
Headline Report

Architecture Working Group

Meeting number **11**

Venue **Teleconference**

Date of meeting **27 October 2020**

Classification **Public**

1. Introduction

1.1 Elexon introduced the eleventh AWG meeting. There were a number of members absent due to school holidays.

2. Updates from other work-streams

Code Change and Development Group (CCDG)

2.1 Elexon provided an update from the CCDG. The objective of CCDG10 had been to sign off the remaining elements of Working Document A. In the meeting, the group agreed processes for demand disconnection events, erroneous transfers and related meters.

2.2 The group had also discussed the exception reporting process, agreeing that parties would be able to look into the central data store to assess what data is missing. There would no longer be an explicit report at run-time because any data that wasn't present in the system would be defaulted.

2.3 There had also been a meeting discussing opt-out, where it was agreed what the supplier would need to ask a customer during the on-boarding process. The data service would then need to be notified as to whether half-hourly, daily or monthly data could be accessed.

2.4 Elexon and Ofgem had met with representatives from DCUSA and MRA to discuss updates to their code change matrices, which would be brought to the next CCDG meeting.

Significant Code Review

2.5 Ofgem provided an update, noting that they are still analysing responses to the Impact Assessment consultation that closed in September, and that they hoped to publish the non-confidential responses soon.

3. Industry Standing Data – Market Domain Data

3.1 Elexon presented the MHHS communications diagram, introducing the Industry Standing Data (ISD) flows. Elexon had looked into the DTN flows, including their frequency and size, and presented the indicative figures. The CCDG Technical Secretary noted that there were new flows not included in Elexon's analysis that had been identified by the CCDG, including new consumption component IDs, new scaling weights and new load shape categories. It was also noted that many of the data flows in Market Domain Data (MDD) relate to the non-half-hourly sector, and wouldn't be needed at the end of the transition, although they would need to be retained during the transition period.

3.2 The group discussed the current methods of disseminating ISD. ISD can be downloaded from the Elexon portal on an ad-hoc basis, but is also sent out monthly via the D269 and D270 data flows. The D269 contains the entire set of industry standing data, with the D270 containing only the incremental changes for that month. It was noted that parties can choose the fields that are relevant to them in their D269/D270 data flows.

- 3.3 The group discussed whether the current arrangement should be changed. It was noted that the current arrangement is on a monthly cycle because changes to ISD have to be agreed by the Supplier Volume Allocation Group (SVG), which occurs on a monthly basis. On the other hand, some group members suggested that in terms of modernising systems, a monthly lead time introduced a large delay.
- 3.4 There was a further suggestion that even if timescales could be shortened, not every party would have the capability to work to an eventing (or 'push') model, where ISD would be disseminated as soon as it is updated.
- 3.5 The CCDG technical secretary presented Working Document A, clarifying which data flows would be required only for the transitional period, and which flows would continue in the MHHS Target Operating Model (TOM).
- 3.6 There was a discussion around the potential innovations that are expected in the TOM. As an example, it was noted that Time of Use (ToU) tariffs would not require an update to the ISD, just a reconfiguration of the customer's smart meter. In this instance, no value would be gained from a faster ISD update process.
- 3.7 The group went on to discuss the costs of the Data Transfer Network (DTN), noting that the cost might factor in to a decision around whether to update the MDD system. A group member noted that the Targeted Charging Review (TCR) would hugely increase the volume of data on the DTN, which in turn would increase DTN charges for parties. There was a further comment that if the DTN was ever going to be replaced, it would be beneficial to do it under the umbrella of MHHS, as there would likely be limited appetite for the change in isolation.
- 3.8 The group agreed to go away and gather more information on the topic, before deciding which route to support.

4. Risk Assessment – Industry Change

- 4.1 The AWG Technical Lead went through the identified risks around Industry Change.
- 4.2 The group agreed to include a risk around creating an architecture that is too narrow, noting the importance of enabling future change in the industry. It was also agreed to include a risk that the architecture may impact on processes that have not been identified yet.
- 4.3 The group discussed the risk around the cost of re-architecting the system. It was noted that although the change was necessary, and that MHHS is a good opportunity for a large-scale upgrade, costs should be kept as low as possible in order to avoid creating a barrier to entry. There was also a comment that there is a risk that costs will not be visible, for example if there is no move away from the DTN, the cost of a more expensive DTN might not be factored in.
- 4.4 The next two risks, around creating an insufficiently scalable architecture and failing to find a balance between current and future needs, were agreed without comment.
- 4.5 The group discussed the risk around duplication of data, noting that it could be mitigated if there was a single, recognised, authoritative data source.
- 4.6 The group discussed a risk around current data transfer Service Level Agreements (SLAs) not being sufficient in MHHS. It was noted that it is within the remit of the AWG to set these SLAs, so the risk can be mitigated by making them suitable.
- 4.7 The next three risks were agreed to be outside the scope of the AWG.
- 4.8 The final risk, that parallel transition and implementation might introduce complexity, was agreed to be unavoidable and therefore not included in the risk assessment.
- 4.9 The discussion of risks around technology issues will be moved to the next AWG meeting.

5. Headline Report and Actions

- 5.1 There were no comments on the AWG10 Headline Report, and no updates to the actions.

6. Next Meeting

- 6.1 The next AWG meeting will be held on 24 November 2020.