

CPC00600 – Impact Assessment Responses for DCP0003

General Comments

Organisation	Agree? (✓/X)	Comments	Impact? (✓/X)	Days Required to Implement	BSCCo Response
Deborah Bird / Jonathan Perks / Martin Mate British Energy Direct Ltd	Neutral	No effect on current Settlement.	Not indicated	Not indicated	N/A
Alastair Barnsley E.ON UK Energy Services Limited	Neutral	This proposal will have no direct impact on our systems & processes.	X	N/A	N/A
Andrew Latham Centrica	Neutral	None	X	N/A	N/A
Tym Huckin ICTIS	Neutral	As a software developer, there is no impact of this decision on the method of operation here, or services offered. Consequently ICTIS has no active part in this DCP.	X	N/A	N/A
Sue Edwards Southern Electric Power Distribution; Keadby Generation Ltd; SSE Energy Supply Ltd; SSE Generation Ltd; and Scottish Hydro-Electric Power Distribution Ltd; Medway Power Ltd	✓	None.	X	N/A	N/A

Organisation	Agree? (✓/X)	Comments	Impact? (✓/X)	Days Required to Implement	BSCCo Response
Roslyn Bucknall Npower Limited, Npower Northern Limited, Npower Northern Supply Limited, Npower Yorkshire Limited, Npower Yorkshire Supply Limited, Npower Direct Limited	✓	None.	X	N/A	N/A
Leanne Cavagan CE Electric UK	✓	None.	X	N/A	N/A
Lauren Appleby CE ELECTRIC UK (NEDL / YEDL)	✓	None.	X	N/A	N/A
Maria Jackqualine ScottishPower Energy Management Ltd. ScottishPower Generation Ltd. ScottishPower Energy Retail Ltd. SP Manweb plc. SP Transmission Ltd. SP Distribution Ltd.	✓	Following a review of DCP0003 and redline changes to BSCP75 everything would appear to be in order.	X	0	N/A
Kate Potts E.ON UK plc, Powergen Retail Ltd, Citigen (London) Ltd, Economy Power	✓	Our opinion is that DCP003 successfully adds clarity (in BSCP75) to the rules for GSP and GSP Group Aggregation in the BSC. As such we agree that it should progress as a CP.	X	N/A	N/A
Dave Morton EDF Energy, Supplier Response	✓	None.	X	0	N/A

Organisation	Agree? (✓/X)	Comments	Impact? (✓/X)	Days Required to Implement	BSCCo Response
Hazel Cotman EDF Energy Networks (EPN) plc, EDF Energy Networks (LPN) plc, EDF Energy Networks (SPN) plc	✓	Minor changes to our business processes will be required.	✓	90	ELEXON has confirmed with the respondent that the DCP requires no system changes for them, and that the lead time is limited to business process changes (e.g. updating local working instructions).
Vara Tadi United Utilities (late response)	X	This proposal will require changes to be made to our GTDVS system which we currently use to validate Group Take and individual GSP and BMU meter period data. This cost has been quoted at £8,840. This proposal will result in additional cost being incurred by United Utilities. This issue currently has no materiality for Settlement accuracy and is simply burdening UU with unnecessary additional costs.	✓	20	ELEXON has discussed in detail with the respondent the concerns expressed in their response. The respondent has confirmed that the costs highlighted result from the changes to the actual Aggregation Rules which were implemented on 31 March 2007, rather than from the BSCP75 changes proposed by CP1197 (which only provide an example of the amended Aggregation Rules). The costs quoted are those which will be incurred by the respondent in amending their own internal systems (which replicate the BSC Systems calculations of GSP Metered Volumes, BM Unit Metered Volumes, and GSP Group Take) to match the revised Aggregation Rules. ELEXON has clarified with the respondent the ISG's rationale for approving the Aggregation Rule changes (i.e. that the previous Aggregation Rules were not aligned with the Code requirements and could lead to Parties disputing TLF values as a Settlement error under a zonal transmission losses scheme), and the timing of the changes (to ensure that the metered data for all Settlement Days used in the TLF calculation is processed in line with the Code). Although the impact on the respondent's systems would not have altered ELEXON's recommendation to the ISG that the Aggregation Rules be changed, ELEXON accepts that the rationale for the changes could have been better communicated to the affected LDSOs such that the impact could have been identified at an earlier stage and presented to the ISG as part of paper 73/02. ELEXON acknowledges that its previous belief (as presented to the ISG) that the Aggregation Rules had no impact on LDSOs was therefore incorrect, and has apologised to the respondent concerned.

Organisation	Agree? (✓/X)	Comments	Impact? (✓/X)	Days Required to Implement	BSCCo Response
					However, given that the Aggregation Rule changes were signed off by the affected LDSOs and are now in use, the cost to the respondent of amending their systems to match these rules has already effectively been 'sunk'. As the changes to BSCP75 are limited to clarifying the already-implemented Aggregation Rule changes, and have no additional cost to the respondent, ELEXON continues to believe that the BSCP changes should be made to aid industry understanding of the (revised) aggregation process.

Redlining Comments

None received.