

Consultation Response

iGT075: Identification of Supply Meter Point pressure tier

Responses invited by: 29 SEP 2016

Respondent Details

Name: Kirsty Dudley

Organisation: E.ON UK

- | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Support Implementation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Qualified Support | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Neutral | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Do Not Support | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Please briefly summarise the key reason(s) for your support / opposition

The provision of this information will greatly reduce the need for the GT1 process which should lead to reduced costs for Pipeline Operators. It will improve competition between Shippers and Suppliers by removing inefficient costs in transportation charges, it will help reduce aborted visit costs from agents, and failed appointment costs paid to customers by enabling the appointment of suitably qualified meter worker for the meter point so that any future work requests are actioned by appropriately qualified meter workers without any delay and which will ultimately lead to an improved customer experience.

For MAMs; Suppliers and Shippers can more easily identify the supply point pressure tier without having to make individual applications to the Pipeline Operator and wait for the information to be provided; it reduces the operational burden of the GT1 process resulting in it becoming more of an exception process rather than business as usual. This more effective self-serve approach for Pipeline Users and will become increasingly beneficial over time as the ramp up in the rollout of smart meters results in a greater number of enquiries being managed by the Pipeline Users in the first instance and seeing the GT1s being used in exceptional circumstances.

The regular data refresh will see data being as up to date as possible which again promotes effectiveness of using the dataset provided by the Pipeline Operator by the Pipeline User rather than relying on the GT1 process.

Self-Governance Statement

Do you agree with the Modification Panel's determination with respect to whether or not this should be a self-governance modification?

We agree for this modification to be Self-Governance as it does not have a material impact on competition, the operation of the pipeline system or modification procedures.

Please state any new or additional issues that you believe should be considered

No new or additional issues.

Relevant Objectives

How would implementation of this modification impact the relevant objectives?

Objectives a) and c) would be positively impacted because the improved process efficiencies would see the creation of a centrally recorded dataset available for use in a self-service approach which should lead to a reduction in costs due to reduced GT1 traffic for Pipeline Operators.

Objective d) would also be positively impacted as the information will be available in a self-service format which would give, in most cases, the correct pressure tier information and lead to a reduction in the number of aborted visits.

Impacts and Costs

What development and ongoing costs would you face if this modification was implemented?

Adopting a more self-serve approach to verify the pressure tier at the postcode will reduce our costs and mean that we only need to request the GT1 by exception. We trust that this will improve the rollout of smart meters, and remove inefficient costs.

Implementation

What lead time would you wish to see prior to this modification being implemented, and why?

We would support a 6 month implementation lead time.

Legal Text

Are you satisfied that the legal text will deliver the intent of the modification?

Post code – We believe the outcode is correct with a field length of 4 but the incode should be 3 rather than 4.

Further Comments

Is there anything further you wish to be taken into account?

No further comments.

Responses should be submitted by email to IGTUNC@gemserv.com