

## MHHS Design Advisory Group (DAG) Headline Report

Original issue date: 29/07/22

Reissue date: 04/08/2022

Meeting Number **DAG013**

Venue **Virtual – MS Teams**

Meeting Date and Time **28 July 2022 09:30-14:00**

Classification **Public**

### 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	Chair	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)	29/07/2022
	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
	DAG13-10	Add design risk on qualification/assurance	Programme (Ian Smith)	10/08/2022

<b>Design Assurance Updates</b>	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 meetings</b>	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
	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
	DAG12-05	Discuss with DCC high level impacts SEC MP162 solution options and seek further understanding of flexibility in decision date and implementation	Chair	10/08/2022

## Decisions

Area		
<b>Level Playing Field Principle</b>	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

RAID area	Description
<b>Design</b>	The DAG agreed to add a Design risk on qualification/assurance
<b>Programme</b>	The DAG agreed to add a Programme Risk related to Change Requests once the Design is baselined
<b>T4</b>	The DAG agreed a risk on the timing was required for industry review of Tranche 4 impacting the quality of review

<b>Mitigations</b>	The DAG agreed on changes to mitigations, such as to update the info regarding the CR-D040 risk to reflect the discussion
--------------------	---

### Key Discussion Items

<b>Area</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
<b>Minutes and Actions</b>	<p>The DAG reviewed the open and outstanding actions from previous meetings, full details of which will be provided in the DAG Minutes and Actions.</p> <p>The Chair confirmed that the minutes from the previous DAG would be sent out by close of play.</p>
<b>Review of RAID</b>	<p>The DAG were asked to review the design risks in the design artefact tracker and provide any points or questions ahead of the meeting. The group reviewed specific risks to ensure the descriptions and classifications were correct and discussed any changes to mitigations or further mitigations. The Chair agreed to make this item ongoing, with the aim for the DAG to discuss what would be a green status for the group for each of the risks.</p> <p>The DAG discussed the price-cap calculation consideration in the 2b arrangement, and whether to raise this risk to Ofgem (see <b>ACTION DAG13-03</b>)</p> <p>The RECCo Representative noted the dissensus log was working well and queried if there were any outstanding actions in the dissensus log and whether the information in the log was still current. The DAG agreed that any updates on the dissensus log for R184 would be discussed in the next meeting (see <b>DAG13-04</b>).</p> <p>The DAG considered the use of a discussion forum to review different comments and proposed to investigate practical mechanisms to resolve elements of contention around design artefacts (see <b>ACTION DAG13-05</b>). One member noted that the DAG was looking for different solutions without yet defining what they are going to do. The Programme agreed to confirm next steps relating to the MPAN Enquiry requirement and arrange a workshop to discuss with impacted stakeholders (see <b>ACTION DAG13-06</b>). The DAG agreed to review the CCAG Horizon Scanning Log in the next meeting, as the Log would bolster design input and mitigate further challenges (see <b>ACTION DAG13-07</b>).</p> <p>In relation to the risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The DAG discussed how several risks would decrease in probability, such as R185 AND R197</li> <li>• Regarding R192, the RECCo Representative raised the only way to mitigate the risk would be to hold open conversation</li> <li>• Regarding R193, the Elexon representative noted nobody had been chosen for performance assurance and qualification. The Chair noted that performance assurance would be covered in the re-plan activity. The DAG agreed to confirm approach and timescales for performance assurance requirements work (see <b>ACTION DAG13-09</b>) and the Programme would add a Design Risk on qualification and assurance (see <b>ACTION DAG13-10</b>)</li> <li>• The Programme agreed to add a Programme Risk related to Change Requests once the Design is baselined (see <b>ACTION DAG13-08</b>).</li> </ul>
<b>Level Playing Field Design Principle</b>	<p>The DAG closed the action to find documents where the 6am read response time working practice is contained by sharing that the window, as well as advice on how to set up schedules, is stated in the DCC Guidance on the SECAS website. The DCC Representative noted a misalignment between what SEC documentation sets out and the operational delivery.</p> <p>The DAG reviewed actions from the previous meeting, and the Chair clarified that the Programme needed SEC MP162 to provide the capacity to deliver what is needed for half-hourly meter data from smart meters as serviced by the DCC. The Chair noted Ofgem would consider what has been recommended by the SEC Change Board, as well as the requirements of the Programme. The Chair clarified the SRO was writing a letter to Ofgem about what is needed in the programme and if Programme Participants need to change the Target Operating Model (TOM), a Change Request would need to be raised.</p> <p>The DAG considered the issue of charging methodology and the cost of recovery. The group agreed, regardless of MHHS or SEC MP162, the charging mechanism does not work for suppliers. The DCC Representative highlighted that Ofgem was aware of the charging model. The Large</p>

	<p>Supplier Representative noted the SEC was written at a time where MHHS was not designed to meet this – it was designed to meet the requirements of smart metering, and now there are additional requirements. The wider question was if the SECAS code meets the needs of MHHS. The DAG agreed the ongoing issue was the cost allocation.</p> <p>As the Chair drew the item to a close, he summarised the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Programme need the capacity and MDR role to deliver the TOM</li> <li>2. SEC Change Board rejected MP162</li> <li>3. The draft findings of the IPA relating to the Level Playing Field Principle are complete.</li> <li>4. The Chair would have a meeting with DCC shortly about options and various impacts.</li> <li>5. The DAG agreed not to hold a joint working group until further development, or subsequent to Ofgem’s decision on MP162.</li> </ol> <p>The DAG concluded Ofgem were expected to make a decision by the end of August, as this was the current implementation decision date specified in SEC MP162.</p>
<b>MHHS Design Status Update</b>	The Design Market and Engagement Lead noted, due to the interdependencies around remaining artefacts, the full set of design artefacts would be published on the 08 August, rather than 29 July. There was a final internal end-to-end review scheduled for Thursday 04 August and Friday 05 August, to ensure all documentation is aligned. The final list of the design artefacts would be published on Monday 08 August. A DAG summary report would be provided giving an indication of all dependencies.
<b>Target Stakeholder Outcomes and Baseline Success Criteria</b>	Following feedback, the DAG confirmed the proposal would use the target outcome as part of the M5 baseline criteria.
<b>M5 Schedule: Phase 2 Updates</b>	<p>The DAG discussed other streams of activity running around the planning around Phase 2 and upcoming activities, including participant experience management workstream and signposting. The signposting material would be published Monday 01 August.</p> <p>The PPC (Programme Party Coordinator) team provided an introduction of their role and team. The PPC’s specific responsibilities include engaging participants on an individual basis. Awareness was noted as the most important outcome for the PPC team; they ensure participants know what they need to do and when they need to do it. The PPC is openly supportive of MHHS and ensure that a two-way dialogue is consistently open. The PPC encouraged DAG members to get in touch with a relevant member of the PPC team, or the general mail, if they had any queries.</p>
<b>Design Assurance Updates</b>	The DAG reviewed a Systems Integrator (SI) Design Assurance Observations Overview slide, which provided a high-level overview of assurance processes. The assurance section was descoped. By the next DAG, the SI Design Assurance Observations Overview slide would be updated, along with suitable supporting information to go with it (see <b>ACTION DAG13-12</b> ).
<b>Summary and Next Steps</b>	<p>The Chair noted DAGs would be three hours moving forward, regardless of whether the group uses up the time.</p> <p>The Chair asked the PMO to make DAG 28 October an all-day meeting (see <b>ACTION DAG13-13</b>).</p>

**Date of next meeting: 10 August 2022 at 09:30am**