

Consultation Response

iGT078s: Ancillary Document for the New Connections Process

Responses invited by: 08 Mar 2016

Respondent Details

Name: Trevor Peacock

Organisation: Fulcrum Pipelines Limited

- | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Support Implementation | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Qualified Support | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Neutral | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Do Not Support | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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

Fulcrum Pipelines updated consultation response

PROJECT SUMMARY REPORT

RT_PS1_PROJECT_SUMMARY

Supplier Short Code – I would still argue that this item should be Optional and not Mandatory on this template. If an iGT were to ask a developer which gas supplier he wanted to establish a contract with and he indicated, for example, Npower, which supplier short code would be correct. I don't think that the developer would know any further information other than Npower.

According to the Market Domain Data participant list, there are 10 supplier short codes associated with Npower.

By making this field mandatory, the iGT's would be forced into guessing which supplier short code would be most appropriate and could start the line of incorrect information being assigned to a supply point.

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