

MHHS Design Advisory Group Minutes and Actions

Issue date: 22/04/2022

Meeting number	DAG008	Venue	Virtual – MS Teams
Date and time	13 April 2022 10:00-12:00	Classification	Public

Attendees:

Chair

Justin Andrews (Chair)

Role

Chair

Industry Representatives

Andrew Green (AG) (on behalf of Gareth Evans)

I&C Supplier Representative

Chris Cook (CC) (on behalf of Craig Handford)

Large Supplier Representative

Donna Townsend (DT)

iDNO Representative

Ed Rees (ER)

Consumer Representative

Gemma Slaney (GS)

DNO Representative

Gurpal Singh (GSi)

Medium Supplier Representative

Sean Donner (SD) (on behalf of Keren Kelly)

National Grid ESO

Robert Langdon (RL)

Supplier Agent Representative

Seth Chapman (SC)

Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent)

Stuart Scott (SS)

DCC Representative (as smart meter central system provider)

MHHS IM

Claire Silk (CS)

Design Market and Engagement Lead

Fraser Mathieson (FM)

PMO Governance Lead

Ian Smith (IS)

Design Manager

Miles Winter (MW)

PMO Governance Team

Simon Harrison (SH)

Design Assurance Lead

Other Attendees

Danielle Walton (DW)

Ofgem

Apologies:

Jo Bradbury (JB)

Small Supplier Representative

Keren Kelly

National Grid ESO

Matt Hall (MH)

Elexon Representative (as central systems provider)

Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date
Minutes and actions	DAG08-01	Bring updated DIP Functional Specification and Non-Functional Requirements to the next DAG for approval	Programme (Ian Smith)	11/05/2022
	DAG08-02	Issue call for agenda items or discussion topics prior to mobilisation of CCIAG	Programme (PMO)	11/05/2022
	DAG08-03	Communicate to DAG members the process for the replanning activity that will be carried out post-M5 (release of detailed design baseline)	Programme (PMO)	14/04/2022
	DAG08-04	Update SECAS on outcomes of DAG discussion relating to SEC MP162	Programme (DAG Chair)	11/05/2022
	DAG08-05	Provide copy of request sent to the Smart Meter Segment Working Group (SDS) regarding consideration of Target Response Times (TRTs) of <24 hours and interaction with SEC MP162 to DAG for visibility	Programme (Claire Silk)	14/04/2022
	DAG08-06	Update the design dashboard to show correct number of technical artefacts approved by DAG for issuance as part of the RFP	Programme (TBC)	11/05/2022
	DAG08-07	Discuss with Chris Cook the IPA recommendation regarding support offered during design artefact review Tranches	Programme (Ian Smith)	11/05/2022
	DAG08-08	DAG members to contact Simon Harrison at DesignAssurance@mhsprogramme.co.uk if they wish to be involved in the user group for the design repository platform	All DAG members	11/05/2022
	DAG08-09	Confirm upcoming DAG meeting dates, reflecting when Tranche 1 design artefacts are ready for approval	Programme (PMO)	14/04/2022
	DAG08-10	Bring design elements of RAID log for review at next meeting	Programme (PMO)	11/05/2022

Decisions

Area	Dec Ref	Decision
Minutes	DAG-DEC-17	Minutes of meetings held 17 March 2022 and 23 March 2022 approved
	DAG-DEC-18	New Design Principles approved
	DAG-DEC-19	DAG agree to proceed with Option 2 regarding technical addressing requirements

RAID items discussed/raised

RAID area	Description
Supplier Engagement	Latest view of how supp engagement at level 4s is going – [note large and medium supp rep received no feedback (technical addressing options) reflecting existing risk – no small supp present]
M5 Milestone	Large and medium supplier representative expressed reservations over levels of comments on Tranche 1 design artefacts, and whether a threshold of materiality exists which may lead to delay of approval by DAG

Minutes

1. Welcome and Introductions

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

2. Minutes and actions

The group approved the minutes of the Extraordinary DAG held 17 March 2022 and DAG held 23 March 2022 with no comments.

DECISION DAG-DEC-17: Minutes of DAG meetings held 17 March 2022 and 23 March 2022 approved

FM provided an overview of the outstanding actions, updates for which can be found within the [meeting papers](#).

The Chair advised that actions relating to [Smart Energy Code \(SEC\) Modification Proposal \(MP\) 162¹](#) would be covered during new recurring agenda item 'Level playing field design principle'.

Other specific action updates and discussions are provided below:

DAG06-10 – Provide cost implications of Option 1 relating to primary and secondary requirements within the technical addressing options, to PMO@mhhsprogramme.co.uk

FM advised one response had been received providing an indication of the likely cost impacts of technical addressing options. It was noted the Programme had also provided high level cost analysis of the three options relating to technical addressing requirements, and these would be discussed under agenda item 6 *Design Decisions*.

Action closed.

DAG07-03 – Programme to bring future versions of DIP Functional Specification and Non-Functional Requirements to DAG, once further updates incorporated

IS noted the Data Integration Platform (DIP) Functional Specification and Non-Functional Requirements documents were issued as part of the Request for Proposal (RFP) to prospective DIP provider bidders. It is expected that once initial proposals are returned in May, bidders are likely to have put forward options and potentially suggest changes which will then return to DAG for decision. For example, bidders may indicate that if changes are made to certain requirements, there may be costs savings overall. Any such suggestions would then be discussed by DAG in terms of whether there are changes required to the documents. IS summarised the current stable view of requirements has been put forward to prospective bidders and the documents will likely return to DAG in May 2022.

Action ongoing.

DAG07-04 – Programme (Charles Hyde) to notify Chair of documents in the DIP procurement pack and provide information on how they have been drafted and reviewed, to ensure good procurement practice has been followed and determine whether DAG approval is required

FM advised a table of the documents issued with the RFP had been provided as Appendix 1 of the meeting papers. This table outlines which documents have been issued and whether they are technical design documents relevant to the DAG. It was highlighted the majority of the documents issued in the RFP will return to DAG for approval, following comments from bidders.

SC asked whether DAG should have reviewed the documents before the RFP was issued, noting that whilst the DIP Functional Specification and Non-Functional Requirements documents were reviewed by the DAG and considered sufficient to be issued as part of the RFP, there are additional documents which will also require consideration by the DAG. IS advised the Functional Specification and Non-Functional Requirements were the key documents relevant to DAG, and several of the other documents principally relate to organisational policies and will not have significant impacts on the technical requirements of the DIP. The Chair added the documents proceeded through the due procurement processes under the Procurement Team and, subject to the decision as to the shortlisted bidders, there is likely to be a procurement committee as there was for Lead Delivery Partner (LDP) procurement. There will be industry engagement in the procurement process.

¹ SEC changes required to deliver MHHS

The Chair highlighted that updates were made to the DIP Functional Specification and Non-Functional Requirements documents following initial comments from DAG members at the last meeting, and comments from the LDP, the majority of which were grammatical or clarificatory. IS confirmed these would be brought to the next DAG for visibility.

ACTION DAG08-01 – Programme to bring updated DIP Functional Specification and Non-Functional Requirements to the next DAG

Action closed.

DAG04-03 – Look at when to stand up the Consequential Change Impact Assessment Group (CCIAG)

GSI asked for an update on the mobilisation of the CCIAG. FM advised consequential change is frequently raised at the CCAG, and there was likely to be an increased need for the CCIAG as industry codes drafting commences and as design consequential change emanating from code becomes more defined. The Chair confirmed the intention is to mobilise the CCIAG in the near future. GSI requested four weeks' notice is provided and Programme Parties (PPs) are invited to provide agenda items for discussion at that inaugural meeting. IS confirmed there had been discussions at the design working groups about how consequential change is defined and PPs were encouraged to provide any specific matters for discussion. GSI suggested notice of the intention to mobilise the CCIAG is cascaded to PPs, and initial feedback invited for consideration by the DAG as part of mobilising the CCIAG.

ACTION DAG08-02 – Programme to communicate request for feedback and any initial agenda items to Programme Participants prior to mobilising the Consequential Change Impact Assessment Group (CCIAG)

SC asked whether the CCIAG may suggest amendments to the design baseline given the group is likely to be mobilised shortly before the release of the baseline and may not have yet had an opportunity to feed into this milestone. The Chair noted this is a question on the scope of the CCIAG explaining the MHHS Programme is charged with delivering the MHHS Target Operating Model (TOM) and discussions on the impacts of consequential scenarios beyond the scope of the MHHS TOM (e.g. impacts on supplier billing systems) are important in terms of whether they are matters the Programme will assist with, or whether these will be matters for individual PPs to manage, but are not anticipated to substantially alter the baselined design.

SC asked whether the use of supplier readings for settlement were in scope of the MHHS Programme. IS suggested this would be discussed by DAG soon, and there are elements of design which may have consequential impacts on PPs emanating from related industry code changes and other requirements which the Programme effectively mandates for parties' internal systems because of the agreed operation of the TOM. GSI noted the Programme is focusing on settlement only, but there are many other industry processes which will be affected by changes within scope of the MHHS TOM and this meant the CCIAG was important. The Chair highlighted Estimated Annual Consumption (EAC) data as a consequential area which will require consideration. GSI commented that many such matters which could be discussed by the CCIAG are consumer focused, providing the examples of change of supplier reads, EACs used for providing quotes to consumers, and the reassessment of customer direct debits.

3. Governance Group Updates

FM provided updates from the level 2 and 3 MHHS governance groups, including the Programme Steering Group (PSG), the Cross Code Advisory Group (CCAG), and the Testing and Migration Advisory Group (TMAG).

PSG

FM highlighted that PSG had recommended MHHS Programme Change Request (CR) 001 to Ofgem for approval, which seeks to move the M5 programme milestone, relating to delivery of the detailed design baseline, to July. FM highlighted the replanning activity which will be carried out post M5 and advised there will be a further opportunity for PPs to provide comments on other Programme milestone delivery dates during the replan consultation.

The Chair asked when Ofgem were expected to provide a decision on CR001. DW replied a decision would be provided as soon as practicable and CR001 was currently under consideration.

RL asked whether other Programme milestone delivery dates should be assumed to remain as they are currently. The Chair confirmed that part of the post-M5 replanning process will involve the Programme calling for views and evidence on the need for changes to the dates of other milestones, and that a new Programme timetable would be consulted on based on the views provided. IS added the Programme is seeking volunteers to assist the replanning activity prior to wider industry consultation. The aim is to achieve a broad consensus across industry on the feasibility of programme delivery dates once parties have had the opportunity to consume the detailed design and understand the impact this will have upon their internal systems.

FM invited parties to contact PMO@mhhsprogramme.co.uk if they would like to volunteer for input to the replan activity.

ACTION DAG08-03 – Communicate to DAG members the process for the replanning activity that will be carried out post-M5 (release of detailed design baseline)

TMAG

FM highlighted two TMAG documents currently out for review. The E2E Testing and Integration Strategy, and the Test Data Strategy. The former has a deadline for comments of 12 April 2022, and responses will be discussed at the next TMAG meeting on 20 April 2022. The latter will be reissued for further review following amendments agreed by the Data Working Group (DWG), with responses to be requested by 29 April 2022.

GSi asked if there is now a supplier on TMAG. FM confirmed there is now a large supplier rep at TMAG, but the medium, small and I&C supplier seats are still vacant.

4. DAG Design Principles

IS provided an overview of amendments and proposed new additions to the Design Principles discussed at the previous DAG meeting. Two new principles were proposed, including the previously discussed 'level playing field' principle, and a new consumer benefits principle drafted by the Large Supplier and Consumer Representatives. The Chair invited ER as the Consumer Representative to comment on the new consumer focussed design principle. ER confirmed they are happy with the principle.

SC believed the consumer benefits principle is likely to be hard to apply in practice and it may be difficult to assess some design artefacts against this principle. The Chair suggested DAG attempt to apply the principle when the Tranche 1 design artefacts are submitted to DAG for approval and assess its application. IS stated some documents are likely to come to DAG that will have a clearer application. The Chair considered an example could be load shaping data where the principle could prompt consideration of whether this data should be made available to other organisations that may enable customers to use electricity more efficiently. SC stated the principle may require review in future, but agreed the principle in its current form is a positive indication of DAG's intent.

The Chair advised these are living principles which can be amended and refined over time and will be a standing agenda item at each DAG. The group agreed to approve the proposed changes to the design principles.

DECISION DAG-DEC-18 – New Design Principles approved

5. Level playing field design principle

The Chair provided updates on multiple actions regarding SECMP162, and these are summarised below.

DAG06.1-01 – Consult the Smart Market Segment Sub-Group (SDS) user group on whether there is a requirement for Target Response Times (TRTs) of less than 24 hours for meter data retrieval related to MHHS, and associated scenarios, frequency of retrieval, and cost implications for suppliers

A request for information has been sent to Smart Meter Segment Working Group (SDS) with specific questions relating to Meter Data Retrieval (MDR) use cases, frequency/volume, energisation of meter, success/failure rates of TRTs, and what material benefit shorter TRTs would provide. The Chair noted no responses have yet been received and offered to circulate the request to DAG members for information.

ACTION DAG08-05 – Programme to provide copy of request sent to the Smart Meter Segment Working Group (SDS) regarding consideration of Target Response Times (TRTs) of <24 hours and interaction with SEC MP162 to DAG for visibility

SC believed the likelihood of timely responses was low as multiple other deadlines for documents and CRs which require review. SC hoped for industry-level analysis of the impact of not receiving data back from de-energised meters to inform discussion on whether there is an essential requirements for TRTs of less than 24 hours. If this leads to minimal settlement error then it may not be a high priority. IS stated the Programme would be happy to extend the response deadline for information on TRTs of less than 24 hours. The Chair asked any PPs who are struggling with any deadlines to inform the Programme to prompt consideration of what could be done to alleviate this.

GS commented if the response indicate there is an essential need for TRTs of 30 seconds for MDR service requests, a new SEC MP would be required, and the cost would need to be incorporated into the Programme. Current rough costings for SECMP162 for DCC are £17m, and an additional SEC MP would potentially add significant cost. IS advised that if a

requirement for TRTs of 30 seconds was desired, it would be assessed in terms of return on investment from improved settlement accuracy, the costs of costs, alongside the Level Playing Field principle.

CC asked for a distinction on how consequential changes, such as MP162, link to the Programme. IS noted that MP162 is slightly different as when the TOM was being developed it was noted there would need to be significant changes to the DCC systems via the SEC. As such, this change commenced very early as it was recognised as significant. SECMP162 has had lots of input from MHHS. CCIAG would look at consequential changes going forward. The Chair outlined the Programme approach is design led, and so the design baseline will come first followed by the code changes, though in this instance, because of the lead time for DCC changes due to SECMP162, this piece of work was started early.

The Chair noted the SEC Code Administrator has indicated a further consultation on MP162 may be required, which may extend the timelines for this change by two to three months. This will need to be assessed in terms of the impact on MHHS delivery. The further consultation aims to align the definition of meter data retrieval and the MHHS MDR service.

SC commented there was a difference between MP162 first and second consultations. There is also a difference between new MDR role proposed by MP162 and MDR in MHHS. A party can undertake MDR as a supplier under SEC. These roles need to be identifiably different so the two qualifications are not conflated. The Chair thanked SC for the clarification.

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

The Chair advised the MHHS Programme Design Team have a representative in attendance at the SEC MP162 working groups.

DAG06-06 Programme to check if response provided to second consultation on SEC MP162 and provide update to DAG

The group were advised the MHHS Programme had not provided a response to the second consultation as there had been no material change from the response provided to the first.

DAG06-04 Review SEC MP162 to ensure alignment with MHHS design

The Chair confirmed consideration of the alignment of the change and the MHHS design was embedded in design activities and under constant consideration. A recurring agenda item will be included within future DAG meetings regarding the level playing field design principle, to ensure continued visibility of developments. SEC representatives will be invited to future DAG meetings where SEC MP162 is due to be discussed, and the Chair will provide an update to SEC following the April DAG.

ACTION DAG08-04 – Chair to update SECAS on outcomes of DAG discussion relating to SEC MP162

DAG06.1-02 Consider whether closer working with SEC working groups is required and consider joint working group with SEC and MHHS parties regarding SEC MP162 and data retrieval from DCC systems

The Chair advised weekly discussions were now occurring between the DAG Chair and the SEC working group manager, and updates being communicated between parties. A decision on whether a joint working group may be beneficial will be taken once information has been received from the SDS on TRT requirements. The Ch

6. Design Decisions

IS ran through the technical addressing options as per the meeting slides. Option 1 (O1) view of secondary parties would need to be maintained by individual participants. Option 2 (O2) would do this centrally but would attract cost for an ability to call data from the DIP in terms of routing. Option 3 (O3) is similar to O2 but would be maintained on an external service. Any third-party service that handled this routing would require a significant infrastructure update. There is also exposure to third-party systems that would be aligned to non-functional requirements. Linking systems in this way would need those requirements to be aligned so would also attract cost.

IS noted O1 in terms of participant routing would require a change from multiple parties. IS explained the rough order of magnitude (ROM) calculations as per the slides and invited views from the DAG. RL thought the estimate for design/test/build would be built into requirements, as participants already have a requirement to send to multiple addressees as part of dataflows system. RL suggested this represented minimal change for participants and so the O1 cost estimate may be high. If the costs of building into DIP is realistic, then O2 is more reasonable.

SC commented O1 cost may be higher than indicated in the ROM, as the estimate of 15 parties may be on the low side. IS recognised this and explained the ROM had tried to factor in that some participants may end up being duplicated, e.g. software providers to multiple suppliers.

The Chair asked if this was part of the Architecture Working Group recommendation for event-driven architecture. IS confirmed this is the case, however, ensuring that only parties who were permissioned to see events, and that they have a legitimate interest in viewing those events, is difficult to manage from a privacy standpoint. There may have to be a maintained view of secondary addressing in the DIP.

IS noted the anticipation there would be no requirements for participant development for O2. There are some potential infrastructure costs as well. O3 participant development costs were difficult to define so a commentary has been left but no further costing. Infrastructure costs would be significant with O3.

IS invited questions on the addressing ROM and the recommendation O2 is agreed. No comments were provided.

The Chair summarised the DAG now sought a decision on which option to proceed with and requested of the Programme recommendation to agree O2. No objections were raised. The Chair clarified O2 is currently reflected in the RFP and approval would not affect the procurement process.

CC advised they had not received enough feedback and the Large Supplier constituency would abstain on that basis.

GSI added medium suppliers have not been able to review the options due to ongoing priority conflicts.

DECISION DAG-DEC-19 – DAG agreed to proceed with Option 2 (secondary addressing orchestrated via DIP) regarding technical addressing requirements for the DIP

7. MHHS Design Dashboard

CS introduced the Design Dashboard which is also presented to PSG and Level 4 Working Groups. Tranche 1 documents are flagged as amber due to the volume of comments received and still outstanding. IS noted there were 700 comments received, the vast bulk of which have been responded to and updated. There's around 70 still being looked at. These are being worked through in themes e.g. comments on data interactions with LDSOs, which are going to be looked at as part of T4. There are a number of specific clarifications that are ongoing with regard to the RMP status and domestic indicator process, but in terms of the materiality of the outcome this isn't seen as a significant change to the stability of T1. The aim is to get to a position by COP today or tomorrow in terms of a stability assessment for T1 as to which documents are stable and which ones still have outstanding snags. This plays into approval processes. Core principles are that Design recognises there will be snags outstanding and when looking for interim DAG approval for these tranches, Design would bring a document to the table that set out the outcomes from the review process, the comment status, and outstanding clarifications. If Design believes there is sufficient stability for that interim approval, does DAG accept that there is sufficient stability that we can move forward with a set of defined snags that will be dealt with as part of the tail of resolution.

The Chair summarised that there are areas of T1 that are stable, though there are other documents that are not yet defined and are due to come at later Tranches. Examples of this might be Operational Choreography. Main focuses are whether the design is in line with TOM, does it lend itself to an MVP, and are these T1 docs sufficiently stable that DAG can approve them. IS added DAG wants to be clear where we believe there is still analysis to be done and provide a clear view as to the materiality of those issues. DAG aren't asking this be signed off in stone, there is a chance that previous artefacts may be reworked at later Tranches.

The Chair noted the amount of work that the L4 WGs have done, alongside the Design team, to refine these artefacts over the last few months, and thanked all those who have been involved in these processes.

DT noted an email received as iDNO rep regarding approval of T1; if DAG approve T1 will it be on a qualified basis or would those documents that haven't been finalised come back to DAG for approval. IS confirmed this would be a qualified approval, and DAG would quantify the view of the 'snagging list', so these could be tracked and closed. DT asked how these snags might be listed if they were to have an impact on T2 docs as well. IS confirmed these would be called out explicitly.

RL asked at the point of baselining will all snags be closed, and if any are outstanding how does that feed in to post baseline. IS commented it is likely there will be outstanding issues once M5 is reached, do we pragmatically agree an M5 baseline with a ramp off time for ironing out any issues. Expectation is that if M5 has a caveated sign off, it would only be accepted if those caveats were clearly understood and there was a plan for dealing with them. The Chair

commented that design artefacts were likely to be continuing to evolve post M5. SH commented the anticipation is there will be things uncovered at Code Change and Testing phases and managing the design pre and post baseline is something the Programme is aware of.

CC raised a point of clarification, would IS come back to DAG with the process for bringing documents back to DAG with the snag list, and if so, which DAG would this be at. IS replied this is likely to be done via correspondence rather than at DAG. CC commented their constituents have been struggling to keep up to date with the changes in the Tranche documents. The main concern is if there is a level of change for the Tranches at the April DAG and if this is due to increase in the coming months, it would be appreciated by PPs for the changes that have occurred to be clearly communicated. IS acknowledged some lessons learned from T1, with the key lesson being that the priority is for the documents post 1st review cycle should be as clean as possible to better capture the comments and what changes have occurred between the review periods. The Chair added the work done so far in review hasn't uncovered any fundamental or significant outstanding issues which is worth bearing in mind.

RL asked for clarity on DIP documents. There are 3 artefacts listed on the slide but DAG has seen only 2 artefacts. IS commented this is the set of documents due to be released shortly. IS ran through Appendix 1 to outline the documents that were going through for RFP review. The other 4 artefacts are going to be dealt with by governance. RL asked which of these latter documents will come back to DAG for review. IS felt these weren't tied to M5 but would be material when parties started their own Design Build Test (DBT) processes.

GS echoed RL's point that anyone viewing the slides with them blind would need some articulation added to it.

ACTION DAG08-06 – Programme to update the design dashboard to show correct number of technical artefacts approved by DAG for issuance as part of the RFP

GSi asked for clarity whether RAG statuses would change once a CR is approved, or are we already at Amber status approaching a July M5. IS said some Amber statuses were reflective of uncertainty and the size of the work not being understood so may remain Amber. GSi noted constituents were asking whether there is a chance of these deadlines being met. CC echoed this for their constituency. The Chair clarified whether the view of the constituents was that the Programme wouldn't meet the deadline or whether they were concerned there wouldn't be enough input from certain constituents. GSi clarified the latter is always true, but the former is what the concern was focused on. Given discussions at DAG today regarding approvals subject to caveats, are DAG likely to meet M5? The Chair confirmed the caveats to design artefacts would mostly be around how PPs would begin to do their DBT.

GSi asked for whether there is a process for appealing rejected comments. The Chair noted this is likely to have a justification in the rejection. If any PP is unhappy with a rejection, they should contact the Design Team for a discussion. CS confirmed this process has been communicated to L4 WGs and PPs should reach out to the Design mailbox at Design@mhhsprogramme.co.uk

CC asked about an assessment period between tranches following recommendations from the IPA. IS said the IPA's recommendation was for the Programme to be explicit as to the support provided by the Programme to participants after baselining.

ACTION DAG08-07 – Ian Smith to discuss with Chris Cook the IPA recommendation regarding support offered during design artefact review Tranches

8. Level 4 Working Group Updates

CS provided updates from the Level 4 Design Working Groups under the purview of DAG.

The group were advised the Design Artefact Tracker had been updated with information on the design artefacts included in each review tranche and with additional detail including the number of comments received for each artefact during review, any outstanding issues, and anticipated submission dates to DAG for approval.

CS highlighted the Tranche 2 documents are out for review with the Business Process Requirements Working Group (BPRWG) and the focus for the remainder of April 2022 was to update the documents as may be required in response to review comments and issue the updated versions for second review.

CS advised the Technical Design Working Group (TDWG) have been focusing on the documentation issued to prospective DIP bidders as part of the Request for Proposal stage of the DIP procurement.

The Chair advised there would likely be a need for a reporting sub-group meeting. IS added several cross WG sessions are going to be scheduled to discuss Operational Choreography. These will be communicated in due course.

9. Post Baseline Design Repository Tooling

SH provided an overview of post baseline design repository tooling, which host all approved design artefacts following delivery of the detailed design baseline and through to post-programme. The intention is to develop a tool which all parties can access and use to collaborate and manage design documentation, to ensure it remains robust.

The repository will be based on Orbus' iServer365 product and will be compatible with Microsoft Office 365. Industry parties will not need any specialist software to make use of the tool.

CC asked if there is a dependency on constituents having Microsoft Office 365 to make use of the tool. SH confirmed the tool will be browser based, accessible by all Programme Parties, and parties will not need to have Microsoft Office 365 to use it.

SH requested volunteers to assist with initial review of the repository.

ACTION DAG08-08 – DAG members to contact Simon Harrison at DesignAssurance@mhhsprogramme.co.uk if they wish to be involved in the user group for the design repository platform

10. Summary and next steps

FM provided an overview of the upcoming DAG meeting dates and expected agenda items. The group discussed the frequency and cadence of upcoming meetings, and agreed several proposed meeting dates should be consolidated based on when the Tranche 1 design artefacts are ready for decision on approval. The Chair advised DAG members would be given at least two weeks to review the Tranche 1 documents prior to the decision on approval.

ACTION DAG08-09 – PMO to confirm upcoming DAG meeting dates, reflecting when Tranche 1 design artefacts are ready for approval

FM summarised the actions from the meeting and asked whether there were any risks or issues the group wished to raise. A possible risk around supplier engagement and another around the level of comments received on the Tranche 1 documentation were raised. The Chair suggested the PMO present the design related items of the Programme's Risks Assumptions Issues Dependencies (RAID) Log at the next meeting.

ACTION DAG08-10 – PMO to bring design elements of RAID log for review at next meeting

GSi queried whether, given the level of comments received in response to the Tranche 1 design artefact review, a similar number of comments in the subsequent tranches may impact the delivery of the design baseline. The Chair advised the documentation and cycle of review should improve in clarity in subsequent tranches and invite fewer comments as a result which may help streamline the process. IS noted the volume of comments did not necessarily mean complexity. The materiality of comments would need to be assessed and thematic analysis undertaken to determine whether further review is triggered or whether there are any potential impacts on the delivery of the design baseline.

The Chair thanked attendees for their contributions and closed the meeting.