

---

<b>Meeting name</b>	BSC Panel
<b>Date of meeting</b>	8 May 2008
<b>Paper title</b>	Request for timetable extension to assessment of Modification Proposal P223 'Profile Administrator Service'
<b>Purpose of paper</b>	For Decision
<b>Synopsis</b>	At its meeting on 10 April 2008, the BSC Panel agreed to raise Modification Proposal P223 and submitted the proposal to a 3-month Assessment Procedure. The Modification Group has subsequently encountered difficulties in adhering to this timetable. This paper describes the difficulties experienced by the Group and requests that the Panel agrees a 1-month extension to the Assessment Procedure timetable.

---

## 1 Background

- 1.1 At its meeting on 10 April 2008, the BSC Panel ('the Panel') agreed to raise Modification Proposal P223 'Profile Administrator Service' (P223) on the recommendation of ELEXON. The solution proposed by P223 is based on the 'straw man' considered by an industry group under Standing Issue 29 'Profile Administration Model'.
- 1.2 The Panel also considered the P223 Initial Written Assessment (IWA) at its meeting on 10 April, and agreed with ELEXON's recommendation that the Modification Proposal should be submitted to a Modification Group for a 3-month Assessment Procedure. The original timetable agreed by the Panel is attached as Appendix 1.
- 1.3 The Panel agreed with ELEXON's recommendation that the P223 Modification Group should be formed from members of the Volume Allocation Standing Modification Group (VASMG). The Panel also requested that the membership of the Group should be supplemented with expertise from the Profiling Expert Group (PEG), and noted that some PEG members had already volunteered to be part of the Group. The resulting membership of the Modification Group therefore encompasses a broad range of expertise, utilising members with detailed knowledge of Supplier businesses, the Issue 29 discussions, and/or the technical aspects of profiling.

## 2 Summary of timetable difficulties

- 2.1 The first steps in the original 3-month Assessment Procedure timetable shown in Appendix 1 were the convening of 2 Modification Group meetings during the fortnight following the April Panel meeting. The aim of these meetings was to agree the P223 solution requirements so that a Requirements Specification could be produced and issued for a 2-week industry impact assessment during late April/early May. To facilitate the early convening of the first meeting, an invitation was issued to the standing list of Modification Group experts on 3 April in advance of the Panel meeting – seeking volunteers to participate in the Group and confirmation of members' availability for the first two meetings scheduled for 11 April and 17 April.

2.2 The first meeting of the Group was held as scheduled on 11 April 2008. The second meeting was held on 18 April 2008, a day later than originally planned due to member unavailability. At these meetings, the Group discussed the Issue 29 straw man and agreed the solution requirements for the Proposed Modification. At this stage, the Group has not identified any Alternative Modification which it believes could better facilitate the achievement of the Applicable BSC Objectives when compared with the Proposed Modification.

2.3 However, the Group has encountered difficulties in adhering to the original 3-month timetable instructed by the Panel. These difficulties are summarised below.

***Group member availability***

2.4 Not all members of the Group have been able to attend both of the meetings held to date, whilst some have only be able to attend for part of the sessions. As a result, some members have raised concerns as to whether the Group as a whole has had the opportunity to comment on the P223 solution, and are concerned that the quality of the solution may be compromised.

2.5 Therefore, the Group has agreed that the industry impact assessment will not be issued until a further meeting has been held to discuss and agree the contents of the draft Requirements Specification. Due to significant diary conflicts amongst members, the Group has been unable to convene a meeting earlier than 2 May (either in person or by teleconference), putting progress at least a week behind the original timetable.<sup>1</sup>

2.6 Due to the delay in issuing the impact assessment, it is no longer possible for the Group to keep to the activity timescales set out in the original plan in Appendix 1. If the implementation costs of P223 (which are likely to be an important factor in Parties' views against the Applicable BSC Objectives) are to be established prior to consultation, then an extension to the Assessment Procedure timetable is required.

***Impact assessment timetable concerns***

2.7 Members of the Group have expressed concern that a 2-week impact assessment will provide insufficient time for Suppliers to return considered and accurate responses. It is felt that the impacts of P223 will require input from across a number of areas of the Supplier business, for example:

- Contracts;
- Supplier Agent management;
- Governance;
- Billing;
- Forecasting;
- IT;
- Legal;
- Customer contact management;
- Public relations; and
- Registration.

---

<sup>1</sup> The industry impact assessment was originally planned to be issued on 29 April, but is now unlikely to commence before 8 May at the earliest. A draft Requirements Specification was issued to the Group on 23 April. However, if the Group wishes to undertake a further review cycle for the Requirements Specification after the meeting on 2 May, this may further delay the start of the impact assessment until the week commencing 12 May.

- 2.8 It is therefore felt that more than 2 weeks should be allowed to ensure that appropriate consideration is given to these impacts. In turn, this should enable the Group to more accurately understand the impacts and costs to Suppliers and Supplier Agents, as well as the required implementation lead times.
- 2.9 The Group has not unanimously agreed what the appropriate duration of the impact assessment should be, but no greater than 1 month has been suggested by any one member. A 1-month extension to the Assessment Procedure timetable would accommodate a 4-week impact assessment period.

***Broader timetable concerns***

- 2.10 A broader observation has been made by some members regarding the Modification Process timescales in general, and whether the BSC's focus on a 'standard' 3-month Assessment Procedure timetable unnecessarily constrains the industry from a full consideration of the issues and impacts relating to Modification Proposals. It is suggested that this could be considered within the Governance Review.
- 2.11 In addition, during the Group's review of this paper, one member has reiterated that they believe the original 3-month timetable may have been unrealistic – noting that the Group was unable to conclude its solution discussions during the first 2 meetings as planned, and has had to arrange an additional unscheduled meeting.

***Data modelling requirements***

- 2.12 The Group has yet to discuss the cost-benefit analysis scenario modelling requirements, which were originally due to be considered at its meeting on 18 April and are now scheduled to be discussed at the Group's next meeting on 2 May.
- 2.13 It is not necessary for the modelling requirements to be agreed before the impact assessment can be issued. However, as the modelling itself needs to be completed prior to the subsequent industry consultation (so that Parties can consider the results as part of their responses), any further delay in considering this area of the Terms of Reference would have the potential to impact the rest of the timetable as a whole.

### **3 Way forward and recommendations**

- 3.1 Views regarding the ongoing timetable have been sought from members by correspondence prior to the next Group meeting on 2 May. The majority recommendation of the Group is that an extension of 1-month is required, with the other members not objecting to such an extension.
- 3.2 Appendix 2 contains a revised plan outlining when the remaining activities would be carried out under an extended Assessment Procedure timetable of 4 months. This timetable is based on:
- The impact assessment being issued no earlier than 8 May, and potentially not until the week commencing 12 May, since the next meeting will not be held until 2 May;
  - An impact assessment duration of 4 weeks, to be undertaken prior to industry consultation;
  - The scenario modelling being undertaken in parallel with the impact assessment;
  - A subsequent industry consultation of 2 weeks (normal duration);

- 2 further Group meetings to discuss the impact assessment/modelling and consultation responses respectively; and
- An Assessment Report being presented to the Panel at its meeting on 14 August (a month later than originally instructed).

3.3 It remains extremely difficult to find dates when the whole Group can attend meetings, due to diary conflicts and the forthcoming holiday season. To attempt to mitigate this issue, ELEXON has secured details of the Group's availability for the next few months in advance. The meeting dates shown in the plan have been based on the majority availability of the Group.

3.4 ELEXON recommends that a verbal update on the Group's progress be presented at the Panel's next meeting on 12 June.

3.5 ELEXON therefore invites the Panel to:

- a) **AGREE** a 1-month extension to the P223 Assessment Procedure timetable (providing that no contrary direction is issued by the Authority), based on the revised plan in Appendix 2; and
- b) **AGREE** that a verbal update on the Group's progress will be presented at the Panel meeting on 12 June 2008.

**Kathryn Coffin (P223 Modification Group chair)**

**Change Delivery** (020 7380 4030, [kathryn.coffin@elexon.co.uk](mailto:kathryn.coffin@elexon.co.uk))

Appendix 1 – Original 3-month Assessment Procedure timetable



