Representation

Draft Modification Report

0457S: Extending the use of the UK Link Network (Information Exchange (IX)) to Meter Asset Provider (MAP) organisations

Consultation close out date: 07 November 2013

Respond to: enquiries@gasgovernance.co.uk

Organisation: Community of Meter Asset Providers

Representative: Kay Houghton

Date of Representation: 29 October 2013

Do you support or oppose implementation?

Support

Please summarise (in one paragraph) the key reason(s) for your support/opposition.

Extending the use of the standard gas electronic communications system provides a Meter Asset Provider (MAP) with another option to utilise in communications between MAPs and other parties. The main communication routes are likely to be between MAPs and Meter Asset Managers (MAMs).

Are there any new or additional issues that you believe should be recorded in the Modification Report?

None

Self Governance Statement:
Do you agree with the Modification Panel's decision that this should be a self-governance modification?

Yes

Relevant Objectives:
How would implementation of this modification impact the relevant objectives?

MAPs are not Code parties so cannot comment on this area. However, from our business perspective this modification does provide for an optional communications mechanism that would improve the communications between MAPs and MAMs and allow us to better manage our meter asset portfolio.

Impacts and Costs:
What analysis, development and ongoing costs would you face if this modification were implemented?

MAPs are not UNC parties. In terms of the UNC we do not believe UNC parties would face any costs as a result of this modification.

As a MAP we would incur the installation and ongoing rental charges of the IX service, any the decision to use the IX service would be taken on a positive benefits case for each MAP.

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

ASAP

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

MAPs are not UNC parties but the legal text appears to meet the intentions of the Modification

Is there anything further you wish to be taken into account?
Please provide any additional comments, supporting analysis, or other information that that you believe should be taken into account or you wish to emphasise.