

Code Administration Code of Practice (CACoP) Meeting 004

23 July 2018 at 10:30am

ElectraLink's Offices, Northumberland House, London, WC1V 7JZ

Attendee	Company	Code
Alexandra Moore [AM]	ElectraLink	DCUSA
Alice Siri [AS]	Ofgem	N/A
Chris Shanley [CS]	Joint Office	UNC
Chris Wood [CW]	ELEXON	BSC
David Spillett [DS]	ENA	D Code
Fraser Mathieson [FM]	ElectraLink	SPAA
John Twomey [JH] (Teleconference)	National Grid	CUSC/Grid Code
Lawrence Jones [LJ]	ELEXON	BSC
Glenn Sheern [GS] (Teleconference) (Part-Meeting)	Gemserv	MRASCo
Rachel Bird [RB] (Teleconference)	Gemserv	iGT UNC
Sasha Townsend [ST]	ELEXON	BSC
Simon Fox-Mella [SFM]	Gemserv	MRASCo
Talia Addy [TA]	Gemserv	SECAS
Secretariat		
Elizabeth Lawlor [EL] (Chair)	ElectraLink	DCUSA
Hollie Nicholls [HN] (Secretariat)	ElectraLink	DCUSA

Apologies	Company	Code
Colin Down	Ofgem	N/A
Teresa Thompson	National Grid	CUSC/Grid Code

1. Administration

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed the members to the meeting.
- 1.2 The Secretariat highlighted that the group should be vigilant in their discussions and be mindful of the Competition Act throughout the meeting.
- 1.3 The group agreed that the minutes from the previous meeting, held on 22 May 2018 were a true reflection of the discussions held. The group updated the Actions Log which can be found as Attachment 1.

2. Joint Market Intelligence Service (MIS) Development Group – Sharing Industry Contacts

- 2.1 GS joined the meeting to discuss a potential option for sharing industry contact details via accessing Application Programming Interface (API) data.
- 2.2 CACoP members requested that GS provide examples of scenarios where this data would need to be shared as there could potentially be GDPR implications.
- 2.3 It was explained that the details would only be provided if there was permission to do so and there would be a security level installed within the database to only allow users with the correct permissions to access data that they are eligible to see.
- 2.4 The Chair questioned how the portal would be governed, i.e. who would manage and be responsible for the governance and who would fund it. GS highlighted that at the moment, the MRA and UNC are responsible, but the plan will be for the costs to fall under the Regulatory Instructions and Guidelines (RIGs).
- 2.5 The Joint MIS Development Group would like to set up discussions with the relevant people within the Codes to be able to establish any impacts that this concept may have. It was also agreed that a webinar on the subject will be circulated to CACoP members for review.

ACTION 04/01: GS

3. Industry Updates

BSC

- 3.1 The BSC representative informed the group of P370¹ which will allow non-BSC Parties to be able to raise modifications to the Code. The BSC Panel will then decide whether the modification should be progressed into the BSC Change Process.
- 3.2 It was also noted that the BSC are looking to host an industry wide smart meter day that will be focussing on how each Code will be impacted by the Smart Meter Roll Out. BSC will be looking to get in touch with other Codes to gauge their interest in presenting at the event. The Chair of the group suggested that BSC should get in touch with SMICoP to attend too.
- 3.3 It was also noted that BSC are looking at the impacts on the Code if Brexit goes to a no deal. The SPAA representative agreed to include a question in the communications with Ofgem's EU Exit Group to understand their view on this.

ACTION 04/02: SPAA

- 3.4 The BSC representative also noted that they had issued a White Paper² which is reviewing whether BSC central services could be adapted to offer Settlement solutions in support of individual customers buying electricity from more than one Supplier. A modification proposal is likely to be raised in the next few months and a solution will need to be refined via a Working Group route. The modification will look at charging, meters and connections so there will be impacts on other Codes within the industry.
- 3.5 It was also noted that issue 70³ is looking into whether data from Operational Metering can be used for Settlement purposes and if not, whether the customer will need to install additional metering at the asset for Settlement purposes. Issue 71⁴ is also examining the possibility of Physical Notification for a site being created via an alternative baseline methodology. Both of these issues have arisen via Project Terre⁵ and will be discussed in one issues meeting. The BSC representative agreed to provide updates at the next CACoP meeting as there are potential impacts on other Codes.

CUSC/Grid Code

- 3.6 It was noted that there were lots of modifications being raised to the CUSC that were duplications of discussions being held by Ofgem's Charging Futures Forum. The CUSC Code Administrator will be reviewing the recent consultation that has been published and will be developing next steps for these modifications.

¹ <https://www.elexon.co.uk/mod-proposal/p370/>

² <https://www.elexon.co.uk/about/innovation-developments-industry/enabling-customers-buy-power-multiple-providers/>

³ <https://www.elexon.co.uk/smg-issue/issue-70/>

⁴ <https://www.elexon.co.uk/smg-issue/issue-71/>

⁵ <https://www.elexon.co.uk/mod-proposal/p344/>

- 3.7 It was highlighted that there will be consultation published shortly which is seeking industry opinion for CMP285⁶. The modification is looking at how the CUSC panel is appointed and their election process.
- 3.8 The Grid Code representative highlighted that the Code is still heavily linked with the EU Network Code, so they are reviewing how leaving the European Union is going to affect the Code.
- 3.9 It was also noted that Grid Code are conducting some prioritisation to ensure that different time scales are adapted to help industry manage the amount of change going on at the moment.

DCUSA

- 3.10 There are two major change proposals in the change process which are looking at residual charging within the CDCM and EDCM (DCP 319⁷ and DCP 321⁸). As both of these Working Groups are looking at similar things, the Working Groups are running joint meetings.
- 3.11 The DCUSA representative also noted that there were still five Change Proposals that were still awaiting Authority Consent.

Distribution Code

- 3.12 The D Code representative informed the group that there were currently 13 modifications open. Three are being developed, five are with awaiting Authority approval and five are out for consultation.
- 3.13 It was highlighted that some of the current work being conducted is as follows:
- The D Code had received a send-back letter from the Authority regarding their P2/8⁹ work;
 - There are updates being made to the G99 and G98 documents;
 - D Code are still awaiting response from Ofgem on their P2/7 work; and
 - The consultations that are currently out are reviewing DG connection guides, G99/98 technical arrangements and National Grid's legal separation.

IGT UNC

⁶ <https://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/electricity/codes/connection-and-use-system-code/modifications/cusc-governance-reform-levelling>

⁷ [DCP 319](#)

⁸ [DCP 321](#)

⁹ <http://www.dcode.org.uk/dcrp-er-p28-working-group.html>

- 3.14 The IGT UNC representative noted that RG004¹⁰ is reviewing the governance and administration arrangements for the Code. A RFI was issued to industry for a 20-day consultation window.

MRA

- 3.15 The MRA representative highlighted that they are going to be hosting faster switching expert group which will be reviewing issues that have already been raised and ensuring that they are developed within the Code.
- 3.16 It was noted that there is likely to be a modification raised shortly that will look at making changes to debt assignment protocols under DAP. This will also affect SPAA, so there is potential to have cross-code working.

Ofgem

- 3.17 The Ofgem representative provided an update on the cross-code survey that was conducted by Future Thinking. The field work was now complete, and all Code level reports are waiting for review and final sign off. It was confirmed that Code Administrators will have access to the reports before they are published to the wider industry. The Ofgem representative agreed to obtain an exact date of when this may be. It was also suggested that Future Thinking can attend each Code Panel to present their findings.

ACTION 04/03: Ofgem

SEC

- 3.18 It was highlighted that there are still 30 open modifications within the SEC change process.
- 3.19 One modification to highlight is SECMP0046¹¹ which is proposing to allow DNOs to control Electric Vehicle chargers connected to Smart Meter infrastructure. The first Working Group has been held and there are five potential solutions that are being progressed. The next Working Group meeting, being held on 07 August 2018, will look at each option and will attempt to cut the number of solutions down. SEC also hosted a Code Administrators meeting with those Codes that would have potential impact, and it was agreed that they will need to wait to see the outcomes of the modification before any changes to other Codes can be made.
- 3.20 The SEC representative also discussed the review of Section D work that is ongoing. There are three modifications raised in this area, two are self-governance and one will require Authority determination.

¹⁰ <https://www.igt-unc.co.uk/review-groups/rg004-review-igt-governance-administration-arrangements/>

¹¹ <https://smartenergycodecompany.co.uk/modifications/allow-dnos-to-control-electric-vehicle-chargers-connected-to-smart-meter-infrastructure/>

SPAA

- 3.21 The SPAA representative informed the group that there are currently eight modifications out for Impact Assessment.
- 3.22 There will be a paper submitted to the SPAA Executive Committee at their July meeting to review the potential of a joint SEG and IREG meeting that will be able to discuss cross-code issues across SPAA and MRA.
- 3.23 It was also highlighted that SCP 443¹² will be aiming to enable gas transporters to obtain customer contact details in case of emergencies. This may be interesting to other Codes who would want to do something similar.

UNC

- 3.24 The UNC representative highlighted that an urgent change proposal (0658¹³) was raised for CDSP to identify and develop improvements to LDZ settlement processes.
- 3.25 It was also noted that the modification that was raised to amend the gas transmission charging regime has 10 alternatives raised against it. None of the proposals were approved by the UNC Panel and the determination is now down to the Authority.

4. Horizon Scanning

- 4.1 CACoP members agreed that the horizon scanning document will need to be discussed at the next meeting when members have had a chance to update the new template.

5. Central Modifications Register

- 5.1 CACoP members agreed that there was nothing further to discuss at this meeting and will re-review at the next meeting.

6. CACoP Voting Arrangement

- 6.1 At the CACoP Reporting Workshop held on 26 June 2018 it was questioned how decisions will be made for the group and what the voting arrangements were.
- 6.2 The Chair confirmed that the voting arrangements are in the Terms of Reference and they state that decisions will be made using a majority vote.

7. Cross-Code Working Groups

¹²

<https://www.spaa.co.uk/SitePages/CPDetails.aspx?UID=1324&Source=https://www.spaa.co.uk/SitePages/CPCurrent.aspx>

¹³ https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/sites/default/files/ggf/book/2018-07/Modification%20Register_2.pdf

- 7.1 The Chair highlighted that at a previous SPAA Executive Committee Meeting, it was questioned whether there was anything that CACoP can do to ensure that cross-code Working Groups are ran efficiently.
- 7.2 It was suggested that in instances where an idea originates, and industry are unsure where it sits then CACoP could nominate a lead Code to provide Chair and Secretarial services.
- 7.3 The Chair agreed to draft a proposal for the group to review at the next meeting.

8. Stakeholder Mapping

- 8.1 At the last CACoP meeting held on 22 May 2018, CACoP members decided that they needed to review their stakeholders and decide where to focus their communication strategy.
- 8.2 A few of the stakeholders identified included:
- Suppliers;
 - Generators;
 - DNOs/IDNOs;
 - GTs/IGTs;
 - Meter Operator Agents;
 - Government – Ofgem/BEIS;
 - National Grid;
 - DCC;
 - Xoserve; and
 - Code Administrators.
- 8.3 The SPAA representative agreed to pull a stakeholder map together, including all mentioned in the meeting, for review at the next communication workshop.

9. Any Other Business

- 9.1 One member of the group requested an updated following on from the reporting workshop that was held on 26 June. The Chair informed the group that the finalised CACoP document, including the new innovation principle had been submitted to Ofgem for their approval. The issues raised on the reporting guidelines and matrix were still awaiting feedback from Ofgem before these could be issued for approval.

- 9.2 The BSC representative questioned whether now that joint activity across the Codes is becoming more apparent and all Codes hold different data sets, is there an opportunity to have a Memorandum of Understanding that allows sharing of data for Modification purposes. CACoP members believed that it would depend on what the request was and who owns the data. It was also suggested that the BSC representative could look at the Innovation Link route for this. Examples of when data would be shared will be brought to the next meeting for further discussion.

ACTION 04/04: BSC

- 9.3 The MRASCo representative noted that there will be Secure Communications Work Group set up in the near future to review aligning of legal text with other Codes in terms of GDPR. It was noted that modifications [SECMP0045](#), [SCP 427](#) and [DCP 316](#) are all uploaded to websites for MRA to review if necessary.
- 9.4 The UNC representative questioned whether any other Codes had any Panel Code of Conduct information. UNC are conducting a governance review and requested information regarding this to be sent over.
- 9.5 It was also noted that DCUSA Panel members questioned whether there is anything that CACoP can do in the instances where Ofgem issue a provisional order before a Supplier of Last Resort is appointed. Industry only receive the notification if they have signed up to the updates with Ofgem so there can be instances where some parties are unaware. CACoP members agreed that they would be unsure what they could do without instruction from the Authority.