






Final Modification Report	At what stage is this document in the process?
<h1>IGT152F:</h1> <h2>Housekeeping Changes for IGT UNC</h2>	<div>01 Modification</div> <div>02 Workgroup Report</div> <div>03 Draft Modification Report</div> <div>04 Final Modification Report</div>
<p>Purpose of Modification:</p> <p>Following a number of identified housekeeping changes being added to the Known Issues Register, as utilised by the IGT UNC Modification Workstream, this change is designed to correct these in bulk and ensure the accuracy of the IGT UNC and associated ancillary documents.</p>	
	<p>Panel consideration is due on xx month 20xx</p> <p><i>(delete as appropriate following Panel's decision)</i></p> <p>The Panel determined that this fast track self-governance modification be implemented.</p>
	<p><i>(delete as appropriate following Panel's decision)</i></p> <p>The Panel determined that this fast-track self-governance modification should not be implemented.</p>
	<p>High Impact:</p> <p>N/A</p>
	<p>Medium Impact:</p> <p>N/A</p>
	<p>Low Impact:</p> <p>N/A</p>

Contents

1 Summary	3
2 Governance	3
3 Why Change?	4
4 Code Specific Matters	4
5 Solution	4
6 Impacts & Other Considerations	4
7 Relevant Objectives	5
8 Implementation	5
9 Legal Text	6
10 Consultation	6
11 Panel Discussions	7
12 Recommendations	7

Timeline

The Proposer recommends the following timetable:

Final Modification Report available for Panel	15 th April 2021
Modification Panel decision	23 rd April 2021



Any questions?

Contact:

Code Administrator



**igtunc@gemse
rv.com**



020 7090 1044

Proposer:

Rebecca Cailes



**Rebecca.Cailes@bu-
uk.co.uk**

1 Summary

What

This change proposal seeks to make an array of small ‘housekeeping’ changes to amend the IGT UNC text ensuring that it is up to date, accurate and relevant.

Why

During the administrative activities of managing a code, from multiple parties, errors can often arise which are overlooked and subsequently not captured. These don't necessarily affect the obligations and processes imposed, but rather create inconsistencies which should ideally be corrected to ensure that codes are read, and therefore interpreted, in the proper way to guarantee consistency. Examples can include a reference to a section of the UNC (Uniform Network Code) which is actually 3.4 instead of 3.3, or perhaps referring to an old piece of legislation which has since been updated and therefore the dates are wrong, but not the title of the reference used.

How

The IGT UNC Modification Workstream has incorporated a process into the ‘Known Issues Register’ whereby parties to the IGT UNC can freely identify and register housekeeping changes required, and the portions of legal text affected. Previously there was the potential for each small change to be its own change proposal which wasn't efficient and, therefore, likely made parties reluctant to raise such changes. Now with the new process, this allows for multiple housekeeping changes to be actioned along with associated amendments to legal text, as addressed later on in this document. These changes have no material impact on code, or any parties affected by it.

2 Governance

Justification for Fast Track Self-Governance Procedures

This change proposal is designed to implement several housekeeping changes which have no impact on parties and therefore does not require extensive review. It is deemed that this change can follow fast track procedures. Likewise, because there is no material impact proposed from this change, it can follow a self-governance approach.

Requested Next Steps

This modification should:

- be subject to fast track self-governance
- Modification will be submitted to IGT UNC Modification Panel 15 Days prior to Panel.
- Voted as to whether it meets fast track self-governance criteria and support for implementation.
- Implemented in the next code release

3 Why Change?

It can occur when managing a code that small errors appear. These don't necessarily affect the obligations and processes imposed, but rather create inconsistencies which are ideally corrected to ensure that codes are read, and therefore interpreted, in the proper way to guarantee consistency. Examples can include a reference to a section of the UNC (Uniform Network Code) which is actually 3.4 instead of 3.3, or perhaps referring to an old piece of legislation which has since been updated and therefore the dates are wrong, but not the title of the reference used.

This change proposal is therefore designed to correct a number of these inconsistencies so that the IGT UNC can be maintained effectively as a code.

4 Code Specific Matters

Technical Skillsets

N/A

Reference Documents

- SOS Ancillary Document – Part four
- Part M of the IGT UNC
- [Known Issues Register](#)

5 Solution

Multiple housekeeping changes have been identified requiring action by the IGT UNC Modification Workstream. These changes have no material impact on code, or any parties affected by it. A number of small changes to the main body of the IGT UNC and one of an Ancillary Documents will ensure the accuracy and validity of the code. These specific changes are covered in more detail within the Legal Text.

6 Impacts & Other Considerations

Does this modification impact a Significant Code Review (SCR) or other significant industry change projects, if so, how?

There are no foreseen impacts on the SCR, and the ongoing Consequential Changes activity, because this change proposal is having no material impact on the code. And any small references and text changes will need to be naturally monitored as the code administrator carries out its requirement of maintaining two versions of the IGT UNC e.g one live and another accounting for identified consequential changes from the REC and Faster Switching.

Consumer Impacts

None.

Cross-Code Impacts

None. All changes are ringfenced to the IGT UNC and its Ancillary Documents.

Environmental Impacts

None

7 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) Co-ordinated, 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 agreements 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 Cooperation of Energy Regulators	None

Due to the nature of the proposed housekeeping changes, objective F will be better facilitated by this change proposal as the IGT UNC will be updated to ensure its accuracy which will improve the administrative efficiency behind the code.

8 Implementation

The implementation of the changes this proposal suggests should be applied to the next code release of the IGT UNC. There is no identified system change requirements or other causes which would cause a delay to these proposed changes.

9 Legal Text

Text Commentary

The following text extracts show the suggested amendments/deletions and inclusions to be made to update the IGT UNC.

Suggested Text

Part M

"Central Data Services Provider" or "CDSP" shall have the meaning in ~~NM~~1.2.1(a);

Pipeline Operator Standards of Service Query Management - Operational Guidelines

4 HIGH VOLUME QUERIES

There may be a number of reasons why a User wishes to submit a large number of queries at once, for example as a result of a data cleansing exercise. These queries which could either be high volume, or complex (or both).

In such cases, the User will endeavour to notify the Pipeline Operator in advance of submission, by means of bi-lateral discussion between. This may take place between escalation contacts, but this is not a necessity.

10 Consultation

Panel invited representations from interested parties before 26th March 2021. The summaries in the following table are provided for reference on a reasonable endeavours basis only. We recommend that all representations are read in full when considering this Report. Representations are published alongside this Final Modification Report.

Representations were received from the following parties:

Organisation	Response	Relevant Objectives	Key Points
Indigo Pipelines	Support	F - positive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We support implementation of these housekeeping changes to correct minor errors identified in the Code. • We agree this should be Self-Governance as none of the updates change the meaning of Code. We are happy for it to be Fast-tracked as there is no material impact to Parties. • Implementation should be at the earliest opportunity after a Modification Panel decision to implement. • We are satisfied with the legal text.

11 Panel Discussions

The Code Administrator will provide a summary of the Panel discussions that inform any decisions taken. This will include a record of Panel's views on the representations, the outcome of any votes and, where alternates exist, Panel's preference.

Discussion

Insert text here

Consideration of the Relevant Objectives

Insert text here

Determinations

Insert text here

12 Recommendations

Panel Determination Fast Track Self-Governance

Members agreed:

- that Modification 152F should [not] be implemented