

## MHHS Design Advisory Group Minutes and Actions

**Issue date: 15 June 2022**

Meeting number	<b>DAG010</b>	Venue	<b>Virtual – MS Teams</b>
Date and time	<b>08 June 2022 10:00-14:00</b>	Classification	<b>Public</b>

### Attendees:

#### **Chair**

Justin Andrews (Chair)

#### **Role**

Chair

#### **Industry Representatives**

Craig Handford (CH)

Large Supplier Representative

Ed Rees

Consumer Representative

Gareth Evans (GE)

I&C Supplier Representative

Gemma Slaney (GS)

DNO Representative

Jo Bradbury (JB)

Small Supplier Representative

Matt Hall (MH)

Elexon Representative (as central systems provider)

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

iDNO Representative

Robert Langdon

Supplier Agent Representative

Seth Chapman (SC)

Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent)

#### **MHHS IM**

Claire Silk (CS)

Design Market and Engagement Lead

Fraser Mathieson (FM)

PMO Governance Lead

Ian Smith (IS)

Design Manager

Miles Winter (MW)

PMO Governance Team

Warren Fulton (WF)

Separation Lead

Simon Harrison (SH)

Design Assurance Team

#### **Other Attendees**

Andy MacFaul (AM)

Ofgem

Colin Bezant (CB)

Independent Programme Assurance

Daniel Morgan (DM)

Independent Programme Assurance

Danielle Walton (DW)

Ofgem

### Apologies:

Donna Townsend

iDNO Representative

Stuart Scott (SS)

DCC Representative (as smart meter central system provider)

## Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date
<b>Tranche 4 Schedule</b>	DAG10-01	Share presentation regarding changes to Tranche 4 timelines with DAG members	Programme (PMO)	09/06/2022
<b>Minutes and Actions</b>	DAG10-02	Publish change marked version of minutes for DAG meeting held 11 May 2022, incorporating amendments requested by DAG members in relation to Tranche 1 approval	Programme (PMO)	15/06/2022
	DAG10-03	Highlight in the post meeting papers any action updates which have changed between publication of the DAG meeting papers and presentation of the updates at the meeting	Programme (PMO)	15/06/2022
<b>Open Design Issues Management</b>	DAG09-04	Add Target Stakeholder Outcomes and Baseline Success Criteria as a standing agenda item for future DAG meetings as part of the consideration of design decisions	Programme (PMO)	06/07/2022
	DAG10-05	Provide any suggested amendments to Target stakeholder outcome and Baseline success criteria by close of business 16 June 2022	DAG Members	16/06/2022
	DAG10-06	Update the Target Stakeholder Outcomes and Baseline Success Criteria based on suggestions of DAG members	Programme (Warren Fulton)	06/07/2022
	DAG10-07	Update the Conditional Approval Process and Work Off Oversight Process and present updates at the next DAG meeting	Programme (Warren Fulton)	06/07/2022
	DAG10-08	Update the MHHS Design Baseline Dashboard to show more detail (e.g. next steps and timings)	Programme (Ian Smith)	06/07/2022
<b>Summary and Next Steps</b>	DAG10-09	DAG members to provide any comments on agenda items 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, and 13 within the <a href="#">meeting papers</a> of the DAG held 08 June 2022 by close of business 16 June 2022	DAG Members	16/06/2022
	DAG10-10	Schedule an extraordinary DAG meeting to discuss SEC MP162/level playing field principle and to review design-related RAID items (agenda items 8 and 10)	Programme (PMO)	w/c 20 June 2022 (TBC)
	DAG10-11	Share copy of RAID for design specific issues for DAG members to review (RAID revision underway as part of Tranche 4 scheduling exercise)	Programme (Warren Fulton)	06/07/2022
<b>Previous Meeting(s)</b>	DAG06-01	Review alignment between related MPAN modifications and design subgroup	Programme (Ian Smith)	13/05/2022
	DAG07-03	Programme to bring future versions of DIP Functional Specification and Non-Functional Requirements to DAG, once further updates incorporated	Programme (Design Team)	13/05/2022
	DAG08-01	Bring updated DIP Functional Specification and Non-Functional Requirements to the next DAG for approval	Programme (Ian Smith)	08/06/2022
	DAG08-02	Issue call for agenda items or discussion topics prior to mobilisation of CCIAG	Programme (PMO)	08/06/2022
	DAG09-03	Provide detailed action plan for resolution of open design issues against T1 design artefacts	Programme (Claire Silk)	25/05/2022

	DAG09-05	Programme to liaise with Programme Participants who have queries on the Programme Design Team's responses to comments on the Tranche 1 design artefacts	Programme (Ian Smith)	08/06/2022
	DAG09-10	Add dependency to outstanding design issues log relating to ensuring design collateral is sufficient to enable code drafting. IS to review example of this and confirm sufficient for code drafting.	Programme (Ian Smith)	08/06/2022
	DAG09-11	Add dependency to outstanding design issues log regarding Programme approach to resolving material design issues which emanate from design assurance process.	Programme (Ian Smith)	08/06/2022
	DAG09-12	Provide a clear plan for the resolution of the recorded outstanding issues related to the Tranche 1 design artefact approval	Programme (Design Team)	25/05/2022

## Decisions

Area	Dec Ref	Decision
Minutes	DAG-DEC-22	Tranche 2 design artefacts conditionally approved

## RAID items discussed/raised

RAID area	Description
None	

## Minutes

### 1. Welcome and Introductions

The Chair welcome attendees to the meeting. Prior to commencement of the agenda, the Programme Design Team requested an opportunity to provide an update on the progression of the Tranche 4 (T4) design artefact review.

#### **Design Team Tranche 4 Update**

The Design Team presented an update on T4 timelines. IS highlighted the design team's desire to ensure the quality of the design and to not compromise this by rushing to meet a deadline. IS gave an overview of the progress of the design artefact review tranches so far, noting the significant number of comments received.

The Design Team advised of a need to delay the release of the T4 artefacts as they are not ready to be published for industry review on 08 June 2022 as planned. This is due to the substantial number of comments received in the previous review tranche and further complexity identified in the Design process. The Design Team have identified some lessons learned from earlier tranches that will be applied to T4.

IS stated that a detailed schedule is currently being developed of all remaining activity prior to the release of the T4 design artefacts, to ensure they are fully reviewed and assured ahead of being shared with industry. The schedule takes into account the impact of the delay incurred in the T4 artefact preparation; industry's concerns that sufficient time must be allocated for review and comment resolution, and; lessons learnt from previous tranches. This revised schedule will be published within two weeks. In the meantime, design activities will continue in terms of preparing the T4 documents and processing the comments from T3.

The Chair asked for clarity that the revised schedule would be released by 22 June, to which IS confirmed it would be.

The Chair asked what level of coverage of the MHHS Target Operating Model (TOM) the T1-3 artefacts represent. IS suggested these artefacts cover a large part of the design, providing much of the substance of the logical interfaces, but there was still work to be undertaken on Operational Choreography, Non-Functional Requirements, reporting and transition.

The Chair asked whether the delay to the release of the T4 artefacts would mean a delay to the delivery of the detailed design baseline, to which IS confirmed it did. The Chair asked DAG members for their views on the updates provided.

## Member's Queries

MH asked if design workshops/sub-groups would continue over the next few weeks. IS confirmed they would and that some would change scope, such as one on reporting and transition expanded from Elexon Central System (ECS) focus.

RL asked whether additional resource is being applied, noting the large volume of comments as part of the Tranche 1 (T1) review. RL stated feedback from constituents has been that the responses to their comments so far has not been sufficient. IS advised additional people had been assigned to assist with the governance/processing for comments and subsequent issue resolution. The Chair asked whether it was possible for subject matter experts from within industry could be seconded into the Programme, as was suggested when the Programme was being mobilised. IS advised they would be supportive of this. RL expressed that when comments are raised, these should be taken back to working groups, which are made up of industry representatives, where the comments can be addressed. In this sense, RL suggested, the working groups should resolve comments and issues rather than the Design Team alone. RL believed this would improve transparency and would utilise the working groups further. RL repeated that the Operational Choreography document is critical and asked whether resource could be focussed on this given the scale of work required. IS advised this was a top priority alongside the publication of the T4 design artefacts for review.

SC asked if items in artefact log marked as placeholders were planned for release in T4. IS noted where placeholder documents are denoted within the log, these are there for areas where work may be required and represent a degree of optionality in the log. RL asked if these will be confirmed/resolved by the end of T4. IS said they would be.

CH thanked the design team for their openness on this update and welcomed the delay if it assists the quality of the design artefacts. CH agreed with RL's view that working groups can be used to assess industry comments in a more open and collaborative way. IS agreed this was the ideal and noted the reality that industry parties often do not agree on the solution to an issue or way forward regarding specific design elements. IS praised the value the working groups have contributed to the design and noted part of the DAG's role is to make timely decisions on design matters where consensus is unlikely to be reached. CH agreed and requested a summary of differing viewpoints is provided, and it be recorded clearly why a decision is made in favour of a particular option.

WF introduced themselves as a member of the MHHS Senior Responsible Owner (SRO) Leadership Team who has joined the Design Team to assist IS on the delivery side of design work, freeing up IS to work more on the technical elements. WF commented in relation to RL's and CH's point on working group review of comments and issues, that the Business Process and Requirements Working Group (BRPWG) last week discussed the detail of some of the issues being brought to DAG today. This meant more detailed actions came out of that meeting and the aim is to bring more refined material to DAG. Replying to RL's comment regarding the volume of comments received as part of T1, WF commented the number of comments received was higher than expected. WF said new processes and tooling are being used to make the management of comments and issues more efficient. WF asked DAG members for examples of comments their constituents feel have not received a complete response.

RL thanked WF for the outline of what is being done to increase management of industry comments and issues and said there was a period where comments were not being responded to which has since improved significantly. RL did not think there was any disagreement this was an issue previously. RL gave the example of comments on the D0142 data flow. IS noted, on this specific issue, the suggestion was to replace the D0142 with a Data Integration Platform (DIP) flow, but following comments received it was recognised this may need to return to a working group for further assessment. RL suggested it should already be the process that contentious comments are worked through at working groups. IS asked if all comments should go back to a working group. RL believed they should, to establish whether consensus could be achieved on whether the proposed approach should be accepted or rejected. IS believed this may require a change to the tranche review process. The Chair suggested this could be done for contentious comments only, as it would not be necessary to do this for all comments (e.g. correction of a typo).

GS thanked the Design Team for their update, stating it demonstrated a positive openness and transparency. GS advised some constituents had suggested their comments were deleted from the comment log, and that it was possible some comments were only visible upon downloading the log rather than viewing it directly on the Programme collaboration portal. GS suggested issuing communications to make parties aware of this. GS felt there was still detail missing in the log on who owns a given comment, whether a comment is returning to working group, whether is it scheduled for discussion at a specific meeting, and when that meeting is. IS asked for any feedback on technical issues with the Programme portal to be passed on as this had not been flagged previously and advised the Programme will follow up on any technical issues.

## Next Steps

The Chair summarised next steps and asked the Design Team whether the delay to T4 meant a Programme Change Request is required to move the M5 milestone relating to delivery of the detailed design baseline. IS responded this is likely to be required. The Chair suggested the new T4 schedule should include a request for subject matter expertise from industry design experts to support the increased use of the working groups for working through Design issues or significant comments. The Chair brought the update to a conclusion, noting the revised T4 schedule would be released within two weeks.

**ACTION DAG10-01: Programme to share presentation regarding changes to Tranche 4 timelines with DAG members**

## 2. Minutes and actions

The group were asked whether the minutes of the previous meeting, held 11 May 2022, should be approved, to which several members highlighted they had provided suggested amendments which had not yet been incorporated. GS and RL noted specific comments provided and SC expressed there should be clearer minuting of decisions, such as the T1 conditional approval. The Chair stated the minutes would be updated to incorporate the amendments suggested by DAG members, and a change marked version published for approval at the next meeting. The Chair advised the minuting of decisions going forward would involve a clear indication of whether members support, reject, or abstain, and any rationale or comments to support this.

**ACTION DAG10-02: Programme to publish change marked version of minutes for DAG meeting held 11 May 2022, incorporating amendments requested by DAG members in relation to Tranche 1 approval**

FM provided an overview of the outstanding actions, updates for which can be found within the [meeting papers](#).

GS noted some updates differed from those which had been published with the meeting papers. FM highlighted the changes made and explained the reasons for this. GS suggested any such changes should be redlined in future and FM agreed to publish the updated actions updates with the post meeting papers.

**ACTION DAG10-03: Highlight in the post meeting papers any action updates which have changed between publication of the DAG meeting papers and presentation of the updates at the meeting**

Regarding action DAG09-02: *Share list of the design document repository user group volunteers with DAG members*; MH advised they had not seen this list but had volunteered for the group. SH agreed to pick this up with MH outside of the meeting.

Regarding action DAG09-05: *Programme to liaise with Programme Participants who have queries on the Programme Design Team's responses to comments on the Tranche 1 design artefacts*; CH did not believe the update provided in the meeting papers reflected the action, stating the action related to participants who had comments rejected. IS advised the Design Team were scheduling discussion sessions with individuals to review their rejected comments. The Chair reminded DAG members of the relation between this action and action DAG09-06: *Advise constituents who have expressed concerns on Programme responses to comments on Tranche 1 design artefacts to contact the Programme Design Team (Design@mhhsprogramme.co.uk)*.

Regarding action DAG09-07: *Add dependency to outstanding design issues log to capture ongoing assessment of MDR TRT requirements in relation to SEC MP162*; RL asked if this was being picked up elsewhere. The Chair confirmed it is an open design issue. RL said they would feel more comfortable if it was captured as an action also. The Chair responded that if it is an open design issue, it would be receiving attention and logging it again as an action is not necessary (see also ACTION DAG10-10).

Regarding action DAG09-13: *Consider whether further extraordinary DAG meeting required to discuss latest information relating to the Smart Energy Code (SEC) Modification Proposal (MP) 162*; SC believed the action was to hold a meeting, not to consider if one should be held (see also ACTION DAG10-10). GS asked whether it was noted anywhere that SEC MP162 and Retail Energy Code (REC) change R0044 were linked. FM replied this was noted in the MHHS Cross Code Advisory Group's (CCAG) Horizon Scanning Log and is being monitored by this group with members of the Design Team in attendance and providing assessment of each new code change which may have an impact on the MHHS Programme, to ensure any necessary actions are undertaken.

## 3. Open Design Issues Management

WF introduced the agenda item, explaining the Programme have implemented additional controls in response to comments at the previous DAG meeting over the need to improve issues management with respect to the comments

received from Programme Participants as part of the T1 design artefacts review. WF provided an overview of several requests to DAG members regarding the processes around issues management. The Chair invited DAG members to provide views from their respective constituencies.

### **Request 1 – Proposed Target Stakeholder Outcomes and Success Criteria**

CH said the outcomes are fit for purpose and questioned how they would be measured, noting ambiguity in the wording may affect measurability. WF noted this, and advised it is feedback such as this that is requested from Programme Parties to finesse the proposed outcomes and success criteria.

JB advised they had not received any views from their constituents but agreed with CH's points.

GS advised annual leave had impacted their ability to obtain constituents views but felt the proposed outcomes and criteria were fundamentally adequate and agreed with CH on fleshing out and finessing detail.

GE said they hold regular meetings with constituents and had received verbal feedback but no written responses and asked how feedback such as this should be managed. The feedback on the outcomes and criteria was agreement in principle subject to further development. The Chair asked DAG members to capture any verbal feedback such as this and email it to the Programme.

MH asked whether the target stakeholder outcomes pre-M5 should include that the TOM meets the overall Programme requirements, to tie the outcomes back to the fundamental purpose of the Programme. WF advised this has been included in the success criteria but could be brought into the pre-M5 outcomes section too.

The Chair summarised the Design Team will use these success criteria when baselining the design and asked whether the intention was incorporate Programme Participant's views into the proposed outcomes and criteria. WF advised input was welcomed from DAG members and their constituents, and DAG would need to approve the final wording.

MH asked if there would be an opportunity to provide further feedback outside of the DAG meeting. WF said yes, and the Programme would redline any amendments arising from feedback provided. WF suggested a new standing agenda item for DAG to receive ongoing updates on the development of the outcomes and criteria, including the need for increased clarity and ensuring measurability.

**ACTION DAG10-04: Add Target Stakeholder Outcomes and Baseline Success Criteria as a standing agenda item for future DAG meetings as part of the consideration of design decisions**

The Chair asked if any DAG member did not agree with the proposed target outcomes and success criteria with, noting the Programme would need to provide further detail on how the success criteria are measured and reported on.

MH stated they were not able to agree at this point but acknowledged the proposed outcomes and criteria had been reviewed and were progressing toward agreement. SC echoed this sentiment.

WF asked whether DAG members objected to the proposed outcomes-based approach and utilisation of success criteria as part of managing issues and ensuring the MHHS design is adequate. No objections were received.

WF summarised that updates would be made to the proposed outcomes and success criteria. WF invited DAG members to provide any further feedback or suggested amendments.

**ACTION DAG10-05: DAG members to provide any suggested amendments to target outcomes and success criteria by close of business 16 June 2022**

**ACTION DAG10-06: Programme to update the target outcomes and success criteria based on suggestions of DAG members**

### **Request 2 – DAG Baseline Governance Processes**

WF summarised that following concerns expressed at the previous DAG meeting over issues resolution both pre and post-M5, the Programme had documented proposed detailed processes for managing this. The documented processes include a conditional approval process for the design artefacts, a process for resolving issues with the baseline design, and a work-off oversight process for the resolution of issues post-M5. WF advised the MHHS Programme Change Control Process would be used to manage any changes to the design post-M5 which are not associated with a baseline design issue (i.e. new issues). The Chair invited comments from DAG members.

CH welcomed this and thanked the Design Team for documenting the processes. CH supported the feedback loop to discuss issues with working groups and believed there needed to be more information on how dissensus is managed.

CH asked whether the Work-Off Oversight Process to resolve pre-existing design baseline issues would operate for three months after M5 and the delivery of the design baseline. WF advised this process was expected to manage any elements of issues that were deemed to not be 'vital', to enable DAG to approve the baseline with non-substantive issues outstanding and ensured a process is in place for closing such issues. Once those issues are closed, the work-off process falls away and the ensuring MHHS Change Control Process will operate.

MH asked if the Work-Off Oversight Process overlapped with code drafting. WF agreed it did and this would need to be managed. WF will be attending CCAG to define how this is managed. IS said this would inform the materiality of any work-off items. If a given issue or outstanding matter is anticipated to require any substantial code drafting, this would not make the work-off list as it would be too large an issue to be accepted. The Chair suggested issues on the work-off list which may have minor impacts on code drafting would be prioritised for resolution.

The Chair asked if DAG approved of the approach outlined and invited any comments or suggested changes to the proposed processes.

RL noted there is no working group interaction within the proposed Conditional Approval Process between reviewing review tranche comments and updating the design artefacts. MH suggested this was acceptable otherwise working groups would be required to review a very large number of comments. SC believed significant changes to design artefacts should be considered by working groups. The Chair suggested an amendment to the process diagram to clarify that where there is a significant change to any design artefact as a result of review comments, it would present to a working group. Several members believed that where the resolution to a given issue may be contentious and that if a single Programme Parties' comments could lead to a significant change, this should be discussed at working group. This would increase transparency and ensure industry expertise is applied in decisions. WF thanked members for this contribution and took an action to modify the Design Baseline Governance Processes.

**ACTION DAG10-07: Programme to update the Conditional Approval Process and Work Off Oversight Process and present updates at the next DAG meeting**

The Chair asked if DAG are happy to approve the Baseline Governance processes subject to amendments to 2.4.1.

RL asked for clarity on how the issues log would be managed. IS said there would be a prioritisation and scheduling of issues for resolution, the timing of which would need to be considered in aggregate against the overall time available. WF advised there will be transparency on this when the log is shared. The Chair suggested there will be some tough decisions on this. IS advised each issue would be categorised based on severity to help manage inherent subjectivity.

SC asked what happens if issues are found following conditional approval. SC offered the example of a Smart Data Services (SDS) method statement currently under review and a validation step which was removed based on comments from Programme Participants. SC believed the step should remain and asked how this is raised within Design Baseline Governance Processes. SC asked how other members would be made aware a change had been made. IS replied if a change is made it should lead to a conversation within a working group or subgroup and if a change was made to resolve an issue, this would be recorded in the issues resolution log. The Chair suggested matters which have led to a change to design artefacts, but where there is not consensus over the change, could be recorded in the open issues log or in a dissensus log, to ensure differing views are retained.

### **Request 3 – Design Baseline Issues Severity Categories**

WF provided an overview of the proposed severity categories for issues, which would assist in guiding the actions required and priority of a given issue. The categories of severity are critical, major, moderate, minor, and cosmetic. Information on how an issue would be categorised was also provided. The Chair invited comments from DAG members.

MH believed the severity criteria were too subjective and need to be more measurable. IS expressed a desire to make them as quantifiable as possible and asked for suggestions on improving measurability. The Chair asked if the criteria had been borrowed from the Faster Switching Programme (FSP). IS said no, but the FSP criteria and other severity criteria has been reviewed when producing the proposed MHHS criteria. MH offered take this away and return with suggestions.

RL agreed with MH and noted they also had no suggestions at this point. Using the issue surrounding the D0142 data flow as an example, RL advised they would categorise this as major as it is unclear how the MHHS design would be implemented without this being understood and that it could lead to a significant amount of change which sits outside of the Programme. RL also suggested severity should be taken in aggregate, such that multiple minor severity issues with a given design artefact could cumulatively constitute a major.

The group discussed how issues would be categorised. MH and SC highlighted the usual criteria for assessing the severity of issues, including cost, time of rework, risk of delay if not resolved. There may also be a need to align with RAID log. IS agreed and noted some of the challenges around subjectivity in the assessment of issues. IS welcomed suggestions for any clarifications members would like to see within the severity categories. SC agreed the number of alternative solutions to an issue and subjectivity may affect whether different parties categorise a given issue major or cosmetic which could affect the prioritisation and certainty Programme Parties received. The Chair noted this was to be reasonably expected as part of a design-led implementation. IS commented they had never seen a programme design phase where design baseline testing (DBT) had not commenced without some uncertainty over elements of the design. The balance required is between uncertainty and cost of delay before the minutiae is fully accounted for.

SH agreed with IS noting a federated piece of design is quite novel. The processes proposed will act as useful 'guard rails', and it is understood there will usually be grey areas over issues and materiality. SC suggested issues or decisions which may cause challenges for individual parties should be recorded, and there should be an element of proportionality in the approach.

CB suggested where there is an issue that feels unduly lowly classified, there should be ongoing debate around that. Once multiple cycles of discussion have been undertaken there should be the formation of a level of confidence which informs any design decision in terms of the impact of any remaining issues and their significance.

MH suggested the scoring of outstanding design issues should mirror the scoring used in the Programme central RAID log, and efforts made to operate a single issues log.

The Chair summarised that DAG members have asked for clear measurability, clear criteria, and consideration of the subjectivity of issues when undertaking prioritisation. The Chair asked if any DAG members would object to using the proposed severity classification, noting further detail will be added. No objections were received.

#### **Request 4 – MHHS Design Baseline Dashboard and Issues/Dissensus/Dependencies Registers**

IS advised the final proposal related to the tools for managing the existing T1 and any Tranche 2 (T2) issues. The tools consist of a dashboard, issues register, dissensus register, and a dependencies register. The Chair invited comments from DAG members.

CH commented on the issues register, querying how the content of this is determined and providing the example of the ten issues related to T2 which were entered into the log but for which 25 actions were recorded in the comments log as part of the T2 artefact review. IS replied there was thematic analysis of the comments, which were aggregated where possible to identify blocks of commentary on a singular issue. WF advised there were likely to be multiple comments that would be resolved by resolution of a single issue. CH highlighted several comments where it was not clear whether these had resulted in an issue. IS advised this would be updated as part of the ongoing management of comments and issues.

The Chair stipulated the comments log must be complete and there should be no elements which lack a Design Team response or indication of the actions or next steps. The Chair requested the review comments log and issues log are checked to ensure this is the case prior to publication.

GS believed the tables within the registers should clearly identify who the owner of an item is, whether this be a working group or the Programme, and which individual action sits with. It should also be clear on which group an issue is being reviewed at and the meeting dates. This would provide greater clarity for Programme Participants viewing the log and provide awareness of who to speak to if they have questions. GS suggested also noted the need expand initialisms to ensure clarity for parties, noting the term 'ECS' which stands for Elexon Central Systems.

<b>ACTION DAG10-08: Programme to update the MHHS Design Baseline Dashboard to show more detail (e.g. next steps and timings)</b>
--

SC highlighted constituent feedback when reviewing the registers with a party who has issues was there is not enough detail to understand whether a given element is outstanding. SC offered the example of Snag 3, stating it was unclear which document it emanated from, and who will undertake the action required to close it. SC requested it is made clear which document and comment an issue has arisen from. IS suggested this could be done by going to comments log and filtering by snag ID.

WF advised the Business Processes and Requirements Working Group (BPRWG) is the control forum for the actions required to resolve open issues, as technical experts are in attendance. If two parties disagree with how an issue is resolved, then it should be escalated to DAG.



The DAG noted the updates to be made to the proposed processes and tools, and the agreement in principle regarding their employment in managing the design approval processes and resolution of outstanding issues.

#### 4. Tranche 2 Approval

##### T2 Overview

IS introduced the agenda item, and summarised the actions required by DAG members in relation to the recommendation for approval of the T2 design artefacts. Actions required included review of the artefacts, consultation with constituents in relation to whether the T2 artefacts meet the requirements of the TOM and are stable, and confirmation any issues are appropriately recorded and tools in place for resolution.

IS provided a summary of the comments received, noting 622 comments were received on the T2 design artefacts, of which 55% resulted in minor changes to the documents. IS noted the Tranche 3 design artefacts were out for review at present.

SH outlined the assurance activities undertaken by the MHHS Design Assurance Team, and the conclusion the T2 design artefacts are stable and sufficient (i.e. no design gaps), and capable of DAG approval. SC asked how assurance issues relating to clarity or ambiguity would be resolved without direct industry input. SH clarified many of these issues were matters that could be resolved simply, for example by adding clarifications to design documents.

IS outlined the request for a recommendation from DAG members that the T2 documents be conditionally approved, subject to any outstanding matters to be resolved in subsequent document tranches. The Chair outlined the method of conditional approval of the T2 artefacts, highlighting DAG members can approve, reject, or abstain from the recommendation they be approved. The Chair requested that any parties who feel they must reject should provide specific reasons and information on why this is so.

SC expressed a concern that conditional approval of all document tranches could result in approved artefacts, but a potential inability to agree the overall design that can be baselined at M5. Additionally, the approval of individual artefacts on their own, where these may rely on artefacts in later tranches, may mean the artefacts overall do not enable the design to be baselined. IS responded that what is sought is an acknowledgement from DAG members that artefacts are sufficiently stable to enable a recommendation for conditional approval, noting there may be outstanding issues which later impact artefacts previously approved. IS recognised the potential risks in this approach and confirmed matters arising in future tranche reviews may require change to artefacts approved in earlier tranches. SC reiterated the concern that some of the conditional approval of T2 relies on matters which will be included in later tranches, and it may not be apparent until all tranches are approved, and a view formed of the design as a whole, that other outstanding matters which affect the ability of parties to commence systems build are then identified, despite the individual tranches having been approved. IS agreed this concern, and it would be important to identify and address any design matters which are felt to be incomplete and to consider the design artefacts as a whole, once all tranches are approved.

##### T2 Conditional Approval

The Chair requested DAG members provide their positions on whether the T2 design artefacts should be recommended for conditional approval. Each constituency position is detailed below:

Constituency	Accept	Reject	Abstain
DNO Representative	✓		
Elexon Representative (as central systems provider)	✓		
I&C Supplier Representative	✓		
iDNO Representative			✓
Large Supplier Representative		✓	
Small Supplier Representative			✓
Supplier Agent Representative	✓		
Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent)	✓		
Consumer Representative	Constituency representative not in attendance		
DCC Representative (as smart meter central system provider)	Constituency representative not in attendance		

Medium Supplier Representative	Constituency seat currently vacant
National Grid ESO	Constituency seat currently vacant

### DAG Members' Specific Comments and Conditions

Constituency	Comments / Conditions
DNO Representative	GS highlighted comments from constituency members but noted there were fewer comments than with T1. As such, GS found it possible to conditionally approve subject to the specific resolution of comments from St Clements and noting some nervousness around the conditional approval of T2 based on certain anticipated developments in T3 and T4. IS advised the points raised by St Clements have been included as an open design issue and will be dealt with as part of issues resolution
Elexon Representative (as central systems provider)	MH advised they would conditionally approve, based on several additional conditions. Specifically: resolution of a missing interface on the update of reporting to data services; addition of dependencies that Elexon central system validation processes require further work; that non-functional requirements will all be captured in a later tranche (which the Chair confirmed was a currently recorded dependency); that process maps need updating, and; that there is a clear plan to action all outstanding design issues and dependencies. Subject to these conditions, MH opted to recommend conditional approval of the T2 design artefacts.
I&C Supplier Representative	GE advised no constituent feedback had been received and as such they would abstain. The Chair queried what their position would be as an expert member of DAG. GE noted their formal abstention on behalf of their constituency, but advised there was nothing that specifically prevented approval and they would have been minded to conditionally approve albeit with some nervousness around this
iDNO Representative	MHu advised feedback from constituents was there are not as many issues in T2 as there may be in T4, and that resource constraints mean the review of the T2 design artefacts may not have been as in depth as many would like. Despite this, MHu opted to recommend conditional approval.
Large Supplier Representative	CH advised the steer from their constituents was to reject, and this was the formal position of their constituency. CH commented that the information provided on the governance of issues and management of future tranches did provide some comfort. CH noted ongoing concerns on outstanding issues, and the assurances suppliers would be contacted but which did not appear to have happened. CH also noted previously expressed concerns about how conditional approval of T1 and T4 interact. CH believed a session with Suppliers following BPRWG on 29 June 2022 would be of great benefit in alleviating concerns on outstanding issues
Small Supplier Representative	JB advised no constituent feedback had been received and as such they would abstain. The Chair queried what their position would be as an expert member of DAG. JB noted their formal abstention on behalf of their constituency, but advised they did not find any significant gaps in the documentation and would have been minded to conditionally approve
Supplier Agent Representative	RL advised feedback from constituents focused on the severity of issues listed in the open design issues logs, and noted that if parties can review this again in future, they would be able to recommend conditional approval of T2
Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent)	SC recommended conditional approval, noting the need to manage and action the issues and dissensus registers

Consumer Representative	Constituency representative not in attendance
DCC Representative (as smart meter central system provider)	Constituency representative not in attendance
Medium Supplier Representative	Constituency seat currently vacant
National Grid ESO	Constituency seat currently vacant

The Chair requested any further views from the Design Assurance Team or Independent Programme Assurance representative. CB advised work is still underway to audit the processes associated with recommendations for design approvals, and there was nothing currently that needed to be raised.

The Chair summarised the recommendations of the group, and, noting there is a clearer feedback loop and issues management process, and the majority of DAG members supported a recommendation for approval of the T2 design artefacts, the Chair would, under powers conferred by the MHHS Governance Framework, conditionally approve the T2 design artefacts.

<b>DECISION DAG-DEC-22: Tranche 2 design artefacts conditionally approved</b>
---

The Chair thanked the MHHS Design Team and DAG members for their input.

**5. [MHHS Design Dashboard](#)**

See ACTION DAG10-09.

**6. [Design Decisions](#)**

See ACTION DAG10-09.

**7. [MHHS Change Control Process](#)**

See ACTION DAG10-09.

**8. [Review of RAID](#)**

See ACTION DAG10-010.

**9. [DAG Design Principles](#)**

See ACTION DAG10-09.

**10. [Level Playing Field Design Principle](#)**

See ACTION DAG10-010.

**11. [Governance Group Updates](#)**

See ACTION DAG10-09.

**12. [Level 4 Working Group Updates](#)**

See ACTION DAG10-09.

**13. [Code Drafting Principles](#)**

See ACTION DAG10-09.

**14. [Summary and next steps](#)**

The Chair noted the positive and productive discussions on T2 approval, the delay to T4, and the approach to issues resolution and management. As a result of these important discussions several agenda had not been discussed and the Chair suggested these items are issued for DAG member comment by correspondence.

<b>ACTION DAG10-09: DAG members to provide any comments on agenda items 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, and 13 within the <u>meeting papers</u> of the DAG held 08 June 2022 by close of business 16 June 2022</b>
--

GS and SC requested an extraordinary DAG is held to discuss SEC MP162. The Chair agreed and added other important items, such as the review of RAID, could be covered here also.

**ACTION DAG10-10: Programme to schedule an extraordinary DAG meeting to discuss SEC MP162/level playing field principle and to review design-related RAID items**

GS questioned where a copy of the RAID could be found, stating this had been requested several times. FM advised each request should have received a reply and advised the RAID log is not currently in the public domain. The current formal position was the RAID would be published in Q3 2022, and ideally sooner. FM advised the RAID would be circulated to GS and all DAG members as soon as it becomes available. SC queried why the RAID log is not yet public. WF committed to providing an extract of the RAID to enable DAG members to review design specific items regardless of whether the full RAID was in the public domain.

**ACTION DAG10-11: Programme to share copy of RAID for design specific issues for DAG members to review (noting RAID revision underway as part of Tranche 4 scheduling exercise)**

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

**Next meetings:**

**Extraordinary DAG: 21 June 2022**

**Standard DAG: 06 July 2022**