

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

Responses invited by: 10/08/2017

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

We support reinstating the query codes because we believe they were decommissioned through iGT073 incorrectly because it was reviewed from the point of view of what the CDSP will complete for the iGTs through Project Nexus; MAM related queries were not part of the Nexus scope so these should not have been removed.

Although emails can be issued to the Pipeline Operator to raise these issues we believe the removal was incorrectly completed as part of iGT073 so they should remain. This modification just reintroduces the codes it doesn't enforce the use of them so Pipeline Users can still continue to issue queries via their current processes.

The iGTs have created an iGT RGMA document which is hosted on the iGT UNC website so there are already recognised links between the activities the iGTs complete as a Pipeline Operator and a MAM.

We view this change as housekeeping as it is just reinstating the query codes and enabling their use it is not mandating and additional procedural changes.

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?

As the change is housekeeping to reinstate query codes which were already included within the ancillary document we do not perceive this change as materially impacting and would support it being treated as self-governance.

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

No new issues have been identified, although in the workgroup report there was a reference to address queries (section 7 relevant objectives) which is not part of the final modification scope we sponsored, the scope is asset queries only, we removed all references to address queries through working group development.

Relevant Objectives

How would implementation of this modification impact the relevant objectives?

It will support objective F to ensure that Pipeline Users are able to contact the Pipeline Operator where they are the iGT as well as the MAM (where there are RPC bundled arrangements).

Impacts and Costs

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

Minimal costs to return the known query codes back into our processes.

Implementation

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

As this is mainly housekeeping to add the codes back into the iGT UNC not mandating parties to use it we believe November 2017 is an achievable implementation date.

Legal Text

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

We have no comments on the legal text.

Further Comments

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

Insert text here

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