Proposal for a Capacity Mark Rules Change	et	Making a positive difference for energy consumer Reference number (to be completed by Ofgem): CP252
Name of Organisation(s) / individual(s): Tim Collins, Centrica		Submitted: tober 2017
Type of Change:	altern	licable, whether you are aware of an ative proposal already submitted which roposal relates to:
□ Addition⊠ Revoke		
Proposal summary (short summary, suitable for publi. We propose rationalising the number of certificate prequalification where the Applicant is not the Leg in a Generating CMU.	s and	declarations required as part of CM
What the proposal relates to and if applicable, what to (please state provision number): The proposal relates to Rules 3.2.3 to 3.2.9, the Ex		
redundant references elsewhere in the Rules.		
redundant references elsewhere in the Rules. Description of the issue that the change proposal see	eks to a	ddress:
	CMU i U, they Legal ropose urces o f non the pro- be re- cts wi lave in and er arriers	s not the Legal Owner of each v are required to obtain either a Legal Owner or an Applicant Declaration e deleting these requirements as they are of competition for CM Agreements. This Applicant parties, unfamiliar with the equal deadline or make trivial errors in jected. The requirement for signatures th the delegations of authority to mid- place. The fact that the CM Rules nsure entry into the CM from actually are excessively high. Ultimately this

note that the various preconditions for receiving CM revenues, Termination Events, Termination Fees, Satisfactory Performance Tests etc render it almost impossible for a CMU to improperly receive CM revenues. In other words, the assurance regime around the CM is more than adequate and the Applicant and Legal Owner Declarations can be removed without compromising the CM's effectiveness.

If applicable, please state the proposed revised drafting (please highlight the change):

Owing to the time constrained nature of this year's window for CM Rule change proposals and the substantial overlap with the prequalification window, we are unable to provide comprehensive legal text.

However, our suggestion is either:

- Amend 3.2.3 such that where the Applicant is not the Legal Owner of each Generating Unit comprising a Generating CMU, this is no longer subject to 3.2.4 to 3.2.9; and
- Delete 3.2.4 to 3.2.9, and all redundant references elsewhere in the CM Rules arising from that deletion.

Or:

- Amend 3.2.4 to 3.2.9 such that in each case, only the Aggregator Declaration (which is completed wholly by the Applicant) is required; and
- Delete all references to the Legal Owner Declaration and the Applicant Declaration, which are rendered redundant.

For the avoidance of doubt, we are happy for Ofgem to consult on alternative legal text, provided the substance of our proposal is achieved.

Analysis and evidence on the impact on industry and/or consumers including any risks to note when making the revision - including, any potential implications for industry codes:

As set out in our description of the issue, we believe the existing declarations required where an Applicant is not the Legal Owner of each Generating Unit comprising a Generating CMU are administratively onerous and restrict legitimate sources of competition for CM Agreements. This is due to the risk that Directors of Legal Owners of non-Applicant parties, unfamiliar with the minutiae of CM prequal, are either "timed out" by the prequal deadline or make trivial errors in their Declarations, causing an entire Application to be rejected. The requirement for signatures from two <u>Directors</u> of the Legal Owner also conflicts with the delegations of authority to midlevel management that many of these companies have in place. The fact that the CM Rules prevent persons authorised by a company to agree and ensure entry into the CM from actually doing so augments the perception that CM entry barriers are excessively high. Ultimately this discourages supply side participation and reduces downward pressure on price.

We believe the Prequalification Certificate (Exhibit A) and Certificate of Conduct (Exhibit C) already require an Applicant to confirm the veracity of their Application. We further note that DSR CMUs can aggregate third party assets without the need for declarations signed by Directors of each Legal Owner and this is (rightly) deemed acceptable by BEIS and Ofgem. Finally, we note that the various preconditions for receiving CM revenues, Termination Events, Termination Fees, Satisfactory Performance Tests etc render it almost impossible for a CMU to improperly receive CM revenues. In other words, the assurance regime around the CM is more than adequate

and the Applicant and Legal Owner Declarations can be removed without compromising the CM's effectiveness.

Details of Proposer (please include name, telephone number, email and organisation):

Tim Collins, Regulatory Manager, Centrica, 07789 577609, tim.collins1@centrica.com