MHHS Design Advisory Group Minutes and Actions

Issue date: 22 September 2022

Meeting number	**DAG015**		Venue	**Virtual – MS Teams**
Date and time	**14 October 2022 10:00-13:00**		Classification	**Public**

Attendees:

Chair	Role
Fraser Mathieson (Chair)	Chair

Industry Representatives	
Craig Handford (CH)	Large Supplier Representative
Matt Hall (MH)	Elexon Representative (as central systems provider)
Neil Dewar (ND)	National Grid ESO
Patricia Parker (PPa)	Small Supplier Representative
Robert Langdon (RL)	Supplier Agent Representative
Sarah Jones (SJ)	RECCo Representative
Seth Chapman (SC)	Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent)
Stuart Scott (SS)	DCC Representative (as smart meter central system provider)

MHHS	
Claire Silk (CS)	Design Market and Engagement Lead
Jason Brogden (JB) (*part meeting*)	Industry Subject Matter Expert
Nicole Lai (NL)	PMO Governance Support
Paul Pettit (PP)	Design Assurance
Warren Fulton (WF)	Separation Lead

Other Attendees	
Andrew Grace (AG)	Large Supplier Representative (Alternate)
Colin Bezant (CB)	Independent Programme Assurance Provider
Daniel Morgan (DM)	Independent Programme Assurance Provider
Danielle Walton (DW)	Ofgem
Jenny Boothe (JBo)	Ofgem

Apologies:

Ian Smith	Design Manager
Gemma Slaney	DNO Representative

Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date
SEC MP162 Update	DAG16-01	Share Programme response to latest SEC MP162 consultation	Programme (Warren Fulton/Jason Brogden)	31/10/2022
Transition Approach	DAG16-02	Ensure responses from DAG members on MWG slides are fed to MWG	Programme (PMO)	31/10/2022
MHHS Design Status Update	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
AOB	DAG16-05	Understand what items from 9 November DAG can be discussed on 31 October DAG	Programme (Warren Fulton)	31/10/2022
Previous meeting(s)	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 confirm whether Industry Standing Data (ISD) entity values will be published as part of M5 or transition plan	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	Dec Ref	Decision
Minutes and Actions	DAG-DEC-30	Minutes of meetings held 14 September 2022 approved

RAID items discussed/raised

RAID area	Description
None:	

Minutes

1.   Welcome and Introductions

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

2.   SECMP162 Update

JB noted an update on Smart Energy Code (SEC) Modification Proposal (MP) 162 was communicated in the Programme newsletter, The Clock, on 12 October 2022. Ofgem has given separate directions to the DCC and SEC Panel to develop options for increasing systems capacity and implementing the Meter Data Retrieval (MDR) role respectively. A recent

SEC consultation closed on 13 October 2022, and the Programme have provided a response outlining that the MDR role is defined in the MHHS Target Operating Model (TOM) and is needed to enable the success of the Programme.

ACTION DAG16-01: Programme to share Programme response to latest SEC MP162 consultation

Regarding the increasing DCC capacity, JB said DCC is collecting impact assessment information from service providers and Ofgem have published a Request for Information (RFI) to licensed energy suppliers and their service providers to gather perspectives on the capacity options. This has been issued to supplier and agent PSG reps, in the hope the information would be cascaded out.

3.   Transition Approach

JB observed the success of the latest Migration Working Group (MWG) and thanked participants for their contribution. The key items from the meeting were reviewing qualitative evidence against each option for migration, then updating and amending evidence with feedback. A qualitative scoring of migration options was undertaken and reviewed with the MWG.

The Programme continue to progress evaluation of migration options. Participants have been invited to provide quantitative evidence in support of migration options. The next steps will be considered, and evidence collated for consideration by the Programme and Ofgem. If Option 3 (reverse migration) is chosen, which received the highest score in qualitative analysis, this would require a change request to alter the TOM and necessitate technical work on reverse migration. This will be discussed with the Programme Sponsor (Ofgem) and attendees have outstanding actions to support decision-making. It was noted DAG members had provided feedback also.

ACTION DAG16-02: Programme to ensure responses from DAG members on MWG slides are fed to MWG

SJ asked whether migration is still due to commence by end of 2022. JB responded the design of basic processes can be commenced, but if reverse migration was required this would take time to design and would likely extend into 2023.

CH asked what will be published from conversation with Ofgem on the options. JB will look at what can be published and noted the Independent Programme Assurance (IPA) provider will be part of the discussion.

MH raised commencing design before end of year presents Helix with some major design issues. JB responded the intention is to commence migration design from the beginning of November, providing the MHHS Design Team are available. WF believed this work would not commence from scratch; there are some existing high-level process maps, two migration processes for change of agent, and change of supplier for migration.

MH further queried the process needed for a change request if Option 3 is taken. JB replied the Programme are considering the requirements and timelines surrounding this, to avoid losing time or causing delays. If Option 3 would be raised as a Programme Change Request (CR), this will be progressed via the Change Board, agreed at Testing and Migration Advisory Group (TMAG), then issued for impact assessment. JB confirmed transition design completion would be post November. MH noted the interim plan states by end of November. SJ supported the assumption it would be end of year. MH noted this and will take away to review.

RL thanked members for the clarification on CR and commented on reverse migration, noting Systems Integration Testing (SIT) should already consider legacy systems, but there is now greater importance on this if reverse migration is being considered. JB believed this is captured under MWG and asked RL to provide a quantitative assessment of impacts to help inform evidence. JB noted the evidence base is key for decision making and the Programme will take whatever can be provided. RL did not believe agents will be proving legacy systems for testing, so it is assumed this is covered elsewhere. JB asked for a communication from RL to that effect. RL asked for immediate notice over whether agents would be required to provide anything on legacy systems.

SC noted there is design work for all options and queried which working group would look at this. WF confirmed design elements would follow the same artefact process through a BPRWG (Business Process and Requirements Working Group) subgroup and any other working groups required will be kicked off.

In terms of replan work, SC asked which option will go into the replan. JB advised the impacts of migration options on the replan were being considered. SC asked because the option chose may require another CR if it changes the timescales in the replan. JB did not believe Options 1 or 2 require a CR, and Options 3 or 4 require change to the TOM. It is difficult to be definitive now as many options are under consideration, but certainty information on migration options going into the replan would be ideal.

4.   MHHS Design Status Update

WF noted the Design Team released responses to consultation comments on 03 October 2022. Most comments were accepted, and a breakdown of comments have been issued via The Clock and in the DAG papers. The comments involved 900 questions, of which most have been worked through. All comments will have responses by 17 October 2022.

Last week, additional objection forms were received, and the Design Team are liaising with parties on these, with responses to be published 19 October 2022.

WF thanked participants for their effort and input into the consultation, and the value of the comments. The design has benefited from this from an integrity perspective, resulting in good updates to artefacts.

The Dissensus Forum was held 12 October 2022, with notes to be issued summarising the meeting. There was an agreed position on two items, one taken away to make a recommendation, and a final needing investigation and analysis. Nothing was considered to prevented baseline approval.

The M5 work-off list is being created and a draft will be issued on 19 October 2022 for industry consumption. As part of baseline decision, the Programme will provide a plan to resolve items on the work off list and these will be timebound.

On 17 October 2022, all updated artefacts and a change control log will be issued.

Significant feedback was received on the interface catalogue, which, along with three technical design documents, will not be issued on 17 October 2022. These documents will issue by 24 October 2022 at latest, and drop-in sessions will be provided to answer any questions on these documents.

The BPRWG and Technical Design Working Group (TDWG) assurance forums will be pushed back by a week, to allow more time to digest updated artefacts. They will be held on 27 and 28 October 2022.

DW raised it is key for Ofgem that the design is fit for purpose and is robust. They asked how any omissions will be addressed and what the process would be. If it is a work-off plan, they queried if deadlines and dependencies would be included. WF responded the work-off plan will be a condition of the baseline approval. The baseline is a snapshot of the design as it is and is used as a reference point; this maintains control and governance around it. The work-off plan would be change controlled, and DAG would be the oversight body for this. The work-off plan will be for items relating to the baseline, which require resolution but do not prevent approval of the baseline. It will be a closed list and new additions will not be allowed after the baseline is approved, otherwise it becomes a change control process. A robust post-M5 change control process will be put in place to manager matters arising after the design is baselined which may require assessment, development, or change to the design. Previous experience in other large scale programmes indicates there are likely to be a significant volume of minor changes which arise as design, build, and test (DBT) progresses. The Programme will ensure a transparent and effective post-M5 change process in place, and this will be communicated in due course.

Regarding consultation comments, PPa raised systems providers do not feel they have received same level of attention from the Programme, noting the Design Team have offered discussions with parties but all comments are not necessarily resolved. WF advised all commenting parties would be offered a bilateral and committed to having these discussions concluded ahead of the issuance of the work-off plan. CH wondered if a note is required to parties to advise this is case. CS replied communications will be issued, which will reiterate all responses go out on 17 October 2022 and work-off on 19 October 2022.

ACTION DAG16-03: Programme to issue comms to parties on when the design baseline work-off list will be published

PPa asked whether the business process diagram clarifications are sufficient to close off parties' comments. CS advised the Design Team are working through the clarification responses, but the substantive issues and potential changes were prioritised. CS advised there is an awareness that responses to clarifications may require additional clarifications or even clarifications within artefacts. CS noted several respondents who were not involved in developing the design have asked for clarifications on matters which would have been apparent had they been involved in the development of the design. The Programme are seeking to identify how to explain these items efficiently, such as directing parties to the design playback recordings. PPa appreciated the level of effort gone into this.

PPa noted the clarification log is not always clear about whether updates have been made and whether further updates are necessary. CS advised the Design Team are updating the clarifications log, and this should be complete by 17 October 2022, and issued with comments responses. If anything changes, the Programme will communicate this out. However, CS believes there will be a stable view of the responses by the publishing date, and any changes will be published in the documents, and the responses will crystalise by then.

SJ wished to understand the process for identifying what will be added to the work-off plan. They raised concern over lack of response to RECCo's comments on retail arrangements pertaining to design and build. SJ asked whether it will be clear which items are for work-off and not. WF advised whilst there is not a specific criteria for work-off, factors include whether there is a need for subgroup discussions or other discussions. In terms of certain RECCo comments raised, WF noted these were provided last week and would receive a response. SJ replied the comments highlight the matters important to party systems, such as Data Transfer Network (DTN) data flow questions.

CS advised the design focus has been on clarification questions and updating artefacts. All outstanding questions and feedback over the last week will be reviewed and the Programme will reach out to all participants who have expressed concerns. The Programme will then discuss whether the matters raised impact the baseline decision. CS apologised to those who have not yet received full responses, noting the majority had now received responses and explaining the finite resource available meant some were still due to receive contact. SJ expressed approval of the process but noted there are things not critical to deliver of MHHS which may be necessary for parties to be comfortable DBT can commence, and these could get in way of baseline approval.

Regarding objection resolution, SC believed a resolution by 19 October 2022 was ambitions, and asked how these may affect the artefacts issued on 17 October 2022 and the work-off list. WF confirmed all objections and comments have been reviewed, the remaining work is to confirm outcomes with parties.

SC expressed concern over how all objections and further comments would be resolved if bilateral meetings are not yet scheduled. SC asked whether parties could object to objection responses and how these would be managed. WF confirmed parties can provide further information or objection on responses, and these would go into the BPRWG/TDWG assurance meetings. WF welcomed parties to raise anything in addition to matters already raised with the Programme and noted the BPRWG assurance forum would be a sweeper meeting to catch these. Parties are also entitled to raise objections and concerns with the IPA and Ofgem.

SC noted some objections from them are 'deal breakers' but they are yet to receive contact. WF advised they would ensure contact and discussion next week. SC asked what the outcomes may be, given the design artefacts will have already been republished. CS responded the publication of artefacts on 17 October 2022 will be about giving people as much time as possible to digest clean versions of the artefacts following changes arising from the consultation. If any objections are upheld, the artefacts could be re-released prior to the DAG decision point on 31 October 2022.

SC asked how parties would know for whether the artefacts are final. WF responded there is the work-off plan; any objections next week will either go into the work-off plan or result in a direct update to the artefacts, which would be re-issued. WF noted the importance of baselining to create a reference point for future development and enable participants to commence DBT. There will be some elements which will continue to evolve and managed through post-M5 change process. SC highlighted parties will need to commence build from the design. WF noted the risk of parties seeking to raise changes having not engaged in the development previously, which is a key driver to get baselined and crystalise the initial operating model, which can then provide the basis of further analysis and a reference point for parties who were not active in the development process. SC added a further comment from constituents on the number of changes to the artefacts following the consultation, noting the changes are positive, but there are concerns over the time available to review. WF noted a change control log is being published to enable review of changes to artefacts and traceability to consultation comment, but believed the short timeframes are one of the unavoidable factors in turning around complexity and managing a timeline.

CB picked up on SC's point about how parties can review the level of change, as well as what ends up on the work-off list and whether there could be issues with how comfortable parties can be with sign off. WF reiterated the methods to ensure governance and transparency in the lead up to 31 October 2022 and highlighted the significant journey the design artefact had been on in terms of development by industry experts, consultation, and issues resolution.

SJ raised the overall M5 baseline has not just been a product of the working groups and wanted to ensure actions on the Programme from other groups, like the Consequential Change Impact Assessment Group (CCIAG), have been considered as part of the potential changes, noting SSC and import/export. CS noted this is captured on the work-off list and will be cross-referenced with the CCIAG list.

ACTION DAG16-04: Programme to cross-reference CCIAG items with work-off plan to ensure any items still needing consideration/action are captured

CH highlighted the importance of ensuring the work-off plan is robust, and parties are comfortable the work-off plan addresses any outstanding items not resolved via comment responses. They noted constituents are eager to see the work-off plan and republished artefacts, stressing the importance of providing comfort and resolving any outstanding

issues. WF noted the work-off plan will be a condition of the baseline decision. CH asked whether there will be anything published on the previous tranche review issues resolution, so parties can be comforted these conditional approval items are resolved. CS noted this was recorded within the Design Artefact Tracker and issues log, and the resolutions recorded for each matter.

RL sought clarification that once artefacts are published on 17 October 2022, any comments still to be addressed could change the artefacts, resulting in another version of the artefacts required. They wished to confirm whether these could change. WF advised documents are to be issued and not changed, but caveats that if anything fundamental comes up that is critical to M5, this may need to happen but was unlikely given the robust process of consultation, Programme response, review, and objection. If a matter is not critical to approval of M5 but accepted as requiring change (e.g. to ensure clarity), it will be added to the work-off and timebound for resolution. RL noted if this does happen, however unlikely, it will require immediate communication to parties as will affect their review of the artefacts. WF noted the BPRWG assurance sessions will be a final sweep of the work-off plan and any items which affect baseline and communications will be issued immediately if any matter of significance arise.

5.   M5 Decision Process

WF advised a report will be provided for the 31 October 2022 DAG meeting, structured against the success criteria, and providing evidence of the robust design development process, evidence of completeness, and information on how the success criteria have been met. The Chair requested an indication of the number of in person attendees for the next DAG, to which nine members confirmed attendance in person.

Regarding DAG success criteria number six (*"[w]e believe the Design is defined appropriately to allow Code drafting to reflect the design without further design debate or further clarifications"),* SJ believed this was a big ask, particularly the wording around "*without further design debate of further clarifications"* noting there may be some further debate and discussions required on certain matters of consequential change. WF noted the code drafting prototyping exercise had demonstrated it was possible to draft code legal text based on the design artefacts without the need for further debate or clarification. Whilst there may be matters of consequential change requiring addressment, the criteria can be met in terms the published artefacts being fit for translation into code without further design work.

MH was unsure whether all success criteria would be met by 31 October 2022 and asked whether this would be recorded in the meeting along with a plan for mitigation if any criteria are not met. WF confirmed an acceptance report will be published to outline how the criteria have been met, any blockers, and any remedial actions.

RL queried if the participants undertaking the code-drafting review would provide their views into DAG. WF confirmed their views were fed into the Cross-Code Advisory Group (CCAG) and a report had been prepared. It was noted the report communicates the prototyping exercise did identify and matters preventing baselining.

SJ advised the prototyping had a somewhat limited scope but had shown code drafting could be undertaken based on the design artefact. However, there are clarifications and questions arising from prototyping, and as such SJ did not believe it should not be wholly relied upon to discharge DAG success criteria six.

SJ noted, fundamentally, artefacts could be taken into drafting. Concerns around drafting are being progressed through the governance process, but there were no issues with translating design into drafting. SJ raised there were gaps on the REC side regarding which CCIAG items, and potential changes to drafting requirements, to include in the change being drafted via the CCAG. The Chair noted this was part of discussions between the Programme and RECCo and was part of the Programme's code workstream with regard to what consequential change items would be brought into the centrally coordinated code drafting via CCAG.

Regarding SJ's point, SC asked if the CCAG report would look at these types of issues. WF confirmed this would be published as part of the DAG success criteria evidence

6.   DAG Design Principles

The Design Team have started crafting an additional design principle related to transition, and more information will be circulated for review once it is completed.

SJ expressed their struggle with Principle 12 (*"[d]esign will be articulated with sufficient breadth and detail required to enable regulatory code drafting in addition to enabling Service Design, Build, Test & Operate"),* noting there are two different questions to consider around code drafting; whether design artefacts can be translated into the code, and whether it is possible to deliver all the changes needed to the code to deliver MHHS. SJ noted RECCo's concerns lie with the latter question. There are elements of the design which result in a need for consequential changes, which, whilst

not critical to the delivery of the MHHS TOM, could prevent code drafting and system development for participants. It was noted this concern is very similar to the concern regarding DAG M5 success criteria six. SJ hoped to have conversations with the Programme around these concerns, and the Programme advised conversations would be held ahead of the Dag on 31 October 2022.

7.   MHHS Design Assurance Summary

PP advised the SI Design Assurance Team had noted 27 observations, which are both positive items and items which have needed to be resolved by the MHHS Programme's Senior Responsible Owner (SRO) and Design Team. PP advised engagement has been effective with programme participants throughout development of the artefacts.

PP noted there are always opportunities to improve, with some actions recommended to reduce risk of ambiguity or interpretation affect commencement of participant DBT. Overall, there was nothing noted as preventing approval of the design baseline, and the design artefacts were capable of approval. The full assurance report will be published on 24 October 2022 for parties to review ahead of DAG on 31 October.

PP provided an overview of SI design assurance observations, noting some items were in discussion with the SRO and most observations were tracking down in terms of impact and resolution effort.

CB provided IPA updates, noting they were most of the way through the latest tranche of assurance review. They have sought to ensure all comments are resolved and any objections appropriately dealt with. There has been some work on raising of comments, Programme response to comments, and whether any items rated lower by Programme demonstrate any systematic bias or a steer toward a desired outcome. CB advised there was no evidence of bias in the design consultation responses, and the Programme have responded effectively thus far.

8.   Minutes and Actions

The minutes of the DAG held 14 September was approved with no comments.

The Chair provided an overview of the outstanding actions:

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

IS was unavailable and therefore could not provide an update. WF agreed to provide a written response to DAG on the position.

Action ongoing.

ACTION DAG11-08: Ensure Programme risk relating to SEC MP162 covers any governance implications for MHHS and Codes

There are eleven items now in RAID on the governance implications of SEC MP162, including multiple risks and dependencies.

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

WF will add the risk to the design log.

Action ongoing.

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

Action retained until timings are noted at CCAG on 26 October.

Action ongoing.

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

The design assurance observations will be issued with the next DAG papers on 24 October 2022. For updates on iServer, please see the response to ACTION DAG14-01 below.

Action closed.

ACTION DAG14-01: Programme to provide information on timeline for iServer implementation (see also ACTION DAG13-12)

The Enduring Design Hub will now be rolled out after baseline, as updating is necessary post-baseline. Action retained to track the implementation of iServer.

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

Members noted entity values will come post-M5. Role codes are slated to be part of M5 but may be part of the work-off plan due to dissensus. Further information will be provided for clarification.

Action ongoing.

ACTION 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)

It was noted these items were now under discussion at the CCIAG, with information provided by RECCo.

Action closed.

ACTION DAG15-01: Issue slides presented to MWG on transition approach to DAG for comment (see ACTION DAG15-02)

The slides on transition approach were issued with the DAG0014 minutes.

Action closed.

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

Comments from RECCo and the Small Supplier Representative had been received. Further comments were welcomed.

Action closed

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

Updates will be provided by the next meeting. The Programme position will be issued if it is relevant to design baseline.

Action ongoing.

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

Invites have been issued to participants.

Action closed.

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

Further information will be provided as part of M5 evidence pack on 24 October 2022.

Action ongoing.

9.   CCIAG Progress Update

The Chair provided an overview of the CCIAG process and shared the dashboard of industry change. The conclusions of CCIAG items will be recorded in the Consequential Change Log. It was noted there were no issues raised at CCIAG thus far which require fundamental changes to design artefacts. SC noted the section on magnitude of the items under discussion at the CCIAG was not particularly informative and of the 23 items raised to CCIAG none had yet been resolved. The Chair responded that work should be undertaken to improve the view of the magnitude of items, and that the discussion matters were still under consideration as to their resolution, but it was likely several would be resolved in the near future and the metrics within the dashboard would track accordingly.

10.   Programme Updates

The Chair provided an overview of updates for other MHHS governance groups and the wider Programme.

The Programme re-plan is progressing and the Round 3 consultation, which will provide detailed dates and other information, is due soon.

It was noted code drafting under CCAG is being further defined. Subject to M5 being approved, preparations for the commencement of M6 delivery (drafting of code changes) is due in November 2022. This is anticipated to be a 12–13-month process, with the aim of completion in January 2024 for implementation later in that year.

11.   Summary and Actions

The Chair summarised the meeting actions as per the table above.

RL queried the agenda for DAG on 09 November DAG, considering the turnaround after the 31 October 2022 meeting. CS advised the meeting date for 09 October 2022 would be reviewed. The Chair noted a discussion will be had on the future of DAG post-M5 and agreed to consider what items may come to the November DAG could be covered in the 31 October 2022 face to face DAG.

> **ACTION DAG16-04: Programme to understand what items from 09 November 2022 DAG can be discussed at 31 October 2022 DAG**

12.   AOB

The Chair invited any other business, to which five matters were raised.

AOB 1

SC requested confirmation on whether the definition of baselining was baselining of the design artefacts. WF confirmed, noting baselining concerns the latest version of the artefacts and the work-off plan and any matters requiring change after the baseline is approved would require a Programme CR.

AOB 2

In the lead up to 31 October 2022, WF requested members to send any major concerns, or items that need raising, directly to the Programme via PMO@mhhsprogramme.co.uk, to avoid new matters being raised at the DAG were a decision on baselining will be requested.

AOB 3

The Chair asked DAG members whether there were any salient matters pertaining to their willingness to approve the design baseline on 31 October 2022 which they would like to raise now, and thereby enable an opportunity to address these in as far as is possible ahead of the next DAG.

The group raised several concerns on baselining. RL raised that SEC MP162 could cause issues if the MDR role is delayed. MH expressed concern about the sizeable volume of the work-off list, as there is a risk that the design documents have not been updated properly after the comment review, which would only provide a short timeframe to resolve any issues. CB noted this on the radar for the IPA for assurance ahead of the reporting.

AOB 4

Regarding the technical specifications not due to be issued with the updated design artefacts on 17 October 2022 (see *MHHS Design Status Update* above), MH sought clarification on which documents would not be issued. CS advised the physical interface specifications are dependent on the interface catalogue were therefore not ready for issuance. Other documents not being issued include the Operational Choreography and certain technical and security artefacts. The vast majority of other artefacts will be available on 17 October 2022, and a communication will be issued to alert members when these are available.

AOB 5

SC requested, with the previous approval of the Tranche 1 design artefacts in mind, whether the Programme could elucidate how a final decision will be made on 31 October 2022, particularly in the case of non-consensus. This will ensure no difference of opinion and should be set out at the start of the meeting. The Chair committed to incorporating this into the agenda, noting the pack, which goes out on 24 October 2022, will include information on the question which will be asked of DAG constituency representatives in the lead in toward the approval decision. Information will also be provided from the DAG Terms of Reference (ToR) and Programme governance framework also.

The Chair thanked members for the significant contributions over the previous months, and praised the collegiate approach taken in the development and refinement of a complex design within rigorous timeframes.

The Chair requested any further items of AOB, to which none were raised. The Chair thanked members again and closed the meeting.

Next meetings:

DAG: 31 October 2022 10am

CCIAG: 10 November 2022 1pm