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# SEMO Update

The Minutes from Meeting 44 & Extraordinary Meeting 45 were read and approved. The final approved version of the Minutes from both Meetings are now published on the SEMO website.

The Secretariat Programme of Work was acknowledged, see appendix 1 for further detail. Supplier Alternate queried as to the status of Mod\_18\_11 *Definition of Availability*. RA Alternate advised that a related TSO consultation paper on availability has not yet been issued. It had been expected that the Consultation would have been published in September. RA Alternate indicated that the intention is for the paper to be published before year end. A decision on Mod\_18\_11 will be issued subsequent to conclusion of the TSO consultation.

SEMO IT representative presented the CMS update advising that SEM R2.0.2 Long Day (DST) was deployed successfully as scheduled on October 23rd, and SEM R2.1.0 was successfully deployed to schedule on Friday November 16th.

SEMO IT representative further advised that the following scope for the April 2013 release (SEM R2.2.0) to has been approved.

|  |
| --- |
| **SEM R2.2.0 - April 2013 Release – Approved Modification Proposals** |
| Mod\_17\_11 Clarifying the requirement to provide Dispatch Instruction for Generator Units |
| Mod\_03\_12 Alignment of TSC with revised VAT arrangements |
| Mod\_17\_12 Report on Offered Capacity in Implicit Auctions |

SEMO IT representative stated that the cut-off date for the October 2013 release to the Central Market Systems is Friday February 22nd 2013. All approved Modification Proposals will be allocated to this release (subject to available capacity).

SEMO IT representative presented Bi-Annual Release Strategy Slides advising that the ESA is expiring after April 2013. SEMO IT representative acknowledged that uncertainty exists over the future appetite for change, given initiatives underway at present (e.g. Market Integration). However T&SC and SDS changes are still being submitted and considered, therefore a mechanism must exist to enable SEMO to implement change if directed.

SEMO IT proposes entering into an agreement with the vendor as follows:

* + Implementation of six bi-annual releases , commencing with the October 2013 release;
	+ Implementation timelines would be unchanged, i.e. April and October;
	+ Each release to have a capacity of 3000 hours of billable work for ABB / Brady – this represents a 50% reduction on the previous agreement and reflects the potential for a reducing level of change going forward;
	+ Release Capacity can flex as required:
	+ Unused capacity from one release would be available for the following release – no loss of hours;
	+ Should additional capacity be required for a release it may be allocated from a subsequent release;

TSO Member queried as to the annual cost incurred by each release. SEMO IT representative advised that a vendor cost of approximately €1.15 million is incurred for a fully subscribed release (6125 hours).

Chair queried as to whether the same systems can be assumed for a change as significant as Market Integration. SEMO IT representative advised that it is difficult to put Market Integration and typical Modification Proposal changes in parallel. The presented release proposal considers changes to the current CMS only.

SEMO IT representative clarified that if all of the hours are not utilised, the cost incurred will not be reimbursed, however certain arrangements may be looked at in the contract to mitigate risk of loss, e.g. transfer of unused hours to Extended Support, rather than ending the contract in April 2016 it may be ended at Dec 2016 etc.

Supplier Alternate queried as to whether there are other vendors capable of doing the work. SEMO IT representative clarified that this occurs in one other market (IMO Western Australia). This alternate vendor however only implements very minor changes, is local to the operational site and have a full team on site. In addition there may be differences around intellectual property rights to the systems and there would be a risk involved in utilising a different vendor as they would not have the same level of expertise with the systems.

MO Member clarified that in order to attain the most competitive deal, an open tender process would be utilised for Market Integration.

Chair queried as to whether SEMO IT’s discussion with the RAs have included a possible moratorium for changes to the Market Rules, and whether 3,000 hours per release could be excessive. SEMO IT representative advised that it is their understanding that no “major market change” (such as those similar in scope to the IDT release) will be included prior to 2016. RA Alternate advised that no moratorium is in place and that any moratorium would likely require a Code Modification. RA Alternate suggested that a balance needs to be struck in deciding on the number of hours to purchase. Given that the hours are take or pay it would be undesirable to have a large number of hours left over at the end of the contract. SEMO IT representative advised that if the proposed agreement is implemented (300 hour capacity), the release cut-off date could be placed closer to the Go-Live dates leading to a faster turnaround for change.

# Review of Actions

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mod ID** | **Action** | **Comment** |
| **Extraordinary Meeting 45** |
| Mod\_21\_12 Amendment to Available Transfer Capacity (ATC) Definition | * Secretariat to ensure FRR includes legal drafting changes agreed at Meeting.
* Move “and” in Sections 5.42(2) and 5.43(2) to the end of 5.42(3) and 5.43(3).
 | * Closed
 |
| Mod\_24\_12 Amendments to the MIUN Calculator to Address Instances of Excessive Area | * Secretariat to ensure FRR includes legal drafting changes as agreed at Meeting.
* Change Last Run Start and Last Run Stop to Previous Run Start and Previous Run Stop (Slide 9)
* Instances of Excessive Area Volume should be changed to Excessive Area.
 | * Closed
 |
| **Dormant Actions** |
| Mod\_18\_10: Intra-Day Trading | Conference Call 8 - 29 Nov 2011* SEMO to progress Option 3 as the preferred option and to monitor its effectiveness.
 | Open-Dormant action again in 6 months.( May 2013)At Conference Call 8 it was agreed to progress Option 3 (Persist COD from the last period (05:30) of WD1 Trading Window) with the proviso that it could be revisited if found not to be the most effective solution. Dormant action created to appear on the Mods Meeting agenda 6 months after deployment.MO Member advised that as EWIC is not operational and as Moyle has been operating at a reduced capacity, currently there is not a significant amount of data to assess. MO Member suggested that the action remains dormant and reappears on the agenda in 6 months time.Supplier Alternate queried as to whether it is more efficient for the action to appear 3 months after EWIC Go-Live in order to have sufficient data to assess.Chair advised that as the issue may not be related to EWIC it is prudent to re-address the item in 6 months time.MO Member stated that if any issues occur during the 6 month period, they will be flagged with Participants. |
| **Action Items from Mod\_11\_12 Definition of Special Units WG 2** |
| Mod\_11\_12 Definition of Special Units | * RA Alternate to check if options present difficulties from a licensing perspective.
* GES to forward additional information on Option 2 prior to impact assessment.
* SEMO to impact assess option 1 and option 2 following receipt of additional information from GES.
 | * Open-In Progress
* Open-GES will issue information to Secretariat
* Open-In Progress
 |
| **Meeting 44** |
| Mod\_20\_12 Timelines in Relation to the Scheduling of Ad Hoc Resettlement following an upheld query | * SEMO to address issue of open-endedness of timings for next meeting
 | * Closed
 |
| Mod\_22\_12 Administered Scheduling for General System Failure | * SEMO to examine Glossary definition and its impact on General System Failure
 | * Closed
 |

# Deferred Modification Proposals

## [Mod\_11\_12](http://semopub/MarketDevelopment/ModificationDocuments/Mod_08_12%20MIUNs.docx) Proposal to extend the definition of Special Units to include Compressed Air Energy Storage

*Proposer: Gaelectric*

Secretariat provided an update on the progress of the Working Group (WG) advising that WG members agreed that Options 1 and 2 should be further developed:

* Option 1 – Full Price Making Storage
* Option 2 – Availability Feasible Storage Unit

Secretariat further advised that the below actions placed at Working Group 2 on 23 October remained open:

* RA Alternate to check if options present difficulties from a licensing perspective.
* GES to forward additional information on Option 1 and Option 2 prior to impact assessment.
* SEMO to impact assess option 1 and option 2 following receipt of additional information from GES.

Secretariat provided background of WGs. Secretariat advised that the next meeting of the WG is provisionally scheduled for 24th January. Secretariat noted that any issues with the proposed date for WG3 should be made known as soon as possible.

Supplier Alternate queried as to whether it is under the remit of the WG to place an action on SEMO or the Modifications Committee generally. Supplier Alternate expressed the view that only the Modifications Committee should have authority to action an Impact Assessment (IA).

Secretariat advised that the Committee are given full information of all recommendations made at all WGs, with comprehensive reports issued subsequent to all WGs. Secretariat further advised that previously, WGs have placed actions on SEMO to procure an IA.

Chair advised that setting up a WG which does not have the authority to fully assess the options presented in relation to the proposals would be a counterproductive and inefficient process. Generator Member expressed agreement with this point.

Supplier Member advised that the idea of a WG is to provide a thorough investigation into the topic and present back a full assessment to the Modifications Committee, to ensure they are in a position to make an informed decision on the proposal.

Proposer clarified that GES will submit information on both options and emphasised that CAES is a serious project with GES investing significant resources.

Actions

* Secretariat to draft a Working Group process document to clarify governance of Working Groups.

Decision

* The proposal was deferred

|  |
| --- |
| **Deferred** |

## Mod\_20\_12\_v2 Timelines in relation to the scheduling of Ad Hoc Resettlement following an upheld Query

*Proposer: SEMO*

*AP Only*

MO Member advised that the Modification Proposal is seeking to improve the approach taken in relation to the management of ad hoc Resettlement as a result of upheld formal queries.

Agreed Procedure 13 stipulates that in the event of an upheld formal Query being deemed to have High Materiality or occurring post M+13 timetabled resettlement, the MO must complete such ad hoc re-settlement within 20 Working Days of receipt of revised external data.

MO Member advised that the alternative version of the proposal is clarifying that in the event that ad hoc resettlement is required for a period greater than two Billing Periods for Energy or one billing month for Capacity, Agreed Procedure 13 will allow for an additional 10 Working Days for a suitable timeline for completion of such ad hoc resettlement. MO Member advised that the 10 Working Days stipulated is addressing the issue of open-endedness as raised at the previous meeting.

Generator Member expressed the view that from a Market Participants perspective, the addition of 10 days is not desirable as the preference would be for a faster turnaround for completion of such ad-hoc resettlement. Generator Member queried as to why it is an additional 10 Working Days that is needed.

MO Member advised that the 10 Working Days is an estimate from SEMO Market Operations and that the additional 10 days would be necessary only where large volumes of resettlement need to be completed within tight timeframes. Observer clarified that Market Operations feel that the additional 10 Working Days gives the MO sufficient time to track payments, issue invoices and so on.

MO Member further advised that generally the resettlement is completed on time and that this is the maximum time that would be needed.

Discussion ensued around the wording with the Committee agreeing that the wording as set out in the alternative version was too definite. It was proposed to change the wording in Section 2.2.4 to, “In such circumstances, SEMO, in consultation with Market Participants, may seek up to a maximum of 10 additional Working Days to allow for completion of such Settlement Reruns and issue a relevant update to the Settlement Calendar.”

MO Member clarified that the original 20 Working Days timeline for the usual case where there is not a large amount of resettlement remains as specified in AP 13, and that the extended time period applies only where resettlement is required for two Billing Periods for Trading Payments and Trading Charges or one Capacity Period for Capacity Payments and Capacity Charges and that completion of ad-hoc re-settlement within 20 Working Days remains the MO’s preference.

Actions

* Secretariat to ensure AP Notification includes legal drafting changes as agreed at Meeting

Decision

* The proposal was Recommended for Approval by Unanimous Vote subject to legal drafting

|  |
| --- |
| **Recommended for Approval by Unanimous Vote (subject to legal drafting)** |
| Denis Kelly | MDP Member | Approved |
| Emeka Chukwureh | Supplier Alternate  | Approved |
| Gill Bradley | Generator Alternate | Approved |
| Ian Luney | Generator Member | Approved |
| James Long | MDP Alternate | Approved |
| Jill Murray-Chair | Supplier Member | Approved |
| Kevin Hannafin | Generator Member | Approved |
| Kris Kennedy | SO Alternate | Approved |
| Mary Doorly | Generator Alternate | Approved |
| Niamh Delaney | MO Member  | Approved |
| Patrick Liddy | DSU Member | Approved |
| Sonya Twohig | SO Member | Approved |
| William Carr | Supplier Member | Approved |
| William Steele | Supplier Member | Approved |

## Mod\_22\_12 Setting of MIUNs in the CASE of General System Failure

*Proposer: SEMO*

MO Member outlined alternative version of proposal. This modification proposes to allow the MO to set MIUNs to zero in the case of a General Systems Failure. This is necessary to account for the situation where the Central Market System is unavailable, yet the Market Operator has an obligation to produce MIUNs for Interconnector trading day ahead and within day. MO Member advised that the alternative version of the proposal inserts the clause into the main body of the Code as opposed to amending the Glossary definition of MSP Failure, as was the case with the original proposal.

Supplier Alternate queried as to why the changes being addressed in the original version of the proposal are not incorporated into the alternative version. MO Member clarified that it is not following process to include the original proposal’s text in an alternative version of a proposal, further advising that only the exact changes to text are included in any Modification Proposal, original or alternative.

Actions

* N/A

Decision

* The proposal was Recommended for Approval by Unanimous Vote

|  |
| --- |
| **Recommended for Approval by Unanimous Vote**  |
| Emeka Chukwureh | Supplier Alternate  | Approved |
| Gill Bradley | Generator Alternate | Approved |
| Ian Luney | Generator Member | Approved |
| Jill Murray-Chair | Supplier Member | Approved |
| Kevin Hannafin | Generator Member | Approved |
| Mary Doorly | Generator Alternate | Approved |
| Patrick Liddy | DSU Member | Approved |
| William Carr | Supplier Member | Approved |
| William Steele | Supplier Member | Approved |

## Mod\_23\_12 minimum stable generation correction

*Proposer: SEMO*

MO Member advised that an alternative version of the proposal will be submitted for consideration at the next Modifications Committee Meeting.

Actions

* N/A

Decision

* The proposal was deferred

|  |
| --- |
| **Deferred** |

# New Modification Proposals

## i. Mod\_25\_12 suspension of interconnector unit on instruction of interconnector owner due to breach of access rules

 *Proposer: Mutual Energy*

Interconnector Owner representative outlined proposal advising that currently the T&SC (section 2.97) provides that the Interconnector Administrator shall verify to the Market Operator whether or not the Party (or Applicant, as applicable) is an Interconnector User. At this stage the Interconnector Administrator is confirming that the Party has met the eligibility requirements for the interconnector. There is currently no mechanism whereby this “approval” can be revoked if the party no longer meets the eligibility requirements or is in breach of the access rules. The purpose of this change is to allow the interconnector owner to request that the Market Operator suspends an Interconnector Unit if it no longer meets the eligibility requirements or is in breach of the interconnector Access Rules.

Interconnector Owner representative advised that it would be prudent to defer the proposal as the detail around suspension issues requires further development.

Demand Side Member queried as to whether compliance issues regarding the access rules need investigation. Interconnector Owner representative advised that Interconnector Users cannot submit into the Auction Management Platform (AMP) if they have capacity holdings but are in breach of their Access Rules, whereas this scenario must be addressed on the Within Day systems.

Supplier Alternate queried as to whether the profit calculation assumes that credit cover for interconnector capacity is provided for within a Participant’s Credit Cover within SEM.

Interconnector Owner representative advised that within the SEM, a Participant must have sufficient credit cover to procure power or they cannot operate, however the SEM credit cover requirement does not cover the exposure to capacity charges for imports or exports over the interconnector which will be calculated and invoiced by the Interconnector Operator.

Supplier Alternate expressed concern over the fundamental difference between Explicit and Implicit Capacity holdings advising that there is a possible legal issue with an IC owner instructing SEMO to suspend a Party to the Code.

MO Member advised that Credit Cover is relevant only for trading within the SEM, not as regards the implicit capacity which is owed to the IC owner. MO Member further advised that the Credit Cover related to the AMP is separate to that of the SEM.

Supplier Member commented that it would be imperative to ensure that the suspension would apply only to the relevant Interconnector Unit and not to any other Units which may owned by the Participant. Interconnector Owner acknowledged that this is an issue which needs further investigation.

Supplier Alternate expressed concern that Implicit Capacity is a joint issue for both SEM Participants and the Interconnector Owner and the management of credit cover for implicit auctions may be jointly the responsibility of the Interconnector Owner and SEMO.

Chair advised that liability to the Market from Implicit trading is a concern and advised that the proposer address these issues and how the risks interact between the IC Owner and the market in the alternative proposal.

MO Member commented that SEMO had discussed the proposal with the proposer and took the view that suspension is a very serious step, which could not be taken based solely on a request from the Interconnector Owner, as currently drafted in the modification, but rather a parallel process tracking an initiation of proceedings against a unit in AMP would have to begin simultaneously in SEM.

Actions

* Participants to issue further comments or issues related to proposal by 11th January

Decision

* The proposal was deferred

|  |
| --- |
| **Deferred** |

## II. Mod\_26\_12 notification time for updating interconnector technical data

*Proposer: Interconnector Administrator*

*AP Only*

SO representative explained the proposal with the aid of diagrams from a PowerPoint presentation. As part of the Intra Day Trading (IDT) Modification, Agreed Procedure 2 was updated in relation to the notification time that the Interconnector Administrator (IA) has to provide SEMO for changes to Interconnector Technical Data. The same timeline as used for other registration data which changes infrequently (29 days) was put in place. However 29 days notice is inflexible, as this length of notice period may impact upon trading on the Interconnectors and also the security of the transmission system. The IA proposes that five working days notice (as was the case prior to the IDT modification) is sufficient to inform SEMO and Interconnector Users of any changes to the Interconnector Technical Data.

Supplier Alternate queried as to whether the IA was aware of this change in notification time when it occurred. SO representative advised that there have not been many situations where the Ramp Rate has changed. Supplier Alternate noted that a recent change had been made to the Ramp Rate, essentially halving it. This was done with very short notice, definitely less than the current stipulation of the T&SC, and hence in breach of the Code, as accepted by SONI.

Supplier Alternate expressed preference in having a mechanism to revert back to the original data.

SO representative drew attention to systems security reasons, reiterating the SO preference for 5WDs to revert the data.

MO Member advised that the intention is that when EWIC has commercially gone live, both EWIC and Moyle will have a Ramp Rate of 5MW, allowing for either Interconnector to ramp up to 10MW if one goes out of service.

Supplier Alternate expressed agreement with that flexibility, however reiterated previous point regarding lack of stipulation in the T&SC around reverting to original data, as opposed to resorting to the 5WD process.

Committee were generally in agreement that it would be favourable to see the Ramp Rate restored as soon as possible.

SO representative acknowledged concern however advised that contact will be part of the process.

MO Member drew attention to Section 4 of AP2 which outlines the procedure for communicating to Interconnector Users.

Chair expressed agreement with proposal, however reiterated Committee concerns regarding the restoration of the Ramp Rate.

Secretariat advised that an AP Notification as opposed to an FRR will be issued; therefore it would be prudent for the IA to take an action addressing the Committee’s concerns.

DSU Member raised a query regarding Section 3.1 and whether all Participants will be informed of the change in IC Technical Data. SONI representative clarified that IC Users only will be notified. DSU Member raised a further query in relation to the timelines of confirmation of receipt by SEMO to IA. SONI representative clarified that SEMO must give IA notice within 1 Working Day.

Chair queried as to what the procedure is if it’s an unexpected occurrence such as an outage. SONI representative advised that as soon as the IA is aware of an issue, they must ensure to follow process and notify SEMO as soon as possible.

SO Member clarified that the TOD belongs to the IC Owner, as opposed to the TSO who validate it.

Committee agreed that the reference to Participants in Section 3.1 should be changed to IC Users for clarification purposes.

Actions

* Interconnector Administrator to revert to Committee at next meeting in relation to issue around Interconnector Administrators discretion in setting the Interconnector Ramp Rate
* Secretariat to ensure AP Notification contains legal drafting agreed at Meeting

Decision

* The proposal was Recommended for Approval by Unanimous Vote subject to legal drafting

|  |
| --- |
| **Recommended for Approval by Unanimous Vote (subject to legal drafting)** |
| Denis Kelly | MDP Member | Approve |
| Emeka Chukwureh | Supplier Alternate  | Approve |
| Gill Bradley | Generator Alternate | Approve |
| Ian Luney | Generator Member | Approve |
| James Long | MDP Alternate | Approve |
| Jill Murray-Chair | Supplier Member | Approve |
| Kevin Hannafin | Generator Member | Approve |
| Kris Kennedy | SO Alternate | Approve |
| Mary Doorly | Generator Alternate | Approve |
| Niamh Delaney | MO Member  | Approve |
| Patrick Liddy | DSU Member | Approve |
| Sonya Twohig | SO Member | Approve |
| William Carr | Supplier Member | Approve |
| William Steele | Supplier Member | Approve |

## III. Mod\_27\_12 representation of price takers in the msp software

*Proposer: SEMO*

MO Alternate explained the proposal with the aid of diagrams from a PowerPoint presentation. The proposal arose following completion of the certification of the MSP Software. Proposer noted that there is no change to the Scheduled Demand calculations and does not change the scheduling of price takers. Generator Member sought clarification that the proposal is correcting the way the software works at present. MO Alternate confirmed that the proposal seeks to remove an inaccuracy in the Code that states that Price Takers are individually represented in the MSP Software.

Generator Alternate questioned if it would be better, from a performance perspective, to complete the calculation outside of the MSP Software. MO Alternate stated that the individual representation of price takers in the MSP Software should not impact on the performance of the MSP Software.

Actions

* N/A

Decision

* The proposal was recommended for approval

|  |
| --- |
| **Recommended for Approval by Unanimous Vote**  |
| Emeka Chukwureh | Supplier Alternate  | Approve |
| Gill Bradley | Generator Alternate | Approve |
| Ian Luney | Generator Member | Approve |
| Jill Murray-Chair | Supplier Member | Approve |
| Kevin Hannafin | Generator Alternate | Approve |
| Mary Doorly | Generator Alternate | Approve |
| Patrick Liddy | DSU Member | Approve |
| William Carr | Supplier Member | Approve |
| William Steele | Generator Member | Approve |

## Mod\_28\_12 clarifications to appendix n

*Proposer: SEMO*

MO Member outlined the changes proposed in the Modification Proposal and advised that the proposal provides a number of clarifications to Appendix N. No questions were raised.

Actions

* N/A

Decision

* The proposal was recommended for approval

|  |
| --- |
| **Recommended for Approval by Majority Vote**  |
| Emeka Chukwureh | Supplier Alternate  | Approve |
| Gill Bradley | Generator Alternate | Approve |
| Ian Luney | Generator Member | Approve |
| Jill Murray-Chair | Supplier Member | Approve |
| Mary Doorly | Generator Alternate | Approve |
| Patrick Liddy | DSU Member | Approve |
| William Carr | Supplier Member | Approve |
| Abstain |
| Kevin Hannafin | Generator Member **Unanimous Vote**  | Abstain |

## Mod\_29\_12 dwell time up & dwell time down glossary definitions

*Proposer: SEMO*

MO Alternate provided an explanation of the proposal advising that the introduction of two new definitions to the Glossary are necessary in order to correctly reflect the meaning of terms used in Appendix N. The proposal also delivers clarification with regard to the order of dwell time up and down trigger points.

Proposer advised that the proposal arose following completion of the certification process which ensures that the MSP software aligns with the T&SC. Supplier Alternate questioned the timing of the certification process. MO Member advised that the certification process takes place in advance of a CMS release and is designed to discover any inconsistencies between the Market Rules and the MSP Software.

Actions

* N/A

Decision

* The proposal was recommended for approval

|  |
| --- |
| **Recommended for Approval by Unanimous Vote**  |
| Emeka Chukwureh | Supplier Alternate  | Approved |
| Gill Bradley | Generator Alternate | Approved |
| Ian Luney | Generator Member | Approved |
| Jill Murray-Chair | Supplier Member | Approved |
| Kevin Hannafin | Generator Alternate | Approved |
| Mary Doorly | Generator Member | Approved |
| Patrick Liddy | DSU Member | Approved |
| William Carr | Supplier Member | Approved |
| William Steele | Supplier Member | Approved |

## Mod\_30\_12 improved efficiencies in unit registration process

*Proposer: SEMO*

SEMO Market Operations representative presented a high level overview of the proposal to the group. The proposal seeks to improve the existing registration process by replacing it with a four step process; application, review, readiness and go-live.

Each step of the process must be completed prior to advancing to the next step. Concern was expressed by the MDP Member over the inability to revert to a previous step should it be necessary. Support for this concern was voiced by the DSU Member who advised that the majority of people at the Meeting had already completed the registration process and it is new potential Participants who will be using the new process. An example raised by the DSU Member with regard to this concern was a change to bank details at a late step in the process. Proposer advised that it is the intention that there will be a final meeting for each new registration to facilitate any such minor changes.

Generator Alternate questioned the timelines of the new process. Proposer advised that parties will not be able to move on to the next stage of the process until the previous step is complete. Further noted that each registration will be case specific and timelines can be discussed with parties at the beginning of the process. Each stage will have defined targets; therefore parties should be able to determine an effective date for their registration.

Attention was drawn to the need for input from all parties who will use the registration process and the proposer suggested that a MOST be held to discuss the topic with all those involved. Proposer asked if Participants could send feedback following review of the Modification Proposal and slides to Market Operations prior to the MOST in order to ensure a productive meeting.

The provisional proposal is expected to be built on with the input from participants at the MOST and an updated proposal inclusive of legal drafting be submitted for the next Mods Meetings.

Actions

* Participants to contact relevant parties in registration to submit feedback by 11th January 2013
* Market Operations to schedule MOST to discuss registration process

Decision

The proposal was deferred

|  |
| --- |
| **Deferred** |

* **erred**

##  AOB/Upcoming Events

Interconnector Under Test Presentation

TSO Member presented slides on the issue advising that when Mod\_10\_11 *Interconnector Under Test* was being developed, the following three options for implementation were assessed.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Option** | **Description** | **Incremental Cost** | **Total Cost** |
| 1 | Application of Testing Charges to I/C for a range of dates | €59.2k | €59.2k |
| 2 | Restriction for submitting bids (definition for a range of testing dates in MPI) | €205k | €264.2k |
| 3 | Inclusion of Testing Profile in Instruction Profiler | €309.3k | €573.5k |

The proposer noted at the time that a full solution implementing Option 2 or 3 would be preferred. However, due to time constraints for EWIC Market Readiness, Option 1 above was recommended for approval by the Modifications Committee at the request of the proposer. The proposal was subsequently approved by the RAs and became effective on 18th July 2012. The TSO advised that a further Modification Proposal would be brought forward in due course seeking implementation of an enduring solution.

In order for the proposal to be implemented successfully, SEMO raised Mod\_33\_11 *Temporary exclusion of Interconnector Error Unit Testing Charges from Settlement calculations* which allowed SEMO to perform a manual work around where the DOG and PUG was set to zero for the duration of EWIC testing. It was recognised at the time that the solution is not suitable for Interconnectors going Under Test during normal operation and was specific to EWIC commissioning prior to go-live.

TSO Member outlined a number of outstanding concerns with the solution that was implemented including:

* No ability to block bids and offers
* No provision available for test profiles
* Cost of Options 2 and 3 to implement

Taking into account the above concerns, the TSO Member recommended that the ATC be set to zero when an Interconnector is Under Test in future, this will eliminate the need for an additional Modification Proposal to implement either option previously assessed.

Generator Member asked how uninstructed imbalances will be treated. TSO confirmed that, as the DOG and PUG are set to zero there is no penalty provided that the Unit under test remains within the tolerance band.

The Chair acknowledged that the TSO are not in favour of raising another Modification Proposal on the issue but noted that the issue merits consideration. A suggestion was put forward that Participants review the slides when published and forward any comments to the Secretariat by 11th January. The item can then be discussed at the next Meeting.

**Action**:

* Participants to provide feedback to Secretariat by 11th January

Euro currency issue

Generator Member asked for release of the contingency plan (even at a high level) detailing how and when changes would be made to market systems in the event of Ireland exiting the Euro.

MO Member confirmed that the item is on the MO risk register and is not an issue at present. MO Member further confirmed that SEMO do not think it appropriate to issue a contingency plan. This is not an issue at present but it will remain on the risk register which is revisited every few months.

MO Member advised that there would be wider Government led implications for the country if this were to happen and that Participants would be immediately engaged.

Calendar updates

Modifications Committee Meeting 47 will take place on February 7th (TBC).

The second Working Group to discuss the CAES options is provisionally booked to take place on 24th January in Belfast (TBC).

# Appendices

## Appendix 1 - Secretariat Programme of Work

|  |
| --- |
| **Status as at 05 December 2012** |
| **FRRs ‘Recommended for Approval’ without systems impacts awaiting RA Decision** |
| **Title** | **Sections Modified** | **Sent** |
| Mod\_18\_11 Definition of ‘Availability’ | T&SC Glossary | 08 September 2011 |
| Mod\_21\_12 Amendment to Available Transfer Capacity (ATC) definition | T&SC Section 5; T&SC Appendix K  | 21 November 2012 |
| **RA Decision Approved Modifications with System Impacts** |
| **Title** | **Sections Modified** | **Effective Date** |
| Mod\_17\_11 Clarifying the requirement to provide Dispatch Instruction for Generator Units | T&SC Appendix O | April 2013 |
| Mod\_03\_12 Alignment of TSC with revised VAT arrangements | T&SC Section 6  | April 2013 |
| Mod\_17\_12 Report on Offered Capacity in Implicit Auctions | T&SC Section 1; Agreed Procedure 6  | April 2013 |
| **RA Decision Approved Modifications without System Impacts** |
| Mod\_16\_11 Credit Worthiness Test for SEM Bank and Credit Cover Provider banks | T&SC Section 6 & Glossary | 01 May 2013 |
| **AP Notifications** |
| Mod\_24\_12: Amendments to the MIUN Calculator to address instances of Excess Area | Agreed Procedure 2  | TBC |
| **CMS cut-off date** |
| Oct 2013 CMS Release | RA Decision Approved Mods only | 22 February 2013 |
| **Working Groups** |
| Mod\_11\_12 Proposal to extend definition of Special Units to include Compressed Air Energy Storage | Working Group 2 | 23 October 2012 |
| Mod\_11\_12 Proposal to extend definition of Special Units to include Compressed Air Energy Storage | Working Group3  | TBC |
| **T&SC Version 12-16 November 2012** |
| Version 12.0 of the Code & Agreed Procedures were published in line with the 12th CMS Release |