

<b>Change Proposal – BSCP40/01</b>	<b>CP No: 1151</b> <b>Version No: 1.0</b>
<b>Title</b> <i>(mandatory by originator)</i> Late Comment on Clarity of the P183 changes to BSCP504 Step 3.2.6.8	
<b>Description of Problem/Issue</b> <i>(mandatory by originator)</i>  <p>On 12 October 2005, ELEXON attended a walkthrough of Customer Transfer Programme (CTP) processes, organised by the CTP and attended by a number of Suppliers and Non Half Hourly Data Collectors. In the course of this walkthrough, concern was expressed that the wording of the BSCP504 changes for Modification Proposal P183<sup>1</sup> was unclear, and could be read in a manner inconsistent with the agreed solution (as documented in the P183 Modification Report). The concern related to step 3.2.6.8 in particular.</p> <p>Unfortunately this concern was not raised when the Nov '05 BSCP504 changes were issued for industry impact assessment, and it is therefore too late to address it in the Nov '05 release. It is proposed instead to clarify the wording of step 3.2.6.8 as a housekeeping change in the Feb '06 release<sup>2</sup>. The use of the housekeeping mechanism is justified because these wording changes do not represent a change to requirements – they are merely ensuring consistency with the approved solution to Modification P183, as documented in the BRS.</p> <p>The issue relates to the wording of the Action column for step 3.2.6.8, which has been modified as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Provide the customer Meter register reading, <u>except if this reading is an old Supplier Estimated reading</u><sup>36</sup>. [P183]</p> <p>The intention of this change was to clarify that the timing requirements for a D0071 containing an Old Supplier Estimated Reading (OSER) are different to those for other D0071 flows. This is clear in the P183 BRS, which states that:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Section 3.2.6, which sets out processes for ‘Change of Supplier for an existing SVA Metering System’, requires amendment to preclude the submission of OSERs to the new NHHDC earlier than SSD+5. The associated flow diagram in section 2.2.6 should be made consistent with this change.</p> <p>However, it’s not clear that the wording change achieves this. In fact, a literal interpretation of the new wording would be that step 3.2.6.8 does not allow the NHHDC to provide an OSER. This was</p>	

<sup>1</sup> Modification Proposal P183 ‘Additional Mechanisms for Obtaining a valid Change of Supplier Reading’ enables Old Supplier Estimated Readings to be used as Change of Supplier readings under certain defined circumstances. P183 is included in the November '05 SVA release, and the BSCP404 changes were approved by SVG on 4 October 2005 (SVG/56/004).

<sup>2</sup> Although P183 comes into effect in Nov '05, allowing use of Old Supplier Estimated Reads in settlement, Suppliers will not be making use of it until Feb '06, when a batch of related CTP changes is delivered. There should therefore be no impact in delaying the implementation of these wording changes until Feb '06.

<b>Change Proposal – BSCP40/01</b>	<b>CP No: 1151</b> <b>Version No: 1.0</b>
not the intention, and would in fact undermine the intent of P183, as it would leave no mechanism in the BSCP for a Supplier to submit an OSER to the NHHDC.	
<b>Proposed Solution(s)</b> <i>(mandatory by originator)</i>	
<p>As explained above, the purpose of this CP is to make the minimum changes necessary to remove any confusion over the P183 solution.</p> <p>With this in mind, the proposed change is to remove the words “except if this reading is an old Supplier Estimated reading” (which will be added in November) from the Action column of step 3.2.6.8, and from the corresponding box on the workflow diagram in step 2.2.6. This will avoid any implication that BSCP504 does not permit an OSER to be submitted on a D0071 flow.</p> <p>The footnote to step 3.2.6.8, stating “An Old Supplier Estimated reading may not be provided by the new Supplier to the new NHHDC earlier than SSD+5”, will remain, to make clear the timing requirements for submission of an OSER.</p>	
<b>Justification for Change</b> <i>(mandatory by originator)</i>	
<p>Modification Proposal P183 only allows an OSER to be submitted into settlement if it is “agreed between the old Supplier and the new Supplier in accordance with BSCP 504”. If this change is not made, there is likely to be uncertainty over whether BSCP504 supports the submission of OSERs into settlement, and hence uncertainty over whether CTP processes are compliant with the BSC. This would undermine the intent of Approved Modification Proposal P183, and potentially lead to unnecessary expense and confusion for Suppliers and NHHDCs.</p>	
<b>Is the Change being proposed a Housekeeping Change?</b> <i>(optional by originator)</i>	
Yes <sup>3</sup>	
<b>Configurable Items Potentially Affected by Proposed Solution(s)</b> <i>(optional by originator)</i>	
Minor change to wording of BSCP504 step 3.2.6.8 – see above.	
<b>Impact on Core Industry Documents or System Operator-Transmission Owner Code</b> <i>(optional by originator)</i>	
None	

<sup>3</sup> The relevant Panel Committee will decide whether a Change Proposal can be progressed as a Housekeeping Change Proposal.

<b>Change Proposal – BSCP40/01</b>	<b>CP No: 1151</b> <i>Version No: 1.0</i>
<b>Related Changes and/or Projects</b> <i>(mandatory by BSSCo)</i>	
<b>Requested Implementation Date</b> <i>(mandatory by originator)</i> <b>February 06 Release</b>  <b>Reason:</b> <b>P183 is due to be implemented in the November 05 Release and the February 06 release is the next possible date for the implementation of this CP.</b>	
<b>Agreed Release/Implementation Date</b> <i>(mandatory by BSSCo)</i> <b>February 06 Release</b>	
<b>Originator's Details:</b>  <b>BCA Name</b> .....  <b>Organisation...ELEXON</b> .....  <b>Email Address</b> .....  <b>Date...24/10/05</b> .....	
<b>Attachments: No</b>	