

MHHS Cross Code Advisory Group (CCAG) Headline Report

Issue date: 25/04/2024

Meeting number **CCAG029**

Venue **Virtual – MS Teams**

Date and time **24 April 2024 10:00-12:00**

Classification **Public**

New / Outstanding Actions

Area	Ref	Action	Owner	Due
Headline Report and Actions	CCAG29-01	Work with JL to engage the DCUSA regarding delivery of DCP433 change.	Programme (Andrew Margan)	22/05/24
CCAG Reporting, Risks and Milestones	CCAG29-02	Create a meeting between Codes (BSC & REC) with Design.	Programme (Andrew Margan)	22/05/24
	CCAG29-03	Update success criteria following CCAG discussion.	Programme (Andrew Margan)	22/05/24
Summary and Next Steps	CCAG29-04	Programme to cancel May CDWG2.	Programme (PMO)	25/04/24
Previous Actions	CCAG28-01	AM to discuss timelines regarding license review with CW, if PPs will have visibility of the response to Ofgem. CCAG request visibility of the response before/when it goes to Ofgem.	Programme (Andrew Margan)	24/04/24
	CCAG28-02	AM to respond to DCP411 consultation noting Programme timescales for June implementation of that change, and related MHHS M6 August delivery timescales.	Programme (Andrew Margan)	24/04/24

	CCAG28-03	NGESO to provide an update on drafting for definitions associated with CUSC modification CMP430 and CMP431.	ESO (Neil Dewar)	24/04/24
	CCAG28-04	Programme to cancel April CDWG1 and host April CDWG2.	Programme (PMO)	28/03/24
	CCAG27-01	ONGOING: To be presented in April.	Programme (Andrew Margan)	24/04/24

Decisions

Area	Ref	Decision
Headline Report and Actions	CCAG-DEC50	Headline Report of CCAG meeting held 27 March 2024 approved.

RAID Items Discussed

RAID area	Description
None	

Key Discussion Items

Area	Discussion
------	------------

<p>Headline Report and Actions</p>	<p>DECISION: Headline Report of CCAG meeting held 27 March 2024 approved. (CCAG-DEC50).</p> <p>The Supplier Agent Representative queried the status of action CCAG28-01, stating that they have not seen anything in the meeting papers indicating that the action should be closed regarding the license review.</p> <p>The Programme provided an update to publish their response that can be found here https://mhhsprogramme.sharepoint.com/sites/Market-wideHalfHourlySettlement/SitePages/MHHS-Supply,-Distribution-and-Transmission-Licence-Review.aspx.</p> <p>The Programme reached out to DCUSA regarding action CCAG28-02, and fed back to DAG that neither changes had a dependency on the Programme and DCUSA did not understand the request or need to implement 411s or 433s. This has been brought back to CCAG to understand the request. The DCUSA representative will discuss and highlighted that the reference to 411 was incorrect and should have been 433. The 411 was rejected last week by the authority. The 433 legal text needs to be added to the DCUSA tariff ID, there is a minor change required in the programme code document as the programme approaches M6.</p> <p>ACTION: Work with JL to engage the DCUSA regarding delivery of DCP433 change (CCAG29-01).</p> <p>The National Grid ESO Representative provided an update on action CCAG28-03. The legal text, original version, went to the working group and there are discussions with internal and external parties. It was responded to as being not workable/feasible to introduce terms to CUSC that would not be defined in BSC until March 2025. There are currently three options being worked on, and there will be discussions with legal teams and Ofgem representatives to see if they are workable. This is ongoing and will be presented at the working group next week.</p>
<p>Horizon Scanning Log</p>	<p>The REC Code Manager provided updates on the REC changes.</p> <p>The Supplier Agent Representative highlighted, for R0095, the issue that there was an agreement to disconnect something when it should not have been disconnected, and there should be ongoing steps to improve the quality of checking before a similar issue occurs in the future. The REC Code Manager responded that from a change process perspective, it has been put on pause as they move to the next stage, but it can be taken away and sense checked. There is an ongoing conversation to wrap the first Impact Assessment phase up, then it can be taken away and sense checked.</p> <p>The Supplier Representative (Domestic), questioned what will happen at the end of the freeze, will priorities be reassessed. The REC Code Manager, cannot give any specific information, but there has been recognition that other things will come out of the Programme that will be high priority with these changes, as well as the BAU feed of change into the process. These changes will be in the change register, and not necessarily at the point of M10, some may be worked on earlier giving appropriate time to work on the right phase.</p> <p>The DCUSA Representative provided update on DCUSA changes.</p> <p>The Programme checked that there is no impact on REC900 and REC901 flows regarding invoices being sent out. The DCUSA Representative replied there is no change as the flows will not be sent as they were rejected by Ofgem.</p> <p>The Supplier Agent Representative queried if there should there have been any BSC updates in horizon scanner. The Elexon Representative stated that there were no updates from BSC this month.</p>
<p>CDWG Escalations</p>	<p>No escalations from CDWG.</p>

**CCAG
Reporting,
Risks and
Milestones**

The Programme provided an update on the Code workstream. The Programme added that Ofgem need to perform activities after receiving final mod reports, they are not in plan yet. This will be brought back to CCAG with update on new timescales.

The REC Representative queried the link between the design process and code updates, and that is it helpful planning between the design team and code drafters. It provides the understanding of what changes will be in IR7 at that point, and to sweep up any changes in Mop-up 2 drafting. This will be helpful as the programme gets closer to M6 consultation in June.

ACTION: Create a meeting between Code (BSC REC) with Design (**CCAG29-02**).

The Programme stated that the code will not delay go-live, but code will get updated as soon as possible.

The Supplier Agent Representative queried if the Programme will be coming back to the May CCAG with further detail on processes as well as timings, parties can live without the code being updated. The representative understood that Go-live may need to occur before the updated documents. The Programme replied that whatever the agreed process is, a document/work off list with the key timelines (high level view) will be made after M7. This will be centrally recorded, and the log can be morphed into a proposal that will run through normal REC/BSC governance, that sits under the Code Bodies governance.

The Programme stated that the Materiality Definition of Material Change is a change that will have an impact on Participants, Systems and/or Processes. This definition is in the control log (https://mhhsprogramme.sharepoint.com/:x:/r/sites/Market-wideHalfHourlySettlement/_layouts/15/Doc.aspx?sourcedoc=%7B4B013961-FBC8-4D3C-8A16-91448C3CC845%7D&file=MHHS-DEL2038%20%20Code%20Drafting%20Change%20Control%20Log%20v1.1.xlsx&action=default&mobileredirect=true)

The Supplier Representative (Domestic) questioned whether the BAU process, that is not always the quickest, will expedite some of those issues in programme design, and if there can be an agreement on a mechanism to do something on an expedited basis, otherwise there is a gap after M7.

- The Programme replied that it was raised in CDWG that a Mod CP would have urgent status, with the caveat example of a CP being raised in December to get it by March, and if it happened after December when would it be received. The options and timelines need to be explored to validate if they are sensible. The Programme does not have the ability to change code after M7.
- The Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent) raised that a change in materiality will need to be done as an urgent change and who is making the decision on that and how it is being made. PPs could raise something and expect it to be dealt with quickly opening the floodgates to series of changes that individual parties would want to see. The Programme replied that there will still be the change freeze and the Programme will only consider changes for defects that need fixing for go live. The Representatives replied that one of the thresholds may need to endorse to make the Programme controls work, from a governance perspective, or similar controls. The Programme replied that Ofgem still has SCR powers, and it is a separate issue to how to make changes, it is what happens if a PP needs to raise something and to decide which controls are applied. PPs do not need to raise changes.
- The Supplier Agent Representative asked how formalised the agreement would need to be on the process to get PPs through this period of time. There is a consultation running currently on P463. The Programme attended P463 and there is no overlap, and it is not applicable here, as this follows the CP process for smaller/catalogue changes. There are no plans to formalise it, but discussions are being held to inform Ofgem and Code Bodies about how to manage it.

	<p><u>M6 Success Criteria</u></p> <p>The Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent) queried the plain English test and if there was a need to check for ambiguity. The Programme replied that there is no ambiguity check, and the success criteria meets the plain English test, and it will be amended to say clearly that it is not ambiguous.</p> <p>The REC Code Manager raised that for the key artefacts REC schedules there is more than one type of REC documents in scope.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Supplier Agent Representative queried the specifics on the BSC subsidiary documents. The Chair emphasised that the slides state the key artefacts and not all, however the Representative makes a valid point, and that all required artefacts should be fit for purpose. • The Supplier Agent Representative followed up by reminding CCAG that there has been reference to the artefacts created for Design purposes and whether they would exist enduring. The Programme replied that business changes are not copied into code. The Representative asked if the business processes would need to be challenged if they are not an enduring document and future PPs will not have access to them, which have sufficient information. The Programme responded that this is not part of the Code workstream, but the Design one. All design artefacts will be handed over from the Programme to the enduring BAU model, and enduring owners will take action. • The Programme stated that the design requirement is mapped into the code requirements and shows what the baseline would need to include. • The Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent) queried that the artefacts are the process and need to illustrate what the requirement is in its own right. This will need to be an admin task for someone to update but needs to be discussed if there is any benefit of that now the BSC/REC schedules have been captured. A number of messages have become optional/flexible, and it is not reflected on diagram showing whether things have evolved over the last few months. • The REC Representative recognises the potential danger around managing two sets of documents, and the potential ambiguity that can raise around out of date information being looked at. • ACTION: Update success criteria following CCAG discussion (CCAG29-03). <p>The REC representative queried that work will not have been complete, and what is the scope around the questions, as well as additional lessons around M7/M8. The Programme replied that these questions will be included in the SCR consultation, and these are in M6 as a pre-empt.</p> <p>The Supplier Agent Representative asked about the broadness of scope and if it looks at the CP and Programme CRs. The Programme replied that the focus is solely on the Code workstream.</p>
M7 Planning	<p>The Programme provided an update on M7 planning.</p> <p>The REC Representative added that this sounds reasonable, and the processes of changes after M6 are still being worked on. Once they have received the clarity, hopefully there will be a revisit of the assumptions.</p>
Mop-up 2 Consultation Update	<p>The Programme provided an update on Mop-up 2 Consultation update.</p>
CDWG Update	<p>The Programme provided updates from April's CDWG meeting.</p>

**Summary and
Next Steps**

ACTION: Programme to cancel May CDWG2 (**CCAG29-04**).

Next CCAG: 22 May 2024 at 10:00am

Next CDWG1: 14 May 2024 at 10:00am

Attendees

Chair

Chris Welby (CW)

Role

SRO Chair

Industry Representatives

Andrew Wallace (AW)

Clare Hannah (CH)

David Kemp (DK)

John Lawton (JL)

Neil Dewar (ND)

Paul Saker (PS)

Tom Chevalier (TC)

REC Representative

Supplier Agent Representative

DCC Representative

DCUSA Representative

National Grid ESO Representative

Supplier Representative (Domestic)

Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent)

MHHS Programme

Andrew Margan (AM)

Jason Brogden (JB)

Lola Gbadamasi

Navdeep Seira (NS)

Steven Bradford (SB)

Governance Manager

Industry SME

PMO Governance Lead

Other attendees

Andy MacFaul (AMF)

Harriet Truss

Marianne Haslam (MH)

Mark DeSouza (MD)

Tim Newton (TN)

Ofgem

REC Code Manager

Elexon

Elexon

Gemserv

Apologies

Andrew Green (AG)

Christopher Day (CD)

Lawrence Jones (LJ)

Supplier Representative (I&C Suppliers)

Elexon Representative

BSC Representative