MHHS Design Advisory Group Minutes and Actions

Issue date: 28 June 2022

Meeting number	**DAG010.1 (Extraordinary)**	Venue	**Virtual – MS Teams**

Date and time	**21 June 2022 13:00-15:00**	Classification	**Public**

Attendees:

Chair	**Role**
Justin Andrews (Chair)	Chair

Industry Representatives	
Craig Handford (CH)	Large Supplier Representative
Gareth Evans (GE)	I&C Supplier Representative
Gemma Slaney (GS)	DNO Representative
Jo Bradbury (JB)	Small Supplier Representative
Matt Hall (MH)	Elexon Representative (as central systems provider)
Neil Dewar (ND)	NGESO
Robert Langdon (RL)	Supplier Agent Representative
Sarah Jones (SJ)	RECCo Representative
Seth Chapman (SC)	Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent)
Stuart Scott (SS)	DCC Representative (as smart meter central system provider)

MHHS IM	
Claire Silk (CS)	Design Market and Engagement Lead
Fraser Mathieson (FM)	PMO Governance Lead
Ian Smith (IS)	Design Manager
Keith Clark (KC)	Programme Manager
Warren Fulton (WF)	Separation Lead
Simon Harrison (SH)	Design Assurance Manager

Other Attendees	
Colin Bezant (CB)	Independent Programme Assurance
David Kemp (DK)	SEC Representative (Observer)
Sinead Quinn (SQ)	Ofgem

Apologies:

Donna Townsend	iDNO Representative
Ed Rees (ER)	Consumer Representative

Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date
Tranche 4 Schedule	DAG10.1-01	Discuss transition timetable and go/no-go decision with MH	Programme (Ian Smith)	06/07/2022
Minutes and Actions	DAG10.1-02	Clarify to JB the optimal communication routes and contact addresses/points of escalation within the Programme	Programme (Claire Silk)	28/06/2022
	DAG10.1-03	Communicate current thinking around transition plan to DAG members	Programme (Ian Smith)	06/07/2022
Open Design Issues Management	DAG09.1-04	Issue design-specific RAID to DAG members as part of communications on design schedule replan to be issued 22 June 2022	Programme (PMO)	22/06/2022
	DAG10.1-05	Issue Programme central RAID log to DAG members	Programme (PMO)	22/06/2022
	DAG10.1-06	Provide any feedback on central Programme RAID prior to next DAG meeting	DAG Members	06/07/2022
	DAG10.1-07	Issue Retail Energy Code Change Proposal R0044 impact assessment document to DAG members	Programme (PMO)	22/06/2022
	DAG10.1-08	Provide update on Retail Energy Code Change Proposal R0044 progress	REC Representative (Sarah Jones)	06/07/2022
Summary and Next Steps	DAG10.1-09	Convene SDS subgroup 30 June 2022	Programme (PMO)	30/06/2022
	DAG10.1-10	Inform constituents of SDS meeting on 30 June 2022	DAG Members	30/06/2022
Previous Meeting(s)	DAG06-01	Review alignment between related MPAN modifications and design subgroup	Programme (Ian Smith)	13/05/2022
	DAG07-03	Programme to bring future versions of DIP Functional Specification and Non-Functional Requirements to DAG, once further updates incorporated	Programme (Design Team)	13/05/2022
	DAG08-01	Bring updated DIP Functional Specification and Non-Functional Requirements to the next DAG for approval	Programme (Ian Smith)	08/06/2022
	DAG08-02	Issue call for agenda items or discussion topics prior to mobilisation of CCIAG	Programme (PMO)	08/06/2022
	DAG09-03	Provide detailed action plan for resolution of open design issues against T1 design artefacts	Programme (Claire Silk)	25/05/2022
	DAG09-05	Programme to liaise with Programme Participants who have queries on the Programme Design Team's responses to comments on the Tranche 1 design artefacts	Programme (Ian Smith)	08/06/2022
	DAG09-10	Add dependency to outstanding design issues log relating to ensuring design collateral is sufficient to enable code drafting. IS to review example of this and confirm sufficient for code drafting.	Programme (Ian Smith)	08/06/2022
	DAG09-11	Add dependency to outstanding design issues log regarding Programme approach to resolving material design issues which emanate from design assurance process.	Programme (Ian Smith)	08/06/2022

	DAG09-12	Provide a clear plan for the resolution of the recorded outstanding issues related to the Tranche 1 design artefact approval	Programme (Design Team)	25/05/2022

Decisions

Area	Dec Ref	Decision
None		

RAID items discussed/raised

RAID area	Description
None	

Minutes

1.   Welcome and Introductions

The Chair welcome attendees to the meeting. Prior to commencement of the agenda, the Programme Design Team provided an update on the new schedule for delivery of the Tranche 4 (T4) design artefact review and M5 delivery. The Chair welcomed a new member of the DAG, Sarah Jones, representing RECCo.

2.   Update on Design Schedule

WF advised work to produce a new timetable for T4 and M5 delivery was underway and involved a schedule of over 400 tasks for developing all the design artefacts. The new schedule is divided into two phases:

- Phase one: the development and sharing of the design artefacts for review; and

- Phase two: the consultation with Programme Participants and the actioning of comments received.

The Programme Design Team have included more time within the new schedule for Programme Participants to review the design artefacts and will now include an opportunity for participants review and comment on any substantive changes to the design artefacts arising from review comments. This will involve changes being presented to one of the existing design working groups with a view to obtaining consensus on any changes or recording the differing views where necessary. The Programme Design Team will also increase the signposting for participants to help direct them toward relevant artefact or review. Additional Programme resource is being applied to change control and issues management, to ensure a comprehensive and expedient approach. The Programme Design Team have carefully considered the timelines required to deliver the enhanced review periods and comment reviews. They have also taken on board; the time it takes to achieve consensus; summer holidays, and; participant (and Design Team) resource availability.

The Programme design team recommend phase one is scheduled to complete at the end of August 2022 and phase two (delivery of M5) moves to the end of October 2022. The DAG were advised an agile approach would be taken whereby design artefacts will be released for review as soon as they are ready, to give participants the opportunity for 'pre-review' prior to formal requests for comment. This timeline mitigates risks and provides some contingency.

A transition design schedule will be produced in due course, and this shares dependencies with migration activities being considered under the Programme's Testing Workstream. MH wished to see the transition schedule as soon as possible, noting this may impact costs and go/no go decisions. IS offered to discuss this offline.

ACTION DAG10.1-01: Programme to discuss transition timetable and go/no-go decision with MH

It is expected there will be higher levels of comments from participants on T4, leading up to M5 (as it is the end-to-end design) and more participants are likely to comment.

GS commented that MHHS Programme Change Request (CR) 002[1] had suggested a delay in the delivery of M5 to November 2022 as industry parties had stated they would require more time, yet CR001, which delayed M5 to the end of July 2022 was approved by the Programme. GS expressed some consternation that the Programme are now advocating a delay of a similar duration. The Chair noted this frustration was understandable, but believed it was right to keep pressure on the design process, to ensure momentum continued. IS stated that the current proposed delay is

---

[1] Design Baseline Replan to November 2022

largely due to the volume of design comments and additional complexity which has arisen during the development of the design process and not scoped at inception of the Programme.

RL echoed GS' point but commented it was positive to see concerns around timeframes and issues resolution addressed. RL asked whether the design artefacts released under T1-3 will be re-issued alongside the T4 artefacts to enable participants to review the design as a whole. IS advised they would and noted the potential need for amendments to be made to T1-3 artefacts to resolve issues identified when the design is reviewed as a whole. RL asked whether new comments on T1-3 would be welcome. WF advised it was the intention that previously agreed positions would not be reopened. IS advised that any key issues or matters of clear materiality would be considered. The Chair confirmed that issues with approved design elements which are not the subject of material issues would require a CR if parties wished to raise novel changes.

JB highlighted difficulties experienced using the MHHS Programme Portal search functionality and with the folder structure present. JB asked what the response timeframes were for questions and comments from Programme Participants, noting there was no formal ticketing system and a potential lack of structure on this. JB commented it was also not entirely clear which Programme contacts participants should use when seeking to raise queries. The Programme took an action to clarify this to JB.

ACTION DAG10.1-02: Programme to clarify to JB the optimal communication routes and contact addresses/points of escalation within the Programme

SC expressed that an updated schedule for delivery of T4 and M5 was positive and agreed with MH the transition schedule was important. IS advised more material was required to develop the transition plan but the Programme would highlight the thinking around this to provide as early view as possible.

ACTION DAG10.1-03: Communicate current thinking around transition plan to DAG members

KC sympathised with the frustration expressed at the prospective movement of M5 to the end of October 2022 but noted the scope of CR002 was broader than what is proposed currently.

MH asked whether there would be an end-to-end playback activity in the new M5 delivery schedule. WF presented the timeline for the new schedule and highlighted the various stages. An end-to-end review will be undertaken by the Programme Design Team in August 2022. The Chair asked whether participants will be provided with an opportunity to undertake an end-to-end review also. JB queried how the Design Team could undertake a comprehensive review before the closure of the industry comments window. IS advised participants would have the opportunity to undertake end-to-end review and the review to be undertaken by the Design Team in August 2022 was a consistency review intended to flush out issues before the design artefacts are issued to participants.

MH queried when participant mobilisation was due to take place. KC advised this will be discussed at the Programme Steering Group (PSG) noting participant mobilisation was originally due to commence two months after M5. KC clarified the M3 programme milestone relates to participant readiness to comments design and build, rather than mobilisation. MH questioned whether industry code drafting could commence until the transition plan is known. KC responded the programme are considering this and will make amendments to the code drafting timelines as necessary. The Chair noted some code drafting elements could commence despite the movement of M5, and MH agreed.

CH stated industry parties would require an opportunity to conduct end-to-end review of the design to ensure it works as a whole and will support organisations commencing design and build activities. SH advised this is what their team is looking into also and the document repository tooling currently in development will assist this end-to-end review by highlighting the interdependencies between design elements. CH stated this is positive and asked this be clearly communicated to participants.

GE enquired as to how M3 interacts with the proposed new schedule for delivery of T4 and M5 and what bearing this has on the impact assessment comments being provided by parties on CR007[2]. KC advised M3 will need to move but it was still useful to receive comments on CR007. KC urged parties to view M3 as readiness for design and build rather than 'mobilisation' per se and advised this milestone would be discussed by the PSG. KC noted that whilst it was not ideal the milestone and timeframe which are the subject of CR007 will change, party responses to CR007 would not be wasted effort.

MH asked whether CR007 impact assessment responses should be provided based on the existing timeframes for delivery of M3 or on the prospective rescheduled timeline. KC noted CR007 is largely about parties' readiness to

---

[2] Proposal to change M3 (Design and Build start) for Programme Participant mobilisation

commence design and build and despite the schedule for M5 moving, there is value in receiving responses on the impacts of changing M3. KC advised CR007 would be submitted for a decision by Ofgem in any case as it straddles the threshold for mandatory Ofgem approval. KC advised there have been discussions with Ofgem as the Programme Sponsor and with the Independent Assurance Provider (IPA). MH highlighted that if M5 is moved, this would squeeze the time allocated for testing activities unless other milestones were also moved. The Chair emphasised the wider programme replan currently underway and advised this provided an opportunity to review the impacts of changes to M5 on subsequent milestones and to seek change to these also if required.

3.   Review of Raid

The Chair advised the design-specific RAID log, which details open design issues awaiting resolution, will be issued to parties alongside communications on the new T4 and M5 schedule.

ACTION DAG10.1-04: Programme to issue design-specific RAID to DAG members as part of communications on design schedule replan to be issued 22 June 2022

DAG members were also advised the central Programme RAID log, which detail risks, issues, assumptions, and dependencies for the Programme as a whole, was recently issued to the PSG and would be issued to DAG members also.

ACTION DAG10.1-05: Programme to issue Programme central RAID log to DAG members

---

ACTION DAG10.1-06: Provide any feedback on central Programme RAID prior to next DAG meeting

---

4.   Level Playing Field Design Principle / SEC Modification Proposal 162

The Chair introduced the agenda item and outlined the purpose of discussions was to consider the latest developments with Smart Energy Code (SEC) Modification Proposal (MP) 162[3] and its consistency with the Programme's level playing field design principle. The Chair advised the initial assessment report for Retail Energy Code (REC) Change Proposal R0044[4], which is linked to SEC MP162, would be published to DAG members with the Headline Report.

ACTION DAG10.1-07: Issue Retail Energy Code Change Proposal R0044 impact assessment document to DAG members

---

Update on SEC MP162

DK, a representative of SEC, provided an update on SEC MP162, noting the modification is due to be presented to the SEC Change Board in July 2022 with a view to Ofgem decision in August 2022.

The Chair queried potential issues between SEC MP162 and the Programme's level playing field design principle. Specifically, matters surrounding Target Response Times (TRTs) for those undertaking the Meter Data Retrieval (MDR) role in Data Communication Company (DCC) systems and how potential different responses times for industry parties may be contrary to the Programme's design principles.

DK advised SEC MP162 has been agreed to progress in its current form, and subject to the outcome of conversations at DAG on the level playing field principle, a further SEC modification could be raised in future if any change is required. DK highlighted an outstanding issue with SEC MP162 relating to cost allocation given the beneficiaries of the modification (agents) were not those would shoulder the cost of the change under the SEC's cost allocation mechanisms. Several members of the group later agreed this was a key challenge with the modification, and one which would drastically affect any appetite for a solution which has significant cost attached to it, such as the provision of sub-24-hour TRTs to non-supplier aligned agents.

The Chair invited questions or comments from DAG members for DK.

GS noted potential uncertainty of the progression of SEC MP162 to the SEC Change Board and expressed some nervousness over the late-raising of REC R0044 and the need to ensure the two changes are congruent. The Chair invited SJ to provide an update on REC R0044.

ACTION DAG10.1-08: RECCo to provide update on Retail Energy Code Change Proposal R0044 progress

---

[3] SEC changes required to deliver MHHS
[4] MHHS Programme Changes required to Central Switching Service

GS noted the importance of ensuring SEC MP162 and REC R0044 are aligned and believed the relative late raising of REC R0044 was an example of cross code change which had not been managed as effectively as it could have been.

CH wished to understand whether the changes in each code were required to implement MHHS, or whether they represented additional functions which the beneficiaries of the changes should pay for rather than suppliers. IS advised the charging arrangements under SEC are not a Programme matter. The core Programme requirement is access to a 24-hour TRT for any party who may undertake an MDR role, which SEC MP162 would currently deliver.

RL advised the matter had been separately raised with the IPA as a competition issue, owing to the matter not yet having been progressed to conclusion through the DAG.

SC queried the governance surrounding REC R0044 and why this is not part of the wider Significant Code Review (SCR) for MHHS. The Chair clarified the dependencies between SEC MP162 and REC R0044 meant both changes were needed to progress before the MHHS design was completed (due to SEC and REC timelines) and awaiting direction via the SCR would mean changes would not be delivered in time for MHHS go-live. SC stated they understood why SEC MP162 was required now but was not clear on why REC R0044 was. SJ advised the rationale for raising REC R0044 now was the same as for SEC MP162, in that there are potential impacts on DCC systems, and the change was needed now to ensure a timely release of any DCC systems changes.

GS asked who has responsibility for ensuring there is a holistic view of all the code changes required in relation to MHHS and whether there are risks regarding ownership and management. FM advised the MHHS Programme's Cross Code Advisory Group (CCAG) have this responsibility and this group consists of both Code Body and industry representatives. The CCAG maintain a Horizon Scanning Log which is design to record all code changes which have any bearing on the MHHS Programme and facilitate review by the MHHS Design Team with a view to identifying any Programme impacts and actions required. The log is review monthly at CCAG and both Code Bodies and the Programme are expected to review the log to ensure any Programme impacts emanating from code changes, or any dependencies between codes, are mitigated.

Update on 24-hour TRT Requirement

The Chair summarised a key question requiring resolution from a Programme perspective was whether the lack of a sub-24-hour TRT for non-supplier aligned agents would impact settlement accuracy. This was the primary question which must be asked in relation to whether there is a specific Programme-related requirement for a less-than-24-hour TRT. The secondary consideration is whether the Programme design principles are met and whether supplier-enabled agents would use the existing 30 seconds TRT functionality for MDR requests, and whether regulatory controls and mechanisms are required to control this potentially unfair advantage. IS added the ultimate goal is a factual basis for a decision on whether a sub-24-hour TRT is required.

SS noted the Programme's position was not materially different to the position in February 2022 and asked when a final position would be determined. GS echoed this and noted SEC is about to issue a change report on SEC MP162 and the resolution of this question was an important part of any response to the change report. SS requested that a resolution is obtained as soon as possible and noted the difficulty in providing an overview of DCC systems costs without a clear set of requirements. Despite this, SS advised the DCC system costs would rise significantly if a sub-24-hour or on demand TRT was required for MDR requests. CH added the conversation over cost allocation under SEC, which sits outside of DAG, is an essential element of industry parties' position on this matter and is something which may be heavily influenced by the position DAG takes.

The Chair asked DK whether SEC cost allocation mechanisms were being reviewed. DK replied this may be discussed in future but would not before a decision is required on SEC MP162.

IS stated the DAG must first determine whether there is a systemic need for a sub-24hour TRT, and if not, whether controls or obligations are required to prevent supplier-enabled agents form using the existing 30 second TRT functionality for MDR requests. MH believed suppliers and agents cannot choose which TRT they use. SS clarified that DCC systems cannot currently differentiate between the purpose of different MDR request (i.e. whether it is for MHHS-related data or not) and therefore it is not currently possible to prevent MHHS-related MDR requests submitted with a 30 second TRT.

RL highlighted an additional issue with supplier-enable agents who have access to 30 second TRTs, as they will also be able to obtain faster processing of information requests made to the supplier, which also contravenes the MHHS level playing field principle. SS noted the challenges of identifying a solution which upheld the level playing field principle whilst not breaking other constraints such as cost.

Conclusions

The DAG considered a Smart Meter Segment (SDS) Subgroup was required as soon as possible to set out the options for resolving this matter and enable DAG to make a final decision on the action required at their next meeting

ACTION DAG10.1-09: Programme to convene SDS subgroup 30 June 2022

RL asked whether DAG members agreed SEC MP162 does not currently meet the requirements of the MHHS level playing field design principle. SC considered the principles are driven by Programme requirements and noted there is currently no specific Program requirement for a sub-24-hour TRT. As such SC wondered whether the level playing field principle was achievable without expanding the change required beyond core Programme requirements. SS believed that the potential differing response times for MDR requests was an issue beyond the MHHS Programme. GS noted the definition of the MDR role by the Programme establishes the need to provide the 24-hour TRT functionality.

DAG members agreed the SDS Subgroup should set out the options and case for and against each to enable DAG to make an informed decision. CH agreed the SDS Subgroup should elicit and document the available options for DAG to decide. GS believed a subgroup meeting would enable a greater level of expert input but will potentially add time to the process, noting the impact this may have on parties' responses to the SEC MP162 change report.

The Chair summarised an SDS Subgroup would be convened and asked DAG members to raise awareness with their constituents and attempt to draw out the options for DAG to make a decision.

ACTION DAG10.1-10: DAG members to Inform constituents of SDS meeting on 30 June 2022

5. Summary and Outcomes

The Chair thanks members for the contributions and brought the meeting to a close.

Next meetings:

SDS Subgroup: 30 June 2022 at 10am

CCIAG: 30 June 2022 at 1pm

Standard DAG: 06 July 2022 at 09:30am