

iGT078: Adding an Ancillary document to the IGT UNC for the new connections process.

Summary of Consultation Responses

Background

The Draft Modification Report for iGT078 was circulated to the iGT UNC on the 18 December 2015, and consultation responses were requested to be submitted to the Code Administrator by the 14th January 2016.

Eight responses were submitted, with a majority confirming qualified support for the Modification.

Objective

This report provides a summary of the consultation responses, highlighting the issues in the current Modification Proposal. More specifically, the Modification's current file formats, which are said to require amendments.

Summary

Brookfield Utilities:

- Small change to the formats. The Market Sector Code is currently within the Header, this should be changed to be within the PS1.

British Gas:

- No Issues have been identified. The standardisation of the file format should also lead to efficiencies for shippers, as they can use a common process for all IGTs. This will avoid parties needing to manually amend PSR information, when loading data to information systems.

ESP:

- Within the PROJECT_SUMMARY_REPORT_V1.1, the field MARKET_SECTOR_CODE should not be within the header record (A00)

because it will cause file validation to fail. It is recommend this this field is moved between NETWORK_DEVELOPMENT_NAME and NUMBER_OF_PLOTS in the PS1 record. All record character counts should be double checked and revised accordingly.

- Within the PROJECT_SUMMARY_REPORT_V1.1, the record code for the METER_POINT record is incorrect, it should read MP1 not MP001. This record name also needs to be corrected in the Record Title on page 6.

Fulcrum Pipelines:

- 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.
- 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.

Indigo Pipelines

- We cannot commit to reissuing all historic PSRs in the new format, we are only able to agree to sending all new PSRs, from implementation date, in the new format. It would take a huge manual effort to revise all historic PSRs, for no benefit whatsoever to the Transporter. Where an old job is revised as a result of

genuine business activity, if the PSR needs to be reissued to the Shipper it will be sent in the new format.

npower:

Supportive of the Modification, however note:

- The key pieces of information required include; the number of plots being built, address data.

SSE:

- The current format enables the ability of a Shipper to overwrite a MAM ID via the PS2, rather than rejecting a PS1 outright. It is apparent that IGTs could be conferred an advantage, via this approach. If they pre-populate their name in the 'MAM' field and an alternative is preferred, this requires rejection of the PSR, which in turn causes delays within the connections process.
- the IGTs should be required to prove that the customer has made a positive request (evidence based), e.g. a logged telephone call so that where the field was pre-populated they would be able to provide that evidence, if/ when requested to do so by the supplier/ shipper the proposed solution should go further to ensure and prevent the proformas being used in a way that confers an advantage on any MAM, by making the connection process faster when using the IGT MAM. Alternatively IGTs should be prepared to evidence the direct approach by the customer to fit a meter, to prove no misuse. Under RGMA if a customer approaches a MAM to fit a meter, the customer would normally be entering into a contract with the MAM and not the supplier. It is of paramount importance to us that the process be remedied to remove our concern regarding IGT pre-population of the MAM. Our preferred solution would be for the 'MAM' field to be left blank, so as to offer full freedom of choice.

E.ON:

- 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

Further amendments were documented in the [Project Summary Notification](#) and [Project Summary report](#). Full consultation responses can be found on the [iGT UNC website](#).