

RG004 – High Level Summary of Responses August 2018

Solution Options – summary of Preferred Options

1. To amalgamate all common areas of the IGT UNC and the UNC into the UNC and to make all those areas that are not common to both Codes an Ancillary Document to the UNC.

SSE Supply

First Utility

Cadent – but not now. Potentially once the new REC arrangements are in place and maybe via an Ofgem Strategic code Review

2. To create a common UNC and IGT UNC modification process so that when a modification is raised under the UNC it considers the IGT UNC, and requires any changes to the IGT UNC legal text to be produced simultaneously.

Anon 2

BG

3. To amend the IGT UNC to reference the UNC at a much higher 'section type' level rather than at the clause level.

None

4. To put the IGT UNC (and its Ancillary documents) in their entirety into the UNC as a separate section, akin to the IGTAD.

Anon 1 – large Governance exercise and difficult to quantify the benefits

WWU – requires resolution of a number of major issues before this approach could be adopted particularly re licenses and funding

5. Allowing the Code Administrator to raise non-material modification proposals on behalf of industry in order to cut down on duplicated resource, and reduction in the frequency of modification workstream meetings.

ESP (with Option 2)

6. 'Do nothing approach'.

Cadent

SGN

Xoserve – concerned that an IGT Review at this time would distract from other initiatives – e.g. the Switching programme

New Options

7. Proposed by BUK

Set up a Cross Code working Group to look to improve the current modification process across both the IGT UNC and the UNC

8. Proposed by Indigo

Increase efforts to encourage Shippers to fill the Panel vacancies, particularly focusing on smaller shippers who traditionally have not been involved

Respondent	Options set out in the RFI						New Options		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Shippers									
SSE Supply	P	M	M	A	M	A			
First Utility	P	A	A	M	A	A			
Anon 1	M	M	M	P	M	A			
Anon 2	M	P	A	M	A	A			
BG	M	P	M	M	M	M			
IGTs									
BUUK	A	M	A	A	M	M	P		
ESP	A	PL	A	A	P	A			
INDIGO	A	M	A	A	M	M		P	
GTs									
CADENT	PL	M	A	A	A	P			
SGN	A	A	A	A	A	P			
WWU	A	A	A	PL	M	A			
OTHER									
Xoserve									
Totals									
P	2	2	0	1	1	2	1	1	
PL	1	1	0	1	0	0			
M	3	5	3	3	6	3			
A	5	3	8	6	4	6			

Codes

P- Preferred; PL- Preferred but not now; M- Maybe; A- Against

Problem Statements

1. Much of IGT UNC work is administrative;
2. Engagement and attendance has declined since Project Nexus Implementation; and
3. Shipper positions on the Panel are not being filled.

Respondent	Problem Statements			Is now the right time for major change?
	1	2	3	
Shippers				
SSE Supply	A	A	A	Y
First Utility	A	A	A	Y
Anon 1	A	IE	A	N
Anon 2	A	A	A	N
BG	A	D	A	N
IGTs				
BUUK	D	D	A	N
ESP	A	D	A	N
INDIGO	D	D	A	N
GTs				
CADENT	IE	IE	A	N
SGN	IE	IE	A	N
WWU	NC	A	A	N
OTHER				
Xoserve				N
Totals				
A	6	4	11	
D	2	4	0	
IE	2	3	0	
NC	1	0	0	
Major change?				
Yes				2
No				10

Codes

A- Agree; D- Disagree; IE- Insufficient Evidence; NC – No Comment

Is now the right time for major change?

Whilst not a direct question in the RFI a number of respondents commented that now may not be the right time for major change due to other work (Switching, REC) being a priority.