

## Stage 02: Workgroup Report

# iGT089:

## Revision to the Modification Rules in Response to CGR3 – Self Governance

At what stage is this document in the process?

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



*This Proposal seeks to introduce the changes required to the iGT UNC in order to comply with the CGR3 final proposals for Self Governance modifications that were issued by the Authority on the 31st March 2016.*



Work Group recommends  
iGT089 proceeds to consultation



High Impact:



Medium Impact:



Low Impact:  
All iGT UNC Parties

## Contents

1. Plain English Summary .....	3
2. Rationale for Change? .....	4
3. Solution.....	4
4. Relevant Objectives.....	5
5. Impacts and Costs .....	5
6. Likely Impact on Consumers .....	5
7. Likely Impact on Environment .....	6
8. Implementation .....	6
9. Legal Text.....	6
10. Recommendation .....	7

## About this document:

The purpose of this report is make a recommendation to the Panel, to be held on 21<sup>st</sup> September 2016, on whether iGT089 should proceed to consultation and to submit any further recommendations in respect of the assessment of this Modification.



**Any questions?**

Contact:  
**Code Administrator**



**igt-unc@gemserv.com**



**0207 090 1044**

Proposer:  
**Kish Nundloll**



**kishn@espipelines.com**



**01372 227 245**

Workgroup Chair:  
**Code Administrator**

iGT089

Workgroup Report

14<sup>th</sup> September 2016

Version 1.0

Page 2 of 7

© 2016 all rights reserved

## 1. Plain English Summary

### Is this a Self-Governance Modification?

The Workgroup recommend that this is a self-governance Modification.

Whilst it is making changes to the iGT UNC Modification Rules, the changes are not considered to be material in terms of the overall application of the Modification Rules.

### If so, will this be progressed as a Fast Track Modification?

The Workgroup recommend that this will not be progressed as a Fast Track Modification.

### Rationale for Change

This Proposal seeks to introduce the changes required to the iGT UNC in order to comply with the CGR3 final proposals for Self Governance modifications that were issued on the 31st March 2016.

### Solution

The current modification rules contain a number of processes that are related to the management of Self-Governance modifications. The CGR3 review has decided that the general rule for all industry Codes is that the default for any modification proposal to a Code should now be Self-Governance.

This Modification seeks to introduce changes as required to make sure that this change of emphasis is recorded in the Modification Rules – i.e. a Modification Proposal should be considered to be a Self-Governance Modification Proposal (or a Fast Track Self-Governance Modification Proposal where relevant) unless the Panel decides that it does not meet the criteria, in which case it will be managed as an Authority decided modification (subject to overrule by the Authority as presently exists). Alongside this change there may need to be changes to the industry Code templates which are being considered by the Code Administrators Code of Practice group

### Relevant Objectives

There should be a Positive impact on Relevant Objectives f)

### Implementation

The Modification Proposal can be implemented as soon as possible after its implementation has been approved.

## 2. Rationale for Change?

The following is an extract from the Code Governance Review (Phase 3): Final Proposals published by Ofgem on the 31st March 2016:

*“Our Final Proposals on the self-governance process require industry to assess whether a modification requires Authority consent, i.e. why it is material, rather than why it is not material, which is the current situation. We also expect code administrators to work together to produce guidance that can be applied across codes to help proposers assess whether their change should follow a self-governance path.”*

In order to comply with these proposals the current Modification Rules as set out in the iGT UNC could be enhanced to reflect this change in emphasis.

## 3. Solution

A review of the current iGT UNC Modification Rules has highlighted a number of areas where changes could be made to address the change in emphasis required by the CGR3 review final proposals.

The first (Clause 10.2.1) is in relation to the content of the Modification Proposal where the Proposer states whether the proposal should be a self-governance modification and the proposer's reasons for that view. This should be changed to require the proposer to state whether the modification should not be self-governance together with the reasons for this view.

A similar change in emphasis should be made in Clause 23.1.1(c) where parties are asked to comment in their Consultation Responses on whether they agree with the classification that has been provisionally been given to the proposal.

A third area is in Clause 25.1(c) (Content of Modification Reports). Currently the report (either Draft or Final) is required to comment in respect of a Self-Governance proposal whether this status was set by the Panel or by the Authority. This should change to detail that where the proposal requires an Authority decision, whether it was the Panel or the Authority which made this judgement together with the reasons behind this judgement.

These changes have been discussed in the RG002 workgroup at its meetings on the 5th July and the 2nd August 2016.

The Work Group concurred with the proposed solution without further comment.

## 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.	None
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.	Positive
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

The Proposer (and Review Group) considers that this Modification would facilitate:

Objective F): The changes should ensure that the Self-Governance process is used as widely as possible where it is relevant. This process is generally more efficient in that it eliminates the need for a delay in potential implementation whilst a Final Modification Report is sent to the Authority for its decision on whether the proposal should be implemented. The safeguard will remain that where a party believes that the modification incorrectly followed the self-governance route, it can still appeal against the decision of the Panel.

## 5. Impacts and Costs

The Work Group identified no impacts or costs.

## 6. Likely Impact on Consumers

The Work Group identified no likely impact on consumers.

iGT089

Workgroup Report

14<sup>th</sup> September 2016

Version 1.0

Page 5 of 7

© 2016 all rights reserved

## 7. Likely Impact on Environment

The Work Group identified no likely impact on the environment.

## 8. Implementation

The Work Group recommend that changes should be implemented in the first release after a decision to implement.

## 9. Legal Text

### 10.2 Content of Modification Proposal

10.2.1 Each Modification Proposal made pursuant to Clause 10.1.1, Clause 10.1.2 or Clause 10.1.3 shall set out the information and be in the form specified on the iGT UNC Website and:

(a) shall state the Proposer's view as to whether it should **not** be a Self-Governance Modification Proposal and the Proposer's reasons for such a view;

### 23 Consultation Procedures

23.1.1 If the iGT UNC Modification Panel determines pursuant to Clause 18.7(a) that a Modification Proposal should proceed to Consultation:

(a) the iGT UNC Modification Panel shall be deemed to have requested that the iGT UNC Operators provide legal text unless the iGT UNC Modification Panel determines that legal text is not required for the purposes of the Draft Modification Report or Final Modification Report (which may be the case where Suggested Text has been provided by the Proposer and is sufficient in the view of the iGT UNC Modification Panel); and

(b) the iGT UNC Modification Panel shall inform the Code Administrator if it determines that the time periods set out in Clauses 19.2 and 19.3 for Consultation should, in its opinion, be deviated from in relation to the relevant Modification Proposal.

(c) where the Modification Proposal is **not** a Self-Governance Modification Proposal, the Code Administrator may invite each iGT UNC Operator, each User, Affected Person (if any) to make representations in respect of whether such Modification Proposal should **not** be a Self-Governance Modification Proposal.

### 25 Content of Modification Reports

25.1 Each Draft Modification Report or Final Modification Report shall set out the information, and be in the form, specified on the iGT UNC Website and:

(a) shall in relation to a recommendation of the iGT UNC Modification Panel under Clause 23.3.3(b), include details of the iGT UNC Modification Panel's reasoning for determining whether or not the Modification Proposal better facilitates achievement of the Relevant Objectives; and

(b) state whether or not a determination has been made by the iGT UNC Modification Panel under Clause 23.3.3(a) and the number of Voting Members in favour of, and the number of Voting Members present and not voting in favour of, the implementation of the Modification Proposal;

~~(c) where it relates to a Self-Governance Modification Proposal, state that fact and whether the iGT UNC Modification Panel or the Authority determined that such proposal satisfied the Self-Governance Criteria;~~

~~(c) where it [the modification report] relates to a Modification Proposal that is neither a Self-Governance Modification Proposal nor a Fast Track Self-Governance Modification Proposal, state that fact together with the reasons why the proposal failed to satisfy both the Self-Governance Criteria and Fast Track Self-Governance Criteria and whether such failure was determined by the iGT UNC Modification Panel or the Authority; and~~

(d) state whether the Modification Proposal is made pursuant to a direction of the Authority in respect of a Significant Code Review.

The Work Group concurred with the proposed legal text without further comment.

iGT089

Workgroup Report

14<sup>th</sup> September 2016

Version 1.0

Page 6 of 7

© 2016 all rights reserved

## 10. Recommendation

The Workgroup invites the Panel to:

- **AGREE** that iGT089 be submitted for consultation; and
- **AGREE** that Code Administrators should issue iGT089 Draft Modification Report for consultation with a close-out of 14<sup>th</sup> October 2016 and submit results to the Panel to consider at its meeting on 16<sup>th</sup> November 2016.