

Consultation Response**iGT078: Adding Non-domestic New Connections Framework Ancillary Document**

Responses invited by: 14 Jan 2016

Respondent Details

Name: Kirsty Dudley

Organisation: E.ON UK

Support Implementation ☐

Qualified Support ☒

Neutral ☐

Do Not Support ☐

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

Although we support the intention of the modification, upon review of the proposed file formats we have identified that some items may require subtle amendments to ensure the files are correctly formatted so give qualified support to the modification.

Details are summarised in further comments with file formats separately attached with comments.

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; we agree this is self-governance according to the criteria held by the iGT UNC

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

There are no additional issues to raise, however, we have identified the following high-level issues with the file formats for the PS1 and the PS2:

- LNG values do not match the descriptions stated
- The conditionality should either be conditional or mandatory to ensure correct completion
- Definitions don't clearly define what the content should be
- The CSEP ID is believed to be correctly placed in the supply level data as the number will be unique for each supply

We believe if the file formats were to be approved as current designed further modification amendments would be required soon after go live to ensure they are fit for purpose.

Relevant Objectives

How would implementation of this modification impact the relevant objectives?

This modification delivers objection F to deliver effective code administration because there is a clearly defined and robust process for the project summary reports.

Impacts and Costs

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

We would encounter costs associated to process design and implementation costs to receive the specified formats; the exact costs are currently unknown.

Implementation

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

A minimum of 6 months lead time is required but with a number of industry initiatives currently in progress we would suggest an implementation period of 6-9 months.

Legal Text

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

Yes, we have no further comments.

Further Comments

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

NA

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