QUESTION	RESPONDENT DETAILS	RESPONSE
Do you have any comments on the proposed solution?	**IMServ Europe** Data Collector	What is the logic for including SMART meters in the scope of this improvement, would they ever form part of a Complex site? I don't believe that User Stories M1 to M4 are complete since they don't include Change of Supplier or Change of HHDC, nor New Connections, which are all scenarios where a form must be issued. In addition, the User Stories do not specifically mention the CSSIF at all, seems an omission.
	IMServ Europe Metering Equipment Manager	As a MOP, we should have contacts for most HHDCs to send the mapping rules to, but how do we determine these for other recipients (DNOs, Supplier, etc.)? Should there be a centrally held register of email addresses to help with this? There was a guide to complex sites in BSCP514 (section 8) and we found this very useful to refer customers/other market participants to when discussing complex sites. This doesn't appear to have been transferred into the REC. Is there a reason why this hasn't been transferred?
What lead time is required for your business to implement this change proposal if it is approved?	**IMServ Europe** Data Collector	As a Distribution Network Operator this change proposal will not affect us, therefore, we have no comment in respect of the implementation date and implementation technique.
	IMServ Europe Metering Equipment Manager	We understand the changes to be process related with no software changes are required, however operational documents & procedures would need to be changed, along with staff training. A two month lead-time would be acceptable
Do you agree with the changes to the	**IMServ Europe** Data Collector	Mostly, but here are some comments: **CSSIF tab**

complex site supplementary information form? if not, why?		Measurement Quantity ID the comment of 'Will be populated as "AI", "AE", "Q1" "Q2", "Q3", "Q4"' is incorrect, Q1 to Q4 are not in the valid set, these should be replaced with 'RI' and 'RE' **Metering System Details tab** There seem to be a lot of unnecessary fields to be completed by the MEM that the HHDC doesn't require, such as 'Supplier', 'Distributor', 'Boundary Embedded Indicator', 'Metering Dispensation Ref', 'Method of Compensation (where applicable)' **Complex Site Mapping Details tab** Multiplier – The default value should be 1 and this field should be mandatory. The correct name of the data item Meter Serial ID is 'Meter Id (Serial Number)' The correct name of the data item O/S Serial Number is 'Outstation Id' The HHDC doesn't need to know both the Meter Serial ID and the O/S Serial Number particularly if the value is the same for both.
	IMServ Europe Metering Equipment Manager	On the whole, it looks ok, however we have not tried to apply the new form to real-world scenarios, and its possible this could unveil weaknesses. In BSCP514 the CSSIF format was optional, MOPs could use the example in BSCP514, or use something different as long as it meets the requirements. Will the new form be optional or mandatory? If the intention I that the published format is mandatory then Schedule 14 needs to be very clear about this.
	IMServ Europe	No

Would implementing this change incur any costs to your business? If so, please provide details.	Data Collector	
	IMServ Europe Metering Equipment Manager	Minimal costs incurred
Do you identify any benefits to your business by implementing the proposed changes?	**IMServ Europe** Data Collector	Yes. This seems a bit of a closed question, as it does not ask respondents what the benefits might be or the scale of the benefit. As a HHDC, improving the clarity of the CSSIF can only improve the chance of correct data entering the Settlement process so this is most welcome. Discovering and rectifying months or years or incorrectly aggregated data is expensive and gives a poor service to Suppliers and their customers.
	IMServ Europe Metering Equipment Manager	Generally we agree that the proposed changes are sensible, however we see the changes as housekeeping, so we expect the benefits to be minimal.
Considering any costs and benefits identified, do you believe this change should be made? Please provide details.	**IMServ Europe** Data Collector	Yes, see question 5.
	IMServ Europe Metering Equipment Manager	Yes - Cost should be minimal and the changes appear to be sensible.
	IMServ Europe	Under ‘Interpretations and Definitions Schedule’, is it always true that SLDs relate to 3 phase supplies only?

Do you have any other comments relating to this change proposal?	Data Collector	Initial Assessment Report - I do not agree that this is medium impact. Even though it impacts a fair number of Parties and Agents, overall numbers are low and a form already exists, even though it isn't perfect and the new form is better. This also seems at odd with a Priority status of 'Low' Having to select Non-Confidential after every question is a bit annoying especially if all of the responses are non-confidential, could there be an overall rating at the start where the respondent can say 'No part of this document is confidential'?
	IMServ Europe Metering Equipment Manager	The complex site process remains entirely manual and operates on the fringes of the settlement process, the changes won't necessary address existing failure point's i.e. automating the transfer Complex Site Supplementary forms on CoS/CoA. Possibly the scope of change should be a little more ambitious, we recognise that introducing new dataflows for would be cost probative considering the low volume. Maybe there could be alternatives to flows, for example all MOPs could be required to uploaded forms to central store, from where they could be accessed by any new MOP/HHDC.