

# Capacity Market Advisory Group Draft Minutes

Meeting number **5**

Venue **Elexon Offices/MS Teams**

Date of meeting **2 March 2023 10:00-16:00**

Classification **Public**

## Attendance and apologies

Attendees	Initials	Type
Brian Lake	BL	Member
Claire Sedgwick	CS	Member
Emma Burns	EB	Member
Euan Graham	EG	Member
Libby Glazebrook	LG	Member
Mark Duffield	MD	Member
Paul Jones	PJ	Member
Raoul Thulin	RaT	Member
Richard Thwaites	RiT	Member
Sarah Honan	SHon	Member
Aled Williams	AW	Representative (EMR Delivery Body)
Rebecca Yang	RY	Representative (EMR Delivery Body)
Richard Griffiths	RG	Representative (EMR Delivery Body)
Georgina Morris	GM	Representative (DESNZ)
Sarah Howarth	SHow	Representative (DESNZ)
Bir Virk	BV	Representative (LCCC/ESC)
Patrick Bibby	PB	Representative (LCCC/ESC)
Ross Haigh	RH	Representative (LCCC/ESC)
Tom Oliver	TO	Representative (LCCC/ESC)
Andrew Macdonell	AM	Representative (Ofgem)
Holly MacDonald	GT	Representative (Ofgem)
Eleanor Haynes	EHay	Guest (EDF Energy)
Lisa Waters	LW	Guest (Waters Wye Associates)
Matthew Billson	MB	Guest (PICLO)
Elliott Harper	EH	CMAG Facilitator (Elexon)

## Attendance and apologies

Chris Arnold	CA	CMAG Secretariat (Elexon)
Jenny Sarsfield	JS	CMAG Secretariat (Elexon)
Kathryn Gay	KG	CMAG Secretariat (Elexon)
Matthew Woolliscroft	MW	CMAG Secretariat (Elexon)
Samraj Gill	SG	CMAG Secretariat (Elexon)

## Apologies

Lee Priestly	LP	Member
--------------	----	--------

### 1. Welcome and Apologies

- 1.1 Elliott Harper (EH) welcomed Members and Representatives and noted apologies from Lee Priestly, with Richard Thwaites acting as Alternate.

### 2. Action Log

- 2.1 The CMAG reviewed the Action Log, all 'Complete' actions will be marked as closed. Discussion on actions 'In Progress' can be found in the CMAG Action Log v5.2 – 09.03.23.

### 3. CM Representative Updates

- 3.1 The Ofgem representative noted that they have finished the CM disputes process, and that the discussion has been finalised and sent to applicants. Ofgem noted that it has received the final CM Rules Change Proposal reports for CP365 'ITE Report Requirements' and CP366 'Total Project Spend', and are in the process of considering them. Ofgem will update the CMAG Secretariat and Members on progress.
- 3.2 The LCCC/ESC representative noted that there was a data error on the operational side between the EMR Delivery Body and EMRS. They are working to resolve the issue and further controls will be put in place to manage the process to mitigate the risk going forwards. The LCCC/ESC representative also made CMAG aware of DESNZ discussions to introduce [CFD exemptions for energy intensive consumers](#). While this would not have a direct impact on capacity providers, it may require system changes if it were to happen.
- 3.3 The EMR Delivery Body representative noted that the results for T-1 for Delivery Year 2023/2024 and the provisional report for T-4 for Delivery Year 2026/2027 were available on its website. They are working with DESNZ and will post their consultation response soon.
- 3.4 The DESNZ representative noted that the auction monitor reports are available online.

### 4. DESNZ Consultation Discussion – Final Thoughts

- 4.1 The CMAG Facilitator noted that the CMAG met on 17 January 2023 to give initial views on the key aspects of the DESNZ Consultation, and a formal response was sent to DESNZ, consisting of a cover paper and meeting minutes capturing the key discussions. The CMAG Facilitator invited Members to provide any final thoughts for consideration before the consultation concludes on 3 March 2023.
- 4.2 LW questioned whether automated reporting of Satisfactory Performance Days would require a system change, as it could cause delays in payments and disputes. The DESNZ representative noted that the system change had been considered and there were no perceived issues. The LCCC/ESC representative noted that in terms of automated reporting it would be a simple change.
- 4.3 A Member questioned why the emissions limit had been set at the stated level. The DESNZ representative stated that this had been discussed in the last CMAG meeting and that the level was set being mindful of security of supply and running behaviour. They offered to discuss further offline. The CMAG Secretariat noted

that the CMAG response to the consultation has been published on the website under rules and documentation, for reference.

## 5. Proposal Form Template Updates

- 5.1 The Ofgem representative highlighted the CM Rules Change Proposal form now includes a title field, updated section for urgency, and an updated section for confidentiality.
- 5.2 A Member queried whether including a question on whether the proposal depends on regulatory change or a change in policy could be helpful. Another Member agreed that this would be useful. The CMAG Facilitator questioned whether there should also be a question around Government subsidy control, but there was no consensus on this.
- 5.3 A Member commented that the proposal form could explicitly ask about other related Change Proposals or Modifications, as CM does not exist in isolation and it may be useful to reference outside things. The Ofgem representative noted that the text could be clarified, as it currently does not specify if it is asking about CM Rule changes or changes more generally.
- 5.4 LW questioned why confidential changes were being allowed when no other code has this. A Member agreed, noting that providing confidential supporting information is understandable, but that when changing the rules for everyone then everyone should have the right to have visibility of the non-confidential aspects of the proposal. The Ofgem representative confirmed that confidential proposals would still be subject to a statutory consultation, and clarified that the aim was to retain a process option similar to the previous process where proposals were submitted directly to Ofgem.
- 5.5 A Member questioned whether there was still need for this confidential route directly to Ofgem. If required, they suggested referring to it as an alternate pathway rather than calling it confidential, perhaps with a note that confidential supporting information can be submitted to the Authority. Another Member noted that it may be confusing having two routes for submitting proposals. The Ofgem representative explained that the concern was that an applicant may be reluctant to submit a proposal if not directly to Ofgem. The intention was to minimise fear of evidence being shared beyond scope. The group suggested Ofgem consider removing confidential proposals, but retains a right for proposers to submit confidential supporting information.
- 5.6 A Member questioned whether the CMAG could have urgent meetings called if any urgent changes required CMAG discussion. The CMAG Facilitator confirmed that urgent meetings could be called, within reason. LW questioned what the urgency criteria were and whether they would be published online. The Ofgem representative noted that guidance is provided on the proposal form but that the urgency criteria could also be published on the CMAG website.
- 5.7 **0323/01 – Ofgem to consider confidential change process and process of submitting confidential evidence to Ofgem, along with the criteria for urgency of CM Rules Change Proposals.**

## 6. Secondary Trading – Approach / CP364 Update

- 6.1 LW questioned if anyone had tracked how many secondary trading requests have been attempted. The EMR Delivery Body representative stated that they could give more detailed analysis in the future.
- 6.2 **0323/02 – The EMR Delivery Body to provide information on the number of secondary trading requests that are processed and rejected, and the CMU relocation process requests**
- 6.3 LG noted that the risk of capacity not being delivered where a transferee is terminated had been resolved and that the transferred part would revert to the transferor in such a scenario. A Member also thought that this had been resolved. The DESNZ representative noted that they would be interested to understand if the position had changed on any of these discussion points, as they were collated early on in the process. The EMR DB has noted this issue is covered from page 33 in V3.2 of 'Secondary Trading Guidance' on the [EMR DB website](#).
- 6.4 LG also commented that for partially traded obligations it seems unfair to be penalised based on the full obligation if you have partially traded out for some of the Delivery Year, and questioned whether the penalty could be scaled down. A Member noted that partial trading had been discussed in previous industry forums. The EMR DB representative noted to respond to this, EMR DB would like to understand which penalties are being referred to, as some milestone penalties are judged on the de-rated position as opposed to the actual Capacity Obligation.

- 6.5 A Member noted that generally while safeguards are needed to protect against perceived gaming of risk, it is not proportionate to insist that all requirements must be fulfilled before you secondary trade, as if you could fulfil these you would not want to secondary trade in the first place. Liquidity could be improved by removing unnecessary checks and balances on the seller before they are able to sell.
- 6.6 The DESNZ representative suggested that a more holistic view of secondary trading could be helpful. They noted that the policy intent is to protect consumers and provide value for money. There is a need to manage risk, but it is helpful to draw out what the potential risks are to balance them.
- 6.7 LW commented that there are rules that the EMR Delivery Body applies that are not in the CM Rules. LW suggested that SPDs are an example - if your CMU does not need to have demonstrated any at the point of trading, why put these obligations on Capacity Providers? LW stated that this goes against interest of customers.
- 6.8 The EMR DB representative stated that EMR DB documents the interpretation of CM Rules in the guidance published on its website. This interpretation can originate from within EMR DB but can also be from Ofgem or DESNZ where EMR DB has sought clarification of the original policy intent. It should therefore not be assumed that EMR DB is the sole source for the interpretation of CM Rules.
- 6.9 LW noted that another problem is that there is no appeals system for the Capacity Market when there are differing interpretations of CM Rules. Currently, if the EMR Delivery Body says something cannot be done, there is no further resource, but you should be able to appeal to Ofgem or DESNZ.
- 6.10 The CMAG Facilitator presented a view of what the process of reviewing secondary trading could look like as per the meeting slides. The suggested approach involved breaking down secondary trading as an issue into a number of high level topics and individual Issue areas to progress as separate CMAG work streams and asked CMAG which areas they would want to tackle first.
- 6.11 A Member noted that it felt important to focus on the high level area of policy first, due to the complexity of secondary trading, and that once the baseline policy was reviewed it would be possible to take a more pragmatic view on the detailed issue areas. Following that, liquidity would be a priority. The CMAG Facilitator noted that a review of policy would require pre-work by DESNZ, which the DESNZ representative said they would be happy to do.
- 6.12 **0323/03 – DESNZ to provide guidance on the policy intent for Secondary Trading so that the CMAG can proceed with its Secondary Trading work in alignment to DESNZ views**
- 6.13 A Member agreed, stating that the review should be mission statement led. If the goal is increasing liquidity, then that should be what CMAG considers first. They felt that while it is important to address the important overarching topics, there are quick wins that can be progressed in the meantime. The CMAG Facilitator commented that the CMAG could progress with initiatives that are not impacting overall policy intent, but that a full review of Secondary Trading should probably sit with DESNZ as this would inherently impact policy.
- 6.14 LW also felt there were quick wins that could be progressed around changing the processes, rather than changing the CM Rules. For example, they have found that trades are being rejected because the sites are not the same, such as one site being larger or not both having a connection agreement on the portal, despite there being nothing in the Rules to say this cannot be done. The EMR Delivery Body representative noted that the CMU reallocation issue would be taken away for consideration.
- 6.15 The CMAG Facilitator clarified that the CP364 subgroup is looking at the timeframes and calculation issue areas highlighted in the approach. There will then be further work to look at the other issue areas for secondary trading. The intention is for CMAG to discuss these areas of secondary trading in the usual CMAG meeting and not via individual subgroups unless there is a need for specific expertise that falls outside of the remit of the CMAG.
- 6.16 A Member noted that secondary trading has been left out of the DESNZ consultation because CMAG is considering it. This is fine but it could cause issues with gathering industry feedback due to the wider industry reach of Ofgem and DESNZ. Another Member agreed that this review will require wider industry involvement and engagement.
- 6.17 The CMAG Facilitator stated that they are creating a distribution list for the CMAG Newsletter, which can eventually be used to gather wider industry feedback on secondary trading, and other Capacity Market areas. They requested that Members share the newsletter with contacts to build the distribution list.

- 6.18 **0323/04 – CMAG Members to provide any further thoughts on how to consider secondary trading so that a formal plan can be generated.**
- 6.19 A Member noted that any changes to secondary trading could have wider impacts, and felt that any transformation of the Rules would need to be handled by DESNZ. The CMAG Facilitator commented that transformation would have to be done by DESNZ, but that CMAG could facilitate iterative improvements which do not alter policy intent.
- 6.20 LW expressed disappointment that CMAG is not attempting to make wider changes. The rules are complex but it is possible to make improvements. The CMAG Facilitator stated that any issues raised can be added to the list for discussion at future CMAG meetings, and highlighted that it is important for industry to communicate issue areas with the CMAG, as without such communication, it would be challenging for the CMAG to understand what issues wider industry has.
- 6.21 LW requested visibility of the EMR Delivery Body processes, to compare against the CM Rules. The EMR Delivery Body representative stated that they have comprehensive working practices and instructions that match the customer guidance. They felt it was more appropriate for CMAG to review the customer guidance, as the internal working instructions are understandably, not public.

## **7. Secondary Trading Proposal – ESC / EMRS**

- 7.1 The LCCC/ESC representative presented a proposed development to secondary trading, with the goal of simplifying administration and creating processes that are more effective. They note that the proposal was relatively simple, essentially using existing data in a more effective way.
- 7.2 A Member said that it was a well laid out proposal, and another Member noted that the proposal sounded like a good idea and that it would be helpful once the right information is in there. The EMR Delivery Body representative commented that it was an interesting proposal that presented some good ideas.
- 7.3 LW questioned if parties that pre-qualified but then did not take agreements would be checked to see if they could actually trade. The LCCC/ESC representative confirmed that the current intention was to only look at eligibility criteria to determine if a party could trade. The LCCC/ESC representative stated that there is potential for creating a more focussed group who want to trade. They also confirmed that those who qualified during the year would be added.
- 7.4 A Member questioned if the work previously carried out in relation to this would be incorporated or if it was separate. The LCCC/ESC representative noted that they were keen to discuss with those who had carried out similar work previously and take learning from them to incorporate into future work. MB commented that they have been working on something similar and had a successful secondary trade on their platform. They would welcome discussion and would be happy to feedback learnings to LCCC/ESC.
- 7.5 The EMR Delivery Body representative noted that, should this be progressed there would need to be coordination with the EMR Delivery Body and EMRS, and that they would welcome an offline discussion. The LCCC/ESC representative noted that they had discussed with the EMR Delivery Body a year ago. A Member also questioned if there would be coordination with the CM Register, and the LCCC/ESC representative stated that it would not rely on those systems.
- 7.6 The EMR Delivery Body representative questioned whether other options would be considered. LCCC/ESC noted that they had already agreed with the EMR Delivery Body that this was one of the best ways to proceed, but that this would be explored further in the discovery phase and that further discussions had been booked in. Outcomes from this will be presented at the CMAG meeting in April. LW questioned if there were alternative options, and the EMR Delivery Body representative confirmed that a number of options had been discussed. They felt there was benefit to presenting the pros and cons of each option, and a recommendation to CMAG for transparency. The CMAG Facilitator suggested that LCCC/ESC and the EMR Delivery Body consider their aligned approach offline and report back to the CMAG at the April meeting.
- 7.7 **0323/05 – LCCC and NGESO-DB to work offline on alternative options relating to the 'Capacity Market Secondary Trading Development' slides to be presented in April to CMAG.**
- 7.8 The LCCC/ESC representative noted that there are options that can be initiated quickly, but that they wanted to gather thoughts from CMAG to determine if this was the right approach.
- 7.9 LW commented that LCCC/ESC might want to note that, from experience of secondary trading, the sellers never want the industry to know that they are the seller until they find a buyer. They may also need to actively

manage the list of those eligible to trade, as there may be other reasons why they did not come to an agreement. The LCCC/ESC representative stated that it would be possible to configure the list for example through tick boxes.

- 7.10 A Member noted that the proposal was positive, but expressed concern that it may not be progressed quickly. They felt there was no need to spend time assessing multiple options when this option looks good. They also stated that the proposal was not controversial as it was just making existing information more accessible.

## **8. New EMR Portal – Process Review**

- 8.1 The EMR Delivery Body representative noted that during the EMR portal process review with the Settlement Body, they explored which improvements would require a Rule change. The intention was not to build a system based on how things work now, but to build a system that works better.
- 8.2 LW commented that, while the proposed portal looks lovely, there are concerns that the portal could be delayed by Rule changes. LW expressed surprise that this level of change was being considered for a portal that had not yet been delivered. The EMR Delivery Body representative explained that their intention is to make some Rule changes for implementation in 2024, but that the portal would be built to cater for future change. The LCCC/ESC representative noted that previously this would have been on the EMR Delivery Body to deliver, but that LCCC are offering another delivery route, which should make things quicker in the future.
- 8.3 LW raised the issue of the security requirements for the portal. The CMAG Facilitator noted that the issue of security requirements had first come up during discussion of CP363. The EMR Delivery Body representative noted that the security requirements referenced was multi-factor authentication (MFA), which is not an uncommon security requirement. They welcomed feedback about the use of MFA, will consider its use further and discuss with the IT team.
- 8.4 **0323/06 – EMR Delivery Body to consider the need for multi-factor authentication on its portal and present back to CMAG**
- 8.5 LW stated that MFA is not necessary and takes too much time, particularly when some clients have large numbers of CMUs. They also expressed concern that this had not been consulted upon. The EMR Delivery Body representative highlighted that authentication is not at CMU level; it is a company login level, though they understand that some people hold CMUs as individual companies which would increase the number of logins required.
- 8.6 A Member noted that they were comfortable with auction access details having authentication required, as they would feel more comfortable knowing that is a difficult to get into. They stated that they would not want unauthorised people setting off secondary trades.
- 8.7 A Member expressed frustration about the portal being delayed. The EMR Delivery Body representative clarified that the portal is being designed for the Rules as they are currently, and they are letting parties test it in a production environment. They want to make sure the portal is compliant and delivers efficiency to streamline processes. During this review, they have identified areas that could be better or more efficient, and it is these changes that may delay the portal. However, most will not cause delays and will be delivered when possible after the portal has launched.

## **9. CMAG Initial View – CP360 (Promoting Net Zero Assets / CCET)**

- 9.1 The Ofgem representative noted CP360 seeks to adjust the final capacity price by an efficiency modifier, so that renewable CM Plants receive a higher price compared to high carbon CM Plants. The exact measure of efficiency to be used has not been provided by the Proposer.
- 9.2 The Ofgem representative noted that due to the significant overlap between this CM Rules Change Proposal and Government policy priorities on energy security and net zero, it would be best for DESNZ to consider whether a change of this scale should be introduced rather than the CMAG. Therefore, Ofgem is minded to reject the proposal with no further CMAG work.
- 9.3 EH asked for views on the Ofgem position from the CMAG. A Member agreed that in their view the proposal would fundamentally change how payments are made in the Capacity Market and thus is beyond the scope of the CMAG to consider. The Member also highlighted that the change would most likely lie within the REMA space or as a separate Regulations issue. The CMAG supported the approach detailed by Ofgem.

## **10. Developing CM Rules Change Proposal – CP362 (CM Agreement Transfers / Waters Wye Associates)**

- 10.1 The proposer noted that this proposal prohibits CMU from secondary trading until it has reached this significant completion milestone and the proposed solution is to delete the ruling.
- 10.2 There were no initial comments by the Members

### **Standard Change Proposal Questions.**

#### **Are there any related changes to the CM Rules in the pipeline?**

- 10.3 CMAG Members noted CP362 is related to changes CP356, and CP369 which all address issues with secondary trading.

#### **Does the CP impact on the Regulations?**

- 10.4 The proposer and CMAG Members did not determine any impacts on the Regulations.
- 10.5 There were no further comments from any members

#### **Are there any impacts on any other central industry frameworks or obligations?**

- 10.6 The proposer and CMAG Members did not determine any impacts on other central industry frameworks or obligations.
- 10.7 There were no further comments from any members

#### **Are there any impacts on consumers, and if so, what are the impacts?**

- 10.8 The proposer noted that in their view there is an impact to consumers and that it make the operation more efficient and that it lowers cost and improves security of supply.

#### **What are the expected impacts and implementation/enduring costs on CM Participants and Delivery Partners?**

- 10.9 The proposer suggested that the impacts on CM participants allows more parties to manage delivery risks lowers costs and for delivery parties should increase the probability of all capacity secured in the auction being delivered.
- 10.10 CA and EH asked the members if there were any thoughts on this proposal and CA questioned if a impact assessment needs to be completed for Delivery Partners at this stage.
- 10.11 The DESNZ representative noted the current solution for CP362 could not be implemented as secondary trading could not start until a Capacity Agreement is in place for the prospective transferor, this raised concerns about the impact on other parts of the CM Rules.
- 10.12 A Member suggested that there are potential other interactions within the Rules that need to be considered. The Member highlighted interactions with Rule 6.7 and that care would need to be taken to avoid wider implications related to policy intent. The DESNZ Member noted the point on Rule 6.7 and agreed to consider it further.
- 10.13 EH asked Members whether in general the CMAG should continue development of the proposals with a recommendation to Ofgem if there are policy interactions or whether work should stop in this scenario until DESNZ clarifies if a proposal interacts with DESNZ policy. The Proposer expressed the view that they could not see the harm in in considering the proposal and sending it through to Ofgem and DESNZ to consider the policy interactions at a later stage. Other Members expressed the view that the government's policy position should be known as to avoid unnecessary work. DESNZ agreed to consider CP362 further and clarify whether the proposal has the potential to impact government policy/subsidy controls.
- 10.14 **0323/07 – DESNZ to provide further information to the CMAG in relation to further development of the CP362 and whether the proposal is impacted by the subsidy control framework**
- 10.15 RaT and LW agreed to develop alternative drafting to consider interactions with Rule 6.7 and share with the CMAG Secretariat prior to the next CMAG Meeting.
- 10.16 **0323/08 – LW and RaT to develop revised CP362 drafting and share with CMAG Secretariat**
- 10.17 There are no further comments from members

#### **Does CMAG agree with the proposed solution and draft legal text?**

- 10.18 CMAG Members agreed with the draft legal text presented for CP362, and that it delivers the intention of the proposed solution.

10.19 No suitable alternative solutions to address the defect were proposed by CMAG.

**Does the CP further the CM Rules Change Objectives and/or Ofgem's Principal Objectives?**

10.20 Members unanimously agreed CP362 furthered Ofgem's Principal Objective.

10.21 Members unanimously agreed CP362 is neutral in promoting investment in capacity to ensure security of electricity supply.

10.22 Members unanimously agreed CP362 is positive in facilitating the efficient operation and administration of the Capacity Market.

10.23 Members unanimously agreed CP362 is neutral in ensuring the compatibility of the Capacity Market Rules with other subordinate legislation under Part 2 of the Energy Act 2013.

**11. Developing CM Rules Change Proposal – CP368 (CVR Publication Deadlines / LCCC)**

**Standard Change Proposal Questions**

**Are there any related changes to the CM Rules in the pipeline?**

11.1 The LCCC/ESC representative noted there are no related changes in the pipeline.

**Does the CP impact on the Regulations?**

11.2 The LCCC/ESC representative and CMAG Members did not determine any impacts on the Regulations.

**Are there any impacts on any other central industry frameworks or obligations?**

11.3 The LCCC/ESC representative and CMAG Members did not determine any impacts on other central industry frameworks or obligations.

**Are there any impacts on consumers, and if so, what are the impacts?**

11.4 The LCCC/ESC representative noted there are no expected impacts on consumers.

**What are the expected impacts and implementation/enduring costs on CM Participants and Delivery Partners?**

11.5 The LCCC/ESC representative noted CP368 has minor impacts for them to update business processes and documentation and there are no expected enduring costs only minor costs.

11.6 The NGESO representative noted there are no expected impacts or costs to them to implement CP368.

**Does CMAG agree with the proposed solution and draft legal text?**

11.7 CMAG Members agreed with the draft legal text presented for CP368, and that it delivers the intention of the proposed solution.

11.8 No suitable alternative solutions to address the defect were proposed by CMAG.

**Does the CP further the CM Rules Change Objectives and/or Ofgem's Principal Objectives?**

11.9 The CM members were generally in agreement with the proposal and expressed the view that it's a small change to the timings, and that it is a positive impact and not material. The LCCC/ESC Representative and the members attending are in agreement that it is a positive on efficiency and recommendations and less on investment and network and did not agree with the proposer's rationale against this CM Rules Objective.

11.10 Members unanimously agreed CP368 is neutral against Ofgem's Principal Objective.

11.11 Members unanimously agreed CP368 is neutral in promoting investment in capacity to ensure security of electricity supply.

11.12 Members unanimously agreed CP368 is positive in facilitating the efficient operation and administration of the Capacity Market.

11.13 Members unanimously agreed CP368 is neutral in ensuring the compatibility of the Capacity Market Rules with other subordinate legislation under Part 2 of the Energy Act 2013.

11.14 The Members unanimously agreed that the implementation date should be as soon as practicable.

11.15 The Members unanimously agreed the draft legal text.

11.16 The Members unanimously recommended that CP368 should be approved subject to statutory consultation.

## **12. CMAG Forward Work Plan**

- 12.1 The CMAG Secretariat presented the CMAG Forward Work Plan, noting that each CM Rules Change proposal has been scheduled according to its current priority score provided by Members.
- 12.2 The CMAG Secretariat informed CMAG that CP360 has been moved forward as Members agreed to provide their initial views at this meeting; CP365 and CP366 are now both with Ofgem for consideration
- 12.3 The CP362 timeline will need be lengthened after today's meeting
- 12.4 CA highlighted the CMAG Forward Plan would be updated following discussion from the meeting, to be discussed at CMAG Meeting 6.
- 12.5 There were no comments with the Forward Work Plan

## **13. Operating Procedure Updates**

- 13.1 The CMAG Facilitator noted the CMAG Operating Procedure has been updated as v1.1 and circulated to all Members and Representatives for review with the meeting materials for CMAG Meeting 5.
- 13.2 Members discussed whether the additional arrangements whereby a Member can be invited to join the CMAG by the CMAG Facilitator if a Member leaves the CMAG midterm are appropriate. The CMAG Facilitator highlighted that Ofgem would be responsible for deciding whether the CMAG Facilitator's invited Member was appropriate. .
- 13.3 A Member highlighted duplicated wording in section 4.7.
- 13.4 The CMAG approved the new Operating Procedure subject to amendments to 4.7.

## **14. CMAG Survey Feedback**

- 14.1 The CMAG Facilitator thanked Members for completing the survey and providing their feedback on CMAG so far and stated that the comments have been helpful whilst highlighting that there is room for improvement.
- 14.2 A Member expressed the view that the survey results are a fair reflection. They questioned whether a timed agenda could be provided, but acknowledged this may be challenging as it can be hard to predict discussions, and it would be a shame to curtail productive discussion in order to stick to an agenda.

## **15. CMAG Distribution List**

- 15.1 The CMAG Secretariat highlighted the CMAG Distribution List is available to sign up to from the CMAG website. Signatories will receive monthly updates from the CMAG Secretariat, outlining key updates regarding CMAG and the CM over the previous month; and notification of new meeting materials being made available.
- 15.2 The CMAG Secretariat requested that Members and Representatives encourage colleagues and industry stakeholders to sign up to the distribution list for all the latest CMAG updates.
- 15.3 **0323/09 – CMAG Members to advertise the CMAG Distribution List to CM contacts**

## **16. Any Other Business (AOB)**

- 16.1 LW requested that there should be a repository where all information from the CM for all parties could be gathered to make it easier for viewers. A member explained a way to add links or redirects into a centralised system. LW is concerned that the links will become out dated especially with the new change of BEIS to DESNZ. CA explained there is a little bit of information which can be seen via the CMAG site. However, the CMAG Secretariat will think about ways in which they can publish clearer information,
- 16.2 There was no further business and the meeting was closed. The next CMAG meeting date is Tuesday 21 March 2023.