

CACoP Forum meeting 52

2 February 2024, 10:00 – 11:00

Teleconference

Minutes

Attendee	Representing
Teri Puddefoot (TP)	Forum Chair
Rashpal Gata-Aura	Forum Secretary
Patrick Matthewson (PM)	BSC
Milly Lewis (ML)	CUSC, Grid Code, STC
Christopher McCann (CM)	DCode
Dylan Townsend (DT)	DCUSA
Helen Bennett (HBT)	UNC
Helen Bevan (HB)	iGT UNC
Elizabeth Woods (EW)	SEC
Puja Vadgama (PV)	Ofgem

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

The Chair welcomed attendees to the first meeting of 2024.

The Chair noted apologies from Yvonne Reid-Healy.

1. ACTIONS UPDATE

Ref	Action	Discussion	Outcome
51/01	Members to consider any viable alternative Forum meeting dates for discussion at the February 2024 meeting	The Forum were happy to continue with the suggested dates/times and address the situation as and when required, and agreed to close the action.	Closed
51/02	Ofgem to provide more details and timeline for its proposed Code Administrator-led surveys approach	The Forum noted the update and agreed to leave the action open pending further information.	Open

Managed by



Ref	Action	Discussion	Outcome
51/03	Members to consider the proposed Code Administrator-led surveys approach and any common questions for inclusion for discussion at the February 2024 meeting	The Forum noted the update and agreed to leave the action open pending further information.	Open
51/04	Code Administrators to add their 2024 Panel and Modification meetings to the CACoP website calendar	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’ could be closed.

The Forum requested further clarification on Action 51/04 asking what meetings should be added to the CACoP website. The Chair took an **ACTION (52/01)** to clarify at the next meeting what needs to be updated on the CACoP calendar – just the Panel Meetings or Workgroup Meetings also.

2. WORK PLAN UPDATE

The Chair presented the Work Plan and shared the latest update. The Forum **REVIEWED** the progress of items on the Work Plan and **AGREED** as below:-

- Reference 002 - to remain as an ongoing item.
- Reference 004 - to remain as an ongoing item.
- Reference 005 – CACoP Document V6 has been presented to Ofgem and approved. The decision letter is on the [Ofgem website](#) and this can now closed.

3. OFGEM UPDATE

The Chair invited Ofgem to provide an update on Code Governance Reform consultations and Cross Code survey information.

Code Governance Reform

PV advised the Forum that the consultation on Implementation of Energy Code Reform had been published on 30 January 2024 and is seeking feedback on Ofgem’s proposal including code consolidation. This consultation is available on the [Ofgem website](#) and will remain open until 23 April 2024.

PV advised the Forum that Ofgem were attending Panel meeting during February and March 2024 to enable Panel members to hear the proposals and ask any questions.

DT questioned whether these meetings were open to all or just Panel members.

PV responded that at this stage it was unclear but suggested that all comments be sent via email and Ofgem would be happy to address.

PV further confirmed that Ofgem were due to meet the Grid Code, CUSC, STC and SQSS Panel Chairs on 8 February 2024, to discuss the proposals and requested a slot at the next CACoP Forum to have a more detailed discussion on the proposals. This would give enough time to look through the consultation and if there were any questions these could be brought to the next CACoP Forum.

PV continued that alongside the publication of the Consultation, Ofgem were also setting up a Workgroup aiming to help develop a code modification process that incorporates the roles and responsibilities introduced by the reforms.

CACoP Forum members were invited to join and participate, voicing their views and comments. To join an email to industrycodes@ofgem.co.uk by 4 March 2024 will suffice, and further information is available on the Ofgem website alongside the consultation.

PV advised that Ofgem were preparing to publish a joint consultation with Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ) which was looking to cover preferred policy options for Code Manager selection. The consultation will also include a number of proposals for Code Manager Licence conditions and publication was envisaged within the next couple of months.

PV informed the Forum for information purposes that there was a new Head of Industry Codes, Gavin Baillie.

Cross Code survey information

PV advised that Ofgem were not looking to commission the 2024 survey and consideration was being given to undertake something similar once the Code Managers were in place. It was Ofgem's preference for the Code Administrators to carry out their own survey and referred to **Action 51/3** having a joint survey rather than individual Code Administrator surveys, however having CACoP involvement to ensure consistency in approaching questions where possible.

PV advised on what Ofgem would like to cover regarding timings and contents. In line with the previous reports, the field work would be carried out by an independent research company, at different time periods and there was no limitation on time frames.

PV noted that Ofgem would recommend avoiding winter months as responses tend to be lower and this would be considered.

Linking to previous surveys, the objective was looking at best practice in how the Code Administrator carried out their role, and to collect research data on the nature of service and the levels of satisfaction. This was started in 2017 and some years were missed due to COVID and other elements. The survey was repeated so that Ofgem could monitor performance over the timeframe and Ofgem's preference would be for the future surveys to cover the same content as previous surveys to ensure continuity for measurement.

PV invited the Forum to have discussions with their teams and email Ofgem their comments and views to give thoughts on the survey.

ML noted a previous discussed and that clarity was required on when the survey should go out and if it was via CACoP or Code Administrators. Additionally, agree timelines to avoid industry having questionnaire fatigue. ML questioned if the purpose of the surveys was to understand how the Code Administrators can operate better. The Forum agreed that the material of the survey could be shared at the CACoP Forum, noting there may be some variance to the codes.

PV suggested that data could be collated and presented to Ofgem via CACoP to give a wider industry view.

DT requested that the Ofgem survey questions from previous surveys be shared. DT stated that it would be practical to send out the survey independently from Codes individuals distribution list, with the results to be sent back to the central CACoP box or to each Code and the results could be collated.

PV took away an **ACTION (52/02)** to identify the questions asked previously and share them with the CACoP Forum for review.

HBT responded that she would need to discuss this with their leadership team to get some feedback which will then be brought to the CACoP Forum. HBT noted that further clarity was required on a more joined up approach and what actions need to be followed to enable the joint survey to be developed.

EW confirmed that SEC undertake a survey annually, take the findings and improve on them; there was a survey planned to go to Panel in March 2024 and to go out to industry in April 2024. EW agreed that a view of the previous questions used would be beneficial to avoid duplication.

The Chair advised that once the Ofgem questions had been received and circulated, a timeline could then be put together and communicated via email before the next CACoP Forum meeting. It was felt that potentially a further discussion was needed before it was sent.

DT voiced that whilst he agreed to have internal discussions and come back to the forum to discuss further, ideally it would be good to look at sending the survey in June 2024, following a discussion at the April 2024 meeting and this way it was not rushed and due consideration had been given.

All the CACoP forum members agreed this way forward to ensure the survey was effective.

4. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Modification Escalation Process

EW asked the Forum for views on code modification escalation following challenges with proposers not engaging.

EW asked the Forum how each Code managed these scenarios, what difficulties were faced and what part of their Code covers this process which could be looked at by SEC to enable them to develop something in their Code or policy.

EW presented an example of a situation where a modification proposal had been raised and due to no follow up the modification then seems to drop off the horizon. Contact with the connected organisation produced no results and the option then is to get agreement from the proposer to either progress the modification or withdraw it.

EW advised that SEC were looking at ways for the modifications to be either withdrawn or adopted.

ML questioned whether SEC had a Prioritisation Stack.

EW responded that whilst SEC had a process of having a Prioritisation Stack, it was not codified, and this was subject to further development.

ML advised that in CUSC and Grid Code it was codified that should a modification not be making progress, on the third time the modification was re-time lined, the proposer must attend Panel to explain what the barriers were, what was being done to progress it and was any help required from Panel. Whilst the Panel do not have the authority to force the withdrawal of the modification, the Panel do have the authority to de-prioritise the modification or move straight to Code Administrator Consultation where the proposer loses the right to continue with their solution.

HBT addressed the Forum regarding the Central Modification Register submission, emphasising that links should be put into the register for the various modifications. Feedback had been received that for some Codes the links are either broken or not put in and going forward when the submissions are received and checked, and if the links are not working then the register will be sent back to update with the relevant links.

DT commented that sometimes the return details were not correct and needed to be updated.

HBT requested DT and anyone else that may have issues with the Central Modification Register, contact her directly so these issues could be resolved.

SUMMARY AND MEETING CLOSE

The next CACoP Forum meeting will be held on Friday 5 April 2024.

The Chair thanked everyone for attending and inputting to the discussions and closed the meeting.