

CACoP Forum meeting 40

12 July, 10:00 – 13:00

Teleconference

Final Minutes

Attendee	Representing
Tina Pearce (TP) (<i>Chair</i>)	Gemserv
Mike Fenn (MF) (<i>Secretary</i>)	SEC
Fiona Murray	REC
Colette Baldwin (CB)	REC
Talia Lattimore (TL)	IGT UNC
Chris Arnold (CA)	BSC
Ivor Macsween (IM)	BSC
Jennifer Groome (JG)	CUSC, Grid Code, STC
Dylan Townsend (DT)	DCUSA
Karen Visgarda (KV)	UNC
Christopher McCann (CM)	D-Code
Jennifer Semple (JS)	Ofgem

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting.

Apologies were made for the absence of Richard Colwill from Electralink and James Rees from Gemserv.

2. MEETING 39 MINUTES 14/06

MF noted there were two minor typographical amendments to the minutes from the meeting on 14 June 2022. TP advised there were no other changes to the meeting minutes.

The forum accepted these changes and the minutes were approved as final.

3. ACTIONS UPDATE

Start date.	Action	Action Owner	Update	Deadline	Status
36/06 8 March 2022	The UNC to raise its proposed changes to the Modification proposal form template as an agenda item as the CACoP Forum meeting on 12 April 2022.	The UNC (HB)	Agenda item 5. Guidance for completing proposal forms shared by KV 14 June 2022.	10 May 2022	Propose to close
38/01 10 May 2022	Code Administrators to review the template individually and come back to discuss further at the next Forum meeting on 14 June 2022.	All	Agenda item 6. Updated table shared, KV awaiting information. DT confirmed release start and finish times. JG confirmed pre the meeting there was no specific release times.	14 June 2022	Open
38/02 10 May 2022	To provide a document for Code Administrators to complete, Code Administrators are to provide their release dates, release times and impacts of Cross-Code misalignment. The Forum members are to provide this information to cacop@gemserv.com by Friday 27 May 2022.	Gemserv (TP)	Provided with the minutes 17 May 2022. Agenda item 6	27 May 2022	Closed
38/03 10 May 2022	Share the Action Paper from the 2021 Code Administrator Performance Workshop.	Gemserv (TP)	The Chair (TP) provided 17 May 2022 with the minutes	17 May 2022	Closed
38/04 10 May 2022	Add the actions from the Workshop to the CACoP Forum Action Paper to discuss at the next meeting on 14 June 2022.	The Secretary (JD)	Agenda item 3.	14 June 2022	Closed
38/05 10 May 2022	Circulate the REC Cross-Code Impact Considerations Paper to with the minutes.	The Secretary (JD)	Provided 17 May 2022 with the minutes	17 May 2022	Closed
38/06 10 May 2022	Send the Minutes and Actions Paper from the Cross-Code workshop held on the 3 May 2022.	The Secretary (JD)	Provided 17 May 2022 with the minutes	17 May 2022	Closed

Start date.	Action	Action Owner	Update	Deadline	Status
38/07 10 May 2022	Code Administrators to provide information on their considerations on the future direction of the Survey.	All	Agenda item 9	14 June 2022	Closed

OPEN ACTIONS FORUM WORKSHOP (03 MAY 2022)

Start date.	Action	Action Owner	Update	Deadline	Status
38-0305/01 3 May 2022	The SEC to explore if specific points of contacts can be appointed within the code.	SECAS	No update yet; due to resource it was recommended the deadline be moved.	31 May 2022 TBC	Open
38-0305/02 3 May 2022	The UNC to ensure the communications sent out regarding changes are made clearer for stakeholders, using dedicated distribution lists where appropriate and looking at email templates to ensure consistency.	UNC	KV to check update with Helen Bennett.	12 August 2022	Open
38-0305/03 3 May 2022	All codes to reflect on how communications sent out regarding changes are interpreted by stakeholders. All codes to avoid using industry jargon where possible.	All codes	JG and CA proposed to close this action as CACoP members have noted it and it is an ongoing process.	12 July 2022	Closed
38-0305/04 3 May 2022	Codes to look at ways of digitalising their online platforms	All relevant Codes	TL is investigating but advised that any change would require a contract extension as it is dependent on expanding the scope of IGT UNC duties.	12 July 2022 Ongoing	Open
38-0305/05 3 May 2022	Training Materials – indicated in Mods to help users understand mods.	All Codes	All codes have addressed the comments from the last survey. JG and CA proposed to close this action as CACoP members have noted it and it is an ongoing process.	14 June 2022	Closed

The Forum **NOTED** the updates.

4. CROSS-CODE STEERING GROUP UPDATES

CB provided a summary of the changes raised since the last meeting and their potential cross-code impacts. CB noted that P442 (raised under the BSC) and DP210 (raised under the SEC) are to be picked up by the REC with Elexon and SECAS respectively at the next Cross-Code Steering Group (CCSG) meeting. CB also noted that change 53 (raised under the REC) may need to be checked with DCUSA as Distribution Network Operators (DNOs) have registered an interest.

TL queried the inclusion of change 811 (raised under the UNC) as having an IGT UNC impact. CB advised nothing has been raised on this since the last CCSG meeting but it was included to check if there could be a potential impact on the disputed read process. KV noted this and confirmed this will be discussed during the change working groups.

TP asked when the next CCSG meeting was scheduled. CB advised that the CCSG are supposed to be collaborating virtually via the CCSG portal, but have decided to hold a meeting to assess how changes are being worked on and address challenges raised by industry about how well the Codes are aligned and how this can be improved. CB noted that one concern was the potential duplication of industry consultations, effectively asking Parties for the same information multiple times. CB advised the meeting is due to be held on Friday 15 July, and the output will be discussed at the next CACoP Forum meeting.

TL advised that change 159 (raised under the IGT UNC), which includes changes to the must-read process for IGTs, would be discussed at a working group and potential similarities to change 812R (raised under the UNC) captured. TL also noted a possible indirect, beneficial impact on the REC.

CB noted that it would be helpful for CACoP members to be made aware of changes that have not yet been officially raised but are on other Codes' radars. CB advised this is already happening with the BSC and it is very useful. CB will pick this point up with the CCSG at Friday's meeting.

TL highlighted that IGT UNC is anticipating a major change with regards to theft, as there are currently no provisions in the Code to address this issue. IGT UNC are looking for a sponsor for the change but progress is slow. TL also advised there are a couple of other changes on the horizon but there is not enough information to share at present.

5. MODIFICATION PROPOSAL FORM TEMPLATES

TP noted that it would be helpful to find out from Ofgem what their expectations are with regards to aligning templates across Codes for modification proposal forms.

JS advised that following a Code Governance Review, the suggestion of aligning the proposal process was welcomed by Ofgem and it was thought creating standard proposal templates would assist with this. Ofgem noted that the use of a standard template would assist those who work across more than one Code and would help to reduce differences in the overall modification process across Codes. JS also noted the inclusion of an item to replace the standard template with a principles-based guidance document in the 2022 FWP and encouraged the Forum to consider whether the

introduction of a principles-based document would bring the same benefits and consistency of a standard template for stakeholders. For example, would a principles-based guidance document be as accessible for all stakeholders, including those less engaged with Codes? JS also noted that Ofgem would expect Code Administrators to clearly demonstrate the agreement of Users that the use of a principles based guidance document is better than a standard template.

CB queried whether CACoP was looking at principle-based guidance or guidance for completing proposal forms. JG clarified that CACoP have been considering their guidance for completing proposal forms, but that this was based in recent discussions and the feedback outlined by JS was from further back. JG noted that CACoP members had previously been looking at aligning their proposal forms but differences in the Codes presented a challenge and so we agreed to move to a principle-based approach, however members went their own ways and there was no central agreement.

KV advised that they are investigating adding links to relevant UNC guidance following discussions with CACoP. KV noted they previously had the same view as CB but understands now there are two different asks.

TL advised that all guidance on completing IGT UNC proposal forms is contained within the form itself, and that this would only be reviewed if suggestions come out of CACoP.

JG highlighted that before reviewing guidance, the CACoP should decide if we're going to adopt a principle-based approach.

CB noted that the REC is in a slightly different position as it is entirely digital, meaning there is no form to complete and any guidance is published separately.

DT put forward that any move away from existing templates needs to be an evidence-based decision. DT noted that DCUSA run a dual approach for proposal submissions, both online and paper based.

CM advised that D-Code has a template and stated aims which could be used to guide the principles, but that these would need to be agreed with CACoP.

TP requested that someone put together suggested principles. MF agreed to complete this.

JG noted that it would be worth looking at previous CACoP discussions on the subject, for example the agreed minimum requirements of each proposal form, and seconded DT's point about change decisions requiring evidence.

JS advised Ofgem would want to see feedback from Code users stating they don't wish Codes to use the same proposal template.

Action 40/01: MF to compile suggested principles from each Code and submit for agreement at the next CACoP meeting.

6. ALIGNING INDUSTRY RELEASE DATES

TP summarised the previous discussions held on this by the CACoP Forum and the current position.

CB noted that this issue was picked up during the creation of the REC, so the timeline extends back to July 2021.

KV advised that the incomplete sections of the Release Dates table are still waiting on information from Xoserve. KV is chasing but apologised as no responses have yet been received.

FM advised that REC are intending to complete a detailed impact assessment of two different scenarios: the first focusing on a change of process, and the second a change of technology. This will identify the impacts of change on Code bodies, users, and wider industry. As part of the assessments, FM advised the scenarios will be provided to Code Administrators so that they can plot the likely series of events prior to a discussion of the potential impacts and benefits.

FM highlighted that if there were any 'show-stoppers' these would be discussed to decide if they are mitigatable and whether the change should continue. If it is decided that it should continue, industry stakeholders will then be consulted on the change.

FM noted that they would like to begin the assessment process at the end of August – mid-September, and feedback the results to CACoP at the October meeting.

TL queried whether a 'lessons learned' exercise could be carried out for known instances, for example the REC v3.0 Release and CSS go-live, which encountered issues due to the period between implementation (00:00) and the beginning of the 'Gas day' (05:00).

FM noted this point and suggested that REC could create a lesson's learned log for the Code Administrators to add to as instances arise, rather than waiting for the assessment sessions.

During the meeting, DT posted comments in the meeting chat for inclusion in DCUSA's section of the Release Dates table. TP advised they would add the comments to the table along with those from Xoserve once they had been provided via KV.

Action 40/02: All Codes to provide FM with details of nominated representatives for their Release process and Technical process by Friday 22 July.

7. JULY 2022 CACoP NEWSLETTER

MF provided a summary of the content currently drafted for the July 2022 CACoP newsletter. MF noted that CB had provided an update on the latest REC release, which will be incorporated prior to distribution to CACoP members for comments.

MF requested an update from Elexon on the Market-wide Half Hourly Settlement programme to be included in the newsletter. CA advised they are reaching out to the relevant team and hopes to provide an update in 1-2 days.

MF requested an update from Ofgem on the Energy Code Reform (ECR) to be included in the newsletter. JS advised an update would be provided in AOB at this meeting, and that they are checking with the relevant team if they would like anything included in the newsletter.

Action 40/03: MF to provide a draft of the July 2022 newsletter with the post-meeting documentation by Friday 15 July.

8. OFGEM'S DECISION ON FUTURE CODE ADMINISTRATOR PERFORMANCE SURVEYS

MF provided a summary of the feedback received from CACoP members on the most recent customer survey and considerations for future surveys.

TL added to this that it would be beneficial for the organisation conducting the survey to have a better understanding of the surrounding context, as this seems to be a recurring issue across the multiple Codes they have worked on. TL noted that the organisation should take time to engage with individual Codes to clarify the scope of the Code Administrator's role. TL cited SEC survey respondents providing negative feedback on the Data Communications Company (DCC), which is a separate organisation outside of the SEC's control.

TL also noted that there should be some differentiation between Code Administrators and Code Managers, if this distinction is still relevant by the time the next survey is conducted.

JS noted the feedback and confirmed that there will be no survey this year due to Ofgem's wish to review how such an exercise would fit into the changing regime.

DT queried whether CACoP members were comfortable with this decision, and cited CACoP Principle 12 which relates to the CACoP commitment to engage in regular surveys and provide data for performance metrics. MF clarified that as Principle 12 only requires CACoP members to engage in customer surveys when requested by Ofgem, we are not at risk of contravening this principle.

JG queried how Codes will receive feedback on their performance without an Ofgem-led survey and suggested that a CACoP-led survey may be an option if there is an appetite for it.

DT noted that Electralink and Elexon have both conducted their own surveys in the past and wondered how much overlap there would be should another survey be introduced.

MF seconded the point regarding overlap, noting that SECAS conduct their own surveys and if Ofgem choose to conduct a survey in future as well then, we are at risk of overloading customers and pushing engagement down.

TP noted concerns around 'overdoing' surveys but suggested that if CACoP can draw up a plan with agreed timelines then individual Codes can use this to inform their own decisions about further surveys.

TL suggested that it was worth considering what reporting metrics would be useful to be standardised across all Codes to allow comparisons, so that these can be included in individual Code surveys.

CB noted that CACoP should be clear on the scope and purpose of any surveys. MF agreed to gather input from all Codes, with the aim of reaching a decision on how to proceed at the September CACoP meeting.

Action 40/04: MF to provide and all Codes to complete a Survey Proposal table.

9. 2022 FORWARD WORK PLAN MID-YEAR REVIEW

TP presented the following items from the CACoP 2022 Forward Work Plan.

Co-ordinating Code release dates

TP noted that this item had been discussed at length under Agenda Item 6. Forum members will engage with FM to assess impacts and reconvene on the next steps following FM's update at the October 2022 meeting.

Assessing and documenting the impacts of change

TP advised that the last recorded action for this item was for Code Administrators to embed the SEC impacts checklist and feed back to the Forum on whether they had found it useful.

Members noted that while this had been discussed at the February 2022 meeting, they were unclear on how this was to be concluded. CB queried what the aim of the exercise is. JG clarified that Code users wish to be able to filter modification lists by their Party type.

TP agreed to confirm where the action arose so that CACoP can agree if this has been covered or if more work is required.

Replacing the proposal form template with principle-based guidance

TP noted that this item was covered under Agenda Item 5. Forum members will input on principles for discussion at the September 2022 meeting.

Reviewing the consumer benefit analysis approach

TL queried whether all Codes are using a common approach to assessments. JG advised that all Codes are using the five consumer benefit categories agreed upon by the Forum, but that as Codes have different approaches to consulting on these areas it is worth reviewing.

KV seconded this point, noting that UNC discuss consumer benefit areas in change working groups.

DT queried whether this relates to the principle-based proposal forms and whether consumer benefit analysis should be a consideration here. MF noted that while it is useful to consider consumer impact when proposing a change, it is often not possible to assess this until a solution has been devised which usually happens much later in the change timeline. JG also commented that a change proposer may have a vested interest in exaggerating the potential consumer benefits.

TL noted that the actual assessment that takes place can sometimes be quite vague. The Forum agreed to revisit this item next month once Codes have had a chance to review their assessment processes. MF agreed to consider this area as part of action 40/01.

Reviewing the central CACoP website

Action 40/05: TP to provide website data for the Forum to review against success criteria.

Collating information and guidance on Code processes

TP noted that the Forum proposed to develop guidance on entering the market and raising a change. MF queried the benefit of creating centralised documentation, as this could be a duplication of work, and suggested instead that links could be provided on the CACoP website to the existing guidance documents hosted on the Code websites.

CB agreed this was worth considering and queried whether there was any data which could be obtained which shows what CACoP website users have searched for, to inform the Forum's decision on which guidance to link to. TP agreed to investigate as part of action 40/05.

10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS SUMMARY AND MEETING CLOSE

JS advised that Ofgem wishes to continue with the 'expected decision date' approach to Authority Determined Modifications that it has been trialling and requested feedback from the Forum.

DT stated a preference for the previous 25 working day KPI, as this made it easier for Code Administrators to target specific release dates.

TL echoed this point, noting that it would be useful to have estimates of how quickly a decision will be returned if outside of the 25 working days rather than an ongoing 'to be confirmed' status. The Forum consensus was that even a rough idea of a return date was preferable to the 'expected decision date' approach.

TL also noted that a review of how decisions are communicated by Ofgem would be valuable, as the IGT UNC weren't advised its latest change had been approved prior to this being communicated to industry. This was echoed by DT for the DCUSA and CM for the D-Code.

JS advised the trial began in April 2022 and there is currently no confirmed onward plan. DT highlighted that an Ofgem representative had previously advised that the intention was to continue with the 'expected decision date' approach, and KV stated the same. DT believed Ofgem has provided communication on this decision but was not certain.

JS noted the Forum's feedback and will return this to Ofgem for consideration.

JS advised the Forum that the Energy Security Bill has now entered Parliament and had its first reading. The Forum noted the update and MF agreed to include this in the July 2022 CACoP newsletter.

CB highlighted that the Horizon Scanner Document is overdue for review. The Forum agreed to add this to the agenda for the next CACoP meeting.

The next CACoP Forum meeting will be held on 9 August 2022.

The Chair thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting.