

Code Administration Code of Practice KPIs

Joint Office of Gas Transporters 2014 Q3 Report

As part of its energy Codes Governance Review (CGR), Ofgem proposed that a Code of Practice, (the CACoP) “be established to facilitate convergence and transparency in code Modification processes and to help protect the interests of small market participants and consumers through various means including increased use of plain English in modification reports”.

The Code of Practice puts forward principles for Code Administrators to follow, but also sets out principles applicable to a code Modification process. A standard Modification process is described, including standard pro-forma code Modification documents, processes and timescales with the CACoP itself, the latest copy of which can be found at:

<https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/licences-codes-and-standards/codes/industry-codes-work/code-administration-code-practice-cacop>

The Joint Office of Gas Transporters (Joint Office) are the Code Administrator for the Uniform Network Code (UNC), which contains the terms of transportation arrangements that are common to gas transporters in England, Scotland and Wales. All modifications referred to in this document are available on the Joint Office website at:

<http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/mods>

Where the CACoP requires us to report an average figure (e.g. days or numbers of modifications), we have included median values to address the skewing effect of particularly large, or small, occurrences.

Readers should be aware of the following when reading this document:

1. In compiling this document, we have reported on UNC Modifications that have completed their respective process cycles (Withdrawal, Panel Determination for Self Governance / Fast Track Modifications or Ofgem Decision otherwise) within the reporting period **01 July to 30 September 2014** (6 modifications) – see Appendix 2 for a full list.

Modification Type			
Self-Governance	Fast Track	Modification	Withdrawn
1	1	2	2

For example, in assessing the information for KPI 10 there are currently several modifications for which a UNC Panel recommendation was made during Q3 2014, but an Ofgem decision is awaited – these modifications will be subsequently recorded when the decision is received.

2. Where item 5 is concerned, in cases where alternative modifications are involved (i.e. 0451V/0451AV etc.) the number of responses recorded against the modifications are combined to reflect the fact that a ‘single’ consultation has been undertaken – this is in order to avoid ‘double or triple counting’ where ever possible. However, this does not discount that fact that in certain circumstances, a response may be provided against only one of the modifications concerned (not relevant for this edition of the report).
3. Items 1 and 4 have been held over pending the 2014 Joint Office Customer Satisfaction Survey.
4. Only calendar days are reported (i.e. not business days).
5. A quarterly comparison and year-to-date position is shown in Appendix 1

1. Number and percentage of survey respondents who stated they were ‘satisfied’ or better with the assistance offered by the code administrator

n/a

2. Number and percentage of reports ‘sent’ back by the Authority.

In Q3 2014, the Authority sent back 0 reports (0%):

	None
--	------

3. Number and percentage of final decisions on which the Authority’s assessment i) accords with the panel recommendation and ii) conflicts with the panel recommendation

2 Ofgem decisions were issued, of which 2 (100%) accorded with the panel recommendation.

		Ofgem Decision	
		Implement	Reject
Panel Recommendation	Implement	2	-
	Reject	-	-

Panel recommended implementation: Ofgem directed implementation:

0494	Imbalance Charge amendments required to align the UNC with the Network Code on Gas Balancing of Transmission Networks
0485	Introduction of the Long-term use-it-or-lose-it mechanism to facilitate compliance with the EU Congestion Management Procedures

Panel recommended implementation: Ofgem did not direct implementation:

	None
--	------

Panel did not recommend implementation: Ofgem did not direct implementation:

	None
--	------

Panel did not recommend implementation: Ofgem directed implementation:

	None
--	------

4. Glossary and plain English summary to be provided with reports

n/a

5. Average number of respondents to consultation

3 consultations on draft modification reports closed in the data sample. These attracted an average of 3 responses (minimum of 2 and maximum of 3) with a median of 3 responses.

0494	Imbalance Charge amendments required to align the UNC with the Network Code on Gas Balancing of Transmission Networks	3
0485	Introduction of the Long-term use-it-or-lose-it mechanism to facilitate compliance with the EU Congestion Management Procedures	2
0472S	Reporting the number of registration attempts by a Gas Shipper	3

6. Percentage of papers published outside of modification rules requirements

The modification rules specify requirements for the publication of modification panel papers, modifications, and modification reports. These have all been met (0% outside modification rules requirements).

7. Number and percentage of reports submitted to the authority in line with original timetable

No timetable is set for when reports should be submitted to the Authority and hence we cannot report on this KPI as described. The modification panel sets a date by which each modification workgroup is requested to report.

During Q3 2014, workgroup reports were received by the panel for 7 modifications. 1 (14%) of these were received within the original requested timetable.

8. Number of extensions to timetable requested

At modification panel meetings held in Q3 2014, 4 requests for workgroup reporting timetables to be extended were accepted.

9. Average time between (non-urgent) proposal being raised and submitted for decision

During Q3 2014, the modification panel determined 4 non-urgent modifications. These were considered, on average, 157 days after they were raised (minimum of 45 and maximum of 283 days) with a median of 150 days.

0472S	Reporting the number of registration attempts by a Gas Shipper	283
0485	Introduction of the Long-term use-it-or-lose-it mechanism to facilitate compliance with the EU Congestion Management Procedures	160
0494	Imbalance Charge amendments required to align the UNC with the Network Code on Gas Balancing of Transmission Networks	139
0503FT	Update of Transporter Procedure Document References within Network Code	45

10. Average time between proposal being submitted for decision and decision being published

This KPI disregards self-governance and fast track modifications but measures the number of days between the Final Modification Report being issued to Ofgem and the date of a decision letter by Ofgem. During Q3 2014, 2 decisions were received from Ofgem. On average, these were received after 34 days (in the range 33 to 34 days) with a median of 34 days.

0494	Imbalance Charge amendments required to align the UNC with the Network Code on Gas Balancing of Transmission Networks	33
0485	Introduction of the Long-term use-it-or-lose-it mechanism to facilitate compliance with the EU Congestion Management Procedures	34

11a. Average time between decision and implementation (separately identifying systems and non-system changes) - for modifications that completed their cycle and were implemented during Q3

3 modifications completed their governance cycle and were implemented during Q3 2014, none of which required changes to central systems. The average time between decision and implementation was 29 days (with a range of 22 to 41 days) and a median of 25 days.

0485	Introduction of the Long-term use-it-or-lose-it mechanism to facilitate compliance with the EU Congestion Management Procedures	41
0472S	Reporting the number of registration attempts by a Gas Shipper	25
0503FT	Update of Transporter Procedure Document References within Network Code	22

11b. Average time between decision and implementation (separately identifying systems and non-system changes) - for modifications completing their cycle in Q2 but implemented in Q3

4 modifications completed their cycle during Q1/2 but were implemented during Q3 2014, none of which required changes to central systems. The average time between decision and implementation was 24 days (with a range of 22 to 25 days) and a median of 24 days.

0488S	Additional Changes to the Mod 81 Reports	25
0482S	Proposed Changes to Mod 81 Reports to be effective from 01/10/13	25
0484S	Guidance for the production of legal text	22
0475S	Update to Section G, Annex G3 (Propsective Erroneous Large AQ Calculation Proforma)	22

12. Number and percentage of reports for which implementation cost estimates were available for consultation

An estimate of implementation costs for central systems (which may be zero) was included in all 3 modifications subject to consultation in Q3 2014 (100%).

13a. Accuracy percentage difference (whether higher or lower) between estimated and actual implementation costs for modifications that were specific to Q3 only

None of the modifications implemented during Q3 2014 required changes to central systems.

13b. Accuracy percentage difference (whether higher or lower) between estimated and actual implementation costs for modifications rolling over (as in KPI 11) from Q1/2 to Q3

None of the modifications rolled over from the Q1/2 reports that were implemented during Q3 2014 required changes to central systems.