

Consultation Response

IGT159: Amendments to the Must Read Process

Responses invited by: DD MMM YYYY

Respondent Details

Name: Oorlagh Chapman

Organisation: Centrica

Support Implementation ☒

Qualified Support ☐

Neutral ☐

Do Not Support ☐

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

The current Must Read process is not fit for purpose; This Modification would improve the customer experience as the information collected would be accurate and up to date, which would reduce the need for additional site visits and reduce costs for consumers. The modification requires IGTs to provide reads within an agreed window which will allow the read to be utilised for Settlement. This modification will allow for Shippers to enter more timely/usable Reads into Settlement. The CDSP will remove a site from the final notification report once advised of known issues, and I believe the legal text aligns to, and delivers, the intent of the solution and the Business Rules.

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

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

None

Relevant Objectives

How would implementation of this modification impact the relevant objectives?

The implementation of this modification would support relevant objective D and F.

Impacts and Costs

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

To be determined

Implementation

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

As soon as possible after approval

Legal Text

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

Yes

Further Comments

Should a reciprocal arrangement be added into the business rules, and therefore the Legal Drafting, for the CDSP to notify an IGT where a Shipper has identified a known issue. *(Please see "Panel Discussions" in Section 10 of the [Draft Modification Report](#) for further context and information)*

Yes I believe this was a clear requirement in the drafting of the modification and meets the requirements.

Further Comments

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

No.

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