

## MHHS – Performance Assurance Working Group

Meeting number **09**

Venue **Remote/Elexon Office**

Date of meeting **Tuesday 4 July 2023**

Classification **Public**

### Attendees and apologies

#### Attendees

|                    |    |                                 |
|--------------------|----|---------------------------------|
| Anna Millar        | AM | Elexon Assurance Representative |
| Oliver Meggitt     | OM | Elexon Assurance Representative |
| Andrew Wallace     | AW | REC Code Representative         |
| Cathy Mulliss      | CM | REC Code Representative         |
| Naomi Walker       | NW | PAWG Member                     |
| Clare Hannah       | CH | PAWG Member                     |
| Nik Wills          | NW | PAWG Member                     |
| James Murphy       | JM | PAWG Member                     |
| Helen Clarke       | HC | PAWG Member                     |
| Thomas Danielle    | TD | PAWG Member                     |
| Angelos Rizoyannis | AR | PAWG Member                     |
| Tom Chevalier      | TC | PAWG Member                     |
| Seth Chapman       | SC | PAWG Member                     |
| Rodger Daniels     | RD | PAWG Member                     |
| Rachael Prosser    | RP | PAWG Member                     |
| Vaishnavi Sharma   | VS | PAWG Member                     |
| David Morley       | DM | PAWG Member                     |
| Dom Bradbury       | DB | PAWG Member                     |

#### Apologies

## 1. Performance Reporting - Performance Standards

1.1 Elexon provided a proposal for the Performance Reporting Supplier Standards under MHHS

1.2 Decision Proposal:

- a) Elexon looked to discuss options for and understand the right time to introduce the monitoring and also for when to start taking action. Four potential options were presented;
  - I. Introduce reporting at M11/M12 but not taking action against PAB agreed thresholds at that point. Would need to agree an appropriate point to start taking action
  - II. Introducing reporting at M11/12 and taking action against PAB agreed thresholds at that point
  - III. Introducing reporting at M15 but not taking action against PAB agreed thresholds at that point. Would need to agree an appropriate point to start taking action
  - IV. Introducing reporting at M15 and taking action against PAB agreed thresholds at that point
- b) Elexon and the PAWG both agreed early reporting was essential and a delay between monitoring and action was agreed as the right approach. That the reporting and data as it becomes available enables thresholds to be more accurately determined for when action and EFR is used.
- c) The group's overall view was to introduce reporting at M11-M12 stage.
- d) For the approach it was agreed to take a pragmatic view on operating the reporting and reviewing the performance. Option 1 was agreed to provide time to build up an understanding of the data and determine thresholds. Elexon will monitor performance and if anything concerning arises Elexon will engage with Parties and then take other action if needed. This will be reviewed quarterly to assess thresholds and also if they will be enforced.
- e) The PAWG also noted that industry should be informed of when these decisions are likely to happen because these are the targets that are used for commercial contracts and SLAs between Agents and Suppliers.

1.3 Actions:

| Meeting | Section               | Action Description   | Decisions Required   | Owner | Relevant Discussions |
|---------|-----------------------|--|----------------------|-------|----------------------|
| 9       | Performance Reporting | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed to introduce reporting at M11/M12.</li> <li>• Agreed to monitor performance and review quarterly what the appropriate thresholds may be and if any are enforced for the next quarter.</li> <li>• Agreed to engage with Parties as concerns arise as an initial step and then take other action if needed.</li> <li>• Elexon to communicate to industry when decisions are likely to happen.</li> </ul> | No Decision Required | ANM   | 1.3                  |

## 2. Performance Assurance Monitoring (PAM) – High Level Principles

2.1 Elexon provided an outline for the approach to Performance Assurance Monitoring (PAM) under MHHS. This included a walkthrough of the previously identified risks and the performance reporting for each.

2.2 Decision Proposal:

- a) Elexon advised that this technique will move away from the requirement for self-reporting with the exception of data required from the Registration Service– all data will be obtained from the relevant centralised systems rather than BSC Parties directly and the next step was to determine is how Elexon obtains this the information (e.g DNOs or the Data Integration Platform (DIP)).
- b) Elexon identified risk that's are relevant to performance reporting and also visible to monitor through new data flows or reports that can be obtained through MHHS services. Services have yet to be approached with our requirements, but once PAWG agree on approach this can be done. This does also not include Central Systems risks.
- c) Elexon presented two registration risk and two data services risks.
- d) It was determined that Elexon would not be asking Parties for self-reporting but it may be the case that because Distribution Network Owners (DNOs) will be the Registration Service it could be individual DNOs that will need to provide this data because it is not held in Elexon central systems. However, the next step is to determine is how Elexon obtains this the information (e.g DNOs or the Data Integration Platform (DIP)).
- e) Elexon confirmed that it is looking into a more general DIP report including where invalid flows have been rejected by the DIP or not received at all and if they have been resent or not and within an acceptable timeframe.

2.3 Actions:

| Meeting | Section                          | Action Description  | Decisions Required                                  | Owner | Relevant Discussions |
|---------|----------------------------------|---|---|-------|----------------------|
| 9       | Performance Assurance Monitoring | Clarify if registration service is under BSC Audit or PAF assurance and needs an associated risk.   | Does Registration Service itself need its own risk. | MAH   | 2.2                  |
| 9       | Performance Assurance Monitoring | Investigate and determine if a separate risk for Energisation Status is needed rather than included with registration risk RE001 due to the ES being owned by the Metering Service. | Does Energisation Status need its own risk.         | MAH   | 2.2                  |
| 9       | Performance Assurance Monitoring | Look into relationship base monitoring.   | Can relationship monitoring be done?                | MAH   | 2.2                  |
| 9       | Performance Assurance Monitoring | Marianne Haslam and Seth Chapman to understand the logic for Data Service Risk reporting for DS001 for rejected data,   | No Decision Required                                | MAH   | 2.2                  |

**3. Performance Assurance Monitoring (PAM) – Implementation**

3.1 Elexon provided an outline of how the performance reporting will be operated including any interactions with the PAB and code changes that may be needed:

3.2 Decision Proposal:

- a) Move away from Party self-reporting;
- b) All data where possible will be obtained from the relevant Central Systems or registration service that will be available after MHHS go live;

- c) Change the name of the Performance Assurance Technique (PAT) from Performance Assurance Reporting and Monitoring System (PARMS) to Performance Assurance Monitoring (PAM);
- d) Ensure the BSC Procedure document (BSCP) aligns with other PAT documents;
- e) Change PARMS to PAM in all relevant code documents;
- f) Updates to BSCP533: PARMS Data Provision, Reporting and Publication of Peer Comparison Data, Section S: Supplier Volume Allocation, Section X-1: General Glossary and Section Z: Performance Assurance.
- g) A PAWG member highlighted that if Parties will be expected to provide data this needs to be determined as soon as possible so they can build this into their changes for MHHS.

### 3.3 Actions:

| Meeting | Section                          | Action Description   | Decisions Required  | Owner | Relevant Discussions |
|---------|----------------------------------|--|---|-------|----------------------|
| 9       | Performance Assurance Monitoring | Elexon took an action to look into the creating a new BSCP for MHHS techniques rather than editing current BSCPs   | Decide if a new BSCP will be created for techniques         | MAH   | 3.2                  |
| 9       | Performance Assurance Monitoring | Look into how visibility can still be achieved while removing PARMs parameters from the BSCP so that Parties are still able to see what is expected of them for their performance. | How can visibility of performance requirements be achieved, | MAH   | 3.2                  |

## 4. Trading Disputes Process

4.1 Elexon provided an update on the proposal for the Trading Dispute process under MHHS.

### 4.2 Decision Proposal:

- a) Elexon outlined the impact of the reduced MHHS Settlement Calendar on the current dispute process. To accommodate the new timetable, Elexon proposed adding an additional run 'D1' run between RF and DF into the disputes process.
- b) Elexon outlined the impact of the MHHS changes on the flexibility of the disputes process. To integrate Trading Disputes into the new MHHS environment, Elexon proposed removing the current Dispute materiality threshold outlined in BSCP11 and creating a dynamic threshold which would be approved annually by the Trading Disputes Committee.

### 4.3 Actions:

| Meeting | Section          | Action Description   | Decisions Required   | Owner | Relevant Decisions |
|---------|------------------|--|----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| 9       | Trading Disputes | Elexon took an action to consider raising a design issue to ensure that there is a mechanism for rejecting data post RF should there be no associated Trading Dispute. | No Decision Required | CHS   | 4.2                |

## 5. Changes to Qualifications

5.1 Elexon provided an update on the Changes to Qualifications under MHHS

### 5.2 Decision Proposal:

- a) Elexon outlined the changes required to BSC Section J following the implementation of MHHS. Elexon proposed it would include new sections aimed specifically at new applicants, and new sections Renewal of Qualification.
- b) Elexon proposed it would remove references to the Annual Statement of Qualified Status process, and remove time bound references within the Surrender of Qualification process. Elexon proposed it would update the Re-Qualification process to align with BSCP537.

## **6. AOB**

6.1 Elexon provided an update requested any other business from Members.