

TRADING DISPUTES EXPERT GROUP MEETING 1 MINUTES

MEETING NAME Trading Disputes Expert Group

Meeting number 01

Date of meeting 02 April 2020

Venue Teleconference

Classification Confidential

ATTENDEES AND APOLOGIES

Attendees	Ed Morris	EM	ELEXON
	Fuwad Chaudhry	FC	ELEXON
	Katherine Higby	KH	ELEXON
	Si Tze Wong	ST	ELEXON
	Keith Phakoe	KP	ELEXON
	Ryan Dale	RD	ELEXON
	Matthew McKeon	MM	ELEXON
	Geoff Matthews	GM	Workgroup Member
	Derek Weaving	DW	Workgroup Member
	Colin Gentleman	CG	Workgroup Member
	Helen Knowles	HK	Workgroup Member
	Lili Carr	LC	Workgroup Member

Apologies	Amanda Dainty	AD	Workgroup Member
	Sokratis Boursalis	SB	ELEXON
	Andy Kelsall	AK	Workgroup Member
	Mathew Talbot	MT	Workgroup Member
	Stuart Cotton	SC	Workgroup Member
	Mark Thomas	MT	Workgroup Member
	Robert Johnston	RJ	Workgroup Member

TRADING DISPUTES EXPERT GROUP

1. Process Mapping

- 1.1 KH addressed the three diagrams in the pre-meeting material, with added details on the changes being made in Change Phase One and Change Phase Two.
- 1.2 No Questions were raised regarding the three diagrams.

TRADING DISPUTES EXPERT GROUP MEETING 1 MINUTES

2. Market Wide Half Hourly Settlement – Disputes Deadlines and Materiality Thresholds

- 2.1 KH recalled the DWG's reduced Settlement timetable for the TOM. An example was presented on how the revised timeframes would impact a SVA HH Trading Dispute. KH presented high level analysis on what the potential impacts of the reduced timetable could be.
- 2.2 KH suggested to alter the working days syntax to calendar days, to which the Workgroup Members agreed.
- 2.3 A Workgroup Member raised with regards to the self-assessment that there will be the need to provide training in order to guide Parties on how to correctly complete the self-assessments. This will build and get better over time as digitalising this method is positive providing people use it.' KH replied that there will be sufficient templates in place in addition with all the data needed in a usable format, so people with less experience in identifying errors in Settlement would still be able to use the templates and the tools provided. KH also noted that this will involve some further testing.
- 2.4 MM, the ELEXON Subject Matter Expert on Market Wide Half Hourly Settlement, questioned 'what percentage of disputes are raised and incomplete, and how many are sent to ELEXON and are ready to be moved into the quantifying stage (presented to the Workgroup).'
- KH replied that in most cases we need more information before we are in a position to present the dispute to the TDC. ELEXON receives disputes which come through with everything completed and ready to be presented to the TDC, however these cases are few in numbers. Usually when ELEXON receives a Trading Dispute there is still analysis for ELEXON to undertake and further data for ELEXON to obtain.
- 2.5 KH noted that the Raising Party self-assessment would hand some of that work over to the Raising Party thereby resulting in ELEXON receiving more complete Trading Disputes when they are raised in the first instance. KH further noted that, according to her previous analysis, 51% of disputes are found to be invalid by ELEXON, so this would in effect be rapidly cutting down on this figure.
- A Trading Disputes Member noted that for the vast majority of Trading Disputes this would have a very positive impact, the caveat is going to be complex sites. However, issue 88 should make complex sites more straight forward.
- 2.6 KH noted that it would be useful in future that the exceptional circumstances be proposed by ELEXON because you would need to run an ESD to process the exceptional circumstances claim. The present Workgroup Members were all in agreement that the exceptional circumstances claim should be raised by ELEXON to the TDC.
- 2.7 MM stated that it is remarkable how often the visit to the site that finds the problem is wholly unconnected, in many cases problems are unearthed on the site with no relationship to the purpose of the visit.
- 2.8 A Workgroup Member questioned how this proposal would be affected by cases where it is needed to understand what the dispute is prior to presenting it to the TDC. KH stated it depends on what kind of rectification period/dispute period we give ourselves. It would be a case of encouraging very quick rectification, with possibility of going through as an exceptional circumstance through an ESD.
- 2.9 KH noted more analysis will be done for the next TDC meeting specifically on block lengths and to create more models based on dispute deadlines. Another exercise KH would like to do is have a look in general at raising Trading Dispute obligations, this is to see whether we can put any obligations into various parts of the BSC which enforces Trading Disputes being raised upon identification of errors.

3. Stakeholder Feedback

- 3.1 ST presented the new reporting which was created for Risk 003. With the incorporation of Power BI the reports have used data visualisation in order to bring out key information in a presentable manner. This would allow to challenge performance with an added level of granularity.
- 3.2 The Workgroup:

TRADING DISPUTES EXPERT GROUP MEETING 1 MINUTES

AGREED to close the feedback point, based on current and future reports that will be created by the PAF team

3.3 KH noted that there is a lack of consistency around lessons learned exercises. In order to provide consistency with lessons learned exercises, ELEXON will create standardised outputs for the TDC, PAB and market participants.

3.4 A Workgroup Member noted that although the equipment form was submitted in 2015 and nothing happened until 2017. We need to be feeding back to the registrants that if they issue a fault report and nothing comes of it that needs to be chased up much sooner.

3.5 The Workgroup:

AGREED ELEXON to produce standardised templates for lessons learned post-meeting

3.6 KH presented High Level Analysis regarding the past 6 TDCs meetings and the relationship with the PAB. RD noted that the first risk report was taken to PAB in the March PAB, RD suggested that this update should be included in a bi monthly basis, this can provide feedback from TDC based on Settlement Errors Risk based, included as an appendix to the new risk report. Increases visibility PAB will get from TDC members.

3.7 The Workgroup:

AGREED for ELEXON to produce a draft report template post meeting

3.8 KH noted that the obligations to raise Trading Disputes are still ongoing and that ELEXON want to undertake an exercise where we add obligations into other parts of the code or BSCPs. An update on this will be provided in the next meeting.

4. Raising Party Self-Assessment

4.1 ELEXON noted that we aim to put together our initial thoughts on what might be provided to parties in order to calculate their own materiality for their disputes. This would be a case of noting down what would be needed. KH asked Workgroup Members if there were any keen Trading Disputes raisers within their organisations that would be willing to help to test some disputes. KH will send out an email requesting this.

5. AOB

5.1 No AOB