

Consultation Response

iGT078S: Adding an Ancillary Document to the IGT UNC for the new connections process

Responses invited by: 14 Jan 2016

Respondent Details

Name: Trevor Peacock

Organisation: Fulcrum Pipelines

Support Implementation	☐
Qualified Support	☒ X
Neutral	☐
Do Not Support	☐

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

Whilst Fulcrum Pipelines support the concept of standardising the PSR process across the industry, we still feel that there a couple of items which need tweaking in order or this to work correctly.

File Format Document iGT to Shipper

RT_PS1_PROJECT_SUMMARY

Supplier Short Code – This item should be optional and not mandatory. It is not guaranteed that the iGT will know the correct Supplier at the time of submitting the PSR1. This would be confirmed by the Shipper when responding to the PSR1.

Developer Contact Details & Developer Contact Telephone Number – At least one of these items should be mandatory. The shipper needs this information to be able to make contact with the developer in order to negotiate a contract.

Whilst both items may not be mandatory, at least one of them needs to be and this should be defined in the description column.

File Format Document Shipper to iGT

RT_PS2_PROJECT_SUMMARY

Shipper Reference Number – This item should be mandatory. It is one of the primary items which is used to confirm that the PSR has been accepted and that a contract has been put in place between the gas supplier and the developer.

Sub Project Number – Isn't this the same as the "Phase Sequence" field on the PS1 file format. If yes then the format of both fields should be the same. One indicates 10 characters, whilst the other only indicates 4.

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?

Yes, Fulcrum Agree that this Modification can be handle as a self governance modification.

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

Fulcrum show qualified support for this modification. Please see section above for details of the files that we believe need attention for this modification to receive our full support.

Relevant Objectives

How would implementation of this modification impact the relevant objectives?

Fulcrum believe that the implementation of this modification would impact relevant objective f) Promotion of efficiency in the implementation and administration of the Code.

Impacts and Costs

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

In order to be able to generate the relevant PS1 files in a csv. format and validate & process the PS2 response file, we would need to develop our systems accordingly. We anticipate that this would incur a one-off cost of approx. £10k

Implementation

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

In order to develop our systems to meet the requirements of this modification we anticipate that a development time of 4 – 6 months.

Legal Text

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

Yes

Further Comments

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

Fulcrum Pipelines support the concept of standardising the PSR process across the industry but feel that there a couple of items which need tweaking in order or this to work correctly. Please see "summary of key reasons" above.

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