MHHS Design Advisory Group (DAG) Minutes and Actions

Issue date: 19/04/2023

Meeting number	**DAG023**	Venue	**Virtual – MS Teams**
Date and time	**12 April 2023 1300-1630**	Classification	**Public**

Attendees:

Chair	**Role**
Chris Welby (Chair)	MHHS IM SME

Industry Representatives

Andrew Green (AG)	I&C Supplier Representative
Carolyn Burns (CBu)	Small Supplier Representative
David Yeoman (DY)	DNO Representative
Donna Jamieson (DJ)	iDNO Representative
Haz Elmamoun (HE)	Large Supplier Representative
Ian Hall (IH)	Supplier Agent Representative
Neil Dewar (ND)	National Grid ESO
Sarah Jones (SJ)	RECCo Representative
Riccardo Lampini (RLam)	Elexon Representative
Robert Langdon (RLan)	Supplier Agent Representative
Stuart Scott (SSc)	DCC Representative (as smart meter central system provider)
Vladimir Black (VB)	Medium Supplier Representative

MHHS

Ian Smith (IS)	Design Manager
Martin Cranfield (MC)	PMO Governance Lead
Paul Pettit (PP)	Design Assurance Lead
Smitha Pichrikat (SP)	SRO Client Delivery Manager
Warren Fulton (WF)	Design Project Manager

Other Attendees

Colin Bezant (CBe)	IPA
Danielle Walton (DW)	Ofgem
Saima Sabir (SSa)	IPA

Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date
Minutes and actions	DAG23-01	Confirm the plan (including timeline, dates, and process) for DIP design documents to be shared with industry	Programme (Paul Pettitt)	10/05/23
	DAG23-02	Clarify the status of DTN flow design issues (DES-196) – both quality issues/discrepancies in the	Programme (Paul Pettitt)	10/05/23

		document and the sign-off process for any document changes		
Change Requests	DAG23-03	Review Change Request analysis reference for grouping organisations into their constituency	Programme PMO	10/05/23
	DAG23-04	Revise CR018 with feedback and clarifications provided at DAG and re-raise to Impact Assessment	Programme (Ian Smith)	10/05/23
	DAG23-05	Add CR019 to the DIN log and progress through new design change management process	Programme (Paul Pettitt)	10/05/23
Design change management process	DAG23-06	Clarify expectations on evidence required to be provided against SIT criteria against baselined versions of design documents – i.e. which versions of documents would evidence be required against at the point of evidence submissions	Programme (Paul Pettitt)	10/05/23
	DAG23-07	Add to the design change management process the ability to release the 'signed off' design issues of a change request, should other design issues in a change request not be approved and need further work	Programme (Paul Pettitt)	10/05/23
	DAG23-08	Progress activity on developing and sharing a design knowledge base – to share common design queries that come into the Programme but do not make it onto the DIN log (i.e., design queries that do not result in changes to artefacts)	Programme (Paul Pettitt)	10/05/23
	DAG23-09	Share design change timeline slides	Programme PMO	10/05/23
Previous Meetings	DAG17-02	Chair to review the DAG Terms of Reference to ensure there is clarity over the role of DAG post-M5	Chair	14/12/2022
	DAG19-02	Ofgem to provide information on assumed half-hourly data opt-out rates	Ofgem (Jenny Boothe)	11/01/2023
	DAG20-03	DAG members to provide any views on the role of DAG post M5 Work-Off Plan completion to support review of DAG ToR	DAG Members	12/04/2023
	DAG20.1-12	Programme to consider how to provide clarity on the data services for import/export meters and how Programme Participants can be given visibility of this	Programme (Ian Smith)	12/04/2023
	DAG20.1-04	Programme to confirm which role code MDS would use (current presumption is SVA code)	Programme (Ian Smith)	15/02/2023
	DAG20.1-01	Programme to consider how to increase awareness of the Programme change request process and Design Change Management Procedure for Participants (e.g., webinar, newsletter article, etc.)	Programme (PMO and Design Assurance Teams)	10/05/2023

	DAG20.1-12	Programme to consider how to provide clarity on the data services for import/export meters and how Programme Participants can be given visibility of this	Programme (Ian Smith)	12/04/2023
	DAG21-03	Programme to consider publishing a log of Programme Change Request, and whether changes progressing via the Design Authority should be published within the same log	Programme (PMO)	10/05/2023
	DAG21.1-13	Programme to confirm when the DIP detailed design artefacts will be submitted to DAG	Programme (Ian Smith)	10/05/2023
	DAG21.1-09	Programme to confirm whether small changes to Programme Change Requests requested by decision-making group prior to issuance for Impact Assessment must always return to the Programme Change Board for validation prior to issuance	Programme (PMO)	10/05/2023
	DAG21.1-08	Programme to consider whether change marked artefacts should be issued with Programme Change Requests and who would be expected to provide any change marking	Programme (PMO)	10/05/2023
	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
	DAG22.1-05	Programme to come back on concerns over quality issues and discrepancies of issued material and documentation (e.g., DES-196)	Programme (Design Team)	12/04/2023

Decisions

Area	Dec Ref	Decision
Minutes and actions	DAG-DEC47	Minutes of DAG meeting held 08 March 2023 approved (with clarifications)
Change Requests	DAG-DEC48	Change Request CR018 to be revised with feedback and clarifications provided at DAG and re-raised to Impact Assessment. Decision on CR017 to be deferred and made alongside CR018
	DAG-DEC49	CR019 approved

Minutes

1.   Welcome and Introductions

The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting and provided an overview of the meeting agenda, noting they were standing in for Justin Andrews.

2.   Minutes and Actions

DECISION DAG-DEC47: Minutes of DAG meeting held 08 March 2023 approved (with clarifications)

SJ noted that a reference to a REC Change Proposal needed to be clarified in minutes. The correct Proposal was CPR006 and this was looking at sharing of MTDs and not the issues discussed at the migration design meeting.

The following clarifications were raised against the actions:

Action DAG19-02 – DW noted this was still ongoing and to be discussed by their organisations.

Action DAG20.1-12 – SJ noted import/export guidance had been shared related to linked meters and the action should remain ongoing.

Action DAG20.1-01 – MC noted a Change Control video in progress and that the action should be closable next month

Action DAG21-03 – PP noted an updated version of the DIN log would be shared 12 April 2023

Action DAG21.1-13 – PP noted this would be available in mid-April. SJ highlighted that this had been raised at CCAG as an important point (to have a clear plan of what the DIP artefacts would be and when they would be shared). SJ noted DAG members had been asking since last year and would escalate to PSG if a plan was not shared. SJ added that the action needed to be updated to be broader. CW noted this could be taken away. MC and PP replied that only some documents would be coming through for industry review. SJ added the Code of Connection was a particularly important document. PP agreed and noted this was intended to be seen by industry in mid/late April**.** IS noted an internal position had been reached on which artefacts would be externally facing but the dates had not yet been shared.

> **ACTION DAG23-01: Paul Pettitt to confirm the plan (including timeline, dates, and process) for DIP design documents to be shared with industry**

Action DAG22.1-01 – MC queried if this could be closed. SJ noted they did not believe the Change Requests on the agenda had delivered on this action and so they felt it should be left open. CW agreed this should be left open.

Action DAG21.1-03 – HE raised query. PP noted the design team logged a call and responded to all queries raised via the design mailbox

Action DAG20.1-12 – IS noted they believed a clarificatory note was going to be issued on this and that they would review internally to check the status

Action DAG22.1-05 – PP noted this related to documents issued as part of code drafting**.** CW queried if this action should sit with CCAG. SJ added that they believed it was to do with DTN flows signed-off as part of the M5 Work Off Plan. PP responded that DES-196 came out of the code drafting activity. SJ noted they believed it should go through the DAG as the design of the data flows needed to be approved by DAG (CCAG would not approve the design). PP responded that it was the quality of the document and not the sign off process. HE clarified that there were two issues – 1) quality issues and discrepancies in the document that needed to be solved, and 2) where this would be signed off. PP agreed they could follow this up internally. IS responded the first thing to do was to review the document and when it would be reviewed internally.

> **ACTION DAG23-02: Paul Pettitt to clarify the status of DTN flow design issues (DES-196) – both quality issues/discrepancies in the document and the sign-off process for any document changes**

3.   Programme Updates

CW introduced the item and noted as read. MC highlighted that the PSG had raised the replan Change Request to Impact Assessment.

4.   Programme Change Requests

CR017/18

CW introduced the item and noted DAG would discuss CR018 first as if this was approved, CR017 would not need to be covered. IA provided a summary of activity that took place in the run up to and development of CR017 and CR018. IA explained feedback from the LDSO community on the content of CR018 that had evolved into conditions for if CR018 was approved. IA explained the conditions from the LDSO community as per the slides and invited questions.

DJ queried how the LDSO conditions would be captured in the design and if they would go onto the DIN log. IA responded that the substance of the agreements and the desire to process the CR with the caveats shared by LDSOs would be developed in a red lined version of the Operational Choreography document to be submitted for review. PP agreed that the content of CR018 would be added to the DIN log and would be scheduled to be updated. PP noted any Change Requests with artefacts to be updated would be added to the DIN log (like CR015). IS noted this would allow a review of the red lined Operational Choreography document to ensure the change was accurately reflected. DY noted previously the Programme had said they were going to verify the change was required and queried if this had taken place. IS responded that there was feedback from parties that there were negative consequences of making no change and therefore a change was required.

DY noted they had expected a revised Change Request to come out updated as per the LDSO conditions, but that the process was now that CR018 was being approved with conditions on top. IS responded that a pragmatic approach was being taken to avoid another loop of the change process and to close out the change taking into account the feedback. CW added that they took the decision on this – to make a decision following the process would mean CR018 should have been withdrawn and reissued but to avoid delay, with proposal was for the conditions provided as clarifications rather than changes to the Change Request itself. DY added that they felt DNOs may not have been completely aligned with the conditions and that a reissuance of the Change Request may have been a better way. CW noted they appreciated the comments but that the Programme were keen to be pragmatic and close the loop without delay. IS added that the conditions were direct feedback from the LDSO community. DY noted that unofficially they did receive revisions of CR018 and that they knew some DNOs had rejected this unofficial version. CW responded that this was a learning from the Programme and that an unofficial version was shared to add clarity and should have been done differently. DY agreed this had muddied the waters and that the responses may not been those that they were expecting.

RLan noted they believed they submitted a response but that it was not reflected on the slide. Referring to the slide with the Impact Assessment analysis summary, RLan highlighted a discrepancy in reported figures. The Programme noted this had been reviewed (to align organisations with constituencies correctly) and that this could be reviewed again. SJ noted the Change Request content needed further clarity and specifics on the detail of the change, including on the timings in the Operational Choreography document.

SJ queried if the decision on the Change Request should be deferred until the red lined text was available against the design artefact. SJ noted this had been raised previously and that further clarity needed to be provided. SJ explained that until parties could see the Operational Choreography in detail, they could not comfortably approve the change.

HE noted strong concerns for the unofficial draft Change Request that had been mentioned and that there was difficulty following the two Change Request (CR017 and CR018) with assumptions being made. HE noted an incorrect number of Large Suppliers recorded in the Impact Assessment analysis.

DY noted an overwhelming majority of DNOs were not supportive of the Change Request although this may have changed given the LDSO conditions presented. DY explained that their preference would be to update CR018 and re-issue the document.

PP noted CR015 had been approved without red-lining and that providing red-lined document was an inefficient way of providing Change Requests, particularly where there were multiple options were being presented. PP explained clarity needed to be provided in the Change Request itself, rather than providing multiple versions of red-lined artefacts. DY responded they wanted to see a revised Change Request for Option C accounting for the LDSO conditions. CW noted the process was, if the SRO approved the Change Request at DAG, then the document would be redlined and shared for review so parties could ensure the document reflected the content of the Change Request. PP agreed and noted industry working groups could be held to ensure the redlined document was correct.

CW moved to a vote, noting the feedback on the change request process was being taken. IS summarised that the decision would be to approve that Change Request with the LDSO conditions added, and for the content of the change to then be written into red-lined text to be approved via the design change process.

CW invited a show of hands in support of the CR. One DAG member supported the change (RLan), two rejected (SJ, DY) and the remaining DAG members abstained. CW made the decision that the Change Request was not approved. SJ queried the process (if a new CR would need to be raised) and the rationale for the abstentions and if there was an option to defer.

CW decided that CR018 be revised (aligned to the revisions as discussed) and re-raised to Impact Assessment. CW noted CR017 would not be re-raised to Impact Assessment and would be deferred for decision alongside the updated CR018. MC queried if a red-lined document would go alongside the CR. CW confirmed a red-lined document would not be going alongside the updated CR018. SJ noted for each SLA in the Operational Choreography document associated with the Registration Service, additional clarity was required for the timings. IS confirmed they understood the requirement.

ND noted National Grid ESO was also incorrectly represented in the Impact Assessment Analysis.

ACTION DAG23-03: PMO to review Change Request analysis reference for grouping organisations into their constituency

DY queried timelines for the revised Change Request. IS responded that the change would have to be shared very quickly to get back to the next DAG.

DECISION DAG-DEC48: Change Request CR018 to be revised with feedback and clarifications provided at DAG and re-raised to Impact Assessment. Decision on CR017 to be deferred and made alongside

CR019

CW noted general support across the constituencies from Impact Assessment and invited comments. None raised. CW moved to a vote. Seven DAG members supported approval of the Change Request (DY, HE, RLan, CB, DJ, AG). No DAG members opposed the change. Three DAG members abstained (SJ, SS, IH). CW approved CR019. PP noted CR019 would be added to the DIN log.

DECISION DAG-DEC49: CR019 approved

HE queried if CR015 was in the DIN log and if there would be an industry working group in the coming few weeks to work through the change. PP confirmed yes and noted this process would be covered in the next item.

5.   Design Authority (DA) updates

PP walked through the update on the Design Authority and the revised process for design change management as per the slides. PP walked through each of the steps in the design artefact update process in detail, noting a large number of artefacts to go through the process. PP noted 252 items on the Design Issue Notification (DIN) log, with the first major release (Interim Release 1) planned to cover over 50% of the updates currently on the DIN log. PP explained there would be a tab on the DIN log with the timelines for documents to move through the process.

PP walked through an additional slide for the timelines for the first three Interim Releases of updated design artefacts. PP noted the intention was to be more delivery focussed and improve the visibility of what was coming up. PP invited comments.

CBu noted a benefit of the DA was to approve cosmetic changes to design artefacts on behalf of the DAG and queried if this had been removed. PP responded that it was more efficient to update a large volume of documents with both major and minor changes (noting all change types were recorded on the DIN log). CBu highlighted a concern that if all minor items were grouped in large Change Requests then these could be held up due to other contentious issues in the change. PP responded that this had been considered and that the minor changes were just typographical meaning delays to minor updates would not preventing participants from executing their DBT (i.e. minor changes were not impactful and therefore timelines did not matter).

CBu queried the DIP provider changes as these were not on the DIN log. PP responded that these would be in Interim Release 1 and were captured in the artefacts in this batch (20 documents total). CB queried when Interim Release 1

would be, noting feedback had been shared previously to the Programme on this topic with no receipt. PP responded Interim Release 1 should be release by COP w/c 11 April.

CBu noted internal milestones for requirements to test and qualify ahead of SIT and queried if there had been any consideration of the dates of document releases to ensure parties could satisfy the right version of documents when demonstrating the criteria to enter SIT. PP responded that they were working closely with the PIT and SIT teams to prioritise the more significant changes and minimise this impact. PP noted the release window was lengthy given the process that documents had to move through in order to provide inclusivity of industry in the process. CBu responded it was important for participants to be able to demonstrate in testing against the correct baselined version of a document.

> **ACTION DAG23-06: Paul Pettitt to clarify expectations on evidence required to be provided against SIT criteria against baselined versions of design documents – i.e. which versions of documents would evidence be required against at the point of evidence submissions**

RLan noted they believed there should be a mechanism to partially approve the content of Change Requests and push those not approved to a later release.

> **ACTION DAG23-07: Paul Pettitt to add to the design change management process the ability to release the 'signed off' design issues of a change request, should other design issues in a change request not be approved and need further work**

HE noted the Large Supplier Constituency were supportive of the updated process. HE added that not every query made it to the DIN log and that there needed to be a way for these items to be logged somewhere for transparency with industry. PP explained there was a ticketing system for items into the design mailbox and that items only made it onto the DIN log if they required changes to an artefact. HE responded they understood this and that it was the items that didn't make it to the DIN log that industry needed to see, independent of if these made changes to artefacts. HE explained this was important for avoiding duplicate queries and showing industry what had already been raised and clarified. PP responded that an FAQ was being developed for design and other parts of the programme, so where there were multiple queries this would be stored in a knowledge base. Commercial sensitivities of participant queries also needed to be respected. CBu noted not all queries would be commercially sensitive and these could be filtered out. PP explained that more detailed queries were being shared as time went by and that these were generally specific to individual parties. There were typically 60-80 queries coming in each week. HE noted they were happy to work through this with the Programme and added that they had this conversation with Large Suppliers at every meeting - there were many instances where Large Suppliers had had a query resolved directly that needed to be shared with other participants.

> **ACTION DAG23-08: Paul Pettitt to progress activity on developing and sharing a design knowledge base – to share common design queries that come into the Programme but do not make it onto the DIN log (i.e., design queries that do not result in changes to artefacts)**

PP thanked participants for their input into the process and noted the artefacts for Interim Release 1 would be out this week. The timelines would be provided in the DIN log. MC noted the DA diary invites would be taken out and the DA stood down.

> **ACTION DAG23-09: PMO to share design change timeline slides**

6.   Summary and next steps

MC summarised the actions as per the table above. PP noted the implementation process for Change Requests was being reviewed internally. CW noted Justin Andrews would return to chair the next DAG meeting.

RLam explained they were taking over from Matt Hall as DAG representative. RLam noted they had some queries on Change Requests they were expecting to be raised (this had already been raised to the Programme) relating to the DIP. PP explained that these Change Requests were due to come from the DIP service provider and related to action DAG23-01.

CW thanked attendees for joining and closed the meeting.

Date of next DAG: 10 May 2023