

Consultation Response

IGT161: Consequential IGT UNC Changes for Switching SCR (REC 3.0)

SCR (REC 3.0)	
Responses invited by: 05 05 2022	
Respondent Details	
Name: Kundai Matiringe	
Organisation: BUUK Infrastructure	
Support Implementation	x
Qualified Support	
Neutral	
Do Not Support	

IGT161 Consultation Response 5th May 2022

Version 1.0

Page 1 of 4



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

Thank you for the invitation seeking representation with respect to the above modification proposal, which BUUK would like to support. The Mod facilitates the alignment of the IGT UNC with the REC V3 Central Switching Service from the Go live date.

IGT161

Consultation Response

5th May 2022

Version 1.0

Page 2 of 4

© 2022 all rights reserved



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 this is a SCR mod and in line with other SCR mods, we believe this should go to Ofgem for approval.

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

N/A

Relevant Objectives

How would implementation of this modification impact the relevant objectives?

We believe this mod progresses necessary consequential changes to the IGT UNC to ensure alignment with REC v3.0 and facilitate the delivery of the CSS and therefore satisfies relevant Objective F. We also agree that the IGT UNC consequential changes support faster, more reliable switching so furthering relevant objective D.

Impacts and Costs

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

BUUK has identified No specific costs, i.e. Faster Switching does cost, but this mod doesn't have any specific impacts that aren't already known.

Implementation

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

Implementation should align with the CSS go-live date (currently expected to be 18.07.22).

Legal Text

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

We are satisfied that the legal text satisfies the intent of the Mod.

IGT161 Consultation Response

5th May 2022

Version 1.0

Page 3 of 4

© 2022 all rights reserved



Further Comments

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

Terminology Mapping (Xoserve using all the definitions) – it would be appreciated if guidance documents could be provided for cross code alignment and better understanding. It has been challenging to review in terms of assessing the impact on IGT UNC, specifically with regards to the terminology changes.

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

IGT161 Consultation Response

5th May 2022

Version 1.0

Page 4 of 4

© 2022 all rights reserved