

MHHS Cross Code Advisory Group (CCAG) Headline Report

Issue date: 28/03/2024

Meeting number **CCAG028**

Venue **Virtual – MS Teams**

Date and time **27 March 2024 10:00-12:00**

Classification **Public**

New / Outstanding Actions

Area	Ref	Action	Owner	Due
Headline Report and 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
Horizon Scanning Log	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
Summary and Next Steps	CCAG28-04	Programme to cancel April CDWG1 and host April CDWG2.	Programme (PMO)	28/03/24
Previous Actions	CCAG27-01	ONGOING: To be presented in April.	Programme (Andrew Margan)	24/04/24

Decisions

Area	Ref	Decision
Headline Report and Actions	CCAG-DEC48	Headline Report of CCAG meeting held 28 February 2024 approved.
Summary and Next Steps	CCAG-DEC49	CCAG approve of the decision to cancel CDWG1 (09 April) and keep CDWG2 (16 April), PMO will action.

RAID Items Discussed

RAID area	Description
None	

Key Discussion Items

Area	Discussion
Headline Report and Actions	<p>DECISION: Headline Report of CCAG meeting held 28 February 2024 approved (CCAG-DEC46).</p> <p>CD, the Elxon representative, informed CCAG that they are raising a change to improve communication methods. This will be going to SVG next week.</p> <p>PS, the Supplier Representative (Domestic), asked what the next step is on the License Review. Am replied that Chris Welby is collating a response which will go to Ofgem. JB added that there are further discussions to have around export. PS also raised if PPs will have visibility of the further discussions / the response that goes to Ofgem. This resulted in an action.</p> <p>ACTION: AM to discuss timelines around license review with CW, will PPs have visibility of the response to Ofgem. CCAG request visibility of the response before/when it goes to Ofgem (CCAG28-01).</p>
Horizon Scanning Log	<p>JL, the DCUSA representative, provided an update on DCUSA changes.</p> <p>AM asked, could the DCP433 be picked up during the finalisation consistency check. JL replied, it would depend on the date, if it is for the June release and in phase then it is not an issue as it is a minor wording change to the document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JB added if it is a housekeeping change, it should be in June release to get into M6, otherwise it would need to be changed. • JL replied it is in the consultation phase and needs authority approval. ESO will view the responses on 10 April. This will impact documentation that has already gone through consultation. • JB asked if it would be worth responding as the Programme for release in June for M6 to make it easier for implementation. JL responded that there is Ofgem representation in the Working Group, but unsure who that is. AMF, an Ofgem attendee, will investigate.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACTION. AM to respond to DCP411 consultation noting Programme timescales for June implementation of that change, and related MHHS M6 delivery timescales (CCAG28-02). <p>HL, a REC representative, provided an update on REC changes; no questions raised.</p> <p>LJ, the BSC representative, provided an update on Code Body changes; no questions raised.</p> <p>MH provided an update on MHHSP changes.</p> <p>LJ commented that they are engaging on the solution for P441 as there are dependencies on CUSC and National Grid. There is complex analysis needed to support the business case and will not be implemented on this side of M10 as it may take longer to finalise the solution.</p> <p>AW asked for clarity on the three new REC changes, which were R0037, R0098 and R0108.</p> <p>ND, the National Grid ESO Representative, commented that in relation to the CUSC mods CMP430 & CMP431, ESO have de-scoped CUSC from the market wide Programme. The two mods 431 (charging mod) and 431 (non-charging mod) to introduce definitions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measurement class for non-MHHS metering systems, which will be the new definition in BSC and X1. • Measurement class for MHHS metering systems post state for metering systems. <p>As well as looking to introduce two terms: connection type indicator, not referenced in BSC, and amendments to domestic premise indicator, the defined terms in BSC as part of Mop-up agreements.</p> <p>KS asked is updates have been made to the domestic premise indicator. ND replied yes there has been. New terms are being added in and being linked to the BSC. There is a working group tomorrow to decide on the solution proposed. There is not a change in methodology to remove the element of continuous charging. The legal text is being developed in line with CR32 and P210, with the intent to deliver the solution to Ofgem by the middle of June. The information from the working group is published online, it is recommended to speak to suppliers who are impacted / can speak to representatives about this on cross code impact.</p> <p>AW asked if the new term connection type indicator, is referenced in the CUSC rather than a data item that parties need to be aware of in terms of message flows. ND replied that this is with their legal team now, as it is not an officially defined term. There is an option presenting to the working group tomorrow, which specifies the defined term that narrates the exact connection type. This will be linked to settlement code BSC707, line for line in CUSC. This discussion resulted in an action.</p> <p>ACTION: Drafting for definitions associated with CUSC modification CMP430 and CMP431 (CCAG28-03).</p>
<p>CDWG Escalations</p>	<p>No escalations from CDWG.</p>
<p>CCAG Reporting, Risks and Milestones</p>	<p>AM provided an update on CCAG reporting, risks, and milestones.</p> <p>CH, the Supplier Agent Representative, asked when will the consolidated comments log be published so PPs can see who has responded and can see what the update is to their comments, including the Code Drafter comments. AM replied that the log will be issued last week. An email will be sent to primary contacts and CDWG contacts.</p> <p>TC, the Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent), asked how the Issue 101 DIP management is being dealt with, and how/when will the PSL100 & PSL200 fall out.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AM replied that the Programme has started the traceability matrix to make sure Issue 101 is captured as part of the consistency check. The traceability has been built but is not finished, it will come out in due course. • The PSL100 decision is for Elexon to make, not the Programme. The PSL200 proposal is removed and maps obligations to various BSCPs, therefore PSL200 is no longer required. • TC raised that some of the comments in Mop-up 2 were ambiguous. AM responded that it has been explained that the square brackets need to stay in for consistency checks but will be removed from the finalisation and consistency checks. • TC questioned when that stage will be met. AM replied over the next two months. • TC raised that the only change will be through CCAG approval step. MD replied that the square brackets are on the consultation where DIP requirements would sit. As Code Drafters, if the requirements of the data services are DIP onboarded and part of that the services need to meet the requirements of the DIP, it does not need to specify all the DIP SLAs and rules. • TC asked for clarity for the square brackets and if there will be changes. KC responded that the square brackets were put in when the document was not shown, some of those updated where there is a reference to operational choreography. Some change will be in the BSC, some has been removed as they reference DIP stuff. The current square brackets can act as a trace in the document and can be ticked off coming out of consistency checks. • TC highlighted the discomfort of the next stage of approval being CCAG approval. AM replied that it will not be removed by next Wednesday, the process starts next Wednesday. PPs can reach out if there is a specific BSCP they are worried about.
<p>M7 Planning</p>	<p>AM provided an update on M7 planning.</p> <p>AW queried that the agreement was the Code Bodies will draft the SCR mods and Ofgem will have their name at the top, in effect raising the modifications. The Code Bodies will support that.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AW also added that to understand the Ofgem scope, the reference to the requirements. Around due process for the finalisation of consultation needs to be an additional programme CR using the new CR process to make any additional changes above the code drafting to agree during the Mop-up phase. How will the Programme CR fit into the Ofgem requirements. • AM replied that in the meeting with Ofgem and Code Bodies, the feedback from the Ofgem legal team was that a Programme CR can be used in protocol, with the caveat there is a call later with Ofgem. The legal team's main concern is a fairness test, for example is a programme CR reaching the right people, even though there is higher penetration through the Programme's process. • AMF added there will be a continuation of discussion this week. • AM added how change is managed. This can be brought and discussed at the April CCAG, ultimately the Programme has tools for changes. The solution will be shared with the Code Bodies before being shared with the CCAG. <p>TC queried which costs were in question.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AM replied that it is the majority of costs, e.g., the Programme costs, system costs, people cost etc. • AMF added that Ofgem is looking to provide the Programme with guidance on precise costs, something comparable for information to gather for Impact Assessment and to insert into the PPIR. • TC highlighted that this is not a trivial task, as costs will include future costs plus operational costs. AMF clarified that it is the legal duty for the code mods to assess impact and do a proportionality check of costs compared with benefits of Impact Assessment from 2021.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TC included the practicalities where parties could be struggling. AM responded that the Programme went through a similar discussion with Ofgem to decide when to do it. • AW added that understanding the reasons is something considered by Ofgem as a M7 decision and agrees with TC it is something for PPs to wrap their head around. For information it would be helpful to receive a view of timeframes around requests or if something can be communicated to parties so they can work out how to update for this round. AM responded that on slide 26 it shows the timeline for this. • PS asked whether parties are required to respond to PPIR. If so, the level of questions would need to be considered, the easier the questions the quicker responses can come in. AMF replied that this is something to consider. AM added that the questions would have a high-level view with a further breakdown. PS replied with regards to the breakdown of questions, the simpler the questions can be would be more beneficial, especially due to multiple roles in the market.
Mop-up 2 Consultation Update	<p>AM provided a verbal update of the Mop-up 2 consultation.</p> <p>The comments that have been triaged have not been actioned or updated to the documents. The triage consolidated comments log will be released next week, and all documents will be updated. At the next CDWG and CCAG there will be detail of what the breakdown of comments were, there were a lot of comments about the square brackets. The Programme is on track to publish those documents with detailed analysis next week, and then we will enter the three-week assurance consultation period.</p>
CDWG Update	No update, as March CDWGs were cancelled.
Summary and Next Steps	<p>DECISION – CCAG approve of the decision to cancel CDWG1 (09 April) and keep CDWG2 (16 April) due to the tight window for content after easter holiday and triage comments (CCAG-DEC49)</p> <p>ACTION: Programme to cancel April CDWG1 and host April CDWG2 (CCAG28-04).</p>

Next CCAG: 24 April 2024 at 10:00am

Next CDWG1: 16 April 2024 at 10:00am

Attendees

Chair

Smitha Pichrikat (SP)

Role

SRO Chair

Industry Representatives

Andrew Green (AG)

Andrew Wallace (AW)

Christopher Day (CD)

Clare Hannah (CH)

David Kemp (DK)

John Lawton (JL)

Neil Dewar (ND)

Lawrence Jones (LJ)

Paul Saker (PS)

Tom Chevalier (TC)

Supplier Representative (I&C Suppliers)

REC Representative

Elexon Representative

Supplier Agent Representative

DCC Representative

DCUSA Representative

National Grid ESO Representative

BSC Representative

Supplier Representative (Domestic)

Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent)

MHHS Programme

Andrew Margan (AM)

Immy Sims (IS)

Jason Brogden (JB)

Kevin Spencer (KS)

Matthew Hall (MH)

Navdeep Seira (NS)

Paul Pettitt (PP)

Steven Bradford (SB)

Governance Manager

Industry SME

Senior Business Analyst

PMO Governance Lead

Other attendees

Andy MacFaul (AMF)

Holly Law (HL)

Marianne Haslam (MH)

Mark DeSouza (MD)

Sinead Quinn (SQ)

Tim Newton (TN)

Ofgem

REC Code Manager

Elexon

Elexon

Ofgem

Gemserv