

MHHS Design Advisory Group Minutes and Actions

Issue date: 17 August 2022

Meeting number	DAG014	Venue	Virtual – MS Teams
Date and time	10 August 2022 09:30-13:00	Classification	Public

Attendees:

Chair

Justin Andrews (Chair)

Role

Chair

Industry Representatives

Carolyn Burns (CBu)

Craig Handford (CH)

Donna Townsend (DT)

Ed Rees (ER)

Gareth Evans (GE)

Helen Metcalfe (HM) (on behalf of Stuart Scott)

Jacqui Barton (JBa) (on behalf of Gemma Slaney)

Jon Hawkins (JH) (on behalf of Sarah Jones)

Jonny Moore (JM) (on behalf of Matt Hall)

Kristina Leary (KL) (on behalf of Robert Langdon)

Paul Akrill (PA) (on behalf of Seth Chapman)

Small Supplier Representative

Large Supplier Representative

iDNO Representative

Consumer Representative

I&C Supplier Representative

DCC Representative (as smart meter central system provider)

DNO Representative

RECCo Representative

Elexon Representative (as central systems provider)

Supplier Agent Representative

Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent)

MHHS

Claire Silk (CS)

Ian Smith (IS)

Fraser Mathieson (FM)

Nicole Lai (NL)

Paul Pettit (PP)

Design Market and Engagement Lead

Design Manager

PMO Governance Lead

PMO Support

Design Assurance

Other Attendees

Daniel Morgan (DM) (on behalf of Colin Bezant)

Martin Crozier (on behalf of Colin Bezant)

Sinead Quinn (SQ)

Independent Programme Assurance Provider

Independent Programme Assurance Provider

Ofgem

Apologies:

Robert Langdon

Seth Chapman

Warren Fulton

Supplier Agent Representative

Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent)

MHHS Separation Lead

Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date
Minutes & Actions	DAG14-01	Programme to provide information on timeline for iServer implementation (see also ACTION DAG13-12)	Programme (Paul Pettit)	07/09/2022
Design RAID review	DAG14-02	Programme to add standing agenda item for DAG on industry code changes which impact design (and vice versa)	Programme (PMO)	07/09/2022
	DAG14-03	Programme to provide information to DAG on approach to ensuring industry code changes are being monitored, managed, and engaged with	Programme (Ian Smith)	14/09/2022
	DAG14-04	Programme to add risk to RAID regarding code changes outside of Programme governance which may impact the MHHS design	Programme (PMO)	07/09/2022
	DAG14-05	Programme to confirm whether Industry Standing Data (ISD) entity values will be published as part of M5 or transition plan	Programme (Chair)	07/09/2022
Transition Plan	DAG14-06	RECCo to advise of any high priority Industry Standing Data (ISD) related items for consideration by the Programme (see also ACTION DAG14-05)	RECCo (Jon Hawkins)	07/09/2022
	DAG14-07	Programme Design Team to liaise with TMAG to confirm how engagement with industry will take place on transition approach/options	Programme (Ian Smith)	07/09/2022
	DAG06-01	Review alignment between related MPAN modifications and design subgroup	Programme (Ian Smith)	17/08/2022
Previous meeting(s)	DAG10-08	Update the MHHS Design Baseline Dashboard to show more detail (e.g., next steps and timings)	Programme (Ian Smith)	10/08/2022
	DAG10.1-01	Discuss transition timetable and go/no-go decision with MH	Programme (Ian Smith)	10/08/2022
	DAG10.1-03	Communicate current thinking around transition plan to DAG members	Programme (Ian Smith)	10/08/2022
	DAG11-02	Discuss with TMAG Chair St Clements participation at TMAG	Chair	10/08/2022
	DAG11-06	Clarify with CCAG Chair and SRO how design drives code changes and how existing MHHS related code changes are managed	Chair	10/08/2022
	DAG11-08	Ensure Programme risk relating to 162 covers any governance implications for MHHS and Codes	Programme (PMO)	31/08/2022
	DAG12-03	Arrange a joint working group with SEC parties, DAG, and Programme to discuss SEC MP162, and seek to identify solution which delivers requirements of the MHHS TOM and adhering to the level playing field design principle, taking into account requirements, costs/impacts, and implementation date	Chair	31/08/22
	DAG12-04	Seek guidance from SRO on Programme position on SEC MP 162	Chair	10/08/2022
	DAG12-05	Discuss with DCC high level impacts SEC MP162 solution options and seek further understanding of flexibility in decision date and implementation	Chair	10/08/2022
	DAG13-01	Provide an update to DAG10.1-03 in the next meeting.	Programme (Ian Smith)	10/08/2022
	DAG13-02	Bring agenda item on transition to next DAG	Programme (Ian Smith)	10/08/2022
	DAG13-03	Feedback to DAG whether the Programme should put the price-cap calculation on the Programme's risk register	Ofgem	10/08/2022
	DAG13-04	Review and update the dissensus log on the Design Artefact Tracker	Programme (Claire Silk)	10/08/2022
	DAG13-05	Look at practical mechanisms for resolving minor elements of contention on Design Artefacts	Programme (Claire Silk)	10/08/2022
	DAG13-06	Confirm next steps relating to the MPAN Enquiry requirements at the next meeting and arrange a workshop to discuss with impacted stakeholders	Programme (Ian Smith)	10/08/2022

	DAG13-08	Programme Risk related to Change Requests once Design is baselined. Add to Programme risk log if not, and import into Design Risk Log	Programme (Ian Smith)	10/08/2022
	DAG13-09	Confirm approach and timescales for performance assurance requirements work and share with the BSC and REC representatives ahead of the next meeting	Chair	10/08/2022
	DAG13-10	Add design risk on qualification/assurance	Programme (Ian Smith)	10/08/2022
	DAG13-12	Find out when iServer release will be, update the SI Design Assurance Observations Overview slide and look into suitable supporting information to go with it	Programme (Simon Harrison)	10/08/2022

Decisions

Area	Dec Ref	Decision
None		

RAID items discussed/raised

RAID area	Description
Code Change	The DAG agreed to add a Programme Risk regarding the monitoring and management of code changes outside of Programme governance which may impact the MHHS design (and vice versa)

Minutes

1. Welcome and Introductions

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

2. Minutes and Actions

There were no minutes for approval.

FM provided an overview of the outstanding actions, updates for which can be found within the [meeting papers](#). Specific updates on actions discussed by the group are provided below:

ACTION DAG06-01: Review alignment between related MPAN modifications and design subgroup

IS noted that there will be a meeting in the next few weeks to discuss next steps, and an update will be provided at the next DAG meeting.

Action ongoing.

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

IS recommended this action is closed, noting the success of the issues resolution process in tracking and recording outcomes via the Design Artefact Tracker and associated dissensus log.

CH asked whether the resolution outcomes had been reviewed by design working group participants. IS noted the focus had been on confirming resolution with individual parties, and an overview then being provided to working groups and DAG on any changes to design artefacts and other resolution outcomes. Change marked versions of the design artefacts have been published alongside the 'clean' versions for transparency. IS noted there is nothing significant outstanding from Tranche 1.

Action closed.

ACTION DAG10.1-1: Discuss transition timetable and go/no-go decision with Matt Hall

IS advised the discussion is yet to take place. This action is related to DAG13-02.

Action ongoing.

ACTION DAG11-02: Discuss with TMAG Chair St Clements participation at TMAG

The Chair advised this action would be resolved by the next DAG.

Action ongoing.

ACTION DAG11-06: Clarify with CCAG Chair and SRO how design drives code changes and how existing MHHS related code changes are managed

See ACTION DAG11-02 above. The DAG considered a 'lessons learned' activity would be prudent to review the management approach to code changes which may have a bearing on MHHS (and vice versa).

Action ongoing.

ACTION DAG13-06: Confirm next steps relating to the MPAN Enquiry requirements at the next meeting and arrange a workshop to discuss with impacted stakeholders

IS advised the MHHS Design Team are creating a view of data items required for the Electricity Enquiry Service (EES). IS will book a working group session to identify validity of options, as soon as availability allows. This session will cover physical overarching requirements and place commentary around options. IS and RL agreed to discuss EES requirements prior to this subgroup meeting.

Action ongoing.

ACTION DAG13-08: Programme Risk related to Change Requests once design is baselined. Add to Programme risk log if not, and import into design risk log

IS advised this action is ongoing.

JB suggested an update to the wording of the risk, with a focus on instances where the MHHS Programme has based design elements on existing processes, systems, or codes which, if changed (by other industry Modifications), could result in fundamental change to the design.

Action ongoing.

ACTION DAG13-10: Add design risk on qualification/assurance

See ACTION DAG13-08 above.

Action ongoing.

Updates on Actions Relating to SEC MP162

ACTION DAG12-03: Arrange a joint working group with SEC parties, DAG, and Programme to discuss SEC MP162, and seek to identify solution which delivers requirements of the MHHS TOM and adhering to the level playing field design principle, taking into account requirements, costs/impacts, and implementation date

The Chair noted this action was on hold until Ofgem's decision on SEC MP162 is published.

Action ongoing.

ACTION DAG12-04: Seek guidance from SRO on Programme position on SEC MP 162

The Chair proposed to close this action, advising the MHHS Programme Senior Responsible Owner (SRO) has written to Ofgem outlining the Programme's position on SEC MP162.

The Chair advised the Programme position remains that to deliver the MHHS Target Operating Model (TOM), ensure additional DCC capacity, and to meet timescales within Ofgem's implementation timetable, SEC MP162 should be approved.

MC noted the final version of the IPA report had gone to Ofgem, along with the Programme's responses to several questions from Ofgem and DCC. MC took an action to check if the correspondence was public domain.

The Ofgem Representative, SQ, confirmed the timescale for a decision on SEC MP162 remains as the end of August. Ofgem have gathered information from the Independent Programme Assurance (IPA) provider, Data Communications Company (DCC), and the Programme, and are forming a decision.

The Chair and IS met with DCC last week to review the impacts on the DCC regarding the options previously discussed at the DAG, e.g., changing the read window. The Chair said they aim to hold further meetings with the DCC and provide more clarity to the DAG, which will also inform **ACTION DAG12-03**.

Action closed.

Updates on iServer

ACTION DAG13-12: Find out when iServer release will be, update the SI Design Assurance Observations Overview slide and look into suitable supporting information to go with it

PP advised there is currently no release date for iServer. PP confirmed iServer is being updated with the Tranche 4 design artefacts.

CH asked if this creates a risk, and whether iServer needs to be approved before the design baseline is released in October. PP clarified iServer contents are not for approval – as it is representing the design artefacts, which are hosted via iServer. PP advised there is oversight from the IPA on how design assurance is conducted from a Programme perspective.

The Chair asked IS and PP if iServer will help market participants review the design artefacts. PP replied yes, with one of the benefits are the design interfaces. The tool offers participants a user-friendly way to view the artefacts and process diagrams, rather than reviewing multiple documents in parallel.

The Chair asked if iServer should be released in time for September, to assist participants in their review of the design artefacts as the formal comments window is opened. PP agreed this would be ideal, however no release date is agreed yet. The DAG agreed if there is a clear benefit, then the iServer should be released sooner if possible. CH considered an earlier date would allow the DAG time to provide any questions or challenges ahead of approval of iServer. PP agreed to provide information on the timeline for implementation.

ACTION DAG14-01: Programme to provide information on timeline for iServer implementation

IS noted the likely outcome of the DAG review of design observations will distil out into a list of corrective actions to ensure consistency across design. PP agreed, as the availability of the full set of artefacts will allow the Programme to consider issues more closely.

Action ongoing.

3. Design RAID Review

DAG members did not highlight any risks for discussion ahead of the meeting.

CH noted the Cross-Code Advisory Group (CCAG) Horizon Scanning Log illustrated several changes in different industry codes which may have a bearing on MHHS. This raised the concern that if any of these incur challenges similar to the experience with SEC MP162, it may result in difficulties that impact on the MHHS design. IS recommended adding a standing DAG agenda item to discuss industry change which may impact the design. The agenda item should seek to ensure Programme requirements are being met and not adversely affected by external industry change and be fully integrated with the work of the CCAG. Actions were taken to provide information to the DAG on how external industry code changes are managed, and to add a risk to the central Programme RAID regarding changes outside of the Programme which may affect the MHHS design.

ACTION DAG14-02: Programme to add standing agenda item for DAG on industry code changes which impact design (and vice versa)

ACTION DAG14-03: Programme to provide information to DAG on approach to ensuring industry code changes are being monitored, managed, and engaged with

ACTION DAG14-04: Programme to add risk to RAID regarding code changes outside of Programme governance which may impact the MHHS design

IS highlighted the importance of the Design Team having visibility and representation on forums for relevant changes upon which the Programme are dependent for MHHS implementation. CH added the DAG needs to monitor whether relevant code changes are on track for delivery. IS agreed; there will be dependencies on such changes being enacted in the way the DAG expects. JH agreed this point was important and links to key lessons learnt from SEC MP162 and REC R044. JH believed the Programme could be more effective at deciding whether involvement is required in changes raised outside of the Programme, noting part of the challenge with SEC MP162 and REC R0044 was that DAG did not have enough input from the start. JH added; any change required to implement MHHS should be within scope of the Programme in terms of input, coordination, and monitoring. This would also help to support individual codes ensuring the business case for changes are articulated in a manner which supports the code objectives.

IS believed the Programme does express their requirements and embed them in the development of code changes, which leads to a discussion on these requirements are resolved. Where there is optionality for how an MHHS requirement is delivered, the Programme may be agnostic about how these requirements are discharged. It is, therefore, more important for the requirements expressed by the Programme to be precise, rather than the solution per se. JH stated the Programme should be agnostic on the way requirements are met. IS replied the level of prescription as to the solution would be articulated within the requirement.

The DAG discussed how to manage a situation where the Programme has a dependency on a regulatory change from another code body and where the levels of authority sit. The Chair noted each code is currently under Significant Code Review (SCR) direction to facilitate MHHS. Additionally, as part of Code drafting, the Programme will be coordinating the code change required to deliver MHHS. The DAG has so far been dealing with exceptions to the rule: SEC MP162 and R0044, due to the implementation lead times were raised prior to the commencement of Programme-coordinated code drafting. Future code changes will be managed as part of the code-drafting work that comes off the back of design and is governed by the CCAG and its sub-group, the Code Drafting Working Group (CDWG). The Chair further noted Balancing and Settlement Code (BSC) Modifications P432 and P434 which were also raised exceptionally as preludes to the TOM.

IS considered if the group should ask CCAG and the Programme Steering Group (PSG) to issue a statement on their formal position. The Chair noted this is relevant to ACTION DAG11-06, and they are yet to have a discussion with the SRO. The Chair agreed with IS that a statement outlining the process would be beneficial as it would provide guidance for changes that are separate to the drafting coordinated by the Programme.

JH said it was important for the Programme to list both MHHS defined and other consequential requirements. JH believed that the DAG should decide whether this is outside the scope of the Programme and consider a sensible way to manage that within the timetable of activities. JH iterated the importance of drawing these points out in mitigation when these risks are added to the RAID.

JM believed there were two primary risks relating to code change. The first relating to enabling modifications which are met with challenges, e.g., BSC Modifications P432 and P434. The second around changes which affect the design and are raised between the design baseline and go-live. JM also stated that any code change which can be undertaken within the code-drafting window coordinated by the Programme should be assessed for MHHS impacts.

IS noted the likely inevitability of change arising post design baseline which may affect the design and will require triage by the Design Team. It is possible working groups may be required to understand impacts and discuss options, with a potential need for wider industry for consultation. JM asked IS if they see this activity happening in parallel to the usual modification development activities. IS replied, from a horizon scanning perspective, that once a change is raised and the Programme or DAG made aware, work would be required to quickly arrive at a Programme position on its impact and determine whether involvement at code development meetings is required.

IS highlighted the risk raised by CH on E7 and E10 meters and requested time with CH to discuss this.

4. Transition Plan

IS updated the DAG on developments about how transition will operate, which will be informed by the overall transition approach. The Design Team are progressing impact assessments of other options than the MHHS TOM recommendation of 'one-way gate', such as considering whether it will be a 'two-way gate', impact of early adopters and if so, how this would relate to design solution to the 'one-way gate' functionality. An option being explored in relation to early adopter, is whether a 'revolving door' could be provided where early migration can be undertaken but also reverted if required. This could bring several benefits in terms of preventing the restriction of customer choice of supplier during the transition period.

There is planned activity next week to look at all the migration and transition options, as well as discuss which actors will be within these processes. The desire is to arrive at high-level solutions that map to each of these transition options. The step following this is to work with the Migration Working Group to understand potential impacts to parties for these approaches. This deviates from the original approach, but the 'revolving door' provides significant upsides.

IS noted the one-way gate approach is simpler than the revolving door approach. IS advised of the need to bring forward analysis to provide further detail and inform decision-making.

The DAG recognised this transition is key to several parties, and it is important to get a solution out as soon as possible. With a new request to look at a different approach, the Design Team is accelerating effort since an outcome is necessary to progress.

IS advised once initial work on high-level solutions is complete by end of next week, industry views will be sought. JH asked if the industry engagement will take the form of a workshop in the third or fourth week of August. IS said they will confirm with Testing Migration and Advisory Group (TMAG), noting it is Programme's testing workstream which is managing this.

ER asked IS when they will provide an update to TMAG. IS noted this conversation has been tabled for the TMAG meeting on 17 August 2022.

ACTION DAG14-07: Programme Design Team to liaise with TMAG to confirm how engagement with industry will take place on transition approach/options

JM asked if there is a Programme risk on the complexity of the revolving door approach, particularly on data services. IS said the approach is still subject to discussion, and part of the decision-making process will be quantifying what these impacts will be before deciding on how to proceed.

JH queried whether Industry Standing Data (ISD) would be published as part of M5 or transition. The Chair took an action to confirm this.

ACTION DAG14-05: Programme to confirm whether Industry Standing Data (ISD) entity values will be published as part of M5 or transition

IS asked JH if they had explicit dependencies for what the data physically looks like and what the values will be. JH agreed to discuss with IS separately.

ACTION DAG14-06: RECCo to advise of any high priority Industry Standing Data (ISD) related items for consideration by the Programme

5. **MHHS Design Status Update**

CS confirmed the design artefacts were published on 08 August 2022, along with a DAG summary report. The artefacts can be found on the E2E pages of the Programme Collaboration Base and MHHS website. The logical data model and physical interface specifications are yet to be published, and these artefacts are scheduled for the 22 August 2022.

Additionally, change marked versions of the design artefacts have also been published, highlighting what has changed in the latest iteration of the artefacts primarily in response to issues raised during the Tranche reviews. A summary log of changes to the business process diagrams, and the versions two and revised version three of the business process diagrams are published alongside the change marked artefacts. They are linked back to the relevant design issues and dependencies and outcomes are also provided in the Design Artefact Tracker.

On behalf of DAG, the Chair thanked the Design Team and the industry working groups for their considerable efforts in producing the artefacts.

CS noted there were 44 design issues identified as part of conditional approval from Tranches 1-3. All open issues are now closed and three remain on hold:

1. SNG_001: Relating to IF 005 Meter Exchange (MEX) approach. Further work is required to demonstrate the series of transactions to illustrate alignment between logical and physical interfaces. This will be considered following feedback from the review process and comment owner.
2. SNG012: Potential additional Unmetered Supplies Operator (UMSO) process steps in artefact BP006. Originally flagged as low priority cosmetic change, and centres around minor contextual updates to process.
3. SNG_038: Potential requirement for additional data privacy statements. The current view is that an additional privacy statement is not required. It is on hold to allow for further analysis on wider retention requirements.

CS advised the Design Artefact Tracker has been updated to reflect the resolutions, and detail is provided in the DAG Tranche 4 Summary Report.

CS noted, of the 23 dependencies identified as part of conditional approval, four remain open and the remaining 19 are resolved. Eight dissensus items were raised and resolved through the Business Process Requirements Working Group (BPRWG).

CH asked if dependencies were discussed at BPRWG. CS replied they are being resolved within sub-working groups. These dependencies have gone out for review.

6. **CCAG Horizon Scanning**

FM shared the CCAG Horizon Scanning Log and noted their position as the CCAG Secretariat and Governance Lead. The log enables the CCAG to have a view of changes going on in the wider industry and codes that have a potential bearing on MHHS. FM provided an overview of the process for managing the log, which includes the expectation that code bodies will update the log as soon as new changes are raised, and the Design Team then triage the new changes and assess what impacts they may have on the Programme.

A challenge with the document is the shared responsibility between code bodies in highlighting changes and updating the log and the Programme Design Team reviewing and making assessments on Programme impact. FM noted ongoing challenges with ensuring the monthly cycle of updates, and the DAG agreed the need for improvements to the monitoring and management of code changes which may affect the Programme.

JM noted several columns were not up-to-date and considered whether it was an issue with the log or code bodies requiring feedback to ensure the right consideration was made at the right stage. FM explained these columns were populated by the code bodies and the log has been modelled on the Central Modifications Register published by the Code Administration Code of Practice (CACoP), to make it as easy as possible for code bodies to update. The information on code changes within the log, including indication as to whether a given change has wider industry impacts or is related to an SCR, is drawn from the respective change proposal forms of each change. JM noted the entry for SEC MP162 indicates there are no SCR impacts, which is known not to be the case. FM responded this was part of the challenge in ensuring the log is accurate, and it was unclear whether this was an omission on the part of the code body populating the log, or whether this meant the SCR impact had not been identified and logged in the change proposal form as it should be.

The Chair raised two points:

1. The Programme would feedback to the CCAG that code bodies need to update their log items, noting the changes are not up to date, especially SEC MP162; and
2. The DAG's prospective standing agenda item on pertinent code changes will provide further opportunity to ensure the CCAG Horizon Scanning Log is accurate.

FM confirmed that code modification means modification to the code and any changes to code subsidiary documents. FM noted work was underway to further develop the log to include licence changes, SCRs, and other wider industry change.

FM noted that activities were underway to improve the efficacy of the log, including improving code body engagement with the log and ensuring effective assessment of Programme impacts and escalation to DAG of design impacts. FM recommended the log is added as a standing agenda item, which would enable the DAG to review and monitor pertinent code changes in future meetings.

7. Design Issues for Escalation

CS noted there were no design issues for escalation.

8. DAG Design Principles

IS said no changes were made to the principles since last discussed.

JH considered the derivation caveat and asked how it was managed. IS observed, so far, no decisions had been made which deviate from the design principles. JH considered any deviation in future would need to be appropriately logged and a record kept of why a derivation was considered necessary.

9. Governance Group Updates

M5 Plan and Programme Re-Plan

FM noted the M5 delivery plan is proceeding at pace, with the formal comments window on design artefacts to open in September 2022. The wider Programme re-plan is also moving into key stages with three rounds of consultation due to commence in August 2022. Any DAG members interested in information on the re-plan were encouraged to contact PMO@mhhsprogramme.co.uk.

CH asked when the re-plan will be ready. FM said they had just finished the pre-consultation phase, and the first round of consultation is due to be issued shortly.

PSG Webinar

FM noted the Programme Steering Group (PSG) are holding a monthly webinar to provide a view of items under discussion. Any DAG members interested were encouraged to get in touch with PMO.

CCAG Updates

Regarding the CCAG, given the M5 delivery date is now moving back, FM noted the CCAG stood down the Code Drafting Working Group in August, and will decide at their next meeting whether to go ahead in September.

TMAG Updates

There are now four testing working groups. Any DAG members interested in joining the working groups were encouraged to get in touch with PMO.

The Chair noted the TMAG took an action to review the four working groups and investigate ways to lighten pressure for market participants. JH asked if any exercises have been conducted around common attendance for working groups and sub-groups and suggested this is worth looking into this as an indicator of the feasibility of merging groups.

Design Updates

CS said they are looking at what the comment resolution process will look like in September and October following the formal design artefacts comments window. CS is currently reviewing the schedule of meetings and will share this in due course.

IS noted the dissensus process was successful and received good feedback from participants. The Design Team intend to adopt a similar process for future comments and dissensus.

Design Playback Sessions

FM advised the Programme are holding playback sessions to end-to-end (E2E) design walkthroughs, deep dives, and surgeries where participants ranging from very engaged to not engaged can obtain support in digesting the E2E design. The Chair observed the E2E walkthroughs have been successful to date with a strong turn-out rate (some over 300 attendees). Questions from market participants were based on a good level of knowledge. The Chair recommended DAG members speak to their constituencies on how useful these introductory sessions were and provide any feedback.

FM advised any DAG members interested in a schedule of upcoming walkthroughs and playback sessions should contact the PMO for details. CS noted the dates of each session can be found on the [Programme Collaboration Base](#), and a reminder will be issued in The Clock also. There is also a special design newsletter edition being issued with details of the sessions.

10. Summary and next steps

FM summarised the meeting actions.

FM advised the DAG of the upcoming Consequential Change Impact Assessment Group (CCIAG). The group is open to all, and DAG members were encouraged to contact the PMO for any further information.

The Chair thanked members for their contributions and brought the meeting to a close.

Next meetings:

DAG: 14 September 2022 10am

CCIAG: 25 August 2022 10am