

■ MP289 'BCDR Engagement'

Talia Lattimore

Raised by David Rollason from DCC

MEDIUM

■ MP289 'BCDR Engagement'

This MP289 deck covers:

- An overview of the Modification
- A view of the next steps proposed for this Modification.

The Modification was presented at the Change Sub-Committee on 15 April 2025. The Modification has raised interest from Sub-Committees, including OPSG, TAG and TABASC.

REVIEW the MODIFICATION and PROVIDE FEEDBACK on the NEXT STEPS and any KNOWN ISSUES

Issues & Impacts

- The DCC's approach to BCDR testing has evolved and the current SEC Party engagement/notification requirements may not be appropriate in every instance of BCDR testing.
- SEC Parties currently have no formal visibility over how the DCC approaches BCDR testing.
- Different engagement requirements across outage activities and advanced planning make it difficult to engage parties in an efficient and joined up manner.
- Lack of formal visibility on DCCs BCDR testing approach gives parties little insight into the purpose and benefits of testing.

■ MP289: Overview (2/2)

Proposed Solution

- Amend the current requirements for engagement and notification regarding BCDR Testing, considering the DCC approach to BCDR Testing.
- Formalise the production and availability of the DCC's BCDR Testing Approach document with a requirement to review the approach on a regular basis.

■ Next Steps



Questions for TABASC

Does TABASC see any issues arising from the implementation of this Modification?



Any other comments/questions?

