

MHHS Design Advisory Group (DAG) Minutes and Actions

Issue date: 21/12/22

Meeting number **DAG019**

Venue **Virtual – MS Teams**

Date and time **14 December 2022 10:00-17:00**

Classification **Public**

Attendees:

Chair

Justin Andrews (Chair)

Role

MHHS IM, DAG Chair

Industry Representatives

Andrew Grace (AG)

Large Supplier Representative

Carolyn Burns (CBu)

Small Supplier Representative

Donna Jamieson (DJ)

iDNO Representative

Gareth Evans (GE)

I&C Supplier 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)

MHHS

Chris Harden (CH)

Programme Director

Claire Silk (CS)

Design Market and Engagement Lead

Fraser Mathieson (FM)

PMO Governance Lead

Ian Smith (IS)

Design Manager

Paul Pettit (PP)

Design Assurance

Simon Harrison (SH)

SI Lead

Warren Fulton (WF)

Design Project Manager

Other Attendees

Colin Bezant (CB)

Independent Programme Assurance Provider

Jenny Boothe (JB)

Ofgem

Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date
Work-Off Plan items	DAG19-01	Programme to issue update on migration / transition activities and plan	Programme (Adrian Page)	11/01/2023 (January DAG)
	DAG19-02	Ofgem to provide information on assumed half-hourly data opt-out rates	Ofgem (Jenny Boothe)	11/01/2023 (January DAG)
	DAG19-03	Large Supplier Representative to provide availability for discussion with Programme on E7/E10 options, with view to reducing the number of options to support formal Impact Assessment via a Programme Change Request	Large Supplier Represent (Andrew Grace)	ASAP
	DAG19-04	Programme to ensure formal Programme Change Request is raised in relation to work-off item D-012 (E7/E10 differential settlement)	Programme (Design Team)	11/01/2023 (January DAG)
	DAG19-05	Programme to issue draft CR relating to D-013 (Registration Service Operating Hours) to DAG for review prior to formal submission	Programme (Design Team)	11/01/2023 (January DAG)
Post-M5 Change Management	DAG19-06	Programme SI Assurance Team to initiate mobilisation of Level 4 Design Authority	Programme (SI Design Assurance Team)	ASAP
	DAG19-07	DAG members to submit any comments on the draft Design Authority ToR v0.8 and Design Change Management Procedure v0.7	DAG members	03/01/2023
	DAG19-08	DAG members to put forward names for appointment to the prospective constituency seats at the Design Authority	DAG members	11/01/2023 (January DAG)
	DAG19-09	Programme to reissue Design Change Management Procedure following comments from DAG members	Programme (SI Assurance Team)	04/01/2023 (January DAG papers)
Next steps	DAG19-10	Chair to provide resolution to ACTION DAG15-03 relating to whether EES and MRPS are considered central system	Chair	ASAP
Open actions from previous meetings	DAG18-01	Chair to provide information on how Performance Assurance requirements manifest in the Design Artefacts	Programme (Design Team)	14/12/2022
	DAG18-02	Programme to update the Work-Off Plan to reflect the inclusion of DTN definitions in Programme activities	Programme (Warren Fulton)	14/12/2022
	DAG18-03	SC and SJ to provide any comments on potential additional detail or clarifications on expected actions for work-off items to the MHHS Design Team (design@mhhsprogramme.co.uk) to enable updates to the Work-Off Plan	Supplier Agent Representative (Seth Chapman) & RECCo Representative (Sarah Jones)	16/11/2022
	DAG18-04	Programme to issue updated Work-Off Plan to DAG with any changes highlighted	Programme (Warren Fulton)	16/11/2022
	DAG18-05	Programme to publish the static list of baselined docs with the DAG minutes	Programme (Claire Silk)	16/11/2022
	DAG18-06	Programme to provide clarity of the scope of transition planning groups	Programme (Design Team)	14/12/2022

	DAG13-09	Confirm approach and timescales for performance assurance requirements work and share with the BSC and REC representatives ahead of the next meeting	TMAG 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
	DAG15-03	Confirm view on whether MPRS and EES are considered central systems, and to liaise with other Programme WGs to confirm the Programme position	Programme (SRO)	14/10/2022
	DAG17-02	Chair to review the DAG Terms of Reference to ensure there is clarity over the role of DAG post-M5.	Chair	14/12/2022
	DAG17-09	<p>Programme to update M5 Design Baseline Report to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add new section to report on discussion and outcomes from DAG review/decision • Add comments to clarify any sections where there are subsequent updates or where future tense is used • Update Section 2 MHHS Recommendations as required in view of updates made to other sections • 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 • Section 4: Add wording that it is out of scope for M5 baseline design decision (but not MHHS Design) • Section 4 Add Performance assurance and disputes • Clarification in Section 5 that all work-off items which result in changes to design artefacts will be subject to change control • Updates to Section 5, point 4, to reference iServer updates • 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 • Update Section 7, Criteria 3, to explain the detail of how this requirement is met • 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 • Reword Section 7, Criteria 4, to note there is nothing preventing baselining of the design • Criteria 5 note DAG wish to see Design Change management process • 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 	Programme (Warren Fulton)	09/11/2022

		reporting, updates to the Work-Off Plan, and how notices to participants will be managed) Add note/link to Section 7, Criteria 9, to Appendix 2 – <i>Post M5 MHHS Design Participant support process</i>		
	DAG17-11	Programme to ensure work-off items which impact code drafting are prioritised and request the Code Drafting Project Manager reviews this.	Programme (PMO)	09/11/2022
	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

Decisions

Area	Dec Ref	Decision
Work-off Plan items	DAG-DEC-34	Work-off item D-012 (registration service operating hours E7/E10 Settlement Differential) can be removed from the M5 Work-Off Plan, subject to the submission of a Programme Change Request and issuance for impact assessment
	DAGDEC-35	Work-off item D-013 (Registration Service Operating Hours) can be removed from the M5 Work-Off Plan, subject to the submission of a Programme Change Request and issuance for impact assessment

RAID items discussed/raised

RAID area	Description
None	

Minutes

1. Welcome and Introductions

The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting and noted the meeting duration had been shortened to allow for an ad-hoc BPRWG & TDWG Subgroup – M5 Work-Off Plan meeting.

The Chair advised this DAG meeting would be used to discuss the two work-off items for which solutions could not be agreed at the BRPWG & TDWG Subgroup meetings, with a view to determining whether solutions can be agreed by the DAG or whether other actions are is required.

2. Work-Off Plan Items

Migration Design

Prior to commencement of discussion on the work-off items, MH requested an update on migration planning. WF advised a weekly Migration Design Subgroup (MDSG) was now in operation led by John Wiggins. Using lessons learned from the MHHS design workstream, the Programme is seeking to be proactive in recording views and decisions, and ensuring the supporting rationales are clear. In terms of timelines, the Programme is seeking to issue the draft migration design and plan in February 20223 and seek approval with DAG in March 2023.

SC queried the transition elements of the migration design. WF replied the migration design is looking to pull together all aspects of transition and communicate how things will tie together. The Programme conformed the timelines stated above include reverse migration design. Other transitional matters under consideration include aspects of parallel systems operation. DAG members requested communications are issued on migration and transition activities.

ACTION DAG19-01: Programme to issue update on migration / transition activities and plan

Work-Off Plan Update

WF advised that, of the 70 items included within the Work-Off Plan, the majority had resulted in non-substantive clarificatory updates to Design Artefacts, and change-marked artefacts would be issued for assurance review in due course. Around 30 work-off items required more detailed discussions, and these were held via the BRPWG & TDWG Subgroup – M5 Work-Off Plan. Of the 30 items for which detailed discussion was required, solutions have been agreed for 28 of these. There are two items remaining which are more challenging or for which the solution options are more contentious amongst Programme Participants.

The Programme will be issuing the change-marked Design Artefacts for comment, with a deadline for assurance review of 13 January 2023. The Programme will respond to all comments by 20 January 2023, Assurance meeting 25 January and an extraordinary DAG will be held 31 January 2023 to carry out assurance and sign-off the Work-Off Plan as complete. WF thanked participants for their efforts in resolving the majority work-off items and highlighted the significant work of the MHHS Design Team in supporting the resolutions in a short period of time.

The Programme proceeded to provide an overview of the two outstanding work-off items.

D-012 - E7/E10 Differential Settlement

IS advised this matter had been highlighted by a Supplier and relates to smart metering customers on E7/E10 tariffs who have opted-out of half hourly (HH) data collection. E7/E10 customers who opt-out of providing HH data may require a different settlement solution if they are to be able to continue to utilise these tariffs. Resolution options have been developed, but following discussions at the BPRWG & TDWG Subgroup, participants have not coalesced around a single option. The Programme advised there is a customer-level issue to be treated, however participants have not been able to agree a solution. In contrast to other work-off items, there is a more pronounced set of views around the ability of parties to deliver certain options by the start of Systems Integration Testing (SIT).

The Chair asked what the current position is on this matter as contained within the Design Artefacts baselined on 31 October 2022. IS replied no option on the treatment of E7/E10 settlement had been enacted within the MHHS Design, which equated to Option 5 reviewed by the BPRWG & TDWG Subgroup (i.e. 'do nothing').

The Chair noted the issue primarily affects Suppliers, and it appears the consequences of delivery of the various options discussed affect parties differently. IS advised, in terms of quantitative inputs provided by parties, there have been several views from Suppliers and others on the delivery impacts of the options. The Chair summarised the Work-Off Plan has been followed, and an impasse reached on the preferred solution. The Chair asked the MHHS Design Team what the suggested next steps are. WF replied the prospective changes to the Design Artefacts, once a solution is agreed, can be turned around relatively quickly. It was noted there have been requests from participants for impact assessment to be undertaken on the solution options, to gather further information on the materiality of the impacts of each option. As such, the MHHS Design Team recommended a Programme Change Request (CR) is raised to draw out the views of parties and enable a formal decision to be made.

The Chair noted the DAG could also make a decision on this matter and invited the views of DAG members on whether a decision could be reached on the preferred solution, or whether a CR was required.

MH believed a CR should be raised to enable the matter to be dealt with.

SC believed part of the difficulty of this issue was understanding the implications for consumers and believed this may be beyond the scope of what the Programme is assessing. There is a question over whether Suppliers are obliged to offer these tariffs to consumers who opt-out of HH data collection. The Chair noted the Programme had attempted to engage consumer representatives on this matter, but no view had been provided. SC did not believe the delivery impacts of the options were clear but believed they should have been planned for already. SC believed the delivery impacts would only become worse as time goes on. MH advised the delivery impacts on Elexon Central Systems (ECS) are either no impact for Option 1, or a one month delay which would impact the commencement of SIT if Option 4 is chosen. As such, MH believed the matter can only be progressed via a Programme CR, noting if the option chosen could require a delay to SIT, this would affect the delivery date of Programme milestone M9 (SIT start).

JB, the Ofgem representative, advised if a CR is raised, Ofgem will want to understand the materiality of the issue in terms of the number of consumers affected. IS advised there was some complexity over this, noting the materiality of the issue on consumers would be determined by the number of MPANs affected, the proportion of these MPANs which have smart meters installed on MHHS go-live, then what the assumed opt-out rate is for these consumers at that moment in time. These factors are all subject to uncertainty, therefore precision in understanding impacts is not necessarily achievable and assumptions would need to be made. IS noted each of the factors listed would also determine the cost

magnitude. The available systems solutions vary also. There are numerous ways load shifting can be managed to help ensure accurate settlement, for example, tagging smart metering consumers on E7/E10 tariffs who have opted out of HH data collection and creating new load shapes for them. IS advised there is a firm view of the problem statement, and options available to treat it, but participants have not been able to centre around a preferred solution option. JB asked whether the Programme is operating with an assumed opt-out rate and whether this could be used as a baseline for assessing delivery and system impacts. The Chair stated the Programme would welcome any insight from Ofgem on assumed opt-out rates. JB advised they would seek information on any assumed opt-out rates.

ACTION DAG19-02: Ofgem to provide information on assumed half hourly data opt-out rates

GE believed the opt-out numbers would be in the millions.

GE advised they had not received responses from I&C Supplier constituents on the E7/E10 issued but asked whether DAG making a decision could negate the need for more protracted options such as a CR, which could be subject to appeals or other requests for escalation. GE believed some of the time which may otherwise be spent on formal impact assessment could be removed if DAG were to decide and parties were to escalate this to the Programme Steering Group (PSG) if they wished. IS believed if DAG were to select an option there would be differing impacts on parties, and potential impacts on systems providers which could affect milestones and therefore should progress via a Programme CR.

SJ believed that when the design was approved/baselined in October 2022, the work-off items would be captured within the baselined design, and as such, would not like to set a precedent for changing the baseline design requiring a CR to amend the 'baselined design' as a result of the resolution of work-off items. However, SJ acknowledged that a CR may be required in this scenario to allow more detailed impact assessment.

The Chair asked whether there were any objections from DAG members to raising a CR to enable full impact assessment to be carried out. No objections were received.

CB wished to understand the consequences of a CR in terms of progressing the Programme milestones. They noted there were solution options which could affect the delivery of SIT and asked whether this would hold up the delivery of the design. CB asked whether there was an option to allow the design to be considered baseline, and enable participant design, build and test (DBT) activities and Programme milestones to progress while a CR is raised which potentially brings in something new later. The Chair considered whether the design baseline, as approved in October 2022, contained the 'do nothing' option in relation to the settlement of E7/E10 tariffs, and as such proceeding on this basis as a CR progresses to find an agreeable solution was not unreasonable. If a new option is chosen as a result of a CR, this would then be treated like any other change to the baselined design. WF noted the aim would be to resolve a CR by the Work-Off Plan deadline of 31 January 2023. CB confirmed that, notwithstanding any attempts to resolve a prospective CR by this deadline, there is an existing option within the Design Baseline which is to do nothing, and this would be the basis upon which parties would proceed if a CR was not resolved by this date. It therefore appeared this would be a reasonable course of action.

SJ wondered whether the question for DAG was whether this issue should cease to be a work-off item and is extricated from the Work-Off Plan in favour of a CR. SJ considered this may not be a question which could be answered until the decision on completion of the Work-Off Plan is undertaken on 31 January 2023. If this way forward were chosen, this matter would cease to be a work-off item, and the do nothing option would effectively be chosen, enabling any CR to take its course.

RL asked whether the implementation date of a prospective CR could be on or around the start of SIT, and whether this could set any poor precedents for future changes. The Chair and IS advised the implementation date of any CR would be part of the considerations for approval and would be for the decision-making body to decide in consideration of any impacts.

CBu noted their involvement in the BRPWG & TDWG Subgroup meetings. They highlighted one Large Suppliers advocates Option 1 and another advocated Option 4 with more detailed backing evidence. No Supplier appears to support Option 5 (do nothing). CBu wondered whether the Supplier who supports Option 4 would be the party most likely to object to the selection of Option 1 and whether direct engagement with this party could enable a decision to be undertaken as part of the Work-Off Plan discussions, and any dissenters could then raise a CR if they wished. IS advised caution over brokering a solution which parties may not want. MH believed Options 1 and 4 are the most likely to be chosen and whilst ECS would not object to Option 4, they may not be able to deliver it within the required timeframes. For these reasons MH reiterated their view a Programme CR should be raised, and the item removed from the Work-Off Plan. SC considered whether discussions with Suppliers could help to reduce the number of options to be impact assessed via a CR, and therefore assist the process. AG highlighted the view of the Large Supplier constituency, noting

there may be more consensus amongst Large Suppliers than appeared through the subgroup. IS requested AG provides availability to discuss the options with the Programme.

ACTION DAG19-03: Large Supplier Representative to provide availability for discussion with Programme on E7/E10 options, with view to reducing the number of options to support formal Impact Assessment via a Programme Change Request

The Chair asked whether there are other parties who may prefer options outside of the two which Suppliers are likely to choose. SC believed the customer issues to be resolved would be primarily decided by Suppliers. DJ noted Option 4 impacts registration systems, and so DNOs would need to be involved in the assessment. GS echoed DJ's views, and asked if the work-off subgroup meetings could not resolve the matter, what is the new question which will be asked and resolved by a CR. The Chair noted it was possible to ask DAG for a decision, and reasonable to assume it would be escalated to PSG. The group wondered whether this was preferable in any case as the matter is likely go to PSG either way, be it via a CR or via an escalation in relation to a DAG decision. The Chair considered whether the deliverability of the options had not been fully drawn out by the subgroup, and whether the real question is whether a CR impact assessment would draw out the delivery impacts as needed.

WF supported a decision being made as soon as possible. SC believed raising as a CR, prompts the relevant questions, and would enable transparency in decision. The Chair asked if any members objected to making a decision in the preferred solution option now. The majority of DAG members present indicated they objected to making a decision now.

Noting the objection, the Chair believed a CR is required, as this is akin to an escalation to the PSG and will allow the drawing out of quantitative information on delivery and system impacts.

The Chair asked whether DAG members object to a CR being raised, to which no objections were received.

The Chair asked whether DAG members object to the notion that the baselined design effectively enacts the do nothing option, as it is silent on the treatment of E7/E10 tariffs, and whether the matter should be removed from the Work-Off Plan subject to the raising of a CR. SC clarified the item would only be removed once the CR is formally submitted. No objections were received.

The discussion concluded with the DAG agreeing a CR should be raised to enable formal impact assessment of the solution options, and the matter removed from the work-off plan once superseded by the submission of a CR.

DECISION DAG-DEC-34: Work-off item D-012 (registration service operating hours) can be removed from the M5 Work-Off Plan, subject to the submission of a Programme Change Request and issuance for impact assessment

ACTION DAG19-04: Programme to ensure formal Programme Change Request is raised in relation to work-off item D-012 (E7/E10 differential settlement)

D-013 - Registration Service Operating Hours

IS explained this item is similar to the E7/E10 issue above in that the Programme believed a CR is now required to draw out supporting impact assessments to the views aired by Programme Participants at the sub working group meetings.

RL sought to clarify the item and asked whether it is about there being no expectation services will operate over the weekend, or whether it is about support staff being available. IS and SJ believed it was the former – i.e. services stop over weekend. RL wondered why participants would not put staff on to deal with issues, but not specifically state the services do not operate over the weekend. GS advised DNO's have a licence condition to ensure support over weekends, and so this is in place. IS noted there is a spectrum of support which can be offered, and any CR would need to consider the consequences of any decision to operate outside the current regulatory requirements. SJ also noted concern that the working group discussions focused on what activities were needed 24/7 rather than acknowledging that 24/7 was the existing baseline and asking the group to consider what needed to change. Wider consideration was needed on the end to end operational choreography if any activities are not 24/7 e.g. what would happen to DIP messages sent over the weekend if no response is received.

SC believed this is not just about registration, but all services. Whether any services need to operate out of hours is a wider question for industry parties than just registration services. SC does not believe this issue was in a place where a CR could be raised as there was not sufficient clarity over the solution options. IS believes it would be possible to collect information on the impacts of services not operating over the weekend, and this is integral to identifying options. IS believed this element can be progressed to begin to quantify the impacts and consider the varying levels of support which could be offered over weekends. The Chair asked whether SC would like further subgroups to develop solutions, or

whether a CR should be raised. SC clarified they believed what needed is more akin to an RFI, as there is not currently an exact view of what would change via a CR. IS believed it would be possible to make proposals for what services would operate over weekends and the level of service staff as a dimension of a prospective CR. Collecting views on this would help to inform the potential updates to be made to Design Artefacts.

WF, in their capacity as Chair of the BPRWG & TDWG Subgroup meetings, did not believe DAG nor the subgroup could decide on this. The deeper principle under discussion is whether the industry can/want to be operating out of hours services or 24/7 services. That is for the industry to decide, and the Programme can then undertake relevant changes to the design.

The Chair asked the DAG to agree the way forward on this. MH believed a CR should be raised. SC believed if a CR is raised the industry will choose non-24/7-operation as the parties who would be in favour of this are the parties most likely to respond to. SC believed the principle of 24/7-operation is already present. SJ did not believe there was clarity on the 24/7-operation principle and this needs to be examined. GS believed there were many unanswered questions and the knock on impacts are significant, meaning the questions to industry must be more granular to draw out not only the principle, but specific options. SC wished to avoid any prospective impacts assessment questions being too granular to avoid any leading questions or distraction from the overall assessment of whether services should be 24/7. GS felt that if the questions in any prospective impact assessment were too high level, they may not draw out the necessary detail. The DAG agreed a draft CR should be produced for review by the DAG ahead of any formal submission to the Programme Change Control Process.

ACTION DAG19-05: Programme to issue draft CR relating to D-013 (Registration Service Operating Hours) to DAG for review prior to formal submission

WF noted current work congestion relating to updating and issuing the Design Artefacts affected by the resolution of work-off items. WF did not believe it would be feasible to draft and issue a CR over the Christmas period owing to this congestion and the general work moratorium over this period. As such, the draft CR will be created and issued for DAG comment in the new year.

The Chair asked whether any members objected to this item coming off the Work-Off Plan, subject to the formal submission of a CR. No objections were received.

DECISION DAG-DEC-35: Work-off item D-013 (registration Service Operating Hours) can be removed from the M5 Work-Off Plan, subject to the submission of a Programme Change Request and issuance for impact assessment

3. Post-M5 Design Change Management

The Chair noted there was not sufficient time available to discuss this agenda item in detail, or to decide on whether the draft Design Authority (DA) Terms of Reference (ToR) and Design Change Management Procedure should be approved. The Chair asked the DAG to authorise the commencement of mobilisation activities for the prospective DA, which was agreed.

ACTION DAG19-06: Programme SI Assurance Team to initiate mobilisation of Level 4 Design Authority

SJ believed formal DAG approval of the Design Change Management Procedure was required. The Chair confirmed the Design Change Management Procedure and draft DA Terms of Reference (ToR) would return to the January 2023 meeting for approval, however the MHHS SI Assurance Team would commence mobilisation activities for the first DA, target to be held at the end of January 2023.

The Chair asked for any objections, to which none were received. SC asked how appointments to the voting seats of the DA would be undertaken. The Programme noted DAG members would be asked to appoint members to the DA for their respective constituencies, and these members should have relevant technical expertise.

ACTION DAG19-08: DAG members to put forward names for appointment to the prospective constituency seats at the Design Authority

The Chair advised the Design Change Management Procure and DA ToR would be reissued with the meeting Headline Report, and asked DAG members to review and provide comments ahead of the next DAG meeting.

ACTION DAG19-07: DAG members to submit any comments on the draft Design Authority ToR and Design Change Management Procedure by 03 January 2023

The Programme advised updated version of the documents would be interested, taking into account comments already received from DAG members.

ACTION DAG19-09: Programme to reissue Design Change Management Procedure following comments from DAG members

4. Summary and Next Steps

The Chair advised any decision items on the DAG agenda which had not been covered would be issued for decision by correspondence, and any other remaining agenda items would be brought to the DAG on 11 January 2023.

The Chair invited any other business. GS raised the topic of whether MRPS and EES are considered central systems, stating they would escalate to PSG by end of week if the question was not resolved. It was noted ACTION DAG15-03 had been raised previously to answer this question, but a resolution had not yet been provided. The Chair agreed to provide an answer on this matter as soon as possible.

ACTION DAG19-10: Chair to provide resolution to ACTION DAG15-03 relating to whether EES and MRPS are considered central system

The Chair concluded the meeting by thanking all parties who have supported the resolution of the Work-Off Plan, noting this had involved substantial effort from participants and the MHHS Design Team. The Chair noted 97% of work-off items had an agreed solution/way forward, with the only two matters discussed above outstanding. SJ stated they had been very pleased with the work-off conversations and extended a thank you from RECCo to the MHHS Design Team for progressing matters over the last month.

Next meetings:

DAG: 11 January 2023 10am

CCIAG: 22 December 2022 10am