| Q# | Question   | Answer   |
|----|--|--|
|    |  | The change is only in how we refer to it in the requirements communications      |
| 1  | Will the BM Unit names change or only names in the bidding template                          | and bidding template. There will also be changes on data portal labelling ie     |
|    |  | We fully appreciate that we are introducing changes that require set up and      |
|    | Could you please provide API specifications asap that also on our side we could start        | testing by our counterparties. We are looking for your input during              |
| 2  | development  | development and we would like your help on testing and set up in UAT. As         |
|    |  | We never plan to run a specific number of auctions per day. The auctions are     |
| 3  | How many auctions are planned per day?   | run to meet requirements. Some days there may be no auctions and some            |
|    |  | Pay as bid is how we run our auctions now. With pay as bid, you submit a price   |
|    |  | and that is what you are paid for your MW. Pay as clear requires you to submit   |
|    |  | a price (the lowest price you are willing to be paid) but you will get paid the  |
|    |  | highest price that is accepted in an auction, therefore everyone is paid the     |
|    |  | same. More information can be found on line and Ofgem have some slides           |
| 4  | What is Pay as Bid vs pay as Clear?  | that are useful.   |
|    |  | There are no plans to change how we communicate requirements. We have            |
|    |  | consdiered linked or contingent bids, so for example you could bid for several   |
|    |  | hours as a block. Currently there is no way to do this. This would be a big      |
|    |  | change for the auction algorithm. For now we are focusing on the platform        |
|    | Will there be a significant change the the types of lots you currently request? e.g. They    | and the communications. We could look at makiong this change in the future.      |
| 5  | are currently all single hourly products, with varying restrictions over the interconnectors | In the consultation, the final question is asking for any other views, so please |
|    |  | Recycling of bids - on occasion we may have requirements for a Lot for an        |
|    |  | hour for multiple interconnectors. We may have another Lot for the same          |
|    |  | hour but on a specific interconnector. This may look confusing for participants  |
|    |  | and means you need to choose which Lot to bid for. When we have different        |
|    |  | requirements to meet on the system the trades are tagged differently and         |
|    | Regarding the use of bids in different lots, how do you differenciate between teh            | may have different reserve prices. Our proposal here is to make it easier for    |
|    | different hours and make sure a bid is not used in an hour with a significant spot price     | participants that have finite capacity on an interconnector. This means you      |
| 6  | difference   | don't have to choose which Lot to bid in for and we will use them in the best    |
|    |  | When we request any IC it means we can fill the requirement across all           |
|    | Your requests should be explicit over how much volume is required over each IC if they       | interconnectors and will fill the Lots in price order while respecting the       |
| 7  | are 'any IC'   | capacity that is available on an interconnector. If requirements come out        |
|    |  | We fully appreciate this but we want to tell you that this is the direction of   |
| 8  | It's a bit difficult to give feedback on the platform without seeing any info/view of it.    | travel. We will share what we can as soon as possible.                           |

Regarding point 7.4 in the document shared, is it correct to assume we can flow due to an economic incentive one way and when NGs requirement comes afterwards to ask the 9 other direction. WE nominate that direction for NG, without cancelling the initial flow

Yes this is correct. As long as this is a pre-exisiting position. For any new trades with us, we expect a new nomination. We don't want to buy from you and then you sell it back immediately.