

MHHS Programme Steering Group (PSG) Minutes and Actions

Issue date: 08/03/2023

Meeting Number	PSG 018	Venue	Hybrid – MS Teams / Elexon Office
Date and Time	01 March 2023 1000-1230	Classification	Public

Attendees

Chair

Helen Tipton (HT) MHHS SRO

Industry Representatives

Andrew Campbell (AC)	Small Supplier Representative
Andrew Green (AG) on behalf of Gareth Evans	I&C Supplier Representative
Caroline Farquhar (CF)	Consumer Representative
Chris Price (CP)	DNO Representative
Del Kang (DK) on behalf of Charlotte Semp	DCC Representative
Graham Wood (GW)	Large Supplier Representative
Jenny Rawlinson (JR)	iDNO Representative
Jonathan Hawkins (JH)	RECCo Representative
Karen Thompson-Lilley (KTL)	National Grid ESO
Lewis Robertson (LR)	Elexon Representative (Central Systems Provider)
Neil Dewar (ND) on behalf of Karen Thompson-Lilly	NGESO Representative
Paul Akrill (PA)	Supplier Agent Representative
Vladimir Black (VB)	Medium Supplier Representative

MHHS IM

Adrian Page (AP)	SI Lead
Andrew Margan (AM)	Governance manager and code lead
Chris Harden (CH)	Programme Director
Chris Welby (CW)	Industry SME
Giles Clayden (GC)	Deputy Programme Manager
Jason Brogden (JBr)	Industry SME
Keith Clark (KC)	Programme Manager
Martin Cranfield (MC)	PMO Governance Lead
Warren Fulton (WF)	Design Project Manager

Other Attendees

Andy MacFaul (AMF)	Observer, Ofgem
Dave Gandee (DG)	IPA
Jenny Boothe (JBo)	Ofgem Sponsor
Melissa Giordano (MG)	Ofgem Sponsor
Richard Shilton (RS)	IPA
Sinead Quinn (SQ)	Observer, Ofgem

Apologies

Charlotte Semp DCC Representative

Actions

Area	Ref	Action	Owner	Due	Update
Programme replan and SIT outlook	PSG18-01	Include a Supplier and Supplier Agent RAG in the SIT status dashboard	Keith Clark	05/04/23	
	PSG18-02	Check PPC engagement with Small Supplier participants, as input to discussions with Ofgem and the Small Supplier rep	Jason Brogden	05/04/23	
	PSG18-03	Mobilise the Fast Track Implementation Group (FTIG)	Keith Clark	03/05/23	
LDSO delivery	PSG18-04	Provide feedback on the approach to sharing the Design Issue Notification Log for the Programme to review internally	Jon Hawkins/ Chris Price/PMO	05/04/23	
	PSG18-05	Look into the assurance process for LDSOs for the accuracy of data for DUoS billing	Jason Brogden	05/04/23	
Change Control	PSG18-06	Progress implementation of CR015 Option A via the Design Authority (DA)	Programme PMO	05/04/23	
	PSG18-07	Update TMAG ToR and the Programme interim plan as per decisions PSG-DEC40 and DEC44	Programme PMO	05/04/23	House-keeping Change Request to be raised
Delivery dashboards	PSG18-08	Add further detail on the status of each change request on the Change Control dashboard (e.g. lifecycle of the change)	Programme PMO	05/04/23	
	PSG18-09	Provide 23/24 budgets in PSG central party finance dashboards	Programme and Central Parties	05/04/23	
Open actions from previous meetings	PSG15-01	Progress work on customer segments in migration at the Migration Design Subgroup (MDSG)	Programme (Jason Brogden)	01/03/23	Discussed at MWG in February 2023. Staying open until there is a conclusion.
	PSG17-03	Discuss at DAG if the DIP design could result in changes to the MHHS core design, and if so, the likely timelines for changes to the core design to be delivered	Programme	01/03/23	A risk has been raised to the Programme RAID log. The risk is currently low scoring. The risk will be discussed

Area	Ref	Action	Owner	Due	Update
					and validated at March DAG.
	PSG17-05	Review the post-implementation approach to Benefits Realisation and how Benefits Realisation will be handed over to Ofgem at M16	Programme (Jason Brogden)	To be reviewed at Control Point 2	To remain open and be aligned to Control Point 2
	PSG17-08	Discuss Small Supplier engagement with the Small Supplier Representative and Ofgem (e.g. engagement requirements, materiality/impact of low engagement, and ways to improve engagement)	Programme	01/03/23	Meeting scheduled

Decisions

Area	Ref	Decision
Minutes	PSG-DEC39	The PSG approved the minutes of the 01 March 2023 PSG
Programme replan and SIT outlook	PSG-DEC40	The PSG approved a one-month delay to the Programme replan timeline (with detail as per the replan Plan on a Page presented to the PSG)
	PSG-DEC41	The PSG agreed to establish the Fast Track Implementation Group (FTIG) and provide transparent meeting outputs and progress reports
M3 approval	PSG-DEC42	The PSG agreed to unconditionally approve Milestone 3
Change Control	PSG-DEC43	The PSG agreed to approve Option A for Change Request CR015

Minutes

1. Welcome

HT welcomed all to the meeting and invited introductions.

2. Minutes and Actions Review

DECISION PSG-DEC39: The PSG approved the minutes of the 01 February 2023 PSG

HT ran through the open actions as per the slides. JB noted there was now a meeting in the diary against action PSG17-08.

3. Sponsor update

JBo noted good news that the core Design had now been baselined. JBo requested that the open Change Requests be addressed as soon as practicable, to prevent impact on the replan. JBo highlighted a good session with IPA, Ofgem and the Programme on change which had been positive and had clarified issues.

MG introduced themselves as the new Deputy Director in Ofgem that would have oversight of the MHHS Programme. MG introduced their background and experience, noting an intention for further in-depth bilateral discussions with PSG members.

4. Re-Plan status

KC explained two areas of focus for the Programme – the critical path to Systems Integration Testing (SIT) and the likelihood of constituting a Minimum Viable Cohort (MVC) ahead of M9. KC walked through the SIT status as per the slides, noting Amber parties were expected to be ready for SIT but currently had some uncertainty. KC explained that detailed planning discussions had taken place with St Clements, including setting parameters for their plan to allow St Clements to join SIT in a phased way. The St Clements plan was expected this week and would inform the Programme's understanding of the likelihood of St Clements supporting the M9 start date detailed in the Round 3 replan (noting a later challenge for St Clements also starting SIT Migration). KC highlighted that Helix were in the process of replanning and an updated plan was expected. RECCo were looking positive.

JH explained that the DCC were responsible for the delivery of CSS for SIT entry while RECCo were responsible for the Code for the delivery of any change proposals that resulted from CSS delivery (RECCo were not accountable for CSS). KC noted the monthly account meetings with DCC suggested CSS would be there for SIT and that the phased approach for Component Integration Testing (CIT) was being working through via the Systems Integration Test Working Group (SITWG).

KC walked through the SIT volunteer status derived from participant Round 3 replan responses. KC noted the Programme were continuing work here – the Programme believed they had enough volunteers to constitute an MVC and were seeking further volunteers to reduce risk and provide contingency. KC noted some parties that had registered interest (but not volunteered yet) looked likely to volunteer and that the position would become more certain over the coming weeks.

CP noted that the Data Integration Platform (DIP) was Green and that the DIP webinar was positive on 28 February 2023. CP highlighted that the DIP provider had said that their understanding of MHHS was developing, and this may have impacts on the Programme that could require change. KC agreed and noted any changes would go through the established Change Control process. CP noted that this may have an effect on the DIP's Green RAG. KC responded that future / unknown change applied to all parties and that this would include appropriate Impact Assessment at the time.

ND noted ESO had a meeting with the Programme to ensure they were appropriately involved and prepared for SIT.

KC thanked parties for volunteering and engaging and that the responses had been very positive. HT reiterated that there was still time to volunteer.

JR queried if changes to the design, such as those that may occur due to the DIP, would have impacts across the board and if they would go through the same change process as broader changes. KC confirmed this was the case for all change. JR noted changes to the Design could elongate the timescales to start SIT.

JR queried if the SIT status would be presented each month. KC confirmed yes. JR queried if supplier agents could be included in the status, as these were important parties for others to test with. KC responded that the intention was for the status to cover the critical path and the MVC, and so the status of other parties in these groups would come in time. KC added that this could be an output of any SIT delivery forum (to be discussed later in the agenda), to track progress of parties required for SIT.

ACTION PSG18-01: Programme to include a Supplier and Supplier Agent RAG in the SIT status dashboard

Re-Plan timeline

KC explained the plan for a one-month deferment to re-plan timelines, as per the slides. KC noted a pre-meet with PSG Constituency Representatives where there had been support for this proposal. KC explained the re-plan Change Request would now come to the April PSG. KC noted a lot of additional detail had been developed in the plan following Round 3 and via the Programme working groups since Round 3 was released in December, and that this made the plan more realistic and achievable.

JBo queried the PSG date and what would be presented at that time. KC confirmed the PSG was 05 April 2023 and that PSG would be reviewing the Change Request and agreeing whether to raise it to Impact Assessment.

GW noted Large Supplier discussion on changes to the expectations and assumptions made in DBT1 and DBT2 and the impact on Round 3 replan responses. GW noted the SITWG on 02 March was clarifying some areas. KC confirmed further clarification would be provided via the SITWG. GW noted they would discuss with their constituents following the SITWG and then speak with the Programme, should further clarification be required. CH noted two Large Suppliers that had had issues and that the Programme would be discussing directly with them. GW also noted that a Placing Reliance Policy was due and was required as input for Large Suppliers determining if they would be in SIT. JBr

confirmed the Reliance Policy had been prioritised to be delivered by the end of this month and that the timelines had been planned in order for this to appropriately feed into and out of relevant Performance Assurance Boards (PABs). GW queried if the 23 April 2023 SIT volunteer date aligned with the PABs. JBr responded that the PAB boards were scheduled for the end of March.

KC noted that any open issues, risks, assumptions would be described in the re-plan Change Request. CP noted that this discussion was related to an element of uncertainty over SIT and CIT. This was consistent with feedback from iDNOs and DNOs and had an impact on who would / would not be volunteering for SIT, as well as requirements for qualification. KC noted more and more information was being developed via the working groups. MC highlighted two documents due to come through the Testing workstream in March that would add clarity – the Placing Reliance Policy and the SIT Scope document.

Re-Plan POAP

KC explained that re-plan playback sessions would be scheduled for when the re-plan Change Request was issued to industry and ahead of the 23 April 2023 date for participants to volunteer for SIT.

JBo noted that Ofgem may not be in a position to make a decision on the re-plan at the middle / back-end of May or early June (as per the POAP presented to PSG). JBo queried if there were any downstream implications for a delayed decision. HT explained the current assumption was the plan would be baselined on 07 June 2023. HT noted Ofgem would not be coming in cold to the decision. JBo responded that a delay may be likely due to alignment with the team and due to the holiday period. The decision would also need to go through Ofgem corporate. JBo noted this was a low risk, due to availability of the relevant people, and that Ofgem would be approving the plan (rather than baselining it), with a decision published. KC noted the Programme were bringing Ofgem on the journey to manage this risk, so Ofgem would be in better to make a decision in the timelines given.

KC noted the PSG should consider contingency, such as if Ofgem did not approve the plan, and if the Programme would work to the re-plan in the interim (rather than the existing baseline) as this was more realistic. RS queried if an action was required to set out the steps for approving the plan by Ofgem. HT confirmed this was already in the plan for the re-plan.

CP noted this was the current timeline and that there were Change Requests in progress that could change the re-plan timeline. KC responded that risks or issues such as this would be laid out to PSG when the Programme presented the re-plan Change Request to the April PSG. KC noted there could be potential changes at any time, and that the PSG would need to have a transparent conversation when making a decision, based on the Programme position at that point. CP noted the timing would never be perfect but if Ofgem were approving the plan in May / June and that there were still uncertainties (such as on adapters) that there could be an argument to wait for this uncertainty to be clarified before baselining the plan. JBo responded that unknowns (such as Change Requests) would be considered in the re-plan approach and that Ofgem wanted the plan baselined as soon as possible. There would always be change and these would be impact-assessed as required at the time. Any changes would go through the change process (and the process could be expedited if required). KC noted that the re-plan approach would consider the scale of any change and if it needed to go to Ofgem for decision.

JH queried if the change process considered the implementation approach of any change, noting the change process may need to become more forensic in future, to get the right information in order to make any decision. KC responded that this was the responsibility of the Change Board, to ensure Change Requests were written in the right way. JH noted the approach to change needed to be flexible. JR noted timelines for implementing change were important. JB agreed and noted this was the responsibility of Change Board (to ensure right content to the right detail).

GW queried the timeline for the Qualification Approach and Plan which a constituent had highlighted as due by the end of May. JBr responded that the timelines had been adjusted based on Round 3 replan responses and would be based on the development of SIT material. The Qualification Approach and Plan had therefore been 'chunked up' to be developed alongside SIT content and this would be communicated and developed through the working groups.

DECISION PSG-DEC40: The PSG approved a one-month delay to the Programme re-plan timeline (with detail as per the re-plan Plan on a Page presented to the PSG)

5. Round 3 re-plan consultation outputs and SIT outlook

KC walked through the outputs of Round 3 re-plan consultation as per the slides, providing an overview of the responses and what these meant for the MVC. JR queried the roles of participants in the different elements of SIT. JBr explained that the roles, requirements and dates for each role had been shared via the SITWG.

CF queried if it was likely that some Programme Participants would un-volunteer for SIT. KC explained that those that had volunteered seemed certain and that there was another wave of volunteers incoming for those that had registered interest and were awaiting more information. KC noted there were incentives for participants to be involved in SIT (shared in a recent webinar) and it was currently looking like more volunteers would come.

JR queried the approach to collaborative testing in SIT. There was some discussion on the detail of DUoS billing and boundaries in testing between participants. JBr noted that this was subject to the Placing Reliance Policy and would be discussed via the SITWG.

KC explained the participant DBT timelines from their delivery plans as per the graphs in the slides. These provided confidence that participants would be ready to go through SIT or Qualification as per the Round 3 re-plan timelines (which hence validated the timelines).

KC explained the non-responders to the Round 3 consultation and that the Programme would be engaging with these. AC queried what the approach would be to engagement and what the relationship would be with Readiness Assessment 3, given this was coming next month. KC responded that the Programme Party Coordinator (PPC) was the vehicle for having conversations with the participants and that a range of coordinated topics were discussed. The Programme had a routine rhythm for engaging participants, via bi-laterals or the existing governance groups. Topics would flex and the Programme would look to support participants, such as on Readiness Assessments. AC queried if the organisations that did not respond to Round 3 had engaged at all with the PPC. KC responded that that was the intention for the PPC but that this was not always possible. JBr noted the Programme were reviewing the approach to Readiness Assessments, to ensure the programme extracted the best value out of any engagement.

ACTION PSG18-02: Check PPC engagement with Small Supplier participants, as input to discussions with Ofgem and the Small Supplier rep

KC explained the proposal for establishing a delivery group of SIT volunteer Project Managers as per the slides (the Fast Track Implementation Group (FTIG)). KC noted the same principle of establishing non-governance delivery groups such as FTIG may in future apply to other elements of the Programme, such as ahead of qualification activities. RS reiterated IPA support for the concept.

JH queried the relationship between this group and the open working groups. KC responded that the approach would be fluid and that while working groups would be looking at principles, scope, and approaches, FTIG would be more practical, looking at the delivery of participants on the ground and how the Programme could help. JH noted support for this group but that it was important not to lose transparency and to maintain open discussion where required. JH noted the outputs should be shared transparently. KC noted the inputs / outputs and progress would be shared. KC added that the attendees were different (e.g., test experts vs project managers).

GW noted the 'invitation-only' element required some discretion and that it should be up to participants to determine who should / should not attend a group. HT responded that the group was a delivery-focused group and therefore attendees needed to be in these roles and that the Programme would manage attendees as required.

Decision PSG-DEC41: The PSG agreed to establish the FTIG & provide transparent meeting outputs

6. M3 approval

KC explained the intention to unconditionally approve M3 as per the slides. KC explained that the criteria had been met.

GW noted that they had no issue with the criteria or approval, but when looking at the detail of the numbers from Round 3 of consultation on the Programme plan, they believed the picture was less healthy. KC responded that this was not within the agreed criteria and that the Programme recognised there were other delivery risks (unrelated to the M3 criteria).

Decision PSG-DEC42: The PSG agreed to unconditionally approve Milestone 3

7. LDSO delivery plans

iDNO plan

JR provided a summary of the iDNO delivery plan as per the slides. JR noted that iDNO parties saw a level of risk largely down to current unknowns in the Programme, such as the current Design Change Requests and the as-yet un-baselined Migration Design. JR noted some concerns regarding DIP service provision and documents iDNOs were waiting for.

KC highlighted that it was important to look ahead to M10 and that it was positive how iDNOs had presented their readiness for M10, given the long time away from this milestone and the current Programme unknowns. JR agreed and noted 10 respondents in the delivery plan was a strong level of engagement (particularly reflecting on the figures previously presented to PSG on iDNO working group attendance). JR noted they had provided the individual progress reports to the Programme. JR added that there was variance across parties and so it was difficult to build an average for all iDNOs.

KC highlighted the need for at least one LDSO in SIT and that there was currently a risk with only one participant who had volunteered so far. KC noted now further iDNOs may be looking likely to volunteer. JR responded that developments relating to responsibilities in testing would help bring further iDNOs in.

DNO plan

CP noted a similar position to JR. CP explained all six DNOs had responded and that all DNOs were looking to procure only one adapter to work across all their systems. CP noted changes to the DIP may have impacts for DNOs and that there was a lot of uncertainty that could impact their timelines (which was particularly important given DNOs were on the critical path). CP explained that the decisions and escalations were requiring input and feedback from the Programme and that these related primarily to the Design and current open Change Requests. HT noted these escalations needed to go to the correct level of governance. CP added that the six DNOs had slightly different takes on the Programme. St Clements were still targeting full delivery of MPRS by the end of January 2024 and conversations were ongoing to deliver chunks of MPRS in an agile approach in order to be aligned to the current timelines.

KC highlighted that again the confidence levels for M10 were positive. CP agreed and noted the real crunch was the design element (for DNOs to deliver their designs to the required quality in the current timelines). KC noted M10 was very important given dependencies on participants, particularly as all LDSOs needed to be ready for then. This was a risk the Programme would be managing more closely. CP agreed and noted some potential for design changes to come through which may impact this confidence.

CP noted DNOs felt there was an issue with the lack of a public design issues log. JH agreed, explaining that this meant there was limited transparency on queries that were coming into the Programme and that this impacted parties' delivery. MC noted an intention for the log to be public.

ACTION PSG18-04: RECCo, DNO and PMO to provide feedback on the approach to sharing the Design Issue Notification Log for the Programme to review internally

RS explained that the IPA had been doing assurance work on the LDSOs and that it was only natural for parties to want certainty. RS added that there were actions in place for the majority of the areas of concern highlighted by CP. RS noted it was positive how parties had been coming together to unblock issues and pull forward their delivery.

JR noted parties were positive about M10 given the time until the milestone, and so assessments needed to take this into account (the milestone felt 'far off' and so parties were likely to be positive in their assessments). JBr added that it was also important to define the scope of the LDSO non-SIT qualification route through the Programme plan.

ACTION PSG18-05: Jason Brogden to look into the assurance process for LDSOs for the accuracy of data for DUoS billing

8. Design update

WF gave a progress update for the core MHHS Design as per the slides. WF thanked participants for their participation, citing significant levels of engagement throughout the process. WF noted many lessons learned that been codified and that a blueprint had now been developed for future industry change.

WF explained that the consultation had closed for the Migration Design with 800+ comments received. WF provided the timelines for the decision on the Migration Design going to DAG. WF noted no major challenges had been identified through the comments so far.

GW thanked WF and the Programme for the work on the Design. AP added that the work being done on the Migration Design related to the previous discussion on the plan to deliver the replan.

9. Change Control

CW provided an overview of the outputs of Impact Assessment for CR015 as per the slides. JBr added to the rationale in the slides that the impact on consumers of not making a change was what moved the Programme to recommend

Option A or B. CW noted some unknowns on the number of consumers that would or would not be set up on E7 or E10 economy meters.

GW explained that Large Suppliers were split between Options A and B and recognised the need for a decision to be made to minimise consumer detriment. GW noted a concern that future change may be required again, even after a decision was made on this Change Request. CF queried if Option B was better for future proofing while Option A was faster/quicker. DG noted the IPA were also supportive of Option A.

HT summarised discussion and made a decision for Option A, noting they were comfortable with the rationale and that a weight of evidence that had been worked through to come to this conclusion.

Decision PSG-DEC43: The PSG agreed to approve Option A for Change Request CR015

ACTION PSG18-06: Programme to progress implementation of CR015 Option A via the Design Authority (DA)

JH queried if there were changes required to the baselined design as a result of the change and how this would be communicated. MC noted this would be worked through the Design Authority (DA) and the Design advisory Group (DAG). JBr noted the Programme's Impact Assessment response had explained the implementation approach and confirmed that the next steps would go through the DA.

10. TMAG governance

CW explained the decision at the Testing and Migration Advisory Group (TMAG) to split the TMAG in two halves (one for Testing and one for Migration) and to allow co-representation for industry constituencies where desired. CW noted a need to update the MHHS governance framework to reflect this in the TMAG Terms of Reference.

ACTION PSG18-07: PMO to update TMAG ToR and the Programme interim plan as per decisions PSG-DEC40 and DEC44

11. Delivery dashboards

HT invited questions on the Delivery Dashboards.

GW queried if the Change Control dashboard could include more information on the life cycle of changes, such as where Change Requests were in the process and when they would go through different steps. CW noted that CR017 and CR018 had come back round to Change Board due to changes to the content of the Change Requests. DAG had agreed for these to go to impact assessment, subject to the changes.

Action PSG18-08: PMO to add further detail on the status of each change request on the Change Control dashboard (e.g. lifecycle of the change)

GW queried when industry would see the 2023/24 budget lines on the central party finance dashboard. CW noted that RECCo and Helix had not yet formally cleared their budgets but that 23/24 budgets could be provided next month, if available.

Action PSG18-09: Central parties to provide 2023/24 budgets in PSG central party finance dashboards

12. Summary and next steps

MC summarised the actions as per the table above. Additional clarification was provided on the detail of action PSG18-01, -04, and -05. HT ran through the agenda items for the April PSG.

JR queried if IPA assurance activity was visible to PSG members and industry. RS responded that outputs of IPA assurance activity could be shared directly with JR and CP and that there was an action tracker shared with the Programme PMO. RS noted the IPA could include the status of actions and themes coming from assurance at a regular interval to PSG e.g. quarterly. RS added that they were working in an embedded way with the Programme and the outputs of assurance were usually reported regularly to PSG. HT noted IPA activities were also being planned to align with the replan.

Date of next PSG: 05 April 2023