

June 2002

ASSESSMENT REPORT
MODIFICATION PROPOSAL P73 –
Addition to data from Transmission
Company when submitting a claim
for Manifest Errors.

Prepared by the P73 Modification Group on behalf
of the Balancing and Settlement Code Panel

Document Reference	MAR061
Version no.	1.0
Issue	Draft
Date of Issue	20 May 2002
Reason for Issue	For Panel Decision
Author	ELEXON

I DOCUMENT CONTROL

a Authorities

Version	Date	Author	Signature	Change Reference
0.1	20/05/02	Assurance Department		
1.0	7/06/02	Change Delivery		

Version	Date	Reviewer	Signature	Responsibility
0.1		P73 Modification Group		
0.1		Assurance Department		
0.1		Legal Department		

b Distribution

Name	Organisation
Each BSC Party	Various
Each BSC Agent	Various
The Gas and Electricity Markets Authority	Ofgem
Each BSC Panel Member	Various
energywatch	energywatch
Core Industry Document Owners	Various

c Intellectual Property Rights and Copyright

This document contains materials the copyright and other intellectual property rights in which are vested in ELEXON Limited or which appear with the consent of the copyright owner. These materials are made available for you to review and to copy for the purposes of the establishment, operation or participation in electricity trading arrangements in Great Britain under the BSC. All other commercial use is prohibited. Unless you are a person having an interest in electricity trading in Great Britain under the BSC you are not permitted to view, download, modify, copy, distribute, transmit, store, reproduce or otherwise use, publish, licence, transfer, sell or create derivative works (in whatever format) from this document or any information obtained from this document otherwise than for personal academic or other non-commercial purposes. All copyright and other proprietary notices contained in the original material must be retained on any copy that you make. All other rights of the copyright owner not expressly dealt with above are reserved.

II CONTENTS TABLE

I	Document Control	2
a	Authorities	2
b	Distribution	2
c	Intellectual Property Rights and Copyright	2
II	Contents Table	3
1	Summary and Recommendations	4
1.1	Recommendations	4
1.2	Background	4
1.3	Rationale for Recommendations	4
2	Introduction	5
3	Modification Group Details	5
4	Description of modification	5
4.1	Background and History of Modification Proposal P73	5
4.2	Modification Proposal P73	6
4.3	Recommend solution and rationale	6
5	ASSESSMENT AGAINST APPLICABLE BSC OBJECTIVES	7
5.1	Applicable BSC Objectives	7
6	IMPACT ON BSC AND BSCCo DOCUMENTATION	7
6.1	BSC	7
6.2	Operational impact	7
6.2.1	The Trading Disputes Committee	7
7	Legal Issues	7
8	Summary of Representations	7
9	Summary of Transmission Company Analysis	7
10	Project Brief	8
Annex 1 - Proposed Text to Modify the BSC		9
Annex 2 - High Level Impact Assessment by NGC – P73		10
Annex 3 - BSC Party Impact Assessments for P73		11

1 SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1.1 Recommendations

On the basis of the analysis, consultation and assessment undertaken in respect of this Modification Proposal during the Assessment Procedure, and the resultant findings of this report, the Modification Group recommends to the BSC Panel that:

- Modification Proposal P73 should proceed to the Report Phase for presentation to the Panel meeting on 13 June 2002.
- Recommend that the Implementation Date for the Proposed Modification should be 15 working days after the date of the Authority's determination.

1.2 Background

Modification Proposal P73 (P73) was submitted on 5 April 2002 by Powergen UK Limited. The Modification Proposal seeks to place an additional obligation on the Transmission Company when raising a Manifest Error Claim. It is proposed that the Transmission Company should identify the erroneous Bid-Offer Acceptance Number as well as the erroneous Bid-Offer Pair(s) which is currently identified when raising a Manifest Error Claim.

The Panel, at its meeting of 18 April 2002, considered the Initial Written Assessment of P73 and agreed that P73 be submitted to the Assessment Procedure, with the Assessment Report to be presented for consideration at the Panel meeting of 16 May 2002. However, due to difficulties forming a Modifications Group it was not possible to undertake the necessary consultation and Impact Assessment in time to report back to the May Panel meeting. A one month extension to the Assessment Procedure was agreed by the Panel at its May meeting. The Assessment Report is to be presented to the June meeting. The Panel agreed that the Assessment Procedure should be undertaken by the same Modification Group that considered Modification Proposal P61.

1.3 Rationale for Recommendations

P73 will assist the Trading Disputes Committee (TDC) decision making process by adding to the clarity of information provided by the Transmission Company. Furthermore Manifest Error Claims raised by the Transmission Company relate to Acceptances so P73 makes the claim process consistent with this by identifying the erroneous Acceptance. The purpose of Manifest Error Claims is to allow for the identification and claiming of an error within a short time period. Manifest Error Claims have to be raised within a four hour window of the applicable Bid-Offer Acceptance time and this proposal removes the potential for the Transmission Company to take advantage of the existing process and provide data outside of the four hour window. The Modification Group therefore believes that the Modification Proposal will better facilitate the achievement of the Applicable BSC Objective 3(d).

The Modification has no impact on BSC Systems.

2 INTRODUCTION

This Report has been prepared by ELEXON Ltd, on behalf of the Balancing and Settlement Code Panel ('the Panel'), in accordance with the terms of the Balancing and Settlement Code ('BSC'). The BSC is the legal document containing the rules of the balancing mechanism and imbalance settlement process and related governance provisions. ELEXON is the company that performs the role and functions of the BSCCo, as defined in the BSC.

An electronic copy of this document can be found on the BSC website, at www.elexon.co.uk

3 MODIFICATION GROUP DETAILS

The Membership of the P73 Modification Group was as follows:

Member	Organisation
Nigel Gibbs	ELEXON (Chair)
Mark Manley	ELEXON (Lead Analyst)
Claire Maxim	Powergen (Sponsor)
Abid Sheikh	Scottish Power
Mark Thomas	Innogy
Mark Edwards	Edison Mission
Sarah Maud	Dynegy
Claire Gwyer	TXU
Deborah Cox	National Grid
Paul Brodrick	ELEXON

In addition the following attendee has attended one or more meetings during the Assessment Procedure

Member	Organisation
Jerome Williams	Ofgem

4 DESCRIPTION OF MODIFICATION

4.1 Background and History of Modification Proposal P73

Manifest Error Claim 14 was raised by the Transmission Company, the claim was raised within the required four hour window and specified an incorrect Bid-Offer Acceptance Number. The Transmission Company realised that it had provided erroneous information and sought to amend this data outside the four hour window allowed for raising claims under Section Q7.2.2. The Transmission Company claimed that they were not obliged to

provide the Bid-Offer Acceptance Number under the BSC and this could be amended subsequently. ELEXON sought legal advice which concurred with this view. However, this led to a lengthy debate at the TDC about the validity of the claim and the ability to amend data.

It was decided that it would be appropriate for a Modification Proposal to be raised to address this issue. As it is outside the scope of the TDC Terms of Reference to raise a Modification Proposal on Manifest Errors, a member of the TDC raised the Modification Proposal to address this deficiency.

The P73 Modification Group have met once and have reviewed P73. A High Level Impact Assessment and a consultation document have been issued.

4.2 Modification Proposal P73

When the Transmission Company raises a Manifest Error Claim it does so in accordance with Section Q7.2.2 of the BSC. The Modification Proposal seeks to extend the information provided by the Transmission Company when raising a Manifest Error Claim.

P73 places an additional obligation on the Transmission Company to provide additional information when raising a Manifest Error Claim namely, the erroneous Bid-Offer Acceptance Number.

4.3 Recommend solution and rationale

P73 makes a provision for additional data by the Transmission Company when raising a Manifest Error Claim.

The Modification Group identified an issue whereby the Transmission Company may be unable to provide the additional data requested by P73. This scenario would occur in exceptional circumstances when there is a Transmission Company Planned or Unplanned outage.

During a period of system outage Bid-Offer Acceptances are issued via the telephone and logged manually instead of being automatically entered. The Bid-Offer Acceptance Numbers are created retrospectively once the systems are operational and the Bid-Offer Acceptances are entered into the Transmission Company's computer system.

Manifest Error Claims must be raised within four hours of the Bid-Offer Acceptance time and it is possible that the system outage may last longer than four hours thus, effectively preventing the Transmission Company from raising Manifest Error Claims during an outage period.

The Modifications group suggested that in the circumstances of a system outage an alternative method of uniquely identifying the erroneous Bid-Offer Acceptance should be made available to the Transmission Company. The Modifications Group proposed that Section Q5.3.1 (a) and (c) be utilised to identify the erroneous Bid-Offer Acceptance during a period of system outage. Section Q5.3.1 (a) provides for the MW "from" and "to" levels and the associated times and (c) specifies the Bid-Offer Acceptance Time.

The Modifications Group agreed that the consultation document be sent to BSC Parties to canvas opinion as to whether to include a provision for exceptional circumstances. The

responses from BSC Parties indicated that a provision covering exceptional circumstances should be included.

The Modifications Group favoured the inclusion of a provision to cover exceptional circumstances, as without the Bid-Offer Acceptance number the claim would be invalidated.

5 ASSESSMENT AGAINST APPLICABLE BSC OBJECTIVES

5.1 Applicable BSC Objectives

The P73 Modification Group believe that P73 would promote efficiency in the decision making process of the TDC and therefore believe that this Modification Proposal better facilitates achievement of the Applicable BSC Objective 3(d), (Promoting efficiency in the implementation and administration of the balancing and settlement arrangements.)

6 IMPACT ON BSC AND BSCCo DOCUMENTATION

6.1 BSC

The proposed legal text for P73 is provided in ANNEX 1. All the changes are to Section Q7 of the BSC. The impact of the legal drafting is to place an additional obligation on the Transmission Company to provide the erroneous Bid-Offer Acceptance Number when raising a Manifest Error Claim. During a period of planned or unplanned outage the Transmission Company can provide alternative information as detailed in Section Q5.3.1 (a) and (c).

6.2 Operational impact

6.2.1 The Trading Disputes Committee

The TDC decision making process will be improved as clear and unambiguous information will be presented to the Trading Disputes Committee. This should improve the efficiency of the decision making process with relation to the validity of the Manifest Error Claim.

7 LEGAL ISSUES

There are no legal issues not covered by rewording of the BSC, see ANNEX 1.

8 SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

Eleven responses (on behalf of Forty-three parties) were received in response to the consultation (see Annex 3). All supported P73 and all respondents indicated that they believe that P73 better facilitates achievement of the Applicable BSC Objectives.

9 SUMMARY OF TRANSMISSION COMPANY ANALYSIS

The Transmission Company response to the High Level Impact Assessment on P73 (Annex 2) can be summarised as: the Transmission Company supports P73 on the basis that as a Manifest Error

Claim relates to an Acceptance it is logical that there is an obligation on them to provide the Bid-Offer Acceptance Number.

The Transmission Company has confirmed that under normal circumstances they will be able to provide the additional information requested by P73. In the case of exceptional circumstances (Transmission Company planned or unplanned outage) the Transmission Company will be able to provide additional data to uniquely identify the erroneous Bid-Offer Acceptance Number.

The only Party impacted is the Transmission Company and the changes are minimal. The maximum notice period requested was at least 5 working days to implement the change.

10 PROJECT BRIEF

It is proposed that P73 solution be implemented 15 working days after the Authority decision. This implementation date reflects that changes are only required to the BSC and that there no BSC Systems implications.

ANNEX 1 - PROPOSED TEXT TO MODIFY THE BSC

P73 – legal drafting

- Q 7.2.2 Where the Transmission Company considers that it has made a Manifest Error, the Transmission Company may, subject to paragraph 7.2.3, as soon as reasonably practicable after becoming aware of the error and in any event no later than 4 hours after the Bid-Offer Acceptance Time, make a claim to that effect by giving notice of such claim to BSCCo, which the Transmission Company shall copy promptly to the Lead Party, identifying:
- (a) each Error Bid/Offer Pair and
 - (b) the relevant Acceptance, by specifying:
 - (i) subject to paragraph (ii), the Bid-Offer Acceptance Number;
 - (ii) where (at the time at which the Transmission Company gives such notice) there is an Outage (as defined in paragraph 1.2.1 (c) of this Section) , the Acceptance Data specified in paragraphs 5.3.1 (a) and (c)."

Annex 2 - HIGH LEVEL IMPACT ASSESSMENT BY NGC – P73

Modification Proposal P73 'Addition to data required from Transmission Company when submitting a claim for Manifest Error'

Respondent:	NGC
Representing (please list all Parties)	
Question	Response
Do you support the principle of Modification Proposal P73	Yes Rationale: BSC Section Q7.1.1(a)(ii) states that the TC raises Manifest Error claims "in relation to an Acceptance", therefore it is logical that there should be an obligation on the TC to identify the BOA number.
Will you be able to provide the additional information requested in Modification Proposal P73 within the four-hour window of the Bid-Offer Acceptance time	Yes Rationale: Under normal circumstances, the information is available to the TC on its computer systems.
In the case of exceptional circumstances (NGC planned or unplanned outage), will you be able to provide information that will uniquely identify the erroneous Bid-Offer Acceptance Number. In accordance with Section Q5.3.1 (a) & (c) of the BSC within the allotted four-hour window of the Bid-Offer Acceptance time	Yes Rationale: In exceptional circumstances that make it impossible for NGC to obtain the BOA number from its computer systems, the information required in accordance with Section Q5.3.1 (a) & (c) will be available from other records.
Are there any instances when you will not be able to provide either the erroneous Bid-Offer Acceptance Number or the alternative information outlined above	No Rationale: See above two boxes.
Do you believe that this Modification Proposal better facilitates achievement of the BSC Objectives (see below) than the current situation?	Yes Rationale: (d) This modification introduces more consistency into Q7.
Any further comments:	The TC will require at least 5 working days' notice to implement this change.

ANNEX 3 - BSC PARTY IMPACT ASSESSMENTS FOR P73

**Responses for
Consultation of Modification P73.**

P73_ASS_001 – Edison Mission Energy

Respondent:	Edison Mission Energy
Representing (please list all Parties)	First Hydro Company, Lakeland Power
Question	Response
Do you support the principle of Modification Proposal P73	Yes Rationale: It adds to the clarity of a Manifest Error Claim by the Transmission Company (TC) and is consistent with Q7.1.1(a) which states that a TC Manifest Error is in relation to an Acceptance.
Do you agree that the Modification Proposal should take into account these exceptional circumstances	Yes Rationale: It is unreasonable not to allow a Manifest Error claim at times of system outages.
Do you agree that Section Q5.3.1 (a) and (c) uniquely identifies the erroneous Bid-Offer Acceptance Number	Yes Rationale: These data would not be replicated in full for different BOAs and would therefore uniquely define an Acceptance.
Do you believe that this Modification Proposal better facilitates achievement of the BSC Objectives (see below) than the current situation?	Yes Rationale: Objectives (a) and (d) below are facilitated, by improving the efficiency of making and processing Manifest Error claims.
Any further comments	

P73_ASS_002 – TXU

Respondent:	Philip Russell
Representing (please list all Parties)	21 TXU BSC Parties
Question	Response
Do you support the principle of Modification Proposal P73	Yes Rationale: Makes it easier for the rest of the Industry to be clear as to which BOA is the subject of the claim.
Do you agree that the Modification Proposal should take into account these exceptional circumstances	Yes Rationale: If it can happen, it probably will.

Do you agree that Section Q5.3.1 (a) and (c) uniquely identifies the erroneous Bid-Offer Acceptance Number	Yes Rationale: For the rare circumstances in which it would be necessary to use these it would seem the most practical option.
Do you believe that this Modification Proposal better facilitates achievement of the BSC Objectives (see below) than the current situation?	Yes Rationale: (d) – administrative efficiency.
Any further comments	

P73_ASS_003 – Powergen

Respondent:	Claire Maxim
Representing (please list all Parties)	Powergen UK Powergen Energy Diamond Power Cottam Development Centre
Question	Response
Do you support the principle of Modification Proposal P73	Yes Removes potential ambiguity
Do you agree that the Modification Proposal should take into account these exceptional circumstances	Yes It would be unreasonable to expect NGC to provide a BOA number where one cannot be assigned by the automatic systems. A pragmatic solution may to be assign "Emergency BOA Numbers" of a different format which may then be used as a reference.
Do you agree that Section Q5.3.1 (a) and (c) uniquely identifies the erroneous Bid-Offer Acceptance Number	Yes
Do you believe that this Modification Proposal better facilitates achievement of the BSC Objectives (see below) than the current situation?	Yes See original proposal
Any further comments	

P73_ASS_004 – London Electricity

Respondent:	Liz Anderson, London Electricity
Representing (please list all Parties)	London Electricity, South Western Electricity, Jade Power, Sutton Bridge Power and TXU West Burton Power Limited.
Question	Response
Do you support the principle of Modification Proposal P73	Yes Rationale: The aim of the modification to aid the unambiguous identification of a Manifest Error will both improve the quality of the information supplied to the Trading Disputes Committee and bring the BSC into line with Balancing and Settlement Code Procedure 735 for the Processing of Manifest Error Claims.
Do you agree that the Modification Proposal should take into account these exceptional circumstances	Yes Rationale: Where exceptional circumstances (e.g. outages) prevent a Bid-Offer Acceptance Number being available it seems reasonable that the Transmission Company should provide alternative information to uniquely identify the erroneous Bid-Offer Acceptance. This will allow the TDC to function as efficiently as possible when considering a Manifest Error claim.
Do you agree that Section Q5.3.1 (a) and (c) uniquely identifies the erroneous Bid-Offer Acceptance Number	Caveated yes. Rationale: Part of Section Q5.3.1 (b) considers the eventuality where Acceptance Data exists with identical Bid-Offer Acceptance Times but different Bid-Offer Acceptance Numbers. It therefore follows that all Acceptance Volume Pairs in the set comprising the Acceptance data for a BMU Acceptance would need to be provided to uniquely identify the erroneous Bid-Offer Acceptance Number. This would cope with a scenario in which some of the Acceptance Volume Pairs in the two Acceptances with the same Bid-Offer Acceptance Time have identical "from" and "to" MW and time values.
Do you believe that this Modification Proposal better facilitates achievement of the BSC Objectives (see below) than the current situation?	Yes Rationale: This modification proposal better facilitates achievement of BSC Objective (d) Promoting efficiency in the implementation and administration of the balancing and settlement arrangements particularly in relation to the operation of the TDC.

Any further comments	
----------------------	--

P73_ASS_005 – Aquila Networks

Respondent:	Rachael Gardener
Representing (please list all Parties)	Aquila Networks
Question	Response
Do you support the principle of Modification Proposal P73	No comment.
Do you agree that the Modification Proposal should take into account these exceptional circumstances	
Do you agree that Section Q5.3.1 (a) and (c) uniquely identifies the erroneous Bid-Offer Acceptance Number	
Do you believe that this Modification Proposal better facilitates achievement of the BSC Objectives (see below) than the current situation?	
Any further comments	

P73_ASS_006 – NGC

Respondent:	
Representing (please list all Parties)	
Question	Response
Do you support the principle of Modification Proposal P73	Yes Rationale: BSC Section Q7.1.1(a)(ii) states that the TC raises Manifest Error claims “in relation to an Acceptance”, therefore it is logical that there should be an obligation on the TC to identify the BOA number.
Do you agree that the Modification Proposal should take into account these exceptional circumstances	Yes Rationale: There would be a possibility in such circumstances that a Manifest Error claim could be rejected on the “technicality” that the BOA number had not been supplied. This would not be desirable given the potential impact on SBP/SSP. The proposed alternative to supplying the BOA number does not lessen the obligation on the TC to identify uniquely the BOA.
Do you agree that Section Q5.3.1 (a) and (c) uniquely identifies the erroneous Bid-Offer	Yes Rationale: In principle, the answer is Yes.

Acceptance Number	The only situation in which Section Q5.3.1 (a)&(c) would not uniquely identify a BOA would be the highly improbable situation where more than one BOA was issued within one minute for exactly the same MW/time points; they would have different BOA numbers. However, the unlikely event of this occurring, the TC would identify that it was the first BOA against which the claim was being raised.
Do you believe that this Modification Proposal better facilitates achievement of the BSC Objectives (see below) than the current situation?	Yes Rationale: (d) This modification introduces more consistency into Q7.
Any further comments	

P73_ASS_007 – SEEBOARD Energy

Respondent:	Dave Morton
Representing (please list all Parties)	SEEBOARD Energy Limited
Question	Response
Do you support the principle of Modification Proposal P73	Yes Rationale: This proposal clearly attempts to address an existing flaw within BSC code.
Do you agree that the Modification Proposal should take into account these exceptional circumstances	Yes Rationale: It makes no sense to provide an incomplete solution and thereby only solving parts of this problem.
Do you agree that Section Q5.3.1 (a) and (c) uniquely identifies the erroneous Bid-Offer Acceptance Number	Yes, but Rationale: As a party we are not currently active within balancing mechanism. Therefore our expertise in this area is limited and there may be ambiguities of which we would not be aware.
Do you believe that this Modification Proposal better facilitates achievement of the BSC Objectives (see below) than the current situation?	Yes Rationale: By ensuring that data requirements in support of a manifest error claim are entirely appropriate objective (d), Promoting efficiency in the implementation and administration of the balancing and

	settlement arrangements, must be satisfied.
Any further comments	

P73_ASS_008 – Dynegy

Respondent:	Dynegy
Representing (please list all Parties)	
Question	Response
Do you support the principle of Modification Proposal P73	Yes Rationale: This proposal provides clarification to the disputes process that eliminates the possibility that the SO could take advantage of current dispute requirements. It also assists the TDC in its role by providing this clarity regarding claim data.
Do you agree that the Modification Proposal should take into account these exceptional circumstances	Yes Rationale: This seems reasonable, as planned outages are an expected aspect of SO activity. The likelihood that any error would be related to a period of exceptional circumstances is small, so this theoretically will not need to be used often.
Do you agree that Section Q5.3.1 (a) and (c) uniquely identifies the erroneous Bid-Offer Acceptance Number	Yes Rationale: Section Q5.3.1 (a) and (c) provide sufficient information in the event of exceptional circumstances. However, only the BOA number, 'k', provides absolute uniqueness. However, Dynegy support using the criteria in Section Q5.3.1 (a) and (c) as criteria to be used in the event of exceptional circumstances.
Do you believe that this Modification Proposal better facilitates achievement of the BSC Objectives (see below) than the current situation?	Yes Rationale: This modification will promote efficiency in the administration of the BSC by reducing the uncertainties surrounding error claims.
Any further comments	No

P73_ASS_009 – British Energy

Respondent:	Rachel Ace
Representing (please list all Parties)	British Energy Power and Energy Trading British Energy Generation Eggborough Power Ltd

Question	Response
Do you support the principle of Modification Proposal P73	Yes Rationale: It would increase transparency and efficiency. It would also assist the Disputes Committee in their work.
Do you agree that the Modification Proposal should take into account these exceptional circumstances	Yes Rationale: This will provide comprehensive coverage.
Do you agree that Section Q5.3.1 (a) and (c) uniquely identifies the erroneous Bid-Offer Acceptance Number	Yes Rationale:
Do you believe that this Modification Proposal better facilitates achievement of the BSC Objectives (see below) than the current situation?	Yes/No Rationale: Better facilitates 7A(C) and (D)
Any further comments	Other aspects of the manifest error provisions in the BSC would also benefit from clarification, for example the substitute prices to be used, and that modification to the provision to allow the Panel more flexibility in the corrective actions permitted would be beneficial.

P73_ASS_010 – Scottish Power UK plc

Respondent:	Man Kwong Liu
Representing (please list all Parties)	<i>ScottishPower UK Plc.; ScottishPower Energy Trading Ltd.; ScottishPower Generation Ltd.; Scottish Power Energy Retail Ltd.; SP Transmission Ltd.</i>
Question	Response

<p>Do you support the principle of Modification Proposal P73</p>	<p>Yes Rationale: It seems sensible to incentivise the System Operator as much as possible to adopt practices which ensure that it is acting in the most efficient manner when operating the Transmission System. This includes the provision of as much information as possible about Bid-Offer Acceptances when the System Operator claims a manifest error. By identifying the relevant Bid-Offer Acceptance Number, the System Operator will be required to adopt high standards of practice which prevent erroneous claims being made. This would also help the TDC to determine the validity or otherwise of a claim by the System Operator.</p>
<p>Do you agree that the Modification Proposal should take into account these exceptional circumstances</p>	<p>Yes Rationale: We recognise that NGC would have particular difficulties in identifying Bid-Offer Acceptances made by phone or for very short time periods. We are not fully satisfied that a planned outage constitutes an exceptional circumstance because this event can be anticipated and some contingent arrangement could be put in place to allow for identification of a Bid-Offer Acceptance. However, for the sake of efficiency, we agree that it is sensible to adopt a uniform approach to the identification of Bid-Offer Acceptances by dealing with all outage situations as exceptional circumstances.</p>
<p>Do you agree that Section Q5.3.1 (a) and (c) uniquely identifies the erroneous Bid-Offer Acceptance Number</p>	<p>Yes Rationale: In most cases, the use of spot times and volumes will provide a means of identification. We await with interest the legal drafting which NGC is to provide to deal with exceptional circumstances.</p>
<p>Do you believe that this Modification Proposal better facilitates achievement of the BSC Objectives (see below) than the current situation?</p>	<p>Yes Rationale: P73 provides a further check upon the System Operator to ensure that Bid-Offer Acceptances are recorded accurately and erroneous manifest error claims are avoided. In this respect, this proposal meets the Applicable BSC Objective requiring the efficient, economic and co-ordinated operation of the Transmission System by NGC and, to a lesser extent, the Objective which seeks to promote efficiency in the implementation and administration of the trading arrangements.</p>

Any further comments	None.
----------------------	-------

P73_ASS_011 – Scottish and Southern Energy plc

This response is sent on behalf of Scottish and Southern Energy, Southern Electric, Keadby Generation Ltd. and SSE Energy Supply Ltd.

In relation to the question in Annex A of the Assessment Consultation Paper, contained within your note of 3rd May 2002 concerning Modification Proposal P73, we do support the principle of this P73 Modification Proposal, which should take account of the exceptional circumstances.

Garth Graham
Scottish & Southern Energy plc