

# MHHS Design Advisory Group Minutes and Actions

Issue date: 07/02/2023

Meeting number **DAG021**

Venue **Virtual – MS Teams**

Date and time **08 February 2023 1300-1630**

Classification **Public**

## Attendees:

### Chair

Chris Welby (Chair)

### Role

Chair

### Industry Representatives

Carolyn Burns (CBu)

Small Supplier Representative

Donna Jamieson (DJ)

iDNO Representative

Gemma Slaney (GS)

DNO Representative

Haz Elmamoun (HE)

Large Supplier 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)

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

Jafer Shah (JS)

Design Assurance Team

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

Andy MacFaul (AMF)

Ofgem

Danielle Walton (DW)

Ofgem

Jenny Boothe (JB)

Ofgem

Sinead Quinn (SQ)

Ofgem

### Apologies

Gareth Evans

I&C Supplier Representative

Vlad Black

Medium Supplier Representative

## Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date
<b>Work-Off Plan Completion</b>	DAG21.1-01	Programme to issue proposed DTN flow changes to DAG and Programme Participants prior to end of February 2023	Programme (Design Team)	28/02/2023
	DAG21.1-02	Programme to issue MPAN Linkage guidance to DAG and Programme Participants prior to end of February 2023	Programme (Design Team)	
	DAG21.1-03	Programme to confirm how MPAN Linkage guidance document and updated MHHS Design Artefacts will be issued	Programme (Design Team)	
	DAG21.1-04	Programme to add wording to the Work-Off Plan completion report to reflect that minor changes required in relation to work-off items D-034d and D-053 are being issued to the Design Authority as 'pre-approved' changes to be scheduled in the next standard artefact release.	Programme (Claire Silk)	
	DAG21.1-05	Programme to update DAG meeting slides to reflect that comments were provided by a Programme Participants on work-off item D-034b	Programme (Claire Silk)	
<b>Work-Off Plan Decision</b>	DAG21.1-06	Programme to confirm the versioning of the technical Design Artefacts	Programme (Claire Silk)	
<b>Programme Change Requests</b>	DAG21.1-07	Programme to consider comments from DAG on CR018 and determine whether changes should be made and the CR resubmitted for decision on issuance to Impact Assessment	Programme (Ian Smith)	
	DAG21.1-08	Programme to consider whether change marked artefacts should be issued with Programme Change Requests and who would be expected to provide any change marking	Programme (PMO)	
	DAG21.1-09	Programme to confirm whether small changes to Programme Change Requests requested by decision-making group prior to issuance for Impact Assessment must always return to the Programme Change Board for validation prior to issuance	Programme (PMO)	
	DAG21.1-10	Programme to advised CR014 Proposer how the update change can be submitted back into the Programme change control process	Programme (PMO)	
	DAG21.1-11	Programme to provide an overview of the CR proves and Change Management Process at next DAG meeting	Programme (PMO)	
	DAG21.1-12	Programme to confirm whether migration Design Artefacts will be submitted to the 08 March 2023 DAG for approval	Programme (PMO)	
<b>Summary and Next Steps</b>	DAG21.1-13	Programme to confirm when the DIP detailed design artefacts will be submitted to DAG	Programme (Ian Smith)	
	DAG21.1-14	Programme to advise where existing approved DIP artefacts are published and confirm whether they will be published in future	Programme (Claire Silk)	
<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)	08/02/2023
	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	<p>Programme to update M5 Design Baseline Report to include:</p> <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> <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,</li> </ul>	Programme (Warren Fulton)	19/12/2022

		fortnightly reporting, updates to the Work-Off Plan, and how notices to participants will be managed)		
		Add note/link to Section 7, Criteria 9, to Appendix 2 – Post M5 MHHS Design Participant support process		

## Decisions

Area	Dec Ref	Decision
Work-Off Plan Completion	DAG-DEC-42	DAG unanimously agree the MHHS M5 Design Work-Off Plan is closed and the MHHS design can be re-baselined

## RAID items discussed/raised

RAID area	Description
None	

## Minutes

### 1. Welcome

The Chair opened the extraordinary meeting and provided an overview of the agenda and objectives. The DAG's primary objective at this meeting was to decide on the closure of the M5 Work-Off Plan and make a decision on the rebaselining of the MHHS Design Artefacts.

### 2. Work-Off Plan Completion

The Programme provided an overview of the consultation issued to DAG members following the publication of the updated and change marked MHHS Design Artefacts, which were updated as part of the M5 Work-Off Plan and following the M5 Design Assurance Forum and DAG meetings held 01 and 08 February 2023. The group reviewed the consultation responses received.

#### Review of Consultation Responses:

**D008 – Complex Site Arrangements:** The Programme advised comments were received from the Large Supplier Representative. The Programme proposed any further activity on this topic is progressed via the Design Authority (DA) as a Design Issue Notification (DIN). HE acknowledged further action on this topic could be progressed by Large Suppliers via the DA, and advised there was an ongoing consideration whether a Programme Change Request (CR) is raised. The Programme recommended this work-off item be closed, to which no objection was received.

OUTCOME: Work-off item closed and referred to the DA.

**D-025 – Definition of changes to DTN Messages:** The Programme advised comments were received from the Large Supplier Representative. The Programme stated a summary of proposed changes to DTN flows will be published by the end of February 2023, and proposed this be monitored by the DAG. The Programme proposed this is recorded as an action and the work-off item closed. No objections were received.

OUTCOME: Work-off item closed and action raised for DAG to monitor publication of proposed changes to DTN flows.

**ACTION DAG21.1-01: Programme to issue proposed DTN flow changes to DAG and Programme Participants prior to end of February 2023**

**D-033 – MPAN Linkage (Related & Import/Export):** The Programme advised comments were received from the Large Supplier Representative. The Programme stated a guidance document on MPAN Linkage would be issued by the end of February 2023. The Programme proposed this is recorded as an action and the work-off item closed. No objections were received.

CBu asked how the guidance document and updated MHHS Design Artefacts would be issued (e.g., via the DAG, DA, MHHS Principal Contacts, The Clock, etc). IS advised the notification would likely go to all of these contacts and agreed to confirm.

OUTCOME: Work-off item closed and action raised for DAG to monitor publication of MPAN Linkage guidance document.

**ACTION DAG21.1-02: Programme to issue MPAN Linkage guidance to DAG and Programme Participants prior to end of February 2023**

**ACTION DAG21.1-03: Programme to confirm how MPAN Linkage guidance document and updated MHHS Design Artefacts will be issued**

**D-034d – Redundant data items in Unmetered Segment:** The Programme provided an update on this item and confirmed a DIN regarding data items not used within the unmetered segment will be discussed at the DA. The Programme noted a comment was received directly from a Programme Participation and this resolution confirmed with them.

OUTCOME: Work-off item closed and referred to the DA.

**D-053 – Minor Corrections – Interfaces:** The Programme advised comments were received from the RECCo and DNO Representatives, and item had been raised as a DIN to for discussion at the DA.

The Programme recommended this work-off item be closed, to which no objection was received.

OUTCOME: Work-off item closed and referred to the DA.

### **Work-Off Plan Recommendation**

CS noted 62 work-off items were closed at the DAG meeting held 08 February 2023. CS went on say that given actions and resolutions were now in place which had allowed the closure of the remaining 11 work-off items, and given no other consultation comments had been provided, the Programme recommends the M5 Work-Off Plan is closed.

DAG were advised that, subject to approval, the current change marked Design Artefacts would be uplifted to v5.0 and published on the MHHS Programme Collab base by prior to 28 February 2023. CS explained the reason for this publication timeframe was to enable updates to the Collaboration Base.

The Programme advised any minor changes to the Design Artefacts as a result of the work-off items which are to be resolved via the DA would be issued one of the scheduled DA releases. The DAG agreed the minor changes required in relation to work-off items D-04d and D-053 would be issued to the DA with an instruction to approve.

### **DAG Member Questions**

SC requested clear wording be included in the Work-Off Plan completion report over the pre-approval of the minor changes required for D-034d and D-053. SC also requested the meeting slides be updates to reflect that comments were provided directly to the Programme by a Programme Participant in relation to work-off item D-034b.

**ACTION DAG21.1-04: Programme to add wording to the Work-Off Plan completion report to reflect that minor changes required in relation to work-off items D-034d and D-053 are being issued to the Design Authority as 'pre-approved' changes to be scheduled in the next standard artefact release**

**ACTION DAG21.1-05: Programme to update DAG meeting slides to reflect that comments were provided by a Programme Participants on work-off item D-034b**

ND queried potential interactions between the work-off items and items within the Consequential Change (CC) Log. IS replied there would be variation in the treatment of items in the CC Log as some will require potential action outside of the Programme, and some may require CRs as discussions develop. ND was happy with this.

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

The Chair asked the SI Design Assurance Team and the Independent Programme Assurance (IPA) provider whether they wished to provide any comments ahead of the DAG being asked to vote on the closure of the work-off plan and rebaselining of the MHHS Design Artefacts. Both parties advised they had no further comments to provide beyond those provided at the last DAG meeting.

The Chair invited any further comments from DAG members prior to voting.

GS expressed some disappointment over how the resolution of the M5 Work-off Plan had operated and how they had assumed when approving the M5 milestone in October 2022 that all work-off items would be fully complete and no actions outstanding. GS noted there are CRs, actions, and DA items which are still progressing, and believed it may have been inevitable DAG would be unable to make decisions on some items.

SC queried the versioning of the Design Artefacts on rebaselining, commenting some would become v5.0, but others were still in draft and would in theory become v1.0. CS responded this relates to some technical artefacts and offered to confirm whether the versions should differ.

**ACTION DAG21.1-06: Programme to confirm the versioning of the technical Design Artefacts**

DJ reiterated GS' view and expressed frustration on behalf of the iDNO constituency that the full and complete MHHS Design was not available for the commencement of design, build, and test (DBT).

MH asked whether the physical interfaces within the design are likely to change in future. IS responded they are not expected to change substantively but there is always scope for change being required as DBT evolves. IS confirmed any substantive changes would be subject to change control and therefore participant impact assessment.

CBu asked for clarity on which Design Artefacts would not be uplifted to v5.0, subject to approval. CS responded it would be technical artefacts only such end-to-end non-functional, architecture, and interface specifications. CS confirmed all updated Design Artefacts would be published together.

SC queried how the migration Design Artefacts will be approved and whether they would be subject to change control. IS advised the artefacts would be baselined by DAG and would be subject to change control thereafter.

The DAG were advised the question they would be asked to vote on was "[d]o you agree the MHHS M5 Design Work-Off plan is complete and the MHHS Design can be re-baselined?". SC stated they did not believe DAG should have been asked to vote on a single question. The Chair explained any such statements can be provided as comments alongside the members vote.

The DAG proceeded to vote as follows:

**DAG Members Votes:**

Constituency	Yes	No
DCC Representative (as smart meter central system provider)	✓	
DNO Representative	✓	
Elexon Representative (as central systems provider)	✓	
I&C Supplier Representative	✓	
iDNO Representative	✓	
Large Supplier Representative	✓	
National Grid ESO	✓	
RECCo Representative	✓	
Small Supplier Representative	✓	
Supplier Agent Representative	✓	
Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent)	✓	
I&C Supplier Representative		Constituency representative not in attendance
Medium Supplier Representative		Constituency representative not in attendance
Consumer Representative		Constituency representative not in attendance

**DAG Members Voting Comments:**

Constituency	Voting Comments
DCC Representative (as smart meter central system provider)	SS voted yes to the closure of the M5 Work-Off Plan and rebaselining of the MHHS Design Artefacts. SS commented the closure of the Work-Off Plan had been challenging, and they did not believe the vote should have been a single question.
DNO Representative	GS voted yes to the closure of the M5 Work-Off Plan and rebaselining of the MHHS Design Artefacts.

	<p>GS believed the vote should not have been a single question as whilst they accepted the rebaselined artefacts, they did not believe the Work-Off Plan was fully complete. WF clarified the closure if the Work-Off Plan was a formality of governance, and created certainty for Programme Participants entering DBT that no further changes to the Design Artefacts could occur via the Work-Off Plan. GS acknowledged the raising of actions and CRs meant the Programme considered the Work-Off Plan complete but this was not what they had expected. Despite this, GS advised they were happy with where things were.</p>
Elxon Representative (as central systems provider)	MH voted yes to the closure of the M5 Work-Off Plan and rebaselining of the MHHS Design Artefacts with no comments.
iDNO Representative	<p>DJ voted yes to the closure of the M5 Work-Off Plan and rebaselining of the MHHS Design Artefacts.</p> <p>DJ commented they were happy to rebaseline noting issues had been addressed via the Work-Off Plan but were not fully completed.</p>
Large Supplier Representative	<p>HE voted yes to the closure of the M5 Work-Off Plan and rebaselining of the MHHS Design Artefacts.</p> <p>HE commented this was a conditional acceptance based on the actions raised and items placed within the DIN Log for transparency and tracking.</p>
National Grid ESO	ND agreed with the other comments raised and voted yes to the closure of the M5 Work-Off Plan and rebaselining of the MHHS Design Artefacts.
RECCo Representative	<p>SJ voted yes to the closure of the M5 Work-Off Plan and rebaselining of the MHHS Design Artefacts.</p> <p>SJ asked for clarity on how the actions to be raised as a result of closing the Work-Off Plan would be tracked. The Programme confirmed these would be tracked via the DAG.</p>
Small Supplier Representative	CBu voted yes to the closure of the M5 Work-Off Plan and rebaselining of the MHHS Design Artefacts.
Supplier Agent Representative	<p>RL voted yes to the closure of the M5 Work-Off Plan and rebaselining of the MHHS Design Artefacts.</p> <p>RL expressed agreement with the other comments by DAG members. RL comments the timescales for responses to the consultation on the Work-Off Plan completion report were tight and they had not received any comments from their constituents. As such, RL stated they must assume there was disagreement over the closure of the Work-Off Plan and rebaselining of the MHHS Design Artefacts. RL believed one of the conditions of the inception of the Work-Off Plan was it would not impact any resourcing elsewhere in the Programme, and they did not believe this had been the case.</p>
Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent)	<p>SC voted yes to the closure of the M5 Work-Off Plan and rebaselining of the MHHS Design Artefacts.</p> <p>SC commented they accepted the rebaselining of the MHHS Design Artefacts and that further changes would proceed via the Programme's change control processes.</p>
I&C Supplier Representative	Constituency representative not in attendance.
Consumer Representative	Constituency representative not in attendance.
Medium Supplier Representative	Constituency representative not in attendance.

The Chair thanked members for the votes and comments, and noted there was unanimous agreement that the MHHS M5 Design Work-Off plan is closed and the MHHS Design can be rebaseline.



**DECISION DAG-DEC-42: DAG unanimously agree the MHHS M5 Design Work-Off Plan is closed and the MHHS design can be re-baselined**

#### 4. Programme Change Requests

FM advised a new CR had been submitted to DAG for a decision on issuance to Impact Assessment (IA), and provided an overview of the decision DAG would be asked to make.

SC queried who the Proposer of CR018 (Registration Service Operating Hours) was, to which IS responded the Programme was raising the change. SC expressed disappointment the Programme did not raise CR017 (LDSO DIP messages processing times) as this resulted in the options available to resolve the issue not being included and the need for CR018 arising. GS echoed this, believing the change could have been raised in November 2022, and believes this was a product of a lack of understanding over Programme change control processes. WF interjected stating they felt it was necessary to clarify the process which had led to the current situation, and noting it was because the DNO/iDNO constituencies did not wish to adopt the consensus option it was agreed a CR was required to formally obtain IA comments from participants. WF wished to ensure only fact-based views are expressed rather than assumptions. FM provided information on where the Programme's Change Control Approach could be found and advised it answers many of the questions GS had raised on Programme change processes.

IS provided an overview of CR018, noting it proposed an option in addition to the options included in CR017 and details elements of functionality which were discussed via MHHS working groups and represented a midway option between the option in CR017. DAG members were invited to comment.

SJ asked about the clarity of what was proposed, noting the CR provides options around the processing of messages out of hours and in the next working day. SJ noted a potential confusion over whether the wording indicates processing will be carried out out of hours, but the registration service would not be required to undertake work on manual expressions. IS responded there are three layers to this; the availability of the Application Programming Interface (API) to consume interfaces (of which the CR states high functionality is required), the receipt of the API message, and manual exceptions. SJ wished to understand the second layer, and whether the receipt of API messages would stop out of hours. IS believed the wording indicated the second layer would cease out of hours and function only in operating hours. SJ stated this means automated processes would not operate at all out of hours, and asked for clarity on this within the CR.

SJ also asked what Design Artefacts are proposed to change, and whether this would be actions within the Operational Choreography documents, or obligations around out of hour service operation. IS advised the variation in CR018's solution is around the treatment of manual exceptions and the 60 minutes response time. SJ stated sight of the changes that would be made to any Design Artefact would assist with IA.

IS agreed to consider the comments raised and determine whether updates should be made to CR018 to be more explicit over the elements where there was potential confusion.

**ACTION DAG21.1-07: Programme to consider comments from DAG on CR018 and determine whether changes should be made, and the CR resubmitted for decision on issuance to Impact Assessment**

SC stated that, having just baselined the Design Artefacts, they would expect all new CRs to be issued for IA with change marked Design Artefacts to assist review of what is changing. MH questioned whether the change can be effectively assessed without a change marked document to understand what is changing.

SC believed all design related CRs should be issued with change marked Design Artefacts. MH stated they fundamentally disagreed with this. IS believed IA was about drawing out comments from participants which would then inform the change marking of the Design Artefacts for participants to assess. One attendee noted this would mean double IA. SC believed that without change marked documents, many participants may struggle to know what they need to assess what is changing. The Chair noted the Programme Change Control Process does not currently require change marked documents to accompany CRs being issued for IA, and a CR would be required to change this.

RL advised they saw both perspectives on this question, considering it may not be right to ask Proposers to change mark Programme documents, but that the change marking of documents after IA essentially requires that two assessments are carried out. RL highlighted CR018 as an example of a chance where the optimal solution was not known and without full clarity over what is proposed to change within the design artefacts, the IA responses could be very different. RL believed there needs to be clarity over what documentation is issued with a CR and how parties are to assess. MH believed the Programme should provide any change marked documents as Proposers could not be expected to know the artefacts well enough to undertake change marking. The Chair disagreed, believing the question at hand was around what stage

in the CR process change marking should be carried out. The Chair noted currently change marking is carried out after IA.

DJ noted the challenges associated with asking Proposers to provide change marked documents, but also noted the challenge of CRs not being specific enough for IA. DJ noted the process under the Distribution Connection and Use of System Agreement (DCUSA) is that redlined legal text is provided with every change being issued for IA. DJ wished to now what was to be assessed under CR018, and what 24/7 service operation really means.

**ACTION DAG21.1-08: Programme to consider whether change marked artefacts should be issued with Programme Change Requests and who would be expected to provide any change marking**

The DAG agreed the decision on whether to issue CR018 to IA would be deferred whilst the Proposer considers updates following DAG comments. The group noted the decision taken at the last Dag meeting to issue CR017 and CR018 for IA together. SC questioned whether CR017 had already been agreed to be issued for IA subjected to amendments. FM clarified the change process required that any updated CRs would need to be reissued to the Programme Change Board for validation prior to returning to the relevant decision-making group for a decision on issuance to IA.

The Chair questioned whether updated CRs must always loop back to the Programme Change Board for revalidation, noting this may protract change timelines. The Programme agreed to take an action to confirm this.

**ACTION DAG21.1-09: Programme to confirm whether small changes to Programme Change Requests requested by decision-making group prior to issuance for Impact Assessment must always return to the Programme Change Board for validation prior to issuance**

MH queried how CR014 (Changes to the baselined LSS Design) could be reinserted into the Programme change process. FM offered to provide information to MH on this directly.

**ACTION DAG21.1-10: Programme to advise CR014 Proposer how the update change can be submitted back into the Programme change control process**

## 5. Summary and Next Steps

The Chair thanks members for their contributions and advised the actions from the meeting would be published with the meeting minutes.

The Chair invited any other business (AOB).

AOB1: SC requested a refresher overview of the Programme change process is provided. The Programme agreed to provide this at the next DAG meeting.

**ACTION DAG21.1-11: Programme to provide an overview of the CR proves and Change Management Process at next DAG meeting**

AOB2: CBU asked whether the migration Design Artefacts would be submitted to the DAG meeting on 08 March 2023. The Programme agreed to confirm.

**ACTION DAG21.1-12: Programme to confirm whether migration Design Artefacts will be submitted to the 08 March 2023 DAG for approval**

AOB3: MH asked whether any transition design artefacts will be part of the migration artefacts submitted to DAG. The Programme advised the migration artefacts would come first and any wider transition artefacts would follow later.

AOB4: SJ asked when the Data Integration Platform, (DIP) detailed design artefacts would be submitted to DAG. IS offered to confirm this.

**ACTION DAG21.1-13: Programme to confirm when the DIP detailed design artefacts will be submitted to DAG**

AOB5: SC asked where current DIP artefacts could be found and requested this is made clearer on the MHHS website.

**ACTION DAG21.1-14: Programme to advise where existing approved DIP artefacts are published and confirm whether they will be published in future**

The Chair noted the significance of decision to rebaseline the Design artefacts and brought the meeting to a close

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

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

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