

Modification Report
Change to Nomenclature for Priority Levels Relating to UK Link Problem
Management
Modification Reference Number 0706
Version 1.0

This Modification Report is made pursuant to Rule 7.3 of the Modification Rules and follows the format required under Rule 8.9.3.

1. The Modification Proposal

Modification of section U 7.6.1 of the Network Code is required to reflect a change in nomenclature to the priority levels used to reference reported UK Link problems contained in section 3.5 "Problem Management" of the UK-Link Manual, IS Service Definition. This is a housekeeping exercise to reflect new terminology being introduced by the NGT IS service provider.

The current UKLink Manual IS Service Definition document refers to 6 priority levels, labeled IM6 to IM1. NGT have outsourced their IS provision to CSC and as part of this process problem management will be provided from a CSC Service Desk. The toolset used by this new Service Desk is configured to use 5 priority levels labeled P1 to P5. There are no detrimental changes to the definitions or response times associated with these levels and for the most significant there is a direct one to one mapping to the new labels as follows.

IM6 becomes P1 – Loss of service that affects more than one UK Link User.
IM5 becomes P2 – Loss of service to an individual UK Link User that affects all ARs.
IM4 becomes P3 – Loss of service to an individual UK Link User that affects more than one but not all ARs.
IM3 becomes P4 – Loss of service but restricted to an individual UK Link User.
IM2 becomes P4 – There is a problem but does not affect the functionality of the service, e.g. poor response times.
IM1 becomes P5 – The call has no impact upon the use of the service, such as general enquiries or queries.

The new service desk is currently scheduled to be taking calls from 31st October 2004. There is no change to telephone numbers, however a new fax number will be provided.

2. Transco's Opinion

It is Transco's opinion that this Modification Proposal should be implemented as it is a housekeeping exercise purely to reflect new terminology being introduced by the NGT IS service provider and has no detrimental changes to the associated definitions or response times.

3. Extent to which the proposed modification would better facilitate the relevant objectives

This is a housekeeping exercise to reflect the new terminology being introduced by the NGT IS service provider. However because the nomenclature is referred to in the Network Code legal text the change is subject to the Modification procedures. The modification will ensure that help desk support is maintained to the optimum standard. This will support the provision of the suite of computer systems which underpin the Network Code thereby assisting the efficient operation of the pipeline system.

4. The implications for Transco of implementing the Modification Proposal , including

a) implications for the operation of the System:

None

b) development and capital cost and operating cost implications:

None

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

Not applicable

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

None

5. The consequence of implementing the Modification Proposal on the level of contractual risk to Transco under the Network Code as modified by the Modification Proposal

Implementation of this Modification Proposal would not increase the level of Transco's contractual risk.

6. The development implications and other implications for computer systems of Transco and related computer systems of Users

None

7. The implications of implementing the Modification Proposal for Users

Users would need to become familiar with the new terminology when they were querying incidents with the Service Desk.

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

No such implications have been identified.

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

No such consequences have been identified.

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

Advantages

Ensures consistency between UK Link problem management priority levels and that used by the NGT IS provider

Disadvantages:

No disadvantages have been identified.

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

Representations were received from E.ON UK plc and British Gas Trading, both respondents support the proposal..

12. The extent to which the implementation is required to enable Transco to facilitate compliance with safety or other legislation

Implementation of this Modification Proposal is not required to enable Transco to facilitate compliance with safety or other legislation

13. The extent to which the implementation is required having regard to any proposed change in the methodology established under Standard Condition 4(5) or the statement furnished by Transco under Standard Condition 4(1) of the Licence

None

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

The online UK Link manuals will be updated to reflect the change

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

This Modification Proposal would be implemented in line with the cut over to the new Service Desk currently scheduled for 31st October 2004

16. Recommendation concerning the implementation of the Modification Proposal

Transco recommends that this Modification Proposal should be implemented.

17. Restrictive Trade Practices Act

If implemented this proposal will constitute an amendment to the Network Code. Accordingly the proposal is subject to the Suspense Clause set out in the attached Annex.

18. Transco's Proposal

This Modification Report contains Transco's proposal to modify the Network Code and Transco now seeks direction from the Gas & Electricity Markets Authority in accordance with this report.

19. Text

Section U

Paragraph 7.6.1 (a)

Amend "IM6" to "P1"

Paragraph 7.6.1 (e) (i)

Amend "IM6" to "P1"

Changes to all the references to IM6-IM1 in the UK Link Manual IS Service Definition to P1-P5, including the following reference in the legally binding table of Appendix 2 - Performance Levels.

Amend "IM5" to "P2".

Signed for and on behalf of Transco.

Signature:

Paul D Hastings
I.S. and Business Support Manager

Support Services

Date:

Gas and Electricity Markets Authority Response:

In accordance with Condition 9 of the Standard Conditions of the Gas Transporters' Licences dated 21st February 1996 I hereby direct Transco that the above proposal (as contained in Modification Report Reference **0706**, version **1.0** dated **10/09/2004**) be made as a modification to the Network Code.

Signed for and on Behalf of the Gas and Electricity Markets Authority.

Signature:

The Network Code is hereby modified with effect from, in accordance with the proposal as set out in this Modification Report, version **1.0**.

Signature:

Process Manager - Network Code
Transco

Date:

Annex

1. Any provision contained in this Agreement or in any arrangement of which this Agreement forms part by virtue of which The Restrictive Trade Practices Act 1976 ("the RTPA"), had it not been repealed, would apply to this Agreement or such arrangement shall not come into effect:
 - (i) if a copy of the Agreement is not provided to the Gas and Electricity Markets Authority ("the Authority") within 28 days of the date on which the Agreement is made; or
 - (ii) if, within 28 days of the provision of the copy, the Authority gives notice in writing, to the party providing it, that he does not approve the Agreement because it does not satisfy the criterion specified in paragraphs 1(6) or 2(3) of the Schedule to The Restrictive Trade Practices (Gas Conveyance and Storage) Order 1996 ("the Order") as appropriateprovided that if the Authority does not so approve the Agreement then Clause 3 shall apply.
2. If the Authority does so approve this Agreement in accordance with the terms of the Order (whether such approval is actual or deemed by effluxion of time) any provision contained in this Agreement or in any arrangement of which this Agreement forms part by virtue of which the RTPA, had it not been repealed, would apply this Agreement or such arrangement shall come into full force and effect on the date of such approval.
3. If the Authority does not approve this Agreement in accordance with the terms of the Order the parties agree to use their best endeavours to discuss with Ofgem any provision (or provisions) contained in this Agreement by virtue of which the RTPA, had it not been repealed, would apply to this Agreement or any arrangement of which this Agreement forms part with a view to modifying such provision (or provisions) as may be necessary to ensure that the Authority would not exercise his right to give notice pursuant to paragraph 1(5)(d)(ii) or 2(2)(b)(ii) of the Order in respect of the Agreement as amended. Such modification having been made, the parties shall provide a copy of the Agreement as modified to the Authority pursuant to Clause 1(i) above for approval in accordance with the terms of the Order.
4. For the purposes of this Clause, "Agreement" includes a variation of or an amendment to an agreement to which any provision of paragraphs 1(1) to (4) in the Schedule to the Order applies.