# MHHS Design Advisory Group Minutes and Actions

**Issue date: 13 July 2022**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Meeting number | **DAG011** | Venue | **Virtual – MS Teams** |
| Date and time | **06 July 2022 09:30-13:30** | Classification | **Public** |

## Attendees:

| **Chair** | **Role** |
|---|---|
| Justin Andrews (Chair) | Chair |
| **Industry Representatives** | |
| Craig Handford (CH) | Large Supplier Representative |
| Donna Townsend (DT) | iDNO Representative |
| Ed Rees (ER) | 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) |
| Neil Dewar (ND) | National Grid ESO |
| Robert Langdon (RL) | Supplier Agent Representative |
| Sarah Jones (SJ) | RECCo Representative |
| Seth Chapman (SC) | Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent) |
| Stuart Scott (SS) | DCC Representative (as smart meter central system provider) |
| **MHHS IM** | |
| Claire Silk (CS) | Design Market and Engagement Lead |
| Fraser Mathieson (FM) | PMO Governance Lead |
| Ian Smith (IS) | Design Manager |
| Paul Pettitt | Design Assurance Team |
| Simon Harrison (SH) | Design Assurance Lead |
| Warren Fulton (WF) | Separation Lead |
| **Other Attendees** | |
| Colin Bezant (CB) | Independent Programme Assurance |
| Danielle Walton (DW) | Ofgem |
| Tim Newton (TN) | Smart Energy Code |

## Apologies:

| | |
|---|---|
| Vladimir Black | Medium Supplier Representative |

## Actions

| Area | Action Ref | Action | Owner | Due Date |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Tranche 3 Approval** | DAG11-01 | Provide draft plan on transition requirements at next DAG meeting | Programme (Ian Smith) | 28/07/2022 |
| | DAG11-02 | Discuss with TMAG Chair St Clements participation at TMAG | Chair | 21/07/2022 |
| | DAG11-03 | Provide assurance findings on T3 to upcoming DAG | Programme (Simon Harrison) | 21/07/2022 |
| **Level playing Field Design Principle** | DAG11-04 | Produce strawman on options and dimensions for MHHS proposals regarding differential read window as defined under Smart Energy Code Modification Proposal 162 solution. Consult with DAG members to garner input on options/dimensions/materiality. | Programme (Ian Smith) | 21/07/2022 |
| | DAG11-05 | Clarify DAG decision making authority regarding MHHS Design and SEC MP162 solution (related to ACTION DAG11-04) | Chair | 21/07/2022 |
| | DAG11-06 | Clarify with CCAG Chair and SRO how design drives code changes and how existing MHHS related code changes are managed | Chair | 21/07/2022 |
| **Summary and Next Steps** | DAG11-07 | Provide any comments on agenda items 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, and 13 within the meeting papers of the DAG held 06 July 2022 by close of business 15 July 2022 | DAG Members | 15/07/2022 |
| | DAG11-08 | Ensure Programme risk relating to 162 covers any governance implications for MHHS and Codes | Programme (PMO) | 21/07/2022 |
| **Previous Meeting(s)** | DAG06-01 | Review alignment between related MPAN modifications and design subgroup | Programme (Ian Smith) | 13/05/2022 |
| | 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 |
| | DAG09-12 | 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 |
| | 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 |
| | DAG10.1-01 | Discuss transition timetable and go/no-go decision with MH | Programme (Ian Smith) | 06/07/2022 |
| | DAG10.1-02 | Clarify to JB the optimal communication routes and contact addresses/points of escalation within the Programme | Programme (Claire Silk) | 28/06/2022 |
| | DAG10.1-03 | Communicate current thinking around transition plan to DAG members | Programme (Ian Smith) | 06/07/2022 |

## Decisions

| Area | Dec Ref | Decision |
|---|---|---|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Minutes and Actions** | DAG-DEC-23 | Minutes of DAG meeting held 11 May 2022 approved |
| | DAG-DEC-24 | Minutes of DAG meeting held 08 June 2022 approved |
| | DAG-DEC-25 | Minutes of DAG meeting held 21 June 2022 approved |
| **Tranche 3 Approval** | DAG-DEC-26 | Tranche 3 design artefacts conditionally approved |
| **Level Playing Field Principle** | DAG-DEC-27 | DAG agreed that:<br>1. The 24hr TRT meets the requirements of MHHS TOM with regard to the collection of residual consumption at point of meter works;<br>2. The SEC MP162 solution for Differential On-Demand Response Timings / Retries on Failure for Suppliers and independent MDRs does not present a Level Playing Field Design Principle issue with regard to the delivery of the MHHS Requirements; and<br>3. The SEC MP 162 solution for Differential Read Windows for Suppliers and independent MDRs does present a Level Playing Field Design Principle issue with regard to the delivery of the MHHS Requirements. |

## RAID items discussed/raised

| RAID area | Description |
|---|---|
| Level Playing Field Principle | The DAG agreed any Programme risk contained with the RAID log relating to Smart Energy Code Modification Proposal (SEC MP) 162 should include reference to the governance implications for MHHS design and industry codes |

## Minutes

### 1. Welcome and Introductions

The Chair welcome attendees to the meeting and provided an overview of the meeting agenda and objectives.

### 2. Minutes and actions

DAG members were advised a changed marked version of the minutes for the DAG meeting held 11 May 2022 had been issued with the meeting papers. The minutes were approved with no further comments.

**DECISION DAG-DEC-23: Minutes of DAG meeting held 11 May 2022 approved**

The minutes of the DAG meeting held 08 June 2022 and the extraordinary DAG meeting held 21 June 2022 were approved with no comments.

**DECISION DAG-DEC-24: Minutes of DAG meeting held 08 June 2022 approved**

**DECISION DAG-DEC-25: Minutes of DAG meeting held 21 June 2022 approved**

Updates on outstanding actions were provided, details of which can be found with in the meeting papers. Several queries were raised, and these are detailed below.

Regarding action DAG09-12: *Provide a clear plan for the resolution of the recorded outstanding issues related to the Tranche 1 design artefact approval;* CH queried when this would return to the DAG to ensure the requirements of conditional approval have been met. WF advised there was a process in place for the review of design artefacts and to satisfy the conditions of approval. The resolution of issues emanating from the design artefact tranche reviews will include the design subgroups. CB suggested the issues log contains an indicator of which working group or subgroup a given issue and any resultant amendments to design artefacts are reviewed at. SC believed the action related to the provision of clear resolution steps and timeframes and expressed concern this did not appear to have been shared thus far. WF clarified how issues resolution operated, and CS advised the Design Artefact Tracker and issues log contain commentary and dates for resolution. The group resolved to retain the action as ongoing for visibility.

Regarding action DAG10.1-01: *Programme to discuss transition timetable and go/no-go decision with MH;* IS advised conversations on the latest go/no-go (GONG) criteria and other planning criteria were ongoing and were a high priority. The Chair asked when the Design Team will provide the DAG with a draft plan for completing transition requirements. IS

replied the intention is provide this quickly, but there were areas of optionality relating to the implementation of a one-way gate which required resolution as this would affect the transition plan and GONG criteria. The group resolved to retain the action and placed a new action for the draft transition plan to be presented to an upcoming DAG.

**ACTION DAG11-01: Programme to provide draft plan on transition requirements at next DAG meeting**

Regarding action DAG10.1-03: Programme to communicate current thinking around transition plan to DAG members; the Chair suggested this action was similar to both ACTION DAG10.1-01 and new ACTION DAG11-01 and could be merged. SC believed actions DAG10.1-01 and DAG10.1-03 were different as on related to transition timelines and the other to the transition plan itself. The group discussed several specifics of the transition requirements such as whether an understanding of how Meter Points are moved is required for M5 and how any fundamental changes to the transition plan or decision on one-way gate functionality may significantly affect transition timelines. SC additionally noted if the assumption regarding a one-way gate changes and two-way functionality is required, this will have implications for participants in commencing systems builds. GS highlighted the one-way gate also affects whether all participants must be ready to go live at the same time as the first participant. IS advised those most impacted would be suppliers and agents in commencing data flows, and the Programme plan and implementation timetable stipulate Elexon and the Data Communications Company (DCC) registration services must be available on day one. GS expressed some frustration over whether St Clements, as a key service provider for registration systems, had been allowed to attend Programme meetings. The Chair clarified St Clements had attended Programme working groups, and now had a seat at the Programme Steering Group (PSG) as the DNO Representative, and queried which groups they had not been allowed to attend, noting working groups are open to all and attendance at advisory groups was permitted at the discretion of the relevant chair. The Chair took an action to discuss St Clements involvement at the Testing and Migration Advisory Group (TMAG).

**ACTION DAG11-02: Chair to discuss with TMAG Chair St Clements participation at TMAG**

## 3. Tranche 3 Approval

### Introduction and Discussion

IS provide an overview of the review of Tranche 3 (T3) design artefacts review, highlighting 530 comments were received from 15 organisations. 64% resulted in minor changes to design artefacts and 8% resulted in further activity to modify or validate elements of the design. The DAG were advised any new issues or matters requiring resolution have been recorded within the Design Artefact Tracker (DAT). Seven design artefacts were issued as part of T3, with eleven new snags and dissensus issues recorded in the DAT. The Chair confirmed all DAG members were able to access and use the DAT.

The group discussed several specific matters relating to approval of the T3 design artefacts, and the conditions attached, including the impact of issues outstanding from Tranches 1 and 2 and the requirements of industry code drafting. SC expressed concern over whether the design artefacts as a whole, once approved following the Tranche 4 (T4) review, will enable industry parties to commence design and build. SC expressed reservations over whether subjectivity may affect the translation of the MHHS design into code drafting and what the precise roles of the DAG and the MHHS Cross Code Advisory Group (CCAG) are in relation to code drafting. The Programme provided comfort on the steps being taken to ensure the completeness of the design and to provide industry parties with the support needed to commence internal design and build activities.

CH advised a specific comment had been provided by a constituent regarding treatment of the D10 data flow and whether an analogue is required under MHHS. IS advised they had spoken with the constituent concerned and the matter was the top item in the dissensus register for resolution.

### Design Assurance

The Programme design team advised the T3 design artefacts are considered stable and capable of conditional approval. The MHHS Design Assurance Team advised no substantive design gaps which materially impact the overall design had been identified as part of its quality assurance activities in Tranche 3. The assurance team also advised the formal assurance findings relating to T3 will be presented at an upcoming DAG and they were satisfied any outstanding matters in relation to T3 will be addressed.

**ACTION DAG11-03: Programme to provide assurance findings on T3 to upcoming DAG**

### DAG Members Comments

SJ commented it was not clear which versions of the design artefacts approval was requested for, noting the importance of version control where conditional approval is sought, and updates are likely to happen in future. IS agreed and noted the imperative for this is crucial during the T4 review a this is the point at which all design artefacts are published as a complete set.

CH noted the end-to-end architecture was originally sue for release in T3 but has now been moved back but is a key part of Large Supplier's overall approval. IS advise this document was reviewed by the Technical Design Working Group (TDWG) and updates were required prior to issuance for review. IS confirmed this will now be issued in the T4 review. The Chair noted this was recorded in the DAT.

SC expressed reservations over whether the content of the design artefacts post T4 will be sufficient to enable participants to commence design and build activities, stating it seemed unclear the extent to which updates will be required to conditionally approved design artefacts once further information becomes available at T4. IS provided comfort that all issues raised in previous tranche reviews had been recorded and were being treated as either issues requiring resolution, or a gap in design which requires treatment as a snag. The aim is to confirm any additional detail provided in later tranches which address the issues noted in previous conditional approvals. The Programme are tracking requirements which may crystalise when additional information is released under T4, such as qualification. SC advised they had not identified specific gaps but expressed continued concern over challenges agents may face such as determining what market messages must be sent and when, and whether there would a holistic view of exactly how participants confirm requirements as they enter design and build. IS responded that, at their core, the design artefacts include business process requirements, logical specifications, interface, and communication information, which, in aggregate, should show the processes which need to be undertaken and will link to the interface catalogue and the design specification. The Chair added that the M5 plan includes end-to-end review and playback sessions an any remaining inconsistencies should be drawn out there.

CH shared these concerns, stating T1 and T2 had a large number of matters still to be confirmed, and expressed uncertainty over whether all such matters were recorded. CH believed there was a need for end-to-end playback sessions with participants to demonstrate the completeness of the design post T4 issuance. IS confirmed all issues resolution outcomes will be recorded in the DAT and presented to a design working group.

SC noted some potential difficulty with the application of the M5 success criteria and conditional approval of T3, noting one of the criteria is that the design artefacts are sufficient to enable code drafting. SC noted this was not something which could be confirmed until all design artefacts were available following issuance of the T4 artefacts. The Chair highlighted the prototyping exercise due to be undertaken on the Load Shaping Service (LSS) which should flesh out how the design is reflected in code. FM advised the success criteria were intended to be applied to in relation to M5, when all design artefacts are available, as opposed to an approval criteria for T3. IS advised the design artefacts should enable parties to commence design, build, and test (DBT) activities, and the nuance of the stakeholder outcome criteria were to confirm any optionality has been defined and services have been properly described in their totality. MH believed as a design-led programme, the design artefacts should enable direct lifting of requirements into code to avoid any potential subjective interpretation of requirements. IS agreed, noting there may be unavoidable ambiguity or optionality which is only drawn out during code drafting activities, and that constant consistency checking will be required to ensure there is no deviation from the design.

SJ stated it will be important to understand the relationship between DAG and the CCAG during code drafting, and to ensure any areas of regulatory design, which are not precisely delineated through the technical design, are treated correctly. In this regard, SJ did not believe requirements within the design artefacts could necessarily be lifted directly into code legal text.

**T3 Approval**

DAG members provided their positions on whether the T3 design artefacts should be recommended for conditional approval, with several members noting specific conditions relating to their approval (please see specific comments and conditions below). Each constituency representative was invited to either accept, reject, or abstain in relation to the recommendation the T3 design artefacts be conditionally approved. DAG members positions are summarised below:

| Constituency | Accept | Reject | Abstain |
|---|---|---|---|
| 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 | ✓ |
| RECCo Representative | ✓ |
| Small Supplier Representative | ✓ |
| Supplier Agent Representative | ✓ |
| Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent) | ✓ |
| Medium Supplier Representative | Constituency representative not in attendance |

**DAG Members' Specific Comments and Conditions**

| Constituency | Comments / Conditions |
|---|---|
| DCC Representative (as smart meter central system provider) | SS provided conditional approval subject to the resolution of open design issues, particularly on SEC MP162. SS expressed an overarching concern the level of risk is increasing as the DAG progress with more conditional approvals and T4 will be a crucial stage. |
| DNO Representative | GS provide conditional approval on the understanding any issues raised during the preceding discussion are added to the relevant logs and trackers. GS echoed general concerns over the need for end-to-end understanding of the design at T4 and the increasing dependency on T4 to avoid issues with the overall design. |
| Elexon Representative (as central systems provider) | MH provided conditional approval. |
| I&C Supplier Representative | GE provided conditional approval stating limited feedback had been provided by constituents and having reviewed the artefacts, and listened to DAG discussions, there did not appear to be any significant gaps or omissions in T3. GE noted comments regarding ensuring the overall design is congruent and believed this indicated a pressing need for end-to-end revie once T4 design artefacts are issued. |
| iDNO Representative | DT provided conditional approval noting some constituent feedback had been received and comments provided as part of the T3 review. DT did not see any specific issues or areas of concern with the conditional approval of T3. |
| Large Supplier Representative | CH provided conditional approval, stating they were largely happy with T3 notwithstanding previous comments regarding end-to-end architecture, which is a specific condition of Large Supplier's approval. CH felt constituent questions regarding the D10 flow had been answered. |
| RECCo Representative | SJ provided conditional approval noting comments provided by RECCo had been added to the snagging list, and as such they were happy to accept T3. |
| Small Supplier Representative | JB provided conditional approval, stating no feedback had been provided by small suppliers. JB stated the basis of their approval was that, following review of the T3 artefacts, no gaps, omissions, or other issues of note had been identified. |
| Supplier Agent Representative | RL provided conditional approval, agreeing with the DAG's comments regarding ensuring the design works as a whole. |
| Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent) | SC provided conditional approval, advising limited feedback had been received from constituents and noting the need to resolve questions over how the design will be translated into code. |
| Consumer Representative | ER advised it was pleasing to see consensus from the group, but having not been close to design decisions, did not feel able to offer a formal position. |

| | |
|---|---|
| National Grid ESO | No comments provided. |
| Medium Supplier Representative | Constituency representative not in attendance. |

## 4. Level Playing Field Design Principle

The DAG discussed outstanding challenges related to whether the solution contained within SEC MP162 supported the MHHS level playing field design principle.

The group discussed several specific scenarios where industry parties may not have equal access to system functions supporting the retrieval of meter data, following discussion on this by the MHHS Smart Meter Segment (SDS) Subgroup on 30 June 2022. The DAG discussed the three areas reviewed and conclusions reached by the SDS sub-group (e.g., 24hr TRT, differential read window, and differential on demand responses timings/Retries. Members concluded the most significant challenge (with regards to the level playing field principle) related to differential read windows in DCC systems, and the ability of supplier-enabled agents to obtain faster response times than independent agents. One member believed this was a competition issue and could create a differential outcome for independent agents who may seek to take up the new Meter Data Retrieval (MDR) role that will be created by implementation of MHHS.

**DECISION DAG-DEC-27:**

**DAG agreed that:**

1. **The 24hr TRT meets the requirements of MHHS TOM with regard to the collection of residual consumption at point of meter works;**
2. **The SEC MP162 solution for Differential On-Demand Response Timings / Retries on Failure for Suppliers and independent MDRs does not present a Level Playing Field Design Principle issue with regard to the delivery of the MHHS Requirements; and**
3. **The SEC MP 162 solution for Differential Read Windows for Suppliers and independent MDRs does present a Level Playing Field Design Principle issue with regard to the delivery of the MHHS requirements**

It was noted there is likely to be dissensus between suppliers and agents on whether additional requirements should be included within the SEC MP 162 solution, owing in part to the nature of cost allocation under the SEC. The group agreed there may be a need to escalate this matter for decision. To support further consideration of the matter by DAG, and to ensure that should escalation occur there is specific and, where possible, quantitative data available to provide as part of any escalation, the group agreed the Programme should produce a paper detailing the options (with dimensions for assessment) available to resolve this matter.

**ACTION DAG11-04: Programme to produce strawman on options and dimensions for MHHS proposals regarding differential read window as defined under Smart Energy Code Modification Proposal 162 solution. Consult with DAG members to garner input on options/dimensions/materiality.**

The DAG acknowledged the potentially significant issues which may occur should SEC MP162 be rejected and considered whether Ofgem would need to become involved should this occur. The group noted they may be a perceived difficulty around the vires of the DAG in relation to external changes such as SEC MP162, which proceed according to governance process which are out with the Programme. Actions were taken to clarify decision making authority in relation to SEC MP162, to discuss the management of changes to industry codes with the CCAG and SRO, and to ensure the existing risk within the Programme RAID log relating to SEC MP162 includes reference to governance implications.

**ACTION DAG11-05: Programme to produce strawman on options and dimensions for MHHS proposals regarding differential read window as defined under Smart Energy Code Modification Proposal 162 solution. Consult with DAG members to garner input on options/dimensions/materiality.**

**ACTION DAG11-06: Programme to produce strawman on options and dimensions for MHHS proposals regarding differential read window as defined under Smart Energy Code Modification Proposal 162 solution. Consult with DAG members to garner input on options/dimensions/materiality.**

**ACTION DAG11-08: Programme to produce strawman on options and dimensions for MHHS proposals regarding differential read window as defined under Smart Energy Code Modification Proposal 162 solution. Consult with DAG members to garner input on options/dimensions/materiality.**

### 5. Review of RAID

See ACTION DAG10-09.

### 6. MHHS Design Status Update

See ACTION DAG11-07.

### 7. Target Stakeholder Outcomes and Baseline Success Criteria

See ACTION DAG11-07.

### 8. Design Decisions

No escalations were raised following the Business Process Requirements Working Group (BPRWG) held 29 June 2022.

### 9. DAG Design Principles

See ACTION DAG11-07.

### 10. Governance Group Updates

See ACTION DAG11-07.

### 11. Level 4 Working Group Updates

See ACTION DAG11-07.

### 12. Code Drafting Principles

See ACTION DAG11-07.

### 13. Summary and next steps

The Chair noted several agenda had not been discussed and invited DAG members to provide any comments on agenda items 4 to 12, as contained within the meeting papers, by correspondence no later than close of business 15 July 2022.

**ACTION DAG11-07: DAG members to provide any comments on agenda items 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, and 13 within the meeting papers of the DAG held 06 July 2022 by close of business 15 July 2022**

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

**Next meetings:**

**21 July 2022 at 09:30am**

**28 July 2022 at 09:30am**