MHHS Design Advisory Group Actions and Minutes

Meeting number	**DAG005**	Venue	**Virtual – MS Teams**
Date and time	**16 February 2022 1500-1600**	Classification	**Public**

Attendees

MHHS IM DAG Chair	Justin Andrews (JA)
DCC Representative (as smart meter central system provider)	Stuart Scott (SS)
Large Supplier Representative	Craig Handford (CH)
Medium Supplier Representative	Gurpal Singh (GS)
Small Supplier Representative	Jo Bradbury (JB)
I&C Supplier Representative	Andrew Green (AG) (on behalf of Gareth Evans)
Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent)	Seth Chapman (SC)
Supplier Agent Representative	Robert Langdon (RL)
DNO Representative	Gemma Slaney (GeS)
National Grid ESO	Keren Kelly (KK)
MHHS IM Design Manager	Ian Smith (IS)
MHHS IM Design Lead	Simon Harrison (SH)
MHHS IM Design Market and Engagement Lead	Claire Silk (CS)
MHHS IM Programme Manager	Keith Clark (KC)
MHHS IM Quality Manager	Dominic Mooney (DM)
MHHS IM PMO	Martin Cranfield (MC)
MHHS IM PMO	Fraser Mathieson (FM)
MHHS IM PMO	Miles Winter (MW)
Ofgem (as observer)	Anna Stacey (AS)
Ofgem (as observer)	Danielle Walton (DW)
Ofgem (as observer)	Vlada Petuchaite (VP)

Apologies

Elexon Representative (as central systems provider)	Matt Hall (MH)
I&C Supplier Representative	Gareth Evans
iDNO Representative	Donna Townsend
Consumer Representative	Ed Rees

Actions

Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date
DAG05-01	Clarify wording on the Interface Approach principle to include logical grouping of data (e.g. sending whole addresses rather than just the part of the address that needs updating)	Ian Smith	09/03/2022
DAG05-02	Email DAG members to seek approval via correspondence for Decisions relating to approval of Interface Approach Option 2 (Thin– Acceptance/Rejection Outcome/message, & Content of original transaction data) and Registration Query Service Approach. **DAG members are to provide responses to pmo@mhhsprogramme.co.uk by COP Friday 18/02/22**	PMO	Action complete
DAG05-03	Ensure PSG are aware that the risks posed by a lack of resource for programme participants are now manifesting and impacting Programme delivery (as exhibited at this DAG where discussions around supplier engagement and resourcing led to Suppliers not being in a position to approve a number of recommendations to DAG)	Programme	02/03/2022

Decisions

Area	Decision
Service Appointments	Decision to progress Option 1 – (CCDG Preferred Approach) Registration Mediated Service Appointments. Existing Supplier-Agent interactions (D155/D11) replaced by new interfaces between Supplier and Registration System via the Data Integration Platform (DIP). DAG members should raise any concerns through PSG on this decision and their rationale for rejecting making a decision at this time.
Interface Approach	The Transactional Messages – Initial Interaction principle was approved, subject to clarifications in wording (Action DAG05-01 above). This principle is: of 'Transactional messages should only contain the data items (including logical groups) specifically related to the processing of that event, and that ancillary data items not directly connected to that transaction/event should not be included.'
	The following decisions have been made by DAG Chair, following consultation with DAG members as per action DAG05-02, to progress on the basis of the evidence presented to the DAG, that a decision was needed to be made at this time to unblock a number of design artefacts, so as to remain on track to meet the Ofgem-set Programme plan. It should also be note that DAG members can raise any concerns through PSG on this decision and their rationale for rejecting making a decision at this time.
Interface Approach	Progress Option 2 based on the rationale that Option 2 only contains necessary data, reduces redundant rejections, and participant responses had been supportive of Option 2.
Registration Query Service Approach	Participants should have a mechanism for obtaining a Real Time a copy of all the current (including historical) data held by the Registration system for a given MPAN.

Minutes

1. Welcome and Introductions

Justin Andrews welcomed all to the meeting and outlined plan for the meeting. JA confirmed that as per the ToR, DAG is responsible for all design decisions and as part of that noted that the Programme have made sure there is full transparency across design groups. The design groups are now escalating issues so that the design progresses according to the currently agreed Ofgem plan.

35 design artefacts are currently blocked by the design issues for discussion, so a DAG decision is needed so that the Programme can progress these design elements.

Seth Chapman asked how DAG propose to make good decisions in this forum? Would this be based on the principles DAG have set out so far? Ian Smith suggested that where there are elements of contention DAG can refer back to the principles and should note that there was a broad approval of the recommended options by market participants who responded.

2.   Ratification of design decision regarding Service Appointments

IS recapped the existing position on Service Appointments as per the DAG slides. IS confirmed that the Design Team supports Option 1 (Registration Mediated Service Appointments.) due to the lower likelihood of errors in the process as a result and noted that there was broad support for Option 1 from the consultation.

IS opened for questions.

CH asked if these were the only two options discussed? IS confirmed this. CH asked whether these options allow retrospective appointments? IS responded that it does not preclude retrospective appointments, and this will need to be considered. The Programme will bring this back once the detail is fleshed out.CH asked if the DAG approved Option 1 or Option 2 (Supplier/Agent Mediated Service Appointments), does the design work then follow whichever option has been selected? IS confirmed yes.

No other questions received.

JA asked if anyone in the DAG disagreed with pursuing Option 1.

CH confirmed that large suppliers as a group aren't able to support either option at this point as some constituents haven't been able to attend the relevant sessions. CH confirmed that they are objecting to the options, as further understanding is required for large suppliers. This is due to not having the resource to review these options in detail. CH accepted that Option 1 seems credible, but reiterated that there hasn't been sufficient time to think it through from a large supplier point of view.

Gurpal Singh added that medium supplier view is that they aren't in a position to approve anything yet.

Andrew Green said non-domestic are also of this view.

JA asked if this was based on not having the resource to review the options. CH, GS and AG confirmed yes.

IS stated that 3 of the large suppliers and 1 I&C supplier did provide feedback.

GS raised a potential risk that the Programme has 100+ market participants, but the feedback presented on the slide is representative of only 11 respondents who were in favour, out of 17 total respondents.

GS pointed out that it's not necessarily a 'resource' issue, but a conflict of priority.

SC confirmed that all his constituents were happy with Option 1, and that his understanding is that the number of respondents is good for an industry project such as this.

JB stated that she had had no response from any of her small supplier constituents so couldn't vote.

SS confirmed that DCC perspective is that Option 1 is preferred, as well as all involvement in working groups suggesting that Option 1 is the unanimous preference. If the choice here is between Option 1 and Option 2, then Option 1 seems the firm favourite.

GS pointed out that the people who might vote Option 2 are the people who are not currently able to engage with the project, i.e. suppliers.

JA clarified that, as shown in the slides, Option 2 was intended to reduce impact on market participants but that it was noted in the feedback that Option 2 did not achieve this in terms of significantly reducing impact.

GeS confirmed that DNOs were in favour of Option 1 and would reject Option 2. GeS noted that 17 responses out of 100 participants is a relatively good response rate and that this is more of an issue with regards to access to resources and ability to engage. This is in the context of Faster Switching also ongoing at the same time. Risk that this will get worse over time and decision paralysis will ensure.

CS pointed out that these documents were sent out 10 working days before hand and will have gone through the parties in the working groups and who had attended supplier engagement sessions. CS confirmed that there was good representation across those groups.

GeS questioned whether this 'good' representation meant that sufficient representation was being reached?

JA noted that this engagement is getting better as time goes by. There are about 35 organisations represented at these working groups. It's not everyone, but it's a better turn out than previous industry change programmes. GeS suggested this is due to there not being a consultation process on this project. JA clarified that consultation wasn't happening at the end of the design but was happening on an ongoing basis through the work groups. JA noted that all of these artefacts are available for all market participants to view at the point at which these go to the work groups, so even participants who cannot attend all the work groups can still view the artefacts and form an opinion on them.

RL stated that Option 1 involved using DIP and not existing flows, and Option 2 involved using DIP and existing flows. RL asked what the difference in effort was for progressing both Option 1 and Option 2 simultaneously? IS responded that there would be significant regret if DAG picked an option and then changed to a different option later. They're so significantly different that the decision materially impacts the number of interfaces, so significant effort would be required to progress both, hence the need to have a decision now by the DAG.

JA summarised that the supplier community do not support making a decision today on either option 1 or option 2. The DCC, Independent agents saying that they support option 1. DNOs support option 1. It was noted that both iDNOs and Elexon were neutral on these options

KK noted that ESO has no strong opinion as they're not majorly affected by this decision. JA asks that as a design expert, which option would be supported? KK confirmed Option 1 based on the info they've been able to review.

JA outlined DAG ToRs and as DAG chair made a decision that based on the evidence on the two options, the Programme progresses with option 1 based on the rationale that it reduces errors. However, if any member of the DAG disagrees with that decision, they can flag it to the PSG. Other rationale for this decision is that the Programme is working to a plan set by Ofgem and that plan cannot be met without making this decision due to the number of design artefacts that are blocked. JA fully recognised that suppliers are constrained by resourcing, and noted this was a discussion ongoing at the PSG.

Decision: Decision to progress Option 1 – (CCDG Preferred Approach) Registration Mediated Service Appointments. Existing Supplier-Agent interactions (D155/D11) replaced by new interfaces between Supplier and Registration System via the DIP. DAG members should raise any concerns through PSG on this decision and their rationale for rejecting making a decision at this time.

---

3.   Ratification of design decision regarding Interface Approach

IS introduced the design decision as per the slides and confirmed that participants were broadly supportive of this recommendation and the Programme is asking for DAG approval as a result.

GeS was of the view that sending only what needs to be sent is something they're supportive of, but if you only change one line of an address, in theory only the line of address that needs changing would be sent, but in reality, you would want to send the whole address. While this seems like an obvious example, GeS wanted to make sure the definition of 'relevant information' is a sensible one. IS agreed with this principle and that the data would be organised around logical groups of data rather than specific data items.

GeS pointed out that there's a rationale for not sending unnecessary data, but asked if there is any evidence to back that up as a theory for not sending the data? IS said that historically where there have been large volumes of data exchanged in the past, there has been a mechanism for not sending more data than is necessary.

AG agreed that this is a reasonable view, that sending additional information that isn't required can cause validation to fail and stop the process that would otherwise have been successful.

SC agreed and pointed out that the more data items you have it increases the amount of work you need to do. SC agreed that you can definitely get rejections occurring when you receive additional, unnecessary data.

CH asked for clarification as to whether participants are agreeing the principle here? CH understood the underlying arguments, but questioned if DAG are potentially constraining ourselves down the line if DAG makes this decision now? IS answered that the Programme think it's important to have this principle as there are a lot of logical interfaces that are being specified at the moment, and so by having a principle like this approved it should allow the Programme to move forward.

SC pointed out that it's not the case that there are conflicting views here, DAG are just looking to approve the principle which could always be changed in future.

JA asked if the DAG were happy for the Programme to work based on this principle.

GeS suggested it be expanded to allow for those additional data items within the group, i.e. the logical grouping of data, just to make the principle is really clear rather than having it as an assumption within the principle. IS suggested that there is room for us to include this in the principle.

Action DAG05-01 Ian Smith to Clarify wording on the Interface Approach principle to include logical grouping of data (e.g. sending whole addresses rather than just the part of the address that needs updating)

Decision: The Transactional Messages – Initial Interaction principle was approved, subject to clarifications in wording (Action DAG05-01 above). This principle is: 'Transactional messages should only contain the data items (including logical groups) specifically related to the processing of that event, and that ancillary data items not directly connected to that transaction/event should not be included.'

At this point, DAG reached the end of the allotted meeting time and some members had to leave the meeting. Given this, JA proposed follow up a decision via correspondence (via email) for the remaining Design decisions on Options for Interface Approach, focussing on if any constituents had a strong opposition to Option 2. This would need to be responded to by close of play Friday.

Action DAG05-02: PMO to email DAG members to seek approval via correspondence for Decisions relating to approval of Interface Approach Option 2 (Thin – Acceptance/Rejection Outcome/message, & Content of original transaction data) and Registration Query Service Approach. DAG members are to provide responses to pmo@mhhsprogramme.co.uk by COP Friday 18/02/22

SC asked if real-time interaction is just related to current data, but should this be historical data too? IS clarified if this was the requirement for the in-time inquiry. SC said that the access to historic data is part of this too and that the slides say 'current data'. The DAG noted this clarification.

GeS noted that comments about resource earlier led to DAG running out of time, so requested that this is formally raised to PSG to highlight the real risk that resourcing is now impacting upon the design.

Keith Clark confirmed this would be raised at PSG in discussion on engagement of different parties and how this affects decision making.

Action DAG05-03 Ensure PSG are aware that the risks posed by a lack of resource for Programme Participants are now manifesting and impacting Programme delivery (as exhibited at this DAG where discussions around supplier engagement and resourcing led to Suppliers not being in a position to approve a number of recommendations to DAG)

As a follow up to action DAG05-02, responses were received by the PMO and below is a summary of the subsequent decisions.

Action DAG05-02*:* PMO to email DAG members to provide approval via correspondence for Decisions relating to approval of Interface Approach Option 2 (Thin) for both Acceptance and Rejection of transactional messages data) and Registration Query Service Approach.
DAG members were to provide responses to pmo@mhhsprogramme.co.uk by COP Friday 18/02/22

4 responses were received to the email request as follows:
- 2 supported and 2 rejected Interface Approach Option 2
- 3 supported (with comments) and 1 rejected the Registration Query Service Approach.

The following decisions have been made by the DAG Chair to progress:
1. **Interface Approach Option 2**: based on the rationale that Option 2 only contains necessary data, reduces redundant rejections, and participant responses had been supportive of Option 2; and
2. **Registration Query Service Approach**: Participants should have a mechanism for obtaining a Real Time copy of all the current (including historical) data held by the Registration system for a given MPAN

These decisions were made on the basis of the evidence presented to the DAG, that a decision needed to be made at this time to unblock a number of design artefacts and remain on track to meet the Ofgem-set Programme plan. It should also be noted that DAG members can raise any concerns through PSG on these decisions, such as their rationale for rejecting making decisions at this time.

The comments on the Registration Query Service Approach will be taken forward by the MHHS Design team in the next stage of design work.