

ANNEX CONTENTS

Annex 1	BSC Agent Impact Assessments	2
Annex 2	BSC Party Impact Assessment Responses.....	8
A2.1	Summary of BSC Party Responses.....	8
A2.2	Detailed BSC Party Responses.....	11
Annex 3	<i>Assessment Consultation</i>.....	18
A3.1	<i>Questions and Summary of responses</i>	18
A3.2	<i>Responses sorted by question</i>	18

ANNEX 1 BSC AGENT IMPACT ASSESSMENTS

A high level impact assessment was issued with the P110 Requirements Specification (reference ??) to the central BSC Agent on 9 December 2002 with a response due by 18 December 2002.

<h1>NETA Change Form</h1>		ELEXON Reference
		P110
Title		Version No.
Nullification Of Volume Notifications Where No Notification Authorisations Are In Place		0.1
		Logica Reference
		ICR459
Type of Assessment	Date CP Received	Date IA Issued
HLIA	9/12/02	18/12/02
Brief Summary of Change		
<p>This change is to allow a Party to request nullification of any volume notifications with another specified Party, for those settlement periods that have not yet passed gate closure. The following conditions must also be met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All notification authorisations between the two Parties have been terminated. • The two Parties cannot agree to establish a new authorisation. <p>The change is in two parts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The process of requesting ECVAAs to nullify volume notifications. 2. The process of ECVAAs nullifying the volume notifications. <p>The following options have been requested to be assessed:</p> <p>Option 1 – automated part 1 and automated part 2 Option 2 – automated part 1 and manual part 2 Option 3 – manual part 1 and manual part 2 Option 4 – manual part 1 and automated part 2 Option 5 – manual part 1 and semi-automated part 2</p>		
Logica's Proposed Solution		
<p>The solution is in accordance with P110 Requirements Specification (P110AS) unless otherwise stated.</p> <p><i>Manual Nullification Request Process</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 3.2.1.1 Note that 1 hour is the timescale to validate and respond to the request and not to take all the resulting actions to actually nullify. 2. Manual processes will be implemented to perform the validation specified in 3.2.1.2 and 3.2.1.3 and generate the request feedback specified in 3.2.1.4. A script will be developed to assist this process, which will establish the validity of the request and report any authorisations that are still in place. <p><i>Automatic Nullification Request Process</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. New business loader will be created to process the new electronic flow. This functionality will perform the validation specified in 3.2.1.2 and 3.2.1.3 and generate the request feedback specified in 3.2.1.4. For Option 1 the functionality will then automatically start the Automatic Notification Nullification Process described below. For Option 2 the functionality will end at this point. As Authorisation Termination Requests and Authorisation Requests are manual flows, interactions between automatic nullification request and manual termination/authorisation requests is unrealistic. The automatic flow will be processed on receipt based on the authorisations in place at that time. If CP888 (automatic termination option) is implemented then we will ensure that all electronic flows (i.e. terminations and nullification requests) from any one party are processed in sequence number order. 		

The cost and timescale of request validation are not affected by which of the 3 rules in 3.2.1.3 are adopted.

Manual Notification Nullification Process

1. New script will be developed to identify the notifications that need to be nullified. It will order the results such that notifications effective today are listed first, then those effective tomorrow etc - this allows scheduling of the manual deletions in order of urgency. This script would be run manually and the notifications identified would then be manually nullified individually. This is a difficult process that would require 2 people to perform to provide the level of error-checking required when altering the live database. As there would be an unknown number of notifications to be nullified, this task would be charged T&M on a per nullification basis. There are three categories of notification to be amended. (For nullification effective from period P on day D)

- a. Notification starting after D : delete
- b. Notification starting on D : amend end date to D and delete period volumes for periods $\geq P$
- c. Notification starting before D and ending on or after D : amend end date to D-1, copy to create single day notification including data for periods 1 to P-1.

Where amendments are made after data has been validated by credit checking (at 3 periods before gate closure for the period), a further deletion from the "performed" table is also required. (care is required to only delete data for day D for periods from P onwards).

Note that if the rules require the effective Settlement Period to always be 1 then the processing is simpler and there are only two categories:

- a. Notification starting on or after D : delete
- b. Notification starting before D-1 and ending on or after D : amend end date to D-1.

Where amendments are made after data has been validated by credit checking (at 3 periods before gate closure for the period), a further deletion from the "performed" table is also required. (in this case, all "performed" data for the day in question will be deleted)

2. Once all of the notifications had been nullified new Notification Reports and Forward Contract Reports would be issued manually as specified in 3.2.2.2. Note it may be necessary to issue multiple forward contract reports rather than a single report covering the 3 year range.

Automatic Notification Nullification Process

2. New module will be developed which will identify and nullify the notifications as specified in 3.2.2.1. There can be no commitment to complete this task within 1 hour as there would be an unknown number of notifications to be nullified and performance would be dependent on the level of normal ECVA notification processing. It is proposed that the nullification process would be prioritised such that the earliest notifications were nullified first as they would be the most urgent followed by those notifications for future dates (Where multiple nullification requests are being processed, it is anticipated that all nullifications for today would be carried out first). Further, any notification processing will have priority over nullification processing. The volume of work required to process each nullification request, coupled with the need to apply prioritisation means that it is impossible to commit to any specific service levels. It is expected that all nullifications for the current day would be applied within 2 hours of receipt.
3. Once the nullification process had run to completion new Notification Reports and Forward Contract Reports would be automatically issued as specified in 3.2.2.2. Note it may be necessary to issue multiple forward contract reports rather than a single report covering the 3 year range.

For Option 1 this functionality will be automatically started by the Automatic Nullification Request Process as described above. For Option 4 and 5 this functionality will be started manually and therefore Option 4 and 5 are in fact the same solution.

Feedback new notified position

3.2.2.1 Where multiple nullification requests are applied for a single participant, a separate set of reports will not necessarily be generated for each request. This is to avoid confusion where a report generated at the completion of processing of one request includes some of the effect of another request that has not yet completed.

Deviation from ELEXON's Solution / Requirements					
As noted in the proposed solution					
Operational Solution and Impact					
<p>Manual Nullification Request Process – manual processes will be charged T&M and would be expected to take approximately 1 hour per request.</p> <p>Automatic Nullification Request Process – None.</p> <p>Manual Notification Nullification Process – manual processes will be charged T&M. The nullification of each notification would be expected to take an average of 1 hour each.</p> <p>Automatic Notification Nullification Process – None.</p>					
Testing Strategy					
Unit	✓	Change Specific	✓	End to End	
Module	✓	Operational Acceptance		Participant Testing	✓
System	✓	Performance		Parallel Running	
Regression		Volume		Deployment/ Backout	
Other:					
Further analysis of testing will be performed as part of the Detailed Level Impact Assessment (DLIA) process.					
Validated Assumptions					
<i>None.</i>					
Outstanding Issues					
None					

Changes to Service							
Services Impacted <i>[Tick boxes to show impacted systems and associated documentation]</i>							
	BMRA	CDCA	CRA	ECVAA	SAA	TAA	Other
Software				✓			
IDD Part 1 (Docs)				✓			
IDD Part 1 (S'Sheet)				✓			
IDD Part 2 (Docs)							
IDD Part 2 (S'Sheet)							
URS				✓			
SS				✓			
DS				✓			
MSS				✓			
OSM				✓			
LWIs				✓			
RTP	(Will be investigated in detail in the DLIA.)						
Comms	None						
Other	None						
Nature of Documentation Changes							
No OSM or LWI changes are required for Automatic Nullification Request Process and Automatic Notification Nullification Process.							
Nature / Size of System Changes							
Medium							
Type of Release Costed:				Standalone patch			
Deployment Issues, eg Outage Requirements:				None			
Impact on Service Levels:				None			
Impact on System Performance:				None			

Responsibilities of ELEXON		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For all DCRs which are subject to review, Logica shall provide one draft issue and a maximum of 5 working days has been allowed for ELEXON to review and comment on the updates. Comments will be addressed and the final issue will be provided. A maximum of 2 working days has been allowed for review confirmation and signoff by ELEXON. Within reasonable levels, ELEXON will make available appropriate staff to assist Logica during the development of this change. 		
Acceptance Criteria		
N/A to HLIA		
Any Other Information		
Note: the solution to CP725 being developed for the Jun03 Release has been designed in anticipation of the Automatic Notification Nullification Process.		
Attachments		
P110 Price Presentation Option 1 Price Presentation Option 2 Price Presentation Option 3 Price Presentation Option 4 or 5		
PRICING		
Price Breakdown		
Item description	Remarks	Price (ex VAT)
Change Specific Cost	Option 1	£115,226
	Option 2	£52,321
	Option 3	£37,526
	Option 4 or 5	£94,119
Project Overhead	Option 1	£281,501
	Option 2	£198,173
	Option 3	£184,481
	Option 4 or 5	£271,247
Total Price (+/-50% in accordance with HLIA criteria)		Option 1 - £396,726 Option 2 - £250,494 Option 3 - £222,006 Option 4 or 5 - £365,366
Project Duration		Option 1 – 15 weeks Option 2 – 10 weeks Option 3 – 9 weeks Option 4 or 5 – 14 weeks

Operational Price (per event)	Option 1 - £0 Option 2 – T&M (estimated £60,000 per event) Option 3 – T&M (estimated £62,000 per event) Option 4 or 5 – T&M (estimated £2000 per event)
Rationale	
<p>For the options that incorporate manual processing the following parameters have been used for the purposes of estimating costs for a single event:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Party in difficulty will have 20 counterparties which will request to nullify their contracts with that Party. • Each counterparty will have 30 notifications that require nullification. <p>Using this methodology: Option 2 – estimated £100 per notification nullification for 600 nullifications. Option 3 – estimated £100 per nullification request for 20 requests plus £100 per notification nullification for 600 nullifications Option 4 or 5 – estimated £100 per nullification request for 20 requests</p>	
Annual Maintenance Price	Option 1 - £55,542 Option 2 - £35,069 Option 3 - £31,081 Option 4 or 5 - £51,151
Rationale	
<p>The Annual Maintenance Price is derived as 14% of the Total Price.</p>	
Validity Constraints	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Price excludes provision for indexation of daily rates from 1st April 2003. • Price and duration assume that this change is developed in isolation and the effects of other changes are excluded. • No allowance is included in the price for Service Descriptions being different from the CP. • Price is for creating DCRs, not a formal documentation issue. • No allowance has been included for supporting PwC activities. <p>The validity period for this quote is 30 days and the offer is based on the following payment schedule:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Logica will invoice 30% on receipt of Purchase Order or authorised start of work, 50% on completion of acceptance tests, 20% on deployment or one month after completion of acceptance tests, whichever is sooner. • Operate and maintain charges will be invoiced monthly in arrears. 	
Authorised Signature	Date Signed

ANNEX 2 BSC PARTY IMPACT ASSESSMENT RESPONSES

A high level impact assessment was issued with the P110 Requirements Specification (reference ??) to BSC Parties on 9 December 2002 with a response due by 18 December 2002. Responses were received from 8 BSC Parties. The detailed responses received are attached below, summarised by question and also the original responses received.

Response	Organisation
Response 1	Powergen
Response 2	Scottish Power
Response 3	National Grid
Response 4	ConocoPhillips
Response 5	British Energy
Response 6	AES Drax

A2.1 Summary of BSC Party Responses

The options assessed during the impact assessment were as follows;

	Nullification Request Processing		Nullification of Contract Volumes		
	Automated Method	Manual Method	Automated Method	Semi-Automated Method	Manual Method
Option 1	✓		✓		
Option 2	✓				✓
Option 3		✓			✓
Option 4		✓	✓		
Option 5		✓		✓	

Q1 Please indicate the timescale for implementation of options 1 to 5 detailed within section 3 of the Requirements Specification and details of any impact on Party and Party Agent systems and processes.

Timescales

Response	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5
Response 1	3 months	3 months	1 week	1 week	1 week
Response 2	6 months	6 months	1 month	1 month	1 month
Response 3	6 Months	6 Months	10 Days	6 Months	10 Days
Response 4	4 weeks	4 weeks	N/A	N/A	N/A
Response 5	9-12 months	9-12 months	9-12 months	9-12 months	9-12 months
Response 6	3 months	3 months	1 month	3 months	3 months

Summary of impacts for each option

	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Response 5	Response 6
1	Update flow handling & creation packages. Create automatic process for alerting receipt of a Nullification Request Feedback file. Implementation costs of £50,000. Probably not automate the nullification process.	Yes	Major change to systems and process	Systems would need to be changed to accept and send the new flows	All options have significant impact on multiple systems.	Need to amend systems to provide for electronic request/response flows and to automatically process an Extended I022. Major Amendment to Business process to deal with out-of-Business hours changes.
2						
3	Would have to ensure that all relevant staff were aware of the process, especially for unrequested receipt of a Nullification Request Feedback fax.	No	Minimal impact of working level procedures	No impact upon internal systems.		No systems changes. Major changes to business processes to deal with 7 day report anomaly

4			Consequential change to systems and process			Amend systems to automatically process Extended IO22 and business process to deal with changes out-of-Business hrs.
5			Minimal impact of working level procedures			Amend systems to automatically process Extended IO22

Q2 The SSMG’s assessment of P110 indicates that it has a close relationship with CP888 ‘Authorisation Terminations Effective on Receipt’. CP888 is currently the subject of a separate impact assessment. Please indicate, in so far as possible, the areas and nature of any overlap should CP888 be approved and implemented either with P110 or before P110 is implemented.

Our view is that there is no overlap between the two proposals. They are dealing with two separate processes, the nullification being dependent on the termination. The termination process is already captured in the BSC – the CP is trying to bring systems and processes into line, and so any timing issues that could be raised if P110 was to be implemented ahead of CP888 can be resolved through a Settlement Dispute.

Whilst there is a close relationship between these two proposals, there is no actual overlap. It would make sense, though, for the decision between manual and automated to be consistent over the two proposals.

We believe that there is minimum overlap and that CP888 can work with or without P110.

Q3 Please indicate if you believe that a manual process for nullifying notified volumes will have an adverse effect on party systems and processes and give rationale for this view (see section 3.3.3).

We believe that a manual process will have no effect on party systems, whereas an automated system would introduce new flows to be processed on a very infrequent basis, which would probably introduce risks of their own. The main effort for a Party will be the nullification of trades in its Notification and Position Management systems – given the very low volume of requests that will be raised it is unlikely that Parties will invest in automated processes triggered by the receipt of an electronic flow from the ECVA. We do not believe that there is a requirement for 24x7 processing of these requests as they are tied to other processes between trading parties that have to be carried out in business hours. We would expect that manual processes would be very much cheaper to implement, which saves costs to BSC Parties.

The requirements specification indicates that the manual process will carry out the nullifications retrospectively. Whilst we could live with this, it is not ideal and the preference would be for all the manual nullifications to be carried out at the one time, as soon as the request is authorised. It is not clear why this should not be possible.

We are aware that a manual process will lead to the ECVA-IO22 not reflecting the correct position following a nullification, however, we are happy to accept this.

Q4 Please also indicate if you believe that there are any other impacts or requirements that have not been highlighted in this document.

There may be a requirement to be able to withdraw a Nullification Request if other associated processes have not been carried out e.g. serving of termination notices. It is possible that the rejection of a Nullification Request should only be sent to the requesting Party. Can the requested start period for the nullification be outside business hours if the request is received in working hours?

Q5 Any other comments?

No comment

On the assumption that the Central BSC Systems costs are reasonable our preference is for Options 4 or 5. These options automate the actual nullifications, which minimises risk and time delays. It also minimises the impact on BSC Parties since there will be no need for new electronic dataflows. We believe that the likelihood of having to make such requests out of hours is low and so does not justify the cost of changes to the IDD and Party systems.

If the Central BSC Systems costs for Options 4 and 5 are not reasonable, then our preference would be for Option 3, as long as the manual nullifications are carried out in full at the time the request is authorised.

ConocoPhillips would like to state its support for the manual process as a result of the simplicity that completing BSCP 71 provides and the potential saving that can be gained from not requiring system changes by either central systems or BSC parties. ConocoPhillips believes that this provision shall be used in exceptional circumstances and therefore the BSCP method is sufficient.

Additional information required from Elexon if the modification goes forward:

- How will the "ECVAA-I014s produced for each settlement day retrospectively changed" fit in with the "normal" ECVAA-I014s? Will a party receive 2 separate types - a "normal" for the day in question plus as many further reports as appropriate for each settlement day retrospectively changed?
- Is the ECVAA-I014 intended to be the way that the party is informed when a manual nullification has been completed?
- The nullification request feedback will be sent to both parties - will the automatic termination request feedback messages also be sent to both parties?
- P110 para 3.2.1.3 - what is the definition of 'Business Hours' in this context?
- For Automated feedback they say that we could receive 7 day reports with up to 3 years of data in it. This could be a large file...could we process it?

A2.2 Detailed BSC Party Responses

Response 01

Respondent Name:	Tim Johnson
Responding on Behalf of :	Powergen UK plc
Role of Respondent:	
BCA	Geoff Allen
Date	17 th December 2002

1. Please indicate the timescale for implementation of options 1 to 5 detailed within section 3 of the Requirements Specification and details of any impact on Party and Party Agent systems and processes.

	Timescale	Impact on systems and processes
Option 1	3 months	We will have to get our NETA Communications Hub Supplier to modify their package to handle the new outward and inward flows. We will also have to get our supplier of our general NETA Message creator package to make the necessary modifications. We would need to create an automatic alerting process for receipt of a Nullification Request Feedback file. Implementation costs of the above would be £50,000. We would probably not automate the nullification process.
Option 2	As Option 1	As Option 1
Option 3	1 week	We would have to ensure that all relevant staff were aware of the process, especially for unrequested receipt of a Nullification Request Feedback fax.
Option 4	As Option 3	As Option 3
Option 5	As Option 3	As Option 3

2. The SSMG's assessment of P110 indicates that it has a close relationship with CP888 'Authorisation Terminations Effective on Receipt'. CP888 is currently the subject of a separate impact assessment. Please indicate, in so far as possible, the areas and nature of any overlap should CP888 be approved and implemented either with P110 or before P110 is implemented.

Our view is that there is no overlap between the two proposals. They are dealing with two separate processes, the nullification being dependent on the termination. The termination process is already captured in the BSC – the CP is trying to bring systems and processes into line, and so any timing issues that could be raised if P110 was to be implemented ahead of CP888 can be resolved through a Settlement Dispute.

3. Please indicate if you believe that a manual process for nullifying notified volumes will have an adverse effect on party systems and processes and give rationale for this view (see section 3.3.3).

We believe that a manual process will have no effect on party systems, whereas an automated system would introduce new flows to be processed on a very infrequent basis, which would probably introduce risks of their own. The main effort for a Party will be the nullification of trades in its Notification and Position Management systems – given the very low volume of requests that will be raised it is unlikely that Parties will invest in automated processes triggered by the receipt of an electronic flow from the ECVA. We do not believe that there is a requirement for 24x7 processing of these requests as they are tied to other processes between trading parties that have to be carried out in business hours. We would expect that manual processes would be very much cheaper to implement, which saves costs to BSC Parties.

4. Please also indicate if you believe that there are any other impacts or requirements that have not been highlighted in this document.

There may be a requirement to be able to withdraw a Nullification Request if other associated processes have not been carried out e.g. serving of termination notices. It is possible that the rejection of a Nullification Request should only be sent to the requesting Party. Can the requested start period for the nullification be outside business hours if the request is received in working hours?

5. Any other comments:

N/A

Response 02

Respondent Name:	Man Kwong Liu
Responding on Behalf of :	Scottish Power UK plc ; ScottishPower Energy Trading Ltd.; Scottish Power Generation plc; ScottishPower Energy Retail Ltd.; SP Transmission plc; SP Manweb pl
Role of Respondent:	
BCA	Man Kwong Liu
Date	18/12/02

1. Please indicate the timescale for implementation of options 1 to 5 detailed within section 3 of the Requirements Specification and details of any impact on Party and Party Agent systems and processes.

	Timescale	Impact on systems and processes
Option 1	6 months	Yes
Option 2	6 months	Yes
Option 3	1 month	No
Option 4	1 month	No
Option 5	1 month	No

2. The SSMG's assessment of P110 indicates that it has a close relationship with CP888 'Authorisation Terminations Effective on Receipt'. CP888 is currently the subject of a separate impact assessment. Please indicate, in so far as possible, the areas and nature of any overlap should CP888 be approved and implemented either with P110 or before P110 is implemented.

Whilst there is a close relationship between these two proposals, there is no actual overlap. It would make sense, though, for the decision between manual and automated to be consistent over the two proposals.

3. Please indicate if you believe that a manual process for nullifying notified volumes will have an adverse effect on party systems and processes and give rationale for this view (see section 3.3.3).

The requirements specification indicates that the manual process will carry out the nullifications retrospectively. Whilst we could live with this, it is not ideal and the preference would be for all the manual nullifications to be carried out at the one time, as soon as the request is authorised. It is not clear why this should not be possible.

4. Please also indicate if you believe that there are any other impacts or requirements that have not been highlighted in this document.

None

5. Any other comments:

On the assumption that the Central BSC Systems costs are reasonable our preference is for Options 4 or 5. These options automate the actual nullifications, which minimises risk and time delays. It also minimises the impact on BSC Parties since there will be no need for new electronic dataflows. We believe that the likelihood of having to make such requests out of hours is low and so does not justify the cost of changes to the IDD and Party systems.

If the Central BSC Systems costs for Options 4 and 5 are not reasonable, then our preference would be for Option 3, as long as the manual nullifications are carried out in full at the time the request is authorised.

Response 03

Respondent Name:	Clare Talbot
Responding on Behalf of :	National Grid
Role of Respondent:	
BCA	Clare Talbot
Date	18 December 2002

1. Please indicate the timescale for implementation of options 1 to 5 detailed within section 3 of the Requirements Specification and details of any impact on Party and Party Agent systems and processes.

	Timescale	Impact on systems and processes
Option 1	6 Months	Major change to systems and process
Option 2	6 Months	Major change to systems and process
Option 3	10 Days	Minimal impact of working level procedures
Option 4	6 Months	Consequential change to systems and process
Option 5	10 Days	Minimal impact of working level procedures

2. The SSMG's assessment of P110 indicates that it has a close relationship with CP888 'Authorisation Terminations Effective on Receipt'. CP888 is currently the subject of a separate impact assessment. Please indicate, in so far as possible, the areas and nature of any overlap should CP888 be approved and implemented either with P110 or before P110 is implemented.

We believe that there is minimum overlap and that CP888 can work with or without P110.

3. Please indicate if you believe that a manual process for nullifying notified volumes will have an adverse effect on party systems and processes and give rationale for this view (see section 3.3.3).

We are aware that a manual process will lead to the ECVAA-IO22 not reflecting the correct position following a nullification, however, we are happy to accept this.

4. Please also indicate if you believe that there are any other impacts or requirements that have not been highlighted in this document.

N/A

5. Any other comments:

None

Response 04

Respondent Name:	Rekha Patel
Responding on Behalf of :	ConocoPhillips
Role of Respondent:	
BCA	Rekha Patel
Date	18/12/02

Below is ConocoPhillips UK Limited response to the impact assessment of modification proposal P110, 'Nullification of volume notifications where no notifications are in place.'

ConocoPhillips would like to state its support for the manual process as a result of the simplicity that completing BSCP 71 provides and the potential saving that can be gained from not requiring system changes by either central systems or BSC parties. ConocoPhillips believes that this provision shall be used in exceptional circumstances and therefore the BSCP method is sufficient.

	Timescale	Impact on systems and processes
Option 1	4 weeks.	Assuming that a file format similar to an ECVN is sufficient, then a timescale of 4 weeks would be required. The file would need to be created and have the ability to be sent to central system. The internal system would also have to accommodate a return of a file stating whether the nullification request had been accepted or rejected.
Option 2	4 weeks.	The same impact experienced in Option 1.
Option 3	No timescale required by the participant as simply completed the new adapted "BSCP 71".	No impact upon internal systems.
Option 4	No timescale required.	No impact upon internal systems.
Option 5	No timescale required.	No impact upon internal systems.

Response 05

Respondent Name:	Rachel Ace
Responding on Behalf of :	British Energy Power and Energy Trading; Eggborough Power Ltd; British Energy Generation
Role of Respondent:	
BCA	
Date	18/12/02

Please provide responses to the following questions:

1. Please indicate the timescale for implementation of options 1 to 5 detailed within section 3 of the Requirements Specification and details of any impact on Party and Party Agent systems and processes.

	Timescale	Impact on systems and processes
Option 1	9-12 months	All options have significant impact on multiple systems.
Option 2	9-12 months	
Option 3	9-12 months	
Option 4	9-12 months	
Option 5	9-12 months	

2. The SSMG's assessment of P110 indicates that it has a close relationship with CP888 'Authorisation Terminations Effective on Receipt'. CP888 is currently the subject of a separate impact assessment. Please indicate, in so far as possible, the areas and nature of any overlap should CP888 be approved and implemented either with P110 or before P110 is implemented.

N/A

3. Please indicate if you believe that a manual process for nullifying notified volumes will have an adverse effect on party systems and processes and give rationale for this view (see section 3.3.3).

N/A

4. Please also indicate if you believe that there are any other impacts or requirements that have not been highlighted in this document.

N/A

5. Any other comments:

Additional information required from Elexon if the modification goes forward:

- How will the "ECVAA-I014s produced for each settlement day retrospectively changed" fit in with the "normal" ECVAA-I014s? Will a party receive 2 separate types - a "normal" for the day in question plus as many further reports as appropriate for each settlement day retrospectively changed?
- Is the ECVAA-I014 intended to be the way that the party is informed when a manual nullification has been completed?
- The nullification request feedback will be sent to both parties - will the automatic termination request feedback messages also be sent to both parties?
- P110 para 3.2.1.3 - what is the definition of 'Business Hours' in this context?
- For Automated feedback they say that we could receive 7 day reports with up to 3 years of data in it. This could be a large file...could we process it?

Response 06

Respondent Name:	Ian Foy
Responding on Behalf of :	AES Drax Power Ltd
Role of Respondent:	
BCA	Ian Foy
Date	18/12/02

Please provide responses to the following questions:

1. Please indicate the timescale for implementation of options 1 to 5 as detailed within section 3 of the Requirements Specification and details of any impact on Party and Party Agent systems and processes.

	Timescale	Impact on Systems & Processes
Option 1	3 months	Need to amend systems to provide for electronic request/response flows. Also to be able to process an Extended 7 day report (1022) automatically. Major Amendment to Business process to deal with out-of-Business hours changes.
Option 2	3 months	Need to amend systems to provide for electronic request/response flows. Major Amendment to Business process to deal with out-of-Business hours changes and 7 day report anomaly.
Option 3	1 month	No systems changes identified. Major changes to business processes to deal with 7 day report anomaly.
Option 4	3 months	Amend systems to be able to process an Extended 7 day report (1022) automatically. Amend Business process to deal with out-of-Business hours changes.
Option 5	3 Months	Amend systems to be able to process an Extended 7 day (1022) automatically.

2. Relationship with CP888:

We do not believe that our responses to P110 are dependent upon CP888 being approved and/or implemented. CP888-related processes are a pre-cursor to any P110-related processes and we do not believe that CP888 raises any issues which are not already covered above.

3. Manual process for nullifying notified volumes:

We are concerned that the manual process described i.e. "in time for Settlement II Run" will leave a Party with an indicated imbalance on any 7 day reports for all nullified periods for potentially 5 business days. We do believe that this would have an adverse effect on our business processes and opens up the possibility of a genuine 7 day report error being overlooked.

4. Any other impacts:

Our current systems do not have the ability to automatically receive and process an extended 7 day report. We would prefer that this process was left as a manual request by the Party(s) concerned if they so require it i.e. the process for getting Extended 7 day Reports is left as it is now.

5. Any other comments:

ANNEX 3 ASSESSMENT CONSULTATION

[This will be completed once the assessment consultation responses have been received]

Representations were received from the following parties:

No	Company	File Number	No. BSC Parties Represented	No. Non Parties Represented
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				

A3.1 Questions and Summary of responses

The questions asked during the consultation were as follows:

Q	No		Yes		No Comment	
	Responses	BSC Parties (Non BSC Parties)	Responses	BSC Parties (Non BSC Parties)	Responses	BSC Parties (Non BSC Parties)
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						

Note: Bold shows the majority response.

A3.2 Responses sorted by question

Below is a summary of the responses received by question. Where responses from different parties were similar they have been merged into one cell. Where a party did not comment on a question they have not been shown in the table but have been included in the figures.