

Change Proposal – BSCP40/02

CP No: 1222

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

Inconsistencies within the SAA Service Description and URS

Description of Problem/Issue (mandatory by originator)

As part of the procurement phase of Project Isis, ELEXON drafted detailed contracts of Business Requirements for the CVA, SVA and FAA Agent Services to issue to tenders. The Business Requirements were also reviewed against the BSC and Code Subsidiary Documents as part of a due diligence exercise.

As a result of the review a number of minor inconsistencies have been discovered in the Settlements Administration Agent (SAA) Service Description (SD) and SAA User Requirement Solution (URS). These inconsistencies are detailed below.

Proposed Solution (mandatory by originator)

CP1222 intends to amend the SAA Service Description and URS to remove the minor inconsistencies and to reflect the new Business Requirements that are required.

The following list identifies the inconsistencies in the SAA SD and SAA URS.

Issue No.	Description
1	Section 1.4 of the SAA Service Description refers to BM Data and BSAD being received "for each Settlement Run". However, this data is typically sent before Initial Settlement, and not resent for each subsequent Settlement Run. Therefore this should be updated.
2	Section 1.4 and 2.1.1 of the SAA Service Description, which details the description of "BM Data" omits MIL/MEL data. This should be included.
3	Section 1.4 and 2.1.1 of the SAA Service Description, which details the description of "BM Data" includes BM Unit Applicable Balancing Services Volume data. This would be better treated as a separate item in its own right, given that neither the BSC (Q6.2) nor the NGC interface spec treats this as part of Balancing Mechanism Data.
4	Section 1.4 and 2.1.1 of the SAA Service Description omits Quiescent FPN data. This should be added to the Service Description.
5	Section 2.6.1 of the SAA Service Description, states that "TLF data and the proportion of losses to be allocated to the exporting BM Units" are received from BSCCo. This is incorrect as they are received from CRA.
6	Section 2.6.1 of the SAA Service Description, states that the proportion is initially zero, but in fact it's always been 0.45.
7	Section 2.6.2 of the SAA Service Description should be removed as the SAA does not apportion ELEXON costs, and it is the ELEXON Finance Department the calculate Section D charges.
8	Remove Section 2.9 from the SAA Service Description as the SAA does not receive Trading Dispute details from Parties, or administer the Disputes process.
9	The SAA Service Description refers to "System Operator" throughout. This should be replaced by "Transmission Company".
10	The SAA Service Description should be updated to include SAA-I025.
11	The SAA Service Description and SAA URS refer to "exporting Trading Units" and

	"exporting BM Units". It would be more accurate (and consistent with the BSC) to refer to "delivering Trading Units" and "BM Units in delivering Trading Units".
12	The SAA Service Description and SAA URS refer to the SAA receiving Balancing Mechanism data from the BMRA. Both documents should be updated to reflect that the Transmission Company send the BM Data.
13	The SAA Service Description (Section 4.2.5) and SAA URS (SAA-I019) refer to a 'BSC Party Performance Report'. This flow is no longer used and should be removed. NETA IDD part 2 will also need to be updated.
14	The SAA URS (SAA-I003) gives the frequency of the SAA receiving Balancing Mechanism data "once a day", the timing is not once per day (see detailed timing details in NGC interface spec).
16	The obligation for the SAA to publish the Post Final Settlement Calendar should be added in to the SAA Service Description.
17	The SAA URS (SAA-I027) gives the frequency of pre-settlement run validation failures as "Low - typically one or two per month". Both the Service Description and the URS should be updated to reflect the higher volume.
18	BSCP14 contains 8 references to the SAA concerning the Processing of Manifest Error Claims - the requirements (including timescale) for SAA action are detailed. These should be reflected in the Service Description.
19	BSCP301 provides for interaction within given timescales between the SAA and FAA if SAA Settlement Results are invalid (£10 difference or more) or data is missing. This should be clarified with in the Service Description.
20	BSC Section N (3.1.1) includes a requirement for the FAA to consult with the SAA over production of the payment Calendar. The Service Description should be updated to reflect this.
21	BSC Section N (6.1.1) requires "In relation to each Settlement Day, following each Settlement Run, the information concerning Trading Charges in respect of Settlement Periods in that Settlement Day is to be submitted by 09.00 hours on the relevant Notification Date by the SAA to the FAA". This timescale is not explicit within the Service Description.
22	BSC Section Q (6.2.1) includes a requirement that "In respect of each Settlement Day, for each BM Unit....the Transmission Company shall send to the SAA (so that such data has been sent by the time which is 15 minutes following the end of such Settlement Day) the following data..." This timescale is not stated in the Service Description.
23	BSC Section Q (6.4.1) includes a requirement that "...the Transmission Company shall send the Applicable Balancing Services Volume Data to the SAA no later than the second Business Day after such Settlement Day". This timescale is not stated in the Service Description.

As the SAA SD and SAA URS are Category 2 Configurable Items, the drafting of the relevant redlined changes to these documents will be carried out as part of the implementation process once CP1222 has been approved for inclusion in a particular release. Therefore the required redlined changes are not provided at this time.

When the changes to the SAA SD and SAA URS are drafted during the implementation process, if any other inconsistencies or typographical errors are identified, they will be included in the redlining. The drafted amendments will be issued for consultation as part of the implementation process.

Justification for Change *(mandatory by originator)*

The updates to the SAA SD and SAA URS are necessary to make sure that the new contracts in February 2009 are consistent with the Business Requirements of the CVA/SVA Operator Hosts.

To which section of the Code does the CP relate, and does the CP facilitate the current provisions of the Code? *(mandatory by originator) BSC Section F*

Estimated Implementation Costs *(mandatory by BSCCo)*

The estimated ELEXON implementation cost is £1,320.1

Configurable Items Affected by Proposed Solution(s) *(mandatory by originator)*

SAA Service Description

SAA URS

FAA URS

NETA IDD Part 2

Please note, that the SAA SD, SAA URS and FAA URS are both Category 2 Configurable Items. Therefore the redlined changes will be produced following Approval and as part of the Implementation Process.

Impact on Core Industry Documents or System Operator-Transmission Owner Code *(mandatory by originator)*

None

Related Changes and/or Projects *(mandatory by BSCCo)*

CP1219 - Inconsistencies within the CDCA Service Description and URS

CP1220 - Inconsistencies within the BMRA Service Description

CP1221 - Inconsistencies within the ECVAA Service Description

CP1223 - Inconsistencies within the Code Subsidiary Documents regarding Business Requirements

Requested Implementation Date *(mandatory by originator)*

June 2008 BSC Systems Release

Reason:

The June 2008 BSC Systems Release is the next available release.

Version History *(mandatory by BSCCo)*

CP1222 was previously DCP0020, issued for participant Impact Assessment on 5 October 2007 via CPC00618. It has since been converted into CP1222.

Originator's Details:

BCA Name.....David Barber.....

Organisation.....ELEXON.....

Email Address..... david.barber@elexon.co.uk

Telephone Number.....020 7380 4327.....

Date.....09 November 2007.....

Attachments: Yes

CP1222 Attachment A NETA IDD Part2 DCR v0.1.doc (4 pages)

CP form Guidelines

- **Title** – mandatory completion by originator – title of Change Proposal.
- **CP No.** – mandatory completion by BSCCo – unique number allocated for each individual CP in the Change Management System.
- **Version No.** – mandatory completion by originator – when first submitted by the originator, the CP should have a version number of v0.1. Following discussions with BSCCo, any changes required following those discussions, the CP should be updated to v1.0. Should any further amendments/additions/deletions be required to the CP during its lifecycle, the version number should be updated to v2.0, v3.0, etc.
- **Description of Problem/Issues** - mandatory completion by originator - a statement of the issue/problem.
- **Proposed Solution(s)** – mandatory completion by originator – this is a single fully defined description of the proposed solution. For the following Configurable Items (Category 1) redlined changes must be included:
 - Balancing Settlement Code Procedures (BSCPs);
 - Business Definition Documents (BDDs);
 - Interface Design Document (IDD);
 - Party Service Lines (PSLs);
 - Codes of Practice (CoPs); and
 - Settlement Software Documents where describing physical interfaces.
- **Justification for Change** – mandatory completion by originator – details of the business case for implementing the proposed change. This section should also include a brief assessment of the risk associated with leaving the problem/issue unresolved, in terms of materiality and probability of occurrence.
- **To which section of the Code does the CP relate, and does the CP facilitate the current provisions of the Code?** – All CPs should be raised in line with BSC section F 3.1.2 ensuring that changes to CSDs and Configurable Items should continue to facilitate the provisions as detailed in the Code and should not impose new obligations or restrictions of a material nature on Parties and Party Agents (or classes thereof) which are not authorised or envisaged by, or subsidiary to, the rights and obligations of the Parties under the Code. As such the originator should highlight the section of the BSC that their proposed change is derived from and if the proposed Change facilitates the existing arrangements in the BSC.
- **Estimated Implementation Costs** – mandatory by BSCCo – These will be broken down into Central System Costs and BSCCo Operational Costs where appropriate.
- **Impact on Configurable Item(s)** – mandatory completion by originator – a list of all Configurable Items potentially affected by proposed solution. Details of how each Configurable Item will be affected should be included, if known, and redlining of Category 1 Configurable Items must be completed.
- **Impact on Core Industry Documents or System Operator – Transmission Owner Code** – mandatory completion by originator, however, BSCCo can advise if originator is

unsure of all the impacts on documents – list of all documents potentially affected by proposed solution. These documents include any changes that will be needed to the DTC or other MRASCo Products. Details of how each document will be affected will also need to be included.

- **Requested Implementation Date and Associated Reasons** – mandatory by originator – identification of any critical milestone date(s) which need to be considered when generating possible solutions, with reasons for these. If change can be implemented at any time i.e. with no time constraints, this should be stated. This will be updated to the agreed Implementation Date once the Panel Committee has voted.
- **Version History** – mandatory completion by BSCCo – details of any previous versions of a Draft CP or details of what has changed between CP versions. If this is the first version then this will be indicated in this section.

Originator's Details – mandatory by originator – the name, organisation, email address and telephone number of the originator and the date on which the originator raised the CP.