

## Issue 101 Workgroup Meeting 3 Summary

### Summary

#### 1. Meeting Objectives

The Chair welcomed attendees and presented the meeting objectives:

- Recap Issue Group meeting 2;
- Seek Issue Group feedback on revised timeline and plan;
- Present updated thinking on DIP Change Management process following WG2.

#### 2. Meeting 2 Recap

Elexon summarised the discussions from the previous meeting, and provided action updates. During discussion of the action to allow BSC Change Proposals (CPs) where only EMAR items are impacted, it was noted that this is a wider issue with the BSC change process that could be required regardless of DIP and Issue 101.

#### 3. DIP Change Management

Elexon presented a proposed change management process, based on the previous Workgroup discussions, for comment. The high-level process involved the following stages: change submission, Code Manager validation, Initial assessment, solution development, consultation, and decision. A Workgroup member commented that it should be ensured that the process was not required to be linear, as simple changes may not require every stage.

##### 3.1 Validation

The Workgroup agreed on criteria under which a DIP change could be rejected by the Code Manager, and that rejection could be appealed to the DIP Board. For transparency, rejected changes should be reported to the DIP Board, and pre-raise changes should be displayed on the DIP website for transparency.

##### 3.2 Initial Assessment

During the initial assessment, the Code Manager should define the issue and solution, identify the impacts, and decide upon an appropriate progression route and timetable. The Workgroup felt that the Code Manager should be empowered to make decisions about progression routes and timetables, and should not have to wait for DIP Board approval. They did think there was benefit in presenting these to the DIP Board for comment and challenge.

##### 3.3 Solution development

The potential need to utilise external experts, such as third party legal advice, was discussed. It was questioned how budget for this would be managed, including if there would be a threshold before approval would be required. The Workgroup also discussed how multiple solutions should be handled. Ultimate decision on which solutions were progressed should sit with the Code Manager, but they should provide reasoning behind the decision.

##### 3.4 Decision

The majority of decisions would be made by the DIP Board, but self-governance criteria should be used to determine which changes are sent to the Authority. Ofgem should also be allowed to call in any change for decision. Where the DIP Code Manager and DIP Board do not agree, the decision will also go to Ofgem.

### Actions

No.	Action	Owner
1.	REC and Elexon to workshop ideas for optimising the BSC CP process for DIP interface change and the interaction with REC	Elexon
2.	Elexon to consider budget arrangements for solution development	Elexon
3.	Elexon to work up a proposed solution for the DIP Board arrangements	Elexon
4.	Workgroup to email Elexon with any comments about the DIP Board and participants within the DIP change process.	Workgroup