

**Draft Modification Report**  
**Re-assessment of User Unsecured Credit Limits**  
**Modification Reference Number 0023**  
Version 2.0

This Draft Modification Report is made pursuant to Rule 8.9 of the Modification Rules and follows the format required under Rule 9.6.

**1. The Modification Proposal**

This is one of a number of Proposals which seek to implement recommendations identified within Ofgem's conclusion document "Best Practice Guidelines for Gas and Electricity Network Operator Credit Cover" 58/05. This concluded the high-level principles that should be applied and further work required in respect of credit cover arrangements for transportation.

This Proposal seeks to implement elements of recommendations detailed within paragraphs 3.4 to 3.9 of the conclusion document.

In accordance with the Code Credit Rules, UNC Section V3.1 details the Code Credit Limits to which Transporters and Users are obliged to adhere. A Code Credit Limit is the amount representing a Users maximum permitted Relevant Code Indebtedness being the aggregate amount, other than Energy Balancing Charges, for which a User is liable to Transco. The overall cap for unsecured credit exposure to any company or group of related companies is currently set at £250million. Any credit requirement in excess of this must be secured by the User.

It is proposed that a Relevant Transporter sets a maximum unsecured credit limit based on 2% of its Regulatory Asset Value. Whilst this would not constrain Relevant Transporters, those who seek other levels of risk may not obtain full pass through in the event of a failure and/or may be subject to objections and disputes from counterparties.

In respect of an individual User's Unsecured Credit limit, this is currently assessed by Transco based on an Investment Grade Rating provided by an approved rating agency being either *Moody's Investors Service* or *Standards & Poor's*. Where such bandings conflict, the Transco will utilise the lower of the ratings provided by the approved rating agencies.

Ofgem's paper concluded that individual counterparty credit limits and those that use Parent Company Guarantees or aggregates of both, should be set using credit ratings (provided by the aforementioned rating agencies) applied under the 'Basel 2' rules for determining bank capital adequacy. These currently are in the ratio of 1 : 2.5, 1 : 5, 1 : 7.5, for *Standards & Poor's* AAA/AA, A, BBB ratings (or *Moody's Investors Service* equivalent). These respectively would imply maximum credit allowances of, 100 percent for AAA/AA and 40 percent for A.

For the third band, (BBB) Ofgem proposes that the above allowance be further sub-divided, such that the following are applied to rated entities:

Standard & Poor's Credit rating	Credit allowance as a percentage of maximum credit limit
BBB+	20
BBB	19
BBB-	18

Transco therefore proposes to amend the UNC to reflect the above method of assessment of User Unsecured Credit Limits.

The scope of the above unsecured credit arrangements mirror the scope currently contained within the 'Code Credit Rules' and therefore Transco does not propose to facilitate unsecured credit limits for entities with *Standards & Poor's* ratings of BB+, BB or BB- (or *Moody's Investors Service* equivalent).

**2. Extent to which implementation of the proposed modification would better facilitate the relevant objectives**

Implementing consistent credit processes which move towards recognised best practice would help ensure that there is no inappropriate discrimination, and no inappropriate barrier to entry, thereby facilitating the securing of effective competition between Relevant Shippers.

**3. The implications of implementing the Modification Proposal on security of supply, operation of the Total System and industry fragmentation**

No such implications on security of supply or operation of the Total System have been identified. Incorporating elements of the existing Code Credit Rules within the UNC may help to reduce the impacts of industry fragmentation.

**4. The implications for Transporters and each Transporter of implementing the Modification Proposal, including**

**a) implications for operation of the System:**

No implications for operation of the system have been identified.

**b) development and capital cost and operating cost implications:**

The proposer has suggested that any costs would be minimal.

**c) extent to which it is appropriate to recover the costs, and proposal for the most appropriate way to recover the costs:**

No cost recovery mechanism is proposed.

**d) analysis of the consequences (if any) this proposal would have on price regulation:**

No such consequences are anticipated.

**5. The consequence of implementing the Modification Proposal on the level of contractual risk of each Transporter under the Code as modified by the Modification Proposal**

No such consequence is anticipated.

**6. The high level indication of the areas of the UK Link System likely to be affected, together with the development implications and other implications for the UK Link Systems and related computer systems of each Transporter and Users**

No systems impacts are anticipated by either Transporters or Users.

**7. The implications of implementing the Modification Proposal for Users, including administrative and operational costs and level of contractual risk**

The proposer believes the level of credit cover to be provided to Transco by some Users would reduce, thereby potentially reducing Users' costs. Other Relevant Transporters have identified that additional credit cover may be called for, potentially increasing costs for some Users.

**8. The implications of implementing the Modification Proposal for Terminal Operators, Consumers, Connected System Operators, Suppliers, producers and, any Non Code Party**

No such implications have been identified.

**9. Consequences on the legislative and regulatory obligations and contractual relationships of each Transporter and each User and Non Code Party of implementing the Modification Proposal**

No such consequences are anticipated.

**10. Analysis of any advantages or disadvantages of implementation of the Modification Proposal**

**Advantages**

- Increased alignment of the UNC with best practice as identified in Ofgem's conclusions document.
- Ensures credit cover continues to be sought on a non-discriminatory basis.
- Ensures there continue to be no inappropriate barriers to entry as a result of credit requirements.

- Reduced credit cover requirements could reduce costs for some Users.

#### **Disadvantages**

- Does not fully implement the best practice approach identified in Ofgem's conclusions document.
- May create inconsistency between the UNC and each set of Code Credit Rules.
- Potential for increased credit cover requirements, increasing costs for some Users.

#### **11. Summary of representations received (to the extent that the import of those representations are not reflected elsewhere in the Modification Report)**

Representations are now invited.

#### **12. The extent to which the implementation is required to enable each Transporter to facilitate compliance with safety or other legislation**

Implementation is not required to enable each Transporter to facilitate compliance with safety or other legislation.

#### **13. The extent to which implementation is required having regard to any proposed change in the methodology established under paragraph 5 of Condition A4 or the statement furnished by each Transporter under paragraph 1 of Condition 4 of the Transporter's Licence**

Implementation is not required having regard to any proposed change in the methodology established under paragraph 5 of Condition A4 or the statement furnished by each Transporter under paragraph 1 of Condition 4 of the Transporter's Licence.

#### **14. Programme for works required as a consequence of implementing the Modification Proposal**

The Proposer believes that minimal changes would be required in respect of operational processes and procedures in the event that this Modification Proposal is implemented.

#### **15. Proposed implementation timetable (including timetable for any necessary information systems changes)**

In light of the limited works required to implement, the proposer believes that this Modification Proposal could be implemented with immediate effect if appropriate direction is received from the Authority.

#### **16. Implications of implementing this Modification Proposal upon existing Code Standards of Service**

No implications of implementing this Modification Proposal upon existing Code Standards of Service have been identified.

**17. Recommendation regarding implementation of this Modification Proposal and the number of votes of the Modification Panel**

**18. Text**

**UNIFORM NETWORK CODE - TRANSPORTATION PRINCIPAL DOCUMENT**

**SECTION V: GENERAL**

*Amend paragraph 3.1.1 as follows:*

For the purposes of the Code:

- (a) the “Regulatory Asset Value” is the value of the relevant Transporter’s regulated assets as published from time to time by the Authority.
- (b) An “Approved Credit Rating” is a published and monitored long term issuer rating (not including private ratings) of not less than Baa3 by Moody’s Investors Service or equivalent rating by Standard and Poor’s.
- (c) The “Unsecured Credit Limit” is that proportion of the Maximum Unsecured Credit Limit extended to a User by the Transporter as calculated in accordance with the table set out in paragraph 3.1.6.

“The Transporter will, in accordance with the Code Credit Rules, determine and assign to each User a Code Credit Limit, which may comprise of an Unsecured Credit Limit calculated in accordance with paragraph 3.1.6 and/or security or surety provided in accordance with paragraph 3.4. and will The Transporter shall keep each User informed of its Code Credit Limit (as revised in accordance with the Code) for the time being. The Transporter shall limit the Unsecured Credit Limit to any User and related company to a maximum of two percent (2%) of the Regulatory Asset Value (The “Maximum Unsecured Credit Limit”).

*Amend 3.1.2 (a) as follows:*

~~“the principles on which the Transporter will assess and from time to time revise (in accordance with paragraph 3.2.2) its assessment of the credit-worthiness of Users (and persons providing surety for Users) and establish Code Credit Limits;~~

***Add new paragraph 3.1.6 as follows:***

Where a User has an Approved Credit Rating, such User’s Unsecured Credit Limit at any time shall be calculated as that percentage (%) of the Maximum Unsecured Credit Limit by reference to the User’s Approved Credit Rating as follows:

<b><i>Approved Credit Rating</i></b>		<b><i>User’s % of Maximum Unsecured Credit Limit</i></b>
<b>Standard and Poor’s</b>	<b>Moody’s Investors Service</b>	
AAA/AA	Aaa/Aa	100
A	A	40
BBB+	Baa1	20
BBB	Baa2	19
BBB-	Baa3	18

Subject Matter Expert sign off:

*I confirm that I have prepared this modification report in accordance with the Modification Rules.*

Signature:

Date :

Signed for and on behalf of Relevant Gas Transporters:

**Tim Davis**  
**Chief Executive, Joint Office of Gas Transporters**

Signature:

Date :