

CACoP Forum meeting 47

11 April, 10:00 – 12:20

Teleconference

Final Minutes

Attendee	Representing
David Kemp (DK)	Forum Chair
Charlotte Riddick (CR)	Forum Secretary
Ivar Macsween (IMa)	BSC
Milly Lewis (ML)	CUSC, Grid Code, STC
Christopher McCann (CM)	D-Code
Dylan Townsend (DT)	DCUSA
Talia Lattimore (TL)	IGT UNC
Colette Baldwin (CB)	REC
Mike Fenn (MF)	SEC
Jennifer Semple (JS)	Ofgem
Michelle Awosoga (MA) (<i>part meeting – item 3</i>)	SECAS
Tracy Hardy (TH) (<i>part meeting – item 6</i>)	RECCo

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting.

1. ACTIONS UPDATE

Ref	Action	Discussion	Outcome
43/02	All Codes to review the diagrams provided by the REC. The REC to then share these for publication on the CACoP website following review and amendments.	The Forum noted the update and agreed to close the action.	Closed

Ref	Action	Discussion	Outcome
46/01	The Chair to reach out to the CUSC, the D-Code, the Grid Code and the STC representatives to discuss the proposal that these Codes become CCSG members.	The Forum noted the update and agreed to close the action.	Closed
46/02	The REC to reach out to the Ofgem CCSG representative to discuss the proposal for expanding the CCSG membership and understand if there were any reasons why the technical Codes were originally not included in the CCSG membership.	CB noted that the REC had reached out to Ofgem to ask why the remaining Codes were not included in the CCSG membership. The main driver for the original membership had centred around the management of the data that the REC holds, though this could be updated over time. There was no position on whether the CCSG membership should be expanded to include the remaining Codes. JS suggested also speaking to colleagues in RECCo about this. CB noted that she had received a paper from Ofgem on this that she read through. Further discussion took place under item 8 (see below). It was agreed that this action could be closed.	Closed
46/03	The Chair to update the dynamic work plan and publish this on the CACoP website.	The Forum noted the update and agreed to close the action.	Closed
46/04	The Chair, RECCo and the REC to confirm the input and support the Forum can provide on the RECCo digitalisation strategy, for addition to the dynamic work plan.	The Forum noted the update and agreed to close the action.	Closed

The Forum **NOTED** the updates and **AGREED** the actions marked 'Propose to Close' can be closed.

2. WORK PLAN UPDATE

The Chair updated the Forum on the latest progress with the items on the Forum's work plan.

JS provided an update under work item 002 on Code Reform, noting that Ofgem would be reaching out to stakeholders to arrange workshops which will focus on Code Manager selection and how

future Code management will operate. JS will update the Forum on the workshops and how members can join. ML asked what level of seniority the workshops would be aimed at, and JS responded this would be dependent on what the content will be which had not been decided yet.

The Chair proposed the REC take control of work item 006 and CB agreed it would.

IM noted that the Forum had planned to look at website statistics before the Forum Chair changed and asked if this could be picked up again. CB suggested it could be helpful to track the downloads of the Industry Code Diagrams that had just been published. The Forum agreed to add a review of the website and how well it is performing to the work plan.

The Forum **NOTED** the updates.

3. COMMUNICATIONS AND ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY

MA presented the Forum with a proposed communication and engagement strategy for the Forum and its activities.

MA updated the Forum on the engagement plan and the different communication channels that the Forum has. They noted that the website is used more but the LinkedIn channel has not been used as much; this was something they wanted to use more. MA asked members if they could follow and engage with the CACoP LinkedIn page and to encourage colleagues and customers to do the same.

MA also proposed to change the frequency of the CACoP newsletter to once every four months now that the meetings have changed to bimonthly. They noted that contribution from all the different Codes to the newsletter would be key to it being a useful document for readers.

ML asked if there was a plan to look at the newsletter distribution list and asked if there was data on how many downloads previous editions have had. MA responded that newsletter subscribers would have proactively signed up, but would like to get more people subscribed they can increase the reach of any communications.

MA queried whether the Forum wanted to call out links to specific Codes in the newsletter, considering that if this was done it should cover all Codes not just a subset. CB noted that the REC sends out weekly bulletin and suggested that they could highlight the CACoP newsletter periodically as part of these. MA agreed this would be good, and encouraged other Codes to do the same.

MA updated the Forum on the proposed communication plan which would list the key messages that the Forum wanted or needed to communicate. They asked the Forum for any items to add to this list and proposed to bring the updated list back to the next meeting.

ML noted that to gain and maintain an audience, the newsletter and other communications need to focus on what was important for that audience. MA agreed with this point.

CB noted that some of the biggest criticism the REC has received is the volume of communications it sends out and that Parties do not have the time to read all of this. They suggested that the Forum should be careful with the volume of CACoP-related communications sent out to avoid the same criticism. CB also suggested that people should be able to easily remove themselves from distribution lists if they wish to. The Chair agreed and noted they wanted to aim for quality communication over quantity.

IM noted the proposed review of the CACoP and suggested using the more recent newsletters to build a list of interested parties that could be engaged with. DT pointed out that the Forum should refer back to the terms of reference to make sure it is not stepping beyond the bounds of what it should be focusing on as a Forum.

MA asked members if they were the best contact for communication updates for the organisations they represented, and most members agreed that they were. The Chair asked members to confirm after the meeting if they could not confirm this at present.

ACTION 47/01: Forum members to confirm to the Secretary the best point(s) of contact for their Codes regarding input for CACoP-related communications.

The Forum:

- **ENDORSED** the proposed communications approach;
- **PROVIDED** views and input on items to add to the communication plan; and
- **AGREED** to provide points of contact from each Code to create and contribute to a CACoP communication plan.

4. CO-ORDINATING APPROACHES TO CODE SURVEYS

ML highlighted Ofgem's recent announcement that there would be no Code Administrator survey this year, and asked the Forum if there was merit in Code Administrators co-ordinating their own surveys to avoid overburdening participants with simultaneous requests for feedback. They noted that National Grid ESO had done a stakeholder check in March and would not do another one for six to nine months. ML asked the Forum if other Codes would be doing a survey and whether members wanted to discuss their survey plans together.

TL noted that the IGT UNC would not be doing a survey this year due to time and cost. They would be in support of the Forum sending out one collective survey to reduce costs. MF noted that a collective survey had been discussed at the end of last year and the conclusion had been that the Forum would not issue its own survey. MF said the Forum had agreed to set out some principles of what would be included to avoid duplicating efforts and to ensure a focus on areas that would be useful for all Codes to look at.

CB agreed that it was worth checking whether each Code body would be doing its own survey to make sure the industry would not be overloaded. The Chair noted that it would be good to know if anyone is sending out a survey in the next quarter. CB also suggested mapping members' surveys to see where they all lie. DT noted that ElectraLink issues surveys each year which cover topics wider than just the DCUSA, and that it might be difficult for it to do anything more than it already does other than adding questions.

ACTION 47/02 Forum members to confirm to the Secretary the timings of any customer satisfaction surveys issued for their Code(s).

The Forum noted work that had been carried out towards the end of last year to develop some common questions that Code Administrators could include in their surveys. Members considered this work should be revisited and completed. The Chair agreed to add this to the work plan.

The Forum **NOTED** the updates.

5. LEGAL TEXT DRAFTING BEST PRACTICE

ML considered that producing the legal text for modifications has often been problematic, with late and sometimes contradictory comments being received from Workgroups. They wanted to discuss this to see if there could be a better way of preparing and receiving input on this. They noted that if there is a Workgroup of around four people then it can be ok but when there are many participants, management of review comments can be a problem.

DT responded that it is less to do with legal text drafting than managing the Code itself. They noted that the DCUSA had done a lessons learnt piece and has tried to use more online documentation management.

CM understood the frustration on legal text for modifications. They noted that the D-Code had tried a master version to try to manage the issues.

CB noted that the REC work more digitally and do not have Workgroups and so everything relies on participants putting in their perspectives. They noted that the REC does respond to points individually and that it has hosted a webinar to look at but that the trouble is often that lawyers do not reply.

ML noted that it sounded like an issue most people faced and that if anyone came up with an idea to help with this to let them know.

The Forum **NOTED** the updates.

6. DIGITALISATION PRINCIPLES WORKSHOP

TH updated the Forum on the Open Data & Consumer Consent project, following the discussion on digitalisation principles at the last meeting. They explained that the project has looked at metadata, analysed these sources and made a data catalogue. The project has also created a data quality log which is then used to look at lessons learned from previous projects. TH noted that they were looking to run a workshop at the end of May with all the Code Administrators, and noted that it would be useful to have a representative from each Code.

ACTION 47/03: Forum members to confirm to the Secretary and/or RECCo the representatives they would like to attend the workshop to discuss the Open Data & Consumer Consent project.

The Chair asked TH how the Forum could further support and help on this project and considered this will likely be clearer after the workshop. The Chair and TH agreed to review this after the workshop has taken place.

ACTION 47/04: The Chair and RECCo to review the support the Forum can provide on the Open Data & Consumer Consent project after the Code Administrator workshop has taken place.

The Forum **NOTED** the updates.

7. CLOSER ALIGNMENT OF CROSS-CODE CHANGES

CB updated the Forum on an approach to ensuring closer alignment of cross-Code changes being developed by the Cross-Code Steering Group (CCSG). The CCSG is analysing any formal changes to be made to relevant processes, and has introduced a cross-Code tracker, which CB demonstrated to the Forum. The CCSG has agreed to trial a single consultation approach on a suitable cross-Code change. CB also noted that the CCSG has moved back to discussing changes at virtual meetings rather than sharing updates on a portal space and that tracking changes was more useful this way rather than doing it individually.

ML asked if there is an overall progress bar on the tracker. CB noted that this was a problem as IGT UNC changes are regularly delayed behind the originating UNC changes as the IGT UNC does not have the power to raise modifications. TL also noted that IGTs may not want the change being made to the UNC and so don't raise the corresponding IGT UNC change. They noted that the CCSG could raise the IGT UNC change but was concerned whether such proposals would be supported by IGTs. As such, this would cause any overall progress status to be red all the time.

CB also noted that they were waiting for confirmation from the DCUSA on some of the other changes. They expect that the tracker will be fully populated ahead of the next CCSG meeting. They also noted that there will always be a time lag between a change being added to the tracker and an assessment taking place.

The Forum **NOTED** the updates.

8. EXPANDING THE CCSG TO INCLUDE ALL CACoP CODES

The chair reminded the Forum that at the last meeting it was noted that there was an overlap between the CCSG and the Forum regarding assessment of cross-Code changes. The Forum had agreed for the Chair to explore whether there would be benefit from the remaining CACoP Codes becoming CCSG members.

CM noted that they had had limited engagement from the D-Code Panel on this and that their views have been that the CCSG terms of reference do not outline the D-Code as a CCSG member. They queried where the driver first came from and noted that regular data changes are seen within the REC where the REC holds the data specifications. They noted that it was a struggle to see the holistic view of what happens in the technical Codes and considered that adding these to the CCSG membership is just administrative.

The Chair noted that there did not seem to be a great deal of support on this. CB noted that although the CCSG does not include the scope of the remaining CACoP Codes, if there is a change that would impact CCSG members, they would happily cooperate. The Chair responded that adding the remaining Codes to the CCSG membership is not something that has a strong business case now but that this could be revisited in the future should circumstances change.

ML asked if the Central Modifications Register could reference cross-Code impacts. The Chair agreed to raise this with the UNC offline.

ACTION 47/05: The Chair to discuss with the UNC the addition of a cross-Code impacts column to the Central Modifications Register.

The Forum:

- **NOTED** the progress with the discussions on whether the CUSC, the D-Code, the Grid Code and the STC should become CCSG members; and
- **AGREED** not to take any changes forward at this time.

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

CB noted that at past meetings the Forum had gone through recent cross-Code changes and queried why this was not on this meeting's agenda. The Chair responded that they had agreed in the previous meeting that they would not go through these moving forward as they did not add much value.

SUMMARY AND MEETING CLOSE

The next CACoP Forum meeting will be held on 13 June 2023. The Chair thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting.