

iGT UNC / iGT INC Consultation Response

Date	23 March 2009
Reference	iGT024VV
Title	Inspection Notification and Cyclical Read File Format and Response File - Clarification of File Naming Convention - Sequential
Respondee	Envoy
Position on the Modification	Do not support Modification
Facilitation of the relevant objectives	
This is a complimentary Modification so the relevant objectives are not applicable.	
Additional Information and Comments	
<p>Envoy does not support this Modification on the basis that we believe sequential file numbering will lead to an increase of work for iGTs when dealing with file queries as it will not be clear if a file has been missed. Though the proposal states that the Shipper is responsible for investigating and resolving any issue with the missing file, we believe that this would be done by contacting the iGT which in turn creates further workload for the iGT. Furthermore, if the files are not monitored by the Shipper and it is realised after a number of months that a file has been missed, it will create further work for the iGT to accept the file as the validation will need to be turned off and the file manually loaded. Further problems may occur if the next file for the meter point has already been submitted. Consecutive number would overcome this as it would be clear when a file has been missed out and the acceptance/rejection files could be checked by the Shipper without iGT involvement. This method will also encourage the Shipper to work efficiently by introducing an incentive not to miss files as any subsequent files will be rejected - there is no incentive for efficiency with sequential numbering.</p>	

Completed forms should be returned to the iGT UNC Representative, Gemserv Ltd at iGT-UNC@gemserv.com or faxed to 020 7090 1001

