MHHS Design Advisory Group (DAG) Headline Report

Issue date: 12/04/2024

Meeting Number	**DAG035**	Venue	**Virtual – MS Teams**
Meeting Date and Time	**10 April 2024 10:00-13:00**	Classification	**Public**

Actions

Area	Ref	Action	Owner	Due
Minutes and Actions	DAG35-01	Programme to provide visibility of the outputs of the lessons learned information provided by participants in relation to the Interface Code of Connections and DIP onboarding processes, as well as information on onboarding requirements for future testing stages	Programme (Smitha Pichrikat)	08/05/2024
CR044 Decision	DAG35-02	Programme to raise Programme risk if CR044 is not approved for implementation pre-M10	Programme (Paul Pettitt)	08/05/2024
CR045 Decision	DAG35-03	Programme schedule Design Resolution Group (DRG) to develop detailed solution for CR045 (and include review of CR044 downstream impacts at this DRG also)	Programme (Paul Pettitt)	08/05/2024
CR045 Decision	DAG35-04	Programme to raise a Programme risk over risks regarding the potential impacts of not implementing CR045 pre-M10	Programme (Paul Pettitt)	08/05/2024
Previous Meeting(s)	DAG34-04	Subject to information being provided on the feasibility of implementing CR045 pre-M10 (Central systems ready for migrating MPANs), Programme to raise Programme risk should implementation not be possible pre-M10	Programme (Sean Cooper)	10/04/2024
	DAG34-08	Programme to advise whether changes to the DAG Terms of Reference are required in response to the changes agreed by the Programme Steering Group to the MHHS Change Control Process	Programme (PMO)	10/04/2024
	DAG34-09	IPA to provide views on the changes to the MHHS Change Control Approach agreed at the PSG on 06 March 2024	IPA (Colin Bezant)	10/04/2024
	DAG34-10	Programme to consider whether the Programme Change Request to implement changes to the MHHS Change Control Approach should be subject to a full Impact Assessment	Programme (PMO)	ASAP

	DAG34-11	DAG members to submit their views on the changes to the MHHS Change Control Approach their Programme Steering Group (PSG) representative for consideration by the PSG	DAG Members	03/04/2024
	DAG32-06	Programme to provide further detail on the change freeze criteria and how change requests are progressed into normal BSC/REC/SEC BAU	Programme (PMO)	06/03/2024

Decisions

Area	Ref	Decision
CR044 Decision	DAG-DEC99	The SRO recommends to the Programme Steering Group that change to the MHHS Design is required in relation to CR044, but that owing to the potential Programme delivery risks of implementation pre-M10, and given the potential impacts of implementation post-M10, the decision on whether to approve or reject the CR should be escalated to the Programme Steering Group
CR045 Decision	DAG-DEC100	The SRO recommends to the Programme Steering Group that change to the MHHS Design is required in relation to CR045, but that owing to the potential Programme delivery risks of implementation pre-M10, and given the potential impacts of implementation post-M10, the decision on whether to approve or reject the CR should be escalated to the Programme Steering Group
CR046 Decision	DAG-DEC101	The SRO approved CR046 for publication in a future IR8.x release and implementation/testing to be confirmed

Key Discussion Items

Area	Discussion
Minutes and Actions	Approval of the headline reports of the previous DAG meeting and the DAG meeting held 14 February 2024 were deferred pending updates. Action wording and updates can be found within the meeting papers and key discussion points are summarised below: **DAG32-06:** The RECCo Representative highlighted the need to consider Retail Energy Code (REC) governance arrangements, and those of other industry codes, as part of the development of arrangements for the management of change and the MHHS Design post 'go-live' (i.e. M10 (Central systems ready for migrating MPANs)). The representative considered it may be prudent to initiate code change processes prior to M10 such that any priority changes known to be required could be ready for approval/implementation shortly after. The Small Supplier Representative believed the Programme Change Board and Programme Steering Group (PSG) should also consider post-M10 change arrangements given their role in managing Programme Change Requests (CRs). The Elexon Representative advised development of post-M10 change arrangements was underway in collaboration with the Programme, and it was likely a Balancing and Settlement Code (BSC) working group/work stream would be established to consider post go-live BSC changes. The IPA added that they are also considering how to assure change process requirements are transitioned to Business-As-Usual (BAU) arrangements in a controlled way. Acton retained as ongoing until arrangements confirmed. Action ongoing.

	DAG34-02: The Small Supplier Representative requested visibility is provided of the outputs of the lessons learned information provided by participants in relation to the Interface Code of Connections and DIP onboarding processes. The Representative requested information is also shared on onboarding requirements for future testing stages (**ACTION DAG35-01**). Action closed and replaced with new action. Action closed.
CR044 Decision	The Programme provided an overview of the Impact Assessment (IA) responses to CR044 (Implementation of 'Data Refresh' Message IF-051). The Chair summarised that the majority of participants supported the change to the MHHS Design but did not believe implementation was possible pre-M10. As such, the Chair advised one option was for the DAG to recommend the design change is undertaken but escalate the decision to the PSG owing to the potential Programme delivery impacts and risks associated with implementation pre or post M10. The Chair invited comments from DAG members: • Elexon Representative: Supported the principle of the change but stated it was unlikely implementation would be possible pre-M10, and to do so would impact existing scheduled work. • DNO Representative: Supported the changes to the MHHS Design but stated initial view was implementation pre-M10 would be challenging. Advised that St Clements, as the Meter Point Registration System (MPRS) provider, may be able to implement the changes in early 2025 following Qualification Testing if a sufficient window is provided, and with a view to undertaking testing ahead of M10 in March 2025 • I&C Representative: Expressed support for the change but did not believe implementation would be possible pre-M10. Suggested consideration should be given to a 'day two' release for changes such as this. • RECCo Representative: Supported the change and agreed that if implementation pre-10 was not possible, it should be as soon after as practicable. Noted that any associated industry code changes which may be required post-M10 would be required to proceed via standard code change processes and DAG's recommendations may be considered but would not be binding. • NGESO Representative: Agreed DAG should recommend design change is undertaken, and that the decision is escalated to PSG. Expressed caution over ensuring design changes which are agreed as being required but cannot be implemented pre-M10 are not 'lost' and noted the potential for such changes to accumulate and require prioritisation for post-M10 implementation. • Large Supplier Representative: Supported the principle of the change but believed the implications of the change may be wider than stated. Requested a development session is held to consider the potential downstream impacts of the change and how these could be managed. The Chair noted this could be discussed at a future Design Resolution Group (DRG). • Small Supplier Representative: Considered that DAG could not approve CRs for implementation post-M10, and urged clarity that DAG could recommend the approval of the design change but could not approve the CR or its implementation. • IPA: Advised caution over potential functionality changes in early 2025 so close to systems go-live. Stated consideration was required of what impacts would arise for data alignment if implementation were undertaken in a controlled manner post-M10 and whether challenging cleansing activities would be required. The DNO Representative advised the CR would enable a solution to refresh data pre-M10 and if not implemented, meant existing data misalignment may continue. The IPA considered the aim of the CR was to halt existing potential for data misalignment, and as such not implementing pre-M10 would not represent a material change to existing impacts.

	The Chair summarised: • DAG agree change to the MHHS Design is required and recommend the solution within the CR is implemented • DAG agree the decision on whether to approve or reject the CR should be escalated to the PSG owing to the challenges associated with implementation pre-M10 and the risks associate with implementation post-M10 • A Programme risk will be raised if implementation is not agreed for pre-M10 (**ACTION DAG35-02**). • Urgent consideration of how known post-M10 design changes are managed via BAU code governance processes is required The Chair, acting with delegated authority of the MHHS Senior Responsible Owner (SRO), determined a recommendation should be made to the PSG that change to the MHHS Design is required, but that owing to the potential Programme delivery risks of implementation pre-M10, and given the potential impacts of implementation post-M10, the decision on whether to approve or reject the CR should be escalated to the PSG (**DECISION DAG-DEC99**).
CR045 Decision	The Programme provided an overview of the Impact Assessment (IA) responses to CR045 (Supply Start Date (SSD) Correction Tool). As with CR044, the Chair summarised that the majority of participants supported change to the MHHS Design but did not believe implementation was possible pre-M10. As such, the Chair advised the decision on CR would be escalated to the PSG, with the DAG asked to provide a recommendation on whether change to the MHHS Design is required. The Chair noted there were risks associated with both not implementing the change and implementing the change pre-M10, and a Programme risk would be raised (**ACTION DAG30-03**). The Programme noted a DRG would be required to develop the detailed design (**ACTION DAG30-04**). The Chair invited comments from DAG members: • Elexon Representative: Supported the change and escalation to the PSG. Noted the settlement risks associated with not implementing meant the change should be prioritised over CR044. Considered that if implementation was not possible pre-M10, it should be prioritised for post-M10 and the outputs of any DRGs should be provided to Code Bodies to support the progression of the change under BAU code governance. • DNO Representative: Supported the change and escalation to the PSG. Noted that, as with CR044, it was possible St Clements could implement in early 2025. • RECCo Representative: Believed an urgent fix was required otherwise existing suppliers may not be able to appoint agents until the Central Switching Service (CSS) and Electricity Enquiry Service (EES) matched. Stated if the change was not implemented rejections may occur which would require manual intervention to resolve, and any such rejections were likely to occur as MHHS migration commences. Agreed a Programme risk should be raised and the change should be prioritised for implementation as soon as practicable. Believed the DRG should consider how many registration corrections occur to highlight the impacts of the issue and whether workarounds may be required to consumption can be allocated to the correct supplier. The Programme responded current indications were the issue occurs for around 100-200 MPANs per month, and as such the associated risks would increase as more MPANs migrate post-M10. • Small Supplier Representative: Believed the CR had broader ramifications for participants and did not support implementation pre-M10 based on the IA responses. Believed the DRG to develop the lower level detail of the design was required before a recommendation could be made.

	Considered that participant IA responses may have been confounded the proposed implementation date being pre-M10 and that better clarity was required in IAs between whether participants supported changes to the MHHS Design and when implementation was feasible. The Chair summarised: • DAG agree change to the MHHS Design is required and the lower level detail should be developed via the DRG • DAG agree the decision on whether to approve or reject the CR should be escalated to the PSG owing to the challenges associated with implementation pre-M10 and the risks associate with implementation post-M10 • DAG agree CR045 should be prioritised for implementation • A Programme risk will be raised given the potential impacts of not implementing pre-M10 The Chair, acting with delegated authority of the SRO, determined a recommendation should be made to the PSG that change to the MHHS Design is required, but that owing to the potential Programme delivery risks of implementation pre-M10, and given the potential impacts of implementation post-M10, the decision on whether to approve or reject the CR should be escalated to the PSG (**DECISION DAG-DEC100** – recording timestamp 01:35:00).
CR046 Impact Assessment	The Programme provided an overview of the IA responses to CR046 (Enabling Metering Point Energy Flow to be changed more than once). The Chair invited comments from DAG members: • Elexon Representative: Expressed support for CR and for implementation pre-M10. Believed that as the associated REC change is already approved, it would be prudent to implement the CR. Considered that as the solution was not expected to be used often, this supported implementation pre-M10. • Small Supplier Representative: Queried whether there would be any regression testing required. The RECCo Representative believed there would not be, highlighting the process to change the Metering Point Energy Flow (MPEF) once already exists within the MHHS Design. The Programme responded that whilst 'forward' change of the MPEF would be tested as part of System Integration Testing (SIT), consideration was required of whether the MPEF changing 'back and forth' would require testing. • Large Supplier Representative: Believed the change was not urgent enough to require implementation pre-M10. • DNO Representative: Stated that following approval of the associated REC change, DNOs are already making the required systems changes. Questioned what will happen if the CR is rejected, and whether the systems changes would need to be unpicked. The Representative considered the frequency of changes to the MPEF was low, and therefore the issue to be resolved was low impact. The Chair noted the existing industry solution was onerous as it required termination of the MPAN and creation of a new one. • RECCo Representative: Advised the REC change would go live as planned as it was believed there was value to consumers in having the solution available now, and if the CR is rejected the REC change would be backed out pre-M10 under REC governance. The Representative considered the CR offered a simple solution to a rare problem, but one where the current industry solution was a 'nuclear' option. The Chair summarised:

	• The majority of participants appear to want the change, and it would be odd to reject the change and force the associated REC change to be rescinded pre-M10, and re-implemented post-M10 • However, the CR did not appear to meet the threshold for implementation despite the Programme change freeze, and could set a precedent if approved • The change could be implemented in a future Interim Release (IR) 8.x, with testing requirements confirmed later but believed to be low impact The Chair invited any objections to approval of the CR. The Large Supplier Representative stated they objected based on the CR not meeting the change freeze criteria. The Chair noted the comments provided, that the associated REC change was already approved, and that the implementation impact were believed to be low, and as such was minded to approve the change on the proviso this did not set a precedent for other future CRs. The Chair, acting with delegated authority of the SRO, approved CR046 for publication in a future IR8.x release and implementation/testing to be confirmed (**DECISION DAG-DAG101** – recording timestamp 02:02:00).
Design Updates	The Programme advised IR7.2 was the current build version for SIT Functional (SIT F) Cycle 2 commencing 10 June 2024. IR8 was the current build version for SIT F Cycle 3 commencing 02 September 2024. There are no further scheduled IRs at present. Approved CRs and defect fixes arising from testing will be released in a future IR8.x ad-hoc release and as much notice provided to participants as possible. The Design Issue Notification (DIN) log remains in operation, with updates applied every Friday. The Small Supplier Representative asked whether the handover of DINs to be implemented post-M10 was being considered. The Programme confirmed a handover plan is being developed for the handover of the MHHS Design to enduring governance arrangements, and DINs will be a part of this.

Next meeting: 08 May 2024 10am

Attendees

Chair	Role
Justin Andrews	Chair
Industry Representatives	
Andrew Grace (on behalf of Craig Handford)	Large Supplier Representative
Carolyn Burns	Small Supplier Representative
Chris Day	Elexon Representative
Daniel Arrowsmith	National Grid ESO
David Yeoman	DNO Representative
Donna Jamieson	IDNO Representative
Gareth Evans	I&C Supplier Representative
Jonny Moore (on behalf of Sarah Jones)	RECCo Representative
Kristina Leary (on behalf of Robert Langdon)	Supplier Agent Representative
Simon Harrison (on behalf of Seth Chapman)	Supplier Agent Representative
Stuart Drinan	DCC Representative (as smart meter central system provider)
MHHS	
Fraser Mathieson	PMO Governance Lead
Paul Pettitt	Design Lead
Sean Cooper	Design Team
Smitha Pichrikat	Design Client Delivery Manager
Other Attendees	
Colin Bezant	IPA
Dale Ryan	RECCo
Danielle Walton	Ofgem
Taylor Thorpe	IPA

Apologies

Caroline Farquhar	Consumer Representative