

CPC00644 – Impact Assessment Responses for DCP0034, DCP0035, DCP0036, DCP0037, CP1249 v2.0, CP1263 and CP1264

DCP0034 - Publication of Additional NHH Combination Data in Market Domain Data

Summary of Responses

Organisation	Capacity in which Organisation operates in (Impacted Capacity in Bold as appropriate)	Agreement Yes/No	Days Required to Implement
Central Networks	Distributor	Yes	0
TMA Data Management Ltd	HHDC, HHDA and NHHDA	Yes	90
EDF Energy	Supplier, NHH Agent and HH MOP	Yes	90
E.ON UK Energy Services Limited	NHHDC NHHDA HH MOA NHH MOA	Yes	-
Western Power Distribution	Distributor, MOA	Yes	180
Scottish Power	Supplier, LDSO, HHDA, NHHDA, HHDC, NHHDC, HHMOA, NHHMOA	Yes	270
NPower Limited	Supplier, Supplier Agents	Yes	9-6 Months
E.ON	Supplier	Yes	6 months
Scottish and Southern Energy	Supplier/Generator/ Trader / Party Agent / Distribution	Yes	0-365
CE ELECTRIC UK	LDSO	Yes	n/a
Electricity North West Ltd	LDSO	Yes	180
British Energy	Supplier; Trader; Generator; CVA MOA	Yes	-
Gemserv Ltd	MRA Service Company Ltd (MRASCo)	Yes	Various (See comments)
IMServ Europe Ltd	HHDC/DA and MO NHHDC/DA and MO	No	190 for NHHDC – see Logica for NHHDA
Independent Power Networks Limited	LDSO, UMSO, SMRA	Neutral	n/a

Detailed Impact Assessment Responses where provided

Organisation	Agreement Yes/No	Comments	Impact Yes/No
Central Networks	Yes	<p>Impact: System Change</p> <p>Implementation: We can continue to use V003 while making necessary changes to start using V004</p> <p>Comments: Option 2 (manually maintained spreadsheet) is the preferred option, though BSCP forms would still be required to update this.</p>	Yes
TMA Data Management Ltd	Yes	<p>Impact on Organisation's Systems and/or Processes? No (option 2)</p> <p>Y (option 1) – Impact on Processes</p> <p>Implementation: Option 1 is expansive and impact all market participants, whereas option 2 offers the same benefits to Suppliers during the registration process without the high cost and impact.</p> <p>Comments: This response is only if option 2, if option</p>	Yes
EDF Energy	Yes	<p>We support this provided new table becomes part of MDD as we do not wish to have to build separate loading processes for some of our systems to load from spreadsheet. We feel that spreadsheet option will not be effective and will be ignored as it is not through normal MDD update channels.</p> <p>Impact: System and process changes required</p> <p>Capacity in which Organisation is impacted: Supplier, NHH Agent and HH MOP</p>	Yes
E.ON UK Energy Services Limited	Yes	<p>We would generally support the aims of this proposed change and would see option 2 as the better way forward from our point of view as a NHHDC & NHHDA</p> <p>Capacity in which Organisation is impacted: NHHDC</p> <p>Impact on Organisation: If option 1 were to be adopted then changes to our systems would be required to process the new entity which would have no material benefit for a NHHDC-DA.</p> <p>However if option 2 were to be adopted then the supplier would have access to the</p>	Yes

Organisation	Agreement Yes/No	Comments	Impact Yes/No
		required data whilst no changes would be required to NHHDC-DA systems.	
Western Power Distribution	Yes	<p>If other market participants need increased visibility of this data then we support it in principle, although it is not entirely clear what we are expected to do with the new table, other than populate and maintain it.</p> <p>Currently, contrary to the claim in the issue description, Supplier registrations will not be rejected by SMRS, providing the combinations they submit are valid according to the existing MDD combination tables. If Suppliers are getting rejections already this extra combination table will not help as, if they don't check their flows against MDD now, they are probably unlikely to do so in future.</p> <p>Capacity in which Organisation is impacted : LDSO/SMRS</p> <p>Impact on Organisation: We will need to populate and maintain the new tables.</p> <p>We prefer option 1 of the proposed solution. Include the new tables in the D0269/D0270 flows. If something needs to be part of MDD then it should be dealt with in the same way as other similar combinations.</p>	Yes
Scottish Power	Yes	<p>We believe that by providing a single source of information to all parties is a major step forward and will help facilitate the efficient operation of the electricity market, which in turn can only aid competition.</p> <p>Our preferred option is the automated solution (Option1), as this enhanced version will contain the full MDD information in a single repository. For a similar reason we do not believe that Option 2 is a viable alternative as this would result in a disjoint in MDD data. We also believe this disjoint could in the longer term impose on the integrity of the data held as it could be possible to update the spreadsheet without updating MDD unless a stringent validation process is put in place.</p> <p>Given our preferred option for the automated process, it is our opinion that version</p>	Yes

Organisation	Agreement Yes/No	Comments	Impact Yes/No
		<p>002 of the D0269/D0270 flows should be decommissioned and that version 3 should be retained in conjunction with the new version 4, however given that a number of companies may still use version 2 any decision on which version to be decommissioned should be delayed until a full industry assessment has been carried out.</p> <p>Capacity in which Organisation is impacted: Supplier, LDSO, HHDA, NHHDA, HHDC, NHHDC, HHMOA, NHHMOA</p> <p>Impact on Organisation: Systems will have to be reconfigured to accept the updated version of MDD and the D0269/D0270 flows.</p>	
NPower Limited	Yes	<p>We fully agree with the principle of this change.</p> <p>Both options outlined in the draft change proposal would involve some development to internal systems.</p> <p>Option 1 is a more robust solution and better controlled. If this was progressed there would be an impact on all users of the decommissioned version of the current flow, although the beneficiaries of the proposal appear to be Suppliers only.</p> <p>Option 2 would have less of a cost impact across the industry but it is not as robust as an automated solution.</p> <p>There is a third option, which would be to create a completely new dataflow for this information. This has the advantage of maintaining the current versions of the MDD dataflow as they are whilst still providing a more robust method of distributing the data to Suppliers. Other recipients of the D269/270 would not have to make system changes to accommodate a new version.</p> <p>For all 3 options the dataflow should be defined in the DTC.</p> <p>Capacity in which Organisation is impacted: Supplier, NHHDA, NHHDC and MOA</p>	Yes
E.ON	Yes	The need for something that aligns the combinations in MDD with those found in	Yes

Organisation	Agreement Yes/No	Comments	Impact Yes/No
		<p>Condition 4 statements of DNOs is long overdue.</p> <p>Option 1 would be E.ON's preferred option. This would mean more development but is more reliable and robust.</p> <p>Capacity in which Organisation is impacted : Supplier</p> <p>Impact on Organisation Changes to our system will be required.</p> <p>Implementation Option 1 would require at least six months development lead time.</p>	
Scottish and Southern Energy	Yes	<p>Impact on Organisation: Changes to systems and processes, the automated solution will have a significance impact on systems.</p> <p>The manual solution seems preferable provided the Elexon costs are acceptable.</p>	
CE ELECTRIC UK	Yes	<p>We agree on the basis that this change will allow all market domain party users to have fully aligned views of the full settlement configuration combinations.</p> <p>Capacity in which Organisation is impacted LDSO</p> <p>Impact on Organisation: We suggest that at least 6 months are given for the implementation of this DCP, specifically of the changes are made to the market domain data data flow (D0269 and D0270)</p>	Yes
Electricity North West Ltd	Yes	<p>Capacity in which Organisation is impacted: LDSO</p> <p>Impact on Organisation (e.g. systems/process changes) System and process changes are required</p>	LDSO
Gemserv Ltd	Yes	<p>We would prefer the manual solution as it would avoid any impact on DTC flows.</p> <p>Impact: The automated solution requires a change in the D0269 and D0270 flows. The extra version (004) of the flows proposed by this change could necessitate the decommissioning of earlier versions of the flow (002 or 003).</p> <p>Implementation: Changes to DTC - Implementation timescales:</p>	Yes

Organisation	Agreement Yes/No	Comments	Impact Yes/No
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From point CP is submitted to MDB decision – approximately 1 month From MDB approval to implementation – standard implementation timescale for any changes to the DTC is 6 months. Changes would be implemented in line with MRA release strategy (there are three releases a year, in February, June and November). If it is a system change then from the date of approval, industry would need 6 months to update their systems accordingly. A procedural change would take approximately 3 months. 	
IMServ Europe Ltd	No	<p>This would have an impact on the NHHDA software and also our bespoke NHHDC software as the structure of the revised flow would necessitate a change to the load and processing packages to accommodate this. This is not just a cosmetic change and would require system change with associated costs which we cannot justify as this would add no real value for us as a NHHDC / DA agent.</p> <p>Capacity in which Organisation is impacted : NHHDC and DA</p> <p>Impact on Organisation: System changes – see above</p>	Yes
Independent Power Networks Limited	Neutral	<p>IPNL agrees that the proposal will improve efficiency in the BSC. Though both options presented improve efficiency, IPNL would support option 2 over option 1 as the implementation costs are perceived to be less.</p> <p>Capacity in which Organisation is impacted None identified</p> <p>Impact on Organisation None identified</p>	No

DCP0035 - Automated Submission and Validation of BSCP509 Forms

Summary of Responses

Organisation	Capacity in which Organisation operates in	Agreement Yes/No	Days Required to Implement
TMA Data Management Ltd	HHDC, HHDA and NHHDA	yes	-
EDF Energy	Supplier, NHH Agent and HH MOP	Yes	30
E.ON UK Energy Services Limited	NHHDC NHHDA HH MOA NHH MOA	Yes	-
Western Power Distribution	Distributor, MOA	Yes	60
Scottish Power	Supplier, LDSO, HHDA, NHHDA, HHDC, NHHDC, HHMOA, NHHMOA	Yes	60
NPower Limited	Supplier, Supplier Agents	Yes	-
E.ON	Supplier	Yes	-
CE ELECTRIC UK	LSDO	Yes	0
Electricity North West Ltd	LSDO	Yes	180
British Energy	Supplier; Trader; Generator; CVA MOA	Yes	-
Scottish and Southern Energy	Supplier/Generator/ Trader / Party Agent / Distributo	In principle – see comments	0
Gemserv Ltd	MRA Service Company Ltd (MRASCo)	Neutral	-
Independent Power Networks Limited	LDSO, UMSO, SMRA	Neutral	n/a

Detailed Impact Assessment Responses where provided

Organisation	Agreement Yes/No	Comments	Impact Yes/No
TMA Data Management Ltd	Yes	This is a beneficial change for all Market participants, existing or new and for Elexon	No
EDF Energy	Yes	<p>Capacity in which Organisation is impacted: All areas</p> <p>Impact on Organisation: Amending internal processes</p> <p>Implementation: 30 Calendar days</p>	Yes

Organisation	Agreement Yes/No	Comments	Impact Yes/No
E.ON UK Energy Services Limited	Yes	<p>These changes would simplify the application process and may eliminate some sources of error.</p> <p>Capacity in which Organisation is impacted : NHHDC-DA MOA</p> <p>Impact on Organisation: In general terms the impacts will be limited to the administration of MDD updates</p>	Yes
Western Power Distribution	Yes	<p>Capacity in which Organisation is impacted: Distributor, MOA</p> <p>Impact on Organisation: Will need to adopt new process for submission of data.</p> <p>Implementation: 60 Days - Best guess – its hard to say until we have more details about exactly what is proposed.</p>	Yes
Scottish Power	Yes	<p>We agree that the current process is overly manual and laborious and would welcome a more automated system. However we have reservations that the required level of data validation and referential integrity would need to be high in order for such a change to be successful and consequently our support is conditional on such validation being included in any CP to result from this initial draft CP.</p> <p>There is the risk that minimal validation of data could lead to participants being less stringent in their review of new entries believing that initial validation had already covered such checks. This could potentially lead to problems of inconsistent data entering MDD.</p> <p>For such an automated system to be progressed we would expect far more validation than is currently proposed within the current DCP. We fully understand that this would incur higher costs for the work to be undertaken however, the risk of inconsistent MDD data in MDD could have significant issues for all market participants and as such any changes to the current MDD process should be undertaken with this high risk in</p>	Yes

Organisation	Agreement Yes/No	Comments	Impact Yes/No
		<p>mind.</p> <p>Submitting a DCP which does not strenuously attempt to minimise this risk raises the question of why progress it all and should we perhaps instead continue with the proven manual process which has shown itself to be relatively robust, when combined with Participant review, in ensuring that MDD data remains consistent.</p> <p>Capacity in which Organisation is impacted (e.g. Supplier, HHDC, etc) DSO, Supplier,</p> <p>Impact on Organisation: Internal processes would need updated if such a change was progressed</p> <p>Implementation: 60 We would prefer to see 60 days to allow internal process updates.</p> <p>Comments: We welcome the inclusion of point 4A which will ensure that all parties publish all relevant combinations to aid participation in the market</p> <p>Within Attachment A ScottishPower feel there are a number of areas which should be considered. The additional points below are by no means exhaustive and we would suggest that more work is undertaken in this area prior to progressing the matter further.</p> <p>7a states correct combinations of MTC/SSC/LLFC/PC. Currently this combination is impossible to make with the current database however we are aware that this is being considered within DCP34. As you will be aware there is cascading referential integrity and validation would be required on the individual data item tables followed by the MTC/SSC, MTC/LLFC/SSC tables and for HH MTC/LLFC tables.</p> <p>It may be useful to include Effective To dates.</p>	

Organisation	Agreement Yes/No	Comments	Impact Yes/No
		<p>Careful consideration should be taken with MTCs which can be end dated but must remain in the system until they are fully progressed through Settlements and any dispute window.</p> <p>SSC and PC integrity via the Valid Settlement Configuration profile class table will also potentially require validation.</p> <p>As stated above, this list is by no means exhaustive and we would expect further work to be undertaken by Elexon prior to progressing the DCP.</p>	
E.ON	Yes	E.ON supports this change. Some business process changes may be necessary if we need to submit new MDD.	No
Electricity North West Ltd	Yes	<p>Improvements in the submission/validation process for BSCP509 forms are required - there is currently too much scope for manual error with typing and re-typing of submitted forms, as well as being time consuming for all Parties.</p> <p>Capacity in which Organisation is impacted: LDSO</p> <p>Impact on Organisation: There will be a requirement for system changes</p>	Yes
Scottish and Southern Energy	In principle	<p>We agree in principle that solutions to automate the validation and submission process should be considered. However, this draft change appears to be inconsistent with the SVG92 minutes. The SVG approved '...a draft change proposal to be raised to investigate solutions to an automated approach for the submission and validation of MDD Change Requests as detailed in Attachment D..'</p> <p>Impact on Organisation Depending on the solution, changes may be necessary to process.</p> <p>How much Implementation Notification would be required from receipt of approved</p>	

Organisation	Agreement Yes/No	Comments	Impact Yes/No
		redline text changes? Implementation: 0 calendar day Depending on solution, if no impact on processes.	
Gemserv Ltd	Neutral	-	No
Independent Power Networks Limited	Neutral	<p>IPNL believe that this proposal will increase efficiency in the MDD approval process. This process is dependent however on our comments for CP0036 where "the relevant communications will... [need to]... be made with the LDSO to ensure that the combinations to be submitted are valid in that area. IPNL also believes that it will be necessary for the DSO to have agreed an appropriate LLFC with the supplier before a formal submission is made for inclusion in MDD."</p> <p>Capacity in which Organisation is impacted (e.g. Supplier, HHDC, etc) See above comments and those for CP0036</p> <p>Impact on Organisation (e.g. systems/process changes) See above comments and those for CP0036</p>	No

DCP0036 - Amendments to BSCP509 following an expert group review of the Market Domain Data process

Summary of Responses

Organisation	Capacity in which Organisation operates in (Impacted Capacity in Bold as appropriate)	Agreement Yes/No	Days Required to Implement
TMA Data Management Ltd	HHDC, HHDA and NHHDA	Yes	-
EDF Energy	Supplier, NHH Agent and HH MOP	Yes	0
E.ON UK Energy Services Limited	NHHDC NHHDA HH MOA NHH MOA	Yes	-
Western Power Distribution	Distributor, MOA	Yes	-
Scottish Power	Supplier, LDSO, HHDA, NHHDA, HHDC, NHHDC, HHMOA, NHHMOA	Yes	0
Independent Power Networks Limited	LDSO, UMSO, SMRA	Yes	0
NPower Limited	Supplier, Supplier Agents	Yes	-
E.ON	Supplier	Yes	-
Scottish and Southern Energy	Supplier/Generator/ Trader / Party Agent / Distributo	Yes	-
CE ELECTRIC UK	LDSO	Yes	0
Electricity North West Ltd	LDSO	Yes	0
Siemens Metering Services	NHHDA, NHHDC, NHHMO, HHDC, HHDA, HHMO	Yes	-
British Energy	Supplier; Trader; Generator; CVA MOA	Accept (subject to resolution of comments)	
Gemserv Ltd	MRA Service Company Ltd (MRASCo)	Neutral	-

Detailed Impact Assessment Responses where provided

Organisation	Agreement Yes/No	Comments	Impact Yes/No
EDF Energy	Yes	No Impact	No
E.ON UK Energy Services Limited	Yes	The proposed changes should improve the clarity of the documentation and reflect current practice	No

Scottish Power	Yes	We welcome the recommendations of the MDD Expert Group that will bring further clarity to BSCP 509. Impact: Documentation changes only	
Independent Power Networks Limited	Yes	IPNL supports this proposal as long as the relevant communications will be made with the LDSO to ensure that the combinations to be submitted are valid in that area. IPNL also believes that it will be necessary for the LDSO to have agreed an appropriate LLFC with the supplier before a formal submission is made for inclusion in MDD. Capacity in which Organisation is impacted: LDSO Impact on Organisation Process – Validation to be carried out on supplier's combinations	Yes
British Energy	Accept (subject to resolution of comments)	Section 1.5 "Associated BSC Procedures" - Agree with removal of BSCP11 "Trading Queries and Trading Disputes" but need to make clear the correct process in the case of an incorrect MDD Publish. Appendix 4.2 "MDD Entity Change Request Forms" - Disagree that there is a need to remove either description or justification field. "Description" should state what the required change is; "Justification" should state <i>why</i> the described change should take place. Therefore, the two fields are not duplications should therefore remain as current. BSCP509 Appendix: MDD Entity Change Request Forms - Address Line 1 is already mandatory and should only refer to address information. Suggestion would be to create a new mandatory field called "Market Participant Name" to increase clarity, both in participant understanding and in the quality of information included in this field.	-

DCP0037 - Market Domain Data Review and Approval Process: Proposed Timetable for SVG meetings

Summary of Responses

Organisation	Capacity in which Organisation operates in (Impacted Capacity in Bold as appropriate)	Agreement Yes/No	Days Required to Implement
TMA Data Management Ltd	HHDC, HHDA and NHHDA	Yes	-
EDF Energy	Supplier, NHH Agent and HH MOP	Yes	0
E.ON UK Energy Services Limited	NHHDC NHHDA HH MOA NHH MOA	Yes	-
Western Power Distribution	Distributor, MOA	Yes	-
Scottish Power	Supplier, LDSO, HHDA, NHHDA, HHDC, NHHDC, HHMOA, NHHMOA	Yes	0
Independent Power Networks Limited	LDSO, UMSO, SMRA	Yea	0
NPower Limited	Supplier, Supplier Agents	Yes	0
E.ON	Supplier	Yes	-
Scottish and Southern Energy	Supplier/Generator/ Trader / Party Agent / Distributo	Yes	-
CE ELECTRIC UK	LSDO	Yes	0
Electricity North West Ltd	LSDO	Yes	-
British Energy	Supplier; Trader; Generator; CVA MOA	Yes	-
Siemens Metering Services	NHHDA, NHHDC, NHHMO, HHDC, HHDA, HHMO	Yes	-
Gemserv Ltd	MRA Service Company Ltd (MRASCo)	Neutral	-

Detailed Impact Assessment Responses where provided

Organisation	Agreement Yes/No	Comments	Impact Yes/No
TMA Data Management Ltd	Yes	This is a very useful change as currently there can be a couple of month between the PAB date where a new market participant is qualified and the date it can go live. This change ensures that a new market participant can go live in the MDD following its qualification.	No
EDF Energy	Yes	We would also like Elexon to consider allowing more time for industry parties to asses MDD changes. Presently we can get as little as 2 days to assess changes.	No

E.ON UK Energy Services Limited	Yes	Capacity in which Organisation is impacted NHHDC-DA MOA Impact on Organisation - Limited impact on administration of MDD update applications	
Scottish Power	Yes	Given that SVG approve MDD changes it seems eminently sensible to align the MDD approval process with the SVG Meeting dates.	No
Electricity North West Ltd	Yes	We agree that it is important to allow for adequate consideration (and discussion in a meeting) by the SVG of any issue associated with a MDD Change Request	No
Gemserv Ltd	Neutral	-	No

CP1249 v2.0 - Correcting MDDM and SVAA Terminology

Summary of Responses

Organisation	Capacity in which Organisation operates in (Impacted Capacity in Bold as appropriate)	Agreement Yes/No	Days Required to Implement
TMA Data Management Ltd	HHDC, HHDA and NHHDA	Yes	-
EDF Energy	Supplier, NHH Agent and HH MOP	Yes	0
E.ON UK Energy Services Limited	NHHDC NHHDA HH MOA NHH MOA	Yes	-
Western Power Distribution	Distributor, MOA	Yes	-
Scottish Power	Supplier, LDSO, HHDA, NHHDA, HHDC, NHHDC, HHMOA, NHHMOA	Yes	0
Npower Limited	Supplier, Supplier Agents	Yes	-
E.ON	Supplier	Yes	-
Scottish and Southern Energy	Supplier/Generator/ Trader / Party Agent / Distributo	Yes	0
CE ELECTRIC UK	LDSO	Yes	-
Electricity North West Ltd	LDSO	Yes	-
British Energy	Supplier; Trader; Generator; CVA MOA	Yes	-
Siemens Metering Services	NHHDA, NHHDC, NHHMO, HHDC, HHDA, HHMO	Yes	-
Gemserv Ltd	MRA Service Company Ltd (MRASCo)	Neutral	-
Independent Power Networks Limited	LDSO, UMSO, SMRA	Neutral	n/a

Detailed Impact Assessment Responses where provided

Organisation	Agreement Yes/No	Comments	Impact Yes/No
E.ON UK Energy Services Limited	Yes	Removes potential ambiguity Capacity in which Organisation is impacted: NHHDC-DA MOA Impact on Organisation: It will be necessary to review existing processes to ensure that they are compliant with the revised documentation	Yes

Scottish Power	Yes	Documentation changes only	No
----------------	-----	----------------------------	----

Comments on redline text

No.	Organisation	Document name (e.g. BSCPXXXX/C oPX)	Location (Section and paragraph numbers)	Severity Code (H/M/L – see below)	Comments by Reviewer
1	British Energy	BSCP514		M	' HHMO MDDM SVAA 001 ' - Not appropriate unless BSCP514 section 5.1 is amended
2	British Energy	BSCP514		M	' NHHMO MDDM SVAA 001 ' - Not appropriate unless BSCP514 section 6.1 is amended
3	British Energy	BSCP508		M	' SVAA LDSO 001 ' - Where is this referenced in BSCP508?
4	British Energy	BSCP508		M	' SVAA BSC Service Desk 001 ' - Suggest BSCP508 section 3.1.9 is amended (NHD amended to BSC Service Desk)
5	British Energy	BSCP508		M	The Authority BSC Service Desk 001 - Suggest BSCP508 section 3.7.12 is amended (NHD amended to BSC Service Desk)
6	British Energy	BSCP508		M	Transmission Company BSC Service Desk 001 - Suggest BSCP508 section 3.7.12 is amended (NHD amended to BSC Service Desk)
7	British Energy	BSCP508		M	BSC Panel BSC Service Desk 001 - Suggest BSCP508 section 3.7.12 is amended (NHD amended to BSC Service Desk)
8	British Energy	BSCP508		M	SMRS BSC Service Desk 001 - Suggest BSCP508 section 3.7.12 is amended (NHD amended to BSC Service Desk)
9	British Energy	BSCP508		M	SAA BSC Service Desk 001 - Suggest BSCP508 section 3.7.12 is amended (NHD amended to BSC Service Desk)
10	British Energy	BSCP508		M	NHHMO BSC Service Desk 001 - Suggest BSCP508 section 3.7.12 is amended (NHD amended to BSC Service Desk)

11	British Energy	BSCP508		M	NHHDC BSC Service Desk 001 - Suggest BSCP508 section 3.7.12 is amended (NHD amended to BSC Service Desk)
12	British Energy	BSCP508		M	NHHDA BSC Service Desk 001 - Suggest BSCP508 section 3.7.12 is amended (NHD amended to BSC Service Desk)
13	British Energy	BSCP508		M	LDSO BSC Service Desk 001 - Suggest BSCP508 section 3.7.12 is amended (NHD amended to BSC Service Desk)
14	British Energy	BSCP508		M	HHMO BSC Service Desk 001 - amended Suggest BSCP508 section 3.7.12 is amended (NHD to BSC Service Desk)
15	British Energy	BSCP508		M	HHMO BSC Service Desk 001 - Suggest BSCP508 section 3.7.12 is amended (NHD amended to BSC Service Desk)
16	British Energy	BSCP508		M	HHDC BSC Service Desk 001 - Suggest BSCP508 section 3.7.12 is amended (NHD amended to BSC Service Desk)
17	British Energy	BSCP508		M	HHDA BSC Service Desk 001 - Suggest BSCP508 section 3.7.12 is amended (NHD amended to BSC Service Desk)
18	British Energy	BSCP508		M	FAA BSC Service Desk 001 - Suggest BSCP508 section 3.7.12 is amended (NHD amended to BSC Service Desk)
19	British Energy	BSCP508		M	Supplier BSC Service Desk 001 - Suggest BSCP508 section 3.7.12 is amended (NHD amended to BSC Service Desk)
20	British Energy	BSCP508		M	P0184 MDD Matrix Changes BSCP508 - MDD Recipient BSC Service Desk 001 Suggest BSCP508 section 3.8.1 is amended (NHD amended to BSC Service Desk) also for consistency in other instances all MDD recipients are defined individually above for P0035 rather than collectively as here.

CP1263 - Changes to Communication Requirements Document arising from Project Isis

Summary of Responses

Organisation	Capacity in which Organisation operates in	Agreement Yes/No	Days Required to Implement
TMA Data Management Ltd	HHDC, HHDA and NHHDA	Yes	-
EDF Energy	Supplier, NHH Agent and HH MOP	Yes	-
Western Power Distribution	Distributor, MOA	Yes	-
Scottish Power	Supplier, LDSO, HHDA, NHHDA, HHDC, NHHDC, HHMOA, NHHMOA	Yes	1
Independent Power Networks Limited	LDSO, UMSO, SMRA	Yes	20
NPower Limited	Supplier, Supplier Agents	Yes	-
E.ON	Supplier	Yes	-
Scottish and Southern Energy	Supplier/Generator/ Trader / Party Agent / Distributo	Yes	-
CE ELECTRIC UK	LSDO	Neutral	0
British Energy	Supplier; Trader; Generator; CVA MOA	Neutral	0
Siemens Metering Services	NHHDA, NHHDC, NHHMO, HHDC, HHDA, HHMO	Neutral	-
Gemserv Ltd	MRA Service Company Ltd (MRASCo)	Neutral	-
E.ON UK Energy Services Limited	NHHDC NHHDA HH MOA NHH MOA	Neutral	0

Detailed Impact Assessment Responses where provided

Organisation	Agreement Yes/No	Comments	Impact Yes/No
Independent Power Networks Limited	Yes	<p>The proposed changes will amend the CRD and consequently clarify the new technical interface requirements.</p> <p>Capacity in which Organisation is impacted : LDSO</p> <p>Impact on Organisation Systems – low grade user</p> <p>Implementation: 20 calendar day Though this is concerning changes to the CRD, the consequential changes will impact our systems.</p>	Yes

CP1264 - Clarification of Password Requirements in the Codes of Practice

Summary of Responses

Organisation	Capacity in which Organisation operates in (Impacted Capacity in Bold as appropriate)	Agreement Yes/No	Days Required to Implement
TMA Data Management Ltd	HHDC, HHDA and NHHDA	Yes	-
EDF Energy	Supplier, NHH Agent and HH MOP	Yes	30
IMServ Europe Ltd	HHDC/DA and MO NHHDC/DA and MO	Yes	0
E.ON UK Energy Services Limited	NHHDC NHHDA HH MOA NHH MOA	Yes	-
Western Power Distribution	Distributor, MOA	Yes	30
Scottish Power	Supplier, LDSO, HHDA, NHHDA, HHDC, NHHDC, HHMOA, NHHMOA	Yes	1
NPower Limited	Supplier, Supplier Agents	Yes	-
E.ON	Supplier	Yes	-
Scottish and Southern Energy	Supplier/Generator/ Trader / Party Agent / Distributo	Yes	0
British Energy	Supplier; Trader; Generator; CVA MOA	Yes	-
Siemens Metering Services	NHHDA, NHHDC, NHHMO, HHDC, HHDA, HHMO	Yes	0
Gemserv Ltd	MRA Service Company Ltd (MRASCo)	Neutral	-
Independent Power Networks Limited	LDSO, UMSO, SMRA	Neutral	0
CE ELECTRIC UK	LSDO	Neutral	-
Electricity North West Ltd	LDSO	Neutral	-

Detailed Impact Assessment Responses where provided

Organisation	Agreement Yes/No	Comments	Impact Yes/No
EDF Energy	Yes	Capacity in which Organisation is impacted: MOP Impact on Organisation: Process amendments	Yes
E.ON UK Energy Services Limited	Yes	The proposed change will remove any ambiguity whilst allowing flexibility in developing appropriate solutions.	

Western Power Distribution	Yes	Capacity in which Organisation is impacted MOA Impact on Organisation Documentation change	
Scottish Power	Yes	Documentation Changes Only	No
Siemens Metering Services	Yes	Capacity in which Organisation is impacted DC & MO Impact on Organisation: This proposal will not impact the way SMS have implemented the Code of Practice Password Control. The proposed rewording for CoP6 and 7 allows for 6 alpha numeric characters. As the alpha characters can be in the range A - Z they could also be in Hex format (Range O - F). For consistency with CoP1, 2, 3 and 5 the additional wording "For hexadecimal character passwords, ensure that passwords are formed from six upper case insensitive hexadecimal characters (0 to F)", should be included, so that all CoP's will have a similar format.	0
Independent Power Networks Limited	Neutral	This is not perceived to have any significant affect on IPNL.	No