MHHS Programme Steering Group (PSG) Minutes and Actions

Issue date: 17/04/2023

Meeting Number	**PSG 019**	Venue	**Virtual – MS Teams**
Date and Time	**05 April 2023 1000-1230**	Classification	**Public**

Attendees

Chair

Helen Tipton (HT)	MHHS SRO

Industry Representatives

Andrew Campbell (AC)	Small Supplier Representative
Caroline Farquhar (CF)	Consumer Representative
Chris Price (CP)	DNO Representative
Deborah Woods-Malone (DWM)	DCC Representative
Gareth Evans (GE)	I&C Supplier Representative
Graham Wood (GW)	Large Supplier Representative
Jenny Rawlinson (JR)	iDNO Representative
Joel Stark	Supplier Agent Representative
Jonny Moore (JM) on behalf of Jonathan Hawkins	RECCo Representative
Karen Thompson-Lilley (KTL)	National Grid ESO
Matt Hall (MH) on behalf of Lewis Robertson	Elexon Representative (Central Systems Provider)
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
Fraser Mathieson (FM)	PMO Governance Lead
Giles Clayden (GC)	Deputy Programme Manager
Jason Brogden (JBr)	Industry SME
Keith Clark (KC)	Programme Manager
Martin Cranfield (MC)	PMO Governance Lead

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

Actions

Area	Ref	Action	Owner	Due	Latest Update
Programme planning	PSG19-01	Ensure that the assumption (that participants going through SIT will not also need to conduct qualification testing) is being managed via the RAID	Programme (Jason Brogden)	03-May-23	Updated in Programme RAID log
	PSG19-02	Share comms to clarify the dependency for participants on DCC June 2023 release in order for participants to be ready for SIT	Programme (Jason Brogden)	03-May-23	Dependency already in RAID log. Comms to be shared
	PSG19-03	Meet to share the approach to Migration in the Programme plan	Programme (Adrian Page, John Wiggins) Ofgem Sponsor (Jenny Boothe)	03-May-23	
	PSG19-04	Ensure the 11 key risks in the replan are appropriately included, scored and managed via the RAID management process	Programme (Keith Clark, Giles Clayden)	03-May-23	
	PSG19-05	Determine and share dates for May PSG accounting for CR022 Impact Assessment period	Programme (Giles Clayden, PMO)	03-May-23	Extraordinary PSG to be scheduled for 12 May 2023
Delivery dashboards	PSG19-06	Clarify dates / timelines for the Transition Design in the Helix dashboard	Programme (Adrian Page) Helix Representative (Lewis Robertson)	03-May-23	
	PSG19-07	Provide a live forward view of industry consultations via the Collaboration Base / Website and / or in the PSG dashboards	Programme PMO	03-May-23	Already in progress across PPC and PMO teams
	PSG19-08	Review risks and mitigations related to the Smart Metering Programme Implementation to ensure relevant risks and implications of legacy meters are appropriately quantified and managed	Programme (Jason Brogden) DCC Representative (Deborah Woods-Malone)	03-May-23	Risk and dependency already in RAID log. Follow-up session scheduled
	PSG19-09	Clarify if the DIP is included in the MHHS budget shared at PSG	Programme (Chris Harden)	03-May-23	Confirmed that DIP is including in MHHSP budgets

Area	Ref	Action	Owner	Due	Latest Update
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	In discussion via the Migration Working Group (MWG). This action will remain 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 RAID log. The risk is currently low scoring. Implications of the DIP design on the core MHHS design will be discussed at DAG once the DIP design is available (this action will remain open until this point)
	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 CP2	To remain open and be aligned to Control Point 2
	PSG18-03	Mobilise the Fast Track Implementation Group (FTIG)	Keith Clark	03/05/23	FTIG mobilised with first meeting 14 April. Fortnightly cadence thereafter
	PSG18-05	Look into the assurance process for LDSOs for the accuracy of data for DUoS billing	Jason Brogden	05/04/23	Programme progressing a statement on assurance to share with LDSOs and Elexon Helix
	PSG18-06	Progress implementation of CR015 Option A via the Design Authority (DA)	Programme PMO	05/04/23	Implementation in progress. Updates will be provided to PSG as the approving body and via the Design change process
	PSG18-07	Update TMAG ToR and the Programme interim plan as per March PSG decisions	Programme PMO	05/04/23	Housekeeping CR for TMAG ToR approved and Governance Framework reissued. Interim Plan Housekeeping CR is in the change process.
	PSG18-09	Provide 23/24 budgets in PSG central party finance dashboards	Programme and Central Parties	05/04/23	23/24 budgets from Helix, RECCo and the MHHS Programme are available in the dashboard. DCC budget is TBC

Decisions

Area	Ref	Decision
Minutes	PSG-DEC44	The PSG approved the minutes of the 01 March 2023 PSG
Programme planning	PSG-DEC45	The PSG approved the Replan Change Request CR022 be raised to Impact Assessment. The PSG agreed for the Impact Assessment window to be extended by three working days to 17:00, 26 April 2023
	PSG-DEC46	The PSG approved the extension to the Interim Plan

Minutes

1. Welcome

HT welcomed all to the meeting noting meeting focus would be on the replan.

2. Minutes and Actions Review

DECISION PSG-DEC44: The PSG approved the minutes of the 01 March 2023 PSG

HT updated against the open actions as per the slides. JBr noted PSG15-01 was on the agenda for the next MWG 13 April 2023. Against PSG17-03, HT noted discussion on this at last PSG and further update to come following further information being shared via DAG.

GW noted they felt there was a lack of visibility of progress of implementation on CR015. This had been highlighted via DAG. HT responded that this was noted and would go back to DAG. JBr highlighted that CR015 was due to be discussed at DA and was an action for the Programme to take forward.

3. Sponsor update

JBo reiterated content of the Sponsor Update as per the slides. JBo noted progress updates to be shared to BEIS and Ofgem Board, with a healthy interest across government from EVs to the Smart Programme. JBo noted action from the Programme following March PSG was welcomed. JBo highlighted an open question on feedback from PSG members on mitigations for risks to entering Systems Integration Testing (SIT). HT added the importance of implementing 'guard rails' to ensure SIT dates were achievable and ensure mitigations were in place to hit the SIT date as per the replan.

4. Programme replan approach and Change Request

GC walked through the replan POAP and current position as per the slides. GC explained that the Programme was on track, with the draft CR022 issued to PSG last week and the artefacts ready to be issued for Impact Assessment today. GC noted an aspiration to hit a four-week cycle for Impact Assessment and the outputs to come back to PSG, however with bank holidays and tight timelines, the Programme wanted to revisit the timelines to May PSG (HT noted to return to this item at the end of the agenda item, noting a desire to maintain the June baseline date so any changes would squeeze timeline in between). GC noted Ofgem had had full visibility of the replan through the process, with an intent to continue engagement with Ofgem throughout the next stages.

GC walked through the basis for CR022 as per the slides. GC explained the case to re-baseline the plan and walked through each of the bullets on changes to the plan since the original timetable. GC invited questions:

- CF queried equivalence noting benefits and risks, with examples of other programmes showing this process may not be beneficial in the long run. JBr noted the Programme had been working with RECCo and Elexon on the risks for code bodies for qualifying participants that had progressed through equivalence. The understanding of risks and required mitigations had been developed further using the test cases and scenarios, and this was a benefit of the Programme being separate from the Code Bodies. JBr was confident the risks were being managed.

- CP noted that the detail of SIT (who needs to do what) was still being worked through and held the view that CR022 had stated assumptions on requirements for the MVC that appeared to be incorrect. CP queried if there were small things in the replan impact assessment process to query or clarify, and if so, what the process

would be for the Programme to review and provide answers. GC responded that the Impact Assessment process would follow the same process as Round 3 with playbacks scheduled w/c 11 April and a drop-in Q&A taking place the following week. GC added that the PMO mailbox would be open throughout, with ongoing bilaterals an option as well. GC added that Table A4 (with MVC clarification highlighted by CP) would be updated in CR022 in the version that would go to Impact Assessment A.

- GW queried equivalence and highlighted a statement minuted at TMAG from Elexon that participants that go through SIT may also need to qualify. GW was concerned that parties would volunteer for SIT and still have to qualify. JB responded that the current assumption was that there would be equivalence and that those moving through SIT would not need to also go through qualification testing. This was an assumption with risk to be reviewed with the code bodies and was being worked through in the QWG and SITWG. This would remain an assumption until resolved via the working groups. MH noted Elexon were working closely with the programme and were co-reviewing content with the Programme to ensure areas like this had input from code bodies and the Programme.

ACTION PSG19-01: Jason Brogden to ensure that the assumption (that participants going through SIT will not also need to conduct qualification testing) is being managed via the RAID.

GC walked through the risks and case for rebaselining the plan as per the slides, highlighting how risks had been quantified and input into the replanning process, and the implications this would have following the plan being baselined.

GC walked through how the Programme plan had developed from CR009 through Round 3 of consultation to CR022. GC explained the main changes in the phases in the plan, highlighting a risk on M10 moving and the implications this would have on the later stages of the plan. GC reiterated the assumptions underpinning the M10 date and the associated risks. GC highlighted the timeline for Component Integration Testing (CIT) and how this had extended from Round 3, but M10 had not been extended further as regression testing had been brought in.

GC walked through the overall Re-baseline POAP. GC highlighted the three critical paths and what each critical path meant. GC noted the POAP had the date ranges for M10-M16. GC invited questions. None received. GC explained that the plan had 11 key risks throughout the Programme, with the first seven risks relating to M10 and following risks on uncertainty and assumptions for the later stages of the plan. GC walked through each of the risks as per the slides. JBo noted that they felt that Risk 2 relating to the MVC was a small risk and that they felt risk 10 was an important one.

JS highlighted a risk relating to MVC participants due to MP162 that was supposed to be ready in June but was already flagged to be delivered late. JS noted the SIT status for these parties in the dashboards should be higher-rated, given the dependency on DCC from participants in order to be ready for SIT. JBr responded that this being raised, was welcomed and required better communication from the Programme. JBr explained that the Programme did not need DCC to be live in the June release in order to be ready for SIT. JBr noted there was a dependency recorded in the RAID for participants on the DCC but that this was not directly linked to the June MP162 release, and therefore the risk was lower than perceived by JS. JS welcomed the explanation from JBr and noted a communication would be helpful.

ACTION PSG19-02: Jason Brogden to share comms to clarify the dependency for participants on DCC June 2023 release in order for participants to be ready for SIT

AP explained Risk 3 for the SI team to be ready for SIT. AP explained a number of mitigations including on resource, artefacts in development and work ongoing with participants such as St Clements. GC walked through the remaining Risks 4-11 as per the slides, highlighting key elements of each risk, the impact they have, and their mitigations. On Risk 11, AP provided additional detail behind the number of MPANs moving through SIT and qualification and the modelling underpinning the timelines provided, and hence the implications on go-live. JBo added that the narrative in the Change Request needed to be appropriate – the Faster Switching (FSP) Period had had a 4-month cutover period. JBo queried the numbers of MPANs and if the timelines were sensible, given how FSP ran. AP responded that the Programme had so far looked 'top down' and that they were now doing an exercise to work with suppliers to understand which phases of the programme they would be going through and hence the implications on plan timelines. JBo noted they were getting more comfortable with the extended timelines given the justification provided but that they needed to understand more detail behind the migration approach. JBr added that while the timing of phasing was what drove the overall timescales, the Programme had also used phasing to squeeze timescales as well.

ACTION PSG19-03: Programme and Ofgem to meet to share the approach to Migration in the Programme plan

GC highlighted an additional risk on the exploded view of the SIT POAP relating to SIT migration. GC noted uncertainties such as on D0170 and open Change Requests and reiterated that further Change Requests on the plan may follow the plan rebaseline. GC noted the Programme would be carefully managing the aggregate risk in SIT functional and SIT migration.

AC agreed that risk on a programme of this scale was expected and queried whether this level of risk was acceptable. AC queried if the risks shared to PSG were also in the RAID (as they were not reported in the delivery dashboards). AC queried the scoring of the risks and what the target scores were for them and if the programme had the level of resource required to manage the risk, given the scale. KC responded that the dashboards looked at risk themes (rather than individual risks) and were shared with PSG to focus on specific risks areas. KC explained that the Fast Track Implementation Group (FTIG) was being set up in order to review and manage risks relating to plan delivery and that further groups may be set up in future.

ACTION PSG19-04: Keith Clark and Giles Clayden to ensure the 11 key risks in the replan are appropriately included, scored and managed via the RAID management process

GC explained the preliminary recommendations for impact-assessing the replan as per the slides. GC explained the rationale for the Programme were recommending the plan be taken forward to industry Impact Assessment. KC added that a lot of detailed thinking had been done since Round 3 – KC explained that the plan was an industry plan that had been developed via the replan consultations as well as the working groups. Governance activity had created alignment between industry and had removed uncertainties. The plan was the best culmination of this activity with industry and was intended to be one that industry bought into and reflected the consensus the Programme had got with industry.

HT moved to make a decision. PSG members unanimously supported raising CR022 to Impact Assessment.

HT noted on timelines to the next PSG needed to be considered for Impact Assessment and analysis. HT proposed the Programme take this away to determine the best approach. CP noted a number of qualification discussions ongoing with assumptions participants would make, and therefore requested if collectively the programme could close out these ambiguities (this would make responses clearer and more definite) before the Impact Assessment window closed. GW queried what action would be taken on timelines. HT responded that there were two areas, one for the Impact Assessment window to be extended and a second for the subsequent analysis to be completed. GW responded that their request was to extend Impact Assessment to Wednesday 26 April, given bank holidays, annual leave, and timelines for other documents to come out from the Programme. KC responded that this would be three additional days for Impact Assessment and that this would move out PSG in May (or require an extraordinary PSG) to enable time to analyse Impact Assessments. GW responded they did not want to extend timelines but that it was important to enable the richest responses. HT responded that the, given feedback, the Impact Assessment window should be extended to 26 April and then the May PSG be a few days later. KC added that, given paper days and the time for analysing outputs of the CR, the May date would need to be pushed slightly further. HT noted this squeezed the decision timeline for Ofgem. GW noted the Ofgem element could be done ahead of time, with the 'process element' completed and any updates made following the Impact Assessment could be done then.

HT summarised that the specific timeline would be reviewed and communicated by the Programme, to include additional time for Impact Assessment (to 26 April 2023) and to allow enough time to analyse Impact Assessment responses. This would likely mean a PSG around 12 May 2023, with a slightly squeezed paper day to allow enough time for Impact Assessment analysis. This would also allow enough time for Ofgem to make a decision by the 07 June deadline.

ACTION PSG19-05: Giles Clayden to determine and share dates for May PSG accounting for CR022 Impact Assessment period

DECISION PSG-DEC46: The PSG approved the Replan Change Request CR022 be raised to Impact Assessment. The PSG agreed for the Impact Assessment window to be extended by three working days to 17:00, 26 April 2023

5. Interim Plan extension

KC introduced the item and explained the background and updates to the interim plan as per the slides. KC walked through some of the key items in the extended Interim Plan.

HT moved to a decision. GW noted the 23 May deadline for SIT volunteers and that the Placing Reliance Policy had a 20-working day period for activity to be delivered ahead of the 23 May deadline that could create challenges for

participants looking to volunteer. HT responded that this would be picked up in the SITWG. KC responded this did not change the 23 May deadline.

PSG unanimously approved the Interim Plan extension

> **DECISION PSG-DEC46: The PSG approved the extension to the Interim Plan**

6. Programme workstream update

AP highlighted some key elements of the SI workstream update:

Design

AP explained key items including the volume of design queries. GW noted ongoing challenges of populating the DIN log (his had already been flagged through the design workstream) and queried if all issues were on the DIN log. AP responded that they believed everything was on the DIN log. HT invited GW to flag any specifics to the design team. AP noted a new way forward was being developed on how design changes would be managed.

AC noted a Red risk of the transition design in the dashboards. The Helix dashboard had a resolution date of April 23 but the Programme were saying May 23. AP responded that the May date was when this would be going to DAG and they would discuss with Helix.

> **ACTION PSG 19-06: Adrian Page to clarify dates / timelines for the Transition Design in the Helix dashboard**

Testing

AP highlighted points on the Reliance Policy, test data and other documents coming through the testing workstreams.

Sims and Ems

AP explained there had been fortnightly show-and-tells on the simulators being shared by the workstream. There was positive use of simulators already with participants. Work on the data generators had begun.

Migration and transition

AP explained that the Migration Design had been approved and further work was being commenced with participants..

AP invited questions. None received.

7. IPA LDSO assurance

RS walked through the summary of lessons learned for LDSO assurance as per the slides. RS explained the detail behind each of the four recommendations. RS invited questions. None received.

8. Reminder on MHHS processes

HT noted these items had been brought to PSG to maintain momentum and ensure collaborative delivery with participants following a consistent approach. HT explained how queries could be directed to points of contact in the programme, with contact emails provided via the website. The escalation process was there to ensure escalations came to the correct level in the Programme and to the lowest level of governance (rather than direct to the senior team).

HT explained the consultation process, noting there was a need for transparency and flexibility for document development moving through consultations with industry. GW noted there were many workstreams and coordination was required when issuing consultations and communicating them with industry. GW noted staggering consultations would be welcomed, together with a forward view of the consultation pipeline.

> **ACTION PSG19-07: Programme PPC to provide a live forward view of industry consultations via the Collaboration Base / Website and / or in the PSG dashboards**

9. Delivery dashboards

HT invited questions on the Delivery Dashboards.

JR noted on the SIT dashboard that iDNOs were looking at collaborative testing and were intending to come into early SIT together. This would give national coverage, as required against one of the earlier risks highlighted in the replan agenda item.

GE queried progress of Smart Metering Programme implementation. HT responded that the MHHS Programme needed to be cognisant that this was a separate programme and that, while there was a dependency, it did not need to be considered in the same way as it was out of Programme scope. GE noted the Smart Metering roll out was not progressing as fast as the Programme would like, and hence there may be a large number of legacy meters still in the market once the programme hit migration. JBr noted thy had received GE's feedback offline and had shared internally for comment. GE added that they expected 3-5 million legacy meters and queried whether the programme and industry would be ready for this. JBr reiterated that the Smart Metering Programme was out of scope but agreed this needed to be discussed by the Programme. DWM noted this was relevant for DCC and requested inclusion in any follow up session.

ACTION PSG19-08: Jason Brogden to review risks and mitigations related to the Smart Metering Programme Implementation to ensure relevant risks and implications of legacy meters are appropriately quantified and managed

---

GW queried the DIP-related costs in the 23/24 budget forecast and if these were included in the Programme costs. HT responded they believed they were included in the MHHS budget.

Action: Chris Harden to clarify if the DIP is included in the MHHS budget shared at PSG

---

10. Summary and next steps

MC summarised the actions as per the table above.

JS noted a forward view of working group consultations would be appreciated, to be added to PSG dashboards. (**see action PSG19-07**). HT walked through the agenda items for the May PSG and closed the meeting

Date of next PSG: 03 May 2023 (note extraordinary PSG to be scheduled for the Programme replan)