

MHHS Migration and Cutover Advisory Group (MCAG) Headline Report

Issue date: 26/02/25

Meeting number	MCAG 010	Venue	Virtual – MS Teams
Date and time	25 February 2025 1400-1600	Classification	Public

Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date	Update
DCWG Update	MCAG10-01	Programme and Small Supplier Representative to catch up offline regarding concerns about the Programme data cleanse.	Programme (Matthew Breen)	25/03/2025	Recommend Closed: Discussion held on 26/02/2025.

Decisions

Area	Decision Ref	Description	Rationale
Headline and Actions	MCAG-DEC21	Headline report was approved with no objections from MCAG members.	The Headline Report was approved without objections from PPs.
Migration Framework Consultation 3 Outputs	MCAG-DEC22	The Chair, acting with delegated authority of the MHHS Senior Responsible Owner (SRO), approved the MCC Framework Consultation 3 outputs.	The Chair asked if there were any objections to approving the MCC Framework Consultation 3 outputs. None were raised and the approval of the artefacts was accepted.
Programme Milestones Related to MCAG	MCAG-DEC23	The Chair, acting with delegated authority of the MHHS Senior Responsible Owner (SRO), approved the creation of milestone Non-SIT Participants Migration Start (T2-MI-8500) end date = 15/05/26.	The Chair asked if there were any objections to approving the creation of the milestone. None were raised; the creation of the milestones was approved.

Key Discussion Items

Area	Discussion
<p>Headline and Actions</p>	<p>DECISION: Headline report was approved with no objections from MCAG members (MCAG-DEC21 – recording timestamp 00:07:18).</p> <p>Regarding action MCAG08-01, the RECCo Representative requested that the action be kept open as the meeting was held yesterday, but further sessions are required. The MCAG chair agreed to keep the action open. Elexon (Helix) provided a summary of the workshop to discuss and support incidents that could require multiple service desks. They detailed that, following the session, Elexon (Helix) will document the activity further and set up fortnightly workshops.</p>
<p>Migration Framework Consultation 3 Outputs</p>	<p>Programme thanked the constituencies for engaging in the consultation and presented the findings. They walked through the slides, highlighting that the due process was followed, involving MWG at every step. An assurance meeting was held on the 13 February 2025, where responses to comments and proposed changes to artefacts based on industry feedback were reviewed. Certain themes needing more work were also highlighted.</p> <p>The consultation went well, with no objections to MCAG approving the Consultation 3 outputs. The scope and content for Consultation 4 were also shared.</p> <p>MCAG Chair asked if there were any questions on Consultation 3 Outputs. Seeing no questions, MCAG Chair asked if anyone objected to approving the MCC Framework Consultation 3 outputs. With no objections, the SRO approved the MCC Framework Consultation 3 outputs.</p> <p>DECISION: The Chair, acting with delegated authority of the MHHS Senior Responsible Owner (SRO), approved the MCC Framework Consultation 3 outputs. (MCAG-DEC22 – recording timestamp 00:17:08).</p>
<p>Service Design Update</p>	<p>Elexon (Helix) provided updates on the operations manual, stating that the next version would be published two weeks following the SIT testing Theme 3 Batch 1, which was due to finish at the end of the week. Future versions would be published monthly. A sheet has been added for further comments, allowing people to see live updates against items they raised. This sheet is linked in the presentation and available on the MHHS Collaboration Base.</p> <p>RECCo Representative raised a question about the governance of these documents, emphasising the need for proper documentation and impact assessment for any changes that might affect party obligations or require Code changes.</p> <p>Elexon (Helix) explained that the final versions of the operations manual would combine the previous SSD and LLSD documents and the operations manual into one final version around June. RECCo Representative pointed out that previous documents had no impact on other parties, but if that changed, the approach would need to be reviewed.</p> <p>Programme clarified that any changes requiring design or Code modifications would need a Programme Change Request and added that the operating manual would need to be re-endorsed by the MCAG before go-live, if it suggested changes affecting participants.</p>

	<p>A representative from Ofgem mentioned that a Ofgem Direction consultation would propose that the document be fully baselined as version 1 by the end of July. Elexon (Helix) emphasised that the process would involve identifying gaps through operational testing and triaging them to come up with a final version.</p> <p>Elexon (Helix) confirmed that the document, currently at version 1, would be iterated as dot X versions until June, after which it would fall under change control.</p> <p>Programme highlighted the importance of delivering the final version for Go-Live, well in time for July to ensure Programme Participants are prepared for go-live in September 2025.</p>
<p>MWG Update</p>	<p>Programme discussed the Consultation 3 process and outputs and provided an overview of the contents of Consultation 4. The next week's MWG Framework Development Workshop will cover the proposed test approach, test strategy, and dress rehearsal approach for the MCC, as part of the Migration report previously presented to MCAG. Key findings and observations, including parameters like supplier ramp-up durations and the core migration window, will be discussed.</p> <p>The consultation will also propose an approach for the PPIR for complex sites and shared sites, detailing how information will be gathered and risks managed. Other items will be discussed in the Framework Development Workshop next week, and the content is on track to be issued for the final consultation.</p> <p>The intention is to baseline the framework as version 1.0 upon MCAG approval of Consultation 4, after which it will come under change control and the MCAG going forward. The next supplier schedule submission is planned for the end of April, and the migration schedule will also be baselined for Go-Live.</p> <p>An update on MCC readiness was provided, stating that a demo of the MCC portal development will be given to the Framework Development Workshop next week. The intention is to use the new MCC toolset for the next supply submission exercise in April as an internal dress rehearsal. Recruitment for the MCC capability is starting, and more information will be shared with participants on how to engage with the MCC processes.</p> <p>MCAG Chair asked when the MCC portal would be ready before the submission deadline on the 28 April. Programme responded that there is a schedule to be published, including webinars and supporting information to onboard participants.</p> <p>DNO Representative asked if there was any requirement for LDSOs to onboard to the MCC portal. Programme clarified that it is not required for this round of scheduled submissions and will be part of a dress rehearsal in June (for reporting).</p>
<p>DCWG Update</p>	<p>Programme stated that the deadline for declarations from all suppliers regarding the working of exceptions from the population of meter location and the number of displayed register digits had passed. Work-off plans have been shared, and the group will monitor these plans and ask suppliers for updates.</p> <p>A specific issue with S2 meters and the number of displayed register digits was discussed. A PPIR was issued, and responses from suppliers accounting for 86% of the market indicated that 218,000 smart meters were impacted by this issue.</p> <p>RECCo Representative clarified that the issue with S2 meters is being reviewed through the REC issue process, and any changes are being considered. An impact assessment is being sent to St. Clements for review.</p> <p>I&C Supplier Representative asked for more information on what is meant by "invalid market segment." Programme explained that the market segment is a data item being populated later this year. The issue arises from incorrect data items between</p>

	<p>meter type and connection type. The MCAG discussed the potential impact of incorrect market segments on domestic and non-domestic meters.</p> <p>Small Supplier Representative raised concerns about the quality of the data cleanse, mentioning that a large supplier stated they are only resolving exceptions for meters they installed. Programme highlighted that the primary objective of the ESME ID population activity was to ensure that every Smart Meter had an ESME ID populated ahead of Go-Live and that this objective has been met. The expectation for Suppliers to resolve exceptions for meters they installed is correct.</p> <p>Programme suggested discussing this offline and clarified that the data plans carried out by REC are different from those led by the Programme.</p> <p>ACTION: Programme and Small Supplier Representative to catch up offline regarding concerns about the Programme data cleanse (MCAG10-01).</p>
<p>TORWG Updates</p>	<p>Programme highlighted the consultation on the early life support model, which started on Friday last week and will run until Friday next week. Participants can access the comments log on the Collaboration Base and share their feedback by the 07 March. The document will go through the normal governance process and be brought back to MCAG for approval, targeting the April MCAG meeting.</p> <p>Programme mentioned the introduction of the Issues Resolution Group through the TORWG in January. There will be further discussion on this in the TORWG on Thursday, and participants are encouraged to attend and provide feedback.</p> <p>Programme discussed the deployment of MPRS Release 9, which will enable data cleansing activities. Feedback on the PPIR was limited, but separate conversations were held with MCAG reps for DNOs and iDNOs. Proposals for the deployment of MPRS 9 will be discussed in the TORWG on Thursday, and updates will be made to the M10/M11 cutover plan based on these discussions.</p> <p>Programme mentioned that the transition design is being updated following CR055, and there will be an update on this in the TORWG on Thursday.</p>
<p>M10 Checkpoint</p>	<p>Programme provided an overview of the M10 readiness process and the importance of tracking progress against the M10 acceptance criteria.</p> <p>Programme mentioned the formation of the Go Live Implementation Group (GLIG), which will track progress of all central parties against the acceptance criteria. This group will operate similarly to the FTIG forum and will make recommendations, endorsements, and review progress of activities and deliverables.</p> <p>Programme discussed the implementation of the M10 checkpoint as part of CR055. The checkpoint will assess the viability of the M10 date, ensuring that the programme is on track to achieve the September deadline. The focus will be on confirming the viability of the M10 date and addressing any significant risks associated with progress.</p> <p>Programme explained that the M10 checkpoint will also assess the feasibility of moving downstream milestones to end the programme sooner. This includes evaluating the capacity within migration envelopes to shorten the migration window and potentially bring M15 and M16 forwards.</p>

	<p>MCAG Chair highlighted the PPIR issued to check the feasibility of bringing M14 forward. Programme encouraged participants to respond to the PPIR with relevant information, as the findings will provide helpful insights into whether M14 and M15 can be moved forwards.</p> <p>This PPIR in relation to Milestone 10 (M10) Checkpoint — Feasibility of bringing M14 forwards can found via the Current PPIRs page of the MHHS website.</p> <p>DNO Representative asked about the terminology and the potential benefit of bringing M10 forward. Programme clarified that they are not looking to move M10 forwards but are focusing on confirming the viability of the M10 date.</p> <p>RECCo Representative asked if core bodies are expected to respond to the PPIR. Programme confirmed that code bodies are not required to respond, but they will be involved in assessing and reviewing the findings.</p> <p>Programme outlined the three-pronged approach to assessing M10 readiness, which includes using the M10 readiness criteria, progress of SIT, and the view of aggregated risk and key dependencies.</p>
<p>Programme Milestones Related to MCAG</p>	<p>Programme mentioned the need to create a milestone ID related to the migration of non-SIT participants in the programme plan.</p> <p>MCAG Chair asked if there were any objections to the creation of the new program milestone. With unanimous support from the MCAG members, the milestone T2-MI-8500 with the date of the 15 March 2026 was approved.</p> <p>DECISION: The Chair, acting with delegated authority of the MHHS Senior Responsible Owner (SRO), approved the creation of milestone Non-SIT Participants Migration Start (T2-MI-8500) end date = 15/05/26 (MCAG-DEC23 – recording timestamp 01:10:43).</p> <p>Programme opened the floor to questions regarding the Programme Milestones, none were raised.</p>
<p>Top Programme Risks Related to MCAG</p>	<p>Programme opened the floor to questions regarding Programme Risks, no comments or questions were raised.</p>
<p>Summary and Next Steps</p>	<p>Programme provided a summary of actions and possible next steps, no comments or questions were raised.</p> <p>Programme noted that the next MCAG meeting clashes with the open day. There is a proposal to move the MCAG meeting to accommodate the open day, but this is yet to be confirmed.</p> <p>The next MCAG meeting will be on the 25 March 2025, subject to confirmation.</p>

Date of next MCAG: 25 March 2025 (TBC)

Attendees

Chair

Justin Andrews Chair

Industry Representatives

Gareth Evans I&C Supplier Representative

Graham Wood Large Supplier Representative

Jonny Moore RECCo Representative

Lijo Louis Medium Supplier Representative

Mark Treanor Small Supplier Representative

David Yeoman DNO Representative

Simon Harrison Supplier Agent Representative (Independent)

Apologies

Alexander Ashbrook DCC Representative

Andrew Dudkowsky National Grid ESO Representative

Michael Ceney Elexon Representative (as BSC/BSCCo Manager)

Morven Hunter iDNO Representative

Sean Doughty Elexon Representative (as central systems provider)

MHHS IM Members

Anne Robinson PMO Governance Lead

Matthew Breen Transition Lead

Warren Fulton MHHS Client Delivery Advisor

Lewis Hall LDP Delivery Manager

John Wiggins Programme Industry SME

Other Members

Robert Golding Elexon (as DIP Manager)

Jenny Boothe Ofgem

Liam Evans IPA

Mark Scott Elexon (as Helix for Service Design item)

Reece Harris IPA