

MINUTES

MEETING NAME Trading Disputes Committee Workshop

Date of meeting 5 December 2019

Venue ELEXON Ltd, 350 Euston Road

Classification Public

1. Stage One Progress

- 1.1 The inputs from each review work stream were discussed with the TDC at a workshop on 05 December 2019 in the form of "as-is" and "to-be" process maps.
- 1.2 The TDC reviewed the suggested changes and provided feedback and guidance on whether the changes should be progressed. The following potential changes were discussed with the TDC:

| Description of change | Comments | To be progressed? |
|--|--|-------------------|
| BSCP11 forms to be replaced with Self-Service Gateway notifications. | The TDC is supportive of BSCP11 forms being replaced with a Self-Service Gateway notifications, providing all of the required information is still provided. | Yes |
| Email communications to be replaced with Self-Service Gateway interactions. | The TDC agreed that communications between Parties and ELEXON should be completed via a Self-Service Gateway, rather than by email. | Yes |
| Introduction of a holding step, and self-assessment against the Trading Dispute criteria to be completed by the Raising Party. | The TDC agreed with Raising Party self-assessment, and therefore the holding step, which will allow self-assessment to be completed within 5 Working Days. The TDC agreed that this would be a positive step and could also provide valuable information regarding which parties require education on assessing Settlement Errors. | Yes |
| Making the Trading Dispute end date mandatory. | It should not be mandatory to have a dispute end date, because some disputes are presented to the TDC for instruction on how errors should be rectified. | No |
| TDC members to be provided with a report of invalid and valid disputes at the self-assessment stage. | The TDC would like to see the reports of invalid Trading Disputes. The TDC would also like to see a report of Trading Disputes closed by ELEXON at the investigation stage. | Yes |
| Should Raising Parties be penalised for raising disputes that are later found to be invalid? | The TDC does not think it would be appropriate to penalise Parties for raising invalid disputes as this could discourage disputes being raised. Self-assessment and education will prevent speculative Trading Disputes from being raised. | No |

MINUTES

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| Changing the appeal window to 5WDs following ELEXON's findings. | The TDC does not feel that the 14-day window should be amended, as there is no clear justification for doing so. This change can be revisited later if required. | No |
| Automated reports of disputes to be produced for TDC members rather than ELEXON writing papers. This would only apply to Trading Disputes that would be selected at ELEXON's discretion. | The TDC is supportive of automated papers being produced for TDC members to save time for ELEXON. The TDC would only see a value on them being sent through by email on paper day. | Yes |
| ELEXON to close ELEXON-raised disputes. | The TDC would be keen to save time by not presenting papers to close Trading Disputes. The TDC expressed that having sight of the disputes is still required for audit purposes. The disputes should go to the TDC as tabled checklists. | Yes – but Mod not required. Internal process only. |
| Reduced Settlement Run timetable (post-MHHS) | The TDC expressed that switching to a smaller timetable will see an increased number of disputes being raised. ELEXON stressed the importance of ensuring that only valid disputes are raised (self-assessment). | Yes |
| Splitting the materiality of Trading Disputes into four blocks, with a materiality for each block. This will allow the TDC to approve corrections in four blocks rather than one (post-MHHS). | The TDC are in favour of this method of materiality calculation, and would be happy for it to be introduced post-MHHS. In the meantime, ELEXON and the TDC should look at the Trading Disputes presented in future TDC meetings to understand what the materiality should be of each of the four blocks for each Trading Dispute type. | Yes |

2. Next Steps

- 2.1 Record all of the planned changes identified in Stage One in a Change Matrix, along with expected implementation dates.
- 2.2 Raise a Change Proposal for BSCP11. This will be an enabling CP to allow information to be submitted to ELEXON via other means aside from BSCP11 forms.
- 2.3 Create an expert group to assist with the implementation of a second CP, which will add a requirement to BSCP11 for the Raising Party to complete Trading Dispute self-assessment. The expert group will also assist with the introduction of Self-Service Gateway into the Trading Disputes process.