

Consultation Response**iGT078: Ancillary Document for the New Connections process**

Responses invited by: 14 01 2016

Respondent Details

Name: Kish Nundloll

Organisation: ESP

Qualified Support X

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

ESP is happy with the purpose of this modification and accepts that the proposer has made every effort to incorporate views from all parties. The modification will hopefully help consolidation with the New Connections 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?

ESP believes that this does meet the self-governance criteria.

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

Within the PROJECT_SUMMARY_REPORT_V1.1, the field MARKET_SECTOR_CODE should not be within the header record (A00) because it will cause file validation to fail. We recommend this field is moved between NETWORK_DEVELOPMENT_NAME and NUMBER_OF_PLOTS in the PS1 record. All record character counts should be double checked and revised accordingly.

Also within the PROJECT_SUMMARY_REPORT_V1.1, the record code for the METER_POINT record is incorrect, it should read MP1 not MP001. This record name also needs to be corrected in the Record Title on page 6.

Relevant Objectives

How would implementation of this modification impact the relevant objectives?

ESP agree that the relevant objectives suggested by the proposer would be met through this modification , with particular emphasis on objective F.

Impacts and Costs

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

N/A

Implementation

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

ESP would be happy to see this aligned with SSP go live as it would be cost efficient and practical in our system build. ESP also believes the two (SSP and Mod) are not dependant on one another, but would still prefer alignment for ease.

Legal Text

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

As mentioned above, if the changes (which are considered immaterial by ESP) are implemented then the legal text is robust enough to fully deliver this modification.

Further Comments

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

N/A

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