

## Non-Confidential Responses for CPC00574

### Detailed Level Impact Assessment of P198 Alternative

Carried out by	Comments
Michelle Derbyshire <b>United Utilities I &amp; C Solutions</b>	<b>I can confirm that this CP does not affect NORW or UUNL MOP</b>
Sue Edwards <b>Southern Electric Power Distribution; Keadby Generation Ltd; SSE Energy Supply Ltd; SSE Generation Ltd; and Scottish Hydro-Electric Power Distribution Ltd; Medway Power Ltd;</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Would either of the potential options for an Alternative Modification P198, as outlined in the attached Requirements Specification, have any additional impact on your organisation compared with Proposed Modification P198? <b>Yes, costs are the same for both options if there is a change to the Settlement Report flow.</b></li> <li>2. If yes, please provide a description of the additional impact, any additional costs which would be incurred, and any additional required development timescales (with supporting rationale). For clarity, please detail the impacts of each potential Alternative option separately. <b>[Confidential cost information removed]</b></li> <li>3. Any other comments: <b>For option 1, would we be expected to hold additional data. E.g. dates for seasonal TLF, if so the costs for making systems changes would be greater.</b></li> </ol>
Dave Morton <b>EDF Energy, Supplier Response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Would either of the potential options for an Alternative Modification P198, as outlined in the attached Requirements Specification, have any additional impact on your organisation compared with Proposed Modification P198? <b>No</b></li> <li>2. If yes, please provide a description of the additional impact, any additional costs which would be incurred, and any additional required development timescales (with supporting rationale). For clarity, please detail the impacts of each potential Alternative option separately.</li> <li>3. Any other comments:</li> </ol>

<p>Alastair Barnsley  <b>E.ON UK Energy Services Limited</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Would either of the potential options for an Alternative Modification P198, as outlined in the attached Requirements Specification, have any additional impact on your organisation compared with Proposed Modification P198? <b>No</b></li> <li>2. If yes, please provide a description of the additional impact, any additional costs which would be incurred, and any additional required development timescales (with supporting rationale). For clarity, please detail the impacts of each potential Alternative option separately.</li> <li>3. Any other comments:</li> </ol>
<p>Gary Henderson  <b>SAIC Ltd</b>  <b>Scottish Power UK plc</b>  <b>ScottishPower Energy Management Ltd.</b>  <b>ScottishPower Generation Ltd.</b>  <b>ScottishPower Energy Retail Ltd.</b>  <b>SP Manweb plc.</b>  <b>SP Transmission Ltd.</b>  <b>SP Distribution Ltd.</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Would either of the potential options for an Alternative Modification P198, as outlined in the attached Requirements Specification, have any additional impact on your organisation compared with Proposed Modification P198?   <b>Yes, both of them.</b></li> <li>2. If yes, please provide a description of the additional impact, any additional costs which would be incurred, and any additional required development timescales (with supporting rationale). For clarity, please detail the impacts of each potential Alternative option separately.   <b>The additional changes for either option, while having impact on the overall system solution, will be incorporated within the changes as required for P198 Proposed. They will therefore have a negligible impact on the overall implementation timescales compared with P198 Proposed. Likewise, there will be no marked increase in associated costs.</b></li> <li>3. Any other comments:   <b>This is also on the basis of the same assumption as P198 Proposed that the notice required for implementation should be from the date of definitive decision for implementation (i.e. after all the appeals if applicable), as P82 experience showed that unnecessary costs were expended by the industry as a result of that process.</b></li> </ol>

Louise Allport  
**British Energy Power & Energy Trading Ltd, British Energy Generation Ltd, British Energy Direct Ltd, British Energy Generation (UK) Ltd, Eggborough Power Ltd**

1. Would either of the potential options for an Alternative Modification P198, as outlined in the attached Requirements Specification, have any additional impact on your organisation compared with Proposed Modification P198? **Yes**
2. If yes, please provide a description of the additional impact, any additional costs which would be incurred, and any additional required development timescales (with supporting rationale). For clarity, please detail the impacts of each potential Alternative option separately.

**If the seasonal TLF values were adopted as the alternative modification we would require an extra month in additional to the original timescale of 3 – 6 months to allow time for commercial forecasting analysis.**

**We would expect that the phasing alternative would have an additional minor impact on systems and business processes compared with the original proposed modification. Our original development timescale of 3 – 6 months remains unchanged.**

3. Any other comments:

**None at this time.**