

Date	27 June 2008
Reference	iGT018
Title	Determination of Implementation Dates by Panel
Proposer	ES Pipelines
iGT UNC / Pipeline Operator	iGT UNC
Modification Proposal Dates	<i>Circulation: 29/02/2008</i> <i>Response: 25/03/2008</i> <i>Circulation of DMR: 15/04/2008</i> <i>Response to DMR: 07/05/2008</i> <i>Circulation of DFMR - 29/05/2008</i> <i>DFMR Presented to Panel - 18/06/2008</i> <i>FMR sent to authority: 27/06/08</i>

The Proposal

Every modification proposal should include a recommended implementation date. This can be commented upon during consultation. The Panel will either agree the recommendation or determine an alternative, based on a 'backstop' date 6 releases (18 months) from Authority approval. An implementation date will be determined for all modifications and recorded in the FMR.

In light of the fact that an equal split in a Panel vote would *not* constitute a recommendation for implementation, (and this is a reasonably likely outcome for many modifications) it is suggested that an implementation date should be *determined* for *all* modification proposals. There is an 'unknown' in the current modification process whereby a modification directed by the Authority for approval can have no implementation date. It is clear that in this situation further discussion would be necessary at industry level, but agreement of an implementation date 'after the event' is not contemplated by the rules as they stand, causing uncertainty and potential inefficiency.

Part L Clause 19.2 provides a starting point for discussion, but it should be recognised that the 2, 4, and 6-month timescales are *minimum* guidelines, and there could be good reasons to deviate from these.

It is further recognised that the 'profile' of the issue of implementation dates should be raised throughout the modification process. For this reason, it would make sense for the Proposer of a modification to recommend an implementation date (in line with the agreed implementation timescales and release schedules) at the point where the proposal is first raised. It may be, for example, that a Party is able to support a proposal with comfort that implementation would not be proposed for some time, where otherwise they may not have done. Additionally, this prompts comments (and potential changes) on this important aspect of code modification throughout consultation.

This proposal seeks to reduce uncertainty in the modification process by ensuring that:

- the issues around implementation are always considered when modification proposal is raised,
- the discussion of implementation dates and timescales is prompted during consultation,
- the Authority have visibility of any anticipated problems with implementation timescales when making their decision,

Administered by



iGT UNC / iGT INC Final Modification Report

- a modification will never be approved by the Authority without prior clarity among all parties on implementation date.

There will be an additional requirement to include a proposed implementation date in a modification proposal. This would be added to L 9.4. This is necessary to ensure that later in the consultation process the Panel are able to ‘endorse’ (or not) this proposed implementation date.

Alter drafting of L 18.5 (c) to reflect the fact that the Panel determines rather than recommends the date for implementation. Additional drafting inserted into Part L, after 18.5 to specify how the Panel makes the determination of implementation date, if it does not endorse the recommendation of the Proposer.

Note: There is an addition required to the modification template, which is being undertaken separately to this modification.

Proposer’s suggested timescale for implementation

The next release of the iGT UNC published after 2 months of receiving notice of implementation from the Authority in accordance with Part L 19.2(a) of the iGT UNC.

Facilitation of the relevant objectives

The Proposer considers this proposal facilitates the promotion of efficiency in the implementation of the network code, since:

- it should remove the requirement for further discussion of modification proposals after Authority determination;
- it will help to ensure that any modification raised takes into account the implementation timescales and schedules already in existence, as the Panel will be making their determination based on these criteria; and
- it will promote discussion of implementation dates during the consultation process, allowing the Proposer, other code parties and the Authority to identify with greater ease the potential impediments to implementation before the Authority make their determination.

Implementation issues

None

Respondents’ views

Individual responses can be viewed [here](#).

Respondee	Response to Consultation	Response to DMR
E.ON UK	Support	No Response
IPL/QPL	Support	No Response
SSE Energy Supply Ltd	Support	Support
SSE Pipelines	Support	Support
RWE npower	No Response	Support
British Gas	No Response	Support
ScottishPower	Qualified Support	No Response

Administered by



iGT UNC / iGT INC Final Modification Report

View of affected Operators on whether or not the Proposal should be implemented

The Operators views are available [here](#).

Other information

None

Panel Decision

The iGT Modification Panel held on 18th June 2008 unanimously agreed that it recommended the Modification for implementation, commenting that it promotes efficiency in the implementation and administration of the Network Code.

The Panel recommended an implementation date of the next release of the iGT UNC two months after receipt of Authority consent in accordance with clause 19.2 (a) of section L.

Proposed Legal Text

New text:

9.4 (f) a recommendation as to a proposed date for the implementation of the Modification Proposal.

To replace current 18.5 (c):

18.5 (c) the determination of a date for the implementation of the Modification Proposal, either by endorsement of the Proposer's recommended implementation date, or pursuant to Clause 18.6.

Add new clause 18.6:

18.6 If the Modification Panel does not determine by unanimous vote to agree the Proposer's recommended implementation date, it will unanimously agree a date, beginning with the earliest practical date (if not that recommended by the Proposer) and ending with a date 5 releases from Authority direction to implement. If no agreement can be reached the implementation date shall be 6 releases from Authority direction to implement, unless unanimous agreement can be achieved on a date further in the future.

(Subsequent Clauses to be renumbered.)