

This document is classified as **Clear** in accordance with the Panel Information Policy. Recipients can distribute this information to the world, there is no limit on disclosure. Information may be shared without restriction subject to copyright.

SECCB_82_2009 – MP207 Impact Assessment Request responses

The Change Board were unanimous in their rejection of the recommendation to request the Impact Assessment for MP207. This document summarises each members vote and the reasons given for the rejection of the Request for the Impact Assessment.

Change Board Member	Vote	Comments
Large Supplier 1 (AH)	Reject	There is no benefits case ¹ , this is not a solution to the problem and a waste of industry time.
Large Supplier 2 (EL)	Reject	No use case has been provided, no business case, the benefits do not align with SEC Objectives, costs do not align to the solution, this will not fix the problem.
Large Supplier 3 (DR)	Reject	We acknowledge there is a firmware problem, but this solution does not solve the problem. The business benefits are not here.
Large Supplier 4 (KC)	Reject	There is no business case
Large Supplier 5 (EJ)	Reject	We acknowledge there is a problem, no point in asking for the IA as the benefits of this solution are not clear or appear to be negative.
Large Supplier 6 (SA)	Reject	There is no viable business case, this doesn't resolve the problem. The proposal has no clear support. It is not helpful that the Proposer is not here,

¹ The Proposer has not provided any evidence and SECAS has not been able to find enough evidence to show a positive benefits/business case.

		they appear to have a conflict of interests as they are looking to enable services they can sell to Parties and no evidence of Parties really needing it.
Small Supplier 1 (CB)	Reject	The solution provided does not address the issue. There is an assumption that Small Suppliers need this, but Small Suppliers have rejected it and it has had no support.
Small Supplier 2 (CT)	Reject	There is no support from Small Suppliers. This is not a good use of industry time and money.
Network Party 1 (JDA)	Reject	This does not solve the issue. There is no support from key Parties. It is a drain on DCC resources and will muddy the waters with respect to responsibility for firmware upgrades.
Network Party 2 (AC)	Reject	There is a lack of business case.
Other SEC Party 1 (NW)	Reject	This does not solve the problem and has no support.
Other SEC Party 2 (IL)	Reject	We agree there is a problem, but this solution will not solve it. There is no evidence that the Suppliers can activate the upgrade once sent. This will be a dilution of accountability on firmware upgrades. We agree with everything already stated by other Change Board members.
Other SEC Party 3 (PCS)	Reject	We are very supportive of the additional services concept, but this is only a partial solution. We cannot support requesting an Impact Assessment when no support has been shown.