

**CODE MODIFICATION PROPOSAL No xxxx**  
**Demand Estimation Section H Changes to Processes and Responsibilities**

**Version x.x**

**Date:** 20/07/2010

**Proposed Implementation Date:** 1/1/2011

**Urgency:** Non Urgent

**1 The Modification Proposal**

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

Demand Estimation processes as outlined in section H of UNC have been essentially unchanged since code inception. The profiling and capacity estimation parameters and seasonal normal CWV derivations and use were set out at a time when all expertise for gas allocation resided within National Grid (Transco as was).

Over the past decade there have been a number of changes within the industry. Shipper organisations bear the impacts from the allocation mechanism and so have an interest in ensuring the process and parameters operate smoothly and are as accurate as possible.

Climate change has meant that Shippers are spending increased time and resources assessing impacts. Many organisations now have meteorologists and expert forecasters embedded within their organisation.

Over the past few years there have been comments in the annual Shipper representations on how ineffective the current consultation process is, many of which centre around identified faults in the profiles that are not corrected due to timing. In addition there appears to be a mismatch between code obligations – which rest with Transporters – and the fact that impacts are on Shipper organisations.

Review Group 280 has discussed changes to the current process to allow cross industry involvement in defining and undertaking the analysis of both general profiles and more involved climate work. This modification builds on the output from review group 280 to provide a basis for moving forwards.

The proposal allows for an expert group formation that would provide a cross industry group responsible for the technical analysis and support for the work areas covered within section H, coupled with oversight through the Demand Estimation Sub-Committee. In doing this many of the technical details currently specified in explicit detail within UNC could be removed allowing the detailed analysis to be flexed as appropriate to ensure the profiles could represent the changing patterns of demand and provide more accurate allocation,

**while maintaining formal governance and escalation routes.**

**Summary of proposal:**

**1. Uniform Network Code Basis**

The Transportation Principal Document Section H provides for the “*Uniform Network Code Committee or any relevant Sub-committee*” to consider a number of matters relating to demand estimation. The Uniform Network Code Committee has established the Demand Estimation Sub-Committee (DESC) meet as necessary to fulfil the functions set-out in Section H.

General Terms Section B 4.3.4 sets out the matters to be determined by a panel majority of the Uniform Network Code Committee:

- a) Membership and manner of appointment of members
- b) Basis of reporting to Uniform Network Code Committee, Users and Transporters
- c) Procedures for the conduct of business

These three matters are implemented for DESC as follows.

**2. DESC Members and Appointment**

- a) DESC members are those nominated by shippers and one representative from each transporter listed below:
  - a) National Grid Gas NTS
  - b) National Grid Distribution
  - c) Northern Gas Networks
  - d) Wales & West Utilities
  - e) Southern Gas Networks or Scotland Gas Networks
- b) Each year, shippers nominate up to nine members. The Joint Office manages the process for nomination on shippers’ behalf. Changes within year may be agreed by shipper members of the Uniform Network Code Committee.
- c) Whilst each Transporter has the right to nominate members, xoserve has currently been appointed as an alternate to represent National Grid NTS and all DNs. xoserve is required to state, where appropriate, when it is speaking or acting on behalf of the Transporters in this capacity.

- d) Attendance is open and xoserve, as the service provider, is invited to send one or more representatives for information purposes.
- e) All meetings are chaired by the Joint Office, which also provides a secretary.

### **3. Basis for Reporting**

The Joint Office, on behalf of DESC, reports each month to the Uniform Network Code Committee, following the standard format used by the Uniform Network Code Work streams except that:

- a) The Topic Status format is used to record progress on any specific issues that do not form part of the typical annual work plan (see Appendix).
- b) The Modification Status format is not used other than to highlight UNC Modification Proposals that might impact the work of DESC.
- c) DESC minutes shall include a summary of the decisions reached by DESC. In particular, using current code references:
  - i. Composite Weather Variable determination taking account of new weather experience (H1.4.2).
  - ii. Demand model smoothing to derive the seasonal normal values of the Composite Weather Variable (H1.5.2).
  - iii. Report and review of NDM Sampling (H1.6).
  - iv. Annual and any interim evaluation of End User Category definitions and Demand Model performance. (H1.8.1)
  - v. Proposed revision of End User Category definitions and Demand Models and discussion of User representations (H1.8.1 and H1.8.4).
  - vi. Matters arising from the source of weather data such as changes in weather stations.
  - vii. Any other particular issue that may arise in the development or revision of End User Categories and Demand Models (H1.8.6).

Minutes of each meeting are made available to DESC Members, all shippers, members of the Uniform Network Code Committee and all other persons requesting copies.

#### **4. Procedures for the Conduct of Business by DESC**

The Chairman's Guidelines apply to the conduct of the meeting.

In principle, meetings shall be open to all but the Chairman may exercise discretion to the extent permitted under the Chairman's Guidelines.

The quorum is at least four voting members or their alternates, of which at least two shall be shippers and two transporter.

Members are permitted to appoint alternates to attend on their behalf and a single alternate may represent more than one member.

Recommendations from the DESC will be reached by a simple majority of voting members present, or their alternate. Where a recommendation can not be reached as a result of a tied vote DESC will pass the matter to the UNCC to be resolved. For the avoidance of doubt a tied vote at the UNCC would represent a recommendation to not implement any proposed change.

#### **5. Role of DESC**

The main role for DESC will be to review the outcomes and recommendations of the work conducted by the Expert Group, and to act as an escalation route for any disputes arising from the Expert Group. In particular DESC will:

- a) Review the Terms of Reference for the Expert Group and determine on any recommendations to change these Terms of Reference, subject to consultation with the Expert Group.
- b) Review the work and analysis being undertaken by the Expert Group with a view to ensuring that timetables are adhered to and a holistic approach is taken to the work being undertaken by the Expert Group.
- c) Raise any particular issues that they believe the Expert group should address and resolve.
- d) Recommend to Users and Transporters whether analysis should be commissioned from industry experts to assess climate change
- e) Determine whether the recommendations from the Expert Group are appropriate and ensure that the approach proposed by the Expert Group represents an economic and efficient solution to the issues being addressed. In instances when the DESC does not determine that the proposed approach is suitable to refer the proposal back to the Expert Group along with an explanation for the DESC's decisions and the areas that they need to be addressed.
- f) In instances when the Expert Group is unable to reach a recommendation DESC will seek to reach a recommendation

based on the information that has been provided to it by the Expert Group. In instances when DESC are also unable to reach a recommendation as a result of a tied vote, they will either:

- i. Refer the issue back to the Expert Group along with an explanation of the information and analysis that the Expert group needs to provide in order for the DESC to reach a recommendation; or
- ii. Refer the issue to the UNCC along with a summary of the issue, the views expressed and the reason why they were unable to make a recommendation.

## **6. Expert Group Members and Appointment**

- a) Expert Group members are those nominated by shippers and one representative from each transporter listed below:
  - National Grid Gas NTS
  - National Grid Distribution
  - Northern Gas Networks
  - Wales & West Utilities
  - Southern Gas Networks or Scotland Gas Networks
- b) These experts will remain in place until they resign from the expert group, or their employing organisation informs the Joint Office that they are no longer their designated representative.
- c) Nominations to join the expert group will be issued by the Joint Office on an annual basis, with sufficient lead time to ensure that additional members are in place to start at the beginning of the Gas Year.
- d) Whilst each Transporter has the right nominate a member, xoserve has currently been appointed as an alternate to represent National Grid NTS and all DNs. xoserve is required to state, where appropriate, when it is speaking or acting on behalf of the Transporters in this capacity.
- e) Attendance is open and xoserve, as the service provider, is invited to send one or more representatives for information purposes.
- f) All meetings are chaired by the Joint Office, which also provides a secretary.

## **7. Basis for Reporting**

The Joint Office, on behalf of the Expert Group, reports to the DESC as appropriate, following the standard format used by the Uniform Network Code Work streams except that:

The Topic Status format is used to record progress on any specific issues that do not form part of the typical annual work plan (see Appendix).

The Modification Status format is not used other than to highlight UNC Modification Proposals that might impact the work of the Expert group .

Expert Group minutes shall include a summary of the decisions reached by the Expert Group. In particular:

Minutes of each meeting are made available to Expert Group Members, all shippers, members of the Uniform Network Code Committee and all other persons requesting copies.

## **8. Procedures for the Conduct of Business by the Expert Group**

For formally scheduled meetings then the Chairman's Guidelines apply to the conduct of the meeting.

In principle, meetings shall be open to all but the Chairman may exercise discretion to the extent permitted under the Chairman's Guidelines.

The quorum is at least 3 voting members or their alternates, of which at least two shall be shippers and one transporter.

Members are permitted to appoint alternates to attend on their behalf and a single alternate may represent more than one member.

Recommendations from the Expert Group will be reached by a simple majority of voting members present, or their alternate. Where a recommendation can not be reached the Expert Group will pass the matter to DESC to be resolved, along with an explanation of the issue, the matters raised and any explanation as to why the Expert group have been unable to make a recommendation.

The expert group will be expected to convene at short notice to assess analysis and make recommendations on progress or alternative investigations. These meetings will by necessity be informal and may be conducted over email or teleconference. In these cases all representatives should be invited with a minimum of 2 being included in the discussions. A summary will be expected to be presented at the next formally scheduled meeting for the record.

## 9. Role of Expert Group

The Expert group will be a sub-committee of the DESC. Its role will be to conduct, oversee and direct the detailed analysis and methodologies required for Demand Estimation purposes under the UNC, in line with the guidance issued by DESC, and make recommendations on these methodologies which will be passed to the DESC for approval. In particular the Expert Group will be responsible for developing an underlying methodology for:

- a) undertaking any profile analysis
- b) determining the frequency with which profiles are updated
- c) agreeing sample sizes
- d) agreeing sample composition
- e) defining the statistical techniques to be used
- f) defining any criteria for decision making through the analysis process
- g) determining what position would be taken if change is not materially or statistically significant
- h) CWV reviews including determination of frequency
- i) seasonal normal reviews including determination of frequency
- j) ad-hoc analysis
- k) The expert group will oversee any decisions that arise during the analysis.
- l) The expert group will review any methodology and make any necessary changes on a regular basis.
- m) The expert group will be notified who is undertaking the analysis, on what frequency and agree access to data if necessary.
- n) The Expert Group should ensure that it is transparent who is undertaking the analysis and all data used in the process is available for Network Code signatories to replicate the analysis if required.
- o) The expert group will ensure that members are available to consult on any data manipulation or exclusions that are required during analysis and decisions are made on the basis of agreed criteria
- p) The expert group will ensure analysis is published for consultation across the industry and questions responded to in sufficient time to meet system requirements

It is intended that Section H will be revised to remove specific details of analysis, and current analytical details be provided in a supporting document that could be revised under recommendation of the expert group.

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

**It is not envisaged that this Mod is urgent**



- 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.**

**As this follows a review group it is proposed that the Mod goes straight for consultation.**

## **2 User Pays**

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

Discussion in the review group suggested that any analysis over and above standard levels of Transporter resource covered under current UNC provision would be raised as User Pays on an adhoc basis. Generally provision of section H UNC would not be User Pays.

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

All costs over and above standard levels of costs recovered 100% from [NDM] Shippers.

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

p/peakdaykWh/day – i.e. the same method as recovering Distribution charges from Shippers.

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

## **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**

Allocation is used to share daily energy across Shipper portfolio. From a Transporter perspective the allocation methodology is designed to fully allocate all energy, and therefore Transporters income for each day is mostly complete with risk for incorrect allocation and subsequent movement sitting with Shippers. It is essential for Shipper organisations to minimise this risk as the differential between purchasing energy for final reconciled position against initial allocation can be significant given price movements. For example, reconciliation for 2009 to date has adjusted over 1TWh of the initial allocation for January 2009 from LSP to SSP markets. Given price changes between purchase could be large this is a high value risk. For example the differential between Sept 2008 purchase prices and Jan 2009 SAP used for reconciliation, only a 4 month difference, was up to 23pence per therm and this amounts to just under £8million on a 0.2% volume change for a single month. It can be seen from this that the risk to Shipper organisations can be significant.

Enabling better allocation will therefore facilitate the Transporter obligation to ensure effective competition as any risk in misallocation is also reflected in an increased



reconciliation risk.

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

**It is not envisaged that there would be any impact**

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

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

**There are no implications for operating the System**

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

**Moves to operating an expert group and cross industry input to the analysis should be manageable within current budget. Where analysis shows there would need to be system changes we would anticipate these being raised as a User Pays modification related to the specific changes being suggested.**

**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:**

**Additional operational costs recovered in line with the arrangements in Section 3.**

**There are no development or capital costs associated with the implementation of this proposal.**

**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**

**This modification should reduce contractual risk for each Transporter by improving industry participation removing the likelihood of disallowal for the proposals.**

**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)**

No impact identified.

**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**

**None without further modifications if specific needs are identified.**

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

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

**There will be a requirement from Users for input into an expert group. As the benefits from improvements to allocation are considerable it is expected that there will be a net benefit to any immediate costs from resourcing the group.**

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

**There will be ongoing operational costs from resourcing the expert group.**

**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 level of contractual risk for Users is expected to reduce under this modification. Improved allocation should provide more certainty for Shippers in levels of commodity charges and reconciliation. Less misallocation between temperature sensitive and less temperature sensitive EUC bands will also provide greater assurance of appropriate charging.**

**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)**

**Non identified**

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

**This reduces the contractual risk of the Transporters as the obligation to develop Demand Estimation processes as covered in TPD Section H will move from Transporters to DESC, and so also Shippers.**

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

**Advantages**

- **Addresses issues identified with the demand estimation process in the past.**
- **Enables Shipper engagement and so buy in, reducing the likelihood of methodologies being disallowed.**

**Disadvantages**

- None identified

**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**

Attached document highlights areas of Code expected to change within section H.

**17 Suggested Text**

**Code Concerned, sections and paragraphs**

Uniform Network Code

Transportation Principal Document

**Section(s)** UNCTPD H

**Proposer's Representative**

*Name (Organisation)* Sallyann Blackett (E.ON)

**Proposer**

*Name (Organisation)* Sallyann Blackett (E.ON)