

MHHS Design Advisory Group Minutes and Actions

Issue date: 06/04/2023

Meeting number	DAG022.1	Venue	Virtual – MS Teams
----------------	-----------------	-------	---------------------------

Date and time	31 March 2023 1000-1200	Classification	Public
---------------	--------------------------------	----------------	---------------

Attendees:

Chair

Justin Andrews (Chair)

Role

Chair

Industry Representatives

Patricia Parker (PP)	Small Supplier Representative
David Yeoman (DY)	DNO Representative
Donna Jamieson (DJ)	iDNO Representative
Haz Elmamoun (HE)	Large Supplier Representative
Gareth Evans (GE)	I&C Supplier Representative
Matt Hall (MH)	Elexon Representative (as central systems provider)
Neil Dewar (ND)	National Grid ESO
Sarah Jones (SJ)	RECCo Representative
Seth Chapman (SC)	Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent)
Robert Langdon (RL)	Supplier Agent Representative
Stuart Scott (SS)	DCC Representative (as smart meter central system provider)
Vladimir Black (VB)	Medium Supplier Representative

MHHS

Amy Clayton (AC)	PMO Governance Support
John Wiggins (JW)	Migration Lead
Matthew Breen (MB)	Migration Design Analyst
Sean Tuffy (ST)	Migration Design Analyst

Other Attendees

Andy MacFaul (AMF)	Ofgem
Colin Bezant (CB)	IPA
Danielle Walton (DW)	Ofgem
Jenny Boothe (JB)	Ofgem
Saima Sabir (SS)	IPA

Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date
BPRWG & TDWG Assurance Forum	DAG22.1-01	Programme to be clear on the impact any Change Requests will have on Design documents in the future	Chair (Justin Andrews)	12/04/2023
	DAG22.1-02	Programme to issue updated Meeting Papers with Headline Report.	Programme (PMO)	03/04/2023
Summary and Next Steps	DAG22.1-03	Programme to issue baselined Migration Design with Headline Report and upload to Programme Collaboration Base	Programme (Migration Design Team)	03/04/2023
	DAG22.1-04	Programme to provide clarity on which Design Artefacts published on the Programme Collaboration Base are to be baselined	Programme (Design Team)	12/04/2023
	DAG22.1-05	Programme to come back on concerns over quality issues and discrepancies of issued material and documentation	Programme (Design Team)	12/04/2023
	DAG22.1-06	Programme to check the comments on Change Request log are up to date	Programme (PMO)	12/04/2023

Decisions

Area	Dec Ref	Decision
Baseline Decision	DAG-DEC-46	DAG unanimously agreed the MHHS Migration Design can be baselined

RAID items discussed/raised

RAID area	Description
None	

Minutes

1. Welcome and Introductions

The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting and provided an overview of the meeting agenda and objectives.

2. Migration Design Overview

ST provided a high-level overview of Migration Design, as per the slide. ST walked through the Migration Design definition and shared this had been adhered to from the start. ST noted the main engagement with participants had been through the Migration Design Subgroups (MDSGs), which were collaborative weekly forums where the Migration Design was developed with participants. It was highlighted that there were 23 key decision points discussed in the MDSGs, with over 100+ specific areas of feedback shared. ST advised all feedback was formally noted, reviewed, responded to and then closed down by the completion of the MDSGs. There was then a two-week consultation period, which saw strong engagement across the constituencies.

ST walked through the Migration Design Timeline, as per the meeting slides. It was noted the MDSGs were planned to run from the 30 November 2022 to 08 February 2023, however the meeting series extended past February as the team believed they were a good way to debate participant feedback before the two-week consultation. The consultation closed on 24 February 2023 with the updated artefacts released for assurance on 15 March 2023. ST noted this meeting was the final DAG approval meeting on the timeline.

ST explained throughout the development of the Migration Design, the team had looked to adhere to the original Design Principles set out by the DAG and MHHS Design Team, but also by a set of new Migration Design Principles to address migration-specific nuances. ST noted these two sets of principles combined to provide an objective framework to evaluate key decisions throughout. ST went through the Migration Design Principles, as per the slide. ST highlighted that point

three was important; that complex change which only offers marginal benefits should be discounted, as this mitigated the scale of change on participants.

3. Summary of Consultation Feedback

MB summarised the feedback received from the consultation period. MB noted there had been 847 comments received from 29 different organisations and 51 different respondents and provided a breakdown of the comments by constituency.

MB highlighted the comments had been broken down by category, as per the slide. MB explained that most of the feedback fell under the 'clarification' or 'minor change' category. It was noted that the 'design issue' category received six comments and the team had closed all of these following the consultation period. These were closed through discussions at the MDSGs and bilateral meetings. Relevant updates were included into the Migration Design artefacts.

4. BPRWG & TDWG Assurance Forum

JW shared a high-level overview of the MPRWG / TDWG Migration Design Assurance Meeting, as per the slides. JW noted some consultation comments were rejected. JW added that a fair amount of revision was made to the Artefacts prior to the assurance forum to remove ambiguity to clarifications and minor changes. The assurance meeting was held as participants in various bilaterals had requested the forum. A number of minor comments were made to the document with the final document issued on Friday 24 March 2023.

Playback of Points Raised

JW outlined that there were three topics that required additional focus from the meeting, as per the slide (13). JW stated on point two 'how the ISD will reflect that a participant is MHHS qualified and has declared they are MHHS operational', ISD feedback that there was a concern around the Migration Design solution for how qualified Suppliers represented in ISD were. JW confirmed that the inclusion of a DIP ID and an Effective from Data within the ISD would indicate that a participant is MHHS qualified from the Effective From Date and the Migration Design has now been updated to reflect this. JW noted that there will be further work undertaken on this and if as a result there is a different physical solution, then this will be applied. The Programme's view is that the requirements are clearly stated and if there are physical changes then this can be undertaken as part of the process. JW added that any changes to core design artefacts that have been baselined will be covered by a separate Change Request, this will uplift the interface specification so they are in line with requirements, post approval of design artefacts.

SC, from the Supplier Agent (Independent Supplier Agent) Constituency, highlighted that he did not believe anything further needs to be changed in ISD, however he highlighted that a Change Request for DIP onboarding may change this. MH, from Elexon, agreed. JW responded that this had been an ongoing discussion with SJ from RECCo. SJ supported JW point, and added that if there is a Change Request to change the interface catalogue then this will be kept separate.

RL, from the Supplier Agent Constituency, asked that the Programme make sure there is visibility of any consequential change in the approval of the Migration Design, and if there are changes to the Core Design these must be visible. JW responded that any potential changes have been set out in the Migration Design document, therefore the Change Request would be to uplift the document and not have any additional changes than those set out in Migration Design document.

SC, from the Supplier Agent (Independent Supplier Agent) Constituency, raised a concern around the process of having a Change Request after the Migration Design approval, highlighting this is not good governance. JW responded that whilst developing the Migration Design the interfaces were being uplifted so it was difficult to maintain the baseline, and the key focus once the Migration Design is approved is to raise the Change Requests in good order without much contention. The Chair reiterated that the Programme will make sure there is as much transparency and visibility of the changes and specifically the interface design document. The Chair noted that in the future DAG will be mindful when we see new Change Requests to not reopen comments on design artefacts that are already approved. MH added that their organisation has already started work on the interface, therefore there is still rework to be done even if the changes are minimal. JW responded that all the changes to the interfaces are called out in the Migration Design and the Change Request is only an uplift. The Chair reiterated that the approach had been set out in the Migration Design and there were no comments raised at this point. The Chair took an action for the Programme to be clear on the impact of any subsequent Change Requests on design documents.

ACTION DAG22.01-01: Programme to be clear on the impact any Change Requests will have on Design documents in the future.

JB asked at when the Migration Design will be approved. JW responded that this was being decided in the extraordinary DAG today. JB highlighted that once the Migration Design is baselined it is then subject to change control, and coordination of parties will be key at this point. JB further noted that the Programme is in the middle of a replan, with SIT to start end of October and before Ofgem will be approving this in early June. It was noted it was important to make sure that these changes do not start driving the plan to the 'right', if Tier 1 milestones start to shift then this has to come back to Ofgem. JW highlighted that once the Migration Design is baselined alongside the Core Design products, any future Change Requests will be assessed against both, giving a clear advantage of approving the Migration Design now, allowing it to be assessed with other baselined documents.

JW explained the third point was the issue of the use of skeleton D0150, which is a 'throwaway' code. Feedback from one party is that it is not the correct option, went back and no other comments to not use this. Having considered the request to re-open the decision, the team has assessed this and based on consultation responses, decided to honour the original decision. Programme is going to include this element in the design. It does not stop the design working, therefore re-opening the decision would go against the Programme's assurance principles. JW added that if a party has issues on this, they can raise a Change Request. The Chair reinforced that there was a minority view on this.

Impact of BST / UTC Time Zones on Settlement

JW explained the impact of BST / UTC Time Zones on Settlement, as per the slide. JW noted that the Programme had received differing opinions from participants on the Time Zones on Settlement, which needs resolving. JW went over the rationale for the current thinking, as per the slides.

JW summarised that this issue is one that affects both the Core and Migration Design that required full evaluation and impact assessment to ensure the implications to the end-to-end Design are understood, and explicitly referenced within both the Core and Migration Design. JW noted that the team has raised a Design Issue (MHHS-DIN-207), as there is clear difference to design principles. JW added that the issue is 'standalone' and should not impact on the decision to approve the rest of the Migration Design.

RL shared that he does not believe there is any ambiguity on the Registration and UTC is in the design principles. JW responded that the ambiguity is around the understanding participants have on BST / UTC. RL questioned where the one-hour gap come from. JW responded that the gap does not exist in Core Design at a steady state, the gap is on the first day of migration and would occur between midnight and 1am. JW added that this will be address in the DIN and is stand alone.

The Chair highlighted that these slides had been updated and the new version will go out with the Headline Report.

ACTION DAG22.01-02: Programme to send out the updated Meeting Papers with the Headline Report.

5. Artefacts to be Baselined

JW explained the Migration Design Artefacts which will form the Migration Design baseline, as per the slide. SC, from Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent), queried if the Programme was approving Artefact IF-003 Interface Specification then raising a Change Request. JW responded that this was on list of documents for review.

6. Baseline Decision

JW shared feedback received from DAG representatives about the Migration Design, as per the slide. JW shared that the key message in Migration Design is that there is no change to when Agent appointments occur. JW highlighted that CBu, from Small Supplier Constituency provided approval of the Migration Design before the meeting, as they were not able to attend.

HE from the Large Supplier constituency, stated their support for the points raised and that they had been discussed with their constituency.

DAG Decision

The Chair went over the baseline decision slides, it was highlighted that the Programme advised a decision was required to help cement this aspect of Migration Design and support the assurance forum due to take place in March.

The Chair asked DAG members to vote on whether the Migration Design Artefacts can be baselined:

DAG Members Votes:

Constituency	Yes	No	Abstained
--------------	-----	----	-----------

DNO Representative	✓
Elexon Representative (as central systems provider)	✓
I&C Supplier Representative	✓
iDNO Representative	✓
Large Supplier Representative	✓
National Grid ESO	✓
RECCo Representative	✓
Small Supplier Representative	✓
Supplier Agent Representative	✓
Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent)	✓
DCC Representative (as smart meter central system provider)	✓
Medium Supplier Representative	✓
Consumer Representative	Constituency representative not in attendance

Commented [FM1]: This vote was blank but assume Gareth approved so have added tick - please remove if not 😊

DAG Members Voting Comments:

Constituency	Voting Comments
Elexon Representative (as central systems provider)	MH supported the approval with the caveat that there is an upgrade to the existing core design that reflects the Migration Design changes
DCC Representative (as smart meter central system provider)	SS supported the approval with the caveat that the BST / UTC discussion due not result in no material impact to the Design
Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent)	SC supported the approval yet noted the amount of change for legacy system is far higher than expecting for constituency
Supplier Agent Representative	RL supported the approval with the caveat that the BST / UTC discussion doesn't result in a material impact to the Migration Design

The Chair thanked members for the votes and comments, and noted there was unanimous agreement that the MHHS Migration Design Artefacts can be baselined.

DECISION DAG-DEC-46: DAG unanimously agree that the MHHS Migration Design can be baselined.

7. Summary and next steps

HE shared that the Large Supplier constituency had welcomed the approach, management and review of the Migration Design, and recommended the Programme use this as a basis for future approaches.

PP shared the Small Supplier constituency asked when the next steps were going to happen. JW responded that they would start raising the Change Request immediately and then work with the Core Design team to uplift the Artefacts and use the appropriate comms method. The Chair noted this related to point 3 'a Change Request will be raised to uplift the Baselined programme interface Spec to reflect the updates required as part of the Migration Design'. However, the Chair asked JW what the proposed date was for comms to be sent to the programme participants that the Migration Design has been baselined to v1.0 and storing the Migration Design on the Collaboration Base under the Migration Design Page.

ACTION DAG22.01-03: Programme to send out the baselined Migration Design with the Headline Report and upload this to the Collaboration Base.

SC, from the Supplier Agent Constituency (Independent Supplier Agent), queried whether the process for the BST / UTC issue will be done with industry engagement. The Chair responded that the Programme has raised a DIN and this will go DA and a technical subgroup will be set up and go from there. SS, from the DCC Constituency, asked what the timeline for this would be. JW responded that practically speaking this would be mobilised mid-April.

PP, from the Small Supplier Constituency, asked the Programme to identify the DIN numbers in order to track. The Chair stated that the updated slide pack will have the DIN tracker in. MB added that the number was DIN207.

SC, from the Supplier Agent Constituency (Independent Supplier Agent), asked whether there was a published list of baselined Design Artefacts, noting there was some confusion over whether the Artefacts published on the Collaboration

Base are baselined or still in draft, and that it was not clear. The Programme agreed to ensure there is clarity on where baselined Design Artefacts are published and took an action to ensure this.

ACTION DAG22.01-04: Programme to provide clarity on which Design Artefacts published on the Programme Collaboration Base are to be baselined.

HE shared that a number of members of their constituency have concerns on the data flow and interface mapping issued and then re-issued. The concerns centre on the quality of document and significant discrepancies. Two large suppliers fed this back to the Programme this week. HE asked the Programme to do a full internal review of material and then re-issued for consultation properly. The Chair noted this request.

ACTION DAG22.01-05: Programme to come back on concerns over quality issues and discrepancies of issued material and documentation.

RL, from the Supplier Agent constituency, noted that he had raised a question to the MHHS PPC Team for Design clarification and there had been no response. RL added that parties are trying to get their design sorted and no responses is going to put at the delivery of this at risk. The Chair asked for RL to resend the email to Paul Pettitt, from the MHHS Design Team.

HE asked the Programme to provide an update on Programme Change Request (CR) 015, that was approved at PSG earlier in the month. The Programme took an action to check the comments on Change Request log are up to date.

ACTION DAG22.01-06: Programme to check the comments on Change Request log are up to date.

Date of next DAG: 12 April 2023 10am