

CACoP Forum meeting 44

8 November, 10:00 – 12:00 Teleconference

Final Minutes

Attendee	Representing
Tina Pearce (TP) (<i>Chair</i>)	Gemserv
Mike Fenn (MF) (<i>Secretary</i>)	SEC
Michelle Awosoga (MA)	SEC
Ivar Macsween (IM)	BSC
Milly Lewis (ML)	CUSC, Grid Code, STC
Dylan Townsend (DT)	DCUSA
Talia Lattimore (TL)	IGT UNC
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 Colette Baldwin (CB) from REC.

2. MEETING 43 MINUTES 11/10

No comments were received on the draft minutes for the October 2022 CACoP Forum meeting. These minutes will be finalised and circulated with the post-meeting documentation for the November 2022 meeting.

3. ACTIONS UPDATE

Start date.	Action	Action Owner	Update	Deadline	Status
41/02	All Codes to provide their updates to the Horizon Scanner document	All	Mixed progress and table updated post the meeting; all Codes agreed to confirm updates by November meeting. Agenda item 6.	8 November 2022	Open
42/01	CM to send D-Code proposal form to CB to be incorporated into the matrix and distributed as final to all Codes.	CM, CB	Completed – Chris to confirm	11 October 2022	Propose to close
42/02	MF to provide survey guidance document to members prior to the October CACoP meeting.	MF	Sent with November meeting materials	11 October 2022	Propose to close
42/03	TP to catch up with former CACoP Forum members to validate the purpose of introducing the Horizon Scanner.	TP	Update to be sent with November post-meeting documentation	11 October 2022	Open
42/04	ML to share revised template and all Codes to provide feedback.	ML	Template sent. Feedback to be sought at November meeting.	8 November 2022	Propose to close
43/01	MF to send simplified Horizon Scanner template to DT and YR-H.	MF	Template sent.	8 November 2022	Propose to close
43/02	All Codes to review diagrams provided. TP to share on CACoP website following review and amendments.	All	Supplier appreciated CACoP's support on this. See slides 8 & 9	8 November 2022	Open
43/03	JS to provide updates to MF on Code Governance Reform and the delays to the Energy Bill.	JS	Update provided and included in October newsletter.	24 October 2022	Propose to close

Following up on action 43/02, TP shared diagrams from Elexon's 'Code Consolidation Insight Study' which shows the different Codes and their relationships to different licences and governance activities. TP noted these would need to be updated to add the IGT UNC and REC and remove references to the MRA and SPAA, but suggested that these could be added to the CACoP website.

TP also shared a diagram from Ofgem's Energy Code Reform consultation, and queried whether Ofgem have a record of published diagrams and how easy these would be to access and update. DT advised they have tried to recreate this same diagram previously, again updating references to MRA and SPAA, and agreed to share following the meeting for other members' review.

OPEN ACTIONS FORUM WORKSHOP (03 MAY 2022)

Start date.	Action	Action Owner	Update	Deadline	Status
38-0305/04 3 May 2022	Codes to look at ways of digitalising their online platforms	All relevant Codes	TL advised that any change would require a contract extension as it is dependent on expanding the scope of IGT UNC duties. No further update.	Ongoing	Open

TL advised that they had no objection to action 38-0305/04 remaining open but advised it was unlikely to be closed as the IGT UC has a fixed price contract and any move to digitalise their online platform would be outside the scope of the contract. TP advised this would remain on the actions list as a standing reminder but the Forum would wait for any updates rather than expecting them.

The Forum **NOTED** the updates.

4. CROSS-CODE STEERING GROUP UPDATES

ML advised that Grid Code has raised urgent modification GC160, which is a consequential change to the BSC's P448.

CM advised that D-Code is currently preparing documents for industry consultation on a change related to Grid Code's GC156.

TL advised that IGT UNC has raised modification IGT162. UNC introduced a change to give permissions to the Central Data Services Provider (CDSP) to act as scheme administrator for the Energy Price Guarantee, and a consequential change is required in IGT UNC. TL also noted that IGT UNC is trying to raise a change to facilitate updates to demand-side response arrangements in the UNC but is currently struggling to find a Party to sponsor the proposal. This change will have an impact on UNC.

5. ENGAGEMENT WITH PARTIES: BEST PRACTICE

MA noted that SEC consultations typically receive responses from 1-4% of the contacts they are sent to. They advised that a group had been set up within the Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat (SECAS) to investigate how this could be addressed and the number of responses increased. MA requested that other Codes advise if they are experiencing the same issues and share any ideas for tackling them.

ML noted that as part of continuous improvement Grid Code is looking at the different types of consultations they issue and investigating any trends in the respondents, for example whether they are also members of the working group for that specific change. ML suggested that Code

participants may experience 'questionnaire fatigue' due to the volume of consultations they are required to complete for each Code they adhere to.

TL advised that this has been an issue for many years and that every time it is investigated the feedback from Parties follows the same themes. Often resource is low and Code change is seen as a low priority, unless it relates to a large or controversial industry change. TL also noted the issue can be specific to the organisation, for example they may be undergoing restructures or be understaffed.

KV agreed with the above points and suggested that Parties could be forewarned of upcoming consultations to allow them time to assign resource. These communications and the subsequent consultations should put the issue in context and be more personal where appropriate to encourage buy-in from the respondents. KV also suggested that Codes should try to make their questions and options for responding as simple as possible.

IM also agreed with the previous points and suggested offering respondents the option of giving a short answer over the phone if they do not have time to complete the whole consultation. IM also noted that the issue of low engagement was being investigated by the working group for BSC issue 102 (discussed further under Agenda Item 7), and that as part of this the suggestion had been raised for a 'tick-box' form to be used for consultations, with an option for respondents to add more detail if they so wish.

DT suggested that tick-boxes could also be used to provide information about the consultation response itself, for example "I need more information in order to respond" or "I have read but I have nothing further to add", which is useful feedback for the Code Administrator and may help them generate more responses in future. DT also suggested that mid-consultation Q&A sessions could be held for further feedback and to encourage engagement.

CM advised that as the D-Code is highly technical, attaching Plain English versions of change documentation helps to encourage wider engagement. CM did also note that this is not always helpful – where a change doesn't affect a Party, they are unlikely to respond to consultations.

TP noted that the REC is looking at similar initiatives to those mentioned and suggested that the most important factors for increasing engagement are to simplify the communications and remove any duplication.

MA thanked the Forum for the discussion and advised the SEC engagement team would consider the points raised in their efforts to increase consultation responses and bring any lessons learned back to the Forum to assist the other Codes.

6. HORIZON SCANNER DOCUMENT

ML clarified the purpose of the Horizon Scanner as providing consistent, high-level information on cross-Code changes to Code Panels and industry stakeholders. ML noted that previous iterations of the document only gave information on what the Code Administrator actions were and no detail on the context or reason for the change. ML also noted inconsistency in the substance of the updates.

ML demonstrated the changes they have made to the Horizon Scanner template:

- addition of a description of the change and the reason for it;

- addition of links to any published materials and relevant contact details;
- change of 'Update Due' field to 'Last Updated'; and
- addition of 'Modifications Expected' field.

MF and KV noted that the changes seemed sensible and made the document more accessible. IM agreed but asked if the 'Lead Code' field could be reinstated in the template so that Forum members were aware who needs to update each change. ML agreed and made the change during the meeting. The consensus of the Forum was to adopt the changes as drafted by ML.

Action 44/01: ML to send revised template to Forum members and TP to add Codes' submissions to central document for final review at December's meeting.

7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

BSC ISSUE 102

IM shared information regarding BSC Issue 102, which is investigating ways of speeding up the BSC change process. A working group, with representatives from other Code Administrators, has been set up to identify and prioritise issues and possible solutions. These have been separated into quick wins, initiatives which have support but require further discussion and those with mixed support.

IM highlighted that within the context of introducing efficiencies to the implementation of cross-Code changes, the issue group discussed the respective scopes of the CACoP and the Cross Code Steering Group (CCSG) and whether there was any overlap which could be reviewed to prevent duplication of work. IM advised this was outside the scope of the issue group but following further discussion could form the basis of a recommendation to Ofgem. The Forum members agreed to review the Terms of Reference and discuss further at the next meeting. IM agreed to seek views from CB as they attend both CACoP Forum meetings and the CCSG.

TL noted that the scopes of CACoP and CCSG are quite different, and that it would be worth going through Ofgem's rationale for forming the CCSG to determine the scope.

TP advised that the CACoP Chair assumes a lot of responsibility and that if the Forum continues in its current guise, it may be beneficial to share out ownership of forward actions and ongoing work. TP noted that recent changes in personnel have presented a challenge, and the Forum should look at ways of improving the pace of actions. IM agreed it was sensible to continue re-evaluating the role of CACoP and improve ways of working. TP will add this as a standing agenda item going forward.

CODE REFORM

JS advised that Ofgem will soon be publishing a call for input into the next stages of the Energy Code Reform. JS noted that the project timeline is currently under review by the UK Government and the consultation will be issued once the review is complete.

XOSERVE RELEASE DATES

TL noted that XOServe has changed its scheduled release dates to Thursdays to align with the REC, unless agreed with a specific Code Administrator introducing the relevant change. TL further noted that XOServe has also moved its schedule November releases to the last week of the month instead of the first. TP advised this may be worth discussing with REC colleagues, and TL noted that they would have expected this kind of change to be discussed at CACoP. This will be discussed at next month's meeting when CB is available.

The next CACoP Forum meeting will be held on 13 December 2022.

The Chair thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting.