

Minutes

BSC Panel

Meeting number	337	Venue	Elexon Offices/Video Conference
Date of meeting	13 April 2023	Classification	Public

Please note that unless otherwise stated, all Panel decisions were unanimous.

Attendees and apologies		
Attendees		
Sara Vaughan	SV	BSC Panel Chair
Phil Hare	PH	Deputy BSC Panel Chair
Andrew Colley	AC	Industry Panel Member
Andy Manning	AM	Consumer Panel Member
Anne Themistocleous	AT	UK Power Networks
Colin Down	CD	Ofgem Representative
Derek Bunn	DB	Independent Panel Member
Diane Dowdell	DD	Industry Panel Member
Elliott Harper	EH	Elexon Head of Governance Services & Panel Secretary
Fionnghuala Malone	FMa	BSC Admin Team Leader
Fungai Madzivadondo	FM	Distribution Business Representative
Iain Nicoll	IN	Elexon (part meeting)
Ivar Macsween	IM	Elexon (part meeting)
Jess McGoverne	JM	Elexon Director of Corporate Affairs
John Lucas	JL	Elexon (part meeting)
Jon Wilkins	JWi	Researchcraft
Karen Thomson Lilley	KTL	NGESO Representative
Keren Kelly	KK	Elexon

Attendees and apologies

Lisa Waters	LW	Industry Panel Member
Mark Oxby	MO	Industry Panel Member
Paul Wheeler	PW	Elexon (part meeting)
Simon Dickie	SDi	Elexon (part meeting)
Simon McCalla	SM	Elexon CEO
Stan Dikeocha	SD	Elexon (part meeting)
Teresa Camey	TC	Department of Energy Security and Net Zero
Tirath Maan	TM	Elexon (part meeting)
Tom Edwards	TW	Industry Panel Member
Victoria Moxham	VM	Elexon Director of Customer Operations
Zaahir Ghanty	ZG	Elexon (part meeting)

Apologies

Jon Wisdom	JW	NGESO Representative
Lawrence Jones	LJ	Elexon BSC Modification Secretary
Michael Robertson	MR	Industry Panel Member
Euan Graham	EG	Consumer Panel Member

Open Session

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Chair noted apologies from Jon Wisdom, whose alternate was Karen Thompson Lilley, Lawrence Jones, Michael Robertson and Euan Graham.
- 1.2 The Chair also welcomed Jess McGoverne as Elexon's new Director of Corporate Affairs.

Part I: Non-Modification Business (Open Session)

2. Elexon Ownership Update (Verbal)

- 2.1 Teresa Camey (TC) (Department of Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ)) and Carly Malcolm (CM) from Ofgem attended the BSC Panel Meeting and provided an update on the Elexon ownership work.
- 2.2 TC noted that the DESNZ [consultation](#) outcome set out DESNZ's policy decision that Elexon should remain in private ownership, under a federated industry ownership structure, with no change to its existing funding. Initially Elexon will be owned by 13 licensed BSC funding parties as shareholders, with one share each. all of which parties have a greater than 2% funding share in Elexon as at 1 January 2023. However, there will be scope for further future shareholders. The shareholders will be required by licence condition to take a share in Elexon. There remains the possibility that Elexon may temporarily have to go into the public sector as a temporary measure, if it looks like the Elexon transaction may slow down delivery of the FSO. Ofgem will be consulting on the appropriate licence changes required for Elexon ownership in summer 2023. The Energy Bill is progressing through parliament for Future System Operator (FSO) project.

- 2.3 TC reassured the Panel that the Elexon ownership and FSO projects will be run separately and as efficiently as possible, given that Ofgem are seeking to complete the FSO transition as soon as possible, with effect by 2024.
- 2.4 CM highlighted that Ofgem are relying on delivery partners on supporting phasing work, whilst working closely with ESO and Elexon to develop the changes required.
- 2.5 SM informed the Panel that there have been structural changes made internally within Elexon to help manage the implementation of the ownership project within Elexon, with the appointment of the Director of strategic Projects.
- 2.6 TC confirmed that DESNZ and Ofgem are working together to implement the changes to Elexon ownership, noting that DESNZ oversees the overall project and will monitor its delivery, alongside collaboration with Ofgem.
- 2.7 A Panel Member queried how licensing will work during organisation mergers and acquisitions, due to the slow process of acquiring a licence through Ofgem. TC highlighted that licence development is at the forefront of the consultation, where the intention is to share draft licences and have multiple engagement points in advance of the changes. She noted there is a separate mechanism in relation to how licence changes will be delivered. A Panel Member expressed their view that licensing should not be a barrier to competition.
- 2.8 TC informed the Panel that some target shareholders had asked clarificatory questions about how the mechanism will work and on licensing in some areas. Further, she noted that some shareholders had been actively planning the transition in relation to Elexon ownership, whilst some had not considered the implications of the changes. TC highlighted that stakeholders have been helpful in identifying where there are challenges.
- 2.9 SM noted that colleagues generally do not have concern around Elexon's ownership work, as our function will continue, and it's more of a formality, albeit an important one. Some individuals who have existing NGESO pensions are interested in the implications of the ownership transition, and we are working through this productively and positively with NGESO.
- 2.10 The BSC Panel:
a) **NOTED** the update

3. Customer Survey Results (Verbal)

- 3.1 Jon Wilkins (JWi) (Researchcraft) provided the Panel with an overview of the Elexon Customer Survey Results 2023.
- 3.2 JW i highlighted that they do have all verbatim comments from the responders, but the presentation covered key themes/areas rather than specific comments.
- 3.3 A Panel Member raised questions around the Customer satisfaction score (CSAT) and whether there is a benchmark to other similar organisations. JW i noted that each company has a unique set of customers, therefore it is hard to generalise. The Panel noted that the Ofgem survey is designed as a benchmarking exercise, where historically Elexon is at the top. CD confirmed that there is no plan to do a cross code survey this year, which will allow Ofgem to focus on other priorities.
- 3.4 A Panel Member queried the definition of value for money as they were keen to understand whether Elexon should offer more services of higher value at the same cost, or the same services at a lower cost. JW i confirmed that value for money is about relativity of what is being provided, more specifically in relation to the quality of the service delivered, and not compromising on the standards of service provided. He confirmed that keeping costs to a minimum is not the priority for most stakeholders.
- 3.5 The Panel sought further clarity on comments related to the website, Portal and Digital Code. In relation to the Digital Code, JW i noted that there were no specifically negative comments, though this may have been blurred with the Elexon Portal. The Panel noted that some results were positive about the Digital Code, whilst others seemed to suggest it was less important for them, which was slightly contradictory.
- 3.6 A Panel Member expressed frustration about receiving surplus operational emails about the status of the Portal, which Elexon acknowledged and noted that the isolated incident was a one-off and apologised for any inconvenience.
- 3.7 VM and JW i agreed to consider trying to reframe the question about the PAF for future surveys.
- 3.8 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

4. Change Report and Progress of Modification Proposals (337/02)

- 4.1 Elexon presented the Change Report and progress of Modification Proposals.
- 4.2 A Panel Member queried how Elexon would recruit enough members for the new Issue Group reviewing Section N, and confirmed that the Panel will also help promote the Issue Group. KK noted that Elexon would reach out to key contacts through Operational Support Managers (OSMs) and the Finance team, in addition to its usual promotion.
- 4.3 A Panel Member queried whether Elexon's existing HMRC tax arrangements would be considered as part of the Issue Group. Elexon did not anticipate that the tax arrangements would be implicated by the Issue Group and would keep this in mind as part of the Issue Group.
- 4.4 Panel Members expressed their support for the review of Section N and the proposed approach outlined by Elexon.
- 4.5 The BSC Panel:
- a) **APPROVED** a six-month extension to the P442 Assessment Procedure;
 - b) **NOTED** the contents of the April 2023 Change Report.

5. P454 'Removal of BSC obligations to provide BMRS Data via TIBCO and the High-Grade Service' (337/03)

- 5.1 A Panel Member queried whether the intention is to remove the obligation to provide the service, or whether it can be limited to preventing new customers on-boarding. Zaahir Ghanty (ZG) confirmed that the intention is to decommission the TIBCO service and since 2014, Elexon have not on-boarded new users.
- 5.2 ZG confirmed that the date to decommission the TIBCO service is not set in stone, though there are some licence implications that will have cost impacts when the current licensing is due to expire in March 2024. EH highlighted that Elexon have been, and will continue, engaging with TIBCO users to ensure they are kept up-to-date and informed about the work to decommission TIBCO, which has already included direct communications.
- 5.3 A Panel Member queried what market share TIBCO users represent, and ZG agreed to take this away. IM agreed to add this into the Workgroup's ToR.

ACTION 337/01

- 5.4 The BSC Panel:
- a) **RAISED** the Modification in accordance with Section F2.1.1(d)(i)
 - b) **AGREED** that it progressed to the Assessment Procedure;
 - c) **AGREED** the proposed Assessment Procedure timetable;
 - d) **AGREED** the proposed membership for the Modification Workgroup;
 - e) **AGREED** the Workgroup's Terms of Reference; and
 - f) **NOMINATED** Zaahir Ghanty as the Panel's representative.

6. P415 'Facilitating access to wholesale markets for flexibility dispatched by Virtual Lead Parties (VLPs)' (337/04)

- 6.1 IM presented the P415 Assessment Report as a joint presentation with the P444 Assessment Report, and therefore, comments on P415 also cover P444.

- 6.2 A Panel Member queried whether either the Proposed or the Alternative solutions are dependent on any scheduled system or solution development. EH confirmed that there is a planned pipeline of work including how P415 and P444 will be delivered, with the change pipeline outlined in the Change Report slides.
- 6.3 IM discussed the issue of mutualisation (page 33 of the paper). He noted that a section of the Workgroup believed VLPs should be liable to pay for compensation as they directly benefit from P415 activity, and noted that this is the simplest solution to implement. However, it was noted that, counter to this, imposing a cost on VLPs was considered to be a barrier to entry by another section of the group. IM highlighted that the Workgroup members which were Suppliers were supportive of enabling flexibility but there were concerns raised on the reporting aspect. It was also confirmed that the Workgroup had raised and discussed the concern that the costs are outside of the Supplier's control.
- 6.4 A Panel Member challenged the preference of the Workgroup given the outcomes of the Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA). They explained that it didn't appear there would be any value to the VLP under Compensation arrangement 1 (where the VLP pays the cost of compensation), so could conclude there would be no or limited uptake of the solution. It was clarified that this remained the Proposer's (a VLP) preferred solution, despite the reduced welfare, and another Panel member commented that this suggested they thought it a viable solution for their business. A Panel Member confirmed that the compensation mechanism is the compromise to minimise the need for any advance reporting to Suppliers of volumes, which was seen as a bigger competition concern amongst the Workgroup.
- 6.5 The Chair queried whether the timescales to implement will be the same for both the Proposed and Alternative solutions. It was confirmed that the implementation timescales are the same for each.
- 6.6 A Panel Member expressed concerns that Ofgem may not be able to make a decision on both Modifications by October. IM confirmed that Ofgem had been fully engaged in both Modifications and had not indicated a concern with the decision timescale requirement. He clarified that Elexon would continue to engage with Ofgem, and would be on hand to answer any questions to minimise any potential risk of send-back or delayed decision.
- 6.7 The Chair noted an observation that the Alternative solution progressed under P415 is at odds with the alternative preference in the consultation responses. In order to enable both a Proposed and Alternative solution to be brought before Ofgem (as they requested), the Proposed and Alternative solutions were flipped, such that the Proposed Solution at the time of Assessment Consultation (Compensation 1 – VLP pays sourcing cost) has now become the Alternative (with Compensation 3 (mutualised at sourcing cost) becoming the Proposed solution). Under the BSC one alternative is permitted, and IM explained that Compensation 2 (mutualised at spot price) had not been taken forward on the basis of concerns over gaming risk and its effects on competition. A Panel Member queried whether the gaming risk should be considered, or whether the Panel should assume it is accounted for by existing regulations. The Chair confirmed that it appears that the Workgroup thought the gaming risk concern was valid, noting they were unclear how it would be caught, and so it should feature in the Panel's deliberations.
- 6.8 A Panel Member raised the topic of Ofgem's price cap continuing. IM confirmed that whilst the price cap is active it will be referred to; and if the cap is removed then the price methodology will be considered as a BSC Category 3 document. Further, he noted that Elexon would have to source a service provider to complete the calculations which would have an associated cost and lead time to be factored in.
- 6.9 A Panel Member expressed disappointment that there were only three responses to the P444 consultation. IM noted that P415 and P444 consultations were sent out together, and a number of arguments across the Modifications are the same, and were highlighted as part of the Workgroup discussions. Therefore, the view was that some parties only responded to one of the consultations. Elexon noted the learning from this, and committed to combining the response forms for the Report Phase consultations to see if this encouraged greater response.
- 6.10 A Panel Member questioned whether there was any possibility of the Implementation Dates being brought forward. IM confirmed that the dates reflect the dates that Elexon can commit to for delivering the solutions. The Implementation Dates are also somewhat reflective of the scale of ongoing change, i.e. Kinnect and the infrastructure upgrade. Panel noted that they understood the concerns around timescales, and the Chair acknowledged that Kinnect is about delivering change more quickly, and that Elexon should take this away to consider more broadly.
- 6.11 The BSC Panel:

- a) **AGREED** that P415 Proposed Modification:
 - i **DOES** better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (b); and
 - ii **By majority DOES NOT** better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (c);
- b) **AGREED** that P415 Alternative Modification:
 - i **DOES** better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (b); and
 - ii **DOES** better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (c);
- c) **AGREED** an initial view that P415 should not be treated as a Self-Governance Modification;
- d) **AGREED by majority** that the P415 Alternative Modification is better than the P415 Proposed Modification; -
- e) **AGREED by majority** an initial recommendation that the P415 Alternative Modification should be **approved** and that the P415 Proposed Modification should be rejected;
- f) **AGREED** that P415 **DOES** impact the EBGL Article 18 terms and conditions held within the BSC;
- g) **AGREED** the impact on the EBGL objectives;
- h) **AGREED** an initial Implementation Date of:
 - i **7 November 2024** and part of the Standard November 2024 BSC Release if a decision is received on or before 6 October 2023;
- i) **AGREED** the draft legal text for the Proposed Modification;
- j) **AGREED** the draft legal text for the Alternative Modification;
- k) **AGREED** that P415 is submitted to the Report Phase; and
- l) **NOTED** that Elexon will issue the P415 Draft Modification Report (including the draft BSC legal text) for a one-month consultation and will present the results to the Panel at its meeting on 8 June 2023.

7. **P444 'Compensation for Virtual Lead Party actions in the Balancing Mechanism' (337/05)**

7.1 IM presented P444 Assessment Report as part of the P415 Assessment Report, and therefore, comments on P415 above also cover this P444 agenda item. P444 seeks to introduce compensation for Suppliers and Virtual Lead Parties (VLPs) for volumes adjusted by VLPs in the Balancing Mechanism (BM).

7.2 The BSC Panel:

- a) **DETERMINED** that P444 Proposed Modification by majority:
 - i **DOES** better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (b); and
 - ii **DOES NOT** better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (c);
- b) **AGREED** that P444 Alternative Modification:
 - i **By majority DOES** better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (b); and
 - ii **DOES** better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (c);
- c) **AGREED** an initial view that P444 should not be treated as a Self-Governance Modification;
- d) **AGREED** that the P444 Alternative Modification is better than the P444 Proposed Modification;
- e) **AGREED** an initial recommendation that the P444 Alternative Modification should be approved and that the P444 Proposed Modification should be rejected;
- f) **AGREED** that P444 **DOES** impact the EBGL Article 18 terms and conditions held within the BSC;
- g) **AGREED** the impact on the EBGL objectives;
- h) **AGREED** an initial Implementation Date of:
 - i **7 November 2024** and part of the Standard November 2024 BSC Release if a decision is received on or before 6 October 2023;
- i) **AGREED** the draft legal text for the Proposed Modification;
- j) **AGREED** the draft legal text for the Alternative Modification;
- k) **AGREED** that P444 is submitted to the Report Phase; and

l) **NOTED** that Elexon will issue the P444 Draft Modification Report (including the draft BSC legal text) for a one month consultation and will present the results to the Panel at its meeting on 8 June 2023

8. **P453 'Amending Metering Dispensation Process, Updating AMP/DMP in the CoPs and Clarifying the Relevant CoP' (337/07)**

8.1 Anne Themistocleous (AT) (UK Power Networks) joined as the Proposer of this Modification.

8.2 The BSC Panel:

a) **AGREED** that P453 progresses directly to the Report Phase;

b) **AGREED** that P453:

i **By majority DOES** better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (a);

ii **DOES** better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (d)

c) **AGREED** an initial view that P453 should be treated as a Self-Governance Modification;

d) **AGREED** that P453 **DOES NOT** impact the EBGL Article 18 terms and conditions held within the BSC;

e) **AGREED** an initial recommendation that P453 should be **approved**;

f) **AGREED** an initial Implementation Date of:

i **2 November 2023** (standard November 2023 BSC Release);

g) **AGREED** the draft legal text; and

h) **NOTED** that Elexon will issue the P453 Draft Modification Report (including the draft BSC legal text) for a 10 Working Day consultation and will present the results to the Panel at its meeting on 11 May 2023.

9. **P452 'Replacement of the Energy Bill Relief Scheme for non-domestic customer with the Energy Bill Discount Scheme' (337/08)**

9.1 SD presented the P452 Draft Modification Report.

9.2 A Panel Member questioned the split voting the last time P452 was considered, relating to Applicable BSC Objective (d), as they were not present. The neutral votes were as a result of Panel members being unable to see any direct benefits to the BSC.

9.3 The BSC Panel:

a) **AGREED** that P452:

i **DOES** better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (c); and

ii **DOES NOT** better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (d);

b) **AGREED** that this Modification should not be treated as a Self-Governance Modification;

c) **AGREED** a recommendation that P452 should be approved;

d) **AGREED** that P452 does not impact the EBGL Article 18 terms and conditions held within the BSC;

e) **AGREED** an Implementation Date for P452 of +1WD after Authority Decision;

f) **APPROVED** the draft Legal Text for P452; and

g) **APPROVED** the P452 Modification Report.

10. **P443 'To Cap NGENSO Interconnector Trades at the Value of Lost Load (VoLL)' (337/09)**

10.1 A Panel Member declared an interest in P443 as she was the Proposer's representative for the Modification. Another Panel Member also declared an interest via their company although, as their organisation was not a majority controlling party, the Panel Member was still able to vote.

10.2 A Panel Member queried what progress NGENSO had made in reviewing what information could be shared regarding interconnectors and interconnector trading. KTL agreed to take this away.

ACTION 337/02

- 10.3 A Panel Member explained their surprise at the recommendation of the Workgroup, given the good reasons put forward in the Assessment Report as to why the Modification should be approved. However, although the Workgroup were sympathetic with the issue raised by the Proposer, they had concerns on capping prices or preventing NGESO from trading with a specific market participant and the unintended consequences of the proposed solution.
- 10.4 A Panel Member queried why Applicable BSC Objective (b) was not included in the recommendations, and PW confirmed this was because the Modification was considered neutral against this by the Proposer and Workgroup.
- 10.5 The Ofgem Representative acknowledged that concerns have been raised in relation to interconnector trading and noted that Ofgem will look at this though there are no associated timelines.
- 10.6 A Panel Member noted that they share concerns with the Proposer about the issues that this Modification has highlighted in relation to the lack of transparency and a regulated framework for Interconnector trading. The Panel discussed this and agreed to write a letter to Ofgem to express these views.

ACTION 337/03

- 10.7 The BSC Panel:
- a) **AGREED** that P443:
 - i **By majority DOES NOT** better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (c);
 - ii **By majority DOES NOT** better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (d);
 - iii **DOES NOT** better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (e);
 - b) **AGREED** an initial view that P443 should not be treated as a Self-Governance Modification;
 - c) **AGREED by majority** an initial recommendation to the Authority that P443 should be **Rejected**;
 - d) **AGREED** that P443 **DOES** impact the EBGL Article 18 terms and conditions held within the BSC;
 - e) **AGREED** the impact on the EBGL objectives;
 - f) **AGREED** an initial Implementation Date of:
 - i **2 November 2023** if an Authority decision is received on or before 31 July 2023; or
 - ii **Three months after the Authority's decision**, if the Authority's decision is received after 31 July 2023;
 - g) **AGREED** the draft legal text;
 - h) **AGREED** that P443 is submitted to the Report Phase; and
 - i) **NOTED** that Elexon will issue the P443 Draft Modification Report (including the draft BSC legal text) for a one month consultation and will present the results to the Panel at its meeting on 8 June 2023.

Part III: Non-Modification Business (Open Session)

11. Elexon Report Minutes of previous meetings and Actions arising

- 11.1 The BSC Panel approved the draft minutes for BSC Panel meeting 336 and 336A. Elexon presented the actions and associated updates for the April 2023 Panel meeting.

12. Chair Report

- 12.1 The Chair highlighted that she met with Martin Cave (Ofgem Chair) where they had discussed EPG and EBRs. He noted that the schemes were very successful, and that they were implemented very quickly. Further, they discussed MHHS, Codes review, REMA and the BSC annual meeting.
- 12.2 The Chair noted that the annual 2023-24 Business plan had now been published:
<https://www.elexon.com/2023/03/30/our-2023-24-business-plan-is-now-available-for-feedback/>
- 12.3 The Chair provided an update from the Credit Committee that the price CAP has been reducing steadily since January 2023, and at the time of meeting was £125.00.
- 12.4 The BSC Panel:
- a) **NOTED** the update

13. Elexon Report – (337/01)

- 13.1 The BSC Panel:
a) **NOTED** the contents of this paper.

14. Distribution Report

- 14.1 The DNO Representative had no updates.
14.2 FM confirmed that she would provide a link to the FGG paper once it is been published.
14.3 The BSC Panel
a) **NOTED** the update

15. ESO Report

- 15.1 The ESO Panel Member noted that the Balancing Services Use of System (BSUoS) fixed tariff went live and that the BSUoS charges now go to final demand. (<https://subscribers.nationalgrid.co.uk/t/d-3A20C5941E5535772540EF23F30FEDED>) Further, she noted that the Transmission Network Use of System (TNUoS) task force meeting will be held on 26 April where they will be looking at the work of a consultancy company.
15.2 KTL highlighted that over the Easter bank holiday weekend; renewable energy met nearly all of the demand.
15.3 A Panel Member queried the NGESO Market roadmaps document, which refers to reserve balancing services which were rejected by Ofgem, and when this will be updated. KTL agreed to take this away.
15.4 A Panel Member expressed their disappointment that in NGESO's published IT innovation strategy , it referred to its top priority being around Net Zero instead of strategising how NGESO can encourage more people into the BM.
15.5 A Panel Member queried what NGESO are doing in relation to BSC issues, more specifically around the plan to improve BM access, and dynamic parameters. NGESO agreed to take this away.

ACTION 337/04

- 15.6 The BSC Panel
a) **NOTED** the update

16. Ofgem Report

- 16.1 The Ofgem Representative highlighted the Code reforms and noted they are reaching out to stakeholders to attend joint Ofgem/DESNZ workshops between May and July. Ofgem want people to engage to share their views to feed into consultation proposals, specifically on Code Manager selection, future Code modification processes and the Stakeholder Advisory Forums.
16.2 Further, CD noted that Ofgem had imposed £70k penalty on DELTA.
16.3 CD noted that Ofgem are seeking feedback on ESOs performance against deliverables and performance plan, to be communicated by 20 April.
16.4 A Panel Member requested CD to look into the timelines of publication on the decision in relation to relevant balancing services under capacity market, as it is presenting an issue for some Parties.
16.5 The BSC Panel
a) **NOTED** the update

17. Tabled Reports

- 17.1 The BSC Panel noted the tabled reports from the ISG, SVG, PAB and TDC.

Part VI: Non-Modification Business (Open Session)

18. AOB

- 18.1 FMa discussed the rolling out of Nasdaq Boardvantage (NBV) to be used when issuing out papers for committee meeting distribution. She confirmed that there will be end user training available as part of the on-boarding process.
- 18.2 FMa confirmed the date of the annual Board/Panel dinner, which will be held on Wednesday 12th July 2023, the evening before the Annual BSC Meeting. Further details will follow.

19. Next meeting

- 19.1 The next scheduled meeting of the BSC Panel will be held in the Elexon Offices on Thursday 11 May 2023