

# MHHS Design Advisory Group Minutes and Actions

**Issue date: 22 September 2022**

Meeting number **DAG015**

Venue **Virtual – MS Teams**

Date and time **14 September 2022 10:00-13:00**

Classification **Public**

## Attendees:

### **Chair**

Justin Andrews (Chair)

### **Role**

Chair

### **Industry Representatives**

Andrew Green (AG)

I&C Representative

Carolyn Burns (CBu)

Small Supplier Representative

Colin Bezant (CB)

Independent Programme Assurance Provider

Craig Handford (CH)

Large Supplier Representative

Gemma Slaney (GS)

DNO Representative

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

Supplier Agent Representative

Matt Hall (MH)

Elexon Representative (as central systems provider)

Morven Hunter (MHu) (On behalf of Donna Townsend)

iDNO Representative

Neil Dewar (ND)

National Grid ESO

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

Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent)

Sarah Jones (SJ)

RECCo Representative

Stuart Scott (SS)

DCC Representative (as smart meter central system provider)

Vladimir Black (VB)

Medium Supplier Representative

### **MHHS**

Ian Smith (IS)

Design Manager

Fraser Mathieson (FM)

PMO Governance Lead

Nicole Lai (NL)

PMO Support

Paul Pettit (PP)

Design Assurance

Warren Fulton (WF)

MHHS Separation Lead

### **Other Attendees**

Colin Bezant (CB)

Independent Programme Assurance Provider

Danielle Walton (DW)

Ofgem

Jenny Boothe (JBo)

Ofgem

## Apologies:

Donna Townsend

iDNO Representative

Ed Rees

Consumer Representative

Robert Langdon

Supplier Agent Representative

Seth Chapman

Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent)

## Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date
Minutes and Actions	DAG15-01	Issue slides presented to MWG on transition approach to DAG for comment (see ACTION DAG15-02)	Programme (PMO)	15/09/2022
	DAG15-02	DAG members to provide comments on the transition approach options and high-level proposals (see ACTION DAG15-01)	DAG members	21/09/2022
	DAG15-03	Confirm view on whether MPRS and EES are considered central systems, and to liaise with other Programme WGs to confirm the Programme position	Programme (SRO)	By next DAG meeting: date TBC
MHHS Design Status Update	DAG15-04	Issue comms/calendar invites for Design Issue Impact sessions, dissensus sessions, BPRWG & TDWG assurance sessions.	Programme (PMO)	15/09/2022
	DAG15-05	Programme to issue information on outcome of code drafting prototyping exercise to support the fulfilment of the design acceptance criteria	Programme (Ian Smith)	By next DAG meeting: date TBC
Previous meeting(s)	DAG06-01	Review alignment between related MPAN modifications and design subgroup	Programme (Ian Smith)	17/08/2022
	DAG10.1-01	Discuss transition timetable and go/no-go decision with MH	Programme (Ian Smith)	10/08/2022
	DAG11-02	Discuss with TMAG Chair St Clements participation at TMAG	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
	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
	DAG14-01	Programme to provide information on timeline for iServer implementation (see also ACTION DAG13-12)	Programme (Paul Pettit)	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
	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

## Decisions

Area	Dec Ref	Decision
Minutes and Actions	DAG-DEC-29	Minutes of meetings held 21 July 2022, 28 July 2022, and 14 August 2022 approved.

## RAID items discussed/raised

RAID area	Description
None:	RAID reviewed, and no specific risks identified by DAG for discussion.

## 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 minutes of meetings held 21 July 2022, 28 July 2022, and 14 August 2022 were approved with no comments.

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 advised an internal session had been held and a written response on action will be issued to the DAG. CH believed this action was likely to have been picked up in existing design artefacts. IS will provide an update to the group after ensuring the correct actions are in place.

Action ongoing.

#### ***ACTION DAG10.1-01: Discuss transition timetable and go/no-go decision with MH***

The Programme have produced high-level transition options. These still require development via working groups, but processes have been put together and presented to the Migration Working Group (MWG) for comment. Several bi-lateral discussions have been held with stakeholders to build an understanding of these options.

Action closed.

#### ***ACTION DAG10.1-03: Communicate current thinking around transition plan to DAG members***

IS noted the need to disseminate discussion slides from MWG to the DAG to close the action. Given the options being considered, the Programme has produced high-level actions and approach information.

The Chair asked whether the Programme will be holding working groups to review the impacts of the options on participants. IS advised this was possible but some quantification of the options is required, before a decision on is made. WF noted each transition scenario would require relevant governance, and a plan on this will be communicated.

IS offered to share the MWG transition materials with DAG and requested members provide comments on impacts, workability, and the validity of the options. IS noted the principles they are trying to adhere is to reduce throw-away development activity for migration.

Regarding the indicative timeframes for issuing a plan, WF noted it will be issued as soon as possible to everyone, ideally within the next fortnight.

CH asked whether the transition plan and migration process would cause issue with the design baseline or design consultation comments. IS replied no but noted challenges around solutions for exchange of data between agents. As such, any deltas would be actioned outside of the baseline. The DAG agreed clarity is required ahead of approval of the design. A clear plan on transition is needed, which does not cause any significant change to the baseline design and any issues could be managed in the work-off plan.

<b>ACTION DAG15-01: Programme to issue slides presented to MWG on transition approach to DAG for comment (see ACTION DAG15-02)</b>
--

<b>ACTION DAG15-02: DAG members to provide comments on the transition approach options and high-level proposals (see ACTION DAG15-01)</b>
---

SJ wished to clarify whether a specific design artefact would be issued for this. IS replied it will be a set of artefacts specific to transition with detailed information. It was confirmed this would be presented to DAG for comment before the end of 2022.

CB noted the MWG slides showing the process steps and asked whether this will be issued in addition to the options presented to MWG. IS advised this is the intention. CB noted changes to the appointment/de-appointment flows, and utilisation of existing flows, and how this may require industry to repurpose these flows for migration, expressing a concern over how it may impact participant confidence in Design Build Test (DBT) activities. IS acknowledged this and advised comments will be welcome on the high-level proposals for transition.

MH noted transition design is split out from M5 and therefore is happy with current arrangements. They noted the importance of participants providing comments via consultation responses if any issues.

Action closed.

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

The Chair advised the matter had been discussed with the Testing & Migration Advisory Group (TMAG) Chair who advised St Clements are invited to attend TMAG for relevant items, as well as any Level 4 working groups. The Chair ask that any comments from DAG members are sent directly to the TMAG Chair either via their constituent representative or the PMO.

SJ queried whether the Programme position was that Meter Point Registration Systems (MPRS) were a central system. IS believed this was the case and asked whether it was suggested elsewhere it is not a central system. SJ noted it was advised at the QWG they were not a central system provider and asked for clarity on this. GS supported this, noting central systems is a defined term within the Programme and it was important to be clear on whether this included St Clements or MRPS. SJ also asked for clarification on whether Electricity Enquiry Service (EES) is a central system.

***ACTION DAG15-03: Confirm view on whether MPRS and EES are considered central systems, and to liaise with other Programme WGs to confirm the Programme position***

Action closed.

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

The Chair interpreted this action as being part of how the Programme identifies and manages external change. They noted work is ongoing via the CCAG to improve processes for monitoring, managing, and de-risking change from the external environment. Code changes arising from design are managed via this route too.

Action closed.

***ACTION DAG11-08: Ensure Programme risk relating to 162 covers any governance implications for MHHS and Codes***

The Chair advised the latest actions on Smart Energy Code (SEC) Modification Proposal (MP) 162, noting the DCC has been directed by Ofgem to identify the impacts of capacity upgrades for either eight-hour or 24-hour windows for Meter Data Retrieval (MDR) role, without any differentiation between service users. The Programme Design Team are available to provide any information to the DCC to assist with this.

JBo advised Ofgem have extracted the DCC capacity increase requirement from the SEC governance needed to introduce the MDR role in code and instructed DCC to provide options analysis to assist the dismissal of unviable options. SEC MP162 has been sent back to the SEC Panel, with the direction to work out how the new party role of MDR is introduced in governance. The Chair advised this is relevant to DAG, as it relates to work to ensure the level playing field design principle can be upheld. SEC and DCC have been instructed to work up these options by October. The Programme will ensure there is MHHS representation within the relevant SEC working groups to ensure adequate arrangements for the MDR role.

GS reiterated the procedural aspects of ensuring this change operates effectively, noting it is potentially split across three different governance arrangements – SEC, MHHS, and DCC – and believed there needs to be better tracking and transparency of how linked changes like these are tracked and managed.

The DAG agreed to retain the action to ensure continued visibility.

Action ongoing.

***ACTION DAG13-05: Look at practical mechanisms for resolving minor elements of contention on Design Artefacts***

WF advised a webinar was held last week providing an overview of how minor elements of contention will be resolved, noting dissensus resolution groups have been scheduled for 12 and 13 October 2022 to discuss.

Action closed.

***ACTION DAG13-06: Determine next steps for MPAN Enquiry API requirements***

IS advised conversations are in progress, with analysis underway of the data items required for the enquiry Application Programming Interface (API), and how this resolves itself with the flow of data from the respective systems which master this data. Some mapping had been carried out of transactions between systems, and these will be further validated by RECCo prior to issue to wider review.

Action closed.

***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 there is a risk on this matter. WF noted part of evidencing to DAG of how the acceptance criteria will be met includes defining how change would be managed and governed post-baseline. WF confirmed evidence will be issued to industry on how post-baseline change will be handled.

Action ongoing until confirmation received from IS or WF on risk log update.

***ACTION DAG13-09: Confirm approach and timescales for performance assurance requirements work and share with the BSC and REC representatives ahead of the next meeting***

The Chair observed there had been discussions between the Programme and the Balancing and Settlement Code (BSC), and it is an item for discussion at the mid-month Cross-Code Advisory Group (CCAG) with Code Bodies.

Action ongoing, with timings to be noted after the CCAG meeting.

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

IS wanted to define the detail of this risk. IS understood it as a risk for when qualifications evolve, and once the detail is worked through, then change requests to the MHHS design could emanate from this process.

SJ believed the risk is that if qualification assurance is deemed outside of the Programme, then it will not be available at go-live and would need to be part of the baseline if reporting is to be available for Programme assurance requirements from go-live.

SJ noted qualifications are part of the Programme scope but not necessarily performance assurance. IS agreed this understanding, noting a risk around qualification already exists within the central Programme RAID log. No objections were received to closure of the action.

CB noted understanding the timing of performance assurance, from the perspective of a broader project workstream, is on the Independent Programme Assurer (IPA) agenda.

Action closed.

***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 updated the DAG that the release date for the Enduring Design Hub content would be close to the design baseline. Any DAG members interested in reviewing and providing views on iServer design repository tooling were encouraged to contact the Design Assurance Team through their PPC representative.

Action ongoing.

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

SJ wished to confirm whether role codes will be part of M5, as REC require these. IS advised there are options for this and will provide confirmation, noting there is variation in what may be available for parties. IS agreed to feedback to RECCo on latest updates.

Action ongoing. IS noted an update is required to the action wording to include SJ's specific point about role codes.

### **3. Design RAID Review**

IS noted there were no specific discussion items received prior to the meeting.

SJ flagged there were numerous risks on the replan documentation that would receive feedback. IS noted they would raise anything of immediate attention into the design workstream.

CBu asked whether themes from the design consultation comments review would feed into the design risk and issues register to support the tracking of resolution. IS responded this would be considered, but the aim of comments resolution was to resolve issues. WF advised risk resolution will be undertaken very quickly following review of the design consultation comments and whilst it was possible to enter items into the Design Artefact Tracker, it was highly likely a resolution would precede this given the focus being given to the consultation comments.

CBu asked whether there would be a summary to DAG on common themes from the comment review. WF replied once common themes had been reviewed, they will be communicated to DAG. The comments will be reviewed prior to issue resolution meetings in October, and any contention would enter the dissensus process for transparency.

#### 4. Code Changes Review

IS provided an overview of Programme actions to manage changes in the external environment.

SJ advised there are two types of changes; those raised that affect the design, and others where the design affects code changes. SJ suggested an explicit category within the CCAG Horizon Scanning Log for which way the impact is. IS agreed. SJ noted CCAG have also discussed grouping according to themes – e.g., REC R0044, SEC MP162, Balancing and Settlement Code Procedures (BSCP), etc. – to assist in grouping relevant subjects together subjects.

SJ updated on REC R0044, advising impact assessment with DCC is in progress around the sharing of data with the Data Service Provider (DSP) and associated security requirements. It was not yet clear whether this would result in standalone REC change or be pulled into the Programme and wrapped up with CCAG code drafting.

CH asked what happens if changes are delayed or not approved, and suggested this is a key question in assessing materiality/criticality.

With SEC MP162 in mind, CH wondered how the Programme would ensure they stay close to the delivery pathway and remain in line with the relevant delivery timescales. IS advised this is part of the improvements underway to the Horizon Scanning process. IS noted it is imperative that changes from the external environment are identified, impact assessed, and a Programme position formulated with actions to manage. It is about ensuring enabling code changes have adequate Programme risks and dependencies to assist in monitoring progression of changes and the Programme inputs into working groups, consultations, etc. CH was keen to ensure Programme stay close to changes which may impact design if outcomes are not what the Programme expect.

IS and FM gave their views on the operation of the horizon-scanning process and current improvements to process underway.

CB advised it is a risk also being considered within the IPA.

IS advised the Horizon Scanning process would be a significant input into the Programme change management approach post M5 where it will be crucial to ensure impacts on the design baseline are managed.

#### 5. CCIAG Progress Update

Interested DAG members can refer to the Consequential Change Impact Assessment Group (CCIAG) [Collaboration Base](#) and the latest [headline report](#).

FM provided an overview of the CCIAG process and encouraged DAG members to advise constituents to raise any matters which they feel are of value and are not currently under discussion to CCIAG for discussion. FM provided an overview of the tools produced by the Programme to manage the assessment of and actions relating to consequential change. Key goals of the tools created include auditability and risk management, as well as a log of all consequential change matters discussed by the CCIAG and their outcomes.

CH noted the importance of consequential change and agreed the process around it have moved forward. They queried how consequential changes were mapped against the design, to which FM pointed out the proposed artefact traceability column in the log.

CH asked whether there would be any impact on design baseline, whether any items would impact baseline approval, and when the log would be available or parties to review. FM advised that of the c.25 discussion topics raised to CCIAG thus far, none appear to require change to the design baseline. Rather, the potential changes are as a result of the baseline and should not affect approval. FM advised the Consequential Change (CC) Log would be published soon and was in the process of being populated.

CH wanted to ensure visibility of anything in the CC log that is a caveat in relation to sign off the baseline to assist in ensuring nothing within the CC log affects parties' willingness to sign off M5. IS confirmed how this would be managed and gave examples of the proposed Estimate Annual Consumption (EAC) analogue, work on data items like SSC/TPR, potential need to provide additional data items, and other categories of change where the Programme is involved. IS noted the Programme is evolving a far richer view on external dependencies and how these are managed or otherwise coordinated by the Programme.

The Chair advised the Programme and participants have been on a journey to understanding how consequential change is managed and what type of actions are needed, and there is understanding now of the types of approaches to Programme involvement. The Chair noted items have come to the CCIAG, e.g., RECCo items, where clarity is needed on areas of consequential change which they govern – whilst this falls outside of Programme scope, the Programme are enabling the discussions and facilitating bringing together experts. The Chair noted the richness of topics coming out through this process. There are further improvements and definition of process in progress, as there will be changes which need central coordination or facilitation to ensure the success of MHHS.

SJ echoed comments that the CCIAG had been very helpful thus far to discuss different areas of consequential change and how they are managed/progressed. SJ agreed to share REC's design traceability mapping.

SJ went on to note the varying potential action outcomes for consequential change, with some things requiring central coordination, and those requiring additional changes in individual governance frameworks, as well as consideration of how code drafting can be taken through to code drafting via CCAG also. Categorisations are important to drive action outcomes and ensure dependencies are tracked.

CBu echoed the progress of the CCIAG and the potential value of the CC log and cautioned against underestimating the emotion behind these processes and products under discussion, particularly where they relate to design, build, and test (DBT activities for parties. If there are significant outstanding issues by M5 approval, CBU believed this could impact approval and are relevant to participant Readiness Assessment 2 (RA2) responses.

ND echoed this point and has appreciated involvement at CCIAG.

FM finished by providing further information on the structure of the CCIAG process, the toolkit for managing consequential change, and the work to get the CC log published. They ended with the message that DAG and participants can bring any matters to the CCIAG.

## 6. MHHS Design Status Update

### Design Activities

WF provided updates on the latest with the design artefact review. Over 1500 comments have been received thus far and are being triaged. No significant issues have been identified at present. Several minor changes and clarifications to design artefacts have been identified thus far, but nothing which may require a Programme change request. A further high volume of comments is expected by the deadline of 16 September 2022.

WF provided an overview of the plan for reviewing and responding to all design comments. All responses will be published with participants given a week to review this and provide any objections to proposed actions. Any objections received will attempt to be resolved via the Design Issues Impact Assessment sessions commencing 03 October 2022. Any areas of non-consensus or objection will then be taken to subsequent dissensus sessions for either resolution, escalation, or recognition as a dissensus items.

**ACTION DAG15-04: Issue comms/calendar invites for Design Issue Impact sessions, dissensus sessions, BPRWG & TDWG assurance sessions**

WF explained the purpose of the Design Issue Impact Assessment sessions is for the Programme to help participants explore themes coming from artefact comments. It will provide the opportunity for parties to understand where there may be areas of dissensus, in which case parties will be asked to complete dissensus form for discussion at the dissensus sessions.

CBu wondered if there will be sufficient time for the Programme to turn around comments. WF advised the Programme are working through comments as soon as they are received. They agreed there are pressing timeframes, but the aim is to triage all comments by 23 September 2022, notify comment owners as soon as possible where contrasting comments/positions are identified. Responses to all comments will be provided before the commencement of the Design Issue Impact Assessment sessions.

CH asked about the traceability of comments to design artefact. IS advised additional process and resources had been put in place internally within the Programme to manage this. CH advised the Large Supplier constituency is planning to collectively review top concerns and then feed these to the Programme. The Chair asked that these are submitted as soon as possible once ready, which will assist triaging and Programme response. CH advised they will prompt this with their constituency.

CH further noted the conditional approvals undertaken for previous design review tranches and asked how this would be fed back to DAG to ensure all outstanding comments have been resolved. WF advised this would be part of the success criteria evidence pack, and it will be evidenced how design issues related to previous conditional approvals have been met and what outcomes were. WF noted there are around 40 issues to be clearly evidenced as to resolution, and the plan is to complete these by week of 10 October 2022. At this point consideration will be given to any items which continue to require a response. CH thanked WF for this and concluded that clear recording of the outcomes and resolution will be an important part of giving comfort ahead of a decision on M5 approval.

SJ noted some issues will relate to how the design can be converted into code drafting. SJ noted work on prototyping code drafting carried out between RECCo, BSC, and the Programme has been a positive demonstration of how this will work, and it would be good to publish.

**ACTION DAG15-05: Programme to issue information on outcome of code drafting prototyping exercise to support the fulfilment of the design acceptance criteria**

### **Programme Design Assurance Updates**

PP provided an overview of the structure of design assurance activities, and how the Programme will communicate with participants. PP went on to provide an overview of the design assurance observations until now, including items such as transition design, operational design coverage, data modelling, implied requirements in other artefacts, requirements coverage, traceability, accessibility of design artefacts (expertise), and Data Integration Platform (DIP) functional specification.

PP advised nothing has yet been discovered which impacts the workability of the design. The information being recorded and tracked will be rolled into the evidence pack for design success criteria and will be published as part of the evidence pack for meeting the success criteria.

SJ noted many of the areas under consideration will be important for code drafting activities and queried when these may be managed through the work-off plan. WF advised the work-off plan will need to be issued with the success criteria evidence pack, which will have clear dates for resolution.

PP noted design assurance activities had been ongoing since Tranche 1, and there is a log of dependencies and matters to be managed, which will be published with the success criteria evidence pack. PP praised the progress and governance around issues resolution under previous review tranches, particularly noting the dissensus logging and how this had provided significant comfort and assurance that issues are being addressed and the design has no fundamental gaps.

The Chair asked about when work-off plan items would be available following the Tranche 4/M5 consultation window closure. WF advised this is unknown at present until the volume of comments is known, and an indication received of how substantive any potential work-off items may be.

### **Design Overview Sessions Feedback**

PP provided an overview of the Design Overview sessions held recently. The sessions resulted in excellent feedback and excellent engagement, with over 1600 attendees across all meetings. Over 500 questions were raised, all of which will receive replies, and all of which will be actioned where necessary. All materials and recordings from each session are available on the [MHHS website](#).

Insights and feedback have been very good, and PP believed the right people and experts joined the right sessions. PP noted nothing came up which fundamentally challenged the design, which reflects the collaborative and inclusive designed approach through the design working groups. Ultimately, the sessions were very successful, and the Programme wished to pass thanks on to all those who were involved.

### **IPA Design Assurance Update**

CB provided an overview of how assurance in general operates. This involves 'three lines of defence' and in the Programme context this consists of the Programme's internal controls, the design assurance team within the Programme, and the IPA's external assurance role. These roles must work together, but also must challenge one another.



CB believed the lines are working thus far, and this was not called out as an improvement recommendation in the recent IPA programme health check review.

Key questions and matters to consider over the next period include assessing the extent to which recommendation from the IPA have been addressed, how the approach to dissensus management is managed, how the outcomes of SEC MP162 are managed to ensure the design is accommodated, also the extent to which internal Programme design assurance activities are address in detailed design risks.

It was noted the IPA attend and observe Programme governance meetings and working groups, and sample test document quality and document integration. If the IPA become aware of any issues which they do not believe are receiving adequate attention through Programme governance mechanisms, they will raise these to the Programme.

The IPA will not undertake a full review of the design but will make a recommendation on approval of the design. Similarly, the IPA will not seek to re-open closed dissensus actions.

## **7. DAG Design Principles**

IS advised no changes were made to the principles since last discussed. The item was taken as read.

IS noted new principles relating to transition will be added in future. One principle will relate to MHHS attempting to re-use existing systems and processes where possible to minimise rework. As part of the transition design, another principle would be that in instances where throw-away change was unavoidable, they would seek to place this change within incoming roles rather than out-going roles.

The Chair confirmed these principles would need to be seen by the DAG prior to M5 approval, since they would be part of sign-off. IS agreed the principles would need to be surfaced prior to that date.

## **8. Programme Updates**

FM advised additional information was now being provided under this standing agenda item to include wider Programme updates in addition to the updates from the other Level 2/3 MHHS governance. The new additional updates include information on the Programme replan, the Programme's Collaboration Base, and the design overview sessions.

The Chair asked whether members had any questions or comments to which none were received.

## **9. Summary and Actions**

FM summarised the meeting actions.

AOB 1: CBu raised a query about constituent roles and requested information on how they work. FM advised work is underway to produce a guidance sheet for representatives, giving information on what is expected of constituency representatives. CBu clarified their question revolved around communications, noting current communications are issued to all principal contacts rather than via industry representatives. WF noted such communications are not channelled through DAG members and intentionally go to nominated principal contact to ensure they are received by each parties designated contact point. The expectation is that the evidence pack is an item that representatives are expected to discuss with their constituents.

AOB 2: The group considered whether to go ahead with the 12 October 2022 DAG, considering there is a clash with the all-day dissensus forum. The Chair believed there would be matters needing progression ahead of the M5 sign-off and this DAG would need to be moved.

CH noted the pathway to 28 October must be smoothed, so an early/mid-October DAG would be valuable.

The group the next DAG should be rescheduled. This would allow the group to discuss any matters pertinent to M5 approval ahead of 28 October 2022,

The Chair request any further AOB, to which nothing was raised.

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

### **Next meetings:**

**DAG: 14 October 2022 1pm**

**CCIAG: 22 September 2022 10am**