

## MHHS Design Advisory Group (DAG) Headline Report

Issue date: 17/10/2022

Meeting Number **DAG016**

Venue **Virtual – MS Teams**

Meeting Date and Time **14 October 2022 13:00-16:00**

Classification **Public**

### Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date
<b>SEC MP162 Update</b>	DAG16-01	Share Programme response to latest SEC MP162 consultation	Programme (Warren Fulton/Jason Brogden)	31/10/2022
<b>Transition Approach</b>	DAG16-02	Ensure responses from DAG members on MWG slides are fed to MWG	Programme (PMO)	31/10/2022
<b>MHHS Design Status Update</b>	DAG16-03	Issue comms to parties on when the design baseline work-off list will be published	Programme (Claire Smith)	31/10/2022
	DAG16-04	Cross-reference CCIAG items with work-off plan to ensure any items still needing consideration/action are captured	Programme (Claire Smith)	31/10/2022
<b>AOB</b>	DAG16-05	Understand what items from 9 November DAG can be discussed on 31 October DAG	Programme (Warren Fulton)	31/10/2022
<b>Previous meeting(s)</b>	DAG06-01	Review alignment between related MPAN modifications and design subgroup	Programme (Ian Smith)	17/08/2022
	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
	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
	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)	14/10/2022

	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
--	----------	---	-------------	------------

## Decisions

Area		
Minutes and Actions	DAG-DEC-30	Minutes of meetings held 14 September 2022 approved

## RAID Items Discussed

RAID area	Description
	None: RAID reviewed, and no specific item raised by DAG for discussion.

## Key Discussion Items

Area	Discussion
<b>SEC MP162 Update</b>	<p>An update on <a href="#">Smart Energy Code (SEC) Modification Proposal (MP) 162</a> was communicated in the Programme newsletter, The Clock, on 12 October 2022. It was explained that Ofgem had directed the SEC Panel to work up options for the inclusion of the MHHS Meter Data Retrieval (MDR) role within the SEC. Similarly, Ofgem have directed the Data Communications Company (DCC) to develop options for the systems capacity increases needed to accommodate MHHS.</p> <p>The SEC Change Board's consultation on the options developed closed 13 October 2022. The Programme response was that the MDR role is needed for the MHHS Target Operating Model (TOM), and the SEC Code Administrator will likely bring consultation responses to a SEC working group (WG) for discussion. This response will be published.</p> <p>Regarding DCC capacity, Ofgem have published a <a href="#">Request for Information</a> (RFI) to obtain supplier views on the capacity options. The deadline for responses is 28 October 2022.</p>
<b>Transition Approach</b>	<p>The Design Team continue to progress the evaluation of migration options. Participants were invited to provide quantitative evidence to support the migration options choice as part of ongoing <b>ACTION DAG15-02</b> (see above). The evidence provided will be collated and discussed with the Programme Sponsor (Ofgem).</p> <p>If Option 3 is chosen, this would require a formal Programme Change Request to alter the TOM and technical work to develop reverse migration capability.</p>
<b>MHHS Design Status Update</b>	<p><b>Comment Responses</b></p> <p>The Design Team issued responses to comments on 03 October. Most comments were accepted, and a breakdown was issued via The Clock and DAG meeting papers. Over 3,100 comments were received, including 900 questions or matters requiring clarification with respondents, of which the majority have been resolved. Responses to all comments will be published on 17 October 2022. Additional objection forms were received last week. The Design Team are liaising with industry parties to resolve any objections and further information will be published on 19 October 2022 with the M5 work-off list. Any further objections received will be discussed at the BPRWG and Technical Design Working Group (TDWG) assurance forums, to be held 27 October 2022.</p>

	<p>One attendee advised they were yet to receive a response to their comments/objections. The Independent Programme Assurance (IPA) representative raised feedback from system providers who feel they have not received the same level of attention from the Programme as other parties. The Programme advised responses will be provided to all comments and objections by 19 October 2022.</p> <p><b>Dissensus Forum</b></p> <p>The Design Dissensus Forum was held 12 October 2022. In the forum, positions were agreed on two items, with one item taken away for the Programme to make a recommendation, and the final item requiring investigation and analysis. There were no issues raised that prevent baseline approval.</p> <p><b>Updated Artefacts and Work-Off Plan</b></p> <p>A work-off list is being created and a draft will be issued on 19 October 2022. The Programme will provide a plan to resolve items on the work-off list as part of the information to support the baseline decision.</p> <p>All updated artefacts, as well as the change control log, will be issued on 17 October 2022. There has been significant feedback on the interface catalogue. This artefact, as well as three technical design documents, will be issued on 24 October 2022 at the latest.</p> <p>The BPRWG and TDWG assurance forums will be rescheduled by one week to allow more time to digest the updated artefacts.</p> <p>The Ofgem representative noted it was key to ensure the design is fit for purpose and queried how items on the work-off list would be addressed. The Programme responded the work-off plan will be a condition of the baseline approval, and will include specific, timebound items.</p> <p>Th group discussed the risk of parties seeking to raise changes having not previously engaged in development, the role of the change control log in enabling the review of changes to artefacts, and the unavoidably short timeframes for reviewing the updated artefacts. One participant believed it was necessary to consider items currently under discussion at the Consequential Change Impact Assessment Group (CCIAG) for inclusion in the work-off list (e.g. SSC and meter import/export).</p> <p>The Design Market and Engagement Lead highlighted the importance of ensuring the work-off plan is robust and addresses any items not resolved by the comment responses. It was noted the key difference between items of potential minor change on the work-off list and those not, are that a Programme CR will not be required to resolve items on the work-off list. The work-off list and resolution plan will form part of the evidence pack issued to DAG to support a decision on approval of the design baseline.</p>
<p><b>M5 Decision Process</b></p>	<p>The Programme advised the evidence pack issued to the DAG to support a decision on whether to approve the design baseline will include information on how the DAG's M5 acceptance criteria have been met.</p> <p>The group discussed potential challenges in meeting certain aspects of the acceptance criteria given the work-off list and matters under discussion at the CCIAG. The Programme advised an acceptance report will be published by 24 October 2022 detailing how the criteria have been met, and any potential blockers.</p> <p>The RECCo representative noted the recent code-drafting prototyping exercise undertaken which sought to demonstrate the design artefacts are sufficient to enable the drafting of code legal text. The representative advised the exercise had not identified any matters which may prevent baselining of the MHHS design.</p>
<p><b>MHHS Design Assurance Summary</b></p>	<p>The MHHS Design Assurance Team provided an overview of design assurance activities to date. A total of 27 observations have been recorded. The TOM is deemed an acceptable level of quality and capable of implementation. The Programme has demonstrated effective engagement and responsiveness to participants throughout artefact development. There are opportunities to improve the quality of design content and recommendations</p>

	<p>will seek to minimise the need to change the artefacts. The assurance report will be distributed to participants on 24 October 2022 for parties to review ahead of DAG on 31 October 2022.</p> <p>The IPA representative noted the current tranche of assurance to ensure all comments are resolved and objections appropriately dealt with. The IPA advised there reviews have found no indication of any systematic bias in the treatment of design consultation comments by the Programme.</p>
<b>AOB</b>	<p>In the lead up to 31 October 2022, DAG members are encouraged to send any unaddressed to concerns directly to <a href="mailto:Warren.Fulton@mhhsprogramme.co.uk">Warren.Fulton@mhhsprogramme.co.uk</a> and <a href="mailto:PMO@mhhsprogramme.co.uk">PMO@mhhsprogramme.co.uk</a>.</p> <p>The Programme noted engagement was ongoing around SEC MP162, and any indications there may be impacts on the MHHS TOM would be raised immediately to the DAG.</p> <p>One attendee expressed concern around the size of the work-off list. There is a risk the design documents have not been updated properly after the comment review, which would only provide a short timeframe to resolve any issues. The IPA representative noted this was on their radar for assurance activity.</p>

**Date of next DAG: 31 October 2022**

**Date of next CCIAG: TBC**