

iGT UNC / iGT INC Consultation Response

Date	23 March 2009
Reference	iGT024VAV
Title	Inspection Notification and Cyclical Read File Format and Response File - Clarification of File Naming Convention - Consecutive
Respondee	Envoy
Position on the Modification	Support Modification
Facilitation of the relevant objectives	
This is a complimentary Modification so the relevant objectives are not applicable.	
Additional Information and Comments	
<p>Envoy supports this modification on the basis that we believe that consecutive file numbering will prove more efficient than sequential numbering as it will make it very clear when a file has been missed. Furthermore, as the Shipper is responsible for investigating and resolving any issue with the missing file, consecutive numbering will enable the Shipper to resolve the issue with very little or no iGT involvement as the Shipper can check which acceptance or rejection files have been received. Envoy also believe that this method will also encourage the Shipper to work efficiently by introducing an incentive not to miss files as files as any subsequent files will be rejected - there is no incentive for efficiency with sequential numbering.</p>	

Completed forms should be returned to the iGT UNC Representative, Gemserv Ltd at iGT-UNC@gemserv.com or faxed to 020 7090 1001

