

Dora Ianora  
Industry Codes and Licensing Manager  
Ofgem  
9 Millbank  
London  
SW1P 3GE

Mark Ripley  
Regulatory Frameworks Manager  
Mark.g.ripley@uk.ngrid.com  
Direct tel +44 (0)1926 654928

26 April 2011

[www.nationalgrid.com](http://www.nationalgrid.com)

Dear Ms Ianora,

**Re: Open letter consultation on Code Modification Urgency Criteria**

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to Ofgem's open letter consultation on Code Modification Urgency Criteria. This response is provided on behalf of National Grid Electricity Transmission plc (NGET) and National Grid Gas plc (NGG). NGET owns the electricity transmission system in England and Wales and is the National Electricity Transmission System Operator. It is responsible for administering the electricity Connection and Use of System Code (CUSC), the Grid Code and the System Operator – Transmission Owner Code (STC). NGG owns and operates the Gas Transmission System and also owns and operates four of the gas Distribution Networks. In association with the three other gas Distribution Network Operators it also jointly provides for the administration of the Uniform Network Code (UNC) Governance arrangements through the Joint Office of Gas Transporters.

We support the review of the urgency criteria and the clarity of application to each industry code and provide the following specific comments.

With regard to the four criteria, we note that only the fourth criteria contains the caveat "*which could not have reasonably been foreseen by the proposer*". We are not convinced that this caveat is required; however, if it is included, it would seem more consistent to apply it to all of the criteria or, as a minimum, the second criterion as well.

We also note the general caveats (in bold text on page 4) which provide for situations when "urgency" may be granted even if the four criteria are not met (or not granted when the criteria are met). The inclusion of these caveats in the guidance may create some uncertainty for those considering urgent status; it could be useful to update the guidance with real examples, where such situations do arise in future, or perhaps to add a note to the caveat that such circumstances are expected to be rare.

We also recommend that additional clarification be provided to cover those instances where the Authority would not grant urgency for modification proposals which have only been raised as urgent because they are unlikely to meet an imminent implementation date if they had otherwise been progressed under non-urgent procedures. We believe this would ensure that urgency is not sought indiscriminately and industry participants are encouraged to raise modification proposals in a timely manner.

One final point of clarification; the guidance refers to events which are "imminent"; we wondered whether it might be worth including some guidance around the principles which would apply to those who might seek to raise an Urgent modification proposal which had retrospective elements.

We hope that you find these comments useful. If you wish to discuss them further, please contact Alex Thomason, on 01926 656379, in the first instance.

Kind regards,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Mark Ripley', with a stylized, flowing script.

Mark Ripley  
Regulatory Frameworks Manager