



Single Electricity Market

MODIFICATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

MEETING 112

CONFERENCE CALL

13th September 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

2. DEFERRED MODIFICATION PROPOSALS

MOD 21 21 UNDO INSTRUCTION SCENARIO 4

MOD 02 22 COST RECOVERY WHEN UNDER TEST V2

MOD 06 22 HOUSEKEEPING ALIGNMENT MODIFICATION V2

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

3. NEW MODIFICATION PROPOSALS

MOD 10 22 STRIKE PRICE VOLATILITY MODIFIER

MOD 11 22 PERMITTING THE USE OF EMAIL TO COMMUNICATE CREDIT COVER CHANGES
ON DEMAND GUARANTEES

4. AOB/UPCOMING MODIFICATIONS

APPENDIX 1 – PROGRAMME OF WORK AS DISCUSSED AT MEETING 112

Document History

Version	Date	Author	Comment
1.0	13 th Sept 2022	Modifications Committee Secretariat	Issued to Modifications Committee for review and approval
2.0	20 th Sept 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_21_21 Undo Instruction Scenario 4
Mod_02_22 Cost Recovery when Under Test
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_11_22 Permitting the use of email to communicate credit cover changes on Demand Guarantees v2

In Attendance

Name	Company	Position
Modifications Committee (voting members)		
Nick Heyward	Statkraft	Flexible Participant Alternate
David Caldwell	Power Ni	Supplier Alternare
Cormac Daly	Tynagh	Generator Member
Robert McCarthy	Electricity Exchange	DSU Member

Eoghan Cudmore	Bord Gais Energy	Supplier Alternate
Sean McParland	Energia	Generator Alternate
Andrew Burke	WEI	Renewable Generator Member
Rochelle Broderick	Budget Energy Ireland	Supplier Member
Brigid Reilly	PrePayPower	Supplier Alternate
Bryan Hennessy	Flogas	Supplier Member
Stacy Feldmann	SSE	Generator Member
Paraic Higgins (Chair)	Bord Gais Energy	Generator Member
Lisa Fahy	Bord na Mona	Generator Alternate
Paul McGuckin	Mutual Energy	Flexible Participant Member
Ian Mullins	Bord Gais	Supplier Member
Cormac Fagan	Electroroute	Assetless Alternate
Modifications Committee (non-voting members)		
James Long	ESB Networks	MDP Member
Karen Shiels	UR	RA Alternate
Grainne Black	CRU	RA Member
Guneet Kaur	CRU	RA Alternate
Adelle Watson	NIE Networks	MDP Member
Martin McCarthy	EirGrid	MO Alternate
Leigh Greer	UR	RA Member
Katia Compagnoni	SEMO	MO Member
Anne Trotter	EirGrid	SO Member
Secretariat		
Sandra Linnane	SEMO	Secretariat
Esther Touhey	SEMO	Secretariat
Observers		
Harry Molloy	Tynagh	Observer
Tadhg Gunnell	Pinergy	Observer

Thomas O'Sullivan	Aughinish	Observer
Sinead O'Hare	Power NI	Observer
Mairead Cousins	Enel X	Observer
Chris Goodman	SONI	Observer
Patrick O'Hagan	SSE	Observer
Ronan Tafferty	Energia	Observer
Deirdre Hughes	EirGrid	Observer

1. SEMO UPDATE

Secretariat welcomed all to Modifications Committee Meeting 112 reminding of the timelines set to register and the guidelines that are there to request the attendance of an Observer. In person meetings were discussed for the future and it was advised that in line with safety and health guidelines, there would be a balance between in person and online meetings.

The minutes for Modifications Committee Meeting 111 were read and approved.

Secretariat noted that the election process had concluded and welcomed back members who had expired and had been re-nominated. It was advised that Rochelle Broderick would take absence from the Modifications Committee and confirmation of her replacement would be issued in due course.

Secretariat confirmed that an RA Decision was received for Mod_05_22 'SEMO Performance Reporting Frequency' and the Programme of Work had been updated.

Market Development Update

MO Member provided an update on Market Development noting that Release J is in the testing phase and deployment is currently underway. A provisional date of 8th November 2022 has been set and will include Mod_13_19 'Payment for Energy Consumption in SEM for non-energy Services Dispatch' in parallel with settlement system. It was advised that the scope for Release K is closed with the Modification for Undo Scenario provisionally included.

Actions

MO Member confirmed that analysis had been carried out on Mod_17_19 'DSU State Aid Compliance Interim Approach' and the impact on imperfection since its implementation on October 1st, 2020 until July 31st 2022 was in the region of 850K. This was considered of low impact. SEMO confirmed that only a handful of events had occurred to date and the impact on Imperfection could significantly change in the future depending on the outcome of the DSU consultation currently ongoing.

MO Member advised that there were some difficulties with the progression of Mod_14_21 due to a number of factors including the availability of the vendor caused by the additional Release H.1 in Jan 2022 overlapping with the development of Release I. There were also problems with additional pieces included at the

Modification when units are to be considered in merit. This has proven difficult to implement and further work is needed to come to a feasible version. Further discussions have taken place with the Regulatory Authorities regarding the implementation of the Modification noting that a more appropriate price to use as reference could be the Imbalance Settlement Price rather than the Strike Price. It was advised that the Modification needs some re-working for it to be implemented.

RA Member noted that the Modification is not implementable because of PINC and the correct term needs to be sought to replace it. And that given the need to amend the mod, it would be appropriate to also consider the use of PStrike and whether it is aligned with the SEM-22-030 consultation. It was advised that the RA decision would have to be to send this Modification back for further work however if an agreement could be reached on the correct legal drafting, an extraordinary meeting could be sought to expedite sending the amended version for RA decision and, if approved, the implementation at least of the manual workaround. It was discussed whether the correct incremental price to be used could be the first in the COD submission or the last up to the availability with Generator Member expressing preference for the use of the first available price.

Several Members shared their dissatisfaction with the delay of this Modification and the fact that the Proposer was yet to be informed of the above. RA and SEMO Members both assured the Committee that these discussions only came about very recently and advised that the changes needed to the algebra could be easily worked on. There was agreement that the changes needed to be raised immediately and a manual workaround put in place before the winter period.

There was also that an Extraordinary Meeting would need to be scheduled and Secretariat took and action to convene such a meeting by the end of the following week.

Action:

- RAs, SEMO and the Proposer to convene a meeting to agree revised legal drafting by the end of the week - **Open**
- Secretariat to circulate revised legal drafting as soon as received; - **Open**
- Secretariat to convene an Extraordinary Meeting to further discuss Mod_14_21 - **Open**

<p>MOD_13_19 Payment for Energy Consumption in SEM for non-energy Services Dispatch</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market Operations to progress request for Impact Assessment - Closed
<p>MOD_17_19 DSU State Aid Compliance Interim Approach</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
<p>Mod_14_21 Extension of System Service Flag to include units providing Replacement Reserve in line with the detailed design</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market Operations to progress request for Impact Assessment – Open
<p>Mod_21_21 Undo Instruction Scenario 4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposer to submit a more detailed Impact Assessment – Open

Mod_06_22 Housekeeping Alignment Modification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposer to provide an assessment of compliance with EBGL – Open • Proposer to provide examples of what happens in cases where offer prices are greater than Strike Price – Closed • Proposer to provide more assessments showing scenarios of how both modifications interact - Open
Mod_08_22 Weekly Strike Price Calculation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEMO to provide a resource impact assessment – Open
Mod_09_22 Exclusion of Difference Charges During Non-Ro events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposer to schedule an industry call to progress Modifications – Closed • Proposer to liaise with SEMO for an initial assessment of Materiality analysis - Open

2. DEFERRED MODIFICATION PROPOSALS

MOD_21_21 UNDO INSTRUCTION SCENARIO 4

The Proposer provided an update on this Modification Proposal relating to one of the Undo Scenarios which relates to a specific scenario when a DSYN is issued soon after the sync instruction and prior to the unit reaching MINGEN. The text of the Modification had been verified as conformed to the current system implementation and therefore a vote was required to relieve SEMO of a non-compliance on the matter.

A Generator Member raised a question in relation to a unit that had been given a sync instruction and if the unit would receive a startup cost. MO Member advised that in all scenarios where the output was ‘error in slope’ no profile would be calculated therefore no startup cost. If an incorrect profile were to be produced as a result of the defect SEMO’s testing showed the start would not be recognized as MINGEN was not reached and start up would not be assigned however, the heat status of the unit would also remain unchanged. Generator Member queried if the Modification was not in place and the event occurred would it be possible to raise it as a settlement query or dispute to recover the missed payments. MO Member confirmed this, and that should the Modification be voted it would not be possible to raise queries in those scenarios.

Decision

This proposal was Recommended for Approval with a majority vote.

Recommended for Approval by Majority Vote		
Paul McGuckin	Flexible Participant Member	Approve
Robert McCarthy	DSU Member	Approve
Eoghan Cudmore	Supplier Alternate	Approve
Sean McParland	Generator Member	Approve

Andrew Burke	Renewable Generator Member	Approve
Rochelle Broderick	Supplier Member	Approve
Brigid Reilly	Supplier Alternate	Approve
Bryan Hennessy	Supplier Member	Approve
Stacy Feldmann	Generator Member	Approve
Paraic Higgins (Chair)	Generator Member	Reject
Cormac Fagan	Assetless Alternate	Approve
Cormac Daly	Generator Member	Reject

Actions:

- Secretariat to draft a Final Recommendation Report - **Open**

MOD_02_22 COST RECOVERY WHEN UNDER TEST V2

The Proposer provided an update on this Modification noting that further work was required to update documents outside the T&SC such as TSO unit under test procedure etc. It was advised that the current rules in relation to cost recovery were a problem and that this modification provided a neater solution.

The Proposer noted there were two elements to this Modification, the first being zero PNs submitted while dispatched to an agreed profile which was brought up in the April Modifications Committee Meeting. The second was a settlement change and a unit which is unable to recover its cost. The Proposer provided assurance that they were not looking to make a profit on the unit but just to recover its cost and the new calculation would not entitle units to a premium charge.

The Proposer referred to the proposal put forward by TSO where generators would notify the test and agree on the preferred times to test if price doesn't allow for an adequate cost recovery. It was advised that in cases where generators may want to defer, there was no path to how generators could recover costs and therefore it did not address the real issue.

The Proposer had offline conversations with DSU member and Interconnector administrator, and they were happy to be exempted for the application of the Modification, however DSU Member clarified that this is based on the current DSU standing in the T&SC which could change based on the ongoing DSU consultation. Any change would need to be considered in the context of the output of that consultation.

The Proposer also commented on the question of impact on Imperfections noting that there were too many variables to be able to quantify but having addressed the profit side as well as the costs should help matters. The potential increase of unnecessary testing was also mentioned by the Proposer stating that if Generators increased testing frequency, removing that Generator from the energy market would cost more.

The TSO noted concerns previously raised with the proposer verbally and via Email, such as the impact on imperfections costs and the extra administrative workload being transferred to the control rooms, especially given that, for many practical reasons generators often require short notice changes to testing. The TSO agreed with proposer that impact on Imperfection costs couldn't be easily quantified using historical data but stressed that that approval of this modification would add significant costs to the current scale of imperfections

cost due to the automatic cover of all under test costs in all circumstances which would equate to a blank cheque to generators. The TSO also noted that the alternative proposal, by the TSOs, whereby PNs would be set to zero, and test profiles entered by the TSOs, was only meant to be for exceptional circumstances, whereby the TSO require a unit back urgently, but the unit wanted to defer, as it could not recover its costs at that time. Given the existing workload and other competing priorities within the control rooms, this modification would likely make the testing process more rigid and formal for all parties, thereby removing the opportunity for ad hoc and opportunistic testing. Concerns were also raised by the TSO that this modification could create a perverse incentive for a unit to go under test and noted that this modification would likely have an impact on testing tariffs which have remained very low to date in recognition that the process was well self-regulated by generators so far the current paper on Testing Tariff published by the TSO might need to be reviewed in light of the possible outcome of this Modification.

The Proposer believed that there was no obvious reason on why the under test behaviour would change but agreed that this could be reviewed further if required.

Decision

This Proposal was Recommended for Approval.

Recommended for Approval by Majority Vote		
Paul McGuckin	Flexible Participant Member	Abstain
Robert McCarthy	DSU Member	Approve
Eoghan Cudmore	Supplier Alternate	Approve
Sean McParland	Generator Member	Approve
Andrew Burke	Renewable Generator Member	Approve
Rochelle Broderick	Supplier Member	Approve
Brigid Reilly	Supplier Alternate	Approve
Bryan Hennessy	Supplier Member	Approve
Stacy Feldmann	Generator Member	Approve
Paraic Higgins (Chair)	Generator Member	Approve
Cormac Fagan	Assetless Alternate	Abstain
Cormac Daly	Generator Member	Approve

Actions:

- Secretariat to draft a Final Recommendation Report – **Open**

MOD_06_22 HOUSEKEEPING ALIGNMENT MODIFICATION V2

The Proposer provided a [presentation](#) on this Modification noting that it seeks to rectify the undo interaction between Mod_01_20 and Mod_02_21. It was noted that the change proposed under this Modification wouldn't affect price formation. The Proposer provided assurance that the legal drafting had not changed from the original version and Version 2 contained additional explanation and examples as requested by Participants at the previous meeting. The Proposer also stated that they didn't consider this Modification to be in breach of EBGL

Assetless Member raised concerns that this proposal would cap the Strike Price and would not allow the imbalance price to go beyond it. Also, the point was raised that it is not correct that non-energy action should not be part of the stack in all circumstances and that Mod_02_21 had limitations as could not distinguish between energy and non-energy actions. Also, questions remain on the compliance with EBGL. The Proposer refuted those observation stating that the strike is already an artificial cap like price ceiling. Assetless Member replied that they are not comparable because the price ceiling is 11,000€ so at a different scale altogether from the Strike Price and no offer would exceed the ceiling while they might exceed the Strike Price. Furthermore, in the example provided should the Modification have been in place the price would have come from the opposite direction of the NIV which would not have been the right signal.

Generator Member expressed support for the Mod and for the fact that non energy actions should not be setting the price.

DSU Member mentioned that following offline conversations with the proposer they had concerns that the Modification is moving beyond the intended aim because it affects all actions and that would be too much; it would be preferable to have a more focused approach.

The Proposer noted that an updated presentation was circulated just before the meeting with two alternative legal drafting's that would make it more targeted and Members may need more time to review it.

They also agreed that that the original legal drafting may be too broad, and it needed to address the conflict within Mod_02_21 specific to the Interconnector. The Ras advised that the original Modification wasn't very clear on how the unintended interaction between Modifications occurred and would prefer to see a finalized alternative proposal before voting. Mod_01_20 applied to all units not just the Interconnector so it would be useful to have some explanation on why Interconnector should be treated differently in terms of Mod_01_20.

Chair also expressed concerns of any interaction with the recent QPAR decision by the Ras and that both are very similar in what they are trying to achieve.

Other Members expressed support for the proposal but preferred to see the alternative version in more details. Discussion followed on whether that should come as V3 of the current Mod or a new submission.

Decision

This Proposal was deferred.

Actions:

-
- SEMO to discuss with SSE the changes to the proposal and if a new proposal / withdrawal will be needed or a V3 is adequate- **Open**

MOD_07_22 INDEXATION TO CALCULATION OF CAPACITY PAYMENTS FOR NEW CAPACITY

The Proposer provided a presentation on this Modification advising that there were changes submitted in the V2 of the Mod following an Industry Call on Monday, 18th July 2022. It was advised that this Modification will help to mitigate the risk that projects securing new capacity contracts will be unable to build as a result of unprecedented rising inflation costs. It was also recognized that this Modification had a significant impact and as such would need careful consideration by the SEMC.

A Generator Member believed that this Modification would change payment terms after the relevant Capacity Auction has taken place and is therefore a retrospective change. It was their view that it shouldn't become effective until after the relevant Capacity Auction. The Proposer replied that they had sought legal advice and the proposal was legally sound and robust

Assetless Member stated that Capacity Auction clear at Price Cap each time and that should allow to build in considerable edge room, if that is not happening then the problem is with the calculation of the Price Cap rather than impacting the price post auction. The proposer disagreed that the Price Cap provide a large band width the Capacity Market Code clearly allow for exceptions to be applied in the T&SC so these should be used in these exceptional circumstances.

The Proposer advised that inflation has been negligible in the region of 0.6% for the past decade and it would have been impossible to forecast the current levels likely to go as high as 15% or more according to some forecasts, posing a serious risk to development of projects at a time of security of supply and that needs to be factored into the decision.

Several Members agreed with this Modification in principal but noted that the risk needed to be addressed appropriately along with wider security supply and delivery of capacity. DSU Member agreed with the proposal in principle but there were some clarifications needed on the algebra included in the legal drafting as there is an overlap in the periods used which would compound inflation on different ranges of periods. Some of the definitions would also need to be clarified to provide a distinction and SEMO also noted that the new terms should be included in the Glossary.

Flexible Generator Member expressed concerns at the VAT blend of 50/50 between NI and ROI as this could significantly diverge going forward. The Proposer replied that was a simplification as it would be difficult to assign an exact figure that would last, this was the least controversial.

A question by Supplier Member was raised on whether any scenario had been run on the potential inflation rates and their impact on the lifespan of a project. The Proposer mentioned that analysis has been carried out and inflation would be very noticeable on the first few years and over the life of the project would come down.

It was agreed that clarification was needed on the definition of Relevant Capacity Year, rounding to nearest half year and glossary definitions. The Proposer agreed that these clarifications could be included in the minuting process and a new version would be worked in collaboration with the DSU Member and submitted for voting at the next meeting

Decision

This Proposal was deferred.

Actions:

- Proposer to work with DSU Member on a revised legal drafting - **Open**
- Proposer and SEMO to review clarifications and decide on whether to withdraw Modification or submit an alternative version - **Open**

MOD_08_22 WEEKLY STRIKE PRICE CALCULATION

Regrettably time did not allow for discussion of this Proposal. This Proposal will be added to the agenda for the next meeting taking place on Thursday, 20th October 2022. Secretariat offered apologies and has requested that Members pro-actively engage with the Proposer in advance of the next meeting to convey questions and comments on this Proposal.

MOD_09_22 EXCLUSION OF DIFFERENCE CHARGES DURING NON-RO EVENTS

The Proposer provided an update on this Modification noting that this was presented at Modifications Committee Meeting 111 and a recent Industry Call held on Tuesday, 23rd August 2022. A background was provided on the proposal and similarities were made to Mod_02_19 which was previously approved by the Committee.

Assetless Member voiced concerns that there was previous disagreement from the Ras in relation to this Modification and queried if these concerns had been addressed.

RA Member advised there was an alternative approach from the other open modifications on Strike Price to better address the issue that this Modification was looking to resolve. RA Member advised that they did not agree with the principal of this Modification because the Strike Price is based on the efficiencies of a unit which currently is set at a low level of 15%. This means that not all units should recover their costs because of the investment incentive should go to units with higher efficiency.

The Proposer reiterated their view that all three Modifications were needed and that even moving the calculation to weekly would not address the current events where gas price has been seen to go from 130€ to 360€ in a matter of hours. Also, Supplier are not affected by this change so it is not fair that the exposure would be on the Generators only.

It was agreed that the Proposer and the Ras would further discuss this Modification offline.

Decision

This Proposal was deferred.

Actions:

- Proposer to discuss principle of Modification Proposal in more detail with RAs - **Open**

3. NEW MODIFICATION PROPOSALS

MOD_10_22 STRIKE PRICE VOLATILITY MODIFIER

Regrettably time did not allow for discussion of this Proposal. This Proposal will be added to the agenda for the next meeting taking place on Thursday, 20th October 2022. Secretariat offered apologies and has requested that Members pro-actively engage with the Proposer in advance of the next meeting to convey questions and comments on this Proposal.

MOD_11_22 PERMITTING THE USE OF EMAIL TO COMMUNICATE CREDIT COVER CHANGES ON DEMAND GUARANTEES

The Proposer provided an update on this Modification noting that Mod_01_22 Balance Surety Demand Guarantee had been approved to add a further form of acceptable collateral called a Surety or Demand Guarantee.

It was advised that currently the T&SC contains a requirement for Demand Guarantee to carry out communication in the form of swift payments by financial institutions and it was found that insurance undertakings could not use swift. It was noted that this Modification will permit email as an alternative form of communications with SEMO. Also, a correction to the definition of Demand Guarantees brought it in line with letter of Credit as they do not need an EEA approval.

MO Observer listed some process changes they would have to implement as a result of this Modification including manual tracking of the Demand Guarantees, while Letter of Credit are managed fully by the SEM Bank. MO Member also noted that Demand Guarantees are financial products product offered by Banks in addition to Insurance Undertakings and that this proposal lacks a template specific to those. This would have to be drafted by a banking institution as it would be very specific to the banking sector.

Following a vote on the Modification Proposal, the MO Member noted that the Proposer failed to mention that minor comments and adjustment to the language of the Demand Guarantee Templates in Appendix A were received by the SEM Bank and those will be circulated for comments by the Members in order to be included in the FRR.

MO Member also raised an issue with Insurance Undertakings that do not have a branch in the Dublin or Belfast area. This creates a risk in case urgent communications are required during software or outlook failure. Currently Letter of Credit Providers have the failsafe of the SEM Bank which are mandated by requirements in the tender process to have a branch in either Dublin or Belfast. In case of system failure documents can be manually couriered between SEMO and the SEM Bank who also has dedicated PC for business continuity. This safety net will not be available with Demand Guarantee because there is no requirement for a locational branch. The Member were requested to consider this risk and whether they would require SEMO to raise an additional Modification to rectify this inconsistency, it was generally accepted that this poses a low risk and no additional Proposal would be required.

Decision

This Proposal was Recommended for Approval.

Recommended for Approval by Unanimous Vote		
Paul McGuckin	Flexible Participant Member	Approve
Robert McCarthy	DSU Member	Approve
Eoghan Cudmore	Supplier Alternate	Approve
Sean McParland	Generator Member	Approve
Andrew Burke	Renewable Generator Member	Approve
Rochelle Broderick	Supplier Member	Approve
Brigid Reilly	Supplier Alternate	Approve
Bryan Hennessy	Supplier Member	Approve
Stacy Feldmann	Generator Member	Approve
Paraic Higgins (Chair)	Generator Member	Approve

Cormac Fagan	Assetless Alternate	Approve
Cormac Daly	Generator Member	Approve

Actions:

- Secretariat to draft a Final Recommendation Report – **Open**
- Proposer to circulate SEM Bank comments on the Modification to Committee prior to finalizing the FRR - **Open**

4. AOB/UPCOMING MODIFICATIONS

Secretariat thanked all for attending Meeting 112 and gave a reminder that Modifications Committee Meeting 113 would be held on Thursday, 20th October 2022 and an Emergency Modifications Meeting will be organized as soon as possible.

APPENDIX 1 – PROGRAMME OF WORK AS DISCUSSED AT MEETING 112		
Status as at 6 September 2022		
Modification Proposals ‘Recommended for Approval’ without System impacts		
Title	Sections Modified	Sent
N/A	N/A	N/A
Modification Proposals ‘Recommended for Approval’ with 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 Proposals ‘Recommended for Rejection’		
N/A	N/A	N/A
RA Decision ‘Further Work Required’		
N/A	N/A	N/A
RA Decision Approved Modifications with System 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
RA Decision Approved Modifications with no System Impacts		
Title	Sections Modified	Effective Date
Mod_05_22 SEMO Performance Reporting Publication Frequency	B, Appendix E	2 nd September 2022
RA 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
AP Notifications		
N/A	N/A	N/A
Withdrawal Notifications		
N/A	N/A	N/A
Modification Proposal Extensions		
N/A	N/A	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting 113 – 20 October 2022 – Conference Call 		

