

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: E.ON
Representative: Colette Baldwin
Date of Representation: 28th October 2013

Do you support or oppose implementation?

Support

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

This would seem a sensible solution that offers MAM users of the IX Equipment secure communication mechanisms with their MAPs to provide them with updates about changes to their asset. This should help improve the timely provision of asset updates from MAMs to MAPs.

Its disappointing that the opportunity for MAPs to communicate directly with suppliers (should each party wish to agree to this) can't be part of the secure communication solution, as we are seeing more and more MAPs needing to engage directly with suppliers than was envisaged when metering unbundled occurred.

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

No

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?

Efficiency in implementation of the network code would be achieved as it would enable efficient use of code communication equipment to communicate asset updates to asset providers.

0457S

Representation

28 October 2013

Version 1.0

Page 1 of 2

© 2013 all rights reserved

Impacts and Costs:

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

None

Implementation:

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

None – it would have no system/process impact on our business

Legal Text:

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

Yes

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.

No