4.3   CP Form

Change Proposal – BSCP40/02	CP No: 1459
	Version No: 1.0 *(mandatory by BSCCo)*

Title Amendments to the process for performing a Post-Final Settlement Run

Description of Problem/Issue (mandatory by originator)

This Change Proposal (CP) proposes changes to address two issues with the performing of the Post-Final Settlement Run (PFSR).

Issue 1

CP1428 'Inclusion of Party Agents in the event of Post Final Settlement Runs' sought to mandate Suppliers to inform both their Data Collectors (DCs) and Data Aggregator (DAs) of the required corrective actions following a determination by the Trading Disputes Committee (TDC). However, the red-lining of CP1428 has not given the desired effect. Furthermore, the red-lining has put an erroneous obligation on the Disputes Secretary (DS), rather than applicable Suppliers, to notify DCs and DAs of a TDC determination.

Issue 2

In 2015, the TDC upheld Trading Dispute DA701. This related to a failure to progress corrective actions following a previous TDC determination. ELEXON believes that there is the potential that other failures to progress TDC determinations have gone undetected. The Software Technical Advisory Group (STAG) has also noted issues with when a PFSR is to be undertaken to action a Trading Dispute determination. Following a review of the processes for performing a Post-Final Settlement Run, the following concerns have been identified:

A: The lack of explicit timescales on a Supplier to advise its agents of required Settlement correction leads.

The STAG noted occurrences where Suppliers did not notify or failed to notify its DC and DAs of the TDC determinations within a timely manner. This can result in the agents being unable to undertake the required Settlement corrections by the PFSR.

B: Weak controls late in the process.

The Supplier Volume Allocation Agent (SVAA) will contact the DAs, known to be associated with at least one Trading Dispute, who fail to submit PFSR files. However, there is no assurance that these files contain the Settlement corrections as determined by the TDC.

C: Timescale constraints to address failures.

The trigger for positive confirmation to the DS is currently within 5 Working Days (WDs) after the associated PFSR schedule day. This leaves short timescales to act upon any failures, including those on acting upon SVAA reminders.

D: Dis-jointed processes.

The PFSR schedule day can be in excess of a year following the date the DS advises a Supplier of a TDC determination. This can result in a dis-joint in the process.

Proposed Solution (mandatory by originator**)**

This CP seeks to amend Balancing and Settlement Code Procedure (BSCP) 11 'Trading Disputes' section 5.4 'Performing a Post-Final Settlement Run':

- To achieve the intention of CP1428.

- To ensure that there are explicit timescales on each process step and that it follows a logical path.

To achieve the intention of CP1428, amendments to BSCP11 are proposed to put an explicit obligation on Suppliers to inform its agents (including but not limited to DC and DA) to take such steps as are necessary to give effect to a determination of the TDC. Also, the erroneous obligation put on the DS to instruct DCs and DAs will be removed.

An explicit obligation will be put on Parties to instruct their relevant agents within 5 WDs following receipt of such a determination. This is so Settlement corrections undertaken by DCs and scheduling of PFSRs by DAs can reasonably be undertaken immediately following receipt of a TDC determination.

Furthermore, to remove the dis-jointed process whereby a Party can provide positive confirmation up to a year following receipt of a TDC determination, the timescales will be limited to within 20 WDs of receipt of such a determination, or within 5 WDs of the PFSR schedule day, whichever is sooner.

Justification for Change

A change to BSCP11 is required to achieve the intention of CP1428 and to provide clarity and efficiency for performing the PFSR to reduce the risk that corrective action is not entered into Settlement.

To which section of the Code does the CP relate, and does the CP facilitate the current provisions of the Code?

BSC Section W 'Trading Disputes'

Estimated Implementation Costs (mandatory by BSCCo)

£240 (1 man day) to implement the relevant document changes

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

BSCP11 'Trading Disputes'
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) 3 November 2016 (November 2016 BSC Systems Release) **Reason:** The next available BSC Systems Release
Version History (mandatory by BSCCo) Version 1.0 was raised by ELEXON on 29 March 2016.
Originator's Details: *BCA Name Simon Fox-Mella* *Organisation ELEXON Ltd* *Email Address bsc.change@elexon.co.uk* *Telephone Number 020 7380 4299* *Date 29 March 2016*
Attachments: **Y** Attachment A : BSCP11 proposed redlining v0.3 (3 pages)