

TRADING DISPUTES EXPERT GROUP MEETING 2 MINUTES

MEETING NAME Trading Disputes Expert Group

Meeting number 02

Date of meeting 02 July 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
	Mark Thomas	MT	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
	Robert Johnston	RJ	Workgroup Member
	Lili Carr	LC	Workgroup Member

TRADING DISPUTES EXPERT GROUP

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

- 1.1 KH provided a recap on the reduced settlement timetable for the Target Operating Model. KH noted that the Key piece of information here is the RF run being reduced to 4 months from 14 months. In addition to a process for raising disputes within the four DF 'bands' that the TDEG has seen before, ELEXON set out an initial strawman proposal for handling disputes relate to issues dating back several years. In such disputes, the cumulative settlement error could be significant but amending metered volumes for potentially hundreds of settlement dates would be far more onerous and time consuming than NHH DC processes are today. For these disputes, ELEXON proposed that the financial imbalance could be corrected without re-reconciling all those settlement dates, given that individual dates would have been adjusted through GCF anyway.

TRADING DISPUTES EXPERT GROUP MEETING 2 MINUTES

- 1.2 A workgroup member noted the outputs of an ESD-type of correction impact a distributor because they won't really see that whereas the DF run if the volumes do change they get to see that through the revised runs. The Workgroup Member further noted that this is difficult given the time an effort required for ELEXON to manage ESD elements and how would that be pulled together.
- 1.3 MM responded that we certainly don't want this process to be opaque, although our understanding is the overall volume has been reconciled then someone else has effectively paid the duos for another party through the redistributed volume. The Workgroup member noted that the problem with this is that distributors charge DUoS on uncorrected volumes, which does not reflect the GCF movements. MM responded that what we are hoping to avoid is the need to go back and re-query the meter and/or amend and resubmit several months of half-hourly data, where for each date the volume difference would have been acceptable had it only affected a single day. We are seeking to create a new "hybrid" category of dispute to cope with the type we see in Non Half Hourly today, but where the NHHDC only needs to correct a few erroneous register reads and new AAs are automatically created. MHHS will require settlement dates to be corrected individually, and so the effort required to re-scale potentially more than a hundred settlement dates would be inefficient. This new class of dispute may also be more appropriate for CT ratio errors where the HHDC/DA has to rescale and re-aggregate metered volumes for every date in the affected range.
- 1.4 A Workgroup member noted that a consideration he would like ELEXON to note is what type of issues leading to disputes we might see under the Market Wide Half Hourly settlement that we are not seeing now.
- 1.5 A Workgroup member asked about the ability to amend half hourly data sourced directly from a smart meter. MM noted that once valid half hourly data has been retrieved from a smart meter we don't want to manipulate it too-much, as that could introduce more errors into settlement

2. Stakeholder feedback

- 2.1 It was noted that reports should be created for the PAB to see details of trading disputes that the TDC hears. ELEXON have put together a bi-monthly report, KH presented a table of the trading disputes that would be shown to PAB. A Workgroup member raised it may be beneficial to include who the agents are just in case for PAB. KH responded that PAB specifically wanted to see what was laying under each settlement risk. RD noted that the PAB said there were a couple clarification notes and that there wasn't any suggestions for any further details, although we are able to add on extra details for parties or agents. KH noted that this would be added on for the next report.
- 2.2 KH noted that the two feedback points; Lessons Learned report and the Supplier obligations to raise Trading Disputes are still in progress.

3. Raising party self-assessments

- 3.1 KH noted that we are looking to incorporate the process into the backend of Salesforce by the end of 2021.

4. AOB

- 4.1 No AOB