

MINUTES

MEETING NAME	BSC Panel
---------------------	-----------

Meeting number	305
-----------------------	-----

Date of meeting	Thursday 13 August 2020
------------------------	-------------------------

Venue	Video Conference
--------------	------------------

Classification	Public
-----------------------	--------

ATTENDEES AND APOLOGIES

Attendees	Michael Gibbons	MG	BSC Panel Chair
	Phil Hare	PH	Deputy BSC Panel Chair (and alternate for SH)
	Colin Down	CD	Ofgem Representative
	Jon Wisdom	JW	NGESO Panel Member
	Lisa Waters	LW	Industry Panel Member
	Mark Bellman	MBe	Industry Panel Member
	Rhys Kealley	RK	Industry Panel 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 (and alternate for ER)
	Fungai Madzivadondo	FM	Distribution System Operator Representative
	Mark Bygraves	MB	Elxon CEO
	Victoria Moxham	VM	Elxon Director of Customer Operations, Panel Secretary
	Claire Kerr	CK	BSC Administration and Configuration Manager
	Elliott Harper	EH	Modification Secretary
	Angela Love	AL	Elxon Director of Future Markets and Engagement (Part Meeting)
	Kate Norton	KN	Elxon (Part Meeting)
	Craig Murray	CM	Elxon (Part Meeting)
	Matthew Woolliscroft	MW	Elxon (Part Meeting)
	Andrew Grace	AG	Elxon (Part Meeting)
	Faysal Mahad	FM	Elxon (Part Meeting)
	Peter McLinton	PM	Elxon (Part Meeting)
	Sophie Bentley	SB	Elxon (Part Meeting)
	Chris Stock	CS	Elxon (Part Meeting)
	Ryan Dale	RD	Elxon (Part Meeting)
	John Lucas	JL	Elxon (Part Meeting)
	Nick Baker	NB	Elxon (Part Meeting)
	David Thomas	DT	Elxon (Part Meeting)
	Peter Frampton	PF	Elxon (Part Meeting)
	Chris Day	CD	Elxon (Part Meeting)
	Tim Collins	TC	SIMEC Kinlochleven Power Ltd (Part Meeting)
Apolo	Mitch Donnelly	MD	Industry Panel Member
	Ed Rees	ER	Consumer Panel Member
	Stew Horne	SH	Consumer Panel Member

MINUTES

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Chairman noted apologies from Mitch Donnelly, Ed Rees and Stew Horne and noted their alternates.

PART I: 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 – (305/03)

- 2.1 The Modification Secretary [presented](#) the Change Report and progress of Modification Proposals.
- 2.2 They highlighted that it had not yet received a decision from Ofgem on [P390 'Allowing extensions to ELEXON's business and activities, subject to additional conditions'](#), sent for decision in May 2020 and is not aware of an expected decision date. However in correspondence Ofgem had advised that this is because it is still working through some outstanding legal questions. MB noted that Elexon had replied to this as long ago as 16 June 2020. The Ofgem Representative apologised to the Panel for the delayed response.
- 2.3 A Panel Member noted the change delivery schedule for forthcoming Releases between November 2020 and April 2021 (and also the TERRE Release) and queried whether Elexon was checking with industry that it was able to keep pace in relation to changes to their own systems. Elexon advised that it had continued its engagement with industry and had been taking BSC Parties through all associated system changes through its usual communication channels.
- 2.4 The Chairman observed that there appears to be a lot of live change in the assessment pipeline, and also a large volume of change in the delivery pipeline, highlighting possible congestion; he queried whether this was due to COVID-19. The Modification Secretary advised that this was largely being driven by industry; lots of big ticket items had been raised which require large system changes but acknowledged COVID-19 had provided some challenge. There had also been a knock-on impact on the delivery side with TERRE being delayed until October 2020 which needed to be taken into account.
- 2.5 The Modification Secretary reminded the Panel that in relation to the AMO's Designation Request, it had requested information from Ofgem on whether the Modification would be subsumed under the Settlement Reform Significant Code Review (SCR) if raised. On 11 August 2020, Ofgem responded confirming that "...if such a proposal were to be raised we would subsume that proposal into our SCR." Subsequently, on 12 August 2020, the AMO confirmed withdrawal of its request for designation. The AMO was grateful for the Panel's consideration of the request and timely response from Ofgem.
- 2.6 A Panel Member commented that the wording in Ofgem's letter "were to be raised" implies that a Modification would need to be raised for these points to be considered. The Modification Secretary noted that for efficiency purposes (if the Modification were raised and then subsumed, it would sit dormant under the BSC requiring resource to monitor), the AMO has withdrawn its request for designation, understanding that Ofgem will consider the points raised under its SCR.
- 2.7 The Panel understood and expected that Ofgem would consider the issues raised by the prospective Modification in the SCR, without the need for the Modification to actually, and inefficiently be raised. If, for some reason they are not, the AMO will still have the opportunity to return to the Panel with the designation request and raise the Modification. A Panel Member commented that the process has worked well in this circumstance and was glad that Ofgem had provided clarity swiftly. However, they suggested that keeping a watching brief would be useful.
- 2.8 NGESO has recently announced that they have "integrated the Power Available signal from over 90 renewable generators into the control systems and processes, providing greater visibility to the control room

MINUTES

engineers as they balance the system on a second by second basis". A Panel Member queried whether the 90 renewable generators are all wind farms. Another Panel Member believed this was the case.

- 2.9 A Panel Member was concerned that all the Modifications listed requiring an extension had already had previous extensions granted. They suggested that Elexon should review the progression of Modifications to ensure timelines are realistic and take account where there are potentially larger changes and impacts. The Panel noted that it would prefer to receive realistic and justified timelines rather than grant extensions to ambitious timelines. Elexon agreed and that realistic timelines that are also understood and agreed by Proposers, particularly given the large volume of change progressing under the BSC.
- 2.10 A Panel Member suggested that it might be useful to review the progress of Modifications over the past year to see how well they have performed to the timetable. Another Panel Member did not want the figures to be skewed by COVID-19. The Modification Secretary accepted the points being made and will work to ensure timelines presented are realistic and thus reduce the issue of multiple extensions per Modification.
- 2.11 The BSC Panel:
- a) **APPROVED** a two-month extension to the P376 Assessment Procedure;
 - b) **APPROVED** a one-month extension to the P399 Assessment Procedure;
 - c) **APPROVED** a two-month extension to the P402 Assessment Procedure; and
 - d) **NOTED** the contents of the August Change Report.

3. P397 'Assessing the costs and benefits of adjusting Parties' Imbalances following a demand disconnection' – (305/04)

- 3.1 A Panel Member queried why it is called Demand Control Event (DCE) 201. Elexon advised that this is how it was detailed in NGESO's report. The NGESO Panel Member agreed to find this out.

ACTION 305/01

- 3.2 A Panel Member noted that the benefits case had diminished over time as the true costs of performing the Settlement Adjustment Processes (SAP) had become clearer. However, a Panel Member commented that the costs of performing the SAP should not exceed the benefits, particularly where the costs are incurred by an event beyond Parties' control and highlighted that there is a drive not to waste money.
- 3.3 The Panel agreed that it now had a good estimate of future SAPs (cost threshold is £93.99/MWh) and believed there was still a benefit in progressing this Modification.
- 3.4 One Panel Member disagreed with Applicable BSC Objective (c) as they did not see a clear benefit for or against competition for Parties.
- 3.5 The BSC Panel:
- a) **AGREED** that P397:
 - i) **DOES** better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (c);
 - ii) **DOES** better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (d);
 - b) **AGREED** an recommendation that P397 should be **approved**;
 - c) **AGREED** that P397 **does not** impact the EBGL Article 18 terms and conditions held within the BSC;
 - d) **APPROVED** the amended BSC legal text, Code Subsidiary Documents and the new 'Demand Disconnection Event Threshold Rules' document in Attachment B;
 - e) **APPROVED** the new 'Demand Disconnection Event Threshold Rules' document as a category 3 Configurable Item owned by the Panel (subject to Ofgem approval of P397); and

MINUTES

f) **APPROVED** an Implementation Date of 5WD following Authority approval.

4. P411 'Including new LDSOs in Qualification to mitigate potential risks to Settlement' – (305/05)

- 4.1 A Panel Member noted that [P411 'Including new LDSOs in Qualification to mitigate potential risks to Settlement'](#) only applies to new entrants and queried whether P411 would place any undue barriers to entry on LDSOs seeking to enter the market. Elexon advised that it did not foresee any barriers to new entrants and clarified that P411 did not seek to place additional responsibility on new entrants, but rather ensure that they were aware of and capable of carrying out the responsibilities of the LDSO role under the BSC before commencing operation. The DSO Representative advised that there had been support from DNOs.
- 4.2 A Panel Member queried whether smaller/newer Parties were of the same view as larger incumbents. The DSO Representative advised that these parties also provided strong support but noted that it was not possible to fully gauge the view of future entrants as they were not known entities.
- 4.3 The Panel also agreed that it would be useful to carry out a post-implementation review of P411 to assess whether there had been any detrimental effects on new market entrants.
- 4.4 The BSC Panel:
- a) **AGREED** that P411:
 - i) **DOES** better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (d);
 - b) **AGREED** that P411 **does not** impact the EBGL Article 18 terms and conditions held within the BSC;
 - c) **DETERMINED** (in the absence of any Authority direction) that P411 **is** a Self-Governance Modification Proposal;
 - d) **APPROVED** P411;
 - e) **APPROVED** an Implementation Date of:
 - i) 5 November 2020 as part of the November 2020 BSC Release;
 - f) **APPROVED** the draft legal text;
 - g) **APPROVED** the changes to BSCP537 for P411; and
 - h) **APPROVED** the P411 Modification Report.

5. CP1535 'Interconnector Fuel Type Category update to BMRS' – (305/06)

- 5.1 A Panel Member expressed concern about the cost implications for making changes to the BMRS as even if the changes are small, they observed that there always appears to have high price tags associated with them. They therefore queried whether these costs fall entirely on Elexon or are split between Elexon and NGESO. Elexon confirmed that these figures are just Elexon's costs. In relation to [CP1535](#), Elexon noted that the figures are higher than [CP1516 'New Interconnector Fuel Type Categories: ElecLink & IFA2'](#) as CP1535 is looking to implement the enduring CP1516 solution and add the new North Sea Link (NSL) interconnector to the BMRS.
- 5.2 A Panel Member queried whether BMRS changes are an area where costs will come down as Elexon starts to move to the Foundation Programme. MB advised that Elexon is bringing forward investment in BMRS on its own roadmap. By reconfiguring and making an investment in the system, Elexon would expect to see costs and/or speed of individual changes coming down which is one of the drivers for doing this.
- 5.3 A Panel Member commented that at the BMRS Change Board (BCB), the BCB was presented with new fuel types as a precursor to a BMRS change and queried how this fits in. Elexon advised that the BCB is part of a separate piece of work that it is doing on how data is published on the BMRS and will support the addition of

MINUTES

future interconnectors as fuel types. However, the purpose of this CP is to ensure that data from the NSL interconnectors is available to help Parties' own trading strategies; one of Elexon's aims is to ensure that the data is transparent and available when needed.

5.4 The BSC Panel:

- a) **APPROVED** the proposed changes to the NETA Interface Definition and Design: Part 1 - Interfaces with BSC Parties and their Agents for CP1535;
- b) **APPROVED** an Implementation Date for CP1535 of:
 - i) 1 April 2021 as part of a Standalone BSC Release;
- c) **APPROVED** CP1535; and
- d) **APPROVED** the North Sea Link Interconnector as a Fuel Type Category under paragraph 6.1.18 (I) of Section Q of the BSC effective from 1 April 2021.

6. Designation Request from AMO to raise Modification Proposal 'Half Hourly Settlement and remote communication obligations for CT Advanced Meters' – (305/07)

6.1 The BSC Panel:

- a) **NOTED** that the AMO had withdrawn the derogation request following Ofgem's letter indicating that if such a proposal were to be raised, it would pick up the issues and subsume that proposal into its Significant Code Review in any case.

7. Issue 90 'Could Elexon (under BSCCo) administrate a tendered Market Maker (tMM)? – (305/08)

- 7.1 Elexon advised that the Issue Group's conclusion was that Elexon would be well-placed for the task of administrating the tender for a Market Maker. However, Elexon also noted that Ofgem had made it clear to the Issue Group that they saw no current need for someone to raise the Modification and should speak to them first.
- 7.2 MB suggested that if Ofgem sees a need for a MM commencing within the next two years, then someone should raise this Modification now. He estimates that while some of the steps could be run in parallel, it will take approximately six months for a Modification, six to nine months for gathering the requirements and then six to nine months for the procurement process.
- 7.3 The Ofgem Representative advised that Ofgem had been awaiting the Issue 90 report following which it will consider the discussion and conclusions in further detail before sharing a view.
- 7.4 The BSC Panel:
 - a) **NOTED** the Issue 90 Report.

PART II: NON-MODIFICATION BUSINESS (OPEN SESSION)

8. Minutes of previous meeting & Actions arising

- 8.1 The BSC Panel approved the draft minutes for BSC Panel meetings 304 and 304A. Elexon presented the actions and associated updates for the August Panel meeting.
- 8.2 In relation to action 302/05 (A Panel Member was of the view that the EDF contract to turn down output and the ODFM to shut off other plants are energy products and therefore queried whether they should form part of the cashout calculation that the ESO sells), the NGESO Panel Member commented that NGESO had attempted to do something quickly given the difficult situation but acknowledged that it was perhaps not as

MINUTES

good as it could have been. In relation to the EDF contracts, these are going through BSUoS. The Panel agreed to close the action.

- 8.3 In relation to action 304/02 (A Panel Member requested for Elexon to prepare a thorough analysis for the Panel of ways in which the TERRE implementation overspend figure could be reduced from the current view of £800k), the Panel Member was concerned that this action was being deferred by a month and queried why nothing could be done to reduce the figure with more urgency. MB advised that Elexon looks to reduce costs where it can but needs to be able to maintain momentum; he clarified that the costs are both that of the Elexon team and its Service Providers. He confirmed that these costs were for continuing with the testing regime (as opposed to payments for stalled services). The Chairman noted that NGESO's Head of its Balancing Programme will be attending the Panel in September which might also help justify Elexon's overspending and changing timescales in the TERRE project.

9. Chairman's Report

- 9.1 The Chairman noted that a Board Letter had been [published](#) on 10 August 2020 from the BSCCo Board to BSC Parties in relation to, amongst other things, progress on our new digital platform.
- 9.2 The Chairman highlighted that Elexon Board Member Anne Heal had been appointed as the Chair of MOSL.
- 9.3 He advised that the Credit Assessment Price (CAP) is currently out for consultation to increase from £36/MWh to £46/MWh.
- 9.4 The Chairman noted that the voting for the BSC Panel Elections process had now opened with the vote closing on 28 August 2020. The Chairman observed that Stuart Cotten had decided not to run as an Industry Panel Member after ten years on the BSC Panel.
- 9.5 The Chairman advised that he had reviewed the Chairman-appointed Panel Members and all three have agreed to continue for a further two years. He highlighted that the Deputy Chairman, Phil Hare, will be responsible for leading the appointment for a new BSC Panel Chairman commencing October 2022. PH noted that he expects to start this process during 2021 and expected to coordinate his efforts with the Elexon Board as he had before.
- 9.6 The Chairman advised that Sarah Munby had become the new Permanent Secretary for the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) on 20 July 2020; he had written to her on behalf of Elexon and the Panel to welcome her.
- 9.7 The Chairman reminded the Panel that the Annual BSC Meeting will take place on 10 September 2020 between 2-4pm after the BSC Panel meeting. All Panel Members and Board Members were expected to attend. He also noted that it had been agreed for full accountability purposes, that all Board Members are put up for re-appointment via a vote by industry.
- 9.8 The Chairman asked the Panel whether, subject to government advice, they would be willing (in principle) to attend the BSC Panel meeting in person in October 2020. The Panel provided a mix of views which were fed back to Elexon.

10. ELEXON Report – (305/01)

- 10.1 MB highlighted that Ofgem's sandbox process was now live (and that Victoria Pelka, a previous Consumer Panel Member on the BSC Panel, was responsible at Ofgem for it).

11. Distribution Report

- 11.1 The DSO Representative highlighted that Grid Code Modification [GC0147: Last resort disconnection of Embedded Generation – enduring solution](#) had been raised which aims to clarify the enduring arrangements for emergency instructions that the ESO can issue to DNOs to disconnect embedded generators in an emergency situation. The change is required to replace the temporary solution which was implemented on 7

MINUTES

May 2020 and expires on 25 October 2020. In developing the solution the Workgroup will need to consider cross-code impacts. One of the key areas to address is the compensation arrangements which are not covered under the Grid Code; consequential changes may be required to the BSC, Connection Use of System Code (CUSC) or DCUSA. The change could also have interactions with [DCUSA 371 - Last resort arrangements for Distributors to manage specific consumer connected devices](#); the Workgroup will need to consider decisions regarding compensation scheme arrangements under GC0147.

- 11.2 The DSO Representative advised that in relation to Ofgem's MHHS impact assessment consultation, a meeting had been arranged for 21 August 2020 for DNOs to meet with Elexon and Ofgem.
- 11.3 In relation to P411, the DSO Representative clarified that the DNOs had been involved with the conversations on the Modification. DNOs had confirmed that they were happy for it to be progressed as they were not impacted by the proposed changes; IDNOs did not provide views on this change.

12. National Grid Report

- 12.1 The NGESO Panel Member advised that the ESO had been working with Elexon on a new BSC Modification which it intends to raise at the September Panel meeting to ensure that the requirements in the Clean Energy Package Articles 5.1/6.5 are correctly implemented in GB. This will mean ensuring that non-BM parties are balancing responsible for non/under-delivery; non-BM are currently adjusted for delivery through the process put in through P354. As such NGESO/Elexon would be engaging at the Association of Decentralised Energy (ADE) and Joint European Stakeholder Group (JESG) over the next couple of months.
- 12.2 The NGESO Panel Member noted that the CUSC re-zoning Modification and the first of Ofgem's TCR Modifications are now with Ofgem for decision.
- 12.3 The NGESO Panel Member advised that the dynamic containment product (frequency response product intended to be fast acting) communications are being issued on 13 August 2020 in relation to a webinar which is being held the week beginning 17 August 2020. This webinar will detail the soft launch of the service due to be in place by autumn 2020 to meet the operational need. NGESO is aware that it needs to do an Article 18 EB GL consultation for this which will be issued shortly.
- 12.4 The NGESO Panel Member also noted that the Price Control draft Determinations have been issued so for industry to provide a response if required.
- 12.5 A Panel Member queried whether Elexon provided a response into Ofgem's report on the ESO's performance review. Elexon advised that it did not provide a response this year.

13. Ofgem Report

- 13.1 The Ofgem Representative advised that Ofgem's [new organisation](#) had now been formalised and published. He highlighted that this is a new and flatter structure where the main changes are further up the chain in terms of how portfolios are allocated to each Director. The Chairman observed that four of nine directorate heads are vacant and queried which directorate is responsible for the BSC. The Ofgem Representative noted that this would be a mix of Cathryn Scott (Director of Enforcement & Emerging Issues) and the currently vacant Director of Energy Systems Management and Security.
- 13.2 The Ofgem Representative noted Ofgem is still of the view that the Code Governance Review remains an important project, and it has recently ramped up planning of the next steps. They expect to publish the summary of responses by late 2020 and are aiming for the next consultation to be issued in 2021. A Panel Member observed that those responses were provided over a year ago during which time new priorities and challenges had emerged for industry and therefore those responses may no longer reflect the views of industry.
- 13.3 The Ofgem Representative noted that Ofgem deferred starting the cross-code survey when lockdown begun. Ofgem has since consulted with all code panels on whether now is the right time to start the survey; most

MINUTES

suggested that the continued impacts of COVID-19 mean this is not the best time to start the survey. MB noted that the BSC Panel had been of the view to progress the survey as soon as possible.

- 13.4 The Ofgem Representative expressed the view that Ofgem was worried that if it carried out the survey, it would not receive enough responses for the data to be robust and it might distract the industry from focusing on its priorities. As such, Ofgem had agreed to skip 2020 and run the next survey in 2021, although it would reassess this nearer the time.
- 13.5 In relation to the ESO performance incentive, Ofgem's overall view was that the ESO had largely met its baseline objectives, with slightly more positives than negatives, and so the ESO will receive a modest financial reward of £1million.
- 13.6 In relation to the Retail Price Cap for the October-March period, the Ofgem Representative advised that the change translates into a fall of £84 a year for a typical consumer. Ofgem decided that consumers with pre-payment meters on the CMA Price Cap would be transferred to the Retail Price Cap at the end of the year (when the CMA Price Cap expires). Additionally, the Ofgem Representative advised that a report had been [published](#) setting out Ofgem's view that the conditions for effective competition are not in place, and as such, Ofgem believes the Retail Price Cap needs to stay in place for at least another year.

14. Tabled Reports

- 14.1 The BSC Panel noted the reports from the ISG, SVG, PAB, TDC, the Trading Operations Headline Report and the System Price Analysis report.
- 14.2 A Panel Member drew the Panel's attention to [Elexon's Request for Information \(RFI\)](#) for Parties to provide their views on the potential impacts of adding large numbers of new Line Loss Factor Classes (LLFCs) (~19,000) and valid set combinations (~300,000) to the Market Domain Data (MDD) in order to facilitate the implementation of [Ofgem's Targeted Charging Review \(TCR\) Decision](#).
- 14.3 A Panel Member requested for the BMRS Change Board (BCB) Headline Report to be added to the September 2020 agenda and any future agenda following a BCB meeting. The Panel Secretary agreed to include this.

ACTION 305/03

15. Update on REC and impacts on Assurance and Metering – (305/15)

- 15.1 The PAB has expressed serious concerns around the proposed split of metering under the REC. As there are potential impacts on Assurance under the BSC, the PAB had requested that Elexon update the Panel with a view to writing to Ofgem with these concerns. The Ofgem Representative emphasised that the REC team is keen for Assurance to be at the forefront of the proposals so will give serious thought to any concerns raised.
- 15.2 MB observed Ofgem's rationale apparently was for the split to improve assurance within the gas market by introducing assurance into the REC. He commented that it was unclear why this did not already occur within the UNC. The paper explained PAB's concern that in seeking to address a gas issue, risk was being introduced into electricity, and that the proposed split between REC and BSC has the potential to create more issues than benefits. It would seem that the new arrangements were not looking to adopt industry best practice, instead they were going to have the effect of achieving the lowest common denominator.
- 15.3 The Panel commented that by going from a mature regime (BSC) to something that does not exist yet (REC) has the potential to introduce additional risk to Settlement.
- 15.4 A Panel Member was concerned with the process of how the proposed split is being communicated to industry which they believed was not being handled well. The Panel Member noted that there needs to be better discussion and consultation with industry, particularly those participants who already have the expertise. Without this, bad industry governance could be created if a solution is not found.

MINUTES

15.5 A Panel Member suggested that it would be useful as well as seeking Ofgem's rationale, to go further in the letter to Ofgem by providing some alternative ways forward in order to help find a resolution.

15.6 The BSC Panel:

- a) **NOTED** the concerns raised in the Paper; and
- b) **AGREED** that the Panel Chair writes to Ofgem on the Panel's behalf, relaying the concerns raised in this paper, incorporating some suggested solutions but particularly highlighting the potential for the proposals around metering under the REC to impact the accuracy of data used under the BSC for the purposes of settlement, and seeking clarity on the rationale for moving assurance to the REC and also for the split of metering obligations as between the REC and BSC.

ACTION 305/04

16. BSC Panel Strategy – (305/09)

16.1 The Panel suggested that P411 should be included in the post-implementation reviews section to ensure that there would be no detrimental effects on potential new entrants. The Panel Secretary agreed to add this in.

16.2 The Panel Secretary also advised that they would set out an action plan for the Panel for when these actions need to be completed so that the Panel has some visibility as to what needs to be discussed at what meeting over the next few months.

ACTION 305/05

16.3 The BSC Panel:

- a) **APPROVED** the BSC Panel Strategy 2020-2022.

17. Approval of 2021 BSC Panel Meeting Dates – (305/16)

17.1 The BSC Panel:

- a) **APPROVED** the proposed Panel dates for 2021; and
- b) **APPROVED** their publication on the Elexon website.

18. Reference Network Mapping Statement for use in BSC Year 2021-22 – (305/10)

18.1 The BSC Panel:

- a) **NOTED** the draft reference Network Mapping Statement;
- b) **NOTED** the Network Mapping Statement for the Determination of Transmission Loss Factors; and
- c) **NOTED** that Elexon will present the draft reference NMS to the BSC Panel for approval at its October 2020 meeting.

19. Annual Performance Assurance Report (APAR) – (305/11)

19.1 The Panel acknowledged that this was a good piece of work and thanked Elexon for the effort that had gone into this.

19.2 The BSC Panel:

- a) **NOTED** the updated provided in the APAR 2019/20.

20. Any other business?

20.1 A Panel Member queried whether there was a monthly summary on how Elexon's data is being used e.g. what are the highest hits on the portal/BMRS, what had the highest number of downloads etc. Elexon

MINUTES

advised that it has this data and as such would liaise with its Communications team to share this data with the Panel.

ACTION 305/06

21. Next meeting

21.1 The next meeting of the BSC Panel will be held remotely on 10 September 2020.
