

MHHS Qualification Advisory Group (QAG) Headline Report

Issue date: 21/03/2024

Meeting Number	QAG002	Venue	MS Teams
Date and Time	21 March 2024 1000-1200	Classification	Public

Attendees

Chair

Chris Welby (CW) SRO SME

Industry Representatives

Andrew Wallace (AW) RECCo Representative
 Clare Hannah (CH) Supplier Agent Representative
 David Yeoman (DY) DNO Representative
 Gareth Evans (GE) I&C Supplier
 Graham Wood (GW) Large Supplier Representative
 Helen Clarke (HC) Supplier Agent (Ind) Representative
 Rachel Stringfellow (RS) Medium Supplier Representative

MHHS IM Members

Ben Wickens (BW) Project Manager - Non SIT LDSO Testing
 Jason Brogden (JB) Industry SME
 Natasha Tomic (NT) MHHS Qualification Test Lead
 Navdeep Seira (NS) PMO Governance Support

Other Members

George Player (GP) MHHS PAF & Qualification Engagement Lead
 Jy Xu (JX) IPA
 Laura Kennedy (LK) MHHS Assurance & Qualification Workstream Lead
 Matt Cogram (MC) Qualification Market Design Advisor
 Sarah Ross (SR) MHHS Qualification Manager
 Taylor Thorpe (TT) IPA
 Vaishnavi Sharma Qualification Market Design Advisor

Actions

Area	Ref	Action	Owner	Due	Latest update
Headline Report and Actions	QAG02-01	QAG reps to provide feedback to PMO with any questions on how to map traceability of test cases to requirements in ADO for Programme consideration	QAG Reps	18/04/24	
Top Programme Risks to QAG	QAG02-02	Programme to look into more explanation and behind any changes to the scores in risks.	Programme	Ongoing	

Decisions

Area		
Qualification Approach and Plan and Annex 1 & Annex 4	QAG-DEC02	QAG approved Qualification Approach and Plan
	QAG-DEC03	QAG approved Annex 1 – Non-SIT LDSO MHHSP Qualification Testing Approach and Plan Annex 1
	QAG-DEC04	QAG approved Annex 4 – Non-Completion of Qualification
Programme Milestones related to QAG	QAG-DEC05	QAG confirms milestone T3-QU-0011, Confirmation of participants for Non-SIT LDSO Qualification Testing
QAG ToR	QAG-DEC06	The headline Report of QWG meeting held 22 February 2024 approved.

Key Discussion Items

Area	Discussion
<p>Headline Report and Actions</p>	<p>DECISION: The headline Report of QWG meeting held 22 February 2024 approved (QAG-DEC06).</p> <p>Rachel Stringfellow, the Medium Supplier Representative, queried the status of action QAG01-04 being closed. RS raised that there is appreciation that the traceability has been added to ADO but will there be a spreadsheet shared with wider industry to close out the action?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JB responded that there is not a separate deliverable, as this 'spreadsheet' is embedded into the ADO tool and the traceability is automated in the tool to map test cases to requirements. • RS added that their test team has investigated the individual test cases, there is no overarching RTTM document which was expected. This discussion resulted in an action. <p>ACTION: QAG reps to provide feedback to PMO with any questions on how to map traceability of test cases to requirements in ADO for Programme consideration (QAG02-01).</p> <p>GW, the Large Supplier Representative, echoed the query raised by RS and added that the large suppliers also mentioned the RTTM matrix. GW will take the action to gather more feedback on the ADO tool from the constituency.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JB highlighted that these are mainly SITAG questions, rather than QAG, as they questions have been around SIT coverage. • RS highlighted that from feedback from medium suppliers, the tool is used a pre-qualification submission and SIT scenarios will eventually map into qualification scenarios. This is the mapping they need to understand the business requirements.
<p>Qualification Approach and Plan and Annex 1 & Annex 4</p>	<p>VS provided update on Qualification Approach and Plan and Annex 1 & Annex 4.</p> <p>VS and GP provided updates on comments raised in Annex 1 and Annex 4 respectively.</p> <p>GW raised comments from large suppliers around the structure of the QA&P and QAD documents and the difficulty to navigate. Would there be a possibility to flag elements that are specific to particular PPs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VS replied that this has been considered. The document has been restructured and specifies which sections are for which PPs e.g., SIT parties, non-SIT LDSOs and Supplier and Agents. • MC added that regarding the QAD, it has clear sections highlighted an organisation section and a role specific section. • SR raised that the QAD being in a word document can be quite tiresome to scroll through to find relevant sections that PPs need to fill in. A QAD portal is being worked on currently, which will flag the relevant sections for PPs.

- GW will feedback to large suppliers and any concerns will be feedback to the Programme/Code Bodies through the appropriate routes.

GW queried when the QAD portal will be introduced / made available. SR replied that it will be spoken through/first look in the open day in April. MC added that the Code Bodies will be looking to do a webinar/walkthrough in May for parties to familiarise themselves with the portal's appearance.

DY queried that the LDSOs in his constituency have not seen responses to their QA&P comments, how were responses sent out. VS replied that individual comments were not responded to, but the comments were collated, and responses were added to them so all PPs (including those that did not comment) can see the feedback. This was communicated last month in The Clock, that QA&P Annex 1 and Annex 4 have been published with the comments log.

(Recording Timestamp: 22:12)

- **DECISION:** QAG approved Qualification Approach and Plan (**QAG-DEC02**)
- **DECISION:** QAG approved Annex 1 – Non-SIT LDSO MHHSP Qualification Testing Approach and Plan Annex 1 (**QAG-DEC03**)
- **DECISION:** QAG approved Annex 4 – Non-Completion of Qualification (**QAG-DEC04**)

These documents will go to the BSC and REC PABs next week for approval.

Qualification Assessment Document (QAD) Consultation

MC highlighted that the QAD consultation log has been added to the QAG papers today. Regarding the QAD governance, as this is a Code Body document it does not go to QAG for approval, it only goes to BSC and REC PAB. Once approved the Code Bodies will look to publish the document on 29 April 2024. This is why the QAD has not been sent out as it is still awaiting approval.

CH, the Supplier Agent Representative, asked when the document goes to PAB will it be under a public paper or a confidential session paper. MC replied that all MHH documents from a BSC point of view have gone through as public. VS added that from the REC side all papers have been issued earlier in the week and are also public.

MC provided an update on Qualification Assessment Document (QAD) Consultation.

GW raised that it is understood that it is a Code Body document, however it is disappointing that this has not followed the same route as the QA&P, maybe a lesson learned going forward.

GW clarified if the QAD was going to be published on Friday and the papers for the PAB have been published. GW had spoken to a PAB member yesterday and there was uncertainty if they had seen the QAD document and therefore unsure how they would approve a document they have not seen.

- MC replied that the BSC PAB papers go out tomorrow (22 March), and the REC PAB papers have gone out earlier as the REC PAB is on Tuesday 26 March.
- VS added that the QAD document and comments log are currently live. REC published the updated QAD document for REC PAB approval on Tuesday 19 March to the PAB portal.
- GW also raised that some of their constituents could not access the link. MC replied that he will work with the Programme to ensure the links work.

MC stated that this is not the final version of the QAD document, it is just an update on the current process. Changes may be made to the document during non-Functional and Migration. The final QAD document should be ready by the end of August.

GW asked with regards to the assessment criteria in PABs next week have been circulated in the wider programme, as the large suppliers have not seen/heard about this.

- MC responded that both BSC and REC assessment criteria have been released before for their functional requirements. Both documents have been updated to include non-Functional and Migration requirements, and once those have both been approved by PABS they will be released.
- VS added that from a REC point of view, it is published in the public papers. There have also been communications through the QWG, the PPC team, and the regular REC code manager communication channel. This will go for approval at REC PAB next week, and the document will live in the REC portal where it will be linked back to the MHHS Collaboration Base.
- MC stated that a similar process to REC will happen with the BSC.

CH raised that in meetings like this, PAB members have more immediate access and are alerted to information/document updates. Could this feature in the newscast on Monday, as many PPs are not as involved in the programme and provide some indication of who the PPs can go to if they have any concerns. MC answered that the queries should go to the Qualification inbox as they are filtered there. If a PAB member has a query, then they should raise it through Matt Cogram as he is the paper owner.

- CH followed up by asking if, by next Thursday, PAB members could be made aware of any queries into the mailbox.

GW specified that this was more of an update of progress rather than an update on content of the QAD.

Updates from QWG

GP provided an update on this month's QWG.

BW provided additional information regarding Placing Reliance assessments, just for LDSOs. The plan is to get back to respondents before Easter just to make sure that there is as little lag on that as possible and the Programme can move on with establishing and finalising what the individual test scope of PPs is going to be.

GW raised a concern from large suppliers regarding the PIT guidance update. There were actions taken away in the QWG that will need to be addressed ASAP to ensure quality answers are received before submission in April. GW also raised there was a slide from his constituency where LDSOs would need to provide their PIT Approach & Plan by 14 June and not 28 April. There needs to be a risk raised that suppliers would not be able to provide quality replies due to the lack of information.

- JB responded that there has been a review session with the Programme and Code Bodies on PIT guidance, and it is being updated now. With regards to GW's concern regarding SIT parties, there is an updated version that needs to go to the SIT team to mitigate against that risk.
- VS echoed what JB had said. There is some content that will be played back to the PPs as soon as possible. The wait is for the SIT team's approval. For clarity the definition has not changed, the Code Bodies/Programme were clarifying to make sure all parties understand and apply it in the same manner, as it was noticed some parties were applying it differently.
- GW queried when the feedback can be expected and whether that will be before the next QWG. VS that that is the expectation.
- VS added that the PIT Approach & Plan is required as part of the PQS to allocate with the new wave allocation currently in progress. This approach would prefer not to be changed as it will have a domino effect on parties. VS would prefer to hold off until the webinar has been held.
- GW reiterated that if the webinar gives the PPs the information they need and gives higher confidence to provide what is needed by 26 April, then that clears any issues. If there is still ambiguity and a risk that the Programme is not going to get those responses or the quality of the response is going to be reduced, then further intervention will be required.
- AW added that the Code Bodies would want as much information as possible alongside the PQS, as there may be further iterations of that document later.

RS provided support in the issue from GW above, as medium suppliers also raised the concern of DBT1 and DBT2 being removed from the PIT guidance. There is an understanding that there could be a risk to that PQS date at the end of April if that is going to change significantly, as a lot of suppliers have based the plans on DBT1 versus DBT2 definitions/assumptions.

<p>Update on Proposed Changes to Qualification Milestones</p>	<p>LK provided updates on programme plan, and that LK and BW were first people to trial the new CR approach, where they held a webinar to talk through the changes in CR047 and CR048 which cover changes to milestones for non-SIT LDSOs and the Supplier and Qualification Testing.</p> <p>LDSO Qualification Testing has been pushed after SIT Cycle 2 which means that the milestones, that are currently baselined in the program plan, are red. The Programme will re-baseline the schedule and update it considering the approach that has been developed over the course of the last few months.</p> <p>DY asked if there is a reason the CR going to Impact Assessment has been delayed to 02 April. The Chair replied that there were requests from PPs for a lockout at the moment as there are three CRs coming through DAG, the timing of the delay still ensures it gets to the same PSG.</p>
<p>Programme Milestones related to QAG</p>	<p>BW provided updates to Programme Milestones related to QAG.</p> <p>GW queried that risk T3-TE-0067 needs an updated forecast date. JB replied that updates to Sandbox have been brought to previous QWGs, with a more substantive update coming in the April QWG. The dependencies on the qualification test environments and the test data approach & plans have been identified, which have been put through QWG. The date is wrong but cannot provide guidance until the environment is understood. At the next QWG, an updated version of what the plan looks like for the delivery of Sandbox deliverables and a more substantive update on the guidance. Once this has been brought to QWG, the updated milestones and timings will be taken through the appropriate governance.</p> <p>DECISION: QAG confirms milestone T3-QU-0011, Confirmation of participants for Non-SIT LDSO Qualification Testing (QAG-DEC05 – recording timestamp: 54:34)</p>
<p>Top Programme Risks Related to QAG</p>	<p>CH asked what the risks are ordered on. JB replied that they are added as and when risks have been brought to the list, not in any order.</p> <p>CH followed up by querying why R695's score has increased since the last PSG meeting. JB responded that the Programme is awaiting a more detailed plan to incorporate into the Programme plan, to see if it fits and brings the risk down. This query resulted in an action.</p> <p>ACTION: Programme to look into more explanation and behind any changes to the scores in risks (QAG02-02).</p>

AOB

RS queried that the Qualification test scenarios have been released earlier this week for consultation. Are they mapped to the Functional SIT scenarios and presume there will be later iterations for Migration and non-Functional. RS sought clarity if the first batch includes Functional side of Qualification.

- LK replied that this is the initial view, and the Code Bodies are in the final round of analysis around coverage of RTTM, against SIT. The second batch will be released in a couple of weeks which is a delta of additional coverage items and any feedback from consultation.
- RS added that parties are using that to understand where they are in Placing Reliance in SIT, and when can they expect to get a view of scenarios ahead of the PQS submission.
- LK answered that the aim is to release the second batch by the end of the month, as the analysis takes time. There is a walkthrough on Monday to provide detailed next steps.

DY asked the Programme for clarity that they will be coming back to LDSO constituents with QAD responses at the end of March. JB replied that the discussions around testing scope based on placing reliance are underway.

HC, the Supplier Agent (Ind) Representative, raised that there are three PQS sessions in April and if they are just for PPs that require support and will not have any new information. GP replied that they are support sessions to help PPs complete their PQS.

Next meeting: 18 April 2024