

MHHS Design Advisory Group (DAG) Headline Report

Issue date: 15/03/2024

Meeting Number	DAG034	Venue	Virtual – MS Teams
Meeting Date and Time	13 March 2024 10:00-13:00	Classification	Public

Actions

Area	Ref	Action	Owner	Due
Minutes and Actions	DAG34-01	Programme to share current DAG design principles and update the principles published on the Programme Collaboration Base	Programme (Paul Pettit)	10/04/2024
Interface Code of Connections	DAG34-02	Programme to provide information on how previous lessons learned with regard to updates to the Interface Code of Connections were communicated and how they were applied to the most recent updates	Programme (DIP Manager)	10/04/2024
CR044 Impact Assessment	DAG34-03	Programme to update CR044 if required to include scenarios where the data realignment mechanism was likely to be used, what safeguards would be in place, and how any reporting on impacted MPANs would be undertaken	Programme (Sean Cooper)	ASAP
	DAG34-04	Subject to information being provided on the feasibility of implementing CR045 pre-M10 (Central systems ready for migrating MPANs), Programme to raise Programme risk should implementation not be possible pre-M10	Programme (Sean Cooper)	10/04/2024
CR045 Impact Assessment	DAG34-05	Programme to provide strawman solution information alongside CR045	Programme (Sean Cooper)	ASAP
CR046 Impact Assessment	DAG34-06	Programme to raise Design Issue Notification regarding how historic consumption should be managed in relation to CR046	Programme (Sean Cooper)	ASAP
	DAG34-07	RECCo to update CR046 prior to Impact Assessment to include a view on implementation	RECCo Representative (Sarah Jones)	ASAP

AOB – Change Control	DAG34-08	Programme to advise whether changes to the DAG Terms of Reference are required in response to the changes agreed by the Programme Steering Group to the MHHS Change Control Process	Programme (PMO)	10/04/2024
	DAG34-09	IPA to provide views on the changes to the MHHS Change Control Approach agreed at the PSG on 06 March 2024	IPA (Colin Bezzant)	10/04/2024
	DAG34-10	Programme to consider whether the Programme Change Request to implement changes to the MHHS Change Control Approach should be subject to a full Impact Assessment	Programme (PMO)	ASAP
	DAG34-11	DAG members to submit their views on the changes to the MHHS Change Control Approach their Programme Steering Group (PSG) representative for consideration by the PSG	DAG Members	03/04/2024
Previous Meeting(s)	DAG33-03	Programme to issue comms shared on 17/01/2024 covering implications of CR036 on Testing with DAG members	Programme (PMO)	15/02/2024
	DAG32-06	Programme to provide further detail on the change freeze criteria and how change requests are progressed into normal BSC/REC/SEC BAU	Programme (PMO)	06/03/2024
	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	Programme (Lee Cox)	10/01/2024
	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

Decisions

Area	Ref	Decision
Interface Code of Connections	DAG-DEC94	The SRO approved the updated Interface Code of Connections and DIP PKI Certificate Profiles for publication
CR043 Decision	DAG-DEC95	The SRO approved CR043 for publication in IR8 with the testing schedule to be determined and communicated to participants
CR044 Impact Assessment	DAG-DEC96	The SRO approved CR044 for Impact Assessment
CR045 Impact Assessment	DAG-DEC97	The SRO approved CR045 for Impact Assessment

CR046 Impact Assessment	DAG-DEC98	The SRO approved CR046 for Impact Assessment
-------------------------	-----------	--

Key Discussion Items

Area	Discussion
Minutes and Actions	<p>Approval of the headline report of the previous DAG was deferred to the next meeting while additional information on decision rationales is added.</p> <p>Action wording and updates can be found within the meeting papers and key discussion points are summarised below:</p> <p>DAG31-11 & DAG31-12: Further to updates within the meeting papers, the Programme advised there is currently no fixed date for the implementation of the remaining elements of Programme Change Requests (CRs) 024 and 025 (<i>see also ACTION DAG32-06</i>). Actions closed.</p> <p>DAG32-02: Webinars will be provided for all new CRs where Change Raisers will present their CR and field questions from participants ahead of Impact Assessment (IA). The first webinar will be held on 19 March 2024 covering CR047. Action updated to closed.</p> <p>DAG32-04: The Programme have confirmed with St Clements that MPRS will be ready to test CR036 at the start of SIT Functional (SIT F) Cycle 2 (C2) in June 2024. The Programme will support workarounds for any known issues/errors at the start of C2, and it is possible there may be more errors than desired. To acknowledge this risk and ensure formal management, the Programme have raised risk R779 within the Programme RAID Log. Action updated to closed.</p> <p>DAG33-01: The Programme advised the design principles which apply to DAG decisions are those as set out and reviewed by DAG from March 2022 onward. The principle relating to the use of UTC emanated from the Cross Code Design Group (CCDG), which operated prior to the commencement of the Programme, and whilst the principles provided by this group have been used for guidance, it is the principles previously agreed by DAG which continue to apply. A new action was raised for the Programme to re-share the DAG design principles agreed from March 2022 onward and update the Programme Collaboration Base with the current principles(ACTION DAG34-01). Action closed and replaced with new action.</p> <p>DAG33-02: The Large Supplier Representative advised the two changes from CR024 incorporated in Interim Release (IR) 7 were the items they would have proposed were brought forward for implementation, and agreed this action could be closed. Action closed.</p> <p>DAG33-03: Several DAG members commented the CR036 walkthrough session provided by the Programme did not provide the end-to-end walkthrough of the Change of Supplier process as they expected and was a high level overview with the opportunity to ask questions. Two members requested more detail is provided and stated they did not believe the webinar met the recommendation provided by the IPA. The Programme noted few question were raised by participants at the webinar and agreed to consider providing more detail and whether further walkthrough sessions were required. Action ongoing.</p> <p>DAG33-04: The Programme advised CR039 would be published in IR8 on 03 April 2024 and implemented in SIT F Cycle 3 (C3). The Programme believed the testing implications of CR039 were small but would require certain interface regression testing, which would be prioritised for the start of C3. Action updated to closed.</p> <p>DAG33-05: The Programme advised there was no intention change Non-Functional Requirements (NFRs) for all participants but advised a consultation would be issued detailing the NFRs to be tested in C3 and participants are welcome to raise CRs to change their NFRs if they wish. The Small Supplier Representative expressed disappointment there was no intention to consider relaxation of certain NFRs centrally by the Programme, and considered less</p>

	<p>engaged participants may encounter detriment as a result. The representative believed this could lead to piecemeal CRs being raised by participants, which they did not consider to be the most efficient way to managed NFRs which may be considered overly restrictive but accepted the Programme’s position. The Chair asked that DAG members encourage constituents to contact the Programme and consider raising a CR if they have issues with NFRs. Action closed.</p> <p>DAG32-06: The Programme advised the change freeze criteria for whether new CRs are permitted to progress to implementation pre-M10 (Central systems ready for migrating MPANs) included whether the change is required to resolve a critical defect or is required pre-M10 to avoid significant detrimental impacts on Programme participants. Where new CRs do not meet these criteria, they are likely to be rejected. The RECCo Representative queried how changes which are not permitted to progress to implementation would be managed post-M10. The Programme advised the management of changes post-M10 should be under consideration as part of the BAU service design strategy being progressed by Elexon and other central parties such as RECCo would need to consider the same. The Programme agreed to liaise with relevant parties to ensure this is raised as part of discussions on BAU service design. Action ongoing.</p>
<p>Interface Code of Connections</p>	<p>The Chair invited any objections to the approval of the updated Interface Code of Connections (CoCo) and DIP PKI Certificate Profiles, following assurance by the Security Design Working Group (SDWG), to which none were raised.</p> <p>The Chair, acting with delegated authority of the MHHS Senior Responsible Owner (SRO), determined the updated artefacts should be approved for publication (DECISION DAG-DEC94 – recording timestamp 00:38:47).</p> <p>The Large Supplier Representative requested information on how previous lessons learned with regard to updates to the CoCo were communicated and how they were applied to the most recent updates (ACTION DAG34-02).</p> <p>The Small Supp Representative believed further minor updates to the CoCo would be likely in relation to the lessons learned information. The Programme agreed, noting improvements identified from Component Integration Testing (CIT) Data Integration Platform (DIP) onboarding and any resultant physical changes to the DIP were within a backlog of other updates to be prioritised for deployment.</p>
<p>CR043 Decision</p>	<p>The Programme provided an overview of the CR043 (<u>Supplier Registration of ABMU and MPAN Mapping</u>) IA responses, per the meeting slides, and invited comments from the DAG.</p> <p>The Programme were supportive of the change and believed it overcame the change freeze as it fixes an issue in MHHS Design. The Programme advised the testing schedule would be developed following approval. The Programme Test Manager noted CRs are usually published in an IR five to six months ahead of testing, providing time for the MHHS Test Team to confirm testing requirements and for participants to consider any internal design and build activities required.</p> <p>The Chair summarised the change, subject to approval, would be published in IR8, with the testing schedule to be determined. The Chair invited any objections to approval, to which none were raised.</p> <p>The Chair, acting with delegated authority of the SRO, approved CR043 for publication in IR8 with the testing schedule to be determined and communicated to participants (DECISION DAG-DEC95 – recording timestamp 00:45:15).</p>

	<p>The Small Supplier Representative advised the change may create a test scenario that not all Suppliers would be able to evidence, and requested clarity is provided on which participants are required to test. The representative highlighted consideration was also needed on how any requirements progress into Qualification Testing (QT). The Chair noted these considerations would now pass to the relevant testing governance groups.</p>
<p>CR044 Impact Assessment</p>	<p>The Change Raiser provided an overview of CR044 (<u>Implementation of 'Data Refresh' Message IF-051</u>) per the meeting slides, advising the change was raised by the Programme and emanated from discussions with central parties where it was considered prudent to propose a mechanism for realigning industry data should an incident occur such as an outage, defect, or other issue which may affect the alignment of data. The Programme clarified the mechanism proposed within the CR was not intended to be used for individual MPANs, but for use during wider incidents that may affect larger volumes of data and would support timely resolution through the existence of a predefined realignment mechanism.</p> <p>The Programme invited suggestions from the DAG on any additional information which should be included within the CR and advised IA comments from participants were required on implementation. The RECCo Representative stated they supported the change, noting there was an existing mechanism for refreshing data within the Electricity Enquiry Service (EES) and the CR was required to ensure this continued to be supported post-MHHS implementation.</p> <p>The Large Supplier Representative was supportive of the CR being issued to IA and requested the CR is updated to include scenarios where the mechanism likely to be used, what safeguards would be in place, and how any reporting on impacted MPANs would be undertaken, if it did not contain this already (ACTION DAG34-03).</p> <p>The NGESO Representative believed there may be benefits to implementing the CR pre-M10 and expressed a desire for the IA to draw out industry views on whether this could be accommodated alongside the considerable volume of other MHHS-related activities ongoing. The Programme agreed and stated a desire for the CR to be implemented pre-M10, subject to industry feedback on the feasibility of this.</p> <p>The Elxon Representative was supportive of the change and believed implementation should be possible pre-M10, subject to any issues being raised in IA responses.</p> <p>The Small Supplier Representative asked whether the CR was required to mitigate an existing Programme risk and whether it may warrant a delay to M10. The Programme advised this was not a current Programme risk, but if implementation was not feasible pre-M10 then a risk would be raised within the Programme RAID Log (ACTION DAG34-04).</p> <p>The Chair invited any objections to the CR being issued for IA, subject to consideration of ACTION DAG34-02 (see above), to which none were raised.</p> <p>The Chair, acting with delegated authority of the SRO, approved CR044 for IA (DECISION DAG-DEC96 – recording timestamp 01:03:49).</p>
<p>CR045 Impact Assessment</p>	<p>The Change Raiser provided an overview of CR045 (<u>Supply Start Date (SSD) Correction Tool</u>) per the meeting slides, advising the change was raised by the Programme on behalf of St Clements to enable the continuation of corrections to Supplier start/end dates where these have been set incorrectly within the Registration Service post MHHS implementation. The CR would give licence to St Clements to develop new mechanisms for Licenced Distribution Service Operators (LDSOs) to correct Supplier start/end dates and provide within the MHHS Design a more structured and organised method of communicating such changes (e.g. new interface event codes to ensure notifications processed as required). It will be for participants to choose how they manage such events internally and the CR does not prescribe that this must be automated, rather, it seeks to ensure a formal notification is issued when a given event occurs. The Programme highlighted that should the CR not be implemented, there was a risk impacted MPANs could become 'stuck' under MHHS arrangements.</p>

	<p>The Programme advised the CR proposes implementation is pre-M10, to enable migrated MPANs to be dealt with immediately following migration, but there was a need to obtain participant feedback on their capacity to implement pre-M10 or whether they may accept the risk of managing corrections on an ad-hoc basis.</p> <p>The RECCo Representative was supportive of the change, and considered it provided a necessary risk mitigation.</p> <p>A representative from St Clements requested the MHHS Migration Team review the change also and provide IA comments on how reverse migration could be accounted for, should a given MPAN correction result in a reverse or forward migration.</p> <p>The Supplier Agent Representative and RECCo Representative believed additional detail on the prospective solution was required alongside the CR to support an understanding of the likely direction development of the solution would take should the CR be approved. The Programme advised a 'strawman' solution that takes into account some of the nuances of process at play was already available and could be published with the IA (ACTION DAG34-05).</p> <p>The Elexon Representative was supportive of the change and considered there may be a risk to settlement should nothing be done, but believed industry code changes may be required as a result.</p> <p>The Small Supplier Representative believed consideration should be given to the costs of the CR as against the risk of do nothing. The Programme advised the CR form contains a section on costs which the Change Raiser should populate and participants are expected to provide information on as part of IA responses.</p> <p>The Chair considered there should be efforts made to eliminate the root causes of incorrect data within the Registration Service and noted efforts ongoing under Retail Energy Code governance on this. The DCC Representative received confirmation from the Programme that the CR would not require any changes to the Central Switching Service (CSS).</p> <p>The Chair invited any objections to the CR being issued for IA, subject to ACTION DAG34-05 (see above), to which none were raised.</p> <p>The Chair, acting with delegated authority of the SRO, approved CR045 for IA (DECISION DAG-DEC97 – recording timestamp 01:33:45).</p>
<p>CR046 Impact Assessment</p>	<p>The Change Raiser provided an overview of CR046 (<u>Enabling Metering Point Energy Flow to be changed more than once</u>) per the meeting slides, advising the CR sought to remove the current restriction which prevents Metering Point Energy Flow (MPEF) being changed more than once, and align the MHHS Design to REC Change Proposal R0062. The RECCo Representative advised the change to the MHHS Design would be to remove a note which references the 'one time only' change to the MPEF.</p> <p>The Programme raised two concern with the CR. The first related to the implication within the CR that the energy direction may require correction more than once, which may indicate a more robust process is needed to eliminate errors in the first instance. The second related to comments from the Elexon Helix team regarding how historic consumption information would be dealt with and whether this would be corrected via the Consumption Amendment process. The Change Raiser responded that whilst the volumes of multiple corrections were very low, the method to apply corrections more than once was onerous and involved the 'nuclear' option of terminating the Registerable Metering Point (RMP) and creating a new RMP with a new MPEF, which has detrimental impacts on consumers and settlement. The RECCo Representative stated they did not wish to include information within the CR on whether historic consumption information would be updated using the Consumption Amendment process as this was for Elexon to determine and may widen the</p>

	<p>scope of the changes required to the MHHS Design, which was not the intention of the CR. The Programme believed this required clarification and considered a Design Issue Notification should be raised to ensure this is provided, if it were not to be included in the CR (ACTION DAG34-06).</p> <p>The Chair commented that R0062 should not have been implemented if changes were required to the MHHS Design without a CR being raised first. The RECCo Representative stated the changes to the MHHS Design were very minor and were believed to only require the removal of a note reference the one time only change. The Chair believed caution was required over the assumption this would be the only change required to the MHHS Design.</p> <p>The Large Supplier Representative believed clarity was required within the CR over when the solution would be implemented and in what instances it would be used, to support the assessment potential downstream impacts. The RECCo Representative advised implementation was requested pre-M10 and expressed a desire for participants to provide views or objections to implementation pre-M10 in IA responses (ACTION DAG34-07).</p> <p>The Chair invited any objections to the CR being issued for IA, subject to ACTION DAG34-07 (see above), to which none were raised.</p> <p>The Chair, acting with delegated authority of the SRO, approved CR046 for IA (DECISION DAG-DEC98 – recording timestamp 02:04:10).</p>
<p>Design Updates</p>	<p>The Programme advised IR8 would be published on 03 April 2024, with the objections window closing 20 March 2024.</p> <p>IR7.1 was issued on 06 March 2024 and the Programme are reviewing whether there is a need for an IR7.2 and will communicate this to participants in due course.</p> <p>The Programme noted there are no further IRs scheduled after IR8, but that following the commencement of SIT F on 11 March 2024, it was likely future IRs would be required to rectify any defects identified.</p>
<p>AOB</p>	<p>Change Control</p> <p>Programme provided an overview of improvements to MHHS Change Control Approach agreed by the Programme Steering Group (PSG) on 06 March 2024, and following recommendations made by the IPA as part of the outcome of the CR036 decision appeal, per the meeting slides.</p> <p>Key changes include the Programme Change Board (CB) being able to issue CRs to IA, rather than CRs needing to be presented to an Advisory Group first for a decision on IA. This would be backed up with industry webinars and an opportunity to ask questions ahead of a CR being issued to IA, and a greater focus on development prior to IA. CRs would then return to the CB following IA and a recommendation provided to SRO on approval, with the decision being ratified by the PSG. The benefits would be to enable a timelier progression of CRs to IA, greater upfront development which would support a more focussed IA, and a greater ability to take account of the increasingly cross-functional/cross-workstream nature of CRs as MHHS progresses with the PSG being able to take a more holistic view of the overall delivery impacts of CRs. The Programme advised the improvements had been devised in collaboration with the IPA and participants would continue to be able to appeal decisions to IPA as per current process.</p> <p>Several DAG members expressed dissatisfaction that DAG would no longer be the approval body for design related CRs, and that DAG had not been consulted prior to the changes being agreed by the PSG. The Small Supplier Representative considered the DAG added value to CRs through offering scrutiny and providing constituent views prior to IA. The Programme noted the increasingly cross-workstream nature of CRs meant discussion may be required across multiple Advisory Groups and the provision of webinars for all new CRs offered a more efficient way of scrutinising CRs and providing initial industry views prior to IA.</p>

The RECCo Representative considered updates may be required to the DAG Terms of Reference in response to the changes, and to understand the expectations on DAG in future (**ACTION DAG34-08**).need to change. Notes DRG is a large forum, and whether is really focussed on development. Would like to understand expectations of DAG moving forward.

The Elexon Representative expressed nervousness that the CB could veto change without industry visibility. The Programme advised the CB would not make a decision on whether to reject a CR in isolation and would consider industry views. The Programme advised consideration was being given to issuing the CB's to a wider audience, and the outcomes of decisions would be made visible through the Change Control Log also.

The Small Supplier Representative expressed further dissatisfaction with the changes and did not believe DAG members had been provided with an opportunity to provide views to their PSG representatives prior to the changes being agreed. The representative advised they would consider disputing the change.

The Programme advised the changes would be progressed via a housekeeping CR with the PSG. DAG members requested the IPA's views on the changes (**ACTION DAG34-09**).

The RECCo representative requested consideration is given to whether there is a benefit to full IA of the changes (**ACTION DAG34-10**).

The DAG requested the views of the DAG Chair, who advised they welcomed improvements that offered a more holistic consideration of the cross-workstream impacts of CRs and believed there was value in increased focus on development prior to IA. The Chair recognised the value DAG has provided in refining CRs prior to IA and noted elements of the improvements were something DAG members had requested previously. The Chair noted how there have been numerous instances of DAG discussion on the approval of CRs straying into testing requirements, and that it has been a challenge for DAG to consider matters which sit under the purview of a different Advisory Group. As such, ratification of CRs by the PSG, where the cross-workstream and Programme delivery impacts of CRs can be better accounted for was beneficial.

The Chair urged DAG members to submit their views on the changes to their PSG representative for consideration by the PSG (**ACTION DAG34-11**).

Ofgem commented that future CRs should be clear on which group would provide a decision on the CR and what the reasoning for this was, and considered this was important in understanding why PSG should make decisions on the approval of CRs.

Next meeting: 10 April 2024 10am