HEADLINE REPORT

MEETING NAME	Code Change & Development Group – Market-wide Half Hourly Settlement SCR

Meeting number	08
Date of meeting	18 August & 25 August 2020
Purpose of paper	Information
Venue	By webinar
Classification	Public
Synopsis	Summary of the eighth CCDG meeting and actions arising.

In order to complete the agenda, this meeting was held over two sessions on 18 and 25 August 2020.

1.   Introduction, apologies and meeting objectives

1.1   The CCDG welcomed Fungai Madzivadondo from the Energy Networks Association, who has replaced David Lane on the group. The Chairman also introduced Thomas Demetriades from Elexon, who will be the CCDG Technical Secretary from September's meeting.

1.2   The Chairman confirmed that the meeting objectives were to:

- Understand the revised CCDG milestone timings / dependencies and where the CCDG's work fits into Ofgem's Significant Code Review

- Understand the progress of other related Ofgem work streams

- Approve the latest outputs from the joint subgroup of the CCDG and Architecture Working Group (AWG)

- Continue progressing and agreeing outstanding areas of the detailed TOM design.

1.3   The Chairman reminded CCDG members that the Headline Reports from each meeting record the group's decisions, the reasoning behind the decisions and the next steps. She suggested that, due to the number of different areas being progressed by the group, it would be helpful if members could use these reports to refresh their memories before each meeting. She also invited feedback on whether the format of these reports can be improved. A CCDG member commented that the current format is sufficient.

2.   Re-planned timings and key dependencies for CCDG deliverables

2.1   Elexon noted that, due to a variety of factors including COVID-19, it has been re-planning the CCDG's and AWG's deliverables with Ofgem. Elexon presented the key messages from this re-planning, highlighting that:

- The scope and sequencing of the CCDG's and AWG's milestones have not changed, but their timings have all moved back by five months so that:

  o   The CCDG's consultation on the detailed TOM design areas and Code Change Matrices has moved from June to November 2020

  o   The CCDG's consultation on the draft redlining to impacted Industry Codes (and industry-facing BSC Code Subsidiary Documents) has moved from February to July 2021

  o   The CCDG's final report to Ofgem has moved from May to October 2021

- This does not affect the SCR critical path since Ofgem's business plan milestones have moved back by six months (with its Full Business Case decision now targeted for Spring 2021)

- The re-plan incorporates the deliverables from the joint CCDG/AWG subgroup, which were not part of the original CCDG and AWG work plans

ELEXON

HEADLINE REPORT

- The joint CCDG/AWG subgroup is running slightly behind on its deliverables – this has the potential to add a further month to the plan and Elexon is discussing with Ofgem how this might be mitigated.

2.2 Elexon also highlighted that the following key activities need to be completed by the CCDG before its consultation can be drafted for publication in November 2020:

- Agreement of any outputs from the joint CCDG/AWG subgroup that materially impact the consultation's content

- Agreement of the outstanding areas of the detailed TOM design

- Agreement of any resulting changes needed to the MRA and DCUSA Code Change Matrices[1]

- Agreement of the consultation's approach to the CUSC, SEC and network charging impacts / interactions[2]

- Assessment of the detailed TOM design against Ofgem's TOM design principles and development principles.

2.3 In response to a question from a CCDG member, Elexon reminded the group of the scope of its deliverables as set out in its original work plan agreed at CCDG01. Elexon confirmed that the redlining overseen by the CCDG will include both amended and new BSC Procedures (BSCPs), as discussed at CCDG01, CCDG05B and CCDG07.

2.4 Elexon advised that, once it has confirmed its revised project plan with Ofgem, it will produce an updated CCDG work plan for the group's review, Ofgem's approval and publication on its website. In the meantime, Elexon highlighted the latest 'Plan On A Page' included in the slides.

3. Updates on other SCR work streams and Ofgem actions

Significant Code Review

3.1 Ofgem reminded the CCDG that its Draft Impact Assessment Consultation closes on 14 September 2020. It noted that it held a stakeholder event by webinar on 22 July 2020 and is planning a second event on 3 September 2020.

Other code bodies

3.2 Ofgem advised that the SEC's Technical Architecture Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC) has agreed formally to introduce a new SEC User Role for independent Meter Data Retrieval (MDR) Services. The detail of this will now be considered by the SEC's Security Sub-Committee.

3.3 Ofgem confirmed that it is discussing with Gemserv how best to complete the SEC Code Change Matrix. For the CUSC Code Change Matrix, the aim is to produce a summary of the CUSC approach for the CCDG's consultation rather than a full matrix. This is because:

- The final legal drafting for the Targeted Charging Review (TCR), and therefore the CUSC drafting baseline, will not be known until October 2020

- It is expected that only minor changes will be needed to the CUSC's charging arrangements to support the TOM.

3.4 Ofgem noted that it will be re-engaging with all impacted code bodies in the next couple of weeks. Ofgem also noted the current re-planning activities around the Switching Programme and REC, and confirmed that it will update the CCDG on any interactions with MHHS once it has more information. Elexon and Ofgem agreed to discuss offline, as part of existing action 05/13, how best to reflect the latest REC traceability matrix within the BSC Code Change Matrix.

---

[1] Master Registration Agreement (MRA) and Distribution Connection Use of System Agreement (DCUSA).
[2] Connection and Use of System Code (CUSC) and Smart Energy Code (SEC).

ELEXON

HEADLINE REPORT

4. CCDG/AWG subgroup outputs for agreement

4.1 A CCDG member presented the following subgroup outputs for the CCDG's agreement:

- Requirements for data exchange between the TOM's Registration Service (SMRS[3]) and Metering Services – discussed at CCDG07 on 1 June and also at a CCDG workshop on 10 July 2020

- Requirements for data exchange between the TOM's Registration Service and Data Services – discussed at the CCDG workshop on 10 July 2020

4.2 Elexon noted that Ofgem had circulated the detailed spreadsheets to CCDG members for review on 23 July 2020 and had received no comments. The presenting CCDG member noted that some of the diagrams presented in the slides have been reused from the 10 July workshop.

4.3 The presenting CCDG member advised that the subgroup has agreed to include an 'Opt Out ID' (with Effective From Date) in the Registration Service, but has yet to agree how this is populated. This will record which Metering Systems are associated with customers who have opted-out of sharing their Half Hourly (HH) data for Settlement. Elexon confirmed that this ID/flag only applies to domestic and Import Metering Systems. Elexon noted that more discussion is needed around what this needs to record in order to reflect Ofgem's policy decisions. Elexon agreed to discuss this further with Ofgem and the subgroup.

ACTION 08/01

4.4 The presenting CCDG member highlighted that the key outstanding question on registration interfaces from the subgroup is how to handle a retrospective change of Data Service. The member outlined the following two options discussed by the subgroup:

- Option 1: Any data submitted by the old Data Service is no longer usable and the old Data Service can no longer submit/change data. Under this option, the new Data Service will provide the (same) data as the 'current view' of data.

- Option 2: Any data submitted by the old Data Service remains in use but the old Data Service can no longer submit/change data. Under this option, the new Data Service can change consumption data, including overwriting with the same values.

4.5 Elexon commented that, under Option 2, the TOM has been designed not to permit overwriting of values. Any replacement values from the new Data Service will therefore need to be submitted with a later time-stamp. Elexon commented that, as the new Data Service is responsible in Settlement, it can choose whether or not to submit replacement values.

4.6 A CCDG member suggested that Option 2 might rule out a distributed technology solution (e.g. use of multiple data stores), although Elexon and some other CCDG members did not necessarily agree.

4.7 A CCDG member commented that the subgroup has also discussed a third option not shown in the slides. This would restrict the ability to retrospectively change a Data Service appointment in the first place. Under this option, a retrospective appointment would not be allowed and the 'correct' Data Service would only be appointed going forwards. The member believed that this option is preferable and commented that the TOM's new appointment process designs out some of the reasons for undertaking retrospective appointments.

4.8 The presenting CCDG member agreed to take this third option back to the subgroup for more discussion.

ACTION 08/02

4.9 Elexon suggested consulting on the different options if there is no consensus. The Chairman suggested that it would be preferable to consult on a majority recommendation rather than no recommendation.

---

[3] Supplier Meter Registration Service.

ELEXON

4.10   The CCDG discussed whether it now has enough detail from the subgroup to proceed with finalising the TOM design and issuing its consultation, or whether there are any outstanding dependencies. Elexon noted that the subgroup will continue its discussions in parallel but that not all questions will be resolved within the CCDG/AWG timescales. Elexon and Ofgem agreed to discuss whether the CCDG and subgroup outputs can now be uncoupled and how to approach any further CCDG reviews of these outputs.

ACTION 08/03

4.11   Elexon advised that its approach to documenting Industry Standing Data (ISD) in Working Document A is to only define the new/amended data items and simply refer to the Market Domain Data (MDD) Handbook for descriptions of all other existing items. Elexon agreed to check with the subgroup and the AWG Technical Lead what ISD information the AWG requires.

ACTION 08/04

5.   Updates on outstanding TOM design areas

Service appointments process

5.1   Elexon presented an update on the changes it has made to the appointments process diagram to take account of Actions 06/04 and 06/05. The diagram has been updated to have more generic wording (allowing for variations in the chosen architecture) and to clarify interactions in the Change of Supplier (CoS) process.

5.2   Elexon noted that it had received further comments from a CCDG member before the meeting. It agreed to address these offline and recirculate the diagram to the group.

ACTION 08/05

5.3   The CCDG noted that the subgroup is proposing to use both Effective Date and Time for certain data items. Elexon noted the need to check whether this impacts the Central Switching Service (CSS).

Registration data items

5.4   Elexon presented an update on Action 07/02, noting that now it has the master set of new/amended Registration data items from the joint CCDG/AWG subgroup it can incorporate this into Working Document A – potentially as an annex.

5.5   Elexon noted that the AWG's outputs will list these data items with their architectural attributes, for a technology audience. However, the CCDG's consultation will need to list them with an explanation of why they are needed to support the TOM requirements, for a business process audience.

5.6   Elexon agreed to discuss with the CCDG members on the subgroup how best to document the data items from a business process perspective, before bringing the write-up in Working Document A to the CCDG for agreement. This will be progressed under existing action 07/02.

5.7   Elexon also presented an update on Action 06/10, regarding use of Line Loss Factors (LLFs) and LLF Classes (LLFCs) under the TOM. Elexon advised that there is still an opportunity to look at using the idea of LLF Groups to mitigate the impacts of the Targeted Charging Review (TCR) on MDD. If taken forward, this idea will be implemented before MHHS. However, the TCR is too far advanced to consider fundamentally changing the use of LLFCs under this work. Elexon suggested that the Access and Forward-looking Charges SCR is the most appropriate forum to develop the Distribution Use of System (DUoS) charging reporting requirements that will apply after the implementation of MHHS. Elexon advised that it will engage with and support this SCR to ensure that the reporting possibilities under the MHHS TOM are understood.

ELEXON

5.8 Finally, Elexon [presented](#) an update on Action 04/17 regarding the potential to link Import and Export Meter Point Administration Numbers (MPANs) to a single address. Elexon noted that Associated MPANs in ECOES[4] only link Import and Export MPANs with the same Meter Serial Number (MSN). Where there is a stand-alone Export Meter with a different MSN to the Import Meter, these are not linked in ECOES or SMRS and there are no plans to introduce a link between them under the [Switching Programme](#).

5.9 Elexon proposed that the CCDG could introduce a new association irrespective of MSN and that this new data item (e.g. 'Import/Export Pair') could be mastered/populated by Distributors at the point of connection. It suggested that Meter Point Address is not a reliable source for inferring these types of relationships and that the Meter pairing could be done without using address data, which has its own set of issues.

5.10 A CCDG member asked where this new data item would be held. Elexon noted that the BSC Central Settlement Services will hold the directional flow, with the Boundary Flow ID set by the Distributor. Some members initially suggested that this falls outside of Settlement. However, others considered that it is a Settlement issue as the [Smart Export Guarantee](#) (SEG) requires both the Import and Export Meters to have the same Meter Operator Agent (MOA), but currently it is difficult to identify the Import MOA.

5.11 The CCDG agreed that this issue therefore needs to be addressed under the current Settlement rules, rather than waiting for the MHHS TOM. Elexon agreed to discuss further with a CCDG member and Ofgem, to establish the best governance route for progressing this (noting the outstanding questions over where MOA governance will sit under the [Retail Code Consolidation SCR](#)).

ACTION 08/06

Exception reporting

5.12 Elexon [presented](#) an update on exception reporting, reflecting further discussion with its Settlement Risk team after previous discussions at [CCDG03](#), [CCDG04A](#) and [CCDG05A](#). Elexon proposed that additional validation of consumption data against Registration data by the Market-wide Data Service (MDS) is necessary to avoid Settlement Risks/Errors.

5.13 The CCDG's discussion identified that members had not changed their views, with members generally falling into one of the following two positions on the need for additional MDS validation and exception reporting:

Arguments against:	Arguments for:
• If the Data Service is already validating consumption data against the registration data held in the Registration Service (SMRS), then the MDS repeating this validation against SMRS data is unnecessary duplication – it adds cost and complexity without adding additional value. If the Data Service has a system outage, it should resubmit data once it's resynchronised with the Registration Service.	• If it can't be guaranteed through the architectural design that the Data Service's system will always be synced with the latest data set in SMRS, then there is the possibility that errors can occur – this architectural question can't be answered at this point in time. Will the Data Service always know if it's become desynchronised from the latest Registration Service view of data?
• The TOM processes have been designed to ensure that Registration data (as the 'single source of truth') is correct and mastered by the authoritative source – many causes of poor data quality have been 'designed out'.	• It's not possible to know whether the data provided by the Data Service contains errors or has been derived correctly without the MDS undertaking further validation checks against SMRS – not validating therefore risks undetected Settlement Errors.

---

[4] The [Electricity Central Online Enquiry Service](#).

ELEXON

Arguments against:	Arguments for:
● Responsibility should be placed on the service that's sending data to validate it before sending – further downstream validation is therefore unnecessary and doesn't place the correct incentives on the sending service.	● SMRS data isn't bulk-cleansed regularly and there will be inherited (legacy) data issues/ mismatches when MPANs are migrated to the TOM.
● Qualification and BSC Audit processes provide controls that can check the Data Service's ability to correctly validate against Registration data. Building in extra validation will incur costs (of running the checks and of providing the extra data items needed to run them).	● Qualification and Audit processes have their own costs and can't check all data – it has not been proven that building in MDS validation checks is disproportionately costly.

5.14 The Chairman noted that the question of costs is difficult to answer at this time until the solution architecture is agreed and a technology solution chosen. She noted that the chosen approach to validation and exception reporting depends on risk appetite and confidence in the data/processes, since further validation appears to be the only way to know for sure whether errors are getting through. She commented that it is difficult to see how to resolve the different views and suggested seeking views through the CCDG's consultation.

5.15 Elexon agreed to write up and circulate the arguments made to date, and to see if the list of data items required for the further validation could be rationalised. Some members suggested that not all of these data items may be needed and asked for more clarification on what Settlement purpose they serve.

ACTION 08/07

Settlement run-off arrangements

5.16 Elexon presented an update on Action 06/01, noting the latest discussions of the Trading Disputes Expert Group (TDEG). The full TDEG paperwork and minutes are available here.

5.17 Elexon also updated the CCDG on its discussions with the Software Technical Advisory Group (STAG) on managing the centrally-provided Non Half Hourly (NHH) Party Agent software during the run-off of the NHH Settlement arrangements. Elexon confirmed that:

● Oracle has withdrawn Extended Support for the current version of the NHH software operating system

● Elexon and its service provider are therefore planning an upgrade of this software to Oracle 19c, which will occur before implementation of MHHS starts

● Oracle's extended support window for 19c will span the NHH Settlement run-off period

● While it is therefore not possible to avoid an upgrade to the existing NHH agent software, this upgrade is needed to support the existing BSC Settlement operations and no further upgrades are required in order to undertake Settlement run-off activities for MHHS.

5.18 Elexon noted that there is therefore no need to amend the run-off approach agreed at CCDG06. It agreed to write this approach up in Working Document C for approval at CCDG09.

ACTION 08/08

Erroneous Transfers

5.19 Elexon presented options for how to manage the Settlement aspects of Erroneous Transfers (ETs) under the TOM, noting that this question had been raised at CCDG05 Part B when reviewing the Code Change Matrices (Action 05/11).

ELEXON

5.20 The CCDG clarified that an ET is when a Supplier erroneously gains a customer with whom it does not have a contract. It noted that the REC contains a [resolution process](#) for ETs, which the REC refers to as Erroneous Switches. Under this REC process the ET is identified[5] and the customer is re-registered to the original Losing Supplier. The REC requires that the customer is only billed once for the ET period. The Losing Supplier has the right to bill the customer for that period as if the ET had never happened (known as continuous billing) but it is up to the Losing Supplier whether they actually bill the customer in practice. The erroneously-Gaining Supplier must refund the customer if it has billed them during the ET period.

5.21 Elexon highlighted that, because the CSS has been intentionally designed not to allow a retrospective CoS, the incorrect (erroneously-Gaining) Supplier will remain registered in SMRS for the period of the ET and will have the associated Settlement responsibility. If Settlement is not corrected to re-assign the customer's energy volumes to the correct (erroneously-Losing) Supplier, the erroneously-Gaining Supplier may incur Settlement charges for energy that they are unable to recoup by billing the customer.

5.22 Elexon noted that, under the existing BSC/MRA ETs process, ETs are also corrected on a prospective not retrospective basis. For NHH customers, the BSC currently 'unwinds' the ET in Settlement by adjusting Register Reads to:

- Zero the consumption for the ET period (with CoS reads either side), such that the incorrectly-appointed Supplier has no Settlement liability for that period

- Reallocate the volume to Settlement Periods after the ET period, so that the Settlement liability falls on the 'correct' Supplier albeit in the wrong Settlement Periods.

5.23 Elexon highlighted that this type of process does not work well under MHHS, where most customers will be settled on real HH data from smart Meters rather than Register Reads, and where the aim is to assign energy usage to the correct half-hour Settlement Periods. The CCDG clarified that there is currently no ET process for elective HH customers. However, the nature of these elective (mostly non-domestic) customers makes ETs less likely as they have different commercial processes for switching Supplier.

5.24 The CCDG discussed the possible causes of ETs, noting that some are caused by poor-quality (incorrect) address data or incorrectly-registered MPANs. It considered that while the Switching Programme may reduce the number of ETs it is unlikely to remove all possible causes, e.g. customers entering incorrect data on switching websites.

5.25 The CCDG clarified that ETs do not include a genuine CoS where a customer switches but then exercises its right to cancel the switch during the cooling-off period. This is because, in this scenario, the Gaining Supplier will still have a contract with the customer for that short interim period.

5.26 The CCDG discussed the following options for re-assigning ET Settlement volumes to the 'correct' (erroneously-Losing) Supplier:

- **Option 1:** Providing pseudo-registration data to BSC Central Settlement Services, to 'over-write' the SMRS view of the appointed Supplier for the ET period and instead assign the Settlement volumes to the correct Supplier – this pseudo-registration data could be submitted by:
  - The erroneously-Losing Supplier (who may not have an incentive to do so)
  - The erroneously-Gaining Supplier (who would have an incentive to reassign the volumes)
  - The CSS, if it is aware of the ET

---

[5] The CCDG clarified that the REC refers to the Supplier who invokes the ET resolution process as the Initiating Supplier, with the other Supplier being the Associated Supplier, regardless of which is the Gaining or Losing Supplier. The REC requires whichever Supplier is contacted by the customer to initiate the ET process.

- ○ The SMRS, if notified by either Supplier – however, this would be a pass-through of information as SMRS cannot change the appointed Supplier retrospectively for the ET period
- **Option 2:** Not correcting Settlement data at all, on the assumption that:
  - ○ The volumes concerned are likely to be small
  - ○ The occurrence of ETs is likely to be distributed evenly across all Suppliers
  - ○ The complexity of any Settlement solution (with associated new interfaces) is therefore likely to be disproportionate.

5.27 Elexon noted that, if Settlement volumes are to be amended/re-allocated, this should not be triggered until the REC's resolution process has completed (i.e. until the customer has been re-registered to the erroneously-Losing Supplier).

5.28 Some CCDG members initially expressed a preference for Option 2, arguing that Suppliers should not be gaining customers erroneously. Some members questioned whether all Suppliers currently correct ETs, or whether they write them off due to the small volumes involved. Other members highlighted that the reasons for an ET are not always within the erroneously-Gaining Supplier's control. A member noted that Settlement corrections are permitted in the gas market and argued that the principles behind the ETs process should be consistent across both fuels.

5.29 CCDG members did not believe that Option 1 would be a proportionate solution and also argued that it would undermine the CSS design principles (which does not allow retrospective CoS) as well as the TOM principle of SMRS being the 'single source of truth'. Elexon highlighted the other following potential issues with Option 1:

- The REC's ET resolution process can take 24 months to complete, while final Settlement reconciliation will be completed in four months under the TOM
- ETs are unlikely to be eligible for correction through a Trading Dispute, as they are unlikely to meet the BSC's definition of Settlement Error or the materiality thresholds for raising a Trading Dispute
- Extra-Settlement Determinations (ESDs) could be considered as a way of correcting ET Settlement volumes, since these are financial adjustments outside of the Settlement Reconciliation Run process – however:
  - ○ ESDs are currently only used to correct Trading Disputes, and a new process would therefore need to be defined to use them for ETs
  - ○ ESDs are complex to calculate, which is why they are little-used – this complexity may outweigh the materiality of the ET
  - ○ ESDs do not feed through into corresponding adjustments to network charges (for example, DUoS charges) in the way that Reconciliation Runs do.

5.30 CCDG members discussed the meaning of paragraph 3.9 in the REC's resolution process, which states that incorrect Settlement volumes should be corrected promptly to avoid any detriment to the customer. However, some members highlighted that the scope of this paragraph applies to all customer-facing switching and billing problems covered by the REC procedure and not just ETs. The CCDG also agreed that, even if the Settlement volumes remained assigned to the incorrect Supplier, there would be no detriment to the customer because the REC process ensures that the customer is not double-billed.

5.31 Some members suggested that it should be left to Suppliers to reallocate Settlement costs bilaterally, potentially under the REC. Other members believed that the REC would see it as a Settlement issue, and considered that it would be difficult for the Suppliers to work out the Settlement cost of a single MPAN for a short period. Some members suggested a compensation arrangement, rather than Settlement adjustment might be more appropriate.

5.32   Elexon suggested that it could notify the Suppliers of what the Settlement charges had been to the erroneously-Gaining Supplier in the ET period. It suggested that, if reallocation of these charges then occurred under the REC, this would get around the timescales issues and be a more proportionate solution. A CCDG member suggested that, under this approach, any cost reallocation could also take account of any associated DUoS costs.

5.33   The CCDG agreed that Elexon should write up this approach in more detail for inclusion in the consultation document. The Chairman suggested including a specific consultation question on this approach.

ACTION 08/09

5.34   The CCDG noted the difficulty in knowing the future volume and materiality of ETs and asked whether the Switching Programme had made any assumptions about this. Members noted that there are two aspects to assessing materiality:

- How frequently ETs occur across all Metering Systems
- How much volume is shifting for an individual Metering System as a result of an ET.

ACTION 08/10

5.35   A CCDG member commented that, separately to ETs (where a Supplier is always on the hook for Settlement charges), it may also be worth looking at the situation in which an MPAN is incorrectly de-registered such that there is no appointed Supplier.

Change of Meter / Market Segment

5.36   Elexon presented a decision tree and accompanying examples/scenarios to illustrate that:

- The Meter Type determines the TOM Market Segment to which the Metering System is allocated (Unmetered, Smart & Non-Smart or Advanced)
- The specific type of Data Service that is a valid appointment for a Meter depends on the Market Segment
- The specific type of Metering Service that is a valid appointment for a Meter depends on the Market Segment and Connection Type.

5.37   Elexon noted that, where a Market Segment is due to change (e.g. because of a forthcoming Meter exchange), any associated change to the type of Data Service and Meter Service appointed to that Meter needs to happen before the actual change of Meter/Segment. However, this undermines the primacy of the Meter Type in the decision tree. Elexon suggested that, to break this loop, SMRS validation could be relaxed on notification by the Supplier of a pending change of Market Segment. However, this would require SMRS to hold an extra data item.

5.38   The CCDG discussed whether there could be retrospective updating of Meter Type, noting that a Meter could be replaced on one day with SMRS updated the following day.

5.39   Several CCDG members volunteered to help Elexon work up a solution further outside of the meeting.

ACTION 08/11

Demand Control Events

5.40   Elexon presented an update on Issue 89 'Ensuring Demand Control Event (DCE) procedures remain fit for purpose'.

5.41   Elexon confirmed that it is still maintaining a watching brief on how the Issue Group's discussions progress. It highlighted that the Issue Group is considering two potential options for centralising the DCE Settlement adjustments process:

- Using National Grid's Demand Control Instructions to apportion the total requested disconnected energy between Parties based on each Party's relative Credited Energy or Market Share

- Using the opportunity of MHHS to calculate estimates of disconnection volumes within the BSC Central Settlement Services, rather than relying on Party Agents to perform this role as currently.

5.42 Elexon outlined some of the challenges associated with the second option, as shown on the slides. It noted that the CCDG has an opportunity to feed views into the Issue Group via Elexon. Elexon agreed to send CCDG members the slides from the latest Issue Group meeting and invited members to email it any comments and views.

ACTION 08/12

GSP Group Correction

5.43 Discussion of this item was postponed to CCDG09 on 15 September 2020.

Update on MRA Issues related to MHHS

5.44 Elexon presented an update on MIF327 'Review of obligations in respect of the Supply Number Format set out in Schedule 5 of the MRA', which Elexon has raised at the CCDG's request (Action 05/12). The MIF asks if amendments are needed to the Supply Number included on customers' bills, since these includes data items (like Profile Class and Meter Timeswitch Code) that will/may no longer exist under the TOM.

5.45 Elexon noted that the MRA's Issue Resolution Expert Group (IREG) discussed this MIF on 12 August 2020. The IREG has agreed that there is an opportunity to make a change ahead of version 3.0 of the REC and has suggested raising it with the Switching Programme for inclusion in a future consultation. Elexon noted that the timing of any change would need to be considered in relation to CSS Go-Live. It also noted that changes to the Supply Number could be made all in one go, or by removing an item at a time.

5.46 Elexon advised that although the Supply Licence refers to the Supply Number, it just says to follow the Supply Number format set out in the MRA/REC. So while there may be an opportunity to amend/remove the licence obligation under the SCR, this is not essential.

5.47 Elexon confirmed that it is speaking to Ofgem's Switching Programme Manager and agreed to include Ofgem's MHHS TOM team in the discussion. This will be progressed under existing action 05/12.

5.48 Elexon also presented an update on MIF328 'Future SMRS reporting requirements for BSC purposes in MRA Clause 27 and Schedule 13', which Elexon has raised following discussion of the MRA Code Change Matrix at CCDG05 Part B (Action 05/10). The MIF was raised to consider if the existing report can be enhanced.

5.49 Elexon noted that the IREG also discussed this MIF on 12 August 2020. The IREG has agreed that SMRS reporting for BSC purposes no longer falls under the MRA's remit. Elexon advised that it has agreed to withdraw the MIF and instead convene a meeting with Supplier Meter Registration Agents (SMRAs) to discuss future reporting requirements and capability. As this will now be a BSC change, Elexon will progress this under the normal change process outside of the MHHS SCR.

6. CCDG07 Headline Report and actions log

6.1 The CCDG07 Headline Report is available here. All open actions were discussed during the meeting.

7. Summary and next steps

7.1 The Chairman confirmed that the next steps are to:

- Work offline on the outstanding actions, involving CCDG and subgroup members where needed/agreed

- Complete as much drafting of Working Documents A, B and C as possible by the next CCDG meeting, for the group's review/approval.

ELEXON

HEADLINE REPORT

7.2   A CCDG member highlighted under Any Other Business that they have raised new [MIF 329 'Removal of eight redundant DTC flows'](#).

ACTIONS

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

ELEXON