QUESTION	RESPONDENT DETAILS	RESPONSE	CODE MANAGER COMMENTS
1. Do you agree that the proposed solution addresses the problem statement? If not, please explain why.	ScottishPower Energy Retail Ltd Energy Supplier	We have struggled to understand what is being taken forward here. Our assumption is this is only taking forward an API based on user maintenance; however, the problem statement includes using an API for working SDEP messages.	The proposed solution is to introduce an Application Programming Interface (API) interface to allow: • SDEP Users to send/receive/respond to messages through the Secure Data Exchange Portal (SDEP) • EES and Secure Data Exchange Service (SDES) Users to carry out Electricity Enquiry Service (EES) Authorised Person Maintenance
	EDF Energy Supplier	No, we disagree with the proposed solution in R009. We agree with the recommendation made by the REC Manager that this change should be rejected and not progressed for development. We feel that the core SDEP solution (MVP) should be reviewed in the first instance to assess the key core functionalities before API automaton is introduced/ discussed. We consider these key aspects to be: 1. Improvements to reporting so that parties can easily monitor and track their processes. We believe that a considerable level of change is required to the reporting provided by the SDEP tool to enable parties to identify the escalations for each industry process and truly utilise the tool to manage the process effectively and efficiently.	The Energy Suppliers agreement with the Code Managers recommendation to reject this Change Proposal, has been noted. Comments relating to further SDEP functionality will be considered as part of the SDEP review.

		2. Introducing functionality to allow parties to bulk upload/ update new users and grant access so that the governance process is less onerous. We believe that this can be achieved in a simpler way than API i.e., a bulk upload tool via SDEP so that parties can choose their MPIDs and relevant processes in bulk to configure for a single/ multiple users as a minimum.	
	Anonymous Energy Supplier	Yes	n/a
	Northern Powergrid Distribution Network Operator	Yes, we believe the proposed solution address the problem statement.	n/a
	Electricity North West Limited Distribution Network Operator	We agree that the solution presented in the change report could address the issue identified in the problem statement.	n/a
2. Do you have any comments on the proposed legal text which sets out the proposed solution?	ScottishPower Energy Retail Ltd Energy Supplier	The legal text is specific to a user maintenance API but this change also relates to a full API where you can work the communications as well as user maintenance. It is unclear what this change is proposing. The name suggests User maintenance API, however all the documents reference the full API.	The draft legal text states there is an API as part of EES and SDEP. The precise functionality of each API would be included as part of the Technical Specifications if the proposed solution was approved for implementation.
	EDF Energy Supplier	Please see our response to question 1.	n/a
	Anonymous	No	n/a

	Energy Supplier		
	Northern Powergrid Distribution Network Operator	No	n/a
	Electricity North West Limited Distribution Network Operator	We have no comments on the proposed legal text.	n/a
3. Do you agree with the Code Manager's assessment of the Change Path, that this Change Proposal should be subject to Self-Governance approval by the Technical Expert Panel?	ScottishPower Energy Retail Ltd Energy Supplier	Yes	n/a
	EDF Energy Supplier	Please see our response to question 1.	n/a
	Anonymous Energy Supplier	*No response received*	n/a
	Northern Powergrid Distribution Network Operator	We agree	n/a
	Electricity North West Limited Distribution Network Operator	We agree with the Code Manager's assessment.	n/a

4. To ensure the cost benefit analysis is accurate, the assumptions made by the Code Manager, and detailed in the supporting R0009 – analysis summary conclusions document, need to be validated. Do you agree with the assumptions made by the Code Manager and used to complete the business case assessment? If not, please explain why	ScottishPower Energy Retail Ltd Energy Supplier	The savings mentioned are based on a full API and not just a user maintenance API.	The savings are based on the proposed solution to introduce changes to enable SDEP Users to send/receive/respond messages through the SDEP via API and for EES/SDES Users to carry out Authorised Person Maintenance via the API.
	EDF Energy Supplier	Please see our response to question 1.	n/a
	Anonymous Energy Supplier	Yes	n/a
	Northern Powergrid Distribution Network Operator	We agree with the analysis completed by the Code Manager but this is based on information gathered and shared rather than our own analysis.	n/a
	Electricity North West Limited Distribution Network Operator	We agree with the Code Manager's assumptions.	n/a
5. Do you agree with the forecasted volumes and values detailed in the analysis summary conclusions document? If not, please explain why	ScottishPower Energy Retail Ltd Energy Supplier	Yes, but struggling to understand the scope for this change.	See responses to questions 1 and 4
	EDF Energy Supplier	Please see our response to question 1.	n/a
	Anonymous Energy Supplier	Yes	n/a

	Northern Powergrid Distribution Network Operator	We agree with the analysis completed by the Code Manager but this is based on information gathered and shared rather than our own analysis.	n/a
	Electricity North West Limited Distribution Network Operator	We agree with the assumed volumes.	n/a
6. To support the Code Manager's validation of the cost benefit analysis and the case for change, what are the identified benefits to your business through the implementation of the proposed solution? Please provide a view on any tangible and intangible benefits	ScottishPower Energy Retail Ltd Energy Supplier	There is no benefit for a user maintenance API for EES or SDEP for us. If this is about the full SDEP API, then we would expect at least an FTE saving of 2 to 3. It is unclear if this includes the improvements that have been recommended. Before SDEP we were able to automate some of the processes within schedule 30, and with its introduction and the inability to use any automation, this has led to inefficiencies and delays.	Noted.
	EDF Energy Supplier	Please see our response to question 1.	n/a
	Anonymous Energy Supplier	reduction in FTE Quicker raising of queries	n/a
	Northern Powergrid Distribution Network Operator	We do not plan to utilise the API message functionality	n/a

	Electricity North West Limited Distribution Network Operator	We have not identified any significant benefits. The vast majority of the benefits will be realised by the Suppliers.	n/a
7. Would you see a benefit from the implementation of the proposed GUI functionality only, to introduce the functionality to raise individual messages in bulk?	ScottishPower Energy Retail Ltd Energy Supplier	Yes, but it needs to be monitored and ensure it is not misused and cause downtime.	n/a
	EDF Energy Supplier	Please see our response to question 1.	n/a
	Anonymous Energy Supplier	Potentially on SDES queries where there is volume, such as Elec Disputes,	n/a
	Northern Powergrid Distribution Network Operator	We would not make use of the proposed changes as we do not utilise the API at present or plan to use the GUI as our volumes are low	n/a
	Electricity North West Limited Distribution Network Operator	We do not believe that we would realise any significant benefits.	n/a
8. Based on the proposed solution, would your organisation invest in the development of your API adapter, to make use of the new	ScottishPower Energy Retail Ltd Energy Supplier	Yes. Unable to provide costs but assume it would be internal development therefore costs would be minimal.	n/a
	EDF Energy Supplier	*No response received*	n/a

SDEP/EES API functionality? If so, what would the cost of this be to your organisation? Please provide a breakdown where possible	Anonymous Energy Supplier	We would like to go back to having an API as with pre SDES, mainly for Dispute and ET queries, to speed up the process and reduce manual effort. We feel the FTE reduction v cost of the API would be realised within the year.	Comments will be considered as part of the SDEP review.
	Northern Powergrid Distribution Network Operator	n/a	n/a
	Electricity North West Limited Distribution Network Operator	We would not invest in the API adaptor as there are very few benefits to DNOs.	n/a
9. Do you agree with the Code Manager's recommendation, that the Change Proposal, should be rejected by the Technical Expert Panel? If not, please explain why.	ScottishPower Energy Retail Ltd Energy Supplier	It is unclear what is being delivered or when, at this time we cannot say.	See responses to questions 1 and 4
	EDF Energy Supplier	*No response received*	n/a
	Anonymous Energy Supplier	NO, This was part of the original process before SDES was released, the API automatically escalated bulk query types with no user intervention, allowing users to focus on working flows and actioning escalations. Now the process is no longer available additional resource has been sourced to do this, slowing down the process and taking users away from working the incoming. The original view was that this would become part of SDES.	Comments relating to further SDEP functionality will be included as part of the SDEP review.

		The review of SDES is underway will some of those improvements speed up efficiency within the system.	
	Northern Powergrid Distribution Network Operator	We agree	n/a
	Electricity North West Limited Distribution Network Operator	We agree with the assessment.	n/a
10. Do you have any other comments relating to this Change Proposal?	ScottishPower Energy Retail Ltd Energy Supplier	Review of how change proposals are presented to ensure parties understand fully what they are being asked to review and what is being delivered.	Prior to publication, the Preliminary Change Report was reviewed and approved by the Technical Expert Panel. However, the Code Manager has noted the feedback and will consider this during the development of future Change Proposal documentation.
	EDF Energy Supplier	*No response received*	n/a
	Anonymous Energy Supplier	*No response received*	n/a
	Northern Powergrid Distribution Network Operator	No	n/a
	Electricity North West Limited	As an industry principle, we (industry participants and the code manager) must ensure that any proposed changes to the REC creates positive cost benefits for customers.	n/a

	Distribution Network Operator	Instances where costs are unlikely to create any value should be rejected and we welcome the conclusions in the preliminary change report to recommend the rejection of this CP.	