



Change Proposal Circular

CPC00692: Impact Assessment of CP1344

Responses for CP1344 'New PARMS Serials: Further Amendments to BSCP533 and BSCP533 Appendices '



Any Questions

If you have any queries, please contact: CCC@elexon.co.uk.

Or contact: BSCP40 Change Process Task Leader 020 7380 4135 stuart.holmes@elexon.co.uk.

Summary of Responses				
Organisation	Capacity in which Organisation operates in	Agree?	Impacted?	Days needed to implement
Independent Power Networks Limited	LDSO, SMRA, UMSO	Neutral	No	-
TMA Data Management Ltd	HHDC, HHDA, NHHDC and NHHDA	Yes	Yes	-
CE Electric UK (YEDL & NEDL)	LDSO	Neutral	No	-
Accenture Services Limited (for and on behalf of Scottish Power)	ScottishPower Energy Management Ltd. ScottishPower Generation Ltd. ScottishPower Energy Retail Ltd. ScottishPower Manweb plc. ScottishPower Distribution Ltd.	Yes	No	-
Western Power Distribution	Distributor, MOA	Yes	Yes	90
npower	Supplier & Supplier Agents	Yes	Yes	-

CPC00692

7 March 2011

Version 1.0

Page 1 of 5

© ELEXON Limited 2011

Summary of Responses

E.ON Energy Solutions	HH & NHH MOA, NHH DC-DA	Yes	Yes	-
Scottish & Southern Energy Plc	Supplier/Generator/ Trader / Party Agent / Distributor	Yes	No	-
GDF SUEZ Energy UK	Supplier	Yes	Yes	-
E.ON UK	Supplier	Yes	No	-

Detailed Impact Assessment Responses

Organisation	Agree?	Impacted?	Comments
Independent Power Networks Limited	Neutral	No	-
TMA Data Management Ltd	Yes	Yes	<p>For which role is your organisation impacted? HHDC and NHHDC</p> <p>What is the impact? Software impact</p> <p>Notice required to implement – There is no additional change days required if CP1344 is approved promptly and implemented at the same time as CP1334.</p> <p>Would implementation in the proposed Release have an adverse impact on your organisation? As stated above CP1344 must be implemented at the same time as CP1334</p> <p>Associated Costs – No additional cost to existing CP1334 costs.</p> <p>Question 6 – No scenarios indentified</p>
CE Electric UK	Neutral	No	-
Accenture Services Limited (for and on behalf of Scottish Power)	Yes	No	<p>Would implementation in the proposed Release have an adverse impact on your organisation? No</p>
Western Power Distribution	Yes	Yes	<p>For which role is your organisation impacted? MOA</p> <p>What is the impact? We need to code PARMS scripts in line with these changes to the original requirements</p> <p>Notice required to implement – Provided these changes are approved at the next SVG and we have sight of the final requirements by end of March then we can still meet the July 1st implementation date.</p>

CPC00692

7 March 2011

Version 1.0

Page 2 of 5

© ELEXON Limited 2011

Detailed Impact Assessment Responses			
			<p>Would implementation in the proposed Release have an adverse impact on your organisation? No, provided these are the final changes to the requirements and they are agreed by SVG in March</p> <p>Associated Costs – No additional cost as we have delayed starting work on the new July 01 serials until we receive confirmation of the outcome of this CP.</p>
npower	Yes	Yes	<p>For which role is your organisation impacted? Our Supplier Agents will be impacted by the PARMS Serial changes (HHDC, HHDA, HHMO, NHHDC, NHHDA and NHHMO).</p> <p>What is the impact? Currently all our Supplier Agents provide PARMS reporting in-line with the timescales stipulated within the relevant Code Subsidiary Documents. Changes to these documents through CP1334 result in reporting changes.</p> <p>Notice required to implement – N/A – this CP provides clarity around implementing CP1334 and we will be implementing the change in line with the timescales stipulated within that CP (June 2011 release).</p> <p>Would implementation in the proposed Release have an adverse impact on your organisation? this CP provides clarity around implementing CP1334 and any adverse impacts to our business would have been highlighted in our response to that CP.</p> <p>Associated Costs – this CP provides clarity around implementing CP1334 and any costs associated with implementation would have been highlighted in our response to that CP.</p> <p>Question 6 – Erroneous flows would be identified as flows that are sent as duplicates or where we may not be the appointed Agent at the time of the effective from date within the flow.</p> <p>Question 7 – Discussions have taken place between npower and ELEXON since receiving this CP for impact assessment around the suitability of HM14. We are happy with the response given and fully understand ELEXON's point of view around this serial. However, would it be possible for ELEXON to add some wording to this serial that would provide clarity that Meter Operator's performance maybe adversely affected by delays out of their control?</p> <p>The clock starts on this serial once a fault has been identified and stops once the results of the fault investigation have been sent to the Supplier / HHDC. However, there maybe a delay between the fault being identified and it being reported to the Meter Operator which would impact the Meter Operator's ability to respond to the investigation within 15 working days.</p>
E.ON Energy Solutions	Yes	Yes	<p>For which role is your organisation impacted? HH & NHH MOA NHH DC-DA</p> <p>What is the impact? Clarification of the requirements of the new PARMS reporting mechanism.</p> <p>Notice required to implement – Change will not impact the timescale associated with the development of the revised PARMS reporting suite.</p> <p>Would implementation in the proposed Release have an adverse impact on your organisation? No</p> <p>Associated Costs – No costs specifically attributable to this change.</p>

CPC00692

7 March 2011

Version 1.0

Page 3 of 5

© ELEXON Limited 2011

Detailed Impact Assessment Responses			
			<p>Question 6 – There will be many varieties of erroneous flow but the key categories include the following.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flows sent in error to non appointed participants • Duplicate flows • Incorrectly completed flows. • Flows for which it is impossible to respond e.g. an D0170 sent for MTDs for a site that has never had metering installed.
Scottish & Southern Energy Plc	Yes	No	<p>Question 6 – Identifying flows to be erroneous is an unknown and based on assumptions. Guidelines on the interpretation would be useful. Some scenarios are, incorrect agent appointment, data cleansing exercise carried out by suppliers or suppliers’ agents or Erroneous Transfers.</p>
GDF SUEZ Energy UK	Yes	Yes	<p>Agree change comment – Provides sensible clarifications on the process and removes inconsistencies</p> <p>For which role is your organisation impacted? Supplier</p> <p>What is the impact? Clarification on how our agents will be producing their PARMs reports following the introduction of the new serials in July 2011</p> <p>Notice required to implement – No impact on systems over that of CP1334.</p> <p>Would implementation in the proposed Release have an adverse impact on your organisation? No Associated Costs – No cost.</p> <p>Question 6 – We would class an erroneous flow as a flow that has been sent unnecessarily or a flow that has been sent with either the incorrect information or in the incorrect format.</p> <p>For the flows that a supplier would send that would affect the new serials (D0155 and D0148) the major causes for this would be unforeseen user or system error.</p>
E.ON UK	Yes	No	<p>For which role is your organisation impacted? Supplier</p> <p>Question 6 - After consideration E.ON’s view is that there are only a few circumstances where a flow should not be counted in the PARMs reporting.</p> <p>During all of our processes where a data flow is provided to an agent requesting information or making an appointment, E.ON would expect a return in all instances within the given SLA. If the returning flow is outside of the SLA then it should be included within the PARMs counts.</p> <p>The only instance of E.ON receiving erroneous / duplicate flows is where a user has requested the flows to be resent without allowing time for the original flows to be provided. Although these flows are duplicate we wouldn’t consider them as erroneous.</p> <p>Where a data flow is superseded by a later flow with an amendment to a single piece of information, we would again not consider this to be erroneous as long as the information within the original flow was valid at the time. For example a D0150 provided to us by the MO held a Valid</p>

Detailed Impact Assessment Responses

			<p>MDD combination. If at a later point the SSC is changed E.ON would have received the original flow in confidence that it was correct.</p> <p>When considering discounting pending counts, flows that are no longer required should be disregarded. For example If an incorrect D0148 is sent to an MO, and then immediately replaced with a revised D0148, we would only expect the pending count of the D0150 / D0168 to be against the latest flow and not both D0148s.</p>
--	--	--	--



About Severity Codes

H (High):
Prejudices document's conclusions, recommendations or fitness for purpose.

M (Medium):
Matter of substance, but not high.

L (Low):
Minor error but document's intention is clear.

Comments on the redline text

No.	Organisation	Document name	Location	Severity Code	Comments
1	TMA Data Management Ltd	CP1344_BSCP533_Appx_B_v0.4	P9	L	<p>"Erroneous flows must still be submitted against for those Serials which measure timeliness. This is because even if it was erroneous the sending of the data flow should still not be late"</p> <p>I suggest: "Erroneous flows must still be submitted for those Serials measuring timeliness. This is because even if it was erroneous, the sending of the data flow should not be late"</p>
1	Accenture Services Limited (for and on behalf of Scottish Power)	BSCP533 App A	Front page	M	The Date should be updated from '1 November 2010' to '1 July 2011'.
2	Accenture Services Limited (for and on behalf of Scottish Power)	BSCP533 App A	Page 2	M	The Date should be updated from '1 November 2010' to '1 July 2011'.

CPC00692

7 March 2011

Version 1.0

Page 5 of 5

© ELEXON Limited 2011