

Responses for MC00036

DLIA of P114

Responses due 27 January 2003

| Organisation | Comments |
|---|--|
| Jim Beynon LE Group | <p>No impact (both solutions).</p> <p>This modification is not applicable to our organisation from a systems / process viewpoint as we are a BSC Party and therefore already have access to SO142 data etc. However, we do have concerns regarding the sharing of confidential data upon which we comment in our responses to the current P102 and P114 Assessment consultations.</p> |
| Rachael Gardener Aquila Networks | <p>No comment.</p> |
| Dave Morton SEEBOARD | <p>No impact.</p> |
| Clare Talbot NGC | <p>Limited impact has been identified on our systems and processes from this modification proposal and the solutions outlined in the Requirements Specification.</p> <p>We would require a timescale of 10 working days notice of implementation for each of the solutions outlined in the Requirements Specification.</p> <p>No cost impacts have been identified arising from the implementation of any of the solutions outlined in the Requirements Specification.</p> <p>As a contract trading party, we would not utilise the benefits of this modification.</p> |
| Sue Macklin Scottish and Southern | <p>No impact.</p> <p>From a cost sharing perspective then our preference would be for non-trading Parties to pay their share of the costs, but at the rates talked about the difference would be small.</p> <p>The solution should not in any way degrade performance of or access to the BMRS for trading Parties.</p> |
| Man Kwong Liu Scottish Power | <p>There may be some minor procedural and documentation impacts on our organisation. Please also see our comments on the P114 Assessment Consultation.</p> <p>Solution 2 will probably require at least 20 days to implement. Please also see our comments on the P114 Assessment Consultation.</p> <p>Minor cost implication provided we do not have to pay for the central systems costs. Please also see our comments on the P114 Assessment Consultation.</p> |

