

## Consultation Response

# IGT173: Gateway Delivery for RPC Backing Data

Responses invited by: 17<sup>th</sup> April 2024

### Respondent Details

Name: Cher Harris  
Organisation: Indigo Pipelines Limited

Support Implementation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Qualified Support	<input type="checkbox"/>
Neutral	<input type="checkbox"/>
Do Not Support	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

We support this move to utilising a less manual and more secure means of transferring invoice backing data

### **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?**

We agree with the proposer that this modification should be subject to Self Governance

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

We have seen the ROM provided by Xoserve for the IX changes, but not the DSC decision on how the costs will be split between parties. We are not comfortable making a decision on implementation until cost allocation is confirmed and parties have a clearer idea about the costs they are committing to

### **Relevant Objectives**

**How would implementation of this modification impact the relevant objectives?**

We agree with the proposer that this modification positively impacts Objective F by introducing a less manual, and more secure, process that will reduce the administrative burden for both shippers and IGTs.

### **Impacts and Costs**

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

**In addition please note the IGT UNC Panel discussion in the Draft Modification Report (pages 9 and 12) on the matter of cost allocation.**

We have seen the ROM provided by Xoserve for the IX changes, but not the DSC decision on how the costs will be split between parties. We are not comfortable making a decision on implementation until cost allocation is confirmed and parties have a clearer idea about the costs they are committing to

## **Implementation**

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

Implementation is dependent on changes to the IX Network, so we would support implementation in the first release after the IX changes are implemented

**In particular the IGT UNC Panel are interested in whether you are in support of a November 2024 release for this Modification or would you require a 6 month lead time and therefore a February release?**

We could support implementation in the November 2024 release if the IX changes are in place by then

## **Legal Text**

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

The proposed legal text fulfils the requirements of the modification

## **Additional Question from the IGT UNC Panel RE Testing**

**Would you like testing to be available prior to implementation and would you wish to participate if it was available?**

We would like to participate in testing prior to implementation

## **Further Comments**

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

**Responses should be submitted by email to [IGTUNC@gemserv.com](mailto:IGTUNC@gemserv.com)**