

MHHS Programme Steering Group (PSG) Headline Report

Issue date: 05/07/2024

Meeting Number **PSG034**

Venue **Virtual**

Date and Time **03 July 2024 10:00-12:00**

Classification **Public**

New / Outstanding Actions

Area	Ref	Action	Owner	Due
Settlement Analysis	PSG34-01	Elexon Settlement Analysis model to be issued to Participants as soon as constructed and to update Participants on any changes to the 4-week construction timeline	Programme / Elexon	07/08/2024
CR045 Update	PSG34-02	Programme to provide an update on post-M10 Change Management and the CR045 journey	Programme	07/08/2024
CR050 Update	PSG34-03	Programme to publish the refined Change Management process diagram and documentation to reflect Ofgem comments	Programme PMO	07/08/2024
Delivery Dashboards	PSG34-04	Programme to update description of Risk849 to reflect recognition of end date staying the same but with a delayed start date	Programme	07/08/2024
Previous Meeting(s)	PSG33-01	Programme to provide information on expectations of Parties post-M10 to support resourcing and management view – Date to be confirmed with Chris Harden at next PSG 07 August 2024	Programme	07/08/2024
	PSG33-02	Elexon to provide further clarity on progress to define how changes required to MHHS arrangements via BAU Code Governance will be managed, and how the Authority will be engaged to ensure the timely progression of code modifications/change proposals which may require direction via SCR powers	Elexon (John Abbott)	03/07/2024
	PSG32-03	Elexon to arrange discussions with PSG on paper on arrangements for Settlement Analysis to consider potential impacts which may occur following MHHS Go-Live	Elexon (John Abbot)	05/06/2024
	PSG32-08	IPA to consider governance of DBT2 assurance and any Participant Impact Assessment required	IPA (Richard Shilton)	05/06/2024

Decisions

Area	Ref	Decision	Rationale
Headline Report and Actions	PSG-DEC80	The Headline Report of the previous meeting was approved with no amendments	No amendments raised by PSG members
Programme Change Requests	PSG-DEC81	SRO rejected CR045, to be handed over to Code Bodies for implementation post-M10	The majority of Participants do not have ability to implement before M10. Details of Change Control documents can be found on Collaboration Base

Key Discussion Items

Area	Discussion
Minutes and Actions	<p>The Headline Report of the previous meeting was approved with no amendments (DECISION PSG-DEC80).</p> <p>Action wording and updates can be found within the meeting papers, and key discussion points are summarised below:</p> <p>ACTION PSG33-01: Programme advised owner of this action has been changed from Elexon to Programme and an update will be provided at PSG 07 August 2024.</p>
Programme Reporting	<p>Tracking to timetable to address and clarify points of concern:</p> <p>Programme provided a high-level report of Sprint 1 but advises that a more detailed report will be distributed to FTIG members later on Wednesday 03 July 2024. Programme provided an overview of the timetable for Sprint 1 and 2, as per the meeting slides. Programme intended to hold cohort meetings to discuss the execution models, the forecasted test velocity, the MVC and the success criteria for moving into the next maintenance window. These meetings were completed on Monday 01 July 2024. Sprint 2 has now begun as of Monday 01 July 2024. Programme is now looking to assess risk to end dates based on the progress of Sprint 1 and 2 and Programme will be signposting intentions for MVC.</p> <p>Minimum Viable Cohorts (MVC) concept and expected operation</p> <p>Programme provided reminder on concept of Minimum Viable Cohort (MVC). MVC is designed to manage the critical path to M10 and to prove the end-to-end MHHS design as quickly as possible. Programme does not require all cohorts to complete SIT simultaneously and the model is based on the delivery philosophy of allowing the fastest moving organisations to proceed at the pace they can sustain. Programme will, however, support every organisation to complete SIT while environments are still available. The plan includes a range of 11 weeks between the fastest and slowest moving organisations. This provides time to accommodate the range of testing velocities between organisations. Participants in the MVC will receive priority support but Programme reiterates that all organisations will be supported throughout to complete SIT whether part of the MVC or not.</p> <p>The MVC concept creates two tiers of cohorts working off two timelines, each consisting of 4 cohorts. The MVC requires two cohorts to prove the design and two back up cohorts, in case the two fastest movers face blockers. Programme may propose new cohort pairings to optimise pace. The MVC tier (Tier 1) will be provided with (as a general guide) 2/3 support with Tier 2 provided with 1/3 support as Tier 1 will be faced with more</p>

defects more quickly and will thus clear the way for Tier 2 when they progress to the same stage. Programme intends to propose the MVC cohorts at the end of Sprint 2 and will justify the rationale. Programme will continue to look at the pairings before Cycle 3 so the MVC Participants are not locked. Programme's decision making will be transparent and Participants will be notified through FTIG.

An attendee notes that they understand and appreciate the rationale of 'reverting' back to the approach. Programme clarifies that it was always the intention to start off without an MVC approach and to subsequently move to an MVC approach. Attendee queries whether the MVC approach is pushing out timescales for completing M10. Programme advises that it will prioritise the MVC cohort but it will ensure there is enough support provided for all Participants to complete SIT and M10.

Attendee raised that St Clements and the DNOs have been working with Programme to ascertain the requirements, beyond their core role, to support SIT and Migration. Attendee notes that the planning for these outcomes is more demanding than envisaged and that St Clements wanted to share with Participants that they are working to get a clear picture of future requirements so as to plan more effectively. Programme advises that this is occurring across Participants and that the nature of testing is that it is not clear, but Programme is working to best reasonable expectations to create a clear plan. Programme highlights that clear communication, planning, agile course correction and risk management are the optimum way forward.

An attendee queries whether all four cohorts must complete M10 to prove the design. Programme advises that only two cohorts need to complete the MVC timeline but ideally all four would.

An attendee questions when MVC will officially commence. Programme advises that it will be the start of Sprint 3. Programme notes that this will be signposted midway through Sprint 2 which began Monday 01 July 2024. Cohort pairings may be subject to change but Participants will not be surprised by start date on 12 July 2024. Cohort pairing changes will not cause delays but will be well signposted as it may impact ways of working. It may be that Programme does not have sufficient evidence through delivery of Sprint 1 and 2 to make a decision, whereby commencement will be deferred by one Sprint but again this will be well signposted. Programme reiterates importance of MVC starting as quickly as possible but not so much that it disrupts testing.

Update on development of test stage firm targets, based on cohort execution models

Programme provided updates on detailed targets for reaching the next maintenance window, 16 August 2024, and these are what progress will be tracked against. These targets are more detailed than those for Cycle 1. See meeting slides for more detail on targets.

Updates on implementation of improvement actions from SIT Functional Cycle 1

Programme provided update on improvement actions resulting from the industry retrospective. Programme advises that the 'must haves' have largely been implemented and the outstanding actions are being tracked and worked through. Fortnightly reporting to FTIG has now commenced as of Friday 28 June 2024 and impacts are being managed through FTIG on a weekly basis. More detail on the actions can be found in the meeting slides.

Cohort meetings update

Programme advises that all 9 cohort meetings have been held, with the final meeting held on Monday 01 July 2024. Programme has laid out the test plans, models and the planning assumptions. The feedback and buy-in from cohorts was positive with most viewing the plans as logical and reasonable, with the caveat that test progress is critical for these plans to complete. Programme advises that the plans will be reviewed during

	<p>every Sprint to ensure compliance with expected testing velocities. Participants also supported the new scoring regime as it allows for more accurate comparisons across cohorts. Cohorts also noted positive improvements in hourly / daily reporting. Some cohorts advised that they would like to move even faster but were being delayed by other cohort members. Programme advised that test coordinators and the LDP will work to ensure collaboration across cohorts for the benefit of everyone and Programme asked Participants for their best effort to support the other members of their cohort. Programme also noted one view that any communication regarding the MVC should be handled with care and Programme advised that it is not necessarily a negative to be in Tier 2 (non-MVC) but that it is just two different timelines, each with their own positives and negatives. More details on the cohort meetings and the cohort's views can be found in the meeting slides.</p> <p>An attendee queried what would happen if a participant couldn't complete either SIT timeline. Programme reiterated that support will be provided to ensure all Participants complete SIT. Programme advised that some Participants have contingency plans in place for a worst case scenario, but Programme advised that the risk is being addressed and support will be provided.</p> <p>Sprint 1 progress vs completion targets (SIT Functional Cycle 2 & SIT Migration)</p> <p>Programme advised that progress through Sprint 1 was slower than expected due to a number of programme wide defects. Programme advised, however, that despite the defects the four fastest moving cohorts achieved between 31% and 39% of the test point achievement in the plan. This is significant as it shows that this was achieved in c. three and a half days, once the defects were resolved. Programme had assumed that between Cycle 1 and 2 test pass rates would increase significantly from c. 62% to c. 82% and this has been the reality. This shows improvements have been taking hold and while the execution rate has been lower than expected in Sprint 1, the pass rate has increased in line with model expectations. Execution rates are now expected to increase due to the resolution of the defect.</p> <p>Programme provided reporting on case design coverage, as per meeting slide and advised that a more detailed reporting of SIT Migration will be distributed to FTIG members later on Wednesday 03 July and to the IPA and Ofgem later that week.</p> <p>Programme also advised that Sprint 2 has commenced and that now that defects have been fixed, execution rates are significantly up and good progress is being made.</p> <p>SIT Settlement Testing Stabilisation: Post Sprint 1 Report - Status</p> <p>Programme advised that Settlement Testing has been delayed from its intended start on Monday 01 July 2024 due to a defect. It will start no later than 08 July 2024 once the defect has been resolved.</p> <p>An attendee queried whether there are more than two Sprints. Programme advised there are four Sprints and the final Sprint is three weeks long, as opposed to the standard two weeks assigned to the other Sprints. This has been communicated in the cohort meetings and Programme will continue to share this information at regular intervals.</p>
<p>Settlement Analysis</p>	<p>Helix advised its intent to develop a modelling tool to utilise real world data to provide outturn calculations that would be expected as a result of the migration to MHHS rules. The intent is that this would be of more practical use to Participants than theoretical modelling. Helix are in the final stages of sourcing the MPAN data from 50,000 MPANs to feed into the model. Helix advised that they are subject to the same demanding timelines as other Participants and expect that this step of the model is the only step they will be required to make as their resources are limited. Helix advised that there is a long set of statements beyond those shown in the meeting slides and can be shared upon request.</p> <p>Helix highlighted the model will show any unwanted commercial movements as a result of moving to Go-Live and shows real world modelling based on our data as it will apply actual rules on real world data. The initial build estimate was 4 weeks, but Helix is working through expected data</p>

	<p>and will update timeline once data has been reviewed. Helix will take an action to outline the completion date of the project once the data has been reviewed (ACTION PSG34-01).</p>
<p>CR045 Update</p>	<p>Programme provided results of PPIR for CR045 which sought views from Participant's on their ability to implement CR045 before M10. 10 respondents supported implementing the change before M10, while 34 respondents stated they could not implement CR045 before M10. Respondents remain supportive of the Change but it is the ability to implement it before M10 that is the issue. Programme recommended that CR045 is handed over to the Code Bodies to be implemented post M10 (DECISION PSG81). More details on the rationale behind respondents answers can be found in the meeting slides.</p> <p>The SRO noted that whilst the recommendation is to hand over to the Code Bodies, the post-M10 change arrangements are under further consideration within the Programme and with Code Bodies. There are powers that exist for the Programme that are likely to facilitate faster processing of change and the Programme is looking to retain ownership of the Change Management process as a consequence.</p> <p>Representative from RECCo advised that RECCo's position is that this Change is highly significant and while it recognises that this Change has been recommended for rejection today, it retains that CR045 should be implemented prior to M10, or as soon after as possible. RECCo will be looking to raise this as a Change Proposal imminently, seeking the earliest possible implementation date. RECCo advises that MPANs migrating without this solution in place should be minimised to mitigate against the recognised risks and that this was seen as a priority by the REC Performance Assurance Board (PAB). The SRO asked whether this applies to both CR044 as well as CR045. RECCo advises that CR044 also needs to be delivered but it is not as urgent and business critical.</p> <p>An attendee asked how does Programme/RECCo see CR045 being actioned and how engagement with Participants will be handled prior to M10, ensuring Participants are ready to implement immediately after M10. RECCo Representative advised that the first step is to agree the mechanics with the Programme of how CR045 will be progressed, how Industry will be involved, which topics will be consulted on, and the impacts of each way forward. RECCo representative believes that it should be progressed despite not every Participant being ready due to the risk to the Central Parties and we should investigate phased implementation.</p> <p>The SRO noted that the new post-M10 Change Management process was still in development but that CR045 should be taken into that development work to map out a process for CR045 given its priority.</p> <p>Programme to provide an update on post-M10 Change Management and the CR045 journey at the next PSG 07 August 2024. (ACTION PSG34-02)</p>
<p>CR050 Update</p>	<p>Ofgem provided verbal update on CR050. Ofgem advised that the CR050 Decision at PSG (PSG-DEC72) came to Ofgem as the Decision was deemed to be more than a housekeeping Change. Ofgem reiterated that there is a Code Change Freeze period in place, unless a Change is fundamental to the commencement of M10. If there are Changes proposed these will be placed in a holding position and reviewed whether to be actioned immediately post M10 or to be actioned through Business as Usual. One key point to consider in Change is transparency and ensuring industry has sufficient time to review changes and implement them at the right time. This is critical if Changes to Design are identified post Testing, as Participants may then need to change their systems. Ofgem noted the need for efficient and quick-change management, to ensure any Programme decisions are clear and explicit, and for Participants to be clear on Changes needed to systems and processes and implementation timescales. Ofgem supported the three mechanisms in place as part of the change process in Webinars, Impact Assessments and the Change Board Proposal.</p>

	<p>Ofgem notes a concern that PSG is a Steering Group and not a meeting for technical discussion, therefore Ofgem is proposing clarifications to the Change Management process for the Change Board to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • set out a detailed rationale for its recommendation to the SRO at PSG and for transparency of the Impact Assessment. This will provide an opportunity for Participants to see and understand the rationale for decisions to be made at PSG. • make a recommendation to the PSG for SRO decision, rather than make a decision that is subsequently ratified. <p>An attendee asked what this refinement will mean for the Change Management process that has already been published from CR050. Ofgem advised that we now operate in this Change Process, with the Programme to publish the refined Change Management process diagram and documentation alongside Headline Report (ACTION PSG34-03).</p>
<p>IPA Plan on a Page (POAP) to Dec 2025</p>	<p>The IPA provided Plan on a Page to December 2025, as per meeting slide. IPA advised that they are continuing ongoing monitoring throughout the different work packages and makes particular note of work packages 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13, which were split by assurance periods, whereby the IPA will be holding bilaterals with a selection of Participants. From period 7 onwards the IPA will provide updates to PSG beyond Testing to include Qualification, Migration and Consequential Change workstreams. Before each period, IPA will provide a holistic overview as to what will be covered. IPA welcomed any Participants to reach out for anything they may wish to discuss. IPA also adds there is an action for IPA to present a more detailed DBT2 approach to MCAG on 25 July 2024, which will be part of the overall assurance period processes outlined in the meeting slides.</p>
<p>Delivery Dashboards</p>	<p>Programme provided update on delivery dashboards, as per meeting slides. An attendee queried why the colour coded square indicating the average RAG was removed. Programme advised it looks to focus on the risk exceptions, those with the highest risks rather than the average and showing the average was misleading.</p> <p>Another attendee asked about the ongoing deferment of the approval of the non-Functional Test Approach Plan and the SIT Operational Approach Plan. Participants are working on these plans without having seen the final versions and attendee asked whether Participants will be given the opportunity to review and reshape these plans once the plans are final. Attendee also noted that this may require extra resources. Programme advised that Non-Functional Test Approach & Plan has been delayed for approval due to a review of Theme 1, DIP and Helix element. However, Theme 2 and 3, the Participant element, will not be subject to change, and test scenarios and test cases have been progressing through Industry consultation which were published Friday 28 June 2024. Programme advised that the Participant element should not be subject to substantial change. Programme noted that the Approach and Plans do still need to be taken to SITAG.</p> <p>Helix representative advised that in relation to Operational SIT, the structure of the model teams have been confirmed, as well as the system components to be used. Helix are progressing the delivery of low-level service designs for 29 July 2024, with a key focus would be on the triage and passing of incidents and queries to other affected Participants. Programme intends to support Helix in their development of this documentation.</p> <p>Medium Supplier Representative acknowledged Programme's recognition of increased severity of Risk849 as a result of increased pressure on participants. The Representative proposed an update of the Risk description to reflect that while the start date may be deferred, the end date will remain the same. Programme advised that it will update the description of Risk849 (ACTION PSG34-04).</p> <p>Representative from DCC praised the collaborative effort taken to address defect P1 in the week 24 – 28 June 2024. SRO noted the successful delivery of the DCC June release and thanked the DCC team for their hard work.</p>

	Programme advised that updates on Qualification Testing and Migration Status have been relocated from a standing item to the delivery dashboards for this and future PSG meetings.
--	--

Date of next meeting: 07 August 2024 at 10:00am (virtual)

Attendees

Chair

Helen Adey (Chair)

MHHS SRO

Industry Representatives

Andrew Campbell

Chris Price

Elaine Eyles

Andrew Green (on behalf of Gareth Evans)

Graham Wood

Jenny Rawlinson

James Murphy (on behalf of Joel Stark)

Simon Harrison

John Abbott

Jonathon Hawkins

Keren Kelly

Tamsin Lucas

Small Supplier Representative

DNO Representative

Medium Supplier Representative

I&C Supplier Representative

Large Supplier Representative

IDNO Representative

Supplier Agent Representative (Independent)

Supplier Agent Representative

Elxon Representative (Central Systems Provider)

RECCo Representative

National Grid ESO

DCC Representative (Central Systems Provider)

Apologies

Seat Vacant

Consumer Representative

MHHS IM

Smitha Pichrikat

Dom Mooney

Roisin Quinn

Chris Welby

Fraser Mathieson

Immy Syms

Jason Brogden

Keith Clark

Lewis Hall

Peter Edwarde

Philip McCann

Roger Robar

Paul Pettitt

Warren Fulton

Andrew Margan

SRO

Test Manager

PMO Team

Programme Industry SME

Governance Lead

PMO Change Lead

Programme Industry SME

Programme Manager

PMO Manager

PPC Team

Governance Lead

Test Lead

Design Lead

Migration Lead

Code Lead

Other Attendees

Renata Yussupova

Jenny Boothe

Sinead Quinn

Andy MacFaul

Fahreen Japp

IPA

Ofgem

Ofgem

Ofgem

Ofgem