

HEADLINE REPORT

MEETING NAME	Code Change & Development Group – Market-wide Half Hourly Settlement SCR
Meeting number	02
Date of meeting	15 January 2020
Purpose of paper	Information
Classification	Public
Synopsis	Summary of the second CCDG meeting and actions.

1. Introduction, apologies and meeting objectives

1.1 The Chairman set out the meeting objectives, which were to:

- Discuss ELEXON’s initial straw men for the following outstanding areas of the detailed Target Operating Model (TOM) design:
 - Redefinition of existing industry data items (split into Measurement Classes, Consumption Component Classes and Industry Standing Data)
 - Registration and Data Services interactions (data items, appointments and confirmations)
 - Exception reporting for Data Services
- For any of these areas still requiring further development, confirm which CCDG members will collaborate with ELEXON to work these up in time for discussion by the whole group at its next meeting in February 2020.

1.2 ELEXON confirmed that it will produce working documents to record the outputs and will bring these back to CCDG03. It advised that it will also bring initial straw men to that meeting for the next set of outstanding detailed TOM design areas, which are:

- GSP Group Correction Factors and Scaling Weights
- Export Settlement.

2. Updates from other work streams:

Significant Code Review (SCR)

2.1 Ofgem provided an update on the SCR. It confirmed that it is working on a draft impact assessment that will be published in the early part of this year.

2.2 The CCDG noted that ELEXON had submitted its work plan to Ofgem on 12 December 2019 for approval. Ofgem advised that it has discussed this with its internal board, which has asked for more information on how stakeholders can engage with the CCDG’s outputs before and between the formal consultations. Ofgem and ELEXON are therefore meeting on 22 January 2020, to start developing a stakeholder engagement / communications plan. ELEXON advised that it would be happy to share this with the CCDG (and potentially wider industry). However, its preference is to keep it separate from the CCDG’s own work plan as it will not alter the CCDG’s planned TOM development activities or the timing of the consultations. ELEXON welcomed any suggestions from CCDG members on how best to engage with stakeholders for this phase of the TOM development work.

HEADLINE REPORT

Other Code Bodies

- 2.3 Ofgem confirmed that it has held a second meeting with ELEXON and other Code bodies to discuss progress with completing the draft Code Change Matrices, and any questions or suggestions arising. Ofgem noted that it still has an action to confirm whether the legal text for Market-wide Half Hourly Settlement (MHHS) should be drafted against the current Industry Codes baseline or the new consolidated Retail Energy Code (REC) baseline (Action 01/02). It is still considering this, and a representative from Ofgem's REC team will be attending future Code bodies meetings. For the time being, Gemserv will complete the matrix based on the current Master Registration Agreement (MRA) baseline, but will add a column to show where any amended MRA text will be moving to the BSC or the REC.
- 2.4 ELEXON noted that ElectraLink has had a first pass at completing the matrix for the Distribution Connection and Use of System Code (DCUSA) and has indicated that it was a useful exercise. A further meeting will be arranged once other Code bodies have begun to complete their own matrices. ELEXON advised that its own work on completing the matrix has highlighted the need to consider certain details of the BSC changes further – for example, what to do with existing Metering System definitions and the Small Scale Third Party Generating Plant Limit (SSTPGPL). ELEXON will bring these to a future CCDG meeting for discussion.

ACTION 02/01

- 2.5 A CCDG member suggested that completing the matrices will potentially be more complex, and take more effort, than actually drafting the required redlined changes once the impacts are known and the drafting approach is agreed. ELEXON agreed and noted that ElectraLink has made the same comment.
- 2.6 ELEXON noted that creating new TOM services presents an opportunity to consider whether their requirements and processes can be presented in a more effective and user-friendly way within BSC documentation: for example, when drafting any new BSC Procedures (BSCPs) or BSC annexes. Two potential approaches that it is currently considering are:
- Including 'clickable' navigation within any new BSCPs, so that users can quickly find the content they need without scrolling. This could potentially be combined with an improved document structure.
 - Introducing a calculations catalogue to store the algebraic equations currently set out in the BSC itself, and simply cross-referencing this from the BSC. This would shorten/simplify the actual BSC document and potentially equations could be moved across to the catalogue gradually over time. The catalogue would need appropriate governance; for example changes to it could require a Modification Proposal.
- 2.7 Some CCDG members expressed support for these suggestions. ELEXON invited CCDG members to provide feedback at any time on these and any other ideas, with particular focus on the benefits to their organisations. It noted the desire to use MHHS as an opportunity to do things better, but also not to make the scope of the MHHS drafting exercise unworkable given the required timescales. Some wider improvements may therefore need to be considered separately and outside of the MHHS drafting.
- 2.8 ELEXON noted that it is also considering whether the BSC's User Requirements Specifications (URS) add value or whether they could be retired, as they duplicate content from other BSC documents. CCDG members indicated that they do not use these documents.

Architecture Working Group (AWG)

- 2.9 ELEXON highlighted the areas discussed by the AWG at its inaugural meeting, as captured in the [AWG Meeting 01 Headline Report](#).
- 2.10 ELEXON noted that it had advised the AWG that, under the TOM:
- Interfaces between the Data Services and the Registration Service are likely to need to be two-way (to cover exceptions/rejections)
 - The Market-wide Data Service (MDS) will not need access to Central Registration Agent (CRA) data

HEADLINE REPORT

- The new Data Services do not need to interact with their legacy predecessor roles (e.g. a Non Half Hourly Data Collector (NHHDC) will not need to interface with a Smart Data Service (SDS)).
- 2.11 ELEXON confirmed that it will continue to relay relevant information between the two working groups. It noted that it is hoping to use Microsoft Teams as a collaboration tool for both groups, but will initially trial this with the AWG. Some CCDG members commented that they have used MS Teams for other industry initiatives and have found it extremely useful.

Trading Disputes Technique Review

- 2.12 ELEXON [presented](#) a brief overview of the initial outputs of the Trading Disputes Committee's (TDC's) workshop on reviewing the Trading Disputes technique. The full outputs will be available on ELEXON's website shortly.
- 2.13 ELEXON advised that the key message is that the TDC is progressing the Design Working Group's (DWG's) recommendations to support the TOM. Regarding the DWG's recommendation of a 'ratcheted' materiality threshold for Disputes, the TDC is beginning to analyse the materiality of current Disputes in this way (without actually changing the threshold at this point) in order to gain insight into its impact.
- 2.14 ELEXON will keep the CCDG updated as the TDC's work progresses.

3. Discuss straw men for detailed design areas

- 3.1 A CCDG member asked a general question about how to capture any consequential industry changes that would be beneficial for MHHS but are not directly required in order to implement the TOM.
- 3.2 The member gave an example of the current ability to have static site-specific Line Loss Factors (LLFs), which they believe are not cost-reflective and therefore not in keeping with the principles behind the SCR. The member believed that, as a minimum, all LLFs should use a Seasonal Time of Day framework. They suggested that this change to BSCP128 could be progressed now by the BSC's Supplier Volume Allocation Group (SVG), in parallel with the TOM.
- 3.3 ELEXON agreed to create a log to record this and any other similar issues/suggestions that arise during the CCDG's discussions of the detailed TOM arrangements. The member agreed to send ELEXON a note on this particular issue for inclusion in the log.

ACTIONS 02/02 & 02/03

- 3.4 The Chairman suggested reviewing the log once all outstanding detailed TOM areas have been discussed, in order to agree the appropriate forums for considering these other potential changes further (which could be under other BSC groups or other Industry Codes). Another member agreed that the CCDG should focus on the changes that are required for the TOM rather than attempting to tackle all possible consequential changes itself.

Measurement Classes and Consumption Component Classes

- 3.5 ELEXON [presented](#) the current Measurement Class IDs and descriptions, along with the DWG's original proposed mapping of these to their destination market segments and Measurement Classes under the TOM.
- 3.6 ELEXON suggested various options for amending Measurement Classes, including:
- Retaining existing Measurement Classes with minimal re-labelling changes (e.g. to their descriptions)
 - Re-aligning or merging existing Measurement Classes
 - Introducing new Measurement Classes
 - A combination of any of the above.

HEADLINE REPORT

- 3.7 CCDG members expressed a lack of clarity about the purpose of Measurement Classes and what changes are required. The Chairman asked whether Measurement Classes are still needed under the TOM and, if so, what purpose they fulfil and what principles should be applied when assessing different options for retaining or changing them.
- 3.8 ELEXON clarified that Measurement Classes are groupings of Consumption Component Classes (CCCs), which are in turn groupings of registration data and other characteristics of the data (e.g. actuals and estimates). They are used to define the attributes of different 'pots' of meter data, which the Settlement systems then use to aggregate metered data into those pots. They are used in performance management (e.g. Performance Serials) and Scaling Weights can also be applied to the different aggregated pots for the purpose of GSP Group Correction.
- 3.9 The CCDG agreed that, if Measurement Classes are retained, they should be redefined in a way that avoids Metering Systems having to undergo a Change of Measurement Class (CoMC) from Smart to Non-Smart (or vice versa) when the Meter itself hasn't changed physically – e.g. in the event of a Smart Meter losing communications and temporarily going 'dumb'. The CCDG agreed that it was desirable to have stable Measurement Classes in order to avoid unnecessary CoMCs.
- 3.10 The CCDG also agreed to apply the principle of aiming for a 'single source of truth'. It agreed that BSC data items should not duplicate, or be used as a proxy for:
- Data items that are already held, or should more appropriately be held, by the Registration Service – especially if they are not needed for Settlement and non-Settlement processes can take the data from elsewhere (e.g. if the Meter Point Administration Service (MPAS) already indicates whether the meter is at a domestic or non-domestic premises)
 - Attributes of metered data that are already stored with that data (e.g. recording what estimation method has been used to produce the data, as this is already recorded in the estimation codes).
- 3.11 ELEXON clarified that the new TOM Load Shaping Service will not need to use Measurement Classes.
- 3.12 The CCDG agreed that potential drivers for defining Measurement Classes could be:
- Settlement aggregation activity
 - Performance management
 - Network charging
 - GSP Group Correction (application of Scaling Weights)
 - Other reporting (e.g. on what Meters are in which market segments).
- 3.13 The CCDG agreed that it was difficult to decide what to do with Measurement Classes without also considering CCCs at the same time. It also agreed that whatever it decided may need to be revisited in light of its planned later discussion on Group Correction and Scaling Weights.
- 3.14 ELEXON [presented](#) the ways in which CCCs are split currently and suggested which existing CCC indicators it believed are (or may be) needed under the TOM and which could be removed. It advised that CCCs are currently used to aggregate data for use in Group Correction Factor calculations, Performance Serials (actual and estimates) and transmission charging.
- 3.15 The CCDG agreed that the Measurement Quantity (Active Import / Active Export) needs to be retained. It noted that this is already a characteristic of the Metering Point Administration Number (MPAN) in MPAS. The CCDG noted that the Data and Communications Company (DCC) currently derives the I/E indicator for its access regime using LLF Classes (LLFCs). The CCDG considered that this is not the most robust approach and that it would be better to use a registration data item.

HEADLINE REPORT

- 3.16 The CCDG agreed with ELEXON that it would be inefficient to apply GSP Group Correction to ~30 million Meters and that correction should be applied after adding up the data.
- 3.17 The CCDG agreed that it would be useful to have a TOM market segment indicator although, as above, it agreed that it was unnecessary to distinguish independently between Smart and Non-Smart for Settlement because of the risk of spurious CoMCs. It also noted that this information could be derived from the metered data estimation codes.
- 3.18 The CCDG agreed that CCCs should have a segment indicator rather than a 'meter type' indicator, and that this should be based on the following three segments:
- Unmetered (U)
 - Smart & Non-Smart (S)
 - Advanced (A)

The CCDG agreed that this 'U-S-A' indicator should form part of registration data as a new field.

- 3.19 The CCDG considered that having a segment indicator could facilitate the application of different Scaling Weights to different market segments, if needed/appropriate. It noted that it has still to determine how to draw the exact dividing lines between the different TOM market segments.
- 3.20 The CCDG agreed with ELEXON that, for GSP Group Correction purposes, there needs to be a way to split out consumption from losses (e.g. a C or L Component Indicator). The CCDG also agreed with ELEXON that the categorisation of Metering Systems into above or below 100kW is no longer required and that the Settlement aggregation process does not need to know whether a Meter is a Whole Current (WC) or Current Transformer (CT) Meter.
- 3.21 The CCDG discussed whether it was useful for the CCC to record the data estimation method, noting that this is not necessarily needed for Settlement could be useful for performance management and reporting / monitoring. A CCDG member suggested that this, and potentially a domestic / non-domestic indicator, could also be needed to apply Scaling Weights.
- 3.22 The CCDG agreed that there should be a new LLF identifier such that the LLFC ID can be re-badged and used solely to identify Distribution Use of System (DUoS) Tariff and Load Managed Area (see the CCDG's discussion on Industry Standing Data below).
- 3.23 After discussion, the CCDG agreed the following initial set of indicators for CCCs and that these should form a new table of CCCs. It agreed that Measurement Classes will no longer be required under the TOM. It noted that, during transition, non-transitioned Meters will continue to use both the existing Measurement Classes and CCCs and the new CCCs. Once transitioned, they will use the new CCCs. Measurement Classes and the old CCCs can then be retired at the end of the transition period.

Segment ID	Active Export / Active Import	Domestic [?] / non-Domestic [?]	Consumption / Losses	Estimated [?] / Actual [?]
Unmetered	<i>Registration-derived</i>		<i>Data-derived</i>	
Smart & Non-Smart				
Advanced				

- 3.24 The CCDG suggested that, if the CCC ID is currently a two-digit number, that it will be necessary to expand this (e.g. to three digits) to cater for the increased number of CCCs.

HEADLINE REPORT

- 3.25 ELEXON agreed to document the above table, add a MoSCoW¹ categorisation as an additional column and circulate it before the next CCDG meeting for further discussion at that meeting.

Action 02/04

- 3.26 The CCDG noted that the table currently covers the expected requirements for imbalance Settlement, Group Correction, performance management and reporting. ELEXON noted that, once there is more clarity on the Settlement requirements to support network charging under the Targeted Charging Review (TCR), ELEXON and the CCDG will need to undertake a similar exercise to establish if any additional registration data items, Industry Standing Data items and CCC indicators are required.
- 3.27 A CCDG member noted that the full MPAN currently includes Profile Class, Meter Timeswitch Class (MTC) and LLFC, but that Profile Classes will no longer exist under the TOM. The member queried whether the full MPAN is still needed or whether Parties just use the core MPAN and look up the rest in MPAS. A member also queried whether MTC is still required for Settlement, suggesting that these type of data items could be retained for legacy processes but not used going forwards.²

Industry Standing Data and registration data items

- 3.28 ELEXON [presented](#) a table listing Industry Standing Data items with links to the existing relevant Market Domain Data (MDD) tables, and a MoSCoW column with ELEXON's view on whether each data item will or could be needed under the TOM. ELEXON noted that all existing MDD data items will be required until the end of transition.
- 3.29 The CCDG reviewed the table and agreed that:
- The new Market Segment ID ('U-S-A') should be added as a new table, linked to the new CCC table
 - Measurement Class should now be categorised as a 'Won't have'
 - Standard Settlement Configurations should be moved out of the BSC and maintained under REC governance for billing purposes, along with the Change of Supplier (CoS) read process (see the CCDG's Registration and appointments discussion below) and any other data items that need to be retained for billing but not Settlement.
- 3.30 The CCDG agreed that it would be desirable to split the DUoS LLFC ID from the LLF, so that they are two separate data items. This is because Distributors currently use the LLFC ID to identify DUoS Tariffs and Load Managed Areas, which causes proliferation of the required LLFC IDs even though there are very few associated LLFs. ELEXON agreed to add this to the table of Industry Standing Data changes.
- 3.31 The CCDG agreed that new 'Market Participant Roles' will need defining to reflect the new TOM services.
- 3.32 The CCDG noted that its discussion on data items is likely to continue throughout the next few meetings as it completes its consideration of the outstanding detailed TOM design areas. ELEXON agreed to clarify what data item outputs the AWG needs from the CCDG, and when.

Action 02/05

- 3.33 ELEXON agreed to update its draft Industry Standing Data table with the CCDG's comments and send to the following CCDG members for further comment before bringing it back to CCDG03:
- Aaron Dickinson
 - Dom Bradbury
 - James Murphy

¹ Must-have, Should-have, Could-have, Won't have.

² For the time being, ELEXON will include this in the log of other potential consequential changes.

HEADLINE REPORT

- Tom Chevalier.

3.34 The CCDG noted that Steven Bradford had also volunteered previously for this area but had been unable to attend the meeting so would not have the benefit of hearing the discussion. ELEXON agreed to contact him to confirm the scope of his input.

Action 02/06

3.35 The CCDG discussed whether new registration data items are needed to support the TOM. ELEXON advised that, as part of the Switching Programme and Retail Code Consolidation SCRs, registration processes and existing MPAS data will be split into:

- Retail (with associated data items to be captured in a new Electricity Retail Data Service (ERDS) that will sync with the new Central Switching Service (CSS))
- Settlement (with associated data items to be captured in the Supplier Meter Registration Service (SMRS))
- Distribution and network charging.

3.36 ELEXON advised that any references to 'registration' data or services under the TOM are therefore to SMRS. All SMRS data items will be defined before implementation of the TOM, and can be changed without impacting the CSS.

3.37 The CCDG agreed that GSP Group, AI/AE indicator and domestic/non-domestic indicator should all be in SMRS. ELEXON agreed to check with St Clements whether any of these data items are already held there.

ACTION 02/07

3.38 The CCDG agreed that the new 'U-S-A' flag should be used to validate that the Data Service is appointed to the correct TOM market segment.

3.39 The CCDG discussed whether a load shape category data item needs to be added to SMRS: for example, a load shape category or flag for Economy 7. There were differing views on the appropriateness of this, as it would not be needed for Settlement but to support billing. ELEXON agreed to take this suggestion away and bring its thoughts on the BSC implications back to a future CCDG meeting.

ACTION 02/08

Registration – appointments & confirmations

3.40 ELEXON [presented](#) an overview of the current Supplier Agent appointment process. It also [presented](#) a suggested straw man on how the Registration Service could be used as a 'single source of truth' (definitive record) and notifier of who is providing which TOM services for a given Meter.

3.41 ELEXON noted that the current appointment process can result in more than one Supplier Agent being appointed in the same role for a particular Meter, or no Supplier Agent being appointed for that role. This can cause duplicated or missing Settlement data. ELEXON advised that the DWG had proposed using the TOM development as an opportunity to design out this risk as far as possible, particularly as CoS (and thereby changes in TOM service provider) can occur daily following implementation of the Switching Programme and because the TOM is also reducing the timescales for the Initial Settlement Run. The DWG had therefore recommended using the Registration Service as the 'single source' of truth and notifier of TOM service provider appointments. ELEXON highlighted that the existing SMRS will need to change to support the TOM regardless. This is because it currently identifies the Meter Operator Agent, Data Collector and Data Aggregator for each Meter, and since new registration data items will be needed for Settlement.

HEADLINE REPORT

- 3.42 ELEXON clarified that the Meter Reading Service (MRS, part of the SDS) will not need access to historic Meter readings, only an initial read for a non-Smart Meter or for a Smart Meter with a communications issue. The CCDG discussed how a CoS read would be established under MHHS, noting that this would no longer be needed for Settlement but is important for billing. ELEXON noted that the proposed new/amended Smart Energy Code (SEC) DCC User Role for the SDS could access any Meter. It also noted that the appointed SDS will not need to have any interaction with any previous legacy agent or SDS, as it can obtain data from SMRS, the Supplier and the Meter. A member suggested that the CoS read process is moved out of the BSC and under the REC.
- 3.43 A CCDG member commented that, while ELEXON's suggested straw man removes the risk of multiple service providers being appointed to a Meter in the same role it does not necessarily remove the risk of a single, incorrect service provider being appointed. The member noted ELEXON's suggestion that the service provider could 'reject' the appointment but that, if the Supplier did not resolve this, the service provider would still be expected to fulfil that role. The member commented that the service provider may not be able to do this if they do not operate in that market segment. ELEXON commented that getting Industry Standing Data and validation rules right would design out this possibility earlier in the process, so that the validation rules would not permit appointment of an invalid agent for a market segment.
- 3.44 The CCDG member suggested that an alternative approach, if the service provider rejects the appointment but the Supplier does not submit a revised appointment, would be to nullify the original appointment. While this would result in no service provider being appointed for that role, channelling the rejection through the Registration Service would mean that the Registration Service has visibility of this situation and could report it for performance management purposes.
- 3.45 The CCDG agreed that, regardless of the approach, any rejections of appointments by service providers should go back to the Supplier via the Registration Service rather than directly to the Supplier in order to give visibility of any issues.
- 3.46 A CCDG member suggested that another possible approach would be for TOM service providers to give the Registration Service advance details of what appointments they will accept or reject. This could form a look-up table that the Registration Service could then validate Suppliers' appointments against. The CCDG discussed whether this could simplify or complicate the process.
- 3.47 The CCDG agreed that ELEXON should work offline with the following volunteer CCDG members before the next meeting, to flesh out different straw man approaches:
- Aaron Dickinson
 - James Murphy
 - Paul Saker
 - Tom Chevalier.
- 3.48 The CCDG agreed that the focus should be on trying to answer any outstanding questions, and clarifying what data / information is passing between services, so that the CCDG can take a view at CCDG03 on the pros and cons of different approaches.
- 3.49 The CCDG noted that Lorna Mallon and Steven Bradford had also volunteered previously for this area but had been unable to attend the meeting so would not have the benefit of hearing the discussion. ELEXON agreed to contact them to confirm the scope of their input.

ACTION 02/09

HEADLINE REPORT

- 3.50 A CCDG member raised a concern that the proposed approach appeared to be a fundamental move away from the existing Data Transfer Network (DTN), around which existing participants have built their systems. ELEXON clarified that participants would not be prevented from continuing to use the DTN, but that new entrants would also not be prevented from using other methods. ELEXON reiterated that the current appointment process will require changes for the TOM regardless of whether the CCDG decides to use the Registration Service as the single source of truth and/or notifier of appointments.

4. Exception reporting

- 4.1 Due to time constraints, this item was not discussed and will be rolled over to CCDG03.

5. CCDG01 [Headline Report](#) and actions

- 5.1 ELEXON confirmed that it had received no comments on the CCDG01 Headline Report.
- 5.2 ELEXON noted that all actions have been completed apart from 01/02, relating to the MRA/REC baseline as discussed under item 2 above.

6. Summary and next steps

- 6.1 The Chairman confirmed that ELEXON will make contact with the Industry Standing Data and Registration appointments/rejections work area volunteers, to initiate the offline working and agree next steps for producing the resulting collaborative output. ELEXON will bring working documents to CCDG03 capturing the outputs of this offline work plus the CCDG's initial decisions on Measurement Classes and CCCs.
- 6.2 At CCDG03, ELEXON will also present further initial straw men on Exception Reporting for Data Services, GSP Group Correction Factors and Scaling Weights, and Export Settlement.
- 6.3 The next CCDG meeting will be on 18 February 2020 at ELEXON. One member gave their apologies for the meeting as they will be out of the country.

HEADLINE REPORT

ACTIONS

Actions on ELEXON:

- 01/03 – ELEXON to update the Work Plan with the CCDG’s agreed change and send it to Ofgem for approval – Closed – Sent on 12 December 2019.
- 01/04 – ELEXON to contact absent CCDG members to confirm which detailed work areas they wish to volunteer for – Closed – Details of post-meeting volunteers added to [CCDG01 Headline Report](#).
- 01/05 – ELEXON to update the Code Change Matrix template with the CCDG’s agreed change and send it to other Code bodies – Closed – Sent on 11 December 2019.
- 02/01 – ELEXON to bring a list of BSC drafting questions to a future CCDG for discussion (e.g. Metering System definitions, SSTPGPL) – Open.
- 02/02 – ELEXON to create a log to record any consequential industry changes that would be beneficial for MHHS but are not directly required in order to implement the TOM – Open.
- 02/04 – ELEXON to document the CCDG’s proposed new CCC table, add a MoSCoW categorisation as an additional column and circulate it before CCDG03 for discussion at that meeting – Open.
- 02/05 – ELEXON to clarify what data item outputs the AWG needs from the CCDG and when – Open.
- 02/06 – ELEXON to update its draft Industry Standing Data table with the CCDG’s comments and send to the agreed list of volunteer CCDG members for further comment before bringing it back to CCDG03. ELEXON to contact Steven Bradford to confirm the scope of his input – Open.
- 02/07 – ELEXON to check with St Clements whether any of the following data items are already held in SMRS: GSP Group, AI/AE indicator and domestic/non-domestic indicator – Open.
- 02/08 – ELEXON to consider the BSC implications of creating a load shape category or flag for Economy 7 and bring its thoughts to a future CCDG – Open.
- 02/09 – ELEXON to work with the agreed list of volunteer CCDG members to flesh out the different approaches to TOM service provider appointments and rejections, before bringing the outputs back to CCDG03. ELEXON to contact Lorna Mallon and Steven Bradford to confirm the scope of their input – Open.

Actions on other members:

- 01/01 – Ofgem to amend the wording of the TOM Development Principle on non-aggregated half-hourly data to be more architecture-neutral – Closed – Final [Development Principles](#) published on 18 December 2019.
- 01/02 – Ofgem to clarify whether the legal text for MHHS should be drafted against the current Industry Codes baseline or new consolidated REC baseline – Open – See update provided at CCDG02 under item 2.
- 02/03 – Raising CCDG member to send ELEXON a description of the static LLF issue for inclusion in the log of other potential consequential changes – Closed – Sent on 16 January 2020.