**Governance, funding and operation of an Event Driven Architecture for Market-Wide Half-Hourly Settlement**

The following responses to the consultation questions are submitted on behalf of Callisto Limited.

Question 1: Do you agree with the proposed criteria for making our decision?

*Yes, agree with the criteria.*

Question 2: Do you have any views about the relative importance of the criteria?

*We do feel the “synergy with other services provided by an EDA operator” is key in maintaining the correct focus on what will be one of the most important infrastructures in the electricity industry.*

*As an example in the event the EDA is subject to a cyber threat, the decision to halt traffic could have a significant impact on settlements. Weighing up the risk/threat versus the impact on the market would be critical. Therefore, the governance around the EDA operator needs to be considered.*

Question 3: Are there any other criteria we should consider in making our decision?

*The track record of the operator to manage third party suppliers*

Question 4: Should the EDA governing body have objectives to provide accurate and timely support for the settlement process and to further consumers’ interests through the appropriately controlled use of data? If not, please provide reasons and set out alternative objectives, also with reasons.

*Yes.*

Question 5: Do you agree that electricity suppliers, supplier agents, DNOs, generators, National Grid (NG) ESO, consumers and energy service innovators should be represented in the governance of the EDA? If not, please give reasons. Should any other categories of party be represented in the EDA governance?

*Yes. In addition to those listed we believe the BSC, as the manager of the central Settlements systems, should input into the governance of the EDA due to the critical role the EDA will have in delivering data into Settlement.*

Question 6: Do you agree that electricity suppliers, supplier agents, DNOs, generators and NG ESO should all take a share in funding the EDA? If not, please provide reasons. Should any other categories of party take a share in funding the EDA? We would be interested in any proposals as to the proportions by which the funding requirement should be shared between these parties.

*We believe that the EDA should be funded through the existing supplier hub model. Additional complexity of adding in other parties who will ultimately recover the costs incurred via the suppliers will only seek to increase costs.*

Question 7: With reference to each of the criteria and objectives, including any additional ones you propose, to what extent do you agree that the governance, operation and funding of the EDA should be managed through BSC and delivered by Elexon?

*Either the RECCo or Elexon are capable of managing the EDA. Elexon would provide oversight of the market in terms of any critical decision making. This could be covered by an operational board including key members of Elexon. However, we feel this should be given due consideration about how such a board would work in practice.*

Question 8: With reference to each of the criteria and objectives, including any additional ones you propose, to what extent do you agree that the governance, operation and funding the EDA should be managed through the REC and delivered by RECCo?

*Either the REC or Elexon are capable of managing the EDA. As above Elexon has an operational role to play in the running of the EDA and decisions relating to the ongoing operations.*

Question 9: Is there any other governance mechanism and party that you consider would be better placed than BSC/Elexon or REC/RECCo to govern, operate and fund the EDA? If there is, please substantiate your response by reference to each of the criteria and objectives (including any additional ones that you propose).

No.