

MHHS Programme Steering Group (PSG) Headline Report

Issue date: 12/03/2024

Meeting Number **PSG030**

Venue **Virtual**

Date and Time **06 March 2024 10:00-12:00**

Classification **Public**

New / Outstanding Actions

| Area | Ref | Action | Owner | Due |
|--------------------------------------|----------|---|-------------------------|------------|
| Qualification Testing Updates | PSG30-01 | Code Bodies to provide status indicator alongside future updates on qualification activities | Exelon & RECCo | 03/04/2024 |
| Programme Reporting | PSG30-02 | Programme to provide updates on Secondary Routing to the Fast Track Implementation Group | Programme (Adrian Page) | 03/04/2024 |
| Change Control | PSG30-03 | Programme to consider whether membership of Programme Change Board should be expanded to include constituency representation | Programme (PMO) | 03/04/2024 |
| | PSG30-04 | Programme to map Change Request scenarios to understand the types of changes which may arise and their suitability for ratification by the PSG | Programme (PMO) | 03/04/2024 |
| | PSG30-05 | Ofgem to advise whether changes to the Change Control Approach require Ofgem approval | Ofgem | 03/04/2024 |
| | PSG30-06 | Programme to consider whether a more frequent PSG should be scheduled for the ratification of Programme Change Requests, to assist timely progression | Programme (PMO) | 03/04/2024 |
| Delivery Dashboards | PSG30-07 | Programme to ensure Core Capability Provider risks and issues provided in Delivery Dashboards are discussed in bilateral account management meetings | Programme | 03/04/2024 |
| Previous Meeting(s) | PSG29-03 | IPA to consider additions or clarifications to the appeals process following the completion of the current CR036 appeal | IPA (Richard Shilton) | 06/03/2024 |
| | PSG28-01 | Exelon to provide detailed update on the progression of the Settlement Analysis Scoping Working Group (SASWG) outputs | Exelon (John Abbott) | 07/02/2024 |

| | | | | |
|--|----------|---|-------------------|------------|
| | 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 | Q1 2024 |
| | PSG18-05 | Progress the assurance process for LDSOs for the accuracy of data for DUoS billing. | IPA | 07/02/2024 |

Decisions

| Area | Ref | Decision |
|---|-----------|--|
| Minutes and Actions | PSG-DEC70 | The PSG approved the headline report of the PSG meeting held 10 January 2024 with no amendments. |
| New Advisory Groups ToR Approval | PSG-DEC71 | The SRO approved the Terms of Reference for the SIT Advisory Group, Migration and Cutover Advisory Group, and the Qualification Advisory Group |
| Change Control | PSG-DEC72 | The SRO approved proposed improvements to the Change Control Approach, subject to consideration by the Programme of the membership of the Change board, consideration of more frequent change-focussed PSG meetings, and the mapping of CR scenarios to understand how the updated process may operate in practice |

Key Discussion Items

| Area | Discussion |
|----------------------------|---|
| Minutes and Actions | <p>The Headline Report of the previous meeting was approved with no amendments (DECISION PSG-DEC70).</p> <p>Action wording and updates can be found within the meeting papers and discussion points are summarised below:</p> <p>PSG18-05: The IPA advised they have met participants and are now finalising findings for submission at the next PSG meeting. Action ongoing.</p> <p>PSG24-01: Per the updates within the meeting slides, Qualification Testing updates are currently a standing agenda item at PSG. Action closed.</p> <p>PSG24-02: Per the updates within the meeting slides, Qualification Testing updates are currently a standing agenda item at PSG. Action closed.</p> <p>PSG28-01: The Elexon Representative advised they were looking at any potential commercial anomalies which may occur following MHHS transition. Settlement experts have been drawn together to assess the Settlement charging scenarios which may be impacted in future. The Elexon Representative advised caution was required around the validity of any modelling given the complexity and far-reaching nature of Settlement processes. The PSG were advised business requirements should be defined within the next four to six weeks and test capability would be built over the next three to four months. Where possible, the work of the MHHS Settlement Analysis Scoping Working Group (SASWG) will be utilised. Action ongoing.</p> <p>PSG29-01: Ofgem advised the Gas and Electricity Markets Authority (GEMA) meeting papers are not available publicly, but the minutes of meeting are. Action closed.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>New Advisory Groups ToR Approval</p> | <p>The PSG were asked to approve the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the new Level 3 Advisory Groups, following recommendations from each group that the ToRs be approved.</p> <p>The Ofgem Representative queried whether the ToRs set out that the Advisory Groups have responsibility for decisions on Programme milestones under their purview. The Programme confirmed the ToRs stated this, and the groups can approve changes to Tier 2 and Tier 3 milestones.</p> <p>The Chair requested any objections to the approval of the ToRs, to which none were raised.</p> <p>The Chair, in their capacity as MHHS Senior Responsible Owner (SRO), approved the ToRs (DECISION PSG-DEC71 – recording timestamp 00:26:40)</p> |
| <p>Qualification Testing Updates</p> | <p>Elxon and RECCo provided updates on qualification, per the meeting slides. It was highlighted the upcoming MHHS Open Day on 23 April 2024 will include specific qualification material. Participants may book attendance here.</p> <p>The IPA requested a view of the status of each qualification activity is provided in future updates (ACTION PSG30-01) and asked whether activities were tracking to plans. Elxon advised they were working closely with participants, and Supplier and Agent qualification activities were on track. The Programme advised non-SIT LDSO qualification activities were also on track.</p> <p>The DNO Representative advised DNOs have had issues with some of the proposed qualification timelines, given dependencies on software provision (e.g. MPRS) for testing. The Programme advised revised timelines for Pre-Integration Testing (PIT) evidence were provided to the Qualification Working Group for discussion on 12 March 2024 and that the PIT evidence had been split between SIT Functional/Migration and SIT Non-Functional/Operational testing to give more time to evidence that phase of testing.</p> <p>The DNO Representative noted the update within the meeting slides relating to a Programme Change Request (CR) to incorporate qualification milestones into the central Programme plan, and asked when the CR would be raised. The Programme advised it would be raised once there was feedback on the timings from QWG and that Tier 3 milestones date changes could be agreed via the Qualification Advisory Group (QAG), whereas changes to Tier 2 milestones would be subject to a CR and Impact Assessment.</p> <p>With regard to Non-SIT LDSO qualification arrangements, the Programme acknowledged a comment from the DNO Representative regarding the relationship between participant Placing Reliance (PR) submissions and the scope of Qualification Testing (QT), and advised the content of the PR proposals would drive the extend of QT. The Programme advised they were working with Code Bodies to understand requirements for QT test cases and were reviewing QT test scenarios and PR submissions to define the scope of QT for non-SIT LDSOs. Meetings will be set up with Non-SIT LDSOs imminently once discussions have concluded with the Code Bodies. The Programme also advised QT test environments were under development and work was underway to finalise test harness requirements. Consideration was also being given to whether a test harness would be required for Elxon Helix testing flows.</p> |
| <p>Migration Updates</p> | <p>The Programme provided updates on the development of the Migration Control Centre (MCC) framework. Development is ongoing via the Migration Working Group (MWG) and standalone MCC development workshops, and consultations will be issued in due course with the first to be issued 18 March 2024.</p> <p>The Programme believed there was now sufficient understanding of the approach to begin increasing the detail reported to PSG. The Chair asked whether industry engagement at the MWG was sufficient. The Programme advised attendance at MWG was strong, and attendance at the MCC development workshops was excellent attendance and highly collaborative. Participant engagement on migration during bilaterals with the Programme Party Coordinator (PPC) team has been seen to be increasing, indicating the participant awareness is increasing. The Chair reminded all PSG representatives to continue to support participants to ensure this workstream is set up correctly.</p> |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| | <p>The Ofgem Representative stated the level of engagement and effort was comforting to hear and asked whether the boundaries between the dual Programme and industry code governance arrangements that will apply have been considered, including any agreements for sharing information between the Programme and Code Bodies. The Programme replied these considerations were known and had formed an important part of the development workshop held 05 March 2024.</p> |
| <p>Programme Reporting</p> | <p>The Programme provided updates on System Integration Testing (SIT) activities, milestones, and risks per the meeting slides.</p> <p>Component Integration Testing (CIT)</p> <p>The Programme advised CIT had now completed and the Programme are finalising the completion reports and assurance. The CIT Completion Report will be presented to the Fast Track Implementation Group (FITG) on 08 March 2024 and a recommendation on approval requested, with final approval being undertaken via the SIT Advisory Group (SITAG) on 11 March 2024.</p> <p>The Programme noted Secondary Routing had been extricated from the main CIT activities but had now been successfully completed directly by the Programme with no impact on participants. One defect was found and resolved, and retesting completed. The Programme will undertake further confidence testing for assurance purposes. The approach and outcome have been validated with the IPA and the Programme will request participants undertake Secondary Routing testing during SIT F also. The Medium Supplier Representative advised their constituents would like to understand any additional testing requirements for Secondary Routing. The Programme advised updates had been provided via the FTIG, and further updates would be provided to FTIG on 08 March 2024 (ACTION PSG30-02).</p> <p>SIT Functional</p> <p>Updates on SIT F commencement were provided per the meeting slides. A decision on approval of SIT F commencement will be taken at an extraordinary SITAG on 11 March 2024.</p> <p>For participants with outstanding SIT F preparation activities, the Programme have agreed delivery timeframes and informed the relevant testing cohorts. The SIT F test ordering for cohorts has been set up in a way which maximises the ability to progress should defects be found in individual tests, with each cohort operating different tests concurrently.</p> <p>Other SIT Stages</p> <p>The Programme advised preparation activities for later SIT stages were progressing, with consultations on SIT Migration, SIT Non-functional, and SIT Operational testing to be issued in due course. The Programme are managing timeline risks and are cognisant of the potential impacts of the Easter holidays.</p> <p>SIT Milestones and Risks</p> <p>The Programme advised milestones which support SIT F commencement had been approved by the SITAG and supported by recommendations from the FTIG. A view of the SIT F decision choreography and decision criteria was provided. The Chair asked whether the Programme were satisfied with the progression of SIT F preparation work-off activities in the lead up to the decision on SIT F commencement. The Programme confirmed work-off activities were proceeding satisfactorily and being managed closely in conjunction with participants.</p> |
| <p>CR036 Appeal Update</p> | <p>Outcome of Appeal</p> <p>The IPA provided an overview of the outcome of the CR036 decision appeal per the meeting slides. The IPA advised they had reviewed meeting recordings, meeting documentation, discussed the appeal with key participants, and considered wider information.</p> |

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| | <p>The outcome of the appeal was that the IPA did not see evidence that the concerns raised outweighed the impacts of overturning the decision. The IPA stated recommendations for improvements to the Programme Change Control Approach had been provided and discussed with the Programme.</p> <p>The IPA noted the industry-wide discrepancy over the use of UTC and Clock Time was out of scope of MHHS, and this meant CR036 was always likely to create impacts and lead to a challenging decision. The key consideration for the IPA around the use of Clock Time as detailed in CR036 related to potential impacts on customer billing, however no issues which were significant enough to justify overturning the decision had been identified.</p> <p>IPA Recommendations</p> <p>The IPA advised that recommendations provided to the Programme on improvements to the Change Control Approach included increasing the development of CRs to better define solutions and allow a recommended option and implementation plan to be included within future CRs, which could then be subject to Impact Assessment (IA) by participants. Complex changes should be supported by documentation which clearly sets out the overall proposed solution and an IA scoring framework added to CR forms to enable better quantification of costs, consumer impacts, and benefits within participant IA responses.</p> <p>The IPA stated the Programme have been receptive to the recommendations and noted proposed updates to the Change Control Approach had already been submitted to the PSG (<i>see next agenda item</i>).</p> <p>The IPA are advised they are considering how the appeals process operated during the CR036 appeal and whether any updates are required, per existing PSG action PSG29-03.</p> <p>Finally, the IPA recommended a wider industry review of the inconsistent use of UTC and Clock Time is undertaken, noting this is outside the scope of MHHS.</p> <p>PSG Comments</p> <p>The DNO Representative considered the potential impacts to participant system development where appeals are upheld, and the time which could potentially be lost given the pace of the Programme whilst a decision is made on a prospective appeal. The representative believed that when appeals are raised it would be useful to understand, prima facie, the likelihood of success. The IPA agreed and stated a time limit on the raising of appeals following a decision would be prudent to avoid potentially significant delays in prospective future appeals.</p> <p>The RECCo Representative advised they had no comments on the recommendations but queried whether additional information on the IPA's assessment and appeal decision rationale would be beneficial. The IPA advised they would consider this as part of potential updates to the appeals process, but noted certain appeal information may be confidential and balance would need to be found.</p> <p>The Supplier Agent Representative stated their constituents were still unclear as to the Programme's rationale in the CR036 original decision.</p> |
| <p>Change Control</p> | <p>Proposed Improvements</p> <p>The Programme provided proposals to improve the MHHS Change Control Approach based on the IPA's recommendations, per the meeting slides.</p> <p>Key improvements would include an improved process for identifying and assessing solution options prior to CRs being issued to IA, to ensure there is an implementable solution and associated implementation plan that can be meaningfully subjected to IA. Where multiple solution options exist, consultations would be undertaken to enable a single solution to be put forward in a CR. Other improvements included rules around the redlining of artefacts which are the subject of proposed change, the capturing of decision rationales, the provision of scoring frameworks for IA responses, and an increase in supporting information around the origins of a CR.</p> |

The Programme further proposed the Programme Change Board is given authority to issue CRs directly to IA without the CR needing to be issued to a Programme governance group first, enabling a swifter progression of CRs to industry IA. This would be supported by the provision of industry-wide webinars on new CRs where the Change Raiser provides an overview of the change and answers questions from participants, thereby enabling finessing of the CR prior to IA and for industry question/answer information to be provided alongside the CR.

The Programme highlighted the increasingly cross-technical and cross-workstream nature of CRs as MHHS progresses, and proposed future IA outputs are issued to the Programme Change Board where experts from across the Programme's workstreams can review and provide a recommendation to support the SRO's decision on approval. The PSG will then be asked to ratify the SRO's decision. Updates will be made to the CR form to make it more user friendly and to increase the information provided on testing, change freeze criteria, and implementation.

A housekeeping Programme CR would be raised to update the Programme Governance Framework in accordance with the proposed improvements, and the Change Control Approach updated.

PSG Comments

Comments by PSG members are summarised below:

- The Ofgem Representative queried whether PSG should ratify the approval of CRs following a decision recommendation by the Change Board, stating PSG is a strategic group and questioning whether the group would have the competency to approve CRs which may become more technical as MHHS progresses. The Programme highlighted the majority of technical changes proceed via the Design Issue Notification (DIN) process or the defect management process, and the CRs which would proceed to PSG would likely be those which are more material or have more fundamental or strategic impacts on the Programme as a whole. It is not expected highly technical changes would come to PSG, and the Programme's proposals for improvement to the Change Control Approach include a greater focus on CR development prior to IA. Ofgem queried the constitution of the Change Board and whether the group should have constituency based membership (**ACTION PSG30-04**).
- The IPA Representative supported greater development of CRs prior to IA and suggested CR scenarios should be mapped to understand the types of changes which may arise and their suitability for ratification by the PSG (**ACTION PSG30-05**).
- The RECCo Representative expressed concern about how CRs would be approved by the PSG in practice and believed lower-level information on the process and approach was required. The representative queried how code drafting related CRs would be approved, believing the competence for this sat with the Cross Code Advisory Group (CCAG). The representative also believed Ofgem would be required to approve the improvements to the Change Control Approach. The Programme responded that CCAG would be expected to provide views and recommendations on relevant CRs to the Change Board and PSG, and Ofgem approval of the improvements to process were not believed to be required as they did not meet the requisite thresholds. The Programme advised that updates to the Change Control Approach are within the vires of the SRO, and any consequential updates to the high level information on change control contained within the MHHS Governance Framework would be progressed via a housekeeping CR (**ACTION PSG30-06**).
- The Medium Supplier Representative believe the improvements proposed by the Programme would provide a better process for CRs, facilitating greater collaboration, and better addressment of the increasingly the cross-functional nature of CRs. The representative believed PSG should delegate decision making authority on CRs to the Change Board to act on their behalf and raise matters to the PSG by exception, with these exceptions clearly defined. The representative believed this would balance the timely progression of CRs with sufficient control.
- The Large Supplier Representative believed the improvement proposals would work in practice, and whilst caution would be required over the ratification of CRs by the PSG, the proposals would enable overarching views on the Programme-wide impacts of CRs to be considered. The

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| | <p>representative stated they saw little risk in PSG reviewing/ratifying CR decision by the Change Board/SRO as any decision can be appealed to the IPA if necessary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The IDNO representative stated they found the discussion valuable and were agnostic as to the ratification of CRs by the PSG. The representative believed appropriate focus on development of CRs and engagement with affected stakeholders to identify workable solutions ahead of IA were the key factors in the successful progression of CRs. The representative queried whether the Change Board should have participant representation to ensure CRs are robust, but noted the potential duplication of effort that may occur if CRs also then progress to the constituency-based PSG and did not immediately see how this would improve the timelines for CRs or the development process. The representative questioned whether a more frequent PSG should be scheduled for the ratification of CRs, to assist timely progression (ACTION PSG30-07). • The Supplier Agent (Independent) Representative queried why CRs should proceed to the PSG at all, given the decision on approval sits with the SRO. The representative believed clarity was required on the role of PSG in ratifying CRs, which they believed to be aimed at ensuring Programme delivery does not fail should a CR be approved. <p>The Chair thanked members for their views and noted the variance between PSG members. The Chair considered a proportionate solution was required for the approval of CRs and noted the number of contentious changes were relatively few and an increased focus on development should enable issues to be thrashed out prior to decision. The IPA offered to review how previously contentious changes may have progressed under the proposed improvements.</p> <p>The Chair stated they were minded to approve the proposed improvements subject to consideration of the above actions, and subject to close monitoring of the efficacy of the improvements and collaboration with the IPA to ensure the optimal process is applied. The Chair urged PSG members to raise any potential issues as the updated process comes into operation and requested Ofgem monitor developments and raise any concerns.</p> <p>The Chair, in their capacity as SRO, approved the proposed improvements to the Change Control Approach, subject to consideration by the Programme of the membership of the Change board, consideration of more frequent change-focussed PSG meetings, and the mapping of CR scenarios to understand how the updated process may operate in practice (DECISION PSG-DEC72 – recording timestamp 02:08:00).</p> |
| <p>Delivery Dashboards</p> | <p>The DNO Representative expressed a desire to ensure risks and issues reported in the Delivery Dashboards are actioned and closed and the ‘RAG’ statuses consistent across central parties. The Chair agreed, noting it is expected the Programme will review the risks submitted and ensure appropriate actions are taken. The Programme Manager noted the management of risks and issues was dynamic in that it incorporated the Programme’s RAID process, the provision of reports by central party, account management meetings with CCPs, and review of the Delivery Dashboards provided to PSG. The Programme Manager highlighted that the Programme sought to ensure RAG status were consistent across central parties during account management meetings, but that it was for central parties to RAG their risks at level that feels appropriate to them and to provide information on how risks/issues are resolved or returned to ‘green’ (ACTION PSG30-08).</p> <p>The Ofgem Representative recommended a quarterly risk ‘deep dive’ is conducted by the PSG. The Chair noted a need to focus PSG discussions on proximate risks and those that are considered high impact but did not wish to convert PSG into a RAID review meeting. The Programme noted consistent efforts had been made to increase the view of risks provided to the PSG and other MHHS governance groups, noting the detailed risk themes provided to PSG each month. The Ofgem Representative advised they would review how risks are being updated month to month.</p> |

Date of next meeting: 03 April 2024 at 10:00am

Attendees

Chair

Helen Adey (Chair)

MHHS SRO

Industry Representatives

Andrew Wallace (on behalf of Jonathon Hawkins)

RECCo Representative

Carl Lang*

Small Supplier Representative

Caroline Farquhar

Consumer Representative

Chris Price

DNO Representative

Elaine Eyles*

Medium Supplier Representative

Gareth Evans*

I&C Supplier Representative

Graham Wood*

Large Supplier Representative

Jenny Rawlinson*

IDNO Representative

Joel Stark

Supplier Agent Representative (Independent)

John Abbott

Elexon Representative (Central Systems Provider)

John Purnell (on behalf of Nital Hooper)

DCC Representative (Central Systems Provider)

Neil Dewar (on behalf of Kerren Kelly)

National Grid ESO

Paul Akrill

Supplier Agent Representative

MHHS IM

Adrian Page

SI Lead

Andrew Margan*

Code Lead

Chris Harden

Programme Director

Fraser Mathieson

Governance Lead

Immy Syms* (part meeting)

PMO Change Lead

Jason Brogden

Programme Industry SME

Keith Clark

Programme Manager

Lewis Hall

PMO Manager

Paul Pettitt*

Design Lead

Warren Fulton* (part meeting)

Migration Delivery Manager

Other Attendees

Jenny Boothe*

Ofgem

Melissa Giordano* (part meeting)

Ofgem

Sarah Ross

Elexon

Richard Shilton

IPA

Sinead Quinn*

Ofgem

*denotes dial-in attendance

Apologies

None