

MHHS Design Advisory Group (DAG) Headline Report

Issue date: 20/12/2023

Meeting Number	DAG031	Venue	Virtual – MS Teams
Meeting Date and Time	13 December 2023 10:00-13:00	Classification	Public

Actions

Area	Ref	Action	Owner	Due
	DAG31-01	Programme to provide response to Supplier Agent Representative's comments on the minutes of the DAG meeting held 08 November 2023	Programme (PMO)	03/01/2023
CR034 Decision	DAG31-02	Programme to issue CR034 redlining to DAG alongside Headline Report of meeting held 13 December 2023	Programme (Paul Pettit)	18/12/2023
	DAG31-03	Programme to clarify IF-021 error message response times and provide update to DAG	Programme (Paul Pettit)	10/01/2024
	DAG31-04	Change Raiser and Programme to update title of CR034 to reflect that CR relates to Level 4 validation (not Level 3 as currently stated)	Change Raiser (NGESO) & Programme (Immy Syms)	18/12/2023
CR032 Decision	DAG31-05	Programme to consider how Change Raiser and Programme responses to Impact Assessment (IA) comments can be provided as part of the IA outputs	Programme (PMO)	10/01/2024
	DAG31-06	Programme to confirm when CR032 (P210 report) will be tested and confirm to DAG	Programme (Lee Cox)	10/01/2024
CR036 Decision	DAG31-07	Programme to issue CR036 redlining to participants and invite comments on improvement ahead of an assurance meeting by the Design Resolution Group (date to be confirmed by Programme)	Programme (Design Team)	13/12/2023

	DAG31-08	Programme to urgently clarify potential implications of CR036 approval on SIT Functional Cycle 1 testing and raise for discussion at SIT Working Group, with an update to be provided at the January 2024 DAG meeting	Programme (Lee Cox)	10/01/2024
	DAG31-09	Programme to liaise with St Clement Services on CR036 implementation	Programme (Design Team)	10/01/2024
	DAG31-10	Large Supplier Constituency to request bilateral with MHHS Design Team to discuss CR036 (UTC/Clock Time)	Large Supplier Representative	10/01/2024
Design (DIN)	DAG31-11	Programme to provide clarity to participants on how the deferral of implementation of CR024 and CR025 should be managed	Programme (Design Team)	10/01/2024
	DAG31-12	CCAG Chair to ensure any actions required for code drafting in relation to the deferral of CR024 and CR025 are undertaken	Programme (CCAG Chair)	10/01/2024
Previous Meeting(s)	DAG29-04	Programme to consider the provision of regular updates to DAG on the interaction of design/testing releases	Programme (Paul Pettitt & Lee Cox)	13/12/2023
	DAG29-05	Programme to review the Programme Change Request template and ensure a view is provided alongside new CRs on the implementation/release outlook	Programme (PMO)	13/12/2023
	DAG27-08	Programme to confirm version incrementing arrangements for data flows and scenario variants changing as a result of MHHS	Programme (Matt McKeon)	13/12/2023

Decisions

Area	Ref	Decision
CR034 Decision	DAG-DEC83	The SRO approved Programme Change Request 034 (<u>Delay to Elexon Level 4 validation response – NFR (1009)</u>) for release in Interim Release 7 on 31 January 2024
CR032 Decision	DAG-DEC84	The SRO approved Programme Change Request 032 (<u>Change to Interface IF-165 P0210 TUoS Reporting</u>) for release in Interim Release 7 on 31 January 2024
CR036 Decision	DAG-DEC85	The SRO approved Programme Change Request 036 (<u>Use of Clock Midnight for Appointments and Reads</u>) for implementation, subject to redlining improvement suggestion being invited from participants and assured at a DRG meeting, confirmation of the approach to SIT Functional Cycle 1 testing, and support being offered to St Clements regarding deployment as part of testing delivery activities

Key Discussion Items

Area	Discussion
Minutes and Actions	<p>The Supplier Agent Representative advised comments had been provided on the minutes of the previous meeting. Approval of the headline report and minutes of the previous meeting was deferred pending review of the comments provided (ACTION DAG31-01).</p> <p>Action wording and updates can be found within the meeting papers and specific updates are summarised below:</p> <p>DAG28-04: The RECCo Representative confirmed the Programme’s recommendation to postpone the implementation of Change Requests (CRs) 024 and 025 had been discussed with RECCo and agreed the action could be closed. Action closed.</p> <p>DAG28-12: The Programme confirmed retrospective amendments had been discussed with Licenced Distribution Service Operators (LDSOs) and the outcomes discussed at a Design Resolution Group (DRG) meeting. The proposed design was issued for final comment by 11 December 2023. Action closed.</p>
CR034 Decision	<p>The Change Raiser noted concerns raised by LDSOs in their Impact Assessment (IA) responses and that consideration had been given to whether the scope of CR034 (<u>Delay to Elexon Level 4 validation response – NFR (1009)</u>) should be expanded to excuse parties in addition to Elexon Helix from the six second response time detailed in the E2E1009 Non-Functional Requirement (NFR). The Change Raiser confirmed the scope of the CR was only for Elexon Helix. The Programme stated that the CR could not be expanded and the DAG noted that LDSOs (or any other PP) could raise a new CR if they wished to pursue this. The Programme advised this clarification resolved several rejection comments provided by LDSOs and CR034 would continue to apply to Elexon Helix only.</p> <p>The Large Supplier Representative stated one Large Supplier was unhappy with being recorded as accepting the change and believed the CR did not explain why the six second response time was chosen and there was insufficient information within the CR on what is to be changed. The participant believed further assessment was required. The Large Supplier Representative noted this view had not been provided as part of IA comments. The Chair advised the Programme would work with Change Raisers in future to ensure such clarity is provided within CRs and reminded the DAG of the importance of raising such questions/concerns when validating CRs ahead of issuance to IA.</p> <p>The Programme provided an overview of the changes to be applied to the MHHS Design Artefacts (‘the redlining’) in relation to CR036 and advised these would be released in design Interim Release (IR) 7 on 31 January 2024, subject to approval. The Large Supplier Representative believed the redlining appeared reasonable. The Programme agreed to issue the redlining alongside the DAG headline report (ACTION DAG31-02).</p> <p>The Supplier Agent (Independent Supplier Agent) Representative asked why Interface 21 (IF-021) had been excluded from response time requirements within the baselined MHHS Design. The Programme’s Design Lead advised this had been excluded some time ago owing to the volumes of IF-021 flows likely to be sent. The Elexon Helix Representative noted there did not appear to be a response time detailed within the MHHS Design for the return of error messages in relation to IF-021 flows, and whilst the business process requirement was unlikely to require an immediate/quick response, this appeared to be a design gap which required clarification (ACTION DAG31-03).</p> <p>The Supplier Agent (Independent Supplier Agent) Representative noted the title of the CR referred to level three validation but the CR applied to level four validation only (ACTION DAG31-04).</p>

	<p>The Chair summarised CR034 would be released in IR7 with testing to be undertaken in SIT Functional Cycle 2 in June 2024. The Chair invited any objections to the approval of CR034, to which the Large Supplier Representative stated they objected based on the comments expressed previously (see above). No other objections were raised.</p> <p>The Chair, acting with delegated Senior Responsible Owner (SRO) authority, approved CR034 for implementation in IR7 (DECISION DAG-DEC83).</p>
<p>CR032 Decision</p>	<p>The Programme advised CR032 (<u>Change to Interface IF-165 P0210 TUoS Reporting</u>) was returning to DAG following a second IA. IA responses were limited and this was expected given the CR only applies to NGESO and Elexon Helix. An overview of IA responses and the proposed implementation plan were provided by the Programme. The Programme noted implementation dates were dependent on the provision of timelines from NGESO and Elexon Helix.</p> <p>The Chair noted IA comments from the Large Supplier Constituency (LSC) regarding concerns the CR would create complexities within the Balance and Settlement Code (BSC). However, the Large Supplier Representative stated they did not have further detail on what these specific concerns were. The Programme noted the CR seeks to replace the proposed ELEX-REP-080 / MHHS IF-165 with the existing Elexon Central Systems (ECS) P0210 file, which contains the same data items but with different names, and this may be the subject of the potential complexity raised by Large Suppliers. The IPA expressed nervousness that a data flow MHHS will rely on may therefore be unreliable and stated this would need to be considered carefully during testing should the CR be approved. The data within the flow is significant for NGESO charging processes.</p> <p>The Large Supplier Representative noted responses had not been provided to the LSC's IA comments and questioned whether the overall IA response rate was satisfactory and provided a clear view of participants feelings regarding the change. The Chair believed the low response rate was attributable to the CR only directly affecting NGESO and Elexon Helix and that it was a second round of IA. The NGESO Representative stated they fully support the change as it allows for the continuity of the P0210 report which supports accurate TNUoS and BSUoS reporting whereas the proposed ELEX-REP-080 / MHHS IF-165 would not provide the data needed. The CR would also simplify and reduce the system change required by NGESO and Elexon. The NGESO Representative highlighted NGESO TNUoS Taskforce would seek to harness the CR also, subject to approval, to ensure TNUoS can be settled as required, and suppliers were welcome to attend the taskforce meetings if they wish. NGESO requested supplier engagement at the NGESO Transmission Charging Methodology Forum and advised any concerns or questions could be raised directly to Neil.Dewar@nationalgrideso.com and Keren.Kelly1@nationalgrideso.com.</p> <p>The Supplier Agent Representative raised a point around governance/assurance of IA comments, noting these have been presented to DAG but it is unclear whether commenters have received responses from the Change Raiser or Programme. The Chair requested commenters are as specific as possible when raising comments such as complexity in code arrangements and stated the Programme must ensure responses are provided to IA comments (ACTION DAG31-05). The Large Supplier Representative supported this.</p> <p>The RECCo Representative queried the implementation approach and the MHHS Design Lead clarified ELEX-REP-080 would be replaced within the MHHS Design Artefacts with references to the P0201 file and there was no requirement for change to the Energy Market Architecture Repository (EMAR) data specification.</p> <p>The MHHS Test Lead confirmed, subject to approval of CR032, the existing design (i.e. ELEX-REP-080 / MHHS IF-165) would not be tested in SIT Functional Cycle 1 and the new requirements would be tested in SIT Function Cycle 2 (dates to be confirmed) (ACTION DAG31-06).</p>

	<p>The Chair invited any objections to the approval of CR032, to which the Large Supplier Representative and I&C Supplier Representative stated they objected based on the lack of responses to some of the IA comments. No other objections were raised.</p> <p>The Chair, acting with delegated SRO authority, approved CR034 for implementation (DECISION DAG-DEC84), noting the relevant Design Artefact changes would be released in IR7 on 31 January 2024 and the Programme would confirm the dates for testing.</p>		
<p>CR036 Decision</p>	<p>The Chair provided a reminder that CR036 (<u>Use of Clock Midnight for Appointments and Reads</u>) was raised to enable IA on the redlining, implementation plan, and testing approach for the use of Clock Time for Change of Supplier (CoS) reads and Service Appointment times, following the SRO decision at the 08 November 2023 DAG meeting over the use of Clock Time. The Chair noted that clarity for participants over the use of UTC or Clock Time was urgently required to resolve ambiguity in the MHHS Design and reduce potential risks in testing.</p> <p>The Programme provided an overview of the IA comments received as per the meeting slides, advising the Programme have been undertaking bilateral discussions with parties who raised concerns. The Programme highlighted that several IA respondents believed the CR lacked detailed rationale and did not believe the original design was ambiguous and therefore required clarification.</p> <p>The Programme provided an overview of the proposed changes to the MHHS Design Artefacts, the implementation plan, and the testing approach. The Programme proposed, subject to approval, the change is released in IR7 on 31 January 2024 and tested in SIT Functional Cycle 2 commencing 10 June 2024.</p> <p>The Chair note the proposed redlining for CR036 was issued to the DAG on 11 December 2023, and proposed that participants are given further time to suggest any improvements to the redlining. The Chair also proposed the redlining receives an assurance review as a DRG meeting to be scheduled in early January 2024.</p> <p>The Chair summarised the following, subject to approval of CR036:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redlining: Participants will be provided with a further opportunity to provide suggested improvements to the redlining, which the Chair will review and agree as required, after which the redlining will be issued back to the DAG and participants before the Christmas break (ACTION DAG31-07). • Implementation: The change would be released in IR7, with participants required to undertake design and build activities by 27 May 2024 ahead of SIT Functional Cycle 2 commencement on 10 June 2024. • Testing Approach: The MHHS Test Lead advised Settlement Testing is not planned until SIT Functional Cycle 2, based on reporting capabilities being delivered in IR7. On this basis, CR036 also aligns to IR7 / SIT Functional Cycle 2. SITWG participants have been asked to consider any impact to their own systems with SIT Functional Cycle 1 operating with different timing rules to rest of SIT. Any implications will be considered by the MHHS testing workstream, with a view to not hindering or impairing participant progress through Cycle 1 if any concerns are highlighted (ACTION DAG31-08). <p>The DAG discussed the proposed redlining and implementation at length and specific DAG member views are summarised below:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="315 1342 2101 1385"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="315 1342 629 1385">Constituency</th> <th data-bbox="629 1342 2101 1385">Comments</th> </tr> </thead> </table>	Constituency	Comments
Constituency	Comments		

DCC Representative (as smart meter central system provider)	No comments.
DNO Representative	<p>Highlighted comments from St Clements regarding implementation of the change, advising St Clements do not believe they can meet implementation in IR7 and request implementation in IR8 as an alternative. Stated a belief that all parties would need to implement Clock Time at the same time as MPRS may reject messages if participants make the change before them. The MHHS Design Lead advised IR7 is the point at which the changes to the MHHS Design Artefacts would be released, however implementation would be ahead of SIT Functional Cycle 2 in June 2024. Regarding a potential IR8 release, the MHHS Test Lead believed there was a dependency on the change to support accurate verification of settlement testing, and as such the Programme recommended IR7 to enable parties to commence design and build with certainty. The MHHS Design Lead considered the potential constraint for St Clements was not a design governance decision but would need to be considered as part of testing/programme delivery. The Chair noted St Clements are an essential service provider and the implementation of CR036 required balance in the need for a timely decision to provide certainty to participants and to enable testing to move at pace, whilst ensuring Core Capability Providers (CCPs) are able to deliver. The Programme advised support would be provided to St Clements via the Programme's testing workstream (ACTION DAG31-09). Stated they are broadly supportive of the change, noting the potential constraint expressed by St Clements.</p>
Elexon Representative (as central systems provider)	No comments.
iDNO Representative	<p>Expressed support for the change but noted the potential issue with implementation timeframes expressed by St Clements. The Chair noted St Clement's comments were provided after the IA deadline and this was unfortunate but the comments had been acknowledged by the Programme and support would be offered.</p>
Large Supplier Representative	<p>Confirmed redlining will be issued to participants and DAG for improvement suggestions (see ACTION DAG31-07). Expressed concerns over differing time codes around smart function may impact customer billing. The Programme advised this had been highlighted throughout development of the solution and the Programme believe, based on discussions with participants, the change will mitigate consumer impacts which may arise should the change not be implemented. The Programme noted Large Suppliers had broadly supported the changes throughout development and highlighted that appointments are currently in Clock Time, which presented a challenge on the treatment of half-hourly pricing and billing should the change not be made. The Programme have also liaised with the DCC Representative and do not believe there are any conflicts with Smart Energy Code (SEC) provisions.</p> <p>Requested the Programme offer a bilateral discussion with the LSC to provide an overview of how the solution was determined and discuss any concerns (ACTION DAG31-10). The Programme noted the LSC were engaged previously and the approach confirmed, with significant effort employed to engage with any participants who requested bilateral discussion.</p> <p>Stated that whilst accepts the proposed approach to next steps (see below) and hopes a sensible outcome can be achieved, would reject the CR based on the steer from the LSC.</p>

I&C Supplier Representative	No comments.
National Grid ESO	Believed the approach proposed by the Programme was sensible and that a timely decision was urgently required. Noted NGESO are not directly affected by the change.
RECCo Representative	<p>Expressed concern the Programme does not appear to have acknowledged potential downstream impacts highlighted in the IA responses nor the potential impacts of moving away from UTC for smart transfer reads. Stated very uncomfortable that the decision on moving to Clock Time was made prior to CR036 being raised and did not believe a change such as this should be pre-approved. Believed the Programme must consider that DAG do not support the change and the IA comments of those who support are not visible, nor is there visibility of IA comments which explain why Clock Time is the right solution.</p> <p>On implementation, believed St Clements are key to the ability to test the change and whilst the Programme should not move at the pace of the slowest participant, this party not being ready for testing would significantly impact SIT Functional Cycle 1 as the current design means parties may be required to test on UTC in Cycle 1 and then change to Clock Time for Cycle 2. Believed Cycle 1 includes tests which cover appointments and if widespread rejections occur this will significantly hinder progress on Cycle 1 The MHHS Test Lead stated SITWG participants have been asked to consider any impact to their own systems with SIT Functional Cycle 1 operating with different timing rules to rest of SIT. Any implications will be considered by the MHHS Testing Team, with a view to not hindering or impairing participant progress through Cycle 1 if any concerns are highlighted (see ACTION DAG31-08).</p> <p>Believed statements by the Programme that the LSC were in unanimous agreement over the approach to UTC/Clock Time were incorrect and the CR was required to prompt the assessment of potential downstream changes. Stated parties changing their minds during development of changes was not an issue.</p> <p>Stated would reject the CR over concerns on implementation and process.</p>
Small Supplier Representative	<p>Requested confirmation over how CR036 is implemented and the redlining finalised. The MHHS Design Lead advised the change would be added to the Design Issues Notifications (DIN) Log to enable release scheduling but there would not be an objections window as there are for DINs. The Chair noted the further time provided for comments on the redlining (see ACTION DAG31-07) and the subsequent DRG assurance session. The Chair will review any amendments suggested by participants and consider/approve these ahead of release in IR7, with the final redlining being issued to parties as usual.</p> <p>Asked why the DAG would seek to approve the CR when further changes to the redlining may arise. The Chair responded the need for a timely decision meant maximum clarity should be provided now, and the Chair will only consider material improvements to the redlining following the DRG assurance session.</p>
Supplier Agent Representative	Expressed continued opposition to the decision to use Clock Time. Believed St Clements have built systems to UTC and change would therefore be required for them. The Programme advised this view was not shared based on discussions with St Clements.

Regarding registration flow testing, believed St Clements would reject all appointments if they have not been able to undertake the changes to accept Clock Time. The Programme noted ongoing weekly discussions with the St Clements design team, and stated this was not the Programme's understanding of how St Clements have built their systems. The Chair asked for the views of the DNO and IDNO Representatives. The DNO Representative stated DNOs support Clock Time for appointments and reads as this is the current status quo. The representative was not aware of any prospective misalignment between DNO and St Clements' systems but stated this would need to be taken away to confirm.

Believed the impacts are larger than was apparent when the Programme Participant Information Request (PIR) was issued following the October DAG. Believed DCC traffic may increase due to reads not being taken at UTC midnight, and therefore requiring ad-hoc read requests. The Programme advised reads would be taken from DCC systems at UTC midnight and would then require downstream action to change to Clock Time, meaning the change should not affect the schedule of reads in DCC systems. The DCC Representative stated DCC have operated on the assumption no system change is required but acknowledged the downstream impacts for participants.

Highlighted a risk that if St Clements are only expecting Clock Time, this will be a significant change for Supplier Agents' systems.

Expressed continued opposition to the decision to use Clock Time.

Questioned what a rejection of the CR would mean. The Chair advised the decision to proceed with Clock Time was approved at the November DAG, and rejection of the CR would mean the redlining does not give effect to this decision. The Chair noted clarity is required urgently and as the evidence provided by participants indicates some have built to Clock Time and others to UTC, there will be impacts on participants either way. As such, the decision on CR036 is essentially whether to approve the redlining or delay approval for further development. The Chair noted the latest IA has not altered the solution nor highlighted any fundamental issues. The Supplier Agent (Independent Supplier Agent) Representative believed the level of change has increased from that which was initially apparent, and the redlining was unclear, and it would be preferable to continue development. The Programme expressed a belief that the latest redlining provided to DAG did not alter any fundamental aspect of the change, and any increase in word count reflected clarifications added rather than additional complexity. The Programme stated the change is implementable in its current state and this had been confirmed during bilaterals. The Supplier Agent (Independent Supplier Agent) Representative agreed the change was implementable but it was unclear whether all comments had been addressed and whether the change would work for participants. The Chair reminded DAG members that further improvements to the redlining could still be suggested (see ACTION DAG31-07).

Stated disagreement with the proposed way forward with redlining and believed more cross-industry involvement was required. Suggested an alternative approach whereby the decision on CR036 is deferred while the redlining is refined. The Chair noted improvement suggestions were invited and the final redlining would be assured at a DRG in January 2024 and reviewed by the Chair ahead of release in IR7. As such, it was possible to decide on CR036 and continue to improve the redlining ahead of release.

Stated would accept the proposed next steps but would reject the CR for the reasons outlined (see above).

Supplier Agent
Representative
(Independent Supplier
Agent)

Consumer
Representative

Representative not in attendance.

Medium Supplier
Representative

Seat vacant.

A representative from the SEC stated whilst there were no concerns regarding the ability of participants to retrieve data from smart meters, there were concerns that industry parties may have built systems to UTC for the execution of service requests. The Programme highlighted appointments are currently in Clock Time, and system change would therefore be required either way. The SEC representative clarified there are downstream impacts for suppliers who may collect data in UTC and then need to convert this to Clock Time, and this may impact scheduling arrangements. The Chair noted industry parties already need to undertake conversions from UTC to Clock Time and there is settlement inaccuracy which arises from this which is currently smeared, but this will not be possible under half-hourly arrangements. The Chair further noted the use of UTC versus Clock Time had been under discussion for several months, and these matters have either been discussed or are new issues which have not been raised previously. The issues highlighted are an example of an industry mismatch which has come to light because of MHHS. Currently, DCC collect data in UTC but CoS under Faster Switching is in Clock Time, and MHHS requires that this misalignment is resolved. The Chair stated that whilst this was a challenging decision with varying impacts for participants, a resolution was required to enable to the benefits of MHHS to be realised.

The IPA provided a view, noting the current challenge centred around a decision on implementation given that a CCP has advised they may not be able to implement the change ahead of SIT Functional Cycle 2. The IPA considered this was a risk which sat outside of the decision before DAG and was more akin to a testing issue than a design issue. The Chair considered the proposal for change was clear and should not be delayed. Once certainty is provided over requirements and prospective timelines, the discussion can then move to into testing delivery arrangements and change can be proposed if challenges with testing delivery materialise.

The summarised the proposed next steps and timelines:

- Redlining will be issued to participants and DAG and improvement suggestions invited by 8am 19 December 2023.
- The Programme will collate any suggestions provided and schedule a DRG assurance meeting in early January 2024.
- The Programme collate any agreed improvement suggestions seek approval of these from the Chair. The Chair will only consider significant improvements or essential clarifications.
- The final redlining will be issued to participants and DAG for visibility, and then released in IR7 on 31 January 2023.
- Participants will be expected to complete design and build activities by 27 May 2024, ahead of SIT Functional Cycle 2 commencement on 10 June 2024.
- Note: SIT Functional Cycle 1 implications will be considered at the SITWG on 08 January 2024 and an update provided to DAG.
- Note: The Programme will work with St Clements to understand any challenges with deployment, and any challenges or implication for the test schedule will be taken through appropriate testing working groups.

The Chair invited DAG members to vote on whether CR036 should be approved, to assist the SRO decision on approval. DAG members voted as follows:

	Constituency	Yes	No	Abstained
	DCC Representative (as smart meter central system provider)			✓
	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)		✓	
	Consumer Representative	Constituency representative not in attendance		
	Medium Supplier Representative	Seat vacant		
	<p>The Chair noted the split voting, with four parties voting to approve and four voting to reject, as well as several abstentions. The Chair considered that an urgent decision was required owing to current ambiguity within the MHHS Design and noting the matter was discussed by the DRG in September 2023, then discussed at October 2023 DAG and a PPIR issued, then discussed at the November 2023 DAG and a CR raised, and the results of the CR then discussed at the December 2023 DAG. In addition, further time would be provided for consideration of the redlining and actions placed to discuss deployment in testing.</p> <p>The Chair, acting with delegated SRO authority, approved CR036 for implementation subject to the approach outline above (DECISION DAG-DEC85),</p>			
Release Management During Testing and Code Deployment	<p>The Programme provided information on how design changes and releases will be managed as testing and code deployment progress, per the meeting slides. There will be a reduction in the cadence of IRs to support stability during testing. IR2 and IR5 are the baseline releases for the first stages of testing (CIT and SIT Functional), and defect fixes have been deployed in an IR5.2 release and may continue to iterate as essential fixes are implemented.</p> <p>An overview of the release schedule and how this interacts with the testing schedule was provided, as well as information on the update of testing environments as testing progresses.</p> <p>A change freeze has been formalised via the Programme Steering Group (PSG) to support the stability of the design as testing and code drafting progress. The effect of the change is freeze is that only material changes will be progressed. The Programme provided an overview of how change the MHHS Design (internal change) and change arising externally, such as industry code change (external change), will be managed at differing stages of the Programme. The impacts of releases on testing will be discussed at the STIWG, the Fast Track Implementation Group (FTIG), and the Testing and</p>			

	<p>Migration Advisory Group (TMAG). The impacts of releases on code drafting will be discussed at the Cross Code Advisory Group (CCAG) and the Code Drafting Working Group (CDWG).</p> <p>Further detail on release management during testing and code deployment can be found within the meeting slides.</p>
<p>Design (DIN)</p>	<p>The Programme advised a review of upcoming design changes had been undertaken in response to concerns raised by participants over the level of design change arising. Scheduled changes which can be moved have been moved, and the Programme have recommended the implementation of CR024 and CR025 are moved to M10 (central systems ready for migrating MPANs). The Programme acknowledged this would result in temporary misalignment between the design and code drafting, and this will be managed via the CCAG. The MHHS Design Team have requested information from participants on whether there are any material impacts should the implementation of CR024 and CR025 be deferred.</p> <p>The RECCo Representative provided views, agreeing code drafting implications would be managed by the CCAG. The representative noted misalignment between the current MHHS Design, the future design once the CRs are implemented, and code drafting may cause issues if parties build to the current design. The Programme took an action to ensure clarity is provided to participants on how this should be managed in testing (ACTION DAG31-11). The representative wished to ensure participants do not need to align their build to a data item contained within the design which will then change on implementation of CR024.</p> <p>The Chair advised the postponement would be accepted, subject to confirmation of ACTION DAG31-11.</p>

Next meeting: 10 January 2024 10am

Attendees

Chair

Justin Andrews

Role

Chair

Industry Representatives

Andrew Green

I&C Supplier Representative

Carolyn Burns

Small Supplier Representative

Craig Handford

Large Supplier Representative

Daniel Arrowsmith

National Grid ESO

David Yeoman

DNO Representative

Donna Jamieson

IDNO Representative

Robert Langdon

Supplier Agent Representative

Riccardo Lampini

Elexon Representative

Sarah Jones

RECCo Representative

Seth Chapman

Supplier Agent Representative

Stuart Drinan (on behalf of Stuart Scott)

DCC Representative (as smart meter central system provider)

MHHS

Berlinda Kugara

Design Team

Fraser Mathieson

PMO Governance Lead

Immy Syms

PMO Change Lead

Kevin Spencer

Design Team

Lee Cox

Test Lead

Matt Hall (MH) (part meeting)

Design Team

Paul Pettitt

Design Lead

Sean Cooper (SC)

Design Team

Other Attendees

Anik Abdullah (CR036 only)

Smart Energy Code

Chris May

Elexon

Colin Berry

Elexon

Colin Bezzant

IPA

Danielle Walton

Ofgem

Neil Dewar (CR034 only)

NGESO

Nigel Rees (part meeting)

Elexon

Taylor Thorpe (part meeting)

IPA

Tim Newton (CR036 only)

SEC

Apologies

Caroline Farquhar

Consumer Representative

