of changes that might be required due to smart metering and the potential opportunity for iGTs to use a common industry platform.

During the GDPCR1 consultation process, Ofgem proposed an industry dialogue leading to an agreement between Users and Transporters on what central information system services would be required from Xoserve in its capacity as the Transporters' agent and how the associated costs should be met. Ofgem prepared a Terms of Engagement for the dialogue, which took place under the auspices of a Xoserve Services Workgroup.

The Workgroup's activities included consideration of the potential high level features of UK-LINK replacement and identified that the contractual and governance framework would be developed by the GTs and Shippers in agreement with Ofgem. The group identified that following this agreement the Transporters would, through the UNC Modification Process, raise and progress the required UNC Modification.

Entitled 'Project Nexus' the gathering of requirements for the contractual framework was undertaken under UNC governance and a dedicated Workgroup established for this purpose. The Workgroup is nearing completion of its work and has identified that it is now timely that relevant UNC Modification Proposals be raised.

Recommendations

It is recommended that this Modification Proposal proceeds to a Workgroup for development.

Oxxx

Modification

Day Month Year

Version 1.0

Page 4 of 20

© 2012 all rights reserved

2 Why Change?

Background to Project Nexus

At the time of the current Gas Distribution Price Control Xoserve anticipated the need for a major IT systems investment programme. Stakeholder consultation was initiated, under the banner of 'Project Nexus' to inform the scope and nature of Xoserve's future services that IT systems would need to support – the detailed Business Requirement Documents that support this document form a key input to the design of that investment programme.

The initial phase of Project Nexus was a consultation exercise, in which interested parties were asked for their views on the long-term strategic requirements for Xoserve's services. The consultation also developed a preferred approach to further definition of stakeholder requirements.

Following the consultation phase of Project Nexus, an Initial Requirements Register (IRR) was compiled, identifying all the topics that respondents to the Consultation had raised.

Topics were grouped into three broad categories:

- UNC changes
- Independent Gas Transporter (iGT) services
- Data management

A UNC Workgroup was established to consider the UNC topics and develop requirements. In respect of iGT services, the requirements have been considered within the remit of iGT UNC governance.

Development of Requirements

In 2009 the UNC Modification Panel agreed a Workstream (later renamed Workgroup) should be set up to define industry requirements for the development and enhancement of the UNC in areas that are relevant to Xoserve's services. The Initial Requirements Register (IRR) formed the basis of the discussions. Consultation responses were grouped into related topics and relevant as-is process models were reviewed and agreed. The Project Nexus Workgroup discussed the responses and reached a consensus on whether to carry forward or close the requirement. The outputs from the Workgroup Topic meetings were baselined Business Requirements Documents (BRDs) and to-be process models (i.e. future state processes).

0xxx

Modification

Day Month Year

Version 1.0

Page 5 of 20

© 2012 all rights reserved

Overview of Business Requirements

The original comments in the IRR were grouped into a number of topics, loosely based on existing industry process areas. These topics were tackled in sequential order, to minimise the amount of re-work. The 8 topic areas covered under the UNC Project Nexus Workgroup were:

- Settlement (i.e. submission of Meter Readings and use in Daily Allocation)
- Annual Quantity
- Reconciliation
- Invoicing
- Supply Point Register
- Retrospective Updates
- Non-Functional requirements
- iGT Agency Services

Business requirements documents (BRDs) have been documented for each of these topics and have been reviewed by stakeholders.

The scope of this Modification Proposal is limited to the following BRD:

- iGT Single service provision

3 Solution

The BRDs identify detailed business rules which form the foundation for the necessary changes to the UNC. The following BRD is relevant to this Modification Proposal:

<i>Document Name</i>	<i>Version and Date</i>	<i>Current Location (12/09/12)</i>
Business Requirements Document for iGT Agency Services	v1.0 17/08/2012	www.gasgovernance.co.uk/nexus/brd

Introduction

The following information outlines arrangements under which the UNC would be modified to provide for arrangements with independent Gas Transporters (iGTs) which are currently contained in Annex A of the LDX CSEP NExA which would enable iGTs to use the services of the Transporters agent Xoserve to administer both their relationships with Users and their relationships with Transporters. This is commonly termed 'Single Service Provision'.

Modification of the UNC is required to remove the LDZ CSEP NExA and to replace this with a new framework which introduces a new UNC document being the iGT Arrangements Document (IAD). Changes to the UNC Modification rules would be required to facilitate iGT participation in governance of the new regime.

Relevant provisions are required within the UNC Transportation Principal Document (TPD) for Supply Point Capacity, Output Nominations, UDQO determination and reconciliation to apply directly to Users having CSEP Supply Points. This would remove

0xxx

Modification

Day Month Year

Version 1.0

Page 6 of 20

© 2012 all rights reserved

the need for LDZ CSEP NExA Annex A Part 12. Where relevant, the cited provisions of TPD would directly refer to CSEPs.

In the absence of a meter (and allocation agency) at the LDZ CSEP, the UNC rules for determination of EUCs and calculation of AQs must be applied. Instead of being in the LDZ CSEP NExA, it is proposed that these rules are incorporated within the UNC.

The LDZ CSEP NExA contains provisions for determining Connected System Shrinkage (presently contained within Annex A part 9). However these do not appear to be referred to in (or otherwise affect) the NExA provisions which operate to determine shipper capacity and offtake quantities. It is proposed that relevant Shrinkage provisions are built into the relevant provisions of TPD.

IGT Arrangements Document (IAD)

The IAD would be created as a new document in the UNC (in addition to the TD, TPD, OAD, GTs and Modification Rules).

The IAD would be binding on GTs, iGTs and Users to the extent that it contains rules which affect them. Each Transporter would enter into a new Framework Agreement (IGT Framework Agreement) with the iGTs which binds the GT and iGTs to the GT's individual network code (*or possibly all GTs and all iGTs enter into a single framework agreement binding them to the UNC*).

The IAD would replace LDZ CSEP NExA Annex A

The contents of the IAD have for convenience been divided into four sections below:

- Classification and general;
- Connection and offtake rules;
- Rules associated arrangements with Users;
- Role of Xoserve.

Classification and general

This would define a SMP CSEP, SPC CSEP and SP CSEP as a 'virtual' CSEP (under UNC TPD A3.3.5) corresponding to each Supply Meter Point and Supply Point (and Supply Point Component if that exists) on the iGT System. It would also confirm the scope of the IAD – i.e. its application in respect of CSEPs.

For each CSEP an IAD Supplemental Agreement would be entered into by the GT and iGT.

A proforma IAD Supplemental Agreement would be an annex to the IAD. The IAD Supplemental Agreement would sets out specific details for each CSEP/COS as in Annex B of the NExA and any other specific details required. A procedure would be required for nominating new CSEPs and for entering into new IAD Supplemental Agreements.

General provisions governing the relationship between GT and iGT such as those in clause 4 and 5 of the LDZ CSEP NExA would be included [*unless these were contained in UNC Section B*].

It would also be necessary to include accession rules for new iGTs equivalent to UNC TPD V2.

Connection and offtake

The IAD would allow iGTs to have their Connected Offtake Systems (COS) connected at LDZ CSEPs.

Generic provisions would be required addressing issues being:

1. Commissioning new CSEPs/COSs;
2. Required equipment, compatibility, modifications of plant, rights of inspection;
3. System validation, network load information exchange, etc;
4. Coordinated maintenance;
5. Liability as respects each other's systems;
6. Emergency cooperation;
7. Other information exchange;
8. CS Shrinkage.

Where appropriate these would refer to site-specific details in IAD Supplemental Agreements.

The IAD would also include rules relating to aggregated offtake information to be provided by the iGT (as per LDZ CSEP NExA Annex A part 11).

Arrangements with Users

These arrangements in the IAD would substitute for the current LDZ CSEP NExA requirements for the iGT to adopt and apply UNC rules for Supply Point classification, EUCs, AQS, NDM Meter Reading, etc. It would be required for the following reasons:

1. The existing requirement (at the LDZ CSEP) to enable Transporters to determine capacity, offtake quantities, etc using existing rules;
2. The requirement (at Supply Points on the iGT's system) for the iGT to have in force the rules which Xoserve's systems are designed to implement.

[This could be done in a number of different ways – 039 group to determine:]

1. The terms could replicate the existing LDZ CSEP NExA provisions which require the iGT to adopt and apply rules corresponding to those of the UNC. That ignores the fact that the iGT rules are now in a iGT UNC which is itself subject to regulatory modification procedures;
2. The terms could refer to the existing iGT UNC (assuming it has been verified that it does achieve this) and then aim to keep the UNC and iGT UNC in tandem so far as relevant provisions are concerned. Given that both are subject to regulatory modification processes, it could not impose an absolute requirement, but it could require 'linked' modification proposals and transparency to Ofgem over the implications of divergent modifications. The assumption is that Ofgem would not sanction diverging modifications unless there was a good reason (in which case the costs would ultimately be visited on consumers). It would be possible to include new provisions within the Transporter and iGT licence conditions on network code which supported

this (e.g. by requiring modification reports to address the matter);

3. The terms could be framed on the basis that relevant parts of the iGT UNC were modified so that they simply referred to, and incorporated by reference, relevant parts of the UNC. This would (from a UNC perspective) be the neatest and simplest approach. Any modification of the relevant provisions of the UNC would automatically be carried over into the iGT UNC. It would require wholesale amendment of relevant provisions of the iGT UNC;
4. Another option would be to include, within the IAD, the full rules to be applied by the iGT in its iGT UNC. This does not seem a particularly good solution since it falls between 2 and 3 above.

There is a requirement for the Transporters and iGTs to exchange information, as currently provided in the LDZ CSEP NExA. The Transporters are required to provide EUCs *[and other data]*; the iGTs have to provide the AQs and Supply Point numbers *[and other data]*.

These data flows are required between GTs/iGTs as principles, even though they would be implemented by Xoserve within its own systems.

Transporter Agency

Provisions are required within the IAD which would entitle iGTs to use the services of the Transporter Agency (Xoserve) for specified purposes. These would include the implementation of the requirements imposed on iGTs as discussed above, and the iGT's data flows with Users as its customers.

The relevant section would describe that Xoserve's systems would operate for the iGT because the iGTs iGT UNC rules (in relevant areas) would be the same as those of the UNC. This section would contain *[or refer to a document containing]* those areas where the iGT would be expressly allowed different rules which Xoserve would support.

Each Transporter and iGT would appoint the Transporter Agency (Xoserve) as its agent for the data flows (between Transporter and iGT).

The IAD would specify the basis on which the iGT would contract with the Transporter Agency and/or on which the Transporter Agency would charge for its services to iGTs. The IAD would also impose requirements (analogous to TPD Section U) on iGTs before they could access Xoserve's systems.

It would *[presumably]* not be necessary to establish a new physical interface between Xoserve and an iGT User since that would already exist (pursuant to TPD Section U). However the iGTs may have certain requirements about the User's use of Xoserve's systems.

Each iGT would need to establish Xoserve as its agent (vis-à-vis its shippers) and contractor by relevant iGT UNC provisions similar to TPD Section V6.5.

Other Uniform Network Code Changes

Treating CSEPs as Supply Points

Changes are necessary to the TPD such that provisions of Sections B, C, E, F and H which provide for determining Supply Point Capacity, Output Nominations, UDQOs, NDM Reconciliation, etc would operate directly in respect of iGT CSEPs rather than through the medium of the LDZ CSEP NExA.

This would be *[done most simply]* by deeming references to Supply Points, Supply Point Components and Supply Meter Points in the relevant provisions of TPD to include SP CSEPs, SPC CSEPs and SMP CSEPs (and where necessary excluding UCSEPs from equivalent provisions which relate to CSEPs). An alternative would be to insert a reference to SP CSEPs, SPC CSEPs and SMP CSEPs in each provision.

In respect of CS Shrinkage adjustment, where this would apply to iGT quantities relevant rules would be added to the relevant provisions of TPD *(or possibly as a generic rule applying to all relevant quantities determined under those provisions of TPD)*. Certain provisions of TPD Section J would no longer be needed in respect of CSEPs.

As noted above, provisions equivalent to NExA Annex A part 12 would not be required, since the TPD would directly identify where it applies to a iGT CSEP (assuming that all iGT CSEPs were to be treated uniformly for all purposes of TPD – *to be verified*). *In some cases it may be simpler to retain the 'relevant CSEP' approach and provide a parameter value in the IAD (as for example with TPD Section L).*

Changes to other relevant provisions of the UNC

Changes to several other provisions of the UNC would be required as outlined below.

UNC Introduction

Add to Section 2 (UNC comprises) the IGT Arrangements Document (IAD) setting out arrangements between Transporters and iGTS

Add to Section 4 that each Transporter's Network Code would be made binding between it and iGTs pursuant to the IGT Framework Agreement.

Transportation Principal Document

Section A

Add after A3.3.7 that where so provided in TPD a reference to a Supply Meter Point, Supply Point Component or Supply Point includes a SMP CSEP, SPC CSEP or SP CSEP.

Sections B, C, E, F, H

Deeming of references to SMP CSEPs, etc.

It will be necessary to review every relevant provision of these Sections to ensure the rules operate correctly.

Section J

0xxx

Modification

Day Month Year

Version 1.0

Page 10 of 20

© 2012 all rights reserved

In paragraph 1.5.4, Network Exit Provisions in relation to a CSEP are contained in the IAD and relevant IAD Supplemental Agreement.

Paragraphs 4.3.7 and 6.4 (modification of Network Exit Provisions) – amend to reflect the IAD arrangements for CSEPs.

Paragraph 6.1.3 – this may be unnecessary for CSEPS, since Users may be directly bound by relevant provisions of the IAD.

Paragraphs 6.5.3 to 6.5.7 can be deleted (because they are replaced by the IAD).

Sections U and V

Possible amendments to Section U, and amendment to Transporter Agency provisions in Section V, to reflect Xoserve functions for iGTs.

Other TPD Sections

It would be necessary to review all of TPD to ensure that any other interaction with the IAD is identified.

Modification Rules

These would be modified so that iGTs participate in the UNC modification procedures in relation to modifications of:

1. The IAD;
2. any provisions of the UNC which are expressly referred to in the IAD;
3. other provisions of the UNC which bind iGTs including the GTs and relevant parts of the Transition Document;
4. the Modification Rules themselves.

Transition Document

Each existing CSEP NExA would be terminated with effect from the corresponding Supplemental Agreement(s) being entered into.

Some other transitional arrangements may be required. *(It would be preferable however to enter into new IAD Supplemental Agreements rather than deem the old NExAs converted into them).*

General Terms

GTA – rules for dispute resolution – would be extended to apply to disputes between GTs and iGTs. If expert determination were to be used in relation to any part of IAD, some changes would be needed to the expert appointment process.

GTB – general – would be amended to refer to the IAD and the IAD Framework Agreement, to iGTs and possibly to shippers in their capacity as iGT shippers. Party is extended to include iGT. Some other definitional and architectural changes would be needed.

Other documents

Agency Services Agreement

As noted above an agreement would be required between iGTs and xoserve.

0xxx

Modification

Day Month Year

Version 1.0

Page 11 of 20

© 2012 all rights reserved

Licences

The GT licence conditions relating to network code would need to be reviewed to establish whether any modification was necessary or desirable to extend the UNC scope to include the subject matter of the IAD, whether the relevant objectives were suitable criteria for decisions on modifications of the IAD, whether the requirements for the modification rules need to be amended to reflect the role of iGTs (or indeed to address parallel modification of the UNC and iGT UNC as mentioned above).

The iGT licence condition relating to network code would also need to be reviewed to establish whether any modification is needed to reflect these proposals.

4 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

Implementation of the changes identified within this Modification Proposal would be expected to facilitate the securing of effective competition between Users. Accurate cost allocations are a fundamental underpinning for effective competition and the changes are expected to lead to more accurate allocation of costs between Users. This results from making use of an increased number of Meter Readings, such that information is more accurate and up to date; increasing the number of Supply Meter Points that are reconciled individually rather than in aggregate. This should not only increase the accuracy of costs allocated to those allocated on a daily basis but also the remaining

0xxx

Modification

Day Month Year

Version 1.0

Page 12 of 20

© 2012 all rights reserved

Supply Meter Points since the total allocated to those Supply Meter Points would be expected to be more accurate.

Implementation of the proposed changes would also be expected to increase the predictability of cost allocations for individual Users. This would result from the use of more accurate and up to date consumption data, such that costs allocated to a given portfolio would more accurately reflect actual consumption that the User would expect to be aware of. Increased predictability would reduce the risk and uncertainty faced by Users, and consequently could be expected to reduce risk premiums that may be reflected in tariffs and/or prices. This would therefore facilitate the securing of effective competition among existing Users.

In addition to facilitating competition for existing Users, the reduction in risk and uncertainty would reduce barriers to entry. Entrants could come to the market with greater confidence that they could align their costs and revenues, and greater confidence that any changes they bring to the market through innovative approaches would be reflected in the costs allocated to themselves – for example, if consumption reducing initiatives are brought to the market, the reduced consumption would result in reduced costs more quickly than if the existing approach were to be retained. This has the potential to facilitate competition by reducing a barrier to entry for those seeking to come to the market with innovative ideas, but would also remove a barrier to existing Users developing new offerings and encouraging customers to switch to their products.

Increased predictability and certainty of allocations would be expected to allow Users to purchase energy that more closely matches true requirements. This will reduce costs for Users and support the development of effective competition.

5 Impacts and Costs

Consideration of Wider Industry Impacts

Consumers

The measures identified within this Modification Proposal would significantly increase the efficiency by which Supply Points downstream of the CSEP/COS are administered. This could be expected to result in costs savings for relevant consumers.

Costs

Indicative industry costs – User Pays	
To be determined	
Identification of Users, proposed split of the recovery between Gas Transporters and Users for User Pays costs and justification	
To be determined	
Proposed charge(s) for application of Users Pays charges to Shippers	
To be determined	
Proposed charge for inclusion in ACS – to be completed upon receipt of cost estimate from Xoserve	
To be determined	

Impacts

Impact on Transporters' Systems and Process	
Transporters' System/Process	Potential impact
UK Link	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major
Operational Processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major
User Pays implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBA

Impact on Users	
Area of Users' business	Potential impact
Administrative and operational	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unknown
Development, capital and operating costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unknown
Contractual risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBA

0xxx

Modification

Day Month Year

Version 1.0

Page 14 of 20

© 2012 all rights reserved

Impact on Users	
Legislative, regulatory and contractual obligations and relationships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant

Impact on Transporters	
Area of Transporters' business	Potential impact
System operation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
Development, capital and operating costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major
Recovery of costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBA
Price regulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
Contractual risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBA
Legislative, regulatory and contractual obligations and relationships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant
Standards of service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None

Impact on Code Administration	
Area of Code Administration	Potential impact
Modification Rules	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant
UNC Committees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
General administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None

Impact on Code	
Code section	Potential impact
TPD Sections A, B, C, E, F, H, J, U, V, Mod Rules, General Terms, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant

Impact on UNC Related Documents and Other Referenced Documents	
Related Document	Potential impact
Network Entry Agreement (TPD I1.3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
Network Exit Agreement (Including Connected System Exit Points) (TPD J1.5.4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
Storage Connection Agreement (TPD R1.3.1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
UK Link Manual (TPD U1.4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBA

Impact on UNC Related Documents and Other Referenced Documents	
Network Code Operations Reporting Manual (TPD V12)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
Network Code Validation Rules (TPD V12)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
ECQ Methodology (TPD V12)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
Measurement Error Notification Guidelines (TPD V12)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
Energy Balancing Credit Rules (TPD X2.1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
Uniform Network Code Standards of Service (Various)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None

Impact on Core Industry Documents and other documents	
Document	Potential impact
Safety Case or other document under Gas Safety (Management) Regulations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
Gas Transporter Licence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None

Other Impacts	
Item impacted	Potential impact
Security of Supply	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
Operation of the Total System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
Industry fragmentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
Terminal operators, consumers, connected system operators, suppliers, producers and other non code parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • iGTs Major

6 Implementation

No implementation date has been identified with respect to this Modification Proposal.

0xxx

Modification

Day Month Year

Version 1.0

Page 17 of 20

© 2012 all rights reserved

7 The Case for Change

This section allows further development of the case than is included in the earlier summaries

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

Advantages

Discussions within the Project Nexus Workgroup have shown that the proposed regime set out within this Modification Proposal would have significant industry benefit. However further discussion is necessary to determine the extent of this.

Disadvantages

To be determined.

0xxx

Modification

Day Month Year

Version 1.0

Page 18 of 20

© 2012 all rights reserved

8 Legal Text

Suggested Text

Legal text is to be provided at a later date.

0xxx

Modification

Day Month Year

Version 1.0

Page 19 of 20

© 2012 all rights reserved

9 Recommendation

The Proposer invites the Panel to:

- DETERMINE that Modification XXXX progress to Workgroup.

Oxxx

Modification

Day Month Year

Version 1.0

Page 20 of 20

© 2012 all rights reserved