

**CODE MODIFICATION PROPOSAL No xxxx**  
**Code Governance Final Proposals Mod x: Appointment and Voting Rights for a  
Consumer Representative and Independent Panel Chair**

**Version x.x**

**Date:** 14/07/2010  
**Proposed Implementation Date:** 1 November 2010  
**Urgency:** Non Urgent

**1 The Modification Proposal**

**a) Nature and Purpose of this Proposal**

Where capitalised words and phrases are used within this Modification Proposal, those words and phrases shall usually have the meaning given within the Uniform Network Code (unless they are otherwise defined in this Modification Proposal). Key UNC defined terms used in this Modification Proposal are highlighted by an asterisk (\*) when first used.

This Modification Proposal\*, as with all Modification Proposals, should be read in conjunction with the prevailing Uniform Network Code\* (UNC).

**Background**

In November 2007, Ofgem announced the Industry Codes Governance Review, which concluded at the end of March 2010 when Ofgem published their Final Proposals for the Code Governance Review (CGR). The Final Proposals covered the following work strands:

- Significant Code Review and Self Governance proposals;
- Proposals on the governance of network charging methodologies;
- Proposed approach to environmental assessment within the code objectives ;
- Proposals on the role of code administrators and small participant and consumer initiatives; and
- The Code Administration Code of Practice.

The Gas Transporters licence modifications necessary to implement the Final Proposals for the Code Governance Review and the Code Administration Code of Practice were published on 3 June 2010 and become effective on the 31 December 2010.

This Modification Proposal aims to implement the Code Governance Review Final Proposals with regards to an element of the code administrators work strand – the appointment of and voting rights for an Authority\* appointed Consumer Representative\* and an independent chair to the UNC Modification Panel.

The relatively narrow scope of change associated with this proposal is in recognition of the industry's interest in the topic of voting rights as shown by Modification Proposals 0286 and 0286A recently raised in this area.

### Code Governance Review Final Proposals and Proposed Licence Amendments

With regards to the appointment and voting rights of Consumer Representative(s) and an independent chair, the CGR Final Proposals can be summarised by the following points. It should be noted that these points are taken directly from the CGR Final Proposals document and do not necessarily reflect the view of the proposer.

- 2 (two) Consumer Representatives will be able to be appointed to the panel, one nominated by the National Consumer Council, and the second nominated by the Authority
- The Authority nominated Consumer Representative shall be appropriate where proposals would have different and potentially conflicting impacts upon various categories of consumers
- Both Consumer Representatives will be full voting members on the panel
- Consumer Representatives will also vote on self governance proposals, as although such proposals will have little or no consumer impacts, Consumer Representatives will have an important role in identifying self governance proposals, and will, as any other party, be at liberty to review its position once such self-governance proposals are considered by panel members
- Each of the main codes is to have an independent chair, but Ofgem will not seek to prescribe how that chair should be selected
- the Authority should have a right of veto over any candidate put forward by the licensee to act as an independent chair
- to provide the independent chair with the authority to carry out their role effectively, the independent chair shall have a casting vote where there would otherwise be deadlock and the panel is required to make a determination
- the independent chair's casting vote is not necessary in the case of a recommendation, which can legitimately reflect a split vote without hindering the ongoing progress of a proposal; it will simply be recorded as such in the modification report to the Authority.
- code parties should agree on how the voting rights of the chair is incorporated into the relevant code rules

To reflect the above views as incorporated into the CGR Final Proposals,

Ofgem has amended Paragraph 6d of Standard Special Condition A11 of the Gas Transporters Licence to state:

*“d. the arrangements establishing a panel body.....whose composition shall include:*

- i) an independent chairperson approved by the Authority; and*
- ii) a consumer representative (appointed by the National Consumer Council, or any successor body) and any other consumer representative as may be appointed by the Authority.*

*each of whom shall have a vote as specified in the uniform network code”*

### Modification Panel Voting

Currently, the Modification Panel\* comprises of 5 voting Transporters' Representatives\* and 5 voting User's Representatives. The Panel Chairman\* is a non voting Panel Member, as are the (up to two) Consumer Representative(s) as nominated by the National Consumer Council. A Terminal Operators' Representative\*, an Independent Transporters' Representative\* and an Independent Suppliers' representative\*) are also non-voting members. Currently the National Consumer Council has nominated Consumer Focus as [one] Consumer Representative.

As specified in section 5.1 of the Modification Rules, panel determinations shall be made by Panel Majority\* i.e. more than half of the applicable votes must be made in support of a decision e.g. that a proposal should proceed to the Consultation Phase. As such, where a Modification Panel vote is tied, it is deemed that the Modification Panel has failed to agree to a decision. Where the panel determines whether or not to recommend the implementation of a Modification and Panel Majority is not achieved, the Modification Panel will be deemed to have not recommended implementation.

### Modification Proposals 0286 and 0286A

Modification Proposals 0286 and 0286A: “Extending Modification Panel Voting Rights to Consumer Representative(s)” were raised in March 2010 by EDF Energy and British Gas Trading respectively. UNC Modification Proposal 0286 sought to amend the UNC modification rules such that the two non-voting seats on the panel currently allocated to consumer representatives are provided voting rights; it did not seek to amend any other aspect of the panel constitution or the rules more generally. Alternative Proposal 0286A sought to limit Consumer Focus to one Voting seat on the panel and clarify that its vote did not extend to self governance proposals or non-modification business carried out under the auspices of the UNC Committee, which has the same membership as the Modification Panel.

The Proposer believes the proposals pre-empted Ofgem's Final Proposals for the CGR and Ofgem has since indicated in the CGR Final Proposals that

although “neither conflicts with the proposed licence modification....if either of the proposals are implemented a further code modification may still be required in order to reflect the potential for a further consumer representative on the panel to be appointed by the Authority”.

[Ofgem subsequently approved Modification Proposal 0286A on XXX and changed the status of one Consumer Representative (Consumer Focus) from a nonvoting to a voting member.]

We are aware that the implementation of these revised voting arrangements is a change in the structure of the UNC Modification Panel and other industry participants may wish to consider further changes to the composition and voting arrangements of the Modification Panel. As the proposed changes in the following section are to simply implement the CGR Final Proposals, it is our view that these considerations should be addressed outside of this proposal.

### **Nature of the Proposal**

#### Consumer Representative(s)

To implement the above CGR Final Proposals with regards to Consumer Representative(s) it is proposed that a number of sections within the Modification Rules be amended.

Firstly, it is proposed that the defined term for Consumer Representative(s) be amended to state that one representative will be appointed each by the National Consumer Council and by the Authority.

Secondly, to reflect the amended membership of the panel it is proposed that Section 3.2 of the Modification Rules be amended to ensure both Consumer Representatives are voting members. In addition, it is proposed that Consumer Representatives should be removed from the second sentence of Section 3.2.2 which states that non-voting representatives should inform the panel of the views of the persons which they represent.

Finally, it is proposed that Section 4 of the Modification Rules be amended to provide the Authority with an option to appoint 1 (one) Consumer Representative as a voting Modification Panel member. [In addition, it is proposed that the National Consumer Council be able to appoint one Consumer Representative, rather than two at present.]

#### Appointment of an Independent Chair

For clarity this proposal proposes that the role of Panel Chairman undertakes the role of independent chair as described within the CGR Final Proposals and Code Administration Code of Practise.

Section 3.6 of the Rules states that the Transporters shall appoint a Panel Chairman by notice to the Secretary and as part of this appointment process the Authority may veto any candidate put forward for Panel Chairman. Therefore the proposer believes that no further amendment of the Rules is

required to reflect the CGR Final Proposals recommendation that the chair is approved by the Authority.

#### Independent chair's casting vote

A number of amendments are also required to the Modification Rules to enable the CGR Final Proposals regarding the independent chair's casting vote to be adopted within the UNC.

It is proposed that Section 3 of the Modification Rules be amended to state that the Panel Chairman shall have a casting vote in all cases other than when a Panel recommendation is made pursuant to section 9.3.3(a) of the UNC Modification Rules. In addition, it is proposed that casting vote become a defined term within the Modification Rules to add further clarity to this process.

This proposal is consistent with the intent of a chair's vote on relevant motions in the Connection and Use of System Code (CUSC) which specifically excludes the chair's vote from being cast in relation to a panel recommendation on a modification proposal.

It is also proposed that the defined term for Panel Majority be amended to reflect that determinations can be made as follows:

- a majority (in number) of the votes exercisable by the Voting Members present at that meeting and voting in favour of such matter, or [as now];
- Only where half of the votes exercisable by the Voting Members present at that meeting have voted in favour of such a matter the Panel Chairman's casting vote shall apply.

For the avoidance of doubt the Panel Chairman's casting vote shall not be applicable in the case of a Panel recommendation pursuant to section 9.3.3(a) of the UNC Modification Rules. It is the proposer's view that this reflects the CGR Final Proposals that such a determination can legitimately reflect a split vote without hindering the ongoing progress of a proposal.

This proposal changes the default position, where if no Panel Majority is obtained it is deemed that the motion under consideration is not supported. We feel that although these circumstances are rare it is appropriate for the independent Panel Chairman to have a casting vote rather than the progression of a Modification Proposal being determined by a default position.

**b) Justification for Urgency and recommendation on the procedure and timetable to be followed (if applicable)**

Not applicable.

- c) **Recommendation on whether this Proposal should proceed to the review procedures, the Development Phase, the Consultation Phase or be referred to a Workstream for discussion.**

The proposer believes that this Modification Proposal is sufficiently clear to proceed directly to consultation

## 2 User Pays

- a) **Classification of the Proposal as User Pays or not and justification for classification**

This Modification Proposal does not affect xoserve systems or procedures and therefore it is not affected by User Pays governance arrangements.

- b) **Identification of Users, proposed split of the recovery between Gas Transporters and Users for User Pays costs and justification**

Not applicable.

- c) **Proposed charge(s) for application of Users Pays charges to Shippers**

Not applicable.

- d) **Proposed charge for inclusion in ACS – to be completed upon receipt of cost estimate from xoserve**

Not applicable.

## 3 Extent to which implementation of this Modification Proposal would better facilitate the achievement (for the purposes of each Transporter's Licence) of the Relevant Objectives

The proposal implements the changes to paragraph 6d of Standard Special Condition A11. Network Code and Uniform Network Code, of the Gas Transporters' Licence as provided below:

*the arrangements establishing a panel body, as specified in the uniform network code, (the "**panel**") whose functions shall include the matters required by this condition and whose composition shall include:*

- (i) an independent chairperson approved by the Authority; and*
- (ii) a consumer representative (appointed by the National Consumer Council, or any successor body) and any other consumer representative as may be appointed by the Authority,*

*each of whom shall have a vote as specified in the uniform network code; and*  
Standard Special Condition A11.2 of National Grid NTS' Licence;

*"In relation to a proposed modification of the network code modification procedures, a reference to the relevant objectives is a reference to the requirements in paragraphs 9 and 12 of this condition (to the extent that those requirements do*

*not conflict with the objectives set out in paragraph 1).*"

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

Not applicable.

**5 The implications for Transporters and each Transporter of implementing this Modification Proposal, including:**

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

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

**c) Whether it is appropriate to recover all or any of the costs and, if so, a proposal for the most appropriate way for these costs to be recovered:**

Not applicable.

**d) The consequence (if any) on the level of contractual risk of each Transporter under the Uniform Network Code of the Individual Network Codes proposed to be modified by this Modification Proposal**

**6 The extent to which the implementation is required to enable each Transporter to facilitate compliance with a safety notice from the Health and Safety Executive pursuant to Standard Condition A11 (14) (Transporters Only)**

Not applicable.

**7 The development implications and other implications for the UK Link System of the Transporter, related computer systems of each Transporter and related computer systems of Users**

Not applicable.

**8 The implications for Users of implementing the Modification Proposal, including:**

**a) The administrative and operational implications (including impact upon manual processes and procedures)**

The proposer is not specifically aware of any such implications

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

The proposer is not specifically aware of any such implications

**c) The consequence (if any) on the level of contractual risk of Users under the Uniform Network Code of the Individual Network Codes proposed to be modified by this Modification Proposal**

The proposer is not specifically aware of any such implications

**9 The implications of the implementation for other relevant persons (including, but without limitation, Users, Connected System Operators, Consumers, Terminal Operators, Storage Operators, Suppliers and producers and, to the extent not so otherwise addressed, any Non-Code Party)**

Consumer Representatives on the Modification Panel will be able to offer views from the important perspective of the impact on consumers, who ultimately pay the costs associated with the operation of the gas regime.

**10 Consequences on the legislative and regulatory obligations and contractual relationships of the Transporters**

Implementation of the proposal would allow the new licence obligation effective on 31 December 2010 to be met.

**11 Analysis of any advantages or disadvantages of implementation of the Modification Proposal not otherwise identified in paragraphs 2 to 10 above**

**Advantages**

The proposal would allow the new licence obligation effective on 31 December 2010 to be met.

Seeking to make existing governance processes more transparent and accessible is particularly important for small participants and consumer groups. Providing the Authority with the option of appointing a further consumer representative will allow a Consumer Representative that may have different views to Consumer Focus to represent an additional set of consumers.

Introducing voting rights for a further consumer-appointed UNC Panel member will provide such representatives with rights to vote on the UNC Panel which are consistent with their rights under the BSC and CUSC.

Providing the independent Panel Chair with a casting vote on governance determinations (that may be subject to an equal number of votes for and against a motion) is an improvement on the default position, which may lead to the progression of Modification Proposals being unnecessarily impeded.

**Disadvantages**



- 12 Summary of representations received as a result of consultation by the Proposer (to the extent that the import of those representations are not reflected elsewhere in this Proposal)**
  
- 13 Detail of all other representations received and considered by the Proposer**
  
- 14 Any other matter the Proposer considers needs to be addressed**
  
- 15 Recommendations on the time scale for the implementation of the whole or any part of this Modification Proposal**
  
- 16 Comments on Suggested Text**
  
- 17 Suggested Text**

**Code Concerned, sections and paragraphs**

To be added

Uniform Network Code

Transportation Principal Document

**Section(s)**

**Proposer's Representative**

Chris Shanley, National Grid NTS

**Proposer**

National Grid NTS