MHHS PROGRAMME
Industry-led, Elexon facilitated

MHHS Settlement Timetable Expert Group (STEG) Headline Report

Issue date: 26/06/2026

Meeting Number	**STEG08**	Venue	**MS Teams**
Date and Time	**24 June 2026 14:00-16:00**	Classification	**Public**

Decisions:

Area	Decision Ref	Description	Rationale
RF Consultation Position	**STEG-DEC01**	The Chair, acting with delegated authority of the MHHS Senior Responsible Owner (SRO), approved progressing the agreed decision criteria and associated decision process to MCAG, following STEG's recommendation.	The Programme invited rejections to the approval of this decision, to which none were received.

Key Discussion Items:

Area	Discussion
RF Consultation Position	The Programme provided an overview of the updated decision criteria, decision choreography and exception process for the M16 settlement timetable decisions. No objections were raised to these being progressed, and STEG agreed that the proposed criteria and associated process could be passed to MCAG for approval. It was also noted that, should any issue of sufficient materiality arise ahead of the decision point, there remains a mechanism to raise an expedited change request for further consideration. The Programme confirmed that an extraordinary MCAG (eMCAG) will take place in early July to discuss the decision criteria and process. • Discussion was had around the RF consultation position, focusing on Supplier Charges, migration / timing, and monitoring / CVA impacts. Members noted that SF impacts could arise earlier than RF, supported clearer migration thresholds within the decision framework, and questioned whether the current market-level monitoring approach could mask more concentrated impacts at individual parties or sites.

	• The EDF Energy Representative noted that a Supplier Charge issues group is incoming. Further details will be shared with the Programme once available so that parties can be appropriately signposted. The Programme also reiterated that concerns relating to Supplier Charges should continue to be progressed through the existing BSC change governance routes, rather than through STEG itself. **DECISION:** The Chair, acting with delegated authority of the MHHS Senior Responsible Owner (SRO), approved progressing the agreed decision criteria and associated decision process to MCAG, following STEG's recommendation. **(STEG-DEC01 – recording timestamp 40:35)**. *Post-meeting note:* The eMCAG will take place on the 07 July 2026.
CVA Assurance Update	Elexon provided an update on CVA assurance activity, noting ongoing work to improve visibility of performance, enhance engagement with parties, and develop targeted assurance and reporting to support readiness for the shortened settlement timetable. The St Clements Representative provided a verbal update on discussions with CVA parties and highlighted concerns in three broad areas: estimation processes, registration / aggregation rule changes, and routes for raising and resolving process issues. Estimation was described as manual, resource-intensive and difficult to operate within shortened timescales; in response, the Programme and Elexon noted that assurance and process improvement work is already underway, and that relevant timetable-related changes, including points within BSCP503, are being reviewed. Concerns were also raised regarding registration and aggregation rule processes, including version control issues, delays in updating aggregation rules and associated financial impacts. In response, it was noted that these concerns would be captured and taken forward through the appropriate existing routes, with a further action agreed for the Programme and Elexon to engage with the relevant service owner(s) and direct the points raised through the appropriate governance and service channels. The St Clements Representative also noted that some parties felt concerns previously raised through existing channels had not always resulted in visible outcomes, and that impacts may not be evenly distributed across the market, with the potential for more significant impacts at individual CVA sites or participants despite relatively low aggregate settlement deltas. STEG noted that the relevant formal routes remain the appropriate BSC issue, modification or change proposal processes. **ACTION:** Programme and Elexon to engage with the relevant service owner(s) on the CVA process concerns raised at STEG and ensure these are directed through the appropriate governance and service channels for follow-up (**STEG08-01**). **ACTION:** Elexon (S&I) to engage with the CDCA to determine whether a representative can attend future STEG meetings to support discussion of CVA process matters (**STEG08-02**).

New and Outstanding Actions:

Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due	Update
STEG07-02	St Clements Representative to provide specific examples of CVA processes for the Programme/Elexon to review and feed back to STEG	St Clements Representative (Vicki Holland)	24/06/26	**ONGOING:** St Clements Representative is continuing to compile examples from supplier contacts. An update will be provided and discussed at the next STEG.

STEG08-01	Programme and Elexon to engage with the relevant service owner(s) on the CVA process concerns raised at STEG and ensure these are directed through the appropriate governance and service channels for follow-up.	MHHS Programme / Elexon Representative (Ian Smith / Simon Waltho)	08/07/26	**NEW**
STEG08-02	Elexon (S&I) to engage with the CDCA to determine whether a representative can attend future STEG meetings to support discussion of CVA process matters.	Elexon Representative (S&I) (Simon Waltho / Andrew Spurr)	08/07/26	**NEW**

Closed Actions:

Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due	Update
STEG06-03	Programme to consider how additional Supplier Charge considerations will be treated within M16 decision making	MHHS Programme (Ian Smith)	29/05/26	**RECOMMENDED CLOSED:** This will be dealt with explicitly as part of the consultation responses.
STEG07-01	Programme to provide worked examples of CVA run-type differences and the impact where charges apply at RF but not DF	MHHS Programme (Justin Andrews)	24/06/26	**RECOMMENDED CLOSED:** Trading Charge impacts are influenced by behavioral factors and portfolio size, with the majority of changes occurring between SF and R2 rather than later run types. No material issues have been identified from a Trading Charges perspective.

Date of next meeting: 08 July 2026