

Modification Proposal – BSCP40/03	MP No: P257 (mandatory by BSCCo)
Title of Modification Proposal: Removal of the concept of Trading Queries	
Submission Date: 08 April 2010	
<p>Description of Proposed Modification <i>(mandatory by originator)</i></p> <p>Section W of the BSC details the Trading Disputes process. It provides the BSC Parties a mechanism for correcting identified settlement errors.</p> <p>The current Trading Disputes process refers to both Trading Disputes and Trading Queries. This Modification proposes to remove the concept of Trading Queries from the BSC as they are superfluous.</p> <p>Where appropriate, this Modification Proposal seeks to incorporate elements of the Trading Query process into the Trading Disputes process.</p> <p>This Modification Proposal also seeks to allow BSCCo to close Trading Disputes (prior to a Trading Dispute being considered by the TDC) where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Trading Dispute does not meet the three criteria (i.e. 1. raised before the applicable deadline, 2. there is a settlement error, 3. the materiality exceeds the threshold); and • There is agreement from the Raising Party; and • There are no objections from any other affected Parties. <p>BSCCo would present a report to the TDC on the Trading Disputes that are closed, but the TDC would not be required to make a decision.</p>	
<p>Description of Issue or Defect that Modification Proposal Seeks to Address</p> <p>A Trading Query is a precursor to a Trading Dispute. When a Trading Query is raised, BSCCo complete a validation check. For a Query to be valid it must satisfy 3 criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Raised before the applicable deadline, 2. There is a settlement error, 3. The materiality exceeds the threshold <p>If the Trading Query is declared valid by BSCCo it is presented to the TDC. If the TDC agrees with the findings in the Trading Query then the settlement error is corrected. If the TDC disagrees with the Trading Query then a Trading Dispute is raised. If a Trading Dispute is raised it is presented to the TDC at a subsequent meeting for review and decision.</p> <p>If a Trading Query is declared invalid by BSCCo the Raising Party can accept the decision (in which case the Trading Query is presented to the TDC for closure) or they can reject the decision (in which case the Trading Query is escalated in to a Trading Dispute and presented to the TDC for decision.).</p> <p>This process is inefficient, as no matter what path the Trading Query takes it will always be presented</p>	

Modification Proposal – BSCP40/03	MP No: P257 (mandatory by BSCCo)
<p>to the TDC for determination. This means that there is no real difference between Trading Queries and Trading Disputes. Having both queries and disputes also causes confusion for Parties using the process. Removing the concept of Trading Queries would streamline the Trading Disputes process and remove any potential confusion for Parties.</p> <p>Furthermore, the current process requires all Trading Disputes to be presented to the TDC for decision even if they haven't satisfied the 3 criteria and BSCCo has not declared them valid. This is inefficient.</p>	
<p>Impact on Code (optional by originator)</p> <p>Section W.</p> <p>Other sections may also be impacted.</p>	
<p>Impact on Core Industry Documents or System Operator-Transmission Owner Code (optional by originator)</p> <p>None</p>	
<p>Impact on BSC Systems and Other Relevant Systems and Processes Used by Parties</p> <p>None</p>	
<p>Impact on other Configurable Items (optional by originator)</p> <p>BSCP11 – 'Trading Queries and Trading Disputes'</p>	
<p>Justification for Proposed Modification with Reference to Applicable BSC Objectives</p> <p>These changes would streamline the Trading Disputes process and remove any unnecessary steps that do not add any value. It would also increase the efficiency of BSCCo and the TDC when progressing Disputes. As such this Modification better facilitates Applicable Objective (d): Promoting efficiency in the implementation of the balancing and settlement arrangements.</p>	
<p>Urgency Recommended: Yes No (delete as appropriate) (optional by originator)</p>	
<p>Justification for Urgency Recommendation (mandatory by originator if recommending progression as an Urgent Modification Proposal)</p>	

Modification Proposal – BSCP40/03	MP No: P257 (mandatory by BSCCo)
Details of Proposer:	
<i>Name</i> <i>BSC Panel</i>	
<i>Organisation</i>	
<i>Telephone Number</i>	
<i>Email Address</i>	
Details of Proposer's Representative:	
<i>Name</i> <i>Chris Rowell (Modification Secretary)</i>	
<i>Organisation</i> <i>ELEXON</i>	
<i>Telephone Number</i> <i>020 7380 4337</i>	
<i>Email address</i> <i>chris.rowell@elexon.co.uk</i>	
Details of Representative's Alternate:	
<i>Name</i> <i>Jonna Piipponen</i>	
<i>Organisation</i> <i>ELEXON</i>	
<i>Telephone Number</i> <i>020 7380 4209</i>	
<i>Email address</i> <i>jonna.piipponene@elexon.co.uk</i>	
Attachments: Yes No (delete as appropriate) (mandatory by originator) If Yes, Title and No. of Pages of Each Attachment: Trading Disputes Process Review 2009 – The Final Findings Report, 38 pages	