

ELEXON'S RESPONSE TO ENTSO-E'S DRAFT WORK PROGRAMME 2017-2018

1. Introduction

On 8 August 2017, the European Network of Transmission System Operators for Electricity (ENTSO-E) published its draft Annual Work Programme covering the remainder of 2017 through to December 2018 for comment. This Work Programme and consultation response form can be found on the ENTSO-E website [here](#).

As ENTSO-E has been granted a very powerful, legally-mandated role in making proposals for balancing markets and imbalance settlement under the European Guideline for Electricity Balancing, and because changes to its European Transparency Platform can have wide-ranging effects on European stakeholders including data providers such as ELEXON and BSC Parties, ELEXON has responded to the consultation as follows.

Format of this document

Responses to the consultation had to be in a set format loaded into a web interface on the ENTSO-E website.

This document was used to develop the ELEXON response in the format required and represents the submission made. We did not answer all the consultation questions. Only the questions to which ELEXON made a response are listed below.

Steve Wilkin, 7 September 2017

2. Consultation Questions to which ELEXON responded and the ELEXON Response

5. Is the information provided in the Annual Work Programme 2018 detailed enough?

ELEXON response (to a multiple choice question): "Enough detail on the key issues"

7. On Chapter 2: Network codes – would you say that ENTSO-E's planned activities....

Take stakeholders' views into account?

- ELEXON response (to a multiple choice question): "I rather agree"

Allow for a timely implementation of the codes?

- ELEXON response (to a multiple choice question): "I rather disagree"

Will allow for sufficient involvement of all concerned market parties?

- ELEXON response (to a multiple choice question): "I rather disagree"

11. On Chapter 6: Co-creation and engagement - Would you say that ENTSO-E's planned activities...

Allow for appropriate dissemination of information to the different categories of stakeholder?

- ELEXON response (to a multiple choice question): "I rather disagree"

Allow for appropriate consideration of stakeholders' views?

- ELEXON response (to a multiple choice question): "I rather disagree"

ELEXON'S RESPONSE TO ENTSO-E'S DRAFT WORK PROGRAMME 2017-2018

12. Open comments - Provide here any general remark and suggestions to complement your answers to the questions above

ELEXON Response:

Stakeholder involvement (Questions 7 and 11)

We welcome ENTSO-E's increasing engagement with stakeholders but given ENTSO-E's powerful and important role in implementing Network Codes and the Transparency Regulation we feel that ENTSO-E could always do more to involve non-TSO experts and opinions, particularly at earlier stages of proposal development. As ENTSO-E itself notes on page 25, "experience has shown that stakeholder contributions decisively increase the quality of our work and facilitate implementation". We wholeheartedly agree. Below we highlight some specific examples where we think that ENTSO-E stakeholder engagement could be increased to the benefit of all parties in relation to Network Code and Transparency implementation and more widely.

On page 10, we note that ENTSO-E is planning to update the manual of procedures of the Transparency Regulation. Changes to the manual can change the structure of data or business validations and impact the upstream data providers, such as ELEXON, individual TSOs and market participants. Therefore we request clarity and that publicly available notice of all changes is given as far in advance as possible.

These changes do not only impact TSOs so should not be hidden in documents on the ENTSO-E internal document sharing system which is only available to ENTSO-E TSO members. Also ENTSO-E should ensure that changes impacting parties external to ENTSO-E members, and which might impact these parties' ability to provide data if not made aware, are highlighted.

On page 24, we note that ENTSO-E will define a European electricity market role model. We would ask that ENTSO-E plans for a public consultation on this to ensure that it accurately reflects the situation in all EU Member States. In particular, we are expecting that a number of other Member States will have non-TSO third party market operators who have been assigned roles under the Network Codes and Guidelines, which should be recognised in the role model. For example, in Britain (GB), ELEXON is expecting that it will continue to: administer balancing settlement; imbalance settlement; and publish GB electricity market data on its transparency platform.

On page 25, we note the existence of the ENTSO-E Advisory Council. ELEXON and many other non-TSO third party market operators are represented at EU level by the Association of European Energy Exchanges ([Europex](#)). Currently the Advisory Council does not include Europex so, although we are a group of stakeholders directly impacted by ENTSO-E's work, we are not represented. We would therefore request that ENTSO-E invites Europex to join its Advisory Council as this will improve ENTSO-E's stakeholder engagement by allowing our views to be heard and considered.

A specific question on ENTSO-E involvement:

On page 10, we note that each TSO has to propose Terms and Conditions (Ts & Cs) for BSPs and BRPs and that ENTSO-E plans involve ENTSO-E and ACER. But under Articles 18 and 5(4) of the draft EB Guideline, the development and approval of Ts & Cs is a Member State competence, so we are not sure what roles are proposed for ENTSO-E and ACER here, including a proposed ENTSO-E consultation and ENTSO-E decision? Please can you explain this element of ENTSO-E's Work Programme.

Time to implement Network Codes and Guidelines (Question 7):

In general the times to implement changes following the approval of ENTSO-E proposals under the EB Guideline are too short, but this is clearly not something that ENTSO-E can do anything about directly, as the deadlines will be

ELEXON'S RESPONSE TO ENTSO-E'S DRAFT WORK PROGRAMME 2017-2018

legally mandated. But, as we noted during the development of the Balancing Guideline, normally we require approximately 18 months to design, publicly consult upon, and obtain mandatory local (GB) regulatory approval for changes to our balancing and imbalance settlement and data transparency systems and to implement them.

Ideally we would see the final ACER approved proposal before starting the GB change process we are required to follow. But that would not give us enough time, so we require very early sight of the proposals that ENTSO-E intends to make, even if they are not yet approved, as this will give us more time to prepare than allowed for in the Guideline. This is also a point we made in our response to the recent TERRE consultation, where our changes are critically dependent on the final central TERRE design.

END