

MHHS Design Advisory Group Minutes and Actions

Issue date: 15/02/2023

Meeting number **DAG021**

Venue **Virtual – MS Teams**

Date and time **08 February 2023 1000-1300**

Classification **Public**

Attendees:

Chair

Justin Andrews (Chair)

Role

Chair

Industry Representatives

Carolyn Burns (CBu)

Small Supplier Representative

Catherine Duggan (CD)

DNO Representative

Donna Jamieson (DJ)

iDNO Representative

Gareth Evans (GE)

I&C Supplier Representative

Gemma Slaney (GS)

DNO Representative

Haz Elmamoun (HE)

Large Supplier Representative

Matt Hall (MH) (part meeting)

Elexon Representative (

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

MHHS

Claire Silk (CS)

Design Market and Engagement Lead

Fraser Mathieson (FM)

PMO Governance Lead

Ian Smith (IS)

Design Manager

Paul Pettit (PP)

Design Assurance Lead

Ross Catley (RC)

Design Assurance Team

Simon Harrison (SH)

SI Lead

Warren Fulton (WF)

Design Project Manager

Other Attendees

Andy MacFaul (AM)

Ofgem

Catherine Duggan (CD) (part meeting)

Energy North West (as proposer of CR017)

Colin Bezant (CB)

Independent Programme Assurance Provider

Apologies

Caroline Farquhar

Consumer Representative

Stuart Scott

DCC Representative (as smart meter central system provider)

Vlad Black

Medium Supplier Representative

Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date
Work-Off Plan Completion	DAG21-01	Programme to confirm how archived versions of Design Artefacts can be made available	Programme (Claire Silk)	08/03/2023
Programme Change Requests	DAG21-02	Programme to ensure CR015 is published on the MHHS website	Programme (PMO)	08/02/2023
	DAG21-03	Programme to consider publishing a log of Programme Change Request, and whether changes progressing via the Design Authority should be published within the same log	Programme (PMO)	08/03/2023
	DAG21-04	Proposer to consider amendments to CR017 to: reference BSCP501; include clarity on whether it is people, services or systems which will only operate in-hours, and; to provide detail on impacts to SLAs.	CR017 Proposer (Catherine Duggan)	ASAP
	DAG21-05	DAG members to provide any additional comments on CR017 directly to the Proposer	DAG members	ASAP
	DAG21-06	Programme to raise Change Request (CR) to provide an alternative option to the solution options detailed in CR017 (LDSO Registration Service Dip messages processing times)	Programme (Ian Smith)	ASAP
Previous Meeting(s)	DAG20.1-01	Programme to consider how to increase awareness of the Programme change request process and Design Change Management Procedure for Participants (e.g., webinar, newsletter article, etc.)	Programme (PMO and SI Design Assurance Teams)	08/03/2023
	DAG20.1-02	DNO Representative to issue draft Programme Change Request on registration service operating hours to DAG for comment ahead of Programme Change Board on 06 February 2023	DNO Representative (Gemma Slaney)	ASAP
	DAG20.1-03	Programme to confirm governance requirements and timelines for potential changes to DTN messages and provide update to DAG (e.g., confirm any design elements of changes which may require approval by DAG)	Programme (Ian Smith)	15/02/2023
	DAG20.1-04	Programme to confirm which role code MDS would use (current presumption is SVA code)	Programme (Ian Smith)	15/02/2023
	DAG20.1-05	Programme to confirm whether additional testing is required for new roles agreed as part of the work-off item D-034a	Programme (Testing Team)	15/02/2023
	DAG20.1-06	Programme to confirm whether is Calculation Self-Assessment Document (CSAD) requirements are within scope of Programme code drafting work	Programme (Ian Smith)	15/02/2023
	DAG20.1-07	Elexon to submit complex site metering issue to item to Design Authority via a Design Issue Notification for to enable prioritisation of discussion as part of the Design Change Management Procedure	Elexon (Jonny Moore)	15/02/2023
	DAG20.1-08	Large Supplier Representative to provide further detail on constituency views on work-off item D008 (Complex Site Arrangements) and proposed alternative	Large Supplier Representative (Haz Elouman)	13/02/2023
	DAG20.1-09	Programme to confirm which release not addresses this work-off item D-009 (Rejection of MDR Notification to DCC) and how Programme Participants would be given visibility of the changes to Design Artefacts	Programme (Design Team)	15/02/2023

DAG20.1-10	Programme to confirm the governance arrangements for approval of the DIP detailed design (e.g., design elements to be approved by DAG and code drafting elements to be approved by CCAG)	Programme (Design Team)	15/02/2023
DAG20.1-11	Programme to provide guidance on the linking of import/export meters (D-033 – MPAN Linkage (Related & Import/Export)) and consider whether any clarificatory additions to the associate Design Artefact are required	Programme (Simon Harrison)	15/02/2023
DAG20.1-12	Programme to consider how to provide clarity on the data services for import/export meters and how Programme Participants can be given visibility of this	Programme (Ian Smith)	15/02/2023
DAG20-01	Programme to issue update on EES/MPRS as central systems to DAG	Programme (PMO)	18/01/2023
DAG20-02	Programme to provide views on DNOs as central system providers	Programme (Design Team)	08/02/2023
DAG20-03	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
DAG20-04	Programme to provide update on status of DTN interface specification and logical data model	Programme (Design Team)	ASAP
DAG20-05	Programme to update DA ToR to include a minimum number of reps for quoracy	Programme (Design Assurance Team)	19/01/2023
DAG20-06	Programme to clarify whether DA as closed group can operate as a L4 MHHS governance meeting	Programme (PMO)	18/01/2023
DAG20-07	Programme to provide guidance and examples on how Programme change processes will operate	Programme (Design Assurance Team)	19/01/2023
DAG20-08	Programme issue reminder to DAG members for appointments	Programme (PMO)	18/01/2023
DAG20-09	Programme to confirm how transition/migration artefacts will be baselined	Programme (Design Team)	08/02/2023
DAG20-10	Programme to issue update on remaining work-off items to DAG	Programme (Design Team)	w/c 23/01/2023
DAG20-11	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
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	<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 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>	Programme (Warren Fulton)	19/12/2022

Decisions

Area	Dec Ref	Decision
Work-Off Plan Completion	DAG-DEC-40	DAG agree the 62 work-off items for which no challenges were received at the M5 Design Assurance Forum are closed
Programme Change Requests	DAG-DEC-41	The DAG Chair, based on the majority view of DAG Members, decided Option 1 should be chosen with regard to the options for the progression of CR017

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. Work-Off Plan Completion

The Programme introduced the work-off items remaining from the previous DAG meeting held 01 February 2023. The group were advised a final report on the closure of the Work-Off Plan had been published and would be updated following the outcome of today's discussion. The Programme advised changed marked copies of the MHHS Design Artefacts had been published, incorporating changes which have arisen as part of the resolution of work-off items. DAG members were requested to consult with their constituents and provide any final comments/challenges on the closure of the Work-Off Plan and re-baselining of the Design Artefacts by close of business 14 February 2023. An extraordinary DAG meeting will then be held 16 February 2023 where a decision will be taken.

The group proceeded to review the remaining work-off items. A summary of discussions and outcomes is provided below:

D-034d – Redundant Data Items in Unmetered Segments: The Programme advised a challenge was received from a participant over the closure of this work-off item, which relates to data items contained in data flows which are not required for the unmetered market segment. The Programme considered this challenge did not align with comments previously received and advice was sought from the SI Design Assurance Team and the Independent Programme Assurance (IPA) provider. The Programme noted a desire to avoid bespoke messages for individual market segments and asked whether the benefit of removing the data items justified the work. The Programme suggested that if parties felt it may be beneficial to insert an explanatory note into relevant Design Artefacts, this could be raised via the Design Authority following re-baselining of the artefacts.

The DAG was asked whether there should be no change to the current draft Design Artefacts, or whether a change should be made in accordance with the participant's view on this. The Programme advised if the DAG decided to make a change to the design artefacts, this would have a time impact and may delay re-baselining by up to two weeks.

The Supplier Agent Representative advised of several data items in the flow which are not required for unmetered sites. The representative noted these items should not be included in flows for unmetered sites but understands the time impact of untangling this. As such, the pragmatic option would be to include a clarifying statement to advise these items are optional for unmetered site flows. The representative highlighted that having these items as mandatory was not necessary and would be inefficient.

The group discussed the option of setting the data item as 'conditional mandatory' within relevant flows – i.e., mandatory if the site is metered, and optional if unmetered. WF suggested that, as the updated Design Artefacts have already been issued, any changes to resolve this work-off item should be raised via the DA as the issue did not warrant delay to re-baselining. The Chair summarised the Programme view is that no change should be made to the unmetered market segment method statements prior to re-baselining, whereas the constituent view is this should be updated now. SJ queried how Unmetered Supplies Data Service (UMSDS) flows would be validated and whether the introduction of conditional mandatory fields may cause validation failures. The Programme advised it was questions such as this which require further consideration and reiterated that the matter should be referred to the DA.

SC believed a change should be made as part of the baselining process. SC believed not making the change now would impact the UMSDS flows. The Elexon Representative advocated not delaying the baselining process as the priority is to get the baselined artefacts out and allow for the commencement of design and build. GS noted the points of view and queried why the change could not be made now. IS advised a clarification statement could be drafted for addition to the relevant artefact, and this could form part of the re-baselining decision on 16 February 2023, but with the specific updates to the artefacts being made via the DA in the next change control release. SC agreed with this option.

DAG agreed a statement on the conditionality of the data items will be added to the unmetered sites method statements and the change issued in the next release of amended artefacts via the DA. The DAG agreed to instruct the DA that this change is already approved and is to be scheduled in an upcoming release.

OUTCOME: Work-off item closed subject to a clarification statement to be added to the UMSDS method statements and scheduled for implementation in the next DA change control release.

D-045 – Unmetered Connection Type: The Programme highlighted the item relates to a potentially redundant data item, yet to make a change to the relevant Design Artefact now would cause a minimum two-week delay. SC noted a potential for contradiction between the ‘connection type’ and ‘unmetered indicator’ data items, which they believed to be an unnecessary item which may cause confusion. SC advocated for the removal of the unmetered indicator and to have the connection type used instead. Despite both data items being provided by the distributor, including both created an unnecessary risk discrepancies and SC believed it would be preferable to simply to remove the unmetered indicator. The Programme noted the relevant data flows and data items are referenced in other areas of the system design and it may not be a simple case of removal of the data item as there may be a need for Impact Assessment (IA) to understand the extent to which this would need to be unpicked. The Programme suggested the item be taken to the DA to enable review of the impacts of removal of the unmetered indicator, whilst avoid any potential delay to the re-baselining decision. SC expressed consternation that this work-off item had not been well understood in time and now the recommendation from the Programme was that no change is made ahead of re-baselining.

The Chair asked whether any DAG members objected to proceeding with the Programme’s recommendation on this item. RL objected, believing change was required. The Chair affirmed the outcome of this item would be ‘no change today’, noting the item will be taken to the DA for a resolution as to how the potential for discrepancy in these data items is resolved.

OUTCOME: Work-off item closed with no current changes to Design Artefacts. The item will be submitted to the DA for discussion on how potential discrepancies between the connection type and unmetered indicator can be resolved.

D-053- Minor Corrections Interfaces: The Programme noted updates had been made to the Design Artefacts in accordance with this work-off item and proposed the item is resolved. SJ did not believe all necessary changes had been correctly reflected in the interface catalogue. SJ did believe this should prevent the re-baselining of the artefacts on 16 February 2023 and suggested the work-off item could be closed providing a clear statement of intention as to the changes which will happen is made, and these are then added to a future change control release via a housekeeping change raised to the DA. SJ noted the need for quality checking as this inconsistency had not been resolved in the recently issued change marked Design Artefacts. The Programme affirmed the Customer Direct Flag data item could only be populated by the incumbent supplier, and agreed the minor change required to ensure this is fully reflected in the Design Artefacts could be progressed via the DA, thereby avoiding any delays to the re-baselining of the artefacts.

The DAG agreed to instruct the DA that this change is already approved and is to be scheduled in an upcoming release.

OUTCOME: Work-off item closed subject to the DA being instructed to approve a housekeeping change to ensure the Design Artefacts comprehensively reflect that the Customer Direct Flag can only be set by incumbents, and schedule this for implementation in the next DA change control release.

Next Steps

The Chair noted that the decision deferred from last meeting on the 62 work-off items was not challenged at the M5 Design Assurance Forum and asked GS whether they now agreed these items were now resolved and could be considered closed. GS agreed the items could be considered closed. The Chair advised the 62 work-off items not challenged at the M5 Design Assurance Forum were now closed.

DECISION DAG-DEC-40: DAG agree the 62 work-off items for which no challenges were received at the M5 Design Assurance Forum are closed.

WF outlined that updates would be made to the *M5 Work-Off Plan – Final DAG Report* to reflect the outcomes agreed above, and the report reissued to DAG members. DAG members are then requested to consult with their constituents ahead of a decision being taken at the extraordinary DAG on 16 February 2023.

GS stated they were happy with this plan but noted the 111 non-material design issue comments which their constituency had raised, and requested clear messaging about how these items are progressing. GS did not believe the items should prevent re-baselining. PP noted the Programme are actively looking at the comments now and are seeking a meeting to triage them and plan resolution activities. PP noted some have already been addressed, and an assessment will be made as to which others must proceed via the DA. The Chair requested other members provide any other batches of issues/comments to the Programme too.

SC requested that visibility of any consultation responses provided by DAG members ahead of the extraordinary meeting on 16 February 2023 be provided, even if this is directly before the meeting, noting the short turnaround timeframes from the deadline for responses and the extraordinary meeting.

CBu asked what happens after the extraordinary DAG meeting. CS advises one week will be required to uplift change marked Design Artefacts to v5.0 and publish them to the Programme Collaboration Base. The change marked version would be removed to avoid any confusion. The items agreed as being taken to the DA will be submitted to the next DA meeting on 23 February 2023. PP advised the Programme's Enduring Design Hub (also known as iServer) will be updated to reflect the amended artefacts one week after publication of the latest artefacts. CBu asked what communications will be issued. CS advised a communications plan is in place, and notice will be provided The Clock, in updates on the MHHS website and Programme Collaboration Base and will be made very easy to find.

SC asks if archive versions of the Design Artefacts would be available. CS agreed to take this away for consideration.

ACTION DAG21-01: Programme to confirm how archived versions of Design Artefacts can be made available

3. SI Design Assurance View

The MHHS SI Design Assurance Team provided a view on the prospective closure of the Work-Off Plan and re-baselining of the Design Artefacts. PP advised the focus had been on assurance of the MHHS design and the majority of this work occurred back in October 2022. All material findings were raised into the Programme RAID Log, and these are being actively managed. The current focus of assurance activities is on the process of resolving work-off items and ensuring satisfactory conclusions are reached, noting the decision to be taken at the extraordinary DAG next week. Following this decision, the assurance plan will continue and will move to design assurance of participants.

PP noted there will always be opportunities to improve the design and its content and this is what DA has been established for. There is an expectation items submitted to the DA will increase as participant design, build, and test (DBT) progresses.

4. IPA View

The IPA provider provided a view on the prospective closure of the Work-Off Plan and re-baselining of the Design Artefacts. CB advised an IPA report is currently under review by Ofgem, but it was possible to provide some high-level highlights.

CB provided an overview of the main conclusions from the IPA report. They noted, having reviewed the Work-Off Plan and resolution, that although there are some issues still to resolve, none of the outstanding items would make it impractical to continue DBT.

CB added that part of the IPA's remit is to observe the way MHHS governance meetings are working and the closing stages of the Work-Off Plan have been difficult. Going forward, there is a need to look at how DAG make decisions better in future. CB was satisfied with how work-off items have taken time to discuss and close, noting this was necessary as the design is bottomed out. However, as the Programme moves to delivery of the design the focus on decisions and speed of decisions becomes more important. There are three recommendations from the IPA in relation to this point:

- 1) Better clarity is required on decision questions made to DAG. This should be clear in any presentations with a focus on fact-based information and the options to be decided upon. The DA's cadence with DAG is important here, and a clear seven days for digesting the outputs of DA before any decisions at DAG is required. These actions sit with the Programme.
- 2) Membership of DAG must draw in the right skills and expertise where required. The group requires members who can provide answers and debate the advantages or disadvantages of proposed issues resolutions in the meeting. This action is with DAG members.
- 3) There will be certain situations where a decision will not be forthcoming. Therefore, the clarity of supporting information, both from the Programme and DAG members, will be important so that if escalation occurs, the escalation point has sufficient information to proceed. This action is with the meeting Chair with the support of DAG members.

CB advised that in the context of the current activities to close the Work-Off Plan and re-baseline the Design Artefacts, not issues had been identified.

The Chair thanked CB for the observations and recommendations, and noted these will feed into the updates to be made to the DAG Terms of Reference (ToR) to improve the DAG's focus as the Programme enters the delivery phase.

5. Work-Off Plan Decision

The Programme noted that as DAG members had been asked to consult with constituents on the *M5 Work-Off Plan – Final DAG Report* and the change marked Design Artefacts and provide views, a decision would no longer be requested at this meeting.

The DAG will be asked to decide on the closure of the Work-Off Plan and re-baselining of the Design Artefacts at an extraordinary DAG meeting to be held 16 February 2023.

6. DAG ToR Review

The Chair advised the DAG ToR was currently under review to ensure the role of DAG is clear post-design baseline. The Chair invited views from the group on the changes which could be made as the Programme enters its delivery phase.

SJ noted there were still aspects of the MHHS design requiring baselining, such as migration design, transition design, Data Integration Platform (DIP) design, and as such there was still 'design' work to proceed via the DAG.

SC suggested a review of the way DAG makes decisions could be undertaken, to make sure this is fit for the next phase of work.

HE asked about DIP design and whether DAG continued to require powers to baseline Design Artefacts. The Chair noted the Programme would clarify which design related artefacts yet to be baselined would come to DAG for approval, and accepted there was a continued role for now for DAG in the baselining or design-related artefacts.

SJ asked whether DAG's working group were under review also, to which the Chair replied they were.

The group queried whether a Programme Change Request (CR) was required. FM confirmed a CR would be required to change the DAG ToR as this forms part of the Programme's Governance Framework which is subject to change control. SJ pondered whether this should be changed to enable the Programme Steering Group (PSG) to approve changes to ToRs of Level 3 Programme governance meetings, rather than a CR being required every time.

7. Programme Change Requests

The Programme provided updates on recent CRs. All Programme CRs can be found on the [MHHS website](#).

CR015 – Differential Settlement for E7/E10 Meters for Smart Opt-out customers

DAG were advised CR015 had been issued for IA by the PSG, with responses required by close of business 16 February 2023.

The group noted the change did not appear to have been published to the MHHS website, and an action was taken to ensure it is published.

ACTION DAG21-02: Programme to ensure CR015 is published on the MHHS website
--

The DAG also requested that a log of all CRs is published, with the status of each change recorded to increase visibility. GS asked whether CRs and changes which progress through the DA could be published in the same log. The Programme agreed to consider this.

ACTION DAG21-03: Programme to consider publishing a log of Programme Change Request, and whether changes progressing via the Design Authority should be published within the same log
--

CR017 – LDSO Registration Service Dip messages processing times

The DAG were advised CR017 had been raised by a DNO constituent and had been routed to DAG by the Programme Change Board for a decision on whether it should be issued to IA.

The Proposer, CD, provided an overview of the CR. CD advised that any change to registration service operating hours is significant for Licenced Distributer Service Operators (LDSOs) and expressed a belief that any such change would go beyond what was intended by the MHHS Target Operating Model (TOM). CD did not believe there should be any change, and any view to the contrary required justification. The need to obtain views and supporting rationales is part of why the CR was raised. CD invited questions from the DAG.

SJ noted the CR contained several references to Retail Energy Code (REC) requirements. They believed the CR should reference Balancing and Settlement Code Procedure (BSCP) 501 too as this is where the Supplier Meter Registration Service (SMRS) operating hours are set out, and the REC provisions align to this. The Chair noted BSCP501 sets out the current requirements on services and operating hours and encourage the group to bear in mind this may not reflect what the requirements will be in the MHHS/ DIP 'world'.

SC believed it was not clear what change is proposed in the CR. They queried whether the implication of the CR is that the registration service only operates in-hours. SC asked whether operating hours referred to the provision of people, services, or systems. For example, whether registration data flows could still be sent out of hours but would not be picked up until the next day. Or whether the implication was everything stops and participants would need to batch their data flows to be sent in-hours.

The potential impacts of the change on Service Level Agreements (SLAs) were also discussed and further detail with the CR was requested.

CD agreed to consider whether changes would be made to the CR in accordance with the comment received.

ACTION DAG21-04: Proposer to consider amendments to CR017 to: reference BSCP501; include clarity on whether it is people, services or systems which will only operate in-hours, and; to provide detail on impacts to SLAs.

The DAG proceeded to discuss specific aspects of the change and its implications.

IS believed caution was required around whether the change may impact other MHHS processes. SC believed this needed to be clear with the CR to enable an effective IA. SC provided an example impact of where consumption data flows do not 'land' until the following morning, which may mean parties have a *de facto* 12-hour window to issue such flows rather than a 24-hour window. The Chair believed this was a key consideration and without such information in the CR there may be a need to conduct further IA of the IA responses. MH did not believe it was for CD to assess wider impacts, and suggested this should be undertaken by a group such as the DA and the CR could be updated and re-issued.

RL wished to clarify whether the intention within the CR was that messages could still be received by systems out of hours but would be stored and processed in working hours. RL wished to confirm the CR was not seeking to remove the ability of registration systems to receive messages out of hours, noting this could cause significant impacts for the processes of those send flows. The Chair believed the CR needs to clarify this.

CD advised they were trying to understand the requirements within the MHHS TOM, which they believed were quite loose. CD advised they liked the idea of the CR going to the DA, and then being issued for IA following development of the problem statement and options but were unsure on the time this would add to the CR's progression. CD stated they wanted to see evidence of the requirements and their necessity which emanate from the Design Artefacts.

GS expressed consternation that the CR did not contain all the options available, and questioned why the change was not raised by the Programme directly to ensure a non-partisan view of the available options and problem statement were articulated. IS advised a CR was drafted by the Programme and submitted to LDSO's for review. LDSO's raised the change into the Programme's CR process having removed one of the options included in the first draft. SC noted the group were back to discussing the raising of CRs directly by the Programme, noting this is why the DAG had requested the Programme draft the change – to ensure all options were included when the CR was submitted to IA. SC asked whether the Programme would now raise another CR, or need to find a sponsor, for a CR with an alternative solution.

PP noted the suggestion that CR017 could be taken to the DA, and considered that as the DA is part of a new process and the typical CR IA window is ten working days, the DA process would be slow in comparison and routing the change here for development would significantly delay it issuance to IA. PP asked the DAG whether the CR should just be issued to IA to initiate industry's assessment. The Chair expressed concern that this may mean an incomplete picture would be issued to IA for participants to assess but they would be lacking a view on the full range of options. This may mean responses are not sufficient to inform the next steps, and could mean participants are not able to fully assess resourcing implications as they would be reviewing options which are not fully formed.

CB noted that if the Programme raise a CR also with additional options there will be two CRs which overlap, and so in terms of the decision on whether CR017 is issued to IA, unless there is a strong reason not to, both CR017 and related alternative should be issued to IA together to mitigate the risk of conflicting responses from participants. CB believed that each time DAG have been asked to make a decision on the topic of registration service hours itself, there have been consistent statements that there is not sufficient information to decide. As such, CB suggested DAG stop talking about

how a decision is made and get on with gathering the information required to make a decision. CB believed it appear that DAG members seemed to understand the issue at hand, and so should be able to submit sensible responses should the changes be issued to IA. This would then bring in information needed to inform the way forward, and if further work was required after IA then this could be discussed by DAG and undertaken where necessary.

IS believed the original collateral from the working groups where this matter was discussed must be visible, as the working groups reached a position where there were a bounded set of issues which could be assessed. The Chair asked whether CD would consider incorporating this collateral into CR017 to enable issuance to IA as one CR. CD expressed nervousness over this, believing their view and the Programme's view differed, and the content the Programme proposed including within an alternative CR is 'downstream' of what is in CR017. The Chair noted this would mean a separate CR would be raised.

The Chair summarised that CD would consider making updates to the CR in accordance with comments from the DAG, and the CR would then be resubmitted and routed back to the Dag for a decision on whether it is issued to IA. The DA could be asked to consider any wider impacts and provide information to inform the CR.

The Chair asked members to provide any specific comments on the CR directly to the Proposer.

ACTION DAG21-05: DAG members to provide any additional comments on CR017 directly to the Proposer

The group considered whether a decision should be taken on whether the change is issued to IA. RL believed if the CR was issued now, it may cause additional unnecessary work for participants because of the current vagueness of the CR. RL believed this would be more effort for participants to assess than the Proposer intends. GS considered that if the detail parties wish to see is present in the CR then it could be issued to IA.

There was significant confusion over the options available on the issuance of the CR to IA, the status of alternate changes, and the role of the Programme Change Board. FM explained the processes and the options available to the DAG.

The Chair provided two options to the DAG for the progression of CR017, and asked for a formal vote from members on which is chosen:

Option 1 – CD revises CR017, IS raises an alternate, and both are issued for IA at same time with responses triaged and further development carried out.

Option 2 – CR017 is not issued for IA, and is instead issued to the DA to develop options to be included with the CR, and the updated CR then returns to DAG for review and decision on issuance to IA.

DAG Members Votes:

Constituency	Option 1	Option 2
DNO Representative	✓	
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)		✓
DCC Representative (as smart meter central system provider)	Constituency representative not present	
Elexon Representative (as central systems provider)	Constituency representative not present	
Medium Supplier Representative	Constituency representative not in attendance	
Consumer Representative	Constituency representative not in attendance	

DAG Members Voting Comments:

Constituency	Voting Comments / Conditions / Caveats
DNO Representative	GS voted for Option 1.
I&C Supplier Representative	GE voted for Option 1, stating parties simply needed to “get on with [it]”.
iDNO Representative	DJ voted for Option 1 to initiate the gathering of information from participants, believing this would be the quickest method of obtaining the information needed to inform the next steps.
Large Supplier Representative	HE voted for Option 1, stated the Proposer of CR017 should be given the opportunity to amend their CR and then it should be issued for IA. HE believed this was the best course of action, noting the notion of a CR on this topic had been in discussion since Autumn 2022 and it was important the change is now issued.
National Grid ESO	ND voted for Option 1 and believed the change should be issued for IA and to enable responses to be provided and reviewed.
RECCo Representative	SJ voted for Option 2 stating they did not believe the alternative CR to be raised by the Programme would provide the clarity on the available options as hoped. SJ believed it would be quickest to submit the change to the DA for development and to clearly define the options.
Small Supplier Representative	CBu voted for Option 1, believing the Proposer should be given the opportunity to amend their CR, and it should then be issued for IA. CBu went on to say that if the IA response prove to be challenging, the CR should then be taken to the DA for refinement. CBu did not believe the change should be held up anymore, noting it had been around for some time. CBu also did not believe the Proposer should be expected to articulate wider or downstream impacts.
Supplier Agent Representative	RL chose Option 2 believing further detail within the CR would make a significant difference in the scale of IA participants would need to undertake.
Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent)	SC voted for Option 2, stating they did not believe there was enough detail currently provided within CR017. SC believed the work participants would be expected to do given the current level of detail would be unrealistic, or would result in IA response which state there is not enough detail provided to enable a meaningful IA.
Elexon Representative (as central systems provider)	Constituency representative not present.
Consumer Representative	Constituency representative not in attendance.
DCC Representative (as smart meter central system provider)	Constituency representative not in attendance.
Medium Supplier Representative	Constituency representative not in attendance.

The Chair noted the majority in favour of Option 1 and determined this was the option that would be taken forward.

DECISION DAG-DEC-41: The DAG Chair, based on the majority view of DAG Members, decided Option 1 should be chosen with regard to the options for the progression of CR017

The Chair requested IS commence with the submission of their alternative CR, to enable it to be issued with the revised CR017 in due course.

ACTION DAG21-06: Programme to raise Change Request (CR) to provide an alternative option to the solution options detailed in CR017 (LDSO Registration Service Dip messages processing times)

The Chair summarised that the next steps would include; resubmission of and amended CR017 by CD; the raising of a new CR by IS; the issuance of both change to IA at the same time, and; the triage of IA responses received with a view to understanding if further development is required via the DA.

8. Design Authority Update

Deferred to next regular DAG meeting.

9. CCIAG Update

Deferred to next regular DAG meeting.

10. Programme Updates

Deferred to next regular DAG meeting.

11. Minutes and Actions

Deferred to next regular DAG meeting.

12. Summary and next steps

The Chair advised the meeting had now timed-out and reiterated the actions required from DAG members ahead of the extraordinary meeting to be held 16 February 2023, where a decision on closure of the Work-Off Plan and re-baselining of the Design Artefacts would be requested.

The Chair thanks DAG members for their contributions and closed the meeting.

Date of next DAG: 16 February 2023 (extraordinary)

Date of next regular DAG: 08 March 2023 10am

Date of next CCIAG: 23 February 2023 10am

Date of next Design Authority: 23 February 2023 2pm