Change Proposal – BSCP40/01	CP No: 1149
	Version No: 2.0

Title *(mandatory by originator)*

NHHDA software does not support reporting to Suppliers of the changes resulting from an SMRS refresh

Description of Problem/Issue *(mandatory by originator)*

Section 3.2.3 of BSCP505[1] describes the requirement for Non-Half Hourly Data Aggregators (NHHDAs) to perform a full annual refresh of Supplier Meter Registration Service (SMRS) data. Included in this process is step 3.2.3.7, which obliges the NHHDA to compare the new data (as contained in the SMRS refresh file) with the old data (as stored on the NHHDA database prior to application of the refresh), and to report any differences to the Supplier.

The requirement to report any differences in old and new data is also contained in clause 1.3.2.2 of PSL140[2]:

> "Upon receiving a Full Refresh, the Non Half Hourly Data Aggregator shall perform a comparison of the old and new versions of the relevant data and shall report on the differences (if any) between them to its Associated Supplier."

ELEXON believe that the intention of this requirement is to provide Supplier with assurance that Full Refreshes are being conducted by NHHDAs in a timely manner in accordance with the timescales specified in BSCP505.

ELEXON has in the past issued the following advice on the interpretation of this requirement[3]:

> "The NHHDA must then send a unique file to each Supplier, highlighting the data differences for Metering Systems registered to that Supplier. Alternatively, NHHDAs may reach agreement with Suppliers, prior to applying the Full Refresh, that a letter providing a synopsis of the updates performed will be sufficient".

Unfortunately, the refresh reporting facilities provided by the NHHDA system do not readily support this requirement. Although the system produces a Refresh Processing Log documenting the changes made to the database, this is not split by Supplier, and there is therefore no simple way for the NHHDA to extract the portion of the log relevant to a given Supplier.

This issue also affects the Half Hourly market, as BSCP503[4] and PSL150[5] do not contain an

---

[1] BSC Procedure BSCP505, 'Non-Half Hourly Data Aggregation for SVA Metering Systems Registered in SMRS'

[2] Party Service Line PSL140, 'Non Half Hourly Data Aggregation'

[3] 'Trading Stage 2 News Bulletin' Iss. 22, Oct. 2000

[4] BSC Procedure BSCP503, 'Half Hourly Data Aggregation for SVA Metering Systems Registered in SMRS'

[5] Party Service Line PSL150, 'Half Hourly Data Aggregation'

obligation for Half Hourly Data Aggregators to report data changes to Suppliers. It is believed that there is no reason for there to be inconsistencies between the Half Hourly and Non Half Hourly Markets in respect of the processing of Full Refresh files.

Note:
Version 1 of this CP proposed 2 solutions:
- Option 1 was to remove the requirement from BSCP505 and PSL140.
- Option 2 was to amend the NHHDA software to include the Supplier Id for each data change reported on the Refresh Processing Log, so that the report can be split by Supplier.

From the responses to the first consultation there was majority support for removing the requirement altogether, although a number of participants felt that the current requirement is a valid one.

Proposed Solution(s) *(mandatory by originator)*

Version 2 of this CP has therefore been raised to introduce another option (Option 3) and Option 2 from CP1149 is not being progressed.

Option 3 (New Option)
It is proposed that the current requirement in section 3.2.3.7 of BSCP 505 is amended in line with ELEXON guidance, such that the requirement is for NHHDAs to provide Suppliers with a description of the updates performed on the database as a result of a Full Refresh. The detail and format would be agreed by Suppliers and NHHDAs.

Section 1.3.2.2 of PSL140 would be removed.

In addition, to bring the Half Hourly market in line with the Non Half Hourly market it is proposed that a step be added after step 3.2.2.11 in BSCP 503 to add a requirement for HHDAs to provide Suppliers with a description of the updates performed on the database as a result of a Full Refresh. The detail and format would be agreed by Suppliers and HHDAs.

The communications do not have to include Supplier-specific details on the MPANs changed or how many have changed. Option 3 is flexible so that Participants' ability to provide data is not impacted.

Option 1
Remove the requirement from BSCP505 and PSL140.

Participants are requested to consider which of the two solutions should be progressed.

Justification for Change *(mandatory by originator)*

Currently there is no cost-effective mechanism for an NHHDA to comply with the requirement in step 3.2.3.7 of BSCP505 and clause 1.3.2.2 of PSL140. Implementation of this change would allow NHHDAs to achieve compliance without incurring disproportionate and unreasonable costs.

The change will also provide consistency between the Half Hourly and Non Half Hourly markets in

respect of Full Refresh file processing.

Is the Change being proposed a Housekeeping Change? *(optional by originator)*

Y/N[6]

Configurable Items Potentially Affected by Proposed Solution(s) *(optional by originator)*

Option 3:
- BSCP 505 – amend 3.2.3.7
- PSL140 – remove clause 1.3.2.2
- BSCP 503 – add a step to section 3.2.2

Option 1:
- BSCP 505 – remove 3.2.3.7
- PSL140 – remove 1.3.2.2

Impact on Core Industry Documents or System Operator-Transmission Owner Code *(optional by originator)*

Related Changes and/or Projects *(mandatory by BSCCo)*

Requested Implementation Date *(mandatory by originator)*

Next opportune release

Reason:

Agreed Release/Implementation Date *(mandatory by BSCCo)*

---

[6] The relevant Panel Committee will decide whether a Change Proposal can be progressed as a Housekeeping Change Proposal.

Change Proposal – BSCP40/01	**CP No: 1149**
	Version No: 2.0

Originator's Details:

BCA Name

Organisation…………ELEXON

Email Address

Date…………………14 December 2005

Attachments: Y/N*   (If Yes, No. of Pages attached:……….)
(delete as appropriate)