

HEADLINE REPORT

MEETING NAME Architecture Working Group

Meeting number 02

Date of meeting 21 January 2020

1. Introduction

1.1 ELEXON opened the second AWG meeting. There were apologies from Richard Warham and Gurpal Singh.

2. Principles

Solution Architecture

- 2.1 The group discussed the solution architecture principles and agreed those set out by ELEXON: business continuity; adoption of best practice; information security; component reusability and simplicity; adaptability and flexibility; and technology interoperability.
- 2.2 The group agreed a further overarching principle stating the primacy of the other principles, and that the introduction should assert cost-effectiveness as primary concern for the entire project. **Action** on ELEXON to draft this principle and circulate to the group for approval.

Data Architecture

- 2.3 The group went through the models that would be used for interfaces: data contracts, and logical data models. The group discussed the level of detail involved in these, and whether the interfaces needed to be defined to attribute level at this stage.
- 2.4 There was a suggestion that it would be difficult to maintain the principle of interoperability without a standardised list of data items. The group concluded that the CCDG would provide data type-level information, but that the possible data values were likely to change as the CCDG work goes on.
- 2.5 The group agreed the proposed AWG data architecture standards, including the applicability of all three types of proposed metadata: descriptive, structural and profile. When it came to profile metadata, there was a discussion of whether it would be necessary. The group agreed to keep the option open until the nature of the data involved became clearer.
- 2.6 The group also agreed to incorporate a lineage standard; this would allow traceability for inaccurate data.
- 2.7 The group discussed pseudo-anonymisation of the data to alleviate GDPR concerns. Ofgem clarified that their policy decision in the TOM had been to avoid pseudo-anonymisation. This is because the only way to tie registration data to meter data is around the MPAN, which makes the data difficult to anonymise.

Security Guidelines

- 2.8 ELEXON presented the proposed security guidelines, which had been selected as the most applicable from the National Cyber Security Centre (NCSC) Cyber Assessment Framework and Cloud Security Guidance, and Ofgem's recommended Security, Privacy and Risk Impact Guidance.
- 2.9 The group discussed the NCSC principles of external interface protection and supply chain security. They suggested that both will be necessary, since there will be external interfaces for parties feeding into the system, and since we couldn't assume that parties involved would be developing interfaces in-house. However, there was also a view that it was not the group's place to define connection standards to that level, or to police third-party relationships. The group agreed to assess the principles throughout the process, including those that had not been included initially.

HEADLINE REPORT

- 2.10 The group discussed the Security, Privacy and Risk (SPaR) Impact levels and noted that it was not the group's place to make the assessment. **Action** on Ofgem are to take away the Security, Privacy and Risk (SPaR) Impact levels and decide where they will fit this assessment into the work plan, as the group agreed that this was Ofgem's responsibility.
- 2.11 **Action** ELEXON to circulate the solution architecture, data architecture and security guideline principles for comment via MS Teams, with the finalised and agreed principles being made available to Ofgem.

3. Detailed Work Plan

- 3.1 The group discussed the updated detailed work plan. There was a suggestion that Ofgem may have some lessons learned from previous initiatives that could be shared to expedite the development of data exchanges. **Action** Ofgem to present a session on lessons learned from previous initiatives. ELEXON to facilitate.
- 3.2 It was agreed that rather than only having a risk assessment phase at the end, the risks should be continually assessed throughout. **Action** on ELEXON to add a continuous risk assessment to the workplan.
- 3.3 **Action** on ELEXON to circulate the document containing proposed content for each meeting.

4. Updates from other work-streams

- 4.1 Kevin provided an update from the CCDG meeting on the 15th January. They are developing strawmen for data items and current standing data. He explained that the group had agreed to remove the current measurement classes, and replace them with a market segment identifier. He also noted that the group are considering whether to retain standing data items that aren't necessary in MHHS, but legacy systems might require.
- 4.2 Jasmine provided an update from Ofgem on the Significant Code Review. Ofgem are working on an impact assessment that they hope to publish for consultation soon, with the full business case due in Q3 this year. Ofgem also noted that they had taken the workplan to the senior responsible owner in December. The SRO raised concerns about only having one consultation at the end of the programme. ELEXON and Ofgem have since agreed to make a joint stakeholder engagement plan, including a joint monthly newsletter.

5. Interface Requirements

- 5.1 ELEXON introduced the next steps; and that volunteers were required for working on interface requirements between meetings. The meetings would be used to agree the work done and debate any issues arising.
- 5.2 The group discussed the impact of Faster Switching on the AWG work. It was agreed that the group would operate on the assumption that the architecture would go live after faster switching implementation. **Action** on ELEXON to capture this assumption.
- 5.3 **Action** on ELEXON to produce a list of interface items, which the group could then populate information on.
- 5.4 **Action** ELEXON to circulate defined functional requirements for the different services identified in the TOM.
- 5.5 **Action** ELEXON to circulate data contracts for the interfaces on the TOM diagram, with the intention of having some of the fields populated, and the contracts agreed at the next meeting.

6. Headline report and actions

- 6.1 The group approved the AWG01 Headline Report and gave updates on the actions arising from the previous meeting.
- 6.2 01/01 – Action closed – Ofgem had addressed questions about the data store in their most recent documentation.

HEADLINE REPORT

- 6.3 01/02 – ELEXON confirmed that they are progressing setting up MS Teams for the group.
- 6.4 01/03 – Action closed – documentation circulated prior to the January AWG meeting.
- 6.5 01/04 – ELEXON confirmed that this question would be assessed through the CCDG’s work.
- 6.6 01/05 – Action closed – ELEXON confirmed that bi-directional flows will be needed. This was clarified in the TOM design.
- 6.7 01/06 – Action closed – ELEXON confirmed that there will be no interactions between new and legacy roles. One member pointed out that there will be a one-time migration between the legacy MOP and the new MOP.
- 6.8 01/07 – Action closed – Ofgem confirmed that there are no discrepancies between the AWG’s principles and the Ofgem TOM development principles.

7. A.O.B.

- 7.1 The group agreed to engage with each other using MS Teams.

8. Next Meeting

- 8.1 The next meeting will be held on the 25th February 2020.