

# HEADLINE REPORT

---

<b>MEETING NAME</b>	Code Change & Development Group – Market-wide Half Hourly Settlement SCR
<b>Meeting number</b>	06
<b>Date of meeting</b>	19 May 2020
<b>Purpose of paper</b>	Information
<b>Venue</b>	By teleconference
<b>Classification</b>	Public
<b>Synopsis</b>	Summary of the sixth CCDG meeting and actions arising.

---

## 1. Introduction, apologies and meeting objectives

### 1.1 The Chairman:

- Thanked Ofgem for providing the teleconferencing for this meeting at short notice
- Confirmed that the objective of the meeting was to progress outstanding areas of the straw men and related actions on the detailed design of the Target Operating Model (TOM)
- Advised that ELEXON would be in touch with members of the joint CCDG / Architecture Working Group (AWG) subgroup to confirm arrangements for that week's meeting
- Highlighted Ofgem's [letter](#) to ELEXON about progressing the CCDG's and AWG's work during the COVID-19 pandemic – noting that this formally confirms the update given at [CCDG05 Part B](#).

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

2.1 ELEXON advised that it will rearrange this item for a future meeting.

## 3. Work plan for joint CCDG/AWG subgroup

3.1 ELEXON and Ofgem [presented](#) the work plan for the joint CCDG/AWG subgroup. They highlighted that:

- The subgroup is identifying the business requirements for data exchange, to help the AWG prepare specifications for the interfaces between TOM services
- The subgroup's work is planned to run until July 2020
- Outputs will be brought to the CCDG for agreement before handing them over to the AWG.

## 4. Updates from other work streams:

### Significant Code Review

4.1 Ofgem advised that:

- It has published its [draft Impact Assessment consultation document](#), which lays out the economic case for Market-wide Half Hourly Settlement (MHHS)
- It has not set a deadline for responses at this time but, once set, the response period will be no less than 10 weeks
- The consultation seeks stakeholders' views on Ofgem's proposals including a four-year period for transitioning to MHHS, as well as views on the impact of COVID-19 on the project timescales
- Although there is no formal deadline for responses yet, Ofgem welcomes any feedback on the consultation by email to [halfhourlysettlement@ofgem.gov.uk](mailto:halfhourlysettlement@ofgem.gov.uk).

# HEADLINE REPORT

---

## Other Code Bodies

- 4.2 Ofgem gave a verbal update on how the Data and Communications Company (DCC) and Genserv (SECAS) are working to agree 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).
- 4.3 Ofgem advised that the SEC's Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC) met on 7 May 2020, where it discussed DCC capacity and how a new or existing DCC User role could facilitate the Meter Data Retrieval (MDR) service. Genserv and the DCC are working up more detailed analysis, based on the TABASC's comments, before coming back to a future CCDG.

## 5. Updated straw man on Settlement run-off arrangements (Action 04/02)

- 5.1 ELEXON [presented](#) the latest run-off straw man, as developed offline with CCDG member volunteers since [CCDG04 Part A](#). The presentation added more detail to the verbal update given at [CCDG05 Part A](#).

### Interaction with migration

- 5.2 ELEXON highlighted that the Settlement run-off arrangements have a dependency on the migration of Metering Systems to the TOM. This is because:
- The migration of a Party's last Metering System to the TOM represents the start of that Party's run-off of the old Settlement processes
  - Once all Metering Systems have migrated to the TOM, this sets the last Settlement Day to be reconciled under the old Settlement arrangements – this can be considered to be the start date of the market-level run-off arrangements
  - The run-off arrangements only end once all migrated Metering Systems have been through the reconciliation timetable for that Settlement Day
  - Different Parties will be migrating Metering Systems at different times – this means that some Parties may complete the run-off of their own Metering Systems through the Reconciliation Final (RF) Run earlier than others, though all Parties will continue to have a potential Settlement exposure until every Metering System has been through full reconciliation
  - The longer the overall migration period, the more protracted the overall run-off arrangements will be.
- 5.3 ELEXON advised that the straw man is designed to ensure that all Metering Systems can be reconciled through to RF. The option to truncate runs remains open, but if taken there will be a need to ensure that all Parties are treated equitably.
- 5.4 ELEXON noted that slide 5 shows a timeline of the key milestones. It highlighted that the exact dates shown are hypothetical, but illustrate that run-off could take two years unless reconciliation is curtailed at RF with no Disputes 'tail'.
- 5.5 Some CCDG members commented that they believe the one-year migration period shown on page 69 of Ofgem's [draft Impact Assessment consultation document](#) may not provide a feasible length of time in which to migrate all Metering Systems. Ofgem clarified that the year shown in its consultation is when Suppliers will be mandated to undertake migration, but that they can start earlier voluntarily at the point that the TOM services are available. Ofgem invited CCDG members to respond to its consultation with their views.
- 5.6 ELEXON commented that there is nothing to prevent Suppliers from preparing the migration of Advanced Meters sooner, since their migration is just about transitioning from the current Settlement data aggregation arrangements. ELEXON suggested that there could be an earlier mandatory migration period for the Advanced market segment. Several CCDG members expressed support for this idea, noting that any mandated start/end dates would need regulatory enforcement.

# HEADLINE REPORT

---

- 5.7 ELEXON noted that, unlike [P272 'Mandatory Half Hourly Settlement for Profile Classes 5-8'](#), no site visits or reconfiguring of Meters will be required. As soon as a Supplier has appointed its TOM service providers, it can start submitting data to Settlement.

## Interaction with Trading Disputes Technique Review

- 5.8 A CCDG member commented that they would like the focus of Trading Disputes to be about Settlement accuracy rather than fixing money. They believed that this would be a better approach to reducing the amount of Disputes during run-off than any proposal to use Extra Settlement Determinations (ESDs). They reiterated that ESDs can cause issues for Distributors since ESDs are a financial correction rather than actual changes to Settlement data. This means that Distributors are unable to make corresponding corrections to Distribution Use of System (DUoS) charges.
- 5.9 ELEXON noted that there are several considerations for handling Trading Disputes during run-off:
- The criteria for raising a Trading Dispute, for example the materiality threshold(s) – the [Trading Disputes Technique Review](#) is progressing the Design Working Group's (DWG's) recommendations in this area (see update at [CCDG02](#)), which need to be in place before the start of migration
  - Whether Disputes Final (DF) Runs can be carried out without live Non Half Hourly (NHH) software
  - Whether a Supplier is able to identify NHH Settlement Errors once it has de-appointed the NHH Data Collector (NHHDC) and is no longer getting NHH Meter readings.
- 5.10 A CCDG member asked how many NHH Disputes are raised currently. ELEXON clarified that these are frequent. However their materiality tends to be low, which is why the thresholds/criteria are being reviewed.
- 5.11 ELEXON advised that the [Trading Disputes Expert Group \(TDEG\)](#) will be meeting in the next month.<sup>1</sup> It agreed to update the CCDG on the interactions between MHHS and the TDEG's work.

**ACTION 06/01**

## Interaction with Oracle support for Non Half Hourly software

- 5.12 ELEXON noted that the Settlement run-off arrangements also have a dependency on the end of extended Oracle support for the centrally-provided NHH software. This is because:
- Upgrades to this software are costly and time-consuming for Party Agents – as the software will no longer be used after completion of run-off, ideally ELEXON and industry will wish to avoid another ~5 year upgrade cycle if possible
  - Agents need to have the live NHH software to submit Supplier Purchase Matrices (SPMs) – this requires extended Oracle support for as long as SPMs need to be submitted for RF Runs.
- 5.13 ELEXON noted that it is still trying to confirm the exact end date for Oracle's extended support for the current version. ELEXON highlighted that, once confirmed, it needs to discuss the impact of this end date with the [Software Technical Advisory Group \(STAG\)](#) in the first instance.<sup>2</sup>

**ACTION 06/02**

- 5.14 ELEXON noted that it is also still considering the feasibility of NHH Data Aggregators (NHHDA's) submitting SPMs early for the RF and DF Runs. ELEXON's working assumption is that it will not need to retain the live software for audit requirements, as long as there is another way to extract data.
- 5.15 A CCDG member commented that, based on the timescales shown in the slides, they are not convinced that another NHH software upgrade can be avoided.

---

<sup>1</sup> Post-meeting note: the TDEG meeting has since been rearranged to follow the Trading Disputes Committee (TDC) meeting on 2 July 2020.

<sup>2</sup> Post-meeting note: the 21 May STAG meeting has since been postponed and has yet to be rearranged.

# HEADLINE REPORT

---

## Next steps

- 5.16 The CCDG agreed that the run-off straw man works at a conceptual level.
- 5.17 ELEXON confirmed that the next steps are to discuss the results of Actions 06/01 and 06/02 with the relevant CCDG member volunteers, before bringing the final straw man to CCDG08 for agreement in July 2020.

**ACTION 06/03**

## 6. Updated straw man on Registration - Data items, appointments & confirmations

### Appointments process (Action 04/16)

- 6.1 ELEXON [presented](#) the latest straw man appointments process, as developed offline with CCDG member volunteers since [CCDG04 Part B](#).
- 6.2 ELEXON highlighted that it has simplified v2.0 of the process diagram to remove overly-complex Old Service Objections, but that otherwise its key features are unchanged. CCDG members agreed that the updated diagram is much clearer.
- 6.3 A CCDG member advised that the joint CCDG/AWG subgroup is assuming that there will be positive acceptance of appointments by services, to try to avoid the existing time-out issues. ELEXON noted that this would change some of the steps on the diagram but not the overall branches.
- 6.4 ELEXON highlighted that positive acceptances rely on services being able to undertake bulk confirmations, rather than the alternative approach of rejecting appointments by exception. The CCDG member considered that there are a finite number of criteria in which a service will accept or reject an appointment (for example, the service does/does not operate in a given market segment or GSP Group). They suggested that these could be set out in a table that allows a service to indicate in advance what appointments it will accept. ELEXON agreed to speak to the CCDG member further offline about this idea, before discussing this with the joint CCDG/AWG subgroup.

**ACTION 06/04**

- 6.5 ELEXON noted that the diagram shows a conceptual process that is intended to be more practical and future-proof than the existing processes covered by the D0011 and D0155 appointment/rejection data flows.
- 6.6 A CCDG member noted that the box 'CSS notify existing service pre-switch' appears duplicated in the follow-on box 'Request existing service details'. ELEXON agreed to check this. It clarified that these boxes are intended to show how the Supplier is aware of its appointment from a given date.

**ACTION 06/05**

### TOM segment allocation (Action 04/15)

- 6.7 ELEXON [presented](#) a potential set of rules or 'decision tree' for allocating Metering Systems to TOM market segments.
- 6.8 ELEXON noted that these raise the question of whether the Market Segment ID is a data item in its own right, or just a product of other existing data items (Metered Indicator, Meter Type and Connection Type).
- 6.9 ELEXON also highlighted the outstanding question of how to handle a change of Meter that results in a change of segment, with slide 10 showing the possible scenarios in which this could occur and slide 11 suggesting a potential approach. The CCDG agreed that ELEXON should take this question to the joint CCDG/AWG subgroup for further consideration.

**ACTION 06/06**

# HEADLINE REPORT

---

## 7. Updates on outstanding TOM design actions

### Update on Actions 05/05 and 05/06 (valid/default Load Shape Categories)

- 7.1 ELEXON highlighted the spreadsheet circulated to CCDG members, setting out ELEXON's proposed set of valid Load Shape Categories for inclusion in Industry Standing Data (ISD). It advised that these are intended to form the estimation process of last resort, as the last backstop before the BSC Central Settlement Services. This should ensure that the Market-wide Data Service (MDS) does not have to default data.
- 7.2 ELEXON advised that it had considered introducing a Load Shape Category ID, similar to the Consumption Component Class (CCC) ID, that would not be held by the Registration Service. However, it had not progressed this as it did not wish this ID to become synonymous with Profile Class ID.
- 7.3 ELEXON noted that it has added new categories for the Advanced market segment, all non-domestic. A CCDG member suggested that domestic categories should also be added for this segment. ELEXON agreed to update Column C, rows 60-67, to read 'N/D'.

**ACTION 06/07**

- 7.4 ELEXON asked the CCDG for its view on whether Load Shapes in the Advanced Market segment can be produced in time for the Initial Settlement (SF) Run.
- 7.5 A CCDG member asked if Load Shapes will be created for Active Export or if data would just be defaulted to zero. ELEXON confirmed that zero values are only used in the requirements for the Smart market segment.
- 7.6 Another CCDG member asked if the valid set can be amended later if needed, after implementation of the TOM. ELEXON confirmed that they can be, but that there may be knock-on impacts of introducing new Load Shape Categories later on.

### Update on Action 05/02 (defaulting rules)

- 7.7 ELEXON [presented](#) its proposed defaulting rules for each TOM market segment, to be used by the MDS if it does not receive data from the relevant Data Service. These included the proposal to default Active Export to zero in the Smart segment. ELEXON noted that these rules are a last-resort protection for Settlement and would only be needed if the upstream Data Service estimation process fails (see item above). It also noted that the Data Service will have the opportunity to correct the data at subsequent runs.
- 7.8 CCDG members considered that the proposed rules were overly-complex for their intended purpose. The CCDG agreed the following changes:
- For Active Import in the Smart segment, the MDS should default the data to the Load Shape held in ISD
  - For Active Import in the Advanced segment, the MDS should default the data to the Load Shape Category for the relevant voltage level
  - For Active Export in the Advanced segment, the MDS should default to zero
  - For Unmetered Supplies (UMS) Active Import, UMS Load Shape Categories should be introduced and the MDS should default to these
  - For UMS Active Export, the MDS should default to zero.
- 7.9 ELEXON agreed to make these changes and capture the rules in one of the CCDG's working documents.

**ACTION 06/08**

- 7.10 A CCDG member noted that there is no obvious way to distinguish UMS customers by their size, and thereby apply different default Load Shapes accordingly. ELEXON agreed to arrange a further offline discussion with the CCDG member on how to create UMS Load Shapes.

**ACTION 06/09**

# HEADLINE REPORT

---

7.11 ELEXON noted that Load Shapes will be created twice: once for the SF Run and again at 10 Working Days.

## Update on Action 04/14 (LLF/LLFC data items)

- 7.12 ELEXON gave a verbal update on this action. It is discussing internally how Ofgem's Targeted Charging Review (TCR) could be an opportunity to formalise the concept of Line Loss Factor (LLF) 'groups' and thereby support Distribution Network Use of System (DUoS) charging while reducing the need to proliferate LLFs and/or LLFCs for non-volume allocation purposes.
- 7.13 The CCDG agreed that this is worth exploring further and noted the need to discuss it with Distributors. ELEXON agreed to circulate an explanatory note to the CCDG and to consider presenting this at an appropriate distribution forum.

**ACTION 06/10**

## Update on Action 05/04 (transitional Scaling Weights)

- 7.14 ELEXON highlighted the spreadsheet circulated to CCDG members, noting that it had not received any comments. The spreadsheet uses a theoretical volume of 1GWh split across CCCs, so that members can attempt to establish the delta between old and new Scaling Weights. ELEXON reiterated the difficulties in analysing the impact of moving to the new Scaling Weights, since it is not possible to establish the accuracy of the existing error allocation.
- 7.15 A CCDG member suggested seeking input from the Supplier Volume Allocation Group (SVG). ELEXON advised that the SVG is unlikely to have any further insight as the issue is lack of data. Those CCDG members who also sit on the SVG agreed that this is the case.

## 8. GSP Group Correction transition requirements

- 8.1 ELEXON [presented](#) its straw man proposal for implementing the new GSP Group Correction Factors calculation, new CCC IDs and new Scaling Weights.
- 8.2 ELEXON proposed that:
- The new calculation, CCC ID table and new Scaling Weights table in ISD are implemented on deployment of the BSC Central Settlement Services
  - Initially no changes are made to the existing CCC Scaling Weights
  - Scaling Weights for the new CCC IDs are set to zero
  - When [X%] of Metering Systems have migrated to the TOM, then both the existing and new CCC revised Scaling Weights are implemented concurrently.
- 8.3 ELEXON noted that the percentage threshold in the last bullet does not need to be set now. The CCDG agreed that it would be more accurate/appropriate to measure this as a percentage of energy settled, rather than a percentage of Metering Systems. ELEXON agreed to make this change and to capture the approach in Working Document B.<sup>3</sup>

**ACTION 06/11**

## 9. CCDG05 Parts A & B Headline Reports and actions

- 9.1 ELEXON noted that it has not received any comments on the [CCDG05 Part A Headline Report](#), which it has now published. It has received minor comments on the CCDG05 Part B Headline Report and will publish this shortly.

---

<sup>3</sup> Post-meeting note: ELEXON has since identified that the proposed approach will not work with zero Scaling Weights for Export. ELEXON will propose an amended approach in Working Document B, for the CCDG's agreement.

# HEADLINE REPORT

---

## 10. Summary, next steps and plan for CCDG07

- 10.1 The Chairman noted that ELEXON has not received any comments on the Code Change Matrices presented at CCDG05 Part B. CCDG members confirmed that they have not had time to consider these fully. ELEXON agreed to extend the deadline for comments to CCDG07.
- 10.2 A CCDG member asked for an update on the planned split in Meter Operator Agent (MOA) governance between the BSC and the Retail Energy Code (REC). Ofgem agreed to check the latest on this as well as any impact of the REC delay on the MHHS work.

**ACTION 06/12**

- 10.3 ELEXON suggested using the opportunity of the TOM to separate the requirements for Smart Metering Equipment Technical Specifications (SMETS) and BSC Codes of Practice (CoPs) compliance, so that participants only have to be compliant with one or the other. CCDG members agreed in principle with this idea. ELEXON noted its existing [guidance note](#) on SMETS and CoPs compliance.
- 10.4 ELEXON confirmed that CCDG07 will be held on Tuesday 16 June 2020, from 10:00-13:00. ELEXON will advise CCDG members of the agenda and joining instructions for this meeting nearer the time.

## ACTIONS

---

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 – Update provided at CCDG02. Ofgem is still considering this, and a representative from Ofgem’s REC team will be attending future Code bodies subgroup meetings.

02/05 – ELEXON to clarify what data item outputs the AWG needs from the CCDG and when – Open – ELEXON gave updates at CCDG03 and CCDG04 Part A. This is also being considered by the new joint CCDG/AWG subgroup. ELEXON to reschedule the Q&A session postponed from CCDG06 – this will now take place at CCDG07.

04/02 – ELEXON to work with the relevant CCDG members to draw out the pros and cons of the three options for Settlement run-off (including quantifying any associated risks), before bringing the outputs to CCDG05. ELEXON to send the relevant STAG paperwork to the volunteer CCDG members – Closed – ELEXON sent the STAG paperwork to relevant members on 26 March 2020. Offline discussion held on 6 April 2020. ELEXON gave a verbal update at CCDG05 Part A. Discussed at CCDG06 under item 5 above.

04/10 – ELEXON to write up, in one of the Working Documents, the solution for adjusting Load Shapes for Register Read Meters with switched load. Write-up to clarify which types of switched load the solution covers – Open – ELEXON will capture this in Working Document A and bring it to CCDG08. Due date revised from CCDG07.

04/11 – ELEXON and the CCDG to revisit the need for any TOM requirements for RTS Meters at a future meeting, once more information is available on any extension to the RTS arrangements – Open – ELEXON is maintaining a watching brief. Due date revised from CCDG07 to CCDG08.

04/13 – ELEXON to continue updating the ISD tables and write-up in Working Document A to reflect the CCDG04 discussions and outstanding areas – Open – Updated with CCDG04 discussions. Due date revised to CCDG07 to allow for further discussion and updates from CCDG06. Due date revised further to CCDG08.

04/14 – ELEXON to work with internal colleagues and a CCDG member to progress a potential solution to separate the LLF and LLFC data items, as discussed at CCDG04 Part B – Closed – Email received from the CCDG member on 3 April 2020, containing suggested options for a LLF look-up table. Discussed at CCDG06 under item 7 above.

## HEADLINE REPORT

---

04/15 – ELEXON and a CCDG member to work up a decision tree, to help determine the best option for validating that a TOM Service Provider can operate in the Market Segment for the Meter to which they are appointed – Closed – Email received from the CCDG member on 3 April 2020 with suggestions for a decision tree. Discussed at CCDG06 under item 6 above.

04/16 – ELEXON to continue finessing the Registration straw man for inclusion in Working Document A, incorporating the discussions from CCDG04 – Open – Discussed at CCDG06 under item 6 above. ELEXON to capture the final straw man in Working Document A for agreement at CCDG08.

04/17 – ELEXON to look into whether the Switching Programme has considered any ways of linking Import and Export MPANs to a single property – Open – Due date revised from CCDG07 to CCDG08.

05/02 – ELEXON to consider further the defaulting rules for each market segment and bring its suggestions to CCDG06 – Closed – Circulated on 1 May 2020. Discussed at CCDG06 under item 7 above.

05/03 – CCDG to revisit its discussion on exception reporting once ELEXON has an update from the CCDG/AWG subgroup's work, potentially at CCDG06 – Open – Due date revised from CCDG07 to CCDG08.

05/04 – ELEXON to update the transitional Scaling Weights spreadsheet to use a theoretical volume of 1GWh split across CCCs, so that members can attempt to establish the delta between old and new Scaling Weights before discussing this further at CCDG06 – Closed – Spreadsheet circulated on 23 April 2020. Discussed at CCDG06 under item 7 above.

05/05 – ELEXON to circulate a proposed table of valid Load Shape categories to CCDG members – Closed – Circulated on 1 May 2020. Discussed at CCDG06 under item 7 above.

05/06 – ELEXON to check that requiring the Load Shaping Service to calculate the Advanced Market Default Load Shape has no other knock-on impacts on the TOM requirements, for example those relating to timescales – Closed – Discussed at CCDG06 under item 7 above. The Load Shapes will be created again after the SF Run, at 10 Working Days – therefore no adverse impacts.

05/07 – Members to send any detailed comments on the Code Change Matrices to CCDGSecretary@elexon.co.uk – Open – No comments received by CCDG06. Deadline extended to CCDG07. Please (re)send all review comments to saskia.barker@ofgem.gov.uk.

05/08 – Ofgem and ELEXON to set up further offline discussions as needed to address the CCDG's matrices comments with the relevant code bodies – Open – Awaiting outcome of action 05/07 so due date revised from CCDG07 to CCDG08.

05/09 – ELEXON, Ofgem and ElectraLink to discuss how to map out the dependencies between the TCR, Review of forward-looking charges and the MHHS TOM – Open – ELEXON and Ofgem held an initial discussion on 27 May 2020. Ofgem to speak to its charging SCR teams about the interactions in more detail. Due date revised from CCDG07 to CCDG08.

05/10 – ELEXON and Gemserv to discuss how any improvements to the MRA's BSC Panel report can best be progressed – Open – ELEXON raised this under AOB at the MRA's Issue Resolution Expert Group (IREG) meeting on 13 May 2020. ELEXON has agreed to raise an MRA Issue Form (MIF) for further IREG discussion. Due date revised from CCDG07 to CCDG08.

05/11 – ELEXON to consider the potential for, and process to correct, Erroneous Transfers under the TOM – Open – Due date revised from CCDG07 to CCDG08.

05/12 – ELEXON and Gemserv to discuss which existing governance forum (e.g. the MRA's IREG) is the best place to consider consequential changes to the Supply Number – Open – ELEXON raised this under AOB at the IREG meeting on 13 May 2020. ELEXON will raise a MIF for further IREG discussion. Due date revised from CCDG07 to CCDG08.



## HEADLINE REPORT

---

05/13 – ELEXON to update the BSC matrices to include any impacted MRA clauses that will move to the BSC and its subsidiary documents as part of the Retail Code Consolidation SCR, as well as identifying any BSC clauses that will be moving to other Industry Codes – Open – Due date revised from CCDG07 to CCDG08.

05/14 – ELEXON to check with its legal team what the original intention of BSC Section K2.4.6 was – Open – Due date revised from CCDG07 to CCDG08.

05/15 – ELEXON agreed to keep a watching brief on Issue 89 and flag where there are dependencies with the MHHS TOM – Open – Due date revised from CCDG07 to CCDG08.

05/16 – Ofgem to confirm whether using the 'other user' DCC role requires a firmware update, and provide a further update on the DCC solution after the TABASC meeting on 7 May 2020 – Open – Ofgem gave a verbal update at CCDG06 under item 3 above. Due date revised from CCDG06 to CCDG08.

05/17 – ELEXON, ElectraLink and Gemserv to record all outstanding impact/drafting questions in their respective Code Change Matrices, so that these can be tracked and revisited – Open – Ongoing. ELEXON has completed this for the BSC. Due date revised from CCDG07 to CCDG08.

06/01 – ELEXON to update the CCDG on the interactions between MHHS and the work being undertaken by the TDEG – Open – The next TDEG meeting has been postponed until 2 July.

06/02 – ELEXON to confirm the end date for Oracle's extended support for the NHH software and discuss this with the STAG – Open – The 21 May STAG meeting has been postponed and has yet to be rearranged.

06/03 – ELEXON to discuss the results of Actions 06/01 and 06/02 with the relevant CCDG member volunteers, before bringing the final run-off straw man to CCDG08 for agreement – Open – Due date revised to CCDG09 as a result of dependencies on Actions 06/02 and 06/03 above.

06/04 – ELEXON to speak to a CCDG member further offline about the idea of Suppliers pre-authorising appointments against set criteria, before discussing this with the joint CCDG/AWG subgroup – Open.

06/05 – ELEXON to check whether, in the appointments process diagram, the box 'CSS notify existing service pre-switch' is duplicated in the follow-on box 'Request existing service details' – Open.

06/06 – ELEXON to ask the joint CCDG/AWG subgroup to consider how to handle a change of Meter that results in a change of TOM market segment – Open.

06/07 – ELEXON to update the Load Shape Categories spreadsheet so that Column C, rows 60-67, reads 'N/D' – Closed – Spreadsheet updated accordingly

06/08 – ELEXON to make the changes to defaulting rules agreed under item 7 and capture these rules in one of the CCDG's working documents – Open.

06/09 – ELEXON to arrange a further offline discussion with a CCDG member on how to create UMS Load Shapes – Open.

06/10 – ELEXON to circulate a note to the CCDG explaining how LLF groups could be formalised under the TCR, and consider presenting this at an appropriate distribution forum – Open – Ofgem to confirm the most appropriate distribution forum at which to raise this.

06/11 – ELEXON to make the changes to the GSP Group Correction transition approach agreed under item 7, and capture the approach in Working Document B – Open – ELEXON has identified changes needed to the approach agreed at CCDG06, and will give an update at CCDG07 before circulating an amended Working Document B.

06/12 – Ofgem to confirm the latest status of the planned split in MOA governance between the BSC and REC, as well as any impact of the REC delay on the MHHS work – Open – Ofgem to give update at CCDG07.