

## MHHS Design Advisory Group Minutes and Actions

**Issue date: 07 November 2022**

Meeting number **DAG017**

Venue **Virtual – MS Teams**

Date and time **31 October 2022 10:00-17:00**

Classification **Public**

### Attendees:

#### **Chair**

Justin Andrews (Chair)

#### **Role**

Chair

#### **Industry Representatives**

Andrew Grace (AG)

Large Supplier Representative

Andrew Green (AGr)

I&C Supplier Representative

Carolyn Burns (CBu)

Small Supplier Representative

Craig Handford (CH)

Large Supplier Representative

Donna Jamieson (DJ)

iDNO Representative

Gemma Slaney (GS)

DNO 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**

Claire Silk (CS)

Design Market and Engagement Lead

Fraser Mathieson (FM)

PMO Governance Lead

Ian Smith (IS)

Design Manager

Nicole Lai (NL)

PMO Governance Support

Paul Pettit (PP)

Design Assurance

Sean Cooper (SCo)

Senior Business Analyst

Ross Catley (RC)

Enterprise Architect

Simon Harrison (SH)

SI Design Lead

Warren Fulton (WF)

Design Project Manager

#### **Other Attendees**

Colin Bezant (CB)

Independent Programme Assurance Provider

Daniel Morgan (DM)

Independent Programme Assurance Provider

Danielle Walton (DW)

Ofgem

## Actions

| Area                                    | Action Ref | Action  | Owner                                   | Due Date   |
|---|------------|---|---|------------|
| <b>DAG Meeting Governance</b>           | DAG17-01   | Programme to add the completion of the Work-Off Plan to the RAID Log as a Programme risk against delivery of M9.  | Programme (PMO)                         | 09/11/2022 |
|   | DAG17-02   | Chair to review the DAG Terms of Reference to ensure there is clarity over the role of DAG post-M5.   | Chair                                   | 09/11/2022 |
| <b>L4 Assurance &amp; Work-Off Plan</b> | DAG17-03   | Programme to add resolution schedule to Work-Off Plan and issue to DAG no later than 04 November 2022.  | Programme (Claire Silk & Warren Fulton) | 04/11/2022 |
|   | DAG17-04   | DAG Members to provide any high priority items or critical dates for inclusion within the Work-Off Plan resolution schedule (information to include the work-off ID, the required dates, and resolution requirements).  | DAG Members                             | 02/11/2022 |
| <b>SI Assurance Report</b>              | DAG17-05   | Programme to publish updated Clarifications Log for review by DAG.  | Programme (SI Design Assurance Team)    | 09/11/2022 |
|   | DAG17-06   | Programme to present post-M5 design change management approach at DAG on 09 November 2022   | Programme (SI Design Assurance Team)    | 09/11/2022 |
|   | DAG17-07   | Programme to issue joining information to DAG Members for post-M5 change management overview webinar, to be held 17 November 2022.  | Programme (PMO)                         | 01/11/2022 |
|   | DAG17-08   | Programme to provide information on transition plan and timelines to DAG on 09 November 2022.   | Programme (Ian Smith)                   | 09/11/2022 |
| <b>Design Baseline Report</b>           | 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> </ul> | Programme (Warren Fulton)               | 09/11/2022 |

|   |          |   |   |               |
|---|----------|---|---|---------------|
|   |          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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, fortnightly reporting, updates to the Work-Off Plan, and how notices to participants will be managed)</li> <li>• Add note/link to Section 7, Criteria 9, to Appendix 2 – <i>Post M5 MHHS Design Participant support process</i></li> <li>•</li> </ul> |   |               |
|   | DAG17-10 | Programme to indicate on Work-Off Plan whether work-off items are likely to require a Programme Change Request.   | Programme (Claire Silk & Warren Fulton) | 09/11/2022    |
|   | DAG17-11 | Programme to ensure work-off items which may impact code drafting are prioritised and request the Code Drafting Project Manager reviews this.   | Programme (PMO)                         | 09/11/2022    |
| <b>Decision</b>                         | DAG17-12 | Programme to make the Programme Party Coordinator (PPC) Team aware of potential impacts of Work-Off Plan items on the information provided by participants for Readiness Assessment 2.  | Programme (PMO)                         | 09/11/2022    |
| <b>L4 Assurance &amp; Work-Off Plan</b> | DAG17-13 | Ofgem to circulate information on the date for decision on migration approach   | Ofgem (Danielle Walton)                 | November 2022 |
| <b>Previous meeting(s)</b>              | DAG13-08 | Programme Risk related to Change Requests once Design is baselined. Add to Programme risk log if not, and import into Design Risk Log   | Programme (Ian Smith)                   | 10/08/2022    |
|   | DAG13-09 | Confirm approach and timescales for performance assurance requirements work and share with the BSC and REC representatives ahead of the next meeting  | Chair                                   | 10/08/2022    |
|   | DAG14-01 | Programme to provide information on timeline for iServer implementation (see also ACTION DAG13-12)  | Programme (Paul Pettit)                 | 07/09/2022    |

## Decisions

| Area                       | Dec Ref    | Decision   |
|----------------------------|------------|--|
| <b>Minutes and Actions</b> | DAG-DEC-31 | Change-marked Headline Report and Minutes of meeting held 14 October 2022 approved |

|                                 |            |  |
|---------------------------------|------------|--|
| <b>Design Baseline Decision</b> | DAG-DEC-32 | The DAG approved the MHHS Design Baseline, as documented in the MHHS Design – Baseline report (MHHS-DEL712, Version 1.0, noting the actions DAG17-03/04/ and the amendments in DAG17-09 and the agreement of DAG to the Work-Off Plan on 09/11/2022. |
|---------------------------------|------------|--|

### [RAID items discussed/raised](#)

| RAID area          | Description   |
|--------------------|---|
| <b>M9 Delivery</b> | An action was taken to add completion of the Work-Off Plan as a risk against M9 delivery to the Programme RAID Log (see ACTION DAG17-01). |

### [Minutes](#)

#### 1. Welcome and Introductions

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

#### 2. Minutes and Actions

The minutes of the DAG held 14 September was approved with no comments.

The Chair provided an overview of the outstanding actions:

##### ***ACTION DAG06-01: Review alignment between related MPAN modifications and design subgroup***

The DAG agree to close this action, noting the advanced stage of the Design Artefacts and that the matter had not been raised during dissensus, objection, or assurance discussions. It was noted Related MPAN processes are also under discussions at the Consequential Change Impact Assessment Group (CCIAG). Action closed.

##### ***ACTION DAG13-08: Programme Risk related to Change Requests once Design is baselined. Add to Programme risk log if not, and import into Design Risk Log***

WF advised a risk will be added to the central Programme RAID log. Action ongoing.

##### ***ACTION DAG13-09: Confirm approach and timescales for performance assurance requirements work and share with the BSC and REC representatives ahead of the next meeting***

WF advised an update will be provided in the next meeting. Action ongoing.

##### ***ACTION DAG14-01: Programme to provide information on timeline for iServer implementation (see also ACTION DAG13-12)***

PP noted work was ongoing with the Programme. While they are aiming to complete implementation as close to baseline as possible, December is a more realistic target.

SJ noted one of the work-off items links to iServer implementation, so it is key to get this done as part of the design timeline. The Design Team agreed to link this to the relevant work-off item.

Action ongoing.

##### ***ACTION DAG14-05: Programme to confirm whether Industry Standing Data (ISD) entity values will be published as part of M5 or transition plan***

The Design Team confirmed ISD entity values were included in the Work-Off Plan. Action closed.

##### ***ACTION DAG15-02: DAG members to provide comments on the transition approach options and high-level proposals (see ACTION DAG15-01)***

FM confirmed comments have been forwarded to the MWG (Migration Working Group) chair. Action closed.

##### ***ACTION DAG15-05: Programme to issue information on outcome of code drafting prototyping exercise to support the fulfilment of the design acceptance criteria***

The Programme has provided information along with the M5 baseline report. Information has also been shared with the Cross Code Advisory Group (CCAG) on the output of prototyping exercise. Action closed.

##### ***ACTION DAG16-01: Share Programme response to latest SEC MP162 consultation***

The group confirmed SEC MP162 was recommended for approval at SEC Change Board last week and has now gone to Ofgem. DW noted they are attempting to tie it in to REC R044, there are no confirmed timescales yet and further clarity on a decision date will be known by end of week. Action closed.

***ACTION DAG16-02: Ensure responses from DAG members on MWG slides are fed to MWG***

It was noted comments had been provided to the MWG chair. Action closed.

***ACTION DAG16-03: Issue comms to parties on when the design baseline work-off list will be published***

It was noted comms had been issued by the Design Team. Action closed.

***ACTION DAG16-04: Cross-reference CCIAG items with Work-Off Plan to ensure any items still needing consideration/action are captured***

The Design Team have compared CCIAG discussion topics against the Work-Off Plan. Action closed.

***ACTION DAG16-05: Understand what items from 9 November DAG can be discussed on 31 October DAG***

The DAG on 9 November will be retained as a mop-off session for outstanding items. No specific items have been brought forward. Action closed.

### 3. **DAG Meeting Governance**

FM provided an overview of the operations and factors that go into making a design baseline decision.

#### **DAG Remit and Objectives**

FM provided a summary of key points on DAG's remit and objectives from the Terms of Reference (ToR). It was noted DAG approves the detailed system design, serving as the primary decision-making authority whose role is to approve the design artefacts. A key point was DAG's duty to ensure the necessary detail is provided to allow parties to *commence* system design and build.

The group discussed DAG's enduring role until the end of design build. It was noted the completion of design cannot be reached without the work-off list being completed, which was agreed to be logged as a Programme risk against M9.

**ACTION DAG17-01: Programme to add the completion of the Work-Off Plan to the RAID Log as a Programme risk against delivery of M9.**

The Chair committed to revisit the ToR to ensure the role of DAG is clear. It was agreed there was a need to be clear on DAG's continual role, as well as the relationship between DAG and CCAG, post-M5.

**ACTION DAG17-02: Chair to review the DAG Terms of Reference to ensure there is clarity over the role of DAG post-M5.**

#### **DAG Decision Making**

It was noted the ToR specifies that while design principles should be adhered to, this does not rule out instances where DAG may deviate to deliver core elements of the design solution.

#### **Previous Decisions**

FM provided an overview of decisions made previously in Tranches 1-3 and factors that helped inform decisions.

SC raised the need to consider the costs and resource impacts of baselining *and* not baselining.

#### **Operation of Decision and Outcomes**

FM provided an overview of the voting process, the outcomes of different voting scenarios, and options around escalation and post-decision.

It was noted the Programme Steering Group (PSG) has a wider remit regarding their ToR, as they provide Programme-level decision making. The design baseline is a fixed L1 milestone that DAG do not have the authority to move. If the design baseline were to be rejected, it would be taken to the PSG to determine next steps.

### 4. **Overview of Design Development**

CS provided an overview of design development. It was noted the full list of design artefacts to be baselined can be found in the Design Artefact Tracker and the baseline does not include the security artefacts.

SC and S-J raised concerns there may be documents which are not ready to be baselined as there is significant work to do e.g., the ECS reporting artefact. SJ believed the ECS reporting artefact was being issued for review rather than baselining. The response was that all artefacts other than the security artefacts would be baselined and changes to the ECS reporting artefact and interface catalogue would be delivered via the Work-Off Plan. SJ requested the Programme issue clear communications to industry to check the Work-off Plan before relying on the documented processes ~~se~~ ~~produces~~ for their own DBT. The Chair urged all constituency representatives to ensure this message is clear to those they represent.

The Chair recognised the significant amount of work to get progress the design and congratulated all involved in, noting it was a huge effort from both Programme Participants and the Design Team.

## 5. L4 Assurance Outcomes & Work-Off Plan

DW advised Ofgem's primary concerns on the Work-Off Plan are that there are clear timelines for the resolution of work-off items, to help minimise impacts on industry systems build activities, ensure transparency, and that there is industry representation in the resolution of items. WF confirmed a work-off schedule will be created and published, that the Work-Off Plan and any discussion groups to resolve items will be open and public, and that change control will be applied in the form of DAG approval of minor work-off items or full Programme change control for any significant or unexpected changes to the design.

The group discussed the importance of the Work-Off Plan having a clear schedule attached. WF provided an overview of the operations around the Work-Off Plan, noting that while there was no schedule attached – the Design Team have defined the items that need to be addressed which went through industry review at the assurance forums held on the week of 24 October 2022. The reason as to why there is no schedule is because further industry engagement is needed on items. Working groups will need to be identified and scheduled, with meeting frequency likely needing to increase. WF considered the operations of providing meeting notice. A resource estimate of approximately six-eight weeks effort to complete the Work-Off Plan was provided.

It was noted a work-off schedule would be circulated at the next DAG on 09 November if baseline is approved.

### Change Requests

The Design Team advised that some work-off list items may result in change requests and a condition of the baseline approval is to make the relevant changes which may emanate from the Work-Off Plan. GS raised the need to be clear on what is being baselined to avoid the possibility of changing items that are not on the work-off list. The Programme agreed on the need for a clear visibility both on any changes and on the approval of those changes.

IS noted there are two aspects to the change process: there will be mechanical changes with a clear resolution that will require a form of change resolution, and there will be items where more fundamental updates may be required that will necessitate a change request and further conversation. WF confirmed all changes to artefacts following baseline will run through DAG for decision. All baselined documents will be issued a document control and given to the SI (Systems Integration) team to cluster into sensible release bundles.

SJ raised the need for the Programme to clearly articulate any items they do not believe can be resolved in the Work-Off Plan or delivered through the change control process.

### Work-off schedule

The group discussed the requirement to have general indications of dates and expectations attached to the Work-Off Plan, to which RL expressed a desire to see fixed dates for work-off items even if far-off, e.g. January 2023. MH added it is the design, rather than the timebound nature of work-off items, that is under decision today. The Design Team committed to issuing a work-off schedule by Friday 4 November 2022, which would then be discussed at DAG on Wednesday 09 November 2022.

The group discussed the need for a risk-based approach if work-off items are not agreed today. GS raised the risk this could prevent DBT (Design Build Test), noting MPRS (Meter Point Registration Systems) providers state they are 54% blocked from design without the final clarifications from the Work-Off Plan, to which IS determined to validate as soon as possible.

DAG attendees expressed uncertainty over the lack of timeframes for priority items, with SJ noting specific dependencies, e.g., REC R044, needing to be called out ahead of Friday. DAG constituents agreed to notify the Design Team of any high-priority items in the work-off list as soon as possible to inform the work-off schedule, including the relevant work-off ID and a hard date of when that item needs to be delivered.

**ACTION DAG17-03: Programme to add resolution schedule to Work-Off Plan and issue to DAG no later than 04 November 2022.**

**ACTION DAG17-04: DAG Members to provide any high priority items or critical dates for inclusion within the Work-Off Plan resolution schedule (information to include the work-off ID, the required dates, and resolution requirements).**

The Design Team expressed understanding of the urgency around completing work-off items, agreeing to aim to complete the activity within the next three months. It was noted the granularity of the Work-Off Plan is key to understanding progression. The Programme committed to liaising with DAG and industry through this activity. DAG members were recommended to raise any concerns around timing to PSG.

### **Migration**

DW noted work is ongoing with Ofgem regarding a decision on migration approach. It was indicated the view may be confirmed this month. DW agreed to circulate the date for Ofgem's decision on a migration approach when available.

**ACTION DAG17-13: Ofgem to circulate information on the date for decision on migration approach**

## **6. SI Assurance Report**

SH noted the MHHS SI Assurance Team had not identified any issues which prevent baselining. There are several observations to be resolved, such as the lack of clarity around transition. There have been 600 clarification questions, which are being pulled into assurance activities and managed through Azure DevOps. CBu advised some positions listed in the Clarification Log have changed based on subsequent discussion and SJ highlighted certain clarification points did not provide answers but stated the document would be updated. The Programme agreed to review the log and it will be published for DAG to review.

**ACTION DAG17-05: Programme to publish updated Clarifications Log for review by DAG.**

SH provided a high-level overview of the design change management process was provided, noting the openness of the triage group and industry representation on the technical design authority. A further explanation on change management approach will be shared with DAG on 9 November.

**ACTION DAG17-06: Programme to present post-M5 design change management approach at DAG on 09 November 2022**

Change management is ongoing in iServer. There will be a version control on the design database, as well as clarity on this in iServer. Azure DevOps will be used to highlight the progression of requirements, and the requirements traceability matrix will be used to show the scope of what needs to be built and allow parties to trace back to where this is in the artefacts.

There is a M5 change webinar lined up for Thursday 17 November, with joining details to be shared with DAG members.

**ACTION DAG17-07: Programme to issue joining information to DAG Members for post-M5 change management overview webinar, to be held 17 November 2022.**

### **Transition design and migration management**

MH asked how transition design would be managed in parallel with the work-off list. It was noted this is a key requirement which needs understanding before DBPT on participant side, as this may significantly affect their actions and planning. The current baseline would mean commencement without consideration of reverse migration. The Chair noted there will be a decision from Ofgem on migration. MH accepted this, noting significant impacts on Elexon.

SC noted there are artefacts under discussion that do not have an artefact, milestone, or plan and are not included in M5. SC said they would like to see these unbounded items listed; with assurance they will route through DAG. WF agreed and noted these will be the next items recorded for transition. SH observed this is RISK107 in the RAID log and understanding of no-regret work is important.

The Chair noted migration is out of scope of the baseline, but the Programme needs to be clearer on how it progresses. MH raised the interim plan states it will be delivered in November, which is not realistic based on current discussions. IS said there will be optionality of how the work for this will be expressed.

The Programme agreed to provide further information on a relevant list of artefacts and transition timelines, subject to several caveats given decisions are still in progress. IS noted much of the decision will be from the MWG.

**ACTION DAG17-08: Programme to provide information on transition plan and timelines to DAG on 09 November 2022.**

SJ noted volumetrics are a key item. It is on the work-off list but could be a big issue if it requires changes to the [CSSEES, particularly increasing capacity for CSS management of appointments during transition.](#)

-

-It is important to ensure this is not forgotten and RECCo need to understand immediately if a change is required. This was noted by the Design Team.

## 7. IPA Assurance Update

CB provided an update on assurance, noting the Independent Programme Assurance (IPA) provider's role was to advise whether it is possible for participants to commence design and build, rather than to undertake an end-to-end review of the design.

CB advised one recommendation is for the Work-Off Plan to be completed as soon as possible, and this was consistent with the discussions of the DAG.

The IPA highlighted their review of the comments and objections resolution processes and whether any matters had been consistently rejected or whether any systematic bias was indicated in the Programme's treatment of specific comments or objections. CB confirmed no bias had been identified, and it was unlikely the Programme had sought to 'down-rate' any items to suit its objectives. CB further noted the IPA's findings suggest sufficient oxygen had been given to items which were important and the treatment of industry comments and objections by the Programme was sufficient.

The Assurance Forums held by the Programme were considered to have provided the right opportunities for Programme Participants to hold open, honest, and transparent discussions, notwithstanding a full audit of these forums has not been conducted.

The IPA noted the key assurance question for M5 is whether participants can commence design and build based on the artefacts which are available, and the items contained within the Work-Off Plan, and whether there is anything which produces concerns regarding the commencement of design and build by industry. CB went on to say this included consideration of anything fundamental or structural within the design, such as important interfaces, which prevents participants from commencing build activities.

CB noted programmes of change within the energy industry are usually highly defined before design/build activities for participants commences, whereas usual transformation programmes commence before everything is 'bottomed out'. CB advised the IPA looked at whether there was anything within the Work-Off Plan which prevents or frustrates the commencement of detailed work by participants – and the answer was no.

CB noted both the IPA and Ofgem wished to see timelines added to the Work-Off Plan and noted the Programme have committed to providing this to the DAG by their next meeting on 09 November 2022, and the current resource indications given by the Programme indicated a duration of approximately six to eight weeks to resolve the work-off items, which is consistent with the IPA's view on reasonable timelines.

The IPA concluded there was nothing on the work-off list which prevents detailed work commencing by participants; a sensible process had been broadly followed.

There were no comments or objections received from DAG members.

## 8. Design Baseline Report

The DAG reviewed the design baseline criteria and provided input on changes to be made.

Please refer to **ACTION DAG17-09** for a summary of all updates to be made to the M5 Design Baseline Report. An overview of discussions on each section of the report is provided below:

### 2. MHHS Recommendation:

#### 2.1. Recommendation to baseline



The wording on the Work-Off Plan will be modified to reflect what is being brought to DAG on 9 November, in view of updates made in other sections.

The group observed the element of rework addressed in this section, with RL expressing the risk of rework outweighs the risk of not baselining and MH observing rework is inevitable and fundamental. SC said one should know how significant the risk of rework is at the point of baseline. It was agreed further clarity will be added to the wording.

## **2.2. Purpose of baselining**

The group discussed the impact of work-off items on code drafting items, with SJ noting such activities had not been referenced in the work-off timeline: if the Work-Off Plan is due to finish in three months at the end of January, this will cut into code bodies' time when code-drafting starts at the beginning of January. SJ raised metering and data services need to be considered and prioritised. It was agreed FM would liaise with CCAG to ensure this.

CB noted this was a risk in PSG.

## **2.3 Consequences of not baselining**

SC noted their earlier comment about the costs and consequences of baselining – if the Programme baselines now, potential risk is added to the cost of constituents. It was noted to expand this subsection to include reference to 'consequences of baselining' in addition to the existing wording on the consequences of not baselining.

## **2.4. Key exam question**

No change.

## **3. Executive summary:**

No change.

## **4. Out of scope:**

The Design Team clarified this section referred to what is 'out of scope for M5 baseline design', rather than 'out of scope of MHHS design.' It was agreed the wording will be adapted to reflect this.

The group discussed the impact of performance assurance, with SC noting performance assurance will affect build, and not baseline design. It was agreed information would be provided on performance assurance and dispute being out of scope. It was noted to clarify SEC and REC changes are material and not wholly out of scope.

## **5. Work-off plan governance:**

The group discussed change control, with IS noting items on the work-off list generally do not require a change request, explaining the Programme is committed to facilitate discussion and any change to design will require a change request. SJ expressed uncertainty over DTN changes, noting they will need to know immediately if a change request is required. The Design Team agreed to clarify that all work-off items that may result in changes to design artefacts will be subject to change control.

SJ was pleased with the clarification, provided the Programme gives clear indication and prioritise items.

SH confirmed work-off item updates and documents will be included in iServer. It was agreed to reference any updates to iServer in Section 5, point 4.

The group discussed the appropriate grammatical tense and requirement to report on outcomes from DAG, with MH noting the section mentions approval of items in the future, but these dates have passed. It was agreed to add a new section to the end of report listing outcomes from DAG, as well as add comments to clarify any sections where there are subsequent updates or where future tense is used. The baseline report was noted to form part of DAG's baseline decision.

## **6. MHHS Design acceptance criteria:**

An overview of the DAG M5 Success Criteria was provided. No change was suggested to this section of the report.

## **7: Performance to acceptance criteria**

### **Criteria 1: DAG believe the Design meets the TOM requirements**

The group discussed evidencing criteria, with SC expressing surprise to read a document that explained how the DAG met criteria before baseline. WF clarified this has been written from a Programme perspective to DAG, rather than the DAG's view on approval of the baseline. It was agreed to update this section to reflect this clarification.

## **Criteria 2: DAG believe the Design meets the agreed design principles**

SJ expressed nervousness on link to Design Principle 12. Currently, RECCo do not feel they are able to deliver the code drafting off the back of design in its entirety, there are concerns around the scope of the design output to allow for code drafting. There are areas of REC design that will need to be developed outside the MHHS artefacts.

RL asked if the design artefacts give enough detail for RECCo to do the code changes. SJ said no. They can take the design artefacts and do the REC drafting but it does not give industry everything they need from a retail side to support MHHS. SJ noted the Programme has the forum of CCIAG to progress those items and there is a CR going through regarding the CCAG's code drafting scope.

MH expressed Design Principle 12 will never be met exactly. MH noted BSC generally agrees with RECCo, but does not believe this prevents baselining, and assurance is needed which will arrive in the future.

FM noted the Programme are putting in place specific mechanisms for traceability regarding code drafting.

RL said the artefacts need to be a position for someone not involved in the Programme to be able to draft up a legal text.

FM noted the CCAG had a success criteria similar to DAG – one of them was whether the design artefacts can be translated into code drafting and the answer was yes. CCAG have a pure instruction to reflect design in code drafting. Matters of interpretation will be fed into post M5 process. There is robust governance around that.

## **Criteria 3: DAG believe the Design is complete and sufficient to enable participants to commence their own detailed design, and that the LDP Systems Integration (SI) have appropriately assured it**

GS noted the DAG's role to allow participants to not only commence design but ensure the completion of DBT. It was agreed to update this section to explain further detail on how this criteria is met.

## **Criteria 4: DAG believe all open material design issues have been resolved, and any residual issues and Work-Off Plans are agreed**

The group discussed Point 3 – 'Are there any material design issues identified in Tranche 4', WF clarified this meant there are no fundamental design flaws in Tranche 4. MH countered noting there are a high volume of work-off issues, but there is nothing that prevents baseline approval. IS agreed there are material items in the Work-Off Plan, but not items which affect the approval required. The Design Team noted to reword the section to clarify there is nothing preventing baselining the design.

The group discussed severity ratings regarding Point 5 - 'Are there any work-off items with critical severity?'. SJ queried whether a severity rating was needed. IS noted a list was published with severity on it and WF added the categorisation was previously agreed by DAG. MH and GS suggested editing the wording to clarify the scope of the Work-Off Plan, and that there are no items preventing the commencement of design. It was agreed to update this section to clarify there are no severity one or two items, and that severity is not recorded in the Work-Off Plan, and that no outstanding items prevent baselining.

It was noted by the Programme that the use of the word '*material*' was subjective and whilst many items on the Work-Off Plan were not material to agreeing the design baseline, there were matters which are material to Programme Participants and Code Bodies in terms of enabling MHHS to be fully implemented into industry governance. The group concluded that whilst this criteria was not fully met, it could be accepted and did not prevent baselining.

## **Criteria 5: DAG believe the change request process and the SI facilitation thereof is appropriate**

DAG members noted this criteria cannot be critiqued as DAG have not implemented a change process yet, as they are still to baseline. It was agreed this criteria was not met but noted the SI Assurance Team have advised a robust post-M5 design change management process will be implemented and a detailed overview provided at the next DAG meeting.

SC asked about the rapidity of the change process. SH responded it is about how big is the change. SC expressed concern over the potential volume of changes post baseline. PP noted the cadence of release for minor changes could be weekly, fortnightly, and for the larger changes something else. This will need to be considered as part of the implementation of the post-M5 design management process. A monthly release cadence could be the right balance of allowing change and not confusing parties.

MH accepted there is not a change process currently, noting the criteria not fully met but can be resolved at next meeting. The group agreed to include an agenda item on post-M5 management process to the 9 November DAG.

The DAG agreed that whilst this criteria is not met, it did not prevent baselining subject to the post-M5 change process being delineated at the next DAG meeting and containing the appropriate controls.

**Criteria 6: DAG believe the Design is defined appropriately to allow code drafting to reflect the design without further design debate or further clarifications**

SJ expressed the key point is whether the design artefacts can be lifted into code and noted the threshold for this criteria was potentially unreasonable. FM highlighted this criteria provided a very high threshold for acceptance, noting its absolute nature made it a higher threshold than even a criminal court would require. WF noted that with hindsight this criteria may not have been worded as it is, but highlighted that as criteria drafted by the Programme, it indicated the desire to hold the design to a high bar. SC and advised they would be willing to accept as long as it is noted and recorded in the meeting minutes.

The group concluded that whilst the threshold for meeting this criteria was very high, it would be accepted and did not prevent baselining subject to any matters requiring further debate being resolved.

**Criteria 7: Participants have had the opportunity to engage in developing and reviewing the Design Artefacts**

No change.

**Criteria 8: Participant contributions have been used or participants have received reasonable justification as to why not**

SJ flagged the percentage of clarifications documented was not reflective of the number of clarifications.

**Criteria 9: Participants know what to expect post-M5**

The group discussed how the progression of work-off items would be managed, with RL querying what would happen if a resolution to a work-off item was unable to be met after three months, and WF noting it would become a PSG matter in that case. It was agreed on the need for updates to PSG and fortnightly reports.

The group discussed how notices to participants would be managed. GS noted two points: the unknowns which cannot yet be accounted for, and the management of the Work-Off Plan to ensure DAG is responsible for monitoring and completing the Work-Off Plan, as well as communicate to participants when these are completed. IS noted there is an ongoing role for DAG to ensure unknowns are managed going forward - and whilst DAG will now move away from tracking against a milestone, they will move the management of a pipeline of work and potential changes emanating from the external environment.

SC asked whether M5 approval would be rescinded if things change and the work-off impacted. The Chair did not believe so. RL noted participants cannot introduce risk by approving M5, but then having items still to resolve.

SJ sought clarity on what DAG will receive, i.e. a whole plan for all work-off items. IS responded it will be staggered, as some items will be quick and easy to remedy and approve via DAG, and other items will require more discussion and development which will come for approval as work has been completed.

The group noted the potential need for extraordinary DAGs to accommodate timeliness of work-off resolution.

**Criteria 10: Participants, as experienced industry technical persons, believe the Design Artefacts can be used to start their detailed design activities and any associated sourcing of software and services**

No change.

**Criteria 11: The Cross-Code Advisory Group (CCAG) was kept updated of Design progress to enable development of the code resource plan**

No change.

**Criteria 12: CCAG believe the Design is defined appropriately to allow code drafting to reflect the design without further design debate or further clarifications.**

SJ noted Criteria 12 was critical and approved of the caveat – ‘...it is unreasonable not to expect some clarifications from the code drafting process as not all topic areas were covered, but this is foreseen to be manageable.’

No change.

**8. Key evidence:**

No change.

## **9. Supporting data:**

No change.

### **Appendix 1 – Post M5 - MHHS Design management approach:**

No change.

### **Appendix 2: Post M5 - MHHS Design Participant support process:**

No change

The Chair asked if the diagram gives further clarity to participants on enduring design. GS replied yes. It was agreed to reference a link to Appendix 2 in Criteria 9.

### **Appendix 3: Post M5 - Communications plan (draft):**

No change.

### **Appendix 4: Post M5 - Cutover schedule from SRO to LDP SI (draft)**

No change.

## **9. Decision**

The DAG discussed whether a decision on baselining the design should be postponed subject to confirmation of the schedule for resolution of work-off items. There were differing views among the group, with some favouring postponement and others favouring proceeding to a decision.

FM, as the MHHS PMO Governance Lead, advised that due to the status of M5 as Programme Level 1 fixed milestone, and due to this milestone deadline being 31 October 2022, it was not possible for DAG to defer the decision, only to approve or reject. GS queried whether DAG members could accept with conditions, to which FM replied they could, and any such conditions would be clearly minuted. Some DAG members expressed disquiet at the risk they could baseline the design with conditions and those conditions could be disregarded or otherwise not resolved, with the baseline still being considered 'baselined'. FM assured DAG members that the recording of conditions in the DAG minutes, and the presence of both the SI Assurance Team, the IPA, and Ofgem at the meeting was sufficient to ensure the Programme could be held to account if necessary, and DAG members protected against making a decision and their conditions being left unresolved.

The Chair noted that if a decision to reject was taken, the matter would be escalated to the PSG.

The Chair summarised that:

- All participants have been provided with opportunity to comment on and object to the design artefacts, that the Programme were recommending approval of the design baseline, and that a Work-Off List was in place.
- The Programme Design Assurance Team agreed the design could be baselined.
- The Independent Programme Assurance (IPA) provider have confirmed an appropriate process has been followed, there has been transparency in the treatment of industry consultation comments, the items on the WO List did not appear to prevent the commencement of participant design and build, and there were no indications of any fundamental flaws in the design or other red flags.
- The DAG have reviewed the design success criteria, and whilst comments and changes to the M5 Design Baseline Report were agreed, the DAG agreed the content required within the report.
- There are participants who wish to commence design and build activities now.
- That all design artefacts, save for the security design artefacts, would be baselined and those affected by the WO List may be updated as part of the resolution of work-off items, and industry oversight would be applied to any changes emanating from work-off items via the DAG.

The Programme advised the voting question was:

*“Do you agree the MHHS design can be baselined, taking into account the agreed Work-Off Plan and any other dependencies?”*

Members were advised they could vote 'no', 'yes', or 'yes, subject to' where they would like to apply conditions or caveats to their vote.

DAG Members proceeded to vote as follows:

| Constituency  | Yes | Yes (subject to...) | 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)  |     | ✓                   |   |
| Medium Supplier Representative                              |     |                     | Constituency representative not in attendance |
| Consumer Representative                                     |     |                     | Constituency representative not in attendance |

#### DAG Members' Voting Comments

| Constituency  | Voting Comments / Conditions / Caveats  |
|---|---|
| DCC Representative (as smart meter central system provider) | Agreed to baseline the design noting that DCC can commence internal design work but cannot complete until the Work-Off Plan is resolved. Furthermore, noting the item within the Work-Off Plan relating to identifiers and how they flow across interfaces, and that whilst internal work can commence based on a working assumption, it cannot be completed until the outcome of the implementation of the Meter Data Retrieval (MDR) role is known. |
| DNO Representative  | Agreed to baseline the design subject to a detailed Work-Off Plan with clear timelines for the resolution of each item, and subject to the prioritisation of work-off items based on any critical dependencies identified by the Programme or provided by constituency representatives (i.e. DAG Members).  |
| Elexon Representative (as central systems provider)         | Agreed to baseline the design subject to the same conditions as other DAG members relating to the Work-Off Plan.  |
| I&C Supplier Representative                                 | Agreed to baseline the design subject to clear minuting of discussions relating to the Work-Off Plan (i.e. that a schedule for resolution of work-off items will be added and the Work-Off Plan, and resolution of the work-off items will be timebound by three months for those items requiring working group discussions).   |
| iDNO Representative   | Agreed to baseline the design subject to the inclusion of resolution timelines/schedule within the Work-Off Plan.   |
| Large Supplier Representative                               | Noted clarity has been provided on the work to be undertaken. Agreed to baseline the design on condition a resolution schedule is added to the Work-Off Plan and participants are provided with clarity on any impact assessment and resourcing requirements, particularly in relation to Programme Readiness Assessment requirements.  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| National Grid ESO   | Agreed to baseline the design subject to clear minuting of the requirement for resolution timelines/schedule to be added to the Work-Off Plan.   |
| RECCo Representative  | Agreed to baseline the design subject to the addition of a schedule to the Work-Off Plan for resolution of work-off items, and subject to their resolution being timebound by three months. Additionally, noting concerns over the wording of some work-off items and agreement from the Programme that such items will be amended to ensure clarity.  |
| Small Supplier Representative                                 | Agreed to baseline the design subject to detail being provided on the approach to change management for any changes to design artefacts emanating from the Work-Off Plan, and the addition of clear timelines for the resolution of work-off items.  |
| Supplier Agent Representative                                 | Agreed to baseline the design subject to any changes to design artefacts being subject to appropriate change management, with change marked documents produced where changes to artefacts occur, and on the proviso all work-off items will be resolved within three months or escalated to the PSG with information on severity and final resolution activities.  |
| Supplier Agent Representative<br>(Independent Supplier Agent) | Agreed to baseline the design subject to appropriate change control for artefacts which may change as a result of the Work-Off Plan and providing work-off items are resolved within three months or escalated to the PSG. A schedule for resolution of work-off items must be provided for DAG to review at the next meeting on 09 November 2022. Additionally, noting constituent views were that baselining was the best way forward, but not necessarily the ideal route or time they would like to have approved. |
| Medium Supplier Representative                                | Constituency representative not in attendance.   |
| Consumer Representative                                       | Constituency representative not in attendance.   |

The MHHS Design Baseline was approved taking into account the Work-Off Plan and other dependencies, as well as the comments and conditions noted above.

The Chair summarised the conditions actions to be taken by the Programme and DAG Members in relation to the updates to be made to the Work-Off Plan. These include:

- The Work-Off Plan is to be timebound by three months.
- The Programme will issue a timetable/schedule for the resolution of work-off items by 04 November 2022, for review and agreement by DAG at their next meeting on 09 November 2022.
- DAG Members are to provide specific comments on their Work-Off Plan priorities by close of business 02 November 2022.
- Change management relating to changes to design artefacts emanating from the Work-Off Plan is to be clearly articulated.
- Wording amendments to work-off items highlighted by RECCo.
- Any challenges with the timelines for resolution of work-off items will be raised to the PSG.

Comments were requested from the IPA, who noted the timelines for the decision on whether to baseline the design had been compressed somewhat but despite this it was sensible to baseline the design with the comments and caveats noted above. The IPA wished to check the Work-Off Plan to ensure it operates as intended and provided confidence parties can commence design and build activities.

One attendee noted the challenging timelines for review and approval of the design, and the Programme noted the challenges in dealing with the uncertainties over the volume and severity of comments and objections raised as part of the design consultation, objection, and assurance activities. The Programme praised the efforts of all DAG Members, industry experts, and other participants in achieving consensus and noted there were many successes to be acknowledged.

## 10. Summary and Next Steps

The DAG discussed the establishment of working group meetings to resolve work-off items which require development or discussion. The Programme agreed to consider how this could operate in practice whilst balancing the need to progress solutions quickly or tackle urgent matters and ensuring industry parties have sufficient notice to resource attendance at meetings. The group considered that a shortened duration for the publication of meeting agendas and any papers ahead of meetings to resolve work-off items may be required. It was noted there may be a requirement for subgroups to discuss specific work-off items, and flexibility may be required in the scheduling of these meetings. IS suggested placeholder meetings should be booked to earmark participants time (e.g. one meeting or more per week) and these could be cancelled if not required. MH believed the Programme must decide the frequency of any subgroup meetings required to resolve work-off items, and the industry would simply respond to this in terms of ability to resource. GS agreed the Programme should press forward with holding the meetings required to resolve the work-off items. Further information will be provided at the next DAG meeting on 09 November 2022.

FM asked the group to confirm the deadline for resolution of all work-off items. The DAG confirmed the deadline is 31 January 2023 (i.e. three months from the baseline decision). The Programme noted an extraordinary DAG meeting will be held this day, or sooner, if possible, to confirm completion of the Work-Off Plan and items will be brought to Dag for updates and approvals in the interceding months.

Finally, one attendee suggested information on migration timings would be useful in view of the three months agreed by DAG for the resolution of the Work-Off Plan, and this should be considered alongside publication of the work-off schedule information. The Programme agreed, noting work currently underway with both the MWG and Ofgem to confirm the migration approach and associated timelines.

The Chair thanked members, the Design Team, and the MHHS PMO for their efforts in developing the design to such a level in a relatively short time period and brought the meeting to a close.

### **Next meetings:**

**DAG: 09 November 2022 10am**

**CCIAG: 10 November 2022 1pm**