

MHHS Cross Code Advisory Group (CCAG) Minutes and Actions

Issue date: 05/01/2023

Meeting number **CCAG013**

Venue

Virtual – MS Teams

Date and time **21 December 2022 10:00-12:00**

Classification

Public

Attendees

Chair

Chris Welby (CW)

Role

MHHS IM

Industry Representatives

Andrew Green (AG)

I&C Supplier Representative

Clare Hannah (CH)

Supplier Agent Representative

Fungai Madzivadondo (FM)

DNO/iDNO Representative

John Lawton (JL)

DCUSA Representative

Jonny Moore (JM)

Elexon Representative (as central systems provider)

Lawrence Jones (LJ)

BSC Representative

Mark DeSouza Wilson (MdW)

Elexon Representative

Neil Dewar (ND)

National Grid ESO

Paul Saker (PS)

Domestic Supplier Representative

Richard Vernon (RV)

DCC Representative

Sarah Jones (SJ)

RECCo Representative

Tim Newton (TN) as alternate to Robin Healey

SEC Representative

Tom Chevalier (TC)

Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent)

MHHS IM

Andrew Margan (AM)

Governance Manager

Becca Fox (BF)

Code Drafting Project Manager

Jason Brogden (JB)

Industry Expert

Martin Cranfield (MC)

PMO Governance Lead

Mathew McKeon (MM)

Design team

Other attendees

Rhiannon Harrison (RH)

IPA

Actions

Area	Ref	Action	Owner	Due
Minutes and actions	CCAG13-01	Review the timing of the dependency on qualification and SAD processes to determine if the dependency could be brought forward	Programme (Andrew Margan, Jason Brogden)	25/01/23

Horizon scanning	CCAG13-02	Review the risks IDs for each Horizon Scanning entry to ensure there is a clear link/cross-reference between horizon scanning items and RAID log entries	Programme (Jason Brogden, Matt McKeon)	25/01/23
CR012 outcome	CCAG13-03	Present the list of consequential change items to be included in code drafting and the rationale for including them to the January CCAG	Programme, Code Bodies	25/01/23
Round 3 replan	CCAG13-04	Discuss BSC PAF and consequential changes timelines and alignment to the code draft plan	Programme (Andrew Margan, Jason Brogden, Beca Fox), Elexon Representative (Laurence Jones)	25/01/23
	CCAG13-05	Share CUSC consequential changes to be included in the consequential change list	NGESO representative (Neil Dewar)	25/01/23
	CCAG13-06	Present an updated version of the design artefact mapping document at January CCAG (to show how design artefacts map to code drafting topic areas)	Sarah Jones, Matt McKeon	25/01/23

Decisions

Area	Dec Ref	Decision
Minutes	CCAG-DEC24	The amended minutes of the October CCAG were approved. The amended Headline Report and amended minutes of the November CCAG were approved.

RAID Items

RAID area	Description
Horizon Scanning	The Programme will review cross-references between the Horizon Scanning log and the RAID log (action CCAG13-02)

Minutes

1. **Welcome**

CW welcomed attendees to the meeting and outlined the meeting agenda.

2. **Minutes and Actions**

CW noted amendments to the minutes of previous meetings has been shared as attachments to the meeting papers. CW invited questions on the amended minutes.

DECISION CCAG-DEC24: The amended minutes of the October CCAG were approved. The amended Headline Report and amended minutes of the November CCAG were approved.

BF ran through the actions as per the slides. CW invited questions.

CCAG12-06: CH noted that they had raised a concern that the extension to code drafting due to CR012 may delay the start of qualification. CH queried if there was enough time between the new M6 date and the relevant qualification milestone and asked if any relevant questions were being asked through Round 3 of consultation to test the assumptions against this timeline. JB responded that a dependency had been added in the programme plan to satisfy the action and there was still plenty of time between M6 and the start of qualification testing to deliver the SAD process as per the Programme plan. JB shared the Implementation Approach POAP (plan on a page) to demonstrate these timelines. The POAP showed a 9-month period for qualification documentation which the Programme felt was more than adequate for participants doing SIT or in advance of qualification. CH queried if this timeline was sufficient for code bodies. JB confirmed the Programme believed the timescales were sensible and that the Programme were in discussions with Elexon and code bodies to further test the assumptions behind the timelines. Code body feedback would be shared through the replan consultation and the Qualification Working Group (QWG). JB pointed participants to the Implementation Approach document published with the Round 3 replan for more information.

TC queried if there should be a dependency on when qualification would be based on the design rather than drafted code. JB responded that qualification testing would be against the design but that the Programme needed code drafting to be completed in order to start looking at the qualification documentation. This had been confirmed through discussions with Elexon. JB added that the design artefacts did not include the SAD process documents and that this would be delivered through code drafting. TC responded that the new dependency could be brought forward to the qualification stage of code drafting, as this could help speed up delivery of the plan (i.e., SAD processes could be delivered earlier as they typically took several iterations). JM highlighted that code drafting was required for formal qualification sign off and that participants could only be qualified in principle against the design.

ACTION CCAG13-01: Programme to consider the timing of the dependency on qualification and SAD processes and if this could be brought forward

3. Programme updates

MC noted the content as read and invited questions. None received.

4. Horizon Scanning log

DCUSA

JL provided an update as per the slides. PS queried if the changes JL presented would come in after or at the same time as go-live and whether there would be an evolution over time away from the DTN to the DIP. JL noted in regard to the DIP this was the intention of the Change Proposal. On the approval timescale, if there was an impact on the Programme the modification would be aimed to be in by SIT testing, so implementation was aligned with the Programme and Programme timescales. LJ queried if the intention was to raise a Change Request to the programme. JL confirmed this may need to happen, should there be an impact on the DIP. This was why the modification had been raised early. AG noted it felt like the modifications would likely be going down the DIP route.

REC

SJ noted changes from last CCAG had been highlighted in red in the slides. CH queried for R0032 whether the comment in the slides on stakeholder positions was still the position or if it was a reference to something historic. SJ responded stakeholder positions was a previous concern but the change did get approved.

SJ highlighted that R0044 was critical for the Programme and had been approved and was now with Ofgem. On R0017, there had been discussions on whether this would be picked up on the Programme Work-Off Plan and this was now being progressed by REC. On R0064, this was very relevant to code drafting on metering to clarify terms under the REC. On R0066, SJ noted this was making some changes to the EES and was going through the final stages.

SJ invited questions on the other REC updates. TC queried the CSS refresh functionality and timing out messages. TC noted the 'failed to deliver' messages could be an issue and was relevant to a M5 Work-Off item relating to operating hours. SJ responded that this had been discussed previously. This was not a direct change to MHHS but was relevant. This applied to a number of changes following on from Faster Switching. From a design perspective, this was a risk and would be continued to be tracked (both the Change Request and wider issues operationally from the new switching

arrangements). TC responded that the Programme needed to learn lessons from this experience of this sort of messaging technology that the DIP would replicate. SJ agreed that these lessons relating to Switching and event driven architecture should be talked through with the Programme before MHHS start work on equivalent activities. TC noted these lessons learned needed to feed into upcoming the design Change Request relating to operating hours.

SJ noted R0083A was a result of MHHS consequential change discussions with two Change Proposals being progressed.

BSC

LJ noted their update was not in the meeting slide pack. P432 was back with Ofgem for decision, with a decision likely in February 2023. P434 was approved by Ofgem earlier in December 2022 and implemented on 14 December 2022 – this modification changed obligations for existing and new MPANs and was pinned to M11. Two data item Change Proposals had also been approved for the June 2023 release. P441 had discussions ongoing to determine a solution and implementation date – LJ noted the BSC would look to work with the Programme and CCAG on the appropriate time for this modification to be scheduled.

TC noted some columns on the horizon spreadsheet referred to risks held in the Programme risk register. TC queried if these could be linked more clearly to specific items in the Horizon Scanning log. TC noted it would be helpful to have a specific cross-reference to risks. MM responded that a more intuitive categorisation would be useful. JB noted they were happy to be involved in a review of the Horizon Scanning log and the RAID.

ACTION CCAG13-02: Programme to check horizon scanning risks against log to ensure clear link between horizon scanning and RAID items

TC queried a SEC change DP206 in the Horizon Scanning log. TC noted the comment in the log was that this had minimal impact. TC had previously noted that MHHS was requiring export to be settled and therefore it should negate previous requirements. The comment in the Horizon Scanning log did not reflect this. TN noted they were speaking to the proposer to check they still wanted to go ahead with the proposal and would keep the CCAG informed of any developments.

CUSC

ND provided an update on CUSC modification 401. This had been issued for consultation in mid-November and closed at the start of December. This modification was to amend a date clause in the CUSC to be aligned to the MHHS Programme. There had been further work through the consultation and CUSC panel to progress the modification, and it had been unanimously approved at the last CUSC panel. The modification was now going to Ofgem for decision in January 2023 and implementation in April 2023. TC queried if this was a consequential change and should be identified and added to the Programme consequential change code drafting list in January. ND responded that it depended on Ofgem's decision and that any consequential changes as a result of the modification should be discussed.

5. CR012 outcome

JB introduced the item and explained the next steps following the decision to approve CR012 as per the slides. JB explained that the Programme were intending to have a clear scope of consequential change to give a clear plan for code drafting with a manageable resource level assigned. This meant a number of steps were required including for the Programme to define the scope of code drafting in January 2023, for code bodies to deliver their consequential change designs, and for the Programme to manage code drafting delivery and change to the code baseline.

CH asked a clarification on code bodies bringing a solution design by August 2023. JB responded that the code draft plan had a topic for drafting consequential change. In practice, there may be some leeway as there was opportunity to bring code drafting through the CDWG earlier. CH noted August 2023 felt early for code bodies to deliver their designs – the CCAG had not yet seen the full list of consequential changes and this felt like a compressed timeline. JB responded that there were risks associated with the plan that the Programme were managing and that feedback through the planning consultation and the CCAG would be welcome.

CH queried if there would be a point in time or person who would sign off the list of consequential changes at the end of January 2023. AM noted the Programme held a list of changes from the code bodies offline and that the Programme was comfortable with the content of the list at the moment. CH summarised that there was not a defined process for signing off the list, and that it was just a list the code bodies would contribute to the end of January. AM responded that there was an informal process and that there may be a risk at the moment of a lack of control of content on the list. AM noted it was important for code bodies to provide all of their consequential changes for visibility to CCAG. If the flood gates opened from areas outside of code draft consequential change, then the Programme may need to split out the code draft consultations into more phases. CH responded it was the unknown of the content of the list that may make this challenging (the scale of work on the consequential change list may adjust the timelines).

TC echoed the concern that other industry participants could raise consequential changes through this process. AM responded that the Programme would be triaging content of the list to ensure changes could not be raised this way as a 'back door'. PS noted that the CCIAG had had a wave of changes at the start of the group but this had dropped off now, and therefore most large consequential changes were known. PS noted the process through the CCIAG was working well. JB reiterated that the CCIAG was working well for this purpose (triaging and filtering where consequential change items should fall).

SJ proposed bringing the consequential change list to January 2023 CCAG to explain what was covered and why.

ACTION CCAG13-03: Programme to bring consequential change list to January CCAG

6. Round 3 Replan Consultation

AM introduced the item as per the slides noting several new factors had been considered in the code draft plan that were now incorporated in Round 3 of consultation on the Programme plan. The Programme had worked internally to develop the best sequence of activities following feedback and the changes required to the plan due to CR012.

AM explained the code drafting plan as per the slides. AM noted the majority of code drafting would be delivered by October 2023. AM added that the Programme had discussed what would need to happen should additional consultation be required and concluded that additional consultation cycles could be factored into the plan if and when.

LJ noted they were including the impact of their PAF consequential changes through their Round 3 replan consultation response. AM responded that the mop-up process was not for this (it was for tying up the loose ends). SJ queried what this meant and if the BSC would not be ready, and therefore would not be delivering any code drafting under the consequential change drafting topic. LJ responded that the BSC were not clear what activity would be delivered in the consequential change and qualification topic areas and reiterated that they would not be ready as per the current plan timescales. JM added that the BSC had been clear that they would not be ready for the deadlines as provided in the timelines.

TC noted they were concerned that the plan was not deliverable, given comments from the BSC. TC noted a list of design artefacts had been shared at the CDWG and it would be useful to see how the design artefacts related to the different code drafting topic areas. This would provide clarity to show which activity would be happening and when. TC added that the work was due to start in January 2023 and queried if the Programme had resource that would be available to start drafting in January, given upcoming Change Requests to the design and the M5 Work-Off Plan was ongoing. TC queried if the programme was confident drafting would start in January. AM confirmed that there would be resource in place to deliver the code drafting in January – this included from the design team as well as a fourth resource starting in January.

ACTION CCAG13-04: Programme to discuss offline with BSC on consequential change and performance assurance timelines and deadlines to start qualification drafting timelines

ND noted that there were potential CUSC consequential changes that may need to be added to the plan to be followed up in January. AM responded that the recommendation was that CUSC should be included in the consequential change topic area.

ACTION CCAG13-05: Neil D to share CUSC consequential change items to be included within code draft consequential change topic

JL queried if there was a mapping document for how the design artefacts map to the code draft plan. AM noted there was a traceability matrix. MM queried the structure required of the document. SJ noted this was shared in a traceability matrix that had the design artefacts and when items were intended to be drafted into code against the plan. BF noted a previous version had been shared as an attachment to CDWG and a live version was not available. MM added that the previous version was a draft and would become the enduring matrix once finalised, and that it was an important document to track code drafting.

ACTION CCAG13-06: Programme and Code Bodies to progress mapping of design artefacts to topic areas and share with CCAG

AM encouraged CCAG members to respond to Round 3 of consultation on the Programme plan.

7. Prototyping update

SJ noted a detailed update on prototyping Sprint 2 had been provided to CDWG. SJ explained that prototyping had been a detailed activity taking the design artefact tracker to determine how they would be mapped into code documents. This had included both left-to-right and right-to-left mapping to determine how much change and effort was required against the existing baselined design documents. The traceability matrix was used to detail the requirements at a more granular level to show the requirements for each design artefact and how these had or had not been translated into code drafting.

SJ explained that a drafting principles and definitions spreadsheet had also been created to define common terms used under the Programme.

MM added that the intention was for these documents to be resource to inform code drafting and for the documents to be enduring. This would help give clear code boundaries as well as definition to the approach and requirements for different parts of drafting.

8. CCAG reporting

BF introduced the slide, noting this would be a monthly status summary slide coming to each CCAG. BF highlighted the table in the status slide, explaining these were the dates in the Round 3 replan consultation and that feedback from the replan consultation would help make these dates more accurate. In reference to TC's comments on starting drafting in January, the Programme was on track as per the plan. BF provided an overview of key items in the status report as per the slides.

TC queried a 2025 date in the status report. BF responded that this was an error in the slides.

9. CDWG update

AM noted the recent CDWG was well attended. AM explained the items discussed at the meeting. This included that CDWG dates had been included in the code draft plan. Prototyping, CR012 and the code drafting Collaboration Base had all been agenda items. The Programme was intending for the code drafting Collaboration Base area to reflect the format of the design Collaboration Base area. AM summarized the actions from the CDWG as per the slides.

AM noted the next meeting was on the 17 January and encouraged attendance. The first meeting in January had been stood down due to proximity to the Christmas period. CW invited questions. None received.

10. Summary and next steps

MC summarised the actions as per the table above.

CW wished attendees a Merry Christmas and thanked them for their contributions over the year. CW closed the meeting.

Date of next meeting: 25 January 2023