

## MODIFICATION REPORT for Modification Proposal P133 Facility to permit BSCCo to undertake the role of Profile Administrator

Prepared by: ELEXON on behalf of the Balancing and Settlement Code Panel

Date of issue: 15 October 2003

Document reference: P133RR

Reason for issue: For Decision

Issue/Version number: 1.0

This document has been distributed in accordance with Section F2.1.10<sup>1</sup> of the Balancing and Settlement Code.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

The Balancing and Settlement Code Panel recommends that:

- **Proposed Modification P133 should be made;**
- **Alternative Modification P133 should not be made;**
- **The Proposed Modification P133 should have an Implementation Date of 5 Working Days after the Authority Decision; and**
- **In the event that the Authority determines that Alternative Modification P133 should be made, it should have an Implementation Date of 5 Working Days after the Authority Decision.**

**Intellectual Property Rights and Copyright** - This document contains materials the copyright and other intellectual property rights in which are vested in ELEXON Limited or which appear with the consent of the copyright owner. These materials are made available for you to review and to copy for the purposes of the establishment, operation or participation in electricity trading arrangements in England and Wales under the BSC. All other commercial use is prohibited. Unless you are a person having an interest in electricity trading in England and Wales under the BSC you are not permitted to view, download, modify, copy, distribute, transmit, store, reproduce or otherwise use, publish, licence, transfer, sell or create derivative works (in whatever format) from this document or any information obtained from this document otherwise than for personal academic or other non-commercial purposes. All copyright and other proprietary notices contained in the original material must be retained on any copy that you make. All other rights of the copyright owner not expressly dealt with above are reserved.

**Disclaimer** - No representation, warranty or guarantee is made that the information provided is accurate, current or complete. Whilst care is taken in the collection and provision of this information, ELEXON Limited will not be liable for any errors, omissions, misstatements or mistakes in any information or damages resulting from the use of this information or any decision made or action taken in reliance on this information.

---

<sup>1</sup> The current version of the Balancing and Settlement Code (the 'Code') can be found at [www.elexon.co.uk/ta/bsc/el\\_docs/bsc\\_code.html](http://www.elexon.co.uk/ta/bsc/el_docs/bsc_code.html)

## CONTENTS TABLE

<b>Summary of impacted parties and documents .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1 Description of Proposed Modification and assessment against the Applicable BSC Objectives .....</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1 Modification Proposal.....	4
1.2 Proposed Modification.....	5
1.3 Issues raised by the Proposed Modification .....	5
1.4 Assessment of whether or not the Proposed Modification would better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives .....	5
1.5 Modification Group's cost benefit analysis of Proposed Modification .....	6
1.6 Alternative Modification .....	6
1.7 Issues raised by the Alternative Modification.....	6
1.8 Assessment of whether or not the Alternative Modification would better facilitated the Applicable BSC Objectives .....	7
1.9 Modification Group's cost benefit analysis of Alternative Modification.....	7
<b>2 Rationale for Panel's recommendations .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3 Impact on BSC Systems and Parties .....</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1 BSCCo .....	9
3.2 BSC Systems.....	9
<b>4 Impact on Code and documentation .....</b>	<b>9</b>
4.1 Balancing and Settlement Code .....	9
4.2 Code Subsidiary Documents .....	10
4.3 BSCCo Memorandum and Articles of Association .....	10
4.4 Impact on Core Industry Documents and supporting arrangements .....	10
<b>5 Summary of consultations .....</b>	<b>10</b>
5.1 Summary of the consultation responses.....	10
5.2 Comments and views of the Panel .....	11
<b>6 Summary of Transmission Company analysis .....</b>	<b>11</b>
6.1 Analysis .....	11
<b>7 Summary of external advice .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>8 Implementation approach .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>9 Document control.....</b>	<b>12</b>
9.1 Authorities .....	12
9.2 References.....	12
<b>Annex 1 Draft legal text .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Annex 2 Modification Group details .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Annex 3 Consultation responses.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Annex 4 Transmission Company analysis .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Annex 5 BSC Agent impact assessments.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Annex 6 Party impact assessments .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Annex 7 Cost benefit analysis .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Annex 8 Core Industry Document Owner impact assessments.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Annex 9 Proposed text to modify BSCCo Memorandum and Articles of Association .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Annex 10 Terms of reference and report/analysis of external consultants/advisors.....</b>	<b>24</b>

### SUMMARY OF IMPACTED PARTIES AND DOCUMENTS

The following parties/documents have been identified as being potentially impacted by Modification Proposal P133.

Parties	Sections of the BSC	Code Subsidiary Documents
Suppliers <input type="checkbox"/>	A <input type="checkbox"/>	BSC Procedures <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Generators <input type="checkbox"/>	B <input type="checkbox"/>	Codes of Practice <input type="checkbox"/>
Licence Exemptable Generators <input type="checkbox"/>	C <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	BSC Service Descriptions <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Transmission Company <input type="checkbox"/>	D <input type="checkbox"/>	Service Lines <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Interconnector <input type="checkbox"/>	E <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Data Catalogues <input type="checkbox"/>
Distribution System Operators <input type="checkbox"/>	F <input type="checkbox"/>	Communication Requirements Documents <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Party Agents</b>		
Data Aggregators <input type="checkbox"/>	G <input type="checkbox"/>	Reporting Catalogue <input type="checkbox"/>
Data Collectors <input type="checkbox"/>	H <input type="checkbox"/>	MIDS <input type="checkbox"/>
Meter Operator Agents <input type="checkbox"/>	J <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Core Industry Documents</b>
ECVNA <input type="checkbox"/>	K <input type="checkbox"/>	Grid Code <input type="checkbox"/>
MVRNA <input type="checkbox"/>	L <input type="checkbox"/>	Supplemental Agreements <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>BSC Agents</b>		
SAA <input type="checkbox"/>	M <input type="checkbox"/>	Ancillary Services Agreements <input type="checkbox"/>
FAA <input type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>	Master Registration Agreement <input type="checkbox"/>
BMRA <input type="checkbox"/>	O <input type="checkbox"/>	Data Transfer Services Agreement <input type="checkbox"/>
ECVAA <input type="checkbox"/>	P <input type="checkbox"/>	British Grid Systems Agreement <input type="checkbox"/>
CDCA <input type="checkbox"/>	Q <input type="checkbox"/>	Use of Interconnector Agreement <input type="checkbox"/>
TAA <input type="checkbox"/>	R <input type="checkbox"/>	Settlement Agreement for Scotland <input type="checkbox"/>
CRA <input type="checkbox"/>	S <input type="checkbox"/>	Distribution Codes <input type="checkbox"/>
Teleswitch Agent <input type="checkbox"/>	T <input type="checkbox"/>	Distribution Use of System Agreements <input type="checkbox"/>
SVAA <input type="checkbox"/>	U <input type="checkbox"/>	Distribution Connection Agreements <input type="checkbox"/>
BSC Auditor <input type="checkbox"/>	V <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>BSCCo</b>
Profile Administrator <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	W <input type="checkbox"/>	Internal Working Procedures <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Certification Agent <input type="checkbox"/>	X <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Other Documents</b>
MIDP <input type="checkbox"/>		Transmission Licence <input type="checkbox"/>
TFLA <input type="checkbox"/>		
<b>Other Agents</b>		
SMRA <input type="checkbox"/>		
Data Transmission Provider <input type="checkbox"/>		

X = Identified in Report for last Procedure  
 N = Newly identified in this Report

<b>Cost of implementing Proposed Modification:</b>	
Change specific	£0
Operational/maintenance	£0
<b>Total:</b>	<b>5 ELEXON man days</b>

# **1 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED MODIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT AGAINST THE APPLICABLE BSC OBJECTIVES**

## **1.1 Modification Proposal**

The Profile Administrator is currently defined as a BSC Agent in Section E of the Balancing and Settlement Code (the Code). As such, the role of the Profile Administrator cannot be undertaken by any Party, nor is it obvious in the Code that the role can be undertaken by BSCCo or any of its subsidiary companies.

The role of the Profile Administrator is currently being undertaken by Electricity Association Services Limited (EASL), appointed by BSCCo. EASL had unofficially informed ELEXON that, as a result of a restructuring process it was planning to undertake, it intended to cease acting as Profile Administrator at some point during 2003. Under the terms of the agreement with EASL, a formal notice period of 6 months is required to be provided in writing to BSCCo, as well as up to a further 12 months of agreed exit management services if required to do so by BSCCo. This informal contact between EASL and BSCCo did not constitute a formal notice from EASL under the terms of its contract as Profile Administrator. As a consequence of this informal approach, BSCCo believed that, unless swiftly remedied, a serious and credible threat to the quality of data entering Settlement would exist, as it would be difficult to procure a service "off-the-shelf" from an organisation that would be sufficiently independent of Trading Parties and have the relevant expertise to commence service provision quickly.

The data provided by the Profile Administrator is an integral part of the Settlement process. EASL's informally stated intention to cease providing the service could have meant that it would not have been possible to procure, at a reasonable cost, and in a timely manner, an alternative independent service provider with the relevant expertise to undertake the role of the Profile Administrator. Notwithstanding any contractual commitments, an issue existed in that if no service was in place to provide the relevant analysis and data, BSCCo may be in breach of its obligations under the Code and the Settlement system might be compromised.

Modification Proposal P133 (P133) is an "enabling" Modification Proposal, intended to provide flexibility to BSCCo in the way in which it is able to secure the provision of the services currently undertaken by the Profile Administrator ("the Profile Administrator Services"). It allows BSCCo, or any of its subsidiary companies, to become responsible for the provision of the Profile Administration Services in the event that a commercial decision to do so were made by the board of BSCCo.

P133 was raised by the Balancing and Settlement Code Panel ('the Panel') on the recommendation of BSCCo following its meeting on 12 June 2003. An initial written assessment was considered by the Panel meeting on 10 July 2003 and the Panel submitted P133 to the Assessment Procedure to be undertaken by a new Modification Group ('the Group'). The Group was formed from members of the existing Volume Allocation Standing Modification Group and the Governance Standing Modification Group. Further details of the Group can be found in Annex 2.

Two meetings of the Group were organised during the Assessment Procedure for P133, (17 July 2003 and 20 August 2003) with further correspondence issued via electronic mail. The Group issued a consultation document based on the discussions and views of the Group at the initial meeting. The second meeting of the Group agreed a provisional recommendation that the Proposed Modification should not be made. Furthermore the Group identified an Alternative Modification that it believed, when compared with the Proposed Modification, better facilitated the achievement of the Applicable BSC Objectives.

## 1.2 Proposed Modification

The Proposed Modification P133 allows BSCCo, or one of its subsidiary companies, to provide the services currently undertaken by the Profile Administrator as described in Section S of the Code with respect to England and Wales.

## 1.3 Issues raised by the Proposed Modification

- **Formal Notice** – At the time P133 was raised, there had been no formal notification from EASL of the desire to terminate its contract with the BSCCo. On 22 August 2003 formal notification, under the terms of the Profile Administrator contract was received and BSCCo is currently in discussions about the exercising of this notice period and the provision of exit management services.
- **Market Testing of the Profile Administrator Role** – At the time of drafting P133 it was not possible to identify the quantity nor quality of companies that may be interested in undertaking the role of Profile Administrator. Outside of the Modification Procedures, BSCCo initiated a market testing exercise to determine whether there are companies who are willing to, and capable of providing the service of Profile Administrator. The market testing exercise is not yet finalised, however it is possible to state that there is an interest from potential service providers to perform the Profile Administration Services. There is a risk however that it will be impossible to procure a capable and cost beneficial service provider within the restricted timescale.

## 1.4 Assessment of whether or not the Proposed Modification would better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives

The Group assessed whether the Proposed Modification better facilitated the achievement of the Applicable BSC Objectives and in so doing took due account of the views of the consultation respondents.

The Group believed that P133 may introduce efficiencies into the balancing and settlement arrangements and therefore would better facilitate the achievement of Applicable BSC Objective (d), in that it would be more efficient to ensure accurate profile data entered the Settlement process than having this data default to a previous year's value.

The Group however discussed the effect on both transparency of the operation of the process within the balancing and settlement arrangements and the costs of those arrangements. In considering whether there would be any cost saving if BSCCo were to provide the Profile Administrator services, the Group believed that were savings to be identified, this would introduce lower costs of entry to the market and hence would better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (c). The Group also recognised that such detailed cost analysis may not be possible without formally undertaking a due diligence exercise on the relevant part of EASL's business. The Group also recognised that such analysis also went beyond the scope of the Proposed Modification which was simply to allow, but not compel, BSCCo to provide the Profile Administration Services.

The Group also believed that there may be a loss of transparency in the way in which the Profile Administration services were provided in the event that a regular re-procurement of the Profile Administration Services was not undertaken by BSCCo. The Group noted therefore that the most cost effective service provider might not always be undertaking the Profile Administrator role. If this were to be the case, then this would suggest that Applicable BSC Objective (c) may not be better facilitated by P133.

The Group concluded that although the efficiency of the balancing and settlement arrangements may be increased by the introduction of P133, this would be outweighed by the negative effects on competition in the generation and supply of electricity. The Group however also concluded that these

concerns could be mitigated through a different approach and therefore an Alternative Modification was developed.

## **1.5 Modification Group's cost benefit analysis of Proposed Modification**

The Group noted that the costs of implementing P133 were solely related to making the changes to the Code and that the costs of exercising this option would only be incurred as a consequence of BSCCo's Board of Directors decision that it was necessary or appropriate for BSCCo to provide the Profile Administrator Services.

In assessing the Proposed Modification, the Group believed that without performing due diligence tests on parts of EASL's business, it was unable to estimate the consequential costs of a decision by the BSCCo Board of Directors to provide the Profile Administrator Services. No further cost benefit analysis has therefore been performed.

At its meeting on 11 September 2003, the Panel concluded that the Proposed Modification better facilitated the achievement of the Applicable BSC Objectives.

## **1.6 Alternative Modification**

The Group considered whether there existed an Alternative Modification that, when compared with the Proposed Modification, would better facilitate the achievement of the Applicable BSC Objectives. In so doing, the Group discussed whether there was any contractual remedy to resolve any lack of notice provided by the incumbent Profile Administrator. The Group however recognised that whatever contractual remedy was in place, this may not ensure that the quality of data entering Settlement was maintained.

The Group considered that, in the event of a crisis arising, where it was unlikely that sufficient notice were to be provided by the incumbent Profile Administrator, it was entirely appropriate for BSCCo to step in as a temporary measure and provide the services. This would be until such a provider of the services could be procured in accordance with Section E of the Code.

The Alternative Modification, sought to allow BSCCo to provide the Profile Administrator Services for a limited period of time (agreed to be one year). This period can be extended by the Panel on an annual basis, in the event that it is not possible to procure an appropriate service provider within that time period. During the period whereby BSCCo undertook the service, BSCCo would seek to procure a new Profile Administrator.

## **1.7 Issues raised by the Alternative Modification**

The Group believed that no significant issues arose as a result of the Alternative Modification, however it should be noted that an attendee of the final Group meeting highlighted the possible implications of BSCCo taking on staff for a short period of time. This person indicated that this may prove to be more costly and there may be protection of employment issues associated within this.

BSCCo believes that there may exist, as yet unquantifiable, cost savings were it to provide the Profile Administration Services in the event that it was not possible to procure an alternative provider in accordance with Section E. BSCCo believes that any such cost savings would be severely curtailed in the event that ELEXON was only permitted to provide the Profile Administration Services for a limited period of time.

## **1.8 Assessment of whether or not the Alternative Modification would better facilitated the Applicable BSC Objectives**

The Group concluded that if BSCCo was to only provide the Profile Administration Services for a limited period of time, whilst the tendering out for that service took place, the concerns expressed in relation to the Proposed Modification could be overcome. Specifically it was the view of the Group that the service would be tendered out to the most cost effective service provider at all times and as a result this would ensure that the costs incurred were the lowest possible. The Group therefore believed that as well as introducing efficiencies into the balancing and settlement arrangements, facilitating Applicable BSC Objective (d), there could be lower costs which in turn would lead to lower costs of market participation and hence better facilitating the achievement of the Applicable BSC Objective (c).

The Panel discussed the Proposed Modification P133, the Alternative Modification P133 and the rationale used by the Group at its meeting on 11 September 2003. The Panel concluded that placing a restriction on BSCCo's ability to provide the Profile Administration Services would not increase the efficiency in the implementation of the balancing and Settlement arrangements and therefore not better facilitate the achievement of Applicable BSC Objective (d). The Panel concluded that when compared with the Proposed Modification P133, the achievement of the Applicable BSC Objectives would not be better facilitated by the introduction of the Alternative Modification P133.

## **1.9 Modification Group's cost benefit analysis of Alternative Modification**

In assessing the Alternative Modification, the Group believed that without performing due diligence tests on parts of EASL's business, it was unable to estimate the consequential costs of a decision by the BSCCo Board of Directors to provide the Profile Administrator Services. No further cost benefit analysis has therefore been performed.

## **2 RATIONALE FOR PANEL'S RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Provisional Recommendation**

In contrast to the Modification Group, the Panel believed that there would be an increase in the efficiency of the implementation of the balancing and settlement arrangements were Proposed Modification P133 to be made. The Panel also believed that the Alternative Modification P133 did not better facilitate the achievement of the Applicable BSC Objectives when compared to the Proposed Modification P133.

At its meeting on 11 September 2003, the Panel considered the P133 Assessment Report and the recommendation of the P133 Modification Group that the Alternative Modification P133 should be made.

The Panel discussed whether the time limit of one year, as proposed within the Alternative Modification P133, was an adequate period to undertake a formal procurement exercise and provide the service.

ELEXON stated that the time limit of one year would cause operational difficulties in relation to for example, recruitment of staff. ELEXON stated that it would be difficult to employ staff with the prospect that they could be made redundant after the time period had expired. Furthermore, it was stated that any decision made by the board of BSCCo would be included within the BSC Strategy which Parties can comment on. It was stated that the aim of BSCCo in the first instance would be to tender out the Profile Administrator role. The Panel noted that these difficulties had been discussed by the Group but it felt that they were not significant enough to warrant the Panel's recommendation of the Alternative Modification.

ELEXON also stated that formal notice had been received on 22 August 2003 and that there is a minimum 6-month notice period during which the Profile Administrator service should continue. After this date there would be a period of Exit Management for up to 12 months. It was stated that this was currently under discussion with EASL.

Furthermore, it was stated that EASL may attempt to close down the service at some point prior to the formal termination in accordance with the contract.

The Panel questioned whether any of the companies expressing an interest in providing the service were capable of undertaking it. ELEXON stated that although there were a number of expressions of interest, formal assessment of the capabilities of each prospective tenderer had not been yet undertaken. It was also stated that it was not appropriate to publicly provide any material information relating to the commercial negotiations in a public forum.

ELEXON stated that it was its preferred approach to contract out the service as a BSC Agent however if BSCCo needed to commence the provision of the service, it should be able to do so in an unfettered manner.

The Panel asked whether it was permissible for the Panel to grant an extension to BSCCo's powers for longer than one year under the Alternative Modification P133. The intention of the Group was that this should not be permitted and the legal text for the Alternative Modification reflects this.

ELEXON stated that the likely duration of any procurement would be approximately 4 - 5 months with a cost of 7 – 10 man months of effort.

A Panel member expressed concern about the transparency of the process were the Proposed Modification to be approved. It was agreed that the draft Modification Report would contain reference to this and BSCCo has publicly stated its intention would be to tender out the service in the first instance and that it would only provide the service were any potential service providers unable to do so at reasonable cost. It was also stated that any such activities to be undertaken by BSCCo would be included within the BSC Strategy.

The Panel then discussed the Implementation Date of 13 weeks after the Authority determination in light of the concern expressed at the Panel meeting that the service may be terminated prior to the end of the contract notice period. ELEXON explained that the Implementation Date had been chosen to allow the various Code Subsidiary Documents to undergo formal approval by the various committees. The actual effort involved in producing the documents would be no more than 5 Working Days. It was stated that it was therefore possible to approve either the Proposed Modification or the Alternative Modification with an earlier Implementation Date. The changes to the documents were to state unambiguously that any data flows to/from the Profile Administrator could be received / sent by BSCCo. Were the Implementation Date to be brought forward, the relevant Code Subsidiary Documents could then either be approved ex-committee or shortly after the Implementation Date. If the latter route were to be adopted then the provisions in the Code would prevail over the relevant Code Subsidiary Documents.

The Panel concluded that the Proposed Modification would lead to efficiencies in the implementation and administration of the balancing and settlement arrangements and therefore would better facilitate the achievement of Applicable BSC Objective (d). However, the Panel also concluded that restricting BSCCo's ability to provide the service, as suggested by the Alternative Modification P133, would not better facilitate the achievement of the Applicable BSC Objectives when compared to the Proposed Modification.

The Panel therefore recommended that the Proposed Modification should be made.

## **Final Recommendation**

At its meeting on 9 October 2003, the Panel considered the draft P133 Modification Report.

The Panel confirmed its provisional recommendation and agreed that the recommendation within the final Modification Report would be that the Proposed Modification P133 should be made.

## **3 IMPACT ON BSC SYSTEMS AND PARTIES**

An assessment has been undertaken in respect of BSC Systems and has identified that there will be no impact to BSC Systems of enabling BSCCo to provide the Profile Administration Services.

### **3.1 BSCCo**

There is a cost of 5 ELEXON man days for both the Proposed Modification and the Alternative Modification. BSCCo, however, recognises that there would be consequential costs were the BSCCo Board to determine it would be appropriate or necessary for BSCCo to provide the Profile Administration Services. In particular, and in relation to the Alternative Modification, BSCCo recognises the difficulties expressed by one attendee of the Modification Group meeting who stated that there may be Transfer of Employment issues and associated costs increases were BSCCo to only provide the Profile Administration Services for short periods of time.

### **3.2 BSC Systems**

No impact to BSC Systems has been identified.

## **4 IMPACT ON CODE AND DOCUMENTATION**

### **4.1 Balancing and Settlement Code**

#### ***Proposed Modification***

The following Sections of the Code would be impacted by the Proposed Modification:

A new paragraph will be required within Section C of the Code to allow BSCCo to provide the Profile Administration Services.

Consequential changes will be required to Section E of the Code to indicate that where BSCCo provides the Profile Administration Services it does not do so as a BSC Agent.

A new definition of Profile Administration Services is required to be added to Annex X-1 and Annex X-2 would require a further change to ensure that references to the Profile Administrator also refer to BSCCo where it is providing Profile Administration Services.

#### ***Alternative Modification***

The following Sections of the Code would be impacted by the Alternative Modification:

In addition to the changes highlighted above, further changes will be necessary to indicate the limited time period for which BSCCo can provide the Profile Administration Services and indicate that the Panel would be required to grant any further extension to this time period.

A copy of the legal text for the Proposed Modification and Alternative Modification is given in Annex 1 of this report.

## 4.2 Code Subsidiary Documents

The following BSCPs will require changes:

- BSCP509 – Refers to the Profile Administrator for nominating changes to a number of Market Domain data items;
- BSCP510 – Refers to the Profile Administrator role in the load research process

One of the Supplier Volume Allocation Agent Service Line may require amendments:

- SSL360 – Refers to the Profile Administrator notifying the SVAA that parties have signed the confidentiality agreement associated with the Technical Deliverables.

All the changes highlighted above would seek to clarify that references to the Profile Administrator would refer to BSCCo in the event that BSCCo were to provide the Profile Administration Services.

## 4.3 BSCCo Memorandum and Articles of Association

No impact identified.

## 4.4 Impact on Core Industry Documents and supporting arrangements

No impact identified.

## 5 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS

Seven responses (45 Parties) were received to the P133 draft Modification Report consultation.

Consultation question	Respondent agrees	Respondent disagrees	Opinion unexpressed
Do you agree with the Panel's views on P133 and the provisional recommendation to the Authority contained in the draft Modification Report that P133 should be made?	6 (39 Parties)	1 (6 Parties)	0
Do you agree with the Panel's view that the legal text provided in the draft Modification Report correctly addresses the defect or issue identified in the Modification Proposal?	4 (31 Parties)	0	3 (14 Parties)
Do you agree with the Panel's provisional recommendation concerning the Implementation Date for P133 (i.e. implementation of either the Proposed Modification or the Alternative Modification should be 5 Working Days after the Authority decision)?	6 (44 Parties)	0	1 (1 Party)

### 5.1 Summary of the consultation responses

#### ***Panel recommendation that the Proposed Modification should be made***

The majority of respondents (6) supported the Panel in its recommendation to approve the Proposed Modification P133. The arguments in favour of this approach were:

- This approach provided a contingency in order to maintain the integrity of Settlement;
- It would seem appropriate as an interim measure whilst procurement activities completed.

A minority view was held that the Alternative Modification should be made as this better facilitated the achievement of the Applicable BSC Objectives by having BSCCo monitoring the performance of a contracted agent and in so doing providing the industry with more comfort. This respondent argued that the Proposed Modification did not better facilitate the achievement of Applicable BSC Objectives (c) and (d). This respondent also recognised that there may be a need to extend the time period allowed under the Alternative Modification as indicated by its addendum to the Assessment Procedure consultation.

### ***Legal Text***

All respondents, who expressed an opinion on the accuracy of the legal text for both the Proposed Modification P133 and the Alternative Modification P133, indicated that they agreed the legal text accurately addressed the issue or defect identified within the Modification Proposal.

### ***Implementation Date***

All respondents expressing an opinion on the Implementation Date agreed with the date recommended by the Panel in the draft Modification Report.

### ***Other comments***

Two respondents provided additional comments in respect of P133.

One respondent suggested that there needs to be an explicit statement that BSCCo would only undertake the role of the Profile Administrator where it was unable to efficiently tender out the service.

Another respondent who was opposed to the Alternative Modification P133, stated that BSCCo should be allowed to undertake the role if there is no alternative potential service provider. This respondent also expressed its support for extending the time period under the Alternative Modification P133 that BSCCo were to be able to provide the service to whatever time period was required.

## **5.2 Comments and views of the Panel**

At its meeting on 9 October 2003, the Panel noted that the majority of respondents to the consultation on the P133 draft Modification Report agreed with its provisional recommendation that the Proposed Modification P133 should be made. The Panel noted the minority view that suggested that BSCCo be granted a time limited power to provide the services currently undertaken by the Profile Administrator and that this time limit should be extended to whatever time was necessary to enable BSCCo to find an alternative Profile Administrator. The Panel therefore concluded that the achievement of the Applicable BSC Objectives would be better facilitated by the introduction of P133.

## **6 SUMMARY OF TRANSMISSION COMPANY ANALYSIS**

### **6.1 Analysis**

During the Assessment Procedure for P133, the Transmission Company identified no impact.

## **7 SUMMARY OF EXTERNAL ADVICE**

No external advice requested.

## 8 IMPLEMENTATION APPROACH

Following approval of the Proposed Modification P133 or the Alternative Modification P133, BSCCo would implement the changes to the Code 5 Working Days after the Authority decision. It should be noted that P133 requires minor changes to Code Subsidiary Documents, which BSCCo would require approval by the owning committees, possibly shortly after the Implementation Date. This is not envisaged to be an issue as the changes to the Code Subsidiary Documents are clarifications which insert a paragraph indicating that the Profile Administration Services could be provided by BSCCo.

## 9 DOCUMENT CONTROL

### 9.1 Authorities

Version	Date	Author	Reviewer	Change Reference
0.1	17/09/03	Richard Clarke	Change Delivery	Peer Review
0.2	19/09/03	Richard Clarke	Change Delivery	Formal Review
0.3	22/09/03	Richard Clarke	Change Delivery	For Consultation
0.4	3/10/03	Richard Clarke	Change Delivery	For Panel decision
1.0	15/10/03	Richard Clarke	Change Delivery	For Authority Decision

### 9.2 References

Ref	Document	Owner	Issue date	Version

## ANNEX 1 DRAFT LEGAL TEXT

- Draft Legal Text for the Proposed Modification is included as Annex 1A and attached as a separate document.
- Draft Legal Text for the Alternative Modification is included as Annex 1B and attached as a separate document.

## ANNEX 2 MODIFICATION GROUP DETAILS

It should be noted that due to other commitments, a limited number of Modification Group members were able to attend each meeting of the P133 Modification Group. It should be noted however that an electronic distribution list was created for correspondence amongst the group; this was used to circulate comments on both the Assessment Procedure consultation document and the final versions of the Assessment Report to ensure that the entire Group was fully consulted on the Group's decision.

Member	Organisation	Present
Graham Webb	ELEXON (Chairman)	Ö
Alan Bender	ELEXON (Chairman)	Ö
Richard Clarke	ELEXON (Lead Analyst)	Ö
Clare Walsh	BGT	
Joanne Ellis	Cornwall Consulting	
Man Kwong Liu	Scottish Power	Ö
Clare Talbot	National Grid	
Terry Ballard	Innogy	Ö
John Sykes	Scottish and Southern	
Phil Russell	TXU	

Attendee	Organisation	Present
Paul O'Donovan	Ofgem	Ö
Kathryn Coffin	ELEXON Analyst	Ö
Martin Mate	British Energy	Ö
Russell Loasby	Powergen	Ö

## ANNEX 3 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

### Responses from P133 Draft Report Consultation

Consultation issued 22/09/03

Representations were received from the following parties:

No	Company	File Number	No. BSC Parties Represented	No. Non-Parties Represented
1.	Innogy	P133_DR_001	9	0
2.	EDF Energy	P133_DR_002	9	0
3.	Centrica	P133_DR_003	1	0
4.	Scottish Power	P133_DR_004	6	0

5.	Powergen	P133_DR_005	15	0
6.	Scottish and Southern (late response)	P133_DR_006	4	0
7.	Aquila Networks (late response)	P133_DR_007	1	0

**P133\_DR\_001 – Innogy**

<b>Respondent:</b>	<i>Innogy</i>
<b>No. of BSC Parties Represented</b>	
<b>BSC Parties Represented</b>	<i>Innogy plc; Innogy Cogen Ltd; Innogy Cogen Trading Ltd; npower Ltd; npower direct Ltd; npower Yorkshire Ltd; npower Yorkshire supply Ltd; npower northern ltd; npower northern supply Ltd</i>
<b>No. of Non BSC Parties Represented</b>	
<b>Non BSC Parties represented</b>	<i>Please list all non BSC Parties responding on behalf of (including the respondent company if relevant).</i>
<b>Role of Respondent</b>	<i>(Supplier/Generator/ Trader / Consolidator / Exemptable Generator / BSC Agent / Party Agent / other – please state)</i>

<b>Q</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Rationale</b>
1.	Do you agree with the Panel's views on P133 and the provisional recommendation to the Authority contained in the draft Modification Report that P133 <b>should</b> be made? Please give rationale.	Yes	
2.	Do you agree with the Panel's view that the legal text provided in the draft Modification Report correctly addresses the defect or issue identified in the Modification Proposal? Please give rationale.	Yes	
3.	Do you agree with the Panel's provisional recommendation concerning the Implementation Date for P133 (i.e. implementation of either the Proposed Modification or the Alternative Modification should be 5 Working Days after the Authority decision? Please give rationale.	Yes	
4.	Are there any further comments on P133 that you wish to make?	No	

**P133\_DR\_002 – EDF Energy**

<b>Respondent:</b>	Paul Chesterman
<b>No. of BSC Parties Represented</b>	
<b>BSC Parties Represented</b>	EDF Energy Networks (EPN) plc; EDF Energy Networks (LPN) plc EDF Energy Networks (SPN) plc; EDF Energy (Sutton Bridge Power) EDF Energy (Cottam Power) Ltd; EDF Energy (West Burton Power) Ltd; EDF Energy plc; London Energy plc; Seeboard Energy Limited
<b>No. of Non BSC Parties Represented</b>	
<b>Non BSC Parties represented</b>	
<b>Role of Respondent</b>	Supplier / Generator / Party Agent / Distribution Business

<b>Q</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Rationale</b>
1.	Do you agree with the Panel's views on P133 and the provisional recommendation to the Authority contained in the draft Modification Report that P133 <b>should</b> be made? Please give rationale.	Yes	
2.	Do you agree with the Panel's view that the legal text provided in the draft Modification Report correctly addresses the defect or issue identified in the Modification Proposal? Please give rationale.	Yes / No	I am not able to provide sufficient resource to confirm that the legal text is satisfactory in this case.
3.	Do you agree with the Panel's provisional recommendation concerning the Implementation Date for P133 (i.e. implementation of either the Proposed Modification or the Alternative Modification should be 5 Working Days after the Authority decision? Please give rationale.	Yes	
4.	Are there any further comments on P133 that you wish to make?	No	

**P133\_DR\_003 – Centrica**

<b>Respondent:</b>	<i>Claire Walsh</i>
<b>No. of BSC Parties Represented</b>	
<b>BSC Parties Represented</b>	<i>Centrica</i>
<b>No. of Non BSC Parties Represented</b>	
<b>Non BSC Parties represented</b>	
<b>Role of Respondent</b>	<i>Supplier</i>

<b>Q</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Rationale</b>
1.	Do you agree with the Panel's views on P133 and the provisional recommendation to the Authority contained in the draft Modification Report that P133 <b>should</b> be made? Please give rationale.	Yes	As a contingency BSCCo should be enable to undertake the role of the PA to maintain the integrity of settlement data.
2.	Do you agree with the Panel's view that the legal text provided in the draft Modification Report correctly addresses the defect or issue identified in the Modification Proposal? Please give rationale.	Yes	
3.	Do you agree with the Panel's provisional recommendation concerning the Implementation Date for P133 (i.e. implementation of either the Proposed Modification or the Alternative Modification should be 5 Working Days after the Authority decision? Please give rationale.	Yes	It is imperative that an early implementation date is provided in light of EASL's formal notification to cease providing the role of the PA.
4.	Are there any further comments on P133 that you wish to make?	Yes	Further to the comments within the MOD report, it must be explicit that the BSCCo would only undertake the role of the PA where it was unable to efficiently tender out the service with this process transparent.

**P133\_DR\_004 – Scottish Power**

<b>Respondent:</b>	Man Kwong Liu (SAIC Ltd)
<b>No. of BSC Parties Represented</b>	6
<b>BSC Parties Represented</b>	<i>Please list all BSC Parties responding on behalf of (including the respondent company if relevant).</i> Scottish Power UK plc; ScottishPower Energy Trading Ltd.; ScottishPower Generation Ltd; ScottishPower Energy Retail Ltd.; SP Transmission Ltd; SP Manweb plc.
<b>No. of Non BSC Parties Represented</b>	0
<b>Non BSC Parties represented</b>	<i>Please list all non BSC Parties responding on behalf of (including the respondent company if relevant).</i>
<b>Role of Respondent</b>	<i>(Supplier/Generator/ Trader / Consolidator / Exemptable Generator / BSC Agent / Party Agent / other – please state)</i> Supplier / Generator / Trader / Consolidator / Exemptable Generator / Party Agent

<b>Q</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Rationale</b>
1.	Do you agree with the Panel's views on P133 and the provisional recommendation to the Authority contained in the draft Modification Report that P133 <b>should</b> be made? Please give rationale.	<b>No</b>	<p>We believe P133 Alternative should be made instead of P133. When comparing with P133, P133 Alternative better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives. This is due to the fact that under the current process of having PA as a BSC agent with BSCCo managing the contract and monitoring its performance gives the industry more comfort that profiles are proper and appropriate. Otherwise (as potentially the case with P133), this would not better facilitates the achievement of the Applicable Objective (c) Promoting effective competition...</p> <p>Also, without a proper tendering process for the service for a permanent PA, the industry would not be satisfied that the best cost effective and efficiency option has been chosen. Therefore, it would not better facilitate the achievement of the Applicable BSC Objective (d).</p> <p>We also believe that Elexon and the Panel mis-interpreted the intention of Mod Group and the Legal text of P133 Alternative, which allows the extension of the period for BSCCo to provide PA service upon Panel Approval.</p> <p>We have recognised the potential need for longer period in order for BSCCo to provide a viable temporary service and have indicated our support in our response addendum.</p>

Q	Question	Response	Rationale
2.	Do you agree with the Panel's view that the legal text provided in the draft Modification Report correctly addresses the defect or issue identified in the Modification Proposal? Please give rationale.	<b>Yes</b>	Not withstanding our comment above, the legal text appears appropriate.
3.	Do you agree with the Panel's provisional recommendation concerning the Implementation Date for P133 (i.e. implementation of either the Proposed Modification or the Alternative Modification should be 5 Working Days after the Authority decision? Please give rationale.	<b>Yes</b>	Not withstanding our comment above, the Implementation Date is acceptable.
4.	Are there any further comments on P133 that you wish to make?	<b>Yes</b>	We remain concerned if there is no potential alternative PA service provider after EASL's termination, that Elexon should be allowed and able to provide the service. In the event that the time limit  (from the Alternative Mod) places a constraint on Elexon's ability to carry out this role, we would support an extension to whatever timescale is required, such that there is no risk of profiles not being updated for usage by the industry due to the fact that Elexon could not provide the PA service."

**P133\_DR\_005 – Powergen**

<b>Respondent:</b>	Russell Loasby
<b>No. of BSC Parties Represented</b>	15
<b>BSC Parties Represented</b>	Powergen UK plc, Powergen Retail Limited, Diamond Power Generation Limited, Cottam Development Centre Limited, TXU Europe Drakelow Limited, TXU Europe Ironbridge Limited, TXU Europe High Marnham Limited, Midlands Gas Limited, Western Gas Limited, TXU Europe (AHG) Limited, TXU Europe (AH Online) Limited, Citigen (London) Limited, Severn Trent Energy Limited (known as TXU Europe (AHST) Limited), TXU Europe (AHGD) Limited and Ownlabel Energy Limited
<b>Role of Respondent</b>	Supplier

Q	Question	Response	Rationale
	Do you agree with the Panel's views on P133 and the provisional recommendation to the Authority contained in the draft Modification Report that P133 <b>should</b> be made? Please give rationale.	Yes	Our primary concern has always been that the process used to appoint a replacement Profile Administrator is transparent, that the cost of providing this service is fully considered, and that the appointed party is accountable. We have no problem with BSCCo fulfilling this role, as long as we can be sure that these three elements have been met. We note that Elexon have now stated publicly that their aim is to conduct a tender process and contract out the Profile Administrator role. Given that this process is likely to take a number of months to complete, it would seem most appropriate for BSCCo to take on the role of Profile Administrator temporarily whilst the tender is being completed. This is consistent with both P133 and with the advantage of the Alternative Modification Proposal, as it allows the BSC Panel further opportunity to review the process. However, we accept the BSC Panel judgment that formal review after a year is unnecessary (or too short a period).
	Do you agree with the Panel's view that the legal text provided in the draft Modification Report correctly addresses the defect or issue identified in the Modification Proposal? Please give rationale.	Yes	No comment.
	Do you agree with the Panel's provisional recommendation concerning the Implementation Date for P133 (i.e. implementation of either the Proposed Modification or the Alternative Modification should be 5 Working Days after the Authority decision? Please give rationale.	Yes	As this is just an enabling modification we see no reason to delay this unnecessarily.
	Are there any further comments on P133 that you wish to make?	No	

**P133\_DR\_006 – Scottish and Southern (late response)**

Dear Sirs,

This response is sent on behalf of Scottish and Southern Energy, Southern Electric, Keadby Generation Ltd. and SSE Energy Supply Ltd.

Further to your note of 22nd September 2003, and the associated Modification Report for P133, we agree with the proposed BSC Panel recommendation to the Authority that Modification Proposal P133 should be made.

For the avoidance of doubt, we also agree with the proposed BSC Panel recommendation to the Authority that the Alternative Modification Proposal P133 should not be made.

If either the original or the Alternative Modification Proposal P133 is approved, we agree with the proposed BSC Panel recommendation on the timing for the Implementation Date, as outlined in the Modification Report.

Regards

Garth Graham  
Scottish & Southern Energy plc

**P133\_DR\_007 – Aquila Networks (late response)**

Please find that Aquila Networks Plc would like to send a response of 'Accept' to P133 Consultation on draft Modification Report.

regards  
Rachael Gardener

Deregulation Control Group &  
Distribution Support Office  
AQUILA NETWORKS



## ANNEX 4 TRANSMISSION COMPANY ANALYSIS

In accordance with paragraph F 2.8 of the Code, please respond to the following questions concerning P133 (including the rationale for each response):

Q	Question	Response
1	Please outline any impact of the Proposed Modification (and, if applicable, any Alternative Modification) on the ability of the Transmission Company to discharge its obligations efficiently under the Transmission Licence and on its ability to operate an efficient, economical and co-ordinated transmission system.	We believe that the implementation of P133 has no impact on the ability of the Transmission Company to discharge its obligations under the Transmission Licence.
2	Please outline the views and rationale of the Transmission Company as to whether the Proposed Modification (and, if applicable, any Alternative Modification) would better facilitate achievement of the Applicable BSC Objectives.	We believe that the modification better facilitates applicable objective d) promoting efficiency in the implementation and administration of the balancing and settlement arrangements as the maintenance of the role of Profile Administrator is a crucial part of the Settlement system.
3	Please outline the impact of the Proposed Modification (and, if applicable, any Alternative Modification) on the computer systems and processes of the Transmission Company, including details of any changes to such systems and processes that would be required as a result of the implementation of the Proposed Modification (and, if applicable, any Alternative Modification)	There is no direct impact on our systems and processes as a result of the proposed modification.
4	Please provide an estimate of the development, capital and operating costs (broken down in reasonable detail) which the Transmission Company anticipates that it would incur in, and as a result of, implementing the Proposed Modification (and, if applicable, any Alternative Modification).	None identified
5	Please provide details of any consequential changes to Core Industry Documents that would be required as a result of the implementation of the Proposed Modification (and, if applicable, any Alternative Modification).	None identified.

6	Any other comments on the Proposed Modification (and Alternative Modification if applicable).	None.
---	---	-------

**ANNEX 5 BSC AGENT IMPACT ASSESSMENTS**

None commissioned

**ANNEX 6 PARTY IMPACT ASSESSMENTS**

None commissioned

**ANNEX 7 COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS**

None commissioned

**ANNEX 8 CORE INDUSTRY DOCUMENT OWNER IMPACT ASSESSMENTS**

None commissioned

**ANNEX 9 PROPOSED TEXT TO MODIFY BSCCO MEMORANDUM AND ARTICLES OF ASSOCIATION**

No impact

**ANNEX 10 TERMS OF REFERENCE AND REPORT/ANALYSIS OF EXTERNAL CONSULTANTS/ADVISORS**

None commissioned