Issue 102 Digital Meeting Etiquette

- Welcome to Issue 102 Meeting 4 – we'll start shortly
- No video please to conserve bandwidth
- Please stay on mute unless you need to talk – use the **Raise hand** feature in the Menu bar in Microsoft Teams if you want to speak, or use the **Meeting chat**
- Lots of us are working remotely – be mindful of background noise and connection speeds

ELEXON

Issue 102 Workgroup Meeting 4

BSC Change Review

16 December 2022

Meeting Agenda & Objectives

- Continue discussions;
- Verify User Stories, Epics and triage the ideas;
- Consider prioritisation; and
- Agree next steps.

Agenda Item	Lead
1. Welcome and Meeting objectives	Chris Day (Chair)
2. Summary of last meeting	Ivar Macsween (Lead Analyst)
3. Issue 102 discussions • Triaging of solutions • Prioritisation	Workgroup
4. A.O.B	Workgroup
5. Next steps	Ivar Macsween
6. Meeting close	Chris Day

MEETING 3 SUMMARY

ELEXON

Issue 102 Last Meeting Summary

- EO1 - Allow non BSC Parties to raise BSC Changes
  - Elexon will triage CPs raised by non-Parties. If deemed not vexatious it will be allowed to progress. Build in an appeals route
- EO2 - More than one Alternative for BSC Mods
  - 5 Alternatives, using the CUSC model of solution ownership.
- EO3 - Amendments to the Housekeeping change process
  - Workgroup felt it appropriate for Code Bodies to make these changes without full consultation process. Consult ahead of time to give visibility - “for information: next month we will be making the following HK changes”. Report to Panel at least quarterly.

Issue 102 Last Meeting Summary

- EO4 - Remove Voting from Workgroup ToR

  - Take Workgroup Votes out but continue to capture views.
  - Suggested ‘Consultation-Light’ digital button to allow industry to submit views quickly. Trial a less burdensome option to simply ask “do you think this is better than the baseline?” to help Ofgem see weight of opinion

- EO5 - Low quoracy

  - For Mods which are not attracting much industry interest, Elexon can contribute to quoracy. If struggling for quoracy and we think Elexon have the expertise necessary to develop the solution, then Elexon can work the solution up, issue it for Assessment Consultation, while the solution can still be tweaked. Could consult on proposed and options to allow for Alternatives
  - Mixed views on constituency voting

- Quick Win - Implement a standing session to invite industry feedback on upcoming CPs

  - Based on adhoc attendance based on interest vs a standing group
  - Run as needed
  - Could also be used for solution development
  - Elexon can trial this, get some feedback and assess attendance, felx it based on feedback

ISSUE 102 DISCUSSIONS

ELEXON

Issue 102 Epic 2/ User Story

- National Grid ESO have provided us with a CUSC Alternative and Workgroup Vote template.

- **Stage 1 - Alternative Vote -** if Workgroup Alternative Requests have been made, members vote on whether they should become Workgroup Alternative BSC Modifications.

- **Stage 2 - Workgroup Vote** - Members assess the original vs Alternatives against the BSC objectives compared to the baseline and vote on which of the options best facilitates these.

- *The Alternative vote is carried out to identify the level of Workgroup support there is for any potential alternative options that have been brought forward by either any member of the Workgroup OR an Industry Participant as part of the Workgroup Consultation.*

- *Should the majority of the Workgroup OR the Chair believe that the potential alternative solution may better facilitate the CUSC objectives than the Original proposal then the potential alternative will be fully developed by the Workgroup with legal text to form a Workgroup Alternative CUSC modification (WACM) and submitted to the Panel and Authority alongside the Original solution for the Panel Recommendation vote and the Authority decision.*

- Each Alternative is owned by a Workgroup member?

Issue 102 Epic 6/ User Story

EO6 Introduce time related deadlines for Modification to remain "live" (active)

- As a Elexon Change Team member

- I want To introduce a process whereby any significant delays to the progression of a Modification (caused by the proposer) are timed and when those delays reach a certain threshold the Modification is withdrawn. These delays could be caused by a lack of engagement from the proposer or an unwillingness from the proposer to withdraw or alter a Modification when met with a universal negative opinion on the likely progression of the Modification

- So that Less resource and time is spent on trying to progress Modifications where a lack of engagement or strong industry blockers are making the Mod unlikely to succeed.

Comments:

- Need clear consistent rules that need to be defined.
- Would need to clearly define the circumstances under which the "clock" starts and stops.

Issue 102 Epic 7/ User Story

EO7 Remove Report Phase Consultations for certain Modifications

- As a Elexon Change Team member
- I want To progress straight to committee decision where the Panel's initial views/ Workgroup views and assessment consultation views all align.
- So that Less resource and time is spent on processing report phase consultations where a particular change has consistent and aligned views across all stakeholders.

Comments:

- Is there some scope for a change that has only received support to skip the Report Phase?

Issue 102 Quick Wins Summary

- Quick Wins:
  - Publicise the existing pipeline of BSC Change (currently published on the BSC Website) via Newscast periodically
    - Implemented from Monday
  - Review and change Housekeeping CP and Mod report templates to slim down documents and associated effort progressing low impact HK Changes.
    - In light of potential recommendations around HK, propose to park to avoid wasted effort
  - Update email templates to make it clearer that interested parties can join distribution lists and Workgroups as observers
    - Implemented by end of 2022
  - Trial a standing session to invite industry feedback on upcoming CPs
    - Trial within first quarter of 2023 to get feedback
  - Tick box at top of the Report Phase Consultation question sheet similar to “I answered the Assessment Consultation and my views haven’t changed”
    - Implemented by end of 2022

Issue 102 Extra Discussion Points (Time Permitting)

- What are Issue 102 group views on the following simplification changes to BSCP40:
  - Remove Draft CP processes
  - Review and simplify BCA/PACA processes, possibly remove from BSCP or maybe only needs a bullets
  - Add ability to withdraw CPs
  - Include CPs within scope of CCSG processes – this would probably need a Mod
  - Include process for dealing with EMAR only changes (for BSC owned items)

Issue 102 Extra Discussion Points

- ‘Tier 2’ Housekeeping changes
- E.g Section B2.7.4(b)(iii) states:
  - A person shall cease to hold office as a Panel Member if “he is or may be suffering from mental disorder and either he is admitted to hospital in pursuance of an application under the Mental Health Act 1983 or an order is made by a court having jurisdiction in matters concerning mental disorder for his detention or for the appointment of a receiver, curator bonis or other person with respect to his property or affairs”.
- This is out of date and needs to be updated, but not recognized as housekeeping
  - Section K 1.2.2(b) (ii) is inconsistent with Section K 2.1.2 which implies that an Exemptible Generating Plant has the choice of registering in both CMRS or SMRS.
  - Section K 1.2.2(b) (ii) defines ‘in the case of an Import to any Generating Plant at which electricity is generated by a Party holding a Generation Licence, shall be that Party.’ This implies that a Generator would have to register a Metering System in CMRS, as SMRS is only open to Licensed Suppliers. Section K 1.2.2(B)(ii) needs an amendment similar to the effect of Section K 1.2.2(a)(ii) to recognise that a Generating Plant can choose another Party to be responsible for their Imports and Exports.
- Do the Issue Group agree that these kind of changes should be progressed more efficiently than they currently are?

Issue 102 Extra Discussion Points

- Is there appetite for expanding the Panel's Self Governance powers?
- Would enable Panel to make more decisions, speeding up the change process for suitable changes.
- Currently, any changes to Implementation Dates, once a Modification has been approved by the Panel under Self-Governance need to be approved by Ofgem. This is not consistent with the Self-Governance arrangements

Section F of the BSC describes how a Modification Proposal may be considered by the Self-Governance route if, when implemented:

- a) Does not involve any amendments whether in whole or in part to the EBGL Article 18 terms and conditions, except to the extent required to correct an error in the EBGL Article 18 terms and conditions or as a result of a factual change, including but not limited to:
  i) correcting minor typographical errors;
  ii) correcting formatting and consistency errors, such as paragraph numbering; or
  iii) updating out of date references to other documents or paragraphs.

- b) unlikely to have a material effect on:
  i) existing or future electricity consumers;
  ii) competition in the generation, distribution, or supply of electricity or any commercial activities connected with the generation, distribution, or supply of electricity; and
  iii) the operation of the national electricity transmission system; and
  iv) matters relating to sustainable development, safety or security of supply, or the management of market or network emergencies; and
  v) the Code's governance procedures or modification procedures,

- c) is unlikely to discriminate between different classes of Parties.

PRIORITISATION

ELEXON

Issue 102 Prioritisation

- Please use Slido to rank the ideas in order of the priority you think they should be given
- Participants can vote at **Slido.com** with the code

  #1236992

- After a test question, you will be asked to rank the Issue 102 ideas
- Click 1st on your highest priority idea, then on 2nd highest, 3rd highest
- Then you can drag and drop to amend your priority ranking

- If all else fails, rankings can be submitted via email and then collated.

slido

Test question: are you feeling festive?

ⓘ Start presenting to display the poll results on this slide.

slido

Priority ranking

ⓘ Start presenting to display the poll results on this slide.

NEXT STEPS

Next steps

- Workgroup summary to be sent to members/ included in final report
- Issue 102 documents to be updated with latest outcomes and solutions

- Is another Workgroup meeting needed?
- If not, Issue 102 Report to be written and shared with members for review

- Any Other Business?

ELEXON

Ivar Macsween

ivar.macsween@elexon.co.uk

BSC.Change@elexon.co.uk

2022