

Public

Call for input

Data inaccuracies in the Balancing Mechanism.

8th October 2025.

Public

Contents

Introduction.....	3
Data Accuracy	3
How to respond:.....	5
Confidentiality:.....	5
Questions.....	6

About This Document

The Market Monitoring team have issued this call for input to industry to gather feedback and views on data inaccuracies that exist within the Balancing Mechanism.

Participants are encouraged to provide detailed feedback by completing the form in this document. Responses should be submitted to Marketreporting@neso.energy by 5PM GMT on 19th November 2025.

Responses will be considered non-confidential unless marked otherwise using the form in this document. Confidential information should be clearly indicated in your response.

Public

Introduction

This document has been prepared by the Market Monitoring team at NESO to collect industry perspectives on existing data inaccuracies within the Balancing Mechanism through a call for input.

NESO recognises the importance of accurate data submissions to the Balancing Mechanism and the challenges associated with ensuring the accuracy of such information. For the avoidance of doubt, all Market Participants participating in the Balancing Mechanism are required to comply with their related Grid Code/BSC/REMIT obligations regarding the accuracy of these data submissions. As the energy sector continues to transform, maintaining data accuracy across all fuel sources within the Balancing Mechanism is increasingly critical.

Following the issuance of this call for input, NESO will collate all industry feedback and complete our analysis on the data accuracy issues raised and complete a prioritisation list based on system impacts, operational impacts, market impacts and consumer cost impacts. Dependant on findings, a clear timeline for action and supporting datasets will be published to provide clarity on next steps.

Data Accuracy

Improving data accuracy in the Balancing Mechanism enhances operational efficiency and ensures accurate balancing activities, while also offering the wider energy market transparency regarding BMU schedules or intentions. The recent success in establishing NESOs view of Good Industry Practice for Wind FPNs serves as a testament to the benefits of improved data accuracy, demonstrating how these improvements can lead to greater market transparency, reduced consumer costs and improved decision making.

Examples of potential data inaccuracies that have been identified by NESO are explained in Table 1 below:

Issue	Context	Impacts
Physical Notifications inaccurately reported across all BMU fuel types	Physical Notifications (PN) should provide a true and accurate reflection of the power (MW) import or export of a Balancing Mechanism Unit (BMU) for a particular half hour. However, there are inaccuracies that exist for all fuel sources between the FPN and the metered output.	Inaccurate PNs reduces the certainty in margin assessments. This can result unexpected imbalances, inefficient dispatch leading to suboptimal operational decisions and increased costs and lack of transparency in the wholesale market.

Public

Bid-Offer Acceptance delays.	A Balancing Mechanism Unit (BMU) can receive a Bid-Offer Acceptance (BOA) instruction from the system operator to either increase or decrease generation. Sometimes, BMUs may accept a BOA but not respond in line with the instruction, and/or be late to deliver the volume of energy instructed.	Delays or not responding in line can disrupt system imbalance and lead to increased costs due to the need for additional or alternative actions. The difference between actual output and data provides further market inefficiencies.
Dynamic Parameters	Dynamic Parameters, such as ramp rates, MEL, SEL, MZT and MNZT are not reflective of wider submitted data, with some PNs submitted that breach these parameters.	This can lead to suboptimal dispatch decisions, based on inaccurate data. If units ramp too quickly this could cause frequency deviations. Misrepresentation of capabilities can affect market competitiveness and reduce ENCC confidence in unit operations. Different commitment periods created by MZT and MNZT can cause excess cost.
Control points not clear	Lack of transparency regarding BMU owners and control points and control point contact details being incorrect, not staffed 24/7 or unable to execute phone Bid Offer Acceptances.	If the ENCC need to contact the control point, out of date contact details or incorrect details for control points can cause uncertainty in balancing actions. Inability of control points to follow phone BOAs reduces security of supply.
Inaccurate Operational Metering data	Inaccurate Operational Metering data leads to less optimal decision making.	Actions are taken based upon the operational metering observed from sites. Where this is inaccurate it leads to poorer decision making and has potential to compromise security of supply.

Public

How to respond:

This call for input will be the primary source of industry feedback regarding data inaccuracies in the Balancing Mechanism so please complete all relevant questions below with supporting examples wherever possible.

Please return the completed form to Marketreporting@neso.energy by 5pm GMT on 19th November 2025.

If you have any questions relating to this call for input, please also contact Marketreporting@neso.energy.

Confidentiality:

Responses will be classed as non-confidential unless otherwise stated in your response. By submitting a response, your organisation accepts that the feedback received could feature in feedback summaries and be shared publicly (including with regulators), with comments attributed to your organisation.

If you wish to share confidential information, please mark this in the table below and highlight any sensitive information in your response. None of the content in your response will be included in any public feedback summaries and would only be visible to NESO and the regulator if required for the purpose of this call for input. Confidentiality is subject to any obligations to disclose information, for example, under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (EIR)¹. NESO will not disclose information that you have provided to us and marked as confidential without consulting you first.

¹ For more information on NESO's obligations under the FOIA and EIR please see the guidance for suppliers, contract partners, and other third parties working with NESO available on this page: [Freedom of Information and Environmental Information Regulations | National Energy System Operator](#)

Public

Respondent details (required)	Please enter your details	
Respondent name:	Samar Ahmed	
Company name:	ESB Generation and Trading	
Email address:	samar.ahmed2@esb.ie	
Which best describes your organisation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Consumer body <input type="checkbox"/> Storage <input type="checkbox"/> Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Supplier <input type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator <input type="checkbox"/> System Operator <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Generator <input type="checkbox"/> Transmission Owner <input type="checkbox"/> Industry Body <input type="checkbox"/> Virtual Lead Party <input type="checkbox"/> Interconnector <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state):	
Please mark here if you would like your response to be treated as confidential:	<input type="checkbox"/> Confidential (please specifically highlight confidential comments within your response)	

Questions

Please express your views in the text box underneath each question in the table below, sharing reasoning and examples relating to your feedback.

Question 1
Do you currently participate in the Balancing Mechanism?
Yes
Question 2
Do you agree with the data inaccuracies identified in Table 1?
Yes
Question 3
Beyond the inaccuracies identified in Table 1, do you have further concerns regarding the accuracy of data submitted to NESO and published to the wider market?

We would like to understand NESO's views on the accuracy of test PN's. From our experience units often submit block PN's during testing, which are then inaccurate compared to their actual output. We would encourage NESO to provide clear guidance on unit testing and the best practices, if not already available.

Public

Question 4

What do you believe are the factors, if any, that may prevent the submission of more accurate data for the items listed in Table 1 or any other inaccuracies you have identified?

Question 5

Where do you think the largest data inaccuracies exist?

Question 6

What do you believe the impact of these data inaccuracies is?

Question 7

What solutions do you think would mitigate the issues caused by these data inaccuracies?

Clearer guidance and transparency from the NESO in some cases.

Question 8

How do current practices in data reporting affect your operations?

Question 9

Are there any specific examples or case studies you can share that illustrate these data inaccuracies?