



**MHHS
PROGRAMME**

Industry-led, Elexon facilitated

Settlement Timetable Expert Group (STEG) #11

05 August 2026

Version 1.0

MHHS-DEL4600

Agenda


#	Item	Objective	Type	Lead(s)	Time	Page
1	Welcome and Agenda	Run-through of the agenda for this week	Information	Chair & Secretariat	14:00 – 14:05 5 mins	2
2	Headline Report and Actions	Approve Headline Report and review outstanding actions	Decision	Chair & Secretariat	14:05 – 14:10 5 mins	3
3	Transition Design Decision Threshold	Update on Transition design threshold and STEG member feedback	Discussion	Programme	14:10 – 14:25 15 mins	6
4	M16 Year Minus 1 Assessment	Overview of discussions on M16 Year Minus 1 Assessment and STEG member feedback	Discussion	Programme	14:25 – 14:40 15 mins	12
5	Decision on Checkpoint 1 Position	Approval of STEG position to MCAG notifying Decision Checkpoint 1 On-track	Decision	Chair & Secretariat	14:40 – 14:45 5 mins	14
6	Settlement Monitoring: SVA and CVA Deltas	STEG review of the SVA and CVA monitoring graphs	Information	Programme	14:45 – 14:45 0 mins	16
7	Migration Reporting	Migration status update	Discussion	Programme	14:45 – 14:55 10 mins	22
8	M16 Risks	Risk matrix and latest risk scores	Information	Programme	14:55 – 15:00 5 mins	25
9	Summary & Next Steps	Summarise actions and agree any agenda items for next meeting	Information	Chair & Secretariat	15:00 – 15:05 5 mins	27
	Appendix	Appendix 1 – Governance Structure Appendix 2 – Migration Metrics Appendix 3 – M16 POAP Appendix 4 – Governance Group Methodology				

Headline Report and Actions

DECISION: Approval of Headline Report of previous meeting and review outstanding actions

Chair & Secretariat

5 mins



Headline Report and Actions Review (Page 1 of 2)

1. Approval of Headline Report from meeting held [22 July 2026](#)
2. Open actions and actions from previous meeting:

Ref	Date Raised	Action	Owner	Due Date	Latest Update
STEG08-01	24/06/26	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	RECOMMEND CLOSED: Programme and Elexon have agreed way forward on CVA issues, including the establishment by Elexon on a new BSC Issue group.
STEG08-02	24/06/26	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	RECOMMEND CLOSED: The Programme have agreed with Elexon appropriate representatives for STEG meetings.
STEG09-02	08/07/26	Programme and Elexon to investigate the difference in weekend performance observed between II and SF settlement data.	MHHS Programme and Elexon Performance Assurance (Kevin Spencer, Andrew Spurr)	22/07/26	RECOMMEND CLOSED: Elexon confirmed that the weekend performance at II is impacted by the difference between calendar data and working day obligations, resulting in some weekend data missing the II Run.
STEG09-03	08/07/26	Programme and Elexon to define the SF monitoring data requirements and assess the feasibility of extracting the required D+6WD data from MDS and report back to STEG.	MHHS Programme and Elexon Representative (Ian Smith, Justin Andrews & Riccardo Lampini)	22/07/26	ONGOING: Programme discussing with Elexon on reporting requirements and its feasibility.
STEG09-04	08/07/26	Programme to review the impact of switching activity, including high-volume switching events, gains and defaulting, on settlement performance monitoring.	MHHS Programme (Ian Smith)	22/07/26	ONGOING: Update provided at the 22 July 2026 STEG meeting on the potential low impact of switching and analysis continuing.

Headline Report and Actions Review (Page 2 of 2)


Ref	Date Raised	Action	Owner	Due Date	Latest Update
STEG09-06	08/07/26	Programme and Elexon to review CVA data substitution and estimation processes and assess what settlement data would be available from CDCA at 6 WDs to support SF decision-making and report back to STEG.	MHHS Programme and Elexon Performance Assurance (Ian Smith, Simon Waltho & Andrew Spurr)	22/07/26	RECOMMEND CLOSED: The Programme understands that this will be a topic in the forthcoming Elexon M16 BSC CVA Issue Group. Therefore, it is proposed to monitor there.
STEG09-07	08/07/26	Programme and Elexon to assess whether TLM variations, across II and SF, and CVA data accuracy can be used to inform SF monitoring.	MHHS Programme and Elexon Performance Assurance (Kevin Spencer, Justin Andrews, Simon Waltho & Andrew Spurr)	22/07/26	RECOMMEND CLOSED Analysis shows that data complexity makes the identification of a suitable metric difficult and of little benefit. TLMs reported over 14 GSP Groups, Settlement Period level and are dependent on periodically set TLFs, Moreover, it does not tell us whether the error is associated with Transmission connected metering, GSP Metering or export being estimated at zero at the II Run. It is also unclear what suitable baseline values could be used in the assessment of error.
STEG10-01	22/07/26	Programme and Elexon to agree the terms of reference / wording for the M16 BSC CVA Issue Group, ensuring alignment with the Programme's M16 decision-making responsibilities.	MHHS Programme and Elexon (Ian Smith, Justin Andrews & Matt Cogram)	05/08/26	RECOMMEND CLOSED: The Programme have reviewed the Issue Group ToR.
STEG10-02	22/07/26	Elexon to invite a Programme representative to attend the M16 BSC CVA Issue Group.	Elexon Representative (Matt Cogram)	05/08/26	RECOMMEND CLOSED: The Programme have been contacted.
STEG10-03	22/07/26	Elexon to provide updates from the M16 BSC CVA Issue Group to STEG as a standing agenda item.	Elexon Representative (Matt Cogram)	05/08/26	ONGOING: Updates to be provided at future STEG meetings.
STEG10-04	22/07/26	Participants to consider the impacts, risks and potential system changes associated with moving from a hard M15 dependency to a threshold-based approach, for discussion at the next STEG.	Programme Participants	05/08/26	ONGOING: See agenda item 3.
STEG10-05	22/07/26	Participants to review the initial M16 Year Minus 1 Assessment content and provide any feedback to the Programme ahead of the next STEG.	Programme Participants	30/07/26	ONGOING: See agenda item 4.

Transition Design Decision Threshold

DISCUSSION: Update on M16 Transition Design threshold and STEG member feedback

Programme

15 mins



Introduction – Actions

Ref	Date Raised	Action	Owner	Due Date	Latest Update
STEG10-04	22/07/26	Participants to consider the impacts, risks and potential system changes associated with moving from a hard M15 dependency to a threshold-based approach, for discussion at the next STEG.	Programme Participants	05/08/26	ONGOING: see agenda item 3

Note – the next 2 slides included are intended to act as RECAP Slides from last STEG to support this action and discussion at the end
Included for Reference purposes only and NOT for discussion this time – replaced by updated positioning in later slides today

Milestone M16 – Cutover to the new settlement timetable

- Defined as the point at which the market cuts over from the legacy 14-month settlement timetable to the new four-month settlement timetable, aligned to the MHHS TOM.
- M16 is expected to take place following a stabilisation period after Migration completion, enabling the market to transition to the new, faster settlement timetable once MHHS arrangements are operating steadily.

At the time of writing the requirements for the baselined Transition Design (MHHHS-DEL 1590 - MHHSP_Transition_to_new_Settlement_Timetable v2.3), there were assumption included that,

- *“Migration activity finishes 2 months earlier than M16”.*
 - *Note - M15 and M16 are 8-week apart in the Programme Plan (7-May-27 and 2-Jul-27)*
- *“Completion of Migration should be known 3 months prior to M16, i.e. if the M16 cutover is at risk”.*

RAID Management

- **A139** – There is an assumption that there is a minimum of a 2-month lapse time between M15 and M16
 - 2 months is a minimum amount of time required to demonstrate some stability in the new arrangements and M16 should be agreed on the basis of criteria rather than any timing, but we have set 6 months as a backstop to ensure that we don't parallel run systems for too long at significant expense
- **D420** – There is a dependency on all MPANs being migrated by M15 for M16 to take place
- **D422** – If there is a delay caused by M15 (see D420), then the delay to M16 is likely to be a day-on-day slip

Additional Considerations

- The baselined Transition Design (MHHHS-DEL 1590) also stated,
 - *“There is no desire to keep legacy “systems” supported longer than necessary. There is a cost for participants to maintain legacy systems operational, staffed, backed up, archived, audited, BSC audited, etc. So, there will be a strong desire to shut these down as soon as possible”.*

Risk – Post OFGEMs approval of P487 and its implementation via CR065, It is conceivable that ‘Full Migration’ complete @M15 may not be practical as there may be continued targeted MPAN Migrations scheduled for some Suppliers post M15 that were not considered within the original assumptions made for the Transition Design.

- *Suppliers may request and be subject to **SRO Exemption @M15***
- *Suppliers may be subject to **Customer Acquisition Ban** from M15 onwards*

For consideration – Impacts on SF Decision

- **If ALL MPANs have not migrated into the new MHHS Settlement Arrangements at Milestone M15, would M16 still be implemented to current planned date?**
- **Need to weigh up the benefits / risks of carrying on with M16 or delaying M16 in this scenario? Impacts either way?**
- **Would changing from a strict absolute 100% ALL MPANs migrated position to one better reflective of the current landscape, using an agreed threshold level of unmigrated MPANs criteria be beneficial?**

Proposal for Discussion

- Update the assumptions supporting the original '**Transition Design**'
- Acknowledge that,
 - it is possible that all MPANs are not migrated by milestone M15 and potentially by the proposed M16 date
 - If this is the case, delaying the M16 Milestone and implementation of the new MST is not necessarily the best outcome
- Include additional item within the **M16 Acceptance Criteria** to recognise this updated assumption and formalise this into Programme decision making process
- For example...*Set M16 Acceptance Criteria based on Acceptable Threshold for MPANs not migrated*

Acceptance Criteria – *The current Migration Complete position across ALL Suppliers is lower than the Acceptable Thresholds defined*

- Determine what are the **Acceptable Thresholds** for approving the M16 decision and introducing the new reduced Settlement Timetables at Milestone M16
- *Maximum MPAN Limit for all remaining not Migrated MPANs e.g. 20,000 MPANs and /or*
- *Maximum Volume Limit associated with all for all remaining not migrated MPANs e.g. 20,000 MWh*
- *Any other thresholds?*

For Discussion: Risk Mitigation – What if MHHS Full Transition is not complete on the baselined date of M15 (Page 1 of 2)

- We must not conflate two distinct consequences of failing to achieve 'Full Transition' by the baselined M15 date.
- Each carries materially different implications and must be considered – and addressed – separately.

Impact 1: Continuation of Legacy Settlement

Risk:

Should Full Transition not be achieved by the baselined M15 date, Legacy Settlement processing must continue to run in parallel until Full Transition is ultimately achieved – that is, until every MPAN has been successfully migrated to the new MHHS Settlement arrangements and none remain under Legacy Settlement.

Risk Mitigation Options:

Single Option: Legacy Settlement **MUST** continue for all Settlement dates and runs beyond M15, until every MPAN has successfully migrated to the new MHHS Settlement arrangements.

This raises a critical follow-on question: **which Master Settlement Timetable (MST) governs these continuing Legacy Settlement dates and runs?**

- (a) A MST reflecting current timelines, or
- (b) A MST reflecting the reduced timelines expected to take effect at M16.

The current Transition Design assumption is that current Settlement Timetable timelines remain in force until **all** MPANs have successfully migrated.

Impact 2: The M16 Cutover Decision

Risk:

Under current **Transition Design** assumptions, the M16 milestone decision – cutover to the new Settlement timetable with reduced settlement run timelines – should not proceed, and must be delayed, until 'Full Transition' is complete.

Query:

Can the M16 milestone (cutover to the new settlement timetable) proceed as planned if Full Transition is not achieved by the baselined M15 date?

Challenge:

Is this assumed delay still the intended and most appropriate position – confirming the existing assumption as-is – or should the original Transition Design assumptions now be revisited, in light of current migration progress, better understanding of delay impacts and the prevailing risk position?

Risk Mitigation Options: see next slide

For consideration – Impact 2: The M16 Cutover Decision (SF Decision)

- If ALL MPANs have not migrated into the new MHHS Settlement Arrangements at Milestone M15, would M16 still be implemented to current planned date?
- Need to weigh up the benefits / risks of carrying on with M16 or delaying M16 in this scenario? Impacts either way?
- Would changing from a strict absolute 100% ALL MPANs migrated position to one better reflective of the current landscape, using an agreed threshold level of unmigrated MPANs criteria, be beneficial?

Risk Mitigation Options:


- **Option 1: Keep the Transition Design assumption; delay the Cutover decision and preserve the 8-week stabilisation period.**
 - Push the timeline back day-for-day until 'Full Transition' is achieved, then set the M16 date as 8 weeks from that revised date.
- **Option 2: Keep the Transition Design assumption; delay the Cutover decision but don't preserve the 8-week stabilisation period.**
 - Set the M16 date to align directly with the revised date on which 'Full Transition' is now expected to be achieved.
- **Option 3: Revise the Transition Design assumption itself, removing the requirement for a strict 100% ALL MPANs migrated position prior to M16.**
 - Replace it with a set of M16 Acceptance Criteria based on agreed threshold levels for unmigrated MPANs / volume.
- **Any other Options for consideration?**

M16 Year Minus 1 Assessment

DISCUSSION: Overview of discussions on M16 Year Minus 1 Assessment and STEG member feedback

Programme

15 mins



Interim Assessment

Proposed Approach

In addition to the specific criteria outlined below, an M16 RAID Assessment will also be carried out against the following criteria across all Decision Points:

- **Issues** : No Critical (5) or High (4) rated Issues remain open on the Programme RAID Log relating to the M16 Milestone.
- **Risks** : No Critical (5) or High (4) rated Risks remain open on the Programme RAID Log relating to the M16 Milestone.


Decision Point	Decision Date	Criteria Status	Criteria Performance	Next Steps	Overall Assessment
RF – 7 Months	September 2026	Defined – Awaiting Approval	Settlement performance within limits and Migration performance on track	1) Continued monitoring against criteria ahead of September Decision Point	
RF – 4 Months	March 2027	Defined – Awaiting Approval	Settlement performance within limits and Migration performance on track	1) Continued monitoring against criteria ahead of September Decision Point	
R1 DF SF	June 2027	Discussions Commenced	TBC	1) Elexon Mobilise CVA M16 Issue Group 2) Determine reporting mechanisms to compare WD+6 and WD+ 14 Settlement positions 3) Once indicative views have been developed noting state of migration, develop views on success criteria	
RAID	Aligned to each Decision Point	Subject to Ongoing Review and Management	• Issues: There are no Issues raised on the Programme RAID log relating to M16 • Risks: There are no Critical or High Risks on the Programme RAID log relating to M16. The highest recorded Risk is currently a 'Medium' risk (scoring at 11/30)	1) Continue RAID Monitoring and active Management	

Decision on Checkpoint 1 Position

DECISION: Approval of STEG position to MCAG
notifying Decision Checkpoint 1 On-track

Chair & Secretariat

5 mins



DECISION


STEG Issue position to MCAG stating that with the information available currently M16 is achievable

Settlement Monitoring: SVA and CVA Deltas


INFORMATION: STEG review of the SVA and CVA monitoring graphs

Programme

0 mins – to be taken as read




SVA Absolute Deltas between RF and R3 by Measurement Class – 2024/25



- Total percentage change is ~0.07% of total volumes.
- Measurement Class D (UMS HH) has the largest swing in Q1 25, due to Migrations from B to D following P434.
- All other Measurement Classes remain below 1%.

Energy				
Year	SVA RF-R3 Delta	Abs SVA RF-R3 Delta	SVA RF-R3 Delta %	Average MSID Count
2024	-163,942.94	177,778.65	0.08%	32,658,721
Qtr 2	-87,438.98	87,438.98	0.12%	32,588,455
A	-94,549.61	94,549.61	0.35%	31,349,565
B	-75.60	190.78	0.54%	28,854
C	15,904.67	26,062.38	0.07%	178,593
D	-1,199.78	1,199.78	0.28%	474
E	1,798.08	2,303.61	0.11%	85,165
F	-8,763.45	8,763.45	0.94%	885,156
G	-553.29	553.29	0.08%	60,648
Qtr 3	-57,095.24	57,095.24	0.08%	32,654,356
A	-77,046.66	77,046.65	0.30%	31,281,004
B	-710.95	710.95	2.15%	28,047
C	26,931.07	28,473.70	0.07%	180,161
D	-2,190.83	2,216.67	0.45%	1,109
E	472.41	1,953.70	0.10%	84,924
F	-3,641.99	3,641.99	0.36%	1,018,340
G	-908.30	908.30	0.12%	60,772
Qtr 4	-19,408.71	33,244.42	0.04%	32,732,589
A	-64,808.19	64,808.19	0.20%	31,247,073
B	5,585.73	5,972.27	17.77%	24,720
C	34,062.76	34,062.76	0.08%	181,550
D	10,979.91	11,137.86	1.66%	4,573
E	-614.54	927.37	0.04%	84,871
F	-2,112.85	2,190.04	0.13%	1,128,436
G	-2,501.53	2,501.53	0.30%	61,367
2025	-13,278.28	22,162.48	0.03%	32,803,629
Qtr 1	-13,278.28	22,162.48	0.03%	32,803,629
A	-47,885.30	48,088.44	0.14%	31,071,221
B	-532.78	532.78	1.82%	21,000
C	14,259.25	18,061.68	0.04%	182,882
D	29,251.97	29,251.97	4.84%	6,872
E	-4,240.74	4,241.87	0.18%	84,639
F	-776.07	4,067.74	0.22%	1,374,210
G	-3,354.61	3,354.61	0.41%	62,805
Total	-177,221.22	199,941.13	0.07%	32,694,452

SVA Absolute Deltas between RF and R2 by Measurement Class – 2024/25




- Total percentage change is marginally higher than RF-R3 at ~0.08% of total volumes.
- Measurement Classes B & D (UMS) have the largest swings.
- All other Measurement Classes are less than 1%.

Energy

Year	SVA RF-R2 Delta	Abs SVA RF-R2 Delta	SVA RF-R2 Delta %	Average MSID Count
2024	-170,615.46	195,561.35	0.09%	32,658,721
Qtr 2	-43,320.10	66,240.82	0.09%	32,588,455
A	-148,112.18	148,112.18	0.54%	31,349,565
B	-1,194.89	1,194.89	3.22%	28,854
C	117,714.33	117,714.33	0.30%	178,593
D	-1,839.15	1,859.91	0.44%	474
E	1,987.01	1,987.01	0.10%	85,165
F	-9,859.06	9,859.06	1.05%	885,156
G	-2,016.17	2,016.17	0.27%	60,648
Qtr 3	-76,860.13	76,860.12	0.11%	32,654,356
A	-108,920.59	108,920.59	0.42%	31,281,004
B	-221.07	246.79	0.75%	28,047
C	45,253.57	47,653.67	0.12%	180,161
D	-4,998.72	4,998.89	1.03%	1,109
E	2,099.33	3,340.54	0.17%	84,924
F	-8,426.26	8,426.26	0.82%	1,018,340
G	-1,646.39	1,646.39	0.22%	60,772
Qtr 4	-50,435.23	52,460.41	0.07%	32,732,589
A	-123,559.07	123,559.07	0.37%	31,247,073
B	5,331.66	5,836.42	17.20%	24,720
C	64,855.54	65,795.62	0.16%	181,550
D	8,417.04	9,110.43	1.36%	4,573
E	1,455.09	1,746.76	0.08%	84,871
F	-6,608.08	6,608.08	0.45%	1,128,436
G	-327.41	539.30	0.07%	61,367
2025	-27,583.82	35,142.13	0.04%	32,803,629
Qtr 1	-27,583.82	35,142.13	0.04%	32,803,629
A	-101,313.80	101,313.80	0.29%	31,071,221
B	-1,018.58	1,018.58	3.40%	21,000
C	70,150.68	70,150.68	0.17%	182,882
D	25,341.82	25,341.82	4.17%	6,872
E	-3,520.95	3,641.35	0.15%	84,639
F	-9,403.69	9,403.69	0.49%	1,374,210
G	-7,819.30	7,819.30	0.92%	62,805
Total	-198,199.27	230,703.48	0.08%	32,694,452


SVA Absolute Deltas between SF and II by Measurement Class – 2025/26



- Total percentage change is ~1.09% of total volumes.
- Measurement Class F (EHH) has the largest swing at 12.42%. The availability of reads by this point in time is expected to improve under MHHS.
- Measurement Classes B and D (UMS) present the next largest segments by % Delta, though with relatively small Volumes.

Year	SVA SF-II Delta	Abs SVA SF-II Delta	SVA SF-II Delta %	Average MSID Count
2024	2,340,831.30	2,340,831.30	1.07%	195,799,214
2025	3,285,785.41	3,340,857.95	1.09%	173,183,700
Qtr 1	1,020,106.42	1,024,960.80	1.25%	196,600,706
A	-79,680.80	90,782.79	0.25%	186,038,596
B	-2,167.06	2,244.46	4.77%	128,279
C	898,403.16	898,403.16	2.21%	1,096,340
D	-114,589.06	123,939.16	11.19%	40,750
E	-1,554.73	12,983.64	0.55%	507,484
F	325,797.67	325,797.67	20.62%	8,412,657
G	-6,102.76	7,971.43	0.92%	376,600
Qtr 2	700,511.13	740,443.77	1.05%	180,374,676
A	-74,168.18	139,366.11	0.53%	167,549,779
B	-783.86	785.51	3.75%	77,846
C	933,755.12	933,755.12	2.38%	1,014,825
D	-92,544.05	92,625.02	11.27%	65,562
E	-4,607.27	10,441.53	0.52%	466,062
F	-56,690.34	102,995.13	4.89%	10,863,175
G	-4,450.28	19,390.32	2.59%	337,426
Qtr 3	570,289.97	580,575.49	0.82%	164,466,426
A	-17,732.99	122,266.38	0.48%	151,555,913
B	-1,507.27	1,507.27	19.73%	23,187
C	775,586.96	775,586.96	1.95%	932,925
D	-150,465.37	150,465.37	17.51%	92,816
E	1,731.38	6,594.20	0.33%	424,464
F	-33,970.13	138,315.37	6.29%	11,127,596
G	-3,352.60	3,875.45	0.53%	309,525
Qtr 4	994,877.90	994,877.90	1.25%	151,880,221
A	-100,277.10	124,460.91	0.37%	140,259,925
B	-236.74	238.82	17.82%	2,829
C	968,213.38	968,213.38	2.36%	868,986
D	-122,165.21	124,376.53	11.70%	102,232
E	16,871.75	18,797.88	0.82%	393,140
F	231,824.27	232,570.81	9.46%	9,969,266
G	647.55	3,352.70	0.41%	283,842
2026	1,330,630.26	1,432,157.28	1.14%	95,576,159
Qtr 1	849,804.90	937,581.05	1.17%	112,993,300
A	-225,033.59	225,033.59	0.68%	104,392,164
B	-29.58	31.19	6.92%	1,453
C	925,830.25	980,178.91	2.33%	709,944
D	-51,263.12	51,263.12	7.14%	81,934
E	8,474.22	15,706.39	0.65%	320,440
F	191,679.24	259,593.05	11.28%	7,257,668
G	147.48	5,687.77	0.71%	229,697
Qtr 2	480,825.36	494,576.23	1.10%	69,878,738
A	-3,761.04	33,728.18	0.24%	64,772,592
B	-30.49	31.91	18.79%	373
C	633,034.07	639,740.85	2.37%	523,259
D	-32,660.89	32,660.89	8.48%	59,923
E	1,677.85	7,496.81	0.55%	234,749
F	-115,119.12	115,559.18	12.42%	4,121,339
G	-2,315.02	2,945.56	0.61%	166,503
Total	6,957,246.98	7,113,846.54	1.09%	166,193,715


MHHS Absolute Deltas between SF and II by Measurement Class – 2025/26



Year	MHHS SF-II Delta	Abs MHHS SVA SF-II Delta	MHHS SF-II Delta %	Average MHHS MSID Count
2025				
Qtr 4				
A	-40,847.93	112,650.13	27.02%	295
S	-1,637,717.10	1,895,503.70	0.95%	307,803
U	0.00	0.00	0.00%	1
2026				
Qtr 1				
A	1,188,561.07	1,762,546.11	13.24%	1,048
S	7,727,471.87	120,507,015.37	2.98%	3,231,555
U	0.00	0.00	0.00%	15
Qtr 2				
A	697,406.73	763,566.14	1.86%	4,295
S	35,964,000.49	84,143,546.77	1.90%	8,281,214
U	1,599.90	1,599.90	22.89%	21

- Total percentage change is reducing for Market Segment S to ~1.90% of total volumes between SF and II. Equivalent Deltas for SVA at SF are ~1.10% in Q2.
- Performance has improved as MSID count has increased.
- Market Segments A and U have relatively small MSID counts still, though A has improved as MSID counts have increased.
- Market Segment U currently has very small counts and volumes, making deltas seem much more pronounced.

CVA Absolute Deltas between SF and II – 2025/26



Year	GT SF-II Delta	Abs GT SF-II Delta	GT SF-II Delta %
2024	-103,721.54	841,757.20	0.43%
Qtr 2	-405,753.60	511,003.50	0.70%
Qtr 3	100,109.85	123,742.83	0.27%
Qtr 4	201,922.21	207,010.87	0.32%
2025	693,142.88	779,126.50	0.34%
Qtr 1	435,033.88	435,037.53	0.69%
Qtr 2	186,516.87	191,111.59	0.42%
Qtr 3	-7,167.63	28,985.82	0.06%
Qtr 4	78,759.75	123,991.56	0.21%
2026	275,820.48	301,641.92	0.30%
Qtr 1	235,057.34	249,607.50	0.40%
Qtr 2	40,763.14	52,034.43	0.16%
Total	865,241.82	1,922,525.62	0.36%


- Average quarterly percentage change is ~0.36% between II and SF runs.
- SF-II Delta percentages have generally decreased year-on-year showing lower volatility over time.

Migration Reporting

DISCUSSION: Migration status update

Programme

10 mins



Cumulative Migration Totals Since M11 as of 24 July 2026

Suppliers currently migrating	Cumulative Migrations Initiated since M11	Initiations % of total MPANs (required for M15)	Cumulative Migrations Completed Since M11	Completions % of total MPANs (required for M15)
15	18,421,226	54.56%	17,244,391	51.08%

Note – Completion occurs 5 WD after initiation occurs

Progress against Plan(s) as of 24 July 2026

	Planned Migrations	Actuals to Plan - % Delta
Actual migration completions	17,244,391	n/a
Current Sprint Plan (Sprint 3) – May 2026	17,521,068	- 1.58%
Original M11 Baseline – Oct 2025	18,333,800	- 5.73%

Progress:

- With 40 Migration Weeks to Milestone 15 (M15), over 54% of MPANs have had a migration initiated. This shows overall migration progress continues to be strong with all active Suppliers continue to operate in line with the Migration Framework.
- Consistent high levels of Migrations Initiation and Completions are being delivered in Sprint 3, with over 80% of the volume planned for Sprint 3 has now been initiated. Largest weekly Initiation volume to date achieved this week.
- Migration volumes, in Sprint 3, remain slightly under plan due to localised issues with some Suppliers, resulting in reduced migration volumes. The MCC has agreed recovery plans with the Suppliers which aims for them to catch up this volume within Sprint 3 which was why initiation volumes for last three weeks was higher than planned. The Suppliers are currently tracking in line with those plans and the delta from planned to actuals has decreased to -1.58%
- Sprint 3 is a high-volume sprint to support the recovery of 'missed' migration volume from Sprint 1 and 2. This has been proceeding well with the gap to the M11 Baseline continue to reduce and is now at -5.73%. While still behind plan, the trend indicates the recovery actions taken are having a measurable impact.
- There was a large spike in IF-32 rejections last week, but this was due to technical glitch with a single Supplier which caused duplicate IF-31s to be sent. Only 5,290 of the 93,294 IF-32 rejections were due to normal migrations and this is in line with volumes from previous weeks in Sprint 3.
- Migration Plan for Sprint 4 was published on Wednesday 29 July.

Migration Progress – Sprint 3

Mig week #	Mig EFD Dates****	Migration Initiations Planned	Actual Initiations Sent (IF-31)	Exceptions (IF-32)	Exceptions %	Completions (PUB-36)	Initiation to Completion %
33*	06/06/2026 - 12/06/2026	807,474	710,240	2,545	0.36%	709,658	99.92%
34	15/06/2026 - 19/06/2026	847,288	781,046	3,970	0.51%	778,393	99.95%
35	22/06/2026 - 26/06/2026	907,606	862,543	16,636	1.93%	854,944	99.12%
36	29/06/2026 - 03/07/2026	1,063,315	1,014,254	4,449	0.44%	1,009,874	99.57%
37	06/07/2026 - 10/07/2026	1,032,742	985,861	4,365	0.44%	981,589	99.57%
38	13/07/2026 - 17/07/2026	1,043,069	1,096,963	4,797	0.44%	1,092,732	99.71%
39	20/07/2026 - 24/07/2026	1,050,422	1,062,917	5,088	0.48%	1,063,633	100.1%
40	27/07/2026 - 31/07/2026	1,100,659	1,138,354	93,294	8.20%		
41	03/08/2026 - 07/08/2026	944,369					
42**	10/08/2026 - 14/08/2026	320,205					
***	TOTALS	9,117,149	7,652,074	135,144	1.77%	6,490,823	99.65%

*. Data for full week even though Monday & Tuesday were part of Sprint 2
** Data for Monday and Tuesday as Sprint 4 planning has not yet happened.


*** Totals include 2 days from Sprint 2 in migration week 33
**** EFD adjusted, if needed, for non-migration days

Migration Completions Progress against Migration Plan

Original M11 Baseline -
Oct 2025
-Tracks progress against the original 'Happy Path' Migration Plan from pre-Migration Start

Current Sprint Plan
(Sprint 3) - May 2026
- Tracks progress against the latest Migration Plan

Actual Migration Completions
- Actual Migration completions to date




- Positive progress is being made and evidenced in Sprint 3 against reducing the delta to the Original M11 Baseline. There are some small deviations to plan due to some Suppliers experiencing localised issues. The applicable Suppliers have agreed recovery plans with MCC and are on track against those recovery plan.
- The target is for Actual Migration Completions to track against the Current Sprint Plan and recover the bulk of the missing migrations in Sprint 3 (end of July).

M16 Risks

INFORMATION: Risk matrix and latest risk scores

Programme

5 mins



Risk Assessment – M16

This slide provides a focused view of the **Programme's highest-priority risks to M16 delivery**. Following consultation outcomes and eMCAG approval of the proposed M16 Decision Making Criteria on 07 July 2026, the M16 RAID landscape has been reviewed, resulting in the closure of several risks. Monitoring of the remaining (and any emerging) M16 RAID items continues to be a key Programme focus.


Risk ID	Risk Description	Mitigation Plan	Latest Updates	Previous Score	Current Score	Risk Status
R1260	The NESO Manifest Error Process managed via BSCP014 has a timeline of 10 days for completion or 2 days before IR run. The M16 workstream will reduce IR timescales from 16 to 8 days. This means the current ME timescales are incompatible with the post M16 settlement timetable timescales	1) Participant to raise change/issue to align BSCP014 Manifest Error timelines with MHHS settlement timetable. 2) Elexon change team to progress issue or modification in line with existing governance arrangements for implementation prior to M16.	- NESO to engage Elexon change team to request change support, with the option to raise an issue or CP to amend BSCP014 Process 3.3 timescales to align with the MHHS Settlement Timetable timescales.. https://bscdocs.elexon.co.uk/bsc-procedures/bscp-14-processing-of-manifest-error-claims - To confirm if issue or Mod has been raised or not to determine next steps. No change to score	11	11	Open
R1293 (New)	There is a risk that M16 monitoring may identify an issue that needs to be reflected in the M16 decision-making criteria, requiring a change to the agreed monitoring framework so it can inform the final M16 decision on shortening the settlement timetable for RF runs	1) Suppliers to ensure they have robust expectation management process and monitoring 2) Suppliers to ensure they are using PUB45 to support identifying MPANs with missing agents' appointments 3) Suppliers to prioritising resolving aged half migrated MPANs were possible	Risk formally opened post consultation period, monitoring in-line with mitigation plan noted	-	10	Open
R1294 (New)	There is a risk that concerns over CVA Settlements' capability to handle the shorter settlement timetable, currently pending discussion at the Elexon BSC Issues Group, are not resolved in time to support the Programme's decision to reduce the settlement timetable for SF runs. This could result in a delay to the M16 Milestone decision to implement the reduced settlement timetable for SF runs.	1) Monitor progress of the Elexon BSC Issue Group that will be established to raise and resolve any CVA issues that related to implementing the reduced settlement timetable as part of M16	Risk formally opened post consultation period, monitoring in-line with mitigation plan noted	-	10	Open
R1194	There is a risk that the information or data required to support the decision to move to the new settlement timetable is unavailable	1) STEG to review all data associated with the defined monitoring approach prior to M16 decisions 2) STEG to continue monitoring the current settlement conditions in case any changes arise before the final RF decisions are made. 3) If any additional monitoring is identified as being required, the necessary data must also be available for the relevant criteria. Ensure reporting and decision-support data is available.	- Settlement and Migration data is available to support current proposed reporting. Noting additional reporting items may be requested over time which are less easily available - The risk remains open. The agreed approach is in place, and data is available to support monitoring through to DP1. However, the risk should remain open for continued monitoring in case any changes arise before the final RF decisions are made - If any additional monitoring is required, the necessary data must also be available for the relevant criteria. No change to the risk score. Risk moved to monitor	8	8	Open
R1241	There is a risk that any delays to Decision Point 1 (RF Reduction from 14 months to 7) an/or Decision Point 2 (SF Reduction from 15WD to 7WD) may have an impact on the achievement of the M16 Milestone.	1) Develop and maintain clear critical path for Decision Point 1 and Decision Point 2. 2) Use STEG working groups to progress decision-making framework and reduce delay risk. 3) Ensure visibility and transparency of decision dependencies across industry. 4) Monitor alignment of decision timelines with M16 milestone requirements.	- Use the STEG WG to help mitigate this risk by socialising the decision points and associated approach to Decision making. Visibility and Transparency should make the Decisions more straightforward and mitigate some risk. - Monitor based on agreed monitoring approach. Recognise M16* option in the plan to act as potential mitigation for this issue (if required) - Risk remains at 7, continuing to monitor as per above rational	7	7	Open
R1256	There is a risk that the minimum number of MPAN volumes successfully migrated to allow/enable the Programme and Participants to make Control Point Decision 1 is not reached resulting in being unable to make the required decision to proceed. This would cause delays to the decision-making process and have a negative impact on the M16 timeline.	1) Monitor MPAN migration progress levels vs proposed Monitoring framework levels 2) Use MCC/MWG reporting to track readiness for decision points.	- Monitoring of the current Migration Execution results as part of the M16 Decision Monitoring process - The consultation response proposes an additional monitoring control, Migration Complete level measure, for mid-September to support DP1 decisions. If unmet, it would flag issues for further consideration and help reduce risk in the M16 decision-making process. Supports additional risk mitigation, so probability reduced to 1 - Migration completions tracking at over 50% now. On track to meet the RF decision making criteria values	7	7	Open

Summary and Next Steps

INFORMATION: Summarise actions and agree any agenda items for next meeting

Chair & Secretariat

5 mins



Summary and Next Steps

Next Steps and Updates:

- Confirm actions/decisions from meeting
- Date of next STEG: **Wednesday 19th August 2026 at 2pm – 4pm**
- Date of next MCAG: **Tuesday 25th August 2026 at 2pm – 4pm**
- Date of next MWG: **Thursday 13th August 2026 at 2pm – 4pm**
- Mailbox: opreadiness@mhhsprogramme.co.uk


Agenda Roadmap – a view of upcoming agenda items:


Meeting Date	19 August
Meeting Focus	1. STEG Monitoring and Reporting 2. SF Decision Criteria 3. M16 Year Minus 1 Assessment 4. Supporting Settlement Timetable material

Appendix 1 – Governance Structure

Please note: These slides are included as a reminder to participants of the governance structure pertaining to the Settlement Timetable Expert Group.


More information can be found in the Settlement Timetable Expert Group section of the Collaboration Base.





Appendix 2 – Migration Metrics

Please note: These slides are included as a reminder to participants of the data points that the MCC will use to report on.



Migration Reporting – 1 of 2

The MCC will provide the STEG reports based on Kestrel data:


Migration MCC Monitoring (Programme):		Detailed requirements:
Aggregate reports on total number of Migrations by LDSO a. By Market Segment	This monitoring will demonstrate if the migrations are on track to complete by M15. If not, this will play into the decision of moving the RF Run into 7 months or 4 months.	RC-05 - Views of transaction initiation and completion: Aggregate views of: • IF-031/PUB-031 initiated • IF-036/PUB-035 completed Summary views of all related migration message submissions/completions/errors
Number of Failed Migrations by Supplier	This monitoring will show if Suppliers are struggling with the migration processes set out in the MHHS design.	RC-05 - Views of transaction initiation and completion: Aggregate views of: • IF-031/PUB-031 initiated • IF-032/PUB-032 rejected • IF-035/PUB-035 rejected Summary views of all related migration message submissions/completions/errors
Number of Reverse Migrations - (only applicable to M14)	Report will help track the expected number of reversals that will need to be re-migrated	RC-05 - Views of transaction initiation and completion: Aggregate views of: IF-003/PUB-003: Notification of Reverse Migration and De-Appointment Count Summary views of all related migration message submissions/completions/errors

The MCC will provide the STEG reports based on Kestrel data:


Migration MCC monitoring (Programme):		Detailed requirements - discuss this section:
Number/Volume of the remaining legacy MPANs not migrated and not meeting M15 criteria	This monitoring may highlight metering scenarios that are affecting the ability to hit the M15 Milestone. There will be burn-down report, scope reduced, on Kestrel backlog	This can be derived from the EES data snapshots.
Any issues impacting the ability to Migrate MPANs, e.g., meterless sites, registration data issues	This monitoring may highlight metering scenarios that are affecting the ability to hit the M15 Milestone.	RP-07 - MCC Operational Migration Dashboard: Consolidated view of various Operational reports for day-to-day migration management, tracking issues and potential issues related to the performance and operations of: • Central services • Registration services • LDSOs • Suppliers • Legacy Agents • Service providers • Elexon

Appendix 3 – M16 Plan on a Page

Please note: These slides are included as a reminder to participants of the M16 Planning milestones.




Transition to new Settlement Timetable and M16 Decision - POAP



Appendix 4 – Governance Group Methodology

Please note: These slides are included as a reference to the planning considerations



Planning Considerations

For reference, shown here are the sequential activities as described in the baselined Transition Design

https://www.mhhsprogramme.co.uk/design/transition-design

4.1 Detailed Steps			
Step	When	What needs to happen?	Comment
1	By start of financial year	The Settlement Calendars shall need to be produced for the Settlement Year as defined in BSCP508. ISD will need to have the Master Settlement Timetable aligned with the existing Settlement Calendars (SVAA and SAA) with Settlement Runs for new MHHS Services (LSS, MDS and VAS) scheduled from the M11 Milestone	Note if the M11 milestone moves the scheduled runs for the new Services will not be undertaken until the revised Migration Start date. See worked example based on the 2023/24 Settlement Calendars: Master_Settlement_Timetable_Examplev1.0
2	From M11	Elxon shall initiate Monitoring of Migrated MPANs commences (evaluation criteria to be defined at a future date)	Monitoring will be undertaken by Elxon from M11 at the start of Migration. Monitoring will include but not limited to: • The number of MPANs, not consenting to provision of HH data in each GSP Group; • The percentage of consumption being settled with Actual Data in each GSP Group; • The percentage of MPANs being settled with Actual Data in each GSP Group; and • The number of open Trading Disputes.
3	By 1st April 2026	The Settlement Calendars shall need to be produced and published for the following Settlement Year for Settlement Dates up until the end of the financial year.	No changes to the timings of Settlement Runs will be introduced in these Calendars
4	M16 Checkpoint 1 - 1 year prior to M16	Review the monitoring data from Step 2 to understand the volume of actual data at each Settlement Run.	Approximately 8 Months of monitoring data should be available by the M16 Checkpoint 1.
5	Following Step 4: Checkpoint for M16 date	Confirm if the M16 date is likely to be retained.	If confirmed move to Step 6
6	6 months after the start of the financial year	Control Point for M16 date	Approximately 12 Months of monitoring data should be available by the M16 Control point. If confirmed move to Step 7
7	By the start of next financial year publish partial revised calendar.	Publish Partial Settlement Calendars from the start of financial year up until the day before M16. When setting this calendar any RF Run where the VAS Run Date would have been greater than the 4 months after M16 will be reduced to 7 months and replace the R3 Runs. Likewise, any R3 Run where the VAS Run Date would have been greater than the 4 months after	This would mean that from the start of the financial year the Settlement Timetable is reduced to 7 months for Settlement Dates that are 6 months before the start of the new financial year. It should be noted that this means the timing of the RF run will be reduced before all Metering Systems have been migrated. The SF, R1 are retained at their pre-cut over timings and DF is still at 28 Months. See example based on the 2023/24 calendar: Master_Settlement_Timetable_Example_replacementv1.0

		M16. will be reduced to 4 months and replace the R2 Run with a RF Run.	and the illustration: Replacement_RF_Settlement_Timetable_RF_Illustration055v1.0 If the M16 date is not confirmed in Step 6 then a calendar shall be produced that moves the RF adjustments in relation to the revised M16 date. E.G. If the milestone moves by 3 months then the RF Runs would only be reduced where they were greater than 4 Months after the revised M16 date.
8	Following Step 6	In case the cut-over date is missed two versions of the Settlement Timetable shall be produced for Settlement Dates from M16 a) A Settlement Timetable that aligns with the Operational Choreography SF 7 WD and R1 at 29 WD with the DF Run reduced to 20 Months up until the end of the financial year. b) A Settlement Timetable that retains the existing timings for the SF Run and the DF Run retained at 28 Months until a date to be defined based on any delay to the M16 Milestone.	Examples of Settlement Calendars a) and b) can be found in: Master_Settlement_Timetable_Example_replacementv1.1 These calendars can be developed at the same time as those for Step 5 and provided to Market Participants for information.
9	M16 Checkpoint 2 – 2 months prior to M16)	Review the latest monitoring data from Step 2 to understand the volume of actual data at each Settlement Run.	
10	Following Step 9 - Readiness for new Settlement Timetable – completed	Readiness assesses Participant's preparedness to transition to the new Settlement Timetable.	The date of this Milestone will need to be agreed.
11	Following Step 10 Confirm M16 date	Confirm if the M16 date will be retained.	
12	Following Step 11	Raise Fast Track Change to ISD If go ahead is given for M16 then publish the Settlement Timetable set out in a) of Step 8. Otherwise, publish all or some of the Settlement Timetable set out in b) of Step 8.	The EMR Settlement Calendar will also need to be cut-over at the same time. It should be noted that the timings may require changes to some regulations which 'hard codes' the timings of CFD and Capacity Runs to the current Settlement Timetable.

Planning Considerations

For reference, shown here are the sequential activities as described in the baselined Transition Design

https://www.mhhsprogramme.co.uk/design/transition-design

4.1 Detailed Steps			
Step	When	What needs to happen?	Comment
1	By start of financial year	The Settlement Calendars shall need to be produced for the Settlement Year as defined in BSCP508. ISD will need to have the Master Settlement Timetable aligned with the existing Settlement Calendars (SVAA and SAA) with Settlement Runs for new MHHS Services (LSS, MDS and VAS) scheduled from the M11 Milestone	Note if the M11 milestone moves the scheduled runs for the new Services will not be undertaken until the revised Migration Start date. See worked example based on the 2023/24 Settlement Calendars: Master_Settlement_Timetable_Examplev1.0
2	From M11	Elxon shall initiate Monitoring of Migrated MPANs commences (evaluation criteria to be defined at a future date)	Monitoring will be undertaken by Elxon from M11 at the start of Migration. Monitoring will include but not limited to: • The number of MPANs, not consenting to provision of HH data in each GSP Group; • The percentage of consumption being settled with Actual Data in each GSP Group; • The percentage of MPANs being settled with Actual Data in each GSP Group; and • The number of open Trading Disputes.
3	By 1st April 2026	The Settlement Calendars shall need to be produced and published for the following Settlement Year for Settlement Dates up until the end of the financial year.	No changes to the timings of Settlement Runs will be introduced in these Calendars
4	M16 Checkpoint 1 - 1 year prior to M16	Review the monitoring data from Step 2 to understand the volume of actual data at each Settlement Run.	Approximately 8 Months of monitoring data should be available by the M16 Checkpoint 1.
5	Following Step 4: Checkpoint for M16 date	Confirm if the M16 date is likely to be retained.	If confirmed move to Step 6
6	6 months after the start of the financial year	Control Point for M16 date	Approximately 12 Months of monitoring data should be available by the M16 Control point. If confirmed move to Step 7
7	By the start of next financial year publish partial revised calendar.	Publish Partial Settlement Calendars from the start of financial year up until the day before M16. When setting this calendar any RF Run where the VAS Run Date would have been greater than the 4 months after M16 will be reduced to 7 months and replace the R3 Runs. Likewise, any R3 Run where the VAS Run Date would have been greater than the 4 months after	This would mean that from the start of the financial year the Settlement Timetable is reduced to 7 months for Settlement Dates that are 6 months before the start of the new financial year. It should be noted that this means the timing of the RF run will be reduced before all Metering Systems have been migrated. The SF, R1 are retained at their pre-cut over timings and DF is still at 28 Months. See example based on the 2023/24 calendar: Master_Settlement_Timetable_Example_replacementv1.0

		M16. will be reduced to 4 months and replace the R2 Run with a RF Run.	and the illustration: Replacement_RF_Settlement_Timetable_RF_Illustration055v1.0 If the M16 date is not confirmed in Step 6 then a calendar shall be produced that moves the RF adjustments in relation to the revised M16 date. E.G. If the milestone moves by 3 months then the RF Runs would only be reduced where they were greater than 4 Months after the revised M16 date.
8	Following Step 6	In case the cut-over date is missed two versions of the Settlement Timetable shall be produced for Settlement Dates from M16 a) A Settlement Timetable that aligns with the Operational Choreography SF 7 WD and R1 at 29 WD with the DF Run reduced to 20 Months up until the end of the financial year. b) A Settlement Timetable that retains the existing timings for the SF Run and the DF Run retained at 28 Months until a date to be defined based on any delay to the M16 Milestone.	Examples of Settlement Calendars a) and b) can be found in: Master_Settlement_Timetable_Example_replacementv1.1 These calendars can be developed at the same time as those for Step 5 and provided to Market Participants for information.
9	M16 Checkpoint 2 – 2 months prior to M16)	Review the latest monitoring data from Step 2 to understand the volume of actual data at each Settlement Run.	
10	Following Step 9 - Readiness for new Settlement Timetable – completed	Readiness assesses Participant's preparedness to transition to the new Settlement Timetable.	The date of this Milestone will need to be agreed.
11	Following Step 10 Confirm M16 date	Confirm if the M16 date will be retained.	
12	Following Step 11	Raise Fast Track Change to ISD If go ahead is given for M16 then publish the Settlement Timetable set out in a) of Step 8. Otherwise, publish all or some of the Settlement Timetable set out in b) of Step 8.	The EMR Settlement Calendar will also need to be cut-over at the same time. It should be noted that the timings may require changes to some regulations which 'hard codes' the timings of CFD and Capacity Runs to the current Settlement Timetable.