

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

Responses invited by: 08 Mar 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 still require subtle amendments to ensure the files are correctly formatted, we therefore give qualified support to the modification.

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

We support the majority of the file changes which have been introduced since the previous consultation; there are still two areas we believe still need to be addressed:

Project Summary Report

1. Phase Sequence – If the site is created in phases it is unclear how this is to be completed. This field requires conditionality guidance e.g. 0 if not multiple phase or a numeric value of how many phases it will be built in. The fields current description could leave it open for inconsistencies and misinterpretation as it is currently a text field with a maximum length of 10.
2. Developer Contact Telephone number – To assist with resolving PSR related queries it we would suggest that the telephone is not an 'or' option, we would instead see this item as a mandatory population with the email as a conditional value.

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.

We suggest the implementation of iGT078 and iGT079 are on the same implementation date.

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