

Draft Change Proposal – BSCP40/01

DCP No: 0004

Version No: **1.0**
(mandatory by BSCCo)

Title (mandatory by originator) Changes to BSCP14 ‘Processing of Manifest Error Claims’ to comply with the BSC.

Description of Problem/Issue (mandatory by originator)

BSCP14 is unclear on the number of Manifest Errors that must be claimed for a sequence of Bid Offer Acceptances (BOAs). As it is set out currently, BSCP14 does not adequately define the processing of a Manifest Error claim raised by a Lead Party and the processing of a Manifest Error claim raised by the Transmission Company. This could lead to the incorrect processing of Manifest Error claims, as happened recently when one Manifest Error was claimed for multiple BOAs. This means that BSCP14 is not in accordance with Section Q of the Code which states that a Manifest Error is “*in relation to a Bid-Offer Pair*”, if submitted by a Lead Party, and “*in relation to an Acceptance*” if submitted by the Transmission Company.

There are also several typographical errors that have been found in BSCP14 that need to be corrected.

Justification for Change (mandatory by originator)

As this BSCP is very often the first point of reference for parties, it is absolutely vital that it is clear on the number of Manifest Error that can be claimed for a sequence of BOAs. The current lack of clarity in the BSCP increases the likelihood of a misunderstanding of the processing of Manifest Error claims, as was shown by a recent incident where a set of Manifest Errors that were claimed included two claims for four BOAs. This runs contrary to Section Q of the Code which states that there can only be one claim per BOA. The proposed changes to BSCP14 should ensure that there will be greater clarity for Parties over what can be claimed as a Manifest error, and thus ensure that there is consistency between BSCP14 and the Code.

The proposed changes would ensure that the BSCP has a better definition of a “Manifest Error” as it is written in the Code, thereby preventing any misinterpretation of the range of items to be included in a Manifest Error, such as a Manifest Error being claimed for multiple BOAs.

Proposed Solution(s) (mandatory by originator)

Clarify the number of Manifest Error claims that must be raised per BOA as follows:

- Section 1.6 “Overview of Manifest Error Treatment in the BSC”, does not make any provision for the Manifest Error claims raised by the Transmission Company, meaning that a “Manifest Error” has not been defined in this Section as it is in the Code. The first paragraph should be altered to make provision for Manifest Error claims raised by the Transmission Company, and thus give a full overview of Manifest Error treatment in the BSC (changes are underlined and written in red below).
“BSC Section Q7 provides for either the Lead Party of a BM Unit or for the Transmission Company to raise a claim of Manifest Error in relation to a particular Bid or Offer that has been accepted in the Balancing Mechanism, or in the instance that the Transmission Company raise a Manifest Error claim in relation to an acceptance of one or more of the Bids or Offers accepted. Such a Manifest Error may arise if a Lead Party submits an erroneously priced Bid/Offer in relation to one of its BM Units, and this Bid/Offer is

Draft Change Proposal – BSCP40/01

DCP No: 0004

Version No: **1.0**
(mandatory by BSCCo)

accepted; or, if the Transmission Company erroneously accepts a Bid/Offer, whether the acceptance is erroneous in terms of volume or price.”

- Section 3.1.1, which relates to the Manifest Error claims raised by the Lead Party should have a footnote added as follows: *“The Manifest Error claim relates to a particular Bid-Offer Pair.”*
- Section 3.2.1 which relates to Manifest Error claims raised by the Transmission Company should have a footnote added as follows: *“The Manifest Error claim relates to a particular Bid Offer Acceptance.”*
- Section 3.3, which relates to the investigation and adjudication of Manifest Error claims, should be changed by having step 3.3.2 removed and placed after the current step 3.3.8, in order to bring BSCP14 into accordance with the Code. The discrepancy in BSCP14 can be removed by changing the “WHEN” reference in 3.3.2 to *“On the same Working Day as 3.3.8”*. The “WHEN” reference in 3.3.13 should be to *“Within 1 WD of 3.3.13”*. This would put the process in line with the Code, as BSCCo can only send an invoice to the Raising Party after the Trading and Disputes Committee (TDC) have validated the Manifest Error claim. As the BSCP currently stands, BSCCo would be expected to invoice a Raising Party for a Manifest Error claim fee, before the TDC has made a decision on the validity of the Manifest Error claim. The Code states in Section Q that the invoice should be sent after the TDC have made a decision. This change will ensure that BSCP14 is compliant with the Code.
- A footnote should be added to Appendix 4.1- Lead Party Manifest Error Claim Form (F14/01) with words to the effect of: *“A single Manifest Error claim must be made for each single Error Bid Offer Pair.”* The following should also be added: *“If there is a need to raise Manifest Error claims for more than one Error Bid-Offer Pair, please use one form for each Error Bid-Offer Pair.”*
- A footnote should be added to Appendix 4.2- Transmission Company Manifest Error Claim Form (F14/02) with words to the effect of: *“According to Section Q a single Manifest Error claim may be made for one or more Error Bid-Offer Pairs in a single Bid Offer Acceptance.”*
- F14/02 should also be amended so that there are 5 rows for Bid/ Offer prices (marked Price 1, Price 2, etc), to emphasise the difference between Manifest Errors submitted by Parties and those submitted by the Transmission Company. The following should also be added: *“If there is a need to raise Manifest Error claims for more than 1 Bid Offer Acceptance, please use one form for each Acceptance.”*

Correct the following typographical errors in BSCP14:

- In the “Contents” table p.5, the title for section 4.13 and the page number should be aligned correctly.
- In footnote 2 on p.6, “Section Q 7.4.2” should be changed to “Section Q7.4.2”, it should also say “At it’s meeting on 22 March 2001....” instead of “At its meeting of 22 March 2001....”
- In section 1.5, there should be a “.” after the reference to BSCP11, and a “.” after the reference to BSCP38.
- Throughout the document there are references to “DA”, the Disputes Authority. These

Draft Change Proposal – BSCP40/01	DCP No: 0004 <i>Version No: 1.0</i> <i>(mandatory by BSCCo)</i>
<p>should be changed to “DS”, for the “Disputes Secretary”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Throughout section 3, there is inconsistent punctuation in the “Action” and “Information Required” fields. All the entries in these sections should have “.” • In the “To” field of step 3.3.2, “BSCCo Finance Department” should be changed to read “BSCCo”. 	
Version History <i>(mandatory by BSCCo)</i> Version 1.0 for Impact Assessment.	
Has this DCP been raised for discussion by a Working Group <i>(optional by originator): N</i>	
Originator’s Details: <i>BCA Name</i> <i>Organisation...ELEXON</i> <i>Email Address...ccc@elxon.co.uk</i> <i>Date...30 March 2007</i>	
Attachments: N	