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# MODIFICATIONS COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

## Recommended for approval – unanimous Vote

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Recommended for Approval by Unanimous Vote (subject to legal drafting)** | | |
| Brian Mongan | Generator Member | Approved – subject to legal drafting |
| Connor Powell | Supplier Member | Approved |
| Eamonn O’Donoghue | Interconnector Member | Approved |
| Grainne O’Shea | Generator Alternate | Approved |
| Jill Murray (Chair) | Supplier Alternate | Approved |
| Mary Doorly | Generator Member | Approved |
| Sean Doolin | Supplier Member | Approved |

Patrick Liddy had to leave the meeting and was unavailable for the Vote, however, he did communicate to the Chair that he would be in favour of voting to approve this proposal.

# Background

This Modification Proposal was raised by SEMO/EirGrid Legal and was received by the Secretariat on 24th July 2015. This modification proposal was raised to address the REMIT Reporting requirement.

SEMO is registered with the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators (ACER) as an Organised Market Place. In accordance with Article 6 of the REMIT Implementing Acts (Implementing Regulation (EU) No 1348/2014), SEMO as *“The organised market place where the wholesale energy product was executed or the order was placed* ***shall, at the request of the market participant, offer a data reporting agreement****.”* Under the legislation the obligation to report rests with the Market Participant however if SEMO is reporting on behalf of Market Participants, SEMO will take on a level of responsibility for mapping and transmitting the agreed REMIT Data to ACER.

The Modification Proposal was discussed at Meeting 62 on 11th June 2015 and Meeting 63 on 13th August where it was voted on.

# PURPOSE OF PROPOSED MODIFICATION

## 3A.) justification of Modification

This modification is being raised in accordance with Section 2.190 of the Trading and Settlement Code. The reason for taking this approach is to allow Market Participants the time to consider if they agree with SEMO’s preferred option. Also to allow sufficient time for Market Participants to raise any legal concerns which they feel need to be addressed.

Due to the extremely tight timeline for implementation and reporting to begin on the 7th October 2015, SEMO and Market Participants will need to be a position to agree an approach at the Modifications Committee Meeting in August. If a modification is the preferred approach it will only apply to those who formally request SEMO to report on their behalf.

## 3B.) Impact of not Implementing a Solution

If a modification to the T&SC is not agreed as the preferred approach then SEMO will, if requested to report on behalf of Market Participants be required to enter into bilateral agreements.

## 3c.) Impact on Code Objectives

The aim of this Code is to facilitate the achievement of the following objectives:

1. to facilitate the efficient, economic and coordinated operation, administration and development of the Single Electricity Market in a financially secure manner;
2. to provide transparency in the operation of the Single Electricity Market;
3. to ensure no undue discrimination between persons who are parties to the Code;
4. **Assessment of Alternatives**

N/A

# Working Group and/or Consultation

N/A

# impact on systems and resources

N/A

# Impact on other Codes/Documents

N/A

# MODIFICATION COMMITTEE VIEWS

## Meeting 62 – 11june 2015

Eirgrid Legal Representative advised that the proposal is being raised in order to address the REMIT data reporting requirement provision. Eirgrid Legal Representative advised that the proposal was not detailed to allow for discussion on this matter and to allow for participants position on this to be considered. Eirgrid Legal Representative also advised that this proposal still required a thorough legal and technical review and welcomed comment and feedback from the Committee to allow them to develop this proposal. MO Member advised that Bord Gais had submitted comments on this proposal in their absence. A concern expressed in these comments related to liability. Eirgrid Legal further explained liability for Participants and SEMO as reporting authority.

Chair asked for clarification as to what was being asked of the Committee by the proposer. Eirgrid Legal Representative asked that the Committee express their position regarding how they wish the requirements to be progressed, stating a preference for either bilateral contracts or a centralised reporting system. All comments and questions on this matter were also encouraged. Generator Member advised that the REMIT workshop created more questions rather than providing information. Supplier Alternate advised the need for overall clarity of the requirements of Suppliers relating to REMIT as he felt a degree of confusion existed in this area and also questioned the area of how this would be accounted for in terms of cost recovery.

MO Member confirmed that SEMO’s obligation is to be able to provide this service and that these obligations came from Europe not RAs.

Generator Member expressed concerns at including an external obligation into the Code. Also Generators have additional obligations that do not fall under SEMO obligation to provide a reporting facility, he therefore questioned whether it would be more efficient for Generators to build their own system without relying on SEMO and duplicating costs. MO member advised that Participants consider the complexity of the obligations required should they not wish to proceed with centralised reporting systems, and the preference indicated from Acer to receive as much data as possible from centralised sources to guarantee consistency of treatment to the data.

Several members of the committee expressed a preference for a centralised approach while there were other members questioning transparency of REMIT project, particularly with regarding recovery of costs. MO Member advised that SEMO’s reporting as it stands, falls within the agreed release budget and only the maintenance costs are to be recovered through the normal channels. Generator Member raised the facility of a receipt being required for this data transaction and if SEMO was facilitating reporting for all obligations. RA Member advised that this provision was only to report on spot market data. MO Member stressed that SEMO will only report on SEMO transactions for which it holds all data and that the concerns regarding receipts have been taken on board but currently there is no such provision planned. Members expressed the need for further discussion on this proposal and REMIT reporting, while Chair proposed possible working group or workshop to progress the issue in more detail. Chair also asked to explore other alternative if possible like a framework agreement. Secretariat addressed the timescale involved as Meeting 63 is in August and the REMIT deadline is October 7th making this matter more urgent. The need for an Extraordinary meeting in September was suggested as a possibility.

MO Member advised that all questions regarding REMIT could also be addressed to [remit@sem-o.com](mailto:remit@sem-o.com) and that not many comments were received after the workshop. Eirgrid Legal Representative asked that all these questions and comments be addressed to both [remit@sem-o.com](mailto:remit@sem-o.com) and [modifications@sem-o.com](mailto:modifications@sem-o.com) for consideration in the development of the modification proposal.

Secretariat proposed that the Committee have a 2 week review period ending 30th June to submit feedback and comments on the reporting approach and approach to be used for furthering this discussion. Eirgrid Legal Representative and MO Member will then use this feedback in the development of a detailed modification proposal or alternative solutions to be circulated to the committee as soon as available to be vote on prior to the October 7th REMIT deadline. The committee were satisfied with this approach.

## Meeting 63 – 13 august 2015

MO Member delivered [REMIT Presentation](http://semopub/MarketDevelopment/ModificationDocuments/MODS%20Meeting%2063%20-%20REMIT.pdf) addressing the stringent timelines involved in progressing this modification proposal to meet the REMIT implementation deadline of October 7th 2015. This presentation also addressed comments received from Participants regarding the detail of the proposal. Each comment was debated in great detail with agreement reached on each point. These discussions will then be reflected in the legal drafting of this proposal.

MO Member addressed the tight timelines involved in progressing this proposal in line with the October 7th REMIT deadline. MO Member suggested that the usual timeline for preparation and review post meeting could be shortened to facilitate the proposal reaching the SEM Oversight Committee Meeting on September 8th. Changes agreed at the meeting would be circulated in a new version 3 of the Modification together with the Minutes of meeting 63 for review, therefore granting additional 5 Working Days to the RAs to provide recommendations in advance of the Oversight Committee. Chair asked was the shorter Committee review period necessary and did the RA’s need this additional time in advance of the Oversight Committee? RA Member advised that this time would be appreciated and needed.

Generator Member enquired when did the Modifications Committee vote to allow SEMO IT to develop the functionality within the Central Market Systems (CMS). Observer advised that systems in question are currently developed in the test environment and that they were included in proposals which, were agreed with the RA’s in May of this year and raised and highlighted in the CMS Updates at both Meeting 61 & Meeting 62. Observer also advised that SEMO in its capacity as the ‘Organised Market Place’ is obliged in accordance with the Implementing Regulation to offer a service to report if requested to do so and preparation for this was carried out on the principle of providing the least cost and least system impact solution.

MO Member advised that the fundamental area of the proposal lay in sections 3.95 – 3.98 as this sets out the legal framework under which SEMO can report on behalf of Participants. Interconnector Member asked for clarification on the difference between section 3.97 and section 3.98. MO Member distinguished the two stages: section 3.97 addresses the responsibility of Participants to provide the required data to SEMO while section 3.98 addresses the responsibility of SEMO to transmit this data to ACER. The EirGrid Group Legal Representative also advised that section 3.98 was drafted in this way to reflect Article 11 of the REMIT Implementing Regulation. Chair and Observer queried why there was an obligation directly shown in section 3.97 but not in section 3.98. MO Member advised that by referencing section 3.95 in section 3.98 this could be addressed. Observer advised that section 3.34 had been referenced in paragraph 3.97 to provide clarity and comfort to Participants that there was no change to the current obligations under the Code. The EirGrid Group Legal Representative advised that REMIT Regulations will take precedence over the Trading & Settlement Code. Chair felt that this should be reflected in the Trading & Settlement Code. MO Member clarified that SEMO is responsible for mapping the data and that it is the responsibility of the Participant to provide valid data as reflected in the Modification. Observer raised concerns that the responsibility in Paragraph 3.98 was not clear enough and that the MO should be the subject of that paragraph. An agreement was reached to refer to paragraph 3.95 and change the subject of the paragraph from ‘Participants’ to ‘Market Operator’.

Generator Member raised concerns regarding liability because the wording of Article 11 of the Implementing Regulation could result in participants being in breach of the legislation. Generator Alternate asked the RAs whether they would be in breach of legislation and have to answer to either/or CER and ACER. Generator Member was unhappy with the lack of consideration for the section in Article 11 of the legislation which says that they would have ‘*to take reasonable steps to validate*’ data. As it stands currently, there is no visibility due to the receipt function not being available to participants. Generator Alternate said that in these circumstances, the reasonable steps were exhausted after appointing the MO as there was no visibility of the file submitted to ACER. Generator Member asked would the RA’s be providing ultimate indemnity. RA Member advised that this was not the case.

Observer explained that this was not possible due to timing and sensitive nature of the information sent at gate closure. To provide an extract of data by Participants it would require system changes which, at this point, can only be discussed after go live and following clarification from ACER as to the type of validation they will have in place for the verification of data. Observer noted that SEMO understood Participants frustration at lack of transparency in this area as they too were dealing with a lack of visibility regarding the validation and data mapping process. Chair advised that adding a requirement for the MO to publish data when clearly they are not in a position to do so would create an automatic breach of the Code which wasn’t desirable. Interim solutions were discussed which relate to publishing submitted data. The RAs questioned the possibility of making the file submitted to ACER available to Participants after the completion of the runs when the same data is no longer confidential. Observer agreed that this was possible on the basis that there were no objections to issuing one file which contains all Market Participants data. Observer stated that this was to enable Participants to validate the data sent and should not to be considered as a receipt from ACER. An agreement to develop a further section 3.99 linked to changes in Appendix E was reached on this interim publication process which is dependent on standard publication of data.

Generator Alternate felt that the wording of section 3.98 relating to ‘…to the extent that such failures are attributable to the Market Operator added a further burden of proof which was unnecessary. The EirGrid Group Legal Representative advised that it was not clear what would be achieved by removing this section and it would need further consideration before it could be removed. Generator Alternate questioned the value of this additional wording as the MO must be considered responsible for the submission to ACER once appointed.

Discussion ensued with regard to the wording in 3.98 and if adding a simple reference to 3.95 would only cover the ability to appoint but did not cover the responsibilities taken on by the MO. Wording of section 3.98 was deliberated in terms of the use of the wording ‘shall be responsible for’. The need to align section 3.95 with 3.98 was also discussed.

Generator Alternate asked if the referenced ‘Notification Form’ was available to Participants as this would affect whether or not the discussed sections could be agreed upon.

MO Member explained that this was in development and displayed a draft template for the attention of the Committee. Chair asked how the transfer of obligation for the reporting was being dealt with. MO Member confirmed that completion of the Notification Form was the request to report and therefore resolved the transfer of responsibility. MO Member also confirmed that this document would be treated as a stand alone form document referenced in the Code in the same manner as other Unit Registration Form and would not be incorporated within the body of Code.

Generator and Supplier Members expressed frustration due to the RAs in NI delaying the opening of the registration process for NI Generators. RA Member acknowledged the issue and stated that the concerns should be addressed directly to the NI Authority. MO member clarified the timelines for submission of REMIT Notification forms and that SEMO will facilitate late submission due to incapacity to register.

Observer asked if back loading of data was being considered. Observer advised that the report provision commences on October 6th to allow reporting of Ex-Ante data for the 7th October.

Summary discussion took place to confirm agreement to the final wording of sections 3.95 – 3.98. plus provisional intent for an additional paragraph 3.99.

Generator Member emphasised the position that there was an element of redundancy that should be addressed throughout the Modification. This is because of a number of references to the appointment of the MO which are already covered in the new terms definitions and in 3.95.

Discussion continued into the afternoon when MO Member addressed the remaining sections of the [REMIT Presentation](http://semopub/MarketDevelopment/ModificationDocuments/MODS%20Meeting%2063%20-%20REMIT.pdf) focusing on the Glossary and Agreed Procedures items of the proposal and comments received. Glossary terms for REMIT Data were discussed at length as MO Member explained that suggested alternative proposals contained terms that were not codified. The term CMS was utilised as this is more appropriate and there was an approach taken by having a general reference to the mapping of CMS data with relevant IDs for REMIT reporting.

Agreement was reached for the Glossary and AP sections referenced in the [REMIT Presentation](http://semopub/MarketDevelopment/ModificationDocuments/MODS%20Meeting%2063%20-%20REMIT.pdf) following more deliberations. There was agreement to remove the need for section 5.2.2 within AP 5 and all insertions in AP06. Data Confidentiality provisions in paragraph 2.344 (and subsequent) were discussed and Generator Alternate questioned if there was a need to add anything further for REMIT. The EirGrid Group Legal Representative believed that section 2.348 sufficiently covers this as it stands. The Emergency Communication Failure scenario in Agreed Procedure 7 was also discussed as to how REMIT Reporting was facilitated should this happen. Observer advised there was an escalation process in place in terms of reporting such incidents and that all RRMs are obliged to report any failure to transmit data to ACER and all affected parties.

The agreed wording will all be reflected in the legal drafting contained in the Final Recommendation Report.

# Proposed Legal Drafting

As set out below – Mod 06\_15 Version 2 with agreed changes -:

1. Data and Information Systems

General

Introduction and Interpretation

* 1. This Section 3 sets out rules relating to the systems and procedures for the communication of Data Transactions and REMIT Data Transactions by each Party to the Market Operator and by the Market Operator to one or more Parties and the rules and principles for the publication by the Market Operator of data and information relating to the trading arrangements in the Pool.

**REMIT DATA**

3.95 A Participant may appoint the Market Operator to report REMIT Data to the European Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators on its behalf by completing the ’Request to Report’ section in the REMIT Notification Form. The Participant may choose to revoke such appointment at any time by completing the ‘Notice to Cease Reporting’ section in the REMIT Notification Form. The provisions of paragraphs 3.96 to 3.99 shall only apply in the event that the Market Operator has been appointed to report REMIT Data in accordance with this paragraph 3.95 and such appointment has not been revoked.

3.96 The Market Operator shall only process and transmit the REMIT Data to the European Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators on behalf of a Participant for the purposes of compliance with REMIT requirements.

**Liability of the Market Operator and the Participants**

3.97 The Market Operator shall have no liability in respect of the completeness, accuracy and timely submission by the Participant of any CMS data required for REMIT Data Transactions, in accordance with paragraph 3.34.

3.98 Without prejudice to paragraph 3.97 and subject to appointment under paragraph 3.95, the Market Operator shall be responsible for failures in the completeness, accuracy or timely submission of the REMIT Data to the European Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators as required under REMIT. 3.99 Subject to appointment under paragraph 3.95, the Market Operator will provide access to REMIT Data Transactions to relevant Participants in accordance with Appendix E.

APPENDIX E: DATA PUBLICATION

Table E.11 – Data publication list part 9: updated as required

| **Time** | **Item** | **Term** | **Subscript** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| as required | REMIT Data Transaction |  | h |

Glossary

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Data Processing Entity | | | | means a person that submits Data Transactions or REMIT Data Transactions on a Participant’s behalf as provided for in Section 3 of the Code. |
| European Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators | | means the European Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators established under Regulation (EC) No 713/2009 where it is also referred to as ACER. | | |
| REMIT | | means Regulation (EU) No 1227/2011 of 25 October 2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council on wholesale energy market integrity and transparency. | | |
| REMIT Data | | means any CMS data mapped to the relevant ID for REMIT reporting, which is processed by the Market Operator for the purpose of REMIT and required to be provided to European Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators to ensure compliance by a Participant with the Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 1348/2014. | | |
| REMIT Data Transaction | | means a set of REMIT Data submitted to the European Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators in accordance with paragraph 3.95. | | |
| REMIT Notification Form | | means the form published by the Market Operator to be completed by a Participant in the event that the Participant wishes to appoint the Market Operator to report REMIT Data to the European Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators on its behalf. | | |

Agreed ProcEdure 1: participant and unit registration and deregistration

**2.1.2 PARTICIPANTS AND UNITS**

Upon registering its first Unit within a Jurisdiction, a Party becomes a Participant. A Participant will receive a Participant ID and Account ID at this time. The Participant ID is a unique identifier pursuant to which Units are aggregated for the purposes of calculating the Required Credit Cover. The Account ID is a unique identifier pursuant to which Units are aggregated for the purposes of:

* + Self-Billing Invoices/Invoicing (AP15);
  + Settlement Reallocation Agreements; and
  + Having access to the data in relation to those Units through a unique digital certificate (as detailed in Agreed Procedure 3 and Agreed Procedure 5).

Save as expressly provided in the Code, a Party may not register more than one Participant in each Jurisdiction.

* + A unique digital certificate will be assigned to each Account ID, which permits access to the Participant’s data.
  + An individual Participant may only have Participant ID but may have more than one Account ID where it registers both Generator Units and Supplier Units.

In order to register a Unit, the required information (Registration Data) must be submitted to the Market Operator by the Party/Applicant and will be assessed by the Market Operator, to ensure that the Registration Data is complete and fulfils the eligibility requirements as set out in the Code. A completed REMIT Notification Form is also provided should the Participant wish to appoint the Market Operator to report REMIT Data for the appropriate Units to the European Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators on its behalf. Once the Market Operator has confirmed that the Registration Data is complete (and taking into account the table in section 3.2.4), any questions or clarifications shall be progressed by all relevant Parties (Participant, Meter Data Provider, System Operator, and/or Distribution System Operator) at the initial Unit Registration meeting.

**2.2.2 Intermediaries**

A person that is not the Unit Owner (excluding Supplier Units) may accede to the Code and register a Generator Unit on the Unit Owner’s behalf with a Form of Authority from the Unit Owner and with the consent of the Regulatory Authorities. A completed REMIT Notification Form is also provided should the Intermediary wish to appoint the Market Operator to report REMIT Data for the appropriate Units, to the European Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators on its behalf.

3.2 Participant and Unit Registration

3.2.1 Overview

In order to become a Participant a Party (or Applicant) must register a Unit.

* + The process flow in Section **Error! Reference source not found.** details the timelines and information involved in the registration of a Unit.
  + The Party (or Applicant) downloads a Registration Pack from the Market Operator Website. The Registration Pack includes the Participation Notice which can be used by the Party (or Applicant) to register its first or any subsequent Unit. It also includes a REMIT Notification Form to appoint the Market Operator to report REMIT Data in accordance with paragraph 3.95.
  + The Party (or Applicant) completes the Registration Pack and submits it to the Market Operator via registered mail.

3.2.5 Procedural Steps

| **#** | **Procedural Step** | **Timing** | **Method** | **By/From** | **To** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

**Stage 2 :Review & Validation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2.1 | Generate Participant ID, Account ID and Unit ID and map the relevant ID for REMIT reporting as required and issue IDs to Applicant. | As Required | Email | Market Operator | Party or Applicant |
| 2.2 | Inform Applicant of all the agreements that need to be in place before a Unit can become effective in the market | Within 1 WD of Stage 2 commencing | Email | Market Operator | Party or Applicant |
| 2.3 | The Applicant confirms the following (where applicable):   1. TUoS / DUoS application in progress 2. Submission of EDIL Data in progress 3. Metering is in place 4. Discussions with Interconnector Administrator in progress for registering Interconnector Users 5. Contact TSO or Interconnector Owner regarding credit cover requirements | Within 15 WD of notification of agreements that need to be in place prior to Unit being effective in the market | Email | Party or Applicant | Market Operator |
| 2.3a | A completed REMIT Notification Form is required to appoint the Market Operator to report REMIT Data | Within 15 WD prior to Trading Day of commencement of REMIT reporting | Email | Party or Applicant | Market Operator |

3.6 intermediary removal

3.6.1 Overview

Three cases of removal of an Intermediary are possible:

* + Case 1: an Intermediary’s consent is revoked by the Regulatory Authorities, or the expiration of Form of Authority
  + Case 2: an Intermediary wishes to voluntarily de-register any or all of the Units
  + Case 3: an Intermediary ceases participating in respect of any Units without first voluntarily de-registering the Units or the Unit Owner wishing to revoke the Intermediary

The Market Operator will deregister the Units in all cases.

In all cases, the Unit Owner may either (subject to Regulatory Authority consent) either procure a substitute Intermediary to reregister the Units or may reregister the Units itself and become the Participant in respect of those Units, unless

* + The Unit is decommissioned; or
  + The Unit is below de minimis and the Unit Owner does not wish the Unit to be registered to a Participant in the SEM.

Note that in any event, the removed Intermediary continues to be bound by the enduring obligations of the Code in respect of the deregistered Units. However, where the Intermediary had appointed the Market Operator to report REMIT Data on its behalf, this will cease on the date of removal.

3.9 Change of Unit Generic Settlement Class

Changes in Unit Classification is triggered by a Participant request in accordance with paragraph 2.56a of the Code. The Participant must provide 29 days notice of its intent to reclassify each Unit(s), and submit any additional information which is required by the Market Operator to enable the new Unit Classification including a completed REMIT Notification Form where applicable should a Participant wish the Market Operator to report REMIT Data on its behalf. For each Classification change, the MO shall determine if all Eligibility requirements have been complied with.

1. DEFINITIONS and Abbreviations

Definitions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Registration Data** | As defined in the Code |
| **Registration Pack** | Documentation and information that assists with Party registration |
| **Regulatory Authorities**  **Remit Data**  **Remit Data Transactions** | As defined in the Code  As defined in the Code  As defined in the Code |
| **Rejection Notice** | As defined in the Code |
| **Required Credit Cover** | As defined in the Code |

Agreed ProcEdure 5: Data storage and it security

2.2.2 Controlling Access to Information

The Market Operator shall implement three levels of data confidentiality in its systems namely:

Public Data– data freely available to all Parties and the general public;

Private Data – data restricted to the Participant relevant to that data;

Market Private Data – data restricted to the Market Operator;

REMIT Data – data restricted to the European Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators and relevant Participants.

To control access to information:

Private Data is restricted to the relevant Participant and Market Operator staff.

Market Private Data is restricted to Market Operator staff;

REMIT Data is restricted to Market Operator staff, staff of the European Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators and relevant Participants.

Agreed ProcEdure 7: emergency communications

1.2 Scope of Agreed Procedure

This Agreed Procedure defines the process requirements for communication of data required for Settlement outside of normal operation of the IT systems. For the avoidance of doubt, this Agreed Procedure does not apply to REMIT Data; however, the Market Operator will comply with all requirements set out by the European Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators where events which relate to communication channels and system performance will impact on REMIT Data Transactions.

# LEGAL REVIEW

Complete

# IMPLEMENTATION TIMESCALE

Due to the REMIT implementation timescales it is proposed that this modification will be effective 2nd October 2015 to allow for the reporting process to complete and for both SEMO and Market Participants to comply.

# appendix 1 : mod 06\_15 Version 2 remit data reporting by the organised market place to acer

[Mod\_06\_15 REMIT Data Reporting by the Organised Market Place version 2](http://semopub/MarketDevelopment/ModificationDocuments/Mod_06_15%20%20V2%20REMIT%20Modification%20Proposal.docx)