

MHHS Migration and Cutover Advisory Group (MCAG) Headline Report

Issue date: 29/02/24

Meeting number	MCAG 001	Venue	Virtual – MS Teams
Date and time	27 February 2024 1400-1600	Classification	Public

Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date	Update
MCAG Terms of Reference (ToR)	MCAG01-01	Programme to update wording in ToR for DCC members (to include Central Switching Services)	Programme (PMO)	28/02/24	RECOMMEND CLOSED: v0.6 has been uploaded for approval at PSG.
Data Cleanse Plan	MCAG01-02	Publish v2.0 of meeting papers	Programme (PMO)	27/02/24	RECOMMEND CLOSED: v2.0 of meeting papers were uploaded to the Collaboration Base.
Top Programme Risks Related to MCAG	MCAG01-03	Lee Cox (Test Lead) to speak to David Yeoman for clarity on risk r677 for SIT and non-SIT	Programme (Lee Cox)	05/02/24	
	MCAG01-04	Update the wording of r677 to: 'Risk is that LDSOs cannot meet migration thresholds. LDSOs need to carry out performance testing with their service providers i.e. SCS.'	Programme (Warren Fulton)	26/03/24	

	MCAG01-05	Programme team to review RAID contained in the Data Cleanse Plan and Service Management Strategy to align (where possible) with the Programme RAID log.	Programme (Matthew Breen) (Sean Tuffy)	26/03/24	
	MCAG01-06	Programme to speak with Lee Cox (Test Lead) to seek clarity on timelines for development of SIT Operational Test Approach & Plan.	Programme (Sean Tuffy)	26/03/24	

Decisions

Area	Decision Ref	Description
MCAG Terms of Reference (ToR)	MCAG-DEC01	MCAG recommended for PSG approval of the MCAG ToR
Data Cleanse Plan	MCAG-DEC02	SRO approved the Data Cleanse Plan v1.3 for publication
Service Management Strategy	MCAG-DEC03	SRO approved the Service Management Strategy v0.3 for publication as v1.0
Programme Milestones related to MCAG	MCAG-DEC04	SRO approved the revised delivery date for milestone T3-MI-0023 to 28 May 2024

Key Discussion Items

Area	Discussion
<p>Headline and Actions</p>	<p>The Chair introduced the meeting and provided an oversight of the purpose of the MCAG.</p> <p>The Chair recommended to close both TMAG actions relating to Migration:</p> <p>TMAG29-02: Programme to identify ownership of milestones which Advisory Group they sit within. Recommend closed as this is covered by Agenda Item 10.</p> <p>TMAG32-01: Programme to check if they have received the Supplier Agent (Independent) nomination for MCAG. Recommend closed as the agent seat is filled.</p>
<p>MCAG Terms of Reference (ToR)</p>	<p>The Chair provided detail of the MCAG Terms of Reference (ToR).</p> <p>ACTION: Programme to update wording in ToR for DCC members (to include Central Switching Services) (MCAG01-01). This action was a result of a question from JM, the RECCo Representative. No further comments were raised by MCAG members on the MCAG ToR. MCAG unanimously recommended the MCAG ToR for approval by PSG.</p> <p>DECISION: MCAG recommended for PSG approval of the MCAG ToR (MCAG-DEC01)</p>
<p>Data Cleanse Plan</p>	<p>MB provided an update of the of the changes made to the Data Cleanse Plan.</p> <p>V1.3 of the Data Cleanse Plan was sent out yesterday (26-Feb) to MCAG members, originally v1.2 was sent out for approval. This was to reflect some minor updates that were made to the plan based on feedback received from participants following the end of the consultation. The minor updates were discussed and agreed with the relevant parties ahead of publication. No comments were raised by MCAG members on the updates to the plan.</p> <p>ACTION: Publish v2.0 of meeting papers (MCAG01-01) MCAG unanimously recommended the Data Cleanse Plan Version 1.3 for approval and uplift to 2.0.</p> <p>DECISION: SRO approved the Data Cleanse Plan v1.3 for publication (MCAG-DEC02)</p>
<p>Service Management Strategy</p>	<p>ST provided an overview of the changes from v0.1 to v0.2, and v0.2 to v0.3 of the Service Management Strategy.</p> <p>DY, the DNO representative, stated that their constituents agreed with the progression and maturity of the document, and are grateful for the Programme's engagement, including the industry workshops. DY raised some feedback about v0.3, stating that some requirements required a cost benefit analysis (CBA). The constituents felt that this should have been completed as part of the strategy development however, they recognised that it may be part of the detailed design work (although they felt that may be late in the process).</p> <p>JW added that this was not in the strategy as the Programme has not gone down to a detailed level of design, i.e., what is a major incident, what would the potential impacts be etc., is not included within the strategy.</p> <p>Following the question from DY, SD, the Elexon representative, included that once the strategy is approved it comes over to Elexon for design. Elexon will engage with LDSOs from mid-late March, this has been done with DCC and Avanade. SD asked DY who the best points of contact are for LDSOs. DY responded to say either himself or</p>

	<p>Catherine Duggan. The MCAG unanimously recommended the Service Management Strategy for approval. DY noted their constituent's' views on approval noting the comment above on CBA.</p> <p>DECISION: SRO approved the Service Management Strategy v0.3 for publication as v1.0 (MCAG-DEC03)</p>
<p>Migration Control Centre Framework</p>	<p>The Chair provided feedback to the MCAG that the MWG has been working very productively. They thanked all those involved, (representatives to feed this back to their constituents) on their expert input to date.</p> <p>WF provided an update of the Migration Control Centre (MCC) Framework development, including consultation and assurance approach.</p> <p>WF stated the Programme is targeting early May for approving consultation 1 Artefacts. The Programme will collate responses/comments, feedback on those, respond with updated, red-lined artefacts, hold assurance meetings with industry and then approve at the May MCAG (an update will be provided at the March and April MCAG meetings).</p> <p>For the consultation, the Programme will highlight any specific areas that need feedback on.</p> <p>DY asked that they have only had two of the Migration Framework workshops, and if there are any further workshops. WF replied that there is another this Thursday (29 February) and depending on the progress of that meeting the Programme will communicate if further sessions are needed.</p> <p>DY also asked about the details of the assurance meeting after feedback from the Programme. WF answered that this is an approach the Programme took during the Design phase, to ensure that industry is comfortable with the Programme's responses and the updated artefacts after receiving industry comments. This is to resolve any remaining concerns or issues before going to MCAG for approval.</p>
<p>Programme Milestones related to MCAG</p>	<p>The Chair queried the RAG status of the milestone T3-MI-0023. MB explained that the milestones have been adjusted or introduced to the Programme plan to seek approval. The Cutover Plan milestone is having a name change, as TMAG is no more, and to refer to the milestone as the M10/M11 plan. The Programme is also planning to produce something related to M15/M16, so the delivery has been split from that.</p> <p>MB seeks approval from MCAG for the revised delivery date of milestone T3-MI-0023 from March to May, this has been presented and recommended from TORWG. This process has been delayed due to the TMAG split. This does not impact any other milestones, as this will be needed in the Migration period next year. MCAG unanimously agreed to this revised delivery date.</p> <p>DECISION: SRO approved the revised delivery date for milestone T3-MI-0023 to 28 May 2024 (MCAG-DEC04).</p>
<p>Top Programme Risks Related to MCAG</p>	<p>JM raised a query on risk T677 and asked if there has been any update, as this was due to be undertaken 16 February 2024.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DY noted that initially performance testing had not gone well, however improvements and changes have been made. There had been more performance testing which looked more favourable and should mitigate the risk. DY believed that this cannot be raised intime for SIT and non-SIT LDSO testing as the Migration volumes are in those phases.

- JM responded if the current classification of the risk, as low, is correct, as it seems like there are still some issues.
- DY responded that the risk would fall under the medium category, as they are still waiting for final details and report from St. Clements.
- JB highlighted that the slide shows the predicted/forecasted risk and the current risk.
- **ACTION:** Lee Cox (Test Lead) to speak to David Yeoman for clarity on risk r677 for SIT and non-SIT **(MCAG01-03)**.
- **ACTION: Programme to** update the wording of r677 to: 'Risk is that LDSOs cannot meet migration thresholds. LDSOs need to carry out performance testing with their service providers i.e. SCS.' **(MCAG01-04)**.

SH, the Supplier Agent Representative (Independent Supplier Agent), raised their concern that there are two artefacts (the Data Cleanse Plan and the Service Management Strategy) that have 32 RAID items in them. There are assumptions and dependencies on those documents, and it wasn't clear where they would be managed. MCAG should know who is owning/actioning the RAID items.

The Chair replied that the where relevant RAID items within the Data Cleanse Plan and the Service Management Strategy should be managed at the MCAG (other items may fall in other areas of the Programme).

SH responded that the RAID log and DPMO is the instrument for doing that, and MCAG members cannot see when someone will pick up an item once baselined. There is a risk that the work has been done to capture the risks, but not considering the progression in workstreams.

The Chair replied that there is RAID within documents and how they are managed in the overall programme RAID log.

ST added that these RAID items should be captured by the Programmes RAID log. **ACTION:** Programme team to review RAID contained in the Data Cleanse Plan and Service Management Strategy to align (where possible) with the Programme RAID log **(MCAG01-05)**

SD commented on the risk R753 of Elexon not meeting the service design timescales, as he was aware the test scenarios were due out in May with testing starting in October. **ACTION:** Programme to speak with Lee Cox (Test Lead) to seek clarity on timelines for development of SIT Operational Test Approach & Plan **(MCAG01-06)**.

Date of next MCAG: 26 March 2024

Attendees

Chair

Justin Andrews Chair

Industry Representatives

David Yeoman (DY) DNO Representative
Gareth Evans (GE) I&C Supplier Representative
Graham Wood (GW) Large Supplier Representative
Jonny Moore (JM) RECCo Representative
Morven Hunter (MH) iDNO Representative
Sean Doughty (SD) Elexon Representative
Simon Harrison (SH) Supplier Agent Representative (Independent)

MHHS IM Members

John Wiggins (JW) Migration Lead
Matthew Breen (MB) Migration Analyst
Navdeep Seira (NS) PMO Governance Support
Sean Tuffy (ST) Migration Analyst
Warren Fulton (WF) MHHS Client Delivery Advisor

Other Members

Alan Simmons (AS) DCC
Hannah Webb (HW) DCC
Taylor Thorpe (TT) IPA