

Annex C – P88 Party and Party Agent Impact Assessment

| Carried out by | Approve | Reject | Comments |
|---|----------|--------|---|
| <p>Gareth Swales Electricity Direct</p> | <p>✓</p> | | <p>Do you support the changes proposed for P88? Yes</p> <p>What impact if any will there be on your organisation? Negotiating new contracts will be very time consuming</p> <p>Do you agree with the proposed Implementation Date of May 2003? If not, what Implementation Date would you prefer? We believe that an accurate decision on the implementation date cannot be obtained until all aspects of REMA have been considered and resolved. Deadline dates are required for these aspects and if not met then the Implementation date should be amended accordingly. These issues include the areas that have been deemed to be outside of the scope of the BSC.</p> |
| <p>Chris Pearson SD Partners</p> | | | <p>Please find attached the impact of P88 on ELEXON Entry Processes:</p> <p>SVA Entry Processes Impact:</p> <p>1. Addition of new data item to D0150 - All expected results relating to D0150 will require changing</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Expected Results 2 days</p> <p>2. Update the NHH scripts and expected results to reflect the split of MOA and MAP obligations:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">approx. 19 scripts Scripts - 12 days Expected results - 7 days Schedule - 1 day</p> <p>Total = 22 days @ £540 = £11,880</p> <p>If it were required to add new tests to cover new business processes for</p> |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | <p>Sale of meter Change of MAP Change of Supplier and MAM (no change of MAP)</p> <p>there would be an additional impact of 17 days ie £9,180 (3 scripts @ 5 days each plus 2 days general documentation/schedule)</p> |
| Derek Livesey United Utilities | ✓ (with reservations) | | <p>Do you support the changes proposed for P88?</p> <p>Yes, but with reservation as expressed below.</p> <p>What impact if any will there be on your organisation?</p> <p>Technically we are sure that the DTC flows will work.</p> <p>However, obtaining consent may need to be further defined. MOAs installing our meters out of area may cause some problems in billing for MAP via DUoS. Also they need to take in the requirements of Load Managed Areas. These tend to be defined by Post Code rather than GSP Group.</p> <p>We also have a few reservations on the commercial side.</p> <p>We currently recover MAP charges through the DUoS standing charge</p> <p>Under arrangement 1 we no longer have a contract with the Supplier for MAP.</p> <p>We may therefore have to come up with a new non-DUoS method of billing for MAP</p> <p>We may have to bill MOAs instead of Suppliers needing new MAP-MOA agreements and credit cover?</p> <p>Do you agree with the proposed Implementation Date of May 2003? If not, what Implementation Date would you prefer?</p> <p>Yes, subject to resolution of commercial issues.</p> |
| Sue Macklin Scottish and Southern | ✓ (with reservations) | | <p>Do you support the changes proposed for P88?</p> <p>Yes - but only when the commercial arrangements are in place.</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| | | | <p>What impact if any will there be on your organisation?</p> <p>Significant impact on systems and processes - 5 man years effort to make changes.</p> <p>Do you agree with the proposed Implementation Date of May 2003? If not, what Implementation Date would you prefer?</p> <p>Our agreement to May 2003 is subject to Ofgem satisfying our concerns, within a reasonable timescale, about commercial arrangements and distribution financial clawback.</p> |
| <p>Tim Fleisig ELEXON Design Authority</p> | | | <p>Impacts the following Design Authority maintained products:</p> <p>SVA Data Catalogue, as described in the modification (D0150), estimated effort 0.5 mandays</p> <p>BSC BPM, (new organisations or description MAM, MAP), estimated effort 0.5 mandays</p> |
| <p>Rachael Gardener Aquila Networks</p> | | ✓ | <p>Please find that Aquila Networks PLC response to MC00003: DLIA of P88 is to Reject on the grounds that there are issues/risks outstanding with the proposal. These are that further work is still required to deliver the REMA solution of which this forms a part, but is probably incomplete (how incomplete is difficult to gauge when the work hasn't been completed) i.e. the agreed format of the new flows, 'Emergency Metering Services', change of MAP process (with change of supplier). Aquila Networks would wish to develop one set of changes rather than being drip fed to assess the cost and the business case for the changes, which it is not possible to do with the current level of completeness.</p> |
| <p>Dave Morton SEEBOARD</p> | ✓ | | <p>Do you support the changes proposed for P88?</p> <p>Yes – but see issues raised in P88 consultation, details on separate attached document.</p> <p>What impact if any will there be on your organisation? Yes.</p> <p>Do you agree with the proposed Implementation</p> |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | | <p>Date of May 2003? If not, what Implementation Date would you prefer? At present this date could still be made but a decision is required in next two/three months for this date still to be possible.</p> |
| <p>Katie Sarl IMServ</p> | ✓ | | <p>Do you support the changes proposed for P88?</p> <p>We do support the changes proposed for P88.</p> <p>What impact if any will there be on your organisation?</p> <p>There will be an impact on the MOA part of our organisation, as we will be intending to provide a MAP service.</p> <p>Do you agree with the proposed Implementation Date of May 2003? If not, what Implementation Date would you prefer?</p> <p>We agree with the proposed Implementation date of May 2003.</p> |
| <p>James Nixon Calanais Ltd</p> | ✓ | | <p>Do you support the changes proposed for P88?</p> <p>While we support the proposed changes, I would like to qualify our position by drawing your attention to the comments we provided on the Assessment Consultation proforma.</p> <p>What impact if any will there be on your organisation?</p> <p>There will be significant impact on our systems and processes</p> <p>Do you agree with the proposed Implementation Date of May 2003? If not, what Implementation Date would you prefer?</p> <p>We agree with the proposed implementation date of May 2003</p> |
| <p>Sue Calvert YEDL/NEDL</p> | ✓ | | <p>Do you support the changes proposed for P88?</p> <p>Yes</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|----------|--|
| | | | <p>What impact if any will there be on your organisation? The changes identified at this stage, in terms of settlements, relate to the implementation of changes to the D150 and (when it happens) D268 DTC flows. Our systems will require updating to enable us to receive the amended flows.</p> <p>Do you agree with the proposed Implementation Date of May 2003? If not, what Implementation Date would you prefer? Yes</p> |
| <p>Alec Thompson LE Group</p> | | <p>✓</p> | <p>LE Group do not support the proposed modification P88.</p> <p>If the modification is implemented small changes to our Supplier and Supplier Agent systems will be required. We do not envisage large changes Resulting from P88, but associated proposed MRA CPs would impact us more significantly.</p> <p>Due to the continued REMA process and issues that have not been resolved, we do not support this implementation date. We believe that until firm proposals stemming from all the parts of the review are completed no firm implementation date can be made. In order to accommodate IT system requirements a period of at least six months from REMA is completed will be required and we expect REMA to continue until the end of 2002 at least.</p> |