

## P295 Consultation Responses

Consultation issued on 20 September 2013

What stage is this document in the process?

01 Initial Written Assessment

02 Definition Procedure

03 Assessment Procedure

04 Report Phase

We received responses from the following Parties

Company	No BSC Parties / Non-Parties Represented	Role of Parties/non-Parties represented
SONI Ltd	1/0	Interconnector Administrator (IA), Interconnector Error Administrator (IEA)
Mutual Energy	0/1	Interconnector Owner
RWE Supply & Trading GmbH	10	Supplier, Generator, Trader, Consolidator, Exemptable Generator, Party Agent
BritNed	1/0	IA
IBM UK Ltd for and on behalf of the ScottishPower Group	7/0	Supplier, Generator, Trader, Consolidator, Exemptable Generator, Distributor
EirGrid Interconnector Ltd	1/0	Interconnector Owner, IA
National Grid Interconnectors Limited	1/0	IA, IEA
National Grid	1/0	Transmission Company
EDF Energy	10/0	Generator, Supplier, Party Agent, Consolidator, Exemptable Generator, Trader
E.ON	5/0	Generator, Supplier, Consolidator, Exemptable Generator, Trader

Question 1: Do you agree with the Workgroup's initial unanimous view that P295 does better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives than the current baseline?

## Summary

Yes	No	Neutral/No Response	Other
8	1	1	0

## Responses

Respondent	Response	Rationale
<b>SONI Ltd</b>	NO	<p>It is not clear that P295 promotes a more efficient, economic and co-ordinated operation of the Transmission System (Objective B), nor that it promotes competition in the generation and supply of electricity (Objective C).</p> <p>Furthermore, should the alternative solution be implemented, SONI strongly disagree that Objective D, the promotion of efficiency in the implementation of the balancing and settlement arrangements, is better facilitated. Any adoption of the alternative solution places an obligation on Interconnector Administrators to submit transparency data to the BMRA in parallel to submission of the data to the EMFIP. Since the transparency data is already available on the FUI auction portal, via the auction management platform, and is to be sent to EMFIP, there is little value in additionally sending it to the BMRA. It will add cost and inefficiencies and our view is that interconnector users will continue to use the current data sources.</p>
<b>Mutual Energy</b>	YES	Facilitates compliance with European legislation which would not be covered by existing baseline
<b>RWE</b>	YES	<p>As required under the Transparency Directive, data needs to be sent to ENTSO-E by some mechanism. Therefore P295 better meets Objective (e) in the absence of any alternative approach towards compliance with the Directive.</p> <p>P295 creates the interfaces necessary for the submission of data to the central European platform via the BMRA. However, if P295 is not implemented then then National Grid has to build a new interface. What is missing is the costs/ timescales of a National Grid alternative to know whether it provides a better route to compliance. However,</p>

Respondent	Response	Rationale
		given the timescales involved and the fact that P291 is already approved then P295 might be the least risky route left to the industry for compliance.
<b>BritNed</b>	YES	BritNed has no reason to disagree with the views of the proposer or the workgroup.
<b>IBM UK Ltd for and on behalf of the ScottishPower Group</b>	YES	<p>P295 Proposed better meets the applicable objectives than the current baseline for the following reasons:</p> <p>Objective b) The Proposed Modification allows National Grid to efficiently discharge its obligations with regards to the Transparency Regulations.</p> <p>Objective c) It's an accepted fact that the more data that is freely available to be used by Parties in their decision making process, the more efficiently the market as a whole operates. This efficiency feeds into cost savings which, in turn, drives down prices and increases competition. This Modification supports that premise, by making available data to all users.</p>
<b>EirGrid Interconnector Ltd</b>	NEUTRAL	<p>The aspects of P295 which relate to data transmission from BMRA to EMFIP will promote effective competition in the generation and supply of electricity (BSC Objective C), and ensure compliance with the Transparency Regulations (BSC Objective E).</p> <p>However, the aspects of P295 which intend to publish data in parallel onto BMRS will lead to duplication of cost and resources and will go against the "efficiency" stated in BSC Objective (D).</p> <p>In relation to Interconnector data, P295 does not propose to send this data to EMFIP; however the potential alternative solution proposes publishing this data on BMRS.</p> <p>It is worth noting that transparency publications are not balancing or settlement and imposing a BSC obligation on interconnector owners/administrators to send data to BMRA creates unnecessary duplication and is contrary to BSC Objective (D).</p> <p>Interconnector data will already be available in one central European platform (EMFIP) and publication on BMRS will add no value. Many interconnector users operate across many zones in</p>

Respondent	Response	Rationale
		Europe and EMFIP will be the most logical location for these users to seek transparency data rather than visiting a number of regional platforms to acquire all the information they require. The principal objective of the Transparency Regulations is to provide one central location for transparency data and remove the need for stakeholders/market participants to traverse a number of sites/platforms for data. The proposal that BMRA would also publish this data on BMRS goes against this objective.
<b>National Grid Interconnectors Limited</b>	YES	<p>NGIC considers that P295 is not contrary to the BSC objectives, and aligns mostly with Objectives (c) and (e). Objective (a) may also be relevant, if the Transmission Company's Licence requires it to comply with European legislation (as do other industry Licences).</p> <p>The Assessment Consultation document states that "the Proposer considers that it would be prudent to make Elexon the data provider for this data under... the Transparency Regulation". The document further states the "there is currently no mechanism under the BSC to allow Elexon to assume this role". With this being neither core 'Balancing' or 'Settlement' activity, it seems quite possible that this role could be provided on a bilateral contracted 'service provider' basis between Transmission Company and Elexon (or other qualified service provider) rather than to mandate Elexon and the Transmission Company via the BSC. This BSC approach is consistent however with that used for the REMIT Inside Information Reporting Platform (P291).</p>
<b>National Grid</b>	YES	We believe P295 will better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives (b) and (c). B will be facilitated because P295 will be utilising existing processes and channels between the Transmission Company and Elexon and hence increase efficiency. The utilisation of the BMRS will result in greater information transparency and promote more efficient operation of the Transmission System. C will be facilitated by the wider availability of data in a format that will be easily accessible by a wide range of industry parties resulting in improve competition.
<b>EDF Energy</b>	YES	The benefit in terms of BSC objectives (b) concerning efficient system operation and (c) concerning competition are unproven, and very

Respondent	Response	Rationale
		difficult to quantify. The central costs of order 0.6-0.8 £m make it difficult to justify under BSC objective (d) concerning efficient BSC administration. However, a “do nothing” option would apparently still require considerable and mandatory BSC central costs over 0.5 £m to provide data to NGET in support of BSC Objectives (a) and (e) concerning NGET’s licence conditions and EU regulations. Therefore only a small benefit is required under BSC Objectives (b) and (c) to result in a net benefit against BSC objectives.
<b>E.ON</b>	YES	<p>We agree that P295 supports Applicable Objective (b), as it is efficient for the Transmission Company to utilise existing channels and platforms to fulfil the requirements of the Transparency Regulation 543/2013.</p> <p>While parties would bear costs from routing the information via BMRA to BMRS and EMFIP, Objective (c) would be furthered as it promotes effective competition to present Transparency, in addition to REMIT-required information, on a common platform accessible and already familiar to all GB Parties. While some parties might choose to view data directly from the EMFIP platform it is not yet clear what this will look like and it makes sense to develop the BMRS for maximum ease of use by GB market participants, particularly smaller parties.</p>

Question 2: Do you believe that the Workgroup's potential alternative solution would be better than the proposed solution and should be raised as an Alternative Modification to P295?

### Summary

Yes	No	Neutral/No Response	Other
2	7	1	0

### Responses

Respondent	Response	Rationale
<b>SONI Ltd</b>	NO	SONI strongly disagree that the potential alternative solution would be better than the proposed solution. Any adoption of the alternative solution would result in the Interconnector Administrator duplicating work as transparency data would have to be submitted, at a cost (incurred through system changes), to the BMRA, in parallel to submission of the same data to the EMFIP. This would not be the case should the proposed solution be implemented.
<b>Mutual Energy</b>	NO	The alternative proposal is inefficient as it would impose obligations on interconnector owners/administrators that are not required under the legislation that P295 seeks to address.
<b>RWE</b>	NO	The incremental costs associated with the alternative are significant (around £100k) for a solution that may simply replicate information sent to ENTSO-E. Furthermore the incremental element may pose a risk to the implementation date as a result of the increase in the scope of the work
<b>BritNed</b>	NO	Due to the costs involved in the alternative solution for Interconnectors to submit their data to the BMRS, BritNed is strongly against the alternative solution. BritNed already publishes its Transparency data via ENTSO-E, the FUI Portal, and its Kingdom Systems. As a result, BritNed does not feel it would be in the interests of interconnectors to publish the stipulated data to another platform and nor would it add a noticeable benefit to the industry. BritNed's Transparency data is published as soon as it is available and therefore is easily accessible to all interested parties on the above platforms. <i>Further confidential information was provided.</i>

Respondent	Response	Rationale
<b>IBM UK Ltd for and on behalf of the ScottishPower Group</b>	YES	Yes, ScottishPower believe that the Potential Alternative modification is better than the proposed on Objective c. The Alternative provides more market data than the Proposed, and should allow for more efficient trading and greater savings, leading to better competition
<b>EirGrid Interconnector Ltd</b>	NO	<p>I do not believe that the potential alternative solution would be better than the proposed solution. The potential alternative solution would place an unnecessary burden on interconnector administrators to ensure that the appropriate systems and processes are in place to ensure data transmission to BMRA. This would be an unnecessary duplication of data feeds and would require associated resources and cost.</p> <p>Initially, there would be one-off set-up costs relating to setting up the IT systems to provide the data feeds to BMRA. Once the initial systems were in place, there would be an on-going resource cost to support the data feed and address any communication issues as they arise. Even though the feed would be a duplication of a feed being sent to the Entso-e EMFIP platform, as there are different systems at either end of the data feed, the timing of support requirements for issues on either system would inevitably</p> <p>Therefore, the alternative solution would be duplication of cost and resources with no real value-add. Even though transparency publications are neither balancing nor settlement, creating a BSC obligation on interconnector owners/administrators to send duplicate transparency feeds to BMRA will be contrary to the "efficiency" stated in BSC Objective (D).</p>
<b>National Grid Interconnectors Limited</b>	NO	<p>NGIC is opposed to the introduction of a mandatory BSC requirement for Interconnector operators to provide data to BMRS.</p> <p>As noted above, P295 originated from the Proposer's (Transmission Company) view that it would be 'prudent' for Elexon to be its data provider to EMFIP. There is absolutely no linkage between this Transmission Company obligation, and the publication of Interconnector data on BMRS. Not progressing the Alternative would not</p>

Respondent	Response	Rationale
		<p>prevent the Transmission Company from fulfilling its obligations under the Transparency Regulation. Nor would it prevent the BSC from achieving its objectives. This additional element within the Alternative is therefore unnecessary and inappropriate.</p> <p>Interconnector Operators must also have the discretion to decide what is right and 'prudent' with regard to their own data publication.</p> <p>There is a GB Interconnectors equivalent of the BMRS, namely the FUI Portal, on which much auction and flow data is published. It would be neither necessary nor efficient to have multiple sites on which GB data is published. If any Interconnector Operator wishes to publish its data on the BMRS then at any time it may discuss/agree on bilateral basis with Elexon accordingly.</p>
<b>National Grid</b>	NO	The lack of detail on the impact of the potential alternative solution means that we do not believe it is a better alternative than the proposed and should not be raised.
<b>EDF Energy</b>	NEUTRAL	It should be simple and low-cost for Interconnector Administrators and/or a central EU cross-border capacity administrator, to mirror to BMRS data that they send to the central EU Market Information Platform. Subject to the IA costs being low, we think the benefits of having all information on a central GB platform (as well as the EU platform) justify the small extra central costs. However, a final view is dependent on the costs.
<b>E.ON</b>	YES	To make the BMRS a 'one-stop shop' for data it would be best for all users of Transparency information data if a complete picture was available from BMRS rather than that missing the interconnector outage data. We agree with the Workgroup that scraping the data back from EMFIP to the BMRS is undesirable. We trust that sending the same data flow twice, once to the Interconnector platform and once to BMRA, should also be straightforward for Interconnector Administrators

Question 3: Do you agree with the Workgroup that there are no other potential Alternative Modifications within the scope of P295 which would better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives?

### Summary

Yes	No	Neutral/No Response	Other
10	0	0	0

### Responses

Respondent	Response	Rationale
<b>SONI Ltd</b>	YES	As there is no requirement to publish transparency data on the BMRS in relation to interconnectors, the proposed modification must appropriately facilitate the applicable BSC Objectives. Data should be sent to EMFIP directly by the data owners and not by Elexon as this is the legal requirement. Further, if Elexon were to take on this obligation to submit data to EMFIP on behalf of SONI, an agreement would be required to ensure that Elexon meet the required service levels and timescales for data submission to EMFIP.
<b>Mutual Energy</b>	YES	None provided.
<b>RWE</b>	YES	In the absence of a proposal from National Grid to develop new interfaces then P295 is the only possible solution to meet the requirements of the Transparency Directive. However, it is unclear as to whether a National Grid solution would be cheaper.
<b>BritNed</b>	YES	BritNed does not believe any other current alternative solutions of P295 are suitable and has no suggestions for other alternatives. Furthermore, BritNed is of the belief that the Proposed Solution is adequate to achieve the goals of the Workgroup
<b>IBM UK Ltd for and on behalf of the ScottishPower Group</b>	YES	None provided.
<b>EirGrid Interconnector Ltd</b>	YES	None provided.
<b>National Grid Interconnectors Limited</b>	YES	None provided.
<b>National Grid</b>	YES	None provided.

Respondent	Response	Rationale
<b>EDF Energy</b>	YES	We have not identified any other potential options to those considered by the workgroup.
<b>E.ON</b>	YES	None Provided

Question 4: Do you believe that the draft legal text in Attachment A delivers the intention of the P295 proposed solution?

### Summary

Yes	No	Neutral/No Response	Other
7	0	3	0

### Responses

Respondent	Response	Rationale
<b>SONI Ltd</b>	YES	None provided.
<b>Mutual Energy</b>	YES	None Provided
<b>RWE</b>	YES	None Provided.
<b>BritNed</b>	YES	As BritNed is defined as an Interconnector Administrator and not a Transmission Company, we are unaffected by the draft of the proposed solution and therefore we have no comment
<b>IBM UK Ltd for and on behalf of the ScottishPower Group</b>	YES	None provided.
<b>EirGrid Interconnector Ltd</b>	YES	None provided.
<b>National Grid Interconnectors Limited</b>	No Response	None provided.
<b>National Grid</b>	No Response	None provided.
<b>EDF Energy</b>	Neutral	We have not reviewed the draft legal text at this stage.
<b>E.ON</b>	YES	None Provided

Question 5: Do you believe that the draft legal text in Attachment B delivers the intention of the P295 potential alternative solution?

### Summary

Yes	No	Neutral/No Response	Other
7	0	3	0

### Responses

Respondent	Response	Rationale
<b>SONI Ltd</b>	YES	None provided.
<b>Mutual Energy</b>	YES	None provided.
<b>RWE</b>	YES	None Provided.
<b>BritNed</b>	YES	We are strongly opposed to the alternative solution but if this impractical solution is adopted we have no major comments to the draft
<b>IBM UK Ltd for and on behalf of the ScottishPower Group</b>	YES	None provided.
<b>EirGrid Interconnector Ltd</b>	YES	None provided.
<b>National Grid Interconnectors Limited</b>	No Response	None provided.
<b>National Grid</b>	No Response	None provided.
<b>EDF Energy</b>	Neutral	We have not reviewed the draft legal text at this stage.
<b>E.ON</b>	YES	None Provided

## Question 6: Do you agree with the Workgroup's recommended Implementation Date?

### Summary

Yes	No	Neutral/No Response	Other
7	0	2	1

### Responses

Respondent	Response	Rationale
<b>SONI Ltd</b>	Not if the Alternative solution is implemented.	SONI have no view on a recommended implementation date of 31st December 2014 insofar as the recommended solution is implemented. However, if the alternative solution is to be implemented, SONI will have to seek regulatory approval for any additional costs incurred and cannot commit to a deadline until such approvals are in place.
<b>Mutual Energy</b>	YES	None provided.
<b>RWE</b>	NEUTRAL	The backstop date for implementation is 4.1.2015 and P295 is proposed for implementation on 31.12.14 if the authority's decision is received by 22.1.14. We note that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 31<sup>st</sup> December is not a good date for go-live of a new system. Perhaps an earlier date either pre-Christmas or between Christmas and New Year would be less risky;</li> <li>- If the authority does not decide by 22.1.14 what would the implementation date be – it looks like the project would have to deliver late on the EU backstop?</li> <li>- If the timescale is an issue, the project may need to phase the delivery with an ENTSO-E interface first and BMRS second.</li> </ul>
<b>BritNed</b>	YES	BritNed believes it reasonable to implement P295 before the Transparency Regulations implementation period comes to a close and enters into force.
<b>IBM UK Ltd for and on behalf of the ScottishPower Group</b>	YES	None provided.
<b>EirGrid</b>	NEUTRAL	The Transparency Regulations must be

Respondent	Response	Rationale
<b>Interconnector Ltd</b>		implemented no later than 4 January 2015. Therefore, the workgroup has no option but to recommend implementation on or before this date.
<b>National Grid Interconnectors Limited</b>	YES	Yes for the proposed solution, N/A for the Alternative.
<b>National Grid</b>	YES	None provided.
<b>EDF Energy</b>	YES	Yes, 31 December 2014 is before the EU deadline of 4 January 2015, and provided a firm decision is made by January 2014, as assumed in the assessment report, would provide almost a year for central and participant system developments to accommodate or use the new data provided on BMRS. A delay between BMRA reporting to the EU platform, and reporting on BMRS reduces some of the benefits of the proposal and should be avoided.
<b>E.ON</b>	YES	Naturally in one phase would be preferable; ultimately we believe that it would be preferable to have interconnector data on the BMRS. As this would involve a duplication of the submission that would fulfil IAs' Transparency obligations we would hope this would also be possible by 31/12/14; if not, then we agree with the two-phased approach for the potential Alternative.

Question 7: Do you think the introduction of a central European auction management platform could interfere with an Interconnector Administrators ability to comply with the BSC obligations that would be introduced under the P295 potential alternative solution?

### Summary

Yes	No	Neutral/No Response	Other
4	1	3	2

### Responses

Respondent	Response	Rationale
<b>SONI Ltd</b>	YES	The introduction of a central European auction management platform could interfere with an Interconnector Administrator's ability to comply with the BSC obligations as the new European auction platform will be designed to communicate with the ENTSO-E EMFIP and not with parties such as the BMRA.
<b>Mutual Energy</b>	YES	If a central European auction management platform is introduced it would become responsible for certain tasks currently undertaken by the interconnector administrator. The IA would therefore be reliant on the central platform providing data to them, to provide to the BMRA and EMFIP. It is our view that the alternative solution is inefficient due to including extra data flows and the establishment of the central allocation platform would add even more data flows to allow data to reach the BMRA via the IA. Under the proposed solution (i.e. interconnector data is not provided by the IA to BMRA) the central auction management platform could simply provide the relevant data to the EMFIP directly so there would be fewer data flows and no BSC changes required as a result of its introduction.
<b>RWE</b>	NEUTRAL	It should be recognised that the route via the Interconnector Platform to ENTSO-E for Interconnector data should be considered as the primary route for interconnector data. If it is considered that there is scope for any possible contention or timeliness issues (which may happen in the case of any systems failure but should not normally happen) then the BSC legal

Respondent	Response	Rationale
		drafting should cover this.
<b>BritNed</b>	NEUTRAL	As BritNed is firmly against the alternative solution we believe there is no need to comment on this matter. The alternative solution should not be adopted and therefore this is not an issue.
<b>IBM UK Ltd for and on behalf of the ScottishPower Group</b>	NO	We agree that it is impractical to second guess future European developments in this area and that we should be focusing on the current obligations. A future change to where Interconnector data is published in Europe should not impact the BMRA, as the requirement is to piggy-back on what is currently sent to EMFIP. The 2 data streams from the Interconnectors to EMFIP and the BMRA are essentially separate. Changes to specific data items can be accommodated by future modifications if necessary, as the Regulations change.
<b>EirGrid Interconnector Ltd</b>	YES	<p>I believe there is a significant risk that the introduction of a central European auction management platform could interfere with an Interconnector Administrator's ability to comply with BSC obligations that would be introduced under the P295 potential alternative solution.</p> <p>Auction Platforms are the key system which will hold most of the interconnector transparency data. At present, all French-UK-Ireland (FUI) interconnectors own their own auction platforms, and if the P295 potential alternative solution was introduced, compliance with the BSC could be achieved by each interconnector owner/administrator at a cost.</p> <p>However, once the central European auction management platform is introduced, each interconnector owner will no longer be in charge of its platform and will need cooperation/agreement from other European TSOs prior to changes to the platform. Agreement in these instances could not be guaranteed. The issue of cost allocation or resources to implement changes could present an obstacle. Also, if these changes were to be made, it is not clear how long the changes would take or the priority which would be given to the changes and there may be a period of non-compliance while doing so.</p> <p>It should be noted that a pilot project is already underway in central Europe to develop a single</p>

Respondent	Response	Rationale
		<p>European allocation platform. The FUI interconnectors have not been included in this pilot project and therefore the initial design of the platform certainly won't cater for any data feeds to BMRA for transparency purposes.</p> <p>If agreement was not reached to adapt the central European auction management platform to send transparency data to BMRA, interconnector owners would need to 'scrape' data from EMFIP for transmission onto BMRA. This method would not meet the timings specified in the draft legal text of the potential alternative solution and therefore would not be compliant with the BSC. It is also likely that there would be significant cost in developing the interface between the data 'scrape' from EMFIP and the data transmission to BMRA.</p>
<b>National Grid Interconnectors Limited</b>	YES	Individual / GB Interconnectors by definition will not have sole control of the future single auction platform and its interfaces, the service provider and technology for which is not yet established. Non-GB co-owners of the single auction platform will not be bound by the BSC, which would present a BSC compliance risk (and hence Interconnector Licence breach) for GB Interconnector operators, should there be a technical or contractual failure to achieve BMRS interface. However if feasible in due course, then publication could be arranged on a bilaterally arranged basis, rather than mandated via BSC.
<b>National Grid</b>	NEUTRAL	It is difficult to comment on a possible future system and the impact it may have on existing obligations (if the potential alternative was to be introduced), however in general terms the development and specification of any future systems should be expected to incorporate existing obligations.
<b>EDF Energy</b>	Yes, but probably not significantly	It could create complications, but as in response to question 2, we think it should be relatively straightforward and low cost for IAs or a central auction platform to mirror to BMRS any data that they send to the central EU Market Information Platform.
<b>E.ON</b>	No View	We do not have the detailed knowledge of the expected auction management platform to answer this question; with enduring obligations under the Transparency Regulation, when P295 only requires a data flow to be sent to BMRA by the

Respondent	Response	Rationale
		IAs as well as onwards ultimately to EMFIP to confirm outage expectations it is not clear to us why there should be interference.

## Question 8: Do you have any further comments on P295?

### Summary

Yes	No	Neutral/No Response	Other
3	7	0	0

### Responses

Respondent	Response	Rationale
<b>SONI Ltd</b>	YES	P295 should seek only to address the requirements of satisfying the transparency data regulations and not add unnecessary complexity, duplication and cost by publishing data on the BMRS. SONI are strongly opposed to the alternative P295 solution.
<b>Mutual Energy</b>	NO	NA
<b>RWE</b>	YES	BSC Parties are impacted because they may be required to submit new data to National Grid for forwarding to BMRA and therefore will need to be involved in the implementation i.e to understand the content and format of data that need to be sent, to see documentation as soon as possible and to be involved in testing. Additionally BMRA users will need to know details of any additional BMRA TIBCO feeds in the course of the project and well before go-live, and we would also like to know whether the receipt of these feeds could be made optional
<b>BritNed</b>	YES	BritNed would like to reiterate that it is strongly against the alternative solution that requires interconnector transparency data to be duplicated on the BMRS. Such a solution would be against the purpose of the Transparency Regulations, which is to have one central European transparency platform. BritNed believes such a solution would be impractical, expensive and counter-productive. Finally, it would add not great value to the industry.
<b>IBM UK Ltd for and on behalf of the ScottishPower Group</b>	NO	NA
<b>EirGrid Interconnector</b>	NO	NA

Respondent	Response	Rationale
<b>Ltd</b>		
<b>National Grid Interconnectors Limited</b>	NO	NA
<b>National Grid</b>	NO	NA
<b>EDF Energy</b>	NO	NA
<b>E.ON</b>	NO	NA