

Consultation Response**iGT100: Reinstating Asset Query Codes**

Responses invited by: 11/08/2017

Respondent Details

Name: Claire Towler

Organisation: SSE plc.

Support Implementation ☒

Qualified Support ☐

Neutral ☐

Do Not Support ☐

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

We support this modification as it will restore the use of query codes that help to facilitate issue resolution between Shippers and IGTs.

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 – this is a documentation only modification that restores queries that have been used in the past, and therefore will not have a material effect.

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

Without this modification, both Shippers and iGTs will continue to require workarounds to resolve day to day issues. Reinstating the codes in question will help to resolve these, and will enable us to have a direct form of correspondence with iGTs in certain scenarios. This would provide benefits for both parties. This modification ensures that iGTs remain obligated to adhere to the Standards of Service, and in the event that these codes are not reinstated, a degree of accountability for iGTs is removed.

Relevant Objectives

How would implementation of this modification impact the relevant objectives?

Implementation of this modification would support relevant objective (F) 'Promotion of efficiency in the implementation and administration of the Code' as the removal of the asset query codes in question have necessitated workarounds in order to resolve issues. The codes proposed for reinstatement support the management of customer facing issues (e.g. meter mix-ups), enabling timely rectification. This modification will restore efficiency in the administration of issues handled by iGTs and Shippers.

Impacts and Costs

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

None, as this modification restores a process that has been used before in the past.

Implementation

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

We are in support of the proposed November implementation as this modification would cause no material impacts. Furthermore, it is important these query codes are reinstated to address the existing 'gap' in the Standards of Service.

Legal Text

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

Yes – this has been reviewed and facilitates the intentions of the modification.

Further Comments

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

None

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