

This document is classified as **White** in accordance with the Panel Information Policy. Information can be shared with the public, and any members may publish the information, subject to copyright.


MP200 ‘Faster Switching consequential changes to the SEC’

Modification Report Consultation responses

About this document

This document contains the full collated responses received to the MP200 Modification Report Consultation.

Summary of responses



Question 1: Do you believe that MP200 should be approved?

Question 1			
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale
Electricity North West Limited	Network Party	Approve	We agree the obligations on Network parties to ensure RDPs send registration data to the DSP should be removed as this obligation will sit with the DCC as the CSS provider from CSS Go live.
Western Power Distribution	Network Party	Approve	We believe that this modification will better facilitate SEC Objectives (a), (d) and (g) for the reasons stated in the report.
DCC	DCC	Approve	We believe MP200 should be approved as it better facilitates SEC Objectives a, d and g for the reasons provided in the Modification Report. MP200 will allow the SEC to be updated to support and reflect the Retail Energy Code (REC) provisions for CSS ahead of CSS Go-Live.

Question 2: Please provide any further comments you may have

Question 2			
Respondent	Category	Comments	SECAS Response
Electricity North West Limited	Network Party	No comment.	
Western Power Distribution	Network Party	<p>We have the following comments regarding the legal text:</p> <p>E2.1 – we believe that there should be a ‘,’ after ‘the DCC’.</p> <p>E2.2 – we believe that there should be a ‘,’ after ‘the DCC’.</p> <p>P1.22 – we note that the DCC doesn’t not need to advise the Panel which IDs are being associated with the RDP function, however, does the DCC not need to advise the Panel which IDs will be used as the CSS Provider function?</p> <p>Appendix X – 2.11 – this paragraph states ‘(e) - (l) below’, however ‘(l)’ is no longer in existence and therefore this should read ‘(e) – (k)’.</p> <p>Appendix X – 3.14 (c) (i) – under the DCC Service Flag it shows a snip of allowable values, however since the implementation of SECMP077 this is incorrect.</p> <p>Appendix X 3.15(c) (i) – under the DCC Service Flag it shows a snip of allowable values, however since the implementation of SECMP077 this is incorrect.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, SECAS will investigate these and make amendments accordingly.</p> <p>Regarding your comments for SEC Appendix X 3.14 (c)(i) and 3.15 (c)(i), when drafting this legal text, SECAS originally prepared the changes for Faster Switching against SEC Appendix X v2.0, whereas the current live version is v4.0. As none of the paragraphs being amended by MP200 have changed in the interim versions, it was not necessary to re-baseline the legal text, although we acknowledge this may have been beneficial for clarity.</p>
DCC	DCC	No comment.	