
Common End to End Process Working Group Session

Meeting number	1	Venue	Virtual via MS Teams
Date of meeting	1 May 2025 – 1:00 pm – 3:00 pm	Classification	Public

Summary

1. Introduction and Context

- 1.1 The Chair opened the meeting by welcoming attendees and providing an overview of Terms of Reference for the working groups. The Chair highlighted the scope and intent of these working group meetings which included developing a view on desired future state and the evolution of artefacts under Common End to End Process.

2. Context around the Common End-to-End process Workstream

- 2.1 Elxon explained that the artefacts developed by the Common End-to-End Process workstream are intended to inform the structure of the Flexibility Market Catalogue, particularly its Sub-market Definitions and Market Coordination Rules. These artefacts will also help shape the metadata schema of the market facilitator repository, with a view to evolving over time to reflect digital best practice.

3. What is the Common End-to-End Process and how do we see it evolving?

- 3.1 Elxon explained that the Common End-to-End Process workstream is focused on developing a shared vocabulary and conceptual model to map the full flexibility market user journey—from exploration to settlement. The approach introduces a structured 'Level 1' user journey, breaking the process into standard phases (e.g. Registration, Competition, Scheduling), and a more detailed 'Level 2' layer which uses verb-noun notation to describe specific activities. These Level 2 processes will be reusable across sub-markets, with variation captured through sequencing, notation, and attributes like data exchanges or preconditions.
- 3.2 The group was shown examples of how generic process maps can be tailored to sub-markets like the Balancing Mechanism, illustrating how different configurations (e.g. sequencing of buy vs sell requirements) emerge in practice. Elxon stressed that this work is critical for ensuring Flexibility Market Rules are clearly defined, support interoperability, and help market participants understand what is required of them. Over time, these artefacts will evolve to become digitally accessible, machine-readable resources within the MF repository.

4. Working Group Discussion Summary

- 4.1 A stakeholder asked whether existing process mapping initiatives (e.g. ENA, NESO) are being considered. Elxon responded that they are in touch with both and plan to develop a shared “de facto” process incorporating lessons from prior efforts.
- 4.2 A stakeholder suggested referencing European frameworks (e.g. EBIX, ENTSO-E) and using modelling standards like ArchiMate or UML for machine-readable outputs. Elxon responded that Excel-based mapping was chosen for initial accessibility, but they are open to evolving this to support future interoperability.
- 4.3 A stakeholder queried the resource demands of bilateral engagements. Elxon clarified that the intention is to engage with representatives who can speak across all process stages, and the team will consider resourcing challenges during planning.
- 4.4 A stakeholder flagged that terminology like “Verification” could be unclear. Elxon responded that this includes four sub-processes: meter data collection, applying the settlement methodology, performance communication, and dispute handling.

- 4.5 The role of “Exploration” was queried, particularly whether it applies to buyers and sellers. Elexon explained all stages are intended to be useful for buyers and sellers. Exploration includes pre-registration activities, both for potential entrants evaluating a market and market developers designing services.
- 4.6 Several stakeholders highlighted the importance of clearer, plain-English descriptions. Elexon acknowledged this feedback and welcomed support in refining the framing of materials for broader understanding.
- 4.7 Clarification was requested around the scope of “Registration.” Elexon responded that it includes registering service providers, assets, and units, and mapping how terminology varies across sub-markets is part of the work.
- 4.8 There was discussion on the long-term use of the process mapping. Elexon confirmed that the aim is to develop a shared terminology (a “common language”) to express future market rules clearly and consistently.

5. Next Steps

- 5.1 Elexon will reconvene the working group on May 28th with the aim of socialising the Level 2 sub-market outputs from the bilateral interviews with the relevant SMEs.