

MHHS Design Advisory Group Minutes and Actions

Issue date: 16 November 2022

Meeting number **DAG018**

Venue **Virtual – MS Teams**

Date and time **9 November 2022 10:00-17:00**

Classification **Public**

Attendees:

Chair

Justin Andrews (Chair)

Role

Chair

Industry Representatives

Andrew Grace (AG)

Large Supplier Representative

Carolyn Burns (CBu)

Small Supplier Representative

Donna Jamieson (DJ)

iDNO Representative

Gareth Evans (GE)

I&C Supplier Representative

Gemma Slaney (GS)

DNO Representative

Matt Hall (MH)

Elexon Representative (as central systems provider)

Neil Dewar (ND)

National Grid ESO

Sarah Jones (SJ)

RECCo Representative

Seth Chapman (SC)

Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent)

Stuart Draper (SD) on behalf of Robert Langdon

Supplier Agent Representative

Stuart Scott (SS)

DCC Representative (as smart meter central system provider)

Vladimir Black (VB)

Medium Supplier Representative

MHHS

Claire Silk (CS)

Design Market and Engagement Lead

Fraser Mathieson (FM)

PMO Governance Lead

Ian Smith (IS)

Design Manager

Nicole Lai (NL)

PMO Governance Support

Paul Pettit (PP)

Design Assurance

Warren Fulton (WF)

Design Project Manager

Other Attendees

Colin Bezant (CB)

Independent Programme Assurance Provider

Danielle Walton (DW)

Ofgem

Apologies

Robert Langdon

Supplier Agent Representative

Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date
Minutes and Actions	DAG18-01	Chair to provide information on how Performance Assurance requirements manifest in the Design Artefacts	Programme (Design Team)	14/12/2022
Work-Off Plan Updates	DAG18-02	Programme to update the Work-Off Plan to reflect the inclusion of DTN definitions in Programme activities	Programme (Warren Fulton)	14/12/2022
	DAG18-03	SC and SJ to provide any comments on potential additional detail or clarifications on expected actions for work-off items to the MHHS Design Team (design@mhhsprogramme.co.uk) to enable updates to the Work-Off Plan	Supplier Agent Representative (Seth Chapman) & RECCo Representative (Sarah Jones)	16/11/2022
	DAG18-04	Programme to issue updated Work-Off Plan to DAG with any changes highlighted	Programme (Warren Fulton)	16/11/2022
	DAG18-05	Programme to publish the static list of baselined docs with the DAG minutes	Programme (Claire Silk)	16/11/2022
	DAG18-06	Programme to provide clarity of the scope of transition planning groups	Programme (Design Team)	14/12/2022
	Previous Meeting(s)	DAG13-09	Confirm approach and timescales for performance assurance requirements work and share with the BSC and REC representatives ahead of the next meeting	TMAG Chair
	DAG14-01	Programme to provide information on timeline for iServer implementation (see also ACTION DAG13-12)	Programme (Paul Pettit)	07/09/2022
	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)	14/10/2022
	DAG17-02	Chair to review the DAG Terms of Reference to ensure there is clarity over the role of DAG post-M5.	Chair	14/12/2022
	DAG17-09	Programme to update M5 Design Baseline Report to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add new section to report on discussion and outcomes from DAG review/decision Add comments to clarify any sections where there are subsequent updates or where future tense is used Update Section 2 MHHS Recommendations as required in view of updates made to other sections Expand Section 2, subsection 2.4, to include reference to 'consequences of baselining' in addition to the existing wording on the consequences of not baselining and reflect wording in 2.1 	Programme (Warren Fulton)	09/11/2022

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 4: Add wording that it is out of scope for M5 baseline design decision (but not MHHS Design) Section 4 Add Performance assurance and disputes Clarification in Section 5 that all work-off items which result in changes to design artefacts will be subject to change control Updates to Section 5, point 4, to reference iServer updates Update Section 7 to ensure clarity the report is the Programme's recommendation to DAG, rather than the DAG's view on approval of the baseline Update Section 7, Criteria 3, to explain the detail of how this requirement is met Update Section 7, Criteria 4, to clarify there are no severity one or two items and that severity is not recorded in the Work-Off Plan Reword Section 7, Criteria 4, to note there is nothing preventing baselining of the design Criteria 5 note DAG wish to see Design Change management process Add additional wording to Section 7, Criteria 9, regarding how notice on the progression of work-off items will be managed (e.g. updates to PSG, fortnightly reporting, updates to the Work-Off Plan, and how notices to participants will be managed) <p>Add note/link to Section 7, Criteria 9, to Appendix 2 – <i>Post M5 MHHS Design Participant support process</i></p>		
	DAG17-11	Programme to ensure work-off items which impact code drafting are prioritised and request the Code Drafting Project Manager reviews this.	Programme (PMO)	09/11/2022
	DAG17-12	Programme to make the Programme Party Coordinator (PPC) Team aware of potential impacts of Work-Off Plan items on the information provided by participants for Readiness Assessment 2.	Programme (PMO)	09/11/2022

Decisions

Area	Dec Ref	Decision
Work-Off Plan Updates	DAG-DEC-33	The DAG majority approved to proceed with a shorter review cycle for the transition design artefacts

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. Minutes and Actions

DAG members were given until close of business 14 November 2022 to provide any comments to the minutes from the DAG held 31 October 2022.

FM provided an overview of the outstanding actions:

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

FM confirmed the risk had been added to the RAID log under risk R312.

Action closed.

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 did not have any updates to provide. FM noted the CCAG are looking at qualification requirements, but not performance requirements more broadly. SJ noted a performance assurance working group (PWG) had been established by Elexon, with expectations on how it will fit into CCAG drafting. It was agreed the new owner of this action would be the Testing and Migration Advisory Group (TMAG) Chair, as performance assurance should be led by the appropriate experts and factor in work by the Programme.

SC noted this action is focused on DAG achieving clarity on what is being delivered under the Programme to inform Performance Assurance design. The Chair agreed to determine how this will manifest through design artefacts.

ACTION DAG18-01: Chair to provide information on how Performance Assurance requirements manifest in the Design Artefacts

Action ongoing.

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

PP noted the timeline for implementation will need to be aligned with the Work-Off Plan activities.

Action ongoing.

ACTION DAG17-01: Programme to add the completion of the Work-Off Plan to the RAID Log as a Programme risk against delivery of M9

FM confirmed the risk had been added to the RAID log under risk R313.

Action closed.

ACTION DAG17-02: Chair to review the DAG Terms of Reference to ensure there is clarity over the role of DAG post-M5

FM noted an update would be provided in the December DAG.

Action ongoing.

ACTION DAG17-03: Programme to add resolution schedule to Work-Off Plan and issue to DAG no later than 04 November 2022

FM noted the Work-Off Plan had been issued and would be discussed later in the meeting.

Action closed.

ACTION DAG17-04: DAG Members to provide any high priority items or critical dates for inclusion within the Work-Off Plan resolution schedule (information to include the work-off ID, the required dates, and resolution requirements)

FM noted the deadline had passed, with high priority items provided.

Action closed.

ACTION DAG17-05: Programme to publish Clarifications Log for review by DAG

SJ noted the clarification log should be reviewed prior to sending. CS noted changes had been made to the live, published clarifications log and the [link](#) would be distributed along with the DAG Headline Report.

Action closed.

ACTION DAG17-06: Programme to present post-M5 design change management approach at DAG on 09 November 2022

FM noted this would be discussed later in the meeting.

Action closed.

ACTION DAG17-07: Programme to issue joining information to DAG Members for post-M5 change management overview webinar, to be held 17 November 2022

FM noted invites had been issued by the Programme.

Action closed.

ACTION DAG17-08: Programme to provide information on transition plan and timelines to DAG on 09 November 2022

WF noted this point would be covered in the Work-Off Plan agenda item.

Action closed.

ACTION DAG17-09: Programme to update M5 Design Baseline Report to include additions agreed at DAG 31 October

FM noted the report would be issued for review over the coming weeks, to be discussed in the December DAG.

Action ongoing.

ACTION DAG17-10: Programme to indicate on Work-Off Plan whether work-off items are likely to require a Programme Change Request

FM noted the updated Work-Off Plan had been issued and would be discussed in the post-M5 design change management agenda item.

Action closed.

ACTION DAG17-11: Programme to ensure work-off items which may impact code drafting are prioritised and request the Code Drafting Project Manager reviews this

FM noted an update would be provided in the next DAG and PMO work is underway.

Action ongoing.

Regarding 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

SJ believed there was still not a clear view from the Programme on whether MPRS and EES are considered central systems. GS noted central systems is a defined term under the Programme and clarity is needed on whether MPRS comes under that definition. It was agreed the action would be re-added to the DAG actions table and outcome should be provided at the next DAG.

Action ongoing.

3. Programme Updates

FM provided an overview of key updates from governance groups and the wider Programme.

Regarding the PSG updates, the DAG noted that Round 3 of the Programme replan consultation had been deferred. The Chair requested the PMO to issue the [PSG Headline Report](#) to the DAG, noting it outlines the PSG approved M3.

FM noted a Systems Integration Test Working Group (SITWG) will be mobilised in December, with meetings to take place on the first Thursday of each month in the afternoon. DAG members interested in attending the SITWG were encouraged to contact PMO@mhhsprogramme.co.uk.

The group noted items raised at the CCIAG, which are now present on the Work-Off Plan no longer require discussion/progression via the CCIAG.

SJ believed the CDWG Sprint 2 Prototyping exercise for code drafting will likely highlight further items for discussion at CCIAG.

4. Work-Off Plan Updates

DW stressed the importance of understanding the priorities within the Work-Off Plan and any risks that might affect the resolution activities and schedule. They believed the resolution deadlines should be reasonable and urged all participants to voice any concerns over deadlines. CB agreed, noting the Work-Off Plan is clear, and is clearly owned by DAG.

WF provided an overview of operations around the updated Work-Off Plan. WF encouraged participants to attend working groups, noting PMO would be attending to ensure decisions and actions are recorded. It was noted CS would issue an invite to the Business Process and Requirements Working Group (BPRWG) and Technical Design Working Group (TDWG) members, with themed discussion items to be communicated so Programme participants can decide which sessions to attend. Once the BPRWG and TDWG work-off subgroup schedule is confirmed, this will be recorded in the Work-Off Plan.

MH raised a query on delegation of authority and whether DAG discussion/approval would be required. WF replied they do not want any further discussions coming out of the subgroups, and the Chair added the groups should provide a clear recommendation for the DAG to approve. Any dissensus would be noted and raised to DAG as part of the approval process for the work-off items.

SJ raised if the Programme agreed the definition of DTN messages will be delivered and the Work-Off Plan updated to reflect the plan to delivering that. IS agreed it will sit under Programme design and governance. The Programme wanted to review the work already done by RECCo and BSCCo and include this in the design artefacts.

ACTION DAG18-02: Programme to update the Work-Off Plan to reflect the inclusion of DTN definitions in Programme activities

WF provided confirmation that the Work-Off Plan is a living document: the Programme will report regularly to the DAG on progress, and the Work-Off Plan will be used to show the Programme's progress towards the resolution of items.

SC noted they would like to see the Work-Off Plan baselined. The Chair noted this was part of the approval today at DAG

SC queried the placement of DTN role codes in the work-off list (D34) and noted the difference from its source. SC raised concern around change to the scope of requirements if the wording of work-off items does not reflect the original ask. WF noted the traceability for items stems from the process of bringing in the original objection linked to the work-off item, noting the original objection holds the detail. Any DAG members with comments on detail, e.g., to amend the wording of work-off items, were encouraged to feedback to the Design team

ACTION DAG18-03: SC and SJ to provide any comments on potential additional detail or clarifications on expected actions for work-off items to the MHHS Design Team (design@mhhsprogramme.co.uk) to enable updates to the Work-Off Plan

MH thanked the Design Team for listening to Programme participants' feedback on prioritisation but noted some items will not be resolved as quickly as they were hoping. While this is a PSG point, rather than a DAG point, MH noted this puts their delivery at risk, as they are working towards unknown requirements. WF acknowledged MH's concern, noting the efforts of the Design team and awareness this is a risk they were going to have. WF offered support, and MH noted the positive feedback from their constituency on sessions with WF.

SC sought clarity that the final version of the Work-Off Plan will be redlined against the current version. WF confirmed.

ACTION DAG18-04: Programme to issue updated Work-Off Plan to DAG with any changes highlighted

The Chair queried if it would be the exception, rather than the rule, that there would be multiple versions of the Work-Off Plan. WF confirmed.

WF noted their greatest concern is that consensus will not be achieved, resulting in extended timelines to deliver, therefore the subgroups are critical. DW acknowledged the Design team's clear reliance on subgroups and Programme Participants should focus on these groups to deliver as much as possible. DW noted the Design Team need to make clear when their resources are stretched and what they can achieve.

CS noted the [Design Artefact Tracker](#) had been updated with baseline version numbers (Version 4.0). A static list of the baselined Design Artefacts, with their version numbers at the time of baseline, will be published along with the DAG minutes.

ACTION DAG18-05: Programme to publish the static list of baselined docs with the DAG minutes

Transition discussion

WF invited the DAG to decide on the process for transition design review, summarising the two possible approaches below:

1. Continue with the traditional schedule of two review cycles: issuing out the artefacts for comments, receiving comments which then go to assurance review, then taking these comments to DAG; or
2. Shorten the process by making decisions in a working group, then going straight to an assurance review to ensure everything agreed in the meeting has been completed in the artefacts.

MH noted the requirement to fully understand the scope of transition. IS replied elements of old and new arrangements will need to be incorporated and discussed. The Chair added the scope should incorporate the one-way gate, as well as events where old settlement type run along with the new MHHS type.

SC raised 'transition' is not the right term. IS agreed – it is about the system mechanics to enable the movement of MPANs and their treatment in their respective systems. It was agreed the wording around transition should be refined.

ACTION DAG18-06: Programme to provide clarity of the scope of transition planning group

The group discussed the two options WF provided for transition design review. CB acknowledged anything that accelerates design would be helpful, but a shorter process could increase the risk of rework on design. The Chair noted an established working group process incorporated into the Work-Off Plan, which runs in parallel with transition, should diminish the risk. CB noted the working groups should be as rigorous as possible.

SC raised disagreement towards a shorter design review, noting there should be a step in the process where participants outside the subgroups can confirm if comments have been accurately baselined.

SJ showed support of the shortened approach, if it does not lead to valid comments being rejected. WF noted the probability is low and the post-meeting actions list and meeting recording would ensure accountability and traceability.

Transition decision

The DAG made a majority decision to proceed with the shortened assurance cycle, subject to the subgroups going ahead in December and early indications that majority of decisions are being made without contention. It was agreed the process would be continually reviewed and the decision will be changed if necessary. A minority of DAG members were concerned about shortening the review cycle.

DECISION DAG-DEC-33: The DAG majority approved to proceed with a shorter review cycle for the transition design artefacts

WF noted extra resources had been brought in for transition. CB acknowledged the usefulness of this conversation ahead of the change review process.

MH expressed concern that the subgroups may not contain participants which consider costs and complexity of design. WF replied those concerned about cost must be in the subgroups, as this would be important for the recommendations made to DAG.

SJ raised the need to be clear in comms that participants must attend subgroups and alternative routes will not be available.

WF confirmed the Design Team will attempt to contain transition design review within one cycle, but if any issues arise during the assurance review assurance, then this will affect timelines. It is a managed risk they will monitor through the process. WF added if a decision is made on reverse migration, this will add three weeks to the process.

It was confirmed 19 December 2022 to 01 January 2023 would not have any work-off subgroups due to the probability industry experts will not be available in the lead up to Christmas.

5. Post-M5 Design Change Management

PP provided an overview of post-M5 design change management, noting information will be made available on the Programme Collaboration Base as this gets progressed. The Design mailbox was noted to exist for the enduring period.

PP provided an overview of the post-M5 design group governance structure. It was noted a centralised log will record information in the mailbox and items in the Work-Off Plan will be passed to IS. PP issues will be logged in a spreadsheet during the initial phases and come to an Azure DevOps tool in the future, so reports can come into DAG more easily than using spreadsheets

An illustration of the design change management process flow was shared, with PP noting that DAG will be the oversight and escalation body for the process and emergency releases had been catered for any critical technical design issues. It was clarified with regard to the proposed Design Authority (DA) working group that 'industry observers' were defined as Ofgem and IPA, and any other interested parties.

PP provided a high-level overview of the release management process, which is currently in development, noting timelines for small and large release changes. It reflects the feedback received, as well as the positive aspects noted, from the faster switching programme. The process will follow ITIL best practice.

SJ noted the DA Terms of Reference (ToR) will provide for any decision-making abilities, as well as the thresholds for whether any matters require escalation to DAG or a full Programme CR.

PP noted they are working on taking onboard DAG feedback from last week about redlining change to ensure clarity.

SC expressed confusion over the process for issues and the process for change. PP said they are looking to mitigate bilateral conversations. The post-M5 design change management process will operate like an issues resolution process, with a layer of decision making for 'small' or uncontentious change and be a process which is appended to the front of the existing Programme change control process. This will help to deal with the potential volume of minor technical change required to the design as parties commence detailed design and build activities. The Chair noted the criteria for change requests should be clear and the impact assessment process made suitable for the type of change coming through.

SJ raised the point that small changes, e.g., typos, do matter as they may result in a changed interpretation of design, and that a potential criteria for the threshold of change the post-M5 process can deal with could be whether impact assessment is required. Any clarifications that change the design itself should be a CR. PP confirmed design artefacts would not be changed without clear industry visibility, opportunity to comment, and, if necessary, full Programme CRs and impact assessment.

SJ asked whether the existing Programme CR process would require change, presuming that it would. FM advised there is no intention to change the formal Programme change control process, advising this process will continue as it is now, and will continue to be accessible to any Participants who may wish to raise changes. As for changes which may be agreed through the post-M5 design change management process, these will be specific to the design baseline, and the thresholds will be detailed in the DA ToR with authority delegated from the DAG, and industry representation present, to ensure potential impacts, or any requirements for impact assessment are considered.

6. Summary and Next Steps

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

Next meetings:

DAG: 14 December 2022 10am

CCIAG: 24 November 2022 1pm