

Headline report

Meeting name	Code Change & Development Group – MHHS SCR	Purpose of paper	Information
Meeting number	10	Classification	Public
Date and time	20 October 2020	Venue	By webinar

Synopsis **Summary of the tenth CCDG meeting and actions arising.**

1. Introduction, apologies and meeting objectives

- 1.1 The Chairman introduced the meeting, noting that it was the first to be held via MS Teams, and covered some of the functionality.
- 1.2 The Chairman confirmed that the meeting objectives were to:
 - Note the update on the new CCDG migration deliverable
 - Agree the content of Working Document A, for inclusion in the consultation document
 - Note updates on the remaining design actions
 - Discuss the Smart Energy Code (SEC) Change Matrix
 - Assess the detailed Target Operating Model (TOM) design against Ofgem’s design and development principles
 - Agree the consultation questions on the detailed TOM design and Code Change Matrices.
- 1.3 The Chairman advised that November’s meeting will focus on reviewing the key messages in the draft consultation document and signing off the BSC, Master Registration Agreement (MRA) and Distribution Connection and Use of System Agreement (DCUSA) Change Matrices. The CCDG will then have the opportunity for a full review of the consultation document by correspondence after that meeting, with final sign-off of the document at December’s meeting. MS Teams will be used to support reviews wherever possible. The consultation is scheduled to be issued shortly after the December meeting.

2. Update on new transition/migration deliverable

- 2.1 The Chairman noted that Elexon is continuing to discuss the scope and timing of the new migration deliverable with Ofgem, and will be able to give a more detailed update in November. She advised that the forthcoming consultation will be on the end-state design, based on the content of Working Documents A and B and the Code Change Matrices. The Settlement run-off arrangements (Working Document C) will now be removed from this consultation and combined into a new deliverable with the upcoming work on migration as well as content on Qualification. This new transition/migration deliverable will have its own subsequent consultation that will take place before the later consultation on the Industry Codes legal text (redlined changes).
- 2.2 The Chairman described the migration deliverable as a drilled-down version of the migration/adoption phase in the transition approach originally developed by the Design Working Group (DWG). It will focus on the logical ordering of key migration activities/milestones by Meter type and market segment, including pre-requisites, dependencies and constraints. It will also include interactions across Industry Codes.
- 2.3 A CCDG member noted that discussions around Qualification will raise questions such as whether a participant can fast-track the Qualification process if they have already completed integration testing.

Headline report

3. Updates on other SCR work streams

- 3.1 Ofgem provided an update on its wider Significant Code Review (SCR). It advised that it is still analysing responses to its [Draft Impact Assessment Consultation](#) and will publish the raw non-confidential responses shortly. Ofgem does not intend to provide any commentary on the responses at this stage.
- 3.2 The CCDG briefly discussed Ofgem's proposals for version 1.1 of the Retail Energy Code (REC), which had been [published](#) on 19 October 2020. However, since most of the group had not reviewed the details yet, it agreed to discuss any impact of this on the Code Change Matrices at its next meeting.

4. Working Document A

- 4.1 Elexon introduced the agenda items on the remaining areas of Working Document A, noting a number of areas that had been discussed but not agreed upon, and a number of areas that had been agreed upon but where the write-up had not been signed off.

Demand Control Events

- 4.2 Elexon [presented](#) the proposed solution for Demand Control Events, explaining that the calculations behind the solution were available if the group wished to see them. The CCDG agreed to take the proposed solution forward into the consultation.

Exception Reporting

- 4.3 Elexon [presented](#) the proposed solution for Exception Reporting by the BSC Central Settlement Services. A call with interested CCDG members after the last meeting had agreed that the amount of central validation and exception reporting can be significantly reduced if the solution architecture can ensure sufficient synchronisation of upstream services to Registration data as the 'single source of truth'. The DWG and CCDG have also designed the TOM processes to ensure that the service mastering the data (e.g. the Data Service) validates it before passing it on. CCDG members also suggested that, rather than having explicit exception reports, parties could go into central systems to find out what data is missing.
- 4.4 The group discussed the run-time default process, noting that it would make sense to connect the Market-wide Data Service (MDS) processing requirements to the exception reporting section in the consultation document. It was also noted that the existing suite of exception reports would have to change.
- 4.5 A CCDG member suggested making clear that the requirements cover exception reporting from central services and not in general.

Erroneous Transfers

- 4.6 Elexon [presented](#) its proposed consultation question on Erroneous Transfers (ETs), noting that this is seeking:
- Evidence to support or contradict the CCDG's view that, under the current BSC/MRA arrangements, Suppliers may not be routinely correcting Settlement volumes associated with ETs
 - Views for or against the CCDG's view that the MHHS TOM should not include a process for correcting Settlement volumes associated with ETs, since the associated difficulties/complexities mean that any solution is likely to be disproportionate.
- 4.7 In response to a CCDG member's questions, Elexon confirmed that:
- The existing ETs process in MRA Agreed Procedure (MAP) 10 only applies to NHH and there is no existing central process to correct Settlement volumes associated with ETs in the elective HH market – such that HH Suppliers wishing to resolve these have to do so bilaterally
 - The 1kW advance process specified in [BSC Procedure \(BSCP\) 504](#) will be removed, as this would only work with Non-Smart Meters
 - The actual Smart Meter data will remain in Settlement and cannot be replaced
 - In case the Settlement data is not corrected following an ET this will need to be reflected in the ET process requirements.

Elexon agreed to make these points clearer in the document.

Headline report

- 4.8 CCDG members considered that some Suppliers may be correcting errors associated with D0086 (Change of Supplier reading) flows.
- 4.9 The group agreed to split the proposed consultation question into two, along the lines of:
- Do you agree that the TOM should not include a process for correcting Settlement volumes associated with ETs?
 - What impact would the lack of a process to correct ET Settlement volumes have on your organisation?
- 4.10 The CCDG agreed to finalise the questions at the next meeting.

Change of Meter with Change of Market Segment

- 4.11 Elexon [presented](#) the proposed process. The group noted that if there is a change of market segment without a change of meter within 30 days, the provisionally-appointed agents would be de-appointed and the original agents would continue as normal.
- 4.12 The CCDG agreed to take the proposed solution forward into the consultation.

Related MPANs

- 4.13 Elexon [presented](#) a proposal from Elexon and a CCDG member on Related Meter Point Administration Numbers (MPANs). The CCDG agreed that there will no longer be a Settlement need for Related MPANs under the TOM end state. However, it agreed not to go as far as suggesting they should be phased out altogether as there may be non-Settlement reasons to keep them. It also agreed that there is a difference between removing the need to create new Related MPANs (which the TOM will otherwise need to support) and phasing out existing ones (which goes beyond the CCDG's Settlement remit).
- 4.14 During the course of the discussion, the CCDG also clarified that:
- Related MPANs are required to have the same Supplier – therefore use of a separate meter for electric vehicles and use of multiple Suppliers are unlikely to be relevant considerations here
 - Customers with boost heating functions currently have two Meters, although some Smart Meter variants can cater for this – the decision whether to keep both Meters may be determined by billing considerations
 - The Central Switching Service (CSS) will force Related MPANs to switch together, removing some of the current issues.
- 4.15 A CCDG member also suggested that the Data and Communications Company (DCC) can support multiple Meters on a single MPAN. Another member considered that it is important to draw out the distinction between metering for billing (which may need to be kept separate for customer validation) and metering for Settlement purposes (which can be collected and summated). Elexon agreed that the CCDG only needs to be concerned with Settlement meters.
- 4.16 The CCDG agreed to include a specific consultation along the lines of 'Are there any non-Settlement reasons why your organisation would require new Related MPANs to be created in the target end state?'. It agreed to confirm the final wording at the next meeting.

Meter Technical Details

- 4.17 Elexon [presented](#) a proposal from a CCDG member, developed in conjunction with a member of the Architecture Working Group (AWG). It discussed the proposed retention of the D0268 flow for the Advanced segment and the D0149/D0150 for Non-Smart Meters. It also noted the proposal that no new flow is created for Smart Meters, as these require a much smaller set of information, but that the new required items are added to Registration data.
- 4.18 The CCDG also discussed the Auxiliary Load Control Switch (ALCS) flag. It was noted that this indicator was specifically for ALCS that are physically connected, not those that were operated wirelessly. It indicates to the Supplier that something is physically wired to the terminal under the cover.
- 4.19 A CCDG member offered to provide descriptions/explanatory text for the new data items.

Action 10/01

Headline report

- 4.20 The group agreed that its remit should be limited to considering only those data flows that are required for Settlement purposes.
- 4.21 There was further discussion around the continued need for Time Pattern Regimes (TPRs) and Standard Settlement Configurations (SSCs) for Non-Smart Meters, noting that this might contradict the CCDG's earlier decision to remove SSCs under the TOM. A number of members¹ volunteered to continue this discussion with Elexon outside the meeting.

Action 10/02

Further areas of Working Document A

- 4.22 In the interest of time, the CCDG agreed to review the remaining areas of Working Document A (relating to the write-up of solutions it had already agreed) outside of the meeting. It agreed to provide any comments through MS Teams.

Next steps

- 4.23 Elexon agreed to update Working Document A with the above comments, plus any further comments received outside the meeting. It will then incorporate this content into the draft consultation document.

Action 10/03

5. Assess detailed design areas against principles

- 5.1 Elexon ran through its initial assessment of the detailed TOM design against the [Development Principles](#) set by Ofgem for the CCDG and AWG.
- 5.2 A number of principles were discussed that were agreed to be within the AWG's remit including around data storage, data and communications, and standards and security standards. It was noted that across these areas, it would be key to not introduce barriers to innovation. On data storage, it was clarified that the CCDG and AWG are not required to deliver third-party access arrangements to data for non-Settlement purposes, but that it was about not closing down avenues for third-party access. The CCDG agreed that its business requirements did not contain any barriers and that it was for the AWG to ensure the same for the solution architecture. On standardisation, the CCDG agreed that this does not mean that all interfaces have to be the same.
- 5.3 The group discussed the use of data for the Load Shaping Service. Elexon explained that data is being stored at MPAN level in order that new load shapes could be developed, and that this would involve those MPANs being removed from their existing category. Elexon noted that creation of new load shapes would also require appropriate identifiers.
- 5.4 The group discussed the transitional arrangements, suggesting that in the consultation there would be a note explaining the further work still to be undertaken on transition. It was noted that the CCDG's work would not be to create a programme plan for the implementation of MHHS, but that it relates more to logical milestones in the migration activities. There will also need to be a further technology design phase to follow the AWG's work.
- 5.5 Elexon highlighted its initial assessment of the detailed TOM design against the [Design Principles](#) set by Ofgem, which the DWG had previously used to assess potential TOMs. Elexon noted that it is part of the CCDG's [Terms of Reference](#) to assess its work against both the Design and Development Principles. In the interest of time, Elexon agreed to share this assessment over MS Teams for comment.

Action 10/04

¹ Tom Chevalier, Seth Chapman and Dom Bradbury.

Headline report

6. Agree consultation questions

- 6.1 Elexon [presented](#) the draft consultation questions, noting the agreed principle of keeping the consultation to fewer, broad questions, rather than a large number of highly specific questions.
- 6.2 It was suggested that Question 1, 'Do you agree that the detailed MHHS TOM design is consistent with the DWG's preferred TOM?' could be removed, as it was unlikely respondents could disagree. Elexon noted that this question, and Question 2 'Do you agree that the detailed MHHS TOM design meets Ofgem's Design and Development Principles?' are deliberately focused on whether the CCDG has delivered its Terms of Reference in these areas. Elexon noted that the purpose of the consultation is to establish whether respondents agree with how the CCDG has developed the DWG's preferred TOM, rather than whether they agree with the TOM itself (which Ofgem has instructed the CCDG to progress). Elexon agreed to consider whether both questions are necessary or can be combined.
- 6.3 The CCDG discussed Questions 3 and 4, which seek to capture any specific comments on the proposed TOM data items and processes respectively. The CCDG agreed to amend the wording to 'Do you have any specific comments on the proposed set of [data items / processes] for the MHHS TOM?'
- 6.4 On Question 6, the group agreed that 'Code documents' was ambiguous in scope and agreed to change it to read 'Industry Codes'.
- 6.5 Elexon agreed to address the above comments, as well as those on ETs and Related MPANs from item 4, in an updated set of questions for the CCDG to agree at its November meeting.

Action 10/05

- 6.6 A CCDG member asked if Elexon is planning to hold a webinar/industry day to support the consultation. Elexon noted that is already part of its MHHS communications plan, along with other engagement mechanisms including publishing pre-recorded presentations.

7. Smart Energy Code Change Matrix

- 7.1 Representatives from the SEC Administration and Secretariat (SECAS) and the DCC [presented](#) the main changes that would be required to the SEC to implement the TOM. The changes largely covered the creation of a new SEC user role for the Meter Data Retrieval (MDR) service, and allocating the necessary permissions to this role to carry out the services required under MHHS.
- 7.2 The group discussed Target Response Times (TRTs), with SECAS noting that they would be extended for the new user role in order to avoid DCC capacity issues. The CCDG considered that, in order to avoid any competition issues or consumer impact, the new TRT should:
- Apply to all MDR requests, regardless of whether the MDR is an independent agent or the Supplier
 - Apply only to requests sent for Settlement purposes (CCDG members noted that there are complexities to consider here if a Supplier is requesting data for billing and Settlement purposes at the same time).
- 7.3 The CCDG agreed that, in order for the DCC to know the identity of the MDR, there may be a need to hold this information in the Registration Service.
- 7.4 SECAS advised that the charging arrangements are still being considered, but that the intention is to apply the same charges to all MDRs regardless of whether they are independent agents or Suppliers. Some CCDG members queried this, noting that Suppliers are already the retriever for non-Settlement purposes and that they would therefore not expect Suppliers' charges to increase.

8. Action updates

- 8.1 This agenda item was not discussed due to time constraints. Elexon agreed to find an alternative way to circulate the specific updates covered in the [slides](#).

Action 10/06

Headline report

9. 2021 CCDG meeting dates

- 9.1 The Chairman presented the proposed CCDG meeting dates for 2021. She noted that these follow the same pattern as 2020 in being the third Tuesday of the month, to avoid clashing with other industry meetings.
- 9.2 The Chairman noted that the third Tuesday in December 2021 is close to Christmas and that an alternative would be to bring this date forward, though it would result in a smaller gap between November and December's meetings. She suggested that the group could discuss this further at the next meeting or nearer the time. She noted that, with the inclusion of the new transition/migration deliverable, the CCDG is now likely to run until at least the end of 2021.

10. Summary and next steps

- 10.1 The Chairman confirmed that the next steps are to:
- Incorporate the content of Working Document A into the draft consultation document
 - Update the consultation questions with the comments received
 - Continue drafting the consultation document for the CCDG's review at its November and December meetings.
- 10.2 A CCDG member suggested lengthening the next meeting on 17 November 2020 to give more review time. Elexon agreed to extend the meeting by 30 minutes for now, to run from 09:30-13:00.