

# Single Electricity Market

MODIFICATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

MEETING 113 CONFERENCE CALL 20<sup>th</sup> October 2022 10.30AM – 2.00PM

#### COPYRIGHT NOTICE

All rights reserved. This entire publication is subject to the laws of copyright. This publication may not be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or manual, including photocopying without the prior written permission of EirGrid plc and SONI Limited.

## DOCUMENT DISCLAIMER

Every care and precaution is taken to ensure the accuracy of the information provided herein but such information is provided without warranties express, implied or otherwise howsoever arising and EirGrid plc and SONI Limited to the fullest extent permitted by law shall not be liable for any inaccuracies, errors, omissions or misleading information contained herein.

# Table of Contents

1.	SEMO UPDATE	5
2.	DEFERRED MODIFICATION PROPOSALS	6
Ν	AOD_06_22 HOUSEKEEPING ALIGNMENT MODIFICATION V2	6
Ν	IOD_07_22 INDEXATION TO CALCULATION OF CAPACITY PAYMENTS FOR NEW CAPA	CITY 6
Ν	IOD_08_22 WEEKLY STRIKE PRICE CALCULATION	8
Ν	MOD_09_22 EXCLUSION OF DIFFERENCE CHARGES DURING NON-RO EVENTS	9
Ν	/IOD_10_22 STRIKE PRICE VOLATILITY MODIFIER	<u>11</u> 10
3.	NEW MODIFICATION PROPOSALS	11
Ν	NOD_13_22 BIDIRECTIONAL IMPERFECTIONS CHARGE FACTOR MODIFICATION	11
	MOD_14_22 REMOVAL OF THE REQUIREMENT TO POST DE-REGISTRATION CONSENT DRDERS	
Ν	NOD_15_22 TIMELINES FOR PROCESSING LETTERS OF CREDIT	<u>14</u> 13
Ν	NOD_16_22 SEMO HOUSEKEEPING 2022	14
4.	AOB/UPCOMING MODIFICATIONS	15
AP	PENDIX 1 – PROGRAMME OF WORK AS DISCUSSED AT MEETING 113	16

3

# **Document History**

Version	Date	Author	Comment	
1.0	27 <sup>th</sup> October 2022	Modifications Committee Secretariat	Issued to Modifications Committee for review and approval	
2.0	3 <sup>rd</sup> November 2022	Modifications Committee Secretariat	Committee and Observer review complete	

# **Distribution List**

Name	Organization
Modifications Committee Members	SEM Modifications Committee
Modification Committee Observers	Attendees other than Modifications Panel in attendance at Meeting
Interested Parties	Modifications & Market Rules registered contacts

# **Reference Documents**

Document Name		
Balancing Market Rules – Trading and Settlement Code & Agreed Procedures		
Mod_06_22 Housekeeping Alignment Modification		
Mod_07_22 Indexation to Calculation of Capacity Payments for New Capacity		
Mod_08_22 Weekly Strike Price Calculation		
Mod_09_22 Exclusion of Difference Charges During Non-Ro Events		
Mod_10_22 Strike Price Volatility Modifier		
Mod_13_22 Bidirectional Imperfections Charge Factor Modification		
Mod 14 22 Removal of the requirement to post De-registration Consent Orders		
Mod_15_22 Timelines for processing Letters of Credit		
Mod_16_22 SEMO Housekeeping 2022		

# In Attendance

Name	Company	Position
Modifications Committee (voting members)		
Bryan Hennessy	Flogas	Supplier Member
Robert McCarthy	Electricity Exchange	DSU Member
Ian Mullins	Bord Gais	Generator Member
Paraic Higgins (Chair)	ESB	Generator Member

Eamonn Boland	WEI	Renewable Generator Alternate
Cormac Fagan	ElectroRoute	Assetless Alternate
Paul McGuckin	Moyle Interconnector Ltd	Flexible Participant Member
Cormac Daly	Tynagh	Generator Member
David Caldwell	Power NI	Supplier Alternate
Brigid Reilly	PrePayPower	Supplier Alternate
Sean McParland	Energia	Generator Alternate
Andrew McCorriston	SSE	Generator Alternate
James Long	ESB Networks	MDP Member
Stephen McClure	SONI	SO Member
Katia Compagnoni	SEMO	MO Member
Deirdre Hughes	Eirgrid	SO Alternate
Modifications Committe	e (non-voting members)	
Leigh Greer	Uregni	RA Member
Martin McCarthy	EirGrid	MO Alternate
Guneet Kaur	CRU	RA Alternate
Kevin Hannafin	Energia	Generator Member
Secretariat		
Sandra Linnane	SEMO	Secretariat
Observers		
Gill Nolan	EirGrid	Observer
Mairead Cousins	Enel X	Observer
Thomas O'Sullivan	Aughinish	Observer
Harry Molloy	Tynagh	Observer
Patricia Brankin	EirGrid	Observer
Fergus O'Boyle	SEMO	Observer
Clare Delaney	EirGrid	Observer
Lenka Peskova	ESB	Observer

\_

Andrew McKeen	SSE	Observer	
Gavin Miller	CRU	Observer	

## 1. SEMO UPDATE

Secretariat welcomed all to Modifications Committee Meeting 113 and noted that going forward it would be held on MS teams rather than conference call. The minutes for Modifications Committee Meeting 111 were read and approved.

Secretariat noted that version 27.0 of the Code Update would be commencing shortly with one Modification currently on the baseline and more expected before the Autumn system Release J is in place. The RAs provided an update on the 4 other Modifications which are awaiting a decision. It was advised that Mod\_21\_21 has been discussed with SEMC already and together with Mod\_02\_22 would be brought up again at the next Oversight Committee.

### Market Development Update

MO Member provided an update on Market Development noting that there were delays with Release J and the delivery would be postponed by 2 weeks. It was advised that the delay was as a result of supply chain issues with hardware being needed and not to do with testing.

Assurance was given that there would be more communication in the coming days in relation to the above. It was advised that Release K was still on schedule for Spring 2023.

## **Actions**

MO Member confirmed that any open actions would be discussed when delivering the deferred Modification Proposals. It was advised that there were two active change requests currently that SEMO is pursuing for Mod\_02\_22 and Mod\_12\_22.

MOD_17_19 DSU State Aid Compliance Interim Approach	• SEMO take a long-term action to undertake mid tariff year (summer 2020) review of the cost of the change on Imperfections Charges post implementation to track any substantial increase in costs- Long Term Action - Closed
Mod_14_21 Extension of System Service Flag to include units providing Replacement Reserve in line with the detailed design	Market Operations to progress request for Impact Assessment – Closed
Mod_21_21 Undo Instruction Scenario 4	Secretariat to draft a Final Recommendation Report – Closed
	5

Mod_02_22 Cost Recovery when Under Test	Secretariat to draft a Final Recommendation Report – Closed
	Proposer to provide an assessment of compliance with EBGL – <b>Open</b>
Mod_06_22 Housekeeping Alignment Modification	<ul> <li>Proposer to provide examples of what happens in cases where offer prices are greater than Strike Price – Closed</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Proposer to provide more assessments showing scenarios of how both modifications interact Open</li> </ul>
Mod_07_22 Indexation to Calculation of Capacity Payments for New Capacity	<ul> <li>Proposer to work with DSU Member on a revised legal drafting – Closed</li> <li>Proposer and SEMO to review clarifications and decide on whether to withdraw Modification or submit an alternative version – Closed</li> </ul>
Mod_08_22 Weekly Strike Price Calculation	<ul> <li>SEMO to provide a resource impact assessment Closed</li> </ul>
Mod_09_22 Exclusion of Difference Charges During	Proposer to schedule an industry call to progress Modifications – Closed
Non-Ro events	Proposer to liaise with SEMO for an initial assessment of Materiality analysis - Open

# DEFERRED MODIFICATION PROPOSALS

# MOD\_06\_22 HOUSEKEEPING ALIGNMENT MODIFICATION V2

The Proposer provided an update to say 06\_22 confirming it will be withdrawn and they are in the process of developing a New Modification Proposal for submission to Modifications Committee 114 on 1<sup>st</sup> December 2022.

## Decision

This Proposal was withdrawn.

## Actions:

• Secretariat to draft a Withdrawal Notification - Open

MOD\_07\_22 INDEXATION TO CALCULATION OF CAPACITY PAYMENTS FOR NEW CAPACITY

The Proposer provided a presentation noting that there were additional changes to legal drafting on how the inflation modifier is calculated and thanked the Members who contributed to the final version for their feedback.

DSU Member was happy that the improvements to the legal drafting were satisfactory but was aware of the RAs call for evidence and queried if we should wait until this had occurred. There was also concerns raised that this Modification was retrospective in effect given that it effectively changes the price after the auction has taken place and may which undermines the integrity of the Modification and competitive Capacity Auction processes. A Supplier Member queried that they had not seen any assessment of what the modification would cost, noted that it would be suppliers paying for it and wondered what the financial impact would be for Suppliers and consumers with the Proposer advising that they did not have a firm financial figure of the cost but that it could be 6-8% but the cost of non-delivery of awarded capacity could be much higher. It was pointed out in response to this that the alternative is not necessarily loss of load because not all new capacity awarded is at risk of not delivering, some is already under construction and capacity could still be delivered, the situation was more nuanced than suggested.

A Generator Member highlighted that there was a <u>I</u>t was suggested by the proposer that there were similarities between their modification and a previous modification that amended secondary trading arrangements after auctions had taken place. It was pointed out in response that this was a spurious connection to make because there is a fundamental difference between a Modification that improves secondary trading arrangements changes the conditions for paying capacity and one that changes the price after the auction. It was noted that if this Modification didn't go through, capacity could still be delivered, and the situation was more nuanced than suggested. The Proposer gave response noting that this Modification does not change the capacity auction price but the settlement of it and if not introduced some of the awarded capacity will not be delivered.

A Supplier Member welcomed the fact that security of supply was addressed noting that funds need to be made available for Generators with every megawatt being needed now.

The outstanding RA's call for evidence was addressed and DSU Member noted that it was not for the Committee to predict what inflation will do and it was up to the Committee to put rules in place. It was advised to put this Modification forward to a vote and if the RAs did not approve it then it could be rejected. A question was raised to the RAs regarding the call for evidence and how they planned to progress with it. The RA Alternate <u>communicated gave assurance that there will likely be a that a</u> decision <u>that</u> would be made based on the responses received and a publication would be made on the matter albeit not a decision as <u>this-the call for evidence iswas</u> not <u>regarded as a a</u>-consultation as such.

A few Members were not comfortable voting. The Proposer advised that if a vote was delayed the RAs would not be able to progress it because they had indicated that a Modification is the catalyst for change therefore one is required to push the issue forward. Flexible Participant Member noted that Members had legitimate concerns but that the security of supply risk outweighed them It was eventually decided to put this Modification to a vote.

## Decision

This Proposal was Recommended for Approval.

Recommended for Approval by Majority Vote		
Bryan Hennessy	Supplier Member	Approve

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Robert McCarthy	DSU Member	Abstain	
Ian Mullins	Supplier Member	Approve	
Paraic Higgins (Chair)	Generator Member	Approve	
Eamonn Boland	Renewable Generator Alternate	Approve	
Cormac Fagan	Assetless Alternate	Abstain	
Paul McGuckin	Flexible Participant Member	Approve	
Cormac Daly	Generator Member	Approve	
David Caldwell	Supplier Alternate	Abstain	
Brigid Reilly	Supplier Alternate	Approve	
Sean McParland	Generator Alternate	Reject	

\*Andrew McCorriston temporarily unavailable at meeting - no vote cast

### Actions:

- Secretariat to draft a Final Recommendation Report Open
- SEMO to seek impact assessment of system changes Open

# MOD\_08\_22 WEEKLY STRIKE PRICE CALCULATION

The Proposer delivered a presentation on this Modification and advised that it was very straightforward. It was advised that this Modification, submitted back in June, demonstrated issues that were not recognized previously due to the changed circumstances. Further review was done on the Modification before it was resubmitted as there was some concerns that it would lead to a higher strike price. The Proposer provided assurance that following a review of the data as shown on the presentation, it was found that there was no correlation between strike price and higher Market Price as this followed the Gas price not the Strike Price.

The Proposer advised that there were a few other questions on resource costs and asked SEMO if it was possible to estimate it.

MO Member advised that a review of the impact on resources was completed. This is a process partially manual and partially automated in the system. It was advised that the SEMO team could absorb the additional manual workload to weekly, but the daily process proposed in Mod 10\_22 would be challenging.

Supplier Alternate questioned the impact of the Modification stating that currently the Strike Price is smoothed out over the month and changing it to a weekly process would create more volatility and potential issue for suppliers in terms of clearing.

Questions were also asked on the use of 'balance of the Month' prices. <u>Assetless Alternate asked the</u> <u>Proposer if they were comfortable using the Day ahead price as suggested in the updated material, given</u> that the strike price would be set for the week based on the day ahead price for one day and there can be significant volatility in day ahead prices day on day. The Proposer confirmed they were comfortable with this. It was agreed that Day Ahead prices would be more appropriate, and the proposer agreed that if carried out, the vote would be subject to that change being made in the FRR. A sunset clause to change it back to monthly was also discussed with MO Member noting that each change was not an automatic switch and would require a new change request to be scheduled in the system releases. It was noted that the vendor indicated at high level that this is not a complicated implementation, but it would need details assessment to confirm that. The Proposer assured that a sunset clause was not essential and if, as indicated by SEMO, this was not feasible they were happy not to include one.

A Supplier Member gave support for the Modification and considered it to be of moderate impact.

MO Member advised that a detailed impact assessment would be sought once a recommendation for approval is voted for.

#### Decision

This Proposal was Recommended for Approval pending an update to the legal drafting in line with the discussion that day ahead prices should be used instead of balance of the month prices.

Recommended	d for Approval by Unan	imous Vote
Bryan Hennessy	Supplier Member	Approve
Robert McCarthy	DSU Member	Approve
Ian Mullins	Supplier Member	Approve
Paraic Higgins (Chair)	Generator Member	Approve
Eamonn Boland	Renewable Generator Alternate	Approve
Cormac Fagan	Assetless Alternate	Approve
Paul McGuckin	Flexible Participant Member	Approve
Cormac Daly	Generator Member	Approve
David Caldwell	Supplier Alternate	Approve
Brigid Reilly	Supplier Alternate	Approve
Sean McParland	Generator Alternate	Approve
Andrew McCorriston	Generator Alternate	Approve

# Actions:

- Proposer to send in revised legal drafting for FRR replacing balance of month prices with day
  ahead prices **Open**
- Secretariat to draft a Final Recommendation Report **Open**
- SEMO to seek impact assessment of system changes Open

MOD\_09\_22 EXCLUSION OF DIFFERENCE CHARGES DURING NON-RO EVENTS

The Proposer delivered a presentation on this Modification advising that it was initially raised by Power NI in 2019 as Mod\_02\_19 and it was noted that this Modification was in line with that one. The Proposer affirmed to have addressed the RAs concerns about lack of clarity around split price and strike price and a supporting note was circulated prior to the meeting to provide more clarity on this issue. The Proposer also stated that the impact on the socialization fund was negligible because when prices are higher Suppliers don't get paid while Generators are exposed to losses.

A Supplier Alternate stated that this was more a Capacity issue rather than Balancing and if Capacity prices are pushing Generators CODS to be higher, the best place to fix it would be Capacity, otherwise there could be unintended consequences and the Market could be open to gaming. The Proposer replied that prices of gas were so high that Generator's bids were greater than the Strike Price and there are also other generators such as Batteries and gas peakers with low efficiencies that would bid above the Strike Price, but there could be no risk of gaming because the MMU would monitor that the Bidding Code of Practice is respected and would investigate any irrational price.

The RAs thanked the Proposer for providing supporting documentation which gave more detail. Assurance was given that if Mod\_08\_22 was approved this would also be taken into consideration as there was a preference to address the issue via that Modification.

Decision

This Proposal was Recommended for Approval.

Recommended for Approval by Majority Vote		
Bryan Hennessy	Supplier Member	Approve
Robert McCarthy	DSU Member	Approve
lan Mullins	Supplier Member	Approve
Paraic Higgins (Chair)	Generator Member	Approve
Eamonn Boland	Renewable Generator Alternate	Approve
Cormac Fagan	Assetless Alternate	Abstain
Paul McGuckin	Flexible Participant Member	Approve
Cormac Daly	Generator Member	Approve
David Caldwell	Supplier Alternate	Approve
Brigid Reilly	Supplier Alternate	Approve
_Sean McParland	Generator Alternate	Approve
Andrew McCorriston	Generator Alternate	Abstain

## Actions:

- Secretariat to draft a Final Recommendation Report Open
- SEMO to seek impact assessment of system changes Open

#### MOD\_10\_22 STRIKE PRICE VOLATILITY MODIFIER

The Proposer delivered a presentation on this Modification noting that further research had been done and they are looking for implementation that will come along in the intervening period prior to Mod\_08\_22 being deployed in the system. The Proposer explained that a spreadsheet had been created to show the functions of the proposed process and the inputs required.

MO Member praised the clarity of the spreadsheet but advised that the Strike Price calculation is partially system led and could not be all done on a spreadsheet. MO Member advised that they could not see this as a bridging Modification before Mod\_08\_22 as it would still need system changes and the timelines would still be the same.

The Proposer suggested that if the volatility was applied to the gas price as the input used in the calculation then it would not require system changes and a revised version of the spreadsheet could be provided with the gas price volatility instead of the final Stroke Price, spread out over the month. MO Member advised that this would considerably impact the manual portion of the process and that a new legal drafting would be needed.

The Proposer agreed they would be happy to work with SEMO to discuss a number of these points offline and work on a revised version. It was also clarified that this is not a bidirectional change but is applied upwards only; this is because as demonstrated in the data provided for Mod\_08\_22, higher Strike Prices don't drive higher market prices. However, Assetless Alternate stated that Future prices already have volatility built in. A Renewable Generator Alternate also added that the changes of Strike Price calculation to weekly proposed in Mod\_08\_22 would be more efficient because the current Mod would make the price more asymmetric.

#### Decision

This Proposal was deferred.

#### Actions:

3.

Proposer to liaise with SEMO to discuss points raised in more detail and to work out a revised version- Open

# NEW MODIFICATION PROPOSALS

## MOD\_13\_22 BIDIRECTIONAL IMPERFECTIONS CHARGE FACTOR MODIFICATION

The Proposer delivered a presentation on this Modification noting that it was an RA request following approval of Imperfection forecast budget. The benefits to this proposal were listed. Questions were raised by DSU Member on the need to remove the potential for additional interim reports being requested by the RAs. The Proposer agreed to review this for the FRR.

RA Observer noted that the SEM Committee decided there would be a bi-annual review at least but there could be more potentially therefore accepted the amendment proposed by the DSU Member.

There was wide support from Members for this Modification.

It was confirmed that voting would proceed based on the reinstatement of the possibility for multiple interim reviews.

# Decision

This Proposal was Recommended for Approval subject to updates to the Final Recommendation Report.

Recommended for Approval by Unanimous Vote			
Robert McCarthy	DSU Member	Approve	
Ian Mullins	Supplier Member	Approve	
Paraic Higgins (Chair)	Generator Member	Approve	
Eamonn Boland	Renewable Generator Alternate	Approve	
Cormac Fagan	Assetless Alternate	Approve	
Paul McGuckin	Flexible Participant Member	Approve	
Cormac Daly	Generator Member	Approve	
David Caldwell	Supplier Alternate	Approve	
Brigid Reilly	Supplier Alternate	Approve	
Sean McParland	Generator Alternate	Approve	
Andrew McCorriston	Generator Alternate	Approve	

\*Bryan Hennessy no longer at meeting - no vote cast

# Actions:

- Proposer to provide a revised legal drafting for the FRR as agreed at the meeting Open
- Secretariat to draft a Final Recommendation Report Open

MOD\_14\_22 REMOVAL OF THE REQUIREMENT TO POST DE-REGISTRATION CONSENT ORDERS

The Proposer went through the Modification Proposal noting that there would be a minor change to Agreed Procedure 18 in relation to the process of issuing de-registration documentation to stakeholders. It was

advised that the added requirement of issuing documents by Registered Post was unnecessary and by removing it, it would reduce paperwork.

A Supplier Member understood the rational above and but noted that registered post provides the trackability needed in these circumstances. It was suggested that a confirmation of receipt could be added for further assurance of delivery and the Proposer agreed to this. An agreement was made that this extra step would be added into the AP Notification.

# Decision

This Proposal was Recommended for Approval subject to an update in the AP Notification.

Recommended for Approval by Unanimous Vote			
Robert McCarthy	DSU Member	Approve	
lan Mullins	Supplier Member	Approve	
Deirdre Hughes	SO Alternate	Approve	
Paraic Higgins (Chair)	Generator Member	Approve	
Eamonn Boland	Renewable Generator Alternate	Approve	
Stephen McClure	SO Member	Approve	
Paul McGuckin	Flexible Participant Member	Approve	
Cormac Daly	Generator Member	Approve	
James Long	MDP Member	Approve	
David Caldwell	Supplier Alternate	Approve	
Brigid Reilly	Supplier Alternate	Approve	
Sean McParland	Generator Alternate	Approve	
Andrew McCorriston	Generator Alternate	Approve	
Katia Compagnoni	MO Member	Approve	

\*Cormac Fagan no longer at meeting - vote not cast.

# Actions:

- Proposer to send revised drafting to include additional step to acknowledge receipt of e-mail in the AP Notification **Open**
- Secretariat to draft an AP Notification Open

## MOD\_15\_22 TIMELINES FOR PROCESSING LETTERS OF CREDIT

The Proposer went through the presentation noting that without this Modification Participants don't get the benefit of using Letter of Credit to remedy a CCIN and due to current processing timelines cash would need to be posted. It was noted that this issue was highlighted in the RAs consultation on Credit Cover where most respondents indicated that timelines for approval of LOC lead to larger than required Credit Cover being posted.

SEMO Observer advised that reducing timelines for approval from 4 days down to 2 would be extremely difficult because often wrong references are being submitted and banks can be very slow in addressing queries. At present SEMO will always endeavor to resolve LOC as soon as received where possible, especially where CCINs are in place, but it is very difficult if a bank is not on the list of credit providers as extra time will be needed to carry out the necessary checks to add them on causing delays on both sides. Assurance was given that there could be delivery before the 2-day turnaround in some circumstances in particular where the request is for amendments to an existing LOC and all documentation provided is complete and correct.

MO Member noted that this Modification is attempting to place obligations to SEMO in circumstances that are outside SEMO's control. SEMO might not be able to fulfil such requirements because of external dependencies and although these could also be an issue for the existing timelines, there is currently enough time to remedy them. Supplier Member asked if the Modification could be limited to existing Credit Cover Providers and questioned how often this process is required. MO Observer replied that this could be very frequent, and it lies on top of the other daily requirement the Finance team has to carry out.

Further discussion took place around Letters of Credit and there was agreement amongst all that any time reduced around the process would be of benefit. Finance advised that reducing the timelines for new Letters of Credit to 2 days is not feasible. Making amendments to existing letters could potentially be reduced. The Proposer also clarified that these timelines would start from SEMO receiving the amendments so any problem the Participant would have with the bank prior to submission is absorbed by the Participant.

The Chair suggested that individual scenarios could be worked out between the Proposer and SEMO.

The Proposer agreed to take the further discussions offline and meet with SEMO before the next meeting.

### Decision

This Proposal was deferred.

#### Actions:

Proposer to further discuss timelines with SEMO - Open

## MOD\_16\_22 SEMO HOUSEKEEPING 2022

The Proposer went through proposal highlighting minor adjustments that needed to be made to maintain clarity and consistency in the Code. It was advised that they were mainly changes in formatting, typos and minor wording adjustments without changes to the intent of the Trading and Settlement Code.

#### Decision

This Proposal was Recommended for Approval.

Recommended for Approval by Unanimous Vote			
Robert McCarthy	DSU Member	Approve	
Ian Mullins	Supplier Member	Approve	
Paraic Higgins (Chair)	Generator Member	Approve	
Eamonn Boland	Renewable Generator Alternate	Approve	
Paul McGuckin	Flexible Participant Member	Approve	
Cormac Daly	Generator Member	Approve	
David Caldwell	Supplier Alternate	Approve	
Brigid Reilly	Supplier Alternate	Approve	
Sean McParland	Generator Alternate	Approve	
Andrew McCorriston	Generator Alternate	Approve	

# Actions:

Secretariat to draft a Final Recommendation Report - Open

4. AOB/UPCOMING MODIFICATIONS

Secretariat thanked all for attending Meeting 113 and gave a reminder that Modifications Committee Meeting 114 would be held on Thursday, 1<sup>st</sup> December 2022.

Status as	s at 20 October 2022	
		ut Custom immosto
Modification Proposals 'Recomr		out System Impacts
Title	Sections Modified	Sent
Mod_21_21 Undo Instruction Scenario 4	Appendix 0.23 table 5	Sent for RA Decision 29/09/22
Mod_02_22 Cost Recovery when Under Test	D,F,G, Glossary	Sent for RA Decision 29/09/22
Mod_11_22 Permitting the use of email to communicate credit cover changes on Demand Guarantees	B, AP09 & Appendix	Sent for RA Decision 29/09/22
Mod_12_22 Extension of System Service Flag to cover Replacement Reserve Resources	N.2	Sent for RA Decision 23/09/22
Modification Proposals 'Recon	nmended for Approval' wit	h System impacts
Mod_14_21 Extension of System Service Flag to include units providing Replacement Reserve in line with the detailed design	N.2	Sent for RA Decision 19/01/22
Modification Propos	als 'Recommended for Re	jection'
N/A	N/A	N/A
RA Decision	n 'Further Work Required'	
N/A	N/A	N/A
RA Decision Approved	Modifications with Syster	n Impacts
Title	Sections Modified	Effective Date
Mod_13_19 Payment for Energy Consumption in SEM for non-energy Services Dispatch	F	Following delivery of required system changes
Mod_05_22 SEMO Performance Reporting Publication Frequency	B, Appendix E	2 <sup>nd</sup> September 2022
RA Decision Approved I	Modifications with no System	em Impacts
Title	Sections Modified	Effective Date
N/A	N/A	N/A
RAI	Decision Rejected	
N/A	N/A	N/A
	RA Direction	
Mod_08_20 Imbalance prices to reflect the real-time value of energy	D.4.4.12	Decision letter received – 29/10/20
•	P Notifications	

N/A	N/A	N/A	
Withdrawal Notifications			
N/A	N/A	N/A	
Modification Proposal Extensions			
Mod_21_21 Undo Instructions Scenario 4	N/A	22/07/22	
Mod_02_22 Cost Recovery when Under Test	N/A	22/07/22	
	L		

Meeting 114 – 1 December 2022 – Conference Call