MHHS Programme Steering Group (PSG) Minutes and Actions

Issue date: 09/08/2023

Meeting Number	**PSG023**		Venue	**Virtual – MS Teams**
Date and Time	**02 August 2023 1000-1200**		Classification	**Public**

Attendees

Chair

Helen Tipton (Chair)	MHHS SRO

Industry Representatives

Andrew Campbell (AC)	Small Supplier Representative
Caroline Farquhar (CF)	Consumer Representative
Gareth Evans (GE)	I&C Supplier Representative
Graham Wood (GW)	Large Supplier Representative
Chris Price (CP)	DNO Representative
Jenny Rawlinson (JR)	iDNO Representative
Jonny Moore (JM) (on behalf of Jonathan Hawkins)	RECCo Representative
Joel Stark (JS)	Supplier Agent Representative (Independent)
Neil Dewar (ND) (on behalf of Karen Thompson-Lilley)	National Grid ESO
Lewis Robertson (LR)	Elexon Representative (Central Systems Provider)
Paul Akrill (PA)	Supplier Agent Representative
Vladimir Black (VB)	Medium Supplier Representative
Del Kang (DK) (on behalf of Deborah Woods-Malone)	DCC Representative (Central Systems Provider)

MHHS IM

Adrian Page (AP)	SI Design Lead
Chris Welby (CW)	Industry SME
Lewis Hall (LH)	MHHS PMO Lead *(Secretariat)*
Giles Clayden (GC)	Deputy Programme Manager
Keith Clark (KC)	Programme Manager
Jason Brogden (JBr)	Programme Industry SME
Paul Pettitt (PP)	SI Design Lead

Other Attendees

Andy MacFaul (AMF)	Ofgem
Jenny Boothe (JBo)	Ofgem
Sinead Quinn (SQ)	Ofgem
Melissa Giordano (MG)	Ofgem, Programme Sponsor
Richard Warham (RW)	St Clements Services
Richard Shilton (RS)	IPA
David Gandee (DG)	IPA

Apologies

Deborah Woods-Malone (DWM)	DCC Representative (Central Systems Provider)
Karen Thompson-Lilley (KTL)	National Grid ESO
Jonathan Hawkins (JH)	RECCo Representative

Actions

Area	Ref	Action	Owner	Due
Programme Governance	PSG23-01	Diarise the extraordinary PSG meeting needed for M9 approval on 30th 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). ***To be kept open until M9.*	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-DEC58	The PSG approved the headline report and minutes of the PSG meeting held 05 July 2023 with no amendments.

Minutes

1. Welcome

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting and introduced the agenda.

2. Minutes and Actions

Programme noted updates against the actions:

PSG17-05: Action to remain open until Control Point 2 where a review of the Benefits Realisation Plan will take place.

PSG18-05: Jason Brogden (JBr) confirmed that the scope of Programme testing and Code Body Qualification will not include DBT2 and will not extend beyond Programme design scope. The Programme is having conversations with the IPA on how adequate assurance is undertaken. There is further work being done to consider assurance of accuracy of settlement outputs (including DUoS Billing reports) which will be progressed through SIT Working Group.

PSG20-03: PSG reps were encouraged to remind their constituencies that should they have any questions on the Programme, or require further bilateral engagement, to contact PMO or PPC.

Chris Price (CP) queried what the route to closure of PSG20-03 was. The Chair reaffirmed that the Programme is at an important stage and bilateral engagements are critical to ensuring alignment between Programme and Participants. It was agreed that this action will remain open and monitored until M9.

PSG21-05: Lewis Hall (LH) confirmed that updates to the MHHS Transition Timetable had been made and IPA activities incorporated. New version of the document will be published in next iteration of the Implementation Approach.

PSG22-01: Paul Pettitt (PP) confirmed the action was closed – Interim Releases (IRs) 1 and 2 have now gone ahead successfully using the Fast Track Design Update Process. IR3 was taking place concurrent to this meeting.

CP raised a question regarding how updates from the Fast Track Design Update Process are implemented through the Change Control Approach. The example given was in the context of CR018 where the change was approved but not the implementation decision or approach.

LH provided clarification over the process, stating that when a change receives Impact Assessment (IA) and the consolidated IA summary report produced for review by the relevant Advisory Group (AG), a programme recommendation for implementation (subject to approval) will also be provided to the AG to review and agree.

Graham Wood (GW) commented regarding CR015 that comments on the solution were missed because this crossed over the objection deadline. PP responded that the Programme would continue to monitor this but there were no objections to CR015.

PP confirmed that CR018 will be incorporated into IR4.

PSG22-03: LH stated that the Programme has introduced risk and issues to each of the AGs and will move to the WGs next. Focus will typically be on the top five risks and issues and any key themes to focus on. It is an iterative process, and the Programme will look to improve this based on feedback. Keith Clark (KC) also noted the Programme are aligning the milestone reporting and approval format with the format shown in PSG across governance groups.

PSG22-04: Adrian Page (AP) stated that weekly test meetings with DCC are in place with close alignment. There have been recent conversations with DCC on delivery assurance and this action was confirmed as closed.

PSG had no comments on the headline report or minutes from PSG held on 05 July 2023.

DECISION PSG-DEC58: The PSG approved the headline report and minutes of the PSG meeting held 05 July 2023 with no amendments.

3. Programme Reporting

Keith Clark (KC) provided an overview of the MHHS Programme Milestone Status, as per the slide. It was noted that the critical point within the plan is the data cut Go/No-Go decision (GONG) due on 16 August 2023. This will continue to be tracked and progressed through the Fast Track Implementation Group (FTIG) and is on track to go ahead as per the date.

The Programme is amber overall as several risks to achieving M9 remain and are being actively managed.

4. Route to M9 Sign-Off

AP provided an overview of the route to M9 (System Integration Test Start) sign off.

It was noted the initial focus would be on SIT readiness and AP provided a view of the proposed test entry criteria to be agreed with PPs and FTIG.

In the Implementation Approach the Programme has timetables for each SIT and CIT interval and these are the starting point for any criteria. SITWG will act as the governance group where the material for approval would be built up and TMAG will be the forum to approve key milestones. There will be readiness criteria for each CIT interval and the plan is to replicate this approach for SIT Functional.

AP went over the timetable, as per the slide. It was noted that the FTIG session on 04 August 2023 will review the proposed criteria.

A key decision-making milestone will be on 23 October 2023 at TMAG (T2-TE-0250) and this will be to approve that all preparation for SIT CIT (Interval 1) is complete.

GW queried the 19 August 2023 TMAG approval date for the data cut as this is a Saturday. The Programme confirmed that this was an error on the slide and the actual date is 16 August 2023.

AP emphasised it is important how this progress is monitored and tracked. AP went over an illustration of PPs readiness reporting scheme, as per the slide.

The Programme is considering how to report on this with a potential RAG status for each of the activities. AP noted that the reporting would be monitored and reported internally (likely daily) and to each FTIG.

There was discussion regarding whether the reporting could be made wider than FTIG and shared with the PSG.

AP and KC agreed that the plan is to share the report widely to promote visibility. GW thanked the Programme for the clarification and reporting on the slide.

KC provided an overview of decision choreography and high-level criteria up to M9, as per the slide. The Programme wants to strengthen support of TMAG decisions through FTIG. Although FTIG is not a formal governance group it is the only group comprised fully of SIT participants.

The key decisions to be made at TMAG on 23 October 2023 and extraordinary PSG on 30 October 2023 will be underpinned by FTIG recommendations.

Both Control Point 2 and Readiness Assessment 3 approvals, alongside milestone T2-TE-0250, will feed into the decision making for milestone T1-TE-1000 (M9 – System Integration Test Start).

KC talked through the premise of Control Point 2 at a high level. Noting that it provides an opportunity for the Programme to step back from delivery and review aggregated risk for the programme, refresh key Programme Strategies and ask the question 'Is the Programme ready to proceed (to the next delivery phase)?'

There was a question regarding whether the PSG decision on M9 would require an extraordinary PSG. The Programme confirmed it would.

> **ACTION PSG23-01: Diarise the extraordinary PSG meeting needed for M9 approval on 30 October 2023.**

Jenny Boothe (JBo) queried the choreography of decision making. Noting that a decision on M9 was scheduled for 30 October 2023 but SIT (CIT) was scheduled to start on 31 October 2023. This timeline seems tight with no contingency.

KC confirmed that decision on test preparation being complete is scheduled to be taken at TMAG on 23 October 2023, so provides 5-working days to address any questions that could arise from the meeting.

It was noted that an FTIG recommendation would be needed ahead of TMAG. This would likely take place on 20 October 2023. It is important that this FTIG recommendation is obtained going into that meeting.

FTIG will be tracking and monitoring progress on fortnightly basis, it was expected that FTIG would likely move to weekly in the run up to M9 decision. This would provide the opportunity to highlight risks to M9 early and often, so if any challenges with 23 October 2023 were apparent, this would be known in advance.

Jenny Rawlinson (JR) asked if it is a PSG decision to sign off M9. The Programme confirmed it is and this will be done on 30 October 2023.

The Chair noted that it is important that TMAG and FTIG are closely aligned in the run up to M9 and working closely together throughout this process.

5. SIT Assurance Observations

KC provided an overview of Delivery Assurance observations, as per the slide.

KC noted Delivery Assurance meetings have been productive and most took place face-to-face. At this stage of delivery there are lots of comments, typically around test data and back-ups, PIT approach alignment and the overall M9 timetable.

KC stated that the overall status from the Cohort 1 delivery assurance questionnaire was amber – which is natural at this stage of the Programme, as also noted by the IPA in their report. The Programme is knowingly managing risks and have gone through delivery plans and Programme Participants' RAID logs in detail.

The Chair thanked each of the parties involved in the delivery assurance, noting that it has been a helpful exercise to identify any potential issues.

PP provided an overview of the Design Assurance timeline, as per the slide. The approach to design assurance differs slightly to delivery. The initial assessment has been completed for the core participants and the Programme is now executing the deep-dives with each of them.

PP noted that the first assessment was done when the volume of design change was high – the Fast Track Design Process has helped address this and this has been apparent in the deep-dives.

PP provided dep-dive statuses and high-level themes, as per the slide. The majority of participants in have provided evidence.

It was emphasised that the focus is on design assurance and not delivery, so the sessions do differ, albeit there is some overlap in particular areas.

PP thanked those involved for their support and time.

6. Core Capability Provider Update

The Chair introduced the next agenda item with presentations to be provided by St Clements (SCS), Smart DCC and RECCo.

St Clements

Richard Warham (RW) introduced himself as the representative from SCS. RW advised slides providing the delivery update would be shared with the Headline Report and Minutes after the meeting.

> **ACTION PSG23-03: Circulate supporting slide pack for St Clements delivery update to PSG members with Headline Report.**

RW noted that SCS were tracking amber towards meeting CIT and SIT Functional, and a revised delivery plan is now in place.

SCS traditionally follow a 'waterfall' delivery approach but to meet the needs to the Programme have moved to a 'micro-waterfall' approach. This will ensure functionality is delivered through a series of sprints and enables several benefits: earlier delivery of key MPRS functionality; de-risking delivery of non-MPRS functions, and; ensuring there are no instances of 'non-delivery'.

RW noted the CR022 dates are challenging and leave little contingency with MPRS being impacted by the long tail of programme design issues following the M5 baseline. Complexity of delivery and higher risk items have been frontloaded into earlier sprints, with the first two being the most complex.

RW talked through SCS' delivery plan. The plan is complete and now aligns to the MHHS Programme Plan and complexity within delivery has been unearthed. SCS expect to track amber as they manage ongoing delivery risk but are on track for M9.

There is zero capacity to absorb further unplanned changed and SCS' ask of the Programme was to minimise unplanned change before SIT Functional.

KC asked if, as per the delivery plan, Sprint 1 had completed and RW confirmed it had. Sprint 2 is underway.

It was re-iterated that Sprint 1 and 2 are the most complex delivery sprints and delivering these on time would give great confidence in preparedness for M9.

Smart DCC

Del Kang (DK) introduced himself and provided an overview of Smart DCC delivery, as per the slide. DCC are flagging as amber on delivery but are making good progress. An internal Programme Advisory Group within DCC has been stood up to govern MHHS internally and manage delivery complexities such as the data cleanse and cut.

DK confirmed switching deliverables are on track. The amber RAG status is due to further clarity being needed on environment requirements and timelines, data cut readiness, and data cleanse requirements.

Joel Stark (JS) queried the delivery of Smart Energy Code Modification Proposal (SEC MP)162 / Meter Data Retriever (MDR) User Interface Testing (UIT) on the DCC's plan as this is scheduled to be delivered five months earlier than planned. JS asked why this was and whether this allows for early DCC testing. DK confirmed that early delivery of SEC MP162 / MDR UIT is at the request of the Programme to ensure environment readiness from SIT Functional, and the gap in timelines was created when the Programme Plan was baselined. Several linked dates moved with the plan but delivery of this did not.

DK reiterated that the delivery of the functionality will be made earlier and will be ready for partners to test against should they wish.

The DCC are on track to be ready for the data cut on 19 August 2023.

KC stated that DCC and the Programme met as part of delivery assurance Cohort 1 and messages in PSG resonate with latest progress presented in that meeting.

It was noted that there were several commercial risks associated with the DCC's delivery which the team have worked to unblock over recent weeks. The Chair acknowledged this and thanked them for their support.

RECCo

Jonny Moore (JM) presented the delivery report on behalf of RECCo. The report was split across 3 key areas of delivery: Electricity Enquiry Service (EES) build, Qualification Testing and Code Drafting.

EES build is on track to meet all internal milestones and is scheduled to complete PIT by mid-November 2023, ready to enter SIT (CIT) by January 2024. JM confirmed RECCo are also on track for the Data Cut on 19 August 2023.

The main risk to delivery as it stands is any unplanned change and how this would fit into the plan should it arise.

JM provided an update on Qualification testing with a RAG status of amber due to several risks. There is a dependency between SIT and Qualification Test deliverables, and this has not been fully clarified yet. This could impact Qualification preparation. Discussions continue between Code Bodies and the Programme to resolve this.

Non-SIT LDSO testing is also takes place during SIT Functional and it is unclear how MPRS will support this testing phase as yet.

JM confirmed that code drafting is on track. It has been recently agreed that interface code drafting will move to October 2023. Migration and Qualification updates are on track for consultation in Tranche 3 later this year.

7. IPA Testing Assurance

Richard Shilton (RS) provided an update on the outcomes of Period 1 Test Assurance and talked through the approach to assurance, as per slide. Overall IPA view is that the Programme is on track to be ready for SIT at M9. There are risks but good awareness around these, and they are being managed. It was noted that Period 1 took place in June 2023, so findings are from that time.

There were two main themes in 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.

RS noted the findings show FTIG is working well and lots of strong bilaterals to resolve issues and concerns are ensuring progress continues.

RS set out the detailed recommendations within the report. The IPA are tracking the detailed recommendations with the Programme to make sure they are closed.

RS flagged that Period 2 of Test Assurance will have a slightly larger sample size, focused on SIT Readiness & Qualification.

JR asked what coordination has been across different areas of assurance activity in the Programme as they take up a lot of time and there are areas of duplication. JR recognised that Programme design and delivery assurance cannot be combined, but IPA assurance has overlap with delivery assurance.

RS recognised the need to minimise unnecessary time but independent assurance is needed. The IPA and Programme meet weekly to align on topics and schedules but RS acknowledged there will be a certain level of overlap.

KC noted that from a Programme perspective the schedule is shared with the IPA, and assurance needs to remain separate. JR understood the IPA provides an independent perspective but asked the Programme and IPA work to make sure duplication is avoided.

8. Delivery Dashboards

The Chair introduced the suite of delivery dashboards put forward to PSG and invited any comments.

Risk Theme Dashboards

JBr focused in on risk theme 1 and the issue regarding qualification testing for Unmetered Supplies. The majority of Suppliers will not serve unmetered segment and it should be revisited as to whether Qualification should cover all customer segments for all Suppliers.

It was acknowledged that this is being discussed with Code Bodies and the Elexon Performance Assurance Board (PAB) and options will be brought forward for discussion at the Qualification and E2E Sandbox Working Group (QWG) next week. It is important to recognise the risk to the Programme and to SIT. If the requirement remains as is Suppliers will have to build additional functionality that they do not need, which may cause delays.

Lewis Robertson (LR) recognised this and reconfirmed it is being investigated with QWG next week.

JBr noted the risk will be raised to FTIG on 04 August 2023.

Gareth Evans (GE) noted this risk is very much out of the Programme's control and what should the Programme do if the position of the Code Bodies doesn't change.

The Chair stated that Code Bodies are participants too and have requirements to collaborate in the delivery of this Programme. A pragmatic approach needs to be considered.

LR agreed and stated that no one should build functionality they do not need. Rules around change and future change must be clear. This risk is being addressed through programme governance.

Change Request Dashboard

JR asked why CR018 was still showing as open, despite being approved. LH noted that it is marked as open due to the ongoing conversations regarding implementation via amendments to the Operational Choreography document. It was agreed the CR will be denoted as 'Approved' as the decision on the CR has been made, but a new category may be required to reflect that final design updates and implementation release are not yet agreed.

The Chair called out good progress across code drafting and gave thanks to the delivery teams from the Programme and Code Bodies.

9. Summary and next steps

The Chair noted that the next PSG meeting would be face-to-face. There was no sponsor update this month as there was nothing to note.

The Chair invited any other business.

GW raised CR018 and appeal from the Large Supplier Constituency (LSC). The LSC has discussed their views on the recently approved CR018 and wanted to raise an appeal, which was submitted to the PMO on 27 July 2023.

The rationale is detailed in a paper submitted to the Programme. GW highlighted concerns from the LSC over the decision making and the robustness of the IA responses in analysing the impacts. The LSC would welcome clarity on what an appeal means and what happens next.

The Chair responded that there is no appeal process within the Change Control Approach, appeals should follow the Governance Framework and go via the IPA. The Programme accepts that lessons have been learned as a result of CR018.

The Programme noted IA responses are for PPs to provide, and not all Large Suppliers provided a response to CR018. Some of the points raised in the appeal paper were not raised during the IA process, so the IA mechanism could not fully analyse this.

The Chair noted that when looking at the justification behind the decision, it will not please everyone, but the Programme believes it is the correct decision and the decision stands. The Chair also reaffirmed the role of AGs is to advise the SRO. Decisions are then made by the SRO and not by the voting mechanism of the AG.

JM commented on the need for lessons learned following CR018, believing that the lack of appeal process within the Change Control Approach should be reviewed. Specifically, for CR018, there was sympathy that PPs were not able to review the redlined document when undertaking their IA, as there would have likely been different responses. JM asked if redlined documents could be shared alongside change requests going forwards.

GW felt like without an appeals process, the process just stops.

The Chair reiterated that content within the appeals paper should be contained within the IAs, which are available to all. The Chair agreed that the Programme would review these suggestions alongside wider lessons learned.

> **ACTION PSG23-03: 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.**

JR asked if next steps will be shared with PSG. The Chair confirmed they would be.

Andrew Campbell (AC), Small Supplier Representative, shared his constituency's concern on the CR018 decision and that they are supportive of the LSC appeal.

GW noted that the consumer impact of the change needs to be reviewed. The Chair noted that not all issues captured in the LSC appeal paper are linked to this change, or within the Programme's scope to address. Some are systemic industry issues and others are related to Switching (as an example).

The Chair agreed that the Programme would review the LSC appeal paper and look at what the Programme can practically address within its scope and what is outside of the Programme's control. The Programme will review this will the LSC and agree a plan to take forward. It was agreed as a first step as part of this action that the potential settlement impact would be discussed at SASWG in the afternoon with GW and JBr to discuss.

> **ACTION 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.**

The Chair thanked members for their contributions and closed the meeting.

Dates of Next Meeting: 06 September 2023 10am (Face-to-Face)