

MHHS Code Change Advisory Group (CCAG) Actions and Minutes

Issue date

Meeting number	CCAG002	Venue	Microsoft Teams Meeting
Date and time	26 January 2022, 10:00-12:00	Classification	Public

Attendees:

MHHS IM SRO - Chair	Chris Welby
MHHS IM Industry Expert	Jason Brogden
Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Suppliers)	Tom Chevalier
MHHS IM Programme Manager	Keith Clark
Supplier Representative (I&C)	Andrew Green (on behalf of Gareth Evans)
MHHS IM PMO Lead	Lewis Hall
Elexon Representative (as central systems provider)	Matt Hall
MHHS IM Design Assurance Lead	Simon Harrison
Supplier Agent Representative	Clare Hannah
REC Representative	Jon Hawkins
Elexon Representative (as BSC/BSCCo Manager)	Laurence Jones
National Grid ESO	Keren Kelly
CUSC Representative	Keren Kelly (on behalf of Paul Mullen)
SEC Representative	Rosie Knight
DCUSA Representative	John Lawton
Ofgem Representative	Andy MacFaul
DNO/iDNO Representative	Fungai Madzivadondo
MHHS IM Governance Manager	Andrew Margan
SEC Representative	Tim Newton
Supplier Representative (Domestic)	Paul Saker
DCC Representative (as smart meter central systems provider)	Richard Vernon
MHHS IM PMO	Miles Winter

Actions Summary

Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date	Update
CCAG02-01	Follow up on prioritised access requests to the Programme Portal and report back to the CCAG next month on status	PMO	23/02/22	
CCAG02-02	MHHS Design workstream to provide a view of the granularity of design documentation to ensure that it can be appropriately lifted into the new BSCP and other legal drafting documents	Simon Harrison / Ian Smith	23/02/22	
CCAG02-03	Set up sessions with each code body to capture their assumptions and bring back to this group for review at the next meeting	PMO	23/02/22	

CCAG02-04	Present to CCAG how the Smart Metering Act Power could designate MHHS code changes	Andy MacFaul	23/02/22	
CCAG02-05	Confirm timelines on opt-out consultation to the CCAG	Andy MacFaul	23/02/22	
CCAG02-06	A "Horizon Scanning" Log to be created and reviewed at each CCAG meeting going forwards	PMO	23/02/22	
CCAG02-07	Engage with code bodies offline on how information on identified consequential changes will be shared with this group	Andrew Margan	23/02/22	
CCAG02-08	Provide a view on behalf of constituencies of when M6 & M8 should take place	Supplier / DNO/ iDNO / Supplier Agent reps	23/02/22	
CCAG02-09	Replace the CCAG meeting papers on the website with the latest version	PMO	27/02/22	Completed

Minutes

1. Welcome and Introductions

CW welcomed all attendees to the meeting and ran through the agenda for the session.

2. Minutes and Review of Actions

CW invited any comments or feedback on the minutes from the previous Cross Code Advisory Group (CCAG) and requested sign-off of the document provided there were no objections received. No comments or objections to the minutes being signed off were received.

DECISION: CCAG minutes from meeting on 24 January 2021 are approved.

3. LDP Introduction

Keith Clark (KC) introduced himself as LDP Programme Manager and provided an overview of the structure of Lead Delivery Partner (LDP) as well as the workstream leads within his team. The LDP were mobilised towards the end of 2021 and will be working closely with the SRO in the delivery of MHHS. KC emphasised that the LDP & SRO see themselves as one programme team to help drive the MHHS Programme forward.

KC walked through the LDP mobilisation plan and noted that the team would be fully mobilised by Monday 31 January 2022. It was noted that the appointment of the Independent Programme Assurer (IPA) was still pending but this would not impact the ability of the LDP to mobilise.

KC briefly talked about the Programme Portal and the importance of this to the Programme in promoting collaboration. CCAG members were encouraged to engage with it and provide feedback to the Programme. As an industry-led programme there is a real opportunity to shape the delivery of this programme and make a difference.

Tom Chevalier (TC) asked whether the launch of the portal would see a move towards a more data focused route of capturing documentation and a move away from Visio documents.

KC said that there are several different solutions and approaches being assessed as part of the portals launch.

Andrew Green (AG) asked how much access would constituents be given to the portal.

KC noted that immediate access has been prioritised for those who need it to be able to review the design documents. The LDP are working on a roadmap for how the portal will be developed and accessed for different parties. This will be communicated through the Programme Party Coordinator (PPC).

Paul Saker (PS) mentioned that a few people have requested access to the portal but still have not received it.

Lewis Hall (LH) said that the first two sets of users have been provided to Expleo IT who are in the process of granting access to these as a matter of priority. The MHHS PMO will follow up with IT to get a progress update and present this back to the group at the next meeting.

Action CCAG02-01 – Follow up on prioritised access requests to the Programme Portal and report back to the CCAG next month on status

4. Programme ways of working – code body feedback

CW introduced the next agenda item and invited each of the code bodies to provide feedback to the CCAG.

John Lawton (JL) talked through the initial impacts on DCUSA. Noting that the charging methodology may be impacted by the SCR change. Between April-July 2022, DCUSA is putting aside a 3-month window to look at access and forward-looking charges.

JL stated that delivery of initial drafted code change is subject to understanding when the design will be agreed. JL expressed concern that there is no starting point to begin drafting code changes without seeing the design, and feels this is a risk to the programme, though could be mitigated when M5 is approved.

PS agreed that if industry participants don't know E2E design it's hard to make progress and understand how code bodies will service the industry and customers.

Andrew Margan (AM) noted that the ambition of the Programme is to have a full E2E design which is signed off and developed by industry. It should be something that everyone can take away with a clear understanding of how to build their system(s).

TC stated that this needs to get to a point where the system and design can do everything. AM noted that a lot of this detail will be discussed at the Level 4 Working Groups.

Jason Brogden (JB) stated that the design must be comprehensive enough to allow programme participants to mobilise their programme and there should not be the need to wait for legal drafting until mobilising.

PS emphasised that some of his constituents would like to see the legal drafting developed alongside the design to provide reassurances that no, or limited, rework would be needed.

AM noted this is as a valid point but re-iterated one of the Programmes core principles is to be 'design-led' and therefore parties will receive the design well before the legal drafting and should not wait for the code drafting before starting their programmes.

JL does not believe DCUSA is on the critical path but reiterated the desire and need to see the design to fully understand impact and changes required.

Rosie Knight (RK) provided an update on behalf of SECAS and walked through the timeline for SEC-Mod-MP162.

Functional requirements under the Target Operating Model (TOM) are well defined, though the non-functional requirements are less clear. SECAS will deliver a new user role for Meter Data Retrieval (MDR).

RK ran through key milestones and timelines. An MP162 Working Group has been mobilised. Aiming for MP162 to be implemented in November 2023. Security will be dealt with by DCC and privacy will be dealt with by SEC.

In terms of resourcing, SECAS/SEC have representatives at CCAG, BPRWG & TDWG.

PS noted that this is a tight timescale and asks if there's a risk MP162 gets rejected by the change board and what that would mean for timescales.

RK says this is always a risk, albeit unlikely. RK will feed back any updates or developments as and when they are identified.

AM asked whether SEC is only going to have one change because of MHHS or are there likely to be other consequential changes.

RK noted that there is one other identified change that is still to be completed. Any questions related to other changes could be taken away and reported back and any new changes would be reported to this forum at the earliest possible opportunity.

Tim Newton (TN) emphasised that everything we know about is included in MP162, but if anything does come up it will be as a consequential change.

RK stated that the DCC will replicate any changes to CSS for the MDR and the SDS.

TC asked for further detail regarding the MDR changes.

Richard Vernon (RV) explained that DCC gets input for the MPAS. This will come via CSS by the time the MHHS Programme goes live. There is not expected to be any significant changes to CSS. There was discussion about what

needs to be included in the MPAS. Current design covers everything under the SEC. Further changes would need to be made under the REC to cover MDR and other changes.

TC suggested that additional change would likely be required.

RV noted that the DCC are expecting a final impact assessment from service providers on 18 February 2022 and would have more information then.

John Hawkins (JH) presented an overview of the high-level impacts to REC. It was noted that current programme timescales are not deemed feasible to make the code changes.

REC have proposed an alternative timescale regarding the length of time for code drafting, impact assessment and refinement as they do not believe they can get to a point where they have everything designed, drafted and ready to go by the end of April 2022, current timeline for M6 – Code change and detailed design recommendations delivered.

JH believes a 6-month window between a signed off design and developing new code change is required.

AM asked whether convening all impacted parties together and looking at the impact assessment earlier than suggested in the plan would speed things up and ensure the design is robust and not subject to change later.

JH noted that this was a possibility in some cases but not possible for others. If a full impact assessment is not completed or the process is rushed through, there is a risk issues are missed and come out in testing.

PS suggested that REC is the most significant area for consequential change and it's unclear how the Programme could start drafting changes without a view of the REC design.

TC noted that REC and other service providers should be engaged in the programme already in the working groups and have a view of how the design is shaping.

JH confirmed REC are engaged in the Level 4 working groups but the speed and intensity with which they've been mobilised has been difficult to resource. REC cannot commit to being at every subgroup at their current intensity. Drafting of code changes is dependent on M5 (Physical Baseline Delivered) and will need to commence following the achievement of this milestone in April 2022.

It was asked when code changes need to become effective. Based on the published Ofgem timetable, people should be designing their changes from summer of this year. So, participants are looking at the impact this will have on their systems now. REC should be looking the impact of MHHS on their systems now, not later in the year.

JH confirmed REC are looking at the impact now but need the completed baseline design to do this and need to further engagement with stakeholders to inform the code changes.

It was raised that code changes could be phased in line with the transition timetable, rather than as a 'big bang' release, but that more clarity is needed to confirm how transition changes will be managed.

CH raised a concern that a phased approach would 1) need to be centrally coordinated to ensure alignment across all codes and 2) may not suit all participants.

AM stated that the CCAG needs to further debate and agree the release strategy as the detail and answer is not yet clear.

AM summarised the general position and acknowledged REC's position presented in this meeting creates risk to the programme. This risk needs to be built into the programme plan and further work with REC and other code bodies is needed to agree how to mitigate these risks.

Keren Kelly (KK) highlighted the different areas of CUSC that will require a code change because of MHHS. The main areas are TNUoS demand charging and BSUoS, particularly with invoice timings and reconciliation. KK noted that NG ESO do have a few questions related to other elements of the design that may need to be addressed later in the process.

KK confirmed that code admins are not attending any other L4 working groups, currently she is attending subgroups along with other colleagues and linking back centrally to the CUSC.

Laurence Jones (LJ) talked through impact on Elexon BSC, noting a few windows of opportunity this year to make the changes. This work is scheduled to start in April or May 2022, depending on when other code bodies can commence.

LJ did call out several constraints, including that Half Hourly Settlement (HHS) drafting would need to build on top of the June 2022 release. This should be achievable once the release of the April code has gone ahead.

November or December 2022 would be first window of opportunity for a release, otherwise it would be from March 2023 onwards. LJ stated that it is BSC's preference to keep M6 (code change and detailed design recommendations delivered) & M8 (code changes delivered) as close together as possible.

Elexon BSC have 2 resources attending the working groups. Delivering documents for review to the CCAG in phases would be beneficial to support current resourcing model.

AG asked for clarity on rationale for release windows and opportunities.

LJ stated that BSC has defined release windows throughout the year, and these already have other functionality being deployed in them. To minimise risk the preference would be to not overfill these releases with additional scope.

AM asked for more information on the release phases.

LJ noted that BSC haven't concluded the thinking of how the work and reviewing will be chunked up and some further work needs to be done here with the Programme.

PS raised concern that of making changes before putting it through any testing. It is unclear on what the impact of this would be and what happens if changes are identified later in the Programme.

LJ noted an assumption that M8 would need to take place before industry testing commences. The Programme will need to provide clarity on this.

CW agreed. Noting that if the code is not there before testing then the Programme is not testing against the code. However, if the code is changed before testing then there is the added complexity of parallel running codes and greater risk of changes during testing.

Clare Hannah (CH) recognised potential impact on testing and that there is the need to have a further discussion on the transition approach and timetable. There are advantages and disadvantages to both approaches.

LJ emphasised that phased development would be the preference of BSC.

TC asked if the design artefacts being delivered at the end of April 2022 were meant to include BSCPs. It was noted that this has been descoped from M5, but the design artefacts will provide enough detail to cover the content that needs to go into the new BSCPs.

LJ noted the assumption that the Programme are holding pen on the BSCP documents.

PS noted that if SLAs, non-functional and functional requirements are included within the design artefacts to be produced then this would not add too much to the legal text. The more detail in the design artefacts, the less required to complete the legal text drafting.

Matt Hall (MH) agreed. It is assumed the code bodies are delivering change based on the design and are being asked to develop changes based on design and not on the BSCPs. This is an important distinction in being design-led and not code led.

It was agreed that more clarity on the level of detail to be held in the final artefacts would be helpful for the code bodies in planning and preparing for their own changes.

Action CCAG02-02: MHHS Design workstream to provide a view of the granularity of design documentation to ensure that it can be appropriately lifted into the new BSCP and other legal drafting documents

5. Programme ways of working – additional clarifications

CW introduced the agenda item noting the intention to explore the dependencies on drafting, approval, releases and go-live, as well as Smart Meter Act powers.

AM stated that the Programme need to work out when the most optimal time for future releases would be.

CW noted that the Programme will need to explore in more detail what the role of sunset clauses is, not just in adding new items but taking out also.

CH noted that her constituency had assumed changes to REC because of the MDR changes and recognises that other assumptions are being made by the other code bodies. It is not clear what the process is for capturing these and how CCAG will have sight of them.

LH confirmed that the MHHS PMO working to capture all assumptions across the programme as part of mobilisation. The PMO will engage each of the code bodies to capture all their assumptions and bring these back to the CCAG for review next month.

Action CCAG02-03 - Set up sessions with each code body to capture their assumptions and bring back to this group for review at the next meeting

TC noted that he is looking for levels of assurance on certainty of design at the end of M5.

JH stated that it feels like the detailed work is now being done in the subgroups and REC cannot attend every subgroup and cannot assume code bodies are attending every subgroup.

CW agreed that it is reasonable to not attend each subgroup and prioritise those with greatest impact to individual constituencies. There should be enough people in those meetings to identify impacts on appropriate code bodies and flag these.

TC mentioned that it is hard to understand where you are in the process, unless you are part of the debate in developing an artefact / process, placing emphasis on needing to attend these meetings.

PS reiterated the need clarifications on stability of the baseline to be able to plan.

AM confirmed that the baseline design should be the baseline and therefore as final as possible - code changes come off that. If constituencies engage at the Level 4 level, there is less risk of the design needing to change after M5.

PS raised concern over speed, pace, and availability of resource. It is very difficult to juggle with need to support the Faster Switching Programme and the industry factors and challenges have made this resource issue worse.

Fungai Madzivadondo (FM) noted that the Programme needs to consider other ongoing work such as smart metering and Faster Switching. This needs to be considered when developing future release or future Go-Live plans and agreeing dates.

AM asked if there could there be an action on Ofgem to have a think about the Smart Meter Power Act designation would deliver the MHHS Programme code implementation.

Andy MacFaul (AMF) confirmed he'd be happy to return to the group with more detail on this.

Action CCAG02-04 - Present to CCAG how the Smart Metering Act Power could designate MHHS code changes

AM asked DNO, iDNO, Supplier Agent and Supplier reps to go away and feedback when they would want these changes to be implemented, it should not just be driven by code bodies.

6. Horizon Scanning Framework

AM thanked all attendees for inputs and feedback into the Horizon Scanning Framework document.

A question was raised on what format should these horizon scanning items be raised, in line with the framework. The suggestion was to approve document but add an appendix covering how the detail will be shared with CCAG.

Decision: Document approved

TC asked if the framework would be published on the portal and AM confirmed it would be.

TC raised a question on 'Opt Out' consultation and understanding more about this and the timelines.

AMF confirmed that it is almost at a position for this to go out but does not have a definitive date yet.

AMF agreed to come back to the group with more information when available.

Action CCAG02-05 – AMF to confirm timelines on opt-out consultation to the CCAG

TC asked whether envisage external items like 'Opt Out' being raised in this forum.

AM confirmed that this would be covered, focusing on anything that impacts the programme. It was noted that this could be a role for the PMO to capture these in a log and make sure they are reviewed at each session.

Action CCAG02-06 – A “Horizon Scanning” Log to be created by PMO and reviewed at each CCAG meeting going forwards

CW reiterated that a guiding principle for the CCAG should be that if you are unclear on anything, please raise this with the programme who can help and support.

Action CCAG02-07 - Engage with code bodies offline on how information on identified consequential changes will be shared with this group

7. Code Drafting Working Group

CW noted that the intention is to raise the possibility of establishing a Code Drafting Working Group with PSG. This would report into CCAG. More information will be shared with this group following decision by PSG.

Action CCAG02-08 Suppliers/DNOs to provide a view on behalf of constituencies of when M6 & M8 should take place

TC noted minor changes to the CCAG papers presented and those issued to the membership and asked latest papers be shared with CCAG.

Action CCAG02-09 PMO to replace the CCAG meeting papers on the website with the latest version

8. Next Steps

LH walked through the actions from the meeting, no further comments.