

MHHS Cross Code Advisory Group (CCAG) Headline Report

Issue date: 26/09/2024

Meeting number **CCAG034**

Venue **Virtual – MS Teams**

Date and time **25 September 2024 10:00-12:00**

Classification **Public**

New / Outstanding Actions

Area	Ref	Action	Owner	Due
Code Meeting Cadence	CCAG34-01	The Programme to remove CDWG2 meeting series.	Programme (PMO)	25/09/24
	CCAG34-02	The Programme to move CCAG forward to 18 th December 2024 to avoid clashes with the Christmas break.	Programme (PMO)	25/09/24
Summary and Next Steps	CCAG34-03	The Programme to cancel October CDWG1.	Programme (PMO)	25/09/24
Previous Actions	CCAG33-01	REC to request St Clements to engage with the Programme promptly to raise a Change Request (CR) in relation to I179.	REC (Harriet Truss)	30/09/24
	CCAG33-02	Programme to develop M6 work off plan and bring back to CCAG.	Programme (Andrew Margan)	25/09/24
	CCAG32-03	Check internally if there will be a decision on P433. This is required asap and before M6.	Ofgem (Andy MacFaul)	21/08/24

Decisions

Area	Ref	Decision
Headline Report and Actions	CCAG-DEC58	Headline Report of CCAG meeting held 31 August 2024 approved.
Code Meeting Cadence	CCAG-DEC59	The SRO approved the Post M6 Code Governance Meeting Cadence.

RAID Items Discussed

RAID area	Description
None	

Key Discussion Items

Area	Discussion
Headline Report and Actions	<p>DECISION: Headline Report of CCAG meeting held 31 August 2024 approved (CCAG-DEC58 – recording timestamp 00:04:03).</p> <p>Updates were provided on the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCAG33-01: The REC representative provided an update that CR56 has been raised in relation to I179 which the Programme confirmed has passed through Change Board and will be going out for Impact Assessment. The current assumption is that there is room for it within the CR55 recalibration exercise. • CCAG31-01: The BSC representative confirmed that final versions of the documents will be issued by the end of the month and closed this action in the meeting.
Programme Updates	<p>The Programme provided an update on the proposed M10 timeline, critical path, and the impact to Code milestones.</p> <p>From a Code perspective, they will maintain M7 where it currently is as per CR22, however, M8 will be impacted to align with M10 (proposed 13th August 2025).</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The DCUSA representative queried the purpose of the alignment between M8 and M10 and asked if this dependency had been reviewed. • The Programme confirmed they are reviewing the dependency between the two and have started preliminary discussions with the Code Bodies. However, there is still more work to do to understand the implications of breaking the dependency and whether it can be done as there are implications on other cross industry system implementations. They clearly stated that this review is not part of CR55. • The Supplier representative supported highlighted some linkages between the two milestones but requested that an Impact Assessment would go out to Suppliers if delinking the two milestones is seriously considered. <p>The Programme outlined that they are actively seeking PPs feedback and input for CR55 through Impact Assessment process. They confirmed that it is unlikely to be the final plan and highlighted Ofgem’s explicit request for quantitative evidence to inform their decision.</p>
Horizon Scanning Log	<p>The National Grid ESO Representative provided verbal CUSC updates on CMP430.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They confirmed that they are waiting on a decision from Ofgem which is due on 30th September 2024. <p>The DCUSA Representative provided verbal updates on DCP444 and DCP445.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Supplier representative queried if DCP444 should have been picked up as a consequential change • The DCUSA representative confirmed that it was embedded deep within the design and the Programme explained it was picked up as an observation out of SIT Settlement Testing. <p>The REC Code Manager provided updates on the REC changes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Supplier representative understood that the implementation for R0060 was chosen because it was after M8, so they asked if M8 moves, will this impact the implementation date for R0060. • The REC Code Manager didn’t have a definitive answer, but explained they are reviewing everything in the context of CR55. <p>The BSC Representative provided updates on P478 and overall BSC changes.</p>
DIP Governance	<p>The DIP Manager provided an update on how DIP Governance will operate.</p> <p>Firstly, they provided an overview of the DIP Rules Points to note and the BSC Structure post-DIP Implementation, particularly highlighting where the DIP Supplement (Section Y of the DIP) sits and that it is subject to the License change process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The REC representative queried if the DIP rules are going to be published on the Elexon website. The DIP Manager (DM) confirmed they will be published on the website on 1st October 2024. <p>An overview of the DIP change process was provided to explain how they will change the DIP Supplement. They explained that non-BSC parties including the DIP manager will be able to raise a modification to amend the DIP Supplement or the Code embedded DIP rules.</p> <p>The DM explained that the initial step would be to raise a CR which the DIP Manager will either accept or reject, for which there is an appeals process against that. BSC anticipate that a lot of the changes will be relatively minor and can progress straight to final assessment, for which there is a period of 10 working days before Ofgem has the ability to step-in if required. The DIP Manager will ultimately make the final decision unless it’s a material change, and the threshold of materiality being less than £250,000 to implement, taking less than two years or does not put new obligations on DIP users such as requiring them to change their business processes.</p>

	<p>One exception was that if it's a change to the EMAR, it will go straight to decision, and it is required that the DIP Manager has to approve changes to the EMAR which would result in a change to DIP in terms of the coding for the message channels, in addition to an update to DIP Swagger.</p> <p>The Programme confirmed that they have had a request from the DIP Manager to attend CCAG and have been approved to join as a standing guest so will be attendance every month.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Supplier representative queried how the change will be publicised to parties. The DM confirmed there will eventually be separate DIP comms, however, in the interim they intend to use normal newscast. They are currently establishing a distribution list and encouraged representatives to contact dipmanager@elexon.co.uk if they would like to be included on the distribution list. • The REC representative asked if they could expect to find the usual information and documents such as Change Request forms on the Elexon website. The DM confirmed that for the short term this is where they can be found but in the long term, they plan to create a service desk. <p>The DM concluded with an overview of DIP change.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Programme asked when DCAB be appointed. The DM confirmed they have received a few nominations already, and if any members of CCAG would like to be a part of DCAB, there are seats still free, and they'd be very interested to hear from them. • The REC representative queried when DCAB meetings will commence. The DM confirmed they are looking to have the first meeting at the end of October/beginning of November to ensure they are fully operable by M10 and equipped to take on responsibility. • The Supplier representative asked for more details on the cost recovery process. The DM confirmed they are currently looking at figures and that the DIP budget will form part of Elexon Business Plan which is due to go out in late autumn. They also stated that the first-year budget will be impacted by CR55. • The Programme asked about awareness of the Non-Functional requirements under the DIP assurance rules and whether any discussions have been progressed on it. The DM confirmed there is a discussion progressing with the Code Bodies which they will circulate once a decision has been made.
<p>Reporting Milestones, CCAG Risks and Post-M6 Change</p>	<p>The Programme provided an update on the post-M6 Code Change process as well as the top programme risks relating to CCAG.</p> <p>They highlighted that they have developed post-M6 work off items which are broadly the changes that need to be made before M8. They are a result of the Design updates (IR8.2 and 8.3) and any programme CRs which are approved which will result in a Design update and therefore Code update. In addition, there are also a series of outstanding DINs that need to be worked through, although none of these are materially impacting the Design.</p> <p>The Programme outlined the post-M6 change strategy, principles and how Code change will be controlled.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The REC representative outlined that the Code Bodies are doing separate examinations of changes that the Programme has stated aren't issues that need to be reflected in updated Design Artefacts ahead of M8 and M10. The Programme explained that it was agreed to have a central repository of all Code changes for MHHS to provide a control and ensure they are tracked and follow BAU processes. • The BSC representative queried if the post-M6 change process will only run up to M8 or beyond it. The Programme confirmed they do not think this process is required long term but is happy to open it up to debate. The BSC representative also added that it would be good to have a view of when the change is wanted by and more specifically than 'post-M10'.
<p>M7 Delivery Update</p>	<p>Ofgem provided an update on the M7 planning.</p>

M8 Code Implementation Update	The Code Bodies provided an update on the M8 Code Implementation/go-live.
Code Meeting Cadence	<p>The Programme proposed a new Code meeting cadence for approval by CCAG</p> <p>The DCUSA representative asked if the CCAG post-M6 Governance proposal considered any changes that need to be made as a result of CR55. The Programme stated that assuming CR55 is implemented in some capacity, then CCAG will be required up until that period and definitely until M8/M10.</p> <p>DECISION - The SRO approved the Post M6 Code Governance Meeting Cadence (CCAG-DEC59 – recording timestamp 01:24:57).</p> <p>ACTION – The Programme to remove CDWG2 meeting series (CCAG34-01).</p> <p>ACTION – The Programme to move CCAG forward to 18th December 2024 to avoid clashes with the Christmas break (CCAG34-02).</p>
CDWG Update	The Programme provided updates from CDWG.
Summary and Next Steps	ACTION – The Programme to cancel October CDWG1 (CCAG34-03).

Next CCAG: 23 October 2024 at 10:00am

Next CDWG1: Cancelled

Attendees

Chair

Chris Welby (CW)

Role

SRO Chair

Industry Representatives

Christopher Day (CD)

Paul Saker (PS)

Neil Dewar (ND)

John Lawton (JL)

Andrew Wallace (AW)

Lawrence Jones (LJ)

Chris Wood (CW)

Elexon Representative

Supplier Representative (Domestic)

National Grid ESO Representative

DCUSA Representative

REC Representative

BSC Representative

DIP Manager

MHHS Programme

Andrew Margan (AM)

Jason Brogden (JB)

Paul Pettitt (PP)

Lola Gbadamasi (LG)

Katie Dyson (KD)

Matthew McKeon (MM)

Kevin Spencer (KS)

Code Lead

Industry SME

Design Lead

Project Manager

PMO Governance Analyst

Other attendees

Harriet Truss (HF)

Andy MacFaul (AM)

Mark DeSouza (MD)

Sinead Quinn (SQ)

Tim Newton (TN)

REC Code Manager

Ofgem

Elexon

Ofgem

Gemserv

Apologies

Andrew Green (AG)

David Kemp (DK)

Jenny Boothe (JB)

Rhiannon Harrison (RH)

Tom Chevalier (TC)

Fungai Madzivadondo (FM)

Kanchan Thite (KT)

Supplier Representative (I&C Suppliers)

DCC Representative

Ofgem

PWC

Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent)

Energy Networks Representative

PWC

Clare Hannah (CH)
Richard Vernon (RV)
Fahreen Japp (FJ)

Supplier Agent Representative
DCC Representative
Ofgem