

MHHS Design Advisory Group (DAG) Headline Report

Issue date: 08 July 2022

Meeting Number **DAG011**

Venue **Virtual – MS Teams**

Meeting Date and Time **06 July 2022 09:30-13:30**

Classification **Public**

Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date
Tranche 3 Approval	DAG11-01	Provide draft plan on transition requirements at next DAG meeting	Programme (Ian Smith)	28/07/2022
	DAG11-02	Discuss with TMAG Chair St Clements participation at TMAG	Chair	21/07/2022
	DAG11-03	Provide assurance findings on T3 to upcoming DAG	Programme (Simon Harrison)	21/07/2022
Level Playing Field Design Principle	DAG11-04	Produce strawman on options and dimensions for MHHS proposals regarding differential read window as defined under Smart Energy Code Modification Proposal 162 solution. Consult with DAG members to garner input on options/dimensions/materiality.	Programme (Ian Smith)	21/07/2022
	DAG11-05	Clarify DAG decision making authority regarding MHHS Design and SEC MP162 solution (related to ACTION DAG11-04)	Chair	21/07/2022
	DAG11-06	Clarify with CCAG Chair and SRO how design drives code changes and how existing MHHS related code changes are managed	Chair	21/07/2022
Summary and Next Steps	DAG11-07	DAG members to provide any comments on agenda items 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, and 13 within the meeting papers of the DAG held 06 July 2022 by close of business 15 July 2022	DAG Members	15/07/2022
	DAG11-08	Ensure Programme risk relating to 162 covers any governance implications for MHHS and Codes	Programme (PMO)	21/07/2022

Decisions

Area	DAG09-11	Add dependency to outstanding design issues log regarding Programme approach to resolving material design issues which emanate from design assurance process.
	DAG-DEC-23	Minutes of DAG meeting held 11 May 2022 approved

Minutes and Actions	DAG-DEC-24	Minutes of DAG meeting held 08 June 2022 approved
	DAG-DEC-25	Minutes of DAG meeting held 21 June 2022 approved
Tranche 3 Approval	DAG-DEC-26	Tranche 3 design artefacts conditionally approved
Level Playing Field Principle	DAG-DEC-27	<p>DAG agreed that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The 24hr TRT meets the requirements of MHHS TOM with regard to the collection of residual consumption at point of meter works; 2. The SEC MP162 solution for Differential On-Demand Response Timings / Retries on Failure for Suppliers and independent MDRs does not present a Level Playing Field Design Principle issue with regard to the delivery of the MHHS Requirements; and 3. The SEC MP 162 solution for Differential Read Windows for Suppliers and independent MDRs does present a Level Playing Field Design Principle issue with regard to the delivery of the MHHS Requirements.

RAID Items Discussed

RAID area	Description
Level Playing Field Principle	The DAG agreed any Programme risk contained with the RAID log relating to Smart Energy Code Modification Proposal (SEC MP) 162 should include reference to the governance implications for MHHS design and industry codes

Key Discussion Items

Area	Discussion
Minutes and Actions	The DAG reviewed the open and outstanding actions from previous meetings, full details of which will be provided in the DAG Minutes and Actions.
Tranche 3 Approval	<p>Introduction and Discussion</p> <p>An overview of the review of Tranche 3 (T3) design artefacts was provided. The DAG were advised any new issues or matters requiring resolution have been recorded within the Design Artefact Tracker (DAT). Seven design artefacts were issued as part of T3, with eleven new snags and dissensus issues recorded in the DAT.</p> <p>The Programme design team advised the T3 design artefacts are considered stable and capable of conditional approval. The MHHS Design Assurance Team Identified no substantive design gaps in the Tranche 3 artefacts as part of its quality assurance activities that will materially impact the overall scope of the design. They also advised the formal assurance findings relating to T3 will be presented at an upcoming DAG (ACTION DAG11-03), and they were satisfied any outstanding matters in relation to T3 will be addressed.</p> <p>The group discussed several specific matters relating to approval of the T3 design artefacts, and the conditions attached, including the impact of issues outstanding from Tranches 1 and 2 and the requirements of industry code drafting. One member expressed concern over whether the design artefacts as a whole, once approved following the Tranche 4 review, will enable industry parties to commence design and build. Other</p>

members expressed reservations over whether subjectivity may affect the translation of the MHHS design into code drafting and what the precise roles of the DAG and the MHHS Cross Code Advisory Group (CCAG) are in relation to code drafting. The Programme provided comfort on the steps being taken to ensure the completeness of the design and to provide industry parties with the support needed to commence internal design and build activities.

Approval

DAG members provided their positions on whether the T3 design artefacts should be recommended for conditional approval, with several members noting specific conditions relating to their approval (please see the DAG Minutes and Actions for full details). Each constituency position is detailed below:

Constituency	Accept	Reject	Abstain
DCC Representative (as smart meter central system provider)	✓		
DNO Representative	✓		
Elexon Representative (as central systems provider)	✓		
I&C Supplier Representative	✓		
iDNO Representative	✓		
Large Supplier Representative	✓		
Small Supplier Representative	✓		
Supplier Agent Representative	✓		
Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent)	✓		
Medium Supplier Representative	Constituency representative not in attendance		

The Chair summarised the position of the group, noting a majority accepted conditional approval of the T3 design artefacts (DECISION DAG-DEC-26).

Level Playing Field Design Principle

The DAG discussed outstanding challenges related to whether the solution contained within Smart Energy Code Modification (SEC MP) 162 supported the MHHS level playing field design principle.

The group discussed several specific scenarios where industry parties may not have equal access to system functions supporting the retrieval of meter data, following discussion on this by the MHHS Smart Meter Segment (SDS) Subgroup on 30 June 2022. The DAG discussed the 3 areas reviewed and conclusions reached by the SDS sub-group, .e.g. 24hr TRT, differential read window and differential on demand responses timings/Retries. Members concluded the most significant challenge (with regards to the level playing field principle) related to differential read windows in Data Communication Company (DCC) systems, and the ability of supplier-enabled agents to obtain faster response times than independent agents. One member believed this was a competition issue and could create an differential outcome for independent agents who may seek to take up the new Meter Data Retrieval (MDR) role that will be created by implementation of MHHS.

DAG agreed that (DECISION DAG-DEC-27):

1. The 24hr TRT meets the requirements of MHHS TOM with regard to the collection of residual consumption at point of meter works;
2. The SEC MP162 solution for Differential On-Demand Response Timings / Retries on Failure for Suppliers and independent MDRs does not present a Level Playing Field Design Principle issue with regard to the delivery of the MHHS Requirements; and

	<p>3. The SEC MP 162 solution for Differential Read Windows for Suppliers and independent MDRs does present a Level Playing Field Design Principle issue with regard to the delivery of the MHHS Requirements.</p> <p>It was noted there is likely to be dissensus between suppliers and agents on whether additional requirements should be included within the SEC MP 162 solution, owing in part to the nature of cost allocation under the SEC. The group agreed there may be a need to escalate this matter for decision. To support further consideration of the matter by DAG, and to ensure that should escalation occur there is specific and, where possible, quantitative data available to provide as part of any escalation, the group agreed the Programme should produce a paper detailing the options (with dimensions for assessment) available to resolve this matter (ACTION DAG11-04).</p> <p>The DAG acknowledged the potentially significant issues which may occur should SEC MP162 be rejected and considered whether Ofgem would need to become involved should this occur. The group noted they may be a perceived difficulty around the vires of the DAG in relation to external changes such as SEC MP162, which proceed according to governance process which are out with the Programme. Actions were taken to discuss the management of changes to industry codes with the CCAG and SRO and to ensure the existing risk within the Programme RAID log relating to SEC MP162 includes reference to governance implications (ACTION DAG11-06 and ACTION DAG11-08).</p> <p>The Programme agreed to produce the options paper for the next DAG meeting, following direct discussions with DAG members and their constituents.</p>
Summary and Next Steps	DAG members were invited to provide any comments on agenda items 4 to 12 within the meeting papers by correspondence no later than close of business 15 July 2022. (ACTION DAG11-07)

Next meetings:

21 July 2022 at 09:30am

28 July 2022 at 09:30am