

## 4.5 MP Form

<b>Modification Proposal – BSCP40/03</b>	MP No: P245 <i>(mandatory by BSCCo)</i>
<b>Title of Modification Proposal</b> <i>(mandatory by originator)</i> : Changes to Long Term Vacant Site Timescales	
<b>Submission Date</b> <i>(mandatory by originator)</i> : <b>23/10/09</b>	
<b>Description of Proposed Modification</b> <i>(mandatory by originator)</i>  <p>There are a number of requirements in Section S of the BSC that must be met before a Supplier can treat a site as a Long Term Vacant site. One of these requirements is that their Non Half Hourly Data Collector (NHHDC) must make two visits to the site to confirm they cannot obtain a reading as the site is not occupied. These two site visits must be ‘not less than three months and not more than seven months apart’.</p> <p>It is proposed that this requirement should be replaced with a requirement for NHHDCs to visit the site ‘not less than 75 calendar days and not more than 215 calendar days apart’.</p>	
<b>Description of Issue or Defect that Modification Proposal Seeks to Address</b> <i>(mandatory by originator)</i>  <p>In February 2007 Modification P196 ‘Treatment of Long Term Vacant Sites in Settlements’ introduced BSC Requirements which allowed Long Term Vacant sites into Settlement on zero consumption, provided that they met strict criteria. After following P196 requirements for the last two years, Suppliers have identified a number of anomalies in the process and the criteria for determining whether a Supplier may treat a site as Long Term Vacant. These were discussed by the BSCP40 issue 4 group (attended by Suppliers and Non Half Hourly Data Collectors).</p> <p>One of the issues discussed under BSCP40 issue 4 was the criterion (in Section S of the BSC and BSCP504) for a NHHDC to make two visits to a site before it can be considered a Long Term Vacant site.</p> <p>The requirements state that the NHHDC must visit the site twice, and on each occasion send the Supplier a D0004 ‘Notification of Failure to Obtain Reading’ Data Flows with Site Visit Check Codes (SVCC) of 02 ‘Site Not Occupied’. These two site visits must be in a time period of at least three calendar months apart and at most seven calendar months apart.</p> <p>This time period was originally chosen to allow Suppliers on both quarterly and six monthly read cycles to use the process without changing their read cycles. The period of seven months (as opposed to six months) was chosen to provide flexibility where a site is on a six month read cycle, but the reading is not scheduled until a couple of weeks after six months since the last reading due to the Data Collectors work order.</p> <p>The issue 4 group noted that this can equally apply to sites on a quarterly read cycle, where the reading may be attempted up to a couple of weeks prior to three months since the last reading, and that this was preventing Long Term Vacant sites entering the process. The group therefore agreed that it would be sensible to change the criteria to allow the D0004 with SVCC 02 to be received between two and a</p>	

<b>Modification Proposal – BSCP40/03</b>	MP No: P245 <i>(mandatory by BSCCo)</i>
<p>half months and seven months to classify the site as Long Term Vacant.</p> <p>In addition, a BSC Audit Issue in this area noted that some Suppliers indicated that they were unsure as to the application of calendar months, e.g. whether three calendar months could be treated as equivalent to 90 calendar days, or whether this was dependant on the number of days in the applicable months. The issue 4 group therefore felt that these requirements should be written in terms of calendar days as opposed to calendar months for clarity.</p>	
<p><b>Impact on Code</b> <i>(optional by originator)</i></p> <p>Section S – Supplier Volume Allocation Section S – Annex S-2 – Supplier Volume Allocation Rules</p>	
<p><b>Impact on Core Industry Documents or System Operator-Transmission Owner Code</b> <i>(optional by originator)</i></p> <p>None</p>	
<p><b>Impact on BSC Systems and Other Relevant Systems and Processes Used by Parties</b> <i>(optional by originator)</i></p> <p>This will impact the systems and processes put in place by Suppliers who operate the Long Term vacant site process.</p>	
<p><b>Impact on other Configurable Items</b> <i>(optional by originator)</i></p> <p>BSCP504 ‘Non Half Hourly Data Collection for SVA Metering Systems Registered in SMRS’</p>	

<b>Modification Proposal – BSCP40/03</b>	MP No: P245 <i>(mandatory by BSCCo)</i>
<p><b>Justification for Proposed Modification with Reference to Applicable BSC Objectives</b> <i>(mandatory by originator)</i></p> <p>This Modification is a tweak to the requirements implemented under P196 ‘Treatment of Long Term Vacant Sites in Settlements’, which introduced a process for dealing with Long Term Vacant sites. A review of this process under BSCP40 issue 4 has recommended a number of minor changes without changing the principles agreed under P196.</p> <p>This change to the process continues to better facilitates applicable objectives (c) in the same way as P196 as it ensures that anomalies in the criteria do not prevent Long Term Vacant sites being treated as such.</p> <p>Applicable objective (c) ‘promoting effective competition in the generation and supply of electricity’</p> <p>The proposed change to the criteria in Section S and BSCP504 would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ allow more Long Term Vacant sites to be treated as such in Settlements, improving the accuracy of consumption data in settlements (and therefore improving the accuracy of settlements);</li> <li>➤ result in a more equitable treatment of Suppliers. Currently those Suppliers who have Long Term Vacant Sites but cannot enter them into the process due to anomalies in the criteria over-pay for these sites in Settlement. This benefits those suppliers with few or no long term vacant sites due to the inequitable allocation of energy between them and associated costs; and</li> <li>➤ stop Suppliers from incurring further costs on unnecessary extra site visits by allowing earlier site visit readings to enter the Long Term Vacant process the first time around..</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Urgency Recommended: No</b></p>	
<p><b>Justification for Urgency Recommendation</b> <i>(mandatory by originator if recommending progression as an Urgent Modification Proposal)</i></p> <p>N/A</p>	

<b>Modification Proposal – BSCP40/03</b>	MP No: P245 <i>(mandatory by BSCCo)</i>
<b>Details of Proposer:</b>	
<i>Name.....Kate Potts.....</i>	
<i>Organisation...EON.....</i>	
<i>Telephone Number...02476 181350.....</i>	
<b>Email</b>	
<i>Address...kate.potts@eonenergy.com.....</i>	
<b>Details of Proposer’s Representative:</b>	
<i>Name.....Colette Baldwin.....</i>	
<i>Organisation...EON.....</i>	
<i>Telephone Number...02476 181382.....</i>	
<i>Email address.....Colette.Baldwin@eonenergy.com.....</i>	
<b>Details of Representative’s Alternate:</b>	
<i>Name.....Suzann Bemanis</i>	
<i>Organisation...E.ON.....</i>	
<b>Telephone</b>	
<i>Number.....02476188188.....</i>	
<i>Email aaddress.....suzann.bemanis@eonenergy.com.....</i>	
<b>Attachments: No</b> <i>(delete as appropriate) (mandatory by originator)</i>	
<b>If Yes, Title and No. of Pages of Each Attachment:</b>	