

## MHHS DAG Actions and Minutes

Issue date: 16/02/22

Meeting number	<b>4</b>	Venue	<b>Virtual – MS Teams</b>
Date and time	<b>09 February 2022 1000-1230</b>	Classification	<b>Public</b>

### Attendees:

MHHS Programme, DAG Chair	Justin Andrews (JA)
Elexon Representative	Matt Hall (MH)
DCC Representative	Stuart Scott (SS)
Large Supplier Representative	Craig Handford (CH)
Medium Supplier Representative	Gurpal Singh (GS)
Small Supplier Representative	Jo Bradbury (JB)
I&C Supplier Representative	Andrew Green (AG) (on behalf of Gareth Evans)
Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent)	Seth Chapman (SC)
Supplier Agent Representative	Robert Langdon (RL)
iDNO Representative	Donna Townsend (DT)
National Grid ESO	Keren Kelly (KK)
Ofgem (as observer)	Danielle Walton (DW)
Ofgem (as observer)	Vlada Petuchaite (VP)
MHHS Independent Programme Assurer Lead	Richard Shilton (RS)
MHHS Programme, Design Manager	Ian Smith (IS)
MHHS Programme, Design Market and Engagement Lead	Claire Silk (CS)
MHHS Programme, Design Lead	Simon Harrison (SH)
MHHS Programme, Solution Architect	Robert Golding (RG)
MHHS Programme, SI Lead	Dariusz Marsh-Mossadeghi (DMM)
MHHS Programme, PMO Lead	Lewis Hall (LH)
MHHS Programme, PMO	Martin Cranfield (MC)
MHHS Programme, PMO	Miles Winter (MW)

### Apologies:

I&C Supplier Representative	Gareth Evans
DNO Representative	Gemma Slaney
Consumer Representative	Ed Rees

### Actions

Agenda item	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date
-------------	------------	--------	-------	----------

Terms of Reference	DAG04-01	Look at potential updates to the DAG's ToR: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Link decision making with recognition of design principles</li> </ul>	Justin Andrews	09/03/22
Design Principles	DAG04-02	Follow up with Craig Handford offline on the Design Principles and clarity on the E2E Design	Ian Smith	23/02/22
	DAG04-03	Look at when to stand up the Consequential Change Impact Assessment Group (CCIAG)	Programme	09/03/22
	DAG04-04	Meet with Seth Chapman to review and update detailed wording of the design principles	Ian Smith	23/02/22
	DAG04-05	Meet with Matt Hall to agree sub-principles of variable settlement period to add to the design principles	Ian Smith	23/02/22
	DAG04-06	Update the design principles to reflect DAG discussion and actions DAG04-04 and -05. Separate the design principles as a new artefact and publish via the Portal	Ian Smith	23/02/22
Level playing field principle	DAG04-07	Update the wording of the level playing field principle as per the discussion at DAG and distribute to DAG members	Justin Andrews	01/03/22
	DAG04-08	Contact SEC WG to make sure the DAG works closely and shares the implications on legal drafting on the level playing field principle	Justin Andrews	01/03/22
	DAG04-09	Pick up with Stuart Scott regarding the SEC changes as a result of level playing field principle	Justin Andrews	01/03/22
	DAG04-10	Schedule DAG sub-groups for further discussion on the level playing field principle as required	PMO	09/03/22
Design Issues	DAG04-11	Check with respondents to Design Issues if they're happy for their responses to be public and shared with DAG. Issue to DAG once confirmed	Claire Silk	16/02/22
Technical assumptions	DAG04-12	Update TDWG High Level Design Principles with comments as per the discussion at DAG and share with DAG members for approval	Ian Smith	23/02/22
	DAG04-13	Make clarifications to the Technology/Architecture Characteristics as per the DAG discussion and share with DAG members for approval	Ian Smith	23/02/22
Working group highlight report	DAG04-14	Build a clearer view of the pathway for artefacts through the working groups to DAG (e.g., life cycles, timeframes). Update DAG on process	Ian Smith & Claire Silk	09/03/22
	DAG04-15	Discuss detail and pathway of network charging artefacts with Keren Kelly	Ian Smith	09/03/22
	DAG04-16	Provide update on March Working Group schedule at extraordinary DAG 16/02	Claire Silk	16/02/22
	DAG04-17	Circulate CCDG code change matrix with DAG members	Justin Andrews	09/03/22

## Decisions

Area	Decision
Level Playing Field Principle	Level playing field design principle agreed in principle. The detailed requirements and use cases for the level playing field principle is to be completed within the Working Groups, with the higher-level principle assessed at further DAG sub-groups. Both groups to be progressed in parallel.
Design Principles	APPROVE High Level Design Principles, subject to updates in wording (Action DAG04-12 above)
Design Principles	APPROVE Technology/Architecture Characteristics subject to clarifications in wording (action DAG04-13)

## Minutes

### 1. Welcome

JA welcomed all to the meeting. Attendees gave introductions, including the IPA (Richard Shilton) who have joined for their first DAG meeting.

### 2. Minutes and actions

#### **Minutes from 12/01/22 were APPROVED**

JA ran through the actions as per the actions slides. Actions DAG03-02 and DAG03-05 were directed to IS for comment.

IS noted that for DAG03-02 he was in the process of reaching out to SC. DAG03-05 remained open following internal discussions and was linked to Service Appointment design, and therefore would not be closed until decision made at the extra-ordinary DAG on 16 February.

JA asked for any final comments on the actions. None given.

### 3. PSG Update

LH ran through the PSG update as per the slide. LH advised DAG members to contact PMO for access or to resolve issues with the Programme Portal. LH asked for questions.

CH noted that suppliers had discussed an alternative programme plan timeline at PSG and queried what the next steps are, how they will be progressed, and if any decisions had been made.

LH confirmed this is high priority for the programme, and that the programme is aiming to engage supplier reps to discuss the proposal in more detail. Timelines to be confirmed.

SH confirms that the programme met with supplier colleagues, with actions for this week to go into further detail. SH added that the discussion is moving forward and proposed CH picks up with Graham Wood (PSG rep).

AG asked who has logins to the portal? Should DAG members be encouraging constituents to contact the PMO?

CS clarified that for portal access going forward, a priority list has been created and shared with PMO and the IT function. The PMO are maintaining a log of requests.

CS also confirmed the original list included anyone from design working groups, and that these should now have access. Any additional requests should contact design or PMO.

AG asked for confirmation that access is not restricted.

LH confirmed access is not restricted and invited DAG members to email additional requests for portal access to PMO.

JA asked for final questions from the DAG on the PSG report and there were none. JA reiterated that until any agreement is reached on changes to plan, we carry on with timelines/milestones in the published Ofgem timetable.

#### 4. Review of Terms of Reference

JA introduced the item as per the slides. JA noted that the DAG ToR were created in November and that the programme had not seen that any changes were required. JA opened for comment, for DAG to reflect on content and any required changes.

CH confirmed his constituents are fine with ToR.

MH confirmed he is happy with the ToR but noted that these have not really been tested yet (no designs or decisions have been brought to table).

JA suggests these will be tested next week with design issues coming to the group. JA added that the ToR might also be tested DAG today as we have technical assumptions for review and approval.

SC suggested a need for more clarity in the ToR on making decisions in a transparent and open way.

JA suggests that DAG ToR could reflect the design principles? JA added that some work is also in progress on the MHHS governance framework and that this will provide more clarity on how decisions are made.

**Action DAG04-01: Justin Andrews to look at potential updates to DAG's ToR, including linking decision making with recognition of design principles.**

#### 5. Design Principles Review

IS introduced the item, noting this comes from actions from previous DAGs to build design principles at a higher level. The aim has been to expand on granular content from previous sessions to build a core set of design principles. The higher level design principles have been built from a number of internal sessions to present today and look for feedback from DAG. IS asked for comment on the content of the slides and if this fits requirement.

CH commented that large suppliers are supportive of the principles but disappointed with limited understanding of overall E2E design more broadly. Large suppliers do not currently have detail on design impacts on other things e.g. settlement process, and need to understand and spend more time to get into the detail.

IS reiterated SH's comments on actions from PSG to engage with suppliers. IS referenced material previously presented looking at design through a 'supplier lens' to pick out areas most relevant for suppliers, e.g. consequential impacts. IS offered an offline conversation.

**Action DAG04-02: Ian Smith to follow up with Craig Handford on the Design Principles and clarity on the E2E Design.**

CH noted he was not raising anything new (re-supplier concerns) but wanted to flag this for DAG too.

JA asked would it help to stand up CCIAG? The ToR of CCIAG were to look at wider factors impacting MHHS.

IS agrees this would be useful, following internal analysis for DNO/iDNO/Supplier.

**Action DAG04-03: Programme to look at when to stand up the Consequential Change Impact Assessment Group (CCIAG).**

SC commented that broadly speaking the principles are great but that he had some comments on detailed wording. No disagreement on principles. One principle missing regarding accuracy settlement.

IS agreed on the inclusion of accuracy of settlement.

JA referenced the MHHS Programme principles, such as accuracy and timeliness, as important factors to be considered alongside the Design principles.

IS suggested adding a 'principle zero' to cover these. JA agreed. IS proposed a session to collect detailed comments.

MH asks if variable settlement period is included.

IS anticipated this would be a sub-principle and suggests further conversation to add this.

**Action DAG04-04: Ian Smith to meet with Seth Chapman to review and update detailed wording of design principles.**

**Action DAG04-05: Ian Smith to meet with Matt Hall to agree the sub-principles of variable settlement period to add to the design principles.**

**Action DAG04-06: Ian Smith to update the design principle to reflect DAG discussion and actions DAG04-04 and -05. Separate the design principles as a new artefact and publish via the Portal.**

RL asked if the level playing field should be added?

JA provided update on action from last DAG, giving an overview as per the slide on the level playing field principle and the DAG sub-group meeting on SECMP162. JA asked for comment.

CH queried who this design principle applies for? RL responded that suppliers have the capability to complete service requests in 30s, but that this design principle would mean that suppliers cannot use this for MHHS, due to the 24hr response time requirement, to ensure a level playing field.

CH agreed that this is for parties using similar services and that the principle should be for comparable roles. CH further queried that if more data is required down the line to support this 'phase' then the programme should be mindful of costs.

SC suggested amending wording to include the services that participants are qualified to do and that the principle should reference services not roles. SC also highlighted a typo in the principle to update.

RL asked for feedback on the DAG subgroups – 1) typo on the slide and 2) has the DAG agreed that the base requirement is 24hrs.

SC believed it had not been agreed by the DAG, However that was the MHHS programme requirement at present. JA confirmed that the current recognised requirement is 24hr as per DCC IA for SECMP162. JA asked the DAG for views on how the design principle and design proposals this should be progressed – continued DAG subgroup or fed into SDS workstream?

SC asked for clarity on 'progress'. JA clarified that this was for where the design requirements under the principle – where would these be progressed best?

SC commented that these are closely tied to Sec Mod group work.

JA believes it is separate from SEC-Mod. If going down supplier role qualification then this is part of MHHS design and therefore progressed under this governance.

IS agreed but added that if there is agreement on the principle then next level of discussion is on what we need to do with principle. Varying design options, e.g. enactment in the SEC on role usage/TRTs, and design use cases for requirement for <24hr response time. Therefore, we need to explore options and expedite conversations re-24hr TRT.

SC agreed with JA but noted that if SEC-Mod legal drafting is going to be influenced by this design principle, then we do not want to have this separate. Groups need to be coordinated.

JA agreed that there is a need to work closely with SEC WG. Other agreements in MHHS need to feed into SEC, REC, BSC etc. This will not be the only SEC change needed. Therefore, we need to work closely with SEC to signpost changes coming.

SC acknowledges Mod raised due to timeframes. Is the legal drafting also time pressured or should it wait for MHHS inputs?

**Action DAG04-07: Justin Andrews to update the wording of the level playing principle as per the discussion at DAG and distribute to DAG members.**

**Action DAG04-08: Justin Andrews to Contact SEC WG to make sure the DAG works closely and shares the implications on legal drafting on the level playing field principle.**

**Action DAG04-09: Justin Andrews to pick up with Stuart Scott regarding the SEC changes as a result of level playing field principle.**

JA asked for agreement on how to take the principle forward via SDS workstream.

IS confirmed that some elements are for the sub working group. May need separate session on suppliers using MDR role – SDS WG may not be appropriate for this. Working group is more in the mechanics, not decisions.

JA asked if the principles & content are worked up in working group but brought back to DAG for sign off?

IS confirmed that 24hr TRT can go to SDS Work stream. Technical enablers of design principles need to be higher level & needs to sit in different forum.

RL noted that DAG needs to consider impact on the design. DCC could not handle suppliers using 30s TRT for MHHS purposes. Subgroup needs to look at detail of outputs of principle.

IS stated that this requires a balanced decision that could come to DAG from subgroup. Technical detail can be explored in subgroup.

RL confirmed that documentation (e.g. SLAs) is needed which can be done in the sub group.

IS stated that outputs may be circular. Detail needs to be articulated. May require a higher-level assessment at higher governance.

JA confirmed everyone having 30s access would add large costs to programme. Not in this scenario.

RL clarified difference between access & use. The problem comes from use not access.

JA summarised approach and asked for comment.

**Decision – Level playing field design principle agreed in principle (subject to further refinement). The detailed requirements and use cases for the level playing field principle is to be completed within the SDS Working Group, with the higher-level principle assessed at further DAG sub-group meeting. Both groups to be progressed in parallel.**

**Action DAG04-10: PMO to schedule DAG sub-groups for further discussion on the level playing field principle as required.**

## 6. Design issues

IS had aimed to bring some design issues for decisions to this DAG, but explained that it got to the point of evaluating these and therefore the extraordinary DAG on 16 February would be considering these. IS provided context that these design issues were blocking a number of logical design artefacts.

IS took DAG through the slide on Change of Agent & Interface Approach. The aim is to align options in line with CCDG recommendations and from feedback from Suppliers. Papers on this are due to go out today. IS invited questions.

CH noted that suppliers have concerns about not having enough time to go through this and how the E2E design works. CH noted a need for a detailed impact assessment on these options. He wanted to give DAG a heads up that on this basis suppliers feel they can't support this at this moment in time.

JA asked for clarification that for large supplier there are two concerns: a) large suppliers haven't had the resource to consider this in full; and b) large suppliers would like to see a full detailed impact. CH confirmed and said that it's unclear how this would work alongside next day switching and to make a proper decision would need to see how this interacted with this.

JA asked IS to clarify what the level of attendance was for the sub-groups.

IS confirmed that there was some feedback from large suppliers on these principles and some of the input was from suppliers. This will be clarified on the papers that go out today. There was a significant number of people at the subgroup sessions and responses have been received from most constituencies.

AG made a general point that if large suppliers have struggled with resource, then generally this would mean that everyone is struggling for resource as smaller suppliers have less resource than the larger ones

Jo Bradbury (JB) confirmed this was the case for their constituency

Donna Townsend (DT) confirmed this for the iDNOs and believed DNOs were similarly struggling. Doing this alongside the other projects such as faster switching has meant being quite stretched in terms of resource. DT raised a question on timing of this project. Would it have made sense to do this after the faster switching programme so that any learnings from faster switching could be incorporated and resource wasn't as stretched?

IS recognises this, but emphasises that it's not within this group's power to change programme timescales of L1 milestones >3 months (Ofgem sponsor decision). As we are working to the currently agreed Ofgem timetable the DAG needs to clear these design issues and make a decision.

IS covered the Interface Approach design and that there are a range of options here. Options have been presented to the working groups and written responses received. This issue blocks a number of logical design artefacts, so we're seeking a decision on this to allow us to move on with the design.

IS invites any questions. None raised.

JA summarises that these Design Issues will be discussed at next week's extraordinary DAG meeting and detailed papers will be sent out this afternoon with a view that we reach a decision at that meeting.

IS says that in collating the information these have been grouped into themes rather than having specific comments in order to prevent any issues with confidentiality. IS asks if anyone in DAG has any issues with these comments being made available to the DAG?

JA suggests this question is asked to respondents directly and asked DAG as to whether this would be useful to have?

Gurpal Singh (GS) says yes this would be helpful, and seeing which constituency the comments came from so that different industry views are understood.

JA says we will work on getting these comments circulated to DAG.

IS asks those on the call who submitted comments to confirm they're happy for these to be released – confirmed yes.

**Action DAG04-11: Claire Silk to check with respondents to Design Issues if they're happy for their responses to be public and shared with DAG. Issue to DAG once confirmed**

**6A Technical Assumptions**

IS provided context that TDWG have been working on understanding some of the requirements for the DOM. Some of the Functional Specification characteristics that TDWG have come up which require approval from the DAG.

IS opened the floor to any challenges, comments or remarks on the TDWG's recommendations.

DT asked if there's going to be an audit trail of which DIP messages have been sent.

RL said that in the functional spec there are requirements for audit reporting. There's a few sketches for comment on the functional spec that go through different transactions in the DIP that monitor business process workflow. These are very high level but there's definitely an intention to provide people with this tooling.

IS noted that this will lead to a further discussion as to what this looks like and will evolve as part of the review process.

SC had had feedback from constituents requiring clarification. First principle, is there clarity on addressing messages: who does this? Would it be considered Business Logic?

IS said this has been an issue we've been wrangling with and routing isn't considered business logic and is handled by the DIP.

SC questioned whether this exception is for addressing rather than routing?

IS confirmed yes.

SC asked if #3 refers to schema being valid as dates being valid dates, or something else?

RL confirmed schema validation will be on the payload, so will check that the payload is the correct shape but won't check the content of it.

IS confirmed it's structural validation rather than content validation but accepts that if field X needs to be a date, then that should be something that is checked.

SC asked if 5 should be an 'and'

RL confirmed yes.

SC asked if 6 applies to future requirements of the DIP?

IS said this will need to be a requirement for the RFP in terms of future proofing the design. Asks what specifically SC would be looking for?

SC said is there anything that the design team is aware of or is making assumptions on that the principle is based on but not referenced directly. RG said these are high level principles and the full detail can be found in the functional spec. In terms of future requirements, these are a principle to be mindful of.

SC asked if we're seeking approval of these principles, or the document that underpins these principles? IS said yes we're approving these principles.

SC asked if these could be updated to include more specific wording of the document. IS said yes.

RL asked if the principle of the routing of the messages different to the principle of the addressing?

IS said we wouldn't exclude the possibility of the DIP doing this, but that we wouldn't consider it to be Business Logic. We can clarify wording of this and can clarify that routing and addressing aren't considered Business Logic and IS is happy to reword this.

RL asked is there a principle around auditing?

IS was comfortable that the right level of thought has been given to this so that it doesn't need additional attention here. This is something we would expect to be there and to be part of the requirement, and so wasn't necessary as a principle. There's no reason not to include it, so we could include it if DAG would like.

SC agreed that we could add it to the Principles given its come up a couple of times.

JA said that as this is included in functional spec we could include it as a principle.

RL questioned on error reporting, is there an assumption made that this will go via the DIP.

RG yes both the DIP and the Message Recipients would report that back via the same channel.

**Action DAG04-12: Ian Smith to update TDWG High Level Design Principles with comments as per the discussion at DAG and share with DAG members for approval.**

JA asked if subject to amendments, are we happy to approve these high level principles?

**Decision: The BPRWG High Level Design Principles were approved, subject to updates in wording (Action DAG04-12 above).**

SC wanted to understand exactly where approval lies for the functional spec.

IS explained that there's some interplay here so a draft of the RFP may have to go out first. There's likely to be some comments to incorporate from the eventual service owner.

JA clarified that the actual requirements of the DIP will be approved by the DAG, and there will be separate requirements that won't necessarily be approved by the DAG?

IS said yes in general, but there are some minor requirements that might come to DAG.

AG asked what the rough timeframes are for the RFP?

IS confirmed it's being fleshed out at the moment but keen to get it going as soon as possible. Lots of this has gone through TDWG already.

AG asked how long after the issue of the RFP are responses required / expected?

IS said there's no set timeline, but a number of weeks is the expectation for bids to be received and then a further number of weeks where workshops are held, responses are assessed etc. so high level timeline is something like July.

IS confirmed that non-functional requirements have been through one iteration with TDWG and are back for another review now. This would come to DAG for approval once finished.

IS moved on to Technology/Architecture Characteristics and opens the floor to questions.

RL asked if there's an assumption on the volume of requests?

IS said this is based on an initial view of a model based on assumptions from functional requirements. This will be published when ready to show how they have derived the volume of a peak load.

RL asked whether we are assuming data won't leave the UK?

IS said we believe this requirement can be met in terms of data being hosted in UK.

RG confirmed that this is the case.

IS said we can append the single cloud provider to be explicit that this is within the UK.

RL asked if RPO is intended to be 0 or N/A?

RG said yes, there's no reason why this figure of 0 is unattainable and to represent that this is transaction based and it's unlikely to have incomplete transactions, they either fail or succeed.

SC asked a question on the basis of 'unplanned' uptime.

RG confirmed that this excludes planned downtime.

SC asked where the figures of 3 seconds and 30 seconds came from in terms of performance. Will this apply even at peak times.

RG said this was originally 1 second and has been relaxed to accommodate registration flows.

IS said that we had some conversations regarding this in terms of scalability and we don't want to build up backlogs within the system as we're going to have high baseline usage anyway.

IS clarified that this is the reason for the 90%/100% targets accommodate for, as you accept that there's likely to be a lag time within peak periods.

SC suggested that there is a difference in scales for registration data and consumption data.

IS said this is likely to come out within the bid process, e.g. if a bidder says costs could be reduced by X amount if the 30 second requirement is moved to 5 minutes. However, TDWG felt this was a reasonable position to start with.

Originally the requirements were harder than this and the original costing process suggested that moving from 1sec to 3sec reduced costs significantly with a relatively immaterial change for users.

JA asked for any other comments on this and was the DAG happy to approve subject to those clarifications raised.

**Decision: The Technology/Architecture Characteristics were approved, subject to clarifications in wording (Action DAG04-13 below)**

**Action DAG04-13: Ian Smith to make clarifications to the Technology/Architecture Characteristics as per the DAG discussion and share with DAG members for approval**

## 7. Report from L4 Working Groups

CS gave an update on the status of Design Artefacts. A full report has been circulated. Key point to note is that the programme has a number of artefacts that are blocked subject to the issues coming to the extraordinary DAG next week. 35 in total.

CS noted that we had anticipated that 17 artefacts would be ready for approval by this DAG, but due to these being blocked these have slipped to March. Other key point to note is that there is a large volume of docs that will be coming through in March & April. We need to review our timelines and submissions of those to DAG for approval, usually 1 week but conscious this may not give enough time for reps to circulate these with their constituents.

CH said they have significant issues with this. April has Easter in there so fewer WDs, meaning it's unlikely they'll be able to approve all 40. He was unclear on the process timescale for reviewing docs in working groups before being brought to DAG and was it too short?

IS noted that the evolution of these artefacts is that they're drafted, get taken through the sub working group to a point where there's consensus there. At that point they will then progress to a review period within the L4 working group, and once it's gone through that stage, it comes to DAG. So when it comes to DAG it's gone through multiple other groups first so the assumption is that when it hits DAG it will already have undergone a significant amount of scrutiny. We do anticipate some slippage, particularly in April, so we recognise this.

CH understands this but the docs still need to be reviewed and as a process this is time consuming. Also doubts that within the same month docs that are going through BPRWG would then be ready to come straight to DAG, so the numbers matching up here doesn't seem likely.

IS said we probably need to re-present the life cycle of these to show the pathway and confidence of these docs coming artefacts through.

CH reiterated that there is concern amongst large suppliers on enough time/resource to provide proper scrutiny on these coming through.

JA asked for clarity on process before coming to DAG. Sub-groups draft and review docs, then take them to BPRWG. At what point does it go out for wider review?

CS clarified that the process is that once it comes out of sub-group, it goes to BPRWG for a two-week review. Assuming no significant comments, we would then submit to DAG and publish to wider industry at the same time. Current timescales would mean these are published with the DAG papers 5WD before DAG, but we're recognising that this may not be long enough at present and seeking to increase.

IS said that we have a monthly cadence on this but perhaps need some further clarity on this

JA asked if when BPRWG get sent the docs for review, could we send it to all market participants at that point?

CS and IS said there's no good reason why this couldn't happen.

JA suggested that the assumption is that the subgroups have already done the heavy lifting, so we could share with all participants at the point that it goes to BPRWG to alleviate these timescales.

IS was supportive of this.

JA asked for clarification on the BPRWG row that there are 12 BP maps coming through, is our expectation now that we may still have 12 going to BPRWG in Feb and that those 12 would therefore come to DAG in March?

CS agreed, the next steps on BPRWG depends on the outcomes of the extraordinary DAG next week. Uncertain if it will meet the March timescales.

JA added on the assumption that those become unblocked and DAG reaches a decision next week, we could theoretically take this to the March DAG.

IS anticipated that a number of elements will slip to later months, partly because of being blocked, but also to recognise that people will need longer timeframes to review.

MH asked would almost everything on these tables move to the right?

IS yes a significant proportion, but there are some elements in flight at the moment and there's some preparation that means some elements will be ready to go subsequent to next week's DAG

MH expressed concern that the figure of 40 docs for review in April looks quite tight

IS accepted this and notes that the figures are likely to change

JB reiterated CH's point, mostly around the holiday period. Not just bank holiday but also school holidays so general staffing will be lower. Thinking about the number of working hours available rather than just bank holidays.

JA confirmed this is recognised

SC passed on feedback from constituents that as the number of documents has increased, some of their constituents have said they're likely to only review later versions of documents

Keren Kelly (KK) noted that in the detailed report there's some artefacts related to network charging and a lot of this is TBC and it's probably lower on the priority list, but it'd be good to understand intent here as there's a risk of requirement there needing amendments further down the line?

**Action DAG04-14: Ian Smith & Claire Silk to build a clearer view of on the pathway for artefacts through the working groups to DAG (e.g., life cycles, timeframes). Update DAG on process**

**Action DAG04-15: Ian Smith to discuss detail and pathway of network charging artefacts with Keren Kelly**

CS stated that the technical design artefacts is on track for March DAG and asked for any specific questions on the slide update?

CS gave view of the BPRWG schedule for February and picking up on CH's earlier point it may be helpful to run further sessions on interactions between DNOs/iDNOs and suppliers. CS is working through the March schedule. Given the number of artefacts we want to move to BPRWG, we're proposing moving to a different model of issuing docs for offline review and comment to give people longer to review and then holding more targeted meetings to review any comments, as opposed to weekly meetings.

CS noted that engagement has been lower in working groups and the feedback has been that this is due to people wanting to take docs offline, so this is being considered with regard to the March schedule.

IS added that some of the volatility around some of these documents is principally based on the decisions we arrive at next week

CS invited any questions

## 8. Summary and actions

JA confirmed dates of next DAG and the meetings going forward up until May.

JA asked CS when the March timetable will be ready?

CS said this may be ready by next DAG on 16/02

JA asks if any additional points to raise

RL says it would be helpful to have more visibility of how everything fits together, including a breakdown of what's being changed and what's being kept from the codes

JA said we do have a code change matrix which can be circulated to the DAG

**Action DAG 04-17: Justin Andrews to circulate CCDG code change matrix with DAG members**

JA closed the meeting

Date of next DAG **16 February 2022 (extraordinary meeting on design issues)**