



## Single Electricity Market

### MODIFICATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

MEETING 97

BELFAST

20 FEBRUARY 2020

10.30 – 12.30PM

---

#### 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. Review of Actions .....5

3. Deferred Modification Proposals .....6

**MOD\_13\_19 PAYMENT FOR ENERGY CONSUMPTION IN SEM FOR NON-ENERGY SERVICES .....6**

**DISPATCH.....6**

**MOD\_14\_19 INTERCONNECTOR REPRESENTATION ON THE MODIFICATIONS COMMITTEE .....7**

**MOD\_15\_19 CLARIFICATION TO THE DESCRIPTION OF THE ROLE OF THE DISPUTE RESOLUTION BOARD UNDER THE TSC .....7**

**MOD\_01\_20 PMEAS NO ENERGY ACTION SAME DIRECTION AS NIV .....7**

**MOD\_02\_20 HOUSEKEEPING FEB 2020 .....9**

5. AOB/Upcoming events .....10

Appendix 1 – Programme of Work as Discussed at Meeting 97 .....14

## Document History

Version	Date	Author	Comment
1.0	27 <sup>th</sup> February 2020	Modifications Committee Secretariat	Issued to Modifications Committee for review and approval
2.0	5 <sup>th</sup> March 2020	Modifications Committee Secretariat	Committee and Observer review complete

## Distribution List

Name	Organisation
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
<a href="#">Balancing Market Rules – Trading and Settlement Code &amp; Agreed Procedures</a>
<a href="#">Mod_13_19 Payment for Energy Consumption in SEM for non-energy Services Dispatch</a>
<a href="#">Mod_14_19 Interconnector representation on the Modifications Committee</a>
<a href="#">Mod_15_19 Clarification to the description of the role of the Dispute Resolution Board under the TSC</a>
<a href="#">Mod_01_20 PMEA No Energy Action Same Direction as NIV</a>
<a href="#">Presentation</a>
<a href="#">Mod_02_20 Housekeeping Feb 2020</a>

## In Attendance

Name	Company	Position
<b>Modifications Committee (voting members)</b>		
Cormac Daly	Tynagh Energy Limited	Generator Member
Mark Phelan	Electric Ireland	Supplier Alternate
Sinead O'Hare	Power NI	Generator Member
Ian Mullins	Bord Gais Energy Ltd	Supplier Member
Paraic Higgins (Chair)	ESB GT	Generator Member
Eoin Murphy	ElectroRoute	Assetless Alternate

Rochelle Broderick	Budget Energy	Supplier Alternate
Robert McCarthy	Electricity Exchange	DSU Alternate
Kevin Hannafin	Energia	Generator Member
Eamonn Boland	Brookfield Renewable	Supplier Alternate
<b>Modifications Committee (Non-Voting Members)</b>		
Gina Kelly	CRU	RA Alternate
Adelle Watson	NIE Networks	MDP Member
Christopher Goodman	SEMO	MO Member
Katia Compagnoni	SEMO	MO Alternate
Brian Malone	EirGrid	TSO Alternate
James Long	ESB Networks	MDP Member
Karen Shiels	Uregni	RA Alternate
Vivienne Price	SONI	TSO Alternate
<b>Secretariat</b>		
Sandra Linnane	SEMO	Secretariat
Esther Touhey	SEMO	Secretariat
<b>Observers</b>		
Kerri Webb	NIE Networks	Observer
Stacy Feldmann	SSE	Observer
Joseph Devlin	Power NI	Observer
John Tracey	EirGrid	Observer
Adam Fitzpatrick	CRU	Observer
Simon Grimes	EirGrid	Observer
Diarmaid O’Foghlu	EirGrid	Observer
Jude Nugent	SONI	Observer

## 1. SEMO UPDATE

The Secretariat welcomed all to Modifications Committee 97. The minutes for Meeting 95 and Meeting 96 were read and approved. The Secretariat welcomed the new TSO Alternate, Brian Malone and Assestless Alternate, Eoin Murphy to the Committee.

The Secretariat went through the Programme of Work confirming that there were ten Final Recommendation Reports out for RA decision. The RAs provided an update confirming that all Modifications had been approved apart from Mod\_03\_18 Autoproducer Credit cover which has an impact assessment outstanding.

The Secretariat advised the Committee that the current code update is being worked on and might not be in line with the next releases as there were currently a number of Modifications on the baseline and this will increase in volume with upcoming decisions. Therefore the code update has commenced and is planned to be published in March.

SEMO provided an update on open actions for Mod\_03\_18 and Mod\_03\_19. SEMO confirmed that there was still no impact assessment for Mod\_03\_18 and this would be progressed once the scope for Release F is finalised with the vendors.

SEMO noted that progress has been made on the open action for Mod\_03\_19. There was an initial delay due to some inconsistencies found in the content of the report being discussed and timing issues noted. These issues will be rectified as a defect fix and the reports published as normal. The vendor has confirmed that on their initial assumption that, with the implementation of Mod\_03\_19, reports 008 would be bundled at the end on the Imbalance Settlement Period, has been withdrawn and publication timelines will remain unchanged. The Modification is now in the priority lists for the next available IT deployments starting from Release G in April 2021.

## 2. REVIEW OF ACTIONS

MOD_03_18 Autoproducer Credit Cover	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEMO to provide vendor impact assessment for existing proposal – <b>Open</b></li> </ul>
MOD_03_19 Amended Application of the Market Back Up Price if an Imbalance Price (s) fails to circulate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEMO to follow up with the vendor regarding potential enhancements to implementation such that publication timings of the Pricing reports are not affected if possible – <b>Closed</b></li> </ul>
MOD_13_19 Payment for Energy Consumption in SEM for non-energy Services Dispatch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEMO and the proposer to investigate feasible ways to implement a solution in the market - <b>Ongoing</b></li> </ul>
MOD_15_19 Clarification to the description of the role of the Dispute Resolution Board under the TSC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposer to review legal drafting and update with changes discussed in the meeting - <b>Closed</b></li> <li>Secretariat to review interim costing for legal review based on legal points noted above – <b>Open</b></li> </ul>
MOD_17_19 DSU State Aid Compliance Interim Approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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- <b>Long Term Action</b></li> <li>Secretariat to draft Final Recommendation Report including legal drafting correction for</li> </ul>

	errant subscript - <b>Closed</b>
MOD_23_19 Modification to allow the Market Operator to seek relief from an obligation under section E.3 to the TSC in exceptional circumstances (until January 2021)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secretariat to convene an Extraordinary Meeting via conference call to discuss the legal drafting of this proposal – <b>Closed</b></li> <li>• Proposer to develop a version 2 of this proposal – <b>Closed</b></li> <li>• Secretariat to draft Final Recommendation Report - <b>Closed</b></li> </ul>
MOD_24_19 Amendment to unsecured bad debt and suspension provisions related to “supplier of last resort”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposer to review timelines for payment of recovered monies and draft a version 2 of this proposal with clarifications if required - <b>Closed</b></li> <li>• Proposer to check and advice regarding communications between SEMO and MDPs where an SoLR event occurs- <b>Closed</b></li> <li>• Secretariat to draft Final Recommendation Report - <b>Closed</b></li> </ul>

### 3. DEFERRED MODIFICATION PROPOSALS

#### MOD\_13\_19 PAYMENT FOR ENERGY CONSUMPTION IN SEM FOR NON-ENERGY SERVICES DISPATCH

The TSO Alternate provided a summary on behalf of the Proposer on the background to this Modification Proposal which looks to explore options to provide compensation for energy consumed whilst providing voltage support. The TSO Alternate explained that there have been discussions with the MDP and a solution to getting the data had not been found and the initial high level impact assessment shows that this would take up to 2-3 years to implement. There were various options on how to treat the data once received but an enduring solution had not yet been found and a request was made for more time to seek these solutions.

A Generator Member noted that this Modification Proposal had been deferred once again and suggested that this may be the wrong forum for this change and it may be something that needs to be developed in the DS3 space. The TSO Alternate noted that this case had been made when the Modification was initially presented and it was a debatable issue. A SEMO Representative noted that the difficulty was mainly due to the fact that the TSO could not tender for this service as they were not providing a payment but only a cost recovery for the demand consumption and having that within the Balancing Market would make the process more transparent. Also it was noted that due to differences in meter’s installations, TSO Meter’s channel could be modified to provide adequate data but the difficulties was mostly on the DSO side. Meetings had been arranged with MDPs to discuss some ideas on what can be done to overcome such difficulties.

An MDP Member advised that meters need to capture this information and from a system point of view he noted that there could be challenges. Another MDP member agreed with this point stating that meters would need to be reconfigured as well as settlement systems and this would not be a simple task. The MDPs recommended further engagement with the TSO on this issue over the next few weeks and suggested a call to discuss it further including possible manual solutions.

A discussion ensued around timelines for progression. The Secretariat gave an overview of the extension process if more time was required for the above investigation and assurance was given that progression on the resolution of the Settlement can run in parallel with the current discussions on metered data.

#### Decision

---

This Proposal was deferred.

**Actions:**

- TSO to review the reasons why they can or cannot proceed with this service in DS3 - **Open**
- MDPs and TSOs to continue to explore ways to get the data to the Balancing Market including potential manual options - **Open**

#### MOD\_14\_19 INTERCONNECTOR REPRESENTATION ON THE MODIFICATIONS COMMITTEE

The Secretariat confirmed that a Working Group will be held following this Modification Committee Meeting.

#### *Decision*

---

This Proposal was deferred.

**Actions:**

- Actions noted in Working Group 2 Report.

#### MOD\_15\_19 CLARIFICATION TO THE DESCRIPTION OF THE ROLE OF THE DISPUTE RESOLUTION BOARD UNDER THE TSC

The Secretariat provided an update on an action in relation to interim costing for legal review. Apologies were given that no figure was available due to current framework negotiations which were taking place within the Legal Department. The importance of progressing this action was noted and this issue has been escalated internally. The Secretariat hoped that this framework would be in place by the Modifications Committee Meeting on 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2020 and any updates on these figures could be discussed at an Extraordinary Meeting (or information call) before April if required.

#### *Decision*

---

This Proposal was deferred.

## 4. NEW MODIFICATION PROPOSALS

#### MOD\_01\_20 PMEA NO ENERGY ACTION SAME DIRECTION AS NIV

The Proposer delivered a [presentation](#) providing a background on this Modification Proposal which seeks to amend how the Marginal Energy Action Price (PMEA) is determined when there are no un-flagged energy actions in the same direction as the Net Imbalance Volume (NIV). The Proposer noted that this happens frequently when the system is short (positive NIV). Under the current drafting of the Code only one un-flagged energy action is needed to set the PMEA regardless of the direction of the action. The proposed change would utilise the PMEA and Replaced Bid Offer Price (PRBO) logic to change pricing outcomes

---

where there is no un-flagged action in the direction of the NIV regardless of whether or not there are un-flagged actions in the opposite direction.

The Proposer went through the slides discussing the frequency of instances where there is no un-flagged action in the direction of the NIV. They described the proposed change and presented calculations for a worked example. They noted that this Modification would expand on the application of existing PMEA functionality, which sets the PMEA to either PCAP or PFLOOR where there are no un-flagged energy actions in either direction and the NIV is either positive or negative. The proposal is that this logic will cover another set of scenarios so that the PMEA is set to either PCAP or PFLOOR whenever there is no un-flagged energy action in the same direction as the NIV.

The worked example presented by the Proposer detailed how the PMEA would change for an Imbalance Pricing Period with a negative NIV with no un-flagged actions in the direction of the NIV and a single un-flagged incremental action in the opposite direction. The existing logic resulted in the price of the un-flagged action setting the Imbalance Price as a result of becoming the PMEA and replacing the price for the all price setting actions via the PRBO logic since that price is greater than all of the prices of the flagged actions in the direction of the NIV.

The example continued by illustrating how this would differ with the proposed Modification in place since PMEA would become PFLOOR so that the PRBO logic results in the prices of the flagged actions in the direction of the NIV being used since they are greater than the PRBO at PFLOOR. In the presented example the Imbalance Price based on the current rules would have been 250 €/MWh based on the price of the un-flagged action but with the proposed change this would have been 35€/MWh based on the re-introduction of the flagged incremental actions.

The Proposer noted that the change they were seeking was targeted in a way that would only affect Imbalance Pricing outcomes where there are no un-flagged actions in the Direction of the NIV but there are un-flagged actions in the direction opposite to the NIV, noting that this meant that where there are un-flagged actions in both directions it was still possible for actions in the opposite direction to the NIV to be used in calculating the Imbalance Price.

An RA Alternate noted that there is currently a Workshop to take place reviewing compliance with the EU Electricity balancing Guideline (EBGL) and that this Modification will be discussed in terms of whether it interacts with EBGL requirements on setting the Imbalance Price. There was also discussion on what the impact of the proposal was on Imperfection costs via the interaction of changed prices with Premium and Discount payments. The Proposer noted that for their three units they anticipated a reduction in these payments based on some analysis they had completed. A TSO Alternate indicated that they would have to investigate further in order to ascertain the potential impact on Imperfections more generally. The potential for interactions with the Clean Energy Package was also noted. A SEMO Member echoed the need to fully understand the implications of the Modification Proposal. They noted that EBGL compliance could necessitate changes to the pricing logic so that it would be efficient to consider this change in that context to avoid potentially making multiple separate changes in the same area. They also expressed the view that it was important to understand the principles underpinning all of the pricing scenarios which the proposal would impact. This was in the context that the instances where there are no un-flagged actions in the direction of the NIV may be indicative of the constrained nature of the system and therefore the pricing signals which this proposal seeks to address could actually be considered appropriate. This was echoed by a number of Generators Members adding that that if this is the case and the price outcomes are considered an issue, then the appropriate way to address them may be the introduction of more flexibility on the system and within the generation fleet in response to this signal. A Generator Member acknowledged this view and noted their concern that making this change might mean that in future, a valid price signal could be lost were there to be instances whereby there are no un-flagged actions in the direction of the NIV but multiple un-flagged actions in the opposite direction that do not set the price as a result of the proposal. An Assetless Alternate stated that they shared this concern.

A number of Members noted that whilst the Proposed Modification appears targeted and they welcomed the efforts to propose an elegant change, they would need to investigate further in order to fully understand the detail of the change both in terms of its material impact and the fundamental pricing principles with which it interacts

Members of the Committee discussed the analysis that was required to explore the impact of the Proposed Modification on Imbalance Prices and Premium and Discount payments and the time that was needed for this. The Proposer confirmed that they had carried out some analysis on a limited range of dates. Both SEMO and the Proposer agreed to work together on this analysis and it was noted that Members should seek to also carry out some analysis to better understand the implications of the proposal. It was noted that the EBGL and Clean Energy Package should also be reviewed for any interaction. A SEMO Member suggested that, since the pricing analysis would be onerous to be carried out on large date ranges, they would seek to try to target the analysis to a broad range of different Imbalance Pricing scenarios in terms of NIV size and direction, high/low wind and load scenarios etc. as opposed to looking solely at a broad and continuous date range.

A discussion took place around the timeline for an impact assessment and system changes following this were the proposal to be pursued. A Generator Member suggested that a system impact assessment could be pursued in parallel with the further analysis in order to avoid any unnecessary delay if the proposed Modification is to be progressed. A SEMO member stated that, although they are guided by the Committees' preference they had some concerns with this. They noted that were the proposal to change before being voted, then a further impact assessment would be required and that given the current environment whereby there are so many changes being progressed this might divert vendor resources from other important work. They also noted that given the large body of work that is being undertaken that it was likely that it would take time for an impact assessment to be progressed, even if it were requested immediately, so that it may be more efficient to wait until further analysis is presented at the next meeting to further inform any potential system change, particularly given that this was unlikely to have any significant impact on the delivery timeline for any change, which would have to go through a prioritisation process for consideration in a future release in any event. SEMO provided assurance that the vendor has seen a reduction in new defects being identified which could free up more time for change requests going forward. The Committee agreed to delay pursuing an impact assessment for the time being and also to defer the proposal pending follow up actions to further investigate the implications of the change. It was agreed that to avoid further delays any analysis should be circulated as soon as available as opposed to wait until the next Modification meeting.

### *Decision*

This Proposal was deferred.

#### **Actions:**

- SEMO, RAs and members to review EBGL and Clean Energy Package for any interactions – **Open**
- SEMO and Proposer to complete analysis on the impact on Imbalance Pricing and circulate as soon as practicable – **Open**
- SEMO and TSOs to analyze impact on Premium and Discount payments and Imperfections – **Open**
- Members to carry out analysis/investigation to better understand the implications of the proposal and share it with the Panel as soon as available - **Open**

#### **MOD\_02\_20 HOUSEKEEPING FEB 2020**

The Proposer provided a summary of the changes included in this proposal confirming that all items were pure housekeeping. These changes were minor corrections to errors in the Code. An explanation was given

in particular to the addition of a new definition for Strike Price which was included due to queries received. Strike Price was previously defined within the Glossary's Variables only but it adds to the clarity of the Code to have a separate definition in the main Glossary with reference to the relevant section, in line with how other prices are defined. There were no further questions and the Panel proceeded to a vote.

**Decision**

This Proposal was Recommended for Approval.

Recommended for Approval by Unanimous Vote		
Rochelle Broderick	Supplier Alternate	Approve
Eamonn Boland	Supplier Alternate	Approve
Cormac Daly	Generator Member	Approve
Mark Phelan	Supplier Alternate	Approve
Sinead O'Hare	Generator Member	Approve
Ian Mullins	Supplier Member	Approve
Kevin Hannafin	Generator Member	Approve
Eoin Murphy	Assetless Alternate	Approve
Robert McCarthy	DSU Alternate	Approve
Paraic Higgins (Chair)	Generator Member	Approve

**Actions:**

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

**5. AOB/UPCOMING EVENTS**

**Settlement Update**

The Settlement team delivered a presentation on a new Modification Proposal which they intend to progress. The Proposer gave a background to this Modification Proposal relating to the effects on Participant's Credit Cover calculation in case of delays in indicative runs. The Settlement team is seeking to change the Code in order to be allowed to take actions to mitigate when these errors are taking place provided that SEMO has received the Metered Data for the affected days and that represents at least 95% of the Traded Amount of the relevant Unit. It was noted that there have only been a few instances of delay in processing and these were mainly seen in October 2019.

A DSU Alternate commended the idea but stated he had some issues with the scenario presented. It was also pointed out that there were a number of Modifications about Trading Not Delivered Exposure and trying

---

to adjust the impact on Participants while failing to address the real issue of whether Traded Not Delivered captures the correct exposure. This was a concern from a Participant perspective.

A discussion took place around the 95% delivery which was believed to be adequate for thermal Generators but less useful to non-predictable Generators due to forecasting errors in the metering and therefore it was too high a threshold. The Proposer noted this was a fail-safe figure which could be reviewed, however from a Market point of view a balance needed to be reached in trying to safeguard the Balancing Market without being too onerous on Participants having to be constantly over-collateralised. A Generator Member expressed concerns that the requirement for this Modification was a symptom that Settlement would be regularly delayed. SEMO's Representative explained that this Modification did not diminish the publishing timelines obligations on the Market Operator but seeks to intervene when system issues might cause unnecessary pressure on a Participant. Also this was becoming more evident on new units due to delay in validating metering at the initial stage. The MDP Member explained that could take few weeks in which case the incorrect data could cause liquidity issues for a prolonged period. The MDP Member explained that they are currently looking at their process to avoid this in the future. There were requests for the slides to be circulated and the Secretariat confirmed that this would be done in due course for all material presented at the meetings. A Supplier Member asked if a lowering in percentage from 95% would cause an increase in settlement activities that Participants should take into consideration when commenting on this proposal, but the Proposer explained that the number of CCINs were limited and were not worked on by the same people trying to address the Settlement issues therefore it will not major impact. A Generator Member also asked whether the Traded Not Delivered Quantity follows the trajectory of Dispatch Instructions. If this was not the case, even a thermal Generator might be affected by incorrect collateral calculation in case of missing Indicative Settlement runs. The Proposer took an action to confirm this and include Dispatch Instructions in the assessment if necessary.

#### **Actions:**

- Proposer to review the Traded Not Delivered calculation to verify if it accounts of Dispatch Instructions – **Open**
- Proposer to quantify the current impact on over-collateralisation to Participants is – **Open**
- MDPs to validate and verify processes for Meter data for new units – **Open**
- Secretariat to circulate slides for this presentation - **Open**

#### **System Update**

A SONI Observer delivered a presentation which provided a market systems update. It was confirmed that in Release E there are 4 Change Requests (CRs) under test and 60 defects. Only one CR related to a Modification.

An RA Alternate expressed satisfaction that CR089, related to incorrect Exchange Rate applied to NI Participants, was scheduled for Release E and sought confirmation on when funds would be released back to Participants. A SEMO Observer gave assurance that this would be staggered within 6-7 months and the upcoming MOUG on 27<sup>th</sup> February will have exact timelines.

The SONI Observer then went through the CRs scheduled for release F showing 4 related to approved Modifications. A Generator Member asked if CR details were going to be published as done during Market Trials. It was noted that previously a CR update was documented and published on a regular basis and if this could be done again. Market Operations explained that this was previously done as part of the Change Control Process during Market Trial. SEMO took an action to investigate internally on the current process. Another Generator Member mentioned that it was quite difficult to track issues and that items had disappeared from the published Known Issues Report. SEMO voiced concerns that this could have happened and asked for the details of the issue in order to take it any further.

---

**Actions:**

- SEMO to check previous publishing process for Change Requests – **Open**

**TSO Update**

The TSO delivered a presentation on an upcoming Modification Proposal to remove monthly load forecast. It was explained that this initially fed into the old market Capacity calculations and can be very time consuming to produce. The TSO completed an internal review and noted that removing this does not affect any other internal processes.

A Generator Member and MDP Member highlighted the possible benefits of this monthly report noting it can provide greater accuracy particularly in light on a new Modification in the Capacity Market which require a forecast quantity. The TSO representative stated that there were not large variations between the yearly and monthly reports. The Committee requested more information on the variation. SEMO's representative also mentioned that the internal review was that the new Capacity Modification might not need the Monthly Load Forecast as it might look ahead at a larger period of time. Confirmation of this will be needed.

**Actions:**

- Proposer to present an analysis of the variation between yearly and monthly forecasts – **Open**
- SEMO and Members to verify the use of monthly forecast in new Modification to the Capacity Market – **Open**

**Regulatory Authorities Update**

An RA Alternate noted ongoing work in relation to the Clean Energy Package, in particular articles five, twelve and thirteen regarding balance responsibility, Priority Dispatch and redispatch. They noted that consultations regarding these items were being worked on and would be issued during March 2020. Some Members queried whether additional time would be allowed for responses if consultations were open concurrently. An RA Alternate indicated that they would consider this when determining closing dates for responses.

A Generator Member welcomed the update noting that some Participants had concerns in relation to Clean Energy Package related changes and that clarity would be welcomed as soon as possible. A SEMO Member stated that the outcomes of a recent Workshop SEMO had arranged, related to considerations of whether Controllable Priority Dispatch Units could become Dispatchable, may be impacted by these consultations. It was noted that it would be prudent therefore, to wait until the consultations had concluded to consider that issue further.

**SEMO Update**

SEMO provided an update on Mod\_17\_19 DSU state aid compliance. Work on system implementation had identified a further change that was needed in order to accurately reflect aggregation of charges for Settlement Documents which was identified while working through the correct approach for VAT reporting. There will be a review to ensure that any necessary additional changes are implemented and a follow up Modification Proposal to this end is expected for the next meeting in April. As Trading payments and VAT treatments require a complex set of algebra, SEMO will have to look at individual components of the overall charge to ensure that this is captured correctly.

---

The Secretariat thanked all for attending and noted that the next Modifications Meeting will take place on Thursday, 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2020.

<b>APPENDIX 1 – PROGRAMME OF WORK AS DISCUSSED AT MEETING 97</b>		
<b>Status as at 20 February 2020</b>		
<b>Modification Proposals ‘Recommended for Approval’ without System impacts</b>		
<b>Title</b>	<b>Sections Modified</b>	<b>Sent</b>
Mod_16_19 Codification of TSO FNDDS Methodology and System Service Flag for DSU Settlement	F.2.7	Sent for RA decision 11/12/19
Mod_18_19 Clarification to apply Recoverable Start Up Costs to DSUs	F.11.2.2 /4/6	Sent for RA decision 11/12/19
Mod_24_19 Amendments to Unsecured Bad Debt and Suspension Provisions Related to Supplier of Last Resort	G.2.7 Agreed Procedure 15	Sent for RA decision 14/01/20
<b>Modification Proposals ‘Recommended for Approval ’ with System impacts</b>		
Mod_03_18 Autoproducer Credit Cover	G.12.4.4, G.14.7.3, G.14.7.3A, G.14.7.4, G.14.7.5, G.14.7.6, G.14.7.7 G.14.8.1, G.14.10.1, G.14.10.2, G.14.10.3, G.14.10.4, G.14.15.6 and G.15.1.1	Sent for RA decision 07/01/20
Mod_03_19 Amended application of the Market Back Up Price if an Imbalance Price(s) fails to circulate V2	E.2.2.4 and E.5.1.3	Sent for RA decision 11/12/19
Mod_17_19 DSU State Aid Compliance Interim Approach	F and H	Sent for RA decision 07/01/20
Mod_19_19 Determining use of Complex Commercial Offer Data in Settlement when Required Information is not Available	F.3.3.2	Sent for RA decision 11/12/19
Mod_20_19 Changing Day-ahead Difference Quantity to Day-ahead Trade Quantity in Within-day Difference Charge Calculations	F.18.5	Sent for RA decision 11/12/19
Mod_21_19 Loss Adjustment Factor for Interconnectors	F	Sent for RA decision 07/01/20
Mod_22_19 Correction of QUNDELOTOL calculations to convert TOLUG and TOLOG to MWh	F	Sent for RA decision 07/01/20
<b>Modification Proposals ‘Recommended for Rejection’</b>		
N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>RA Decision ‘Further Work Required’</b>		
N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>RA Decision Approved Modifications with System Impacts</b>		

Mod_05_19 Amendment to Uninstructed Imbalance Charge (CUNIMB) to correct for Negative Price Scenarios	F.9.4.1 Part B Glossary List of Variables and Parameters	5 July 2019
Mod_07_19 Correction to No Load Cost “and” vs “or”	F.11.2.3	3 May 2019
Mod_08_19 Clarification to Intraday Difference Quantity and Payment	F.20.2.3	27 Sept 2019
Mod_09_19 Removal of locational constraints from Imbalance Pricing calculation	Appendix N.1	2 May 2019
Mod_10_19 Removal of negative QBOAs related to dispatchable priority dispatch units from the imbalance price	Part B Section D New Paragraph D.4.4.12	Oct 2020 (possible system implementation)
Mod_11_19 Correction to the determination of COP and clarification of CNLR	F.11.2.5, F.11.3.1	27 Sept 2019
Mod_12_19 System Service Flag for Demand Site Units	F.18.6	13 Nov 2019
<b>RA Decision Approved Modifications with no System Impacts</b>		
Mod_33_18 Update to Unit Under Test Process	Part B Section D.7.3  Part B Appendices F and J  Part B Glossary Definitions related to Under Test status  Part B Agreed Procedure 4 Sections 2.4 and 3	2 July 2019
Mod_01_19 Negative Interest in the SEM	Section 6.16-6.19 & 6.35 AP-17 Banking and Participant Payments  Section G.1.4.3 to G.1.4.5 & G.1.5.1 AP-17 Banking and Participant Payments	2 May 2019
Mod_23_19 Modification to allow the Market Operator to seek relief from an obligation under Section E.3 of the TSC in exceptional circumstances (until 1 January 2021)	H.6, B.14, E.3	7 Feb 2020
<b>RA Decision Rejected</b>		
Mod_38_18 Limitation of Capacity Market Difference Payments to Metered Demand	F.20.1.1	12 Nov 2019

<b>AP Notifications</b>		
Mod_04_19 Running Indicative Settlement on all days	2.5.1	AP Notification sent 29/11/19
<b>Withdrawal Notifications</b>		
Mod_32_18 Removal of exposure for in merit generator units against BOA	Appendix N	05 July 2019
Mod_06_19 Determination of the Marginal Energy Action Price where no energy is available in the Net Imbalance Volume	Section E.3.4	17 Oct 2019
<b>Modification Proposal Extensions</b>		
Mod_03_18 Autoproducer Credit Cover	G4 to G15	Extension approved 04/07/19
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Meeting 98 – 23 April 2020 - Dublin</b></li> </ul>		