

## MHHS Design Advisory Group Minutes and Actions

Issue date: 07/02/2023

Meeting number	<b>DAG021</b>	Venue	<b>Virtual – MS Teams</b>
Date and time	<b>08 February 2023 1300-1630</b>	Classification	<b>Public</b>

### Attendees:

#### **Chair**

Justin Andrews (Chair)

#### **Role**

Chair

#### **Industry Representatives**

Carolyn Burns (CBu)

Small Supplier Representative

Donna Jamieson (DJ)

iDNO Representative

Gareth Evans (GE)

I&C Supplier Representative

Gemma Slaney (GS)

DNO Representative

Haz Elmamoun (HE)

Large Supplier Representative

Jonny Moore (JM)

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)

Robert Langdon (RL)

Supplier Agent Representative

Stuart Scott (SS)

DCC Representative (as smart meter central system provider)

#### **MHHS**

Claire Silk (CS)

Design Market and Engagement Lead

Fraser Mathieson (FM)

PMO Governance Lead

Paul Pettit (PP)

Design Assurance Lead

Ross Catley (RC)

Design Assurance Team

Warren Fulton (WF)

Design Project Manager

#### **Other Attendees**

Colin Bezant (CB)

Independent Programme Assurance Provider

Danielle Walton (DW)

Ofgem

Jenny Boothe (JB)

Ofgem

Sajwal Dash (SD)

Independent Programme Assurance Provider

#### **Apologies**

Vlad Black

Medium Supplier Representative

## Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date
<b>CR014 Impact Assessment Decision</b>	DAG20.1-01	Programme to consider how to increase awareness of the Programme change request process and Design Change Management Procedure for Participants (e.g. webinar, newsletter article, etc.)	Programme (PMO and Design Assurance Teams)	08/03/2023
<b>Work-Off Plan Completion</b>	DAG20.1-02	DNO Representative to issue draft Programme Change Request on registration service operating hours to DAG for comment ahead of Programme Change Board on 06 February 2023	DNO Representative (Gemma Slaney)	ASAP
	DAG20.1-03	Programme to confirm governance requirements and timelines for potential changes to DTN messages and provide update to DAG (e.g. confirm any design elements of changes which may require approval by DAG)	Programme (Ian Smith)	15/02/2023
	DAG20.1-04	Programme to confirm which role code MDS would use (current presumption is SVA code)	Programme (Ian Smith)	15/02/2023
	DAG20.1-05	Programme to confirm whether additional testing is required for new roles agreed as part of the work-off item D-034a	Programme (Testing Team)	15/02/2023
	DAG20.1-06	Programme to confirm whether is Calculation Self-Assessment Document (CSAD) requirements are within scope of Programme code drafting work	Programme (Ian Smith)	15/02/2023
	DAG20.1-07	Elexon to submit complex site metering issue to item to Design Authority via a Design Issue Notification for to enable prioritisation of discussion as part of the Design Change Management Procedure	Elexon (Jonny Moore)	15/02/2023
	DAG20.1-08	Large Supplier Representative to provide further detail on constituency views on work-off item D008 (Complex Site Arrangements) and proposed alternative	Large Supplier Representative (Haz Elouman)	13/02/2023
	DAG20.1-09	Programme to confirm which release not addresses this work-off item D-009 (Rejection of MDR Notification to DCC) and how Programme Participants would be given visibility of the changes to Design Artefacts	Programme (Design Team)	15/02/2023
	DAG20.1-10	Programme to confirm the governance arrangements for approval of the DIP detailed design (e.g. design elements to be approved by DAG and code drafting elements to be approved by CCAG)	Programme (Design Team)	15/02/2023
	DAG20.1-11	Programme to provide guidance on the linking of import/export meters (D-033 – MPAN Linkage (Related & Import/Export)) and consider whether any clarificatory additions to the associate Design Artefact are required	Programme (Simon Harrison)	15/02/2023
	DAG20.1-12	Programme to consider how to provide clarity on the data services for import/export meters and how Programme Participants can be given visibility of this	Programme (Ian Smith)	15/02/2023
	<b>Previous Meeting(s)</b>	DAG20-02	Programme to provide views on DNOs as central system providers	Programme (Design Team)
DAG20-03		DAG members to provide any views on the role of DAG post M5 Work-Off Plan completion to support review of DAG ToR	DAG Members	08/02/2023
DAG20-04		Programme to provide update on status of DTN interface specification and logical data model	Programme (Design Team)	ASAP

	DAG20-05	Programme to update DA ToR to include a minimum number of reps for quoracy	Programme (Design Assurance Team)	19/01/2023
	DAG20-06	Programme to clarify whether DA as closed group can operate as a L4 MHHS governance meeting	Programme (PMO)	18/01/2023
	DAG20-07	Programme to provide guidance and examples on how Programme change processes will operate	Programme (Design Assurance Team)	19/01/2023
	DAG20-08	Programme issue reminder to DAG members for appointments	Programme (PMO)	18/01/2023
	DAG20-09	Programme to confirm how transition/migration artefacts will be baselined	Programme (Design Team)	08/02/2023
	DAG20-10	Programme to issue update on remaining work-off items to DAG	Programme (Design Team)	w/c 23/01/2023
	DAG20-11	Programme to consider what items should be brought to 08 February 2023 DAG meeting to confirm whether the meeting should be ahead	Programme (Design Team)	01/02/2023
	DAG19-01	Programme to issue update on migration / transition activities and plan	Programme (Adrian Page)	11/01/2023
	DAG19-02	Ofgem to provide information on assumed half-hourly data opt-out rates	Ofgem (Jenny Boothe)	11/01/2023
	DAG19-03	Large Supplier Representative to provide availability for discussion with Programme on E7/E10 options, with view to reducing the number of options to support formal Impact Assessment via a Programme Change Request	Large Supplier Represent (Andrew Grace)	ASAP
	DAG19-04	Programme to ensure formal Programme Change Request is raised in relation to work-off item D-012 (E7/E10 differential settlement)	Programme (Design Team)	11/01/2023
	DAG19-05	Programme to issue draft CR relating to D-013 (Registration Service Operating Hours) to DAG for review prior to formal submission	Programme (Design Team)	11/01/2023
	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"> <li>• Add new section to report on discussion and outcomes from DAG review/decision</li> <li>• Add comments to clarify any sections where there are subsequent updates or where future tense is used</li> <li>• Update Section 2 MHHS Recommendations as required in view of updates made to other sections</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• Section 4: Add wording that it is out of scope for M5 baseline design decision (but not MHHS Design)</li> <li>• Section 4 Add Performance assurance and disputes</li> </ul>	Programme (Warren Fulton)	19/12/2022

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarification in Section 5 that all work-off items which result in changes to design artefacts will be subject to change control</li> <li>• Updates to Section 5, point 4, to reference iServer updates</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• Update Section 7, Criteria 3, to explain the detail of how this requirement is met</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• Reword Section 7, Criteria 4, to note there is nothing preventing baselining of the design</li> <li>• Criteria 5 note DAG wish to see Design Change management process</li> <li>• 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)</li> </ul> <p>Add note/link to Section 7, Criteria 9, to Appendix 2 – Post M5 MHHS Design Participant support process</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

## Decisions

Area	Dec Ref	Decision
None		

## 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. The Chair noted the DAG's primary objective at this meeting was to discuss the work-off items and completion of the M5 Work-Off Plan, so as to make a decision on the re-baselining of the MHHS Design Artefacts.

### 2. CR014 Impact Assessment Decision

SC noted the CR is very brief, and needed more detail to describe where in the Design Artefacts change is proposed. They advised the third area Elexon proposed changing had been part of the design since early 2022 and was therefore not a new requirement. SC believed the remaining proposed changes included a reasonable clarificatory change and a reasonable change to the totals calculations.

RL believed it was accepted by MPs that a load shape rolling annual total is required and believed that the CR should propose a replacement total and where this should be calculated. They did not agree with some of the statements in the CR on benefits of the change were correct (e.g. there is a benefit to removal of the load shape annual rolling total).

GE noted the potential impacts of the change on industry processes and customers if the data items proposed for removal are removed. They believed it may cause customer issues or panic, if further information on the potential impacts is not provided, as there may be challenges for industry assessing impacts to commercial processes.

The group discussed what options were available in terms of whether the change is ready to be issued to Impact Assessment (IA). The Programme advised the change had been validated by the Programme Change Board, which meant the change had been deemed capable of being presented to the DAG for a decision on whether it should be issued to IA. The Programme advised the DAG's role was to determine whether the CR was capable of being issued to IA, and it was at the discretion of the proposer as to whether further information is added to the CR based on any comments provided by the DAG. The group discussed what options were available in terms of whether the change is ready to be issued for IA.

GS asked what the Programme Change Board's role was. It was explained this group consists of Programme personnel and the change proposer and its purpose is to validate new changes and, where a change exceeds the thresholds for a housekeeping change, route them to an appropriate decision making group, such as DAG, to determine whether a change is issued to IA. JB expressed concern the DAG did not have a clear understanding of the Programme Change Control Approach and suggested there was value in a session to educate parties on the process. The group agreed this would be useful, and the potential requirement extended beyond DAG alone. The Programme agreed to consider how this could be best achieved.

**ACTION DAG20.1-01: Programme to consider how to increase awareness of the Programme change request process and Design Change Management Procedure for Participants (e.g. webinar, newsletter article, etc.)**

The group concluded that further detail within the CR, including more information on impacts and detail on how the load shape rolling annual total is delivered, would be beneficial. The proposer agreed to defer the decision on whether the CR is issued to IA, so as to consider whether amendments will be made in accordance with the comments of DAG members.

### 3. DAG Meeting Governance

FM provided an overview of the DAG's remit, objectives, previous design baseline in October 2022, and the factors taken into account when making decisions.

#### DAG Remit and Objectives

FM provided a brief summary DAG's remit and objectives as denoted in the DAG Terms of Reference (ToR). It was noted DAG is responsible for developing and approving the detailed system design to ensure the necessary detail is provided to allow parties to commence system design and build.

#### DAG Decision Making

It was noted the ToR specifies that while decisions will be made by consensus where possible, if there is not consensus the DAG Chair, as appointed by the Programme's Senior Responsible Officer (SRO), is empowered to make decisions on matters within the remit of DAG.

FM provided information on the factors taken into account during previous decisions of the DAG, including impacts on delivery timescales, cost impacts to industry, and supporting evidence provided by DAG members and Programme Participants.

#### Operation of Decision and Outcomes

FM provided an overview of the voting process, the outcomes of different voting scenarios, and options around escalation and post-decision.

It was noted DAG members could escalate any matters they disagreed with to the Programme Steering Group (PSG), the Independent Programme Assurance (IPA) provider, and to Ofgem as Programme sponsor.

### 4. Work-Off Plan Completion

The Programme provided an overview of the substantial work undertaken to review, discuss, assure, and complete items within the M5 Work-Off Plan. The DAG were advised that of the 73 work-off items in the plan, 62 had been resolved and had resulted in either changes to the Design Artefacts, clarifications to Programme Participants, or no further action. The Programme advised that of the eleven-remaining work-off items, four required changes to Design Artefacts, two required clarification statements, one required detailed design timelines for the Data Integration Platform (DIP) to be known, one is to be progressed via the Programme's code drafting workstream, and three required a decision from DAG.

The Chair asked the group whether the 62 items which were not challenged at the M5 Design Assurance Forum could be considered complete. No objections were raised, however some members wished to review the items for which further

work was required. The Chair confirmed members did not object to the closure of the 62 items, and the decision would be revisited.

The group proceed to review the remaining work-off items. A summary of discussions and outcomes is provided below:

**D013 – Registration Service Operating Hours:** The DAG noted this work-off item was agreed in December 2022 as requiring a Programme CR to enable IA by Programme Participants over the preferred solution. The DNO Representative advised this CR had now been submitted to the Programme and was due to be submitted to the Programme Change Board for initial validation on 06 February 2023. Subject to validation, the CR will likely be issued to the DAG for a decision on whether it should be issued to IA. The group asked whether the CR could be shared with DAG members immediately and the DNO Representative took an action to issue the document for comment ahead of the Programme Change Board (**ACTION20.1-02**). The group did not believe this work-off item could be considered complete until the associated CR has been validated by the Programme Change Board.

OUTCOME: Item closed subject to validation of CR0017 by the Programme Change Board.

**D-012 – E7/E10 Differential Settlement:** The DAG noted this work-off item was agreed in December 2022 as requiring a CR to enable IA by Programme Participants. The group were advised CR015 has now been raised and validated by the Programme Change Board. The CR will be issued for IA in the coming days. The group considered this work-off item to be closed now the associated CR has been raised.

OUTCOME: Closed given the raising of CR015 and issuance to IA.

**D-025 – Definition of changes to DTN Messages:** The Programme advised the resolution of this work-off item will not require changes to the Design Artefacts. There may be a small number of changes to data items within data flows, which would be progressed externally. Development of the changes will require assessment of scenario variants and the approach to codification. The Programme recommended this item is moved into the code drafting workstream. SJ questioned the governance of this work-off item if it moves into the code drafting workstream, stating they were not clear where approval of any code changes will occur and that a plan is required. SJ advised it was critical for Programme Participants to know what changes will occur to DTN flows. The Programme advised any changes to physical flows would need to come to DAG for consideration as a design matter, whereas expressions of routine matrices and any participant actions in relation to flows then this would require discussion under code drafting. SJ did not believe these questions were a blocker to closing the work-off item, but clarity is required on how it is managed beyond the Work-Off Plan. The Chair suggested this work-off item is closed subject the Programme confirming the governance of the design related aspect and any related code drafting requirements. SJ stated they were comfortable with this approach subject to a planned dates . The Chair asked the MHHS Design Team for an indicative timeframe, to which the response was this item would be prioritised and would be likely due to complete by the end of February 2023 (**ACTION20.1-03**). The Supplier Agent (Independent) Representative advised their constituents had expressed disappointment at the pushing out of timeframes for completion of this item.

OUTCOME: Item closed subject to clarification from the Programme of the governance of potential MHHS design or code drafting requirements, confirmation of any design aspects which may benefit from review/approval by DAG, and provision of a plan/timeline for completion.

**D-034a – DTN Role Code:** The Programme advised the view of this item had changed from the position published to the assurance forum. New DTN role codes will be required. These were clarified with ElectraLink and published on 31 January 2023. The Elexon Representative questioned that the MDS does not have a DTN role code assigned but will receive a DTN Flow, and asked whether the assumption is the existing SVAA role code will be used. The Programme agreed this was the correct assumption and took an action to confirm (**ACTION DAG20.1-04**).

The Small Supplier Representative noted the addition of new role codes may require additional industry testing, and wished to ensure this is considered as part of the conclusion of this work-off item (**ACTION DAG20.1-05**). The RECCo Representative highlighted a link between this work-off item and item D-025 (above), in that additional roles codes required for different REC Metering Equipment Manager (MEM) activities may require additional testing also, and this has been flagged by REC from a migration perspective.

OUTCOME: Item closed noting the clarifications required on new IDs/role codes and any additional testing requirements.

**D-011 / D-050 – LLF Data Definition / Minor Corrections- Interfaces:** The Programme advised the steps recommended to close these work-off items involved the publication of clarification statements, and these were issued on 31 January 2023. No change to the baselined Design Artefacts is required. The DAG were asked whether they accepted the clarifications. The Elexon Representative whether changes to the Calculation Self-Assessment Document

(CSAD) had been covered in the statements. The Programme Design Manager advised the CSAD had been decoupled from this work-off item. The Elexon Representative decoupling concern the changes required to the CSAD may not be picked up in consequential code drafting, as they had not been entered into the CC Log ahead of the deadline. The Large Supplier Representative advised the same concern had been expressed by their constituents. The Programme agreed to confirm whether CSAD had been decoupled and will be picked up as part of code drafting (**ACTION DAG20.1-06**).

OUTCOME: Item closed subject to confirmation of whether CSAD changes will be picked up as part of consequential change code drafting.

**D008 – Complex Site Arrangements:** The Programme recommended this item be resolved by including a requirement within MHHSP-BRS004 (Supplier Requirements Overview) stating that where a complex site arrangement is cross segment, the Data Service (Smart) (SDS) and the Data Service (Advanced) (ADS) roles must be performed by the same organisation. The Elexon Representative stated it was not clear how the ADS would obtain information from a smart meter and additional design work was required to understand how a split in smart/advanced meters works in a complex site arrangement. The Chair suggested this could be raised as a Design Issue Notification to the Design Authority (DA) and resolved as part of the Design Baseline Change Management Procedure. The Elexon Representative did not believe the design was complete around complex site metering but agreed the work-off item could be closed providing the DA are instructed to prioritise the progression of this item (**ACTION20.1-07**).

The Large Supplier Representative advised several comments from their constituents following the design assurance forum expressed the Programme proposal for completion of this work-item was unacceptable. The Programme noted the decision to be made is whether the work-off item can be closed in lieu of the forward action (as described above). The Programme noted the distinction between whether any constituents believe the design does not work or whether there is simply dislike of the recommended resolution. The Large Supplier Representative took an action to obtain further detail on what their constituents found unacceptable and what the proposed alternative is (**ACTION DAG20.1-08**).

The NGESO Representative noted there may be impacts on Electricity Service Operator (ESO) systems as a result of finalising the solution to D008. Potential links to BSC Modifications P441 and P443 were noted. The NGESO Representative consider how the solution to D008 may cause impacts if systems changes must occur later as a result. The representative did not believe this prevented closure of the work-off item and agreed with the Programme Design Team this would require monitoring.

OUTCOME: Item closed subject to the raising of a Design Issues Notification to enable discussion at the DA.

**D-009 – Rejection of MDR Notification to DCC:** The Programme note the outcome of discussion on this item at the design assurance forum was to incorporate a change into MHHSP-BRS003 (Registration Service Requirements). The Programme noted challenges raised by the Meter Point Registration Service (MPRS) provided was rejected at the assurance forum. The RECCo Representative did not believe the item could be closed until the updated Design Artefact could be reviewed. The representative stated they could not find a reference to the proposed changes in the release notes provided by the Programme. The DCC Representative shared this view, and expressed some nervousness around potential risks which could emanate from the lower-level design. The Chair asked whether participants have had sufficient time to ensure changes to artefacts agreed at the Design Assurance Forum (DAF) have been reflected in the artefacts. An action was placed with the Programme to confirm what changes address this work-off item, and how Programme Participants would be given visibility of the changes to Design Artefacts (**ACTION DAG20.1-09**).

The Programme advised an action placed on the MPRS provider at the Design Assurance Forum (WOA-0095) would potentially proceed via the DA.

OUTCOME: Item ongoing until Programme Participants review changes to Design Artefacts accurately reflect the outcome of the DAF on work-off item D-009ed.

**D-022 – RMP/MPAN Status:** The Programme advised the resolution of this work-off item would not require change to Design Artefacts. A high-level timeline for the DIP detailed design was issued with the v2.0 DAG meeting papers. The Chair asked if members were happy to close this item subject to the detailed DIP design timeline being provided by the DIP provider. The RECCo Representative advised they were willing to close the item but requested the Programme confirm the governance arrangements for the DIP detailed design, stating it was not currently clear whether DAG would approve this (**ACTION DAG20.1-10**). The representative advised the interactions which will be described in the detailed DIP design will be critical for Programme Parties in understanding requirements. The Programme advised some elements of the DIP design will be submitted to the DAG for approval.

OUTCOME: Item closed noting the requirements to confirm the governance arrangements for approval of the DIP detailed design.

**D-033 – MPAN Linkage (Related & Import/Export):** The Programme highlighted the proposed changes to Design Artefacts as detailed in the release notes provided in v2.0 of the meeting papers. The Programme noted the updates to Design Artefacts would provide clarity on ‘many to one’ interfaces and seek to incorporate changes agreed at the design assurance meeting. The Large Supplier Representative believed the processes were unclear and requested further guidance from the Programme on linking import/export meters. The Small Support Representative supported the provision of additional guidance also (**ACTION DAG20.1-11**). Both representatives noted the importance of being able to review the specific changes made to relevant Design Artefacts, noting the changes may not have been developed via an MHHS working group.

The Elexon Representative conveyed an understanding there may also be a requirement for change to Section J of the Balancing and Settlement Code (BSC). This may be a significant change to how import/export meters are managed, and the representative did not believe this had been specifically discussed at a working group. The representative was not averse to the closure of the work-off item but did not believe it was clear the required changes have/or will be made. The Chair summarised that the design is clear there can be separate Data Collectors (DCs) for import and export meter and there will be changes required to BSC documents as a result of the design. The group considered whether this should be more clearly reflected in the design or picked up via code drafting. The Elexon Representative believed this depended on how participants were consuming the design, noting that, as a design-led programme, participants have been advised to initiate design and build activities based on the design, not code drafting. The Large Supplier Representative did not agree the item should be closed, believing the process is not clear. The Programme agreed clarity was required on how the design represents different data services for import/export meters, and participants should be given visibility of any changes (**ACTION DAG20.1-12**).

OUTCOME: Item closed subject to the provision of guidance from the Programme on linking import/export meters and the provision of clarity within the Design Artefacts on the different data services.

**D034b – MPID:** The Chair advised a decision was required from DAG over whether four-character Market Participant IDs (MPIDs) should be included in the appointment interfaces. The Chair provided three options to members:

- Option 1 – No change
- Option 2 – Addition of MPID to the MHHSP-IF-001 ‘Notification of Change of Supplier’ interface only
- Option 3 – Addition of MPID to all appointment interfaces

A majority of DAG Members favoured Option 3 as it best mitigated risks around the matching of Supplier IDs and DIP IDs. The DNO Representative advised they were in favour of Option 3, however stressed this could not be at the expense of a delay to the release of the interface specifications. These were critical for the MPRS provider to enable the commencement of build activities.

The Programme advised the changes would be made to the interface specifications, but noted a review of any associated validation requirements could also be necessary.

OUTCOME: Item closed subject to the addition of MPID to all appointment flows, and provision of visibility to all MPs.

## 5. **SI Design Assurance View**

Deferred to next meeting.

## 6. **IPA View**

Deferred to next meeting.

## 7. **Work-Off Plan Decision**

Deferred to next meeting.

## 8. **Summary and Next Steps**

The Chair advised the meeting had now timed-out and the decision on completion of the Work-Off Plan and hence decision on rebase-lining the MHHS Design would require deferral to a future DAG meeting. The DAG agreed to review the remaining three work-off items (D-045, D-034D and D-053) at the next regular DAG meeting on 08 February 2023 and make the decision on completion of work-off plan and re-baselining of Design Artefacts. The Chair stated that any



further potential changes to the baselined design, should be raised via the DA for consideration through the enduring change management process.

Several members queried when the revised Design artefacts would be released. The Programme advised the intention was to release these as soon as possible, and they were currently due to be published no later than 08 February 2023. Members noted the challenges this may cause with reviewing the changes and confirming constituent views. Two members expressed they did not believe the DAG should agree the re-baselining of Design Artefacts they had not seen the change marked version of.

The Chair summarised that the Programme will issue information on the changes to be made to Design Artefacts as soon as possible and at the next DAG meeting the group would focus on the outstanding work-off items and how any other outstanding matters would progress. One member requested the Programme issue information on what to expect in the coming weeks as soon as possible.

The Chair thanked members for their pragmatic contributions and closed the meeting.

**Date of next DAG: 08 February 2023 10am**

**Date of next CCIAG: 23 February 2023 10am**

**Date of next Design Authority: 23 February 2023 2pm**