

MHHS Design Advisory Group SEC-MOD-MP162 Meeting #01 Summary

Issue date: 04/04/22

Meeting Number	DAG SEC-Mod-MP162, meeting #01	Venue	Microsoft Teams Meeting
Meeting Date and Time	01 February 2022 15:00-16:00	Classification	Public

Discussion Items	SEC-Mod-MP162 Introduction and Context	<p>Context was provided for the origin of this meeting as per action DES-03-8 from January DAG.</p> <p>Background to SEC Mod MP162 was given (as per slide 5) with an overview of DCC planned changes and proposals for Service Request Target Response Times (TRTs).</p> <p>It was confirmed that SECAS have now issued a Refinement Consultation on the updated MP162 solution and draft legal text. This has been received by working group members for review by 8th Feb, and then issued for consultation with responses due by 7th March</p>
	Proposed design principle and why it is needed	<p>The 'level playing field' design principle was proposed by the Supplier Agent Representative:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“Level playing field – All participants operating under MHHS will be afforded the ability to deliver the same level of service regardless of role”.</p> <p>The need for this principle was discussed. At present, the baseline requirement of MHHS is a 24hr Target Response Time (TRT) for service requests. The DAG can't see a need where you would need a faster response time than 24 hours for MHHS, although it is recognised that suppliers have a need and capability for faster response times under their activities as a supplier (e.g. customer service). Slide 14 was discussed to support this, demonstrating the different service request times required for different DCC User Roles (Supplier and MDR) for scheduled and on-demand requests. The need for a 24hr TRT helps DCC scheduling and capacity, smoothing the flow of requests across the day and avoiding unnecessary costly extra DCC capacity.</p> <p>Supplier's capability for a faster response time for service requests outside of MHHS means that they could theoretically use this capability for service requests within MHHS. This would mean there is not a 'level playing field'. The design principle is therefore required to ensure suppliers with Supplier User Roles on DCC do not have a competitive advantage against other agents.</p> <p>Feedback was received on the principle, including that there are subtleties in the underlying detail that vary depending on the user. The design principle was agreed in principle, but required some updates to wording (e.g., use of the word 'role' to distinguish between DCC User Roles and the service roles that a single market participant, e.g. a supplier, might be performing).</p> <p>Action: programme to redraft design principle to reflect comments from the group</p>

	<p>Design proposals to satisfy design principle</p>	<p>As per slide 9, current proposals to satisfy the design principle were raised: add drafting into the SEC to ensure that all MHHS-related service requests are subject to the 24hr TRT regardless of the User Role submitted the request, or; assess the option for Suppliers qualifying as MDRs and only accessing MHHS service requests through that MDR role.</p> <p>The DAG subgroup discussed some factors affecting the solutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At present, the DCC cannot distinguish between an on-demand request that comes from a Supplier User Role for general service requirements from one that is sent for MHHS purposes. If Supplier DCC Users do not register as MDRs, then it will not be possible to see what their service request is for. There therefore needs to be a way of codifying that Suppliers are not using on-demand requests for MHHS purposes, and instead are using scheduled requests with 24hr TRT; • An impact assessment of each solution would be required. Some concerns were raised that this may overlap with an existing DCC impact assessment into MDRs. Suppliers acting as MDRs may be a big change for suppliers, adding complexity and costs that are not necessary; and • A further solution was raised for DCC creating a ‘flag’ in their system that differentiates between the intention of on-demand requests from a single User Role. This solution would also add additional cost and complexity and had been discussed but ruled out by the SECMP1262 work group. <p>No decisions were made on a solution to pursue, with further discussion required to explore each of the options in more detail via the design workstream.</p> <p>Action: Programme to discuss next steps for design proposals and bring to next appropriate governance forum (e.g. next DAG, ad hoc DAG, BPRWG Level 4 SMART Working Group)</p>
	<p>Next steps</p>	<p>JA summarised that in principle, DAG is happy with the level playing field principle, though there is some clarification needed on wording. JA concluded that the discussion would need to continue, with an update to be taken to the next DAG meeting on 9 February 2022.</p>