

## Responses from P133 Draft Report Consultation

Consultation issued 22/09/03

Representations were received from the following parties:

<b>No</b>	<b>Company</b>	<b>File Number</b>	<b>No. BSC Parties Represented</b>	<b>No. Non-Parties Represented</b>
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</p>

Q	Question	Response	Rationale
			indicated our support in our response addendum.
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