MHHS Design Advisory Group Minutes and Actions

Issue date: 18/05/2022

Meeting number	**DAG009**	Venue	**Virtual – MS Teams**
Date and time	**11 May 2022 10:00-12:00**	Classification	**Public**

Attendees:

Chair	**Role**
Justin Andrews (Chair)	Chair

Industry Representatives	
Craig Handford (CH	Large Supplier Representative
Donna Townsend (DT)	iDNO Representative
Gareth Evans (GE)	I&C Supplier Representative
Gemma Slaney (GS)	DNO Representative
Gurpal Singh (GSi)	Medium Supplier Representative
Jo Bradbury (JB)	Small Supplier Representative
Kristina Leary (KL) (on behalf of Robert Langdon)	Supplier Agent Representative
Matt Hall (MH)	Elexon Representative (as central systems provider)
Seth Chapman (SC)	Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent)
Stuart Scott (SS)	DCC Representative (as smart meter central system provider)

MHHS IM	
Andrew Margan (AM)	Governance Manager
Claire Silk (CS)	Design Market and Engagement Lead
Fraser Mathieson (FM)	PMO Governance Lead
Ian Smith (IS)	Design Manager
Keith Clarke (KC)	Programme Director
Miles Winter (MW)	PMO Governance Team
Warren Fulton (WF)	Separation Lead
Paul Pettitt (PP)	Design Assurance Team

Other Attendees	
Colin Bezant (CB)	Independent Programme Assurance
Danielle Walton (DW)	Ofgem

Apologies:

Ed Rees	Consumer Representative
Robert Langdon	Supplier Agent Representative
Sean Donner	National Grid ESO

Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date
Minutes and actions	DAG09-01	Liaise with Programme SRO team to present information to DAG on the IPA work package related to the scope of independent assurance on Programme design work	Chair	08/06/2022
	DAG09-02	Share list of the design document repository user group volunteers with DAG members	Programme (Paul Pettitt)	18/05/2022
Tranche 1 Approval	DAG09-03	Provide detailed action plan for resolution of open design issues against T1 design artefacts	Programme (Claire Silk)	25/05/2022
	DAG09-04	Produce guidance outlining how parties can engage with design artefact review process, including how issues can be raised	Programme (Claire Silk)	25/05/2022
	DAG09-05	Programme to liaise with Programme Participants who have queries on the Programme Design Team's responses to comments on the Tranche 1 design artefacts	Programme (Ian Smith)	08/06/2022
	DAG09-06	Advise constituents who have expressed concerns on Programme responses to comments on Tranche 1 design artefacts to contact the Programme Design Team (Design@mhhsprogramme.co.uk)	DAG Members	08/06/2022
	DAG09-07	Add dependency to outstanding design issues log to capture ongoing assessment of MDR TRT requirements in relation to SEC MP162	Programme (Ian Smith)	18/05/2022
	DAG09-08	Add dependency to outstanding design issues log under routing to ensure other mechanisms for publishing data to other parties is captured	Programme (Ian Smith)	18/05/2022
	DAG09-09	Add dependency to outstanding design issues log regarding technical resolution of delivery of load shape data to non-DIP actors	Programme (Ian Smith)	18/05/2022
	DAG09-10	Add dependency to outstanding design issues log relating to ensuring design collateral is sufficient to enable code drafting. IS to review example of this and confirm sufficient for code drafting.	Programme (Ian Smith)	08/06/2022
	DAG09-11	Add dependency to outstanding design issues log regarding Programme approach to resolving material design issues which emanate from design assurance process.	Programme (Ian Smith)	08/06/2022
	DAG09-12	Provide a clear plan for the resolution of the recorded outstanding issues related to the Tranche 1 design artefact approval	Programme (Design Team)	25/05/2022
Next Steps	DAG09-13	Consider whether further extraordinary DAG meeting required to discuss latest information relating to the Smart Energy Code (SEC) Modification Proposal (MP) 162	Programme (Design Team)	
	DAG09-14	Issue correspondence to DAG members seeking approval decisions on the latest Data Integration	Programme (PMO)	13/05/2022

		Platform (DIP) Functional Specification and Non-Functional Requirements document, and approval of the Consequential Change Implementation Advisory Group (CCIAG) draft Terms of Reference, and seeking comments on the code drafting principles provided by the Cross Code Advisory Group (CCAG)		
	DAG09-15	Review length forward DAG meetings to ensure sufficient time to discuss all agenda items	Programme (PMO)	13/05/2022
Previous Meeting(s)	DAG06-01	Review alignment between related MPAN modifications and design subgroup	Programme (Ian Smith)	08/06/2022
	DAG08-02	Issue call for agenda items or discussion topics prior to mobilisation of CCIAG	Programme (PMO)	08/06/2022

Decisions

Area	Dec Ref	Decision
Minutes	DAG-DEC-20	Minutes of meetings held 13 April 2022 approved, with no comments.
Tranche 1	DAG-DEC-21	Tranche 1 design artefacts conditionally approved

RAID items discussed/raised

RAID area	Description
None	

Minutes

1.   Welcome and Introductions

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

2.   Minutes and actions

The group approved the minutes of the DAG meeting held 13 April 2022 with no comments.

DECISION DAG-DEC-20: Minutes of DAG meeting held 13 April 2022 approved

---

FM provided an overview of the outstanding actions, updates for which can be found within the meeting papers.

DAG04-03 to be discussed as an agenda item today.

DAG06-01 IS confirmed internal conversations ongoing and would update CH accordingly.

DAG08-04 CH asked if DAG have a route into SECAS in the same way that SECAS has a route into MHHS. FM confirmed that MHHS has representation at the SECAS working group. JA added there is a weekly call with SECAS for which the MHHS rep for SECAS Working Group is also in attendance.

DAG08-07 CH asked when DAG will see the design assurance measures from the IPA. JA believed the SRO team are agreeing the work package with the IPA now and DAG should see this. CB clarified the work packages have been drafted and are currently being reviewed by Ofgem. They are mostly a formalisation of the original contract and there is no objection to having these shared.

ACTION DAG09-01: Chair to liaise with Programme SRO team to present information to DAG on the IPA work package related to the scope of independent assurance on Programme design work

---

IS recognised there are engagement sessions being planned post-M5 and once this is clarified this will be communicated. JA added the intention of this action is to provide clarity on this planning activity. CH noted main concern was having the confidence in the assurance that changes post-M5 will be picked up and there is a process to follow for this. IS said any uncertainty with the design post baseline would be noted and called out. There will be a mechanism to capture these elements and communicate these to PPs. CH noted it is worth discussing when DAG comes to Tranche 1 approval later

today. JA noted from attendance at BPRWG the design team needs to be clear about any open design issues and the actions that will be taken to close these design issues.

DT noted some iDNOs found the design approval (timeline) a bit squeezed. iDNO members on the L4 groups felt they did not have much time to respond to design docs, and where comments have been rejected, they feel there is not adequate scope to challenge these. JA thanked DT for this contribution and said this would be covered at the Tranche 1 approval later.

DAG08-08 PP thanked DAG members for volunteering and noted this activity had already begun. GE asked how many volunteers there were. PP responded around ten. GE asked for a list, as some groups may wish to join but are conscious of duplicating viewpoints.

ACTION DAG09-02: Programme to share list of the design document repository user group volunteers with DAG members

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

Attendees were advised MHHS Programme Change Request (CR) 001, which moves the M5 programme milestone relating to the release of the detailed design baseline to July 2022, had been approved by Ofgem.

The group were also advised that CR006, which updates the DAG Terms of Reference in accordance with updates previously agreed at DAG, was also approved and the outputs will be incorporated into an updated MHHS Programme Governance Framework document.

CCAG

CR003, which seeks to move the M6 and M7 programme milestones relating to the delivery of code drafting and enactment of statutory powers by Ofgem, was approved by the CCAG. The change has now been submitted to Ofgem for approval, with a response anticipated no sooner than 18 May 2022.

CCAG have produced a series of code drafting principles to help guide the code drafting process, which is anticipated to last nine to ten months. The CCAG have request the principles are reviewed by DAG to enable the incorporation of any suggested additions or amendments (see ACTION DAG09-13).

The CCAG have commenced discussion on the governance of the Data Service Provider (DSP) role and have identified a need to consider whether use of term DSP under the MHHS Programme may cause confusion with the role of the same name within Data Communication Company (DCC) processes.

TMAG

The first version of the E2E Testing and integration Strategy has been released. Similarly, the first version of the Test Data Strategy is due to be released following approval by TMAG in the coming weeks. Both documents will subject to further changes as the Programme progresses.

New testing working groups are due to be established in the coming months in addition to the existing Data Working Group (DWG) and Migration Working Group (MWG). Parties will be provided with at least one month's notice and notice will be published in the Programme newsletter 'The Clock' as well as being emailed to those on the TMAG, DWG, and MWG distribution lists.

4.   Tranche 1 Approval

IS outlined that DAG are asked to conditionally approve the Tranche 1 (T1) design artefacts following review by the Business Process and Requirements Working Group (BPRWG). IS advised there has been analysis of the comments received during review by the DAG and BPRWG and an outstanding design issues log has been created to track any matters which cannot be immediately resolved and to ensure these are addressed. IS stated the T1 design artefacts have been subject to Programme assurance measures and are considered sufficiently stable to allow conditional approval. Where there are changes required to these conditionally approved documents as part of the resolution of any outstanding issues these will be updated in the design issues log so there is a clear trail of updates to the design documents. JA clarified this will be the process for all tranche reviews.

T1 Issues Resolution Process

CH queried how this process would work, advising they would like to see an issues resolution plan and information that sets out how any new issues or any updates to the T1 documents will be incorporated and approved. Without this, CH believed it would be difficult to understand what conditional approval means in this context. IS replied that in terms of conditional approval, the principle at play is a recognition there is a level of stability within the artefacts that enables them to be conditionally approved subject to the resolution of outstanding issues. IS advised many of the outstanding issues related to matters which are yet to be decided and for which a resolution will only be possible once further review tranches are completed. Similarly, there are outstanding issues which will require assessment and recommendations from design working groups before a resolution can be confirmed. IS gave the example of comments received regarding the D0142 flow, stating it is not fit for purpose and should be replaced. This would require a new interface within the Data Integration Platform (DIP) and will require discussion at design working groups and subgroups regarding new interface design. Another example related to RMP status and the need to ensure MHHS processes are aligned against the RMP status held in the registration service systems. This would require a desk-based reconciliation exercise and potential changes to validation rules, as well as explicit definition of the outcomes to be achieved, and as such cannot be immediately resolved. IS stated that issues are logged and being tracked, with resolution actions planned. Notwithstanding the need to resolve outstanding matters such as this, the T1 artefacts are sufficiently stable to enable conditional approval and allow design work to progress according to the Ofgem-set timetable.

CH reiterated their wish to see a clear process for the management and resolution of outstanding issues. The Programme Design Team provided a diagram with a high level view of the process and proposed a standing agenda item for future DAG meetings where specific sections of artefacts that have been conditionally approved are change marked to highlight any amendments associated with resolution of a given issue. CS went on to highlight there will be a tracking log of any conditionally approved documents which then records any changes as part of issues resolution or as a result of review of the end-to-end design. The Programme Design Team will publish the upcoming tranche review dates and DAG approval meetings next week and will feed discussion material on the resolution of issues into the BRPWG.

> **ACTION DAG09-03: Programme to provide detailed action plan for resolution of open design issues against T1 design artefacts**

The Chair confirmed any changes to the T1 design artefacts would not require a formal programme change request prior to the release of the detailed design baseline. Any changes required post-baseline will require a formal change request and supporting evidence.

GS advised they were struggling with how the Level 4 working groups and Programme are interacting with participants, and they find the portal difficult to navigate and engage with unless direct hyperlinks are provided. GS wanted the outstanding issues log to be a live document with clear action owners detailing which group(s) (where appropriate) are working on resolutions to the outstanding issues. CS advised MHHS Portal links will be embedded in the design artefact tracker to provide a quick link to the outstanding issues and resolution information.

DT noted feedback from one of their constituents that they had provided comments at BPRWG review stage, but some comments were rejected. In the constituent's mind, the comment was misinterpreted, but there was no clear pathway for responding to the rejection. CS noted there is a process for this, but perhaps it has not been adequately communicated. If a party disagrees with any comment responses, they can come directly to the design mailbox, design@mhhsprogramme.co.uk, and this will be addressed by the Design Team. The Design Team would then assess the next course of action e.g. whether a change was needed to the design artefact, discussion a L4 sub-group, etc.

> **ACTION DAG09-04: Programme to produce guidance outlining how parties can engage with design artefact review process, including how issues can be raised**

DT and GS highlighted feedback they had received from St Clements, who provide the registration service, that despite comments provided, DAG had approved processes which St Clements felt were not workable or were not addressed to their satisfaction. As St Clements are not members of Level 3 governance groups such as DAG, they felt there was not an adequate route to highlight this. The Chair outlined that an industry participant can reach out for clarification directly from the Programme Design Team. Where any party feels a comment has not been addressed, or an outstanding matter not added to the outstanding issues log, the Chair encouraged parties to raise this directly with the Programme Design Team. IS confirmed they had received and read GS's email relating to this matter and noted the specific query from St Clements had been recorded in the issues log for further consideration, and in this regard, the comments are acknowledged and will be accounted for.

ACTION DAG09-05: Programme to liaise with Programme Participants who have queries on the Programme Design Team's responses to comments on the Tranche 1 design artefacts

DT relayed feedback from St Clements that essential comments are not easily provided as they are blocked from attending Programme meetings. AM, as the Programme's Governance Manager, confirmed St Clements have attended Level 4 design working groups (and provided valued expert input) and subgroups and are not blocked from attending Level 2 or Level 3 meetings. If they identify an issue that needs their technical expertise, they can contact the Chair of the meeting to request attendance. AM further noted the matter of whether St Clements should hold a constituency seat at Programme governance meetings had been discussed with them previously. The conclusion was they are a party who are capable of being represented by their constituency representative which is a position that has been communicated to St Clements and accepted. GS stated they do not believe St Clements are accepting of this and whilst they may acknowledge this position, they do not necessarily agree with it. DT asked if there was scope for St Clements to join DAG as an observer. The Chair confirmed they are open to this and encouraged parties to request this if they feel the attendance of other industry parties would be beneficial.

MH felt that several of their comments on the T1 artefacts had not been sufficiently addressed via updates to the documents and could not see the comments recorded within the outstanding issues log. MH also queried the timelines for the resolution of outstanding issues, expressing nervousness over the potentially tight timeframes from conditional approval to resolution, and finalisation of the artefacts. IS advised issues resolution would progress alongside other ongoing design work, and updates provided on resolutions through the outstanding issues log. Where any material changes are required to design artefacts to resolve a given issue, the artefact will be submitted again for approval in a subsequent review tranche.

T1 Assurance

IS outlined the assurance undertaken by the Programme Design Assurance Team, the outcome of which was that no substantive design gaps, or concerns had been identified in the T1 artefacts. MH felt there were some gaps which may be resolved in future artefact tranches. PP expressed the Programme Design Assurance Team considers the T1 documents are sufficiently stable to be considered capable of conditional approval, subject to the resolution of any outstanding issues.

SC suggested some of this assurance work should be done ahead of the future design tranche approvals. PP confirmed this has been started already for future tranches. Some of the Tranche 3 (T3) documents have already been reviewed by the assurance team, and feedback provided to the Design Team, with the aim of mitigating future comments or issues. The Chair clarified the intention is for the Design Team to provide design artefacts to the Design Assurance Team ahead of their submission to the BPRWG for review. SC confirmed this was what they were suggesting.

MH asked how conditional approval works with regards to potential future changes to the documents and the storage of the documents in the design document repository. PP noted changes could come about following the release of the future trances and in relation to the resolution of outstanding issues. From a design assurance point of view, the aim is to resolve as quickly as possible issues or other matters that do not have a material impact on the overall design. Any changes would be reviewed the Design Team or DAG as required. It was confirmed that any material changes to documents or process diagrams emanating from issues resolution, design assurance, or the movement of diagrams from Microsoft Visio to the design document repository would be approved via DAG or the Design Team as appropriate. MH expressed concern that issues which may arise from design assurance may not be represented in the information presented to DAG as part of the current request for conditional approval.

IS reiterated the view of the Design Team is there is a high level of stability and a log to record and manage issues both for T1 and future Tranches. The Design Team have not uncovered anything that substantively alters the design at this point. MH noted they had provided comments for which they were still awaiting a response, and explained they felt they were being asked to conditionally approve the T1 artefacts based on IS' responses to their comments, which they not yet seen. IS responded the Design Team would reach out to MH to reconcile any concerns they may have (see ACTION DAG09-05).

The Chair confirmed later review tranches (T3 and T4) will have design assurance carried out as part of the review process ahead of going to BPRWG, to improve the quality of these documents. For T1 and T2 there is an element of catch up here but the comments from the Design Assurance Team have not indicated substantive change may be required to the documents.

The Chair suggested a clear feedback loop to be established between the commenters on documents and the Design Team. IS noted this is what the design team aims to establish as part of the review process. Where any party feels there

are unsatisfactory responses to comments, this needs to be addressed by the Design Team though requires the commenters to reach out in such instances.

> **ACTION DAG09-06: DAG members to advise constituents who have expressed concerns on Programme responses to comments on Tranche 1 design artefacts to contact the Programme Design Team (Design@mhhsprogramme.co.uk)**

Code Drafting Considerations

SC expressed concerns over whether the design artefacts would be of adequate quality and detail to enable legal text drafting for industry codes, stating the T1 artefacts alone are not sufficient to enable code drafting. The Programme Design Team agreed code drafting could not be fully undertaken based on the T1 artefacts alone and explained the outputs of T2-4 approval would be required to enable this. IS agreed code could not be drafted based on the T1 artefacts and process maps, and the point at which this would be possible would be after the approval of subsequent document tranches. It was noted this has been raised as a Programme risk by both the CCAG and Elexon and was something that would be included in the exit criteria to be applied to the completion of the M5 milestone.

SC asked whether future document updates, upon which the requested conditional approval is based, may include unaddressed comments that were not currently on the outstanding issues log, or that did not naturally fit on the issues log. IS agreed these needed to be logged and could result in changes if these are necessary. The Chair noted one area of dependency related to the Operational Choreography work. SC suggested this was a key area of work as part of the T1 conditional approval.

Review of Dependencies

The group reviewed the dependencies noted by the Design Team alongside the outstanding issues log. Several new dependencies were suggested, and the Programme took actions to add these to the log. A summary is provided below:

- Open design issues will include any updates following resolution of any specific comments where parties believe their comments not resolved to their satisfaction
- Change to Load Shaping Service non-functional requirement on settlement period duration
- Approval of interfaces is on data items only
- Add dependency relating to the ongoing assessment of Meter Data Retrieval service Target Response Times requirements relating to Smart Energy Code Modification Proposal 162
- Add dependency under 'routing' to ensure alternative mechanisms for publishing data to parties who will not be required to use the Data Integration Platform (DIP) are captured
- Add dependency regarding technical resolution for requirement to deliver of load shape data to non-DIP users
- Add dependency relating to requirement that design collateral is adequate to enable code drafting
- Add dependency regarding Programme approach required to resolve material design issues which emanate from the design assurance process

> **ACTION DAG09-07: Programme to add dependency to outstanding design issues log to capture ongoing assessment of MDR TRT requirements in relation to SEC MP162**

> **ACTION DAG09-08: Programme to add dependency to outstanding design issues log under routing to ensure other mechanisms for publishing data to other parties is captured**

> **ACTION DAG09-09: Programme to add dependency to outstanding design issues log regarding technical resolution of delivery of load shape data to non-DIP actors**

> **ACTION DAG09-10: Programme to add dependency to outstanding design issues log relating to ensuring design collateral is sufficient to enable code drafting. IS to review example of this and confirm sufficient for code drafting**

> **ACTION DAG09-11: Programme to add dependency to outstanding design issues log regarding Programme approach to resolving material design issues which emanate from design assurance process**

Conditional Approval

The Chair invited the DAG to provide their recommendations on conditional approval of the T1 design artefacts.

GS stated they feel forced to approve the documents to chase deadlines and noted a substantial list of issues come with conditional approval. As a result, GS did not feel able to recommend approval per se but would accept approval if required.

CH felt it was important to get design right, and the perspective of their constituency is there are still quite a number of issues to be resolved and matters on governance to be addressed. As a result, they are not comfortable recommending approval before understanding the detail of how issues are resolved.

MH stated they were happy to approve based on what was discussed and on the condition that responses to outstanding comments do not result in significant change to T1 artefacts.

SC felt similarly to GS, and was happy to approve, acknowledging it may be necessary to recommend approval to ensure deadlines are met but felt it may not be wise to recommend approval given the issues discussed.

DT felt this decision is being rushed to meet the timeline and there should be more clarification around how everything is managed before approval can be recommended.

KL agreed to conditional approval, noting the concerns of the DAG members and stated if there was a detailed plan to resolve the issues then DAG may be better placed to offer a recommendation for conditional approval.

SS asked whether DAG need to soften the 'approval' sought at this meeting, and whether DAG should rephrase to say the documents are being baselined subject to changes as issues are addressed. The Chair advised the purpose of the conditional approval is to say the design is substantially robust recognising the open design issues.

GSi provided an observation they would like to have seen this feedback to look at whether any assumptions are incorrect and need a fuller addressment. GSi found it difficult to recommend approval based on level of issues outstanding and no clear view on their materiality. GSi further noted the process maps published in T1 are not sufficient to enable parties to commence build. IS responded that process maps are not intended to enable detailed build and the Design Team have tried to be precise in terms of outstanding issues. IS stated, regarding materiality, the overall volume of documentation in T1, and despite some agonising by the Design Team over outstanding issues, they found there was a huge amount of material that was non-contentious and wished members to consider that majority of T1 is stable and sufficient for approval.

GSi asked whether parties are expected to commence systems build from these artefacts. IS confirmed no, this was not expected until later artefacts release the necessary detail for this activity. GSi stated approval means different things, and as they cannot begin to identify build requirements, they cannot recommend approval.

The Chair summarised discussions and DAG concerns, and, noting the required timeframes and conditions to be attached, determined the T1 design artefacts should be conditionally approved, subject to the following points:

- The T1 design artefacts meet requirements of MHHS Target Operating Model (TOM) and Programme timetable
- Outstanding issues will be reviewed, with the Programme Design Team providing a response to each issue and ensuring a resolution plan is put into action.
- The resolution of outstanding issues do not require material change to the design
- The T1 artefacts will be amended and brought back for DAG decision where agreed dependencies are resolved once further information is made available in future design artefact review tranches (list of dependencies amended by DAG at this meeting)
- Future amendments will not include material changes to the design
- The Programme Design Team will provide a resolution approach for all current and potential future issues

In accordance with powers conferred on the DAG Chair by the Programme Governance Framework, the T1 design artefacts were conditionally approved subject to the above points.

ACTION DAG09-12: Programme to provide a clear plan for the resolution of the recorded outstanding issues related to the Tranche 1 design artefact approval

DECISION DAG-DEC-21: Tranche 1 design artefacts conditionally approved

5.   Summary and next steps

The Chair noted several other agenda items which the Dag had not been able to cover given the discussions on T1 approval and recommended any matters for approval are carried out by correspondence ex-committee.

MH advised they were keen to discuss Smart Energy Code (SEC) MP162 updates. The Chair offered an extraordinary DAG meeting to cover this specifically.

ACTION DAG09-13: **Programme to consider whether further extraordinary DAG meeting required to discuss latest information relating to the Smart Energy Code (SEC) Modification Proposal (MP) 162**

MH asked what the DAG Terms of Reference (ToR) states regarding how decisions are made. FM advised the ToR confers power on the Chair to make decisions where there is not consensus among the group.

The group acknowledged agenda items not covered would be carried out by correspondence.

ACTION DAG09-14: PMO to issue correspondence to DAG members seeking approval decisions on the latest Data Integration Platform (DIP) Functional Specification and Non-Functional Requirements document, and approval of the Consequential Change Implementation Advisory Group (CCIAG) draft Terms of Reference, and seeking comments on the code drafting principles provided by the Cross Code Advisory Group (CCAG)

The Chair and MH suggested the duration of future DAG meetings should be considered to ensure sufficient time to discuss all agenda items.

ACTION DAG09-15: Programme to review length forward DAG meetings to ensure sufficient time to discuss all agenda items

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