

# Assessment Procedure Consultation Responses

## P315 'Publication of Gross Supplier Market Share Data' v3.0

This Assessment Procedure Consultation was issued on 3 July 2015, with responses invited by 23 July 2015.



### Phase

Initial Written Assessment

Definition Procedure

Assessment Procedure

Report Phase

Implementation

### Consultation Respondents

Respondent	No. of Parties/Non-Parties Represented	Role(s) Represented
SmartestEnergy	1/0	Supplier
Opus Energy Ltd	1/0	Supplier
TMA Data Management Ltd	0/1	Supplier Agent
RWE npower	9/0	Generator; Supplier; Supplier Agent
ScottishPower	1/0	Supplier
Good Energy	1/0	Supplier; ECVNA; MVRNA
GDF SUEZ Energy UK	1/0	Supplier
Ovo Energy	1/0	Supplier
Cornwall Energy	0/1	Other – Service Provider
EDF Energy	9/0	Generator; Supplier; Non Physical Trader
National Grid Electricity Transmission plc	1/0	Transmission Co.
Spark Energy Supply Ltd	1/0	Supplier

P315  
Assessment Consultation  
Responses v3.0

24 Jul 2015

Version 1.0

Page 1 of 33

© ELEXON Limited 2015

Question 1: Do you agree with the Workgroup's initial unanimous view that P315 Proposed solution **does** better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives than the current baseline?

## Summary

Yes	No	Neutral/No Comment	Other
7	5	0	0

## Responses

Respondent	Response	Rationale
SmartestEnergy	Yes	Transparency is good for competition. Whilst we acknowledge that competition may not be best served if very small companies are hindered from growing, one of the purposes of this modification is to inform potential new entrants what level of penetration in the market is achievable. A potential new entrant is not likely to have aspirations to be come as large as the Big 6. It is therefore appropriate that there is visibility of medium sized companies. Thresholds of 1% are not unreasonable, although we believe that these could be lower.
Opus Energy Ltd	No	We are opposed to both the Proposed and Alternative Solutions for the reasons as detailed in our response to Question 2.
TMA Data Management Ltd	Yes	We are disappointed that full free access to all report has been removed from P315 and its alternative, however, we still support P315 and agree that P315 proposed solution does better facilitate objectives b and c.
RWE npower	Yes	N.A
ScottishPower	Yes	We believe that P315 better facilitates Applicable BSC Objective (c). The reason for this view is that we believe the information will allow ScottishPower as a Supplier to monitor and react to competitors changes in the marketplace. In addition given that the Transmission Company have indicated that the information will be useful for their purposes going forward we agree that it also better facilitates BSC Objective (b).
Good Energy	No	This further Assessment Procedure Consultation does not address the concern raised by respondents to the previous consultation for the need for a proper justification of the proposal. Without a clear explanation of where any perceived cost benefit arises from the P315 Proposed solution we are of

Respondent	Response	Rationale
		<p>the view that it does not better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (d) because it imposes costs that will ultimately be borne by customers for no quantified benefit. We also do not consider that P315 will better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (c), and is more likely to have the opposite effect. It would facilitate larger market participants with access to the required resources to analyse and process the data being able to drive out competition from smaller participants.</p> <p>We consider P315 to be neutral to the other Applicable BSC Objectives.</p>
GDF SUEZ Energy UK	No	<p>In reference to BSC (c), the proposed modification will not achieve the desired result of increased market competition via visibility of higher granularity market share data. There has, to date been no evidence presented that would suggest the current level of information available is insufficient in increasing competition in the market place.</p> <p>In addition, there would be an increased resource requirement for smaller players, which would be required in order to make the published data meaningful. This would have the potential to disincentivise competition rather than encourage it.</p>
Ovo Energy	Yes	N.A
Cornwall Energy	No	<p>Against objective B – there are benefits to the system operator from seeing the level of embedded generation on the system, we believe the benefit to other market participants will be marginal as they already have access to information on levels of embedded generation good enough to make trading decisions with</p> <p>Against objective C - there are risks from larger incumbent market participants accessing market share of challenger suppliers, this data is confidential and should not be released without their express permission. Larger suppliers have an information processing advantage and can use this information to gain a competitive advantage not available to their challenger rivals.</p> <p>Against Objective D – The extra information from Elexon will come at a cost and the benefit to the market will be negligible considering the concentration of market share within certain parties and the fact that the market already provides this</p>

Respondent	Response	Rationale
		<p>information.</p> <p>There are a number of alternatives that would better meet the applicable BSC objectives. Forced disclosure of sensitive company information does not match objective C on facilitating competition. By showing rivals how businesses have developed the modification would make freely available the intellectual product and business development accrued by companies often over many years. There may be a public interest for disclosing sticky customers of incumbents. However this is different from disclosing the supply bases of companies who have competed their way in to the market over many years. As it is written, P315 is most damaging to those independent suppliers that have been most successful in establishing themselves in the market as it would force the disclosure of the most new information on them. P315 is effectively saying that no new entrant can build a unique proposition in the electricity market as, when it achieves a minimal level of scale, its successes (and failures) will be visible to all and therefore much more likely to draw a response from threatened larger incumbents. As a minimum, as with Ofgem and FOI requests about energy suppliers, suppliers should be asked if they wish to opt in to information disclosure of the type envisaged by P315.</p> <p>The modification confuses two objectives of helping the system operator balance better and forcing disclosure of commercially sensitive information. To aid the system operator, confidential release to it of information by region, meter type or even supplier may be appropriate. A separate BSC modification to this end would better meet BSC objectives if it enables the SO to fulfil its balancing responsibilities better.</p> <p>There is a difference between types of consumers being exposed for example the difference between participants with large shares of sticky or legacy customers and companies which have more engaged consumers won through competition in the retail market, it would be in the interest of the market to expose only the market share of consumer which haven't switched within a defined period. Even then this modification ignores those consumers that switch tariffs at the same supplier and could send a distorted view of consumer engagement by making the market look less active than it actually is. This could be disadvantageous to</p>

Respondent	Response	Rationale
		new entrants by encouraging them to join a market that appears different to how it actually operates.
EDF Energy	Yes	<p>Increased visibility of the numbers of customers/meters by broad type and size and their contribution to individual supplier electricity volumes should promote competition by allowing existing and prospective suppliers and other market participants to better understand market opportunities and trends in the markets for electricity supply and licence exempt generation.</p> <p>Increased visibility and prompt reporting of the numbers of customers/meters by broad type and size and their contribution to GSP Group totals should promote competition and efficient system operation by allowing market participants to better understand and forecast underlying levels of electricity demand and licence exempt generation within GSP Groups. Most of this information is already available to Suppliers, but the proposal would make it more readily available to other market participants.</p> <p>The benefits of transparency in meeting BSC objectives are hard to quantify. The BSC is already more transparent than most other market arrangements, and the value of additional transparency is uncertain. The net benefit of a particular level of transparency compared to the administrative cost of delivering it and using it is necessarily subjective. It is difficult to say definitively whether the benefits would outweigh the implementation costs (indicated as £80k), but on balance we think there is a good chance that BSC Objectives would be better met overall.</p>
National Grid Electricity Transmission plc	Yes	<p>We agree with the WG that the P315 Proposed solution better facilitates Applicable BSC Objective (c) compared to the current baseline as the increased transparency as a result of the additional data is likely to increase general understanding of how the market operates and thus support competition.</p> <p>Furthermore, we also believe that the P315 Proposed solution better facilitates Applicable BSC Objective (b) compared to the current baseline as the additional information available will be beneficial to the Transmission Company (alongside our existing processes and data sources) both in relation to our demand forecasting and charge-</p>

Respondent	Response	Rationale
		setting activities. This is because it will allow better visibility of embedded generation impacts which are becoming increasingly relevant from a system operator perspective.
Spark Energy Supply Ltd	No	Confidential.

Question 2: Do you agree with the Workgroup's initial unanimous view that P315 Alternative solution **does** better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives than the current baseline?

## Summary

Yes	No	Neutral/No Comment	Other
6	5	1	0

## Responses

Respondent	Response	Rationale
SmartestEnergy	Yes	The alternative does achieve one of the other purposes of the modification which is to provide greater granularity of data to sense check settlements.
Opus Energy Ltd	No	<p>1) We do not agree with the proposer's reasons for raising this modification. There is no real justification provided, only a loose reason citing improved competition.</p> <p>2) The proposed information to be made available is commercially sensitive and so should not be made publically available but should remain confidential. For example, information currently available via consultants is pulled together from data that suppliers provide to those consultants but this is the supplier's choice and doesn't necessarily mean there is an argument for the data to be published.</p> <p>We acknowledge that, following responses from previous consultation stages, the current Alternative Proposal has been amended in an attempt to address some of these concerns.</p> <p>Our understanding is that no Supplier ID level information will be accessible at GSP level and that for any Supplier that has a small market share (approximately 1% of the respective domestic or non-domestic market shares) would not be published individually.</p> <p>For Suppliers exceeding the reporting threshold, it will show, by Supplier ID, but at a GB level rather than GSP level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The total volume of electricity per Supplier ID; and</li> <li>• The total number of MPANs registered per Supplier ID.</li> </ul>

Respondent	Response	Rationale
		<p>Although we recognise that the Workgroup have proposed these amendments in response to concerns raised in previous consultation rounds, we still firmly believe that larger Suppliers in particular, who would be best placed to have the required resources to do so, could potentially utilise the proposed information together with other data available in order to obtain a more granular view of competitive Supplier activity.</p> <p>The proposed solution seeks to resolve a matter for which there is no obvious defect.</p>
TMA Data Management Ltd	Yes	N.A
RWE npower	Yes	N.A
ScottishPower	Yes	Reason as per Q1 response.
Good Energy	No	Our rationale is the same as set out above in response to Question 1.
GDF SUEZ Energy UK	No	See Above
Ovo Energy	Yes	N.A
Cornwall Energy	No	No. None of the proposed or alternative modifications better facilitates appropriate BSC objectives.
EDF Energy	Neutral	The alternative proposal provides the same benefits as the proposal, but adds some additional reporting on daily estimates of annual aggregate consumption for different classes of NHH meters within GSP Groups. It also reports historic half-hourly GSP Group Consumption Component Class data. We are unsure whether the additional benefit of making this data available justifies the additional cost (indicated as £24k).
National Grid Electricity Transmission plc	Yes	<p>As above, we agree with the WG that the P315 Alternative solution also better facilitates Applicable BSC Objective (c) compared to the current baseline as it proposes publishing more information than the Proposed solution and we cannot identify anything obviously detrimental to competition associated with this incremental increase in published information that would outweigh the positives outlined for the Proposed solution.</p> <p>For similar reasons, we believe that the P315 Alternative solution also better facilitates Applicable</p>



Respondent	Response	Rationale
		BSC objective (b) compared to the current baseline. In fact our support for the alternative is actually increased (i.e. compared to the previous response) by the fact that historical data will be made available which we are in favour of.
Spark Energy Supply Ltd	No	Confidential.

Question 3: Do you agree with the Workgroup's initial unanimous view that P315 Alternative solution **does** better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives compared with the P315 Proposed solution?

## Summary

Yes	No	Neutral/No Comment	Other
7	4	1	0

## Responses

Respondent	Response	Rationale
SmartestEnergy	Yes	N.A
Opus Energy Ltd	No	In line with our response to Question 2, we are opposed to both the Proposed and Alternative Solutions. Rather than meeting the BSC Objective to promote competition, in particular from an independent supplier perspective, publication of this data could potentially act as a barrier to competition. We do not believe that the solutions under P315 better facilitate competition, but potentially hinder it. Adequate market share information is already available from other sources and is fit for purpose. We do not believe that potential benefits to participants exceed the costs.
TMA Data Management Ltd	Yes	N.A
RWE npower	Yes	N.A
ScottishPower	Yes	N.A
Good Energy	No	In the absence of a proper justification for either solution we are of the view that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Proposed solution is preferable to the Alternative because it appears to have lower implementation and ongoing costs;</li> <li>neither solution is better than the current baseline.</li> </ul>
GDF SUEZ Energy UK	Yes	The alternative is slightly preferable than the original proposal with the archive period for the P0276 data being agreeable. However, we maintain that neither proposal creates a greater facilitation of the relevant BSC clauses.
Ovo Energy	Yes	N.A

Respondent	Response	Rationale
Cornwall Energy	No	See above
EDF Energy	Neutral	Assuming a solution as described in the latest assessment consultation (page 4 and pages 10-12), we are uncertain of the value of the additional information in an aggregated D0082 report (GSP level aggregate numbers of NHH meters and annual NHH energy in each class for each settlement run, derived from Supplier Purchase Matrix). This and provision of historic half-hourly CCC data would provide some additional indication of trends in demand and licence exempt generation, but we are unsure of the additional value. We are unsure whether the additional benefit of making this data available justifies the additional cost (indicated as £24k).
National Grid Electricity Transmission plc	Yes	We agree with the WG that the P315 Alternative solution better facilitates Applicable BSC Objective (c) than the P315 Proposed solution as we consider the additional information provided under the Alternative (compared to the Proposed) to be beneficial in terms of increasing general understanding of both new and existing market participants and thus supporting competition. In addition, we believe that, due to the increased amount of additional data (including historical data) that is made available under the P315 Alternative solution, this better facilitates objective (b) compared to the Proposed solution. This is because the breakdown of the data in the D0082 by NHH Profile Class may be useful to both our demand forecasting and charge-setting activities.
Spark Energy Supply Ltd	No	Confidential.

Question 4: Do you agree with the Workgroup that there are no other potential Alternative Modifications within the scope of P315 which would better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives?

## Summary

Yes	No	Neutral/No Comment	Other
7	4	1	0

## Responses

Respondent	Response	Rationale
SmartestEnergy	Yes	N.A
Opus Energy Ltd	No	Potential alternative solutions include allowing those Suppliers that have concerns regarding publication of their market share data to opt out of the P315 release, in line with Ofgem's approach to releasing data to the European Commission.
TMA Data Management Ltd	Yes	The other possible options were explored during the previous consultations.
RWE npower	Yes	N.A
ScottishPower	Yes	Given the debate and responses that P315 has generated and the subsequent restrictions placed on the group as to the granularity of the data that could be published we believe that no other potential alternative modification is available that would better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives.
Good Energy	Yes	We are not aware of any potential solutions within the scope of P315 that better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives than the existing baseline arrangements.
GDF SUEZ Energy UK	Yes	We remain unconvinced that there is an actual need to amend current industry practice, and therefore would not be proposing an alternative modification.
Ovo Energy	Yes	N.A
Cornwall Energy	No	A modification that provided nearer time information confidentially to the system operator may better facilitate BSC objectives.
EDF Energy	No	There is no evidence that competition, BSC Objectives, or consumers, would be harmed by simply reporting the relevant data for all suppliers, rather than explicitly treating arbitrarily small suppliers differently. An alternative could remove

Respondent	Response	Rationale
		<p>this discrimination recently introduced into the proposal and alternative.</p> <p>There are different and overlapping types of classification and volume aggregation associated with flows within GSP Groups/Distribution Systems. Distribution loss adjustment and GSP Group Correction applied to actual or estimated meter values for the purpose of settlement further complicate the types of data available. The proposal and alternative have focussed on particular groupings of data, but other groupings are possible and might be useful. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reporting of aggregated volume without losses and/or of volume without GSP Group Correction might be useful.</li> <li>• Estimated half-hourly data within the D0030 (Non Half Hourly DUoS Report) or similar reports (as referenced by proposal P300 including HH data in Measurement Classes F and G) could add additional value to the daily reporting of aggregate historic AA and estimated EAC annual values in the D0082 report under the alternative proposal.</li> </ul> <p>However, given the uncertain value in adding to existing and proposed reporting, we have no firm alternative proposals of this type at this time.</p>
National Grid Electricity Transmission plc	Neutral	N.A
Spark Energy Supply Ltd	No	Confidential.

**Question 5: Do you agree with the Workgroup that the draft legal text in Attachment A delivers the intention of P315 Proposed Modification?**

**Summary**

Yes	No	Neutral/No Comment	Other
5	4 <sup>1</sup>	3	0

**Responses**

Respondent	Response	Rationale
SmartestEnergy	No comment	N.A
Opus Energy Ltd	No	N.A
TMA Data Management Ltd	Yes	N.A
RWE npower	Yes	N.A
ScottishPower	Yes	N.A
Good Energy	No comment	N.A
GDF SUEZ Energy UK	Yes	N.A
Ovo Energy	Yes	N.A
Cornwall Energy	No	N.A
EDF Energy	No	<p>1. The proposed quarterly report is described and defined as the "Supplier Quarterly Consumption Report". One of its specific purposes is to report the import and export making up net volumes, publicly. Although the BSC uses the term Consumption for both import and export within Section S referring to the SVA arrangements, a more appropriate title would be "Supplier Quarterly Volume Report". This would avoid inconsistency with use of the term "consumption" in the rest of the BSC and in common understanding, better representing transparency and simplicity.</p> <p>2. Similarly, the term "Consumption Reporting Group" seems inappropriate to describe public reporting of both import/consumption and export/generation. "Supplier Volume Reporting Class" would be more descriptive of what is actually</p>

<sup>1</sup> Two respondents did not support the modification and therefore disagreed with the draft legal text.

Respondent	Response	Rationale
		<p>being done.</p> <p>3. No reference is made to the determination of numbers of BM Units and volumes to be reported for CVA BM Units, as described in the assessment consultation. Some parts of the consultation (eg. requirement 1.2 at pages 8 and 11, and at the bottom of page 15, and at page 41) suggest CVA import volumes (determined from SAA-I014-3 report) would be added to those for SVA Half-Hourly BM Units. CVA meter data is aggregated and reported in a different manner to SVA data, and we think it would be best to report Supplier CVA import and export volumes as additional line items in the quarterly report, although they can be determined relatively easily by parties in receipt of existing SAA-I014-2 data. The method of determination of this data, and an appropriate Reporting Group/Class(s) for it, should be added to the legal text.</p> <p>4. Approved modification P305 makes extensive changes to the legal text in BSC Section S. We have not checked whether these would interact with the changes proposed by P315.</p> <p>5. Proposed changes to Annex S-2:</p> <p>a. At 9A.1, quantity <math>CiN(c)P_j</math> is described, and is defined in proposed additions to Tables X-6 and X-7, as a value for a particular Consumption Component Class N (not for losses) and Profile Class P. However, its determination indicates summation over Profile Class. Should P be removed from summation subscript? The meaning of subscript <math>N(c)</math> is not explained or defined.</p> <p>b. At 9A.2, quantity <math>CLOSSiN(c)P_j</math> is described, and is defined in proposed additions to Tables X-6 and X-7 as a value for a particular CCC (for losses) and Profile Class. However, its determination indicates summation of volume over Profile Class before summation by LLF Class. Should P be removed from the summation? The meaning of subscript <math>N(c)</math> is not explained or defined.</p> <p>c. At 9A.3, the weighted addition of quantities <math>CiN(c)P_j</math> and <math>CLOSSiN(c)P_j</math> to give Corrected Component by Profile Class <math>CORCiN(c)P_j</math> is described, but only makes sense subject to the comments in a. and b. above.</p> <p>d. At 9A.4, we suggest the Quarterly Supplier Energy Consumption (or as we would prefer to call</p>

Respondent	Response	Rationale
		<p>it Quarterly Supplier Energy Volume) CORCZqG for each reporting group/class would be more clearly described as:</p> <p>"9A.4 The Quarterly Supplier Energy Volume CORCZqG for each Supplier Volume Reporting Class G [note Group/G risks confusion with GSP Group which has subscript H] shall be determined as the sum:</p> <p>(a) <math>\sum ZqGiNPj \text{ CORCiN(c)Pj}</math> over those Consumption Component Classes N and Profile Classes P appropriate for each of Supplier Volume Reporting Classes 1 to 3 [associated with NHH Metered Import Profile Classes] and over all BM Units for Supplier Z.</p> <p>(b) <math>\sum ZqGiNj \text{ CORCiNj}</math> over those Consumption Component Classes N appropriate for each of Supplier Volume Reporting Classes 4 to 8 [associated with NHH Unmetered Import, NHH Export and HH], and over all relevant BM Units i for Supplier Z."</p> <p>Note that values of C, CLOSS and CORC will exist under 9A1 to 3 for all NHH Profiled data regardless of whether it is used for CORC as reported under 9A.4. If summing under 9A.4 was (a) for 1-5 NHH and (b) 6-8 HH, the result should be the same.</p> <p>Ideally, there would be explicit description of the CCCs to be used for each, but with the changes above the text would probably be sufficiently clear. Subscript N(c) is not described.</p> <p>e. At 9A.5, newly defined NMqG should have also have a Z subscript. We think it would be more accurately described as:</p> <p>"9A.5 The Quarterly Metering Systems by Supplier (NMZqG) for each Supplier Volume Reporting Class G shall be determined as <math>\sum ZqGHd \text{ NMZHGd} / \sum qd1</math>, where NMZHGd is the total number of meters registered to Supplier Z in GSP Group H in Supplier Volume Reporting Class G on day d, summed over all GSP Groups and all days in the relevant calendar quarter q, and <math>\sum qd1</math> is summation of all the days in relevant calendar quarter q."</p> <p>NM is not an existing BSC quantity, so the expression NMZHGd used here is a shortcut to achieve the intent of the proposal, with no special consideration of de-energised meters, meter types, classes or other registration complexities. Given that NMP and NMN are not existing defined</p>



Respondent	Response	Rationale
		<p>quantities, there seems little point bringing in the distinction between NHH Profiled Metered Import and whatever NMN represents.</p> <p>6. At proposed Section V we suggest:</p> <p>At 4.2.2(g), capitalise Supplier Market Share Data.</p> <p>"4.2.10 For the purposes of paragraph 4.2.2, Supplier Market Share Data means the Supplier Quarterly Volume Report containing information for individual suppliers, except for data relating to any Suppliers for whom the criteria in paragraph 4.2.11 are satisfied, which BSCCo shall aggregate and report as a single anonymous supplier". [It cannot be guaranteed that individual such suppliers will not be capable of being identified, if for example there were only one or two of them]</p> <p>7. At proposed Section V4.2.12, "the" before receipt is unnecessary.</p> <p>8. Annex V-1 Table 7 "Supplier Quarterly Consumption Report": See previous comments on preference for "Volume" to "Consumption" and for Supplier Volume Reporting Class rather than Supplier Consumption Reporting Group. The description refers to "consumption data (consumption plus losses)", but would more accurately say "volume data (actual or estimated meter volume adjusted for distribution losses and GSP Group Correction)".</p> <p>9. Annex X-1: See previous comments on naming.</p> <p>10. Annex X-1 Table X-6: Definitions of C and CLOSS refer explicitly to active import. Annex S-2 9A1 to 3 refer to any NHH Profiled measurement. This is inconsistent, even though unmetered (in G=4) and export (in G=5) values aren't used for the final reporting in 9A4 (though they could be, by summing profile classes in G=4,5 as for G=1 to 3).</p> <p>11. Annex X-1 Table X-6: Definition of Corrected Component by Profile Class CORC refers to being after the application of GSP Group Correction Factor. For purposes of reporting under P315 it also includes adjustment for Line Loss Factor. (No separate reporting of uncorrected and corrected).</p> <p>12. There is no description of how or where the GSP Group Consumption Information which would be made available to Any person (on request)</p>

Respondent	Response	Rationale
		(Annex V-1 Table 7) would be provided.
National Grid Electricity Transmission plc	Neutral	N.A
Spark Energy Supply Ltd	No	Confidential.

Question 6: Do you agree with the Workgroup that the draft legal text in Attachment B delivers the intention of P315 Alternative Modification?

## Summary

Yes	No	Neutral/No Comment	Other
5	4 <sup>2</sup>	3	0

## Responses

Respondent	Response	Rationale
SmartestEnergy	No comment	N.A
Opus Energy Ltd	No	N.A
TMA Data Management Ltd	Yes	N.A
RWE npower	Yes	N.A
ScottishPower	Yes	N.A
Good Energy	No comment	N.A
GDF SUEZ Energy UK	Yes	N.A
Ovo Energy	Yes	N.A
Cornwall Energy	No	N.A
EDF Energy	No	Comments as for Question 5 concerning the Proposal. In addition:  There is no description of how or where the GSP Group Market Matrix Report which would be made available to Any person (on request) (Annex V-1 Table 7) would be provided.
National Grid Electricity Transmission plc	Neutral	N.A
Spark Energy Supply Ltd	No	Confidential.

<sup>2</sup> Two respondents did not support the modification and therefore disagreed with the draft legal text.

## Question 7: Do you agree with the Workgroup's recommended Implementation Date?

### Summary

Yes	No	Neutral/No Comment	Other
7	4 <sup>3</sup>	1	0

### Responses

Respondent	Response	Rationale
SmartestEnergy	Yes	N.A
Opus Energy Ltd	No	Although it should be feasible to facilitate implementation by the dates specified, for the reasons specified above we do not support any of the options for this proposal.
TMA Data Management Ltd	Yes	The lead time of 6 months should be sufficient for the required changes to be developed and tested.
RWE npower	Yes	N.A
ScottishPower	Yes	While supporting the Workgroup's proposed implementation dates, we would prefer a June 2016 implementation as this would avoid pro-rating of data should the November 2016 date be chosen.
Good Energy	No	We are opposed to both the Proposed and Alternative solutions being implemented. However, should an agreed solution be developed we believe it should be implemented as part of a routine BSC Systems release.
GDF SUEZ Energy UK	Yes	N.A
Ovo Energy	Yes	N.A
Cornwall Energy	No	The modification should not be implemented.
EDF Energy	Yes	Implementation on 30 June 2016 if an Authority decision is received on or before 22 October 2015, or 03 November 2016 if a decision is received after 22 October 2015 but on or before 25 February 2016 would give more than sufficient notice for EDF Energy. Given that operational and financial impacts on our business of the solutions described are negligible, the notice period required is minimal.

<sup>3</sup> The respondents disagreed with the Modification and therefore disagreed with the proposed Implementation Date.

Respondent	Response	Rationale
National Grid Electricity Transmission plc	Neutral	N.A
Spark Energy Supply Ltd	No	Confidential.

## Question 8: Do you support the reporting threshold approach?

### Summary

Yes	No	Neutral/No Comment	Other
6	4	2	0

### Responses

Respondent	Response	Rationale
SmartestEnergy	Yes	N.A
Opus Energy Ltd	No	The introduction of a reporting threshold, below which data published would be aggregated together and reported as "Other Suppliers" would introduce a non-level playing field for those small Suppliers that exceed the threshold. This is in line with our primary concern (with both Proposed and Alternative solutions) that, rather than facilitate competition, P315 could hinder it.
TMA Data Management Ltd	Yes	We support the idea of a threshold to reporting Suppliers to ensure a meaningful.
RWE npower	Yes	N.A
ScottishPower	Yes	We agree with the proposed reporting threshold approach as it takes into consideration the market split by both MPAN count and GWh.
Good Energy	Yes	The proposed threshold approach appears to be consistent with that used by Ofgem to report domestic and non-domestic market shares.
GDF SUEZ Energy UK	No comment	N.A
Ovo Energy	Yes	N.A
Cornwall Energy	No	<p>The reporting threshold is damaging to competition as it exposes the most information on those companies which have been most successful in scale terms in establishing themselves as competitors to the large vertically integrated companies. These companies would become disproportionately more vulnerable to competitive responses that might not otherwise have occurred imperilling the investments made in developing their business and the benefits they have brought to consumers.</p> <p>Furthermore implementing p315 would establish the principle that it is acceptable to disclose new</p>

Respondent	Response	Rationale
		company sensitive information without the consent of those involved. Not only would this add commercial risk to those suppliers as they push through whatever threshold is decided it would increase risk for all suppliers as, in the case of the current modification, a competitor may decide that would be beneficial to force more disclosure so it can see in more detail how its rivals are faring.
EDF Energy	No	There is no evidence that explicit discrimination between large and smaller suppliers in publishing the proposed data would better meet BSC Objectives relating to efficient operation or competition, or otherwise support consumer interests. The additional processing required to identify and aggregate data for smaller suppliers will incur cost, acting against BSC Objective (d). Reduced quantities of reported data may marginally reduce storage and data transmission costs, but this is probably insignificant.
National Grid Electricity Transmission plc	Neutral	N.A
Spark Energy Supply Ltd	No	Confidential.

**Question 9: Do you believe that the reporting thresholds which equate to approximately 1% market share are acceptable?**

**Summary**

Yes	No	Neutral/No Comment	Other
5	5	2	0

**Responses**

Respondent	Response	Rationale
SmartestEnergy	Yes	N.A
Opus Energy Ltd	No	Whilst this demonstrates that concerns raised by a number of suppliers regarding the disclosure of commercially sensitive data have been considered by the Workgroup, this threshold is too low to “protect” all but the very smallest Suppliers and would introduce a non-level playing field for data disclosure.
TMA Data Management Ltd	Yes	We are concerned that the 1% threshold only reports on 15 Suppliers out of a possible 49, leaving 34 as anonymous but we understand the concerns of some participants and the ones expressed by Ofgem. We would rather have a 1% threshold than no reporting at all.
RWE npower	Yes	N.A
ScottishPower	No	We agree with the Proposer that the threshold could be lower given that a 1% threshold would anonymise more than two thirds of the current market and as such potentially defeat the purpose of the Modification. However, it may be that 1% of market share could be set as an early benchmark and reduced accordingly at some point in the future.
Good Energy	Yes	The proposed thresholds appear to be broadly consistent with those used in existing industry market share reporting and provide anonymity for smaller suppliers.
GDF SUEZ Energy UK	No comment	N.A
Ovo Energy	Yes	N.A
Cornwall Energy	No	No thresholds are acceptable as the modification should not be implemented.



Respondent	Response	Rationale
EDF Energy	No	There is no evidence that explicit discrimination between large and smaller suppliers would better meet BSC Objectives or otherwise support consumer interests. Thresholds of 250,000 domestic NHH MPANs (perhaps around 100 MW average) and/or 500GWh/Quarter HH and non-domestic NHH MPANs (well over 200 MW average) seem arbitrary. Smaller thresholds averaging around 10-50 MW would be more consistent with the resolutions used in the Grid Code for submission (and publication) of volumes.
National Grid Electricity Transmission plc	Neutral	N.A
Spark Energy Supply Ltd	No	Confidential.

Question 10: What are your preferred thresholds for Domestic (expressed as % market share or number of MPANs)? and Non-domestic (expressed as % market share or GWh volume)?

## Summary

1%	0.25%	10,000 MPAN 100GWh	0%	Neutral/No Comment	Other
3	1	1	1	3	3

## Responses

Respondent	Response	Rationale
SmartestEnergy	10,000 MPAN 100GWh	N.A
Opus Energy Ltd	N.A	In line with our responses to Questions 8 and 9, we do not believe that the introduction of a threshold which would introduce a non-level playing field for those small Suppliers that exceed the threshold is in the interests of competition.
TMA Data Management Ltd	1%	Please see response to question 9.
RWE npower	1%	We agree with the proposed thresholds.
ScottishPower	0.25%	On examining the threshold scenarios within the consultation paper we believe a 0.25% market share would seem to be appropriate as this would mean that overall market published data would be split on an almost 50/50 basis.
Good Energy	1%	Please refer to our response to Question 9.
GDF SUEZ Energy UK	No comment	N.A
Ovo Energy	No comment	N.A
Cornwall Energy	N.A	No thresholds are acceptable as the modification should not be implemented. As stated above, any forced disclosure of industry data would only give a partial view of the market that could attract flawed investment and damage the commercial interests of those who have already sunk considerable effort in to establishing themselves in the market.
EDF Energy	0%	There is no evidence that discriminating between Suppliers according to size will better meet BSC

Respondent	Response	Rationale
		Objectives or other customer interests.
National Grid Electricity Transmission plc	Neutral	N.A
Spark Energy Supply Ltd	No	Confidential.

Question 11: What do you believe are the lowest acceptable thresholds for Domestic (expressed as % market share or number of MPANs) and Non-domestic (expressed as % market share or GWh volume)?

## Summary

1%	0.25%	10,000 MPAN 100GWh	0%	Neutral/No Comment	Other
2	1	1	1	4	3

## Responses

Respondent	Response	Rationale
SmartestEnergy	10,000 MPAN 100GWh	The purpose of this threshold is to protect suppliers whose growth could be inhibited by being seen as too small. It is important that the threshold is guided by this principle and not by some unjustifiable preconceived notion of the difference between large and small suppliers. We do not believe that a small player in the domestic market should be ashamed of a domestic portfolio of 10,000 MPAN. Indeed, in the domestic market there are suppliers who have been established for many years and who have portfolios not significantly higher than this. In the non-domestic market we believe the volumetric threshold needs to be proportionately higher because it is possible to have quite a small number of high volume customers.
Opus Energy Ltd	N.A	Please see our response to Question 10.
TMA Data Management Ltd	N.A	N.A
RWE npower	1%	We do not believe the thresholds should be any lower than those already proposed as they are the most appropriate.
ScottishPower	0.25%	See Q10 – as per 0.25% market share – 69,000 MPANs and 142GWh.
Good Energy	1%	We believe the thresholds proposed by the workgroup to be the lowest acceptable thresholds. The proposed thresholds appear to be broadly consistent with those used in existing industry market share reporting and provide anonymity for smaller suppliers.
GDF SUEZ Energy UK	No comment	N.A

Respondent	Response	Rationale
Ovo Energy	No comment	N.A
Cornwall Energy	N.A	No thresholds are acceptable as the modification should not be implemented. As stated above, any forced disclosure of industry data would only give a partial view of the market that could attract flawed investment and damage the commercial interests of those who have already sunk considerable effort in to establishing themselves in the market.
EDF Energy	0%	There is no evidence that discriminating between Suppliers according to size will better meet BSC Objectives or other customer interests.
National Grid Electricity Transmission plc	Neutral	N.A
Spark Energy Supply Ltd	N.A	Confidential.

## Question 12: Do you believe historical P0276 data should be made available to BSC Parties and data licensees?

### Summary

Yes	No	Neutral/No Comment	Other
6	4	2	0

### Responses

Respondent	Response	Rationale
SmartestEnergy	No comment	N.A
Opus Energy Ltd	No	No, because BSC Parties already have access to this data.
TMA Data Management Ltd	Yes	In order to have a significant effect for demand forecasting and seeing the evolution, the publication of historical data for P0276 allows the benefits of trend analysis to be realised as soon as P315 is implemented rather than having to wait for 2 years after P315 implementation.
RWE npower	Yes	We believe this may have potential benefits to all parties especially new entrants and small suppliers.
ScottishPower	Yes	We agree with the workgroup's view that having access to historical P0276 data would assist parties in developing a better understanding of GSP Group demand and the development of embedded generation over time, in addition we believe such data will give a sound base to assist in forecasting going forward.
Good Energy	No	Making historical P0276 data available would result in additional costs in respect of which workgroup has not demonstrated there to be commensurate benefits.
GDF SUEZ Energy UK	No comment	N.A
Ovo Energy	Yes	N.A
Cornwall Energy	No	No because BSC parties already have access to it and, though it may be nice to have no-one else needs it. Much more granular data on regional markets is available from DECC.
EDF Energy	Yes	There would be benefits for accurate forecasting if trends can be better identified from historical data. However, given uncertainty in the size of the benefit, limited expenditure should be made on

Respondent	Response	Rationale
		making historic data available.
National Grid Electricity Transmission plc	Yes	N.A
Spark Energy Supply Ltd	No	Confidential.

## Question 13: Do you have any further comments on P315?

### Summary

Yes	No
4	8

### Responses

Respondent	Response	Comments
SmartestEnergy	No	N.A
Opus Energy Ltd	No	N.A
TMA Data Management Ltd	No	N.A
RWE npower	No	N.A
ScottishPower	No	N.A
Good Energy	No	N.A
GDF SUEZ Energy UK	Yes	<p>To date, there has been no actual evidence presented to assert the suggestion that current industry practice is anti-competitive.</p> <p>Indeed, the recent publication of the CMA initial findings has shown that the opposite is true and that VI and the market share of smaller suppliers are actually increasing.</p>
Ovo Energy	No	N.A
Cornwall Energy	Yes	<p>Market share information is useful to market participants and observers where it illustrates market structure. The retail markets are dominated by large participants and releasing the market share of their smaller rivals in to the public domain will not bring any immediate benefits in terms of competition. There is benefit in using a measure of market power such as the Herschman Herfindal Index to publish the market shares of those companies who are seen to be able to wield market power.</p>
EDF Energy	Yes	<p>Half-hourly profiled NHH data and HH data for Measurement Classes 'F' and 'G' within the D0030 NHH DUoS or similar reports would provide more easily accessible information on half-hourly patterns of flow in different profile classes (before adjustment for Line Loss and GSP Group Correction) than aggregated EAC/AA data in the D0082 file, which requires combination with profiling data to</p>



Respondent	Response	Comments
		<p>determine half-hourly values. EAC/AA has the advantage of less influence from short term weather conditions.</p> <p>Annex 2 of the assessment consultation shows example formats for the quarterly Supplier Market Share Summary Data. To avoid any misunderstanding on the nature of the relevant data source, the column headings for HH Import and HH Export should specify SVA HH Import and SVA HH Export. NHH and Unmetered measurements are not used in CVA, so there is no ambiguity for these.</p> <p>At page 27 of the assessment consultation document v3, reference is made to the requirement to migrate PC5-8 meters to HH by 1 April 2016. This has now changed due to Ofgem's approval of P322 combined with delay of P272 to 1 April 2017.</p>
National Grid Electricity Transmission plc	No	N.A
Spark Energy Supply Ltd	Yes	Confidential.