

MHHS Migration and Cutover Advisory Group (MCAG) Headline Report

Issue date: 24/10/24

Meeting number	MCAG 007	Venue	Virtual – MS Teams
Date and time	22 October 2024 1400-1600	Classification	Public

Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date	Update
Service Design Consultation	MCAG07-01	Programme to provide more details on the risks associated with Elexon (Helix) not meeting the December deadline for producing the Service User Operating Manual and include these details in the headline report.	Programme (PMO)	24/10/2024	RECOMMEND CLOSED: It was noted during the session that the risk IDs for these risks were R991 and R992.
	MCAG07-02	Programme and RECCo will discuss and agree on the wording for a risk to be added to the RAID log. This risk concerns the potential delay in Helix artefacts not being ready and the need for other service desks to have sufficient lead time to implement changes and any required code updates.	Programme and RECCo (Matthew Breen and Jonny Moore)	24/10/2024	Recommend Closed: Jonny and Matthew discussed this after the meeting and agreed that this is covered by risk R966 which was raised through CCAG.

Decisions

Area	Decision Ref	Description	Rationale
Service Design Consultation	MCAG-DEC16	MCAG endorsed the Service Design Document v2.4 and the Low Level Service Design v2.2.	The Chair asked if there were any objections to endorsing the two Helix artefacts. Since none were raised, the endorsement was accepted. However, the MCAG noted that the interaction between service desks would need to be detailed in the Service User Operating manual to be produced in December.

Key Discussion Items

Area	Discussion
Headline and Actions	<p>The Programme provided an update on the ongoing designation of the framework and schedule in code in relation to action MCAG03-01: MCAG to agree how the MCC Framework artefacts are designated, as the migration plan as per the BSC Section C12.11.3a. Programme suggested keeping the item ongoing until they reach a point where they can baseline the entire framework.</p> <p>Large Supplier representative asked about MCAG05-01: Large Supplier representative to gather feedback from large suppliers on the six-month core Migration Window, stating that there was no formal legal compliance requirement written down in governance or codes. They suggested closing the action on the premise that any future formal requirements would include appropriate clauses to account for potential issues during migration.</p> <p>Programme agreed and emphasised the need for clear expectations in the framework. They also highlighted the complexity of the migration phase and the interdependencies between parties and the need for accountability. Programme mentioned that they would share their findings from the supply submissions soon and that these findings would be discussed in Migration Working Group (MWG) and subsequent consultation.</p> <p>RECCo representative confirmed that the 'Migration Plan' was codified in the REC and BSC, thus ensuring that the migration plan would have legal standing. Programme acknowledged this and mentioned that they had received feedback from suppliers about potentially contradictory information in the framework, which the Programme would clarify.</p>
Service Design Consultation	<p>Elexon (Helix) started by summarising the feedback received on the Service Design Document (SDD) and the Lower Level Service Design (LLSD). They mentioned that they had follow-up sessions with respondents to provide clarity on their questions and ensure the answers made sense. The documents have been published, and anonymised feedback data is available for those who need it.</p>

	<p>Elexon (Helix) then addressed questions around service hours, the operator portal, and Service Level Agreements (SLAs). They explained that they are currently working on the Service User Operating Manual, which is due in early December. This manual will provide more detailed information and will supplement the LLS and SDD. To support this work, they are scheduling workshops in November to understand ways of working with all involved parties. These workshops aim to provide more detail in several areas including, change management and major incident processes and how different parties will interact.</p> <p>The Chair asked about the next steps for the operating manual, to which Elexon (Helix) responded that they plan to have it ready by early December and will solicit feedback through workshops. They emphasised the collaborative nature of these workshops and the importance of gathering as much information as needed to ensure effective communication and interfacing with all parties.</p> <p>RECCo representative raised a point about the arrangements for interaction between service desks, highlighting that this aspect is currently missing from the design. They also noted the tight timeframe for getting the documents and workshops ready by December, given that similar processes have taken longer in the past. They emphasised the need for early communication of any potential code changes required for M6.</p> <p>Large Supplier representative raised a concern about the tightness of the deadlines and the potential risks associated with code changes and operator testing. They questioned what would happen if they didn't meet the December deadline and how it would impact the project. Elexon (Helix) acknowledged the concern and mentioned that the risk had been raised recently and was being tracked. Programme confirmed that the risk related to the delivery of test scripts and promised to provide more details during the call and in the headline report.</p> <p>ACTION: Programme to provide more details on the risks associated with Elexon (Helix) not meeting the December deadline for producing the Service User Operating Manual and include these details in the headline report (MCAG07-01).</p> <p>It was noted during the session that the risk IDs for these risks were R991 and R992.</p> <p>RECCo representative highlighted the need for other service desks to have enough lead time to introduce changes and any required code changes. They emphasised the importance of having these elements codified before the migration starts. The Chair agreed and suggested capturing an action for RECCo and the Programme to discuss and agree on the wording for the risk to be raised in the RAID log.</p> <p>ACTION: Programme and RECCo will discuss and agree on the wording for the risk to be added to the RAID log. This risk concerns the potential delay in Helix artefacts not being ready and the need for other service desks to have sufficient lead time to implement changes and any required code updates (MCAG07-02).</p> <p>DECISION: MCAG endorsed the Service Design Document v2.4 and the Low Level Service Design v2.2, noting that the interaction between service desks would need to be detailed in the Service User Operating manual to be produced in December (MCAG-DEC16).</p>
<p>Updates from MWG</p>	<p>Programme expressed gratitude to suppliers for their engagement and detailed submissions, noting that 99.72% of MPANs have been accounted for. They highlighted the effectiveness of the Migration framework tested through</p>

	<p>consultations and mentioned that they are now optimising it based on data and feedback. The framework aims to achieve M15, operate within thresholds, provide flexibility, and protect quality.</p> <p>Programme discussed the roadmap for MWG, mentioning that they will propose an updated roadmap factoring in CR055 and adjusted timelines. They also noted that the development workstream for the Migration Control Centre tools has been mobilised, with detailed timelines to be shared in the new year.</p> <p>Regarding the consultation timeline, Programme indicated that they are aiming for December but may push it to early January due to the Christmas period.</p>
Updates from DCWG	<p>Programme provided an update on DCWG. They mentioned that several population activities have been carried out, which involved taking data from DCC systems and meter operator systems and loading it into MPRS. LDSOs are currently updating EES with this data, and once completed, the data will be available within the EES. This will allow the Programme to review the data quality and discuss any potential further data cleanse activities with participants.</p> <p>Programme emphasised that the goal is not to clean up historical data issues, but to address any material issues for MHHS that need to be resolved before the migration period. They mentioned that any additional work proposed would go through the normal consultation process and require approval from the MCAG.</p> <p>Large Supplier representative raised questions about the data cleanse deadlines and the potential impact of recent changes. Programme confirmed that there are no changes to the deadlines for the current activities, but they are open to discussing any exceptions and potential further activities with participants.</p> <p>The item concluded with a reminder for participants to raise any points they feel are worth discussing before the next DCWG.</p>
Updates from TORWG	<p>Programme provided an update on the early life support model, explaining that the consultation had been delayed due to the CR055 impact assessment. They now plan to put the document out for consultation in early November, with participants having two weeks to review it. The document will then go through the standard process of feedback, assurance meeting, and necessary updates before being brought to the MCAG for approval, likely in December or January.</p> <p>Programme also mentioned that discussions on the M16 success criteria have been paused, due to the significant impact of CR055 on the transition design. There is no specific deadline for the success criteria, but they will use the additional time provided by CR055 to review and rediscuss the criteria.</p>
Programme Milestones Related to MCAG	<p>Programme provided an update on Programme milestones, noting the extraordinary PSG recommendation on CR055 and now the required next stage of Ofgem's decision regarding CR055. MCAG noted that everyone is required to work to the CR055 timelines approved in the ePSG, until an Ofgem decision from Ofgem.</p>
Top Programme Risks Related to MCAG	<p>The Programme ran through Top Programme Risks Related to MCAG, no comments or questions were raised.</p>
Summary and Next Steps	<p>The Programme provided a summary of actions and possible next steps, no comments or questions were raised.</p>

The MCAG noted the date of the next meeting in November. Currently no items were due for MCAG consideration, therefore this meeting may be cancelled.

Date of next MCAG: 26 November 2024 (TBC)

Attendees

Chair

Justin Andrews Chair

Industry Representatives

Andrew Green (on behalf of Gareth Evans) I&C Supplier Representative

Christopher Day (on behalf of Michael Cenev) Elexon Representative (as BSC/BSCCo Manager)

Claire Ellington (on behalf of Alexander Ashbrook) DCC Representative

David Yeoman DNO Representative

Graham Wood Large Supplier Representative

Jonny Moore RECCo Representative

Morven Hunter iDNO Representative

Simon Harrison Supplier Agent Representative (Independent)

Apologies

Andrew Dudkowsky National Grid ESO Representative

Sean Doughty Elexon Representative (as central systems provider)

MHHS IM Members

Anne Robinson PMO Governance Support

Matthew Breen Migration Analyst

Warren Fulton MHHS Client Delivery Advisor

Other Members

Chris Wood Elexon (as DIP Manager)

Fahreen Japp Ofgem

Ian Giles Elexon (as Helix for Service Design item)

Liam Evans IPA

Mark Scott Elexon (as Helix for Service Design item)

Reece Harris IPA