

MHHS Design Advisory Group Minutes and Actions

Issue date: 30/03/2022

Meeting number	DAG007	Venue	Virtual – MS Teams
Date and time	23 March 2022 13:00-16:00	Classification	Public

Attendees:

Chair	Role
Justin Andrews (Chair)	Chair
Industry Representatives	
Craig Handford (CH)	Large Supplier Representative
Donna Townsend	iDNO Representative
Ed Rees (ER)	Consumer Representative
Gemma Slaney (GS)	DNO Representative
Gurpal Singh (GSi)	Medium Supplier Representative
Keren Kelly (KK)	National Grid ESO
Matt Hall (MH)	Elexon Representative (as central systems provider)
Robert Langdon (RL)	Supplier Agent Representative
Seth Chapman (SC)	Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent)
Stuart Scott (SS)	DCC Representative (as smart meter central system provider)

MHHS IM

Charles Hyde (CH) (Part Meeting)	DIP Procurement Lead
Claire Silk (CS)	Design Market and Engagement Lead
Fraser Mathieson (FM)	PMO Governance Lead
Greg Bird (GB) (Part Meeting)	DIP Procurement Team
Miles Winter (MW)	PMO Governance Team
Robert Golding (RG)	Design Team
Simon Harrison (SH)	SI Design Assurance Lead

Other Attendees

Colin Bezant (CB)	MHHS IPA Design Assurance Lead
Danielle Walton (DW)	Ofgem

Apologies:

Andrew Green	I&C Supplier Representative
Jo Bradbury	Small Supplier Representative
Ian Smith	

Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date
Level playing field design principle	DAG07-01	Ensure Smart Market Segment Sub-Group (SDS) discuss SEC MP162 as soon as possible to inform SEC working group	Programme (Design Team)	As soon as possible

	DAG07-02	Discuss with SECAS whether working group for SEC MP162 should be postponed to await the outcome of MHHS SDS discussion regarding MDR TRT requirements are included within SEC MP162	Programme (DAG Chair)	As soon as possible
Design decisions	DAG07-03	Bring future versions of DIP Functional Specification and Non-Functional Requirements to DAG, once further updates incorporated	Programme (Design Team)	11/05/2022
	DAG07-04	Notify Chair of documents in the DIP procurement pack and provide information on how they have been drafted and reviewed, to ensure good procurement practice has been followed and determine whether DAG approval is required	Programme (Charles Hyde)	25/03/2022
	DAG07-05	Update DAG on the outcome of ACTION DAG07-06 relating to documents within the DIP procurement pack	Programme (DAG Chair)	13/04/2022
Level 4 working group updates	DAG07-06	Arrange session with Elexon central systems representative regarding Load Shaping Service (LSS) documents and their comments on Tranche 1 design artefacts	Programme (DAG Chair)	13/04/2022
	DAG07-07	Add documents relating to transition to the design artefact log	Programme (Claire Silk)	13/04/2022
Terms of Reference	DAG07-08	Raise a Change Request to incorporate new DAG ToR into the MHHS governance framework	Programme (PMO)	13/04/2022

Decisions

Area	Dec Ref	Decision
Minutes	DAG-DEC-14	Minutes of DAG meeting held 09 March 2022 approved.
Terms of Reference	DAG-DEC-15	Updates to DAG ToR approved.
Design Decisions	DAG-DEC-16	Issuance of Functional Specification and Non-Functional Requirements documents to prospective service providers as part of Request for Proposal (RFP) approved.

RAID items discussed/raised

RAID area	Description
N/A	

Minutes

1. Welcome and Introductions

The Chair welcome attendees to the meeting. CB from the Independent Performance Assurance (IPA) service provider introduced themselves to the DAG.

The Chair provided an overview of the meeting agenda and objectives.

2. Minutes and actions

The group approved the minutes of the DAG held 09 March 2022 with no comments.

DECISION DAG-DEC-14: Minutes of DAG meeting held 09 March 2022 approved.

FM provided an overview of the outstanding actions and noted the majority are due to return to the next DAG on 13 April 2022. The group agreed to close action DAG0-02 relating to provision to DAG of the draft high level Change Control Process The remaining outstanding actions can be found within the meeting papers [here](#).

3. Governance Group Updates

FM provided updates from the level 2 and 3 MHHS governance groups, including the Programme Steering Group (PSG), the Cross Code Advisory Group (CCAG), and the Testing and Migration Advisory Group (TMAG).

PSG

FM highlighted Change Requests (CR) CR001 and CR002 which seek to change the date of the M5 milestone relating to publication of the detailed design baseline are currently at impact assessment, with a deadline for submitting comments of Friday 25 March 2022. FM advised responses will be considered at the PSG on 07 April 2022 after which Ofgem will determine which CR is implemented.

The Chair asked whether the timeframe for Ofgem's decision on which CR is implemented is known. FM responded this had been discussed at the CCAG and whilst a firm date was not provided, Ofgem are aware approval is required in April prior to the current M5 deadline.

MH asked whether it should be assumed the Programme is working towards the CR001 timescales until a response is received from Ofgem. The Chair confirmed whilst the outcome of the impact assessment and Ofgem's decision could not be prejudged, the CR001 timeframe is the earlier (additional 3 months compared to 7 months).

CCAG

FM highlighted a CR seeking to change the M6 and M7 milestones, which relate to the delivery of drafting for changes to industry codes, will be issued for impact assessment soon. FM noted code drafting will mirror the design and will commence once the design baseline is published, culminating in delivery of M6 where code legal text will be provided to Ofgem for approval. Development of code drafting will require significant coordination between CCAG and DAG as the drafting develops.

TMAG

FM highlighted recently approved changes to the testing advisory group's terms of reference (ToR) which bring migration activities under the purview of the testing workstream. The TMAG will provide oversight for the distinct areas of testing and migration. It aims to mobilise a Migration Working Group to draw together the expertise required for migration planning in mid-April.

MH queried if migration was considered the same as transition. FM responded TMAG have discussed this and agreed the two areas are distinct and that migration relates to the arrangements for the transfer of metering systems from old to new systems, whereas transition will include the planning and cutover arrangements for commencement of new systems. Members agreed these should be separate and transition arrangements should continue to sit with the Business Process Rule Working Group (BPRWG).

Finally, FM advised the TMAG have agreed the principles underpinning the E2E Testing Strategy, which will be published in due course once agreed by the TMAG.

4. **DAG ToR Updates**

The Chair presented proposed new wording for the DAG ToR following discussion at the DAG held 09 March 2022 relating to instances where DAG may choose to deviate from the Programme design principles (e.g. where there is a conflict between principles, or where it is otherwise prudent to do so). FM added it was proposed any such deviations are recorded in the meeting minutes as opposed to a standalone log. The Chair agreed and suggested this could also be documented in the design artefact logs. CB note deviations of this nature are usually context sensitive and determined by the circumstances of the individual deviation. As such, it would be appropriate to detail these in minutes as this will provide the context of the decision to deviate from the Programme design principles. The Chair suggested any deviations would be highlighted to the PSG and, where necessary, Programme Participants (PPs).

The Chair asked whether the proposed ToR updates were satisfactory, to which no objections were raised.

DECISION DAG-DEC-15: Updates to DAG ToR approved

POST MEETING UPDATE: The Secretariat has been advised an MHHS Programme Change Request is now required to amend the ToR, following the mobilisation of the MHHS Change Control Process.

ACTION DAG07-08: Programme to raise a Change Request to incorporate new DAG ToR into the MHHS governance framework

5. **Level playing field design update principle**

The Chair summarised the discussions of the extraordinary DAG held 17 March 2022 where the subject of whether Smart Energy Code (SEC) Modification Proposal (MP) 162 ¹ sufficiently enacts the level playing field principle was discussed.

¹ SEC changes required to deliver MHHS. Available [here](#).

The key question to be answered is whether there is an essential requirement for MHHS service requests relating to Meter Data Retrieval (MDR) activities which require a Target Response Time (TRT) of less than 24 hours. The outcome of discussion was the Smart Meter Segment Sub-Group (SDS) must discuss this matter to enable the DAG to determine the next steps for enacting the principle. DAG members suggested SDS should provide context on the scenarios where MDR requires a <24-hour TRT, and the prospective frequency and volume of these, as well as commercial/cost implications.

The Chair noted there is an existing requirement for a <24-hour TRT in the documents currently in Tranche 1. This relates to de-energisation and retrieving meter data at the point of de-energisation to obtain the part-day meter readings. The Chair contrasted this with meter exchange use cases, where there is not currently a requirement in the Tranche 1 design artefacts for a <24-hour TRT, despite a similar potential rationale for retrieving meter data on the day of an exchange. This requires clarification and will be discussed by the SDS. The Data Communications Company (DCC) have advised there is likely to be a significant cost associated with enabling TRTs of <24 hours for non-supplier parties carrying out the MDR role.

Depending on the outcome of discussion at the SDS, the matter may return to DAG for review and approval. The Chair also noted the importance of close working between the MHHS Programme and SEC. The group agreed and considered whether there may be a need for a joint working group with SEC parties regarding SEC MP162.

CH advised the decision on approval of SEC MP162 is due June 2022 and noted a degree of time pressure. The Chair explained June is the planned date for Ofgem's decision on the modification, and the SEC Change Board decision is in May, so the timescale is tighter. SS echoed CH's sentiment and asked if DAG had a target decision date for when a decision on this could be made. The Chair suggested the aim for this would be the 13 April DAG meeting.

ACTION DAG07-01: Programme to ensure Smart Market Segment Sub-Group (SDS) discuss SEC MP162 as soon as possible to inform SEC working group

SC asked if a member of the MHHS Programme would be attending the SECMP162 working group on 04 April 2022. The Chair confirmed that a member of the Programme would be in attendance.

GS asked if the Programme need to suggest to SECAS that further discussion and any decisions on SEC MP162 should be postponed awaiting the determinations of the SDS regarding TRTs, to ensure any necessary updates can be included.

ACTION DAG07-02: Discuss with SECAS whether working group for SEC MP162 should be postponed to await the outcome of MHHS SDS discussion regarding whether MDR TRT requirements are included within SEC MP162

The Chair noted the current proposed implementation date of SEC MP162 is 02 November 2023 and there was a window for implementation with a possible release in February 2024. After this date implementation would be affected by other Change Requests, as well as Data Service Provider (DSP) re-procurement. GS added it is preferable to deliver something that meets requirements rather than rushing it through and incurring additional cost to make future changes.

6. Design Decisions

RG introduced two documents for approval, the Data Integration Platform (DIP) Functional Specification and Non-Functional Requirements document, which will be issued to prospective bidders as part of the Request for Proposal (RFP) phase of the DIP procurement. RG advised the documents have been in production for five months, have been through three rounds of review at the Technical Design Working Group (TDWG), and are being recommended for approval by the TDWG. Feedback from prospective bidders is expected as the procurement progresses, and the document will likely go through several future iterations. It was also noted that comments had been received from DAG members.

MH questioned what DAG being asked to approve if there are amendments to be incorporated and it is known the documents will change. RG clarified that DAG approval is for the documents to be issued with the RFP. The Chair added that there would flexibility in the procurement process for changes to be suggested by bidders as it may aid innovation and result in a better service being procured. MH asked if the baselined design was being issued to prospective bidders or just the RFP document. RG confirmed just RFP documents which will contain the first version of the DIP Functional Specification and Non-Functional Requirements documents, and other documents (e.g. contractual requirements, SLAs, information on security requirements, etc.).

GS highlighted comments provided on the DIP Functional Specification and asked when these would be incorporated and how it would affect the current request for approval. RG responded the intention was comments would be incorporated alongside other comments received from both bidders and the Programme. GS drew attention to their comments on figures 7 and 8 within the DIP Functional Specification relating to time out messages and recipient error.

GS highlighted a discrepancy between the processes for failed messages in the two diagrams. RG replied the end-to-end (E2E) architecture document is in production and this will help to clarify some of the processes. RG added the diagrams were provided as an indication of the interaction the DIP would need to cater for between parties rather than being a finalised representation of the design.

SS commented DAG was being asked to approve a document which is known to be subject to change and questioned whether it was therefore worthwhile to approving at this point. The Chair clarified that DAG members are being asked whether they believe version one of the documents are suitable to be issued for the RFP. SS commented if the future changes to the documents are significant then approval is challenging. SH advised the majority of feedback thus far is minor rather than substantive and no fundamental change to core design elements is being suggested at this point. RG advised the RFP documents are due to be issued Friday 25 March 2022 and the Chair noted the TDWG recommends approval for issuance. Several members of the group asked whether the documents would return to DAG for further approval as changes are made. RG suggested feedback on changes suggested by bidders and any other sources could be given to DAG throughout the iterations of the documents.

GS asked for clarity as to whether any comments received thus far on the documents would be incorporated prior to issuance, and as such, whether DAG were able to approve the document before them for issuance. RG replied there would be updates made in future as feedback is received, but that no substantive elements of the documents will change prior to issuance with the RFP and DAG will receive sight of the next iteration.

CH stated from a large supplier perspective, there has not necessarily been representation at the TDWG and whilst a quick review has been undertaken, there is a risk that large suppliers have not had sufficient input into the design of the DIP to affirm the readiness of the documents for issue as part of the RFP. As such, and in the absence of any specific objections, CH abstained from the decision on whether to approve the documents for issuance. The Chair noted this point, and stated a decision was required given the timescales to issue the RFP.

SC had reviewed the documents but felt there was insufficient detail for them to go to RFP and queried whether there were any supplementary documents being issued also. RG replied a suite of documents will be issued and suggested the MHHS Procurement Team could attend the DAG to explain the process and documents. SH added the Programme team have reviewed the supplementary documents and given feedback and was satisfied the initial documents could be issued with the RFP.

SC asked about core hours, which are currently 0800-1800, but as a service provider lots of processing activity will happen outside of these hours. RG noted there will be support outside of these hours, though not a fully staffed service desk. GS echoed SC's concerns about working hours and noted potential disparity between working days / working hours definitions between the documents and the industry codes. RG responded detail of this nature does not change the bidding process and will be clarified once the detailed design baseline is published. The majority of the bidders will be focusing on the architecture in initial representations. The Chair noted other potential refinements to the documents that may emanate from the detailed design and urged these to be accounted for as soon as is possible to avoid potential disagreements with any bidders or eventual service provider(s).

GSi stated medium suppliers recognised the importance of reviewing this, but due to resourcing conflicts have not been able and cannot therefore provide a view on whether the documents are suitable for issuance with the RFP.

MH suggested the documents be issued to ensure the DIP procurement commences effectively, noting specifics of service standards can be clarified later and are a smaller risk than a delay to the RFP.

RL suggested, based on their experience as a bidder, it would be preferable to await updated documents, than to bid on a document which will change. As such RL asked whether approval should be delayed, and GS echoed this. The Chair asked if it was clear to bidders the document they would receive would be subject to updates. RG said this would be expected and is a common aspect of the dialogue between procurement teams and prospective service providers.

Members of the MHHS Procurement Team joined the meeting and CHy advised the TDWG, and Security Design Working Group (SDWG) had been refining the documents in March. Bidders are aware these are draft documents and are keen to view them and start their official bid processes. Chy went on to say bidders are not expecting finalised documents per se, providing there are no substantive changes. The current procurement aim is to narrow the current pool of bidders to a shortlist of three or four, to enable progression to the next stages of the procurement process.

CHy noted substantial changes to the documents could have cost implications but reiterated the current aim in issuing the RFP documents is to identify bidders who are a sufficient fit for the service requirements before shortlisting occurs. It was noted the scheduled DAG meeting on 11 May 2022 is currently when the DIP Functional Specification and Non-Functional Requirements document will be finalised.

MH suggested the documents are issued to RFP with a proviso they will be updated in due course, which, providing there are no substantive changes, avoids a month's delay to commencement of this aspect procurement. The Chair suggested it was important to ensure clarity on how the DAG review future iterations. CB suggested if there are no substantive changes in subsequent iterations, issuance of the documents now within the RFP would not strongly impact the bid process. SH added opportunity to make amendments supports an effective procurement by allowing scope for bidders to add and suggest options for how problems are solved as part of the RFP.

The group discussed potential cost drivers relating to the definition service levels and specific aspects of design which need consideration to ensure cost effectiveness. For example, a prospective change to requirements relating to activities currently conducted on working days only would require comparison with any changes that would require such activities on calendar days instead in future, especially if these activities are essential to effective settlement under MHHS.

The Chair thanked members for their comments both prior to and during the meeting. The Chair noted both CH and GSi did not feel able to provide a decision on the issuance of the documents. It was noted this may leave scope for later comments on the DIP Functional Specification due to these constituencies not having reviewed it. The Chair then noted the timetable that DAG are operating to, the multiple reviews carried out on the documents, the comments provided by both DAG members and the wider Programme, and that there will be opportunity to make changes in future iterations. Noting these points, the Chair decided the documents were capable of being issued by the Programme as part of the RFP process.

DECISION DAG-DEC-16: Issuance of Functional Specification and Non-Functional Requirements documents to prospective service providers as part of Request For Proposal (RFP) approved

ACTION DAG07-03: Programme to bring future versions of DIP Functional Specification and Non-Functional Requirements to DAG, once further updates incorporated

The group discussed the E2E security documents which would be included in the RFP document suite but had not been specifically approved for issuance by the DAG. CHy advised these documents had been approved for issuance by the SDWG. RG asked whether these should be approved by DAG also. SH noted review had also been undertaken by security experts at Expleo. The Chair asked the group whether it was felt the documents should also have been reviewed by the DAG. The general consensus was they should be, and the Chair agreed to review the additional documents being published in the RFP and update the DAG.

ACTION DAG07-04: Procurement team to notify Chair of documents in the DIP procurement pack and provide information on how they have been drafted and reviewed, to ensure good procurement practice has been followed and determine whether DAG approval is required

ACTION DAG07-05: Chair to update DAG on the outcome of ACTION DAG07-04 relating to documents within the DIP procurement pack

7. Level 4 Working Group Updates

CS presented a breakdown of organisations who had responded to the Tranche 1 documentation review under the BPRWG. Over 600 comments were received, and document updates made accordingly, with further review to begin 28 March 2022.

CS noted a slight overlap with the Tranche 2 documentation review that is due for release on 04 April 2022, owing to the absorption of a one-week delay into the timeframes for Tranche 1. The Chair advised that when the Tranche 1 documents are issued for further review, they will be available to the DAG to review and will then be brought to the late April or early May DAG for approval.

SC queried how review comments which state further information is required would be incorporated into the review. CS clarified these would be provided to the design subgroups for detailed design conversations which would then feed back into the documents. These documents would likely then be moved out of Tranche 1 and into other tranches depending on timeframes.

MH asked about challenging any comments rejected by the Design Team or subgroups. CS advised these could be raised for discussion by contacting design@mhhsprogramme.co.uk.

MH had some specific comments on the Load Shaping Service requirements. The Chair offered to discuss this offline.

ACTION DAG07-06: Chair to arrange session with Elexon central systems representative regarding Load Shaping Service (LSS) documents and their comments on Tranche 1 design artefacts

CH commented on matters not defined in the Tranche 1 design documents which they felt presented challenges with approval. CH noted that with 600 comments received, if some of these are substantial, they may change the documents fundamentally and so at the second review a similarly large number of comments may be expected. CH added that while Ovo and EON had responded to these documents at the working groups, they wanted it noted their responses were not as thorough as they would have liked due to resource constraints. As such, further comments may arise from large suppliers during the next review phase of the Tranche 1 documents. The Chair thanked CH for these points.

SC asked if there would be a way of viewing all the documents with comments that need addressing. CS confirmed comments for discussion would be included

GSi asked for a count of outstanding comments to be released alongside the documents when they are being reviewed. The Chair noted these comments would either be resolved or would require a design decision from DAG; an outstanding comment might be due to there being an outstanding piece of work or discussion point. The comments would either be resolved or have an action to be resolved.

MH noted CR001 does not provide for time at the end of the plan for document reviews and asked if there needs to be a holistic review of the DAG documents at the end of the design phase. The Chair expected during review of later tranches, there will be review of any outstanding comments from Tranche 1. It was noted the plan presented to the group shows Tranche 1 finishing at the end of June, but any residual matters can also continue under subsequent tranches and after the final tranche also if necessary. CS added the current design artefact plan runs to June, but any additional time needed can be scheduled to continue after June.

RL echoed MH's concerns and asked how the planning around tranche reviews would change going forward. CS accepted the management of review periods would continue to develop and as review cycles are undertaken and the design led process means review time will be provided as needed.

CS advised the work group calendars have now been updated until June (see Attachment 3 of the meeting papers available [here](#)), and provide detail on the matters to be covered in each meeting. This is live in the MHHS portal also and will be kept up to date. Similarly, the status of design artefacts is available in the portal through a live document which will be kept updated.

CS invited questions about the document review plan and tranches. RL asked about the operational choreography and forward view of when documents would be available for review. CS highlighted an action was taken at the last DAG to look at Operational Choreography document and this would be scoped and brought to DAG for review.

SC asked when transition and qualification documentation would be available. CS responded this was another action from previous DAG which is in progress, with the documents to be added to the full list of design artefacts and assigned to review tranches.

8. Summary and next steps

FM gave a summary of the forward meeting schedule for DAG.

The Chair noted subject to any replanning, the Tranche 1 documents will be presented to DAG for review at their meeting late April or early May 2022. The Chair asked for any comments on this timeline, and none were received.

FM summarised the new actions.

The Chair asked for any other business. SC asked if all documents for review by DAG should have a two week review period prior to any decisions being expected. The Chair confirmed this is the aim, to ensure representatives can coordinate with their constituents. MH stated there were documents mentioned at the meeting relating to transition which did not appear to be included in the design artefact schedule presented by CS. An action was placed to ensure these are captured in the design artefact log.

ACTION DAG07-07: Programme to add documents relating to transition to the design artefact log

The Chair thanked attendees for their contributions and closed the meeting.

Next meeting: 13 April 2022.