

MHHS Design Advisory Group (DAG) Headline Report

Issue date: 09/03/2023

Meeting Number **DAG022**

Venue **Virtual – MS Teams**

Meeting Date and Time **08 March 2023 1000-1300**

Classification **Public**

Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date
Programme Change Requests	DAG22-01	Programme to consider how further information provided by distributors on CR017 could be disseminated and whether a Q&A session should be held to assist parties in undertaking Impact Assessment of the change	Programme (PMO)	ASAP
	DAG22-02	Programme to include DAG and DA members when issuing CRs for Impact Assessment, and to take on other DAG feedback regarding improvements to the Programme's Change Control approach.	Programme (PMO)	12/04/2023
Overview of MHHS Change Control Approach	DAG22-03	DAG members to provide any further suggestions for improvements to the Change Control Approach to PMO@mhhsprogramme.co.uk by close of business 17 March 2023	DAG Members	17/03/2023
Summary and Next Steps	DAG22-04	Programme to provide clarity on which Design Artefacts published on the Programme Collaboration Basse are baselined	Programme (Paul Pettitt)	ASAP
Previous Meetings	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
	DAG21.1-03	Programme to confirm how MPAN Linkage guidance document and updated MHHS Design Artefacts will be issued	Programme (Design Team)	28/02/2023
	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)	08/03/2023
	DAG21.1-13	Programme to confirm when the DIP detailed design artefacts will be submitted to DAG	Programme (Ian Smith)	08/03/2023

	DAG21-03	Programme to consider publishing a log of Programme Change Request, and whether changes progressing via the Design Authority should be published within the same log	Programme (PMO)	08/03/2023
	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
	DAG20.1-04	Programme to confirm which role code MDS would use (current presumption is SVA code)	Programme (Ian Smith)	15/02/2023
	DAG20.1-07	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
	DAG20.1-12	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
	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
	DAG19-02	Ofgem to provide information on assumed half-hourly data opt-out rates	Ofgem (Jenny Boothe)	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

Decisions

Area		
Sender of the D0170 Data Flow	DAG-DEC-43	The DAG agree by majority decision the Registration Service should be the sender of the D0170 data flow
CCIAG Update	DAG-DEC-44	Closure of the Consequential Change Impact Assessment Group (CCIAG) approved
Minutes and Actions	DAG-DEC-45	Headline Report and amended Minutes of the DAG meeting held 11 January 2023, and Headline Report and Minutes of the DAG meeting held 08 February 2023 approved

RAID Items Discussed

RAID area	Description
None	

Key Discussion Items

Area	Discussion
Sender of the D0170 Data Flow	The Programme presented an overview of the work of the Migration Design Subgroup (MDSG). The purpose of the MDSG was to articulate the technical process through which MPANs will be migrated from legacy arrangements to new MHHS arrangements. The Chair of the MDSG praised the input of industry technical experts and thanked parties for their constructive collaboration. The group were advised of the timelines for Migration

Design approval. This includes an assurance meeting on 17 March 2023 and an extraordinary DAG on 29 March 2023 where approval of the migration artefacts will be requested.

The Large Supplier Representative asked whether this planned timeline was realistic, noting some participants were still awaiting a response on their feedback comments. The Programme advised the timeline was under close consideration and it was possible there may be a change to the date of the extraordinary DAG if necessary and parties would be kept informed. The DNO Representative noted the level of feedback received (c.700 comments) and asked when participants could expect responses by. The Programme advised all comments will receive a response and all responses will be published in a response log. Subject to the review and provision of responses a decision will be taken on whether the extraordinary DAG would be moved back by up to two days, and this decision will be informed by discussion at the MDSG.

Overview of D0170 Flow Options

The DAG were advised there was one area of Migration Design which was the subject of dissensus. This related to the use of the legacy D0170 data flow, which is proposed to be sent to the outgoing Meter Operator (MOP) and outgoing Data Collector (DC). The Programme highlighted it was crucial that parties receive the D0170 in the form agreed by the MDSG as this was essential for migration. There is a choice as to whether this flow should be sent by Suppliers or by the Registration Service, which would require system changes for whichever party is chosen. The MDSG discussed other options also. The view of the MHHS Design Team was that as both options would require systems change, the sending of the flow by the Registration Service would represent the least impact/cost option. Provision of this flow by the Registration Service will also support a centralised and robust issuance of this important market message. The Programme explained the principles which underpin this view, including core MHHS design principles such as seeking to minimise total cost to industry, and Migration Design principles such as avoiding impacts to the Registration Service and Agents unless legacy flows do not support migration.

The Programme provided a comparison of the pros/cons of the D0170 being sent by Suppliers versus the Registration Service. The full analysis can be found within the meeting papers. Considerations included impacts as against existing processes, design logic, delivery impact, and the total number of impacted parties. The net cost was believed to be greater should Suppliers be required to send the D0170, given the scale of parties who would be required to make changes to systems, as opposed the relatively fewer parties who would be impacted should the Registration Service be required to send the flow. The Registration Service will also be the central orchestrator of Agent appointments under new arrangements, and data for the D0170 is held by the Registration Service. Both factors support the notion the flow should be sent by the Registration Service. The Chair noted the metrics on delivery impacts between both options, highlighting that regardless of the options chosen, there will be parties who need to make a change to systems and this has been escalated to DAG for a decision owing to the impasse reached in terms of consensus at the MDSG.

DAG Members Views

The DNO Representative noted that the view of the number of Suppliers how may be required to make changes to systems was perhaps lower than stated, as many Suppliers use a shared systems service provider. The representative noted the impacts of the changes on the Registration Service provider were likely to be substantial and potentially impact Programme milestones. The Chair asked for further detail, to which the representative advised they do not have specific information but believed the impacts were significant. The Programme noted there were options to mitigate the time impacts of the change. The Programme noted this flow must be in place for M11 and the commencement of migration, and reach a point of natural obsolescence as migration activities end.

The Supplier Agent Representative asked for a walkthrough of when the D0170 would be sent, and whether it was a requirement of reverse migration also. The Programme advised the flow is only required for forward migration and another solution is being developed for reverse migration. The flow would be generated when new service providers have accepted their appointment. The D0170 is then generated and sent to the old service

provider/agents to advise a change is happening and the site is migrating, which will indicate to them the site has moved into the new MHHS arrangements. The representative noted the D0170 can current be used for response flow after the initial notification of de-appointment. The Programme advised it would be a 'one time' flow and if the Registration Service were to be the sender of the flow, they would take no responsibility for assurance of appropriate actioning by recipients of the flow and the D0170 would not be used for any response messaging, this being required to be undertaken bilaterally. The REC Representative noted an ongoing REC Change Proposal which seeks to resolve the need for any response messaging.

The iDNO Representative thanked the Programme for the summary. They wished to understand how many systems across Suppliers would actually be affected. The representative advised the D0170 is for the benefit of Suppliers, and not DNOs, and also noted Suppliers do not need to be ready for SIT whereas DNOs do. These factors may affect critical path activities for the commencement of SIT if the Registration Service is required to send the flow. The Programme noted feedback from some Suppliers was that they would also potentially be impacted in terms of SIT commencement if they are required to send the flow. As such the focus had been on delivery impacts, and this is why the Registration Service is being recommended as the sender. The Representative further noted potential data quality issues which could occur if the Registration Service is chosen as the sender of the flow. The Programme noted this would be discussed in a data quality report, but noted Suppliers would also face potential data quality risks.

The Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Agent) commented the migration design places significantly more change on legacy systems that they were expecting. Potential impacts on SIT have not been quantified, and the representative believed either option may impact the delivery of Programme milestones given the change which would be required for the start of migration. As such, the assessment of impacts in terms of commencement of SIT could lead to a future need to consider a replan of SIT commencement dates.

The Programme concluded the recommendation is the Registration Service is the sender of the flow based on the benefits of a central operator, the lower risk to the testing of migration specific SIT components, and the overall industry change required including impacts and costs.

DAG Decision

The Programme advised a decision was required to help cement this aspect of Migration Design and support the assurance forum due to take place in March.

The Chair asked DAG members to vote on the following options:

- 1) Option 1 – Registration Service sends the D0170
- 2) Option 2 – Suppliers send the D0170

DAG Members Votes:

Constituency	Option 1	Option 2	Abstained
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)	✓
	DCC Representative (as smart meter central system provider)	Constituency representative not in attendance
	Medium Supplier Representative	Constituency representative not in attendance
	Consumer Representative	Constituency representative not in attendance
	The DAG Chair noted the majority in favour of Option 1 and approved this option (DECISION DAG-DEC-43).	
Programme Change Requests	New Programme Change Request	
	<p>The Programme introduced new Programme Change Request (CR) 019 (Replacement of D0242 D0315 for MHHS) advising the change had been raised by UKPN as a result of a Distribution Connection and Use of System Agreement (DCUSA) change proposal. The DCUSA change seeks to introduce a new Data Integration Platform (DIP) data flow to mitigate impacts on existing Data Transfer Network (DTN) flows arising from MHHS. The DAG were advised the Programme Change Board had validated the change and advised that as the change had been subject to development via DCUSA working groups, and had already been subject to consultation, it was recommended the CR is issued directly to Impact Assessment (IA).</p> <p>One attendee asked whether the proposed solution was stable. The Programme confirmed there was a detailed solution which had been developed via multiple DCUSA working groups and a new flow specification had been developed and included as an attachment to CR019. The iDNO Representative confirmed they had attended the DCUSA working group and a robust development process had been undertaken.</p> <p>Another attendee noted a complete DIP flow specification had been provided with CR019 but did not believe it was clear which MHHS process the flow would be inserted into. The attendee believed there would be impacts on transition work.</p> <p>The group concluded that CR019 would be issued for IA following updates to attach the DCUSA change to the CR and to add detail on transition impacts. Once the requested updates have been made and the amended CR resubmitted to the Programme Change Board, the DAG agreed CR019 could be issued directly to IA.</p>	
	Existing Programme Change Requests	
	<p>The Programme advised CR017 (Licensed Distribution System Operator (LDSO) Registration Service Data Integration Platform (DIP) messages processing times) and CR018 (Registration Service Operating Hours) had been issued for IA, with responses requested by close of business 16 March 2023. The Programme requested DAG members encourage their constituents to respond to the IA.</p> <p>The DNO Representative advised DNOs had provided consolidated views on CR017 to the Programme which included requests for clarifications to be added to the CR. The Programme advised any material changes to CR017 would not be possible whilst the CR was at IA. The group considered whether the information provided by DNOs could be issued to parties to assist their IA responses, and whether a questions and answer session could be held to help (ACTION DAG22-01).</p>	

**Overview of MHHS
Change Control
Approach**

Overview of the Change Control Approach

The Programme PMO Change Lead introduced themselves and provided an overview of the Programme's Change Control Approach. The DAG were advised the Programme Change Control Approach is a baselined document, which was reviewed by the IPA and approved by Ofgem. The Change Lead advised the Programme CRs raised to date have focussed on Programme governance and other Programme level activities, and as such have been reviewed and voted on by the Programme Steering Group (PSG). Recently more design focussed CRs have been raised which propose changes to the Design Baseline, and this is why more changes have been coming to the DAG.

The changes which have recently been submitted to DAG have incurred some pain points, and the Change Lead provided reassurance on this, and outlined what the process requirements are and several improvement points.

The proposed improvements include a change dashboard to be shared with DAG each month, and external webinar to provide an overview of the change control process. It was noted there are existing documents which support the change process and visibility of these will be increased. A succinct guidance sheet is also under development to inform parties on the change process. An update will be made to the MHHS website to include a change dashboard.

DAG Comments

The Supplier Agent Representative stated the proposed improvements were good and would address some feedback received from constituents. The representative requested better visibility of the IA response deadlines. The Change Lead noted the typical response window is 10 working days and agreed to include better clarity on timelines to help participants with managing responses. The Representative also requested a view of who are impacted by changes to help guide and prioritise responses given the increasing level of CRs and finite resource available to review and respond.

The Small Supplier Representative asked which distribution lists are being used to issued CRs for IA, believing DAG and the Design Authority (DA) should be included. The Change Lead confirmed CRs are issued to all Principal Contacts and notification is also provided via The Clock. The Change Lead agreed to include the DAG and DA when design related changes are issued and to take on other feedback on improvements to the Change Control Approach (**ACTION DAG22-02**).

The Change Lead provided an overview of the existing pathways for new CRs. Full details can be found within the meeting papers. The Change Lead highlighted the role of the Programme Change Board in validating and routing changes. One attendee asked why CRs are sent to an advisory group like DAG. The Change Lead responded this is about ownership of the decision to approve/reject a given CR following IA.

The Ofgem Representative considered whether the most agile approach would be for there to be a Subject Matter Expert at the Change Board who could help address points about whether the necessary information is present in the CR before it proceeds to a decision group.

The Elexon Representative asked how the DA fits into the Change Control Approach. The Change Lead advised the DA process looks specifically at minor changes to the Design Baseline which have arisen following a Design Issue Notifications. Whereas the Programme Change Control Approach looks at Programme level changes including major change to the Design Baseline and other changes which could affect Programme milestones. The Design Resolution Group (DRG) is a subgroup of the DA which seeks to provide early insight on changes on the horizon and enable visibility, debate, and if necessary, development of changes which require deeper input. This helps to provide forward visibility of changes which may affect the Design Baseline.

	<p>The Chair summarises that design changes can be raised either as CRs, or via the DA process, both of which provide a mechanism to manage the Design Baseline. The Chair requested DAG members provide any other suggested improvements on the Change Control Approach by 17 March 2023 (ACTION DAG22-03).</p>
Design Authority Updates	<p>The Programme provided updates from the Design Authority, noting the changes directed by the Dag to the DA as part of the completion of the Work-Off Plan were approved, and another item is still awaiting feedback from the Large Supplier Representative.</p> <p>The Programme provided a summary of the changes discussed and approved at the last DA, noting several minor changes were approved, several were deferred for further information, and others were not discussed owing to the availability of time in the meeting. The Programme advised the changes not discussed would be picked up at the next DA meeting and discussed via the provision of a redlined artefact which addresses multiple Design Issue Notifications in one. This should provide a quicker and more streamlined process to help the review and approval of minor DIN changes.</p> <p>The Large Supplier Representative requested the DIN log is updated as quickly as possible to include the D008 work-off item. The Design Assurance Lead noted the large volume of other DINs being received, and how these required discussion with the raisers before entry into the DIN log and the Programme were striving to input these into the log.</p>
CCIAG Update	<p>The DAG were advised the CCIAG had successfully concluded and the primary output was the Consequential Change (CC) Log, from which a list of topics considered to be required as part of consequential change code drafting will be output to the Code Drafting Working Group (CDWG).</p> <p>The group were advised no significant changes to the Design had arisen from the CCIAG. Several items were accepted as part of the core MHHS Design but the majority were concluded as progressing externally via Code Bodies, with any consequential change to be brought into Programme code drafting following solution development under respective codes.</p> <p>The Ofgem Representative asked what would happen with any in flight discussions which may lead to consequential change. The Programme confirmed the CC Log is now closed and has crystallised. Any future change required to the MHHS Design or for inclusion on code drafting will need to be raised as a CR.</p> <p>The DAG agreed the CCIAG is now closed, having successfully delivered its objectives (DECISION DAG-DEC-44).</p>
Transition Plan Update	<p>The Programme advised working groups will be held in the near future to develop the transition plan. The likely timescales for developing and baselining transition artefacts is 8-12 weeks. Consideration will be given to whether changes to the settlement timetable are considered as part of transition arrangements.</p>
Minutes and Actions	<p>The DAG reviewed the outstanding actions. The latest updates can be found within the meeting papers and will be published with the meeting minutes.</p>
Summary and next steps	<p>AOB1: The Supplier Agent (Independent Supplier Agent) noted some confusion in discerning which Design Artefacts published on the Programme Collaboration Base were the baselined Design Artefacts. The Programme agreed to ensure this was clear (ACTION DAG22-04).</p>

Date of next Design Authority: 23 March 2023 2pm

Date of next DAG: 12 April 2023 10am