



Stage 04: Final Modification Report

P291 'REMIT Inside Information Reporting Platform for GB Electricity'

The Regulation on Wholesale Energy Markets Integrity and Transparency (REMIT) is an EU regulation aimed at preventing market abuse in wholesale energy markets. A key requirement is for market participants to publish inside information.

P291 proposes to use the Balancing Mechanism Reporting System (BMRS) as a platform to publish the necessary information to meet the requirements of REMIT inside information reporting for the GB electricity sector.



- The BSC Panel:
- Recommends **Approval** of P291



- High Impact:
- Balancing Mechanism Reporting Agent (BMRA)
 - Transmission Company



- Medium Impact:
- BSC Parties



- Low Impact:
- ELEXON

What stage is this document in the process?

01 Initial Written Assessment

02 Definition Procedure

03 Assessment Procedure

▶ 04 Report Phase

Contents

1	Summary	3
2	Why Change?	4
3	Proposed Solution	6
4	Impacts & Costs	14
5	Implementation	17
6	Workgroup's Discussions	19
7	Panel's Initial Discussions	29
8	Report Phase Consultation Responses	30
9	Panel's Final Discussions	34
10	Recommendations	35
11	Further Information	35
	Appendix 1: Message Data Items	36
	Appendix 2: Workgroup Details	40
	Appendix 3: Estimated Industry Progression Costs	42

About this Document

This is the P291 Final Modification Report, which ELEXON has submitted to the Authority on behalf of the BSC Panel. It includes a summary of the Workgroup's assessment, the Panel's full views and the responses to both the Workgroup's Assessment Consultations and the Panel's Report Phase Consultation. The Authority will consider this report and will decide whether to approve or reject P291.

There are four parts to this document:

- This is the main document. It provides details of the solution, impacts, costs, benefits/drawbacks and proposed implementation approach. It also summarises the Workgroup's key views on the areas set by the Panel in its Terms of Reference, and contains details of the Workgroup's membership and full Terms of Reference.
- Attachment A contains the approved redlined changes to the BSC for P291.
- Attachment B contains the full responses received to the Workgroup's Assessment Procedure Consultation.
- Attachment C contains the full responses received to the Panel's Report Phase Consultation.



Any questions?

Contact:

David Kemp



david.kemp@elexon.co.uk



020 7380 4303

P291
Final Modification Report

12 July 2013

Version 1.0

Page 2 of 42

© ELEXON Limited 2013

Why Change?

The Regulation on Wholesale Energy Markets Integrity and Transparency (REMIT) requires market participants to publish information that, were it not to be published, would be considered inside information. The guidance on REMIT from the Agency for the Co-operation of Energy Regulators (ACER) expresses a preference for this information to be published on central reporting platforms.

Solution

P291 proposes to introduce a REMIT inside information reporting platform to the Balancing Mechanism Reporting System (BMRS) website. Participants will be able to submit messages to this platform through existing Grid Code submissions (in relation to outages, PN and MEL/MIL re-declarations), modified to include additional information, or through the ELEXON Portal, provided they have the necessary authorisation.

Impacts & Costs

P291 impacts the BSC and the Balancing Mechanism Reporting Agent (BMRA) Service Description and User Requirement Specification. It will also require changes to the Grid Code.

It will impact the BMRA, the Transmission Company and ELEXON, and is likely to impact most BSC Parties. However, use of the P291 REMIT platform by Parties, and therefore the associated implementation impacts, would not be mandatory under the BSC.

The central implementation cost of P291 is approximately £475k, comprising £105k in BMRA costs, £20k in ELEXON effort and £350k in Transmission Company costs. Respondents to the Workgroup's consultations have identified estimated individual Party costs to utilise one of the submission routes ranging from minimal up to £300k.

Implementation

P291 is proposed for implementation on 31 December 2014 if the Authority's decision is received by 31 March 2014.

Panel's Recommendation

The Panel unanimously agrees with the Workgroup's unanimous view that P291 would better facilitate Applicable BSC Objectives (c) and (e), and therefore recommends that P291 is approved.



What is REMIT?

The Regulation on Wholesale Energy Markets Integrity and Transparency (REMIT) is a legally binding EU regulation (Regulation (EU) No 1227/2011)¹ that came into force on 28 December 2011 and is aimed at preventing market abuse in the wholesale energy markets. It establishes a new framework for the monitoring of wholesale energy markets. A key requirement of this framework is for market participants to publish information that, were it not to be published, would be considered inside information.

The Agency for the Co-operation of Energy Regulators (ACER) has published its second edition of its non-binding guidance on REMIT² which includes details on the reporting of information that would otherwise be considered inside information. This guidance states that inside information should be disclosed in a manner ensuring that it is capable of being “disseminated to as wide a public as possible”, and suggests that market participants with potential inside information should use centralised platforms for disclosing their information if such platforms exist, although they can also use their own websites. The guidance considers that the use of a transparency platform will decrease the organisational burden on market participants, and that the use of such platforms would allow information to be more accessible to all market participants.

What information is required to be reported under REMIT?

The REMIT regulation does not explicitly set out what should or should not be reported under the regulation. Article 2(1) of the regulation sets out the definition of ‘inside information’ as:

- Information of a precise nature which has not been made public, which relates, directly or indirectly, to one or more wholesale energy products and which, if it were made public, would be likely to significantly affect the prices of those wholesale energy products.

The REMIT regulation further defines ‘information’ as:

- Information relating to the capacity and use of facilities for production, storage, consumption or transmission of electricity or natural gas or related to the capacity and use of LNG facilities, including planned or unplanned availability of these facilities; and
- Information which is required to be disclosed in accordance with legal or regulatory provisions at Union or national level, market rules, contracts or customs on the relevant wholesale energy market, in so far as this information is likely to have a significant effect on the prices of wholesale energy products; and
- Other information that a reasonable market participant would be likely to use as part of the basis of its decision to enter into a transaction relating to, or to issue an order to trade in, a wholesale energy product.

REMIT has been in force since December 2011 with market participants publishing information on a number of individual websites. Generator outage data seems to feature significantly on market participants’ existing publications.

What is the issue?

A requirement of REMIT is for participants to publish any inside information. The ACER guidance advocates the use of reporting platforms for this.



What is inside information?

Article 2(1) of REMIT defines “inside information” as:

- Information of a precise nature;
- Which has not been made public;
- Which relates, directly or indirectly, to one or more wholesale energy products; and
- Which if it were made public, would be likely to significantly affect the price of those wholesale energy products.

ACER’s guidance contains further information on what it currently considers to be covered by the above criteria.

P291
Final Modification Report

12 July 2013

Version 1.0

Page 4 of 42

© ELEXON Limited 2013

¹ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:326:0001:0016:EN:PDF>

² http://www.acer.europa.eu/remit/Pages/ACER_guidance.aspx

What is the BMRS?

The Balancing Mechanism Reporting Service (BMRS) is a service for publishing and reporting data relating to the Balancing Mechanism, Settlement and the market in general. This includes data provided by National Grid relating to balancing actions and indicative data relating to Balancing and Settlement, including indicative data for each Settlement Period shortly after its completion. All of the data published on the BMRS is indicative data, calculated from the information available at the time, and is not used within Settlement, but its publication helps to facilitate the operation of the GB electricity market. Market participants can choose to receive the information via a 'high-grade' service, where the information is sent to them directly via a TIBCO feed, or they can use the 'low-grade' service, the BMRS website³. The low-grade service is freely available to anyone.

In a similar fashion to the data currently published on the BMRS, inside information required under REMIT would not be used in Settlement, but would help to facilitate the operation of the market. In addition, its publication would enable the industry to align with the most recent ACER guidance, which expresses a preference for using central reporting platforms to publish potential inside information in a place freely accessible to anyone.

What problem does P291 identify with the current arrangements?

National Grid has launched a REMIT transparency platform for the GB gas market⁴, but there is currently no such platform in place for the GB electricity market. The Proposer considers that the BMRS would be the most suitable place for a platform.

The BMRS has grown and evolved into an electricity data reporting tool, even where the data is not directly used in Settlement. This combined with ACER's preference to use existing industry reporting platforms for publication of potential REMIT inside information makes the BMRS a logical reporting mechanism for displaying the required information. Activities of the Balancing Mechanism Reporting Agent (BMRA) and functionality of the BMRS are specified under the BSC. Therefore, in order to allow REMIT inside information to be published on the BMRS website the BSC must be amended accordingly.

The Proposer considered that the BSC Modification process would provide a path by which to define the platform requirements as well as ensuring the platform meets the REMIT requirements and ACER guidance. This included aligning with the guidance on what should be published on the platform and how the platform should operate.

In the absence of a central inside information reporting platform, BSC Parties (and other participants within the electricity industry) have to comply with the REMIT requirements by reporting potential inside information on their own websites (or by other reporting channels, for example social media) which makes it difficult to locate all the published information. Publishing potential inside information reported by market participants on a single platform will make it easier to locate. Furthermore, this will also align GB practices with the non-binding ACER guidance on REMIT, which expresses a preference for reporting potential inside information on central platforms where these exist.



Modification Proposal Form

A copy of the Proposer's Modification Proposal Form can be found on the [P291](#) page of the ELEXON website.

³ <http://www.bmreports.com/>

⁴ <https://www.remit.gb.net/>



Proposed solution

P291 proposes to amend the BSC to allow a REMIT inside information reporting platform to be introduced on to the BMRS website. This will enable the publication of necessary information for market participants to meet the requirements of REMIT inside information reporting for the GB electricity market, as well as establishing expected standards and methods for the input and reporting of such data. Code changes will be required to obligate the BMRA to provide the service and set out who can submit data, how they will do so, and how it will be reported.

REMIT data reported on the BMRS will not be used in Settlement, but reporting the information in this way will help facilitate the wholesale electricity trading market by providing near to real-time reporting and historic market information.

When developing its solution to P291, the Workgroup has considered the Nord Pool Spot reporting platform⁵ to be a good example to follow. This platform has also been highlighted within the ACER guidance as the best example to follow. Many of the requirements for the proposed BMRS platform have therefore been based on this platform.

The P291 proposed solution will introduce two routes through which participants with inside information will be able to submit their messages; through existing but modified flows under the Grid Code (in relation to outages) and/or through the ELEXON Portal. In both cases, the messages will be published on the BMRS website for all participants to view. Participants will not be mandated under the BSC to use the BMRS reporting platform and can elect to continue to use their own websites instead or in parallel should they choose.

Submission via the Grid Code

Participants who submit information to the Transmission Company under the Grid Code⁶ will be able to include their inside information messages via the following flows:

- The submission of generator outage information that participants are required to make to the Transmission Company under Section OC2 'Operational Planning and Data Provision' of the Grid Code; and
- The submission of short term Physical Notification (PN) and Maximum Export/Import Limit (MEL/MIL) re-declarations (not captured under OC2 data) that participants are required to make to the Transmission Company under Sections BC1 'Pre Gate Closure Process' and BC2 'Post Gate Closure Process' of the Grid Code.

The relevant flows will be expanded as part of P291 to include the extra fields required for the additional information that will be needed for these messages (such as the cause of the outage or the expected duration). The exact solution will be fully developed separately by the Transmission Company alongside the corresponding changes to the Grid Code.

It should be noted that only participants who are required to submit the above information through the Grid Code (generators and Interconnector owners) would be able to make use

What is the proposed solution?

P291 proposes to introduce a REMIT inside information reporting platform to the BMRS website.

Participants will be able to submit messages through the ELEXON Portal or through existing Grid Code submissions.

⁵ <http://www.nordpoolspot.com/Message-center-container/UMM-List/>

⁶ You can find further information in the relevant sections of the Grid Code, which are available at: <http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/Electricity/Codes/gridcode/gridcodedocs/>

of this method. In addition, this route would only cater for messages relating to outages. Other participants that are not subject to the Grid Code, and so do not have the systems in place to make Grid Code submissions, or any participant that wishes to submit REMIT information not covered by the Grid Code messages, would need to use the ELEXON Portal to submit information for publication on the BMRS REMIT reporting platform.

Submission via the ELEXON Portal

Under P291 participants may also submit information for publication on the REMIT platform via the ELEXON Portal. Participants may choose to submit information via the Portal because:

- They cannot submit via the Grid Code (because they are not subject to the Grid Code and do not have the necessary systems);
- They choose not to submit REMIT information through the Grid Code (e.g. for commercial or technical reasons);
- They wish to submit REMIT information not covered by the Grid Code submission method (i.e. not relating to outage information); or
- They wish to submit further information relating to a REMIT submission initially made via the Grid Code (e.g. to provide clarification or an update on the situation).

Submission of REMIT information via the Portal would be made by participants entering messages through an 'online form' on the ELEXON Portal. Participants would be required to log in to their account in order to access the reporting areas. Category A Authorised Signatories under BSC Procedure (BSCP) 38 'Authorisations' will automatically be able to report information for all 'assets' (such as BM Units) belonging to the Party IDs for which they are a Category A signatory. They will also be able to delegate authority to report against these assets to other participants as required. An equivalent process will be put in place for the authorisation of REMIT information submission by non-BSC Parties who have assets that they need to report against.

For the avoidance of doubt, under P291 participants would be able to submit REMIT information via both the Grid Code and ELEXON Portal routes, provided that they are subject to, and have the necessary systems for, the Grid Code, and have the necessary Portal authorisation.

Legal text

The proposed redlined changes to the BSC to deliver the proposed solution to P291 can be found in Attachment A.

Assessment Consultation respondents' views on the draft legal text

A large number of comments were received in the Assessment Consultation on the legal text. A majority of these comments have been accepted and incorporated into the latest version of the draft legal text. A summary of the points that were not automatically accepted and incorporated can be found below, along with a summary of the Workgroup's view.



Assessment Procedure Consultation

The full responses made by Parties to the Assessment Procedure Consultation can be found in Attachment B.

P291
Final Modification Report

12 July 2013

Version 1.0

Page 7 of 42

© ELEXON Limited 2013

Comments on P291 Legal Text	
Comment	Workgroup's Response
Five minute 'lag time' for the Transmission Company to forward messages to the BMRA is too long.	<p>These timescales will be amended to be "as soon as reasonably practicable after receipt (taking into account any technical constraints)", to align with the equivalent wording in the ACER guidance. The relevant Code Subsidiary Documents will place expected 'standards' on each step of the process, and the Workgroup considers that these should be set to one minute for BSCCo and five minutes for the Transmission Company to forward messages they receive to the BMRA.</p> <p>This approach will also be applied to the step of BMRA publishing the messages it receives on the BMRS, with a one minute standard.</p> <p>The Workgroup's detailed discussions can be found in Section 6.</p>
An equivalent minimum time for BSCCo to forward messages received through the Portal to the BMRA has not been included.	
Reference should be made to Category A Authorised Signatories being able to submit messages.	A reference has been included to state that "Inside Information Data shall be submitted by an authorised person previously approved or a delegate otherwise approved in accordance with BSCP38".
Reference should be made in regards to non-BSC Parties being able to submit messages to the platform, to provide protection for BSC Parties.	The BSC and relevant Code Subsidiary Documents cannot place obligations or requirements on non-BSC Parties. Instead, any non-BSC Parties that sign up to the ELEXON Portal will be required to agree to appropriate terms and conditions before they can use the message submission functionality.

You can find the full responses to the Assessment Procedure Consultation in Attachment B.

The Workgroup has therefore amended the draft legal text since the version issued in the Assessment Consultation to account for the comments received in the consultation and the minor amendments to the solution with regards to submission timescales made since.

What information would participants need to submit?

Article 4(1) of REMIT states that disclosures "shall include information relevant to the capacity and use of facilities for production, storage, consumption or transmission of electricity ... including planned or unplanned unavailability of these facilities". The ACER guidance considers that the following pieces of information should be included in any publication that Parties issue on inside information:

- The caption "Publication according to Article 4(1) of REMIT / UMM – Urgent Market Message";
- A subject heading that summarises the main content of the publication;
- The name and contact information of the market participant;
- If applicable, the name and location of the respective asset;
- If applicable, the balancing area or market area concerned;

- The time and date of the relevant occurrence, including e.g. the (estimated) duration of outages;
- The time and date of publication;
- If applicable, the reasons for the unavailability of generation units, consumption units or parts of the electricity or gas grid; and
- If applicable, a history of prior publications regarding the same event e.g. if a prognosis is updated or an unplanned outage becomes a planned outage.

The Workgroup has considered this list when developing its solution, to ensure that all of these points have been captured where possible. As part of its considerations, it has based the list of required data on that displayed in messages published on Nord Pool Spot's reporting platform. The list of data items for P291 includes two data items (the cause of the event in question and the expected duration) which are not listed under the ACER guidance on REMIT but will be required under the Transparency regulation (see below). Please see Appendix 1 for a full list of the data items that will be included in any inside information messages submitted under P291.

The Workgroup also originally considered including specific contact details for each participant on the platform, to allow other participants with follow-up queries to have a point of contact. Members have since elected to remove this requirement, believing that such contact could itself constitute a form of inside information, as the participant making the enquiry could become party to additional information not available to everyone else at that time. It was also considered that such contact points would likely be generic helpdesks which may be unable to offer much assistance with these specific queries. It was therefore decided that these requirements will be removed from the solution.

How does P291 relate to the Transparency regulation?

P291 has been raised in response to the REMIT regulation, seeking to put in place a central platform that meets the requirements of this regulation. However, much of the information that is captured by REMIT in relation to outages will also be captured under the regulation on submission and publication of data in electricity markets (the Transparency regulation) (Regulation (EU) No 543/2013)⁷, although outage information will only be a subset of the data required under the Transparency regulation. The Transparency regulation was published in the Official Journal of the European Union on 14 June 2013, and came into force on 4 July 2013, 20 days after publication. There is an 18 month implementation period commencing from this date to implement the arrangements that will deliver the Transparency regulation. This means that the arrangements delivering the Transparency regulation must be implemented no later than 4 January 2015.

Article 2(1) of REMIT states that inside information includes any information that participants are required make public under EU Regulation 714/2009⁸. The Transparency regulation will amend Annex I of this regulation, and therefore any information that is required to be made public through the Transparency regulation could subsequently fall under REMIT too.

The Transparency regulation, its implementation into the GB arrangements, and any interaction with the BSC has been considered separately to P291 under [Issue 47 'GB](#)

⁷ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2013:163:0001:0012:EN:PDF>

⁸ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:211:0015:0035:EN:PDF>

Implementation of the European Transparency Regulation'. However, the P291 Workgroup has considered that it would be prudent to accommodate the relevant requirements of the Transparency regulation in relation to outage information as much as possible in the P291 solution. This will mean that only a minor change would be required to the P291 solution as part of any future Modification relating to the Transparency regulation, such as the introduction of a flag to indicate that the REMIT message should also be treated as a Transparency message.

Workgroup members have therefore agreed that the P291 solution should be developed in order to meet the defect identified by this Modification (i.e. that a central platform for reporting the information required under the REMIT regulation should be developed). They have noted that the wider requirements of the Transparency regulation is out of scope of P291, and that this will be considered and addressed separately under Issue 47. However, the Workgroup believes that the P291 solution should accommodate the relevant information that will be required under the Transparency regulation where possible, where this is known, as the Transparency regulation requires only a couple of additional items of information beyond that captured in ACER's guidance document. P291 is currently scheduled to be sent to the Authority for decision in mid-July 2013, and the Workgroup considers that the Authority would be able to take a more holistic view when making its decision.

Are there any potential alternative solutions for P291?

The Workgroup were unanimous in agreeing that the inside information should ultimately be published on the BMRS website. However, the Workgroup considered various methods through which participants would be able to submit their messages to the reporting platform. The Workgroup put forward three possible routes:

- **Via the ELEXON Portal:** This method would make use of the existing login functionality of the ELEXON Portal. Participants would log in to their Portal accounts and would be able to submit information from there. Portal accounts are free for any participant to create, irrespective of whether they are a BSC Party or not.
- **Via the BMRS website:** This method would be equivalent to the ELEXON Portal route, except that participants would log in to the BMRS website. However, that functionality does not currently exist on the BMRS website, and so would need to be created and developed as part of P291 if this route was chosen, increasing costs accordingly.
- **Via existing Grid Code submissions:** This method would make use of the existing submission of OC2, PN and MEL/MIL data to the Transmission Company, which would be linked to a vast majority of potential messages. The relevant Grid Code flows would be expanded to cater for the additional information required for the BMRS messages. The Transmission Company would then forward this information on to the BMRS website once it had been received.

It was also considered that the Transmission Company could create functionality akin to the Portal/BMRS routes. However, this solution was dismissed following impact assessment, as it would be more expensive than the other routes, and was deemed inefficient because it would require new functionality to be developed that would simply duplicate functionality that already exists in the ELEXON Portal.



What solutions did the Workgroup consider?

The Workgroup's Industry Impact Assessment contained six possible solutions for submitting messages to the BMRS reporting platform:

- A: Portal only
- B: BMRS only
- C: Grid Code only
- D: Grid Code and Portal
- E: Grid Code and BMRS
- F: Grid Code and Transmission Company functionality akin to Portal/BMRS routes

The proposed solution to P291 is Solution D from this Impact Assessment.

The detailed requirements for each solution can be found in the Industry Impact Assessment document, which is available on the [P291](#) page of the ELEXON website.

P291
Final Modification Report

12 July 2013

Version 1.0

Page 10 of 42

© ELEXON Limited 2013

The Workgroup also considered a wholly Transmission Company based solution, where the Transmission Company would both receive and publish the messages. However, this solution could not be taken forward under P291 as it would not have a BSC impact.

Some members of the Workgroup considered that the Grid Code route could not be taken forward as a standalone solution, as it would exclude non-Grid Code participants from being able to submit messages, and would not cater for REMIT messages that did not relate to outages. They therefore considered that the Grid Code submission route should only be taken forward as part of a 'hybrid solution' in parallel with either the ELEXON Portal or BMRS website route. The Workgroup subsequently agreed that the Grid Code-only solution should not be taken forward.

Workgroup members considered that the hybrid solutions would be the more pragmatic solutions to progress. These solutions would allow Grid Code participants to utilise the Grid Code submission route to submit their outage messages, which would be more efficient for them, but would also allow a route both for non-Grid Code participants to submit messages and for both Grid Code and non-Grid Code participants to submit non-outage related REMIT messages. However, the Workgroup also considered that a solely web-based solution (Portal or BMRS website only), as well as being cheaper and simpler, would allow the Authority to implement a solution to P291 sooner, as the lead times for those solutions are shorter than those for the hybrid solutions (please see Section 5 for more information on the lead times).

Following impact assessment, the Workgroup noted that the central costs of implementing the solutions involving the ELEXON Portal would be cheaper than those involving the BMRS website. One Workgroup member queried the reliability of the ELEXON Portal, noting that those solutions would have a greater risk of failure due to involving two separate websites and the passing of information from the Portal to the BMRS website. It was noted that the historic actual availability of the Portal since its introduction in February 2012 has been 99.99%, well above the required SLAs for the site⁹, and so can be deemed to be highly reliable. It was also highlighted that the BMRS website solutions would make use of some of the existing Portal infrastructure, rather than developing everything from scratch.

Following these discussions, the Workgroup expressed a preference for taking forward the Portal routes for message submission over the BMRS website routes and, taking into account the benefits for Grid Code participants of including a Grid Code submission route, therefore agreed that the hybrid solution allowing both Grid Code and ELEXON Portal submissions should be taken forward as the proposed solution to P291.

Some Workgroup members considered that it might be best for the Portal-only solution to also be put forward to the Authority for decision, as it would be a simpler, highly adaptable solution with lower development and maintenance costs and a quicker implementation lead time. The Authority would then be able to decide between the two solutions when making its decision.

The Workgroup sought views on the potential Portal-only solution in its Assessment Consultation. However, the Workgroup, including the Proposer, ultimately concluded that the proposed solution would allow more flexibility for participants in deciding how they wanted to submit messages. It was felt that limiting the solution to a Portal-only route, while making the solution quicker and easier to implement, would not be a better solution overall due to the overall impact on participants being more significant. Consequently, the Workgroup concluded that this solution would not be a better solution to P291 than the

⁹ The SLAs for the availability of the ELEXON Portal are 99.7% within working hours and 99.0% outside of working hours.

proposed solution, and therefore could not be taken forward as an alternative solution under P291. It was noted that any participant who wanted to use only the Portal route to submit their messages would be able to under the proposed solution, which allows participants to only use one of the two routes on offer should they wish.

The Workgroup therefore concluded that there are no alternative solutions to P291 that would better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives than the proposed solution.

Further information on the Workgroup's wider discussions on the solutions can be found in Section 6.

Industry Impact Assessment respondents' views on alternative solutions

Respondents to the P291 Industry Impact Assessment were split in their views as to which of the solutions the Workgroup had considered should be taken forward. A majority of respondents were in favour of a hybrid solution, as it would allow Grid Code participants to utilise those flows for submitting messages, while still allowing a web-based approach for other participants or for REMIT messages unrelated to outages. However, there was no clear consensus as to which of those solutions would be best.

A couple of respondents noted that the Portal-only or BMRS-only solutions would offer the industry the greatest value and would be the simplest and most cost-effective solutions, as long as the automated data submission elements were present. There was a view that allowing multiple submission methods could run the risk of duplicating messages, conflicting notifications or errors. These participants felt that a Portal-only or BMRS-only solution would mean that participants would modify any systems or front-end interfaces used to submit data to the Grid Code to also submit the same data to the Portal-only or BMRS-only solution at the same time. However, other respondents believed that the solely web-based solutions would themselves be inefficient, if these modifications were not possible for either technical or cost reasons, as participants would be required to follow-up their notifications to the Transmission Company under the Grid Code with a separate message to the BMRS website, resulting in a need to submit the same information twice.

The majority of respondents believed that the Workgroup had considered all the possible options for P291, and that there were no other possible alternative solutions.

One respondent commented that a large number of participants are likely to continue to report information on their own websites, and so considered the possibility of the BMRS 'pulling' data from participants' websites, rather than participants needing to 'push' the information. The Workgroup noted that both the proposed solution and the possible Portal-only solution would have the ability for participants to automatically submit data to the BMRS. Participants would be required to make the relevant changes to their systems to achieve this, but it would be possible for participants to submit any information to both the BMRS and their own websites, through either the ELEXON Portal or the Grid Code route, through a single submission.

Another respondent thought that some changes could be made to existing Grid Code requirements in order to "knit together" the shorter-term Electronic Dispatch Logging (EDL) flows with the longer-term OC2 data, removing the cross-over at around two days out when OC2 data ceases to be required and the EDL submissions take over. However, this is something that the Transmission Company would need to consider as part of the corresponding changes under the Grid Code.



Industry Impact Assessment

The full responses made by Parties to the Industry Impact Assessment can be found on the [P291](#) page of the ELEXON website.

The Industry Impact Assessment sought views on all six of the Workgroup's proposed solutions.

You can find the full responses to the Industry Impact Assessment on the [P291](#) page of the ELEXON website.

Assessment Consultation respondents' views on alternative solutions

The majority of respondents to the P291 Assessment Consultation believed that the Workgroup had considered all the possible solutions to P291, and were satisfied that there were no further potential alternative solutions.

One respondent commented that they would have preferred an alternative solution where submission of messages to the platform would be mandatory, in order for the P291 solution to be fully effective. They felt that P291 would only be fully effective (in terms of both functionality and cost) if it was used by all relevant Parties. This approach would enhance the quality and completeness of the information published on the BMRS platform, which would better enhance competition. However, they noted that this may be introduced by the solution implemented for the Transparency regulation.

One respondent felt that there was a further potential alternative solution where participants voluntarily use standard formats on their own websites, which would be registered with the BMRA. The BMRS would then gather and collate the relevant data from these websites. However, this respondent conceded that this solution would have less resilience than a solution where participants actively submit the same data to separate websites. The Workgroup considered this solution to be similar to the 'BMRS pulls' solution proposed by an Impact Assessment respondent, and felt that this solution should not be taken forward for the same reasons.

You can find the full responses to the Assessment Procedure Consultation in Attachment B.



Assessment Procedure Consultation

The full responses made by Parties to the Assessment Procedure Consultation can be found in Attachment B.

The Assessment Procedure Consultation sought views on the proposed solution (Solution D from the Impact Assessment) and the Portal-only solution (Solution A from the Impact Assessment).

Estimated central implementation costs of P291

The total central implementation cost for P291 is approximately £475k. This comprises:

- Approx. £105k in BMRA effort;
- Approx. £20k (90 man days) in ELEXON effort; and
- Approx. £350k in Transmission Company costs.

The BMRA costs are for updating the ELEXON Portal to allow participants to submit messages (including via an automated data feed), updating the BMRS website to include the platform where messages will be published, and amending systems to receive messages submitted via the Transmission Company. The ELEXON effort is required to update the relevant documents for P291 and to oversee the implementation project.

P291 will also require the Transmission Company to update its systems (in particular the Transmission Outage and Generator Availability (TOGA) and Electricity Balancing System (EBS) systems) to receive messages and subsequently forward them to the BMRS website, and to update the Grid Code accordingly. You can find the Transmission Company Analysis for P291 on the [P291](#) page of the ELEXON website.

Since the Transmission Company completed its original analysis, it has identified that the TOGA architecture may not be the most appropriate mechanism for submitting messages through. P291 requires messages to be published in real-time, but TOGA does not possess this functionality, as its current outputs are published only daily. The Transmission Company therefore notes that the final solution developed to deliver the Grid Code submission route may not include the TOGA aspects, which would mean that messages could not be submitted as part of OC2 submissions. It also considers that changes to the requirements within the solution around submission timescales since the original Impact Assessment means that the costs it would incur in implementing P291 may be higher than originally estimated. You can find further details and the Workgroup's discussions in Section 6.

Indicative industry costs of P291

Respondents to the P291 Industry Impact Assessment and Assessment Consultation have indicated costs ranging from minimal up to £300k for implementing the P291 proposed solution, although a majority of costs have been estimated at around £100k or less. In their responses, respondents noted that impacts would include system, documentation and process changes and the corresponding training. It was also expected that updates would be needed to the systems that interact with the Transmission Company if changes were made to the submissions made under the Grid Code. Other systems would also need to be updated to realise any automated data submission elements of the solutions.

Many participants have noted that they would likely only submit messages via one of the submission routes, and would therefore only implement the necessary changes required for that route. Additionally, some Parties have estimated costs for developing automated solutions while others intend to make manual submission.



Transmission Company Analysis

The full Transmission Company Analysis response can be found on the [P291](#) page of the ELEXON website.



Industry Responses

The full responses made by Parties to the Industry Impact Assessment can be found on the [P291](#) page of the ELEXON website.

The full responses made by Parties to the Assessment Procedure Consultation can be found in Attachment B.

P291
Final Modification Report

12 July 2013

Version 1.0

Page 14 of 42

© ELEXON Limited 2013

P291 impacts

Impact on BSC Systems and process

BSC System/Process	Impact
BMRA	The BMRA will be responsible for receiving inside information and publishing that information on the BMRS.
BMRS	The BMRS will be updated to include an inside information reporting platform and a list of historic messages stored as daily .csv format files.

Impact on BSC Parties and Party Agents

BSC Parties (and other market participants) will be able to publish inside information to, and obtain this information from, a central reporting platform following implementation. Parties may also wish to align or develop automated data submission processes in line with the solution requirements should they wish, although this is optional.

BSC Parties who submit information to the Transmission Company under the Grid Code may be required to amend their systems to account for changes to the relevant flows under the proposed solution.

Impact on Transmission Company

The Transmission Company will be required to receive inside information from participants as part of notifications under the Grid Code, and will be required to submit this information to the BMRS website.

Impact on ELEXON

Area of ELEXON	Impact
Release Management	ELEXON will manage the implementation project.
ELEXON Portal	The ELEXON Portal will be amended to allow participants to submit their inside information via the Portal. ELEXON would also be required to approve 'pseudo Category A' participants for non-BSC Parties wishing to submit messages.

Impact on Code

Code Section	Impact
Section Q	Changes will be required to implement the proposed solution. The approved changes can be found in Attachment A.
Section V	
Section X Annex X-1	

Impact on Code Subsidiary Documents

CSD	Impact
BMRA Service Description	Changes will be required to implement the proposed solution.

Impact on Core Industry Documents and other documents	
Document	Impact
Grid Code	Changes will be required to implement the proposed solution.

Impact on other Configurable Items	
Configurable Item	Impact
BMRA User Requirements Specification	Changes will be required to implement the proposed solution.

Recommended Implementation Date

The Workgroup recommends an Implementation Date for P291 of:

- 31 December 2014 if the Authority's decision is received on or before 31 March 2014.

The Workgroup has elected to propose an Implementation Date for the end of 2014 as this is the anticipated date that the requirements for the Transparency regulation will need to be implemented by. Workgroup members consider that it would be more efficient if the P291 changes were implemented in parallel with any further changes required for the Transparency regulation.

The Workgroup noted that, although use of the P291 solution will be completely voluntary, there was a possibility that the changes required to the Transmission Company's systems to accommodate the submission of REMIT messages could result in mandatory changes being required to Grid Code participants' systems (e.g. to accommodate the addition of extra fields into the relevant data flows). This would therefore require Grid Code participants to amend the relevant systems even if they intend to use only the Portal route to submit REMIT messages, removing the voluntary aspect of the solution. However, any changes required for the Transparency regulation are expected to impact the same systems, and, unlike P291, these changes are likely to be mandatory. Workgroup members therefore felt that it would be appropriate to make any changes to Grid Code systems required for P291 alongside any mandatory changes required for the Transparency regulation, when Grid Code participants would be required to update their systems anyway. The Transmission Company has since confirmed that its new Electricity Balancing System (EBS) will be flexible enough to support dynamic data feeds whereby participants would be able to send only the data that is relevant to them.

The Workgroup also notes that the Authority has the power to request a revised proposed Implementation Date if it feels that the proposed Implementation Date is no longer appropriate (BSC Section F2.11.18). Members consider that the Authority may wish to request a revised Implementation Date for P291 should the date on which the requirements of the Transparency regulation need to be implemented by be notably delayed, so as to maintain a parallel implementation approach.

The nine month lead time for P291 is driven by the lead time required by the Transmission Company to amend its systems. The lead times for the remaining central changes and those indicated by all respondents to the Industry Impact Assessment would all be shorter than this.

Assessment Consultation respondents' views on Implementation Date

Parties were consulted on the Workgroup's original proposed Implementation Date of 26 February 2015 (February 2015 BSC Systems Release). This date had been proposed as it was the earliest viable date the Transmission Company considered it could implement P291, due to the implementation of its new EBS system, which will replace its existing Balancing Mechanism systems and is due to be completed in late 2013. Respondents generally considered this date to be appropriate, but many noted that they would prefer an earlier Implementation Date in order to align with implementation of the requirements for the Transparency regulation. The Workgroup has since amended the proposed Implementation Date accordingly, for the reasons given above.



Assessment Procedure Consultation

The full responses made by Parties to the Assessment Procedure Consultation can be found in Attachment B.

P291
Final Modification Report

12 July 2013

Version 1.0

Page 17 of 42

© ELEXON Limited 2013

One respondent considered whether P291 could be implemented in two parts, with the changes to the ELEXON Portal and the BMRS made first and the relevant changes to the Grid Code made later. They believed that this would allow many of the benefits of the proposal to be realised earlier. Another respondent also noted that they would like the central platform to be available as soon as possible, to minimise the time in which participants are 'for an interim period' publishing messages on their own websites only. The Workgroup considered this two-stage approach, but decided that it would be simpler to implement all the changes at the same time. It was also considered that, if the two-stage approach was taken, participants intending to use the Grid Code route may not use the Portal route in the intervening period, which could result in participants who had intended to use the Portal route not submitting messages to the BMRS platform either during this time, nullifying the benefits of the approach.

You can find the full responses to the Assessment Procedure Consultation in Attachment B.

What is the most appropriate route for submitting messages?

The Workgroup discussed the best approach for allowing participants to submit messages to the reporting platform. The Authority representative informed the Workgroup that the requirements they considered important for the solution were that it: needed to comply with the REMIT regulation; needed to be accessible to all market participants; needed to provide all the information required; and should be free or not too expensive to submit messages.

Submission through a web-based approach

The Workgroup began by considering the use of the ELEXON Portal as a route to submit messages. The Portal already contains a lot of the functionality that would be required for this solution, such as login functionality, and would also be cheaper and easier to develop than it would be to create a system from scratch, such as would be required to build this functionality into the BMRS website itself. Some Workgroup members were keen to explore a BMRS-only approach, believing that it would be more efficient to keep everything on a single website. However, it was noted that the central costs of this approach were notably more than those for the ELEXON Portal approach.

Some Workgroup members highlighted that a web-based approach would be inefficient for a lot of Parties, as it would require them to make an additional submission above what they would already need to submit. For example, if a generation unit suffers a failure, the generator is already required to make appropriate submissions to the Transmission Company to inform them of this. Requiring them to make a further submission to report this on a central platform would be an additional manual step that the generator would need to do, taking time that they would prefer to use to try to assess and resolve the situation. The Workgroup were keen that any web-based method would need to be capable of being automated; otherwise there would be a risk that Parties would elect to continue to use their own websites and not the BMRS platform.

Several Workgroup members noted that it would not be that difficult for them to amend the systems and/or front-end interfaces that they use currently, either to submit information to the Transmission Company or to their own websites, to also simultaneously submit a second message on to the BMRS website. It was thought that the costs to an individual Party to achieve this would vary depending on their systems.

One Workgroup member queried the reliability of the ELEXON Portal over the BMRS website. They noted that needing to submit messages through the Portal meant that you had not only the risk of the BMRS website being unavailable but also the Portal being unavailable, or a failure of the link between them. A BMRS-only approach would reduce the risk of unavailability accordingly, which could justify the increased costs. However, it was noted that the ELEXON Portal has been available 99.99% of the time since its launch, far exceeding its service level agreements, and making it extremely reliable. The Workgroup accepted that the difference in the risk of unavailability would therefore be negligible between the two approaches.

Submissions under the Grid Code

One Workgroup member suggested that the submissions made by Parties to the Transmission Company under the Grid Code could be used. A significant majority of events that would likely to be classed as inside information would be reported through the Grid Code currently, such as planned outages through OC2 data or an unplanned outage through a MEL/MIL re-declaration. Submitting information through this route would protect the integrity of the data, due to the security and backup procedures already in place, and would also prevent Parties from having to report an event twice (i.e. making the Grid Code submission then needing to post a message via a web-based approach). The information currently submitted through the Grid Code would need to be expanded to provide all the information needed under REMIT. However, once that had been completed, all a participant would need to do is include the relevant extra information in its submissions to the Transmission Company, rather than make a second, completely separate, submission via a different route. Several other members of the Workgroup also supported this approach.

Hybrid solutions – submissions via both approaches

It was highlighted that not every industry participant is able to submit information via the Grid Code. While generator outages will form the vast majority of likely messages, there will be other types of REMIT messages being reported from other market participants, which this route would not cater for. Although it would be possible to amend the Grid Code to allow other participants to submit information this way, these participants would also need to set up the relevant communication systems required to submit the information to the Transmission Company, and the cost of this could be significant for a small market participant. It was felt that an alternative route would be required for these participants, via a web interface. However, one Workgroup member cautioned against having multiple submission routes, as that could lead to confusion.

It was noted that the Grid Code route would also be limited to only being able to report outage-related information, and that if market participants had information that was unrelated to an outage, they would need an alternative route to submit such information. It was therefore agreed that the Grid Code route would need to be implemented in parallel with a web-based route, as a 'hybrid' approach. However, participants would have the option of only using one of the two routes on offer should they wish, rather than both.

One Workgroup member commented that there would need to be a way to link together submissions made through the two separate approaches, should a hybrid approach be taken. For example, a generator may initially report an unplanned outage through the corresponding MEL re-declaration under the Grid Code, but may wish to update that message later, for example to update the cause or expected duration or report the conclusion of the outage, through the web-based approach. It was agreed that this would be included in the solution to any hybrid approach. The Transmission Company representative also noted that any participant using the Grid Code approach would be able to submit updates through that route should they wish, rather than having to switch to the web-based approach. It was agreed that both options should be available.

One member of the Workgroup noted that a hybrid solution would be a pragmatic approach as it would cater for all participants. Participants that are required to submit via the Grid Code would be able to submit any accompanying REMIT messages to the BMRS at the same time as making their submission to the Transmission Company, while other participants would have access to a free web-based solution. In addition, Grid Code

participants would also have a choice of whether to use the Grid Code approach or the web-based approach to submit their messages.

Assessment Consultation respondents' views on the most appropriate route

Respondents to the Assessment Consultation were split in their views as to whether they would find the web-based or Grid Code approach easier to use. A majority of Grid Code participants believed that it would be easier for them to submit messages via the Grid Code route as it would only require them to provide a little extra information as part of a submission they are already required to make. This approach would be more robust and would avoid any duplication of effort in needing to make a separate submission to the BMRS platform following the original Grid Code submission.

Other participants, including some Grid Code participants, consider that the web-based approach using the ELEXON Portal would be easier for them to use. They consider that the automated data submission functionality would make it easier to synchronise with their existing processes and the methods they currently use to submit messages to their own websites. Several of these participants are not Grid Code participants, and therefore could not use the Grid Code approach, but they consider that participants who are may prefer to use only the one system.

A majority of respondents to the consultation believed that the hybrid approach would be better at satisfying wider participants' requirements than the Portal-only approach. They felt that it was better to have both routes available, as this would allow participants to choose the most appropriate route for them. Several respondents also noted that they would prefer to use the Grid Code route to submit messages, and that they would incur additional implementation costs and impacts if they were required to use the Portal route instead. Although the hybrid approach would incur higher central implementation costs, the overall costs incurred by individual BSC Parties would likely be lower, since participants can choose to use the submission route that is best for them. One respondent commented that it is also important to balance costs with maximising participation in order to realise the full benefits of P291. However, another respondent had concerns that the Grid Code route could result in a REMIT message being published in response to every single MEL/MIL re-declaration, rather than just those that would affect the market price.

You can find the full responses to the Assessment Procedure Consultation in Attachment B.



Assessment Procedure Consultation

The full responses made by Parties to the Assessment Procedure Consultation can be found in Attachment B.

Which participants are likely to submit messages?

Several Workgroup members could not see a reason why a non-Grid Code participant would be in a position where they would need to submit information under REMIT. They noted that the threshold for needing to submit information is 100MW, and stations of this size should fall under the Grid Code. The Authority representative informed the Workgroup that they had received numerous queries from participants with large demand portfolios who were not sure whether they would be required to report inside information under REMIT. At this stage, it is difficult to say whether they would be required to or not, and it was stressed that the solution should therefore cater for these participants in case they are. It was also highlighted that network outages and related issues would also need to be reported, as these too would have an impact on prices. The ability to submit messages should also be open and accessible to everyone as a means of future-proofing the solution, as it is hard to say what may happen over the next few years, and who else may subsequently be impacted by REMIT. The Workgroup elected to seek further information

on the potential impact of REMIT on participants on the supply side of the market as part of the Assessment Consultation.

Assessment Consultation respondents' views on the impact of REMIT on supply-side participants

Many respondents to the Assessment Consultation were unsure how REMIT would impact participants on the supply side of the market, although there were views that they would not be impacted. It was noted that consumers of more than 600GWh/year are regarded as wholesale participants, which equates to around 68MW peak demand, and there are only a few sites with this potential outside of Interconnectors and pumped storage sites. REMIT only requires sites with a capacity of 100MW and above to report inside information, and so unless a site had the potential to consume that much then it is unlikely it would fall under REMIT.

Another respondent also highlighted possible complications with consumers that own multiple sites, especially if those sites are served by different Suppliers. In any event, it would need to be considered who would submit messages in these situations; the consumer or the Supplier. The Workgroup has noted this consideration, but believes that it is not for P291 to answer this query. P291 only seeks to put in place a reporting platform for reporting REMIT messages; it will then be up to individual participants to decide who should submit the messages and how they will do so.

You can find the full responses to the Assessment Procedure Consultation in Attachment B.

How quickly should messages be published?

The Workgroup noted comments received in the Assessment Consultation in relation to the time that was being imposed for the Transmission Company to forward any messages it had received from participants on to the BMRA (originally set as five minutes) and for the BMRA to publish messages on the BMRS upon receipt (originally set as two minutes). Respondents had noted that this would mean it could take messages submitted via the Grid Code route up to seven minutes to be published on the BMRS reporting platform, which they considered to be too long. In contrast, the Transmission Company felt that the obligation should be on a "reasonable endeavours" basis, in order to account for any system failures that may occur.

The Workgroup considered these views, and elected to amend the legal text such that BSCCo and the Transmission Company would be required to send messages on to the BMRA, and the BMRA would be required to publish messages on the BMRS "as soon as technically possible". Members consider that this would align with the requirements within the ACER guidance, which states that platforms should be able to publish messages "as close to real time as is technically possible on a reasonable commercial basis". They highlight that the intent behind this wording is to ensure that each step in the process is done as quickly as possible, but also caters for any technical failures, which could place the relevant participant in breach of its obligations. However, the Workgroup considers that the relevant Code Subsidiary Documents should place specific 'standard' timescales that the relevant participants should work to, to act as 'backstops', and believed that these should be set to one minute for each step (i.e. one minute for BSCCo or the Transmission Company to send a message to the BMRA, and one minute for the BMRA to then publish the message on the BMRS). This would have the effect that each step should, in



Assessment Procedure Consultation

The full responses made by Parties to the Assessment Procedure Consultation can be found in Attachment B.

accordance with the Code, be as short as possible, with the backstop in the Code Subsidiary Documents being that this is expected to be less than one minute, at most.

The Transmission Company representative noted that the specifications for the new EBS system have been based on the existing Balancing Mechanism systems. They therefore considered that a one minute standard may not be appropriate as the system has not been designed to meet that. The current standard is that a MEL/MIL re-declaration would be submitted to the BMRS within five minutes of receipt, and that this is likely where the original five minute obligation had been derived from. It should be highlighted that this is a 'maximum' time for submissions, and that they are often likely to be made quicker. However, the Transmission Company representative noted that changing the scope of the EBS system to require submissions within one minute is likely to increase the costs that would be incurred by the Transmission Company in implementing this solution. The Workgroup considered these views, and agreed that the standard for the Transmission Company forwarding messages to the BMRA should be set to five minutes.

One Workgroup member had concerns with this approach, believing that this was potentially worse than the original approach. They felt that the relevant times for these steps should remain within the Code, and believed that the current drafting could allow for longer submission timescales if it was not 'reasonably practical' for the relevant participant to meet the standard placed on them by the Code Subsidiary Documents. However, the majority of the Workgroup felt that this approach was the most appropriate to take in this case.

The Transmission Company representative also noted that the TOGA system currently submits information to the BMRS on a daily basis, and that it may be expensive to amend that system to submit messages more frequently, and so this aspect of the proposed solution may be changed or removed.

Should the solution be mandatory or voluntary?

The Workgroup considered whether the P291 solution should be made mandatory for participants. Participants are obligated under the REMIT regulation to report any inside information, but it is not mandatory for them to use a central platform for this, and they can use their own websites should they so wish. Although the ACER guidance expresses a preference for the use of centralised reporting platforms, this does not oblige participants to do so.

The responsibility for reporting inside information falls on the participant, as do the liabilities associated with any failure to report information. One Workgroup member highlighted that the obligation to report information would not be removed just because a central platform was unavailable. The Workgroup believes that participants would likely continue to use their own websites as backup even if they did use a central reporting platform. This would mean that if the central platform was unavailable, a participant could still report the information on its own website and thus could subsequently trade on that information.

The Workgroup also discussed the issue of liability for the use of the platform. It was noted that the BMRS reporting platform would display disclaimers informing participants that the BMRA would not accept liability should the BMRS reporting platform be unavailable, nor would it accept liability for the accuracy of any information that was published on the platform.

It was highlighted that it is not just BSC Parties that are required to publish inside information, as the obligations of REMIT fall on all market participants. However, it is not possible for the BSC to place obligations on non-BSC Parties, such as large consumers who are embedded within a Supplier BM Unit, in which situation the BSC requirements would fall on the Supplier. One Workgroup member noted that BSC Parties would bear all the central costs of implementing P291, but that non-BSC Parties would also be able to benefit from its implementation. Another Workgroup member agreed that this may not initially appear be fair, but noted that BSC Parties would realise ancillary benefits from non-BSC Parties submitting their information to the central platform.

It was suggested that non-BSC Parties could be charged for submitting messages to the BMRS platform. However, it was believed that this may deter these participants from using the platform, which would be detrimental to the solution. One of the key benefits arising from having a central reporting platform is that all messages from all participants could be available in a single location; if participants were deterred from using the platform, its value would be reduced.

In light of these reasons, the Workgroup agreed that the P291 solution would not be mandatory on BSC Parties.

Would P291 require changes to the Transmission Licence?

The Workgroup was asked to consider whether P291 would require a change to the Transmission Licence before it could be implemented, as the information that P291 was seeking to add to the BMRS website is not related to nor would have an impact on Settlement, and is therefore not a part of the BSC. The Workgroup noted that the BMRS website already reports information that is not related to Settlement, such as information related to the Large Combustion Plant Directive (LCPD) that was introduced by [Approved Modification P226 'Improving Large Combustion Plant Directive Information Disclosure'](#). In light of that, Workgroup members agreed that P291 should be considered as an evolution of the data currently reported on the BMRS website.

The Transmission Company's view is that P291 would not impact the Transmission Licence, and that P291 is within the scope of the Balancing and Settlement activities provided for in the Transmission Licence, which are to facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives, as stated in Standard Licence Condition C3.3. It considers that the REMIT regulations are concerned with trading, in that information only needs to be reported if it would have an impact on trading prices, and notes that the Balancing and Settlement arrangements are fundamentally linked to trading. A provisional view was sought from the Authority, which agrees at this time with the Transmission Company's view and rationale that a change to the Licence would not be required.

One Workgroup member queried why the Workgroup had been asked to consider this issue, and was not sure what it would need to consider in order to answer this question. They believe that it is not in the scope of a Modification Workgroup to consider this area, and that this is an issue that should be resolved between the Transmission Company and the Authority. They therefore believe that this is not an appropriate question to be put to a Modification Workgroup.

What impact would the Transparency regulation have?

The Workgroup considered how the Transparency regulation may interact with P291. It was noted that the Transparency regulation is itself outside of the scope of P291, and has been considered separately under Issue 47, but it was also noted that some of the information that will be required under the Transparency regulation overlaps with information required under the REMIT regulation. The Workgroup therefore deemed it prudent to take into account the relevant requirements under the Transparency regulation when developing the P291 solution.

One Workgroup member noted that there are only two pieces of information required under the Transparency regulation, in relation to outages, which aren't covered by the REMIT regulation or noted in ACER's guidance. These are the cause of the relevant event and the expected duration. Both of these items had already been considered for inclusion as part of the P291 Draft Solution document, and it was agreed that it would be sensible to retain these items within the solution going forward.

It was highlighted that the introduction of the Transparency regulation could make the use of central reporting platforms mandatory. The REMIT requirements do not currently mandate the use of central reporting platforms, and the ACER guidance only states a preference for their use, and therefore the P291 solution will not be mandatory on BSC Parties. However, ENTSO-E has indicated the possibility that reporting to the new Electricity Market Fundamental Information Platform (EMFIP), which would report the data submitted under the Transparency regulation, would be performed by no more than three national platforms per member state, rather than individual participants submitting their information directly to the platform. This would suggest that participants would be required to submit their inside information to a central platform at a future date. However, the Workgroup agreed that this should be left until such a requirement comes into force, and that P291 should continue to propose that the central REMIT reporting platform be voluntary.

There was concern that the solution selected for P291 could end up being incompatible with any wider solution implemented in response to the Transparency regulation. Workgroup members were keen to ensure that the solution implemented for P291 would be compatible with any Transparency regulation solution developed under Issue 47, and noted that compatibility with a wider Transparency regulation solution had been a consideration in the development of the P291 solution. It was noted that the Issue Group has had visibility of the progression of P291, and could take its solution into account.

What would be deemed to be inside information?

The Workgroup debated what could be deemed to be inside information. One Workgroup member noted that inside information had to be precise and definite data or information. If the event in question was only a possibility then that would not constitute inside information at that time, and so would not need to be reported.

One Workgroup member highlighted the example of a generator discussing a potential planned outage with the Transmission Company, and wondered at what point these discussions would be deemed inside information and would have to be declared before either party could trade. In particular, they cited future arrangements where the Transmission Company could veto a generator's planned outage. This could imply that the Transmission Company could be deemed to hold inside information, as they had the final power of decision, and so could not trade until that information was made public.

Conversely, as the generator will not know for sure when the planned outage will take place until the Transmission Company makes its confirmation, it could trade on the assumption that the planned outage will occur at the time it requested without needing to make that information public, as the event would not yet be definite. Another Workgroup member queried at what point a Party would be required to report this information, for example whether it would need to be published during discussions or after final confirmation had been received.

Another example was highlighted where the Transmission Company may be aware of a forthcoming Transmission outage. This outage may not impact any particular generator, but the Transmission Company would need to compensate for this outage. If it were to trade out its position without announcing the outage then it could potentially do so at cheaper prices than if other participants knew of the outage; this could be deemed to be trading on inside information.

The Workgroup agreed that it is important to know what would need to be reported under the REMIT regulation, but that this was not an issue for P291, which only seeks to provide a platform for any such messages to be published on.

What are the Workgroup's views against the Applicable BSC Objectives?

The following table contains the Proposer's and the Workgroup's views against each of the Applicable BSC Objectives:

Does P291 better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives?		
Obj	Proposer's Views	Other Workgroup Members' Views ¹⁰
(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neutral – No impact. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neutral (unanimous) – No impact.
(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neutral – No impact. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neutral (majority) – No impact. • Possibly Yes – System Operator may be able to use the additional information to operate the Transmission System more efficient and securely, although much of the relevant information for this is already provided in accordance with the Grid Code. • Possibly Yes – Increased transparency should facilitate forward trading to better balance positions, although extent is hard to quantify.



What are the Applicable BSC Objectives?

(a) The efficient discharge by the Transmission Company of the obligations imposed upon it by the Transmission Licence

(b) The efficient, economic and co-ordinated operation of the National Electricity Transmission System

(c) Promoting effective competition in the generation and supply of electricity and (so far as consistent therewith) promoting such competition in the sale and purchase of electricity

(d) Promoting efficiency in the implementation of the balancing and settlement arrangements

(e) Compliance with the Electricity Regulation and any relevant legally binding decision of the European Commission and/or the Agency [for the Co-operation of Energy Regulators]

P291
Final Modification Report

12 July 2013

Version 1.0

Page 26 of 42

© ELEXON Limited 2013

¹⁰ Shows the different views expressed by the other Workgroup members – not all members necessarily agree with all of these views.

Does P291 better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives?		
Obj	Proposer's Views	Other Workgroup Members' Views ¹⁰
(c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes – Publishing wholesale inside information on a public platform will ensure that this information is freely accessible to all Parties. • Yes – Although non-BSC Parties would be able to benefit from P291 without having to contribute towards the costs, this would be outweighed by the ancillary benefits arising from BSC Parties being able to see messages from non-BSC Parties on the platform. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes (unanimous) – Agree with Proposer.
(d)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neutral – No impact. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neutral (majority) – No impact. • No – Costs would be incurred by BSC Parties to implement and maintain the platform with no benefit with regards to improving the efficiency of BSC processes.
(e)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes – P291 would align with the spirit of this objective. • Yes – P291 would better facilitate Parties' compliance with the relevant REMIT regulations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes (majority) – Agree with Proposer. • Neutral – ACER guidance is not legally binding.

The Workgroup unanimously believes that P291 does better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives, and therefore recommends that P291 is approved.

Assessment Consultation respondents' views on the Applicable BSC Objectives

Respondents to the Assessment Consultation unanimously agree with the Workgroup's unanimous view that P291 would better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives overall. All respondents are neutral on Applicable BSC Objective (a) with arguments based on the remaining Applicable BSC Objectives.

Respondents generally agree with the Workgroup's views on Applicable BSC Objective (c), and the majority agree with the Workgroup's majority view on Applicable BSC Objective (e), with no new arguments put forward. However, several respondents agree with the Workgroup's minority view that P291 is neutral with respect to (e) as the ACER guidance is not legally binding, and even if it was, there would be no obligation for that platform to sit under the BSC. There is also a view that sharing the costs of developing the platform with BSC Parties that would not use or benefit from it would be detrimental to (c).

One respondent agrees with the minority Workgroup view that P291 may better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (b). They consider that the System Operator may be able to use the additional information to help operate the Transmission System more efficiently and securely, although they note that the information to do this is already provided in the



Assessment Procedure Consultation

The full responses made by Parties to the Assessment Procedure Consultation can be found in Attachment B.

P291
Final Modification Report

12 July 2013

Version 1.0

Page 27 of 42

© ELEXON Limited 2013

existing Grid Code submission. They also consider that increased transparency should facilitate forward trading, which would help Parties to better balance their positions, although the extent is hard to quantify.

This respondent also agrees with the Workgroup's minority view that P291 would be detrimental to Applicable BSC Objective (d). The costs that would be borne by BSC Parties, either directly or via ELEXON and the Transmission Company operating the platform and message submission routes, would not improve the efficiency of any BSC processes. This would remain the case as long as the requirement to report REMIT information centrally remains voluntary. However, this respondent considers that the benefits under the other objectives would outweigh the detrimental impact on (d), and so supports P291 overall.

You can find the full responses to the Assessment Procedure Consultation in Attachment B.

Panel's views on the Applicable BSC Objectives

The Panel unanimously agrees with the Workgroup's unanimous view that P291 would better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives. The views of Panel Members are broadly in line with the views of the Workgroup, as set out in Section 6.

One Panel Member queried whether any non-BSC Parties had been contacted with regards to whether they would use the platform. The Panel noted that no non-BSC Parties had been contacted, but that the Workgroup had not identified any non-BSC Parties that were likely to need to submit REMIT messages to the platform at the current time.

The Panel unanimously believes that P291 does better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives, and therefore initially recommends that P291 is approved.

Panel's views on the draft legal text

The Panel unanimously agrees with the Workgroup's view that the proposed changes to the BSC in Attachment A deliver the intention of P291.

Panel's views on the proposed Implementation Date

The Panel unanimously agrees with the Implementation Date proposed by the Workgroup, as detailed in Section 5.

8 Report Phase Consultation Responses



What are Report Phase respondents' views?

The majority of respondents support approving P291.

The full responses made by Parties to the Report Phase Consultation can be found in Attachment C.

This section summarises the responses to the Panel's Report Phase Consultation on its initial recommendations. You can find the full responses in Attachment C.

The seven Parties who responded to the Report Phase Consultation had all responded to the Assessment Procedure Consultation, and their views are largely in line with their previous responses. There were no new respondents.

Summary of P291 Report Phase Consultation Responses

Question	Yes	No	Neutral/ No Comment	Other
Do you agree with the Panel's initial unanimous recommendation that P291 should be approved?	6	0	1	0
Do you agree with the Panel that the redlined changes to the BSC deliver the intent of P291?	5	0	0	2
Do you agree with the Panel's recommended Implementation Date?	6	0	0	1
Do you have any further comments on P291?	3	4	0	0

Respondents' views on the Applicable BSC Objectives

The majority of respondents to the Report Phase Consultation agree with the Panel's initial view that P291 would better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives and should be approved. Their views are broadly in line with those expressed by the Workgroup and the Panel. All respondents are neutral on Applicable BSC Objective (a) with arguments based on the remaining Applicable BSC Objectives. No new arguments for or against have been raised.

Respondents generally agree with the views previously expressed that P291 would better facilitate Applicable BSC Objectives (c) and (e), with no new arguments in support put forward. One respondent continues to agree with the minority view that P291 is neutral against (e) as the ACER guidance is not legally binding, and even if it was, there would be no obligation for that platform to sit under the BSC. They also believe that P291 would be detrimental against (c) as the implementation and operating costs would be borne by all Parties, but not all Parties would use or benefit from P291.

One respondent continues to agree with the minority view that P291 may better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (b), for the same reasons as given before. They also consider that P291 would be detrimental to Applicable BSC Objective (d) as costs would be borne by BSC Parties through P291, but this Modification would not improve the efficiency of any BSC processes. However, this respondent still believes that the benefits under the other objectives would outweigh the detrimental impact on (d), and so supports P291 overall.

One respondent is neutral with respect to whether P291 should be approved or rejected. They note that [P295 'Submission and publication of Transparency regulation data via the BMRS'](#) has since been raised in order to implement the Transparency regulation

P291
Final Modification Report

12 July 2013

Version 1.0

Page 30 of 42

© ELEXON Limited 2013

arrangements within GB, and they highlight the overlap between the REMIT and Transparency regulations, as discussed by the Workgroup. While this respondent supports the principle of having a central platform for REMIT messages, they consider there to be merit in making a more holistic consideration of such publication requirements and the Transparency regulation.

It should be noted that P291 was raised to fix a specific defect (i.e. that a central platform for reporting the information required under the REMIT regulation should be developed), and the solution for P291 has been developed on these grounds. The Transparency regulation is therefore outside the scope of P291, although the Workgroup has considered the requirements of the Transparency regulation while developing the P291 solution, so that minimal change would be required to adapt this solution to fit in with a wider Transparency regulation solution.

The Panel can only consider P291 on the basis of whether it resolves the identified defect and whether it better facilitates the Applicable BSC Objectives compared to the current BSC baseline when it makes its recommendation. However, the Authority can consider P291 in a wider context when making its decision.

Respondents' views on the draft legal text

Most respondents agree that the draft legal text for P291 delivers the intention of P291. However, two respondents made comments on the legal text.

One respondent commented on the use of the term 'inside information' within the legal text. They consider that participants would seek to ensure public disclosure of their information via their own websites before they submit a message to the BMRS for central publication. This would mean that the information would be public, and so would no longer be deemed inside information, by the time they then submit the information to the BMRS platform. The respondent therefore considers that the legal text should be amended to use the term 'information' instead.

The prohibition on trading on information before it has been publically disclosed suggests that participants would continue to use their own websites in parallel with using the BMRS platform, as this could potentially allow them to trade on the information more quickly. In this scenario, they would be able to trade as soon as the message had appeared on their own website, rather than having to wait for it to be published on the BMRS platform, which may take several minutes via the Grid Code route. The ACER guidance references that the use of a central platform would mean that participants would not need to use their own websites as well, though they may do so if they wish. However, although a majority of participants have indicated they would continue to publish any messages on their own websites in parallel with sending the information to the BMRS, it cannot be guaranteed that all participants would do so. Consequently, we do not believe a change is needed in the use of the term 'inside information' within the P291 legal text.

Another respondent made numerous comments on the draft legal text. These comments are summarised in the table below, along with our responses, which the respondent has said they are content with. You can view the respondent's full comments in Attachment C.

Comments on P291 Legal Text		
	Respondent's Comment	ELEXON's Response
1	Amendments have been proposed to the wording for Q6.1.24 and Q11.3.1 in order to improve the clarity of these clauses.	These proposed amendments are appropriate, and have been made.
2	There are concerns with the wording "as soon as reasonably practicable after receipt (taking into account any technical constraints)" for the timescales for ELEXON or the Transmission Company to forward messages to the BMRA or for the BMRA to publish messages on the BMRS.	This approach to the timescales was agreed by the Workgroup as part of the P291 solution, and its rationale for this approach can be found in Section 6. It would not be appropriate to change it now. We therefore do not believe that any amendments are required.
3	There are concerns that the list of data items in Q11.2.3 does not make it clear in which situation certain data items are required to be submitted.	We believe that the list in Q11.2.3 makes it clear which data items are mandatory and which are optional, and we do not believe that the level of detail suggested as to when each optional data item is or is not required is necessary within the Code, but would instead sit within the relevant Code Subsidiary Documents. We therefore do not believe that any amendments are required.
4	There is a potential issue in that REMIT doesn't necessarily relate to the asset owner but to the market participant. For example, the licence holder may not necessarily be the asset owner, or the asset could be embedded within a Supplier BM Unit.	We have drafted the legal text to take into account the existence of non-BSC Parties or assets not registered in central systems as much as possible. We note these comments, but we do not believe that any amendments are required.
5	The "normal operating capacity of the asset" referred to in Q11.2.3(i) is not clear, as this can change over time.	Q11.2.3(i) has been amended to read "the normal operating capacity of the asset at the time of the event to which the message refers (in MW)".
6	It may be preferable to separately define "Inside Information" and "Inside Information Data", with the former being linked to the appropriate definition within the REMIT regulation and the latter referring to the list of data items in Q11.2.3.	Two separate definitions for "Inside Information" and "Inside Information Data" have been added to the list of definitions in Section X Annex X-1 based on the definitions suggested by the respondent.
7	The reference to "Inside Information Message" within Table 1B of Section V Annex V-1 provides no useful information.	A definition for "Inside Information Message" has been added to the list of definitions in Section X Annex X-1.

Respondents' views on the proposed Implementation Date

All respondents to the Report Phase Consultation agree that the proposed Implementation Date for P291 of 31 December 2014 is suitable, with several respondents welcoming the decision to align P291 with the expected date for implementing any changes required for the Transparency regulation.

The Transparency regulation was published in the Official Journal of the European Union on 14 June 2013, after the P291 Report Phase Consultation was issued, and came into force on 4 July 2013, 20 days after publication. There is an 18 month implementation period commencing from this date to implement the arrangements that will deliver the Transparency regulation. This means that the arrangements delivering the Transparency regulation must be implemented no later than 4 January 2015.

Respondents' other views and comments on P291

A couple of respondents stated a preference for the Portal-only solution that the Workgroup had considered as a potential alternative solution, believing this to be a simpler solution that would offer the industry better value. However, these respondents concede that the proposed solution is a more pragmatic approach that would suit all Parties. One of these respondents did note a concern that the Grid Code route could result in every single re-declaration made under the Grid Code producing a message on the BMRS platform, rather than just the selective ones that could affect the market price.

One respondent noted concerns that other mandatory developments for the Transparency regulation could interact with the P291 solution, and could render the Grid Code part of the solution inefficient. Another respondent noted the comments made by the Transmission Company on the suitability of the TOGA architecture for REMIT reporting, and considers there to be merit in investigating potential upgrades to this system; this is something that the Transmission Company would need to look at separately.

One respondent suggested potential definitions for the list of proposed entries for the 'Cause' field, as noted in Appendix 1. However, they recognise that definitions must work for all plant types, and so feel that further work needs to be undertaken with these outside of the Modifications process.

Panel's views on the Applicable BSC Objectives

The unanimously final view of Panel Members is that P291 would better facilitate Applicable BSC Objectives (c) and (e) for the reasons previously expressed by Workgroup members in Section 6 and Report Phase Consultation respondents in Section 8.

Panel Members highlighted that the obligation to report inside information under the REMIT regulation lies with participants and not with the BMRA, and that the BMRA would not accept any liability for any unavailability of the central platform. In addition, this obligation falls on all participants, whether they are a BSC Party or not. As participants are required to make any information public before they can trade on it, it was considered that they are likely to continue to use their own websites, to ensure that this information is made public as soon as possible. However, one Panel Member raised a concern that publishing the information on two sites could give rise to market manipulation if different participants were to seek the information on different sites, but they noted that these issues may be mitigated if ELEXON were to be used as a reporting hub.

Panel Members commented that the BMRS platform would provide participants with a convenient place to publish messages, but it would not be mandatory for them to use it. It was also noted that it would be up to individual participants to decide who would submit the messages for a particular asset; P291 simply provides them with a platform on which they can do so. One Panel Member queried how easy it would be for non-BSC Parties to submit information to the platform, and it was confirmed that the solution had been designed to allow any participant to be able to submit messages via the ELEXON Portal route.

The Authority representative noted that a third edition of the ACER guidance is due to be published soon. It is currently unknown whether this will impact the proposed solution for P291, but the Authority will liaise with ACER and will account for any changes that may be required when it makes its decision. It should be noted that the P291 solution is now fixed and cannot be changed. However, if any changes are required to the solution as a consequence of the revised guidance then these could be made either through P295, which may itself impact the P291 solution as discussed by the Workgroup in Section 6, or through a further, separate Modification.

The Panel unanimously believes that P291 does better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives, and therefore recommends that P291 is approved.

Panel's views on the draft legal text

The Panel unanimously approved the proposed changes to the BSC for P291, which can be found in Attachment A.

Panel's views on the proposed Implementation Date

The Panel unanimously approved the implementation approach proposed by the Workgroup, as detailed in Section 5.

10 Recommendations



Recommendation

The Panel unanimously recommends that P291 should be approved.

The BSC Panel recommends to the Authority:

- That P291 **should** be made;
- An Implementation Date for P291 (if approved) of:
 - 31 December 2014 if an Authority decision is received on or before 31 March 2014; and
- The BSC legal text for P291.

11 Further Information

More information is available in:

Attachment **A**: Approved Legal Text

Attachment **B**: Assessment Consultation Responses

Attachment **C**: Report Phase Consultation Responses

For further information, including a complete version of the Impact Assessment responses received, please see the [P291](#) page of the ELEXON website.

Appendix 1: Message Data Items

Data items for inclusion in messages

The Workgroup has considered that the following data items should be included in messages submitted to the BMRS reporting platform:

Message Data Items	
Data Item	Description
Message Summary	
Message Heading*	Provides a one-sentence summary of the event. Can be automatically generated or can be freely entered (free entry only available via the web-based approach).
Event Type*	Radio button list to describe the type of event covered by this message. Select from 'Planned Outage', 'Failure' or 'Special Information'. The selection will determine some other fields in the table. Definitions will be provided for each Event Type.
Published	Automatically populated when the message is published.
Asset Details	
Asset*	Drop-down list containing a list of the assets that the participant is eligible to report on. Category A signatories will automatically have access to all relevant assets, and they will be able to delegate these assets to other participants to report on. Asset list will be generated based on the Transmission Company's list of assets used within the Balancing Mechanism. Participants can manually register assets not recorded with the Transmission Company. The option 'No Asset' will be available for use if the participant has general information that doesn't relate to a specific asset.
Asset Type	Automatically populated based on asset information. Assets will be classed as 'Generation', 'Demand', 'Transmission' or 'Distribution'.
[Affected Unit]	Automatically populated based on asset information. Provides the registered ID (e.g. BM Unit ID) of the asset, where one exists. Field name will depend on type of asset being reported on (e.g. BM Unit, Transmission Line etc.).
Participant ID	Automatically populated based on asset information. Relevant BSC Party ID will be used. An equivalent will be required to identify non-BSC Parties. A 'Participant Name' entry may also be added for clarity.
Affected Area	Automatically populated based on asset information. Currently proposing using the BMRS Zones.
Fuel Type	Automatically populated based on asset information.
Normal Capacity (MW)	Automatically populated based on asset information.

Message Data Items	
Data Item	Description
Event Details	
Available Capacity (MW) [†]	Number field to indicate the capacity of the asset available during the event.
Event Start [†]	Date-time field to show the time the event started/will start.
Event End [†]	Date-time field to show the time the event ended/is expected to end.
Duration Uncertainty	Free text field to describe the level of uncertainty in the expected duration. Would not be required if the duration is certain (e.g. for a completed event).
Cause [†]	Drop-down list to describe the cause of the event List to be finalised, but will include 'Unknown/Under Investigation'. A provisional list of Causes can be found below. Definitions will be provided for each Cause.
Event Status [†]	Radio button list to describe the current status of the event. Select from 'Open' (default option), 'Closed' or 'Cancelled' (other types may be added). Definitions will be provided for each Event Status.
Related Information	
Related Information	Free text field where the participant can add any further information they feel necessary.

* denotes mandatory field.

[†] denotes mandatory field if 'Event Type' is 'Planned Outage' or 'Failure' but optional if 'Special Information'.

Any non-mandatory fields left blank by the participant will not be shown on the published message.

Please note that some data item may be renamed during implementation to align with terminology used under the Transparency regulation (e.g. 'Event Start' could be renamed 'Start Date' etc.). However, the corresponding definitions for these data items would not change.

More details can be found in the Workgroup's Draft Solution issued as part of its Industry Impact Assessment, which is available on the [P291](#) page of the ELEXON website.

List of reasons for the 'Cause' field

The Workgroup has proposed a provisional list of reasons for the 'Cause' field. This list is not exhaustive, and other reasons are likely to be added during implementation. However, it provides a view as to what reasons participants are likely to be available to choose from when submitting messages.

The reasons put forward by the Workgroup so far are:

- Planned Outage
- Boiler
- Turbine Generator
- Feed System
- Fuel Supply
- Testing
- Ash & Dust and Flue Gas Desulphurisation
- Common Water Services
- Control and I.T.
- Electric Power Supply Systems
- Other (see 'Related Information')
- Unknown/Under Investigation

Definitions for each cause will be produced during implementation.

Example of expected layout of a published message

Message Heading

[Follow-up]

Published: dd/mm/yy hh:mm

Participant ID: Text

Asset: Text

Asset Type: Text

[Affected Unit]: Text

Affected Area: Text

Fuel Type: Text

Normal Capacity (MW): Number

Event Type: Text

Event Status: Text

Available Capacity (MW): Number

Event Start: dd/mm/yy hh:mm

Event End: dd/mm/yy hh:mm

Duration Uncertainty: Text

Cause: Text

Related Information: Text

Related Messages: ➤ [dd/mm/yy hh:mm](#)
[dd/mm/yy hh:mm](#)
[dd/mm/yy hh:mm](#)

Workgroup's Terms of Reference

Specific areas set by the BSC Panel in the P291 Terms of Reference

What information would participants need to include in their disclosures?

What are the system requirements for the reporting platform? As part of this, the Workgroup should consider:

- How participants would submit their information to the BMRS; and
- How the information would be reported through the BMRS.

Should reporting on this platform be mandatory or voluntary?

What liability issues would there be if the BMRS was unavailable? What other potential liability issues may there be?

Is there any relationship between P291 and the forthcoming Transparency Regulation?

What changes are needed to BSC documents, systems and processes to support P291 and what are the related costs and lead times?

Would changes be required to the Transmission Licence for P291?

Does P291 better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives than the current baseline?

Assessment Procedure timetable

P291 Assessment Timetable

Event	Date
Panel submits P291 to Assessment Procedure	14 Feb 13
Workgroup Meeting 1	25 Feb 13
Workgroup Meeting 2	14 Mar 13
Industry Impact Assessment	21 Mar 13 – 12 Apr 13
Workgroup Meeting 3	19 Apr 13
Assessment Procedure Consultation	29 Apr 13 – 21 May 13
Workgroup Meeting 4	30 May 13
Panel considers Workgroup's Assessment Report	13 Jun 13

Workgroup membership and attendance

P291 Workgroup Attendance					
Name	Organisation	25 Feb 13	14 Mar 13	19 Apr 13	30 May 13
Members					
Dean Riddell	ELEXON (<i>Chair</i>)	✓	✓	✓	✓
David Kemp	ELEXON (<i>Lead Analyst</i>)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Andy Colley	SSE (<i>Proposer</i>)	✓	✓	✗	✗
Garth Graham	SSE (<i>Proposer's Representative</i>)	✗	✗	✓	✓
Phil Hewitt	EnAppSys	✓	☎	✗	✗
Esther Sutton	E.ON	✗	☎	✓	✓
Man Kwong Liu	IBM	✓	✗	✓	✗
Cem Suleyman	Drax	✓	✓	✓	✓
Bill Reed	RWE Supply & Trading	✓	✗	✗	✗
Lisa Waters	Waters Wye Associates	✗	✗	✗	✗
Tariq Hakeem	National Grid	✓	✓	✓	✓
Sarah Owen	Centrica	✓	✗	✓	✗
Simon Piercy	Congito	✓	✓	✗	✗
Richard Hall	Consumer Focus	✗	✗	✗	✗
Colin Prestwich	SmartestEnergy	✗	✗	✗	✗
Martin Mate	EDF	✗	✓	☎	✓
Attendees					
Zaahir Ghanty	ELEXON (<i>Design Authority</i>)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Tina Wirth	ELEXON (<i>Lead Lawyer</i>)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Talia Addy	ELEXON	✓	✓	✓	✗
Clémence Marcelis	Ofgem	✗	✓	✓	✗
Áine Higgins Ní Chinnéide	Ofgem	✗	✗	✗	✓



Initial estimate of industry progression costs from the IWA

Estimate of Total Industry Assessment Costs – Initial Written Assessment					
Workgroup support	Est #mtgs	Est #att	Est effort	Est rate	Sub-total
	3	8	1.5	£605	£21,780
Consultation response support	Est #cons	Est #resp	Est effort	Est rate	Sub-total
	3	8	2.5	£605	£36,300
Total Costs					£58,080

Industry Assessment Costs

Industry Workgroup support and consultation response costs represent an approximation of industry time and effort in attending Workgroup meetings and responding to consultations.

The initial calculation is based upon an estimate of how many attendees we expect to attend each meeting and how many responses we expect to receive to each consultation.

Updated estimate of industry progression costs

Estimate of Total Industry Assessment Costs – Modification Report					
Workgroup support	Meeting	Act #att	Est effort	Est rate	Sub-total
	25 Feb 13	8	1.5	£605	£7,260
	14 Mar 13	8			£7,260
	19 Apr 13	8			£7,260
	30 May 13	6			£5,445
Consultation response support	Consultation	Act #resp	Est effort	Est rate	Sub-total
	IA	10	2.5	£605	£15,125
	Assessment	11			£16,638
	Report	7			£10,588
Total Costs					£69,576

The updated calculation is based on the actual number of attendees at each meeting and the actual number of responses received to each consultation.

The calculations assume that each attendee will require 1.5 man days of effort per meeting and each response will take 2.5 man days of effort, multiplied by a standard rate of £605 per man day.