

Agenda Item	Lead	Minutes
Introduction	Anthony Riding	5
Other Work-stream Updates SCR Update	Kevin Spencer / Mark De Souza-Wilson Jasmine Killen	10
ISD (market domain data) – How to specify	All	20
Risk Assessment – Industry Change	All	30
Risk Assessment – Technology Issues	All	20
Headline Report & Actions	Callum Chalmers	10
Next Steps	All	10
AOB & Close	Anthony Riding	5

CCDG-10

Completed: 20th October

Sub-Group refresh

Date not set

SCR Update

OFGEM:

MHHS 121 – ISD Catalogue.xlsx

BSC Central Settlement to:

- Metering Services
- Data Services
- DNO's

Question:

The architecture design is too simple/narrow to cater for future changes in the energy market	enable future change
MHHS may impact other as-yet unknown processes	Architecture may not be an ideal fit for every resulting IT or business change
A radical re-architecture may be too costly for some participants (re-word)	Existing technology is due for an upgrade and we should take advantage, even though cost will factor it should be balanced by market progress Balance the benefits against the cost (front-load costs?)
Cost effective or simpler design may not cater for future growth or requirements (merge with first)	Cost effective or simpler design may not cater for future growth or requirements
Design may need to cater for a greater number of meters or shorter settlement periods, resulting in incremental data and processing resources needs	Scalable architecture; with regard to number of data transfers and/or sources and destinations.

Question:

The balance between meeting current versus future needs may be skewed in the wrong direction	Assess the current requirements vs possible future requirements and their costs
Data storage limited to settlement calendar may result in duplicated data being stored across industry	Recognise an authoritative source.
Existing data transfer SLAs are not correct for MHHS	Only a risk if existing SLA's are unsuitable. If we negate this risk with new SLA's we can remove this risk.
The maximum coverage for accurate meter reads should be possible. Maximize settlement performance.	Not a risk for AWG
Commercial risk of being expected to settle half-hourly but not having access to the data	Not a risk for AWG (part of the CCDG and TOM)

Question:

Smart meter roll-out is not great enough to enable MHHS to be advantageous for participants	Not an AWG risk
Parallel execution in a transitional approach to implementation may be overly complex	Unavoidable.

Question:

Differences from current participant technology stacks may negatively impact participants ability to implement the architecture	
The AWG architecture may prove to be impractical or inflexible during design and build	The architecture should follow an industry standard pattern for data integration.
A complex architectural approach may be a barrier to inclusion	
Data governance, data integrity or best practices are not defined in the market model	Architecture can prescribe some of these, but will they be correct?
Technology transition approach and ease of implementation	

Question:

Any data storage requirements must be able to exceed current volumes for growth	
Must be possible to component test or boundary test in isolation or in limited configuration	

Question:

Data being transferred should not be accessed by other parties	The architecture must define appropriate security standards regarding data distribution.
Data access from an authorized source must have appropriate governance mechanisms	The architecture must allow for some governance or data management standards to be integrated.
Create an organizational matrix for data interfaces rather than data items.	
Check if anything in ISD has restrictions	

AWG 10 Headline Report

Actions Log

BPM for energisation status / change of meter / ISD	Target: 20 th November
Risk Assessment – break out groups to complete from this AWG	Target: 13 th November
Complete ISD discussion	Target: 24 th November
Sub-groups to review BPM and identify changes to existing D-flows	Initiate Activities
AWG 12	24 th November

