

MHHS Programme Steering Group (PSG) Headline Report

Issue date: 04/08/2023

Meeting Number **PSG023**

Venue **Virtual – MS Teams**

Date and Time **02 August 2023 1000-1200**

Classification **Public**

New / Outstanding Actions

Area	Ref	Action	Owner	Due
Programme Governance	PSG23-01	Diarise the extraordinary PSG meeting needed for M9 approval on 30 th October.	Programme (Fraser Mathieson)	06/09/2023
	PSG23-02	Circulate supporting slide pack for St Clements delivery update to PSG members with Headline Report.	Programme (Lewis Hall)	04/08/2023
	PSG23-02	Review the existing appeals mechanisms as described in the existing Governance Framework and determine whether a defined appeals process needs to be documented elsewhere. Findings will be shared with PSG.	Programme (Lewis Hall & Fraser Mathieson)	06/09/2023
	PSG23-04	Review LSC appeal and determine what the Programme can address within its scope and what is outside of the Programme's control (ie. wider industry issue). Review this with the LSC and agree a plan to take forward.	Programme (Jason Brogden & Lewis Hall)	06/09/2023
Previous Meeting(s)	PSG21-05	Programme to discuss with IPA the potential inclusion of IPA test assurance activities alongside programme plan information, to assist participants' view of effort requirements.	Programme and IPA	08/06/2023
	PSG20-03	PSG Constituency Representatives to encourage constituents to request bilateral discussion with Programme on SIT planning (e.g. to discuss systems, processes, practicalities of testing and qualification, operation of placing reliance policy, etc). <i>***To be kept open until M9.</i>	PSG Constituency Representatives	30/10/2023
	PSG18-05	Progress the assurance process for LDSOs for the accuracy of data for DUoS billing.	Jason Brogden	05/07/2023
	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

Decisions

Area	Ref	Decision
Programme Governance	PSG-DEC57	The PSG approved the headline report and minutes of the PSG meeting held 05 July 2023 with no amendments.

Key Discussion Items

Area	Discussion
Minutes and Actions	<p>The minutes of the last meeting were approved with no amendments (DECISION PSG-DEC57).</p> <p>Action wording and updates/resolutions can be found within the meeting papers.</p> <p>The DNO representative raised a question regarding the Fast Track Design Update Process and how Change Requests are implemented.</p> <p>Clarification was provided by the Programme, confirming that going forward implementation plans will be presented to the appropriate Advisory Group, alongside the Change Request for decision. This is captured within the MHHS Change Control Approach.</p> <p>There was further discussion regarding the implementation plans for CR018 and CR015. Clarification was provided by the Programme as to when these are planned to be implemented.</p>
Programme Reporting	<p>The Programme provided an update of progress against the Programme Plan. The Programme is tracking Amber in its readiness for M9 (System Integration Test start) at the end of October, with risks being actively managed. It was highlighted that a critical point in moving towards the M9 milestone will be the production data cut 'Go/No-Go' decision due on 16-Aug-23.</p> <p>The data cut is on track and activities needed to take place to achieve this are being monitored through the Fast Track Implementation Group (FTIG).</p>
Route to M9 Sign-Off	<p>The Programme introduced the proposed route to M9 achievement. Initial focus was on readiness for SIT, with view of the proposed test entry criteria that will need to be met in order for M9 to be achieved. It was noted that readiness will need to be assessed for each of the different Component Integration Test (CIT) intervals and the process and timeline, if working well, would be replicated for SIT Functional.</p> <p>There was a walk-through of the timetable and how progress will be tracked, noting that the key testing milestone for approval at TMAG is scheduled for 23-Oct-23 - <i>SIT Component Integration Testing 1 Preparation Complete (including approval of SI SIT Component Integration Test Readiness Report)</i>.</p> <p>It was noted that slide #10 of the pack stated TMAG approval of the detailed acceptance criteria was due on 19-Aug-23, when this is actually 16-Aug-23. The Programme confirmed that 16-Aug-23 was the correct date.</p> <p>The Programme gave an overview of the intended reporting scheme leading up to M9, proposing to track progress through FTIG, which may become weekly, as well as SIT Working Group, TMAG and PSG.</p>

	<p>There was a question raised by the Large Supplier representative regarding whether the readiness reports used to track progress could be made available to an audience wider than FTIG. The Programme confirmed that this would be done to provide transparency and visibility on progress.</p> <p>The Programme also provided a view on the proposed choreography of decision making up to M9. It was noted that milestone decisions will be made by TMAG and PSG, with underpinning recommendations being provided by FTIG. It was noted that FTIG is not a formal governance group, but it is the only group that comprises all SIT participants and so its supporting activity alongside TMAG and PSG is critical.</p> <p>Further information was provided on key milestones that will come to PSG for decision, as well as those intended to go to TMAG (and when).</p> <p>The Ofgem representative asked if an extraordinary PSG would be needed to make the decision on M9 and the programme confirmed this was the case. This will be diarised by the PMO in due course.</p> <p>There was discussion on whether the PSG decision scheduled for 30-Oct-23 was too late considering CIT is scheduled to start on 31-Oct-23. The Programme confirmed that the TMAG decision to confirm CIT preparation is complete will take place on 23-Oct-23, giving 1 week to address any concerns the group may have.</p> <p>It was recognised that the timelines were tight but weekly reporting will be in place through FTIG and any risks that materialise will be identified well before the decision date.</p> <p>The Programme reaffirmed that the approval of M9 will be a PSG decision.</p>
<p>SIT assurance observations</p>	<p>The Programme provided an introduction to the delivery and design assurance process and timelines. An overview of the general highlights and insights was also presented. It was acknowledged that the status of assurance following Cohort 1 was Amber, which is natural at this stage of the Programme, as also highlighted by the IPA in their reporting on the Programme.</p> <p>The Programme provided a general overview of how the sessions were run, duration and focus. The Programme thanked participants for their support in progressing this important exercise.</p>
<p>Core Capability Provider Update</p>	<p>Representatives from St Clements, Smart DCC and RECCo presented an overview of their delivery progress and readiness for M9.</p> <p>St Clements</p> <p>The PSG were informed that St Clements were tracking Amber against M9 having now agreed a revised plan. The delivery approach has been tailored from a traditional waterfall delivery to a 'micro-waterfall' approach, consisting of multiple sprints. This is to enable earlier delivery of various components, de-risk delivery and to ensure there is no 'non-delivery' of functionality.</p> <p>CR022 timelines are challenging and leave little contingency. The long tail of programme design issues after the M5 baseline has had an impact on the MPRS plan. St Clements' delivery plan is frontloaded to tackle the greater complexity, higher risk items in the first two delivery sprints. Later sprints are then expected to be less complex (subject to confirmation via detailed impact assessments in each sprint).</p> <p>The St Clements Representative confirmed that Sprint 1 has now completed and Sprint 2 is well underway. They also stated that there is zero capacity to absorb unplanned change between now and SIT start.</p> <p>Smart DCC</p>

	<p>DCC are tracking Amber overall against the plan but continuing to make good progress. The main reasons for tracking Amber are due to further clarity needed on environment requirements and timelines, data cut readiness, and data cleanse requirements. Core build components and changes to CSS are on track and DCC is confident in taking their data cut on 19th August.</p> <p>The DCC representative confirmed that an internal Programme Advisory Group has now been stood up and will oversee and guide on upcoming delivery challenges. It was noted that there were several commercial risks associated with the DCC delivery which the team have worked to unblock over recent weeks. The Programme thanked them for their support in doing this.</p> <p>It was raised to the DCC that the delivery plan shared with PSG had the MP162 / MDR UIT activity completing 5-months ahead of schedule. The PSG asked why this was the case and whether that meant DCC testing could commence early.</p> <p>The DCC representative confirmed that the early delivery is at the request of the Programme to ensure environment readiness for SIT Functional, and the gap in timelines was created when the Programme Plan was baselined, and several dates moved out. The changes will be delivered early and should partners wish to test early they will be able to do so.</p> <p>RECCo</p> <p>The update from RECCo was split into 3 parts, covering: EES build, Qualification Testing and Code Drafting.</p> <p>EES activity is all on track for upcoming milestones. PIT is expected to complete by mid-Nov 2023 ready to commence SIT in Jan-24. All preparation activities for the data cut later this month are progressing to plan. The main risk to EES delivery is unplanned change, should it arise, it will be hard to fit in to existing timelines.</p> <p>The RECCo representative noted that there is a dependency between SIT and Qualification deliverables that has not been fully clarified yet and this could impact progress of Qualification preparation. Discussions are ongoing between Code Bodies and the Programme to resolve this. Non-SIT LDSO testing is scheduled to start during SIT Functional Testing and it is therefore unclear how MPRS will support this testing phase.</p> <p>For the above reasons, Qualification preparation was flagged as Amber.</p> <p>Code Drafting overall is on track, with Migration and Qualification updates on track for consultation in Tranche 3 later this year.</p>
<p>IPA Testing Assurance</p>	<p>The IPA representative provided an update on test assurance activities from 'Period 1' and talked through the overarching approach, ensuring duplication with programme assurance (delivery and design) is avoided.</p> <p>It was noted that the field work for Period 1 was completed in Jun-23, so findings will relate to progress at that point in time. The general findings are that the Programme is on track to meet M9 in October, acknowledging that there are several risks and issues that need to be resolved before then.</p> <p>There were two main themes from the report: (i) Greater clarity on what is needed in order to be ready for SIT and PIT needs to be provided; and (ii) test data remains a key area of risk due to complexity and volume of work to be completed between now and the M9 date.</p> <p>There was a query raised from PSG about how the Programme and IPA could be more joined up in assurance activities going forward to alleviate the time burden on those PPs involved. This was acknowledged by the Programme and IPA, and it was stressed that time has been taken to ensure alignment in approach and avoid duplicating topics in the assurance exercises. It was conceded that there will naturally be some overlap.</p> <p>It was acknowledged by PSG that independent assurance is needed and so a level of separation from Programme assurance activities does need to be in place.</p>

<p>Delivery Dashboards</p>	<p>The Programme invited comments on the suite of delivery dashboards put forward to the PSG.</p> <p>There was discussion on the risk related to the scope of Supplier qualification testing for Unmetered Supplies. This is being reviewed by Elexon and other Code Bodies, with options to be brought forward to the Qualification Working Group on 8-Aug-23.</p> <p>It was acknowledged that it is important to recognise the Programme risk associated with this and, if the guidance remains as is, it will require suppliers to build additional functionality, which could lead to delays to delivery. The Programme stated that the risk will be raised at FTIG on 04-Aug-23.</p> <p>There was a query on why CR018 was showing as 'Open' on the Change Request Dashboard. Following discussion, it was agreed that this will be marked as 'Approved' as the decision on the CR itself has been made, but this may require a new category to reflect that final design updates and implementation release were not yet agreed.</p> <p>The good progress across code drafting was acknowledged with thanks given to the delivery teams from the Programme and Code Bodies.</p>
<p>Summary and next steps</p>	<p>The PSG in September will be in person on 06-Sep-23.</p> <p>AOB (Large Supplier Constituency appeal to CR018 decision)</p> <p>The Large Supplier Representative tabled an appeal to the decision to approve CR018 made at DAG on 12-Jul-23. The representative also sought clarity on the appeals process for future situations like this.</p> <p>It was noted that each participant has had the opportunity to respond to the Change Request through the Impact Assessment process and a number of Large Suppliers did not respond. This should have been the opportunity for them to raise concerns, rather than after the fact.</p> <p>The Programme acknowledged that decisions like this will not always please everyone but the rationale for the decision was made very clear by the DAG Chair and the decision stands.</p> <p>It was reaffirmed that the role of the Advisory Groups is to advise the SRO in decision making, rather than decisions being made via a voting mechanism.</p> <p>The decision made with regard to CR018 was the one designed to have the least impact on the Programme's deliverables and timelines.</p> <p>There was discussion regarding lessons to be learned that the Programme agreed to take away and review ahead of the next PSG. This included exploring whether an appeals process is appropriate to be drafted and whether redline documents could be shared with industry alongside Change Requests for Impact Assessment.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Large Supplier representative would take away the feedback from the Programme and discuss with his constituency and a follow up discussion with the Programme may be sought. The Small Supplier rep conceded that his constituency had not engaged heavily in the initial analysis of the change but did support the position of the Large Supplier representative.</p> <p>It was felt that not all consequences of this change laid out in the appeal document by the Large Suppliers were in the scope of the Programme to resolve and many are systemic issues impacting the industry currently and this would need to be reviewed. It was agreed to raise the consequential impacts into the SASWG for assessment.</p>

Date of next meeting: 06 September 2023 10am