CPC00596 – Impact Assessment of Responses for CP1182 v2.0, CP1183 v2.0, CP1184 v2.0, CP1185 v2.0 and CP1187

CP1182 v2.0

Organisation	Agreement (✓/X)	Impact (✓/X)	Rationale	Mandays Required to Implement	Redline Comments
UNITED UTILITIES – UUNL/NORW NHH MOP BCA/PACA	✓	✓	Minimal change to processes required	28	–
IMServ	✓	X	–	0	–
Western Power Distribution	✓	✓	We will need to review areas of the business which will now come under a PSL for the first time. Any changes needed are likely to be minor.	180 We would need 6 months notice and would be happy with the proposed November 2007 implementation date	–
Npower Limited, Npower Northern Limited, Npower Northern Supply Limited, Npower Yorkshire Limited, Npower Yorkshire Supply Limited, Npower Direct Limited	✓	–	–	–	Re PSL120 v17 (NHHDC) – possible errors? • 5.1.1.2 (Retention of Records) of PSL120 is mapped to PSL100 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 (Data Confidentiality). However it is 5.1.2.2 of PSL120 that refers to Data Confidentiality.

15 February 2007

v.1.0

CPXXXX - Internal Assessment Log

v.0.1

29 January 2007

Page 1 of 41

© ELEXON Limited 2007

					• 5.1.4.2 (Development Controls) of PSL120 is mapped to PSL100 6.2.1 and 6.2.3 (Change Controls). However, we believe 6.2.3 is closer related to 5.1.4.3.
Southern Electric Power Distribution; Keadby Generation Ltd; SSE Energy Supply Ltd; SSE Generation Ltd; and Scottish Hydro-Electric Power Distribution Ltd; Medway Power Ltd;	✓	X	Agree change in principal	–	Agree change in principal but we have one or two queries listed below:- Page 5 1.1.2 & 1.1.3 - is it possible for a CVA metering point to have a Registrant that is different to the Supplier? If the Supplier is always the Registrant then footnote 1 in relation to 1.1.2 is meaningless. Page 11 5.4.3 & 5.4.4 & 5.4.5 are 5.4.4 & 5.4.5 a sub paragraph of 5.4.3 5.4.4 - in PSL 120 (5.1.2.7) there is an additional bullet "adequate insurance cover for processing interruption, including employee fidelity

					insurance" - why has this been removed?
					5.4.5 - 4th bullet "• insurance policies to cover hardware, communications and all line development and data including systems software and programs" bit in bold is missing in new draft
					Page 11
					6.1 and 6.2 - what is the difference between qualified systems and 'other systems'. The BSC is only concerned with qualified systems, i.e. the ones that support settlement.
					Page 12
					8.1.1 - shouldn't this be "All controls devised to meet the BSC requirements"?
					Page 13
					8.1.2 - isn't this a sub paragraph of 8.1.1?
					Page 13
					9.1.1 - third bullet - does this really mean anything over and above the requirements

					contained in the first two bullet points? Page 14 - Requirements of 'Audit and Record Keeping' are contained in 10.3 but this does not include a corresponding paragraph to PSL 120 1.1.5.4 "The data shall be retained in such a format which will allow items of information retained via clause 1.1.5.3 to be subsequently searched, located and checked for validation purposes." This para appears in the other PSLs.
SAIC Ltd. Response provided on behalf of: **ScottishPower Energy Management Ltd.** **ScottishPower Generation Ltd.** **ScottishPower Energy Retail Ltd.** **SP Manweb plc.** **SP Transmission Ltd.** **SP Distribution Ltd.**	✓	✓	The creation of a generic Party Service Line will reduce duplication between requirements contained in current Party Service Lines. As a result, Parties will be able to focus on one Party Service Line containing non-functional requirements. The non functional requirements of the generic PSL are being added to the scope of LDSOs and UMSOs. As a result assessment will be required as to the impact on systems and processes. We would support this change being included in the November 2007 release.	–	–

United Utilities (NORW) HH & NHH MOA	✓	X	Agree as it will be beneficial to users to only have to refer to one document which should help with finding information required and reduce the time taken to find the information.	No impact on systems so November 2007 planned release date is not a problem.	–
Siemens Energy Services	✓	✓	–	–	–
E.ON UK Energy Services Limited	–	✓	We do not believe that the operational benefits have been fully demonstrated Mapping Matrices will be updated **Other Comments**: Great care will need to be taken when developing Audit criteria during the implementation period	–	–
EDF Energy, Supplier	✓	✓	A check will be required to ensure all processes within the generic and each individual party service line are as expected.	90	–
EDF Energy Networks (EPN), plc, EDF Energy Networks (LPN) plc, EDF Energy Networks (SPN) plc	✓	X	–	–	–
British Energy group of BSC Parties	✓	✓	Minimal changes to work instructions would need to be actioned.	90	Our main focus has been the impact on CVA Meter Operation, a service we both provide and use. As this CP is only concerned with the addition of a generic PSL, and does

					not attempt to re-assign functional requirements into an applicable BSCP, we have reviewed the document on the basis that it should replicate all non-functional requirements set out in PSL180 CVA Meter Operation. In addition, we have checked to see if any new non-functional requirements will now apply to the CVA MOA.
					Backup and Disaster Recovery
					Existing PSL180 Section 1.1.8.1 contains an obligation on the CVA MOA to resume normal working following a disaster as soon as reasonably practicable but within 24 hours. New PSL100 Section 2.3.1 contains a similar obligation but does not stipulate 'but within 24 hours'.
					Although we believe 24 hours is an unrealistic time in which to expect CVA Meter Operation to be resumed following a

					disaster in all circumstances, we do consider there should be a backstop requirement for the protection of individual parties and industry as a whole.
					Access to Non-Computerised Records
					Existing PSL180 Section 5.1.7 states that the CVA MOA shall ensure that all Meters and Outstations are marked with a unique identifier to facilitate identification and subsequent maintenance and reading.
					New PSL100 Section 4.2.1 does not contain this obligation.
					We presume this can be considered a functional requirement and wait for its inclusion in the applicable BSCP when these are moved across at a later date.
					We would expect to see the following functional requirements

						currently in PSL180 captured when a CP is raised to move these into an applicable BSCP;
						- 1.1.2 Metering Equipment
						- 1.2 Registration Obligations
						- 1.3 Metering Obligations
						- 1.4 Interface to Other Agents
						- Appendix 2 - MOA Service Levels
						In addition we have noted a typo within Attachment A (Page 2) - HHHAs and HHHCs should read HHDAs and HHDCs respectively.
Centrica	✓	X	It is important that the utmost care is taken when transferring information into one generic Party Service Line. We have already seen a number of BSC Modifications raised for housekeeping errors	-		-
			Final question here - will this form part of the audit scope of the BSC auditor in their work at each participant? For the auditor to do all of the work necessary to cover this document in respect of compliance at all Suppliers will add significant cost to the market.			

CP1183 v2.0

Organisation	Agreement (✓/X)	Impact (✓/X)	Rationale	Mandays Required to Implement	Redline Comments
IMServ	✓	✓	Minor change to business process. No ongoing impact.	30* *Process changes only	–
Western Power Distribution	✓	✓	Seems a sensible solution. We will need to introduce a new manual procedure.	90	–
Npower Limited, Npower Northern Limited, Npower Northern Supply Limited, Npower Yorkshire Limited, Npower Yorkshire Supply Limited, Npower Direct Limited	✓	–	–	–	We would like to make the following observation: BSCP502 v13 – page 7 of Attachment A Redline Changes 3.3.3 Energise a SVA Metering System Within Ref. 3.3.3.1 TO: HHDC(4) The footnote states 'If an HHDC is aware that their record of the Energisation status of a Metering System is inconsistent with the Energisation status of the Metering System on site, the HHDC should notify both the

CPC00596 - Impact Assessment Responses for CP1182 v2.0, Cp1183 v2.0, CP1184 v2.0 CP1185 v2.0 and CP1187
15 February 2007
Page 9 of 41

v.1.0
© ELEXON Limited 2007

					HHMOA and the Supplier'. It is not stated which methods of communication the HHDC should use to notify the HHMOA and the Supplier, nor is it specified what the timescales should be for this information to be passed on. It is felt that having this information documented and agreed upon would aid all parties.
Southern Electric Power Distribution; **Keadby Generation Ltd; SSE Energy Supply Ltd; SSE Generation Ltd; and Scottish Hydro-Electric Power Distribution Ltd; Medway Power Ltd;**	✓	✓	Minor changes	10	–
SAIC Ltd. Response provided on behalf of: **ScottishPower Energy Management Ltd.** **ScottishPower Generation Ltd.**	✓	✓	SP support version 2.0 of this change and are in agreement with allowing a date to be deemed for a change in Energisation Status of a Half Hourly Meter. This change will impact SP processes and a system change will be required for HHMOA. **Other Comments:** It would appear that the	270	–

ScottishPower Energy Retail Ltd. SP Manweb plc. SP Transmission Ltd. SP Distribution Ltd.			concerns we raised in our response to version 1.0 of this change have been addressed by the proposed addition of footnotes to BSCP514 and BSCP502.		
United Utilities (NORW) HHMOA & NHHMOA	X	✓	A D0139 should not be sent until the deemed date for energisation/de-energisation has been agreed by the supplier (in the form of an email or other method) so an audit trail can be kept. I am concerned that if a D0139 has been sent to change energisation status (most probably upon receipt of a D0001 from the HHDC), it is highly likely that the agreement from the supplier will not be received by the HHMO, resulting in a non-compliance for the HHMOA. If the BSCP specified that the agreement is received from the supplier prior to the D0139 being sent, I would agree with the change. Staff training would be required and business processes updated	180	–
Siemens Energy Services	✓	✓	–	90	–
E.ON UK Energy Services Limited	✓	✓	This would address a known industry issue Changes to procedures	–	–
EDF Energy, Supplier	✓	✓	New process for dealing with queries on HH energisation/de-energisation dates will be required.	60	–
EDF Energy Networks (EPN), plc, EDF Energy Networks (LPN) plc, EDF Energy	–	–	–	–	–

Networks (SPN) plc					
British Energy group of BSC Parties	✓	✓	Minimal systems and processes changes would need to be actioned. **Other Comments:** BEDL request that allowing a date to be deemed for a change in energisation status should also be considered for Non Half Hourly as it would help to resolve D0095 exceptions. We note that the description in the summary of an obligation on the Supplier to instruct or agree a confirmation or rejection of Energisation Status Change (D0139) is subject to the normal query/dispute process.	90	–
Centrica	✓	X	There doesn't seem to be a provision within CP1183 to accommodate the classification or differentiation of a deemed or actual date. In this case, is it a fair assumption that we can request D0139's from all HHMOA's without prejudice and should expect to receive for audit trail purposes?	-	-

CP1184 v2.0

Organisation	Agreement (✓/X)	Impact (✓/X)	Rationale	Mandays Required to Implement	Redline Comments
UNITED UTILITIES-NORW/UUNL NHH MOP	✓	X	–	–	–
IMServ Europe Ltd	✓	✓	Process changes	30* *Process changes only	–
Western Power Distribution	✓	–	–	0	–
Npower Limited, Npower Northern Limited, Npower Northern Supply Limited, Npower Yorkshire Limited, Npower Yorkshire Supply Limited, Npower Direct Limited	✓	–	We note the comments added to CP1184, version 2, under 'Justification for Change', where it states that other suggested changes to the CP have not been included, in particular No1 'Obligation on LDSO to send D0139 and D0150 flows to MOA when they de-energise and remove a meter.' We would reiterate our previous comments to CP1184 v1 regarding this, and agree that a review of the disconnection process, as noted in the Change Proposal, needs to be carried out.	–	–
Southern Electric Power Distribution; Keadby Generation Ltd; SSE Energy Supply Ltd; SSE Generation Ltd; and Scottish Hydro-Electric Power Distribution Ltd;	✓	X	–	0	–

Medway Power Ltd;					
SAIC Ltd. Response provided on behalf of: **ScottishPower Energy Management Ltd.** **ScottishPower Generation Ltd.** **ScottishPower Energy Retail Ltd.** **SP Manweb plc.** **SP Transmission Ltd.** **SP Distribution Ltd.**	✓	✓	We agree with the CP as the BSCP will more accurately reflect industry practice where an LDSO has to disconnect a Metering System which has not been de-energised. Impact to MOP and Distribution processes	150	–
United Utilities (NORW) HHMOA & NHHMOA	✓	✓	Staff training would be required and business processes updated	November 2007 planned release date is fine	–
Siemens Energy Services	✓	✓	Although we are in agreement with the principle of this change, we do still have concerns over the method of communication between LDSOs and MOAs, and whether in practise the MOA will be able to remove and recover the meter.	90	–
E.ON UK Energy Services Limited	✓	✓	This would address a known industry issue Changes to procedures	–	–
EDF Energy, Supplier	✓	✓	Are we confident that LDSOs have enough information to ensure that meters can be returned to all possible MOPs? To ensure MOP processes align with changes.	30	–
EDF Energy Networks (EPN), plc, EDF Energy	✓	X	We agree with the principal of this CP as in most cases the LDSO is usually notified the day before of an imminent demolition of a property.	–	–

Networks (LPN) plc, EDF Energy Networks (SPN) plc			In such cases the LDSO has insufficient time to follow the de-energisation process before the supply is disconnected.		
British Energy group of BSC Parties	X	X	We believe relaxation of the current process could lead to an increase in the incidence of settlement data errors arising from uncertainty in energisation status. Any solution to the LDSO audit issue should also seek to reduce the incidence of problems for Suppliers due to de-energisation, rather than simply mask the problem. De-energisation process should at least be applied retrospectively.	0	–
Centrica	X	X	Our main concern with this one is around the disconnection process as a whole and the lack of communication between distribution and MOP. Having said this, we understand that this CP is simply formalising a process that already takes place in the industry and we would fully support a review of the entire disconnection process.		

Centrica continued:

The proposed wording of BSCP515 is far too woolly and at the very least should be tailored to ensure that all relevant dataflows are included in the table - at the moment the following flows are excluded:

•   D0139 (confirmation of energisation status from MOP)

•   D0125 (confirmation of disconnection from the Distribution), and

•   D0171 (confirmation of disconnection from MPAS)

In section 3.7.4 I would include the sending of

			a D0150 and D0010 from LDSO to MO as this would be in line with BSCP514 when an LDSO replaces a meter.		

CP1185 v2.0

Organisation	Agreement (✓/X)	Impact (✓/X)	Rationale	Mandays Required to Implement	Redline Comments
IMServ	✓	✓	Currently deem where SSC change is consistent with a meter change – so will need to expand to cater for an SSC change without a corresponding meter change	0	_
Npower Limited, Npower Northern Limited, Npower Northern Supply Limited, Npower Yorkshire Limited, Npower Yorkshire Supply Limited, Npower Direct Limited	✓	_	_	_	We would like to make the following observation: BSCP504 v17 – Attachment A redline changes Ref: 3.3.6.11 Action: send initial and/or final Meter register reading. From: MOA, Supplier To: NHHDC The initial and/or final Meter register reading in this instance would be held by the MOA. Therefore, the Supplier would have to contact the MOA for the reading. We would suggest that the requirement for the Supplier to provide a reading to the NHHDC

					be removed. Ref: 4.5.2 Deeming circumstances r) Change of Standard Settlement Configuration (SSC) Second paragraph, last sentence ... the NHHDC shall request the reading from the MOA and also from the Supplier. In support of the above comment, then the following wording would need to be removed '... and also from the Supplier'.
Southern Electric Power Distribution; **Keadby Generation Ltd**; **SSE Energy Supply Ltd**; **SSE Generation Ltd**; **and Scottish Hydro-Electric Power Distribution Ltd**; **Medway Power Ltd**;	X	✓	Allowing a reading to be deemed on change of SSC reduces the pressure on the MOP/NHHDC to get the right reading which flies in the face of the importance being placed on the 97% target. We would like to maintain the highest level of accuracy and not provide another avenue for degrading data. Significant system changes	12 months	–
SAIC Ltd. Response provided on behalf of: **ScottishPower Energy Management Ltd.**	✓	✓	While such occurrences should be rare enough, Scottish Power can foresee situations arising where, to prevent the Settlement process from stalling, it would prove necessary to deem readings following changes of SSC.	0	–

ScottishPower Generation Ltd. ScottishPower Energy Retail Ltd. SP Manweb plc. SP Transmission Ltd. SP Distribution Ltd.			Furthermore, it believes that this change will more accurately reflect existing industry practice – where readings may be deemed on the reconfiguration or replacement of metering systems – introducing greater consistency to BSCP504. A minor process impact is anticipated.		
United Utilities (NORW) HHMOA & NHH MOA	–	–	Does not appear to affect MOAs	–	–
E.ON UK Energy Services Limited	✓	✓	This would address a know industry issue Initially this would be addressed with a manual procedure. However post implementation an automated solution may be developed.	–	–
EDF Energy, Supplier	–	✓	The current set of circumstances for deeming reads is not complete. Adding the ability to deem a read on a change of SSC should fill in a missing area. However in practice a change of SSC will almost always coincide with a change in metering details for an MPAN, which is already a circumstance in which a DC can deem reads if they are missing. The number of instances in which reads are deemed should not therefore increase significantly. Our only concern is if data quality issues lead a DC to deem a read for what they believe is a change of SSC but is purely down to data quality issue due to inconsistencies This could lead to problems when that data is amended with having to remove deemed reads to ensure settlement integrity. Presently we have no views on, therefore, if this change will be of benefit.	90	–

EDF Energy Networks (EPN), plc, EDF Energy Networks (LPN) plc, EDF Energy Networks (SPN) plc	–	–	–	–	–
AccuRead Ltd	✓	✓	The amendments to the CP are welcome and have cleared up any issues or questions we had concerning the original CP. Time would be required to develop the required changes to the NHHDC deeming system.	183 We estimate that six months development time would be required to implement this change.	–
British Energy group of BSC Parties	✓	✓	Minimal changes to systems and processes would need to be actioned.	90	–
Centrica	X	-	I am not clear why this CP has been raised. P176 concluded that reconfiguration or change of meter was an allowable deemable circumstance - this included instances where an SSC did or did not change. Under what additional circumstances would an SSC change without a reconfigured or changed meter? If the CP is agreed 'It should be noted that a reading should not be deemed for a change of SSC date which is prior to the Implementation Date of this CP.' This could cause problems as DCs are actually doing this now so if this line says in the document, there could be a risk of a number of MPANs getting stuck in the process and never getting fixed.	-	-

CP1187

Organisation	Agreement (✓/X)	Impact (✓/X)	Rationale	Mandays Required to Implement	Redline Comments
IMServ	X	✓	**Overall Summary** HP UIX is the best of a bad bunch but we could live with HP UIX relatively pain free. There would be considerable pain and disruption in implementing either Sun Solaris or IBM AIX and at an expected considerable cost to the business which we believe is not justifiable on the basis that the HP UIX solution is available. **Option I – HP UIX** **Questions:** 1. What would the impact be on your organisation if HP UX was chosen? 2. What would your organisation do if HP UX was chosen, e.g. port software, buy new hardware, etc? 3. What would be the estimated costs for your organisation if this option was chosen? **Answers**: This is by far the most attractive option of the 3 presented to us in this CP. Our company already has existing applications using the HP UIX operating systems, therefore we have the skill set required to implement and maintain HP UIX for the NHHDA and EAC/AA applications. This would ensure that the implementation costs and disruption levels would be kept to a minimum. We also think that choosing HP UIX	Depends on solution eventually agreed	_

Organisation	Agreement (✓/X)	Impact (✓/X)	Rationale	Mandays Required to Implement	Redline Comments
			is the least risk option for Elexon and all other NHHDA agents as the conversion from HP Tru64 to HP UIX would be managed by the same company HP and most current NHHDA agents are running the current HP tru64 version without the "porting" option. If this option were to be chosen then our company would purchase new hardware and not opt for the porting of the software. **Option ii – Sun Solaris** **Questions:** 4. What would the impact be on your organisation if Sun Solaris was chosen? 5. What would your organisation do if Sun Solaris was chosen, e.g. port software, buy new hardware, etc? 6. What would be the estimated costs for your organisation if this option was chosen? **Answers**: Our company has have never had any applications using Sun Solaris, therefore we have no experience of using Sun Systems. Purchasing Sun hardware is also not part of our current IT strategy. This makes assessing the impact of having to use Sun Solaris very difficult. Currently, we don't know what type of Sun Box is equivalent to our existing HP Tru64 set up in order to cost up this option at this point in time. We are attempting to get this information but it will not be available until after		

CPC00596 - Impact Assessment Responses for CP1182 v2.0, Cp1183 v2.0, CP1184 v2.0 CP1185 v2.0 and CP1187
15 February 2007   Page 22 of 41

v.1.0
© ELEXON Limited 2007

Organisation	Agreement (✓/X)	Impact (✓/X)	Rationale	Mandays Required to Implement	Redline Comments
			the deadline for responses to this CP. We can forward this information on once we have this information. From our internal knowledge of Sun Solaris, we would expect that the cost of purchasing new hardware to support Sun Solaris to be large and significantly greater than that of the HP UIX option. We have concluded that there is no business benefit to switching to Sun Solaris over HP UIX but there is increased cost, therefore from a business operations viewpoint this would be a non favourable option and one which would not make sense to us. Initial thoughts are that "Porting" from Sun Solaris back to one of our company's preferred platforms of Linux or HP UIX could be our preferred approach as this would prevent the extra operational overhead of having to employee new staff to manage and run new hardware for which we have no experience at present and avoid the costs of having to purchase new expensive hardware. The final decision on this would be dependant on the costs associated with the porting of the software which as of this moment in time are unclear as we have never opted to port the software before. Ideally, we would still not wish to port the software but use a favourable "agreed" hardware platform beneficial to all. **Option iii – IBM AIX** **Questions**:		

Organisation	Agreement (✓/X)	Impact (✓/X)	Rationale	Mandays Required to Implement	Redline Comments
			7. What would the impact be on your organisation if IBM AIX was chosen? 8. How would your organisation do if IBM AIX was chosen, e.g. port software, buy new hardware, etc? 9. What would be the estimated costs for your organisation if this option was chosen? **Answers**: Our company has only had a limited number of applications using IBM AIX and it is not one of our preferred hardware platforms. Purchasing Sun hardware is also not part of our current IT strategy. This again makes assessing the impact of having to use IBM AIX very difficult. Currently, we don't know what type of IBM AIX is equivalent to our existing HP Tru64 set up in order to cost up this option at this point in time. We are attempting to get this information but it will not be available until after the deadline for responses to this CP. We can forward this information on once we have this information. From our internal knowledge of IBM AIX, we would expect that the cost of purchasing new hardware to support this new hardware to be large and significantly greater than that of the HP UIX option. We have concluded that there is no business benefit to switching to IBM AIX over HP UIX but there is increased cost, therefore from a business operations viewpoint this would be a non favourable option and one		

Organisation	Agreement (✓/X)	Impact (✓/X)	Rationale	Mandays Required to Implement	Redline Comments
			which would not make sense to us. Initial thoughts are that "Porting" from IBM AIX back to one of our company's preferred platforms of Linux or HP UIX could be our preferred approach as this would prevent the extra operational overhead of having to employee new staff to manage and run new hardware for which we have no experience at present and avoid the costs of having to purchase new expensive hardware. The final decision on this would be dependant on the costs associated with the porting of the software which as of this moment in time are unclear as we have never opted to port the software before. Ideally, we would still not wish to port the software but use a favourable "agreed" hardware platform beneficial to all. **Other Comments:** Our company would, in an ideal world, still like to see Linux Red Hat considered as an option as we believe this to be the least cost solution delivering all the benefits of the other 3 hardware platforms listed in the CP.		
Npower Limited, Npower Northern Limited, Npower Northern Supply Limited, Npower Yorkshire Limited, Npower Yorkshire	✓	–	–	–	–

Organisation	Agreement (✓/X)	Impact (✓/X)	Rationale	Mandays Required to Implement	Redline Comments
Supply Limited, Npower Direct Limited					
Southern Electric Power Distribution; Keadby Generation Ltd; SSE Energy Supply Ltd; SSE Generation Ltd; and Scottish Hydro-Electric Power Distribution Ltd; Medway Power Ltd;	✓	✓	**Option i: HP UX** **Questions:** 1.　What would the impact be on your organisation if HP UX was chosen? 2.　What would your organisation do if HP UX was chosen, e.g. port software, buy new hardware, etc? 3.　What would be the estimated costs for your organisation if this option was chosen? **Answers**: 1. 2. 3. **Option ii: Sun Solaris** **Questions:** 4.　What would the impact be on your organisation if Sun Solaris was chosen? Minor 5.　What would your organisation do if Sun Solaris was chosen, e.g. port software, buy new hardware, etc? Buy new hardware 6.　What would be the estimated costs for your organisation if this option was chosen? £50k plus **Answers**: 4. 5. 6.	–	–

Organisation	Agreement (✓/X)	Impact (✓/X)	Rationale	Mandays Required to Implement	Redline Comments
			Option iii: IBM AIX **Questions**: 7.　What would the impact be on your organisation if IBM AIX was chosen? Minor (preferred) 8.　How would your organisation do if IBM AIX was chosen, e.g. port software, buy new hardware, etc? Potentially upgrade existing hardware or buy new hardware 9.　What would be the estimated costs for your organisation if this option was chosen? £50K **Answers**: 7. 8. 9.		
SAIC Ltd. Response provided on behalf of: **ScottishPower Energy Management Ltd.** **ScottishPower Generation Ltd.** **ScottishPower Energy Retail Ltd.** **SP Manweb plc.** **SP Transmission Ltd.** **SP Distribution Ltd.**	✓	✓	ScottishPower agrees that there should be a change to the default hardware and operating system for NHHDA and EAC/AA as the current platform has a short remaining lifetime for support by the vendor. Elexon should consider the total cost to the NHHDAs when selecting the new environment. Selecting HP UX may simplify Elexon's operational support but could cause significant problems for the NHHDAs in the industry, especially if a majority of the market participants have to port the software to their own platform of choice. This will cause complications in the contractual support agreements with Elexon. The impact upon ScottishPower will depend	Minimal notification is required, assuming that Elexon will be supporting the current environment in parallel with the new environment. This will allow ScottishPower to instigate a contractual support arrangement if necessary.	–

Organisation	Agreement (✓/X)	Impact (✓/X)	Rationale	Mandays Required to Implement	Redline Comments
			upon the environment selected by Elexon. This will either have no impact (for IBM or SUN) or will require the development of a contractual arrangement with a support company for them to port and support the NHHDA and EAC/AA software. See 'Other Comments' below. **Option i: HP UX** **Questions:** 1. What would the impact be on your organisation if HP UX was chosen? 2. What would your organisation do if HP UX was chosen, e.g. port software, buy new hardware, etc? 3. What would be the estimated costs for your organisation if this option was chosen? **Answers:** 1 ScottishPower would continue to port software onto their preferred platform. This assumes that the software could be ported (and operated) and that a porting agent could undertake the work. See 'Other Comments' below. 2 ScottishPower would have to negotiate a porting contract with a software company. It is unlikely that ScottishPower would invest in HP hardware and associated operating system. 3 The costs would involve the physical porting of software and the management of a complex contract chains. Costs associated with porting could be significant as the compatibility		

CPC00596 - Impact Assessment Responses for CP1182 v2.0, Cp1183 v2.0, CP1184 v2.0 CP1185 v2.0 and CP1187
15 February 2007   Page 28 of 41

v.1.0
© ELEXON Limited 2007

Organisation	Agreement (✓/X)	Impact (✓/X)	Rationale	Mandays Required to Implement	Redline Comments
			/ ease of porting from HP UX to ScottishPower's preferred platform is unknown. Contractual agreements and boundaries of responsibilities would have to be created, managing the software from LogicaCMG – Elexon – 3rd Party Porting Agent. See 'Other Comments' below. **Option ii: Sun Solaris** **Questions:** 4.　　What would the impact be on your organisation if Sun Solaris was chosen? 5.　　What would your organisation do if Sun Solaris was chosen, e.g. port software, buy new hardware, etc? 6.　　What would be the estimated costs for your organisation if this option was chosen? **Answers**: 4　　No impact on ScottishPower 5　　ScottishPower already uses Sun Solaris for NHHDA and EAC/AA. 6　　ScottishPower would no longer need to port software onto Sun Solaris, so the costs associated with porting software would be removed. ScottishPower's costs would be reduced if this option was selected. **Option iii: IBM AIX** **Questions:** 7.　　What would the impact be on your organisation if IBM AIX was chosen?		

CPC00596 - Impact Assessment Responses for CP1182 v2.0, Cp1183 v2.0, CP1184 v2.0 CP1185 v2.0 and CP1187
15 February 2007　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Page 29 of 41

v.1.0
© ELEXON Limited 2007

Organisation	Agreement (✓/X)	Impact (✓/X)	Rationale	Mandays Required to Implement	Redline Comments
			8. How would your organisation do if IBM AIX was chosen, e.g. port software, buy new hardware, etc? 9. What would be the estimated costs for your organisation if this option was chosen? **Answers**: 7 Minimal impact on ScottishPower. 8 ScottishPower already uses IBM AIX, although not currently for NHHDA and EAC/AA. 9 ScottishPower would no longer need to port software onto Sun Solaris, so the costs associated with porting software would be removed. ScottishPower's costs would be reduced if this option was selected. **Other Comments:** It is understood that Elexon consider the overall support of NHHDA and EAC/AA can be minimised by running them on the same platform as CVA systems – scheduled to run using Hewitt-Packard (HP) UX. It is also understood that a majority of the current NHHDAs will have to port the software from HP Tru64 onto their various platforms. ScottishPower currently has to port the NHHDA and EAC/AA software from HP AlphaServers running on Tru64 Unix 5.1b to Sun Solaris. If Elexon selects HP UX as the sole development platform then most NHHDAs will incur porting costs as they do not use (or intend to use) HP UX. This is a "market cost" and should be considered when developing the		

Organisation	Agreement (✓/X)	Impact (✓/X)	Rationale	Mandays Required to Implement	Redline Comments
			business case for adopting an alternative (or additional) hardware platform.		
			There will also be the operational complexity for market participants due to the additional layer of contractual obligations associated with support of the ported versions of the applications. Problems with NHHDA or EAC/AA software will be more difficult to assign to the correct support team – the porting agent or the development team. Since Elexon does not support ported versions of the software, it is highly likely that most versions of NHHDA and EAC/AA will, due to porting requirements, officially be unsupported. This is a risk to the operation of NHHDA and ultimately Settlements. Raising and resolution of Helpdesk problems will be more complex and arguably take longer.		
			Elexon could argue that there would not be a 'support issue' if all NHHDAs ran their systems on HP UX, but this would require considerable hardware / support / training investment by most NHHDAs.		
			Porting software assumes that HP UX source code from the software developers (LogicaCMG on behalf of Elexon) can be easily ported to whatever future environment NHHDAs select without introducing any additional complexity or errors. There is also an assumption that a software developer can be engaged to port the code accordingly.		
			ScottishPower is cognisant of the balance		

Organisation	Agreement (✓/X)	Impact (✓/X)	Rationale	Mandays Required to Implement	Redline Comments
			between their share of the 'centralised cost of supporting the Elexon development environment' and the 'individual costs associated with the ported version and complex support arrangements'.		
United Utilities (NORW) HHMOA & NHH MOA	–	–	Does not appear to affect MOAs	–	–
Siemens Energy Services	✓	✓	We would support the move to upgrade to the Sun Solaris operating system. We believe that this operating system is favoured by a significant section of the market, and as such it would result in reduced costs if this option were to be selected. **Option i: HP UX** **Questions:** 1. What would the impact be on your organisation if HP UX was chosen? 2. What would your organisation do if HP UX was chosen, e.g. port software, buy new hardware, etc? 3. What would be the estimated costs for your organisation if this option was chosen? **Answers**: 1. We would require ported versions of the software as SES use the Solaris operating system. To facilitate this a new porting contract would be	Minimum 6 months.	–

CPC00596 - Impact Assessment Responses for CP1182 v2.0, Cp1183 v2.0, CP1184 v2.0 CP1185 v2.0 and CP1187
15 February 2007   Page 32 of 41

v.1.0
© ELEXON Limited 2007

Organisation	Agreement (✓/X)	Impact (✓/X)	Rationale	Mandays Required to Implement	Redline Comments
			required.		
			2. Software would need to be ported.		
			3.		
			Option ii: Sun Solaris		
			Questions:		
			4. What would the impact be on your organisation if Sun Solaris was chosen?		
			5. What would your organisation do if Sun Solaris was chosen, e.g. port software, buy new hardware, etc?		
			6. What would be the estimated costs for your organisation if this option was chosen?		
			Answers:		
			4. We support the Solaris option as this is the platform that SES already operate on. This option would result in a significant reduction in (porting) costs for our organisation.		
			5. No action would be required if this option were to be taken.		
			6.		
			Option iii: IBM AIX		
			Questions:		
			7. What would the impact be on your organisation if IBM AIX was chosen?		
			8. How would your organisation do if IBM AIX was chosen, e.g. port software, buy new		

Organisation	Agreement (✓/X)	Impact (✓/X)	Rationale	Mandays Required to Implement	Redline Comments
			hardware, etc?		
			9. What would be the estimated costs for your organisation if this option was chosen?		
			Answers:		
			7. We would require ported versions of the software as SES use the Solaris operating system. To facilitate this a new porting contract would be required.		
			8. Software would need to be ported.		
			9.		
E.ON UK Energy Services Limited	–	–	**Option i: HP UX**	–	–
			Questions:		
			1. What would the impact be on your organisation if HP UX was chosen?		
			2. What would your organisation do if HP UX was chosen, e.g. port software, buy new hardware, etc?		
			3. What would be the estimated costs for your organisation if this option was chosen?		
			Answers:		
			1. Energy Services (ES) would look to carry on getting a ported version as we are doing now. If no ported version was available then HP UX could be used but it is not an EON IS (ONE.IS) supported platform, and ES don't		

Organisation	Agreement (✓/X)	Impact (✓/X)	Rationale	Mandays Required to Implement	Redline Comments
			support HP Unix either.		
			2. ES would carry on getting a ported version for Sun. ES will be having Sun for all of the four MPID's after the migration project completes in Q3, after spending considerable time and effort in setting up and testing this solution. ES would not want to get new HP UX after the new Sun servers reach end of life unless it becomes an ONE.IS standard, which is unlikely as it is more expensive.		
			3. Incur porting costs the same as we will be doing now for running on Sun. If had to buy HP kit would need to pay costs for this all to be set up, and all testing and reaccredidation effort would need to be added so would be quite significant impact.		
			Option ii: Sun Solaris		
			Questions:		
			4. What would the impact be on your organisation if Sun Solaris was chosen?		
			5. What would your organisation do if Sun Solaris was chosen, e.g. port software, buy new hardware, etc?		
			6. What would be the estimated costs for your organisation if this option was chosen?		
			Answers:		
			4. This is ES favourite hardware choice for		

Organisation	Agreement (✓/X)	Impact (✓/X)	Rationale	Mandays Required to Implement	Redline Comments
			this application and is supported by EON IS, and ES have the skills to manage the environment. This would be the preferred choice of native platform as wouldn't have to pay porting costs as ES will use it for all four instances after Q3 2007. 5. ES already have Sun, so would possibly look to see if porting contract could be cancelled (as it would be the base version, so nothing to port!). EON IS would renew hardware after 2010 to newer Sun specification required at that time, which would not be a huge risk. 6. Reduction in Porting costs after 2010 (or earlier if contract can be cancelled due to it being the standard version). Best option for ES and EON IS in terms of costs, work and risk and support. ES would not have to test moving platform and reaccredidation effort again so less risk. **Option iii: IBM AIX** **Questions:** 7. What would the impact be on your organisation if IBM AIX was chosen? 8. How would your organisation do if IBM AIX was chosen, e.g. port software, buy new hardware, etc? 9. What would be the estimated costs for		

Organisation	Agreement (✓/X)	Impact (✓/X)	Rationale	Mandays Required to Implement	Redline Comments
			your organisation if this option was chosen? **Answers**: 7. This is an acceptable Hardware choice and is supported by EON IS. ES do have AIX kit already, but don't have any spare capacity so would need to purchase new machines. 8. ES would probably carry on porting software to Sun until 2010, and then investigate if more cost effective to migrate to AIX, or stick with Sun and keep the porting costs. The porting costs are likely to be less effort, cost and risk than the testing and reaccredidation if moved to AIX. 9. If AIX was the standard then ES could look into migrating to that when the Sun servers become end of life (2010), which will reduce the porting costs, however would need to buy AIX kit and pay costs for this all to be set up, and all testing and reaccredidation effort would need to be added. Would also need to change how the clients interface with the AIX server as will be using Sun based Oracle Application Server middle Tier. So to summarise, EON ES preference is for the standard platform to become Sun Solaris.		
EDF Energy, Supplier	X	✓	We are rejecting at this stage because at	_	_

Organisation	Agreement (✓/X)	Impact (✓/X)	Rationale	Mandays Required to Implement	Redline Comments
			present we have been unable to assess all options to provide a view to assist on a decision. We believe additional time is required to enable a full assessment of this change.		
EDF Energy Networks (EPN), plc, EDF Energy Networks (LPN) plc, EDF Energy Networks (SPN) plc	–	–	–	–	–
AccuRead Ltd	✓	✓	AccuRead agree with the change, with a preference to move to HP-UX. The hardware/Operating System that NHHDA and EAC/AA run on will have to be replaced. **Option i: HP UX** **Questions**: 1. What would the impact be on your organisation if HP UX was chosen? 2. What would your organisation do if HP UX was chosen, e.g. port software, buy new hardware, etc? 3. What would be the estimated costs for your organisation if this option was chosen? **Answers**: 1. If HP UX was chosen AccuRead implement the change, this would require the purchase of new hardware.	365 This is to allow time for purchase of new hardware as well as technical implementation.	–

Organisation	Agreement (✓/X)	Impact (✓/X)	Rationale	Mandays Required to Implement	Redline Comments
			2. Buy new hardware and licenses 3. The initial cost to implement each option taken in isolation is similar, however as part of the larger IS costs HP-UX is anticipated to be cheaper in the longer term. **Option ii: Sun Solaris** **Questions:** 4. What would the impact be on your organisation if Sun Solaris was chosen? 5. What would your organisation do if Sun Solaris was chosen, e.g. port software, buy new hardware, etc? 6. What would be the estimated costs for your organisation if this option was chosen? **Answers**: 4. In both cases new hardware would have to be purchased and new skill would have to be bought into AccuRead either via additional staff or training 5. In both cases the decision on whether to port or buy new hardware would depend on the costs at the time and the envisaged ongoing cost include length of time the platform was like to remain the same and the likely number of release that porting would be required for. 6. The initial cost to implement each option taken in isolation is similar, however as part of the larger IS costs HP-UX is anticipated		

Organisation	Agreement (✓/X)	Impact (✓/X)	Rationale	Mandays Required to Implement	Redline Comments
			to be cheaper in the longer term. **Option iii: IBM AIX** **Questions:** 7. What would the impact be on your organisation if IBM AIX was chosen? 8. How would your organisation do if IBM AIX was chosen, e.g. port software, buy new hardware, etc? 9. What would be the estimated costs for your organisation if this option was chosen? **Answers**: 7. In both cases new hardware would have to be purchased and new skill would have to be bought into AccuRead either via additional staff or training 8. In both cases the decision on whether to port or buy new hardware would depend on the costs at the time and the envisaged ongoing cost include length of time the platform was like to remain the same and the likely number of release that porting would be required for. The initial cost to implement each option taken in isolation is similar; however as part of the larger IS costs HP-UX is anticipated to be cheaper in the longer term.		

Organisation	Agreement (✓/X)	Impact (✓/X)	Rationale	Mandays Required to Implement	Redline Comments
British Energy group of BSC Parties	–	X	Not a Non-Half Hourly Data Aggregator or a Non-Half Hourly Data Collector.	0	–
Centrica	X	✓	Currently we do not have enough information to make an informed decision on how this would affect the company. Therefore we have to reject the change until further information is available. Unable to evaluate fully	-	-

CPC00596 - Impact Assessment Responses for CP1182 v2.0, Cp1183 v2.0, CP1184 v2.0 CP1185 v2.0 and CP1187
15 February 2007   Page 41 of 41

v.1.0
© ELEXON Limited 2007