

Modification 0152a “Limitation on Retrospective Invoicing and Invoice Correction”

The Proposer, Statoil (U.K) Ltd (STUK), requests a variation to this Proposal, pursuant to UNC Modification Rules Section 6.5.1(c) of the UNC.

Reason for Variation

Following discussions at and following the June Modification Panel, BGT believes that it is necessary to add further clarity to the original modification proposal, in particular how their suggested model will actually work in practice. A further change has been made by BGT to emphasise that Energy Balancing invoices will be caught by this proposal. This alternate modification requires variation to reflect the change in the original modification.

STUK believes that as this alternate modification is essentially the same as the BGT modification and only differs in the timescales used for the cut-off period the best way forward is to mirror the changes to the Proposal made by BGT.

Nature of Variation

In the variation of the original modification BGT has not sought to change the original intention or purpose of this proposal, simply to clarify the meaning behind the terms used and to emphasise that energy balancing invoices will be caught by this proposal. STUK wish this same clarification to be reflected in this alternate. The intention behind STUK’s modification proposal however is not changed. It is still STUK’s intention that their proposal put in place a hard cut-off date for all Transporter-Shipper invoices once a year. Under the STUK proposal this would be exactly 6 years previous ensuring that parties exposure under statute of limitations remains unaffected.

This clarity has been added through additional wording at various points in the proposal, and by appending the business rules, as drafted by Review group 0140, to the end of the proposal for further clarity.

The timeline has also been updated.

Proposer
Richard Street - Statoil (U.K.) Ltd

Proposer’s Representative
Richard Street - Statoil (U.K.) Ltd