

# MINUTES

---

<b>MEETING NAME</b>	BSC Panel
<b>Meeting number</b>	264
<b>Date of meeting</b>	9 March 2017
<b>Venue</b>	ELEXON Ltd, 350 Euston Road, NW1 3AW
<b>Classification</b>	Public

---

## ATTENDEES AND APOLOGIES

---

<b>Attendees</b>	Michael Gibbons	MG	BSC Panel Chairman
	Andy Knowles	AK	Industry Panel Member
	Chris Fox	CF	Transmission Company Panel Member
	David Lane	DL	DSO Representative
	Derek Bunn	DB	Independent Panel Member
	Lisa Waters	LW	Alternate for Barbara Vest
	Nadir Hafeez	NH	Ofgem Representative
	Phil Hare	PH	Independent Panel Member
	Stew Horne	SH	Consumer Panel Member
	Stuart Cotten	SC	Industry Panel Member
	Tom Edwards	TE	Industry Panel Member
	Antonio Del Castillo Zas		National Grid
	Arik Dondi		Ofgem
	Ryan Place		National Grid
	Emma Tribe	ET	ELEXON (Part Meeting)
	David Osborne	DO	ELEXON
	Douglas Alexander	DA	ELEXON (Part Meeting)
	Giulia Barranu	GB	ELEXON (Part Meeting)
	Jason Jackson	JJ	ELEXON (Part Meeting)
	Jemma Williams	JW	ELEXON (Part Meeting)
	Kathy Ferrari	KF	ELEXON (Part Meeting)
	Mark Bygraves	MB	ELEXON
	Max O'Connor	MO'C	ELEXON (Part Meeting)
	Nicholas Rubin	NR	ELEXON (Part Meeting)
	Nicola Dempsey	ND	ELEXON
	Richard Hampson	RH	ELEXON (Part Meeting)
	Victoria Moxham	VM	ELEXON
<b>Apologies</b>	Barbara Vest	BV	Industry Panel Member
	Diane Dowdell	DD	Industry Panel Member
	Mitch Donnelly	MD	Industry Panel Member

---

# MINUTES

---

## 1. Apologies

- 1.1 The Chairman confirmed the apologies of Barbara Vest, Diane Dowdell and Mitch Donnelly. Lisa Waters and Phil Hare attended as Barbara and Diane's alternates.

## NON MODIFICATION BUSINESS (OPEN SESSION)

---

## 2. Faster Switching Update

- 2.1 Arik Dondi from Ofgem gave the Panel an update on Ofgem's Faster Switching Programme.
- 2.2 The Chairman asked how involved Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (BEIS) was in this work. Ofgem noted that BEIS was on the steering committee for the Faster Switching Programme.
- 2.3 David Osborne drew attention to the proposed new DLS Product Retail Energy Code, he noted that the general direction of travel favoured by Ofgem has been to simplify and merge Codes; he asked what Ofgem's thinking was on forming an additional Code. He also asked whether Ofgem had considered if and how such a Code would impact on ELEXON's work and what the work of the new Code would be. Ofgem noted that it is still investigating options and solutions in this area, based on the work that will need to be done to deliver faster switching. It may decide to fit the regulation on Faster Switching into an existing Code but it is currently exploring all possible options. Until it has done that it can't say what impact forming a new Code may have on ELEXON.
- 2.4 A Panel Member noted that Ofgem would need to implement a Significant Code Review and expressed his belief that Ofgem's updates were vital to ensuring that the Panel understood Ofgem's rationale for the changes and which of the Applicable BSC Objectives those changes should be judged against. He was eager to see Ofgem's cost benefit analysis as he felt that it would assist the Panel's thinking in this area. Another Panel Member noted that many of the consumer benefits of the Faster Switching Programme would be difficult to quantify and balance against the costs to industry of implementing changes.
- 2.5 Ofgem agreed that this is a difficult area, noting that it is working with Citizens Advice and other organisations to better understand what consumer priorities in this area are. However he noted that the benefits may not be clear cut and that it is expecting that the Faster Switching Programme will need to strike a balance between consumer expectations and industry costs. It expects to put a cost benefit analysis out for consultation in August 2017, which will help it decide on the best package of reforms to progress.
- 2.6 A Panel Member commented on the plan to have the DCC procure a central registration service and asked if Ofgem intended that only customers with Smart meters would have access to faster switching. Ofgem stated that customers without Smart meters would have access to the benefits of faster switching but noted that there were barriers to this for them.
- 2.7 Mark Bygraves noted the intent for DCC to procure a central registration system and commented that there were lessons to be learned from large IT system procurements in our sector e.g. DCC, NEXUS and including the procurement by ELEXON's subsidiary, EMRS, for the EMR settlement systems which had led to the appointment of a large service provider under an extensive contract by such provider had ultimately been terminated, and instead ELEXON, working with a few experienced personnel, had created an alternative system to the original requirements, ahead of regulatory need and without seeking additional funding from users. He asked if Ofgem had reviewed these experiences to ensure that lessons would be learned for this programme. Ofgem noted that it was aware of the issues in several recent industry projects and would be using this knowledge to inform the Faster Switching project.

# MINUTES

---

- 2.8 Another Panel member raised a concern about how Ofgem would balance this programme with its Half-Hourly Settlement programme noting that both projects placed large workloads on industry.

## 3. National Grid EBS Update

- 3.1 Antonio Del Castillo Zas gave the Panel an update on National Grid's Electricity Balancing System upgrade.
- 3.2 The Chairman asked when National Grid's Senior Management would make the necessary decisions which would lead to confirmed delivery dates. National Grid stated that it should have an idea of dates by April's Panel meeting.
- 3.3 A Panel Member noted that while he understood that National Grid could not give an exact date for the implementation of the EBS, it would be useful to have a range of target dates to allow industry to budget its resources and staffing.
- 3.4 A Panel Member thought that the idea of a new user group was a good one but noted that in her previous experience it is difficult for smaller parties to give input into these groups and asked that National Grid develop other ways of communicating with interested parties. She also noted that the implementation of the EBS will have a major impact and therefore is very important to industry. National Grid noted that the new user group was set up after feedback from interested parties that its communication was too IT focussed and it intended that the new group would have a broader base.
- 3.5 David Osborne noted that while he understood the issues around the implementation of the EBS, the impact on [P297 'Receipt and Publication of New and Revised Dynamic Data Items'](#) meant that a 4 year old modification was still not implemented. A Panel Member asked if Ofgem had any plans to sanction National Grid for the delay to the P297 Implementation, noting that National Grid is a monopoly and Ofgem is the only body with the authority to sanction it. The Ofgem Representative stated that he was unaware of any plans by Ofgem to do this.

## 4. Implementation of Open Governance on the Grid Code

- 4.1 Ryan Place from National Grid gave the Panel a presentation on its implementation of Open Governance on the Grid Code.
- 4.2 A Panel Member noted that the proposals seemed to suggest that Modifications not sponsored by National Grid would not receive adequate resourcing. National Grid noted that its aim had been to ensure that proposers understood that they had ownership of the Modification proposals, not that they would not be supported.
- 4.3 A Panel Member asked if National Grid intended to limit alternative modification proposals. National Grid responded that there would be no limit as it envisaged the Grid Code working the same way as CUSC did currently.
- 4.4 The Chairman asked how National Grid was working to ensure that smaller, less well-resourced parties could participate and be involved in the Grid Code Panel and Panel elections. National Grid noted that it was keen to increase participation from these parties and had been working with Citizens Advice and Energy UK to develop and encourage engagement. Mark Bygraves noted that the proposals implied that Proposers should write the legal text as part of that proposal and commented that ELEXON's experience with Modifications is that Proposers, while having good understanding of BSC and the change they wished to make, did not always have the knowledge or resource to amend and write legal text. He encouraged National Grid to adopt a more supportive, collaborative approach with Proposers. National Grid noted that the intention was to give Proposers the option of drafting legal text if they wished.

# MINUTES

---

## MODIFICATION AND CHANGE BUSINESS

---

### 5. Change Report and Progress of Modification Proposals – 264/03

- 5.1 The Modification Secretary, Douglas Alexander, updated the Panel on the progress of Modifications.
- 5.2 The Chairman observed that [P325 'Improving the accountability of BSCCo to stakeholders and better aligning BSCCo governance with best practice'](#) is a fairly complex Modification and that progress has been rather slow. ELEXON noted that the Proposer was keen to keep the Modification open and that it had been difficult to get a quorate Workgroup to discuss next steps.
- 5.3 A Panel Member noted that the Workgroup did need to consider whether it should continue to progress the Modification.
- 5.4 The Panel suggested that the Proposer of P325 come to the next Panel meeting to discuss the Modification and why he wishes to continue with it.

**ACTION 264/01**

- 5.5 The BSC Panel:

a) **NOTED** the contents of the Change Report.

### 6. CP1479 'Updates to the Defined Metering Points in Codes of Practice 1, 2, 3, 5 and 10' – 264/11

- 6.1 The Panel was invited to approve Change Proposal (CP) 1479 'Updates to the Defined Metering Points in Codes of Practice 1, 2, 3, 5 and 10'. CP1479 was presented to the Imbalance Settlement Group (ISG) and to the Supplier Volume Allocation Group (SVG) for decision. CP1479 had been unanimously approved by the SVG; the ISG was unable to make a unanimous decision but recommended by majority (all but one) that CP1479 should be approved. Under the ISG's Terms of Reference, CP1479 therefore reverts to the BSC Panel for final decision.
- 6.2 Mark Bygraves asked for clarification of the SVG's position and the reason for the ISG minority view. ELEXON replied that the SVG's view was that the CP needed to be assessed against the baseline not against a possible future issue and that the ownership of the transformers was not a BSC issue.
- 6.3 One Panel member asked for clarification on the purpose of the CP and on the benefits of the proposed solution. ELEXON noted that there are situations where it is not clear where the DMP should be set. Therefore, this CP is adding clarification on the current practice, stating that the DMP should be at the point of connection/commercial interface. The Panel member was happy with the clarification.
- 6.4 The BSC Panel:
- a) **NOTED** that the ISG did not make a unanimous decision on 21 February 2017, but recommended by majority that the Panel approves CP1479;
- b) **NOTED** that the SVG unanimously approved CP1749 on 28 February 2017;
- c) **APPROVED** CP1479 for implementation on 2 November 2017 as part of the November 2017 BSC Release; and
- d) **APPROVED** the proposed changes to CoPs 1, 2, 3, 5 and 10 as contained in Attachments C-G of the paper.

### 7. European Network Code Implementation Plan – 264/04

---

# MINUTES

---

- 7.1 ELEXON provided the Panel with an overview of the European Network Code Implementation Plan that will be presented to Ofgem on 14 March 2017.
- 7.2 A Panel Member noted that there were many changes included in the plan and asked which ELEXON considered to be material to the BSC. ELEXON responded that it was currently difficult to determine which of the changes would be material to the BSC. However, ELEXON indicated which Modifications might be more material, dependent on the exact proposals.
- 7.3 The Chairman noted that under the Guidelines, ELEXON needs to be assigned or delegated the balancing and imbalance Settlement tasks they currently undertake. The Transmission Company Panel Member noted that it has been discussing options with ELEXON and Ofgem about whether to assign or delegate those powers and believed that assignment was the best way to proceed. Once the European Parliament has voted on and accepted the Electricity Balancing Guideline, on 16 March 2017, this process will begin.
- 7.4 A Panel Member asked if the assessment and reporting timeframes for these Modifications would need to be quicker than usual. ELEXON noted that the Electricity Balancing Guideline typically gives 12 months for implementation after regulatory approval; however as the typical Modification timescale was closer to 18 months that the industry would probably have to start the work before the regulatory approval at European level, in order to meet the deadlines. The Transmission Company Panel Member noted that there is an opportunity for Transmission System Operators (TSOs) to request more time for implementation.
- 7.5 A Panel Member noted that there seem to be several stages during the process where the TSOs can request derogations and exemptions; she asked when that would happen. The Transmission Company Panel Member noted that derogations are time bound and exemptions would be permanent. The Transmission Company Panel Member indicated that National Grid were looking to request an exemption on the 15 minute imbalance Settlement period, which it has discussed at the European Joint Stakeholder Group, and confirmed that it will need to write a letter of intent and receive a letter of comfort from Ofgem confirming its agreement to the exemption of that element. National Grid may also seek derogation on imbalance Settlement to prevent system changes being made twice in a short space of time.
- 7.6 The BSC Panel:
- a) **NOTED** the European Network Code Implementation Plan; and
  - b) **NOTED** that the BSC Implementation Plan will be presented to Ofgem on 14 March 2017.

## NON-MODIFICATION BUSINESS (OPEN SESSION)

---

### 8. Minute of Meeting 263 & Actions arising

- 8.1 The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed and an update on the actions provided. Actions 263/01, 262/03, 261/01, 258/01, 256/03 and 251/08 remain open.

### 9. Chairman's Report

#### BSC Annual Meeting

- 9.1 The Chairman noted that the BSC Annual Meeting would be held on 13 July 2017 and that Dermot Nolan, the Chief Executive Officer of Ofgem, would be speaking.

#### Ofgem Meeting

- 9.2 The Chairman noted that he and Mark Bygraves had recently met with Rachel Fletcher and Lesley Nugent at Ofgem to discuss various current issues.

# MINUTES

---

## Utility Week

- 9.3 The Chairman noted recent articles in Utility Week about the CUSC Panel. He did not wish to comment publicly on the content of the article but observed that ELEXON has developed a draft statement should it be asked to comment on how it and the BSC Panel work. Several Panel Members asked to see that draft statement and the Chair agreed that it could be sent to them, but on the basis that any public comment should be routed via the Chair.

**ACTION 164/02**

## 10. ELEXON Report – 264/01

- 10.1 Mark Bygraves provided an overview of ELEXON's consultation responses.

### BSCCo Business Plan

- 10.2 2017/18 BSCCo Business Plan has now been approved by the Board and will be published on the ELEXON website by the end of March 2017.
- 10.3 For further details on ELEXON's work over the past month, please see the [ELEXON](#) Report.

## 11. Distribution Report

- 11.1 There was no Distribution Report.

## 12. National Grid Report

- 12.1 The Transmission Company Panel Member noted that the Electricity Balance Guidelines will be discussed and voted on at the European Parliament next week.

## 13. Ofgem Report

- 13.1 The Ofgem Representative noted that it had issued a consultation on its proposed approach to Cost Recovery in relation to Capacity Allocation and Congestion Management mechanisms for electricity interconnectors. This consultation relates to Ofgem's national decision on how Great Britain's share of Price Coupling Project and Cross Border Intraday (XBID) Project development and operational costs will be recovered. The consultation closes on 31 March 2017 and Ofgem was keen to receive comments on the proposals set out in the consultation letter which is available on the Ofgem website.
- 13.2 A Panel Member asked if ELEXON had received information from Ofgem about the timing of the planned VoLL increase to £6,000 per MWh when the Capacity Market is delivered. Ofgem noted that no decision has been made as yet.

## 14. Report from the ISG – 264/01c

- 14.1 The Panel noted the report from the ISG.

## 15. Report from the SVG – 264/01d

- 15.1 The Panel noted the report from the SVG.

## 16. Report from the PAB – 264/01e

- 16.1 The Panel noted the report from the PAB.

## 17. Report from the TDC – 264/01f

# MINUTES

---

17.1 The Panel noted the report from the TDC.

## 18. Trading Operations: BSC Operations Headline Report – 264/02

18.1 The Panel noted the BSC Operations Headline Report.

## 19. System Price Analysis Report – 264/03

19.1 The Panel noted the SPAR.

## 20. Review of Specified BSC Charges – 264/05

20.1 ELEXON presented the results of its review of the Specified BSC Charges as set out in Section D which are determined by the Panel. In accordance with P346, it recommended a flat charge of £0.00598/SVA MSID per month (reduced from £0.35/MSID/month) be levied for both Half Hourly (HH) and non-Half Hourly (NHH), across all Measurement Classes.

20.2 The BSC Panel:

a) **APPROVED** the new SVA Specified Charge of £0.00598/SVA MSID per month.

## 21. BSC Audit Scope – 264/06

21.1 ELEXON provided the Panel with details of the proposed BSC Audit scope for the audit period 1 April 2017 to 31 March 2018. This had been endorsed by the Performance Assurance Board (PAB) at its meeting on 23 February 2017. The Panel was invited to approve the proposed BSC Audit scope and to delegate authority for any in-year changes in scope to the PAB.

21.2 A Panel Member welcomed the examination of the 'off the shelf' Suppliers. A Panel Member asked what 'off the shelf' Suppliers audited through the BSC Audit would be benchmarked against. ELEXON noted that this addition to the audit was to assess the perceived risk posed by this type of Supplier which in some instances sit just below the threshold of audit. However, it agreed that a Supplier that has entered the Market through traditional channels but is positioned similarly with respect to the audit threshold should be audited in order to provide a benchmark against which 'off the shelf' Suppliers can be assessed. The Panel Member believed that this would be helpful in determining the significance of the risk posed by the increase in the number of 'off the shelf' Suppliers.

21.3 The Panel Member noted that the Market Issue referencing a lack of documentation relating to CVA MOA processes was listed as a significant risk but that ELEXON was proposing to exclude two small CVA MOAs from scope for 2017/18 based on information provided by Central Systems showing that no activity at these MOAs to date in 2016/17. He asked what action ELEXON was taking to address this. ELEXON noted that currently there is no obligation in the BSC for CVA MOA's to have process documentation in place, so while it has been identified as a risk, it is not an issue that ELEXON is readily able to address under the BSC arrangements as they stand. However, ELEXON is taking a paper to the PAB's March meeting to discuss how best to approach this and other Market Issues.

21.4 A Panel Member noted that some of the responses to the PAF review engagement indicated that the BSC Audit is inefficient and costly and asked why the industry should continue to conduct it if this is the case. ELEXON noted that it is obliged by the BSC to conduct the audit and that work is being done to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the BSC Audit. ELEXON additionally noted the spot checks of the BSC Auditor's site work it is undertaking to provide assurance of the effectiveness of the BSC Audit, noting that the outcomes of these checks are being reported to the PAB.

# MINUTES

---

- 21.5 The Panel Secretary also noted that re-procurement of the BSC Auditor is due next year which would potentially give ELEXON a chance to reduce the cost.
- 21.6 The BSC Panel:
- a) **NOTED** that the PAB has endorsed the BSC Audit Scope for 2017/18;
  - b) **APPROVED** the BSC Audit Scope for 2017/18; and
  - c) **AGREED** to delegate responsibility for any future amendments to the BSC Audit Scope 2017/18 to the PAB.

Lisa Waters left the meeting

## 22. Performance Assurance Framework Review: Scope and Approach Approval – 264/07

- 22.1 ELEXON set out the conclusions of the planning phase of the Performance Assurance Framework (PAF) review, and invited the Panel to approve the scope and approach for the design of the review.
- 22.2 The BSC Panel:
- a) **APPROVED** the scope and approach for the PAF review;
  - b) **AGREED** that Mitch Donnelly should be appointed as Panel Sponsor for the review; and
  - c) **AGREED** that the PAB should continue to manage the review on the Panel's behalf.

## 23. Review of Metering Dispensations and non-Standard BMUs – Final Report – 264/08

- 23.1 ELEXON has completed its review on Metering Dispensations and non-standard BM (Balancing Mechanism) Unit (BMU) applications. This paper summarised the review's main findings and recommendations and sought the Panel's endorsement of the Final Report and its findings.
- 23.2 A Panel Member sought to understand how the situation with non-Standard BMUs had developed and how ELEXON could prevent it happening in the future. ELEXON observed that the review had identified some non-Standard BMU configurations, and therefore felt that it would be good practice to check BMUs as it came across them in the course of normal operations and to ensure that if they discovered any non-Standard BMU's that did not have the necessary dispensations, that it got them. However, it could not identify how they had arisen in the first instance, although it believed that the issue was not the consequence of a change in operations but merely that they would have been considered as 'standard' when they were commissioned.
- 23.3 The Panel Member asked what the impact of having a non-Standard BMU was. ELEXON responded that from a purely BSC point of view, there was no issue provided that a Meter was in place, however, it recognised that National Grid may feel differently. The National Grid Representative noted that the categories exist to provide consistency across the system.
- 23.4 A Panel Member asked if ELEXON had considered how to prevent non-Standard configurations of BMU's. ELEXON noted that the ISG could refuse to grant dispensations. The Panel Member asked if ELEXON worked with project developers to communicate the need for Standard configurations. ELEXON observed that this isn't something that they do but that the configurations are in the BSC and the Guidance was widely available to industry.
- 23.5 The BSC Panel:
- a) **NOTED** the content of the Final Report;
  - b) **NOTED** that the ISG and SVG had reviewed the Final Report and recommendation;

# MINUTES

---

- c) **NOTED** that the Final Report represents the conclusion of a BSC Review and so will be sent to the Authority, included in Newscast and published on the BSC Website in accordance with Section C 3.8.6;
- d) **ENDORSED** the recommendations summarised and set out in the Final Report; and
- e) **NOTED** that ELEXON will develop a plan to implement the recommendations and will return to the Panel to present an implementation plan.

## 24. P305 Post Implementation Review – 264/09

- 24.1 ELEXON presented the 12 month post implementation review of Modification P305 '[Electricity Balancing Significant Code Review Developments](#)'.
- 24.2 A Panel Member commended ELEXON on the quality of the report. He noted that he would have liked to have seen some analysis of the impact that P305 had on market behaviour, noting that offer prices rose post implementation which he believed was key to what was happening in other parts of the market. Further analysis on how the change from a fixed DRM to a floating DRM impacted on RSP prices would also have been useful. However, he felt that the report showed that P305 had been a qualified success and noted that the system is less balanced than it was. ELEXON noted that both of the points raised by the Panel Member were outside of its scope of analysis.
- 24.3 The Chairman asked ELEXON whether it had noted any surprising or unexpected changes as a result of P305. ELEXON noted that it had not initially considered the effect of the single imbalance price on dual accounts. Once it realised there was an impact it examined how those imbalance volumes had changed between accounts and focussed on what a Party's net energy imbalance was and how it had changed.
- 24.4 A Panel Member noted that the report showed a trend in the market index prices and the rise in system prices and asked ELEXON to what extent it believed the market mechanism in the system prices had influenced the market index price. ELEXON stated that the evidence was not clear as to what had caused this because it could be due to several factors.
- 24.5 A Panel Member recalled that one of the proposed benefits of P305 was that it would allow Parties to net across accounts and would be interested to know if this was something that smaller Parties had been able to do or if that was just adopted by larger Generators and vertically integrated Parties.
- 24.6 The National Grid Representative noted that the report highlights that the change in imbalance volumes is not solely due to the move to a single imbalance price but down to other changes on the system.
- 24.7 A Panel Member noted that the report is useful as there are other changes due to happen under P305 and reports such as this will keep industry informed on the likely effect of those changes.
- 24.8 A Panel Member asked if analysis on the impact of P305 on different types of Parties had been done and ELEXON responded that it was in the report.
- 24.9 Mark Bygraves asked Ofgem if the report or any of the analysis had led to Ofgem reconsidering the move, or the timing of the move, to 1MWh Price Average Reference (PAR), noting that such a change would be happening on 1 November 2018. The Ofgem Representative will take that back and update the Panel later.

**ACTION 264/03**

24.10 The BSC Panel:

- a) **NOTED** the analysis in the post implementation review.

# MINUTES

---

## CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS (CLOSED SESSION)

---

### 25. Development of P350 Deliverables Required for Procurement Purposes – 264/10

- 25.1 ELEXON provided the Panel with an update on the [P350 'Introduction of a seasonal Zonal Transmission Losses scheme'](#) procurement activities that it has carried out in advance of the Authority's decision, and on the activities that will be carried out directly following receipt of the Authority's decision in March 2017.
- 25.2 A Panel Member noted that there were only two tenders submitted for the Transmission Loss Factor Agent (TLFA) role and asked if ELEXON had expected more. ELEXON replied that there had been eight requests for the tender documents but that six companies had declined to submit tenders based on the technical requirements and tight timeframes of the project. However, it noted that the two tenders submitted were from credible suppliers and this would allow ELEXON to run a competitive tender.
- 25.3 The Chairman noted that the role of Model Reviewer was not subject to a tender process and asked why ELEXON had chosen to appoint directly. ELEXON noted that there were very few suitable candidates for the Model Reviewer role and that given the very tight timeframes for this work, in order to meet P350's Implementation Date, it had decided to appoint the Model Reviewer via a single-sourcing approach and focus on the tender process for appointing the TLFA.
- 25.4 The BSC Panel:
- a) **NOTED** that the TLFA Service Description, LFM Specification and the Model Review ToR were drafted in advance of the Authority's decision on P350;
  - b) **NOTED** the next steps for the TLFA Service Description, LFM Specification and the Model Review ToR; and
  - c) **NOTED** the single-sourcing of the Model Reviewer to a qualified independent expert.

### 26. Any other Business

- 26.1 There was no other business in the Closed Session.

### 27. Next meeting

- 27.1 The next meeting of the BSC Panel will be held at the offices of ELEXON Ltd, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW on Thursday 12 April 2017.