

<b>Change Proposal – BSCP40/02</b>	CP No: 1376  <i>Version No: 1.0</i>
<b>Title:</b> Issues with Reporting Failed Instructions (D0023) Flows	
<b>Description of Problem/Issue:</b>  <p>Failed Instructions (D0023) flows are issued, in the Non Half Hourly market, by Non Half Hourly Data Aggregators (NHHDA) to inform Non Half Hourly Data Collectors (NHHDC) of issues with the processing of instructions. The majority of Failed Instructions are issued to NHHDCs when NHHDA fail to process D0019 flows (Metering System EAC<sup>1</sup>/AA<sup>2</sup> Data).</p> <p>NHHDCs are required to resolve all issues that result in a Failed Instructions. The requirements for NHHDCs are set out in BSCP504 ‘Non Half Hourly Data Collection for SVA Metering’. Any unresolved Failed Instructions are considered outstanding. When a Supplier decides to change NHHDC or a NHHDC’s contract expires, the old NHHDC is required to retain responsibility for failed instruction files until all outstanding instructions have been processed correctly. However, Failed Instructions for de-appointed NHHDCs represent a much lower risk to Settlement than those for the current NHHDC, because a) the impact is time-bound (i.e. the data relates to the period of appointment) and b) the new NHHDC can provide consumption data for the old NHHDC’s period of appointment, thus resolving issues without the need for the old NHHDC to correct the Failed Instruction.</p> <p>Each year, in order to ensure that Agents are processing Failed Instructions correctly, the BSC Auditor requests counts of outstanding Failed Instructions from NHHDA and NHHDCs. Several Parties have received Audit Issues as a result of discrepancies between the NHHDA and NHHDC counts, and a Market Issue has also been raised (Market Issue 2289).</p> <p>There are however, a number of aspects of the reporting process that contribute to these discrepancies and therefore bring into question the validity of these Issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Inconsistent reporting between NHHDA and NHHDCs</u>  <p>The BSC Auditor notes that the number of Failed Instructions reported by NHHDCs is generally lower than the number of Failed Instructions reported by NHHDA. The reason for this discrepancy is that NHHDCs only report those Failed Instructions where they are still appointed to the Metering System in question (high risk exceptions) while NHHDA report all Failed Instructions, including where the NHHDC is no longer appointed (low risk exceptions).</p> </li> <li>2. <u>Inconsistent Reporting between NHHDA</u>  <p>There is no standard query which NHHDA can run in order to ensure consistent reporting. As such NHHDA have developed their own queries. While these are likely to be broadly similar, consistency cannot be guaranteed.</p> </li> </ol>	
<b>Proposed Solution:</b>  CP1376 seeks to address both issues as identified above with the aim to improve the way that Failed Instructions are reported across industry. There are two elements to the solution, these are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Responsibility for high risk Failed Instructions</u>  <p>BSCP504 section 1.2.5 states that ‘following de-appointment by the Associated Supplier, the old</p> </li> </ol>	

<sup>1</sup> Estimated Annual Consumption

<sup>2</sup> Annualised Advance

NHHDC shall retain the responsibility for instruction files sent to the Associated NHHDA until all outstanding instructions have been processed correctly’.

The CP would amend this requirement to make it explicit that the outgoing NHHDC should only remain responsible for material or high risk Failed Instructions where a Supplier requires them to be because they cannot be resolved by the new NHHDC or through other means. This would reduce discrepancies between NHHDAs and NHHDCs; because NHHDCs would no longer be responsible for Failed Instructions for periods in which they are no longer appointed. It would also remove unrealistic expectations on them to resolve exceptions that represent a much lower risk to Settlement.

## 2. Standardised reporting script(s)

To help ensure consistency in reporting and to identify where the discrepancies between Failed Instruction counts are occurring BSCP505 section 1.6 would be amended to require NHHDAs to use a standardised script for reporting Failed Instructions.

Introducing a standardised script to report the numbers of exceptions in a consistent manner will allow the auditors to establish the level of material error in the industry. The script(s) would provide the following information for each NHHDC:

- Count of all Failed Instructions
- Count of material Failed Instructions
- Count of Metering Systems with Failed Instructions
- Count of material Failed Instructions (excluding those for NHHDC with no active appointment to the Metering System)
- Count of Metering Systems with material Failed Instructions (excluding those for NHHDC with no active appointment to the Metering System)
- List of Metering Systems with material Failed Instructions (excluding those for NHHDC with no active appointment to the Metering System) – to allow NHHDCs to focus on correction of errors.

### **Justification for Change:**

The proposed changes will have a number of benefits:

- allow for more focussed analysis on the extent of outstanding failed instructions across the industry;
- assist in the resolution of any issues;
- provide better information to the BSC Auditor in their assessment of the level of market and individual DC error;
- allow ELEXON to better assess the strength of the Failed Instructions Report as a mitigating control against the risks in the Risk Evaluation Register;
- allow ELEXON to compare NHHDC performance more equitably and to apply Performance Assurance Techniques such as Error and Failure Resolution more effectively; and
- NHHDCs will have access to better information allowing them to focus their effort more efficiently on those failed instructions that are having a material impact.

**To which section of the Code does the CP relate, and does the CP facilitate the current provisions of the Code?**

Section S

**Estimated Implementation Costs:**

ELEXON costs: the estimated ELEXON implementation cost is 14 man days of effort which equates to £3360.

Service Provider: ~ £10,000 (developing and testing of script)

**Configurable Items Affected by Proposed Solution(s):**

BSCP504 - Non Half Hourly Data Collection for SVA Metering Systems Registered in SMRS

BSCP505 - Non Half Hourly Data Aggregation for SVA Metering Systems Registered in SMRS

**Impact on Core Industry Documents or System Operator-Transmission Owner Code:**

None

**Related Changes and/or Projects:**

None

**Requested Implementation Date:**

27 June 2013

**Reason:**

Next available Release prior to audit.

**Version History**

*CP1376 was initially sent round as DCP0049 on 30 September 2011.*

**Originator's Details:**

*BCA Name:* Paul Saker

*Organisation:* EDF Energy

*Email Address:* [paul.saker@edfenergy.com](mailto:paul.saker@edfenergy.com)

*Telephone Number:* 020 8298 8901

*Date:* 23 December 2011

**Attachments:** Yes

CP1376\_BSCP504\_Redlined\_v0.1 (2 pages)

CP1376\_BSCP505\_Redlined\_v0.1 (2 pages)