

# Minutes

## BSC Panel

Meeting number	<b>306</b>	Venue	<b>Video Conference</b>
Date of meeting	<b>Thursday 10 September 2020</b>	Classification	<b>Public</b>

### Attendees and apologies

#### Attendees

Michael Gibbons	MG	BSC Panel Chair
Phil Hare	PH	Deputy BSC Panel Chair
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 (and Alternate for MBe)
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	BSC Administration and Configuration Manager
Lawrence Jones	LJ	Modification Secretary
Angela Love	AL	Elexon Director of Future Markets and Engagement (Part Meeting)
Peter Stanley	PS	Elexon Director of Digital Operations (Part Meeting)
Elliott Harper	EH	Elexon (Part-Meeting)
Andrew Grace	AG	Elexon (Part-Meeting)
Oliver Meggitt	OM	Elexon (Part-Meeting)

Attendees and apologies		
Dnieper Cruz	DC	Elexon (Part-Meeting)
Nick Baker	NB	Elexon (Part-Meeting)
Tirath Maan	TM	Elexon (Part-Meeting)
Kathryn Coffin	KC	Elexon (Part-Meeting)
Justin Andrews	JA	Elexon (Part-Meeting)
Nicholas Rubin	NR	Elexon (Part-Meeting)
Mark De-Souza Wilson	MW	Elexon (Part-Meeting)
Freya Gardner	FG	Elexon (Part-Meeting)
Anna Stacey	AS	Ofgem (Part-Meeting)
Steph Clements	SCI	ScottishPower (Part-Meeting)
Graham Dolamore	GD	NGESO (Part-Meeting)
Graham Neale	GN	NGESO (Part-Meeting)
Thomas Cadge	TC	BUUK (Part-Meeting)
Kayt Button	KB	Ofgem (Part-Meeting)
Andrew Colley	AC	SSE (Observer)
Alessandra De Zottis	AZ	SembCorp (Observer)
Apologies		
Mark Bellman	MBe	Industry Panel Member
Stew Horne	SH	Consumer Panel Member
Mitch Donnelly	MD	Industry Panel Member

## 1. Introduction

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

## Part I: Non-Modification Business (Open Session)

### 2. Market Wide Half Hourly Settlement (MHHS) SCR Update – (Verbal)

- 2.1 Anna Stacey (AS), Head of Settlement Reform from Ofgem, provided an update on its Market-wide Half Hourly Settlement (MHHS) Significant Code Review (SCR). In particular she noted that the update would cover the resulting timings post-COVID-19, Ofgem's draft impact assessment consultation, and the particular options in the consultation for programme governance. She noted that the full business case target has been put back so publication is now due in Spring 2021.
- 2.2 The Chairman noted that the assurance role needs to be reporting to Ofgem but queried whether Ofgem intended to carry out the assurance role themselves. AS advised that Ofgem had not yet decided on what the governance model would be.
- 2.3 The Chairman also noted that the annual net benefits to GB consumers in the impact assessment are expected to be around £100-200million. He suggested that this would imply that a six-month delay is going to cost consumers £50-100million. AS noted that Ofgem is conscious of the scale of benefits to consumers both in terms of money as well as decarbonisation and the contribution towards net zero. While the urgency of MHHS

Programme is clear, Ofgem wanted to avoid the pitfalls involved large industry change programmes, particularly them being over-ambitious and delayed. She believed a realistic view from the start is key.

- 2.4 There was a discussion on the governance processes ahead. In addition to the SCR powers, BEIS also gave Ofgem powers via the Smart Meters Act which allows Ofgem to make changes directly to codes and reduces standstill periods for license changes. These powers have to be switched on by the Secretary of State and will last for five years (which has not happened yet); Ofgem has said that they expect that these powers will be switched on when the Full Business Case start date is confirmed.
- 2.5 The NGESO Panel Member commented that this programme is similar to the gas Project Nexus Programme and queried whether Ofgem is taking on the lessons learned from this. AS noted that Ofgem had paid attention to the lessons learned from both Project Nexus and the implementation of [P272 'Mandatory Half Hourly Settlement for Profile Classes 5-8'](#). One of the key learnings from Project Nexus was being particularly careful in choosing a governance model; Ofgem will need to look at the incentives of all parties and ensure a joined-up approach as industry plans change. AS was of the view that Ofgem does not need to be 'hands-on' for MHHS to be delivered hence looking at a spectrum of governance models.
- 2.6 MB queried whether Ofgem had any updates on the timing of the decision of the Project Manager role. AS noted that Ofgem had not reached a decision yet. However if Ofgem wants the governance framework in play by Spring 2021 when the full business case is expected, Ofgem needs to have made a decision some time before then.
- 2.7 AL queried whether the intention is for the roles to be funded via BSC Parties. AS noted that tailed in its impact assessment consultation, Ofgem's proposed that the method for funding regardless of provider, should be via BSC Parties. Ofgem sought stakeholder views on this proposal as part of the consultation.
- 2.8 The BSC Panel:
  - a) **NOTED** the update.

---

## Part II: 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

### 3. Change Report and Progress of Modification Proposals – (306/03)

- 3.1 The Modification Secretary presented the Change Report and progress of Modification Proposals.
- 3.2 They invited the Panel to provide comment either at the meeting or by correspondence on the proposed role of the Panel and the establishment of the BMRS Change Board under [P398 'Increasing access to BSC Data'](#), especially given previous Panel caution with the establishment of the BMRS Change Board.
- 3.3 In relation to [P379 'Multiple Suppliers through Meter Splitting'](#), CEPA have been selected, subject to contract to conduct the cost-benefit analysis (CBA). Work is due to start this month and the final report is expected by February or March 2021. A Panel Member commented that Elexon also needs to consider how communication occurs between multiple Suppliers with different DNOs as customer interests need to be protected. Elexon agreed to ensure that this is included in the scope. The Consumer Panel Member also suggested that the Smart Energy Modification [SECMP0046 Allow DNOs to control Electric Vehicle chargers connected to Smart Meter infrastructure](#) and the Distribution Connection and Use of System Agreement (DCUSA) Change Proposal [DCP371 - Last resort arrangements for Distributors to manage specific consumer connected devices](#) might be helpful to look at in relation to P379.
- 3.4 The Modification Secretary advised that an opportunity has arisen, following the announcement of TERRE delay, to bring the [CP1535 'Interconnector Fuel Type Category update to BMRS'](#) delivery forward to 3 December 2020 from 1 April 2021 (which would also align with [P408 'Simplifying the Output Usable Data Process'](#) delivery, which the Panel approved at its 13 August 2020 meeting). Bringing the delivery forward will deliver benefits for BMRS Users earlier by reporting all Interconnector volumes in a disaggregated format, removing the [CP1516 'New Interconnector Fuel Type Categories: ElecLink & IFA2'](#) 'interim solution'. Additionally it would be more efficient to implement alongside P408 as both impact BMRS reporting; this will in turn improve capacity in the BSC delivery pipeline. The Panel welcomed Elexon responding to the changing circumstances.

- 3.5 A Panel Member expressed surprise that Elexon was not requesting a delay to [P407 'Project MARI \(Manually Activated Reserve Initiative\)'](#) while issues relating to access to European platforms are still live. They suggested that no further Workgroups should be held until there is further certainty. Elexon advised that the next joint BSC/Grid Code Workgroup is due to take place on 15 September 2020. The NGESO Panel Member noted that it would be premature to put P407 on hold while NGESO is still under a legal obligation to deliver by a certain date.
- 3.6 The Chairman noted that Ofgem had still not made a decision on [P390 'Allowing extensions to ELEXON's business and activities, subject to additional conditions'](#) and queried when this could be expected. The Ofgem Representative commented that since the previous Panel meeting, a conversation had taken place between Ofgem and Elexon re some further legal queries. When asked if it is still feasible to get a decision out by the end of September 2020, the Ofgem Representation noted it should be feasible.
- 3.7 The BSC Panel:
- a) **APPROVED** a three-month extension to the P332 Assessment Procedure;
  - b) **APPROVED** an eight-month extension to the P395 Assessment Procedure;
  - c) **AGREED** that the Implementation Date for CP1535 is brought forward from 1 April 2021 to 3 December 2020;
  - d) **AGREED** that the North Sea Link Interconnector as a Fuel Type Category under paragraph 6.1.18 (l) of section Q of the BSC effective from 3 December 2021;
  - e) **AGREED** that we consult industry for 10 Working Days on the proposed date change for CP1535;
  - f) **NOTED** we will bring back CP1535 for approval on 8 October 2020; and
  - g) **NOTED** the contents of the September Change Report.
4. **P412 'Ensuring non-BM Balancing Services providers pay for non-delivery imbalances at a price that reflects the real-time value of energy' – (306/04)**
- 4.1 A Panel Member suggested that the P412 Workgroup should additionally consider settling at imbalance versus settling at penalty as part of the P412 Workgroup's Terms of Reference. They commented that if the imbalance price is negative, then Balancing Service Providers could possibly benefit from under-delivery. Elexon agreed to include this.
- 4.2 A Panel Member queried whether there is any consideration of how IT changes for P412 would fit into Elexon's wider IT change pipeline, and questioned whether it foresees any impact on it. Elexon confirmed that it expects system impacts, however the scale of these impacts and thus any impact on the delivery pipeline can only be assessed after a solution has been developed and impact fully assessed.
- 4.3 A Panel Member had concerns over the title of the Modification as they believed that as drafted, non-BM Service providers may not think that P412 impacts them, given they are not a BSC Party. They highlighted that the Panel has a duty to ensure that parties are being treated in the same manner whether they are a BSC Party or not and did not believe the way the Modification was currently phrased was doing that. The Panel Member was also concerned that NGESO had not brought this forward to an Issue Group first.
- 4.4 The Proposer commented that NGESO raised a Modification as they believed the defect to be specific and therefore using the BSC Modification route was the most efficient way forward to progress the changes required. The Proposer noted that this mechanism would make sure it was truly reflective of BM and non-BM Balancing Service Providers. The Proposer added that the main challenge NGESO would have is creating something that is managed via contracts only for non-BM Balancing Service providers as NGESO would need to create huge duplication of what the imbalance price is at any time for non-delivery; that information itself would not feed into BSC calculations meaning the data would be missing. The Proposer agreed to amend the title going forwards to 'Ensuring non-BM Balancing Services providers pay for non-delivery imbalances at a price that reflects the real-time value of energy' to provide further clarity.
- 4.5 A Panel Member was concerned that it is not just energy imbalances that need to be considered but also the failure to deliver on balancing services, which cause higher penalties. They were concerned that the full options were not being explored if parties would only be penalised at the imbalance price point. Elexon agreed that the Workgroup needs to consider non-delivery charges for BM and non-BM service providers to ensure that there is consistent treatment between BM and non-BM service providers.

4.6 The BSC Panel:

- a) **AGREED** that P412 progresses to the Assessment Procedure;
- b) **AGREED** the proposed Assessment Procedure timetable;
- c) **AGREED** the proposed membership for the P412 Workgroup; and
- d) **AGREED** that the Workgroup should additionally consider settling at imbalance versus settling at penalty.

5. **P413 'Require Elexon to be the Programme Manager for the implementation of Market-wide Half Hourly Settlement' – (306/08)**

- 5.1 Panel Members were supportive of Elexon carrying out the Programme manager role, with some going further in pointing out that the detailed technical knowledge needed to do this, the urgency of the timescales as noted in the previous presentation by Ofgem, and the proposed funding structure through the BSC all made Elexon the obvious organisation to carry out this role. In this context, much of the discussion focused on the appointment process.
- 5.2 A Panel Member noted the term 'require' in the P413 title and suggested that 'enable' was a more suitable term instead. The Proposer commented that they had chosen 'require' as they believed that Elexon would be best placed to carry out the role and therefore should move this proposal forward as soon as possible. Elexon noted that 'require' had been used as the role would be a BSC activity with budgeting, transparency around cost recovery and overall accountability to Ofgem etc. Additionally, it was hoped that using 'require' would both provide transparency to BSC Parties of the function as a BSC activity and would simplify the decision-making process by P413 going to Ofgem for decision; ultimately if Ofgem approved the Modification then Elexon would be awarded the role. Elexon agreed to discuss the use of the word 'require' with the Workgroup.
- 5.3 A Panel Member queried what would happen if a Party raised a different Modification for somebody else to be the Programme Manager; this would be running a procurement de facto. Another Panel Member queried whether Ofgem could not just appoint Elexon as the Programme Manager if it is obvious that Elexon is best-placed to take on the role and if not, whether Ofgem would carry out a procurement process. Elexon advised that it would be down to Ofgem to make a decision on this; this is all subject to timing as Ofgem's preference is to have the Programme Manager in place before its Full Business Case decision in Spring 2021.
- 5.4 AS reiterated that Ofgem had not made a decision on governance yet; a decision on who would carry out this role needs to be made but highlighted that Ofgem's proposed method for funding regardless of provider, as detailed in its consultation, is via BSC Parties. Elexon commented that there is currently no clear indication that there will be a tender process for the PM role and therefore P413 is a way to put the 'Elexon proposal' forward for BSC Parties' consideration, as Parties will be paying the costs of the role. It noted that, even if Ofgem decided to appoint Elexon without P413, BSC changes would still be needed to enact this change to Elexon's permitted activities and to introduce the BSC cost-recovery mechanism.
- 5.5 The NGESO Panel Member queried whether any changes would need to be made to the BSC to allow Elexon to carry out the Programme Manager role and queried what the cost-recovery mechanism would be (e.g. whether this is through the BSC's Main Funding Share and whether these costs are funded by BSC Trading Parties only). The NGESO Panel Member also commented that if Elexon is not providing the function, whether any cost-recovery mechanism through the BSC would apply. Elexon noted that introduction of a BSC cost-recovery mechanism would still be required if someone else was the Programme Manager, but that this is not part of P413 as proposed (which only applies to Elexon). If someone else is appointed, the necessary BSC changes could either be a separate Modification Proposal or directed by Ofgem using its Smart Meters Act powers.
- 5.6 A Panel Member noted similarities between P413 and P390 as enabling Modifications and queried how P413 was different. Elexon advised that P390 and past vires Modifications have been to enable Elexon to bid into other processes outside of the BSC. They have aimed to achieve funding from BSC Parties for initial bid costs only, with the ongoing costs of the relevant non-BSC activities then recovered outside the BSC under a separate contract if awarded. The MHHS Programme Manager role is different as Ofgem proposes that BSC Parties fund all of its activity costs regardless of provider and for the duration of the function's existence. Elexon reiterated that it is not clear that there will be a tender process for the Programme Manager role and therefore Elexon is not in a P390 kind of bid scenario. The Panel Member suggested that P413 should include a cost-recovery mechanism to apply whoever fulfils the Programme Manager role, and not just if this is Elexon. The



Panel Member stressed that, in suggesting this, they were not saying that they did not support Elexon fulfilling the PM role, but commented that the Panel needs to consider efficiency of introducing Modifications.

- 5.7 The DNO Representative also commented that DNOs were comfortable with Elexon taking on the role but would like to understand how interfaces with other systems or codes would be considered and how other industry expert views will be taken on by the PMO.
- 5.8 The BSC Panel:
- a) **AGREED** that P413 progresses to the Assessment Procedure;
  - b) **AGREED** the proposed Assessment Procedure timetable;
  - c) **AGREED** the proposed membership for the P413 Workgroup; and
  - d) **AGREED** the Workgroup's Terms of Reference.

---

### **Part III: Non-Modification Business (Open Session)**

#### **6. Update on National Grid ESO Balancing Programme – (Verbal)**

- 6.1 Graham Dolamore (GD), Chief Product Owner - Energy Balancing Systems from NGESO, provided an update on Project TERRE including amendments to the go-live date, timeline for Brexit and next steps.
- 6.2 A Panel Member requested for NGESO to stop spending any more of its own and industry's money. GD confirmed that stopping today is not an option; NGESO is examining all nine systems that TERRE affects to recommend a suitable position for GB going forwards. GD noted that NGESO can then look at the benefits and re-plan appropriately.
- 6.3 A Panel Member queried whether GB is able to create its own LIBRA. GD noted that Intellectual Property rights need to be worked through for legal clarity but that NGESO had already started speaking to Ofgem about this.
- 6.4 A Panel Member expressed concern re continuing with P407 'Project MARI' and did not understand why NGESO would not just pause and stop spending customers' money while there is uncertainty. GD advised that there is a wider review of the whole Brexit implications for GB and from an ESO perspective, which is being run as a separate programme. GD agreed that NGESO should not be committing to something further down the track without legal certainty. GD noted that NGESO had been looking at MARI delivery timescales prior to the European Commission's letter but will go back to discuss internally.
- 6.5 PS advised that Elexon had been working closely with NGESO on its alignment of testing plans and costs. He noted that Elexon had taken a risk-based view that each time NGESO tests, Elexon gets increased benefits from this in being able to test complex scenarios. Elexon is still working within the provision of the £850,000 that it shared with the Panel in July 2020. PS noted that despite changes to NGESO's plan, after the end of November 2020 (3 weeks past 27 October 2020 date), test costs would still be within the contingency (£60k more) but that this is still £50k less than overall predicted £850k cost. Elexon noted that it agrees with NGESO that it is better to achieve a stable position prior to pausing so that there is a lot lower risk for when the project resumes.
- 6.6 A Panel Member queried whether NGESO/Elexon could have done a better job if it had had more notice of a delay. The Panel Member was of the view that NGESO was put in a difficult situation institutionally as any project management decisions NGESO makes are influenced by the nature of its wider relationship with Ofgem. While the Panel Member accepted it was fair for Ofgem to put pressure on NGESO to deliver projects like TERRE to time/cost, Ofgem also needs to recognise that these types of projects are becoming more uncertain as they proceed; and it is unhelpful if NGESOs role as project manager is compromised by any politics associated with Ofgem (e.g. communication of evolving programme risks to Elexon and Parties). GD advised that NGESO had been pushing the European Commission and Ofgem hard to get clarity on all European projects; NGESO recognises its role to the wider industry and as such communicated as soon as it had better visibility.
- 6.7 A Panel Member queried how much money in total had been spent on TERRE to date and an estimate of Party spend. PS agreed to obtain these figures.

**ACTION 306/01**

- 6.8 The BSC Panel:

a) **NOTED** the update.

---

## **Part IV: Non-Modification Business (Open Session)**

### **7. Minutes of previous meetings & Actions arising**

- 7.1 The BSC Panel approved the draft minutes for BSC Panel meetings 305 and 305A. ELEXON presented the actions and associated updates for the September Panel meeting.

### **8. Chairman's Report**

- 8.1 The Chairman acknowledged that this was Stuart Cotten's last BSC Panel meeting after ten years' service. In that time he had served as a member of the Credit Committee throughout and as a Panel Sponsor on the Trading Disputes Committee. He thanked Stuart for all his hard work and contributions. SC thanked the Panel noting that he will continue to champion the BSC and Elexon. He added that the Panel is collaborative and hopes that continues in the future.
- 8.2 The Chairman announced that the five successful candidates elected in the BSC Panel Elections 2020 are Lisa Waters, Andrew Colley, Rhys Kealley, Tom Edwards and Mark Bellman. The Independent Members of Panel will continue to be Derek Bunn, Diane Dowdell and Phil Hare.
- 8.3 The Chairman noted that another Credit Assessment Price (CAP) consultation had been triggered which would result in an increase from £46/MWh to £56/MWh.

### **9. Elexon Report – (306/01)**

- 9.1 MB reported that the Elexon offices would not be opening to external visitors until at least the beginning of 2021 (save for exceptional circumstances).

### **10. Distribution Report**

- 10.1 The DNO Representative commented that the DCUSA DCP371 and SEC0046 Workgroups are planning to have a joint meeting to better understand the solutions.

### **11. National Grid Report**

- 11.1 The NGESO Panel Member noted that NGESO's Electricity Balancing Guidelines (EB GL) Article 18 consultation had been issued with responses due by 21 September 2020; he encouraged participants to respond.
- 11.2 The NGESO Panel Member also noted that the second BSUoS taskforce is reaching its conclusions and so the report will be issued by the end of September 2020. NGESO expects a response from Ofgem by the end of November 2020.

### **12. Ofgem Report**

- 12.1 The Ofgem Representative noted its summer review of ESO balancing costs. He advised that some roundtables were planned for early September 2020. The aim of these is to conclude in October 2020, so the findings can feed into the mid-year review of the ESO's performance.

### **13. Tabled Reports**

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

### **14. Market Domain Data (MDD) Change Requests for Version 302/303 – (306/05)**

- 14.1 Elexon advised the Panel that a productive discussion had taken place on 9 September 2020 between Elexon, Ofgem, LDSOs, DNOs and St Clements (DNOs' Service Provider) to discuss whether the Targeted Charging Review (TCR) April 2021 deadline was negotiable. Elexon noted that the April 2021 deadline was set by LDSOs as they felt constrained by the Faster Switching Programme but that it was causing a number of challenges; there is a short period of time from now until April 2021 to make considerable changes to MDD, extensive changes to internal processes and for industry being able to load a large MDD set.

- 14.2 Elexon noted that following the discussion, LDSOs were now open to exploring MDD updates beyond April 2021. LDSOs had highlighted that there should not be any constraints on them to make MPAS changes in 2021 (between April-October 2021) after which there may be constraints placed on them. Elexon noted that this opens the door for re-planning as if there is more time to implement MDD into later 2021, it will help manage its own internal risks when creating MDD (e.g. manual processes of creating files) and industry risks of being able to load files; if there is more time this would also enable industry testing to be carried out.
- 14.3 A Panel Member queried what Elexon means by large data sets in terms of combinations and Line Loss Factor Classes (LLFCs). Elexon advised that there are 19,000 new LLFCs and 300,000 new valid set combinations.
- 14.4 A Panel Member commented that many Parties have concerns that the sheer size of the files could be a source of risk to Settlement; and that their views were endorsed by the information from the Request for Information (RFI). Elexon advised that whilst there may be impacts to Settlement, the early MDD CRs are unlikely to break the systems but it is the cumulative total of MDD CRs that will cause this risk to become an issue.
- 14.5 A Panel Member queried why the LLFC/MDD approach was being used in the first place. Elexon noted that the TCR SCR was approved in December 2019, following which LDSOs, Elexon, Electralink and NGESO met on a number of occasions to discuss the best way forward. At the time it was agreed that there was not enough time to create a new registration system so LLFCs were seen as the practical solution; these have already been used to identify DUoS charging tariffs for a number of years so are not an unknown quantity. However, what was unknown was the number of LLFCs needed which did not become clear until Q2 2020.
- 14.6 KB from Ofgem noted that this issue had only recently been identified despite discussions had at various Steering Groups and through Modification Proposals. She advised that Ofgem's role is to encourage industry to work together to find a way forward as the TCR will come into effect in 2022. A Panel Member expressed concern that this process might have extremely high costs for customers. KB noted that there had been various consultation processes and this had not come up as a barrier; consequently decisions had been made based on the information provided.
- 14.7 The DNO Representative added that it is important that changes are met to meet the 2022 TCR deadline. LDSOs and IDNOs have agreed to work with Elexon to create a migration plan to work on MDD and when the files can be transferred. The DNO Representative noted that once agreed, this plan will be shared with industry.
- 14.8 Elexon therefore recommended that the CRs which include LLFCs to support both the TCR and other billing requirements (M3629 and M3631) are approved as the BSC arrangements have mitigating processes, e.g. reconciliation and defaulting rules, but that the CRs that only contain changes to support the TCR (M3630 and M3632) are deferred until Elexon knows how long it may need for testing and rescheduling a plan with LDSOs. Elexon noted that rejecting MDD CRs means they will need to be approved later, which without re-planning increases risks for MDD creation later in the process. The Panel agreed that this was a sensible approach.
- 14.9 The BSC Panel:
- a) **APPROVED** Change Requests M3629 and M3631 which include LLFCs to support both the TCR and other billing requirements; and
  - b) **DEFERRED** Change Requests M3630 and M3632, which only contain changes to support the TCR, until further information on the 1 April 2021 deadline and testing has been provided.

## 15. Performance Assurance Board Recommendations for Reinstating Supplier Charges – (306/06)

- 15.1 The BSC Panel:
- a) **NOTED** the recommended criteria by the Performance Assurance Board to reinstate Supplier Charges.

## 16. Any other business

- 16.1 AL noted that at the Annual BSC Meeting, Elexon will be sharing some further thoughts on simplification and consolidation of the codes body landscape. Elexon is creating a thought-piece for establishing a Market Operator and will be sharing with industry to prompt discussion, but would circulate to the Panel in advance for their thoughts. A Panel Member commented that he was supportive of this as he was concerned that the Ofgem/BEIS codes review is still on hold and needs pushing forward.

## 17. Next meeting

- 17.1 The next meeting of the BSC Panel will be held remotely on Thursday 8 October 2020.