

P243 Consultation Responses

Consultation issued on 17 November 2009

We received responses from the following Parties

Company	No BSC Parties / Non-Parties Represented	Role of Parties/non-Parties represented
National Grid	1/0	Transmission Company
Drax Power Limited	1/0	Generator
Immingham CHP LLP	2/0	
SAIC Ltd. (for and on behalf of ScottishPower)	7/0	Supplier / Generator / Trader / Consolidator / Exemptible Generator / Distributor
Scottish and Southern Energy	9/0	Supplier / Generator
LDHE Energy Services	1/0	Trader
RWE Supply & Trading GmbH	10/0	Supplier/Generator/ Trader / Consolidator / Exemptible Generator / Party Agent
International Power	6/0	Trader/Generator
EDF Energy	13/0	Supplier/Generator/Trader/Consolidator/Exemptible Generator/Party Agent/Distributors
Centrica	10/0	Supplier/Generator/Trade
Nexen Energy Marketing London Ltd *	1/0	Trader
Intergen*	3/1	Generator Trader

What stage is this document in the process?

01 Initial Written Assessment

02 Definition Procedure

03 Assessment Procedure

04 Report Phase

Question 1: Do you agree with the Panel's initial majority view that the Proposed Modification should be rejected?

Summary

Yes	No	Neutral/Other
9	3	-

P243
Report Phase Consultation
Responses

1 December 2009

Version 1.0

Page 1 of 20

© ELEXON Limited 2009

* Late response

Responses

Respondent	Response	Rationale
National Grid	Yes	See response to Q2.
Drax Power	Yes	Drax agrees with the Panel's view that the Alternative Modification better facilitates the BSC Objectives.
Immingham CHP LLP	No	The original has clear benefits for market participants. It increases certainty of the type of plant generating, which is useful in calculating the marginal stack of power stations and therefore assists in pricing future periods. A problem discussed with the original was that it 'may enable other Parties to work out a Generator's Outage periods and trading position' in relation to fuel types with only a few Generators. Based on the fuel types currently published on bmreports this is presumably referring primarily to OCGT and oil generation. Even if market participants were able to work out outage patterns of individual units, power is less likely to have been forward sold in significant quantities for these plant types compared to the large baseload plants run by independent generators and therefore there would be no significant market price impact of these outages being public.
SAIC Ltd	Yes	-
Scottish and Southern Energy	No	Whilst we have serious reservations about the use to which the information disclosed by way of this Proposed Modification (see our comments in response to Question 8 below) will be applied we believe that the P243 Original better facilitates the Applicable BSC Objectives when compared with the Alternative. This is because the Original relates to publishing generic information across the GB market (as requested by the proposer of P243) without disclosing confidential information which was only ever intended for system operation purposes (and not commercial trading activities).
LDHE Energy Services	Yes	The Proposed and Alternative Modifications are better than the current arrangements. However, the Alternative Modification provides a more detailed view on the future availabilities and hence better suits our requirements.
RWE Supply & Trading GmbH	Yes	We believe that the proposed modification would better facilitate competition (Objective c) when compared to the current baseline, but is not better than the alternative modification proposal.
International	No	We think that the main benefit in publishing the data

Respondent	Response	Rationale
Power		<p>by fuel type would be in suggesting what the marginal fuel type might be and when a fuel switch might occur. This should allow Parties to make more informed trading decisions and thereby increase competition. This benefit is tempered however by the fact that the fuel types proposed would make the plans of certain types of generator more visible than others due to the limited number of parties operating within certain categories.</p> <p>However, under the current arrangements, where Output Useable data is published by zone, the forecast availability of some units is already more visible than others. For example, it is not difficult to assess the outage plans of units in Zone A which only contains three stations. Also, units at certain stations have a 'distinctive' generation capacity making them more visible in the data as published presently.</p> <p>We believe that any such 'discrimination' issues would be potentially greater under the potential alternative inasmuch as this change could make the positions of generators with smaller portfolios proportionally more visible than those of the large portfolio players. Clearly this would need to be balanced against the potential benefits of improved transparency.</p> <p>We believe that P243 would help to better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objective C. It provides more transparency to the market, without impacting on commercial confidentiality.</p>
EDF Energy	Yes	<p>Publication of aggregate forecast output usable data in the categories proposed would unduly discriminate against some parties. In particular, for the categories of nuclear, pumped storage, and possibly non pumped storage hydro, submitting Output Usable data, it would not be difficult for some or all parties to determine the future availability plan for individual parties and probably individual generators, in conjunction with the total and zonal data already published. By contrast, the availability plans of parties and generators within a larger grouping of coal and gas would not be visible, except in those zones where only two generators operate, where those generators would have information advantage.</p> <p>This discrimination raises concerns:</p> <p>(1) that some parties could somehow unfairly exploit information available about other parties, without</p>

Respondent	Response	Rationale
		<p>revealing their own individual future plans.</p> <p>(2) Parties with detailed information on other parties as well as information known only to themselves about their own plant would have more information than others on which to forecast future market prices. Better information on which to forecast future market prices gives a commercial advantage (the point made by the proposer in the proposal).</p> <p>In the Netherlands, the single nuclear and single biomass plant are aggregated into the coal category specifically to avoid such issues of commercial discrimination (http://www.productiondata.nl/index.php?page[]=2) .</p> <p>This disadvantage would act against achievement of BSC Objective (c) relating to competition, and despite other unquantifiable benefits of general market transparency described by the proposer, when taken together with the considerable costs of the proposal, on balance we think the proposal would not better meet BSC objectives.</p> <p>(The full list of categories is currently: (a) CCGT Modules; (b) Oil Plant; (c) Coal Plant; (d) Nuclear Plant; (e) Power Park Modules; (f) Pumped Storage Plant; (g) Non Pumped Storage Hydro Plant; (h) Open Cycle Gas Turbine Plant; (i/j) External Interconnection flows from France to England/Northern Ireland to Scotland; and (k) anything else)</p>
Centrica	Yes	-
Nexen Energy Marketing London Ltd	Yes – but conditional on the Alternative being accepted.	Nexen believes that availability information will increase the market information in such a way as to help the market as a whole operate more efficiently, better facilitating the relevant objectives. The proposed is therefore better than the baseline, but the alternative is our preferred solution
Intergen	Yes	-

Question 2: Do you agree with the Panel's initial majority view that the Alternative Modification better facilitates the achievement of Applicable BSC Objectives (b) and (c) when compared with the current arrangements and the Proposed Modification, and should be approved?

Summary

Yes	No	Neutral/Other
9	3	0

Responses

Respondent	Response	Rationale
National Grid	Yes	<p>National Grid agrees with the Panel's initial majority view that, compared with the current arrangements and the Proposed Modification, the Alternative Modification better facilitates the achievement of Applicable BSC Objectives.</p> <p>The Alternative Modification proposes to provide the forward availability information at a more detailed level i.e. by BM Unit. As a matter of principle, greater transparency provided by increased granularity of data provides better market signals to all participants (including small players and new entrants). This promotes competition and efficient market operation (Applicable BSC Objective (c)).</p> <p>National Grid has some concern that publishing the detailed information, that National Grid presently receives to manage the system may have unintended consequences and potentially adverse impact the efficient and economic operation of the National Electricity Transmission System (NGET). Specifically, National Grid would be concerned if publishing such commercially sensitive information led to deterioration in the quality or timeliness of Grid Code OC2 data. Further, National Grid would be concerned if such information were able to inform parties of potential market power (specifically locational) if such market power was abused.</p> <p>Equally, National Grid considers that the potential Alternative could also have beneficial impact. Greater transparency at BM Unit level would enable industry greater scrutiny of such information; this may act as a deterrent to any reduction in the quality, timeliness or any potential abuse of market power from having detailed Grid Code OC2 data. Ultimately, any unintended consequences could be addressed by</p>

Respondent	Response	Rationale
		<p>other means (e.g. licence obligations);</p> <p>On balance, National Grid therefore considers that the potential Alternative could also facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (b).</p>
Drax Power	Yes	<p>Drax believes that both of the suggested proposals under P243 would better facilitate BSC Objective C; each proposal provides greater transparency of generator outage data, which should help to facilitate price discovery and, thereby, market competition. Drax believes that the Alternative Modification provides a further benefit in that both plant availability and Output Usable data is provided to market participants on the same basis; this makes it easier for parties with less resource to analyse such data.</p> <p>For this reason, Drax agrees with the Panel's view that the Alternative Modification better facilitates the BSC Objectives.</p>
Immingham CHP LLP	No	<p>The alternative gives only a small additional benefit in calculating future prices, and only where a participant has detailed information about individual plants, however it would have significant detrimental impacts for independent generators such as ourselves particularly in the short term market. The alternative is attempting to solve a problem which would have no or minimal market impact by proposing a solution that is more costly to implement and which could have a negative impact on market prices.</p>
SAIC Ltd	Yes	-
Scottish and Southern Energy	No	<p>For the reasons outlined in our answer to Question 1 above, we believe that publishing confidential information which was only ever intended for system operation purposes (and not commercial trading activities) will not be conducive to the better facilitation of the Applicable BSC Objectives when compared with the Original.</p> <p>In particular we feel that the Alternative might, in extremis, result in a diminishing of the information currently provided to the GBSO for operational purposes as BSC Parties, mindful of the publication of this information, might be more 'conservative' with their views about their operational matters. This, in our view, would not be helpful for BSC Objective (b) in terms of promoting the efficient operation of the national Transmission System.</p> <p>A further consequence of such an approach could be a diminution of the effectiveness of this information for market purposes which, in turn, would be damaging to BSC Objective (c).</p>

Respondent	Response	Rationale
LDHE Energy Services	Yes	-
RWE Supply & Trading GmbH	Yes	We believe that the proposed modification would better meet Objectives b ad c when compared with both the base line and the proposed modification. We believe that improved information transparency on generation outages will improve competition and market liquidity.
International Power	No	<p>Despite additional transparency benefits, on balance we believe that these may be outweighed by its negative aspects. Specifically, there is the potential for discrimination against smaller, independent generators under the Alternative. In general, BMU level data transparency will tend to 'expose' the trading position of single site generators versus the large vertically integrated companies.</p> <p>We recognise that any such disadvantage is mitigated by the delay between a generator's submission of OC2 data and its publication on the BMRS. However, particularly for a smaller player, it may not always be possible to cover a sizeable short position within these timescales. We are also concerned that an unintended consequence of the alternative might be that the availability data becomes less accurate as parties become slower to firm up outage plans because of the visibility their disclosure would have on trading positions. This might also detract from the benefits of implementing the alternative. Overall, whilst we believe that the Alternative would better meet the applicable objectives B and C, when compared with the current arrangements, we do not think it has advantages over the Proposed Modification.</p>
EDF Energy	Yes	<p>Output usable reveals more about the expected operation of some BM Units than it does for others, particularly baseload units, and is discriminatory against operators with a concentration of such BM Units, in the sense of revealing relatively more commercial information. Similarly, for a party with a smaller portfolio and less flexibility in delivering physical energy, the information may be relatively more revealing of their individual commercial position. However, it is not obvious how the information would give relative advantage to competitors, unless a position of market power is exercised, which is a regulatory matter.</p> <p>By additionally publishing the output usable for all BM Units for which it is available, transparency would be</p>

Respondent	Response	Rationale
		<p>improved without introducing the level of information discrimination described above for the proposal.</p> <p>The additional transparency over and above the proposal should add confidence that movements of availability of individual units were not somehow taken unfairly in response to outages or operation of other units.</p> <p>It would maximise the availability information available to everyone for price forecasting, and allow the estimated costs of different types of generator within the broader categories to be considered. For example, there is a range of costs of gas and coal generators, which can lead to different prices depending on which is available.</p> <p>The publication of information by BM Unit would be consistent with publication by unit for markets in Germany, Scandinavia and the Czech Republic, and initiatives to increase transparency in other European markets.</p> <p>The additional central implementation cost over and above the proposal is relatively modest.</p> <p>On balance we think the alternative proposal would better meet BSC objective (c) relating to competition by better informing forecasts used in trading decisions, on an equitable basis, and thereby promoting trading liquidity.</p> <p>More information on future availability should also promote BSC objective (b) relating to efficient system operation, by allowing participants to optimise their outages relative to each other, and identify any unexpected outage behaviours.</p>
Centrica	Yes	-
Nexen Energy Marketing London Ltd	Yes	<p>Nexen is at a market disadvantage by not having as much information as our counter-parties, the generators. The availability of plant is crucial to the way that the market operates, notably plant margin impacts prices over peak periods. Availability data also tells us about the use of ancillary services contracts by the SO. Power prices will only efficiently reflect the physical state of the market if all players have access to this data. This is vital to signal to new market entrants where the gaps in generation are and what types of investment will help meet future demands.</p> <p>The modification, as well as improving efficiency, will improve competition as all players will be operating base on equitable market knowledge.</p> <p>Nexen expects that the data will be use by the market to judge plant margin in the future, as it will be planned outages which are likely to be more robustly recorded. Physical players are likely to respond to such information by scheduling planned maintenance to spread outages through the seasons. This rescheduling should improve the efficiency of the physical system as well. It should also help improve security of supply.</p>

Respondent	Response	Rationale
Intergen	Yes	Intergen prefers the Potential Alternative Modification as it provides greater granularity and transparency than the proposed modification. The Alternative would take away any perceived discrimination against parties in less populated fuel type categories.

Question 3: The Panel are keen to understand if independent Generators believe that there are discriminatory issues under the Alternative Modification as is described in section 9 of the draft Modification Report.

Do you feel that there are any discriminatory issues under the Alternative Modification?

Please provide details on any discriminatory issues that you feel arise under the Alternative Modification, particularly if you are an independent Generator.

Summary

Yes	No	Neutral/Other
4	6	2

Responses

Respondent	Response	Rationale
National Grid	Yes	National Grid acknowledges that there may be potential discrimination issues where a generator (unlike portfolio players) only has a single BM Unit. As System Operator of the national electricity transmission system, National Grid is not sure about the extent of discrimination that the Alternative Modification may pose.
Drax Power	No	Drax believes in an open and transparent market place; both the Proposed and Alternative Modifications result in greater market transparency that should promote competition within the GB wholesale electricity market (this benefits all parties). With regards to avoiding discrimination between parties, the Alternative Modification is the better solution. The Proposed Modification will affect some businesses more than others, particularly if a given company has a large market share of a particular type of generation (e.g. nuclear); in this case it would be much easier to determine the outage position of such a business. The Alternative Modification has the same effect on all companies / plant, in that the availability of their

Respondent	Response	Rationale
		<p>plant is apparent regardless of portfolio size or the mix of generation within that portfolio.</p> <p>Further to this, and with particular regards to independent generators, other sources of information disclosure and the effects of information disclosure on the market must be taken into account when considering the potential for discrimination. For publicly listed companies, such information on the operation of plant (including outages) may have to be reported to the financial markets, meaning that this type of data may already be made available in certain cases regardless of modification to the BSC.</p>
Immingham CHP LLP	Yes	<p>We are an independent generator with a single generation site and a small supply contract. As Elexon is aware most power output is sold on a forward basis, and while members of the group believe that planned outages may already be hedged a greater, unaddressed, issue relates to short term unplanned outages. For a company such as ourselves, with no possibility to balance reduced availability at one plant versus increases in generation in other generation, the implication of any trip is that repurchases of forward sold generation will be required. The power market is recognised as illiquid by Ofgem, so providing information indentifying a participant with a large forced purchased requirement will push up prices and therefore be detrimental to the generator compared to a situation of aggregated data.</p>
SAIC Ltd	No	N/A
Scottish and Southern Energy	Yes	<p>Whilst not an Independent Generator we understand, and have sympathy with, the views surrounding the matter of discrimination that might arise if P243 Alternative were to be implemented.</p>
LDHE Energy Services	-	-
RWE Supply & Trading GmbH	No	<p>Since all players will be required to disclose information on outages we do not believe that there are any discrimination issues.</p>
International Power	Yes	<p>We do see the potential under the Alternative, for smaller, independent generators to be disadvantaged. In general, BMU level data transparency will tend to 'expose' the trading position of single site generators versus the large vertically integrated companies. For instance, if a short term outage is required, with OC2 data published at BMU level, it will be clear to the</p>

Respondent	Response	Rationale
		<p>rest of the market that the generator is a distressed buyer (and seller of gas if the generator owns a CCGT). The need to buy will to a large extent be masked for BMUs that are part of a larger generation portfolio as here the shortfall can be made up on other generation in the portfolio leaving the market uncertain as to the purchase requirement.</p> <p>We recognise however, that these issues need to be balanced against the potential transparency benefits of the Alternative.</p>
EDF Energy	Yes/No	<p>The Alternative Modification does have some discrimination against certain types of generator and/or company, in terms of relative transparency of likely commercial position, but for the alternative we consider it justified, for the reasons given in response to question 2 above. By treating all generating units equally, all parties have the same opportunity to forecast market prices, and identify any activity considered unfair.</p>
Centrica	No	<p>By publishing by BM Unit, the alternative modification would mean information is published at the same level of granularity for each party. This provides equal information disclosure. We do not believe this equal disclosure would be unduly discriminatory toward Centrica.</p>
Nexen Energy Marketing London Ltd	No	<p>The modification will help improve liquidity in the market and that will be to the benefit of the independent players as it will make it easier to cover their positions during outages. They will also be able to maximise their plant value by scheduling outages when the market has greater margin available. The plants concerned already have to cover outages, so they will be more likely to benefit than lose from the change.</p>
Intergen		<p>InterGen does not believe that future availability data published by BMU would disadvantage IPPs and small generating companies as it is already possible to infer this information from studying changes to zonal availability and cross referencing with BMU location and size.</p> <p>This modification makes this information available to all without the requirement for additional analysis effort.</p>

Question 4: Do you believe there are any benefits (qualitative and quantitative) in having Output Usable data published at a BM Unit level on the BMRS?

Summary

Yes	No	Neutral/Other
9	3	-

Responses

Respondent	Response	Rationale
National Grid	Yes	<p>The benefits of any information transparency change are difficult to quantify. Key qualitative benefits of Alternative Modification include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All participants, including small players and new entrants, have access to the same market information, enabling all participants to respond to the resulting market signals; this should lead to more efficient decision making by the market as a whole; Publication of the availability of renewable generation types will make transparent how much capacity for these fuel types is underlying future views of generation surpluses. This could lead to optimised generation outages and ensure that sufficient non-renewable generation is available to meet demand. Publication of forward availability at BM Unit level could help Scottish Transmission Owners to better align their outages with generator outages, which may help alleviate Scottish constraints thus facilitating the economic and efficient operation of national electricity transmission system.
Drax Power	Yes	It makes sense to publish data of the same type in the same location, in order to ensure ease of access and data consistency.
Immingham CHP LLP	No	--
SAIC Ltd	No	<p>There do not appear to be any Quantitative benefits for Output Usable data being published at a BM Unit level on the BMRS. If this Modification is implemented then there is no obvious method of measuring the value of providing the detailed information or the cost savings to current or new market entrants.</p> <p>The Qualitative benefits are marginal. The main thrust of the (Alternative) Modification suggests that</p>

Respondent	Response	Rationale
		<p>more detailed information will provide an equitable trading environment whereby all Output Usable data is published for all BM Units. However, the value of such data is questionable as it may not bear a close relationship to actual output.</p> <p>The proposed caveats on the relevant website pages / screens concerning the use of Output Usable data should warn the users of the transient nature of the data and the danger of basing any business decisions on such data.</p>
<p>Scottish and Southern Energy</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>We note the comments on page 12 of the Draft Modification Report as to the difficulty in quantifying the benefits that might accrue to P243 (Original or Alternative) being implemented.</p> <p>Given this, we believe that if P243 (Original or Alternative) were to be implemented then this could be a candidate for a 'post implementation review' as recommended in the House of Lords Select Committee on Regulators Inquiry "UK Economic Regulators" report (of November 2007) in the comments on "Assessing regulatory decisions post-implementation".</p> <p>In this regard we are also mindful of the Government's response to that House of Lords Select Committee report dated 31st January 2008, and in particular:-</p> <p>"The Government agrees that post-implementation evaluation is a key tool to ensure policies are having the intended effect in a proportionate way, and that it can provide good evidence for improvement where necessary. The Government's Impact Assessment template requires policy makers to commit to a date when they will review the actual costs and benefits of any new proposal and establish whether the policy has achieved the desired effects. We commend this approach to regulators."</p> <p>Furthermore, a view was expressed during the Modification Group meetings that whilst, in theory, information transparency is fully justified, this has to be balanced by the requirement (and associated costs) that arises in such circumstances of needing to process / analyse such information on an ongoing basis if a competitive position is to be maintained.</p> <p>Smaller BSS Parties, for example, may not be in a position to fully utilise such information, from a practical perspective, as they seek to avoid being embrangled by the voluminous data that may arise.</p>
<p>LDHE Energy Services</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>It will improve the quality of information on likely availability of generation capacity and increase competition between market participants in this area. When publishing Output Usable on a Unit level the UK</p>

Respondent	Response	Rationale
		markets provides the same level of information as given in other European power markets which can reduce market barriers.
RWE Supply & Trading GmbH	Yes	The proposed modification would enable price discovery in the wholesale market, enhance liquidity and improve competition.
International Power	Yes	Data at this level of granularity clearly does provide increased transparency to the market. As such, it would remove the need for further analysis of zonal data to understand discrete plant availability. Whilst this is desirable, we believe that the main benefit to be derived from the publication of more detailed availability data would be in assessing marginal fuel type / likelihood of fuel switching. In other words, the incremental benefit of the Alternative over the Proposed Modification is relatively small.
EDF Energy	Yes	It would maximise the availability information available to everyone for market price forecasting, allowing the estimated costs of different generators within the broader categories to be considered. For example, there is a range of costs of gas and coal generators, which can lead to different market prices depending on which is available. Benefits should result from competing generators refining their availability plans to take advantage of times of highest price, dependent on other generators availability (thus aiding system security), and increased trading liquidity as suggested by the proposer (and hence reduced market risk).
Centrica	Yes	Benefits arise from having the information more readily available rather than having to expend resource trying to infer the information from data currently in the market combined with assumptions. It is difficult to quantify these benefits. Similarly it is difficult to quantify the detrimental impact on competition arising from undue discrimination.
Nexen Energy Marketing London Ltd	Yes	<p>BM units are the key to price setting and are also of locational importance. We believe the alternative is better because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The market will know more about plant performance • The market can monitor behaviour – i.e potential gaming of constraints • The market will know if a specific type of genset is subject to maintenance issues that will impact margins • The market will know how much the SO may be using STOR contracts, as it says it wants to signal more longer term investment in such plant • The greater the information and the more equitable access to information the more efficient the market should be

Respondent	Response	Rationale
Intergen	Yes	The Alternative would provide a greater level of transparency and would therefore assist in developing a better appreciation of the market.

Question 5: Do you agree with the Panel's suggested Implementation date of 05 November 2010 if an Authority decision is received on or before 28 January 2010, or 23 February 2011 if the Authority decision is received after 28 January 2010 but on or before 30 March 2010?

Summary

Yes	No	Neutral/Other
11	1	-

Responses

Respondent	Response	Rationale
National Grid	Yes	-
Drax Power	Yes	The suggested implementation dates appear reasonable
Immingham CHP LLP	Yes	-
SAIC Ltd	Yes	-
Scottish and Southern Energy	Yes	The costs (and lack of quantifiable benefits) leads us to believe that if P243 (Original or Alternative) were to be implemented it should be in conjunction with other changes, such as P244, to minimise costs.
LDHE Energy Services	Yes	Implementation is favoured as soon as possible.
RWE Supply & Trading GmbH	Yes	The implementation dates appear reasonable.
International Power	Yes	We are surprised that implementation will takes such a long time but agree with the suggested dates.
EDF Energy	Yes	9 months notice should be sufficient to make necessary system and process changes.
Centrica	Yes	-
Nexen Energy	No	Nexen would like to see faster implementation, even

Respondent	Response	Rationale
Marketing London Ltd		if via a manual work around. We understand that this data is already collected by NGC and should therefore be available to the market faster. Liquidity is an issue and we want timely solutions.
Intergen	Yes	-

Question 6: Do you agree with the Panel's suggested approach to implement both Modifications P243 and P244 together as part of a standard BSC Systems release?

Summary

Yes	No	Neutral/Other
11	1	0

Responses

Respondent	Response	Rationale
National Grid	Yes	-
Drax Power	Yes	Should both modifications gain approval, it would appear more efficient (in terms of resource) to implement them together.
Immingham CHP LLP	Yes	-
SAIC Ltd	Yes	The changes required by P244 are closely related to those for P243 and as such it makes economic sense to implement both at the same time.
Scottish and Southern Energy	Yes	For the reasons given in response to Question 5 above.
LDHE Energy Services	Yes	-
RWE Supply & Trading GmbH	Yes	The proposed implementation strategy is the most cost effective solution.
International Power	Yes	Yes – this is more efficient
EDF Energy	Yes	Efficient for process and system changes.
Centrica	Yes	-
Nexen Energy	No	Given the importance of such information to the

Respondent	Response	Rationale
Marketing London Ltd		market we believe that a one of change to the systems (covering both modifications) would have a positive value to the market as a whole. As noted above, if this cannot be achieved we would like to see a manual solution.
Intergen	Yes	-

Question 7: Do you agree that the Panel's recommended legal text delivers the solution agreed by the Modification Group for P243?

Summary

Yes	No	Neutral/Other
7	0	5

Responses

Respondent	Response	Rationale
National Grid	Yes	-
Drax Power	Yes/No	No comment.
Immingham CHP LLP	N/A	-
SAIC Ltd	Yes	-
Scottish and Southern Energy	Yes	It appears to.
LDHE Energy Services	Yes	-
RWE Supply & Trading GmbH	Yes	The proposed legal text delivers the solution.
International Power	Yes	-
EDF Energy	Yes/No	<p>We have suggested a number of clarifications to Elexon, of which we think these summaries are of particular note:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is deliberate ambiguity about the inclusion of interconnector expected transfers in the data to be reported, to cover the possibility that an associated Grid Code change proposal may or may not result in interconnector capacity being reported as Output

Respondent	Response	Rationale
		<p>Usable data. It would be clearer if the two possibilities were explicitly considered. A later housekeeping modification might resolve this.</p> <p>2. The text refers to Total Output Usable by Fuel Type Category and by BM Unit, but Total Output Usable is explicitly defined as the sum of [all] Output Usables. The intention is probably clear but a different form of words is required to distinguish different totals of the component data and avoid having multiple meanings for Total Output Usable.</p> <p>3. The text for the alternative refers to Output Usable being published for BM Units, by implication BM Units as described in the BSC. However, Output Usable is provided to National Grid in a slightly different form, "National Grid BM Units" as discussed by the modification group. National Grid BM Units do not have one to one correspondence with BSC BM Units. For example, Interconnector availability would be reported by interconnector, not BM Unit. The modification group discussed this and it was our expectation that under the alternative the "BM Unit" data would be reported as provided to, and by the same unit description as used by National Grid, with an ad-hoc mapping to BSC BM Units provided. This issue is mentioned at page 15 and 16 of report consultation appendix B.</p> <p>4. Associated Grid Code change F/09 refers to separate Output Usable for export (to transmission = import to GB) and import (from transmission = export from GB). If the Grid Code change is approved, clarity may be needed in the BSC to distinguish the two possible values of Output Usable when totals are reported.</p>
Centrica	-	Centrica has no been able to review the legal text.
Nexen Energy Marketing London Ltd	Yes	-
Intergen	-	-

Question 8: Do you have any further comments on P243?

Responses

Respondent	Response	Rationale
National Grid	No	-
Drax Power	No	-
Immingham CHP LLP	No	-
SAIC Ltd	Yes	<p>There are a number of potential issues arising from the implementation of the Alternative Modification for P243:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailing Output Usable data at a BM Unit level on the BMRS may compromise commercial confidentiality. • There is a question about the value of providing the Output Usable Data as a comparison to Outturn Data given the concern that these data items are not directly comparable. The data will not account for generation restrictions, constraints, Demand BM Unit availability, etc. If new market entrants use the comparison between the Output Usable Data and Outturn Data then this could provide a false or incomplete market view. • It is important to state that generators will not be liable for the impact of decisions made by other traders based on Output Usable data information. For example, were a trader to incur a loss as a result of a trade placed in response to a view of generator outages published, the generator could not be held accountable for such loss. OC2 data is submitted as being a best view, and is subject to movement due to a number of legitimate physical and economic factors. • Were prices to spike as a consequence of traders front-running generators purchasing power to cover outage periods, the generator would be expected to legitimately respond to the economic signal by moving the outage to an alternative period. This movement in outage dates may lead to increased costs being incurred by the System Operator if they have booked transmission outages to coincide with the original generator outage dates - in the event that they are subsequently unable to move the dates / outages.
Scottish and Southern Energy	Yes	<p>We have concerns regarding the suggested 'defect' which P243 is attempting to address. The P243 defect is stated as being:-</p> <p>"The future availability of a Plant/Generator availability cannot easily be viewed due to lack of published data. Allowing publication of relevant data will enable information on potential prices of electricity, the availability of different fuel types, the</p>

Respondent	Response	Rationale
		<p>potential to switch from one fuel source to another and any strategic decisions on generation can be made.”</p> <p>It seems to us (assuming P243 were to be implemented) that there is a distinct risk that stakeholders in looking at this information will make false assumptions about “the availability of different fuel types, the potential to switch from one fuel source to another and any strategic decisions on generation”.</p> <p>In this regard we are mindful of the defect identified in a similar Modification Proposal P226 which, like P243, was related to generator information.</p> <p>In particular, the P226 defect included:-</p> <p>“In addition there have been instances where BSC Parties have made wrong assumptions about likely plant availability because they were unaware of derogations applied for Opted In LCP Units...”</p> <p>If P243 were to be implemented then all stakeholders need to understand and appreciate that if they make assumptions based on the data provided then their assumptions may well, on reflection, be false or wholly incorrect.</p> <p>The Generator, in providing the original information to National Grid, gives no warranty to any stakeholder who chooses to use that information for any other purpose. Stakeholders need to recognise that the information provided by the Generator relates to a physical asset which means that information provided even relatively recently might, in accordance with the laws of physics and engineering, now no longer be accurate.</p> <p>Finally, with respect to the comments, on page 13 of the Draft Modification Report, concerning an EU Directive we look forward to the information obtained by Elexon being provided to BSC Parties in due course.</p> <p>In general we believe it is ‘good practice’ to wait and see what, if anything, might be required by any EU Directive once that Directive has been through due process. We recall occasions in the past where purported changes arising from a proposed EU Directive have failed to materialise when the final</p>

Respondent	Response	Rationale
		<p>document comes into legal force. If we were to proceed with changes to the BSC on the basis of what might be required; as opposed to what is actually required; then this would be a very retrograde development.</p> <p>Furthermore, we observe that it would appear, from the map used by the proposer (as shown on page 1 of the Stage 3 Detailed Assessment document) that the majority of European countries do NOT currently provide Output Usable data broken down by Fuel type.</p>
LDHE Energy Services	No	-
RWE Supply & Trading GmbH	No	-
International Power	Yes	At EU level we are aware that there may be a requirement to publish planned available capacity at generator unit level updated within one hour of any change. There is no clarity when or if this requirement will be introduced. IPR does not believe that this uncertain requirement should be used as justification to approve P243A.
EDF Energy	Yes/No	We would not expect to have to pay to stop receiving the current service of zonally aggregated data being published on the Elexon website. If the data is instead published on the BMRS website as part of this proposal we would expect some savings from ceasing the existing Elexon website publication service.
Centrica	No	-
Nexen Energy Marketing London Ltd	No	-
Intergen	No	-