

Consultation Response

IGT140: Changes to the IGT Panel Rules

Responses invited by: 16/10/2020

Respondent Details
Name: Cher Harris
Organisation: Indigo Pipelines Ltd

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Support Implementation | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Qualified Support | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Neutral | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Do Not Support | Y |

Please briefly summarise the key reason(s) for your support / opposition

Whilst we support the attempt to address the current lack of quoracy at Panel, we feel the proposed changes go further than are necessary or appropriate at this time.

We are uncomfortable with the principle of having different requirements for different constituencies, this concern was raised during the Workstream discussions. We also think it inappropriate for the Panel Chair to have to allocate extra votes to a single representative during a meeting where a particular constituency is under-represented – constituency representatives should agree amongst themselves prior to the meeting if votes are to be cast on behalf absent parties or vacant positions.

The proposed changes to the meeting quoracy rules are inferior to the current arrangements and risk preventing meetings from taking place, therefore inhibiting decision making. By applying the same quoracy rules to both the initial Panel meeting and the re-convened Panel meeting, this is likely to result in no meetings ever reaching the quoracy requirements due to the current issue of limited Shipper participation. We feel it is better for the re-convened Panel meeting to go ahead even without full representation than for it not to take place at all. Last month we adopted a pragmatic workaround where both the initial and re-convened Panel meetings took place on the same day which made it easy for participants to schedule time in their busy diaries.

Self-Governance Statement

Do you agree with the Modification Panel's determination with respect to whether or not this should be a self-governance modification?

We agree this Modification should be not classified as Self-Governance as it impacts on governance procedures and therefore requires Authority approval

Please state any new or additional issues that you believe should be considered

None identified

Relevant Objectives

How would implementation of this modification impact the relevant objectives?

Whilst some elements of the proposal, such as the proxy voting form, go some way towards positively impacting Objective F, we feel this is effectively cancelled out by the proposed changes to meeting quoracy, which in our view are inferior to current arrangements and therefore negatively impact Objective F

Impacts and Costs

What development and ongoing costs would you face if this modification was implemented?

There are no identified costs to implementing this change however if it results in Panel meetings not taking place due to lack of quoracy, there may be costs incurred due to the inability to approve and implement changes going forward

Implementation

What lead time would you wish to see prior to this modification being implemented, and why?

Implementation could be in the next scheduled release after Authority approval

Legal Text

Are you satisfied that the legal text will deliver the intent of the modification?

We are satisfied that the legal text meets the Proposer's requirements

Further Comments

Is there anything further you wish to be taken into account?

Insert text here

Responses should be submitted by email to IGTUNC@gemserv.com