

<b>Change Proposal – BSCP40/02</b>	<b>CP No: 1421</b> <i>Version No:</i> <i>(mandatory by BSCCo)</i>
<b>Title</b> (mandatory by originator)  Linking BSCP520 obligations to the Operational Information Document	
<b>Description of Problem/Issue</b> (mandatory by originator)  <p>The Supplier Volume Allocation Group (SVG) identified a potential risk to Unmetered Supplies (UMS) Settlement accuracy, resulting from the interaction between the Balancing and Settlement Code's (BSC) Charge Code process and the Government's UMS Regulations, which as primary legislation take precedence over the BSC. A risk arises if one or more Unmetered Supplies Operators (UMSOs) agree a UMS connection without the SVG having oversight of the Charge Code, which estimates the equipment's consumption for Settlement.</p> <p>The SVG identified four potential changes to the <a href="#">Operational Information Document (OID)</a> and BSC Procedure (BSCP) <a href="#">520 'Unmetered Supplies Registered in SMRS'</a> which were considered at the February 2014 Unmetered Supplies User Group (UMSUG) meeting (<a href="#">UMSUG111/07</a>). One of these changes involved reviewing the balance of the requirements in BSCP520 and the OID. The OID was originally part of BSCP520 but was removed and made into a guidance document so it would be easier to change in the future. However, as guidance, the content of the OID is not enforceable.</p> <p>ELEXON questioned whether the balance of BSCP520 requirements and OID guidance was appropriate or could be strengthened, by potentially moving some or all of the OID content back into the BSCP. For example, the current OID wording about using 'local' Miscellaneous Charge Codes only has the status of guidance rather than a BSC requirement which leaves it open to interpretation. The UMSUG therefore agreed that a subset of UMSUG Members should review what OID content should be moved to BSCP520 and what should remain as guidance.</p> <p>The UMSUG sub-group discussed potential issues with moving OID content back into the BSCP and agreed that it was not desirable to have the information in two places or that the two documents were aimed at different audiences. For example, guidance on testing requirements for manufacturers should stay in the OID as they would not look for this in the BSCP. Similarly, the BSCP cannot place obligations on manufacturers as they are not BSC Parties.</p> <p>The UMSUG sub-group considered that section 1.2 of BSCP520 already sets out the responsibilities for UMSOs, Suppliers, Non Half Hourly Data Collectors (NHHDCs) and Meter Administrators (MAs). However, BSCP520 does not detail any testing guidance in the OID as obligations under the BSC.</p>	
<b>Proposed Solution</b> (mandatory by originator)  CP1421 proposes to strengthen the wording in BSCP520 to ensure that ELEXON obtains the appropriate test data from applicants and constructs Charge Codes and Switch Regimes in line with the guidance set out in the OID. The additional text to section 1.2.5 of BSCP520 will provide sufficient 'hooks' to the OID, and sufficient BSCP clarity regarding the intention of	

‘national’ versus ‘local’ Charge Codes, while avoiding either:

- conflicting with UMSOs’ ability to provide UMS connections under the [Electricity \(Unmetered Supplies\) Regulations 2001](#); or
- requiring monthly updates to the OID.

Wording that required ELEXON to only use conventions set out in the OID would mean that the OID would always need to be up-to-date with the latest agreed conventions. We consider that monthly OID updates may be inefficient, as this would require the UMSUG to agree formal monthly recommendations to the SVG by correspondence in the absence of monthly UMSUG meetings. We suggest that our proposed wording retains the UMSUG’s ability to agree new conventions as and when required, with ELEXON continuing to make periodic updates to the OID to reflect recently-agreed additions and amendments to these conventions.

**Justification for Change** (mandatory by originator)

The proposed changes have been reviewed by both the UMSUG and its sub-group who have recommended that this CP be raised. The changes are considered a ‘quick win’ but may need further consideration in the longer-term as the content of both BSCP520 and the OID may be impacted by further changes to resolve this issue.

**To which section of the Code does the CP relate, and does the CP facilitate the current provisions of the Code?** (mandatory by originator)

Section S ‘Supplier Volume Allocation’

**Estimated Implementation Costs** (mandatory by BSCCo)

One ELEXON man day of effort to implement the redlined changes. One ELEXON man day equates to £240.

**Configurable Items Affected by Proposed Solution(s)** (mandatory by originator)

BSCP520 ‘Unmetered Supplies registered in SMRS’

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

None identified.

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

None identified.

**Requested Implementation Date (mandatory by originator)**

Requested implementation for 26 February 2015 as part of the February 2015 BSC Systems Release.

**Reason:** Next available Release.

**Version History (mandatory by BSCTCo)**

Version 1.0 of CP1421 was issued on 6 October 2014.

**Originator's Details:**

**BCA Name**.....*Claire Anthony*.....

**Organisation**..... *ELEXON Ltd*.....

**Email Address**..... [claire.anthony@elxon.co.uk](mailto:claire.anthony@elxon.co.uk) .....

**Telephone Number**.....*020 7380 4293*.....

**Date**.....*12 September 2014*.....

Attachments: Y/N

CP1421\_ BSCP520\_redlined\_v0.1 (2 pages)