

## MHHS Design Advisory Group Actions and Minutes

Issue date: 16 March 2022

Meeting number	<b>DAG006</b>	Venue	<b>Virtual - MS Teams</b>
Date and time	<b>9 March 2022 1000-1300</b>	Classification	<b>Public</b>

### Attendees:

#### **Chair**

Chris Welby (Chair)

#### **Role**

SRO Chair

#### **Industry Representatives**

Craig Handford (CH)

Donna Townsend (DT)

Ed Rees (ER)

Gareth Evans (GE)

Gemma Slaney (GS)

Gurpal Singh (GSi)

Jo Bradbury (JB)

Matt Hall (MH)

Robert Langdon (RL)

Seth Chapman (SC)

Large Supplier Representative

iDNO Representative

Consumer Representative

I&C Supplier Representative

DNO Representative

Medium Supplier Representative

Small Supplier Representative

Elexon Representative (as central systems provider)

Supplier Agent Representative

Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent)

#### **MHHS IM**

Claire Silk (CS)

Fraser Mathieson (FM)

Ian Smith (IS)

Miles Winter (MW)

Simon Harrison (SH)

Design Market and Engagement Lead

PMO Governance Lead

Design Manager

PMO Governance Support

Design Assurance Lead

#### **Other Attendees**

Danielle Walton (DW)

Vlada Petuchaite (VP)

Ofgem (as observer)

Ofgem (as observer)

### Apologies:

Colin Bezant (CB)

Justin Andrews (JA)

Keren Kelly (KK)

Stuart Scott (SS)

MHHS IPA Design Assurance Lead

DAG Chair

National Grid ESO

DCC Representative (as smart meter central system provider)

## Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date	Update
Governance Group Updates	DAG06-01	<b>Review alignment between related MPAN modifications and design subgroup</b>	Programme (Ian Smith)	13/04/22	
	DAG06-02	<b>Publish draft Change Control Process to DAG members</b>	PMO	10/03/22	Draft Change Control Process can be viewed within the Governance Framework v2.4 document published with the PSG 02 March 2022 meeting papers. Available <a href="#">here</a> .
DAG ToR Updates	DAG06-03	<b>Consider updating DAG ToR to explain approach to deviation from design principles where necessary (e.g. conflicting principles or other agreed deviations) and consider how the rationale behind such decisions would be documented (e.g. within log appended to ToR, or other method)</b>	Programme (Ian Smith)	13/04/22	
Level playing field design principle	DAG06-04	<b>Review SEC MP162 to ensure alignment with MHHS design</b>	Programme (Ian Smith)	13/04/22	
	DAG06-05	<b>Programme to consider whether attendance at SEC MP162 working group is required</b>	Programme (Ian Smith)	13/04/22	
	DAG06-06	<b>Programme to check if response provided to second consultation on SEC-MP-162 and provide update to DAG</b>	Programme (Ian Smith)	13/04/22	
Design Principles	DAG06-07	<b>Circulate updated design principles and include updated level playing field</b>	Programme (Ian Smith)	13/04/22	
	DAG06-08	<b>Draft customer principle and return to group with update</b>	Craig Handford	13/04/22	
	DAG06-09	<b>Update Design Principle 8 to reference all relevant industry codes</b>	Programme (Ian Smith)	13/04/22	
Integrations Platform Decisions	DAG06-10	<b>Provide cost implications of Option 1 relating to primary and secondary requirements within the technical addressing options, provide to PMO</b>	DAG members	13/04/22	
	DAG06-11	<b>Produce rough order of magnitude (ROM) comparison for Options 1, 2 and 3 of the primary and secondary requirements within the technical addressing options for consideration by DAG</b>	Programme (Ian Smith)	13/04/22	
Level 4 Working Group Updates	DAG06-12	<b>Review the design artefact subtotals and update where necessary</b>	Programme (Ian Smith)	13/04/22	

## Decisions

Area	Dec Ref	Decision
Minutes and Actions	DAG-DEC12	Minutes of DAG meeting held 09 February 2022 approved
Integrations platform Decisions	DAG-DEC13	Addressing decision in principle, subject to ROMs on Options

## RAID items discussed/raised

RAID area	Description
None	

## Minutes

### 1. **Welcome and introduction**

The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting and provided an overview of the agenda.

### 2. **Minutes and actions**

The Chair requested comments on the minutes of the DAG meeting held 09 February 2022. No comments were received, and the minutes approved as final.

### **DECISION DAG-DEC12: Minutes of DAG meeting held 09 February 2022 approved**

FM provided an overview of the outstanding actions and latest updates. No objections or queries were received regarding the actions that are proposed to be closed. Action DAG04-05 agreed verbally during the meeting to be closed.

No comments or questions received.

### 3. **Governance Group Updates**

FM introduced this new standing agenda item which is aimed at assisting visibility between the level 2 and level 3 MHHS Programme governance groups. These groups include the Programme Steering Group (PSG), the Cross Code Advisory Group (CCAG), and the Testing Advisory Group (TAG).

#### **PSG**

FM highlighted updates from the PSG, including the following:

- The Independent Performance Assurance (IPA) provider is now mobilised and will commence attendance at MHHS governance meetings.
- An extraordinary PSG will be held 11 March 2022 to discuss prospective Programme Change Requests to move the M5 milestone relating to the publication of the detailed design baseline.
- Updates to the MHHS Programme Governance Framework were approved.
- The MHHS Programme Change Control Process has been updated and will be published to all Programme Participants (PPs) in due course.

CH asked for clarification on when the prospective change requests seek to move M5 to and whether this was already approved, noting the design timelines are already stating June as the earliest date for publication of the detailed design baseline. The Chair clarified the programme plan timelines have not yet changed and currently the anticipated delivery of M5 would be 'late' compared with the plan. The change requests being considered would explain the reasons for re-baselining this milestone and, subject to impact assessment and approval, change the plan dates such that the milestone is on time according to the plan.

#### **CCAG**

FM then provided updates from the CCAG noting this group is looking at how changes to industry codes emanating from MHHS implementation are orchestrated. FM highlighted the group are currently discussing the timelines for code drafting

and implementation, and that Ofgem are likely to seek to direct implementation using Smart Meters Act Powers (SMAP). CCAG are also planning to raise a Change Request to move the M6 milestone relating to the delivery of code change drafting, in response to the likely movement of the M5 milestone. FM explained, the deliverables under M6 are likely to be enhanced as a part of this prospective Change Request.

CH highlighted a paper on related MPANs discussed at CCAG, and asked how the design workstream would discuss this, noting the paper is contrary to the current position of Large Suppliers regarding Radio Teleswitch (RTS). CH expressed the need to ensure the design and associated code changes work hand-in-hand to ensure the correct sequencing of the MHHS changes. IS replied this is something being considered by the Design Team and was discussed at a design subgroup this week.

**ACTION DAG06-01: IS to review alignment between related MPAN modifications and design subgroup**

SC queried whether the updated programme Change Control Process would be published to PPs once approved. The Chair confirmed any changes to the process would require Ofgem approval and would be published to all PPs once approved. In the meantime, the Chair highlighted the existing change process will be utilised. SC requested the draft process is shared with DAG.

**ACTION DAG06-02: PMO to publish draft Change Control Process to DAG members**

**TAG**

FM then provided updates from TAG, highlighting this group will soon become the Testing and Migration Advisory Group (TMAG). The group is currently developing the end-to-end testing strategy and has mobilised the Data Working Group (DWG) to develop the Test Data Strategy that will define how data to be used in testing will be generated, managed, and maintained. The DWG will be held on the second Thursday of each month and the next meeting is 07 April 2022. The group is open to all and parties should contact [PMO@mhhsprogramme.co.uk](mailto:PMO@mhhsprogramme.co.uk) for further information.

GE enquired whether there were supplier representatives at TAG yet to which the Chair confirmed there is not.

**4. DAG ToR Updates**

The Chair provided an overview of updates made to the DAG ToR and invited comments or queries.

RL asked whether a design recommendation which did not align with the design principles would be rejected outright. IS responded the principles should act as a guide and if there was a recommendation that deviated from these principles it should be considered and not dismissed. An example would be where there are contending design principles requiring discussion. RL suggested the DAG ToR should reflect this. GS agreed, noting the current ToR wording may not allow for such nuances.

**ACTION DAG06-03: IS to consider updating DAG ToR to explain approach to deviation from design principles where necessary (e.g. conflicting principles or other agreed deviations) and consider how the rationale behind such decisions would be documented (e.g. within log appended to ToR, or other method)**

**5. Level playing field design principle**

The Chair reiterated the principle and confirmed there is an extraordinary DAG meeting on the 17 March at 10am to discuss how the principle is enacted. It was highlighted that Smart Energy Code (SEC) Modification Proposal (MP) 162 is most relevant to how the principle will be delivered.

CH suggested the programme needs to ensure the decision made for SEC MP162 is aligned with the proposed design for MHHS. IS noted the Design team are working closely on this to ensure alignment and identify any design impacts, via the design working groups and CCAG.

**ACTION DAG06-04: IS to review SEC MP162 to ensure alignment with MHHS design**

RL requested clarification on whether the principle had been agreed in principle by DAG and the issue here is just how it is enacted. IS confirmed yes and the next steps were to ensure it is properly enacted in code.

GS voiced concern over the alignment of the design principle and the wording of SEC MP162. IS replied DAG were comfortable with the proposed wording of SEC MP162 during impacts assessment. GS asked if the Target Response Times (TRTs) in SEC MP162 will be mandatory for suppliers. IS suggested this will be discussed at the extraordinary DAG meeting on 17 March 2022, and the Programme are comfortable with the principle, noting detailed business rules are still required. There is a risk if the conversations in DAG arrived at a systemic mechanism for enacting the principle, it may require change to the system/process originally subject of the impact assessment.

GS asked whether the MHHS Programme would be attending the relevant SEC working group discussions on SEC MP162. IS confirmed the expectation is this would be the case, particularly in understanding volumetric discussions and how this will impact the programmes functional requirements.

**ACTION DAG06-05: Programme to consider whether attendance at SEC MP162 working group is required**

SC asked if the Programme had responded to the second consultation on SEC MP162. IS agreed to check this and provide an update to CCAG.

**ACTION DAG06-06: Programme to check if response provided to second consultation on SEC-MP-162 and provide update to DAG**

## 6. Design Principles

IS introduced minor clarifications and amendments to principles agreed at DAG on 23 February 2022. IS asked whether the group were comfortable with the proposed changes. SC supported the changes but noted the updated level playing field design principle was yet to be included. IS committed to updating this.

**ACTION DAG06-07: IS to circulate updated design principles and include updated level playing field**

CH noted customers are not mentioned in the design principles and it was important to ensure customers are at the forefront of the principles underpinning design. The Chair asked the group for views on how customers could be included. CH offered to draft a principle to include this. GE agreed this was a prudent suggestion and requested all customer types are captured in this including both domestic and non-domestic customers.

**ACTION DAG06-08: CH to draft customer principle and return to group with update**

RL asked for an explanation of principle three, and whether addressing and routing should be separated. IS responded this principle was not intended to address any nuances of the difference between addressing and routing but rather to highlight that both are not considered business rules. RL accepted this but cautioned around the perception design principles may be amended to make decisions easier in future.

GS asked if the wording contained in the slides, *"It should be noted that these principles should be adhered to wherever possible, this does not rule out instances where DAG may deviate from these where sufficient justification exists to deliver the core elements of the solution."* could be placed in the DAG ToR as a footnote as a resolution to Action DAG06-03. IS agreed to look at this.

ER requested inclusion of a principle around customer experience and asked about scope for future changes to design principles as new use cases emerge within the design. IS confirmed the Programme is mindful of this and the design principles may evolve over time, with DAG able to consider additional use cases in the future as they arise. DAG members can put forward future design principles if they wish.

GSi asked for clarity on consequential code changes and where these would be discussed. IS confirmed the Consequential Change Impact Assessment Group (CCIAG) would be the likely place for these discussions and would be mobilised when required. The DAG noted potential difficulty in defining consequential change and this requires input from industry parties at groups like the CCIAG. GSi asked if this should be recognised within the design principles. IS responded the scope of consequential changes is not fully known at present, and the principles are likely to evolve over time, and as such DAG may choose to add this. GSi believed it would be pertinent to include this within the design principles, though noted the specific wording would require further consideration.

## 7. Technical Assumptions

IS introduced the Technical Assumptions clarifications that had arisen from the previous DAG, explaining the changes are minor. No comments were received.

## 8. Integrations Platform Decisions

IS introduced the issue for decision, outlining the problem as per the slide, as well as the Options for consideration by DAG. IS talked through the further information slides and invited questions on these.

CH asked if Option 2 is effectively mirroring data already available on the registration system and is mirroring that on a different data store? IS confirmed yes because the flows containing those appointments flow through the Data Integration Platform (DiP) and so can interrogate those flows to retrieve that data.

SC asked if there are any non-appointed parties who may need to call that data? IS explained there is a category of messaging where there are no constraints on calling that data. If a party is permissioned to view half-hourly data, then they may do so. The challenge is how to restrict this data within the streams. In the future, the capability would exist to add a new role where you had an MPAN level look up but for that new role there would need to be a way to communicate the party level role to the system. SC suggested this aligns better to Option 2 then. IS agreed and noted if it was a lower volume then Option 3 might be preferred, but given volume size here Option 2 is recommended.

IS confirmed the Option 3 approach would result in a very high volume of API calls per day. This option has been reviewed within the Technical Design Working Group a number of times.

IS talked through the advantages and disadvantages of each Option as per the slide.

SC suggested Option 1 doesn't follow AWG principles. IS responded this was what the wording clarification around what 'business logic' constituted is what lent itself to this point.

CH asked about cost. Is there any variation in cost of these Options? Data storage, ongoing maintenance, and how these impacts the Options? IS suggested when this goes to RFP this would be more certain. There would be cost implications to the DiP for Option 2, but it simplifies participant systems as participants won't need to maintain a view of the secondary parties for that approach. This centralises the complexity of the systems rather than pushing those costs out to the parties themselves.

CH asked how Programme Participants establish a single version of the truth, e.g. if a flow gets rejected by the DiP, and how do Programme Participants manage this so there aren't two sets of conflicting data? IS confirmed the registration service would be what was adhered to here. Industry would take data directly from the 'Master' registration service.

RL asked if the existing flows of DTN are still going, so would there still be a need to address flows in that manner? Would there be a duplication of effort if flows continue to have to be addressed? IS said you don't have the same secondary addressing issues with dataflows as you would with the DiP. It doesn't entirely remove the requirements for the recipient to be addressed but means additional parties who want to subscribe to that data can do so. RL asks if this could be made a bit more clear, as current wording suggests the sender wouldn't be doing any addressing. IS confirmed there would always be a need for primary addressing as there's a need to segregate data to permissioned parties and so there would need to be a filtering system. RL asked if that's a requirement of MHHS? IS said yes fundamentally because it was a part of the AWG recommendation to allow parties to subscribe to streams of data.

SC clarified this principle came from Ofgem's design principles.

IS summarised by recognising the split in opinion on Option 1 vs Option 2 at working groups and the Programme has tried to analyse these differences. IS summarised the pros and cons and noted the Design team are recommending Option 2 and would like to seek DAG's view of whether DAG are supportive of this.

GS noted it's one thing to approve the Option based on principles, but without a view of cost it's difficult to make an informed decision. Although one Option might be preferred, it may have a significant cost associated; how can DAG compare the Options effectively without an idea of costs? IS noted this isn't expected to be a high-cost change but as part of the RFP process a specific costed element could be asked for.

RL agreed with GS's comments on cost. RL supported Option 1 and not putting the data into the DiP.

GE supported Option 2 on the basis of centralising the complexity of the design as it simplifies development for other parties and reduces likelihood of error based on interactions between parties versus centralising it. DAG should be wary of viewing central costs as the only costs, as there are also going to be industry costs for individual parties, so shipping costs on to parties for the sake of a cheaper central cost may not be the best option.

SC asks for clarification of the Decision here. Are DAG looking for a decision on the direction, or as a final decision on this? IS responded this is primarily for direction, but this is a bit of a fork in the road in terms of which direction the design progresses in. SC expressed preference for Option 2, though would like to see a proportionate and reasonable limit of cost for this route.

MH agreed with GE that it should be cheaper to build something centrally once rather than dozens of times.

The Chair invited any strong objections to Option 2.

RL said without a view of the costs, he would reject Option 2 and prefer Option 1.

GS noted she prefers the idea of Option 2 but is anxious about cost and how this is kept in check.

IS doesn't believe this would be the bulk of the cost. It would be maintenance of existing flows that need to be built already and the change in complexity would be similar for any secondary interfacing requirements that would need to be implemented across participant systems.

ER noted that given the view on costs, the benefit of more reliable data is what makes Option 2 attractive rather than relying on inter-supplier communications. Having a centralised single view of the truth would make Option 2 the preferred Option. IS added if the principal concern is one of cost, there may be a way of getting rough order of magnitude (ROM) costs for these Options. This would need rough calculations also of costs to programme participants to make a fair comparison.

GE noted if parties are reliant on competitors and agents to send information, this can be quite messy as it is at the moment. A central view of the truth is really helpful in the industry, and someone not updating the permissions is a much lower risk than the amount of incorrectly sent files going between industry parties.

The Chair suggested a decision in principle to proceed with Option 2 subject to a rough order of magnitude calculation for each option.

GSI noted suppliers would like to see a cost comparison including O3 as it would still offer a single version of the truth and may be a lower cost option. IS disagreed as it would significantly increase the non-functional requirements of the system so would be very surprised if this was the cheaper option.

**DECISION DAG-DEC13: Proceed with Option 2) DiP Addressing – DiP maintains a view of parties appointed to an MPAN and routes messages to appointed secondary parties, subject to costs information for the different Options**

**ACTION DAG06-10: DAG members to provide cost implications of Option 1 relating to primary and secondary addressing requirements within the MHHS Target Operating Model (TOM)**

**ACTION DAG06-11: IS to produce rough order of magnitude (ROM) comparison for Options 1, 2 and 3 of the primary and secondary addressing requirements for consideration by DAG**

## 9. Level 4 Working Group Updates

CS introduced the BPRWG Design Roadmap that underpins the plan. As discussed earlier, this is pushing out to June. Given the engagement to date, this is moving to a two-cycle review. Each of the design artefacts will have a 2-week review with BPRWG, before a 2-week internal review, when it will then go out for general review.

CH asked for clarification on the two methods of feedback; one is a word template and one is a spreadsheet template. CH ask how these are collated and are they treated the same way. CS confirmed this was correct, the mechanism for comparing the feedback is these are picked up and transferred to the live comments log and are treated in the same way.

SC asked if there was an intention to have any further discussion on comments received as part of the review if the comments are contradictory. CS confirmed this process identifies comments requiring further discussion and these are evaluated before making updates or releasing documents for review.

RL asked about timelines on design artefact documents coming to DAG for approval. IS said the expectation is this will be detailed in the Operational Choreography (OC) and there are other elements that will fall under non-functional processes. The substance of it will come under OC though. Key areas the Programme are reviewing currently include time constraints of the execution windows and the MDS.

SC asked where things like transition and qualification come in. IS responded this needs thinking about in terms of how the process will work during the transition window. Most likely a process whereby an MPAN is migrated during the MPAN registration process, but this will be communicated out when more information is available.

CS noted comments had been received for the current Tranche 1 documents and next steps are to action any minor changes and to identify any requiring further discussion. Plan is for these to go out for the second review period on 21<sup>st</sup> March.

GE felt it was useful to get the breakdown from various constituents just to see what the split is and where these points are coming from. CS noted there is work ongoing to improve this reporting.

CH raised concern around the volume in April due to Easter and general availability of people. IS accepted this and noted there would be some movement in these numbers and if the timescales do change as per PSG input into Change Review, then there's scope to shift this further.

RL wanted to check some of the figures added up. IS accepted the figures may not and would check and update this

**ACTION DAG06-12: IS to review the design artefact subtotals and update where necessary**

## 10. Summary and next steps

FM summarised the meeting actions and invited any feedback on any missed actions. No further actions were identified.

The Chair requested any other business

RL raised a further comment regarding design principles, specifically principle 8; could this be expanded to include all relevant industry codes. IS agreed to update this to reflect relevant governance regimes (i.e. not BSC alone).

**ACTION DAG06-09: IS to update Design Principle 8 to reference all relevant industry codes**