

CACoP Forum meeting 12

10 March 2020, 10:00-13:00

Teleconference

Minutes

Attendee	Representing
Paul Rocke (PR) (<i>Chair</i>)	IGT UNC
Holly Burton (HBu) (<i>Secretary</i>)	SEC
David Kemp (DK)	SEC
Eugene Asante (EA)	MRA
Matthew Woolliscroft (MW)	BSC
Kirsten Shilling (KS)	CUSC, Grid Code, STC
Helen Bennett (HB) (<i>part meeting</i>)	UNC
Neil Brinkley (NB)	SPAA
Richard Colwill (RC)	DCUSA
Jonathan Coe (JC)	Ofgem

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

The Chair highlighted that in relation to recent publications regarding the coronavirus (COVID-19), Gemserv agreed it would be a good idea to test and trial a remote meeting using Teams for teleconferencing. CACoP members noted the guidance from the government regarding COVID-19 and to only travel when necessary.

The Chair noted apologies had been received from Loraine O'Shaughnessy (LOS).

2. MEETING 11 MINUTES

The Forum approved the minutes from the last meeting.

3. ACTIONS UPDATE

Ref	Action	Update
10/02	Gemserv to confirm to ElectraLink if it would be willing to contribute to the cost of the central CACoP website	It was noted in meeting 11 that this is dependent on other factors, including whether other Code Administrators will be contributing. A decision will be made once more details are available.
10/05	Each Code Administrator to provide information on its market entry process to LOS	It was noted that Loraine O'Shaughnessy could not attend the meeting therefore, an update will be provided at the next CACoP Forum on 14 April 2020. This action will be left open.
11/01	The Chair to response to the SPAA Executive Committee's letter.	A response was sent on 20 February 2020. This action can now be closed.
11/02	Ofgem to confirm whether the contact details in the CACoP document can be updated without Ofgem approval.	JC confirmed the details in the CACoP document did not require change control; however, change in details should be coordinated in advance to avoid several adjustments being made at different times. It was also confirmed that switching the document to the new branding as previously discussed was accepted. This action can now be closed.
11/03	The Chair to propose some criteria for the updates to be provided by Code Administrators.	Some criteria have been included in the email with the meeting papers. This action can now be closed.
11/04	The MRA to add a column to the Central Modifications Register to highlight modifications that impact on the Significant Code Request.	It was noted that the MRA have since added a column to the Central Modifications Register to highlight modifications that impact the Significant Code Request and was circulated before being implemented. This action can now be closed.
11/05	Each Code Administrator to consider what steps are needed to bring the REC into the process for identifying cross-Code impact.	It was noted that the integration of the REC would be expedited once Code Managers are appointed beyond June 2020. This action will remain open until decisions have been confirmed.
11/06	ElectraLink to prepare a paper providing the justification, solution and business case for a central CACoP website.	This action is due for completion at meeting 13 in April 2020.

Ref	Action	Update
11/07	Each Code Administrator to provide a link to their modification proposal form to the secretary.	It was noted that this action was raised as the previous workshop in order to review best practice and as such, five template forms were received from Code Administrators. An update to create a baseline which can be deviated across all Codes was provided under Agenda Item 7. This action can now be closed.

ACTION 12/01: DK to prepare an updated copy of the CACoP document on the new template with updated contact details noted in previous meetings for agreement by the Forum.

4. CODE UPDATES

Each Code Administrator representative provided an update on notable activities under their Code(s).

The Chair noted that based on previous conversations regarding the inconsistencies between the different updates, there were three main areas to focus on which would improve the structure of information being provided by each Code Administrator. These are:

- Ongoing modifications or other work areas that have confirmed cross-Code impacts;
- New modifications or other work areas raised in the last month that are expected to have cross-Code impacts; and
- Modifications and other work that do not have cross-Code impacts but are progressing ideas or developments that other Codes may want to consider.

PR also suggested for Ofgem to provide an update on open Significant Code Reviews (SCRs), including a discussion on progress being made. JC agreed to provide these in future meetings.

The Forum agreed the criteria were sensible and that future updates would be based on these.

IGT UNC

PR provided the following updates:

- [IGT130 'Applying password protection encryption to electronic communication containing MPRNs'](#) has been raised to ensure that where the Meter Point Reference Number (MPRN) and other personal data is sent between industry parties to meet IGT UNC requirements, that sending of data meets the requirements under the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). This modification is currently out for consultation ahead of a Panel decision. The proposed implementation date is the first release occurring at least three months after an Authority decision to implement.

- [IGT131 'Automatic updates to Meter Read Frequency'](#) has been raised to mirror the changes proposed to the UNC in modification 0692. The intent of the change is to place an obligation on the Central Data Services Provider (CDSP) to automatically update the Meter Read Frequency of a Class 3 or 4 Supply Meter Point to Monthly in certain circumstances. The development of the IGT UNC modification is on hold pending a decision by Ofgem with respect to an appeal on UNC 0692.
- [IGT132 'Introduction of IGT Credit Code Rules'](#) has been raised to implement credit cover arrangements into the IGT UNC to provide protection for Pipeline Operators against Pipeline Users that cease trading. The development of the modification has considered the arrangements in both the UNC and the DCUSA, and the current drafting is closely aligned to the DCUSA arrangements. This modification remains at Workgroup stage, with a proposed implementation date of the first release after an Authority decision to implement.
- [IGT133 'Transition of IGT Theft Reporting into the IGT UNC'](#) has been raised to introduce reporting obligations on Pipeline Operators regarding theft activities which had previously been held under the SPAA. This modification will align with the obligations introduced by UNC 0704, and the implementation date will be set accordingly. The Workgroup Report is currently being prepared.
- [IGT134 'Introducing 'Research Body' as a new user type to the Data Permissions Matrix and IGT UNC'](#) has been raised to recognise Research Body as a user type within the Data Permissions Matrix. The Data Permissions Matrix describes the protected information data items that each market role type is entitled to access. The matrix is formalised within the UNC and the IGT UNC. This change has been raised to align with UNC 0702, and development of that change at the UNC Distribution Workgroup is being monitored.
- [IGT135 'Alignment of the IGT UNC Part K and the Data Permissions Matrix'](#) has been raised to remove inconsistencies between a section of the IGT UNC and the Data Permissions Matrix and has been raised to mirror UNC 0697 within the IGT UNC. Development of UNC 0697 at the UNC Distribution Workgroup is being monitored.
- [IGT136 'Introducing 'Performance Assurance Framework Administrator' as a new user type to the Data Permissions Matrix'](#) has been raised to recognise Performance Assurance Framework Administrator as a user type within the Data Permissions Matrix. This change has been raised to align with UNC 0707, which is currently out for consultation.
- [IGT137 'Alignment to the IGT UNC in Advance of Faster Switching'](#) has been raised to ensure that the changes proposed in UNC 0708 are reflected in the IGT UNC. UNC 0708 seeks to re-order the UNC in advance of faster switching. The progression of IGT137 and UNC 0708 are critical in ensuring the production of accurate Retail Code Consolidation SCR legal text as per a previous request, and delays in the finalisation of the UNC modification have raised the risk of the text not being prepared by the agreed deadline.
- [IGT138 'Performance Assurance Techniques and Controls'](#) has been raised to reflect within the IGT UNC the amendments to the performance assurance framework proposed by UNC 0674. The progression of UNC 0674 through Development Workgroup is being monitored to ensure ongoing alignment between the modifications.

SEC

DK provided the following updates:

- There has been no further movement over [SECMP0046 'Allow DNOs to control Electric Vehicle charges connected to Smart Meter infrastructure'](#). SECAS is now working on the Modification Report which includes the preparation of legal text. RC noted that the DCUSA has had further discussions about the consequential changes, but it is not yet clear who the Proposer for that modification would be.
- SECAS has agreed in principle with the MRA that [MP077 'DCC Service Flagging'](#) will be targeted for the June 2021 release. The MRA will be attending the next Working Group meeting on 1 April 2020.
- SECAS asked the SPAA how quickly it could address any consequential changes arising from [MP101 'Large Gas Meter Displays'](#). NB noted he had liaised with SECAS to discuss the current solution and stated that large gas meters are exempt in line with the advice given. As the SPAA solution is a light solution and gas meters are being installed onto the Central Products List (CPL), the solution will be implemented in June 2020 which could be the final SPAA release before the REC goes live. This would also futureproof the REC to note that large gas meters are not required to meet display requirements. The SEC modification is currently targeting the November 2020 release.
- SECAS is yet to be in touch with the UNC regarding [MP106 'CHISM update for Unknown WAN Variant'](#). The SECAS Lead Analyst will also confirm whether there will be any impact on the IGT UNC as a result of any UNC changes.
- [MP079 'Provisions for withdrawing modifications'](#) was raised as the SEC does not provide any power for SECAS, the SEC Panel or the SEC Change Board to withdraw a modification. SEC Parties had expressed support for the SEC Panel to have the power to remove modifications that were being stalled. This modification was rejected by the Authority on 2 March 2020.
- [MP088 'Power to raise modifications'](#) is currently with the Authority for a decision, and would allow SECAS, the SEC Panel and SEC Sub-Committees more scope to raise modifications themselves.
- SECAS has prepared a prioritisation matrix in response to the significant level of modifications, with a paper being presented to Panel on 13 March 2020 to endorse the approach.

MRA

EA provided the following updates:

- The MRA held a secure joint webinar with the SPAA, where the background and changes to the MRA in relation to the establishment of the Secure Data Exchange Platform (SDEP) were discussed. This change has a target implementation date of June 2020. The session covered the changes to the technical solution, functionality, access process, implementation of UAT and any next. The MRA has also established a dedicated email address for Parties to send any questions, which to date has been a success.

- The MRA is currently working with SECAS in order to progress MP077 'DCC Service Flagging' which relates to the D0350 flow. This also relates to [MIF297 'Use of a D0304 Data Flow \(from MOp to Supplier\) in a New Connection Scenario'](#) where the distribution businesses initially flagged this issue. This issue is also considering with the industry whether the D0350 flow is still required moving forward or whether this should be retired. High level conversations are being had before confirming whether to progress.
- EA noted the cross-Code modification arising from BSC Issue 86. This change is expected to affect MAP 08, with improvements looking to reduce timescales from 30 Working Days to between 15 and 20 Working Days. This will be a change to MAP08 and may affect the baseline for the switching programme changes.

BSC

MW provided the following updates:

- Two new modifications have been raised looking at governance. [P400 'BSC Panel Modification via Video/Teleconference'](#) looks at allowing the Panel to make decisions via teleconference for modifications. [P401 'Governance arrangements for BSC Panel Alternates'](#) looks at how the voting for BSC Panel Alternates work and how Alternates are appointed, to make sure the governance is in place and keeping up with technology on the BSC Panel governance issues.
- Early this month, sub-committees voted to reject [CP1524 'Improving the communication methods in the fault rectification process'](#) and [CP1526 'Introduction of Service Level Agreements for rectifying Meter faults'](#) which will be taken to the Panel at the end of the month. The groups didn't think the benefits outweighed the costs, therefore they were rejected.
- A decision on [CP1525 'Improving the involvement of the LDSO in the fault resolution process'](#) was deferred because all consultation responses had given their costs and impacts as a combination of three CPs. The groups wanted to review what the costs and impact would be if only this one CP was to be processed. The BSC has since identified it would be better to progress this forward as a modification to place obligations in the BSC.
- Ofgem has approved P383, which was designed to facilitate CUSC modifications [CMP280 'Creation of a New Generator TNUoS Demand Tariff which Removes Liability for TNUoS Demand Residual Charges from Generation and Storage Users'](#) and [CMP281 'Removal of BSUoS Charges From Energy Taken From the National Grid System by Storage Facilities'](#).
- [P392 'Amending BSC Change Process for EBGL Article 18'](#) looked at aligning the BSC change process with the EBGL change process. National Grid ESO has now delegated that responsibility to ELEXON, and the Workgroup is working with internal teams to finalise the process. This modification is expected to be implemented in June 2020.
- [P398 'Increasing access to BSC Data'](#) is progressing with the BSC remaining aware there are overlaps of data sets. Should some open data sets be published then there is potential for Suppliers to cross reference. ELEXON will look to ask other Code Administrators before any data is published and give a 15 working day objection window to highlight if something has

been published which shouldn't have been. A Workgroup meeting is being held at the end of the month, and Code Administrators were advised to contact ELEXON if they plan to attend.

- The proposer of [P397 'Assessing the costs and benefits of adjusting Parties' Imbalances following a demand disconnection'](#) has withdrawn this modification but this has been subsequently picked up by another Party, and so this modification will progress as originally intended. Ofgem has since sent back P397 as the information required to make a decision was not available when the final Modification Report was sent.

DK noted the progression of P379 and the impacts this is expected to have on the SEC. Given the change is likely to require significant impacts on SEC technical documentation which will likely incur significant cost and impact, he emphasised the need for the BSC to be working with the SEC now, as the solution is developed, and not wait until afterwards. MW agreed the BSC will contact the SEC and will work in collaboration to develop the solution.

ACTION 12/02: ELEXON to contact SECAS and begin cross-Code collaboration over the solution for BSC modification P379.

CUSC AND GRID CODE

KS provided the following updates:

- The CUSC is currently looking to hold 12 working groups in March 2020 as well as the Grid Codes Workgroups. The Transmission Charging Review (TCR) modifications are being progressed on time and most have reached the consultation phase.
- A new Workgroup template has been trialled with DCUSA colleagues confirming several differences to the original document, but overall feedback has been positive.
- The Code Administrator consultation for the European Electricity Balancing Guideline (EBGL) is being released on 16 March 2020.
- KS noted two new Grid Code modifications [GC0138 'Compliance process technical improvements \(EU and GB User\)'](#) and [GC0139 'Enhanced Planning-Data Exchange to Facilitate Whole System Planning'](#) have been raised. Ofgem confirmed it is expected to provide a decision on the Modification Reports for [GC096 'Energy Storage'](#) and [GC105 'System Incidents Reporting'](#) by the end of March.
- Across all of its Codes, National Grid ESO has implemented a new initial written assessment document, which were trialled against two new modifications. This will now be rolled out for all new modifications for all three Codes.
- The CUSC Panel has agreed for [CMP332 'Transmission Demand Residual bandings and allocation \(TCR\)'](#) to be progressed to the joint DCUSA working group. The CUSC now has urgent timescales granted by Ofgem, with the final report due to be sent by 9 June 2020.
- Urgent timescales are being worked towards regarding [CMP335 'Transmission Demand Residual - Billing and consequential changes to CUSC Section 3 and 11 \(TCR\)'](#) and [CMP336 'Transmission Demand Residual - Billing and consequential changes to CUSC Section 14 \(TCR\)'](#), which are looking to revise Section 3, 11 and 14 of the CUSC.

- A new Grid code modification GC0138 has been progressed with the Panel having agreed this can now be pushed through the founding governance group.

HB was interested in the new templates and asked if a copy of these could be forwarded to the UNC before the next CACoP meeting.

ACTION 12/03: KS to forward the new National Grid ESO templates to HB.

UNC

HB provided the following updates:

- The UNC Panel decided in January 2020 that the determination made in December 2019 for Modification 0692 'Automatic updates to Meter Read Frequency' was confirmed but implementation is yet to be confirmed. No further action is being taken at this time.
- No other cross-Code modifications have been raised since the last CACoP meeting.

SPAA

NB provided the following updates:

- [SCP 467 'Market Participant MDD Migration to UNC Governance'](#), which is cross-Code impacting with the UNC, was implemented in the February 2020 release. As a result, the SPAA Market Domain Data (MDD) now only holds Meter models, converter Models and valid set data items.
- [SCP 486 'Exempting Large Gas Meters from Display Requirements'](#) which upholds exemption for large gas Meters for the display requirements is currently being progressed with the SEC.
- [SCP 492 'Joint Theft Reporting Review – Reporting Theft of Gas'](#) was due to be presented to the SPAA Change Board on 10 March 2020 with this then being issued for impact assessment. The intent is to place an obligation onto Suppliers parties to ensure that confirmed theft data is reported through to the appropriate shipper.
- Five new CPs, [SCP 487 'Requirements on Suppliers to submit Outcome Files regardless of the Investigation Outcome'](#), [SCP 488 'Theft Detection Incentive Scheme Company Mergers'](#), [SCP 489 'TDis – Clarification to the Final Supply Point Market Share \(FSMS\)'](#), [SCP 490 'Extra Theft Data Shared Between the TRAS and the AUGS via CDSP'](#) and [SCP 491 'Amendment to the Gas Theft Detection Incentive Scheme \(GTDis\) Timing'](#) were raised relating to theft which requires Parties to submit outcome files regardless of the investigation outcome.

DCUSA

RC provided the following updates:

- The DCUSA and the CUSC have a similar change being progressed for [DCP349 'Effectiveness of the current provision of unsecured cover under Schedule 1'](#) which will work to reduce the amount of cover built on recent failures. As per the DCUSA consultation relating to DCP349, Parties have requested an in-depth impact assessment regarding costs and what secure/unsecure covered failures are in place. A request for information has been released

to Distribution Network Operators (DNOs) asking for anonymised information regarding credit arrangements for Suppliers that have failed.

- [DCP350 'Creation of Embedded Capacity Registers'](#) will be sent to the DCUSA Panel. The published data would help National Grid with security of supply, and a few legal requirements are yet to be confirmed. This would also have links to the Distribution Code.
- Four changes have been raised from the Ofgem targeted charging review. Positive feedback has been received from the joint Workgroup regarding CMP334 and the group is looking to consult later this month. Out of the four changes, three modifications will be consulted upon soon, with the fourth expected to be issued at a later date as the calculation of charges need to be modelled before consultation.
- [DCP363 'Refining the definition of 'Eligible Electricity Storage Facility' in the EDCM'](#) is currently out for invitation at the Workgroup which looks to request details of current out of hour meeting provisions in place.

OFGEM

JC provided the following updates:

- Ofgem is currently working on the impacted Codes and asking them to identify the areas of their Codes which need to be changed in order to implement half-hourly settlement. JC advised that if there are any Codes that are not currently working with Ofgem but would require changes as a result of half-hourly settlement then they should get in touch. A draft impact assessment will be worked on over the upcoming weeks, which will then go out to consultation to help steer the final decision on how and when to implement half-hourly settlement.

5. MARKET ENTRY GUIDANCE NOTE

HB provided an update on behalf of LOS in which a draft document for the Market Entry Guidance Note has been prepared. There are some questions which need to be considered for discussion at the next CACoP meeting in April 2020.

HB questioned whether the framework is correct as she believed this document will evolve during discussions at future meetings. PR noted he was not familiar with the structure of the note, and asked if this could be circulated. Members can feed back ideas to LOS in readiness for discussion at the next CACoP Forum meeting in April 2020.

HB also noted that the links attached in the documents will be linked to relevant areas of each Code Administrators website.

There is a need to understand who will be responsible for owning and updating the document and whether this would sit with the Forum Chair. PR noted the MRA currently maintains the Central Modifications Register and felt this is something that the UNC could retain ownership of in the future in a similar way.

HB asked, if a central CACoP website is agreed, whether this document should only sit on the website, with each Code Administrator linking the guidance note to their individual websites.

PR agreed for the guidance note to be circulated to Forum members, who can then provide feedback to LOS before the next meeting in April 2020.

ACTION 12/04: HB/LOS to circulate the current Market Entry Guidance Note to the Forum.

ACTION 12/05: Forum members to review and provide feedback on the draft Market Entry Guidance Note to help shape discussion at the next meeting.

6. APRIL 2020 CACOP NEWSLETTER

DK provided an update on the content that is currently being drafted for April's CACoP Newsletter. He proposed that it includes an update on the outputs of the workshop which took place in February 2020. The next area of focus would be Principle 3, which requires information to be made promptly and publicly available to Users.

DK requested Code Administrators to provide any updates on cross-Code activities which can then be incorporated into the newsletter.

PR questioned whether Code Administrators are considering different approaches to meetings based on recent events regarding the coronavirus (COVID-19). Gemserv is currently following government advice regarding large groups of people but to date, Gemserv has not taken any action to stop holding general face to face meetings. All Code Administrators agreed their approach has been to follow government advice and to ensure teleconference options are available. This situation will be reviewed when needed. PR felt it would be good to highlight within the newsletter that all Code Administrators do offer teleconference capabilities and remote participation.

HB questioned Code Administrators approach to Panel meetings, as the UNC has an obligation to hold face to face meetings. MW noted the BSC Panel needs to attend in person to vote on modifications unless it is for an urgent modification. Under the SPAA, MRA and IGT UNC, it was confirmed that as long as quoracy has been achieved then voting can be held either by face to face or teleconference.

DK requested for Code Administrators to send all items to cacop@gemserv.com by 31 March 2020. A final review of content will take place at the meeting on 14 April with the target issue date for the newsletter being 22 April 2020.

ACTION 12/06: Code Administrators to provide cross-Code updates and newsletter items to cacop@gemserv.com by 31 March 2020.

7. BEST PRACTICE WORKSHOP FOLLOW-UP

DK provided a recap on the previous discussion to identify whether any areas of best practice could be identified. This agenda item sought to review the understanding of different baselines and whether there are any areas to investigate further. Code Administrators also discussed ideas that

could be adopted immediately, ideas that could be developed further and anything that will require Ofgem support.

Please see the minutes from meeting 11 for a summary of the discussions at the workshop.

MODIFICATION PROCESSES

PR highlighted the importance of non-Parties being able to raise modifications and whether a level of consistency can be achieved. The industry is currently moving into a stage of openness which encourages modifications to be raised by a range of participants. DC noted SEC modification MP088 'Title', which is seeking to allow SEC Panel, SECAS and SEC Sub-Committees greater power to raise modifications. PR noted this will provide an opportunity to encourage Code Panels to approve the way forward rather than wait to be directed.

MW advised that non-BSC Parties could now apply to the BSC Panel to be allowed to raise modifications. To date, this power has not been used. PR noted that if it is working well and there is justification for a change then this would be a beneficial change. MW noted that it would likely be innovators seeking to use this provision but can't raise a modification directly as they are not a Party. PR wondered if this is something the other Code Administrators should raise with their Panels, noting this would be dependent on the provisions in place for each particular Code.

KS noted that the CUSC has reviewed its pre-modification process and are starting to improve the initial written assessments. She noted the useful discussions at the Forum which will be fed into a future approach with the proposal forms.

PR queried if there was some misunderstanding over the role of a Code Administrator, and whether it was because different organisations had been contracted to do different things. Although the Forum is striving to facilitate an aligned approach across different Codes, there may be valid reasons for differences, which should be documented somewhere. For example, not every Code will draft new proposals for the Proposer. DK considered the proposed guidance note on the different modification processes would be a sensible place to include this.

SHARING OF INFORMATION

The Forum began by reviewing the current versions of the different proposal forms.

PR ran through the structure of the IGT UNC's current proposal form, noting that the structure and content has not changed since the last review. The proposal form includes information such as:

- Reference Number
- Purpose for the modification being raised
- Proposed governance method
- The Proposer's view and the urgency of the modification
- A summary of what the modification is, why it is being raised and how it will impact the Code and Parties
- Code specific matters
- the proposed solution and which relevant objectives it facilitates

- Implementation approach and proposed timings
- Proposed legal text and changes to the Code section by section

The Forum noted the Grid code, MRA, UNC and DCUSA forms are broadly similar. However, there are areas of repetition in the forms which do not best represent the modification process. As a result of this, feedback will be received in order to adapt the forms accordingly.

EA noted the MRA proposal form has the proposed implementation date on the front page, which is a key segment in any change along with the version number. PR noted this was a preferred structure of a proposal form in that key information should be provided up-front.

DK noted the SEC no longer has a paper proposal form nor is a document published. Instead, the SEC asks Proposers to fill in an online form asking three questions on the issue, the impact it is having, and how the issue relates to the SEC. This information is then used to populate a first draft of the Modification Report with the 'Impact' section filled in. When more detail is received, the SEC will then update this accordingly. The aim of this structure is for the proposer to provide the issue first, then build the report over time. This ties in with the SEC's approach of ensuring the issue is fully defined before any consideration is given to a solution, to ensure that the best solution can then be developed. This approach seeks to prevent the industry getting blinded by the initially proposed solution before the issue has been validated. This is particularly so given the significantly higher costs that can be incurred for a systems-impacting solution under the SEC compared to under other Codes. PR noted that this approach may be too distinct from standard code practices to consider as a practice for wider adoption.

MW highlighted that the BSC has straddled the difference between these approaches by focusing on the problem trying to be resolved and the solution. He noted the form has tabulated information regarding progression routes, meaning Proposers can scan through the document and use the prompts in the tables to then highlight what information relates to the proposed modification. A modification using this template was raised a few months ago, but firm feedback has not yet been received.

PR stressed this was an innovative idea that should be explored further across other Codes. He was interested to know if something like this would be applicable to other Codes and felt the Forum should look at this for next meeting. He noted this would show an innovation the Forum could explore further. He asked Forum members to look at this ahead of next month's meeting and whether there was anything that could be used to simplify the other forms.

ACTION 12/07: Code Administrators to consider how their proposal forms can be simplified.

PR noted that the value of CACoP is in the perception of the products the Forum has produced. He asked the Forum if there were any other products it could put out there. EA noted the Forum has not come up with anything beyond the current set of items. DK stressed the need for quality over quantity, feeling it would be better to have a small number of good products than having many items just to feel like the Forum is doing things. He also asked if Forum members would have the time to maintain further products.

PR asked what Parties had said in the past. He wondered if this would require further market research to seek what Parties want. EA advised that from the products had been discussed at the Engagement Day last year, with the comments mainly being tweaks to the existing items.

EA asked how the Forum could further gauge Parties' views on the CACoP products. DK queried if this was something Ofgem could ask about as part of the CACoP survey. This would be better than sending out yet another feedback request to Parties. JC agreed to raise this with the Ofgem team responsible for the survey.

ACTION 12/08: JC to confirm if Ofgem would be willing to ask further questions on behalf of the CACoP Forum as part of the CACoP survey.

PROVISION OF EXPERT SUPPORT

The Forum noted the use of central mailboxes for Codes and encouraging Parties to use Lead Analysts as a central point of contact. They can then draw in other consultants and technical experts from their organisations to the conversations or meetings required. Members were supportive of adopting these approaches and had nothing further to add.

PROVISION OF CRITICAL FRIEND SUPPORT

EA agreed that it seemed sensible for the role of the critical friend to cover the whole lifecycle of a modification, and even post-implementation. He asked if Parties had the vision to see the end product of a modification. PR felt Parties would expect Code Administrators to be proactively identifying and driving consequential changes forward and would expect more activity on this than is currently happening. RC agreed, noting the industry seems to want Code Administrators to move towards being Code Managers. He felt that any help Code Administrators could give to shaping solutions would be appreciated by Parties. Under the current landscape, Code Administrators' roles are defined. If they are acting purely as administrators then they would be facilitating progression of a solution being developed, but industry seems to be wanting them to take a more active role.

DK highlighted that Parties' regulations teams are being downsized. His discussions with SEC Parties show they are looking for more to be done centrally and for a more Code Manager style service to be provided. RC noted it is about finding that balance. For example, Code Administrators constantly seek more information on smaller supplier impacts, but don't get the responses from them that they'd like.

The Forum recognised there is currently inconsistency in how impacts are drawn out in Modification Reports. DK queried if a list of questions could be prepared to highlight specific impacts of a change. Supporting on consequential changes to other Codes is also required to ensure this delivers the original modification's intent.

The Forum agreed that further work around drawing out the impacts of changes and on progressing consequential changes could be done through the Forum. These will be added to the agendas for subsequent meetings.

WIDER ENGAGEMENT

PR noted that most Parties provide initial contacts via the accessions process. However, the IGT UNC does not have an accessions process for Shippers, and so the IGT UNC often has no direct contact with these Parties. As the IGT UNC has no direct relationship with Shippers, it often liaises with the UNC to relay messages to ensure that Shippers receive these.

DK queried whether the Forum should explore the use of smarter communications rather than wider communications. PR noted that all Code Administrators generally use emails and the more traditional communication channels.

WORKGROUP QUORACY

Greater use of teleconferencing is being echoed across the industry. DK noted that Parties will usually dial into industry meetings that are less than half a day long, rather than attend in person. PR noted that the Forum is limited in what it can do, as it cannot force people to engage with the Codes.

SEEKING RESPONSES TO CONSULTATIONS

The Forum noted the discussion under 'Wider Engagement' has covered this area and there was nothing further raised.

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

DK informed the Forum that last week, Gemserv published an article in Utility Weekly regarding digitalisation that Gemserv is performing which references to the CodeWorks platform. Members were asked to send any questions they may have to DK or PR.

DK highlighted that BEIS has recently discussed with the Smart Metering Key Infrastructure Policy Management Authority (SMKI PMA) a proposal to introduce a new type of XML signing certificates. BEIS is proposing a dispute resolution process for the SEC Panel. As part of this, BEIS is proposing to change the BSC to require the BSC Panel provide support and assistance to the SEC Panel regarding this dispute. BEIS was not sure what the equivalent gas code would be and want to find the Code that allocates registration data identifiers to gas Suppliers. RC noted that identifiers are issued by Xoserve and the governance sits under the UNC.

JC noted that the Energy Data Task Force has changed expectations for use of data within the Energy sector which has an effect on Code Administrators. This was recently discussed at the BSC Panel which resulted in Ofgem trying to coordinate the work across Code Administrators to make sure there is not a duplication of effort. PR advised this should be a cross-Code process and could be discussed at a future Forum meeting. He noted the agenda would need to be shared in advance to ensure the correct expert representation. JC agreed to liaise with his colleague about the information looking to be shared before attending a future CACoP meeting.

EA thanked those Code Administrators who sent through updates to the CMR. He reminded the other Code Administrators to speak to appropriate colleagues to ensure the relevant sections of the spreadsheet are complete. As per the previous action, the MRA has now included an additional column to list any SCR impacts.

MW noted a colleague had questioned the need for DCUSA modification DCP362, as he had thought under the EU withdrawal agreement there didn't appear the need for any change. MW questioned whether this was a DCUSA-specific modification and whether anything has been identified that did need changing. RC agreed to investigate the next steps for this.

9. SUMMARY AND MEETING CLOSE

The Chair confirmed the next meeting would be on 14 April 2020 at the Gemserv offices, although considering the coronavirus there is the potential it could be held fully by teleconference again.

The Chair thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting.