

MHHS Design Advisory Group Minutes and Actions

Issue date: 18/01/2022

Meeting number	DAG020	Venue	Virtual – MS Teams
Date and time	11 January 2022 1300-1630	Classification	Public

Attendees:

Chair

Justin Andrews (Chair)

Role

Chair

Industry Representatives

Andrew Green (AG)

I&C Supplier Representative

Carolyn Burns (CBu)

Small Supplier Representative

Donna Jamieson (DJ)

iDNO Representative

Gemma Slaney (GS)

DNO Representative

Haz Elmamoun (HEI)

Large Supplier Representative

Jonny Moore (JM)

Elexon Representative (as central systems provider)

Neil Dewar (ND)

National Grid ESO

Sarah Jones (SJ)

RECCo Representative

Seth Chapman (SC)

Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent)

Robert Langdon (RL)

Supplier Agent Representative

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

Paul Pettit (PP)

Design Assurance Lead

Ross Catley (RC)

Design Assurance Team

Warren Fulton (WF)

Design Project Manager

Other Attendees

Colin Bezant (CB)

Independent Programme Assurance Provider

Danielle Walton (DW)

Ofgem

Jenny Boothe (JB)

Ofgem

Sajwal Dash (SD)

Independent Programme Assurance Provider

Apologies

Vlad Black

Medium Supplier Representative

Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date
Minutes and Actions	DAGCCAG20-01	Programme to issue update on EES/MPRS as central systems to DAG	Programme (PMO)	18/01/2023
	DCCAG20-02	Programme to provide views on make clear that DNOs are central system providers as MPRS is a core capability provided by Central Parties	Programme (Design Team)	08/02/2023
	DCCAG20-03	DAG members to provide any views on the role of DAG post M5 Work-Off Plan completion to support review of DAG ToR	DAG Members	08/02/2023
	DCCAG20-04	Programme to provide update on status of DTN interface specification and logical data model	Programme (Design Team)	ASAP
Post-M5 Design	DCCAG20-05	Programme to update DA ToR to include a minimum number of reps for quoracy	Programme (Design Assurance Team)	19/01/2023
	DCCAG20-06	Programme to clarify whether DA as closed group can operate as a L4 MHHS governance meeting	Programme (PMO)	18/01/2023
	DCCAG20-07	Programme to provide guidance and examples on how Programme change processes will operate	Programme (Design Assurance Team)	19/01/2023
	DCCAG20-08	Programme issue reminder to DAG members for appointments	Programme (PMO)	18/01/2023
Work-Off Plan	DCCAG20-09	Programme to confirm how transition/migration artefacts will be baselined	Programme (Design Team)	08/02/2023
	DCCAG20-10	Programme to issue update on remaining work-off items to DAG	Programme (Design Team)	w/c 23/01/2023
Summary and Next Steps	DCCAG20-11	Programme to consider what items should be brought to 08 February 2023 DAG meeting to confirm whether the meeting should be ahead	Programme (Design Team)	01/02/2023
Previous Meeting(s)	DAG19-01	Programme to issue update on migration / transition activities and plan	Programme (Adrian Page)	11/01/2023
	DAG19-02	Ofgem to provide information on assumed half-hourly data opt-out rates	Ofgem (Jenny Boothe)	11/01/2023
	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
	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
	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	Programme to update M5 Design Baseline Report to include:	Programme (Warren Fulton)	19/12/2022

		<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 reporting, updates to the Work-Off Plan, and how notices to participants will be managed) <p>Add note/link to Section 7, Criteria 9, to Appendix 2 – Post M5 MHHS Design Participant support process</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

Decisions

Area	Dec Ref	Decision
Minutes and Actions	DAG-DEC-36	Amended Minutes of DAG meeting held 31 October 2022 approved
	DAG-DEC-37	Amended Headline Report of DAG meeting held 09 November 2022 approved
	DAG-DEC-38	Amended Minutes of DAG meeting held 14 December 2022 approved
Post-M5 Design Change Management	DAG-DEC-39	Design Change Management Procedure and Design Authority Terms of Reference approved subject to agreed amendments

RAID items discussed/raised

RAID area	Description
-----------	-------------

None

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

DAG approved the minutes of meetings held 31 October 2022 and 14 December 2022 with amendments. The DAG approved the Headline Report of the meeting held 09 November 2022 with amendments.

DECISION DAG-DEC-36: Amended Minutes of DAG meeting held 31 October 2022 approved

DECISION DAG-DEC-37: Amended Headline Report of DAG meeting held 09 November 2022 approved

DECISION DAG-DEC-38: Amended Headline Report of DAG meeting held 09 November 2022 approved

The DAG undertook an in-depth review of outstanding actions:

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

Regarding the approach and timescales for performance assurance (PA) requirements work, the Programme advised an update is expected by April 2023. One attendee noted code drafting for the qualification aspects of performance assurance may commence but detailed assurance processes would be separate and would likely be contained within a non-codified document developed by the Elexon-led Performance Assurance Working Group (PAWG). The RECCo representative advised they were satisfied this action could be closed as it is being discussed outside of DAG. Other members agreed the action could be closed provided any risks or dependencies are noted.

Action closed.

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

Regarding implementation of the Ensuring Design Hub (also known as iServer), the Programme advised this will be implemented on 08 February 2023 and will be announced in the Programme newsletter, the Clock.

Action closed.

ACTION 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

Regarding whether the Meter Point Registration Service (MRPS) is considered a central system, the Chair advised the Programme definition of Central Parties relates to those who are responsible for providing essential market infrastructure. The Programme then also defines 'Core Capabilities'. MRPS is a Core Capability but St Clements, as the provider of the service, are not a Central Party as they are not responsible for providing the system, this responsibility being with the Distribution Network Operators (DNOs). The Chair noted DNOs are represented at all Level 2 and 3 Programme governance groups, and St Clements can request attendance at these groups at the discretion of the relevant chair. One attendee asked why DNOs are not considered Central Parties by virtue of the Programme definition, as they are responsible for the provision of MRPS. The Programme took actions to provide the full view on the status of MRPS to the DAG and to provide a view on whether DNOs should be considered Central Parties.

Action closed.

ACTION DAG20-01: Programme to issue update on EES/MPRS as central systems to DAG

ACTION DAG20-02: Programme to provide views on DNOs as central system providers

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

Regarding review of the DAG Terms of Reference (ToR), the Chair advised a review of the ToR will be undertaken at the February 2023 DAG meeting. Review considerations will include potential updates to reflect the role of the new Design Authority (DA) and move to the enduring design baseline change management process. Other considerations will include DAG's role in work which may affect design artefacts in future, such as migration, transition, and Change Requests (CRs). The Chair requested views on the role of DAG following the completion of the M5 Work-Off Plan. The Elexon representative expressed concern over when transition design will be available. The Chair noted this is a risk and required further detail. The RECCo representative stressed the importance and urgency of receiving an update on transition design. [SJ raised a request that the Chair confirm the approach to amending the ToRs. On the basis a CR was required to amend the CCAG ToRs, it would be expected that a CR be raised to amend the DAG ToRs.](#)

Action ongoing.

ACTION DAG20-03: DAG members to provide any views on role of DAG post M5 Work-Off Plan completion to support the review of DAG ToR

ACTION DAG17-09: Programme to update M5 Design Baseline Report to include additions agreed at DAG 31 October

Regarding updates to the M5 Design Baseline Report, the Programme advised this was still in progress owing to the focus on completing the Work-Off Plan in the last few months.

Action ongoing.

ACTION DAG17-11: Programme to ensure work-off items which may impact code drafting are prioritised and request the Code Drafting Project Manager reviews this

Regarding the prioritisation of work-off items which may impact code drafting. The Programme confirmed a prioritisation was undertaken.

Action closed.

ACTION 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.

The Programme advised the Programme Party Coordinator (PPC) Team were made aware of potential impacts of Work-Off Plan items on the information provided by participants for Readiness Assessment 2.

Action closed.

ACTION DAG18-01: Chair to provide information on how Performance Assurance requirements manifest in the Design Artefacts

Regarding how PA manifests itself within the Design Artefacts, the Chair advised it was likely to manifest in changes to the Design Artefacts as work through the PAWG develops. PA code drafting via the Cross Code Advisory Group (CCAG) will commence in April 2023. One attendee noted the PAWG is looking at industry-level risks by market segment as opposed to by market role and will seek to recommend how PA reporting requirements are met. It was confirmed that any changes emanating from the PAWG would proceed through the Programme change control process as a Change Request. The Elexon Representative confirmed the PAWG's work is underway and primarily focussing on Balancing and Settlement Code (BSC) PA at present. The RECCo Representative highlighted the PAWG Terms of Reference provides for discussion on Retail Energy Code (REC) PA requirements also. The group concluded it was clear at present whether there may be changes to MHHS Design Artefacts as a result of PA requirements or whether new artefacts or just new code documents will be introduced.

Action closed.

ACTION DAG18-02: Programme to update the Work-Off Plan to reflect the inclusion of DTN definitions in Programme activities

The Programme confirmed (as per last DAG meeting) Data Transfer Network (DTN) messages are included within the Programme's scope. SJ noted associated Work-Off Plan (WO Plan) item D-025 was not yet complete.

Action closed.

ACTION 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

Comments received and work-off items updated.

Action closed.

ACTION DAG18-04: Programme to issue updated Work-Off Plan to DAG with any changes highlighted

Issued as part of fortnightly progress report

Action closed.

ACTION DAG18-05: Programme to publish the static list of baselined docs with the DAG minutes

Published in November 2022 DAG meeting papers.

Action closed.

ACTION DAG18-06: Programme to provide clarity of the scope of transition planning groups

Explained that covered in the first Migration Design Subgroup (MDSG) meeting.

Action closed.

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

PP advised this action was in progress and an update would be provided at the next meeting.

Action ongoing.

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

DW advised Ofgem were looking at options around this. The Chair noted the outcome may support the E7/E10 settlement differential Change Request due to be raised.

Action ongoing.

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

HEI advised the Large Supplier Representative had contacted the Programme with availability and was waiting a response. HEI stated the matter may be raised to the Programme Steering Group (PSG) as a design gap. WF advised the Programme would facilitate a discussion. GS noted this discussion was intended to look at how the prospective solutions options could be reduced and asked whether DNOs or the MRPS service provider, St Clements, would be invited as the outcome may affect registrations. GS expressed a concern over the solution options being reduced by discussions amongst Large Suppliers, if this meant options which DNOs may prefer are excluded from the CR to be raised.

CB noted the Programme CR process should include adequate details to enable parties to respond regarding impacts as part of the CR impact assessment. HEI was open to DNOs joining this discussion if it may help to reduce difficulties later. The Chair urged caution over repeating the discussions held at the M5 Work-Off Plan Subgroup meetings where agreement could not be reached. HEI noted Large Suppliers may elect to include 'lead options' within the CR and highlight other options available, as included in the options papers presented to the work-off subgroup.

Action ongoing.

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

The Programme advised discussions with the Large Supplier constituency were underway.

Action ongoing.

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

GS stated that the Programme would draft this CR for review by the DAG, however noted DNOs had been asked to raise it. GS believed the MHHS Target Operating Model (TOM) does not require 24/7 services and queried why DNOs would raise a CR as they are not seeking change to this position. WF confirmed the Programme will draft the CR and ask DNOs to take on ownership of the change as the Programme must remain impartial to any potential outcome.

WF reiterated the need for a CR, as agreed by the DAG in December 2022, to ascertain participants' detailed views via impact assessment. GS noted the potentially significant implications on LDSOs regarding work-off item D-013 (Registration Service Operating Hours) if it required 24/7 service requirements. The Chair noted several participants have sought 24/7 service, and the TOM will implement an event driven architecture which facilitates real time events. The CR is required to bottom out how the MHHS design is supported by the Registration Service. WF clarified the Programme are not seeking 24/7 operation *per se* but noted there are participants who believe 24/7 services are required, it depends on what this service covers. This is why an impasse was reached at the M5 Work-Off Plan Subgroup meetings.

SC was not comfortable that DNOs may be asked to raise the CR as this does not guarantee the D-013 WO item will be sufficiently addressed. SC stated a preference for the Programme to raise the CR and believed this is what was agreed at the December 2022 DAG meeting. GS agreed, noting the contrast with the E7/E10 settlement differential CR which the Programme simply took an action to ensure is raised, whereas the 24/7 draft CR was to be raised by the Programme to ensure all options are objectively included. GS believed the associated WO item would need to continue until DAG confirmed the CR addressed all elements raised by the WO item. JM also believed the Programme would raise this change and this was the basis of agreement over removal of the item from the WO Plan.

The Chair confirmed the Programme will draft the CR and send for DAG review. The Programme will then consider whether there may be any issues over impartiality if ownership of the change is not taken by a participant or constituency.

Action ongoing.

DW queried the driver for the CRs discussed, querying whether they are required to remove items from the WO Plan or not. DW wondered whether the question being asked of participants may not be correct and believed it may be better to focus on how the decision will be made, what the impacts would be, and how the changes would be taken forward as a result. The Chair believed full impact assessment was required by participants and the CRs prompt the formal submission of detailed views and impacts. This then provides an evidence base for DAG or PSG to make an assessment against the Design Principles and seek input from Ofgem or the Independent Programme Assurance (IPA) provider if necessary.

SC believed there was a potential conflict with the CRs and the Design Principles (such as time and cost) and this would need to be considered by DAG, who will then require evidence to inform a decision. The CRs facilitate the gathering of this evidence and as such, SC felt it was the right approach to raise CRs, as the issues go beyond the MHHS design, as they potentially impact cost and functionality.

The Chair noted the DAG will need to be satisfied the CRs are in progress before being asked to remove the relevant items from the WO Plan.

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

The mobilisation of the Design Authority (DA) is underway, and the first meeting is due to be held 26 January 2023.

Action closed.

ACTION DAG19-07: DAG members to submit any comments on the draft Design Authority ToR v0.8 and Design Change Management Procedure v0.7

Comments received. See section five for further information.

Action closed.

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

The Programme advised only two appointments had been received thus far and urged DAG members to provide their appointees without delay. A further call for appointees will be made alongside the publication of the meeting minutes.

Action closed.

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

Updated procedure issued to DAG with December 2022 DAG Headline Report.

Action closed.

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

See ACTION DAG15-03 above.

Action closed.

JM advised transition arrangements are Elexon's biggest concern at present and noted no update had been provided on this. PP advised there is no further update currently. The Chair requested an updates as soon as possible. HEI advised Large Suppliers had highlighted some Design Artefacts, such as the DTN interface specification and logical data model, which were yet to be issued but were crucial for participants to receive. PP advised the logical data model is being worked on the MHHS Design Team and will be issued for review as soon as possible.

ACTION DAG20-04: Programme to provide update on status of DTN interface specification and logical data model

3. Programme Updates

This item was taken as read.

4. Post-M5 Design Change Management

PP introduced the item, advising decisions are required from the DAG on the approval of the Design Change Management Procedure and DA ToR.

DA ToR

GS noted comments provided to the Programme ahead of the meeting and asked whether there would be a quoracy requirement for the DA given it will be decision-making group. The group considered how the Faster Switching Programme DA operated and agreed a quoracy requirement was necessary.

ACTION DAG20-05: Programme to update DA ToR to include a minimum number of representatives for quoracy

SC asked whether the DA is an open group like other Level 4 MHHS governance groups. The Programme advised it would be a closed group, and any requirements for discussion of solution development would be undertaken at open groups such as the proposed Design Issues Resolution Group (DIRG). This is to ensure the DA operates as a decision-making group not a discussion group. SC challenged this, expressing a belief the MHHS Governance Framework requires all Level 4 groups to be open. FM advised this was not the case, e.g. SDWG, and took an action to confirm the vires for the DA operating as a closed group.

ACTION DAG20-06: Programme to clarify whether DA as closed group can operate as a L4 MHHS governance meeting

Design Change Management Procedure

SJ expressed concern over the definition over the definition of major and minor change as stated in the draft procedure. SJ noted it appears to be the case that if a resolution to a design issue cannot be agreed by the DA this then becomes a 'major' change and requires a CR. SJ queried what DAG can approve as the escalation body. The Chair clarified any items determined to be major change will require a CR. SJ and GS believed the procedure appears to indicate major changes will be submitted to DAG and queried in what instances DAG would decide or the full CR process used. The Chair summarised the procedure is focussed on design change with the aim of engaging subject matter experts where required to review potential changes to the design baseline. The DA will be able to approve minor change so as not to 'clog' the full CR process. If there is not unanimous agreement amongst the constituency appointees at the DA, then the DA provide expertise in pursuing a full CR. The Chair recommended the procedure is updated to provide better clarity over what is a major or minor change. SJ wished to ensure safeguards against changes via 'the backdoor' or major change not proceeding through the full CR process. The Chair confirmed participants may still raise a full CR at any time if they wish.

SC believed guidance examples were required to demonstrate how the parallel design change management process and full CR process will operate.

ACTION DAG20-07: Programme to provide guidance and examples on how Programme change processes will operate

RC advised examples would be provided at the first DA meeting. RC went on to note another key aim of the DA is to assist in the understanding of the time, cost, and technical impacts of design issues.

CB noted the challenge of implementing processes of this nature is assurance on the efficacy of the processes, and this is often difficult to plan or gauge in advance. CB advised it is often not until the process is in operation that its effectiveness can be determined. PP agreed and advised the desire of the Programme is commence operation of the process and assess it on an ongoing basis to ensure it is the optimal solution to avoiding the potential negative consequences of a high level of low-level or minor change to the design baseline as parties commence design, build, and test (DBT) activities. PP further noted the DA replaces certain BPRWG and TDGW processes, allowing these group to potentially be wound down.

SJ considered the impacts of the procedure on the Programme Change Control Approach document (DEL171) and believed this must be amended to reflect ~~that change to Design Artefacts may also emanate from this procedure~~ that minor change to Design Artefacts may also be approved via this procedure and for this to be approved by the PSG. There was debate over whether the DAG could approve the commencement of the DA without changes to the DEL171 document being in place first. ~~PP advised changes to the DEL171 were underway. PP advised changes to the DEL171 were underway and FM advised the nature of the changes were clarificatory only and did not alter, nor provide any specific vires, for the operation of the DA, or the change control approach.~~ SJ noted that DEL171 defined the approved programme change control process and was clear that this was not the route used for approving change to the baselined design artefacts, including housekeeping change. Any change to that principle required a change to the governance framework that underpinned the Programme.

The Chair summarised the changes required to the Design Change Management Procedure and DA ToR:

- DA ToR to be amended to include a quoracy requirement
- Design Change Management Procedure to be amended to include examples and guidance on how design issues progress and definitions to be updates to describe matters raised to the DA as design 'issues' rather than design changes
- Design Change Management Procedure section 5.1 to be updated to ~~refer to~~ make clear that 'major change' is not referred to the DAG 'for approval' but would require a CR
- A review of arrangements is to be conducted after three months of operation

The DAG approved the procedure and DA ToR subject to the approval of the changes listed above to the DEL171 document being approved. ~~and noting the amended DEL171 requires approval from the PSG.~~

DECISION DAG-DEC-39: Design Change Management Procedure and Design Authority Terms of Reference approved subject to agreed amendments

The Programme reminded DAG members of the need to provide appointment to the DA ahead of the first meeting.

ACTION DAG20-08: Programme issue reminder to DAG members for DA appointments

5. CCIAG Updates

An amended CCIAG ToR was presented to the DAG, with an updated definition of consequential change.

The Chair asked whether there were any objections to approving the updated ToR. RL questioned whether the update was worthwhile as the CCAIG may be wound down in the near future. It was highlighted that the CCIAG ToR is the only Programme document where 'consequential change' is currently defined.

The Chair asked whether there were any objections to the revised definition of consequential change. The majority of the group had no objections, with several members stating they agreed with the revision. RL expressed concern over the revised definition. The group consider that, as the CCIAG may be wound down, it may be preferable to place the revised definition in another Programme governance document. The Chair posited two options; the revised definition could be inserted into the DAG ToR when this is reviewed (see ACTION DAG20-03), or the placement of the definition is reviewed as part of the decision to disband the CCIAG and potentially shifted to a higher level document such as the MHHS Governance Framework.

The majority of DAG members agreed with the Chair and the group determined there would be no change to the CCIAG ToR. The proposed revised definition of consequential change will be considered at the February 2023 DAG meeting as part of discussion on the future of CCIAG.

6. Work-Off Plan

The Programme provided updates on the WO Plan, advising updated Design Artefacts are due to be published for assurance review ahead of a decision on whether the plan is complete. WF advised the Programme were reviewing the recordings of the M5 Work-Plan Subgroup to ensure the resolutions for work-off items are recorded accurately. An offline review between the Programme and RECCo will also be undertaken.

WF advised, regarding the DTN role code work-off item, the consensus had been there is a requirement for separate role codes. WF noted there are also questions over the interface catalogue and there is work to complete in this area. The interface catalogue WO Item was also raised at the PSG. HEI also raised that the interface catalogue was missing DTN Changes sheet and Logical Data Model. WF stated this would be checked.

SJ noted DTN roles were being removed from the interface catalogue and requested it is minutes that the MHHS design must capture the DTN flow definitions. SJ advised the REC definitions have been issued to REC parties for consultation, but it was unclear whether this was the case for the BSC also. SJ did not believe this work-off item would be able to be closed by the target deadline of the end of January 2023. WF advised discussions would be held with code drafters and other relevant parties to rectify this.

SC questioned how items such as the DTN role codes would be resolved by the end of January 2023 and believed it was unlikely parties could be consulted and provide responses by this target deadline. SC noted there appear to be four work-off items still requiring comments to enable them to be closed. WF advised the Programme would provide a position on these and issue updates, and the current plan was to continue with the completion of the WO Plan by the target deadline. If consensus over the closure of the WO Plan cannot be reached the DAG and Programme will need to consider the position on this. SC noted the slim timeframes available to make any further changes to the Design Artefacts. WF responded there was no evidence currently to indicate there may need to be significant changes to artefacts as a result of the remaining work-off items. If significant changes were to be required, the DAG and Programme would need to consider the timelines for these.

The Chair summarised the potential options for the completion of work-off items:

- 1) Changes to Design Artefacts are agreed and the artefacts re-baselined
- 2) Programme Change Requests are raised
- 3) A further period of work is agreed by the DAG and Programme for items which can be resolved within a defined timeframe.

SC considered the DAG might not agree the WO Plan is complete at the end of January 2023, if document updates are still outstanding. The Chair questioned this, if all the agreed WO items and their associated design artefacts are complete (noting any outstanding items which may include CRs) would the DAG not agree those that are complete and baseline. SC believed the whole WO Plan should be agreed as complete at the same time. The Chair noted this did not fit with the Programme's current agreed implementation plan, and it was important to provide as much certainty to participants as possible by release/re-baselining Design Artefacts as soon as they are ready (and avoid delay and costs).

WF advised the updated artefacts would be issued and an assurance meeting held 27 January 2023 to present the updates. If participants consider additional time is required to review any items, this would need to be considered, with the Programme making the final decision in consultation with the DAG. The Chair added there may be standalone items which the DAG will need to consider. WF noted the dissensus over many of the work-off items, and how the Programme had gone about recording differing views.

JM asked what would happen with design elements which emanate from the migration/transition design, and whether this would require a CR. JM clarified there are no transition artefacts currently and wished to know how these would be produced and baselined. WF considered whether baselining of such design documents may be undertaken via the DAG, given this was part of the DAG's remit as described in its ToR. An action was taken to consider this and return to the next meeting with an update.

ACTION DAG20-09: Programme to confirm how transition/migration artefacts will be baselined

HEI requested work-off updates to be provided to identify the next steps for any outstanding items and understand what implications may exist or whether anything should be challenged.

ACTION DAG20-10: Programme to issue update on remaining work-off items to DAG

WF stated the Programme will issue updates on the remaining work-off items week commencing 23 January 2023.

SJ queried whether DAG will be asked to approved the completion of the WO Plan and the updated Design Artefacts at the extraordinary DAG meeting to be held on the 31 January 2023. The Chair advised this would be the case and would involve updates from the MHHS Design Team on outstanding issues. Any contentious or 'sticky' items would require a decision from DAG. WF reiterated the aim of the work-off process was to complete/resolve design issues and queries, and of the 75 items within the WO Plan, the majority are complete, and the updated artefacts should be re-baselined accordingly.

7. Summary and Next Steps

CB noted a clash between the currently scheduled extraordinary DAG on 31 January 2023 and the Data Communication Company MHHS summit to be held the same day. DAG members considered whether the extraordinary DAG meeting should be moved and agreed to change this to 01 February 2023 instead.

The Chair asked DAG members to consider whether the next regular DAG meeting on 08 February 2023 would still be required. The group provisionally agreed the meeting should go ahead and the Programme should consider what items may be added to the agenda in support of a decision on whether to stand down the meeting or not.

ACTION DAG20-11: Programme to consider what items should be brought to 08 February 2023 DAG meeting (to confirm whether the meeting should go ahead
--

Date of next CCIAG: 26 January 2023 10am

Date of next Design Authority: 26 January 2023 2pm

Date of next DAG: 01 February 2023 1pm