

Elxon’s Comments on Consultation Responses

P474: Consultation on the proposed changes to the BSC to enable the ongoing governance, funding and operation of the Data Integration Platform (DIP)

This Consultation was issued on 17 June 2024 to seek industry feedback on the proposed changes to the BSC and the draft DIP Subsidiary Documents (DSDs), with responses invited by 17 July 2024.

Elxon has reviewed the responses and had discussions with several respondents and the Proposer. This document presents Elxon’s comments on the consultation responses. Some responses have been combined and/or edited for clarity. The full public consultation responses can be viewed in the consultation response document. Any confidential responses will be visible to the Authority only.

Comments relating to Information Security Management System (ISMS) and ISO 27001

Consultation Response	Elxon comments	Actions Required
<p>We have concerns around the reference to ISO/IEC 27000 throughout the legal text and supporting documents. This certification has a number of serials that may not apply to industry parties and which they will be bound to given the wording in this change.</p> <p>We also note that references to ISO 27000 and ISO27001 appear to be used interchangeable through the documentation. We require clarity on the serials to be used. If ISO27000 is to be used, then this includes all associated serials, and the impact is significant.</p>	<p>The legal text and supporting documents state that DIP Users will have to adhere to ISO 27000 series, <u>to the extent that the standards are applicable to their organisation</u>. The intention of this was for DIP Users to be ISO 27001 certified or, where that is not appropriate for the DIP Users business model, to show how their Information Security Management Systems (ISMS) aligns with the relevant parts of the ISO2700 series.</p> <p>These requirements has come from the Interface Code of Connection (DEL1197) produced by MHHS, which included the requirement for ISO 27001 certification or equivalency.</p>	<p>In light of the discomfort around the reference to the full ISO 27000 series, all references have been removed or explained. The legal text and supporting documents refer to ISO 27001 certification, or equivalent.</p>

Consultation Response	Elexon comments	Actions Required
<p>In the Data Integration Platform Supplement section 3.3.3, the text states:</p> <p><i>“Without prejudice to chapter 1 of this DIP Supplement, the DIP Manager shall review and, where relevant, update all relevant requirements relating to information security, in order to ensure it remains aligned to ISO 27001”.</i></p> <p>However, the requirements elsewhere vary between being aligned to ISO 27001, adhering to the requirements of the ISO 27000 series, and complying with guidance on which parts of ISO 27000 series is applicable.</p>	<p>DIP Supplement 3.3.3 means that the DIP Rules, and any guidance we issue shall be commensurate with ISO 27001 and be updated when ISO 27001 is updated, for example, it was last updated in 2022 and changed from ISO/IEC 27001:2013 to ISO/IEC 27001:2022.</p> <p>ISO/IEC 27001 certification means that an organisation adheres to the relevant parts of the ISO 27000 series for their organisation, which is why both have been referred to.</p>	<p>The legal text and supporting documents now refer to ISO 27001 certification or equivalent only, with any references to the ISO 27000 series explained.</p>
<p>We believe that further clarification on which parts of the ISO 27000 series are applicable is essential in this proposal to define explicitly which parts are applicable to DIP Users, as without this it remains open to interpretation, and could place an additional burden on parties.</p>	<p>The Information Security Management System (ISMS) Guidance referenced in the drafting has been published on the Elexon website to give details on how to comply with ISMS requirements and ISO/IEC 27001 equivalency.</p> <p>As the guidance states, the DIP Manager has discretion and is open to discussion, meaning that the DIP Manager will be able to determine which requirements are relevant, specific to a DIP User’s market type.</p>	<p>Elexon have communicated the ISMS expectations to the respondents, and have held a drop-in session to discuss the ISMS requirements with any interested parties.</p> <p>Elexon will continue to engage to discuss further their submissions and requirements.</p> <p>The ISMS Guidance has been updated following these consultation responses to provide further clarity.</p>
<p>Currently the ISMS requirements are placed on all DIP Users. We propose that the ISMS requirements should only apply to systems that connect directly to the DIP. This would mean that DIP Users using a DIP Connection Provider (DCP) would not need to meet the requirements, only the DCP would.</p>	<p>There are concerns that, where a DIP User intends to connect to the DIP via a third party, they could, at any time, stop using the third party and connect to the DIP directly themselves. If the DCP’s ISMS were to be accepted, then any DIP User moving from a third-party DCP would have to give sufficient notice and assurance that their ISMS meets the requirements. If sufficient notice is not given, there is a risk that a DIP User’s DIP access would have to be revoked until they can prove they have the minimum ISMS requirements in place.</p>	<p>The ISMS requirements have been updated to allow for the DCP ISMS to be considered where a third party is being used to connect to the DIP. The requirement for sufficient notice before ending DCP use has been added.</p>

Comments relating to the application of BSC Modification Rules to the DIP Supplement

Consultation Response	Elexon comments	Actions Required
<p>We do not support the inclusion of the DIP Supplement within the scope of the BSC Modification Rules. This is a change to proposals presented in the Issue 101 report, which clearly captured the DIP Supplement within the scope of the DIP CR process.</p> <p>The principle of governance separation from the BSC Panel was subject to two consultations and was clearly agreed by industry following signalling from Ofgem that this was the desired approach.</p> <p>We note the reference in the P474 Modification Proposal to Ofgem requesting amendments to the legal text in order to avoid making changes to the National Grid ESO's electricity Transmission Licence. In responding to this request, we are concerned that alternative approaches, that would have lessened the impacts, and been more in keeping with the agreed principles, have not been adequately developed and discussed with impacted parties.</p>	<p>As noted, the need for the DIP Supplement to fall out of scope of the DIP CR processes is due to being unable to amend National Grid ESO's electricity Transmission Licence at this time. The Licence is very explicit on the change process that changes to the BSC must go through, and the DIP Supplement is part of the BSC.</p> <p>Several different options were discussed with Ofgem, and this was the preferred interim solution. It is possible that this issue will be resolved in the future, for example during Code Reform. In the meantime, several mitigations have been put in place to reduce the impact to DIP Users, as discussed below.</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>
<p>It is not clear why all material content from the DIP Supplement has not been moved into the DSDs. Such an approach would better mitigate the risks noted below and would have more closely matched the industry developed and agreed governance model.</p> <p>For context, the DIP Supplement contains material provisions for the operation of the DIP Rules. For example, it includes the DIP Relevant Objectives, the Categories of DIP Users, DCAB membership, elections and term, data protection and confidentiality provisions, DIP CR implementation arrangements, cost recovery, requirements on all DIP Users to onboard to the DIP prior to accessing the service etc.</p>	<p>Prior to raising P474, as much content was removed from the DIP Supplement as practical. It is noted that there is still some material content, but for the most part the requirements in the DIP Supplement are high level and unlikely to be changed.</p> <p>The potential for moving further content from the DIP Supplement as a result of consultation responses received was considered, but it was decided that no significant changes to the P474 legal text should be made at this stage to ensure transparency.</p> <p>Following Implementation of P474 it will be possible to raise a BSC Modification and consequential DIP CR to amend the location of DIP Rules content if desired, which will allow the changes to be fully communicated with DIP Users, and considered by the DCAB.</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>

Consultation Response	Elxon comments	Actions Required
<p>Throughout discussions on Issue 101 it was clear that a separate governance body was required to recognise that the DIP User community are not covered by the BSC Panel representation.</p>	<p>We have endeavoured to retain the integrity of the Issue 101 proposals while meeting the Licence requirements by ensuring that the BSC Panel is not a decision maker in respect to the DIP Rules.</p> <p>All changes to the DIP Supplement will require assessment by the DIP Manager and, where the change is material, a recommendation from the DCAB. These will be included within the BSC Modification report and considered by the Workgroup and Panel.</p> <p>The changes to the definition of “Self Governance Criteria” in BSC Section X-1 mean that the BSC Panel is not able to make a decision on the DIP Rules, only make a recommendation to the Authority, therefore Ofgem will make all determinations on whether changes to the DIP Supplement will be Implemented. While Elxon is not privy to the Authority’s decision making process, it is assumed that consideration will be given to the views of the DCAB.</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>
<p>Any change to the DIP Supplement will now be assessed against the Relevant Objectives of the BSC rather than the Relevant Objectives of the DIP. We are concerned that this will prevent the DIP from being developed in the way intended.</p>	<p>In accordance with DSD004 2.9.2 the recommendation of the DIP Manager/DCAB will consider the DIP Applicable Objectives so that the Authority, when making their decision, shall be aware of the impact on the DIP Applicable Objectives. This is also reflected in the proposed BSC Section F 2.8A</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>
<p>The rights of appeal of DIP Users that are not BSC Parties are materially reduced from the Issue 101 proposal. The original intent was for all DIP Manager decisions on DIP CRs (including changes to the DIP Supplement) to be appealable to DCAB. DCAB decisions would be appealable to the Authority. Under P474, our understanding is that DIP Users that are not DIP Parties do not have appeal rights against BSC Panel decisions and the rights to appeal against an Authority decision to approve/reject a proposal are constrained. We do not consider this to be an acceptable position.</p>	<p>The BSC Panel will not be making decisions in respect of the DIP Rules, therefore a DIP Users ability to appeal BSC Panel decisions is not relevant. Any appeals will be made to the Authority via their appeal processes.</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>
<p>Unlike the proposal set out in the Issue 101 report, the BSC Modification Rules do not permit any person to raise a change to the DIP Supplement.</p>	<p>The proposed new BSC Section F2.1.1(j) will allow the DIP Manager and any DIP User to raise a Modification Proposal to amend the DIP Supplement or to a Code Embedded DIP Rule (the parts of the BSC not in the DIP Supplement or DSDs that form the DIP Rules).</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>

Consultation Response	Elaxon comments	Actions Required
<p>The views of DIP Users are not sought on a BSC Modification that impacts the DIP Supplement. Instead, the views of DIP Manager and/or DCAB are requested as a proxy.</p>	<p>Anybody, including all DIP Users can respond to a BSC Modification consultation (BSC Section F 2.5.4(c) and 2.7.4) and all consultation responses will be forwarded to the Authority as per F2.7.7 – this will be in addition to the DIP Manager/DCAB’s recommendations. The DCAB constituency representatives will seek constituency views before making any recommendations.</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>
<p>There is drafting overlap between the DIP Supplement and the DSDs. Where a proposal requires a change to both the DIP Supplement and the DSDs, dual governance creates a risk of confusion, inefficiency in having to run two change processes and potential for conflict between the decisions made by the BSC Panel (in relation to the DIP Supplement) and DCAB (in relation to the DSDs) given their differing Code Objectives.</p> <p>Notwithstanding our first preference that all material content is moved to the DSDs, we propose that, where there is an overlap, the detail is removed from the DIP Supplement and retained in the DSDs to ensure the original principles can be applied to these rules.</p>	<p>Where this arises, the intention is to handle it as a consequential code change following the CCSG principles. There are several precedents of changes being made to the BSC at the same time as other Codes. Further, as the Authority will be determining whether to approve the DIP Supplement change, they can also direct changes to the DSDs as per DSD004 2.3.1 (the Authority can raise the DIP CR if needs be). If the Authority is concerned that the DIP Manager may not approve a consequential change to the DIP Supplement, they can take the decision themselves as per DSD004 2.8.6.</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>
<p>The change process for the DIP is via the BSC Panel. DNO’s do not have a vote on this panel and therefor are impacted by any changes made by this proposal without being able to input into the final decision.</p>	<p>The BSC Panel will only be involved for changes to the BSC, i.e. to the DIP Supplement or Embedded DIP Rules. For these Modifications, the BSC Panel will not make decisions; they will only make a recommendation to the Authority, who will make a determination. Additionally, any material changes to the DIP Supplement will require a recommendation from the DCAB which will involve the DCAB Distributor representation seeking the views of the constituency.</p> <p>DNOs will also be able to respond to any consultations on DIP changes, whether via a BSC Modification or a DIP CR. BSC Panel recommendations to the Authority are always be subject to consultation.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that BSC Panel voting members are not representative of different types of Party, they are independent of a market sector and act on behalf of the whole industry. Distributors do have a non-voting representative on the BSC Panel.</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>

Comments on Assurance of DIP Rules

Consultation Response	Elxon comments	Actions Required
<p>We do not support the proposal for a DIP User, that is also a Party to an Industry Code (e.g. the REC), to be subject to the performance assurance requirements of that Industry Code should there be a breach of the DIP Rules. This is proposed in DIP Supplement para 1.5.5 and DSD003 para 4.13.</p> <p>There are currently no provisions under the REC that require a party to comply with the DIP Rules and therefore no rights under the REC for action to be taken for non-compliance with the DIP Rules. The REC arrangements for MHHS (developed through industry consultation and now going through the MHHS Programme Consistency Check Consultation ahead of M6 approval by CCAG at the end August) require that REC Parties complete DIP Testing and become a DIP User in accordance with the DIP Rules. Under these arrangements, a REC Party would only be in breach in the event they are suspended or removed as a DIP User.</p> <p>We note that new provisions could be added to the REC to require assurance of the DIP Rules to fall within its scope. However, such an approach should be avoided as it would create confusion on assurance arrangements between the DIP Rules and creates a risk of double jeopardy which would be unreasonable and would expose RECCo to a risk of challenge if we sought to impost a Performance Assurance Technique (PAT) for something that should more appropriately be dealt with under the DIP Rules.</p>	<p>Elxon agrees that if a non-compliance with DIP Rules is identified then it should be handled by the DIP Manager in the first instance, as detailed in DSD003. Where the DIP User is also a Party to an Industry Code, the relevant Code Body would also be informed of any breaches.</p> <p>If rectification of a compliance issue is not possible, then the only recourse for the DIP Manager is to suspend or remove a DIP User. This means that the consequence of a breach of the DIP Rules could lead to a breach of the REC in due course.</p> <p>The intention was never for other Industry Codes to impose PATs for non-compliance with the DIP Rules, merely to utilise the ability to take 'punitive' actions in the event of a breach.</p>	<p>DIP Supplement 1.5.5 and the second sentence of DSD003 4.1.3 have been removed.</p> <p>The DIP Manager will still report any breaches to RECCo and other relevant Industry Codes, but there will be no requirement for action under the DIP Rules.</p>
<p>We request confirmation on whether the DIP Manager or BSC PAB are responsible for performance assurance against the DIP Supplement to avoid the potential for dual governance. There may be confusion on the role of the BSC PAB as the DIP Supplement is part of the BSC and subject to the BSC Modification rules.</p>	<p>DIP Supplement 1.2.2 precludes the BSC Panel or its committees (which includes the PAB), from having anything to do with the DIP Rules. It also states that the DIP Manager shall owe nothing to the BSC Panel or its committees or BSC Parties in respect of the DIP Rules – other than where specifically stated e.g. changes to the DIP Supplement.</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>

Comments regarding missing DSD Requirements

Consultation Response	Elexon comments	Actions Required
<p>A traceability exercise conducted by the MHHS Programme Code workstream and Elexon have identified five requirements that have not been included within the DIP Rules. These requirements must be included in the DIP Rules for MHHS Milestone 10 (M10) for MHHS Go-live.</p>	<p>The requirements that are missing from the DIP Rules are not new requirements; they are existing requirements in the MHHS Design. As such, it could be argued that amending the draft DIP Rules following this consultation to include the requirements would be possible, as it would not constitute a material change. However, following discussion with Ofgem, it was decided that no significant changes to the P474 legal text should be made at this stage to ensure transparency.</p> <p>Following Implementation of P474 the DIP CR process will be used to amend the DIP Rules to include the missing requirements. This will allow the changes to be fully communicated with DIP Users, and allow them to be Implemented prior to M10.</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>
<p>We understand that the intention is for the DIP Manager to use the new DIP Change Management rules to implement the missing MHHS Design requirements. As this is a new process, this approach carries a risk that the missing requirements are not implemented ahead of M8/M10, or not at all as parties may seek to reject or amend the MHHS Design requirements.</p>	<p>Elexon are confident that the changes will be Implemented ahead of M10, despite the DIP CR process being new.</p> <p>As the missing requirements are existing MHHS Design requirements, if Parties do wish to reject or amend them they would have to go through the MHHS Change process, which is subject to a change freeze until post-M10.</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>
<p>There is a risk that a BSC Modification would be needed in addition to a DIP CR to include the missing requirements. This dual governance approach could cause additional complexity.</p>	<p>The missing requirements do not need to be added in to the DIP Supplement, and will be added to DSD002 and/or the DSD002 Annexes; there will be no dual governance issue.</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>
<p>All DIP requirements should be captured in P474 before it is approved. If the missing requirements are not added to the DIP Rules via P474, we would welcome assurances that Ofgem will closely monitor the progress of any required DIP CR to ensure that the MHHS design has been fully transcribed into the DIP Rules for M8/M10.</p>	<p>The DIP Manager, MHHS Programme and Ofgem will continue to work closely together to ensure that all necessary code changes are in place prior to M10.</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>
<p>The MHHS Programme has recently proposed a change to the DIP Interface Code of Connection which is a baselined MHHS design artefact. If agreed, this change would also need to be captured into DSD002-A2. We welcome assurances that proposed changes to the MHHS Design ahead of M8/M10 will carefully consider how these are implemented into the DIP Rules to avoid a situation where parties are working to the MHHS Design but are not compliant with the DIP Rules.</p>	<p>Following Implementation of P474 the DIP CR process can be used to amend the DIP Rules to include any changes necessary due to approved changes to the DIP Co-Co or other MHHS design documents. This has already been provisionally included as part of the DIP transition plan to ensure that the DIP Rules are correct for M10. Following the DIP CR process will ensure that changes are communicated fully with DIP Users.</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>

Comments on the DIP Change Process

Consultation Response	Elaxon comments	Actions Required
<p>As described in DSD004 para 1.1.1, the scope of the DIP Change process covers both the 'DIP' and the 'DIP Rules'.</p> <p>The implication of the drafting is that a change to the DIP, where this does not impact the DIP Rules, will require a DIP CR. We do not understand the intent of this requirement and how it is expected to work in practice. Parties do not have sight of the DIP contractual requirements and therefore will not be able to request changes to the DIP outside of service provisions documented within the DIP Rules.</p>	<p>While we fully understand this position, the concept of a 'system only change' is a concept reflected in BSC Section F4.2 – this reflects such arrangement into the DIP Rules. Changes to the DIP do not relate to the contractual requirements, but the system itself, where DIP Users may identify issues through their interactions with.</p> <p>As inferred, it is highly unlikely that a change to the DIP would occur without being captured in DSD002, or its Annexes. However, this is a future proofing measure included just in case. If we do ever raise a system-only change, this will be reflected in the Initial Assessment (DSD004 2.4.3) and it will be possible to raise an objection to there being no proposed change to the DIP Rules (DSD001 5).</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>
<p>The DIP Rules should set out the relevant requirements for the DIP Service Provider and parties should be able to raise changes to the DIP Rules to amend, add and remove DIP Service Provider requirements.</p>	<p>The DIP Rules includes requirements for the DIP Manager, which a DIP CR can be raised to amend. The DIP Manager then has a contractual arrangement with the DIP Service Provider to help meet those requirements. It is not appropriate for that contractual arrangement to be amended based on changes sought by other parties.</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>
<p>The DIP Manager may request changes to the DIP that do not impact functionality described in the DIP Rules. Any such changes would be progressed bilaterally and not require a DIP CR.</p>	<p>While the DIP Manager will have the ability to raise changes with the DIP Service Provider that do not impact functionality in the DIP Rules, the DIP rules have been designed in such a way that all changes will be published as this tie-in with the DIP Manager's principals of openness and transparency.</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>
<p>We are concerned by, and do not understand the justification for, the requirement set out in DSD004 para 2.3.2 which requires an Industry Code to raise a complementary DIP CR where a REC change requires a change to the DIP (not the DIP Rules). Our view is that it would be for the DIP Manager to take forward any required changes to the DIP Service Provider contract which are required as a consequence of either a change to the DIP Rules or a change to another Industry Code which impacts the DIP e.g. the introduction of a new DIP message.</p>	<p>Where a consequential DIP CR is required, this will be progressed following CCSG principles. It is possible for the DIP CR to be raised by the Code Body pursuant to DSD004 2.3.2, or for the DIP Manager to raise it. Paragraph 2.3.2 gives Code Bodies the failsafe to ensure the DIP CR is raised without having to rely on the DIP Manager.</p> <p>It should be noted that changes to the DIP where the DIP Rules are not affected, such as the introduction of a new DIP Message, will not constitute a change to the DIP Service Provider contract and will be progressed as a DIP CR so that DIP Users are aware of any changes.</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>

Consultation Response	Elexon comments	Actions Required
<p>There are several references in DSD004 to changes to the ‘DIP legal text’ as being something different to a change to the DSDs. The term ‘DIP legal text’ is not defined and it is not clear if this is intended to refer to the DIP Service Provider contract or something else. DSD004 para 2.7.2 refers to this ‘DIP legal text’ needing to be in the DIP CR. All relevant requirements should be defined in the DIP Rules, and we would welcome confirmation of the scope of the DIP legal text and the requirement to use the DIP CR process to amend it.</p>	<p>In the BSC change process, ‘legal text’ is used to refer to the BSC; the drafting has been updated to clarify this.</p>	<p>References to “DIP legal text” corrected.</p>

Other comments

Consultation Response	Elexon comments	Actions Required
<p>Whilst it is imperative that the DIP Rules are in place for DIP on-boarding, if they are not fully fleshed out (i.e. DIP guidance to follow) it is inappropriate to implement them.</p>	<p>It is standard practice Modifications and their legal text to be approved first, and then draft guidance later, prior to Implementation. The drafting and publication of DIP guidance is included within the DIP transition plan.</p>	<p>No further action required, but we will be publishing the DIP transition Plan on a Page (POAP) shortly.</p>
<p>It is not clear why P474 is being implemented ahead of M8/10 or why there wasn’t time to engage with industry on the significant and material changes to the original proposal developed under Issue 101 ahead of taking this modification proposal forward.</p>	<p>The reasoning for the Implementation timeline was explained in the P474 consultation report (Section 6 – Implementation) and DSD001 Annex One. This is to ensure that the DIP change management processes are in effect for the transition period, recognising the unique position of the DIP as the only central system build by MHHSP and subject to a handover. The timeline will allow all MHHS Design requirements to be included within the DIP Rules for M10, considering the potential changes that will occur during the transition and the need for collaboration on DIP change between the MHHSP and the DIP Manager.</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>

Consultation Response	Elaxon comments	Actions Required
<p>We are still concerned that Suppliers are only given minimal representation on the DCAB. We would prefer a model similar to the Smart Energy Code (SEC) Change board where suppliers are well represented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 member from each Large Supplier voting group with one vote each • 3 Small Suppliers • 3 Network Parties • 3 Other SEC Parties • 1 Consumer Representative • DCC and Ofgem • Chaired by SECAS 	<p>The makeup of the DCAB was discussed extensively during Issue 101. The intent is to give all DIP User types equal standing and not give more influence to one over another. No other concerns with the DCAB representation were raised during this consultation.</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>
<p>A concern with the process for assessing P474 is the statement the BSC Panel unanimously approved the proposals. Network Operators are not BSC Trading Parties and as such do not have a vote on the BSC Panel but are impacted by this proposal.</p>	<p>There are several DIP User types impacted by P474 that are not represented on the BSC Panel. However, the BSC Panel will only be providing a recommendation to Ofgem. Ultimate decision on P474 will be made by the Authority, who will consider the wider industry impacts of the Modification.</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>
<p>The successful implementation of the DIP Rules will require cooperation, planning and work between the REC Code Manager, BSC Code Manager and the DIP Manager to operationalise the new arrangements. We are committed to supporting this activity and look forward to continuing to engage with the DIP Code Manager to meet this aim.</p>	<p>REC Code Manager's assistance throughout the process has been greatly appreciated and we look forward to continuing to work together.</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>

P474 Redlined Legal Text

Location	Comment	Elxon comments	Actions Required
Section C 12.15	Refers to Data Collectors & Aggregators qualifying for MHHS - this is obviously wrong. Aggregators do not exist in MHHS, DCs become Data Services	This is out of the scope of P474. Updates to the BSC relating to MHHS have been drafted as part of MHHS Code drafting and will be implemented as part of a separate Authority Led SCR Modification.	No further action required.
Section C 12.2.13	This section should be amended to make it clearer as to the exact requirements.	In accordance with paragraph 1.2.2 (b) of the DIP Supplement, BSC Section C12.2.13 does not apply to the DIP Rules.	No further action required.
Section F 1.1.2	We suggest that DIP Users are informed of changes to the BSC where a modification impacts the DIP Supplement.	DSD004 2.4.3 implies this will happen, but we will make it more explicit	Sub clause proposed to the end of DSD004 2.9.5 to require DIP Manager to publish their recommendations to BSC Panel, ergo notifying DIP users that a BSC Mod has been raised. Sentence also proposed at the end of DSD004 2.1.3
Section X-1	Refers to Data Collectors & Aggregators qualifying for MHHS - this is obviously wrong. Aggregators do not exist in MHHS, DCs become Data Services	This is out of the scope of P474. Updates to the BSC relating to MHHS have been drafted as part of MHHS Code drafting and will be implemented as part of a separate Authority Led SCR Modification.	No further action required.
DIP Supplement 3.2.6	Typo. Sentence should start 'DIP Users' or 'A DIP User'.	This has been actioned.	Proposed amendment made to DIP Supplement 3.2.6
DIP Supplement 5.3.5	This para provides for the DIP Manager to determine 'materiality criteria' that would allow it to approve a DIP CR without DCAB approval. We recommend that these materiality criteria are approved by DCAB rather than simply having their views taken into account. It is important that the users of the service have sufficient control of the changes to that service.	The materiality criteria were published in DSD004 para 2.1.5, we will amend the paragraph to clarify this. The reference to seeking views from DIP Participants and DCAB means that a DIP CR to amend the materiality criteria would be required to go through consultation. Even without it being explicitly stated, a change to materiality criteria would be considered a Tier One DIP CR where the DCAB would make the decision, as it is a material change.	Proposed amendment to DIP Supplement 5.3.5

P474 Draft DSDs

Location	Comment	Elexon comments	Actions Required
DSD001 2.1.1	It is not clear why the DIP Applicable Objectives are set out in the DIP Supplement rather than in this DSD. Any change can only be made if this furthers the objectives of the BSC. This is unduly restrictive in allowing the DIP to be developed to meet non-Settlement use cases.	<p>The DIP Applicable Objectives are high-level principles, hence their inclusion in the DIP Supplement.</p> <p>While the BSC Panel will assess against the BSC Objectives, the DIP Manager/DCAB shall give their assessment against the DIP Objectives when making their recommendation to the Authority (via the BSC Panel).</p> <p>Even if the BSC Panel determine that a DIP CR is against the BSC Objectives and recommend that it is not approved, the final decision will be with Ofgem and they can take into account the recommendation of the DIP Manager/DCAB.</p>	No further action required.
DSD001 3.6	We do not understand the purpose of this section as there are no DIP Manager Terms of Reference stated. Will these be developed and implemented through a future DIP CR?	Para 3.6.1 states that DSD001 Paragraph 3 (i.e. 3.1 to 3.6 inclusive) 'shall be considered the DIP Manager's Terms of Reference'.	No further action required.
DSD001 A1 3.2.1	This section sets out a dual running period where decisions relating to the DIP shall be agreed by the DIP Manager and the MHHSP, with the MHHSP having primacy. Please confirm that the scope of this provision excludes changes to the DIP Rules. We think this is the intent of 3.1.4, but it is not explicitly stated.	This has been actioned.	Proposed additional sentence to end of 3.1.4
DSD001 A1 3.2.2	Please confirm that the intent of this paragraph is to have the DCAB in place six weeks ahead of the proposed implementation date of 1 October, i.e. by mid August. If this is correct, we welcome further information on when requests for DCAB membership nominations will be published.	The request for DCAB Nominations shall be published imminently.	No further action required.
DSD001 A1 3.3	<p>In this section the terminology switches between SIT and MHHS SIT.</p> <p>The terminology also switches between MHHS Qualification and Qualification.</p> <p>Our assumption is that is a drafting error and a single set of terms should be used consistently in this section.</p>	This has been actioned.	Proposed deletion of superfluous 'MHHS' in 3.3.3

Location	Comment	Elaxon comments	Actions Required
DSD002 4.3.2 i)	We are not clear why a failed supplier, that has had its licence removed by Ofgem as part of the SoLR process, should be permitted to continue to have access to the DIP. As drafted, such access is granted if the failed supplier 'requires it' without consideration of the risks or controls that should be in place.	This is because a company may be accessing the DIP as more than one DIP User type. For example, the Supplier could also be a Data Service provider, and would continue to provide these services and require DIP Access in that role.	No further action required.
DSD002 5.3.1	Typo – Last sentence refers to 'that paragraph amended' but it is not clear which paragraph is being referred to.	This has been actioned.	Proposed amending 'that paragraph' to 'paragraph 4'
DSD002 6	<p>This section requires DIP Users to comply with the sections of the ISO/IEC 27000 series as applicable to their organisation.</p> <p>There is a requirement for the DIP Manager to provide guidance on which parts of the ISO/IEC 27000 are applicable. We consider that parties should have access to this guidance so that they can fully understand their requirements before they can enter into Access Agreements. We understand that this guidance is expected to be published shortly.</p> <p>This guidance should be subject to consultation, with updates being appealable and have a mechanism for impacted parties to raise changes/or an annual review so that it remains appropriate and proportionate.</p>	As discussed above, this section has been simplified in line with the consultation responses received. The guidance has now been published and any issues can be raised with the DIP Manager.	Proposed amendments to DSD002 6.
DSD002 6	This section should be amended to make it clearer as to the exact requirements.	As discussed above, this section has been simplified in line with the consultation responses received	Proposed amendments to DSD002 6.
DSD002 6.1.3	<p>This clause is too vague and creates an immediate risk for Participants planning to use the DIP.</p> <p>The ISO 2700 series is a large suite of documentation with multiple requirements, each of which typically incurs resource, time and cost to implement.</p> <p>The elements of the 2700 series that are applicable to DIP users should be documented and made available now so that all Qualification participants are aware of these in advance of the start of the Qualification exercise. The method of providing this guidance also needs to be described.</p> <p>The 2700 series is subject to revisions therefore there also needs to be a formal mechanism to implement any changes to this guidance.</p>	As discussed above, this section has been simplified in line with the consultation responses received	Proposed amendments to DSD002 6.
DSD002 6.1.4	Typo – start sub paras with 'a' rather than 'c'.	This has been actioned.	Proposed correction of typo

Location	Comment	Elexon comments	Actions Required
DSD002 A1 1	This section should be amended to make it clearer as to the exact requirements.	As discussed above, this section has been simplified in line with the consultation responses received to remove references to the ISO 27000 series	Reference to ISO 27000 series removed.
DSD002 A2 2.1.17/6.3.6	What about other test environments that will be stood up (as per 2.1.12)?	Test Environments are pre-production by definition.	No further action required.
DSD002 A2 2.2.2	Which of the market participant user roles will have access to the Admin portal and user portal?	The Admin Portal is for the DIP Manager, the user portal for DIP Users. We will make this clearer.	Proposed additional note under diagram in 2.2.2
DSD002 A2 2.2.2	Will market participant user have access to the DIP Service Desk via the user portal to raise incidents?	See MHHS Service Definition Document for details.	No further action required.
DSD002 A2 2.5.2/6.3.4	2.5.2 suggests a participant can use separate certificates for message signing and mTLS, whilst 6.3.4 appears to contradict this?	If the DIP User is an Active User i.e. they send/receive their own messages, then they only need one Digital Certificate for both signing and mTLS. However, if they are non-Active i.e. use a DCP, then they will need separate Digital Certificates for signing and mTLS and it is their responsibility to pass their signature Certificate to their DCP safely as explained elsewhere. Paragraph 2.5 is titled 'Active Market Participant' so saying one Digital Certificate is correct given the context of 2.5.2. 6.3.4 is also about Active Market participants.	Propose adding 'Active Market Participant' in parenthesis to 6.3.4 for clarity Also propose addition to 2.6.3 to make it clear the DCP user is the active DIP User's Digital Certificate for signing
DSD002 A2 3.3.1	PKI Role Governance - Does the vetting and registration process applicable only for the first certificate admin (i.e., the additional certificate admins will not be going through the vetting process)?	The organisation is vetted, not the individual.	Proposed clarification in parenthesis at end of 3.3.1 to add clarity
DSD002 A2 5	This section should be amended to make it clearer as to the exact requirements.	As discussed above, issues with the ISO 27000 series equivalency have been covered in the ISMS Guidance.	No further action required.
DSD002 A2 6.7.1	Should specify how the notification occurs	The means of notification will be determined at the end of IR8.1 implementation and we will update DIP Rules then. This has been added to the DIP backlog.	No further action required.
DSD002 A2 8.9.2	How long are messages left on the dead letter queue and is there any mechanism for them to be resent?	The replay functionality (which is the Dead Letter Queue) last up to two years.	No further action required.
DSD002 A2 9.12.4	This is not correct. API key pairs are per DIP ID. Please update	A primary and secondary key are issued per DIP ID to allow for rotation (succession), as written.	No further action required.

Location	Comment	Elxon comments	Actions Required
DSD002 A2 10.5.6	Can multiple MPIDs within the same MPO have the same certificate? Or do each MPID should have its own certificates?	The Digital Certificate is issued to the MPO, not MPID, as described elsewhere.	No further action required.
DSD002 A3 2.2.1	Extraneous characters at the end of (b)	This was a typo of "and".	Typo corrected.
DSD002 A3 4.7.3	Delete 'the'	This has been actioned.	Typo corrected.
DSD002 A3 5	This section should be amended to make it clearer as to the exact requirements.	As discussed above, issues with the ISO 27000 series equivalency have been covered in the ISMS Guidance.	No further action required.
DSD003 3.1.1	This paragraph creates an expectation that DSD003 will list the reports to be generated. However, a list of reports is not provided. Para 3.1.4 provides some 'examples' of DIP reports that 'may' be provided but does not match the perceived intent of para 3.1.1.	This has been actioned.	Reference to reports listed in the section removed.
DSD003 3.3.1	<p>This paragraph sets out the instances where the DIP manager shall disclose the content of DIP Messages. There are four individual circumstances (as indicated by the 'or' at the end of sub-clause c).</p> <p>We welcome confirmation that the intent of this section is that any party can have access to the data if they have controls in place or are willing to be audited. We suggest that further consideration is given to the arrangements for data provision, e.g. whether the party must have controls in place and be willing to be audited.</p>	Sub paragraph (c) and (d) as drafted should be combined into one paragraph, so that there are three individual circumstances.	Sub paragraph (c) amended for clarity.
DSD003 4.1.3	<p>For the reasons set out in our response to Question 2 we do not agree that non-compliance with the DIP Rules is a performance assurance matter under the REC.</p> <p>Suggest that this is amended to clarify that, if as part of its activity, the DIP Manager identifies a potential non-compliance with another Industry Code, it shall notify that Industry Code and provide all necessary information to allow that potential non-compliance to be investigated.</p>	As discussed above, we will remove implication that a Code Body may have to act upon a non-compliance with the DIP Rules. The DIP Manager will still report any breaches to any relevant Industry Codes, but there will be no requirement for action under the DIP Rules.	Deletion of second sentence in 4.1.3.

Location	Comment	Elaxon comments	Actions Required
DSD004	<p>The DIP will need to be subject to regular updates. Infrastructure updates (even for PaaS services) could introduce breaking changes and DIP software libraries etc will need to be regularly patched and presumably tested as per the NFR requirement of maintaining software. Who will be monitoring for breaking changes introduced by MS? Also, this continuous software delivery and lifecycle management falls under which category in 2.1?</p>	<p>The DIP Manager will work with the DIP Service Provider to monitor. Any changes in this respect will be covered as system only changes as detailed in paragraph 2.15.</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>
DSD004 General	<p>As noted above, we are concerned that the change process is being used to decide contractual matters that are outside of the scope of the DIP Rules and which parties do not have sight of.</p> <p>Suggest removing references to the scope DIP CR process including the 'DIP' so that it is clear that it is only applicable to changes to the DIP Rules.</p>	<p>As discussed above, the DIP Rules are not suggesting that the DIP CR process be used for changes to contractual arrangements. Changes to the DIP refer to changes to the DIP system.</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>
DSD004 2.1.4	<p>We propose that the decision of the DIP Manager to determine a DIP CR to be Tier 2 should be appealable to DCAB.</p>	<p>This decision is appealable to the DCAB, as per DSD004 2.2.4 which states that any DIP Manger decision during the change process is appealable.</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>
DSD004 2.1.5 b)	<p>Suggest that the scope of this sub-clause is extended so that a DIP CR is considered to be material (and therefore requiring DCAB approval) where it would amend an existing obligation. Currently, the clause only refers DCAB approval of new obligations.</p>	<p>The amendment of an existing obligation, except where the obligation is removed or reduced, is equivalent to proposing a new obligation.</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>
DSD004 2.3.2	<p>As set out in our response to Question 3, we do not agree that an Industry Code such as the REC should be required to raise a DIP CR where a REC CP requires a change to the DIP.</p> <p>As management of the DIP is a contractual matter, we would expect the DIP Manager to contribute any REC Change Management Impact Assessment request and identify DIP impacts. If the REC CP is agreed, we would expect the DIP Manager to make all necessary changes to the DIP to implement that change.</p> <p>Where there a change to the DIP Rules are identified, we would expect this to be progressed in accordance with the arrangements set out in the CCSG (as set out in para 2.6.4).</p>	<p>As discussed above, changes to the DIP as a result of another Industry Code change will be progressed as a DIP CR via CCSG processes. This DP CR can be raised by the DIP Manager or the lead Code Body as decided by CCSG. The DIP CR process will still be followed so that the change can be properly assessed and communicated to DIP stakeholders.</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>
DSD004 2.4.3 k)	<p>Typo – refers to 'core DIP services'. Suggest using the defined term 'DIP Core Services'.</p>	<p>This has been actioned.</p>	<p>Typo corrected.</p>

Location	Comment	Elexon comments	Actions Required
DSD004 2.6.1	DIP Manager should be required to set out the criteria that it shall use to determine whether not to consult on a DIP CR. In developing such criteria, the DIP Manager should take into account the views of DIP Users. The criteria should also be approved by DCAB. Where criteria are not in place, the default position should be to consult.	This is contrary to the DIP Manager role and principle. If a DIP User disagrees with the DIP Manager's determinations, they can appeal once the Initial Assessment is published.	No further action required.
DSD004 2.7.2	Refers to a change to the 'DIP legal text or DSDs'. As noted above, we are not clear what is meant by DIP legal text.	This has been actioned.	Wording in various parts of DSD004 corrected to remove referenced to "DIP legal text".
DSD004 2.9.1 and 2.9.4	These paragraph sets out obligations on the BSC Panel. Please confirm that the BSC Panel is subject to the provisions described in the DSDs. If not, these provisions should be moved to the BSC Section F and cross references added to the DSD to assist parties in following the end-to-end process.	These obligations are reflected in BSC Section F but are clarified here. The BSC Panel are subject to these provisions - see DIP Supplement 1.2.2 which states that explicit provisions in the DIP Rules can apply to the BSC Panel. It should be noted that the DSDs are given power from the BSC.	No further action required.
DSD004 2.13.4	We welcome the provisions that set out arrangements for amending the DIP Flows. However, we are unclear what is intended by the reference in this para to a decision being treated in the same way as a DIP System only change. In accordance with para 2.15.5, this may require a DIP CR and appears to contradict the intent of section 2.13 which would require the DIP to be updated as necessary to implement the DIP Flow changes outside of the DIP CR process.	As discussed above, this has been actioned.	Additional sentence for clarity on the end of 2.13.4.
DSD005 3.1.2	No mention of continuous maintenance of software?	Any changes in this respect will be covered as system only changes as detailed in DSD004 paragraph 2.15, with the costs coming under change costs.	No further action required.
DSD005 3.1.2	Should additional test environments be added to this list?	There will be one pre-production (test) environment maintained and is included in the DIP operating costs (see 3.1.2 (a)), others will be built as required and form part of the change cost.	Parenthesis added to 3.1.2(a)
DSD006 3.2.3	This paragraph requires the DIP Manager to seek the advice/permission from the owner of data/Mata Data prior to release. In relation to Data Items and DIP Messages, please confirm that DIP Manager will reference the Energy Market Data Specification to identify ownership.	We will look at various sources to identify the owner of the Meta Data including the EMDS. Some clarification has been added.	Additional words to parenthesis at end of 3.2.3

Location	Comment	Elexon comments	Actions Required
DSD007 Section 2 – Access Agreement	It is not clear what is meant by the DIP User being 'bound by the DIP'. Suggest that this is amended to 'bound by the DIP Rules'	Yes, this should be 'DIP Rules' – this has been actioned.	Amended.
DSD007 Section 2 – DIP Change	As noted above, we are concerned that the change process is being used to decide contractual matters that are outside of the scope of the DIP Rules and which parties do not have sight of. Suggest removing 'and/or the DIP'.	As discussed above, changes to the DIP are not referring to changes to contractual arrangements.	No further action required.