

CACoP Forum meeting 21

8 December 2020, 10:00 – 11:40

Teleconference

Final Minutes

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

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting.

The Chair noted apologies from Fraser Mathieson (SPAA).

2. MEETING 20 MINUTES

The Secretary noted no comments were received on the minutes from CACoP meeting 20 which took place on 10 November 2020. The Forum approved the minutes as written.

3. ACTIONS UPDATE

Ref	Action	Update	Status
11/05	Each Code Administrator to consider what steps are	It was noted in meeting 12 that the integration of the REC would be	Closed

Ref	Action	Update	Status
	needed to bring the REC into the process for identifying cross-Code impact.	expedited once Code Managers are appointed beyond June 2020. This action will remain open and on hold until decisions have been confirmed.	
18/04	Code Administrators to review the updated business case and provide comments offline by 25 September 2020.	The CACoP Chair (PR) updated the Centralised CACoP website business case which was subsequently circulated as part of the meeting papers. A further discussion was held under Agenda Item 6.	Closed
18/05	Code Administrators to discuss the business case with Code Panels and/or management teams in October 2020 to seek commitment for funding the central website.	The CACoP Chair (PR) updated the Centralised CACoP website business case which was subsequently circulated as part of the meeting papers. A further discussion was held under Agenda Item 6.	Closed
19/04	Code Administrators to present the Consumer Benefits Guidance Document to their relevant Codes before making appropriate changes to their templates from whatever mechanism is used to do so. Code Administrators will then be requested to report back at the next CACoP meeting in November 2020 advising on progress and whether further work should be progressed.	Updates from several Code Administrators was discussed at the last CACoP meeting in November 2020. The BSC confirmed the Consumer Benefits Guidance Document has been presented to its Panel and is waiting to be approved. The BSC Panel's decision will be presented at the January 2021 CACoP Forum meeting.	Closed
19/07	Gemserv (PR) to adopt all open actions from ElectraLink relating to the Central CACoP Business case such as updating the CACoP website business case to include a breakdown of associated Code costs per annum, alongside a risks and mitigations matrix.	The CACoP Chair (PR) updated the Centralised CACoP website business case which was subsequently circulated as part of the meeting papers. A further discussion was held under Agenda Item 6.	Closed
19/08	Gemserv (PR) to seek third party quotes from website developers to design a centralised CACoP Website and update the business case with associated outcomes ready for discussion at the	The CACoP Chair (PR) updated the Centralised CACoP website business case which was subsequently circulated as part of the meeting papers. A further discussion was held under Agenda Item 6.	Closed

Ref	Action	Update	Status
	next CACoP Forum in November 2020.		
19/09	MRA (EA) to incorporate agreed changes to the Central Modifications Register which should be made effective from the next update in November 2020.	<p>The changes discussed at the October 2020 CACoP Forum meeting have been incorporated. The register has been circulated to industry requesting for updates by 3 December 2020.</p> <p>Positive feedback has been received from wider Parties however after raising some concerns, the Forum agreed the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend the Central Modifications Register to only include 'Live' modifications. The 'Live & Closed' field should be removed Include a 'Other' as a new field within the Party Impacted Section for any non-standard parties to be added <p>MRA (EA) advised these changes will be included within the January 2021 Central Modifications Register as updates have already been published from Other Codes.</p> <p>The latest Central Modifications Register for December 2020 can be found here.</p>	Closed
19/10	ElectraLink (FM) to work alongside UNC (HB) and the Chair (PR) in starting conversations to seek future representation from Xoserve, which will in turn feed into future update requests from the CMR.	<p>There was no progress reported against this action.</p> <p>HB previously agreed to reach out to Xoserve to seek future CACoP Forum engagement, subject to some supportive wording being provided by ElectraLink (FM). As this is yet to be received, SPAA (NB) agreed to work with ElectraLink (FM) and UNC (HB) to seek future engagement. In addition, the CACoP Chair (PR) agreed to provide support where necessary.</p>	Open
20/01	Gemserv (PR) to re-circulate the latest CACoP Website business case document to the UNC (HB).	The latest CACoP Website business case was circulated to UNC (HB) post meeting, and as also part of the meeting papers.	Closed
20/02	Code Administrators to consider potential items which	No items were received ahead of the meeting.	Closed

Ref	Action	Update	Status
	can be included as part of the 2021 Forward Work Plan.	A further discussion was held under Agenda Item 9.	
20/03	Code Administrators to provide any further information on the appointment of non-Party Panel members to National Grid ESO (JH).	The Chair (PR) agreed to close this action.	Closed

4. CODE UPDATES

As part of streamlining future meeting minutes, the Chair (PR) and Forum agreed to reduce the content of future meeting minutes.

Whilst each Code Administrator representative provided an update on notable activities under their Code(s), Codes/Parties are requested to refer to the updated [Central Modifications Register](#) for any cross-Code related activities.

5. JANUARY 2021 CACoP NEWSLETTER

DK provided an update on the content that is currently being drafted for January's CACoP Newsletter. The following items have been proposed:

- Spotlight on the Forward Work Plan for 2021
- Cross-Code Working updates
- Recap of the RCC SCR Engagement Day (whilst including the link to the live recording which has now been published onto the MRA website)
- Principle Focus on CACoP Principle 6 (which relates to Proposer ownership)

DK requested for Code Administrators to send content and any further items to cacop@gemserv.com by 31 December 2020. The draft Newsletter content will then be circulated with papers on 5 January 2021 before the Forum approves the content at the Forum meeting on 12 January 2021.

ACTION 21/01: Code Administrators to provide cross-Code updates and newsletter items to cacop@gemserv.com by 31 December 2020.

6. CACOP WEBSITE BUSINESS CASE

The Chair (PR) informed the Forum that the Central CACoP Website business case document had been updated and was circulated as part of meeting documentation, to fully develop anticipated costs.

Based on provisional costs, it is expected that the cost for initial design, development, test, and implementation of a website meeting the requirements would be in the region of £27,000. It was also highlighted that ongoing third-party charges with respect to hosting and support, including implementation of periodic platform updates and security checks, are expected to be in the region of £4,000 per annum.

The Chair highlighted that a memorandum of understanding will be established between Gemserv and each of the code administrators, whereby Gemserv will maintain the contract with – and ensure payment is made to – the relevant third party developer and will invoice each of the code administrators for an equal portion of the associated charges.

As part of the next steps, Code Administrators should look to reach out to their Code Panels to seek commitment to partly fund the development of the centralised website. Once positive communication has been received, Gemserv will formally engage with developers to commence the build. The suggestion is that after approval from Code Panels, the development and establishment should take around three months.

UNC (HB) suggested revisiting the concept of the centralised website and how this would be managed/what protection will be built in terms of GDPR. The Chair (PR) referred back to the several iterations noting that, nothing has changed in terms of the requirements for the centralised website. However, a firm set of technical requirements are yet to be established with the developers, but security is guaranteed.

Each Code Administrator will have administrative access to the website to update their common areas however, Gemserv will play a vital role in setting up User profiles. The management of content and information relating to the future website enhancements can be found in Section three of the website business case. The Chair (PR) reiterated that, once confirmation has been received from Code Panels, the website will be designed collaboratively with the developers in order to achieve continuous progress.

National Grid (KS) thanked the Chair for work undertaken to date however, stressed the importance to include a separate section on risks and how this could potentially be mitigated. As such, the Chair agreed to update the latest website business case with a deadline for final comment by 5pm on Friday 11 December 2020.

The considered risks to be included are as follows:

- Duplication of information
 - There is a risk that documentation held on the central website will become inaccurate or out of line with information held on individual code websites
 - There is a risk that the requirement to maintain information on a central website may lead to duplication of effort and inefficiency of process

- Resource involved in each Code
 - There is a risk that information relating specifically to individual codes may be updated by another code administrator's admin user
- Control of data
 - There is a risk that the financial contributions from each code administrator (initial and ongoing) are not forthcoming or are delayed

In light of this, the quote provided by website developers is only valid for a certain period of time meaning, the aim is to get the business case finalised as soon as reasonably practical before seeking Code Panel commitment for funding.

ACTION 21/02: Code Administrators to provide final comments against the updated website business case (in particular the updated risks and mitigations within section 5), to cacop@gemserv.com by Friday 11 December 2020.

ACTION 21/03: Code Administrators to present the finalised Central Website Business Case to their Code Panels in order to gain commitment for funding by the end of January 2021. By doing so will allow Gemserv to accept the quote produced by third party website developers who can then start to build the proposed website.

7. RCC SCR SEMINAR DEBRIEF

The Chair (PR) thanked the Forum and those that contributed as part of the RCC SCR Engagement Day Webinar which took place on Thursday 19 November 2020. There was attendance from over 120 Representatives, with confirmation that the engagement day had exceeded expectations. Speakers/presenters were proficient and able to expertly answer any questions raised and the overall feedback has been overwhelmingly positive.

Forum members noted the link to the live recording and the presentation slides have been uploaded to the MRA website [here](#). In addition, the Secretary (HB) agreed to circulate these details to the Forum so that this information can be pushed out to wider Users.

ACTION 21/04: The Secretary (HB) to circulate the live webinar link from the RCC SCR engagement day which took place in November 2020, for Code Administrators to push this out to wider industry for reference.

8. SEC MODIFICATION PROCESS REVIEW

As part of the previous update, the Forum noted that the SEC is undertaking a full end to end review of SEC Section D 'Modification Process', whilst seeking feedback from Ofgem and other various Parties. The Forum were requested to provide information on how their change process is overseen, whether this be by their Code Panels or other sub-committees and how their approach works alongside the merits.

Under the SEC, the Panel is responsible for the progression of the modification process whereas, the Change Sub-Committee works to define the issue before taking to Change Board for final decision on modifications. As a result of the SEC Section D review, SECAS are looking to streamline to make this approach more efficient.

The Chair noted there is a more simplistic view on behalf of IGT UNC in that, changes and impacts are much lower compared to other Code modifications. There is a modification Panel which receives Change Proposals before agreeing to send them out to a modification workstream group who meet monthly to develop the change in order to finalise the workgroup report. The modification Panel will then circulate the report for Consultation. UNC (HB) mirrored the IGT UNC process in that, they too have a modification Panel alongside DSC change management and contract management committees.

National Grid (KS) clarified Grid Code have a review Panel where Proposals are reviewed at early stages which is different to the formalised Grid Code Panel. These modifications will be taken to the mentioned Panels before deciding whether these Proposals should be taken to Working Groups for further development or whether they should be sent to Authority for approval.

The MRA holds an executive committee which is formed in line with a strategic Panel. The Development Board receive the change Proposals in a fairly established state. In addition, SPAA have an overarching Panel which delegates responsibility to change Boards. Issues are raised at an Issue Resolution Group before developing into a solution. The change Proposals are then sent to change Board where recommendations will either be approved or rejected.

RC noted DCUSA have a Panel where initial assessments are made but, also have two standing groups which review and assess the change alongside the charging methodology. Both of these groups are responsible for reviewing the change to decide whether the proposal better facilitates the Codes' objectives.

The Forum were then asked to consider how effective are Working Groups in inputting to a modification's development.

Around 18 months ago, the SEC moved to an approach where one Working Group meeting is held monthly whilst holding ad-hoc sessions for modifications that require an in-depth review/discussion. Feedback from Parties to date has been positive given current time constraints within the industry.

UNC (HB) advised when a modification is raised, it is sent straight to UNC Panel to determine which of the Working Groups this should fall into (such as distribution WGs, MTCMF/Charging). All modifications are discussed as the Working Groups including development of the Report and Legal text to support the modification. IGT UNC are similar in that, a single Working Group will meet monthly to prioritise modifications rather than hold stand-alone meetings.

NB highlighted SPAA rarely hold Working Group meetings are the changes that are raised are relatively straight forward. Should a Working Group meeting take place, attendees will send a request to the SPAA Executive Committee to seek funding after setting a work plan on what is expected to be achieved and presented.

Lastly, the Forum considered how a final decision on a modification is made under each Code. Again, within the SEC, the Change Board sit separately to the SEC Panel who vote against these decisions before sending to Panel with their final recommendation.

RC highlighted DCUSA hold Party votes whereby, the Change Report will be sent to Panel requesting approval. When proceeding to vote and depending on the impacted Parties, for part 1 matters (Authority determined modifications), the modification will be approved if agreeance from a Party category is greater than 50%. Part 2 matters (which do not require Authority approval), the same principle applies except the agreed total should be greater than 65%. The same threshold applies to that in SPAA.

Based on previous quoracy issues, the SEC are looking to see whether it would be beneficial for Party categories to vote beforehand should they be unable to attend a meeting where a decision is required.

The Forum noted the update.

9. FORWARD WORK PLAN 2021

The Forum noted the forward work plan has now been drafted for 2021 and will look to cover the following:

- Implementing and integrating the central CACoP website
- Collating information and guidance on Code processes
- Assessing and documenting the impacts of change
- Embedding and reviewing the consumer benefits analysis approach
- Reviewing the Applicable Code Objectives
- Developing a consistent approach to identifying cross-Code impacts
- Reviewing the CACoP Forum's terms of reference

The Forum noted the update and additional next steps which will consist of a paper being brought back to the January 2021 CACoP Forum meeting to specifically expand on each given point before seeking approval at the next meeting.

ACTION 21/05: Gemserv to formalise the forward work plan for 2021 by expanding on each topic as part of a paper which will look to be taken to the January 2021 CACoP Forum meeting for approval.

10. 2021 MEETING DATES

The Secretary provided an overview of the proposed meeting dates for 2021, highlighting that Gemserv were proposing to continue with the same schedule in that, meetings will be scheduled for the second Tuesday every month.

The Forum also noted that CACoP Forum chairmanship rotates each calendar year, moving through the Codes alphabetically. In 2021, the CACoP Forum's chairmanship will therefore move from the IGT UNC to the next Code alphabetically, which will be the Master Registration Agreement (MRA). As

both Codes are administered by Genserv, this will mean no change in either the Forum Chair or the secretariat.

The CACoP Forum agreed the meeting dates for 2021.

ACTION 21/06: The Secretary (HB) to issue all calendar invites to the CACoP Forum for 2021 by **COB** Friday 11 December 2020.

11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

JH highlighted that CUSC and Grid Code Panel members need to have signed up to the relevant framework agreements, but for some seats, the relevant Parties are not CUSC Schedule 1 Parties. This means they need to write to Ofgem to gain materially impacted Party status. JH believed the National Grid ESO Codes were the only ones that had this restriction. National Grid ESO has spoken to Ofgem, with the consensus being approval of this status could be taken on by National Grid ESO.

12. SUMMARY AND MEETING CLOSE

The next CACoP Forum meeting will be held on 12 January 2021.

The Chair thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting.