

Consultation Response

iGT078: Adding an Ancillary Document to the iGT UNC for the new connections process

Responses invited by: 08 Mar 2016

Respondent Details

Name: Kiran Samra

Organisation: RWE npower

Support Implementation

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

RWE npower are supportive of this change as it seeks to introduce a structure for the New Connections Process. This modification seeks to standardise the current process by adding an ancillary document. The change has meant a lot of amendments to the current PSR template, which in turn will result in better data being exchanged between the iGT and Shipper. The key pieces of information that is required is clearly outlined within the Project Summary Report, such as the number of plots being built, address data and other pieces of information which will be of key importance for the Shipper. This in turn will result in better data being passed from one party to another. The process allows greater flexibility as well, with the shipper being able to reject a PSR will selecting the reasons for rejection. Also with the insertion of the free text fields shippers and iGT's have greater flexibility of detailing areas of concern.

This change is better for the customer, with all their plot details being captured at the point of the meter being installed and prevent any delays or inconvenience.

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?

After much discussion the workgroup deemed that the modification met the self-governance criteria and RWE npower agree with this decision. This change will have material impact but as this wasn't quantified we still believe it meets the self-governance rules.

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

RWE npower would like to reinforce the point that this change should be considered in light of the process that currently exists and that this change is looking to document and streamline the current process. This in turn is a better landscape for all parties affected by the PSR process. RWE npower also do not believe any party has a competitive advantage, as stated the process isn't looking to change what already happens but to document and provide clarity.

Relevant Objectives

How would implementation of this modification impact the relevant objectives?

Relevant objective D: Securing of effective competition, as more accurate data will support the CoS process and thus support competition between Suppliers.

Relevant objective F: Promotion of efficiency in the implementation and administration of the Code, as this change will improve governance arrangement and therefore improve administration of the Code.

Impacts and Costs

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

There will be costs associated with this change as there are system changes needed. However these shouldn't be an excessive amount. Within the development of the change, no party stated what the costs would be there to their systems.

Implementation

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

In recognising that system changes are needed a minimum of six months will be required, at the point the change is agreed for implementation. Even though we don't believe this change is Nexus dependent it would be recommended to Go Live with Nexus on the 1st October 2016. If Nexus is delayed we do believe that this change shouldn't be held back.

Legal Text

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

Yes, we are happy with the legal text

Further Comments

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

This change has been discussed in great detail within the workgroup forum.

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