MHHS Cross Code Advisory Group Headline Report

Issue date: 24/02/22

Meeting Number	**CCAG003**	Venue	**Virtual – MS Teams**
Meeting Date and Time	**23 February 2022 1000-1200**	Classification	**Public**

	Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date	Update
Actions	**Minutes and actions review**	CCAG03-01	Provide detail on Operational Choreography design artefact content and SLAs (such as when further detail on timing and performance behind each design artefact will be provided to CCAG)	Programme (Justin Andrews)	23/03/22	
	Smart Meters Act Powers	CCAG03-02	Present the seven steps for code drafting and code approval at next CCAG for discussion, as raised by AMF	Ofgem (Andy MacFaul), Programme (Andrew Margan)	23/03/22	
		CCAG03-03	Update on the parliamentary approval process for SMAP e.g. lead times and if the process can work during parliamentary recess	Ofgem (Andy MacFaul)	23/03/22	
		CCAG03-04	Provide feedback on how CCAG would make code change recommendations to Ofgem, and how Ofgem designating changes would work in practice	Code bodies	16/03/22 (to include in meeting papers)	
		CCAG03-05	Update at next meeting how consequential changes are captured in SMAP	Ofgem (Andy MacFaul)	23/03/22	

	CCAG feedback on M6 and M8	CCAG03-06	Clarify with PMO who would own the Change Request for M6	Programme (Jason Brogden /PMO)	23/03/22	
		CCAG03-07	Raise at the Testing Advisory Group (TAG) whether qualification will be tested against code drafting or design baseline	Chris Welby	23/03/22	
		CCAG03-08	Ensure the dependency between qualification and code drafting is captured in the Programme RAID Framework	Programme (PMO)	23/03/22	Update: Dependency has been submitted to the RAID Management Framework
		CCAG03-09	Escalate to PSG that M6 will need to change via a Change Request	Chris Welby	02/03/22	
	Code Body Assumptions Review	CCAG03-10	Add code body assumptions presented at CCAG to the RAID Framework, with updates as per CCAG discussion	Programme (PMO)	23/03/22	
		CCAG03-11	Provide rewording of DCUSA/A1 assumption	DCUSA (John Lawton)	02/03/22	
	Horizon Scanning	CCAG03-12	Provide details of REC Modifications R15 and R32 to the PMO to update in the CCAG Horizon Scanning Log	REC (Ann Perry)	23/03/22	
		CCAG03-13	Review contents of the CACoP Central Modifications Register and share any code modifications currently missing from MHHS Horizon Scanning Log with the PMO	Code bodies	23/03/22	
		CCAG03-14	Update MHHS Horizon Scanning process and re-issued to CCAG members to review	Programme (Andrew Margan, PMO)	23/03/22	Update: Shared alongside CCAG Headline Report 24/02/22
		CCAG03-15	Review CACoP Central Modification Register template to see if an MHHS impact field can/should be added	BSC (Elliot Harper)	23/03/22	
	Other	CCAG03-16	Update and re-issue assumptions CCAG meeting slides to correct typos	Programme (PMO)	24/02/22	Update: Shared alongside CCAG Headline Report 24/02/22

		CCAG03-17	Share link to PSG paper pack with headline report to highlight agenda item on Cooperation Principles and Ways of Working for CCAG member feedback	Programme (PMO)	24/02/22	Update: Shared alongside CCAG Headline Report 24/02/22
		CCAG03-18	Share BSC update on BSC changes P432 and P434 with CCAG members. Present updates on these changes at next CCAG	BSC (Elliot Harper)	24/02/22	Update: Shared alongside CCAG Headline Report 24/02/22

	Area	Discussion
Key Discussion Items	Minutes and actions review	Actions updates were provided as per the CCAG meeting pack. A query was raised on when CCAG members would see further detail and timeframes underneath the design artefacts. Justin Andrews clarified that detail on the 'what' and 'how' of the design were detailed within each artefact, and that the 'when' is being developed within MHHS Operational Choreography. The design team will provide an update on this at the next CCAG (action CCAG03-01).
	Smart Meter Act Powers	Andy MacFaul (Ofgem) presented an update on the Smart Meters Act Powers (SMAP) and received questions from the CCAG: • SMAP gives powers to Ofgem to directly modify codes and licenses, with swifter process that SCR (if necessary). SMAP has not been activated yet. Once activated, SMAP lasts for five years, and therefore Ofgem do not want to activate early. • Activation of the Powers requires specification of a 28 day consultation. If Ofgem proceed with activating the Powers, Ofgem will provide a detailed description of the steps and changes. • Use of SMAP (as opposed to SCR) means implementation of code changes can be quicker than the usual 56 days. However, consultation needs to explain why this is 'necessary or expedient' and won't have any adverse effects on license holders. Ofgem therefore need to review the suite of modifications proposed in MHHS to determine if SMAP is needed. If SMAP is not needed, MHHS code changes will be designated using SCR. Ofgem already has implemented powers to support changes to MHHS (e.g. MHHS governance arrangements), and also needs to consider if these are sufficient without SMAP activation. The CCAG raised concerns that SMAP had been developed specifically for MHHS and therefore SMAP should be activated. • On timeframes for enacting SMAP, Ofgem require further time to understand the steps in the plan following M5 and the activities below code drafting milestones. This is to ensure SMAP is activated at the right time. The CCAG raised concerns that the timeframes for enacting SMAP may be longer than expected (e.g. parliamentary activation).
	CCAG Feedback on M6 and M8	The Programme provided an overview of the requirements on the CCAG if the CCAG is proposing changes to milestones in the baseline plan. The CCAG would need to submit a Change Request to move M6. Any proposal for later milestones in the plan would be wrapped up in the Programme's re-planning activities after M5. The Programme provided a 'straw man' proposal for code drafting and approval. This included outlining changes to milestones in the baseline plan, and a period of 'mini-consultations' with code bodies while changes are drafted. The CCAG raised comments including: • General support for mini-consultations by code 'area' throughout code drafting, with a final 'mop up' consultation

		• Resourcing challenges and uncertainty on the transition from design to code drafting. Further detail is needed to plan working groups and workstream ownership • Queries on qualification processes, and whether qualification would be against code drafting or design (see action CCAG03-07) • Whether parties' DBT could start before seeing legal text. Feedback from the Programme is that MHHS is design led, therefore legal text should reflect the design, although parties should not wait for code changes before starting DBT
	Code Body Assumptions Review	The CCAG discussed assumptions submitted by each code body by exemption. Some updates were proposed, with the PMO to update and submit the assumptions to the RAID management framework (action CCAG03-10)
	Horizon Scanning Log	The Programme updated on the Horizon Scanning Process and presented the Programme Horizon Scanning Log. The CCAG was asked to review the process and the CACoP Central Modifications Register, and submit any code modifications currently not captured within the Log (action CCAG03-12-15)