

<p align="center"><b>Change Proposal – F40/01 (Page 1 of 2)</b></p>	<p><b>CP No: 567</b> <i>(mandatory by BSCCo)</i></p>
<p><b>Title</b> <i>(mandatory by originator)</i> Modification to BSCP15 and BSCP20</p>	
<p><b>Description of Change</b> <i>(mandatory by originator)</i></p> <p>This Change Proposal addresses NCR 349, which in turn was a response to Helpdesk Query 23345</p>	
<p><b>Proposed Solution(s)</b> <i>(mandatory by originator)</i></p> <p><b>BSCP15</b> Under the ACTION column in BSCP 15 "This process continues under BSCP509" to be moved from step 3.3.5 to step 3.3.6.</p> <p><b>BSCP20</b> Add a footnote number 3 in section 3.1.8 to state "Where the Technical Details are not consistent or not compliant to the relevant CoP the registration will be rejected, and MOAs will be required to resubmit the Meter Technical Details under step 3.1.7."</p>	
<p><b>Justification for Change</b> <i>(mandatory by originator)</i></p> <p>The amendments are required as a result of a Helpdesk query: <b>Helpdesk Query 23345</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BSCP15 3.3 Registration of Base BM Units in the process 3.3.5 CRA sends notification to BSCCo of the registration, there is a prompt to proceed to BSCP509 is this to the process BSCP509 4.11 Registration of Balancing Mechanism Unit(s)? If so shouldn't this be to the BSC Party?</li> <li>BSCP20 3.1 Registration of New Metering System – process 3.1.8 – note 3 – Where the Technical Details are not consistent or not compliant to the relevant CoP the registration will be rejected, does this terminate the whole process or just that specific part?</li> </ol> <p>Response</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The reference under BSCP15 3.3.5 is to show the link into BSCP509. To ensure the point is clear a NETA Change Request will be raised. Amendment: move "This process continues under BSCP509" in step 3.3.5 into step 3.3.6, under the ACTION column.</li> <li>BSCP20 will cease the registration process at step 3.1.8, once the Metering Technical Details have been verified the process will continue. Amendment: expand footnote 3 "Where the Technical Details are not consistent or not compliant to the relevant CoP the registration will be rejected, and MOAs will be required to resubmit the Meter Technical Detail under step 3.1.7."</li> </ol>	
<p align="center"><b>Change Proposal – F40/01 (Page 2 of 2)</b></p>	<p><b>MP No:</b> <i>(mandatory by BSCCo)</i></p>

<p><b>Other Configurable Items Potentially Affected by Proposed Solution(s)</b> <i>(optional by BSCCo)</i></p>
<p><b>Impact on Core Industry Documents</b> <i>(optional by originator)</i></p>
<p><b>Related Changes and/or Projects</b> <i>(mandatory by BSCCo)</i></p>
<p><b>Originator's Details:</b></p> <p><b>BCA Name...</b>John Cunningham.....</p> <p><b>Organisation...</b>ELEXON.....</p> <p><b>Email Address...</b>john.cunningham@elexon.co.uk</p> <p><b>Date.....</b>29<sup>th</sup> May 2001.....</p> <p><b>Organisation.....</b></p>
<p>Attachments: N(If Yes, No. of Pages attached: )  <i>(delete as appropriate)</i></p>

**NETA Programme Change Request Form**

**Change Request ID: NCR334**

<b>Change Request Name:</b> BSCP 26; Change to timing of notification of site Visit	<b>Priority</b>		
	Critical for Go live	Desirable for Go Live	<b>Not needed for Go Live</b>

<b>Identified By:</b> Drew McGregor	<b>Date Submitted:</b> 12/02/2001
-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------

**Description of Proposed Change:**

All references are to BSCP 26 v 2.0

1. Paragraph 1.3, second bullet point: change 10 WD to 20 WD
2. Paragraph 1.9, first sentence: change 10 WD to 20 WD
3. Table 3.4, ref. 3.4.1: in "when" column change 10 WD to 20 WD
4. Table 3.4, ref. 3.4.2: in "when" column change 10 WD to 20 WD

**Reason for Proposed Change (Benefits) and/or Implications of not making the Change:**

During the inconsistency checking exercise, inconsistencies in timings were identified between the Code, BSCP 26 and the TAA\_URS. The Code specified 20 WD notice for a Site Visit, BSCP 26 specified 30 WD and the TAA\_URS specified 10 WD.

BSCP 26 was modified (NCR 225) to align it with the TAA\_URS (i.e. the Registrant receives 10 WD notice of a proposed Technical Assurance Visit from the TAA).

A change request was also raised to remove the 20 WD from the Code and refer all timings to the relevant BSCP. This change request was subject to the consultation process and a response has been received which stated that the Registrant should get as much time as possible to make the necessary arrangements for a sit visit and the timing should not be reduced.

This proposed change in the BSCP from 10 WD to 20 WD does not have any software implications and the Service Provider has indicated that it could be accommodated.

Increasing the notice period a registrant receives about a TAA site Visit will enable him to

make all the necessary arrangements with his MOA and, if appropriate, the Site owner in a more realistic timescale.