

# MINUTES

---

<b>MEETING NAME</b>	BSC Panel
<b>Meeting number</b>	304
<b>Date of meeting</b>	Thursday 9 July 2020
<b>Venue</b>	Video Conference
<b>Classification</b>	Public

---

## ATTENDEES AND APOLOGIES

---

<b>Attendees</b>	Michael Gibbons	MG	BSC Panel Chair
	Phil Hare	PH	Deputy BSC Panel Chair (and Alternate for MBe)
	Colin Down	CD	Ofgem Representative
	Jon Wisdom	JW	NGESO Panel Member
	Lisa Waters	LW	Industry Panel Member
	Rhys Kealley	RK	Industry Panel Member (Alternate for MD)
	Stuart Cotten	SC	Industry Panel Member
	Tom Edwards	TE	Industry Panel Member
	Derek Bunn	DB	Independent Panel Member
	Diane Dowdell	DD	Independent Panel Member
	Fungai Madzivadondo	FM	Distribution System Operator Representative
	Ed Rees	ER	Consumer Panel Member (and Alternate for SH)
	Mark Bygraves	MB	Elexon CEO
	Victoria Moxham	VM	Elexon Director of Customer Operations, Panel Secretary
	Claire Kerr	CK	Panel and Committee Support Manager
	Lawrence Jones	LJ	Modification Secretary
	Sara Vaughan	SV	BSCCo Board Member (Observer)
	Geraldine Buckland	GB	Elexon Chief People Officer (Observer)
	Peter Stanley	PS	Elexon Director of Digital Operations (Part Meeting)
	Leonardo Costa	LC	Ofgem (Part Meeting)
	Jamie Webb	JW	NGESO (Part Meeting)
	Tom Chevalier	TC	Association of Meter Operators (Part Meeting)
	Andrew Grace	AG	Elexon (Part Meeting)
	Craig Murray	CM	Elexon (Part Meeting)
	Matthew Woolliscroft	MW	Elexon (Part Meeting)
	Nick Baker	NB	Elexon (Part Meeting)
	Peter Frampton	PF	Elexon (Part Meeting)
	Nicholas Rubin	NR	Elexon (Part Meeting)
<b>Apologies</b>	Mark Bellman	MBe	Industry Panel Member
	Mitch Donnelly	MD	Industry Panel Member
	Stew Horne	SH	Consumer Panel Member

---

## 1. Introduction

# MINUTES

---

- 1.1 The Chairman noted apologies from Mark Bellman, Mitch Donnelly and Stew Horne and noted their alternates.
- 1.2 The Chairman noted exchanges with David Lane who was no longer the Distribution System Operator (DSO) Representative for the BSC Panel. David had been the longest serving member of the Panel having been a founding member over 20 years ago. He has also served on several other Panel Committees over the years. The Panel thanked David for his long, expert and diligent service, and his regular wise and constructive contribution to debate at the Panel. The Chairman will write to David and include comments from current Panel Members. He also welcomed Fungai Madzivadondo who has been appointed as the new DSO Representative for the Panel.

## MODIFICATION AND CHANGE BUSINESS (OPEN SESSION)

---

**IWA:** Initial Written Assessment | **AC:** Assessment Procedure Consultation | **AR:** Assessment Report  
**RC:** Report Phase Consultation | **DMR:** Draft Modification Report

### 2. Change Report and Progress of Modification Proposals – (304/03)

- 2.1 A Panel Member queried whether any of the change priorities, due to COVID-19 had changed. The Modification Secretary confirmed that they had not.
- 2.2 A Panel Member queried why [P395 'Excluding generators from BM Unit Gross Demand and the calculation of EMR Supplier Charges'](#) had been staggered, despite being a priority. The Modification Secretary advised that P395 potentially has a long Implementation Date and staggering it would reduce the burden on other Modifications.
- 2.3 In relation to [P379 'Multiple Suppliers through Meter Splitting'](#), the Modification Secretary confirmed that following the Panel's advice to use a third party to provide or support the cost-benefit analysis (CBA) Elexon has drafted a specification for the work and held preliminary discussions with selected organisations. Based on these, a budget of £40-80k and a timescale of four-six months is likely to be required. Elexon now plans to initiate a Request for Proposal (RFP) the week commencing 13 July 2020 and subject to a successful bid, intends to begin the CBA in September 2020 with a consultation to follow before the end of the year. A final CBA paper is planned for early Q1 2021.
- 2.4 A Panel Member noted that they had received push-back on this Modification with some Suppliers informally commenting to them that this would be detrimental and asked Elexon to be cautious in its progression of P379. The Modification Secretary noted these views, acknowledging that there had also been mixed views amongst Members of the Workgroup. The CBA should provide a robust basis for informing the Panel's decision to continue with P379.
- 2.5 In relation to [P383 'Enhanced reporting of demand data to the NETSO to facilitate CUSC Modifications CMP280 and CMP281'](#), the Modification Secretary advised that the implementation cost estimates have increased from £465k to £905k. The P383 costs originally provided to the Panel were only on a standalone basis and despite their apparent precision had not included costs arising from interactions with other system changes. Elexon now has a clearer view of the current change pipeline through to April 2021 and highlighted that:
  - The baseline against which P383 was originally assessed has significantly changed;
  - Complexity of the change pipeline means we have risks costed into the estimate, but are still only risks at this stage; and
  - £350k has currently been provisioned for management oversight and contingency within the overall estimate and this is currently being discussed with our service provider before committing to a contract to see if the cost of managing these risks can be reduced.

# MINUTES

---

- 2.6 A Panel Member queried whether the stability path finders would be included in the P383 solution. The NGESO Panel Member commented that this would happen for voltage path finders for Transmission Network Use of System (TNUoS) charges which would be implemented in 2022. However, if something similar needed to be done for Balancing Services Use of System (BSUoS) charges, this would need to be carried out by the BSUoS task force. He noted that they are in discussions with Ofgem but agreed to discuss this out of the Panel meeting to provide further clarification.
- 2.7 The NGESO Representative noted Elexon's increase in cost estimates but queried whether there would be any risk in implementing the changes. PS commented that there is no significant additional risk; the increase is down to further testing required as a result of changes to the baseline complexity to which P383 was originally assessed against.
- 2.8 A Panel Member queried why the cost of interacting with the other systems was not originally included in the figures. They suggested that this was a significant omission. PS noted that actual costs are hard to predict 18 months in advance of implementation. However, he differentiated between the work on P383 with work on the November 2020 Release, work on the Foundation Programme and April 2021 Release. Additionally, PS clarified that £905k now includes a risk margin and commercial discussions are ongoing with Elexon's service provider to manage the cost down to closer to the original estimate.
- 2.9 Elexon has revised its estimates of the additional costs due to NGESO-initiated delays to complete the industry-wide testing for TERRE upwards from the £850k from the £400k noted in the previous Panel Meeting. PS clarified that a contingency of £111k is now included in this latest estimate to take into account any further changes needed for changes to the ESO plan. A large amount of the bilateral testing is now complete and Elexon is now working with NGESO to finalise the testing programme. BSC Parties will then be able to carry out their testing of the end-to-end process. All these additional costs are effectively borne by Parties even though they are outside Elexon's control.
- 2.10 A Panel Member asked the Ofgem Representative to flag to Ofgem that NGESO's performance should be noted on this work and highlighted that NGESO needs to be clear that there are no further delays to the programme. The NGESO Panel Member acknowledged that NGESO could be more transparent and suggested that someone from their balancing programme could attend the August Panel meeting to advise further on the challenges that NGESO are experiencing with TERRE. Further, he noted that NGESO is not expecting any further delays.

## **ACTION 304/01**

- 2.11 A Panel Member queried whether Elexon had informed BSC Parties. MB clarified that Elexon is not asking for further funds from Parties and these costs would be sourced from the existing Demand Led budget. Nevertheless, it will potentially impact any underspend of ELEXON budget which would otherwise be 'returned' to Parties. PS also highlighted that whilst there had been a £300,000 unused (originally included within the contingency included within the budget for P344). This unused amount had already been distributed back to Parties as it related to 2019/20.
- 2.12 A Panel Member suggested that regardless of whether the overspend was caused by NGESO, Elexon should be strongly pursuing ways to reduce the extra costs and requested that Elexon prepare a thorough analysis of ways in which the figure could be reduced for the Panel.

## **ACTION 304/02**

- 2.13 A Panel Member suggested that the Panel will need to be wary of approving [P407 'Project MARI'](#) when this is presented to the Panel for decision as they would not want to have the same thing happen i.e. Elexon having a significant increase in costs despite completing its duties on time. The NGESO Panel Member agreed to also feed this back to NGESO noting that NGESO is restricted on what it can do due to compliance issues but that it may be something that Ofgem can consider.

# MINUTES

---

- 2.14 The Modification Secretary took the Panel through the EB GL change process in relation to the Article 18 terms and conditions following the approval of [P392 'Amending BSC Change Process for EBGL Article 18'](#) (see Panel 304 [slides](#) for further information), and noted that BEIS intends to direct a change to the Panel responsibilities to support the Smart Energy Code (SEC) Panel for certain tasks.
- 2.15 The BSC Panel:
- a) **APPROVED** a one-month extension to the P398 Assessment Procedure;
  - b) **APPROVED** the change to the Standard Workgroup Terms of Reference; and
  - c) **NOTED** the contents of the July Change Report.

## 3. P410 'Changing imbalance price calculations to comply with the Imbalance Settlement Harmonisation regulations' – (304/04)

- 3.1 A Panel Member strongly disagreed with the assessment made in the report with respect to the Applicable BSC Objectives. They did not agree that the benefits exist and therefore believed there would be a detrimental impact to Applicable BSC Objective (b). The Panel Member noted that the Value of Avoided Activation (VOAA) of balancing energy from frequency restoration reserves or replacement reserves is not likely to be representative of a good incentive to balance when the Net Imbalance Volume (NIV) equals zero. The Panel Member also disagreed that P410 would better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (c) as they believed it would be contradictory to harmonising the market.
- 3.2 The same Panel Member also expressed concern that this Modification would require significant IT challenges which would take a significant amount of time to implement. They were also concerned that only scheduling three Workgroup meetings would not be enough to fully assess the profound changes proposed. The Panel Member suggested that it would also be beneficial for an impact assessment to be carried out on changing the Market Index Price as part of the Modification process. The Panel Member expressed concern that without this, bad decisions were likely to be made by market participants having to second guess what NGESO did not do. Elexon agreed to add these two suggestions to the Workgroup's Terms of Reference.
- 3.3 However, the Panel noted that including the two new additions to the Workgroup's Terms of Reference would increase the timescales for progressing the Modification and would therefore require a longer timetable. Noting the Proposer's deadline, the Panel agreed that the Assessment Procedure timetable will need to be extended by three months. The NGESO Representative requested that any extension including dates be shared with NGESO as the Proposer as soon as possible just in case it needs to request that P410 be treated as an Urgent Modification.
- 3.4 A Panel Member suggested that it may be worth waiting before progressing this Modification to see what other markets do. Another Panel Member was disappointed that NGESO had chosen to focus on P410 and was worried that it will distract from other market improvements that NGESO should be progressing. Additionally, the Panel Member believed that there would not be repercussions if Elexon/NGESO was non-compliant. The Proposer acknowledged the concerns but highlighted that P410 had been scheduled to hit compliance deadlines under EU Law; if NGESO waited to see what happens, they would not be able to be compliant.
- 3.5 A Panel Member queried how active the UK had been in its discussions with the European Union Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators (ACER). Elexon advised that Elexon and NGESO had been in constant contact in relation to drafting proposals which were submitted to ACER back in December 2019. Unfortunately these proposals were rejected but new terms had been prepared by ACER which were significantly different. Elexon noted that a decision from ACER is expected on these in a couple of weeks and once received, Elexon and NGESO will have 18 months to comply with the obligations.

# MINUTES

---

3.6 A Panel Member asked Ofgem whether there would be an opportunity to apply for a derogation. LC (Ofgem) commented that derogations are limited and he did not see the possibility of derogation for this; the purpose is to harmonise across all markets and approving a derogation would be contrary to this.

3.7 The BSC Panel:

- a) **AGREED** that P410 progresses to the Assessment Procedure;
- b) **AGREED** the proposed Assessment Procedure timetable, subject to a three month extension;
- c) **AGREED** the proposed membership for the P410 Workgroup; and
- d) **AGREED** the Workgroup's Terms of Reference, subject to assessing the impacts of changing the Market Index Price for an Imbalance Settlement Harmonisation Regulation and compliant Value of Avoided Activation.

## 4. 'Including new LDSOs in Qualification to mitigate potential risks to Settlement' – (304/05)

4.1 The BSC Panel:

- a) **RAISED** the Modification in Attachment A in accordance with F2.1.1(d)(vi);
- b) **AGREED** that the Modification should progress directly to the Report Phase;
- c) **AGREED** that the Modification:
  - i) **DOES** better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (d);
- d) **AGREED** that this Modification does not impact the Article 18 Terms and Conditions held within the BSC;
- e) **AGREED** an initial recommendation that the Modification be approved;
- f) **AGREED** an initial Implementation Date of:
  - i) 5 November 2020 as part of the November 2020 BSC Release;
- g) **AGREED** the draft legal text;
- h) **AGREED** the draft changes to BSCP537;
- i) **AGREED** an initial view that the Modification should be treated as a Self-Governance Modification; and
- j) **NOTED** that ELEXON will issue the Draft Modification Report (including the draft legal text) for a 12 Working Day consultation and will present the results to the Panel at its meeting on 13 August 2020.

## 5. P397 'Assessing the costs and benefits of adjusting Parties' Imbalances following a demand disconnection' – (304/06)

5.1 Elexon confirmed that the identifier DEC00201 did not mean ELEXON had received 201 Demand Control Events (DCEs) instructions prior to DCE00201.

5.2 As to the lack of responses from Suppliers, a Panel Member asked whether any Suppliers who Panel members worked for had responded to the consultation: one advised that they were in the process of finding the correct person within their organisation to provide a response.

5.3 The DSO Representative suggested that this should go out for consultation given the short timescale given to consider the current options.

5.4 A Panel Member noted that the analysis provided challenges the concerns the Panel had at the time P397 was raised and subsequently submitted to the Authority. They noted that industry's costs of performing the Settlement Adjustment Processes (SAP) have largely been explained and it is only left for Suppliers to provide their costs. The Panel Member highlighted that the costs to the industry appear far less than originally

# MINUTES

---

identified but that they would need Suppliers to confirm these. Elexon advised that three Suppliers had informally communicated their rationale for not responding to the Request for Information (RFI) was that they believed the impacts to be immaterial; or that they had not gathered the data necessary to effectively assess them.

- 5.5 The Panel agreed that it would be sensible to consult on whether [P397](#) should be amended to incorporate Option 1 (the original P397 solution (i.e. if the cost of the DCE is greater than the benefit, the SAP will not be run) updated using data and findings from the Request for Information (RFI)), in line with the Issue 89 recommendation. A Panel Member suggested that Elexon include in the consultation that the Panel had discussed this issue and needs Suppliers to confirm whether there is still an issue. The Panel also agreed to chase Suppliers to respond to this consultation to help form their final views on this Modification.
- 5.6 Elexon also advised that [Issue 89 'Ensuring Demand Control Event \(DCE\) procedures remain fit for purpose'](#) is ongoing and so there is still more to consider for this issue.
- 5.7 A Panel Member commented that while the prevailing costs estimates made introducing this Modification made a lot of sense at the time, the actual costs now expected for similar events had reduced to the level where they felt that this Modification was not useful to the efficiency of the Code.
- 5.8 The BSC Panel by majority:
- a) **AGREED** that the P397 solution should be amended to incorporate Option 1, in line with the Issue 89 recommendation;
  - b) **AGREED** that P397:
    - i) **DOES** better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (c);
    - ii) **DOES** better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (d);
  - c) **AGREED** an initial recommendation that P397 should be approved;
  - d) **AGREED** an initial Implementation Date of 5WD following Authority approval;
  - e) **AGREED** the BSC legal text;
  - f) **AGREED** the Code Subsidiary Documents;
  - g) **AGREED** the revised new 'Demand Disconnection Event Threshold Rules' document;
  - h) **AGREED** to re-issue P397 for Report Phase Consultation;
  - i) **NOTED** that ELEXON will issue the revised Draft Modification Report for a 12 Working Day Consultation and will present the results to the Panel at its meeting on 13 August 2020.

## 6. **P409 'Aligning BMRS Reporting Requirements with the Clean Energy Package' – (304/07)**

- 6.1 The BSC Panel:
- a) **AGREED** that P409:
    - i) **DOES** better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (e);
  - b) **DETERMINED** (in the absence of any Authority direction) that P409 is a Self-Governance Modification Proposal;
  - c) **APPROVED** P409;
  - d) **AGREED** that P409 does not impact the EBGL Article 18 terms and conditions held within the BSC;
  - e) **APPROVED** an Implementation Date of:

# MINUTES

---

- i) 5 November 2020 as part of the November 2020 BSC Release;
- f) **APPROVED** the draft legal text; and
- g) **APPROVED** the P409 Modification Report.

## 7. P408 'Simplifying the Output Usable Process as a consequence of GC0130' – (304/08)

### 7.1 The BSC Panel:

- a) **AGREED** that P408:
  - i) **DOES** better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (a);
  - ii) **DOES** better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (b); and
  - iii) **DOES** better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (c);
- b) **AGREED** that P408 does not impact the EBGL Article 18 terms and conditions held within the BSC;
- c) **DETERMINED** (in the absence of any Authority direction) that P408 is a Self-Governance Modification Proposal;
- d) **APPROVED** P408;
- e) **APPROVED** an Implementation Date of:
  - i) 3 December 2020
- f) **APPROVED** the draft legal text; and
- g) **APPROVED** the P408 Modification Report.

## 8. Designation Request from AMO to raise Modification Proposal 'Half Hourly Settlement and remote communication obligations for CT Advanced Meters' – (304/09)

- 8.1 The Chairman queried why a BSC Party had not agreed to proceed with raising this Modification. A Panel Member suggested that this may be down to timing, taking into consideration Ofgem's Market Wide Half Hourly Settlement (MHHS) Significant Code Review (SCR). The prospective Proposer was of the view that this Modification would be complimentary to the SCR and as such could be coordinated alongside it. He noted that although the SCR timeline had slowed, Ofgem could implement this aspect prior to the implementation of the full SCR.
- 8.2 A Panel Member noted that they had received feedback from Suppliers that it would not be helpful for Ofgem to proceed this Modification separately to the SCR. However they acknowledged that elements of the Modification should be considered more widely as part of the SCR. The Ofgem Representative commented that this proposal is likely to fall under Ofgem's SCR but that there is a separate question over whether Ofgem would want to subsume the Modification under its SCR, or allow the industry to progress it (which Ofgem is still considering). A Panel Member queried whether the Proposer had been in conversations with Ofgem regarding this. The prospective Proposer noted Ofgem's position in encouraging an organisation (BSC Party or non-BSC Party) to raise a Modification Proposal that the organisation believed to be valid. However, they had not received correspondence from Ofgem setting out whether this Modification does or does not fall under its SCR.
- 8.3 The Panel emphasised that they welcomed this first designation request from a non-BSC Party who had presented a validly drafted Modification. The Panel did not want to be seen as a barrier but in this instance was concerned with the procedural aspects of the Modification itself due to Ofgem's ongoing SCR. A Panel Member suggested that in considering the application, it should consult with Ofgem as an interested third party before making the designation request. The majority of the Panel agreed that this would be the most sensible and efficient approach.

# MINUTES

---

- 8.4 One Panel Member was uncomfortable with this scenario as it was the first time the Panel had received a designation request from a non-BSC Party and it was unfortunate that it was not in a position to immediately designate due to Ofgem's SCR. The Panel overall had sympathy for the prospective Proposer's position but agreed that taking efficiency into account, it would be pragmatic to defer the decision until it had consulted with Ofgem. The Panel welcomed an Ofgem decision by the August Panel meeting.
- 8.5 The BSC Panel:
- a) **DEFERRED** the designation request from the AMO to raise the attached Modification Proposal until the August 2020 Panel meeting, pending response from Ofgem that the proposal can proceed outside of the Electricity Settlement Reform Significant Code Review.

## NON-MODIFICATION BUSINESS (OPEN SESSION)

---

### 9. Minutes of previous meeting & Actions arising

- 9.1 The BSC Panel approved the draft minutes for BSC Panel meeting 303. ELEXON presented the actions and associated updates for the July 2020 Panel meeting.
- 9.2 In relation to action 296/01 (Ofgem to investigate ways in which duplication of effort and expenditure in respect of IS development might be mitigated), the Panel agreed to close the action on the basis that Ofgem provided a response that code systems developments are currently the responsibility of the separate code bodies. The issue of future coordination, strategic guidance of this type, and possible consolidation is the subject of the pending Codes Review.
- 9.3 In relation to action 303/05 (Elexon to consider whether the provision for a Proposer to describe the impact on emissions in Modifications should be used in the future), Elexon advised that the BSC already requires the assessment of the impact of Modification Proposals on greenhouse gas emissions, where those impacts are likely to be material. This was introduced under [P263 'Code Governance Review: Send Back Process and Environmental Assessment'](#), however Elexon is not aware that an assessment has ever been done before. Going forwards, Elexon proposes to show for all Modifications whether it is likely to reduce, increase or have no impact on greenhouse gas emissions; where this is identified as material will require an assessment.
- 9.4 The Ofgem Representative queried how this would work in practice as there is currently a free text box for rationale. The Modification Secretary suggested that this still be included but that also a colour or symbol system would be included to show the level of impact. A Panel Member suggested that the term 'greenhouse gas emissions' be changed to 'net zero policy' on the form and whether the Modification was consistent with net zero or not. The Modification Secretary agreed that this could be amended.
- 9.5 A Panel Member supported the suggestion but noted that it may be difficult to complete accurately. They noted that the key is interactions when it comes down to carbon emissions i.e. changing one part of the industry/network. Additionally a Panel Member queried how Elexon would get NGENSO involved as they would be picking up the consequences. The Modification Secretary shared the complexity concerns noting that a lot of these impacts would be cross-code impacts. They suggested that including an 'insufficient data to say' text box might also be useful. The Panel agreed that it needed to start somewhere and that this was a sensible first step.
- 9.6 In respect of 303/02 (ELEXON to write to Stuart Lacey, CEO of Electralink in relation to the incorrect information detailed in their webinar on energy governance transformation and December 2019 Accounts), MB responded that no reply had been received from Electralink. He was also aware that the SEC Panel Chair had written to Electralink expressing similar concerns. The Panel requested the letter be copied to Ofgem.

**ACTION 304/03**

### 10. Chairman's Report

---



# MINUTES

---

- 10.1 The Chairman noted that the Annual Report for 2019/2020 had now been published and thanked PH and MBe for their review of the document.
- 10.2 The Chairman advised that the Annual BSC Meeting had now been confirmed for Thursday 10 September 2020 following the BSC Panel meeting in the morning. Jonathan Brearley, CEO of Ofgem had confirmed he would be the guest speaker. The Chairman noted that BSCCo Board and Panel Members are expected to attend.
- 10.3 The Panel Secretary advised that the nomination forms for the BSC Panel Elections 2020 had now been issued to all Trading Parties. Nominations should be sent via email to the Elections Coordinator, Claire Kerr, by 5pm on Friday 24 July 2020.
- 10.4 The Chairman observed that the Credit Assessment Price (CAP) had been breached again which had resulted in a consultation with responses due by 8 July 2020. A Panel Member observed that often there is not a lot of time to respond prior to a consultation being issued so agreed with a potential review of the CAP process as detailed in the BSC Panel Strategy.

## 11. ELEXON Report – (304/01)

- 11.1 MB asked the Panel to note that he had written to BSC Parties on 16 June 2020 in relation to the cyber-attack and confirmed the Information Commissioner's Office conclusions that it would be taking no further action. He advised that Elexon was would be carrying out a lessons learned exercise in discussions with the Panel, Energy Networks Association (ENA) etc.
- 11.2 In relation to COVID-19, MB noted that a letter had been issued to BSC Parties on 2 July 2020 on their expectations for returning to Elexon's offices. Elexon had received 81 responses so far and he encouraged the Panel to respond as well.

## 12. Distribution Report

- 12.1 The DNO Representative suggested discussing Ofgem's MHHS impact assessment with Elexon. MB agreed that this could be arranged.

## 13. National Grid Report

- 13.1 The NGESO Panel Member noted that the RIIO-2 draft determinations were issued on 8 July 2020. This is the first time that the ESO has had a separate price control framework published with Ofgem commenting on them.
- 13.2 The NGESO Panel Member informed the Panel that the Data Portal went live on 25 June 2020, with much quicker data updates and greater transparency.
- 13.3 The NGESO Panel Member also highlighted that [P371 'Inclusion of non-BM Fast Reserve actions into the Imbalance Price calculation'](#) went live on 25 June 2020. Fast Reserve data is now being sent to Elexon for use in cashout.
- 13.4 The NGESO Panel Member noted that [CMP345 'Defer the additional Covid-19 BSUoS costs'](#) had now been approved by Ofgem. This Modification caps BSUoS prices at £15/MWh until the end of August 2020.
- 13.5 Finally, the NGESO Panel Member highlighted that TNUoS costs assistance is now available for eligible Suppliers through the ENA similar to the DUoS scheme supported by the ESO and the TO's.

## 14. Ofgem Report

- 14.1 The Ofgem Representative highlighted Ofgem's [proposals](#) for a five-year investment programme of £25bn, with the potential for an additional £10bn or more, to transform Britain's energy networks to deliver emissions-free green energy for GB, whilst cutting the cost of this investment for consumers. Ofgem is seeking views on this proposal by 4 September 2020.

# MINUTES

---

- 14.2 The Ofgem Representative advised that the 12-week period for responding to the impact assessment on MHHS has now officially started, with responses due by 14 September 2020. Ofgem has arranged for an online event on 22 July 2020 to walk through the publication and invite views.
- 14.3 The Ofgem Representative noted that Ofgem had issued a number of [publications](#) on COVID-19 and priorities (both Ofgem's and industry's):
- Ofgem: Set out its updated expectations on priorities to September 2020; and
  - Industry: Ofgem confirmed that normal regulatory rules will apply from 1 July 2020 (this follows on from its regulatory easement letters issued earlier in the year). Ofgem worked closely with stakeholders in coming to that position.
- 14.4 A Panel Member asked Ofgem to set out the process/guidance of what it expects when there is a Modification Proposal submitted under the EB GL terms and conditions. In particular, what Ofgem expects when this Modification needs to be treated as Urgent.

## ACTION 304/04

15. The Chairman noted that a few senior people at Ofgem (Mary Starks, Joe Perkins and Sarah Cox) have been leaving the organisation recently and asked whether the Ofgem Representative could comment. The Ofgem Representative confirmed that there is no formal messaging to relay but that in his opinion, when there is a new CEO, there is often an organisational restructure, which often results in some people leaving. He also noted that the new CEO is looking to flatten the layers of sign off and so this could be related.

## 16. Tabled Reports

- 16.1 The BSC Panel noted the reports from the ISG, SVG, PAB, TDC, the Trading Operations Headline Report and the System Price Analysis report.

## 17. BSC Panel Strategy – (304/10)

- 17.1 The Chairman thanked PH, DD, CK and VM for the hard work that had gone into producing the newly-designed Panel Strategy document.
- 17.2 The Panel Secretary highlighted the main Panel actions for 2020-2022, noting that post-implementation reviews would be added as an additional action to this section.
- 17.3 A Panel Member suggested that it might be useful to provide target dates for when each topic will be concluded/actions closed out. Another Panel Member suggested that the net zero ambition by 2050 includes how the Panel/Elexon intends to help industry with this.
- 17.4 Another Panel Member suggested highlighting that the BSC delivers value for money. Another Panel Member requested that the ways in which Modifications will impact Consumers is brought out a bit more. Another Panel Member was of the opinion that the pictures included in the document were not completely reflective of the industry as a whole and suggested that alternatives were considered for the final version.
- 17.5 The Panel Secretary agreed to address these amendments and circulate an updated redlined version to the Panel for their review.
- 17.6 The BSC Panel:
- a) **DEFERRED** the approval of the BSC Panel Strategy for 2020-2022 to the August Panel meeting, until the final Panel comments are incorporated into the document.

## 18. Any other business

# MINUTES

---

- 18.1 A Panel Member highlighted the Distribution Connection and Use of System Agreement (DCUSA) CP 371 for information. He noted that the CP is still in draft, and the issue is being discussed at a DCUSA Sub-Group but the materials (including the draft CP) can be found [here](#).
- 18.2 Another Panel Member highlighted the corresponding SEC Modification Proposal 46 which can be found [here](#).

## 19. Next Meeting

- 19.1 The next meeting of the BSC Panel will be held remotely on Thursday 13 August 2020.

