

MHHS Programme Steering Group Headline Report

Issue date: 14/03/22

Meeting Number	PSG005.1 extraordinary PSG	Venue	Virtual – MS Teams
Meeting Date and Time	11 March 2022 1400-1530	Classification	Public

Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date	Update
Raising CR001 and CR002	PSG05.1-01	Provide guidance/principles for how CR001 and CR002 may impact later milestones and go-live to inform Programme Participant's Impact Assessments (note: this will not form part of the Programme's own Impact Assessment)	Programme (PMO)	18/03/22	
	PSG05.1-02	Review the Change Control process (e.g., Change Request form, Impact Assessment requirements, Change Board) using this first Change Request experience as a means of gathering feedback. Gain PSG member views as part of review process	Programme (SRO)	04/05/22	
	PSG05.1-03	Share Impact Assessment requirements with Programme Participants following review by Ofgem	Programme (PMO)	14/03/22	Complete – see Key Discussion Items below
	PSG05.1-04	Raise CR001 and CR002 for impact assessment	Programme (PMO)	11/03/22	Complete – raised by PMO on 11 March
	PSG05.1-05	Share Change Requests and Impact Assessments with constituent members. Support constituent members to complete Impact Assessments as appropriate. Ensure Impact Assessments are returned to the PMO by or before 25 th March	Constituency reps	25/03/22	

Decisions

Area	Dec Ref	Decision
Raising CR001 and CR002	PSGDEC-09	Raise CR001 and CR002 for Impact Assessment

RAID Items Discussed

RAID area	Description
Supplier engagement and the delivery of M5	This extraordinary PSG was dedicated to progressing Change Requests proposing delays to M5 and resolving challenges around supplier engagement.

Key Discussion items

Area	Discussion
Action taken since last PSG and next steps	<p>The Programme presented action taken since last PSG. This included sessions with PSG members to provide detail on a plan for M5 in July, which should be used as a basis for participants to assess CR001 impact. The Programme outlined next steps for the Change Requests for M5:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Raise CR001 and CR002 for Impact Assessment by all Programme Participants (10 days for Impact Assessment). Change Requests to be shared with Constituency Reps, directly with Programme Participants, on the MHHS Website, and via the Clock2. Review Impact Assessments at the Change Board3. Bring outputs to 06 April PSG to agree a recommendation to go to Ofgem4. Ofgem to make a decision
Guidance on completing Change Request Impact Assessments	<p>Ofgem indicated that in order to take a decision on a Change Request they would need to be able to understand:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Whether the proposals outlined in a Change Request would result in plan that is credible and achievable and which parties would have confidence can be fully delivered;2. The assumptions made in any Change Request or Impact Assessment. These should be clearly stated and thought-through;3. The benefits of the Change Request against the current baseline plan;4. The costs and impacts on the Programme, industry participants and consumers. This would need to be the full cost of the changes, including costs to all Programme Participants and the cost of any delay in realisation of benefits to consumers.5. Both the immediate and forecasted impacts and costs. For example, immediate impacts may look at short term costs to a Programme Participant. Forecasted impact may look at delayed benefits to the consumer, delayed benefits realisation, and impacts on the MHHS business case.

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Whether the proposed timeline is the most cost-effective approach taking into account the costs of all Programme Participants and the delayed benefits to consumers as a result of overall programme delay; 7. Whether there are steps parties could take to make a cost-effective timeline realistic, credible and achievable, and what consideration has been given to taking those steps; 8. Whether the implications of movement of M5 have been worked through the rest of the plan, including the implications on the start and end of migration and the provision of benefits to customers. Have steps been taken to minimise this delay and are parties committed to taking them? This will be particularly important to Ofgem because any delay in the start or end of migration will delay the realisation of benefits to customers and impacts to support the move to net zero. Any such decision would require thorough consideration. <p>The IPA added:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extent to which parties can or cannot engage with the design activity prior to the proposed M5 milestone needs to be understood and supported by clearly evidenced analysis. <p>Further guidance on Impact Assessments was shared by the Programme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact assessments must provide evidence why a participant CANNOT deliver against the current plan and why they CAN deliver against the Change Request proposal (and vice versa). Evidence and rationale behind any justification must be well thought-out (not back of the envelope) with clear analysis. For example, if a party believes the risk or cost posed by the current plan is greater than the risk or cost posed by a proposed change, they must clearly show their analysis. • Impact Assessments should be taken against the Programme current baseline plan (M5 in April). • Impact Assessment should take a risk-based approach and consider the balance of the risk of later Change Requests to the design, against the costs of a proposed delay. • Impact Assessments should provide evidence to substantiate any claims (for example, that cost savings later will exceed any costs incurred now, or of how timelines of later milestones in the plan may be shortened) • While it is a consideration, Impact Assessments should not be a direct comparison of CR001 against CR002. • Impact Assessments should be quantified where possible e.g., costs should be £ values and not a qualitative 'high' or 'low' • Participants are encouraged to make Impact Assessments as detailed as possible. This will allow for more informed decision-making.
<p>Discussion on Change Requests</p>	<p>The supplier rep raised challenges on completing the Impact Assessments to the required level of detail, given current challenges in supplier engagement in the Programme.</p> <p>The PSG discussed in detail the need to understand how the Change Requests would impact later milestones and go-live. Initially, Ofgem requested that this was detailed within the Change Requests, however the discussion identified that this would be difficult for Change Raisers to determine, particularly given that these Change Requests have been raised before the Programme re-plan. Determining the impact on later milestones would require input from all parties and would need a detailed planning activity. Parties would also have different opinions on how long each element of the plan will take (e.g., migration). It was agreed that no central planning activity would occur at this stage and that the Programme would provide some guiding principles on how the Change Requests may affect later milestones and go-live (action PSG05.1-1). This would be for use by Programme Participants in their Impact Assessments. The outputs of Impact Assessments would then be compiled into a single view of impact on later milestones and go-live for April PSG.</p>

The Programme provided some clarification on CR001, including that the intention of the plan to July was to allow Suppliers to spread their resource across a longer period and to focus their resource on a smaller number of design artefacts (~1/3 of artefacts).

The I&C Supplier rep provided an overview of the content and justification for CR002. Queries were raised about the detail of CR002. The Elexon rep noted that there was not enough detail below the CR002 plan to inform their Impact Assessment. For example, CR002 did not show what activity would be undertaken by the Programme and Programme Participants between now and September, when suppliers begin their engagement. The Supplier rep responded that suppliers did not have enough capacity to complete a detailed plan as per CR001, nor did they know enough to be able to define these requirements and impacts on other parties.

Some constituency reps raised their support for CR001, citing reasons such as additional costs and risk posed by CR002. This included the Elexon rep, the DCC rep (who also raised specific challenges on timelines for DSP procurement), and the Consumer rep.

The Programme agreed to review the Change Control process following resolution of these Change Requests (action PSG05.1-05). This would be to respond to learnings and comments from participants on the CR process, such as the level of support from the programme to Change Raisers, Impact Assessment requirements/guidance and scoring processes, and the level of detail required in Change Request forms (as some PSG members noted Programme Participants cannot provide the same level as detail as the Programme).