

## Market Change Request

Number		Title	Priority
<b>MCR</b>	<b>0161</b>	Increasing the threshold for connection agreement return	<i>Medium</i>

Date	Version	Reason For Change
21/05/2008	1.0	Market Change Request raised containing no changes from the associated Discussion Request.
	1.1	Included following changes (changes made in red): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All existing MPRNs with MIC <math>\geq</math> 100 kVA <b>which did not have a current active connection agreement</b> were updated in 2006 with a 'deemed' agreement on foot of the CER decision.</li> <li>A change of supplier for a site <math>\geq</math>100 kVA where no change of legal entity is requested or inferred from the data on the CoS</li> <li>A change of supplier for a site <math>\geq</math> 100 kVA where a CoLE is requested or inferred from the data on the message</li> </ul>

CHANGE REQUEST:			
<b>Name of Requesting Organisation</b>		RMDS	
<b>Contact name</b>		Jessica Gregory	
<b>Date Change Request Raised</b>		21 <sup>st</sup> May 2008	<b>Originating Discussion Request</b>
		DR	0154

Detail of Discussion Request
<p><b><u>Background:</u></b></p> <p><b><u>DR122</u></b>  DR 154 is closely linked with the requirement in DR 122 to remove the requirement for a signed connection agreement in the case of a change of supplier with no CoLE. This requirement was required by CER decision made in 2006 CER06143 (see link below).</p> <p><a href="http://www.cer.ie/CERDocs/cer06143.pdf">http://www.cer.ie/CERDocs/cer06143.pdf</a></p> <p>The decision in DR122 allowed for the connection agreement requirement to remain where</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the MIC was 100 kVA or greater and where the CoS is combined with a CoLE</li> <li>the MIC was greater than or equal to 100 kVA and a CoLE had previously taken place without the signed connection agreement being returned by the customer.</li> </ul> <p>Further analysis of DR122 revealed that it may not have been the best option available. This DR essentially involved the removal of the connection agreement requirement for all CoS requests with no CoLE.</p> <p>Analysis of this DR determined that the change would produce limited short-term value and left issues for the longer term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All existing MPRNs with MIC <math>\geq</math> 100 kVA which did not have a current active connection agreement were updated in 2006 with a 'deemed' agreement on foot of the CER decision.</li> <li>CoLEs still require a CA. Over time an increasing number of MPRNs would experience a CoLE. While a CoLE automatically triggers the issue of a new connection agreement to the customer, there is a risk a number of these will not be returned as the customer has no immediate incentive to do so. If the connection agreement is not signed and returned by the customer, a</li> </ul>

## Detail of Discussion Request

subsequent CoS will require a connection agreement return before it can complete.

### **DR 154**

This DR (154) proposes a change to the threshold for returning signed Connection agreements (for existing sites).

Advantages of this option:

- The scale of the overall issue (delay in processing due to connection agreements not returned) into the future will be permanently reduced
- A smaller number of agreements will require follow up

DR 154 develops the concept of reducing the number of instances where a signed connection agreement is required for CoS completion. The suggestion is to apply the signed connection agreement requirement only to sites with a connection voltage of medium voltage (MV) and higher. This follows the approach taken in Northern Ireland.

There are 2 main connection agreement relevant scenarios for a change of supplier.

1. A change of supplier for a site  $\geq 100$  kVA where no change of legal entity is requested or inferred from the data on the CoS : A check is performed to see if a signed connection agreement is in place. If the agreement exists, the process continues. If there is **no signed connection agreement, this will usually mean there has been a previous CoLE without return of the connection agreement. In this event, the process will wait until the CA is returned.** A message 102P is sent to supplier indicating provisional acceptance.

2. A change of supplier for a site  $\geq 100$  kVA where a CoLE is requested or inferred from the data on the message.: A Connection agreement is issued. The process then **waits on the return of the signed connection agreement** in order to complete the CoS. A 102P is sent to the supplier indicating provisional acceptance.

### **Proposed Change**

The change proposes a change across the market processes in the threshold for the requirement of a signed connection agreement for existing MPRNs. This DR proposes to replace the MIC threshold of 100 kVA for this market requirement with a connection voltage threshold of Medium Voltage and higher.

This means that, for an existing meter point, a CoLE would lead to the requirement for a signed connection agreement with the new customer only where the connection voltage was medium voltage and higher. It would also mean that a CoS could proceed for all LV connection points even where the data on the CoS message implied a CoLE.

Advantages

- This would greatly reduce the number of MPRNs and processes requiring a CA returned.
- MPRNs where there is a heightened level of safety awareness required would still fall within the scope of the new requirement.
- The majority of new connections within a commercial complex would not need a connection agreement prior to connecting the new tenant. (A supplier registration would still be required.)
- This is compatible with the retail market design in Northern Ireland. That is it is consistent with retail market harmonisation which is a regulatory and government objective
- Delays in the majority of CoS processes will be removed.

Disadvantages

- This change involves complex and significant development and testing to all processes that involve the connection agreement for ESNB.

<b>Detail of Discussion Request</b>	
<b>Reason for Discussion Request</b>	
To reduce any unnecessary delays in processing Change of Suppliers.	
<b>Market Design Documents impacted by Request</b>	
Supplementary Information document embedded in MPD 1 Supplementary Information document embedded in MPD 2 Add detail to object information behind the process box 'Check if prov. Acceptance is required" for MD1 Add detail to object information behind the process box 'Check if prov. Acceptance is required" for MD2	
<b>Date of IGG where discussed</b>	15 <sup>th</sup> May 2008
<b>Change Request xref (if applicable)</b>	N/A

<b>PART 2 MARKET ASSURANCE:</b>				
<b>Applicability</b>				
ESB Networks	Suppliers	TSO	SSA	Generators
X				
<b>Scope of Test</b>				
Connectivity	DTT	MSA	IPT	Other
			No. Of Scenarios	

<b>PART 3 RESPONSES AND MODIFICATIONS:</b>
<b>Collation of Impact Assessment (from Form C)</b>
<i>Not Applicable</i>
<b>Modifications Included</b>
<i>Not Applicable</i>
<b>Reason for Modifications</b>
<i>Not Applicable</i>

<b>PART 4 ASSESSMENT &amp; RECOMMENDATION:</b>
<b>Part 4(a) ASSESSMENT</b>
<b>Summary of Impact Assessment</b>
<b>Recommendation on Implementation Plan</b>

--

<b>Part 4(b) RECOMMENDATION</b>			
<b>ACCEPTANCE</b>	<b>REJECTION</b>	<b>NO RECOMMENDATION</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>
<b>Reason for Recommendation</b>			
<b>Date of Recommendation</b>			

Filename: MCR 0161 -Increasing the threshold for connection  
agreement return v1.1.doc  
Directory: C:\Documents and Settings\Cowley\_G\Local  
Settings\Temporary Internet Files\OLK234  
Template: M:\MOIP\_Prog\Market Implementation Group\Change  
Control\Form A - Discussion Request.dot  
Title: Form A – MIG Design Discussion Request  
Subject:  
Author: Lee\_Dv  
Keywords:  
Comments:  
Creation Date: 29/05/2008 11:19 AM  
Change Number: 3  
Last Saved On: 24/06/2008 9:00 AM  
Last Saved By: gregory\_je  
Total Editing Time: 1 Minute  
Last Printed On: 25/06/2008 10:18 AM  
As of Last Complete Printing  
Number of Pages: 4  
Number of Words: 1,018 (approx.)  
Number of Characters: 5,807 (approx.)