

## MHHS Design Advisory Group Minutes and Actions

**Issue date: 04 August 2022**

Meeting number	<b>DAG013</b>	Venue	<b>Virtual – MS Teams</b>
Date and time	<b>28 July 2022 09:30-14:00</b>	Classification	<b>Public</b>

### Attendees:

#### **Chair**

Justin Andrews (Chair)

#### **Role**

Chair

#### **Industry Representatives**

Craig Handford (CH)

Donna Townsend (DT)

Ed Rees (ER)

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

Jacqui Barton (JB) (On behalf of Gemma Slaney)

Carolyn Burns (CBu)

Matt Hall (MH)

Neil Dewar (ND)

Robert Langdon (RL)

Sarah Jones (SJ)

Seth Chapman (SC)

Stuart Scott (SS)

Large Supplier Representative

iDNO Representative

Consumer Representative

I&C Supplier Representative

DNO Representative

Small Supplier Representative

Elexon Representative (as central systems provider)

National Grid ESO

Supplier Agent Representative

RECCo Representative

Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent)

DCC Representative (as smart meter central system provider)

#### **MHHS IM**

Claire Silk (CS)

Ian Smith (IS)

Miles Winter (MW)

Nicole Lai (NL)

Paul Pettit (PP)

Design Market and Engagement Lead

Design Manager

PMO Support

PMO Support

Design Assurance

#### **Other Attendees**

Colin Bezant (CBe)

Sinead Quinn (SQ) (On behalf of Danielle Walton)

Tim Newton (TN)

Independent Programme Assurance

Ofgem

Smart Energy Code

Peter Edwarde (PE)

PPC MH

### Apologies:

Fraser Mathieson (FM)

Warren Fulton (WF)

PMO Governance Lead

Separation Lead

## Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date
<b>Actions update</b>	DAG13-01	Provide an update to DAG10.1-03 in the next meeting	Programme (Ian Smith)	10/08/2022
	DAG13-02	Bring agenda item on transition to next DAG	Programme (Ian Smith)	10/08/2022
<b>Raid Review</b>	DAG13-03	Feedback to DAG whether the Programme should put the price-cap calculation on the Programme's risk register	Ofgem	10/08/2022
	DAG13-04	Review and update the dissensus log on the Design Artefact Tracker	Programme (Claire Silk)	10/08/2022
	DAG13-05	Look at practical mechanisms for resolving minor elements of contention on Design Artefacts	Programme (Claire Silk)	10/08/2022
	DAG13-06	Confirm next steps relating to the MPAN Enquiry requirements at the next meeting and arrange a workshop to discuss with impacted stakeholders	Programme (Ian Smith)	10/08/2022
	DAG13-07	Share link to CCAG horizon scanning log with Headline Report and add to agenda for next DAG	Programme (PMO)	28/07/2022
	DAG13-08	Programme Risk related to Change Requests once Design is baselined. Add to Programme risk log if not, and import into Design Risk Log	Programme (Ian Smith)	10/08/2022
	DAG13-09	Confirm approach and timescales for performance assurance requirements work and share with the BSC and REC representatives ahead of the next meeting	Chair	10/08/2022
<b>Design Assurance Update</b>	DAG13-10	Add design risk on qualification/assurance	Programme (Ian Smith)	10/08/2022
	DAG13-11	Send out slides with SI Design Assurance Observations	PMO	10/08/2022
	DAG13-12	Find out when iServer release will be, update the SI Design Assurance Observations Overview slide and look into suitable supporting information to go with it.	Programme (Simon Harrison)	10/08/2022
<b>Summary and Next Steps</b>	DAG13-13	PMO to make DAG on October 28 an all-day session (10:00 – 17:00).	PMO	10/08/2022
<b>Previous Meeting(s)</b>	DAG06-01	Review alignment between related MPAN modifications and design subgroup	Programme (Ian Smith)	17/08/2022
	DAG09-05	Programme to liaise with Programme Participants who have queries on the Programme Design Team's responses to comments on the Tranche 1 design artefacts	Programme (Ian Smith)	08/08/2022
	DAG09-12	Provide a clear plan for the resolution of the recorded outstanding issues related to the Tranche 1 design artefact approval	Programme (Design Team)	08/08/2022
	DAG10-08	Update the MHHS Design Baseline Dashboard to show more detail (e.g., next steps and timings)	Programme (Ian Smith)	10/08/2022
	DAG10.1-01	Discuss transition timetable and go/no-go decision with MH	Programme (Ian Smith)	10/08/2022
	DAG10.1-03	Communicate current thinking around transition plan to DAG members	Programme (Ian Smith)	10/08/2022
	DAG11-02	Discuss with TMAG Chair St Clements participation at TMAG	Chair	10/08/2022

	DAG11-06	Clarify with CCAG Chair and SRO how design drives code changes and how existing MHHS related code changes are managed	Chair	10/08/2022
	DAG11-08	Ensure Programme risk relating to 162 covers any governance implications for MHHS and Codes	Programme (PMO)	31/08/2022
	DAG12-03	Arrange a joint working group with SEC parties, DAG, and Programme to discuss SEC MP162, and seek to identify solution which delivers requirements of the MHHS TOM and adhering to the level playing field design principle, taking into account requirements, costs/impacts, and implementation date	Chair	31/08/22
	DAG12-04	Seek guidance from SRO on Programme position on SEC MP 162	Chair	10/08/22
	DAG12-05	Discuss with DCC high level impacts of SEC MP162 options and seek further understanding of potential flexibility in decision date and implementation	Chair	10/08/22
	DAG12-06	Consider impacts / implications of each of the proposed options for SEC MP162 in preparation for meet joint working group (see ACTION DAG12-03)	DAG members	31/08/22

## Decisions

Area	Dec Ref	Decision
Level Playing Field Principle	DAG-DEC-29	<p>DAG agreed that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The charging methodology relating to the Level Playing Field Principle does not work for suppliers.</li> <li>2. A joint working group would not be held until further development, or subsequent to Ofgem's decision on MP162.</li> </ol>

## RAID items discussed/raised

RAID area	Description
Design	The DAG agreed to add a Design risk on qualification/assurance.
Programme	The DAG agreed to add a Programme Risk related to Change Requests once the Design is baselined.
T4	The DAG agreed a risk on the timing was required for industry review of Tranche 4 impacting the quality of review
Mitigations	The DAG agreed on changes to mitigations, such as to update the info regarding the CR-D040 risk to reflect the discussion

## Minutes

### 1. Welcome and Introductions

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

### 2. Minutes and actions

There were no minutes for approval as the previous DAG was a week ago. The Chair said the DAG-12 minutes will be published by close of play today or tomorrow.

As per DAG12-01, in depth updates were given for ongoing actions.

Regarding DAG06-01, IS said the key individual was on leave. While it does not have a key bearing on core design, it will be a consideration for consequential change and a conversation will take place in the next couple of weeks. The Chair asked IS if one likelihood around DAG06-01 was that it would get taken in the code drafting. IS replied yes.

Regarding DAG09-05, IS said a clean-up around documentation is in place. The comments have been picked up and are in the process of being closed out. CS said they are updating the tracker and will send out a full DAG summary report with the artefacts on August 8<sup>th</sup>. The Chair noted to keep this action open but close it when the pack goes out on the 8<sup>th</sup>.

Regarding DAG09-12, The Chair proposed to close this action on the 8<sup>th</sup>. The DAG did not provide any objections.

The Chair proposed to close DAG10-06.

Regarding DAG10-07, The Chair asked when the DAG will have clarity on how the Work Off Oversight Process will work. IS said some of today's meeting will cover this, fundamentally it will be a process governed by DAG at various points from now until baselining. Views will be presented on what will end up on the Work Off list and when they conclude, the resolutions post-M5 will be stated. The Chair asked if the group objected to closing this action. IS replied that this would need to be formally documented before closure. The Chair asked CS if they could add a statement in the pack about the baseline sign-off of M5. CS replied yes. The Chair closed DAG10-07.

Regarding DAG10-08, IS suggested to leave the action open until the DAG went through all the meeting items.

The DAG agreed to leave DAG10.1-03 open, with the Programme to provide an update in the next meeting and IS to pull together high-level assumptions of how they think the transition plan will work.

**ACTION DAG13-01: Programme to provide an update to DAG10.1-03 in the next meeting**

Regarding DAG10.1-01, SJ asked if there was more clarity on the plan for defining the transition design, as it was becoming a big risk. IS said they are looking at November/December. SJ asked if this meant the final position. IS said yes, they expect there will be working groups in November to discuss.

**ACTION DAG13-02: Programme to bring agenda item on transition to next DAG**

Regarding the transition on changing from traditional to new agents, RL noted this would require moving the MOP and the DC at the same time. IS agreed. RL said there would be a significant difference across different agents, and both need to be aligned and ready for transition. IS said their immediate thoughts around the mechanics of how this will be done will include business choreography. The delineation IS saw is they will provide the physical mechanisms by which suppliers can input on the transition progress, but the Migration Working Group and detailed planning will focus on how parties will need to be qualified, with contracts in place with qualified agents, and there will be some differentiation in portfolio.

Regarding DAG11-02, The Chair confirmed this was still ongoing.

SJ said DAG11-06 was around the concerns raised when approving Tranche 3 and that the design should be of sufficient quality and clarity for code-drafting. The action was to raise this with the CCAG Chair. This issue was raised at CCAG yesterday, but the CCAG Chair confirmed the conversation has not happened. SJ noted this was very critical, because the design should be lifted and shifted into the drafting. The DAG agreed to keep this action open.

The Chair noted DAG11-08 needs to be updated following the SEC Change Board meeting.

Regarding DAG12-03, The Chair confirmed this action was still ongoing.

### 3. **Review of RAID**

The DAG was asked to review design specific risks and provide any points or questions ahead of today's meeting.

CH noted one RAID log finishes at RAID167, whereas one starts at RAID184. IS confirmed they will check that there is not a missing list of RAID items.

CH noted specific items were missing from the working RAID log. IS and CH said the following items were:

1. There is a risk being raised for the overall support of the smart processes around retrieving half-hourly consumption. It has been suggested the support around that is not as relevant as the smart functionality. The concern is that elements of Smart Arrangements are not aligned to the objectives of MHHS.

- a. CH noted this risk ultimately comes down to the cost issue. The SEC is fit for purpose for smart metres. The SEC and MHHS need to work together, but they have different objectives, and the work that has been going on is how to provide direction to guide them together.
  - b. IS noted this risk refers to controls and alerts that are absent in this space that are present in others. No explicit requirements have been drafted yet. IS said the next step is to understand what the perceived gap is and validate the detail.
2. An ongoing risk is that overtime, as customer behaviours change, they could be exposed to bias within the load shapes. Overtime, there could be a future requirement for them to further differentiate customers to enable the calculation of more accurate load shapes. This is where the biasing is around, as there are customers that are likely to have EVs and take advantage of tariffs and market-wide half-hourly, which will inform load shapes. However, the customers exposed to the traditional load shapes will be less exposed to tariffs. The current view is that this needs to be tracked by the Programme because as the Programme sees more half-hourly data comes in as the load shaping process starts, more mechanisms are required to track the accuracy of these load shapes.
  3. There is a risk around opt-outs for certain meters, e.g., E7s and E10s. There have been several internal conversations around this topic, and this will be an ongoing Programme risk. The technical resolutions for this issue are likely to be difficult. The short settlement timeline will require parties to read trad meters more frequently, and this will need to be monitored by the Programme on an ongoing basis.
  4. There is a risk about price-cap. It has been raised how price-cap calculation will be considered in the 2b arrangements. CH followed that this was raised in CCIAG to be brought to Ofgem. The Chair asked if it was enough for Ofgem to confirm they conduct the price-cap calculation, and Ofgem will request the data they need from the settlement process to carry out this calculation. SQ volunteered to take this away and feedback.

**ACTION DAG13-03: Ofgem to feedback to DAG whether the Programme should put the price-cap calculation on the Programme's risk register**

MW shared the Design Artefact Tracker live in the meeting. The Chair said this would be an ongoing item, and in the next review, the DAG could consider what would be a green status for each of the risks.

IS confirmed a '5' signifies high severity in this current discussion.

Risk	Discussion	Concluding comments	Action (if relevant)
<b>R184</b>	<p>IS sought to lessen the probability of this risk, since many of these working groups have taken place.</p> <p>SJ asked if there were any open actions on the dissensus log. IS said they will review, and they did not believe any actions were left in the log. IS believed the dissensus position has evolved from what is currently in the log.</p>	<p>IS said the question, mitigation, and impact for R184 was suitable. As the working groups come to conclusion, the probability will diminish and R184 will be replaced by a different risk in the final review.</p>	<p><b>ACTION DAG13-04: Review and update the dissensus log on the Design Artefact Tracker</b></p>
<b>R185</b>	<p>IS said there are certain key resources within the team that fell on the critical path of design activity, and there was a significant risk getting around to the work they had. As the work concludes, this risk will diminish.</p>	<p>R185 will diminish as the cadence of work transitions over from delivering the artefacts to processing the comments when they come back in September.</p>	
<b>R186</b>	<p>IS said they have tried to mitigate R186 by moving the Phase 2 plan to September and releasing the artefacts as soon as possible. The review period has also been increased to three weeks.</p> <p>The Chair asked CS if it was true that Level-4 sub working groups had not been</p>	<p>SC asked the DAG if R186 would be better expressed as a risk of the quality of review given the number of documents, rather than length and time. IS agreed.</p> <p>Following SC's comment, CB asked whether a steer on priority</p>	

---

scheduled for this period. CS said yes, and there is the option to stand down these groups during that period to free participants up to do their review, e.g., TMAG.

SJ asked if R186 should be reworded to cover the risk that there may not be sufficient time in Phase 2. IS agreed, as this risk no longer serves any purpose; when building out the timeline, they have listened to people's concerns and integrate them into the timeline. The Chair proposed to close this issue and replace it with SJ's suggestion about the risk of parties having enough time to comment.

CH noted that as a DAG, it is important to go through issues and stand them down. CH said the continuation of open transparency is needed to resolve these issues, and this transparency can be achieved by addressing issues and queries head on, then landing and documenting a position.

of review would be offered to anybody if necessary to help mitigate that risk. CS replied that on Monday 1 August, signposting materials for constituencies will be published regarding which artefacts to prioritise. CS also noted they are directing people to conditionally approved artefacts that have changed because of closing issues and dependencies. CB observed this is a strong mitigation against the risk.

---

These risks are bound together, as they centre around the theme of the volume of activity to be done in the comment process. IS noted their main concern is around resolving issues with conflicting comments.

The Chair asked if doing the dissensus items at the BPRWG to date has worked well. IS replied yes, and internal conversations have suggested that they will require a similar mechanism as part of comment resolution. They are trying to work out how best to enact that.

R187

R188

R189

The Chair asked CS if BPRWGs have been booked for September and October. CS said they are currently planning around logistics and participants' availability. CS confirmed they plan to produce guidance around how this process works, and people's roles and responsibilities. This will come out in the next few weeks.

The Chair asked CS if there will be weekly BPRWGs in the future. CS replied yes, with the possibility of daily sessions being needed. IS said closure via discussion will be necessary, so it is better to over-forecast the time required for these sessions.

CBe and CH asked if there was a discussion forum that could be used to review the different comments, or a written method to resolve two conflicting responses that may not be fundamental to design. CS and IS said they will consider this, and whether they can leverage Teams for any of these thoughts.

<b>ACTION DAG13-05: Look at practical mechanisms for resolving minor elements of contention on Design Artefacts.</b>
--

---

Regarding the dissensus element, JB asked if it would be helpful within the BPRWG meetings to allocate slots of time for interested parties to dial in and out of, or club common issues together. IS replied yes.

CS noted they were still working through the mechanics of the drop-in process. The sessions will touch on common themes and clarifications, and they are looking to possibly pull through deep-dive sessions. There may be a clarification log for people to reference their feedback and comments during the review process. CS said within the next couple of weeks, this full process will be bottomed out.

---

**R190**

R190 is about maintaining end-to-end design integrity. It is an ongoing risk in terms of noting there are parallel workstreams and more changes to artefacts. IS said a lot of time is being put into this risk and minimising the risk of inconsistency, such as enhanced artefact change controls.

IS noted the key element for them is having frequent spot-checks in terms of where changes are made to the design that take the form of cross-team sessions to ensure everything is covered off. The key mitigation for this is to have more robust document controls and internal review processes.

---

**R191**

IS noted R191 has been wholly superseded. There will be Programme level risks for this to be joined in to.

IS suggested there is no need to spend time discussing this risk.

---

---

This risk is driven by the requirement, agreed by the DAG, stating that an enquiry service is necessary to allow services to query the state of a particular MPAN and for that data to be relatively fresh.

IS said the final resolution of this will be a candidate for a work off list pre-M5, and ideally not post-M5. There has been conversation regarding the application of architectural principles. The likely outcome is this will get resolved to ECOES in terms of the enquiry landscape. There will then be decisions to make on how much of this is prescribed in the industry design.

SJ said it would be useful to get commitment that there will be a subgroup to work through the solutions as it has been mentioned, but the information that came out was not clear on next steps. It would be worth updating the risk to include this mitigation. IS said there is some information to be collected, which will be the purpose of the working group. It is a two-stage process. IS agreed to update the risk to reflect this.

R192

SJ said since the information is old, this risk requires an update. It would be helpful to get the latest understanding of the position, as SJ expected a working group to pick this up. The only way to mitigate this risk is to hold open conversation. SJ has concerns around the design of how getting this data into the ECOES will be managed. IS said this is the analysis they are working through—fundamentally, the two options are to enhance the existing interface or collect this information directly via DIP interfaces. SJ expressed concern that they are duplicating IS' work. IS said it is better for them both to check this information to ensure they do not reach different conclusions.

SC said this has not been discussed since Tranche 1 and they are concerned that the requirements have not been discussed by the DAG yet. DAG are looking at different solutions but are yet to define what they are going to do. IS said the overarching requirements that drove the uncertainty is that this data needs to be fresh, and the concern was raised about using anything other than a

The Chair asked if the way forward would be to create an appropriate working group. The decision to be made was whether this was needed for the M5 baseline. IS replied that this risk is likely to be in the work-off list and not agreed at M5. SJ noted this is a real risk to them, as there are service providers to make changes to. The Chair suggested to take an action to work out the requirements and plan, then come back to the DAG as to when this can be fitted in.

<b>ACTION DAG13-06: Confirm next steps relating to the MPAN Enquiry requirements at the next meeting and arrange a workshop to discuss with impacted stakeholders</b>
---

---

direct enquiry would result in data that was not an update.

---

**R193** IS said this is discussed at length in preceding sections. The 10<sup>th</sup> of August DAG will provide further clarity.

---

The Chair noted this was in the dissensus issue. IS said they have reached a Programme position and the next steps are to feed this back formally into the change process.

The mitigations will need to be updated dependent on the BPRWG agreement on REC40 change. SJ agreed that the risk stays as is and it will be progressed ASAP.

The Chair checked that at the BPRWG, it was agreed to keep off pending requirements. SJ said the pending would stay, but there is still a REC CP to go through. IS added that if the pending is retained, there is no longer a risk from a Programme perspective.

**R194** JB asked the DAG if they should log a risk that there may be changes to CSS as it goes live, noting that the MHHS is basing a lot of its processes on the current design of CSS.

Following JB's query, the Chair then asked IS if there was a Programme risk to changes happening to the Industry Code that affects the MHHS Design. In one way, they are captured by the CCAG and there is an action to tighten up CCAG to the governance. IS replied that post-M5 there is a process in place to detect these changes, as the CCAG is horizon scanning any changes to the industry and will service the interface for impact assessment. However, pre-baseline - it becomes more volatile. IS agreed with JB that there is a risk that over the years, change will come from Industry that will impact Design. This is a Programme risk, and mitigation comes from CCAG.

JB noted that it would be helpful to have visibility of the horizon scanning at DAG, or even at BPRWG, levels.

The Chair agreed the horizon scanning link will help bolster Design input back into the CCAG and mitigate further changes.

**ACTION DAG13-07:**  
**Share link to CCAG horizon scanning log with Headline Report and add to agenda for next DAG.**

---

**R195** The Chair confirmed the BAs across the team have been working together to ensure consistent interface. IS said the mitigation is to have regular internal sessions to review the thread of activity and ensure they will not diverge in approach.

---

**R196** The analysis has been carried out. No impacts have been determined on design elements so far. This risk will be closed out soon.

---

<b>R197</b>	IS said this has evolved and there is no need for additional data to be moved around the system for this.	The probability is diminishing.
<b>R198</b>	The same mitigation has been put in place for R195.	
<b>R199</b>	<p>IS said this has gone through the Technical Design Working Group now.</p> <p>SJ asked where the Market Participant ID will be shared. IS said it will be updated in the end-to-end architecture, and mapping tables will be added into ISD.</p> <p>SC asked if there will be a working group to present thoughts on market participants and how it will work. The Chair said they will check, as they believed it had been covered last Thursday by the TDWG.</p>	

**ACTION DAG13-08: Programme Risk related to Change Requests once Design is baselined. Add to Programme risk log if not, and import into Design Risk Log**

SC noted there was no risk included in the log that the design would be incomplete or lacking in sufficient detail. SC noted the playbacks would be part of the mitigation. IS agreed, and that this will be validated by what they hope to be a wider review in Phase 2.

SC noted there should be a risk on transition and qualification/assurance.

MH noted nobody has yet been defined for performance assurance definition and qualification. The Chair said the performance assurance requirements work has been put in the re-plan, and there have been discussions between the Programme and the performance assurance function within Elexon and RECCo. There is a plan to agree the approach, which mirrors the co-drafting type of work, and an activity has been put in with clear obligations on the Programme and the two co-bodies. The Chair said they were unsure when the drafts go out, but there is a proposed time scale. SJ said it had not been discussed with them at all, but they would like this discussion to start in September. The Chair said the date is September or October, but they will confirm.

**ACTION DAG13-09: Confirm approach and timescales for performance assurance requirements work and share with the BSC and REC representatives ahead of the next meeting**

**ACTION DAG13-10: Add design risk on qualification/assurance.**

**4. Level Playing Field Design Principle**

The Chair noted DAG11-04 was discussed in the previous meeting and closed the action.

Regarding DAG11-05, The Chair noted this was still ongoing.

Regarding DAG12-02, SS said they had struggled to find formal documents where the 6am read response time working practice is contained, however, in the DCC User Interface Design Specification Guidance Document (DCC Guidance), this window is stated with advice on how to set up the schedule. SS suggested there is a misalignment between what the SEC documentation sets out and the operational delivery. Although not formally documented, changing this working practice would give rise to challenge.

The Chair asked the DAG how someone would change the current working practice. SS wanted clarification between whether this was through increasing or changing it. The Chair said either. SS said this would prove challenging, as it is not governed by the SEC. The first order would be to discuss with the DCC; then consult with user groups; and finally, canvas opinion through working groups.

The Chair asked if the DAG agreed whether they needed to raise this with SECAS. RL asked how much this was done in the impact assessment. The Chair said because of the MP162 solution, there needs to be clarity around the governance of this working practice. CH agreed with that view. The group needs to establish what they can and cannot do. The Chair said it could be an issue where users want access to data, and they are being disadvantaged.

SC said as DAG, there is no need to raise it. They could raise an observation for SECAS to formalise it into governance over time. The Chair questioned how one can build half-hourly settlement without establishment. SC replied they were separate things. The Chair hypothesised a situation without a differential read window: if someone were to come in, change the window and it affect half-hourly settlement, this would no longer be DAG's issue. SC replied it was dubious.

CBu said the DCC Guidance Document was simply for DCC users to get additional context and the guidance document does not have to exist at all. It was there to assist organisations facing issues. SS agreed - there was no intent to make the document part of the SEC. The request would be how to govern this part of the solution that is not aligned to the rest of the SEC. CBU said to leave the DCC Guidance Document in the forums but pick out the DAG section that required governance in a different manner.

The Chair asked what was stopping the DCC not following this window if there is no governance for them as an industry. SS said it is because of the history coming with it, there is nothing is stopping them directly changing it. However, history notes that if they were to change, users would challenge this. CBU could not recall a dispute with the guidance document. SS said they had a responsibility to discuss with users and have always managed to find a way forward. CBU said they have seen differences in traffic profile from the beginning of the DCC going live until now. There is still an overarching 24-hour target response time.

The Chair asked the DAG if they agreed to not flag this up as an issue. SS suggested it would be fair to say it is causing additional challenges, and there is a recommendation for SECAS to clarify as it would help with any issues moving forward. SS recommended for DAG to suggest to DCC that they change this guidance, as this does not fall in line with requirements of what has been set to date.

Regarding DAG12-03, The Chair had not arranged a joint working group yet, as this was subject to later actions.

Regarding DAG12-04, The Chair clarified the position that the Programme needs SEC MP162 to provide the capacity to deliver MHHS through the collection of half-hourly meter data from smart meters as serviced by the DCC. The Programme needed it to deliver an element of the TOM for the MDR role. The Chair also stated the requirement agreed by the DAG is the need for a 24-hour target response time. The Chair also clarified there is a level-playing field issue with the read window that is part of the SEC MP162 solution, and DAG need to assess the materiality of that.

Regarding DAG12-05, The Chair said he has a meeting at 2pm that afternoon with the DCC.

Regarding DAG12-06, The Chair said this was completed, as this was reflected with the members of the SEC Change Board.

SC said they thought DAG12-04 was a general interaction, rather than focused on MP162. The Chair said Ofgem will consider on their decision on SEC MP162 what has been recommended by the SEC Change Board, as well as the requirements of the Programme. SQ agreed.

The Chair clarified the SRO is writing a letter to Ofgem about what is needed by the Programme through the delivery of SEC MP162. The Chair suggested if Programme Participants want to change the TOM, then a change request will need to be raised and approved by Ofgem. The Chair mentioned they were unsure if any changes are going through the change process currently.

SJ said MOD44 had been raised under the RECCo, and they had a conversation with the Programme a while back on their discomfort progressing it as a REC change. The agreement received at the time was that they would carry out the impact assessment, so they would get the understanding of the implementation approach and costs from the service providers. They don't see the argument for having it as a standalone separate change and would prefer to bring it into the scope of the delivery, so the testing and implementation aligns. The SEC Mod is currently under the SEC, but the actual feed of the data that has been pushed into the REC change is not being progressed under the BSC change, leading to a mismatch in how they approach things under different codes. SJ therefore did not want to make any assumptions today on that REC Mod going forward.

CBu mentioned someone can raise a CR to get it assessed, but they were unsure who would do that. CBU wondered if Ofgem would reassess the TOM. The Chair replied the £9mil is not just for the MDR role, but the whole Mod capacity.

The Chair summarised what happened at the SEC Change Board meeting:

1. In response to the request, 14 participants rejected the Mod.
2. The reasons for this rejection were the cost, the cost allocation mechanism, additional capacity was not needed, the level playing field design principle issue, charging methodology.
  - a. CBU said as a Small Supplier Representative, the Mod cannot be proceeded in its current state because of the cost and design disputes.
3. The majority agreed to go for a vote to either approve or reject.
4. All the constituents rejected the Mod, barring the distribution businesses who abstained.
  - a. CBU noted throughout the consultation not one Large Supplier expressed an intent to use the MDR role. Many suppliers were public and vocal on not using it since everyone can currently collect this data on their own. The cost and charging methodology apply proportionately per market share, it was rejected on this basis from Large Suppliers. Small Suppliers tried to raise awareness of it, including CBU, but no intent was raised for it.

The Chair asked the DAG for their view on if they agree, or object, that the actual charging methodology is not an issue for MHHS. RL said not just for SEC MP162 or MHHS, but in general - this charging mechanism does not work for suppliers. The Chair said it is a wider issue that the charging methodology is not an issue for MHHS. This will be difficult for Ofgem to consider rejection or approval of SEC MP162 where there is a wider charging methodology issue.

SS noted Ofgem are aware of the charging model that exists within the SEC, and this is not new news. CBU said this has been discussed at SEC panels and was not a new topic. CH said SEC code was written to meet the requirements of smart metering, and now there are additional requirements. The wider question is if the SECAS code meets the needs of MHHS.

The Chair said following DAG12, there were options around modifying the read window (1, 2a, 2b, 2c). The Chair considered the possibility to have a meeting with DCC and discuss the delta and various impacts of the options. Based on that outcome, there could then be a wider SEC MP162 working group to find new solutions that meet the requirements of the TOM and the level-playing field design principle, which therefore can be implemented in time for go-live or testing within the Programme time scales. The Chair was unsure whether this was a valid way forward. However, even if it worked, The Chair said there is still a charging methodology issue that prevents this from going anywhere. SS noted it was dependent upon what Ofgem decided to do with it. CBU said Ofgem need to deliberate it. The Chair said the potential benefit of working out a joint group is they can tell Ofgem there has been a solution for the way forward. SQ said CBU was correct, and they can push the Mod forward to accept or reject.

CBU observed for suppliers that don't use a MDR, there will still be a time delay for when they've collected the data using their target response times. CBU wondered if the difference in the level playing field is really that realistic to keep the Mod having challenges raised against it. JB replied the level playing field is around the two different times parties could send an SRV, and the fact that they are proposing a peak and an off-peak around the fact that they were going to introduce the concept of a north-bound prioritisation. It does not become a level playing field with those peak and off-peak playing fields, or a prioritisation over one section. Those are the technical elements that would need to be resolved.

SS said the only reason DCC went down this route was to reduce the cost, which is a key design principle. Since it is unaligned to the TOM, it becomes a different solution due to being a different requirement, so going down that route is complex.

The Chair noted, as of today, the Programme have reiterated their position and will write a letter to Ofgem about MHHS regarding extra capacity and the MDR role. The SEC Change Board have recommended rejection, with one of the reasons for that being a separate wider issue around the charging methodology. The Programme are yet to have a discussion with the DCC about the implications for cost or time scales around the various options discussed at DAG.

The Chair asked the DAG if they agree whether the actions around talking to DCC about impact and holding a wider SEC MP162 work group meeting were still worthwhile. Ultimately, they cannot deliver MHHS without the capacity element of SEC MP162 or to deliver the element of the TOM on MDR. SC replied that it was not worthwhile as it adds confusion unless there is a request from Ofgem to continue.

CBU added Ofgem mentioned a Smart Meter Act to give powers to the market-wide Programme to deliver outside the SEC. The Chair clarified that there is the significant code review (SCR) on settlement reform, which gives powers to Ofgem to direct changes on codes. They still have those powers and have the ability on the Smart Meter Act powers to direct changes again. Once this has been enacted, this gives Ofgem a 5-year window to direct other changes in codes

and licenses. One assumption is that these powers will be used to direct the code changes after the design baseline. SQ said this was correct.

CH agreed with SC, as they do not see the value of a joint meeting. CH expressed uncertainty on how to achieve a decision.

IS said another element worth exploring is that the MDR role is not necessary. In terms of the technical role not being necessary as part of SEC MP162, it is arguable that additional capacity will be required. From a cost proportion point of view, it would be useful to understand what proportion of the cost of SEC MP162 increases capacity across the network.

RL said it is worth considering the design aspect for the MDR role not existing. IS replied that it would require a fundamental change to the TOM and does not believe the DAG is sincerely suggesting the role is going to go away from a Programme perspective. CBU said if the design could be concluded and agreed, then it is up to Ofgem to decide whether the Mod is accepted regardless of supplier views on cost. Cost allocation is still the major ongoing issue. One option is that it does proceed as it is now, and the Programme needs to work with it. The Chair added if anybody were to change the TOM, they would have to raise a change request, and this change would have to be approved by Ofgem.

CH said a draft report for comment has been sent to Ofgem and the SRO, which summarises a lot of what has been discussed in this DAG. The report put forward that SEC MP162 is there to fulfil a capacity concern with the expected demand on the smart meter system because of introducing MHHS, and there is a consequence to MHHS if MP162 does not go ahead.

CH said the feedback they received was that it was not a fundamental level playing field issue in terms of basic settlement process, but it was an issue around settlement.

The Chair drew this item to the close. They noted that:

1. SEC Change Board rejected MP162.
2. The draft findings of the IPA are done.
3. The Chair will have a meeting with DCC shortly about options and various impacts.
4. As a DAG, they agree not to have this joint working group until further development or subsequent to Ofgem's decision on SEC MP162.

SC asked when Ofgem expect to make their decision on SEC MP162. The Chair replied August, as this allowed them to meet the current implementation decision date specified in MP162. SQ confirmed the date.

## 5. MHHS Design Status Update

Regarding development of the artefacts, CS said they held additional working groups over the last couple of weeks and are processing all the information that has come back out, as well as finalising Tranche 4 artefacts. They have taken the decision - because of the interdependencies around some remaining artefacts - to hold back publication. They will use one week in the contingency of the plan. Rather than publish the artefacts on 29<sup>th</sup> of July, they will now publish the full set of artefacts on the 8<sup>th</sup> of August, allowing them to go through all interdependencies. The team is currently working through the change control and red lining any of the changes off the back of resolving the open issues and dependencies.

CS noted they have a final internal end to end review scheduled for next Thursday and Friday to ensure all documentation is aligned. The full set of documents will be uploaded to the collaboration base and MHHS website on the Design page over the weekend, so they will be available Monday morning.

CS said they were updating the view of the design artefacts in the tracker. The final list of artefacts will be published as part of the signposting material that goes out on Monday. CS noted they are aligning the tracker and have taken the decision to consolidate some of the artefacts.

Regarding open issues, CS said it was still work in progress. The intention is that on Monday 8<sup>th</sup> August, they will release a DAG summary report that will give an indication of all dependencies. CS noted there are 44 open design issues, and five in proposed close status as there is no change being identified to any of the conditionally approved artefacts. All updates should be available by the end of next week.

CS said they are working through the list of dependencies to close them out. They are also going through the consolidated comment log to ensure all open comments from previous Tranches have been closed.

SC noted some of the artefacts released in Tranche 4 would not have been through a BPRWG period. CS agreed, as due to time scales they will be released at the end-to-end review.

## 6. Target Stakeholder Outcomes and Baseline Success Criteria

Regarding WF's proposed way forward, CS summarised that the proposal following feedback is to use the target outcomes as part of the M5 baseline criteria, noting that they will no longer use the success criteria as this will be picked up by the IPA.

SC commented the issue of co-drafting needs to be resolved. CS said they will consider this.

## 7. M5 Schedule: Phase 2 Updates

Regarding the Plan on a Page, CS touched briefly on the other streams of activity that are running around the planning around Phase 2 and upcoming activities. There is a participant experience management workstream. CS is working with the PPC team and comms team to ensure that they have the right levels of communication for all participants. Participants user' journeys have now been designed, and they are working on comms surrounding this.

CS said the other activity to note is the signposting. They are intending to publish material on Monday, August 1, which takes all the design artefact and breaks it down at process level, so it shows the process and related interfaces and supporting artefacts for that process. They will then signpost the recommendation for prioritisation. The intention is to publish it on the collaboration base, and they will be front and centre on the design page, so the DAG can review them before delving into artefacts. This will be used for the initial playback session.

PE introduced the DAG to the PPC team. PE noted the PPC's specific responsibilities are around engaging with participants on a 1-2-1 basis. In terms of outcomes, PE said awareness is the most important, so participants know exactly what they need to do and when they need to do it by, e.g., webinars on collaboration base, Design Playbacks, etc. It is the PPC's responsibility to know when these events are and cherry-pick the most relevant.

PE said they attempt to keep a two-way dialogue, and place emphasis on transparency and openness and keep it open and transparent. PPPC is openly supportive of MHHS and take this into all their bilaterals.

PE encouraged the DAG to get in touch with anybody seen on the Team Introduction slide that they deem relevant. Alternatively, general mail can be sent to the PPC mailbox.

## 8. Design Decisions

CS confirmed there were no design decisions.

## 9. Design Assurance Updates

PP took over from SH for this DAG and shared a slide on SI Design Assurance Observations Overview. This slide was a high-level overview of assurance processes. Looking at all aspects of the design, the slide summarised an overview of the areas they have been looking at. Some of this is done in close contact with the IPO. PP noted the slide provided a good picture of showing how everything is moving to the Left, and moving Downwards, into the low-resolution piece. They had themed the areas: design coverage, design quality, programme logistics, stakeholders. They are all moving in the right direction. They are building up assurance and observation to feed into the M5 deliverable. All this is feeding into that process.

PP said the assurance section has been descoped, and is unsure when it is coming back in. They could take an action to find out when that is going to be. CH asked, if this will be put back several weeks, whether something could be shared through a different method of means.

The Chair asked for an updated version of the slide for the DAG on the 10<sup>th</sup> of August. The Chair also wanted PP and SH to look at suitable supporting information to go with it.

**ACTION DAG13-11: PMO to send out slides with SI Design Assurance Observations**

**ACTION DAG13-12: The Programme to find out when iServer release will be, update the SI Design Assurance Observations Overview slide and look into suitable supporting information to go with it.**

## 10. Summary and next steps

MW summarised meeting actions.

The Chair thanked members for the contributions and brought the meeting to a close.

The Chair proposed DAGs should be 3 hours moving forward, and any extra time will be given back to the group.

**ACTION DAG13-13: PMO to make DAG on October 28 an all-day session (10:00 – 17:00).**

**Next meetings:**

**10 August**

**14 September**