



Change Proposal Circular

CPC00676: Impact Assessment of CP1325 and CP1326

Responses for CP1325 'Removal of Obsolete PARMS Serials'

Summary of Responses

Organisation	Capacity in which Organisation operates in	Agree?	Impacted?	Days needed to implement
Gemserv	MRASCo Ltd	Neutral	No	0
Independent Power Networks Limited	LDSO, UMSO, SMRA	Neutral	No	0
British Energy Direct Limited	Supplier	No	Yes	90
G4S Utility Services (formally AccuRead)	NHHDA, NHHDC, NHHMO & HHMO	Yes	Yes	182
Western Power Distribution	Distributor, MOA	Yes	Yes	180
United Utilities	NHHMO and HHMO	Yes	Yes	180
IMServ Europe Ltd	HHDC and DA, NHHDC and DA, MOP	Yes	Yes	30



Any Questions

If you have any queries, please contact:
CCC@elexon.co.uk.

Or contact:
**BSCP40 Change
Process Task Leader
020 7380 4213
task.leader@elexon.
co.uk.**

CPC00676

1 April 2010

Version 0.1

Page 1 of 9

© ELEXON Limited 2010

Summary of Responses				
SAIC on behalf of: ScottishPower Energy Management Ltd. ScottishPower Generation Ltd. ScottishPower Energy Retail Ltd. SP Manweb plc. SP Transmission Ltd. SP Distribution Ltd	Supplier, LDSO, HHDA, NHHDA, HHDC, NHHDC, HHMOA, NHHMOA	Yes	Yes	180
Scottish & Southern Energy	Supplier/ Generator/ Trader/ Party Agent/ Distributor	Yes	Yes	4 – 6 months
NPower Limited	Supplier/Supplier Agents	Yes	No	0
E.ON UK Energy Services Limited	NHHDC-DA MOA	Yes	Yes	0
Stark Software Int Ltd	HHDC HHDA NHHDC NHHDA	Yes	Yes	60

Detailed Impact Assessment Responses			
Organisation	Agree?	Impacted?	Comments
Gemserv	Neutral	No	Would implementation in the proposed Release have an adverse impact on your organisation? No impact Please provide details of the associated costs on your organisation to implement the change: None
IPNL	Neutral	No	-
British Energy Direct Limited	No	Yes	Comments: NM01 – this Serial should be retained taking into consideration the introduction of Smart metering. NM02 – we agree to the removal of this Serial providing new Serial 9 will be implemented. For which role is your organisation impacted? Supplier Please state what the impact is? There will be an impact on our systems. Would implementation in the proposed Release have an adverse impact on your organisation? No
G4S Utility Services	Yes	Yes	For which role is your organisation impacted? NHHDC.NHHDA,NHHMO & HHMO Please state what the impact is? Change to current reporting and removal of the

Detailed Impact Assessment Responses

			<p>reports which are no longer required</p> <p>Would implementation in the proposed Release have an adverse impact on your organisation? No. Provided the impact deadline allows enough time for implementation as indicated in question 3</p> <p>Associated costs: : Not known at this time</p>
Western Power Distribution	Yes	Yes	<p>For which role is your organisation impacted? MOA</p> <p>Would implementation in the proposed Release have an adverse impact on your organisation? No</p> <p>Associated costs: <£500</p>
United Utilities	Yes	Yes	<p>For which role is your organisation impacted? NHHMO and HHMO</p> <p>Please state what the impact is? System and Process changes would be required</p> <p>Would implementation in the proposed Release have an adverse impact on your organisation? No</p> <p>Associated costs: No costs</p> <p>Any other comments: We are now aware that the exclusion deadline is to be increased to +15 WDs but please could you advise where CP1248 states the exclusion deadline was reduced from +10 WDs to +5 WDs i.e. "If the Date of Action Required by in the data flow is greater than +5WDs after the end of the period t-1 then the data flow should not be counted as it may lead to incorrect pending counts". Please could you also advise whether a decision has been made following the PARMs Serial Review 2009 and whether we can expect a reply to the questions we raised in our response.</p>
IMServ Europe Ltd	Yes	Yes	<p>For which role is your organisation impacted? HHDC and DA, NHHDC and DA and MOP</p> <p>Please state what the impact is?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Decommissioning of reports used for "obsolete" serials 2. Amendment to scripts used to extract NM03 and 4 data <p>Implementation: We would have preferred a June 2010 implementation date.</p>
SAIC on behalf of: ScottishPower Energy Management Ltd. ScottishPower Generation Ltd. ScottishPower Energy Retail Ltd. SP Manweb plc. SP Transmission Ltd. SP Distribution Ltd	Yes	Yes	<p>For which role is your organisation impacted? Supplier, HHDA, HHDC, NHHDA, NHHDC</p> <p>Please state what the impact is? Systems will have to be amended to accommodate changes.</p> <p>Would implementation in the proposed Release have an adverse impact on your organisation? No adverse impact anticipated.</p>

CPC00676

1 April 2010

Version 0.1

Page 3 of 9

© ELEXON Limited 2010

Detailed Impact Assessment Responses			
Scottish and Southern Energy	Yes	Yes	For which role is your organisation impacted? Supplier, NHHDC, NHHDA, MOP Please state what the impact is? Amendments to the reporting tool to remove the obsolete serials and the required changes to NM03/4 and the associated cost implication. Would implementation in the proposed Release have an adverse impact on your organisation? No Associated costs: Cost to make changes to internal reporting tool.
NPower Limited	Yes	No	Please state what the impact is? Currently we do not envisage any impacts on Systems or Processes Would implementation in the proposed Release have an adverse impact on your organisation? No impacts currently identified. Associated costs: No costs currently identified.
E.ON UK Energy Services Ltd	Yes	Yes	Please state what the impact is: The Expenditure of resources associated with the generation and maintenance of these serials will be eliminated. Would implementation in the proposed Release have an adverse impact on your organisation? No Do you have any other comments? No.
Stark Software Int Ltd	Yes	Yes	If yes, then for which role is your organisation impacted? HHDC/ HHDC/ HHDA Please state what the impact is: Removal of Serials



About Severity Codes

H (High):
Prejudices document's conclusions, recommendations or fitness for purpose.

M (Medium):
Matter of substance, but not high.

L (Low):
Minor error but document's intention is clear.

Comments on the redline text					
No.	Organisation	Document name	Location	Severity Code	Comments
1	SAIC on behalf of. . .	BSCP503 v12.0 Redlined Text v0.2	4.8	M	Presumably as the two entries in the table are being removed, the table itself will be removed and consequently the paragraph previous to the table, beginning 'It should be noted that the following table...' will be removed?
2	SAIC on behalf of. . .	BSCP533 Appendix B v14.0 Redlined Text	3	L	Font is different to the font in the rest of the document.
3	SAIC on behalf of. . .	BSCP533 Appendix B v14.0 Redlined Text	3.2.4	M	If the text in this clause is being removed, will 'Not Used' be inserted or will the content of 3.2.5 be renumbered accordingly to 3.2.4?

CPC00676

1 April 2010

Version 0.1

Page 4 of 9

© ELEXON Limited 2010

Responses for CP1326 'Update to BSCP128 from lessons learnt exercise carried out with LDSOs'

Summary of Responses				
Organisation	Capacity in which Organisation operates in	Agree?	Impacted?	Days needed to implement
Gemserv	MRASCo Ltd	Yes	No	0
Independent Power Networks Limited	LDSO, UMSO, SMRA	Yes	Yes	0
British Energy Direct Limited	Supplier	Neutral	No	0
Western Power Distribution	Distributor, MOA	Yes	Yes	30
Central Networks		Yes	Yes	0
SAIC on behalf of: ScottishPower Energy Management Ltd. ScottishPower Generation Ltd. ScottishPower Energy Retail Ltd. SP Manweb plc. SP Transmission Ltd. SP Distribution Ltd	Supplier, LDSO, HHDA, NHHDA, HHDC, NHHDC, HHMOA, NHHMOA	Yes	Yes	180
Scottish & Southern Energy	Supplier/ Generator/ Trader/ Party Agent/ Distributor	Yes	Yes	3 months
Electricity North West Ltd	LDSO	Yes	No	0
NPower Limited	Supplier/Supplier Agents	Yes	No	0
E.ON UK Energy Services Limited	NHHDC-DA MOA	Neutral	No	0
Stark Software Int Ltd	HHDC HHDA NHHDC NHHDA	Yes	Yes	60

CPC00676

1 April 2010

Version 0.1

Page 5 of 9

© ELEXON Limited 2010

Detailed Impact Assessment Responses

Organisation	Agree?	Impacted?	Comments
Gemserv	Yes	No	Please provide any comments: Makes the audit process less onerous and more efficient. Would implementation in the proposed Release have an adverse impact on your organisation? No Please provide details of the associated costs on your organisation to implement the change. None
IPNL	Yes	Yes	For which role is your organisation impacted? LDSO Please state what the impact is: Change in LLF Submission and audit process times and inclusion of data request in the MSAD for embedded LDSOs. How much notice would you need to implement this change, if they were approved? We believe this data to be readily available and therefore do not require any implementation/development time. Would implementation in the proposed Release have an adverse impact on your organisation? No
British Energy Direct Limited	Neutral	No	Would implementation in the proposed Release have an adverse impact on your organisation? No
Western Power Distribution	Yes	Yes	Would implementation in the proposed Release have an adverse impact on your organisation? No Associated costs: No real extra costs. The work will be absorbed within normal workload
Central Networks	Yes	Yes	Do you agree with the change? See Question 7, yes we agree but a few things still need to be addressed. If yes, then for which role is your organisation impacted? DNO Please state what the impact is: Nothing significant, just slight change to practices. How much notice would you need to implement this change? We'll start work nearer the time, no prior notice required. Would implementation in the proposed Release have an adverse impact on your organisation? No
SAIC on behalf of: ScottishPower Energy Management Ltd. ScottishPower Generation Ltd. ScottishPower Energy Retail Ltd. SP Manweb plc. SP Transmission Ltd.	Yes	Yes	For which role is your organisation impacted? LDSO Please state what the impact is? Documentation / Manual Processes / LLF production

Detailed Impact Assessment Responses			
SP Distribution Ltd			
Scottish and Southern Energy	Yes	Yes	For which role is your organisation impacted? Supplier/ Distributor Please state what the impact is? Minimal changes to processes and training procedures. Would implementation in the proposed Release have an adverse impact on your organisation? No Associated costs: Minimal costs
Electricity North West Ltd	Yes	No	Would implementation in the proposed Release have an adverse impact on your organisation? No
NPower Limited	Yes	No	Please state what the impact is? Currently we do not envisage any impacts on Systems or Processes Would implementation in the proposed Release have an adverse impact on your organisation? No impacts currently identified. Associated costs: No costs currently identified.
E.ON UK Energy Services Ltd	Neutral	No	-



About Severity Codes

H (High):
Prejudices document's conclusions, recommendations or fitness for purpose.

M (Medium):
Matter of substance, but not high.

L (Low):
Minor error but document's intention is clear.

Comments on the redline text					
No.	Organisation	Document name	Location	Severity Code	Comments
1	Gemserv	Not stated	Footer		The documents have "ELEXON Limited 2009" in the footer. Shouldn't this read "ELEXON Limited 2010"?
1	Central Networks	CSAD	Table 2.1	M	Do you mean circuit name or do you mean site name / site reference?
2	Central Networks	CSAD	Table 2.1	M	Do we have to provide the MVA if it is not used in our calculations?
3	Central Networks	CSAD	Table 2.1	M	Do you mean last annual submission? What if a mid-year update was done?
4	Central Networks	MSAD	1.3 / 11	M	We still do not have a definition of "robust error detection" – last year this term was used to justify a level of scrutiny that we did not think was warranted, so we would like this to be defined.
5	Central Networks	BSCP128	1.8.2	H	Definition of EHV – the license no longer defines EHV.
1	SAIC on behalf of . . .	BSCP128	Page 25, REF. 2.4.64	L	2.4.4 being amended to 2.4.6 but the 4 does not have line through it to indicate it will be deleted – highlighted to ensure it is not missed.
2	SAIC on behalf of . . .	BSCP128 Appendix 1	Entire document	H	References and page numbers are inconsistent throughout entire document. A few sample examples are listed below: Page 4, 1.1 Introduction Page 6, 1. Introduction Page 4, 1.1 Introduction Page 4, 1.2 General Information Page 7, 1.1 General Information

CPC00676

1 April 2010

Version 0.1

Page 8 of 9

© ELEXON Limited 2010

Comments on the redline text					
3	SAIC on behalf of . . .	BSCP128 Appendix 2	All page numbers following page 5	H	There are 4 instances of 'Page 7 of 8' all of which are wrong. Page 7 of 8 is actually page 6 of 9 Page 7 of 8 is actually page 7 of 9 Page 7 of 8 is actually page 8 of 9 Page 7 of 8 is actually page 9 of 9
4	SAIC on behalf of . . .	BSCP128 Appendix 3	Page 11 Section 1.3 No.6	M	Consider removing (Y/N) option for consistency with No.5.
5	SAIC on behalf of . . .	BSCP128 Appendix 3	Page 11 Section 1.3 No.8	M	Consider removing (Y/N) option for consistency with No.5.
6	SAIC on behalf of . . .	BSCP128 Appendix 3	Page 12 Section 1.3 No.9a	M	Consider removing (Y/N) option for consistency with No.5.
7	SAIC on behalf of . . .	BSCP128 Appendix 3	Page 12 Section 1.3 No.9b	M	Consider removing (Y/N) option for consistency with No.5.
8	SAIC on behalf of . . .	BSCP128 Appendix 4	Page 4 Contents 2.1	M	Title on Contents page inconsistent with title of section 2.1 on page 18. Page 4: 'Site Specific supporting information for both CVA and SVA (if applicable)' Page 18: 'Site Specific and EHV generic supporting information for both CVA and SVA (if applicable)'.
9	SAIC on behalf of . . .	BSCP128 Appendix 4	Page 13 Section 1.3 No.8		Consider removing (Y/N) option for consistency with No.5 and No.6.
10	SAIC on behalf of . . .	BSCP128 Appendix 4	Page 13 Section 1.3 No.9a		Consider removing (Y/N) option for consistency with No.5 and No.6.
11	SAIC on behalf of . . .	BSCP128 Appendix 4	Page 13 Section 1.3 No.9b		Consider removing (Y/N) option for consistency with No.5 and No.6.