

# CACoP Forum meeting 23

9 February 2021, 10:00 – 11:50

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
Claire Kerr (CK)	BSC
Jennifer Groome (JG)	CUSC, Grid Code, STC
Helen Bennett (HB)	UNC
Richard Colwill (RC)	DCUSA
Fraser Mathieson (FM)	SPAA
Chris McCann (CM) ( <i>part meeting</i> )	DCode
Roberta Fernie (RF) ( <i>part meeting</i> )	Ofgem
Saskia Barker (SB) ( <i>part meeting</i> )	Ofgem

### 1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting.

### 2. ACTIONS UPDATE

Ref	Action	Update	Status
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	HB highlighted that in order to seek future representation from Xoserve, a clearer rationale/reasoning is required beforehand to understand the exact benefits of Xoserve attending.	<b>Closed</b>

Ref	Action	Update	Status
	future update requests from the CMR.	FM agreed to provide some draft wording explaining the reason for attendance and how the CACoP will benefit. This has been raised as a new action. This action has subsequently been closed.	
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.	An update from each Code was provided under Agenda Item 5. This action has subsequently been closed.	<b>Closed</b>

**ACTION 23/01:** The SPAA (FM) to provide the UNC (HB) with wording highlighting how the CACoP Forum would benefit from future Xoserve attendance.

### 3. CODE UPDATES

*As part of streamlining meeting minutes, the Chair and the Forum previously agreed to reduce the content of 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.*

DK highlighted BSC modification P379 and how this is likely to impact on the Smart arrangements. The SEC Panel agreed in January to write to the BSC Panel about this change, flagging concerns that the BSC has not engaged the SEC over this.

There have also been some Market Domain Data (MDD) changes that arose from DCUSA Change Proposal DCP361 last year, where SEC Parties are now querying what this change means for them and how this will fit into the SEC. SECAS is working with Elexon and Ofgem to try and understand these issues, how they interlink and what SEC Parties would need to do in response to the change.

The Chair highlighted these are examples which would have expected to have some form of strategy about how to collaboratively address these cross-Code issues. The Chair did not believe that full discussions need to be scheduled to discuss every issue. The expectation is that Code Administrators should hold bilateral discussions with each other to progress these issues, with these being noted at the Forum.

JG suggested if a modification was being raised which had cross-Code impacts, that Code should directly contact all other affected Codes instead of waiting to raise this as an issue at the Forum. Several CACoP members agreed that there could be a lack of knowledge in the Forum to determine what specific Codes would likely be affected when a modification is raised, based on the high level summary provided at the Forum.

FM agreed that sometimes cross-Code impacts are spotted, but this can heavily rely on Industry to steer in the right direction. There is a question around who is best placed to work out the cross-Code impacts as CACoP members specifically are not users of the Codes.

The Chair clarified there will be a significant change with the introduction of the Cross-Code Steering Group (CCSG). Ofgem is engaging with Code Administrators to make sure they are aware of this change and are able to support it.

The CCSG will play a much more proactive role in terms of identifying and appointing lead Codes in cross-Code changes. There is an overlap with the CACoP here, and the scope of the Forum in this space will need to be revisited. The REC Code Manager is now at the point where it wishes to engage with the CACoP Forum to understand the CCSG further, what this means and what it means for CACoP.

**ACTION 23/02:** The Chair (PR) to invite the REC Code Manager to the March CACoP Forum meeting to update on the establishment of CCSG and what this will mean for the CACoP Forum moving forward.

RF highlighted the intent of CACoP Principle 13, which requires engaging with Proposers, stakeholders and Working Groups. Ofgem would expect this to be happening across the process and continually reviewed as the solution evolves. The Forum noted the proposal form has a space for identifying cross-Code impacts, but that this may not always be obvious. Members agreed continually analysing the impacts is important.

The Chair suggested having a named person from each Code who would be responsible for co-ordinating cross-Code discussions within their organisations. This will help prevent the issue of things getting lost in the flow of correspondence in group mailboxes. Some shared mailboxes are extremely busy, and having one named individual will provide additional security.

**ACTION 23/03:** Code Administrators to confirm a single point of contact for each Code who can confirm and co-ordinate any cross-Code changes within their Code.

The Forum also noted comments raised by the Chair that the Forum should not be the first time where a cross-Code impact has been raised. There should first be a bilateral discussion between the affected Codes with the respective subject matter experts. The Forum will then be used to re-capture the information. The Forum agreed it would no longer present the Code updates but instead members would recap any new cross-Code impacts identified since the last meeting and the discussions being held.

EA and FM noted that the MRA and the SPAA are in the process of standing down groups ahead of the transfer to the REC.

- Under the MRA, the MRA Development Board (MDB) has been stood down now and will only meet if urgent. The Issue Resolution Expert Group (IREG) and the Green Deal Expert Group (GDEG) are meeting up to August 2021, before handing over to the REC. Any changes raised going forward need approval under both the MRA and the REC. This is to help stabilise the landscape during the transfer.
- The SPAA Change Board will continue to meet until September, but workload is expected to drop significantly. Parties can continue to raise changes, but the Change Board will determine if they are critical or not.

FM noted it is not clear who needs to identify if UNC changes will also require changes under the IGT UNC and was unclear at what point this would be known. PR noted the IGT UNC continually reviews the UNC's output to identify potential impacts, but this is a manual process and instances can be missed. FM considered the best point is likely when the UNC legal text drafting has been prepared, although this comes quite late in the process and is reliant on a Party then raising the consequential change. HB noted the UNC Workgroup will consider if IGT UNC changes are also needed.

## 4. COLLABORATION ON CROSS-CODE MODIFICATIONS

---

The Chair highlighted that this agenda item was raised to highlight open modifications that will impact on other Codes and discuss how to work collaboratively on these and others going forward.

The intended discussion points under this item merged into the above agenda item. As a result, this separate agenda item was no longer needed.

## 5. CACOP CENTRAL WEBSITE UPDATE

---

The Chair informed the Forum that in December 2020 the Forum agreed to circulate the updated Business Case to Code Panels to seek support for the funding contribution for the development and maintenance of a new central website. The cost was around £2,500 for each Code Administrator for the initial implementation, with it then being around £400 per year for ongoing maintenance.

Most Code Administrators had come back confirming their Code Panels decisions; however, there were still some outstanding Codes yet to confirm.

JG noted to her understanding, this has not yet been sent to the National Grid Codes' Panels and asked for an update on other Panels' conclusions. The Chair confirmed an email had received confirming National Grid ESO was happy to proceed on the basis that there is complete consensus from other Codes.

CM confirmed that there have been some offline discussions around circulating this to the DCode Panel for decision but have not yet reached an official decision.

FM confirmed the SPAA is still awaiting formal approval from its Panel; this is being presented on 24 February 2021. It is highly likely that the request to support the Central CACoP website and sign off of the business case will be approved.

The Chair highlighted the last Panel yet to confirm their consent is the IGT UNC Panel. However, as they are not a decision-making group it will be sent to the INA which is the decision-making group, who are meeting this month. Gemserv has confirmed it is happy to give consent on behalf of the IGT UNC to proceed with the website development.

The BSC Panel is the only Panel at present who had not approved the website business case and progression under the current terms set out. MW confirmed this was sent to the BSC Panel in January 2021 who noted it is open to the idea of a website but considered more thought is needed, in particular around quantifying the desire for the website. The BSC Panel suggested circulating a two-minute survey Industry to gather quantifiable views, as the need for the website is not

specifically clear. The Panel also wanted more assurance over how any future developments would be funded between the Codes, and sought a more structured agreement for on-going maintenance, involving service levels and a cap.

PR noted it has taken a long time for the Forum to act on the original feedback around a central website. Support for this had come from Parties originally, and had been backed up in the last Ofgem-led survey. FM agreed that issuing further requests for support would likely frustrate the industry. JG acknowledged the points but was concerned with what any survey would ask of Parties. Asking the industry if it wanted a central website would very likely result in a positive response. RC noted most Code Panels, whose members are elected by Parties, had accepted the business case and was concerned with how the Forum would be perceived if it subsequently went out seeking further support. FM noted the BSC could issue its own survey but felt if the Forum was to do so it would be seen as dithering.

RC suggested proceeding based on majority support, and to split the cost among those Codes who had agreed to contribute. Several members were against the idea of redistributing the costs in this way. The Chair noted that for the website to work, all Codes needed to be involved, and that without full commitment, Gemserv would be liable for any outstanding costs. They noted that the terms of reference did not currently accommodate this scenario, and this would be investigated in the planned review later in the year.

HB asked that if there should be a GDPR breach, who would be responsible for this? The Chair confirmed that this is a fair question and would be set out in the contract with the developer. However, as the website is not likely to hold any personal data, this should not be an issue. HB also asked around a data sharing agreement and would one be needed should Gemserv be the custodian of the website on behalf of Codes. The Chair confirmed Gemserv would not be the custodian of the website but would instead be the custodian of the contract. Each Code Administrator would be responsible for uploading information relating to that Code through their own access.

The Chair was not comfortable with proceeding further without full support from all Codes. They planned to raise this with the governance steering group to seek its input. CK noted Elexon will feed back these discussions at the next BSC Panel meeting.

**Post Meeting Note:** *The BSC Panel subsequently provided its support for the costs to fund the development of the website on 11 February 2021. This was subject to the CACoP Forum carrying out a post-implementation review within 12 months of the website go-live, which the Chair agreed could be delivered by the Forum. Following this decision and the updates provided by other Codes at the meeting, the Chair's understanding is that support has been provided from all the Codes, accounting for those which had agreed to proceed subject to consensus. Consequently, Gemserv will now look to engage with the web developer to commence the build of the website.*

## 6. REGULAR UPDATES IN THE CACoP NEWSLETTER

---

DK noted that the CACoP Newsletter had been created in 2019 to provide a regular summary of CACoP Forum and cross-Code activities for Parties. However, the updates provided by Codes has been inconsistent, and this may be due to it being unclear what types of updates should be included.

Recent newsletters have included updates on:

- Distribution Network Operators' proposals to be able to use smart metering functionality to reduce the charging rate of electric vehicle chargers during times of network stress, which impacts the SEC and the DCUSA.
- The Targeting Charging Review Significant Code Review (SCR), which impacts the CUSC and the DCUSA.
- The Secure Data Exchange Portal (SDEP), a development affecting the MRA and the SPAA.
- Project MARI, which impacts the BSC and the Grid Code.

JG and HB both agreed that cross-Code updates should look to be included within the newsletter. However, they sometimes struggle to determine what other updates should be provided that do not relate to cross-Code modifications.

The Chair noted the first step would be to seek some qualitative feedback from Parties about what they would like to see from the newsletter. The second step would be to seek analytics which is not currently done as the newsletter is issued across several different Codes. This can look to be done once the website has been developed.

Updates on improvements made across Codes from the CACoP surveys should also look to be included to provide a consolidated view.

Members agreed to have a think of potential updates that can look to be included ahead of the April 2021 CACoP newsletter. DK noted that members could raise any ideas they weren't sure about at the Forum in advance of the newsletter being issued, to seek the views of the group on including it.

## 7. PARTY ENGAGEMENT IN CODES DIGITALISATION

---

PR highlighted the IGT UNC has been experiencing party engagement issues since 2018, which has culminated in two longstanding Shipper Panel vacancies as well as lower meeting turn out and consultation responses.

The IGT UNC Workgroup and Panel have been discussing different approaches to increasing engagement and have taken the following steps to date:

- Engagement survey – Sent out to the IGT UNC and UNC distribution lists to canvas for potential issues of engagement;
- Running an open-ended Panel election Process to ensure that time pressures are not an issue. This is publicised through the IGT UNC and UNC distribution lists on a monthly/six-weekly basis;
- Approaching Industry meetings – the IGT UNC Shipper Panel member has lobbied at Data Services Contract (DSC) Change Management Meetings as well as a monthly constituency meeting; and
- Considered initial steps of Code digitisation.



The IGT UNC Panel has asked the Code Administrator to approach the CACoP Forum to discuss party engagement and digitisation. These discussions will feed into a wider review in the IGT UNC on the Code's approach to party engagement and potential next steps.

HB noted an internal discussion was held earlier where the UNC confirmed they would be more interested to find out how the REC is managing digitisation as it is exploring this. The UNC currently does not have any problems with involvement from Panel or workgroups and are well attended.

FM highlighted there was a previous concern under the SPAA around not being able to fill every seat during its election period due to the wind-down of the SPAA. Therefore, measures had been put in place to include more direct engagement with Parties highlighting the benefits and why they should represent the Industry.

The Chair summarised that the wider industry is not experiencing the same issues of the IGT UNC, however they will feed back the above statements.

## 8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

---

DK asked if it would be beneficial to undertake a review of the Horizon Scan as it has been a while since it was last updated.

**ACTION 23/04:** The BSC to circulate the Horizon Scanner to CACoP members to make the necessary updates before it is reviewed at the meeting in April 2021.

JG noted that the National Grid managed Codes had issued their own satisfaction survey in lieu of there not being a wider one led by Ofgem this year. Responses show there has been a significant improvement based on the outputs from the previous CACoP survey. The websites have been updated and National Grid ESO has improved proposal templates and communications since the last survey; the feedback has been extremely complimentary in these three areas.

JG also wanted to thank Elexon for sharing best practice on recent joint modifications and noted that representatives from each of the BSC and CUSC Panels had attended the other to see what could be learnt. CK noted if any Panel Chairs wanted to attend the BSC Panel or have the BSC Panel Chair attend theirs, to let her know.

## 9. SUMMARY AND MEETING CLOSE

---

The next CACoP Forum meeting will be held on 9 March 2021.

The Chair thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting.