# MHHS Cross Code Advisory Group (CCAG) Minutes and Actions

**Issue date: 01/09/2022**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Meeting number | **CCAG009** |  | Venue | **Virtual – MS Teams** |
| Date and time | **24 August 2022 10:00-12:00** |  | Classification | **Public** |

**Attendees**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Chair** | **Role** |
| Chris Welby (Chair) | Chair |
|  |  |
| **Industry Representatives** |  |
| Alex Travell (AT) | IDNO Representative |
| Andrew Green (AG) | I&C Supplier Representative |
| Ann Perry (AP) | RECCo Representative |
| Clare Hannah (CH) | Supplier Agent Representative |
| John Lawton (JL) | DCUSA Representative |
| Lawrence Jones (LJ) | Elexon Representative (as BSC/BSCCo Manager) |
| Matt Hall (MH) | Elexon Representative (as central systems provider) |
| Neil Dewar (ND) | NGESO Representative |
| Paul Saker (PS) | Supplier Representative (Domestic) |
| Tim Newton (TN) | SEC Representative (on behalf of Robin Healey) |
| Richard Vernon | DCC Representative |
| Sarah Jones (SJ) | RECCo Representative |
| Shaun Brundrett (SB) | Small Supplier Representative |
| Tom Chevallier (TC) | Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent) |
|  |  |
| **MHHS IM** |  |
| Andrew Margan | MHHS IM Governance Manager |
| Becca Fox (BF) | Code Draft Project Manager |
| Fraser Mathieson (FMa) | PMO Governance Lead |
| Nicole Lai (NL) | PMO Governance Support |
| Paul Pettit (PP) | Design Assurance Team |
| Pete Edwarde (PE) | PPC Lead |
| Simon Harrison (SH) | MHHS IM Design Assurance Lead su |
|  |  |
| **Other Attendees** |  |
| Sinead Quinn (SQ) | Ofgem |
|  |  |

**Apologies**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Justin Andrews – MHHS Design Team  Matt McKeon – MHHS Design Team  **Actions** |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Area | Action Ref | Action | Owner | Due Date |
| **Minutes and Actions** | CCAG09-01 | Chair to follow-up with MHHS Testing Workstream regarding response to CH query on qualification | Chair | 31/08/2022 |
| CCAG09-02 | All Code Bodies to confirm approach to legal review of code text (e.g. will this occur during each drafting topic prior to consultation, or later, for example, during consistency review, etc.) | Code Bodies | 14/09/2022 |
| **Horizon Scanning Log** | CCAG09-03 | BSC Representative to check whether recent BSC sandbox application is affected by MHHS. | BSC Representative (Lawrence Jones) | 14/09/2022 |
| CCAG09-04 | CCAG to provide reminder to MHHS Design Team to resource attendance at CCAG and present on progress of latest changes | Chair | 14/09/2022 |
| **Design Success Criteria** | CCAG09-05 | Highlight BSC MHHS success criteria to DAG | Programme (PMO) | 14/09/2022 |
| **Code Drafting Approach Decisions** | CCAG09-06 | Programme to produce key code drafting dependencies relating to qualification to inform view of code drafting and text activation requirements | Programme (Andrew Margan) | 14/09/2022 |
| CCAG09-07 | Programme to update Programme plan with latest code drafting inputs through the MHHS replan activities. | Programme (Becca Fox) | 09/09/2022 |
| CCAG09-08 | Programme to engage with Ofgem regarding CCAG decision to link M7/M8 delivery to M10. | Programme (Andrew Margan) | 14/09/2022 |
| **AOB** | CCAG09-09 | Programme to confirm where/how DIP data specification is hosted, managed, and owned. | Programme (Design Team) | 14/09/2022 |
| CCAG09-10 | CCAG members to discuss with constituents whether a pre-CCAG webinar would be of value and provide views to Programme to enable decision | CCAG members | 14/09/2022 |
| **Previous Meetings** | CCAG07-11 | Consider the enduring referencing and hosting of design artefacts and how this should be brought into each code. Update the code draft principles for approval in July CCAG. | Programme  (Andrew Margan)​ | 20/07/2022​ |
| CCAG08-01 | Speak with design team and clarify the process of how data item industry changes are tracked and managed within the Programme | Programme (Fraser Mathieson) | 17/08/22 |
| CCAG08-04 | Meet with Justin Andrews (DAG chair) to discuss CCAG member concerns that some design artefacts are not sufficient to draft code from | Chris Welby | 17/08/22 |
| CCAG08-05 | Discuss with REC any implications for code drafting as a result of MHHS on the REC that sit outside scope of the Programme design. Raise with design as required (e.g. through CCIAG) | Programme (Jason Brogden) | 17/08/22 |
| CCAG08-06 | Provide feedback and supporting rationale on whether new code needs to be implemented for qualification (i.e. if qualification start is dependent on M6 (CCAG approval of code) or M8 (code implementation)). If code does not need to be implemented for qualification, provide feedback and rationale on the time at which new code does need to be implemented. | CCAG members | 17/08/22 |
| CCAG08-07 | Progress discussions on the enduring solution for hosting design artefacts and bring back to CCAG:   1. Whether the design will be maintained post go-live (and if so, how) 2. Confirm for all code bodies the role iServer plays for their code drafting | Programme (Jason Brogden) | 17/08/22 |
| CCAG08-08 | Determine the approach to drafting topic areas that will not be drafted from the design baseline (e.g. qualification, transition) and bring to back to CCAG. | Programme | 17/08/22 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Decisions | | | |
| **Area** | **Dec Ref** | **Decision** |
| **Minutes** | CCAG-DEC17 | Minutes of meeting held 27 July 2022 approved | |
| **Items for approval** | CCAG-DEC18 | Code Drafting Working Group (CDWG) Terms of Reference approved | |

**RAID items discussed/raised**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **RAID area** | **Description** |
| **Code Drafting Approach** | Add assumption to RAID that code bodies will determine legal review requirements for code drafting as required for their code. |

**Minutes**

1. **Welcome and Introductions**

The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting and outlined the agenda.

1. **Minutes and Actions**

The Chair invited comments on the July CCAG minutes. No comments were received, and the minutes were approvedas final.

|  |
| --- |
| **CCAG-DEC17: Minutes of meeting held 27 July 2022 approved** |

***ACTION CCAG08-01: Speak with design team and clarify the process of how data item industry changes are tracked and managed within the Programme***

A further update will be provided in the next meeting.

JB noted a useful reference point for the group was the [mapping](https://mhhsprogramme.sharepoint.com/:x:/r/sites/Market-wideHalfHourlySettlement/_layouts/15/Doc.aspx?sourcedoc=%7BBC2135FD-06A6-43A6-9E8B-D857354CCFB8%7D&file=MHHSP-%20DES196-%20D-Flow%20and%20Interface%20Mapping%20V.0.xlsx&action=default&mobileredirect=true) of Data Integration Platform (DIP) flows and existing Data Transfer Network (DTN) flows, recently published with the design artefact release.

Action ongoing.

***ACTION CCAG08-04: Meet with Justin Andrews (DAG chair) to discuss CCAG member concerns that some design artefacts are not sufficient to draft code from***

CW said the meeting had been held, but a follow-up was needed.

AM noted the importance of the design team knowing which design artefacts aren’t sufficient so they can assess and address them. CW advised CCAG members to share examples of design artefacts they are concerned about, and to raise these specific examples before the consultation in September.

SJ noted their constituency had provided examples of areas where the code had resulted in difficulties, such as the lack of clarity and progression around the DTN / DIP spreadsheet. JB advised SJ to raise their constituency’s issues through consultation responses.

Action ongoing.

***ACTION CCAG08-06: Provide feedback and supporting rationale on whether new code needs to be implemented for qualification (i.e. if qualification start is dependent on M6 (CCAG approval of code) or M8 (code implementation)). If code does not need to be implemented for qualification, provide feedback and rationale on the time at which new code does need to be implemented.***

The Chair stressed the importance of CCAG members to confirm if they wish to provide their view.

CH raised they were still awaiting a response on their comment from the previous CCAG. The Chair agreed to follow up on CH’s query.

**ACTION CCAG09-01**: **Chair to follow-up with MHHS Testing Workstream regarding response to CH query on qualification.**

CH noted their constituency held diverse and strong views on whether they believed further qualification was required after System Integrating Testing (SIT).

CH considered the need for clarity on what qualification would entail. JB confirmed the definition would be further discussed in the Qualification Working Group (QWG) and summarised the latest elements of qualification:

1. The testing element, which is equivalent to what participants will be executing under SIT.
2. The administrative and governance element, where workflows are associated with the administration of going through qualification. This will not be done in SIT.
3. The assurance and evidence element around testing of back-office systems, which is yet to be scoped.

TC expressed SIT testing did not replace qualification testing. JB agreed and noted these discussions would be held within the QWG and any future working group related to SIT.

Action ongoing.

***ACTION CCAG08-12: Confirm when legal input will be provided in the steps of the code draft plan***

SJ posited if a consistent approach was needed, then a discussion would be necessary to confirm REC’s position.

LJ noted previously, the CCAG agreed legal input would be discussed on a case-by-case basis, since some areas would be impacted more so than others. The CCAG considered the need for code-bodies to confirm this approach.

**ACTION CCAG09-02: All Code Bodies to confirm approach to legal review of code text (e.g. will this occur during each drafting topic prior to consultation, or later, for example, during consistency review, etc.).**

Action ongoing.

1. **Programme Updates**

FMa shared updates for PSG, TMAG, and DAG. FMa noted PSG had approved a recommendation to Ofgem that CR009 be implemented.

Regarding wider Programme updates, there was significant work on the Programme re-plan, with another round of consultation to open in September. Numerous design playback sessions were taking place, and any CCAG members interested in joining were advised to contact [PMO@mhhsprogramme.co.uk](mailto:PMO@mhhsprogramme.co.uk).

JB noted re-plan drop-in sessions had been scheduled for Thursday 25 August and Friday 26 August.

1. **Horizon Scanning Log**

FMa introduced the item and invited code bodies to provide feedback on the efficacy of the horizon scanning log process. FMa noted there were gaps for both the Programme assessments and population of columns by code-bodies.

AM added this was on Ofgem’s radar, as there had been criticism of CCAG, and the process was not working well.

PS noted the log was not up to date and does not reflect when end-changes are approved or rejected. They observed the log did not add value to the Code Administration Code of Practice (CACoP) Central Modification Register.

AM clarified the purpose of the process was so the Programme could be informed of any industry change that may impact the Programme and triage the changes. The process was a modification of the CACoP process for CCAG purposes.

LJ stressed the importance of code-bodies to maintain the process and revisit changes as they progressed. LJ considered if more discussion between relevant code-bodies and the Programme was needed. AM raised FMa’s suggestion for the Programme to attend CACoP. LJ agreed with the suggestion, as code-bodies had to be held to account. SJ agreed CACoP would be a good session for the Programme to attend.

TC considered the reference to SCR modifications and the sandbox application from Good Energy. TC noted that while the Sandbox application may have no impact on MHHS, the sandbox application was affected by MHHS, resulting in the sandbox becoming irrelevant due to design decisions already agreed. LJ replied there would be consultations on sandboxes where feedback should be given and took an action to follow up on this.

**ACTION CCAG09-03:**  **BSC Representative to check whether recent BSC sandbox application is affected by MHHS.**

JB noted the sandbox application and its impact on MHHS had been fed into the Programme for further consideration.

Regarding the Horizon Scanning Log process, TC noted P432 had been rejected by the panel yet there were no updates on the log. TC wondered at what stage should the CCAG consider this and the implication for MHHS. AM replied internal monitoring was fed in through design work. The Chair noted they are in discussion with Ofgem about P432 and are looking at potential options.

AT expressed surprise that P432 was not on the CCAG agenda, as they assumed CCAG was the group to discuss such issues. LJ noted the panel recommended rejection.

Following AT’s point, AM noted the importance of Design to be on CCAG calls, as areas such as P432 needed updates. AM summarised when there is a new change raised under a particular code area, that change must be presented by the code body and the code body should explain how this change impacts the Programme. The triage findings of that change should then be presented to the group.

CH considered how the views of the Programme were represented in the consultation process. AM confirmed the consultations were open. The Chair noted Programme representation would be especially important once the design is baselined.

SJ considered the role of the Programme’s governance groups. The Chair noted the CCAG would work with the design team to triage changes, and a design team member would need to attend Mod groups since they understand the consequences of certain changes. AM considered the technicality of certain changes and the need to involve Design CCAG meetings moving forward to provide insight into these changes.

**ACTION CCAG09-04: CCAG to provide reminder to MHHS Design Team to resource attendance at CCAG.**

1. **Design Success Criteria**

JB introduced the item and reviewed the approved set of criteria that Design Advisory Group (DAG) would assess ahead of M5. As code bodies were required to deliver the code drafting, and confidence is needed to ensure design transition, a CCAG meeting would need to be held ahead of the DAG meeting on M5.

TC shared the MHHS success criteria set out in the Balancing and Settlement Code ([Section C 12.7](https://mhhsprogramme.sharepoint.com/sites/MHHS-Internal/Shared Documents/General/04. PMO Workstream/03. Programme Governance/05. Code workstream/Cross Code Advisory Group (CCAG)/10. 28 September 2022/How do I add a link to this https:/bscdocs.elexon.co.uk/bsc/bsc-section-c-bscco-and-its-subsidiaries" \l "section-c-12-12.7)). TC recommended the DAG should refer to the MHHS BSC obligations, to the agreement of the CCAG.

**ACTION CCAG09-05: Highlight BSC MHHS success criteria to DAG**

LJ asked if there would be an equivalent set of criteria for code-drafting ahead of sign-off. AM and JB noted this was on the roadmap. The planned activity was to deliver a set of documentation and artefacts on the approach to code-drafting, so there is a set approach to take into the code-drafting process itself.

1. **Code Drafting Approach Decisions**

AM provided updates on several code drafting areas, opening the floor for discussion and feedback from the CCAG.

**Prototyping**

AM noted the code-drafters had put a plan together to prototype how they will conduct code-drafting. The decision on how, and if, they would use iServer for design artefact hosting is key to mobilisation.

AM noted they would bring any findings back to the CCAG

**Legal text activation**

AM noted the L3 Plan of Consultation states the code-drafting delivery (M6) would be complete before qualification starts. They have received feedback that it does not need to go in as early as planned, which results in the following two model options:

1. Code-drafting delivery should be done as early as possible.
2. Code drafting delivery should be done as late as possible.

AM noted, as long as CCAG had approved code documents and it was sat under Programme governance, then other code does not need to be in place until M10 and participants can commence internal activities. Since this would fall under the second model of code-drafting being delivered at the latest opportunity, this would feed into replan opportunity and require a change to the code drafting plan.

AM opened the floor to CCAG members to advise when they believe the text should go into the code.

PS noted the view of their constituency was if it was baselined by CCAG and had stability around it - there would be no benefit to bringing the code-drafting into effect prior to qualification. Bringing it in early would create risk since it would be out of the control of the Programme. AT agreed, stressing the need for participant visibility and clarity within the change process.

AT considered what constitutes qualification, as previously, it had focused on the BSC process. AM replied this comes back to discussions that need to be had in the QWG. There would need to be approval of qualification prior to migration.

LJ noted more detail was needed for the code-drafting options analysis before they could decide what code documents had to go live and when. AM thanked LJ for the prompt and noted they would take an action to follow this through.

**ACTION CCAG09-06: Programme to produce key code drafting dependencies relating to qualification to inform view of code drafting and text activation requirements**

**Code drafting from artefacts outside the baseline design**

CH considered the nature of complicated change within the industry and the inevitability of gaps when working on design and implementation system. AM noted the importance of building against design baseline, and a formal change should be raised if there is a flaw in the design.

CH considered the difficulty of visualising qualification without a time scale. Since changes are constantly happening in the background, CH raised the question of what criteria participants should qualify to for the design baseline. The Chair replied they hope to mitigate changes, but testing raises challenges, which is why it is so important for participants to review the design.

**ACTION CCAG09-08: Programme to engage with Ofgem regarding CCAG decision to link M7/M8 delivery to M10.**

SJ considered the importance of transparency in the change process given DAG is a closed group. SJ noted the key topic of entry gates to qualification and the need for design stability so changes would come through SIT and any testing issues are considered and reflected. JB replied they are taking all this into account, but a definition of enduring governance design approach is still in progress.

JL asked for clarification on M8 and M10 delivery dates. The Chair replied M10 is the start of migration.

SJ noted they would like to start code-drafting as soon as possible.

On Option 2, AT noted the longer the period is, the longer consequential change and other codes would have to be kept up to date. AM said this is their biggest concern with Option 2, which is why post M-5, it is crucial the CCAG horizon scanning process is monitored and managed effectively.

CCAG members collectively agreed Option 2 was the preferable approach.

The Programme agreed to explore the enduring solution for hosting design artefacts after the Programme.

**ACTION CCAG09-07: Programme to update Programme plan with latest code drafting inputs through the MHHS replan activities.**

1. **RAID review**

FMa reviewed the item and noted the RAID review was a live, dynamic document that is continuously updated.

JB encouraged CCAG participants engage with the RAID review and dPMO tool.

FMa reviewed the RAID Log Input Form: a single point of entry for CCAG participants to update RAID items in the log.

1. **dPMO tool**

FMa introduced the item and demonstrated where to find the tool on the Collaboration Base. Any CCAG members requesting access were encouraged to contact [PPC@mhhsprogramme.co.uk](mailto:PPC@mhhsprogramme.co.uk).

FMa illustrated the risk dashboard specifically, demonstrating how to filter the items to view the most pertinent risks.

1. **CDWG Update**

AM said the code-drafting work was yet to start and recommended to stand down the September CDWG. The group agreed.

Regarding the latest ToR updates, the group reviewed the comments. CH queried the use of the word ‘may’ to the CDWG’s obligation to review code. The group agreed to change the wording to ‘shall’ and decided to approve the ToR.

1. Summary and Next Steps

FMa summarised the meeting actions as per the table above.

AM provided an overview of upcoming agenda items for CCAG.

LJ queried about the DIP having its own data specification, considering where it would sit and how this decision is being made. The Chair took an action to confirm this.

**ACTION CCAG09-09: Programme to confirm where/how DIP data specification is hosted, managed, and owned.**

JB noted DIP would implement what had been set out in design.

LJ asked where the DIP’s data spec would be held and where this is being decided. JB said this should be flushed out in prototyping activities.

LJ asked if this would be a CCAG or a Design decision. The Chair replied DIP governance would sit under enduring service operators.

The Chair noted PSG had asked whether L3 groups should have a pre-meeting webinar, in the same way PSG does. The Chair took an action for CCAG members to consider this with constituents.

**ACTION CCAG09-10: CCAG members to discuss with constituents whether a pre-CCAG webinar would be of value and provide views to Programme to enable decision**

**Date of next meeting: 28 October 2022**