ELEXON

Headline report

Meeting name	**Architecture Working Group – MHHS SCR**	Purpose of paper	**Information**
Meeting number	**17**	Classification	**Public**
Date and time	**1 June 2021**	Venue	**By webinar**

1. Introduction

1.1 Elexon opened the seventeeth AWG meeting. There were apologies from Dominic Talbot.

2. Updates from other work-streams

Significant Code Review

2.1 Ofgem informed the group that the [Governance and Implementation Consultation](#) was still out for responses, closing 25 June, and that they'd been hosting stakeholder events with Code bodies and Industry Forums. Ofgem also noted that SECAS/DCC have raised a [SEC Modification](#) to make changes to SEC and DCC systems for the Target Operating Model, and that they'd be publishing the high level requirements soon.

CCDG

2.2 Elexon provided an update from CCDG17. The group are working on a consultation for the Transition deliverable to go out for responses on the 5th July. Members are currently working on the document with questions to be confirmed at the next meeting.

Project Manager/System Integrator

2.3 Elexon are currently mobilising to carry out the Project Manager/System Integrator role for MHHS, as proposed by [Ofgem in January](#).

3. Consultation Responses Discussion

3.1 The group discussed the responses to the six consultation questions, noting that for the most part responses had been supportive.

Q1 - Scope of the Recommendation

3.2 There were a number of comments that the scope of the recommendation wasn't broad enough, and should be expanded to include areas such as smart grids. It was noted that this point was more about the scope of the whole MHHS project, rather than the remit of the AWG.

3.3 A number of respondents suggested they could not properly assess the recommendation without more detail of the implementation.

Q2 – Integration architecture style

3.4 Some respondents suggested that adding a new integration style would create increased complexity. There were also some suggestions that the EDA capability of near real-time data exchange wouldn't be necessary for MHHS.

Q3 – Event Driven Architecture

Headline report

3.5   The group suggested that we should clarify that the architecture removes the need for batching and throttling processes and emphasises interoperability. This serves to simplify data exchanges rather than complicating them, as some responses suggest.

3.6   There were some concerns around the cost of change and the impact on party systems.

Q4 – New Integration Services

3.7   The group noted concerns that it would be difficult to change all industry integration styles in one go. It would be more sensible to slowly implement the new architecture across future changes, with only the data flows necessary for MHHS moved to the new system at this stage. It was suggested that this was clarified further in the recommendation.

3.8   It was noted that there were concerns about the monopolistic nature of the event broker role. The group suggested that this monopoly role was necessary, but that industry would be involved in the design of the role.

Q5 – Further Benefits of EDA

3.9   There were no comments on the responses to question 5.

Q6 – Further Comments

3.10   There were some concerns that smaller companies were limited in their capacity to respond to industry change, including consultations and impact assessments. MHHS is building on the workload from the Faster Switching Significant Code Review.

4. AWG Response

4.1   The Group then discussed how they would respond to the comments on the recommendation and how they would amend the recommendation if necessary. The AWG's responses to the comments will form an appendix to the consultation.

Q1

4.2   The group noted that it was important to acknowledge that a number of respondents had though there was insufficient detail to assess the impact on their business. It was suggested that it would help to highlight what would be coming in the next stage of the process.

Q2

4.3   It was suggested that the group emphasise that the EDA will provide a spine for the industry to move processes onto as they are changed, and that it would not be a case of re-routing the whole DTN straight away.

Q3

4.4   The group noted that there were no major complaints about Event Driven Architecture as a style.

4.5   There had been some suggestions that suppliers' traditional processes of batching and sending data would lead to an increased load on the broker. The group proposed emphasising that the EDA supports batch processing if necessary, and that it is not anticipated that the size of potential peaks of data would be an issue.

Q4

4.6   The group suggested a number of reasons why current industry arrangements are not suitable for MHHS: the potential for real-time processes, and that this presents the best opportunity to make future-proof changes.

Q5

4.7   The group acknowledged the additional benefits of the EDA suggested in the responses.

Q6

Headline report

4.8   The group agreed to include a note acknowledging the strains on industry resource at present, and that there would be further opportunity to comment further along the process.

5.   Summary

5.1   Further clarifications suggested by the group included that the DTN would continue to be used for processes outside those required for MHHS, and that adaptor would be considered throughout the process design, but that they would ultimately have to be commercially procured and not provided.

5.2   The group agreed that with the recommendation submitted to Ofgem, there would be no need for further AWG meetings. The final recommendation document with a summary of consultation responses could be signed off via email. It was noted that the Microsoft Teams area would remain available for the time being, and the group would be notified before it was closed.