

Minutes: NEG Technical Committee Date: Wednesday December 17 th , 2014 Time: 09:00 – 16:00 Place: Arlanda December 18 th , 2014	 NEG Nordic Ediel Group
---	---

Present: Jan Owe, Svenska kraftnät
Jari Hirvonen, Fingrid
Jon-Egil Nordvik, Statnett (Convenor)
Mats Elmér, Svenska kraftnät
Ove Nesvik, Edisys (Secretary)

To (NTC): Antti Niemi, Nord Pool Spot
Christian Odgaard, Energinet.dk
Eveliina Ishii, Nord Pool Spot
Hanna Blomfelt, Nord Pool Spot
Jan Owe, Svenska kraftnät
Jari Hirvonen, Fingrid
Jon-Egil Nordvik, Statnett (Convenor)
Kim Dahl, Statnett
Marja Eronen, Nord Pool Spot
Minna Arffman, Fingrid
Ole Fredsø Weigelt, Energinet.dk
Ove Nesvik, Edisys (Secretary)

(NBS): Mats Elmér, Svenska kraftnät
Minnakaisa Ahonen, eSet
Morten Hilger, Energinet.dk
Morten Torgalsbøen, Statnett
Pasi Lintunen, Fingrid

Unicorn: Filip Kral, Unicorn
Miloš Mojžiš, Unicorn

CC: Anders Bergqvist, Svenska kraftnät
Anne Stine Hop, Statnett
Oscar Ludwigs, Svenska kraftnät
Tor Bjarne Heiberg, Statnett
Tor Åge Halvorsen, NordPool

Appendixes: MBA-MGA relation discussion



NEG Common rules
and recommendatio

Attachment: , see item 7, Review of comments to NEG Common rules and recommendations

--- Combined NBS and Ordinary NTC---

1 Approval of agenda

The agenda was approved with the following additions:

- SvK exchange with Lithuania, see 16.1 under AOB
- Micro production in Sweden, see 16.2 under AOB

2 Approval of previous meeting minutes

The minutes from the two previous meetings were approved.

3 NBS Issue list

#	Issue	Clarification, discussion, conclusion and/or action
Issue 1	Structure data flows	<p>20141217:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated BRS for NBS master data exchange was reviewed and updated, see item 4 <p>20141014:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ove had made a first draft of a BRS for NBS master data exchange <p>20140916:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ove will make a first draft of a BRS for NBS master data exchange. <p>20140623:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ove had made a draft document • To be followed up <p>20140523: Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ove will make a draft specification including all Structure data flows specified by Unicorn and an extension for Resource Object (Production Unit) Master Data
Issue 2	Decision for means of communication	<p>20141217:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MADES will not be implemented in the first version. • From eSet steering group minutes: <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“SG decision: The SG decided that MADES will not be implemented before the NBS go-live. However, the message for the market participants will be that the MADES will be introduced in the later phase after the go-live.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The item will be followed up. <p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mats will distribute the conclusion, related to not implementing MADES, from the NBS steering group minutes to NTC. <p>20141014:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no final decision regarding MADES. • The item will be followed up.

#	Issue	Clarification, discussion, conclusion and/or action
		<p>20140916:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NBS will support FTP and SMTP and MADES is under investigation. If anyone want encryption, compression etc. MADES should be used <p>20140623:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jari informed that NBS is planning to offer a combination of MADES, FTP and SMTP (see also information from 20140523 below) • To be followed up <p>20140523: To be followed up</p> <p>20140523:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSG has approved the MADES as a standard, but not what version of the MADES, i.e. the standard version from Unicorn or a multithreaded version. • NBS propose to support FTP, SMTP and MADES: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal was supported by NTC ○ If anyone want encryption, compression etc. MADES should be used (there are no encryption in Sweden today related to settlement)
Issue 3	Decision on solution for test portal	<p>20141217:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Norway and Sweden will use the “Ediel-portal”. This means that the actors will use a test system they know from before. • Finland will make their own test system. • The item will be removed from the issue list. <p>20141014:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be a test portal. The procurement is not yet finalised. • The item will be followed up. <p>20140916:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Still under discussion. Jari informed that there will be a “kick-off meeting” next week. <p>20140623:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jari informed that this will be a “summer task” for the NBS project • To be followed up <p>20140523: To be followed up</p> <p>20140523:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Morten informed that NBS will investigate an external supplier for a test portal <p>20140509:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The issue is not a task for NTC, but will be followed up for information
Issue 4	Should we regulate the sizes of the files (similar sizes ??)	<p>20141217:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No answer from Unicorn. • The item will be followed up.

#	Issue	Clarification, discussion, conclusion and/or action
		<p>20141014:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No answer from Unicorn. The largest documents will contain metered values from production MPs in a MGA, i.e. no documents sent to/from NBS will be “large”, hence not seen as a big issue. The item will be followed up. <p>20140916:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To be followed up <p>20140623:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ove informed that the Norwegian Elhub will have a limit on 10.000 Metering points in one document The item was postponed <p>20140523: Awaiting Unicorn</p> <p>20140509: Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jari will ask Unicorn if they have a preference for a limit of file size
Issue 5	Unicorn would like to get the Domain code for Nordic Market Area	<p>20141217:</p> <p>Continued homework:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jon-Egil will follow up. <p>20141014:</p> <p>Continued homework:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jon-Egil will follow up. <p>20140916:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A MR was sent before summer, but no code have been issued <p>Homework: Jon-Egil will follow up</p> <p>20140623:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jon-Egil has sent a request to ENTSO-E for a EIC code, however not yet issued by ENTSO-E <p>20140523: Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ove will make an MR for ENTSO-E for adding a Domain code for the Nordic Market Area and send it to Jon-Egil for submission to WG-EDI before the meeting June 3rd and 4th

4 Specification of a Master Data (Structure Data Flows) Documents

Actions (homework) from previous meeting:

- Mats will:
 - Try to get the rules for update of MBA-MGA relations into the next version of the handbook.

Status:

- Currently the text in the Handbook is very general, since the process not is 100% finalised.
- The hypotheses is that NBS will provide the information, using the NEG Area Specification Document, which will be documented in the handbook when finally agreed.

- Try finding requirements for what kind of production types we need in "NEG Resource Object (Production Unit) Master Data Document"
 - Status:**
 - "B20 Other" was added to the current list
- Find out if Master Data for production Units will be entered via "NBS On-line services" or via an XML file in the first version of NBS
 - Status:**
 - Master Data for production Units will be entered via "NBS On-line services"
 - The exchange was added to sequence diagram
- Find out who will distribute Master Data for MBA-MGA relation, NBS or NPS
 - Status:**
 - NBS will distribute Master Data for MBA-MGA relation
 - Comments were removed from sequence diagram
- Verify if the profiled consumption will be sent from Svenska kraftnät in Sweden and how this affects exchange of Master Data
 - Status:**
 - SvK will send profiled consumption
 - This has however no effect on the exchange of Master Data

Ove had as homework updated the BRS for Master Data, including the addition of a "Bilateral Trade Master Data process", which was reviewed and updated.

Jan missed the "Main (or Central) grid" as a "MGA Type" (in Sweden there are local, regional, and main grids). The current list of MGA types are:

Z01	Regional
Z02	Only losses
Z03	Industrial
Z04	Distribution
Z05	Non-concessional

Mats promised to verify with eSet if Basse need a MGA Type of **Z06** (?) Main (central) grid.

Morten had sent a mail regarding the MBA-MGA relation process, see discussion in Appendix A. The questions was reviewed, but no one had a strong opinion on how to handle the reporting of MBA-MGA relations. This is more a business question that should be asked to the NBS reference group.

Homework:

- Ove (Erik) will update the BRS, User Guide (UG) and XML schemas:
 - Change all occurrences of Validity Start/End to be of type "DateType" (and not DateTimeType) in all Master Data documents and XML schemas, BRS and UG
 - The term "structure information" will be renamed to "master data" in BRS and UG
 - Rename NBS to Imbalance Settlement Responsible (ISR) in all documents, codes etc., when used as a role.
 - To be published together with other changes.
 - Distribute to NTC before December 29, if possible.
 - Ask for comments within two weeks and publish if no blocking comments

- Mats will verify if Basse need a MGA Type of **Z06** (?) = “Main (or central) grid”, to be used in “NEG Area Specification Document for MBA and MGA Master Data”

5 Routing of acknowledgements versus MADES for routing purposes

Due to lack of time the item was postponed.

6 Format for “Information Service”

Due to lack of time the item was postponed.

7 Review of comments to NEG Common rules and recommendations

Due to lack of time the item was postponed.

8 Status for Settlement BRSs and UserGuide

From Jan:

In the NBS Handbook I read:

“The market participant is required to use one single coding scheme per object per country towards eSett in all communication. This can be for example EIC, GS1 codes or a code based on a national scheme. If a market participant is active only in a one country it can use the national coding scheme, but if market participant is active in more than one country it has to use EIC or GS1.”

But in Appendix B in the NBS-BRS I read that for Finnish and Swedish parties the only Id:s that can be used are national ones.

That has probably to be extended with EIC and/or GS1-codes to be used by those actors being active in more than one country. Otherwise that will not work for eSett.

For Sweden we currently suggest EIC codes. However, I know that there are Swedish companies having GS1 codes even though those are not used in the power industry. A company active in Norway, using its GS1-id there and towards eSett, will probably, when expanding, use the same id in all countries.

So my suggestion is to either add EIC and GS1-codes for parties in all countries, or add a comment below the table that for parties active in more than one country only one id, GS1 or EIC will be used when communicating with eSett.

Conclusion:

- We add a comment below table 13 (Appendix B) that for parties active in more than one country only one id, GS1 or EIC, shall be used when communicating with eSett.

From Ove:

During a Norwegian “NEE post-NBS/pre-Elhub project” meeting it was found that the ENTSO-E ESP Energy Account Report Document specifies the following Business type:

- B14** Production deviation
- B15** Consumption deviation
- B29** MGA imbalance

With the comment that “All Business types are sent to the BRPs (if relevant). **B29** MGA imbalance is in addition sent to the DSO (Metered Data Aggregator) in question”.

But the Area is only MBA (The Market Balance Area to which the settlement result belongs) – Should it be MGA in addition?

Conclusion:

- We add MGA

From Jan:

We at Svenska kraftnät do not know the supplier (retailer) in a MGA when we aggregate time series. So when sending messages according to arrow 8 in Figure 5 in the BRS, we can not include the balance supplier, just the BRP.

But in the class diagram as well as in the schema the balance supplier is required. See ebIX_AggregatedDataPerMGAFORSettlementForSettlementResponsible_2013pA.xsd

It will not be a problem to change the cardinality for balance supplier to 0..1, since that is the cardinality within ebIX. But of course we should have the comment in the BRS that it is only for Sweden that balance supplier will (or may) be omitted (or perhaps better the opposite: “Required in Norway and Finland”).

Ove had already made the Balance Supplier (BS) optional in the Schema. However, during the update he noted that both the BS and the Balance Responsible Party (BRP) are optional in the Schema, but mandatory according to the BRS.

Conclusion:

- Corrected – Both BS and BRP are dependent and the dependencies were added to the Attribute table.

Homework:

- Ove (Erik) will update the BRS, User Guide (UG) and XML schemas:
 - Both BS and BRP will be made dependent [0..1] in ebIX_AggregatedDataPerMGAFORSettlementForSettlementResponsible_2013pA.xsd
 - Add MGA to ENTSO-E ESP Energy Account Report Document
 - Add a comment below table 13 (Appendix B) that for parties active in more than one country only one id, GS1 or EIC, shall be used when communicating with eSett.
 - Changes will be sent on circulation for comments to NTC for two weeks and thereafter publish if no blocking comments

9 Status for continuation of the HNR project

NordREG has sent a letter to MSG (Market Steering Group) asking MSG "to facilitate the creation of a Nordic harmonised electricity market by assigning the Nordic Ediel group with the task to, in close cooperation with the stakeholders, complete the Nordic technical handbook". To discuss how to continue the HNR project, NordREG has asked for a meeting with NEG January 19th.

During the last weeks, NordREG and MSG have discussed the continuation of the HNR project by phone and letters. It seems that MSG want to have a face-to-face meeting with NordREG before NEG is being involved in

the planning of the continuation of the HNR project. A final date for the face-to-face meeting between NordREG and MSG will probably not be set before Christmas, but a possible date is January 19th.

This means that we must postpone the planned NordREG and NEG meeting scheduled at Arlanda on January 19th 2015.

10 Status for MRs to ENTSO-E

No new information.

11 Status for NPS implementation of NEG Documents and alignment of ESS/Area specification documents

From Eveliina (for information):

Greetings from NPS Day-ahead XML API project!

Thank you again for your replies to our earlier questions. We have now decided the technical solution for Day Ahead XML API. Quick details:

- RESTful service - plain XML over HTTP protocol
- URLs structure along with XSD schema of the messages will be provided
- Document Id shall be generated by members in similar way as for EDIEL messages
- Client certificates provided by NPS will be used as an authentication mechanism

XML schema package is now updated in www.ediel.org and is also attached to this email. Attached are also some simple examples of the SpotMarketBidDocument XML messages.

Additional **question**: Is there need for receiving orders back to your system in same SpotMarketBidDocument format?

Eveliina had also sent some comments regarding “Mismatch in schedule document usage”, see Appendix B.

There were not enough time to review the links between the BRS for Schedules, Settlement and Trade, hence the item was postponed

12 Status RPMimp project

The need for informing the BRP (Resource provider) if the activation is seen as a “special regulation” was discussed at the NTC/RPMimp meeting November 26th. It was noted that the SO often don't not know if the activation is a “special regulation” or not, hence this information should be sent in another document, such as the ERRP Allocation Result Document, which is used to inform the BRP daily activated/deactivated bids.

Conclusion:

- OK

Ove mentioned that the UseCase Operate form the NEG Domain Model includes more than the Activation process, i.e.:

The business process operate includes the message exchanges to handle the Balance regulation market and Ancillary services markets, e.g. the System operator orders up and down regulation to keep the balance in the system. Examples of processes are Bids from Producers or Traders to the System operator for the Balance regulation market and Ancillary services markets, and the processes of ordering up and down regulation to the Producers or orders to the Grid operators for disconnecting disconnectable installations.

Should we move the rest of the “operational markets” into the Nordic operational system BRS and only keep the “day-ahead (Elspot)” and “intraday (Elbas) markets” in the Nordic trading system BRS?

The BRS for Nordic operational system was reviewed and updated:

- Move of processes from the BRS for trade will be discussed at the next meeting together with the item from NPS above.

Homework:

- Ove will update the BRS and send it on circulation for comments, until next NTC meeting, to NEG and RPMimp project

13 Review of www.ediel.org

Ove had, as action from previous meeting, published the latest HNR report and earlier NTC minutes that had not been published.

14 Information (if any)

No new information exchanged

15 Next meeting

Monday January 19th, Helsinki, 9:00 – 16:00 (15:30?)

16 AOB

16.1 SvK exchange with Lithuania

Jan reported that there is a need for new Business Types when communicating with Lithuania. Unfortunately also Lithuania is using Znn codes and there is no CodingScheme attribute in the ENTSO-E documents, neither in the “old proprietary” ENTSO-E documents, nor in the newer IEC/CIM based documents.

Due to lack of time the item was postponed.

16.2 Micro production in Sweden

Sweden get a new law from January 2015, where the Balance Supplier (BS), supplying the consumption, also must take the production, unless the Customer chooses another BS. New codes are needed for this process. Micro production is production where a fuse of maximum 100 A (Ampere) is used.

Due to lack of time the item was postponed.

Appendix A MBA-MGA relation discussion

Från: Morten Torgalsbøen <Morten.Torgalsboen@statnett.no>

Datum: 22 oktober 2014 10:29:31 CEST

Till: Elmér, Mats <Mats.Elmer@svk.se>, Lintunen Pasi <Pasi.Lintunen@fingrid.fi>

Ämne: SV: Providing market participants with MGA and MBA information

My input to your questions.

There are actually four files that the TSO shall send to eSett; MGA master data, MBA master data, MGA-MGA relations and MGA-MBA relations. Of these four files it will be the MGA-MBA relations that are most interesting for the market participants.

I think NTC should contribute to the discussion regarding reporting when changed or with a predefined frequency. For me this is linked to data technical needs. The same solution should be applied for TSOs reporting to eSett and for eSetts reporting to market participants.

I think all countries should be included in one file.

Regarding the question of sending files, subscriptions or providing a file for download we need to assess the risk involved. eSett take on more risk if we send it than what we do if we make it available for download. The current model is that NPS makes it available for download. Since the file is public it will also make it easier for anyone interested to get the data.

BR, MT

Fra: Elmér, Mats [<mailto:Mats.Elmer@svk.se>]

Sendt: 21. oktober 2014 16:04

Til: Morten Torgalsbøen; Lintunen Pasi

Emne: SV: Providing market participants with MGA and MBA information

Hi,

As I previously mentioned, the proposal is ok with me.

Just to summarize and add some questions:

- TSOs will send the file (national) to eSett with the MGA-MBA relations.
 - When changes has been done or with frequency?
- eSett will offer, as a service, the market participants, including NPS, the MBA-MGA relations for each country.
 - We need to decide if the file should be sent per country or per MBA? I will check the format how it is described in current version.
 - Some kind of subscription which can be filled in on Online Service?
 - If subscription: what kind of options can be done? (*Country specific, MBA specific..)
 - Should the file be sent with some frequency or just when a change has occurred? Both?

Is there anything else?

Br,
Mats

Från: Morten Torgalsbøen [<mailto:Morten.Torgalsboen@statnett.no>]
Skickat: den 20 oktober 2014 12:10
Till: Elmér, Mats; Lintunen Pasi
Ämne: SV: Providing market participants with MGA and MBA information

Hi,

I interpret your feedback so that the file with the MGA-MBA relations specified by NTC shall be provided to the market participants and that it will be up to the TSOs to do so if eSett lacks the resources to include it in its services. Since the dataflow for receiving these messages from the TSO is incorporated I expect that providing them as a data package or publishing them to the FTP server would be manageable. Is it in data flows or BSS that this shall be addressed?

BR, MT

Fra: Elmér, Mats [<mailto:Mats.Elmer@svk.se>]
Sendt: 17. oktober 2014 14:57
Til: Lintunen Pasi; Morten Torgalsbøen
Emne: SV: Providing market participants with MGA and MBA information

Hi,

I would say that the proposal is ok with me.

Our "process" is that we make a decision which we publish on our website. The market participants can then visit <http://www.natomraden.se/> to see which MBA the MGAs belongs to.

Market participants in Sweden are not used to receive a file for this but it might be helpful.

/Mats

Från: Lintunen Pasi [<mailto:Pasi.Lintunen@fingrid.fi>]
Skickat: den 17 oktober 2014 14:33
Till: Morten Torgalsbøen; Elmér, Mats
Ämne: VS: Providing market participants with MGA and MBA information

Hi Morten,

correct that we do not have that kind of process in Finland.

Generally, your proposal is okay for me. Because these files relates to Basse, we've to evaluate the realistic time schedule for implementation. Like we discussed today Unicorn has a bad recourse problems and we've to ensure that the most important functionalities are ready in Basse before NBS go-live in 11/2015. And now I don't mean that this is not an important issue :)

Pasi

Lähetinjä: Morten Torgalsbøen [<mailto:Morten.Torgalsboen@statnett.no>]
Lähetetty: 17. lokakuuta 2014 15:24
Vastaanottaja: Lintunen Pasi; Elmér, Mats
Aihe: Providing market participants with MGA and MBA information

Hi,

One very important piece of information for market participants in Norway and partly in Sweden is the file that describes which MBA the MGAs belong to. Would it be beneficial for this process if this information was provided for all market participants by eSett. We could then harmonize this process and the rules for when the data is provided, for how long it is valid etc.

Do you agree with this proposal? If so it will be necessary to investigate how these processes are today. I expect that there are no process for this in Finland and that a process easily could be established since it wouldn't affect you much. In Sweden you should have an existing process to inform the market of which MGAs that belong to the MBAs and also the validity of this. It happens from time to time that MGAs change MBA in Sweden even though they are quite stable.

BR, MT

Appendix B Mismatch in schedule document usage

Hi,

I could in some way be more correct to specify **A19** as Process Type if the process is only covering the Intraday market, due A17 is telling the is covers all process (LongTerm, DayAhead and Intraday).

Venlig hilsen

Ole Fredsø Weigelt
IT Serviceudvikling
+4530674701
OFW@energinet.dk

From: Ove Nesvik [<mailto:ove.nesvik@edisys.no>]

Sent: 17. november 2014 10:30

To: Eveliina Ishii; Jan Owe (SvK); Jon-Egil Nordvik; Jari Hirvonen (Jari.Hirvonen@fingrid.fi); Ole Fredsø Weigelt

Cc: Elmér, Mats; Kim Dahl (kim.dahl@statnett.no)

Subject: FW: Mismatch in schedule document usage

Dear Eveliina and all,

All: I do not have the business expertise to be sure I answer this (see below) correctly so please comment.

As far as understand, the document described in the *BRS for the Nordic TSO Scheduling and Ancillary Services Process* is sent from the BRPs (including NPS) to the TSOs, while the document described in the *NBS BRS for NPS-TSO* is sent from NPS and the TSOs to NBS.

However it looks a bit strange that the document from NPS to the TSOs not specify Elbas and Elspot as process types (?)

Attribute	Nordic TSO Schedules BRS v2r1A 20140207.pdf	Nordic Balance Settlement NBS for NPS-TSO Draft 1r3A – 20141017.pdf
Process Type	A17 Schedule day Should we add Elspot and Elbas, i.e. A01 Day-ahead (Elspot) A19 Intraday accumulated (Elbas)?	A01 Day-ahead (Elspot) A19 Intraday accumulated (Elbas)
Sender Role	A08 Balance Responsible party (Nord Pool Spot is seen as a BRP)	A04 System Operator A11 Market Operator
Receiver Role	A04 System Operator	A05 Imbalance Settlement Responsible
Out Party	Balance Responsible party, usage: see 0	The unique identification of the Market Operator
Capacity Contract Type	Not used internally in the Nordic market	<missing>

Capacity Agreement Identification	<missing> Do we need a portfolio in this document?	The unique identification of the portfolio in question
-----------------------------------	---	--

Are we able to clarify this via mail? Alternatively, do we need a telephone conference? Alternatively, is it good enough to discuss it at the next NTC meeting, December 17th?

Rgds,

Ove Nesvik
Senior rådgiver / Senior adviser
Mobil (+47) 928 22 908



Havnelageret
Langkaia 1
0150 Oslo
Tel: (+47) 22 42 13 80
Fax: (+47) 22 42 26 40
www.edisys.no

From: Eveliina Ishii [<mailto:eveliina.ishii@npspot.com>]
Sent: 17. november 2014 09:56
To: Ove Nesvik
Subject: Mismatch in schedule document usage

Hi Ove,

Follow up on earlier email conversation (7.-8.11.2014), there is a mismatch in Schedule document usage. Please see following and please inform me which one is the correct one to be used and please correct the information in the erroneous one.

Nordic Trading System BRS (Nordic Trading System BRS 1r1C – 20141016.docx), Table 2 refers to use following:

Day-ahead schedules per BRP	ESS Schedule document, See BRS for the Nordic TSO Scheduling and Ancillary Services Process [10]
-----------------------------	--

I assume this is Table 1 in Nordic TSO Scheduling and Ancillary Services Process BRS, (Nordic TSO Schedules BRS v2r1A 20140207.pdf).

However, we have discussed that NPS should send schedules according to description in Nordic Settlement System NBS for NPS-TSO, Table 5 (Nordic Balance Settlement NBS for NPS-TSO Draft 1r3A – 20141017.pdf).

I found following differences between these two documents / tables:

Attribute	Nordic TSO Schedules BRS v2r1A 20140207.pdf	Nordic Balance Settlement NBS for NPS-TSO Draft 1r3A – 20141017.pdf

Process Type	A17 Schedule day	A01 Day-ahead (Elspot) A19 Intraday accumulated (Elbas)
Sender Role	A08 Balance Responsible party (Nord Pool Spot is seen as a BRP)	A04 System Operator A11 Market Operator
Receiver Role	A04 System Operator	A05 Imbalance Settlement Responsible
Out Party	Balance Responsible party, usage: see 0	The unique identification of the Market Operator
Capacity Contract Type	Not used internally in the Nordic market	<missing>
Capacity Agreement Identification	<missing>	The unique identification of the portfolio in question

Br,
Eveliina