

**MOD 10_20:
Further update required to T&SC
and Previous Examples**



MOD 10_20: Further update required to T&SC

Legal Drafting update required to Notices section of T&SC:

B.32.2.4 Any Notice of a kind listed in any of paragraphs B.32.1.1(a) to B.32.1.1(c) and B.32.1.1(g) to B.32.1.1(l) given by facsimile or email shall be confirmed by forwarding a copy of the same by pre-paid registered post provided that failure to receive such confirmation shall not prejudice effective receipt of the notice under paragraph B.32.2.5. This is with the exception of SEM NEMO Credit Reports, a Required Credit Cover Report containing a Warning Notice, a Required Credit Cover Report containing a Credit Cover Increase Notice, **Notice of Rescinded CCIN** which do not require confirmation by post.

MOD 10_20: Previous Example 18/11/2019

Context of delay:

- On 18/11/2019 the settlement team were more than two runs behind for indicative processing.
- The delay was caused by internal processing and not by external data providers or System Operator receipt of data.
- As a result, five days were included in the calculation for Traded Not Delivered Exposure (ETND) for the evening credit report, instead of the two days which would have occurred if processing was on time.

MOD 10_20: Previous Example 18/11/2019 continued

Two participants were in breach for the evening credit report on 18/11/19.

Assessment Date	Participant	Breach Amount	Traded Not Delivered Exposure	Credit Assessment Price (PCA)	Total Meter Values for Additional Days 15/11/19 - 17/11/19	PCA * Additional Days
18/11/2019	PT_XXXXXX	-3,212.68	-89,450.52	43.45	1,200.33	52,154.34
18/11/2019	PT_XXXXXX	-42,007.00	-564,895.62	43.45	6,782.53	294,700.93

As the table displays, total metered generation for delayed indicative runs multiplied by Credit Assessment Price is greater in magnitude than the amount by which the Participant breached. Therefore SEMO would have issued a Notice of Rescinded CCIN if MOD_10_20 was in place.

MOD 10_20: Previous Example 16/04/2020

Context of delay:

- On 16/04/2020 the settlement team were more than two runs behind for indicative processing.
- The delay was caused by internal processing and not by external data providers or System Operator receipt of data.
- As a result, ten days were included in the calculation for Traded Not Delivered Exposure (ETND) for the evening credit report, instead of the two days which would have occurred if processing was on time.

MOD 10_20: Previous Example 16/04/2020 continued

Five participants were in breach for the evening credit report on 16/04/20.

Assessment Date	Participant	Breach Amount	Traded Not Delivered Exposure	Credit Assessment Price (PCA)	Total Meter Values for Additional Days	PCA * Additional Days	Comment
16/04/2020	PT_XXXXXX	-102,605.64	-368,562.53	35.72	0.00	0.00	ETND is being generated by Assetless Unit
16/04/2020	PT_XXXXXX	-59,946.13	465,920.96	35.72	0.00	0.00	PT has 1 SU with only negative metering so breach is valid
16/04/2020	PT_XXXXXX	-8,725.49	36,532.63	35.72	0.00	0.00	PT has 1 SU with only negative metering so breach is valid
16/04/2020	PT_XXXXXX	-1,112.37	0.00	35.72	0.00	0.00	Zero Traded Not Delivered
16/04/2020	PT_XXXXXX	-11,139.54	-31,536.25	35.72	0.00	0.00	ETND is being generated by Assetless Unit

As the table displays, total metered generation for delayed indicative runs multiplied by Credit Assessment Price is not greater in magnitude than the amount by which the Participant breached. Therefore SEMO would not have issued a Notice of Rescinded CCIN if MOD_10_20 was in place.