

**Change Request Form**

## Change Request details

| Change Request details | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Change Request Title | *Extend the provision of the SIT A environment for Production, covering the ELS phase of the MHHS Programme.* | | |
| Change Request Number |  | | |
| Originating Advisory / Working Group | *GLIG/SITWG/TORWG* | | |
| Risk/issue reference |  | | |
| Change Raiser | [*E.ON*](http://e.on) *Next* | Date raised: | *1 July’25* |

***For further guidance on how to complete this document please see the supporting Change Request Form Guidance for Programme Participants. The guidance will support raising a change and responding to a change request via Impact Assessment. The Change Raiser should consider sharing the draft Change Request Form with impacted programme parties, prior to submission to PMO. The guidance, as well as other key documents are referenced below and can be found via the MHHS website.***

| Change Request to be read in conjunction with: |
| --- |
| MHHS Change Request Form Guidance for Programme Participants |
| MHHS Change Control Approach |
| MHHS Governance Framework |
| Ofgem’s MHHS Transition Timetable |

### Part A – Description of proposed change

**Guidance *– This section should be completed by the Change Raiser when raising the Change Request.***

| Part A – Description of proposed change | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Issue statement:**  *(the issue that needs to be resolved by the change)*  The SIT A environment has been built, maintained and successfully used for execution for a large proportion of SIT E2E functional testing activities since January 2024, across all market roles and central parties. It’s is scheduled to be stood down and decommissioned in line with the current progress plan - 24 October 2025, just 2 days after M11/12 (Start of Migration for Smart, Non-Smart, Advanced, UMS MPANs). This is when the true test of Industry-wide systems will come into force to confirm that all is working correctly and ‘as designed’, following months of SIT execution and will be closely monitored and scrutinised in live production by multiple interested parties.  With the Early Life Support model now published for Migration, from M11/12, and with SIT phases concluding in Q3 with added risk and complexity for SIT participants, this CR has been raised to request an extension to the SIT A environment being made available throughout the ELS period. This will provide mitigation and reinforcement for any:   * Production/Live Major Incident(s) * Change Request(s)   that would require multiple-market roles to collaborate in fixing, testing and deploying, in order to resolve and restore service/functionality in a timely manner against SLA’s as per Organisation’s Service Management arrangements and reduce impact / detriment to customers.  This outcome would allow the MHHS Programme, Elexon (as the enduring owner) and all SIT participants to reduce the risk profile for M11/12 entry, and also satisfy their own individual organisation’s risk assessments. As per the latest Industry programme plan (DEL1139), there is no available E2E environment to execute Industry testing after 24 October, that would provide greater industry confidence in live issue resolution and not impact customers and organisations further by silo fixes and deployments that have not been proven to work E2E when deployed to production.  As the raising party, we are concerned that a lack of an E2E testing capability for Industry during this phase, may lead to the following:   * Increase chances of problems during migration * Affect on organisation’s meeting performance targets / incentives as outlined in MHHS and/or Code Body artefacts * Performance assurance measures as part of initial operational delivery post go-live when organisations will be dual-running both the legacy and new arrangements. | | |
| **Description of change:**  *(the change being proposed)*  Extend and maintain the SIT A environment across Central Parties and M10 & M11/12-ready participants for the duration of the Early Life Support model from M11/12. This would need to include SIT A DIP certificate renewal activity c. November 2025 (1 year renewal date). | | |
| **Desired implementation date and rationale:**  *(proposed implementation date of the change and why this date is required)*  The dates should be extended from the current date of 24 October 2025 and run for the length of time dictated by artefact MHHS-DEL3094 - MHHS Early Life Support Model. This currently has a ‘forecast end date’ of 22 January 2026. | | |
| **Justification for change:**  *(please attach any evidence to support your justification including why it should be exempt from the change freeze)*  Justification for this change is widely available in the public domain. In a complex programme of energy transformation and change, spanning multiple organisations, an integrated, end-to-end test environment is not just beneficial, but **critically necessary** for fixing and deploying code changes to production when either priority live operational issues arise or an emergency change request is required and necessitates many organisations working together to ensure ‘it’ll work’. Here's the comprehensive justification and rationale:  **1. Replicating Production Complexity and Interdependencies:**   * **Diverse Systems and Applications:** Large transformation programmes inherently involve a multitude of systems (legacy, new, third-party) and applications, each with its own data models, business logic, and APIs. * **Inter-Organisational Data Flow:** Data often traverses across different organisations, undergoing transformations and validations at various points. An issue in one part of this flow can have cascading effects. * **Complex Integrations:** The sheer number and complexity of integrations between these systems and organisations make it incredibly difficult to isolate issues without a representative environment. * **Justification:** A truly integrated, end-to-end test environment is the only way to accurately replicate the intricate web of systems, data flows, and integrations present in live operations. This allows teams to understand the full impact of a bug and ensure that a fix doesn't introduce new issues elsewhere.   ***2.* Accurate Problem Diagnosis and Root Cause Analysis:**   * **Isolating the Source:** When an issue occurs in live, pinpointing the exact source (which system, which integration, which data transformation) can be challenging in a complex environment. * **Reproducing the Issue:** To fix a bug, it must first be consistently reproducible. An end-to-end environment allows teams to replicate the exact conditions that led to the live issue. * **Justification:** Without an integrated environment, teams might spend significant time and resources chasing symptoms rather than addressing the root cause. This leads to prolonged outages, repeated incidents, and a significant drain on operational resources.   **3. Comprehensive Solution Validation and Risk Mitigation:**   * **Understanding Impact of Changes:** A code change, even seemingly minor, can have unforeseen ripple effects across interconnected systems. * **Regression Testing:** An integrated environment facilitates comprehensive regression testing, ensuring that a fix for one problem doesn't break existing functionality or introduce new bugs in other areas. * **User Acceptance Testing (UAT):** Before deploying a fix to production, business users from all affected organisations need to validate that the solution meets their needs and resolves the issue effectively. An end-to-end environment provides the perfect platform for this. * **Data Integrity and Consistency:** Fixing an issue often involves data corrections or schema changes. The integrated environment allows for thorough testing of data integrity across all affected systems. * **Justification:** Deploying a fix without thorough end-to-end validation is akin to operating blindfolded. It significantly increases the risk of introducing new, potentially more severe, issues into production, leading to further disruption, financial losses, and reputational damage.   **4. Accelerated Time to Resolution (MTTR - Mean Time To Recover):**   * **Reduced Debugging Time:** By accurately replicating the production environment, developers can more quickly debug and identify the problematic code. * **Streamlined Testing Cycles:** The integrated environment allows for parallel testing of different components, accelerating the overall testing cycle. * **Faster Deployment Confidence:** With a high level of confidence gained from comprehensive testing, deployment times can be significantly reduced. * **Justification:** In live operations, every minute of downtime or degraded service translates to lost revenue, decreased customer satisfaction, and potential regulatory non-compliance. An integrated test environment directly contributes to a faster Mean Time To Recover (MTTR), minimising the business & Industry impact of issues.   **5. Enhanced Collaboration and Communication:**   * **Shared Understanding:** An integrated environment provides a common platform for developers, testers, business analysts, and operations teams from all participating organisations to collaborate effectively. * **Clear Ownership and Accountability:** When issues are reproduced in a shared environment, it becomes easier to identify which team or system is responsible for the fix. * **Improved Troubleshooting:** Cross-functional teams can work together to troubleshoot complex issues, leveraging diverse expertise. * **Justification:** Complex test environments lead to finger-pointing, siloed efforts, and inefficient communication. An integrated environment fosters a collaborative problem-solving culture, essential for complex multi-organisational programmes.   **6. Compliance, Governance, and Auditability:**   * **Traceability:** A well-managed integrated test environment provides a clear audit trail of testing activities, including bug fixes, test cases executed, and sign-offs. * **Regulatory Requirements:** The Energy industry has strict regulatory requirements regarding software quality, data integrity, and system resilience based on code obligations. * **Justification:** For large, multi-organisational programmes, especially those handling sensitive data or critical business processes, demonstrating due diligence in testing and deployment is paramount. An integrated environment provides the necessary evidence for compliance and audit.   **7. Cost Efficiency in the Long Run:**   * **Reduced Downtime Costs:** Faster issue resolution directly translates to reduced revenue loss, operational costs, and potential penalties associated with downtime. * **Fewer Production Incidents:** Proactive and thorough testing in an integrated environment reduces the likelihood of issues making it to live production. * **Optimised Resource Utilisation:** Teams spend less time on manual workarounds, complex debugging, and repeated deployments. * **Justification:** While continuing to access and maintain the integrated end-to-end test environment, the long-term cost savings from reduced incidents, faster recovery, and improved operational efficiency far outweigh the additional cost in keeping the environment active and available ‘just in case’.   In conclusion, for a large technology and data transformation programme operating across several organisations, an integrated, end-to-end test environment is not a luxury, but an **absolute necessity**. It is the foundational pillar for ensuring the stability, reliability, and continuous improvement of complex, interconnected systems in a multi-organisational landscape. Without it, the programme could face significant risks of prolonged outages, increased operational costs, reputational damage, and ultimately, failure to deliver its intended benefits and potentially risking delivery against the planned timeline. | **Change Freeze criterion impacted** | **Yes / No** |
|  | **No** |
|  |  |
| **Consequences of no change:**  *(what would happen if the change was not implemented)*  Consequences of no change are widely available in the public domain. The consequences of *not* having an integrated, end-to-end test environment when migration commences, particularly one spanning multiple organisations, are severe and can lead to significant negative impacts across the entire Programme and beyond. Here's a breakdown of generic, critical drawbacks:  **1. Increased Risk of Critical Defects in Production (Go-Live Failures):**   * **Undetected Integration Issues:** Individual components or systems might work perfectly in isolation, but fail when integrated. Without an end-to-end environment, these "integration bugs" could re-surface in live operations, and fixes would need retesting as such, to not detriment the code base further. * **System Crashes and Downtime:** A seemingly minor change in one system can trigger a cascade of failures across connected systems, leading to widespread outages and system unavailability. * **Unforeseen Performance Bottlenecks:** Performance issues often only become apparent when the entire system is under realistic load, interacting across all components. Without an integrated environment, these bottlenecks are discovered in production, leading to slow performance and user frustration.   **2. Prolonged Downtime and High Costs of Fixes:**   * **Difficult Root Cause Analysis:** When an issue arises in a complex, multi-organisational production environment without an integrated test environment, it's incredibly challenging and time-consuming to pinpoint the exact source of the problem. Teams from different organisations may point fingers, delaying diagnosis. * **"Fixing Blindly":** Without a proper environment to replicate the issue, teams may attempt to deploy fixes based on assumptions, leading to ineffective solutions or even introducing new problems. * **Increased Rework and Hotfixes:** Bugs discovered in production are exponentially more expensive and time-consuming to fix than those found earlier in the development lifecycle. This leads to constant "firefighting" and a build-up of technical debt.   **3. Poor User Experience and Reputational Damage:**   * **Frustrated Users:** Frequent bugs, system errors, slow performance, or inconsistent data directly impact end-users, leading to frustration, loss of productivity, and decreased satisfaction. * **Damaged Brand Image:** For organisations involved in the transformation, repeated failures in critical systems can severely harm their reputation, erode customer trust, and potentially lead to financial losses or competitive disadvantage. * **Loss of Credibility:** The project team and the organisations involved lose credibility with stakeholders and end-users when systems consistently fail or perform poorly.   **4. Inefficient Development and Testing Cycles:**   * **Siloed Testing:** Without an integrated environment, testing often occurs in isolated "silos," where individual components are tested independently. This misses the crucial interactions between components. * **Lack of Collaboration:** Teams from different organisations may struggle to collaborate effectively on testing and debugging without a shared, representative environment. This can lead to communication breakdowns and duplicated effort. * **Delayed Releases:** The inability to confidently test and validate changes in a holistic manner leads to slower release cycles, as teams are hesitant to deploy without sufficient assurance. * **Wasteful Resource Allocation:** Resources are spent on reactive fixes, manual workarounds, and extensive post-production troubleshooting.   **5. Non-Compliance Risks:**   * **Failure to Meet Regulatory Requirements:** Many industries have strict compliance requirements related to data integrity, system uptime, and auditability. Production failures due to insufficient testing can lead to regulatory penalties and legal issues. * **Lack of Audit Trail:** Without a structured test environment, it's harder to maintain clear documentation and an audit trail of testing activities, which can be problematic for governance and compliance, where required.   **6. Erosion of Stakeholder Confidence:**   * **Project Delays and Budget Overruns:** The costs associated with fixing production issues, re-architecting solutions, and extending timelines can lead to significant budget overruns and project delays, eroding confidence from senior leadership. | | |
| **Alternative options:**  *(alternative options or mitigations that have been considered)*  UIT (sandbox) environment - this will be in constant use by non-SIT participants during the migration phase from M11/12. The environment is also not integrated E2E across market roles and central parties and relies on stubs and test harnesses to simulate the Industry functionality and design. These have drawbacks such as:   * Limited Scope and Inability to Replicate True System Behaviour * Maintenance Overhead and Fragility * Reduced Confidence in Production Readiness * Hindrance to Collaboration and Holistic View. | | |
| **Risks associated with potential change:**  *(risks related to implementation of the proposed change that have been identified)*  **High Cost and Resource Intensity** - infrastructure cost and maintenance overhead per market role, data management - mitigated by Ofgem directive 9 May 2025:  *2.2 We proposed that all MHHS Participants shall:*  *…Identify, allocate and deploy sufficient budget and appropriately skilled resources to promote timely delivery against their MHHS Participant Plans and/or against Programme milestones*  *Resource allocation and internal governance - Ofgem’s position*  *Allocating sufficient budget and skilled resources is critical to the timely delivery of MHHS. Consistent with the joint letter of 7 April 2025 from the Secretary of State and Ofgem’s Chief Executive, we intend to implement this element of the direction without amendment. We agree that MHHS Participants cannot be held responsible for the performance of other parties with whom they have no contractual relationship. Where there is a contractual relationship, however, MHHS Participants must ensure that service providers deploy the resources required to deliver on time.*  **Risk to settlements, and consequentially the risk to Industry and Consumers** by not having an e2e integrated environment to deploy/test collaboratively within at times of a critical MI/eCR(s)  **Complexity and Setup Challenges** - mitigated as this environment already exists however could experience configuration drift if not maintained / uplifted to organisation’s latest code base  **Stability of the environment** - mitigated as this has been maintained over the SIT phase since January 2024  **Data Privacy & Security** - mitigated as this has been maintained over the SIT phase since January 2024  While these risks are real, the potential downsides of not having an integrated test environment in the early life support phase, far outweigh the challenges of managing one effectively. It's about proactive risk management rather than avoidance. | | |
| **Stakeholders consulted on the potential change:**  *(Please document the stakeholders, or stakeholder groups that have been consulted to date on this change. The Change Raiser should consult with relevant programme parties in the drafting of the request, prior to submission to PMO).*  Intent to raise this CR has been discussed with the MHHS Programme - LDP & SRO, the IPA, the Large Supplier Constituency (LSC), [E.ON](http://e.on) and our Technology Partner.  [E.ON](http://e.on) Next also raised this as a Delivery Obstacle on MHHS-DEL1281 Delivery Obstacles Log v1.0, reference SIT M DO07 (16 May 2025) and within the GLIG-SIT & M10 working groups. | | |
| **Target date by which a decision is required:** Q3 2025 |  | |

### Part B – Initial Impact of proposed change

**Guidance *– This section should be completed by the Change Raiser before being submitted to the MHHS PMO.***

***Please document the benefits of the change and to delivery of the programme objectives***

| Programme Objective | Benefit to delivery of the programme objective |
| --- | --- |
| To deliver the Design Working Group’s Target Operating Model (TOM) covering the ‘Meter to Bank’ process for all Supplier Volume Allocation Settlement meters | Better enables a smoother delivery of the TOM within agreed timescales by ensuring any live issue fixes or change requests can be tested and validated more robustly, cross-party, where required, without causing further delay (time) or impact (quality). |
| To deliver services to support the revised Settlement Timetable in line with the Design Working Group’s recommendation | See above |
| To implement all related Code changes identified under Ofgem’s Significant Code Review (SCR) | See above |
| To implement MHHS in accordance with the MHHS Implementation Timetable | See above |
| To deliver programme capabilities and outcomes to enable the realisation of benefits in compliance with Ofgem’s Full Business Case | See above |
| To prove and provide a model for future such industry-led change programmes | See above |

**Guidance *– Please document the known programme parties and programme deliverables that may be impacted by the proposed change***

| Impacted areas | Impacted items |
| --- | --- |
| Impacted Parties | M10 & M11/12-ready participants - market roles and central parties. |
| Impacted Deliverables | None - this seeks to support Programme deliverables and mitigate issues which *may* be identified via organisation’s service management teams and processes when the Programme starts migrating MPANs through the new arrangements from M11/12. |
| Impacted Milestones | This change is linked to M11/12 Start of Migration for Smart, Non-Smart, Advanced, UMS MPANs and exit aligned to DEL3094 MHHS Early Life Support Model exit - *milestone tbc by Programme and DEL1139 MHHS Outline Plan.* |

**Note *– Please refer to MHHS DEL174 Change Request Guidance for Programme Participants for information on how to score the initial assessment.***

**Guidance *– Please include a reference and link to any additional documentation which the change relates to.***

| Change Request to be read in conjunction with: | |
| --- | --- |
| **Title** | **Reference** |
| MHHS-DEL3094\_-\_MHHS\_Early\_Life\_Support\_Model\_v1.0 | *https://www.mhhsprogramme.co.uk/uploads/cc31125e-d4d8-4756-b1a8-d3ccfbf704bc/MHHS-DEL3094\_-\_MHHS\_Early\_Life\_Support\_Model\_v1.0.pdf* |
| MHHS-DEL618 Environment Approach & Plan v3.0 | *https://mhhsprogramme.sharepoint.com/sites/Market-wideHalfHourlySettlement/Testing%20Documents/Forms/All%20Documents%20v2.aspx?id=%2Fsites%2FMarket%2DwideHalfHourlySettlement%2FTesting%20Documents%2FMHHS%2DDEL618%20%2D%20Environment%20Approach%20%20Plan%20v3%2E0%2Epdf&parent=%2Fsites%2FMarket%2DwideHalfHourlySettlement%2FTesting%20Documents* |
| Elexon\_Service\_Definition\_Document\_v2.4 |  |
| Helix Low Level Service Design - Service Users - v1.2 |  |
| MHHS Service User - Operations Manual - 1.4 - RED LINE VERSION |  |
| MHHS - DEL3808 CR062 -Issue Resolution Group (IRG) – MHHS Programme Governance Framework Update | *https://mhhsprogramme.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/Market-wideHalfHourlySettlement/\_layouts/15/Doc.aspx?sourcedoc=%7B9B70AB2B-D590-432E-88B4-101DA4C2F59E%7D&file=MHHS%20-%20DEL3808%20CR062%20-Issue%20Resolution%20Group%20(IRG)%20%E2%80%93%20MHHS%20Programme%20Governance%20Framework%20Update.docx&action=default&mobileredirect=true&DefaultItemOpen=1* |
| Ofgem - Directions to Market-wide Half-Hourly Settlement (MHHS) Participants: decision 9 May 2025 | *https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/decision/directions-market-wide-half-hourly-settlement-mhhs-participants-decision* |

### Part C.1 – Summary of Impact Assessment

### Note – *This section will be completed initially by the Change Raiser and then by Programme Participants as part of the full Impact Assessment.*

### *All Impact Assessment responses will be considered public and non-confidential unless otherwise marked. If there are any specific elements of the response (e.g. costs) that are confidential, please mark the specific sections as confidential rather than the response as a whole. The MHHS Programme will publish all Impact Assessment responses and redact any confidential information as noted.*

**Guidance – Programme Participants are required to:**

1. **Respond with ‘Agree’, ‘Disagree’ or ‘Abstain’, deleting as appropriate. If the respondent agrees, they can provide additional evidence to further support the assessment. If the respondent disagrees or abstains, they should provide a detailed rationale as to why.**
2. **Add any additional effects that have not already been identified. In doing so, they should provide as much detail as possible to allow a robust assessment to be made.**
3. **Indicate whether the change would have a minor, medium or significant impact on their activities, referring to slide 16 of *MHHS-DEL171 Change Control Approach* to assess each criterion, using N/A to indicate no impact.**
4. **Proceed to Part C.2 for Impact Assessment Recommendation response once completed.**

| Part C.1 – Summary of Impact Assessment (complete as appropriate) |
| --- |
| **Effect on benefits**  *Change Raiser to provide initial impact assessment.*  *Better enables the delivery of Programme benefits within agreed timescales.* |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
| *Impact Assessment respondents to add supporting commentary to support their selection. Where possible, Impact Assessment respondents to identify and describe any further impacts.*  *Impact Assessment respondents should consider and provide detail of any additional effect e.g. whether there will be an impact on when a benefit will be realised; who will realise the benefit; the extent to which the benefit will be realised.*  *Where possible, contextual information should be included e.g. the benefit will be delayed by X weeks; the change means Y population will also realise the benefit.*  *Please indicate below, using an (X), the extent to which you believe implementing this change would impact Programme benefits.*   | 1. *Minor impact* | 1. *Medium impact* | 1. *Significant impact* | | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  | |
| **Effect on consumers**  *Change Raiser to provide initial impact assessment.*  *Better enables issue resolution as quickly as possible and with greater quality where multiple parties are required to test/support, which means minimal disruption to Programme deliverables and Programme timescales, which will have a positive impact to consumers as it will ensure the consumer benefits can be realised without further unnecessary delay.* |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
| *Impact Assessment respondents to add supporting commentary to support their selection. Where possible, Impact Assessment respondents to identify and describe any further impacts.*  *Impact Assessment respondents should consider and provide detail of any additional effect e.g. whether there will be an impact on service delivery to consumers; will there be a cost impact to consumers; will there be a choice impact to consumers?*  *Where possible, contextual information should be included e.g. what is the scale of the effect? Will the effect be permanent?*  *Please indicate below, using an (X), the extent to which you believe implementing this change would impact consumers.*   | 1. *Minor impact* | 1. *Medium impact* | 1. *Significant impact* | | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  | |
| **Effect on schedule**  *Change Raiser to provide initial impact assessment.*  *Better enables the schedule to be delivered to agreed timescales and against plan.* |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
| *Impact Assessment respondents to add supporting commentary to support their selection. Where possible, Impact Assessment respondents to identify and describe any further impacts.*  *Impact Assessment respondents should consider and provide detail of any additional effect e.g. will the schedule/milestones be directly impacted; will the schedule/milestones be indirectly impacted.*  *Where possible, contextual information should be included e.g. the change will delay the project by X days; the change will require additional resource to complete (though detail resource in resource section); the delay can/cannot be recovered by condensing Y activity.*  *Please indicate below, using an (X), the extent to which you believe implementing this change would impact your ability to meet the Prohgramme schedule.*   | 1. *Minor impact* | 1. *Medium impact* | 1. *Significant impact* | | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  | |
| **Effect on costs**  *Change Raiser to provide initial impact assessment.*  *We expect there to be some cost to parties to extend the environment for longer however we do not have the full breakdown of costs to support this CR impact assessment. By extending the environment for longer, it will better enable issue resolution across parties through quality testing, which should better ensure costs related to production issues are mitigated earlier/not prolonged by independent party testing, reducing overall costs compared to if no environment is available.* |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
| *Impact Assessment respondents to add supporting commentary to support their selection. Where possible, Impact Assessment respondents to identify and describe any further impacts.*  *Impact Assessment respondents should consider and provide detail of any additional effect e.g. will the change cause a loss of income; will the change cause additional cost; will the change cause a reprofiling of cost?*  *Where possible, contextual information should be included e.g. whether it is capital or operating expenditure that will be affected; what period costs will be affected in; what the rough order of magnitude of the cost impact will be and if organisation will be able to absorb it?*  *Please indicate below, using an (X), the extent to which you believe implementing this change would impact your organisation’s costs.*   | 1. *Minor impact* | 1. *Medium impact* | 1. *Significant impact* | | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  | |
| **Effect on resources**  *Change Raiser to provide initial impact assessment.*  *This change will have an impact on resources, as impacted parties will need to ensure resources are available to both test and maintain the environment for the extended period.* |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
| *Impact Assessment respondents to add supporting commentary to support their selection. Where possible, Impact Assessment respondents to identify and describe any further impacts.*  *Impact Assessment respondents should consider and provide detail of any additional effect e.g. will there be an impact on tools or equipment; will there be an impact on staff capacity; will there be an impact on staff skills or capability?*  *Where possible, contextual information should be included e.g. the change will require X additional staff for Y period of time; the change requires Z training or support.*  *Please indicate below, using an (X), the extent to which you believe implementing this change would impact your organisation’s resources.*   | 1. *Minor impact* | 1. *Medium impact* | 1. *Significant impact* | | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  | |
| **Effect on contract**  *Change Raiser to provide initial impact assessment.*  *This change will have an impact on impacted parties’ contracts should they need to agree and extend their environment and resourcing arrangements.* |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
| *Impact Assessment respondents to add supporting commentary to support their selection. Where possible, Impact Assessment respondents to identify and describe any further impacts.*  *Impact Assessment respondents should consider and provide detail of any additional effect e.g. whether there will be an impact on contracts with sub-contractors; whether there will be an impact on contracts with vendors; whether there will be an impact on contracts with regulators/ESO.*  *Where possible, contextual information should be included e.g. the changes will require new contracts to be created; the changes will variations to existing contracts; the changes will affect ability to meet contract requirements.*  *Please indicate below, using an (X), the extent to which you believe implementing this change would impact your organisation’s contracts.*   | 1. *Minor impact* | 1. *Medium impact* | 1. *Significant impact* | | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  | |
| **Risks**  *Change Raiser to provide initial impact assessment.*  *The extension of the environment should be agreed so as to better manage go-live risk through go-live issue co-ordination & resolution and ensuring defect solutions or change requests are developed, tested and implemented quickly across multiple market roles.* |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
| *Impact Assessment respondents to add supporting commentary to support their selection. Where possible, Impact Assessment respondents to identify and describe any further impacts.*  *Impact Assessment respondents should consider and provide detail of any additional effect e.g. will existing risks be affected; will new risks be created?*  *Where possible, contextual information should be included e.g. the change will affect the likelihood of a risk occurring, the change will affect the impact the risk would have, the change will require additional controls and mitigation.*  *Please state any additional risks introduced by the change.* |

### Part C.2 – Impact Assessment Recommendation

### Note – *This section must be completed initially by the Change Raiser and then by Programme Participants as part of the full Impact Assessment.*

**Guidance – The primary reporting metric of the Impact Assessment is the recommendation response. The consolidated response will be presented to the relevant governance group(s) and decision maker(s) with the totals for ‘Agree’, ‘Disagree’ or ‘Abstain’. As such, please ensure this section is completed before the form is returned to MHHS PMO. Provide detailed rationale and evidence in the commentary field.**

| Part C.2 – Impact Assessment Recommendation (mandatory) |
| --- |
| **Recommendation**  *Change Raiser to provide initial recommendation.*  **It is recommended by the Change Raiser the change is approved.** |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
| *Impact Assessment respondents to add supporting commentary to support their selection.*  *Please indicate below, using an (X), the extent to which you believe implementing this change would impact the Programme and/or your organisation overall.*   | 1. *Minor impact* | 1. *Medium impact* | 1. *Significant impact* | | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  | |
| **Change Freeze**  *Change Raiser to provide justification that their Change Request meets the Change Freeze criteria (critical to M10 and/or fixes a defect in the design).*  *The change freeze criteria are to apply to the MHHS TOM and MHHS Design. This change impacts neither area and supports achievement of milestones M11/12 and M15. Therefore, the change freeze criteria does not apply.* |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
| *Impact Assessment respondents to add supporting commentary to support their selection.* |

**Impact assessment done by:** Cathy Mulliss & Ellie Crawford

**Guidance*: If you are a third party responding on behalf of another Programme Participant, please state this in your response.***

**Impact assessment completed on behalf of:** [E.ON](http://e.on) Next - Supplier

### Part D – Change approval and decision

**Guidance*: The approvals section will be completed by the MHHS PMO once the Impact Assessment has been reviewed.***

| Part D - Approvals |
| --- |
| **Decision authority level**  <Based on the impact assessment, state who is required to make a decision concerning this change> |

**Guidance** - ***This section will be completed by the MHHS PMO and Change Owner following the review of the impact assessment and decision reached by the SRO.***

| Part D – Change decision | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Decision: |  | Date | |  |
| Approvers: |  |  | |  |
| Change Owner: |  | | | |
| Action: |  | | | |
| **Changed Items** | **Pre-change version** | | **Revised version** | |
|  |  | |  | |
|  |  | |  | |
|  |  | |  | |
|  |  | |  | |

### Part E – Implementation completion

**Guidance *- This section will be completed by the MHHS PMO at the end of the post-implementation process.***

| Part E – Implementation completion | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Comment |  | Date |  |

**Guidance *– The Closure Checklist in MHHS DEL175 Change Log must also be completed by MHHS PMO at this stage.***

| Checklist Completed | Completed by |
| --- | --- |
| Yes/No |  |

**Guidance – *This section will be completed by the MHHS PMO at the end of the post-implementation process and should be* used to add any appropriate references of the change once it has been completed.**

| References | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref** | **Document number** | **Description** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |