

Stage 01: Proposal

OXXX: Review of LDZ Customer Charges

The Modification proposes a review of the LDZ Customer charges to base them on current Network costs.



The Proposer recommends that this modification should be referred to a Workgroup for assessment



High Impact:



Medium Impact:
Distribution Networks



Low Impact:

What stage is this document in the process?

- 01 Proposal
- 02 Workgroup Report
- 03 Draft Modification Report
- 04 Final Modification Report

Oxxx

Modification

Day Month Year

Version 1.0

Page 1 of 19

© 2012 all rights reserved

Contents

- 1 Summary
- 2 Why Change?
- 3 Solution
- 4 Relevant Objectives
- 5 Impacts and Costs
- 6 Implementation
- 7 The Case for Change
- 8 Legal Text
- 9 Recommendation

About this document:

This document is a proposal, which will be presented by the Proposer to the Panel on xx xx 2012. The Panel will consider the Proposer's recommendation, and agree whether this [self-governance] modification should proceed to consultation or be referred to a Workgroup for assessment.



3 **Any questions?**

4 Contact:

7 **Joint Office**



12 enquiries@gasgovernance.co.uk

13



16 **0121 623 2115**

17

Proposer:

17 **Scotia Gas Networks**

18



18 Joel.martin@sgn.co.uk

19



07966317785

Transporter:

Scotia Gas Networks



Joel.martin@sgn.co.uk



07966317785

Xoserve:

Insert name



commercial.enquiries@xoserve.com



0000 000 000

0xxx

Modification

Day Month Year

Version 1.0

Page 2 of 19

© 2012 all rights reserved

1 Summary

Is this a Self-Governance Modification

The implementation of this Modification could have an impact on competition between Shippers and therefore it is not proposed that this MOD follows the self-governance route.

Why Change?

The DNs have been carrying out a programme of work agreed with Ofgem shortly after Network Sale to make the LDZ transportation charges more cost reflective by basing them on DN specific costs rather than the national costs on which the charges were based at Network Sale. DNPC05 reviewed the split of DN costs between System costs and Customer costs and put the split on a DN specific basis. DNPC08 reviewed the structure of the LDZ System charges and put them on a DN specific basis. The DNs are now in a position to review the structure of the LDZ Customer charges and to put them on a DN specific basis. This is the last structural change outstanding in the programme of work agreed with Ofgem.

Solution

The DNs are proposing not just that the Customer charges be put on a DN specific basis but also that the structure of the charges should be made more cost reflective.

Impacts & Costs

A restructuring of the customer charges will cause some end-users to experience increases in their transportation charges and some to experience reductions. Potential impacts are highlighted.

There may be some xoserve costs as a result of changing the charging functions but it is not envisaged that there would be any increased administration costs to shippers.

Implementation

Because it is recommended that this proposal should be assessed by a Workgroup a timescale for the implementation of the Modification is not currently proposed. However as this proposal involves changes to the LDZ transportation charges and the charge change date specified in the DNs' Licences is 1 April it is suggested that the target implementation date should be 1 April 2014.

The Case for Change

The case for change is to improve the cost reflectivity of the LDZ Customer charges and to complete the programme of work agreed with Ofgem to put all the LDZ transportation charges on a DN specific basis.

Recommendations

It is recommended that this proposal should be assessed by a Workgroup.



Insert heading here

Use this column in a Q and A style for explanations, in order to preserve the flow of the main text.

Insert text here

0xxx

Modification

Day Month Year

Version 1.0

Page 3 of 19

© 2012 all rights reserved

2 Why Change?



Insert heading here

Use this column in a Q and A style for explanations, in order to preserve the flow of the main text.

Insert text here

The DNs have been carrying out a programme of work agreed with Ofgem shortly after Network Sale to make the structure of the LDZ transportation charges more cost reflective by basing it on DN specific costs rather than the national costs on which the structure was based at Network Sale. DNPC05 reviewed the split of DN costs between System costs and Customer costs and put the split on a DN specific basis. DNPC08 reviewed the structure of the LDZ System charges and put that on a DN specific basis. The DNs are now in a position to review the structure of the LDZ Customer charges and to put it on a DN specific basis. This is the last structural change outstanding in the programme of work agreed with Ofgem, although all of the above items may be subject to periodic review over the next price control period.

The work to put the structure of the customer charges on a DN specific basis has inevitably involved reviewing the existing structure with a view to improving the extent to which the charges to supply points of different sizes reflect the costs which those supply points cause to be incurred. Currently, apart from the relatively small fixed charges in the charging band 73.2-732MWh all customer charges are based on supply point capacity (SOQ). The DNs have been examining whether, given the costs which are reflected in the customer charges, an alternative charging structure might be more cost-reflective.

The costs reflected in the customer charges are:

Supply Point Emergency Service Costs: These costs are mainly the costs of the emergency teams which are called out when a leak is reported downstream of the main. The costs of call-outs relating to mains are not included as these are included as LDZ system costs. The costs include an allocation of call centre costs and overheads. From the DNs' investigations there is no evidence to show that these costs vary with the size of the supply point SOQ.

Services Replacement Costs (Repex): These costs are the costs of the replacement of services funded by the transporter or adopted by them. The cost evidence available provides a breakdown into costs for domestic and non-domestic supply points, but is not sufficiently detailed to provide evidence that costs vary by supply point size within the categories of domestic and non-domestic.

Leakage is a relatively small element of the costs associated with services which is too small to be treated as a separate cost category. It is included with Replacement because for the purposes of cost recovery this is the most appropriate cost category.

Asset Related Costs: Services Depreciation: The depreciation costs reflected in the customer charge are almost entirely depreciation of the capital cost of services funded by the transporter. Since the separation of the British Gas Corporation into Transportation and Trading in 1994 the great majority of these costs have been the cost of the Domestic Load Connection Allowance (DLCA). The DLCA is a statutory allowance set out in the Gas Act (1985) and under it the transporter does not charge for the first 10 metres of service laid in public property to domestic properties situated within 23

0xxx

Modification

Day Month Year

Version 1.0

Page 4 of 19

© 2012 all rights reserved

metres of an existing main. Since 1994 all non-domestic connections and other domestic connections have been funded by the connectee, and therefore the great majority of the depreciation on services which is reflected in the customer charge can be attributed to the DLCA. There may be some depreciation relating to non-domestic services dating back to before 1994 when many British Gas Regions gave Load Connection Allowances to non-domestic connections, but the proportion this represents of the total is now very low.

Asset Related Costs: Network Rates: The Network Rates reflected in the customer charge are based on the same capital cost of services funded by the transporter as the depreciation and are treated in the same way.

The table below shows the relative importance of the costs which are reflected in the customer charges for each Network.

	Scotland	Southern	Wales & West	Northern
Emergency:				
Direct Costs	18.1%	17.3%	16.5%	14.1%
Opex+Work Management	3.6%	2.8%	5.0%	2.9%
Total Emergency	21.7%	20.0%	21.5%	17.0%
Replacement:				
Direct Costs	27.6%	32.4%	26.6%	22.1%
Opex+Work Management	5.4%	5.2%	8.1%	4.5%
Service Leakage	2.0%	2.1%	2.8%	2.6%
Total Replacement	35.0%	39.6%	37.5%	29.1%
Asset Related Costs:				
Regulated Depreciation	29.8%	25.1%	26.8%	32.7%
Network Rates	13.5%	15.3%	14.1%	21.2%
Total Asset Related Costs	43.3%	40.4%	41.0%	53.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100%

	East of England	London	North West	West Midlands
Emergency:				
Direct Costs	15.9%	20.1%	19.6%	16.8%
Opex+Work Management	3.4%	6.0%	4.7%	3.7%
Total Emergency	19.3%	26.1%	24.4%	20.5%
Replacement:				
Direct Costs	21.1%	19.6%	26.1%	26.6%
Opex+Work Management	4.6%	5.8%	6.3%	5.9%
Service Leakage	2.1%	1.8%	2.2%	2.1%
Total Replacement	27.8%	27.2%	34.5%	34.6%

0xxx

Modification

Day Month Year

Version 1.0

Page 5 of 19

© 2012 all rights reserved

Asset Related Costs:				
Regulated Depreciation	30.1%	28.6%	25.7%	27.9%
Network Rates	22.8%	18.1%	15.5%	17.0%
Total Asset Related Costs	52.9%	46.7%	41.1%	44.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Revenue Recovery: The actual level of the charges will be adjusted to ensure that the revenue recovered is in line with the System/Customer Charge split established in DNPC05.

3 Solution



Insert heading here

Use this column in a Q and A style for explanations, in order to preserve the flow of the main text.

Insert text here

Proposals

Currently, apart from the relatively small fixed charges in the charging band 73.2-732MWh all customer charges are based on supply point capacity (SOQ). There are three charging bands:-

1. 0-73.2 MWh: For supply points with an AQ below 73.2MWh there is a fixed unit rate in terms of pence per peak day kWh per day.
2. 73.2 - 732 MWh: For supply points with an AQ between 73.2 and 732 MWh there is also a fixed, but lower, pence per peak day kWh per day unit rate, plus the fixed charge depending on frequency of meter reads.
3. >732 MWh For supply points with an AQ greater than 732 MWh the unit rate depends on the SOQ of the supply point as it is calculated using an exponential function.

This Mod is proposing a more cost reflective charging structure based on the costs reflected in the Customer Charges. The charge would consist of three parts, reflecting the three main types of costs which are recovered through the customer charges. With the first two elements, Emergency costs and Services Replacement costs, the charges are set to be as cost reflective as possible given the evidence available. For the third element, Depreciation (mainly DLCA) costs, two options are proposed for consideration by the Workgroup, and these are discussed more fully below.

The proposed charges will also be more cost reflective than the existing charges because they will be based on individual DN costs rather than national costs and will reflect an up-to-date balance of costs involved.

Emergency Costs: Because there is no evidence that supply point Emergency costs vary with supply point size it is proposed that these costs be recovered by a single flat rate charge which would apply to all supply points, irrespective of size.

Services Replacement Costs (Repex) In most Networks there is cost evidence that Services Replacement costs are higher for non-domestic supply points than for domestic supply points, which is to be expected on the basis that non-domestic supply points will, on average, have larger services. However the available cost data is not sufficiently detailed to provide evidence that costs vary by supply point size within the categories of domestic and non-domestic. Therefore for these Networks it is proposed that there should be one flat rate for the 0-73.2 MWh charging band, which consists mainly of domestic supply points, and a slightly higher flat rate for the 73.2 – 732 MWh and >732 MWh charging bands which consist mainly of non-domestic supply points. In Southern Network the cost evidence does not justify a higher rate for the 73.2 – 732 MWh and >732 MWh charging bands and therefore a single flat rate charge across all three charging bands is proposed.

Asset Related (DLCA) Costs: As discussed in Section 2, the great majority of the asset related costs on services which are reflected in the customer charge can be

0xxx

Modification

Day Month Year

Version 1.0

Page 7 of 19

© 2012 all rights reserved

attributed to the DLCA. The proposers of the Mod consider that it was the intention of the Gas Act (1985) that the cost of the DLCA should be recovered from all gas customers and not just from those who benefitted from the Allowance. This part of the charge is not intended to be cost reflective because it is to recover an allowance and not an operational cost. Two options are proposed for the recovery of these costs:-

Option 1. A single flat rate charge applied to all supply points, irrespective of size. This would mean that the Depreciation costs would be recovered from all supply points, but with no attempt to vary the contribution by size of supply point.

Option 2. A single unit rate capacity charge applied to all supply points based on the square root of the supply point SOQ. An SOQ based charge to reflect the asset related costs would mean that the contribution made was proportionate to supply point size. It is proposed to base the charge on the square root of the SOQ to reflect the fact that the cost of capacity rises more in line with the square root of the capacity rather than the level of capacity itself.

Impacts on Charges

Option 1: Under Option 1 there would be a flat rate charge for all three elements of the charge. For Emergency and asset related costs there would be a single flat rate charge across all supply points, and for Replacement for seven of the eight Networks there would be one flat rate for the 0-73.2 MWh charging band and a higher flat rate for the other two charging bands. For Southern Network there would be the same flat rate charge across all load bands.

For the purposes of illustration only how this charge might look in the Charging Statements for Scotland, based on 2011/12 revenue recovery, is shown in the table below.

Scotland	
AQ	Pence per Supply Point per day
Up to 73,200 kWh pa	12.0729
73,200 to 732,000 kWh pa	13.3941
732,000 kWh pa and above	13.3941

The impact of this structure on charges is shown in the table below.

Option 1	Scotland		Southern		Wales & West		Northern	
	Impact on:		Impact on:		Impact on:		Impact on:	
Load Band	Customer Charge	Total Charges	Customer Charge	Total Charges	Customer Charge	Total Charges	Customer Charge	Total Charges
0 - 73.2	3.6%	1.5%	4.2%	1.4%	2.8%	1.0%	4.4%	1.6%
73.2 - 146.5	(45.0%)	(10.5%)	(63.3%)	(12.1%)	(9.4%)	(1.8%)	(56.5%)	(10.6%)
146.5 - 293.1	(48.8%)	(6.6%)	(66.3%)	(7.4%)	(17.7%)	(2.1%)	(60.3%)	(6.7%)
293.1 - 439.6	(53.7%)	(4.7%)	(69.9%)	(5.2%)	(26.3%)	(2.2%)	(63.9%)	(5.1%)

Oxxx

Modification

Day Month Year

Version 1.0

Page 8 of 19

© 2012 all rights reserved

439.6 - 586.1	(57.1%)	(4.0%)	(72.5%)	(4.4%)	(32.7%)	(2.2%)	(66.6%)	(4.4%)
586.1 - 732.7	(60.8%)	(3.5%)	(74.7%)	(3.9%)	(38.6%)	(2.2%)	(69.4%)	(3.9%)
732.7 - 2,198	(78.4%)	(5.1%)	(87.6%)	(5.7%)	(68.7%)	(5.0%)	(85.2%)	(5.8%)
2,198 - 2,931	(87.8%)	(5.6%)	(94.1%)	(6.0%)	(81.0%)	(6.0%)	(90.9%)	(6.1%)
2,931 - 5,861	(91.5%)	(5.7%)	(94.7%)	(6.0%)	(87.3%)	(6.6%)	(93.8%)	(6.2%)
5,861 - 14,654	(95.2%)	(5.9%)	(97.3%)	(6.1%)	(92.7%)	(7.2%)	(96.6%)	(6.3%)
14,654 - 29,307	(97.4%)	(5.9%)	(98.6%)	(6.0%)	(95.8%)	(7.7%)	(98.1%)	(6.2%)
29,307 - 58,614	(98.7%)	(5.8%)	(99.0%)	(5.9%)	(97.7%)	(8.0%)	(98.9%)	(6.2%)
58,614 - 293,071	(99.3%)	(5.7%)	(99.6%)	(5.8%)	(98.7%)	(8.3%)	(99.4%)	(6.1%)
>293,071			(99.9%)	(5.5%)	(99.7%)	(9.0%)		

	East of England		London		North West		West Midlands	
	Impact on:		Impact on:		Impact on:		Impact on:	
Load Band	Customer Charge	Total Charges	Customer Charge	Total Charges	Customer Charge	Total Charges	Customer Charge	Total Charges
0 - 73.2	5.5%	1.9%	5.0%	1.9%	3.8%	1.2%	3.5%	1.1%
73.2 - 146.5	(58.9%)	(12.4%)	(61.7%)	(14.6%)	(54.3%)	(9.0%)	(40.4%)	(6.6%)
146.5 - 293.1	(62.3%)	(7.7%)	(64.6%)	(9.1%)	(57.7%)	(5.8%)	(45.6%)	(4.3%)
293.1 - 439.6	(66.0%)	(5.6%)	(68.2%)	(6.5%)	(61.9%)	(4.2%)	(52.1%)	(3.2%)
439.6 - 586.1	(68.8%)	(4.7%)	(70.5%)	(5.5%)	(64.7%)	(3.6%)	(56.2%)	(2.8%)
586.1 - 732.7	(71.3%)	(4.2%)	(72.6%)	(4.9%)	(67.8%)	(3.1%)	(59.9%)	(2.6%)
732.7 - 2,198	(86.0%)	(6.4%)	(86.3%)	(6.9%)	(84.0%)	(5.4%)	(81.6%)	(4.9%)
2,198 - 2,931	(91.2%)	(6.8%)	(91.8%)	(7.4%)	(90.7%)	(6.0%)	(88.3%)	(5.5%)
2,931 - 5,861	(93.9%)	(7.0%)	(94.2%)	(7.6%)	(93.2%)	(6.2%)	(91.5%)	(5.8%)
5,861 - 14,654	(96.6%)	(7.2%)	(96.9%)	(7.8%)	(95.9%)	(6.6%)	(94.8%)	(6.3%)
14,654 - 29,307	(98.0%)	(7.4%)	(98.2%)	(8.0%)	(97.9%)	(6.9%)	(97.1%)	(6.8%)
29,307 - 58,614	(98.9%)	(7.5%)	(99.1%)	(8.1%)	(98.8%)	(7.2%)	(98.3%)	(7.2%)
58,614 - 293,071	(99.5%)	(7.5%)	(99.7%)	(8.2%)	(99.5%)	(7.5%)	(99.1%)	(7.6%)
>293,071	(99.9%)	(7.7%)	(99.8%)	(8.2%)	(99.8%)	(7.8%)	(99.6%)	(8.2%)

In all Networks Option 1 would result in an increase in total charges for the 0-73.2MWh charging band, ranging from 1.0% in Wales & West to 1.9% in East of England and London. For the 73.2-732 MWh charging band there would be reductions across all of the eight Networks. For the largest charging band, >732 MWh, there would be significant reductions in all Networks, ranging, in terms of total charges, from a maximum of 5.7% in Scotland to a maximum of 9.0% in Wales & West.

Option 2: Under Option 2, the flat rate charges for Emergency and Replacement are the same as Option 1 but the asset related costs would be reflected in charges based on a single unit rate capacity charge applied to the square root of the SOQ. For illustrative purposes only, how these charges might look in the Charging Statements for Scotland, based on 2011/12, is shown in the table below (Charge is fixed element plus SOQ-based element).

Scotland		
AQ	Pence per Supply Point per day	Pence per vSOQ per day
Up to 73,200 kWh pa	6.8335	0.4412
73,200 to 732,000 kWh pa	8.1547	0.4412
732,000 kWh pa and above	8.1547	0.4412

Option 2

	Scotland		Southern		Wales & West		Northern	
	Impact on:		Impact on:		Impact on:		Impact on:	
Load Band	Customer Charge	Total Charges	Customer Charge	Total Charges	Customer Charge	Total Charges	Customer Charge	Total Charges
0 - 73.2	1.5%	0.6%	2.7%	0.9%	1.2%	0.4%	2.0%	0.7%
73.2 - 146.5	(20.2%)	(4.7%)	(42.4%)	(8.1%)	14.0%	2.7%	(25.0%)	(4.7%)
146.5 - 293.1	(6.5%)	(0.9%)	(33.1%)	(3.7%)	17.8%	2.1%	(11.6%)	(1.3%)
293.1 - 439.6	4.0%	0.4%	(26.8%)	(2.0%)	17.7%	1.4%	(4.0%)	(0.3%)
439.6 - 586.1	8.2%	0.6%	(24.4%)	(1.5%)	15.8%	1.1%	(0.4%)	(0.0%)
586.1 - 732.7	10.9%	0.6%	(23.4%)	(1.2%)	12.9%	0.7%	1.8%	0.1%
732.7 - 2,198	(24.2%)	(1.6%)	(52.4%)	(3.4%)	(32.8%)	(2.4%)	(35.8%)	(2.4%)
2,198 - 2,931	(41.8%)	(2.7%)	(66.0%)	(4.2%)	(50.0%)	(3.7%)	(48.0%)	(3.2%)
2,931 - 5,861	(50.4%)	(3.2%)	(67.3%)	(4.3%)	(60.0%)	(4.5%)	(55.8%)	(3.7%)
5,861 - 14,654	(61.1%)	(3.8%)	(75.3%)	(4.7%)	(69.9%)	(5.4%)	(65.4%)	(4.2%)
14,654 - 29,307	(69.5%)	(4.2%)	(81.2%)	(4.9%)	(77.0%)	(6.2%)	(72.7%)	(4.6%)
29,307 - 58,614	(76.7%)	(4.5%)	(83.6%)	(5.0%)	(82.6%)	(6.8%)	(78.2%)	(4.9%)
58,614 - 293,071	(81.5%)	(4.7%)	(88.7%)	(5.1%)	(86.2%)	(7.3%)	(82.6%)	(5.0%)
>293,071			(93.9%)	(5.1%)	(92.1%)	(8.3%)		

	East of England		London		North West		West Midlands	
	Impact on:		Impact on:		Impact on:		Impact on:	
Load Band	Customer Charge	Total Charges	Customer Charge	Total Charges	Customer Charge	Total Charges	Customer Charge	Total Charges
0 - 73.2	2.7%	0.9%	2.7%	1.1%	2.1%	0.7%	1.6%	0.5%
73.2 - 146.5	(27.6%)	(5.8%)	(36.9%)	(8.7%)	(28.3%)	(4.7%)	(13.2%)	(2.2%)
146.5 - 293.1	(12.4%)	(1.5%)	(24.9%)	(3.5%)	(18.6%)	(1.9%)	(3.1%)	(0.3%)
293.1 - 439.6	(2.5%)	(0.2%)	(16.1%)	(1.5%)	(11.5%)	(0.8%)	2.9%	0.2%
439.6 - 586.1	2.2%	0.2%	(12.6%)	(1.0%)	(8.9%)	(0.5%)	4.2%	0.2%
586.1 - 732.7	4.7%	0.3%	(10.5%)	(0.7%)	(7.4%)	(0.3%)	4.2%	0.2%
732.7 - 2,198	(33.7%)	(2.5%)	(42.5%)	(3.4%)	(42.9%)	(2.8%)	(41.0%)	(2.4%)
2,198 - 2,931	(45.6%)	(3.4%)	(53.8%)	(4.3%)	(55.6%)	(3.7%)	(52.7%)	(3.3%)
2,931 - 5,861	(53.1%)	(4.0%)	(60.2%)	(4.9%)	(61.4%)	(4.1%)	(59.3%)	(3.8%)
5,861 - 14,654	(63.0%)	(4.7%)	(69.3%)	(5.6%)	(68.9%)	(4.7%)	(67.5%)	(4.5%)

0xxx

Modification

Day Month Year

Version 1.0

Page 10 of 19

© 2012 all rights reserved

14,654 - 29,307	(69.8%)	(5.2%)	(75.2%)	(6.1%)	(76.4%)	(5.4%)	(74.6%)	(5.2%)
29,307 - 58,614	(76.1%)	(5.7%)	(80.9%)	(6.6%)	(81.0%)	(5.9%)	(79.5%)	(5.8%)
58,614 - 293,071	(82.4%)	(6.3%)	(88.1%)	(7.2%)	(86.1%)	(6.5%)	(84.1%)	(6.5%)
>293,071	(92.2%)	(7.1%)	(89.6%)	(7.3%)	(90.2%)	(7.1%)	(88.5%)	(7.3%)

Under this Option the increases for the 0-73.2 MWh charging band would be smaller than in Option 1. In seven of the eight Networks the increases, in total charges, would be less than one percent and in London the increase would be 1.1%. The charging band 73.2 – 732 MWh would see a mixture of increases and reductions, although only in Wales & West would the increases, in terms of total charges, exceed 1%. In Wales & West the increases range from 2.7% down to 0.7%. The charging band >732 MWh would experience reductions in charges, although not as large as under Option 1. The maximum reductions would range from 4.7% in Scotland to 8.3% in Wales & West.

For shippers with a balanced portfolio of supply points the impact of the proposed changes should be close to zero.

4 Relevant Objectives

Implementation is expected to better facilitate the achievement of **Relevant Charging Methodology Objectives a and b.**

Proposer's view of the benefits against the Code Relevant Objectives

Description of Relevant Objective	Identified impact
a) Save in so far as paragraph d) applies, that compliance with the charging methodology results in charges which reflect the costs incurred by the licensee in its transportation business	Positive
b) That, so far as is consistent with sub-paragraph (a) the charging methodology properly takes account of developments in the transportation business;	Positive
c) that, so far as is consistent with sub-paragraphs (a) and (b), compliance with the charging methodology facilitates effective competition gas shippers and between gas suppliers	None
d) that the charging methodology reflects any alternative arrangements put in place in accordance with a determination made by the Secretary of State under paragraph 2A(a) of SSC A27 (Disposal of Assets)	None
e) compliance with the Regulation and any relevant legally binding decisions of the European Commission and/or the Agency for the Co-operation of Energy Regulators	None



Insert heading here

Use this column in a Q and A style for explanations, in order to preserve the flow of the main text.

Insert text here

Objective a)

This Mod proposal would better facilitate the achievement of Objective a) above by having the structure of LDZ customer charges for each DN reflect the costs of that DN instead of reflecting national costs.

Objective b)

This Mod proposal would better facilitate the achievement of Objective b) above because it would make the structure of the LDZ customer charges reflect the existing structure of the distribution networks.

In the case of a modification to a DN Charging Methodology, please state why the modification does not conflict with paragraphs 2, 2A and 3 of Standard Special Condition A4 of the Transporter's Licence.

This Modification proposal would affect only the Customer Charges themselves and has no impact on compliance with paragraphs 2, 2A and 3 of Standard Special Condition A4 of the Transporter's Licence.

0xxx

Modification

Day Month Year

Version 1.0

Page 12 of 19

© 2012 all rights reserved

5 Impacts and Costs



Insert heading here

Use this column in a Q and A style for explanations, in order to preserve the flow of the main text.

Insert text here

Concisely state the impact the modification will have on the relevant objectives. Indicate an estimate of likely implementation costs (if known).

Consideration of Wider Industry Impacts

Will the modification be impacted by or have an impact upon wider industry developments? If an impact is identified the Workgroup should justify why the benefit of the modification outweighs the potential impact.

Insert subheading here

Insert text here

Costs

Include here any proposal for the apportionment of implementation costs amongst parties.

Indicative industry costs – User Pays
Classification of the proposal as User Pays or not and justification for classification
Identification of Users, proposed split of the recovery between Gas Transporters and Users for User Pays costs and justification
Proposed charge(s) for application of Users Pays charges to Shippers
Proposed charge for inclusion in ACS – to be completed upon receipt of cost estimate from Xoserve

Impacts

Impact on Transporters' Systems and Process	
Transporters' System/Process	Potential impact
UK Link	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None
Operational Processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None
User Pays implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None

Impact on Users	
Area of Users' business	Potential impact
Administrative and operational	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None

0xxx

Modification

Day Month Year

Version 1.0

Page 13 of 19

© 2012 all rights reserved



Where can I find details of the UNC Standards of Service?

In the Revised FMR for Transco's Network Code Modification **0565 Transco Proposal for Revision of Network Code Standards of Service** at the following location:
www.gasgovernance.co.uk/sites/default/files/0565.zip

Impact on Users	
Development, capital and operating costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None
Contractual risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None
Legislative, regulatory and contractual obligations and relationships	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None

Impact on Transporters	
Area of Transporters' business	Potential impact
System operation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None
Development, capital and operating costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None
Recovery of costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None
Price regulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None
Contractual risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None
Legislative, regulatory and contractual obligations and relationships	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None
Standards of service	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None

Impact on Code Administration	
Area of Code Administration	Potential impact
Modification Rules	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None
UNC Committees	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None
General administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None

Impact on Code	
Code section	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•

Impact on UNC Related Documents and Other Referenced Documents	
Related Document	Potential impact
Network Entry Agreement (TPD I1.3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None
Network Exit Agreement (Including Connected System Exit Points) (TPD J1.5.4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None

0xxx

Modification

Day Month Year

Version 1.0

Page 14 of 19

© 2012 all rights reserved

Impact on UNC Related Documents and Other Referenced Documents	
Storage Connection Agreement (TPD R1.3.1)	• None
UK Link Manual (TPD U1.4)	• None
Network Code Operations Reporting Manual (TPD V12)	• None
Network Code Validation Rules (TPD V12)	• None
ECQ Methodology (TPD V12)	• None
Measurement Error Notification Guidelines (TPD V12)	• None
Energy Balancing Credit Rules (TPD X2.1)	• None
Uniform Network Code Standards of Service (Various)	• None

Impact on Core Industry Documents and other documents	
Document	Potential impact
Safety Case or other document under Gas Safety (Management) Regulations	• None
Gas Transporter Licence	• None

Other Impacts	
Item impacted	Potential impact
Security of Supply	• None
Operation of the Total System	• None
Industry fragmentation	• None
Terminal operators, consumers, connected system operators, suppliers, producers and other non code parties	• None

6 Implementation

Because it is recommended that this proposal should be assessed by a Workgroup a timescale for the implementation of the Modification is not currently proposed. However as this proposal involves changes to the LDZ transportation charges and the charge change date specified in the DNS' Licences is 1 April it is suggested that the target implementation date should be 1 April 2014.



Insert heading here

Use this column in a Q and A style for explanations, in order to preserve the flow of the main text.

Insert text here

0xxx

Modification

Day Month Year

Version 1.0

Page 16 of 19

© 2012 all rights reserved

7 The Case for Change



This section allows further development of the case than is included in the earlier summaries

In addition to that identified the above, the Proposer has identified the following:

Advantages

The proposal has the advantages that it would improve the cost reflectivity of the customer charges and place them on a DN specific basis.

Disadvantages

A possible disadvantage is that the proposal would result in a fixed charge for all domestic customers, regardless of size. This could be mitigated if the charge to domestic customers continued to be on an SOQ basis, even though there is no evidence to show that this is would be cost-reflective.

Insert heading here

Use this column in a Q and A style for explanations, in order to preserve the flow of the main text.

Insert text here

0xxx

Modification

Day Month Year

Version 1.0

Page 17 of 19

© 2012 all rights reserved

8 Legal Text

Text, either suggested or formal, should be inserted at this point. The status of this text should also be stated.

Insert subheading here

Insert text here

0xxx

Modification

Day Month Year

Version 1.0

Page 18 of 19

© 2012 all rights reserved

9 Recommendation



The Proposer invites the Panel to:

- DETERMINE that Modification XXXX progress to assessment by a Workgroup.

Insert heading here

[Insert relevant text or delete box]

0xxx

Modification

Day Month Year

Version 1.0

Page 19 of 19

© 2012 all rights reserved