
****Design Authority****

****Terms of Reference****



|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Document owner | Document number | Version |
| **Ross Catley** | **MHHS-DEL762** | **0.9** |
| Status: | Date | **Classification** |
| **DAG Approval** | **15 December 2022** | **Confidential** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Document owner | Document number | Date |
|  |  |  |

# Contents

[1 Contents 1](#_Toc120891842)

[1.1 Change Record 2](#_Toc120891843)

[1.2 Reviewers 2](#_Toc120891844)

[2 Purpose and duties of the MHHS Design Authority 3](#_Toc120891845)

[2.1 Objective and Operation 3](#_Toc120891846)

[2.2 Design and Programme Change Process Relationship 4](#_Toc120891847)

[2.3 Decision-making 5](#_Toc120891850)

[3 Membership 6](#_Toc120891851)

## Change Record

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Date | Author | Version | Change Detail |
| 26th October 2022 | Ross Catley | 0.1 | Initial Draft |
| 9th November 2022 | Ross Catley | 0.2 | Update with comments from initial reviewers |
| 10th November 2022 | Ross Catley | 0.3 | Update with comments from DAG |
| 23rd November 2022 | Ross Catley | 0.4 | Updated with comments from Fraser and Clare |
| 25th November 2022 | Ross Catley | 0.5 | Updated with SRO comments |
| 27th November 2022 | Ross Catley | 0.51 | Included 2nd diagram for change process |
| 30th November 2022 | Ross Catley | 0.6 | Included comments from SRO |
| 2nd December 2022 | Ross Catley | 0.7 | Updated Diagrams, further comments from DAG Chair |
| 7th December 2022 | Ross Catley | 0.8 | For DAG Approval |
| 15 December 2022 | Paul Pettitt | 0.9 | For approval following updates following DAG comments |

## Reviewers

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer | Role |
| Simon Harrison | SI Design Lead |
| Paul Pettitt | Enterprise Architect |
| Warren Fulton | Separation Manager |
| Ian Smith | SRO Design Lead |
| Claire Silk | SRO Engagement Manager |
| Fraser Mathieson | PMO Governance and Secretariat Lead |
| Andrew Margan | SRO Governance Lead |
| Nigel Hall | SI Test Manager |
| Marc Towers | LDP Quality Manager |
| Smitha Pichrikat | Client Delivery Programme Manager |
| Justin Andrews | DAG Chair |
| Jason Brogden | Industry Programme Expert |

# Purpose and duties of the MHHS Design Authority

## Objective and Operation

**Definitions**

Throughout this document, the following definitions are used:

**Minor change**

A change that needs only a clarification back to the change party on how the design operates, or fixes an administrative error such as a typo. These changes must be agreed unanimously by the Design Authority or they will be treated as a major change.

**Major change**

Any change which is not a minor change, which will be referred back to the DAG for decision

It is proposed that these definitions are reviewed quarterly in the light of experience of the types of changes received.

**Responsibilities**

The Design Authority (DA) is being established as a Level 4 MHHS Programme Working Group reporting to the Design Advisory Group (DAG). It’s role is to manage the MHHS Design Baseline by reviewing and developing prospective changes to the baselined Design Artefacts raised by Programme Participants following commencement of M5 baseline approval. The DA will provide design advice on potential changes and will ensure Programme Participants are represented and relevant experts engaged in the assessment of design issues and in the development of prospective solutions.

The MHHS Design Authority is responsible for:

* Assessing proposed changes to the baseline design whilst considering efficiency and cost of implementation across the industry to minimise the overall cost and time impact to industry
* Approving minor changes which are unanimously agreed by the DA’s constituency representatives
* Ensuring proposed changes maintain the integrity of the core MHHS design and approved changes to Design Artefacts are released in accordance with industry-recognised best practice
* Ensuring the Cross Code Advisory Group (CCAG) are informed and consulted where proposed design changes may affect requirements for industry code drafting
* Standing up Design Issue Resolution Groups to consider the impact of design change on the build and test phases of the programme, and their impacts on industry participants. There may be more than one of these groups stood up to look at different design issues. The Design Authority will maintain overall ownership of the output of this group.
* Considering how Programme Participants will be engaged in assessing prospective change to Design Artefacts and whether Technical Impact Assessment is required
* Ensuring the stewardship of the artefacts is maintained, with current versions available and released in accordance with the release management procedure.
* Changes with a cost and/or time impact will be referred to DAG along with analysis of the change and recommendation.
* Issuing design changes for Impact Assessment (IA) and submitting a Programme Change Request for changes that impact any programme milestones or programme costs.

The DA is established with delegated authority from the DAG to make decisions on minor change, where there is unanimous agreement amongst the constituency representatives of the DA. Such changes include requests that simply require clarification of existing design, or housekeeping updates (e.g. correcting typo errors). This definition and process has been used previously throughout the design phase.

It is proposed to be a technical level body, with participants expected to have good understanding of the solution and the processes the solution supports. It is proposed that subject matter experts from industry and central bodies represent those constituencies, and that DAG should appoint these technical reps.

The Design Authority will initially meet monthly, but this could be increased to fortnightly should the volume of change warrant it.

Approved changes will be presented to DAG as part of a monthly status dashboard. In addition, and where necessary, detailed reporting will be provided to DAG.

Where design changes impact time or cost, then DA will raise a Programme Change Request.


## Design and Programme Change Process Relationship

There are two scenarios where a design Impact Assessment (IA) will work within programme governance. The first is if a design change request identifies impacts to time and cost. In this case the DA will recommend to DAG to raise a Programme Change Request to follow the programme CR process. The IA will be part of the submission of the CR, so effort is not duplicated, and the Programme Change Board and PSG will either approve or reject the request.

Diagram

Description automatically generated

The second scenario is if a Programme Change Request is raised that involves a design change. In this case the DA will review the CR Impact Assessment and look at solution options before presenting to DAG their findings. This Impact Assessment will be returned to the Programme CR process.



## Decision-making

If a design change request is considered minor, i.e. it generates a clarification of the design or it addresses a housekeeping issue such as a typo and consensus cannot be reached, the Chair may:

* commission further work and defer the decision to the next meeting of the Design Authority; or
* escalate the decision to the DAG.
* Decisions made by the Design Authority during the DBT phase of the Programme are expected to be either:
* **ACCEPT** a proposal from a work group with the effect that it will be included in a future technical release (Design Authority is not responsible for release management but will be a consultee), create a change to a business process document, create a change request for a code or a combination of these.
* **REJECT** a proposal as it does not meet either a stated requirement or objective of the programme. The Design authority will provide reasons for the rejection and explain where further work is required on the proposal or if there dependencies elsewhere in Programme that bear upon the proposal being considered.
* **ESCALATE** the decision to DAG, if the group cannot meet consensus.

For a major change, the Design Authority is responsible for identifying potential solutions and sending a recommendation for approval to DAG. The group will create working groups as required to work thorough issues that require more focus. These working groups will report back to Design Authority to review outputs before a recommendation is sent back to DAG.

The Design Authority must escalate a decision to the DAG when the decision is deemed by the Design Authority to:

* have an impact on the implementation cost or timescales for the DBT Phase
* result in an increase in the net costs of the Programme; and/or
* have a significant impact on other areas of work, for example by introducing controversial or novel aspects; and/or
* require additional budget or resources that are not available to the Programme
* create consequential change to industry

Some examples of changes which will be escalated include

* Changes which require impact assessment with all Programme Participants (as opposed to changes where input by parties via DA constituency representatives or subgroups is deemed acceptable)
* Changes which may affect a Tier 1 or 2 Programme milestone (and therefore require Ofgem or SRO consent). These changes will also require a Programme Change Request is raised.
* Changes where there is not unanimous agreement between constituency representatives at the DA]

The group will target acknowledgement of receipt of Design Change Requests via the [design@mhhsprogramme.co.uk](mailto:design@mhhsprogramme.co.uk) e-mail 1 working day and to triage the request within 5 working days.

# Membership

The Design Authority will be chaired by a member of the Programme Design Team

Members are accountable for managing the interdependencies between areas of work in their areas of responsibility, the MHHS programme and wider industry. As appropriate, members should take responsibility for reporting specific issues of relevance back to (and/or escalating specific issues within) their own teams and organisations.

The constituencies on DA will be the same as DAG, but the individuals are expected to be senior technical staff able to understand complex technical ecosystems and able to represent their organisations and make decisions.

The table below lists the members of the Design Authority with effect from approval of the M5 milestone.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Role** | **Responsibilities** | **Who** |
| *Chair* | * Accountable for ensuring that the group reaches consensus where possible, and where not to escalate or take appropriate action to get the issue to resolution. * Chairs the Design Authority | Programme Design Team |
| *Secretariat* | * Provides secretariat function to the Design Authority – organises meetings, sends out meeting papers, and records and circulates minutes. | PMO |
| *Programme Design Team Representatives* | * Advises on impacts and updates from the Design Issues Resolution Working Group(s) (spun up around specific issues) and Design Support Group (an programme wide group for users to share and collaborate on issues and experiences) * Manages the flow of papers into the Design Authority for consideration and approval. | Programme Design Team |
| *Programme Party Representatives* | * Accountable for ensuring that the needs of programme participants are represented in the design change decision making process | DAG Appointed technical experts from industry – based on current constituency model of DAG |
| *Industry Observers* | * Providing independent oversight and input to the Design Process * Ensure process is working and participants are being treated fairly | Ofgem  IPA |