

# HEADLINE REPORT

---

<b>MEETING NAME</b>	Code Change & Development Group – Market-wide Half Hourly Settlement SCR
<b>Meeting number</b>	07
<b>Date of meeting</b>	16 June 2020
<b>Purpose of paper</b>	Information
<b>Venue</b>	By webinar
<b>Classification</b>	Public
<b>Synopsis</b>	Summary of the seventh CCDG meeting and actions arising.

---

## 1. Introduction, apologies and meeting objectives

- 1.1 The Chairman highlighted that the recent cyber-attack on ELEXON’s internal network had severely constrained ELEXON’s ability to progress actions from CCDG06. She advised that ELEXON is currently re-planning CCDG activities due to the impacts of both COVID-19 and the cyber-attack. The CCDG discussed this further under item 8.
- 1.2 The Chairman confirmed that the CCDG07 meeting objectives were to:
- Answer any questions on the role of the Architecture Working Group (AWG), noting that this item was postponed from CCDG06
  - Review the first outputs from the joint CCDG/AWG subgroup
  - Agree further areas of the detailed TOM design, where ELEXON has been able to progress these.

## 2. Q&A session with ELEXON on scope of Architecture Working Group’s deliverables

- 2.1 The ELEXON technical lead for the AWG [presented](#) an overview of the typical lifecycle for a technology project, explaining how the AWG’s work fits into this lifecycle.
- 2.2 ELEXON advised that the key messages for the CCDG are that:
- The AWG’s work will complete the first requirements phase shown in the lifecycle diagram.
  - The AWG’s role is to make recommendations to Ofgem on what it believes is the best solution architecture to support the Market-wide Half Hourly Settlement (MHHS) Target Operating Model (TOM).
  - The inputs to the AWG’s work are the business requirements (and non-functional requirements) for the TOM, as developed by the Design Working Group (DWG) and the CCDG. The business requirements comprise data transfer between TOM services and the process models relating to these (e.g. conditions, triggers) that cross different functional silos.
  - The AWG’s output is a Solution Architecture Document (SAD), which needs to be written in a language that technology experts can understand. The SAD is not a prescriptive technology model but a statement of the problem that needs to be solved by technology, along with the business context. It will comprise:
    - Conceptual architecture (a contextual diagrammatic/table overview of what the TOM services do)
    - Business architecture (describes the business context)
    - Logical architecture (a description of each logical component such as a TOM service, what it does and who it interacts with)
    - Physical architecture (describes any existing hardware/software constraints that will impact the solution)

# HEADLINE REPORT

---

- Security constraints (e.g. access/key management, encryption).
  - The AWG will consult on its recommendations before submitting them to Ofgem. Ofgem will make the final decision on whether to approve the solution architecture recommended by the AWG.
  - The AWG's recommendations will be technology-agnostic and there will be many different technologies that can implement its recommended solution architecture. A further, more detailed, design phase will be needed after the AWG has concluded and this is the second phase shown on the lifecycle diagram.
  - This further design phase will select the technology components to solve the problem identified by the AWG. It will need wider stakeholder representation, to enable impacted parties to input into the technology solution. It will also produce the high-level technology design needed before participants can begin the detailed design and build of their systems, which then takes place in the third and final phase of the lifecycle. The end product of the final build phase will be a set of IT programs.
  - The CCDG should be neutral on / unconstrained by architectural considerations when developing what it believes are the best business requirements to deliver the DWG's TOM.
- 2.3 The CCDG highlighted that the existing BSC Procedures (BSCPs) currently detail the method of data exchange for each process step. If this will not be known until a later design phase, this dependency needs to be overcome if the CCDG is to deliver redlined BSCPs. ELEXON and Ofgem confirmed that they are discussing options for addressing this. ELEXON suggested that one approach could be to remove the data exchange method from the BSCPs and place this in another type of document to be developed later on. Ofgem also noted that, under its Smart Meters Act powers, it can stagger its direction of the necessary document changes as needed.

### 3. CCDG/AWG subgroup outputs for agreement

#### Data exchange between Registration Service and Metering Services

- 3.1 ELEXON reminded the CCDG that the subgroup is identifying the business requirements for data exchange, to help the AWG prepare specifications for the interfaces between TOM services. These interface specifications will form part of the AWG's industry consultation and the SAD.
- 3.2 ELEXON [presented](#) the first set of subgroup outputs, covering data exchange between the Registration Service and Metering Services. As well as the presentation slides, ELEXON provided CCDG members with drafts of the interface specification and data exchange spreadsheet.
- 3.3 ELEXON described the process followed by the subgroup to flesh out the business requirements and data items needed to support the CCDG's straw man on Registration (Data items, appointments and confirmations). It also explained the structure and content of the interface specification.
- 3.4 ELEXON clarified that the work being undertaken by the subgroup is a translation exercise. It will turn the CCDG's business requirements into a common format and terminology that can be understood by technology experts who may not have the wider business context.
- 3.5 ELEXON sought CCDG members' views on the best way to present future subgroup outputs back to the CCDG. The CCDG agreed that the spreadsheets were more useful to it than the draft specifications, since the spreadsheets contain more detail and context. It agreed that, for each future subgroup output, ELEXON should present the key messages needing CCDG discussion/agreement but also provide the spreadsheets for optional review if members wish to refer to these. ELEXON agreed to consider the best way to do this for future outputs.
- ACTION 07/01**
- 3.6 ELEXON noted that the subgroup is following an iterative process, meaning that it will not finalise all outputs until it has completed work on all the interfaces.

# HEADLINE REPORT

---

- 3.7 The Chairman noted the need to be clear on the boundaries between the CCDG's and AWG's accountabilities, consultations and deliverables. She clarified that the CCDG only needs to review any extra/amended business requirements developed by the subgroup (including any new/amended data items). The resulting interface specifications will be consulted on and agreed by the AWG.
- 3.8 The CCDG agreed that any new data items introduced for the TOM will need defining, with an explanation of why they are needed. CCDG members suggested that these are best defined in the CCDG's deliverables. ELEXON agreed to consider how and where to capture these.

**ACTION 07/02**

- 3.9 CCDG members had no other comments on the subgroup outputs so far.

## 4. Updates on outstanding TOM design areas

### Revised transitional approach for GSP Group Correction Factors and CT SMETS Meters

- 4.1 ELEXON [presented](#) suggested amendments to the transition approach for GSP Group Correction Factors, originally agreed at [CCDG06](#).
- 4.2 ELEXON noted that the approach agreed previously does not work with zero Scaling Weights for Active Export, as the new GSP Group Correction calculation would be trying to divide a numerator of zero by a proportion of the Import volume. It therefore proposed to adjust the transition approach so that the Scaling Weights for existing Consumption Component Classes are revised on deployment of the BSC Central Settlement Services, rather than at the end of migration as previously agreed. All other aspects of the approach remain unchanged from CCDG06.
- 4.3 ELEXON also highlighted a recent [announcement](#) by SSE Business Energy that it intends to start rolling out three-phase SMETS2<sup>1</sup> smart Meters. ELEXON advised that the current set of TOM CCCs does not cater for these if they are low voltage Current Transformer (CT) Metering Systems.
- 4.4 CCDG members believed that the Metering Systems announced by SSE will be Whole Current, with all three phases wired directly into the Meter. Members noted the existing licence condition that CT Meters need to be Advanced and considered that the SMETS requirements are not compatible with CT metering. The CCDG therefore believed that there is no issue. ELEXON agreed to confirm this understanding with SSE.

**ACTION 07/03**

## 5. Updates from other work streams:

### Significant Code Review

- 5.1 Ofgem advised it is checking with its Targeted Charging Review (TCR) team when it can start re-engaging with National Grid Electricity System Operator (ESO) on the MHHS changes to the Connection and Use of System Code (CUSC).
- 5.2 Ofgem highlighted that it has set up a regular catch-up with its Retail Energy Code (REC) team, to understand any impact of the pause in REC work on MHHS as well as the next steps on MOA governance (Action 06/12).

### Other code bodies

- 5.3 ELEXON noted that it has not received any comments from CCDG members on the Code Change Matrices presented at [CCDG05 Part B](#). Members confirmed that they were happy with the overviews of the matrices presented at that meeting. ELEXON agreed to extend the final deadline for comments to 30 June 2020.

---

<sup>1</sup> Smart Metering Equipment Technical Specifications.

# HEADLINE REPORT

---

## 6. SEC/DCC Meter Data Retrieval requirements

- 6.1 The Data and Communications Company (DCC) and Genserv (SECAS) gave a verbal update on the DCC solution to implement the TOM. This needs to be confirmed before Genserv can identify the changes needed to the Smart Energy Code (SEC).
- 6.2 The DCC advised that:
- The SEC's Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC) has agreed that a new DCC user role would need to be created to facilitate the TOM's Meter Data Retrieval (MDR) service
  - Existing DCC capacity includes the capability to provide a Half Hourly profile once a day to one type of user, for Import only
  - The DCC has concerns that, if multiple types of user wish to access smart Meter data for different purposes (not limited to MHHS), this could have implications for DCC network capacity
  - The DCC is discussing these wider capacity concerns with Ofgem and the TABASC.
- 6.3 Ofgem confirmed that the capacity questions are broader than MHHS and fall outside the remit of the CCDG. However, it asked the Supplier members of the CCDG to confirm whether they believed that Suppliers who use a separate MDR would also want to retrieve smart Meter data themselves.
- 6.4 CCDG members noted that Suppliers need smart Meter data for other non-Settlement purposes, and believed that individual Suppliers may have different preferences. The decision may, in practice, depend on what is the cheapest / most efficient approach – and this may be to only collect the data once. However, as it stands under the TOM, this is a commercial decision for individual Suppliers to make. The CCDG also noted the need to consider that customers can choose to appoint their own agents.
- 6.5 A CCDG member suggested that it was for the TABASC to review other uses of the data. Another member considered that the non-Settlement uses may support services that customers want, and so any limiting of these would need careful consideration.
- 6.6 Ofgem noted that the TABASC is continuing its discussions in this area.

## 7. CCDG06 Headline Report and actions

- 7.1 ELEXON noted that it had received minor comments on the CCDG06 Headline Report (since published [here](#)).
- 7.2 ELEXON noted that the cyber-attack has limited its ability to progress outstanding actions. The CCDG discussed this further under item 8 below.

## 8. Summary & next steps

- 8.1 ELEXON confirmed that it is currently re-planning CCDG activities due to the impacts of both COVID-19 and the cyber-attack. It noted that its ability to progress work has been severely constrained since CCDG06. ELEXON advised that it is considering cancelling the CCDG meeting scheduled for 21 July 2020, in order to focus on clearing the backlog of actions and thereby make the best use of members' time at the next full meeting. ELEXON asked members to keep the meeting in diaries for now until it confirms otherwise.
- 8.2 ELEXON suggested that, in place of the scheduled July meeting, it could instead circulate materials for review by email as they are completed (e.g. Working Document B) and work offline with members on actions where appropriate. It noted that it is continuing work with the joint CCDG/AWG subgroup, whose timescales may also need to be revised.
- 8.3 ELEXON advised that, under its original work plan, the CCDG would have issued its consultation in June 2020 and that some key project members therefore have pre-existing leave in July. ELEXON noted that it will need to re-plan around this. It asked CCDG members to also let it know of any leave they have planned during July and August 2020, so that this can be factored in.

## HEADLINE REPORT

---

### **ACTION 07/04**

- 8.4 A CCDG member asked if it is possible to review group materials using Microsoft Teams. ELEXON confirmed that the aspiration is still to use Teams if possible; however there are still IT restrictions to overcome before this can happen.

### **ACTIONS**

---

See separate actions log on the [CCDG07](#) web page.