MHHS Testing and Migration Advisory Group (TMAG) Actions and Minutes

Issue date: 20/10/22

Meeting number	**TMAG 010**	Venue	**Virtual – MS Teams**
Date and time	**19 October 2022 1000-1200**	Classification	**Public**

Attendees

Chair

Chris Welby (CWe)	MHHS SRO

Industry Participants

Dave Jones (DJ)	RECCo Representative
Ian Hall (IHal)	Supplier Agent Representative (Independent)
Ian Hatton (IHat)	DNO Representative
Martin Hanley (MH)	Large Supplier Representative
Shaun Brundrett (SBr)	Small Supplier Representative
Stacey Buck (SBu)	iDNO Representative

MHHS IM members

Adrian Ackroyd (AA)	Test Manager
Adrian Samlal (AS)	Environments Manager
Carly Ward (CWa)	Migration Lead
Jason Brogden (JB)	Industry SME
Kate Goodman (KG)	Test Architect
Martin Cranfield (MC)	PMO Governance & Secretariat Support
Nigel Hunt (NH)	Test Lead

Other Attendees

Sajwal Dash (SD)	IPA Lead
Sinead Quinn (SQ)	Ofgem (as observer)

Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date
Replan	TMAG10-01	Share further SIT POAPs showing the path for remaining Programme Participant groups (e.g. non-MVC)	Programme (Kate Goodman)	16/11/22
Environments Approach and Plan	TMAG10-02	Encourage their constituents to attend the EWG and engage with the review process for the Environments Approach and Plan	TMAG members	01/11/22

TMAG constituency reps	TMAG10-03	Raise the open TMAG Large Supplier Representative position with other large supplier representatives and at the PSG	Programme (Jason Brogden)	16/11/22

Decisions

Area	Decision Ref	Description
Minutes	TMAG-DEC14	The minutes of the TMAG on 22 September 2022 were approved

Minutes

1.   Welcome

CWe welcomed all to the meeting.

2.   Minutes and Actions

DECISION TMAG-DEC13: The minutes of the TMAG 22 September 2022 were approved

MC provided a summary of the actions as per the slides. No comments received.

3.   Programme Updates

MC highlighted design and programme replan updates as key Programme updates. No comments received.

4.   Migration options

CWa provided an update from the Migration Working Group (MWG). Migration options had been socialised via the MWG, with the latest evaluation framework and supporting information shared last week. The options analysis had used information sourced via the MWG as well as from the Round 2 replan consultation. The Programme were now working with Ofgem to agree the way forward.

CWa noted that the Option 4 description was to be updated to provide further detail on what 'operational workarounds' meant. KG provided an overview of Option 4. The consensus was that Option 4 was not one to progress. In Option 4, there was no reversal back to the old arrangements but there was the ability for a consumer with MPANs migrated to new arrangements to choose a supplier still in the old arrangements. The MPAN would not move back to old arrangements but stay in new arrangement on a defaulting arrangement. There would be no ability for the gaining supplier to either appoint agents or to receive settlement reports (as they would not be on the Data Integration Platform (DIP)). This meant this option was not a satisfactory arrangement for many reasons including that settlement accuracy goes down.

CWa provided an overview of the options analysis summary as per the slides. This information had come primarily from Programme Participants. Following MWG, further qualitative pros and cons had been added across the framework (such as feedback on Option 4 as per KG's comments). The framework had originally had both qualitative and quantitative information, but the approach to quantitative information had been changed recently to use a different method to score cost and time impacts. The new approach and full options evaluation framework would be shared back out to parties to provide feedback on the impact of each option. CWa invited questions.

DJ noted that the last MWG had had a lot of discussion on updating the scoring but that no updates had been shared with industry since. CWa noted the headline report had been shared. In the MWG, the group had aligned on the qualitative scores and the Programme was now going to send out an updated version with updated commentary asking Programme Participants to comment. This was planned to be shared 19 October. This had been delayed slightly to ensure the latest position was reflected following discussion with Ofgem and that necessary detail was provided on the qualitative side.

MC provided an overview of the change control process that the outputs of the migrations options analysis may need to follow. This included how any Change Request (CR) would need to travel through TMAG. IHal queried if a CR would

only be required for Option 3 or 4. JB confirmed this was the case and added that if there was a decision between options, the Change Request might be required to gather information via Impact Assessment in order to inform that decision (i.e. the Change Request may not be for a final option, it may have multiple options in order to gather evidence to decide between them).

5.   Programme re-plan

KG provided an overview of the Round 2 consultation responses on the length of the migration period as per the slide. Feedback in Round 2 had been more positive feedback than heard through working groups/other forums. KG noted a big variation in time taken for suppliers and agents to complete migration (which may be largely due to planning and trialling). KG summarised some of the key takeaways as per the slide.

CWe noted a takeaway that UMS and Advanced would start early and queried if they would still need to migrate. KG confirmed UMS and Advanced would be half-hourly before migration but not market-wide half hourly. This means their data would be ready and migration would be easier. CWe queried if the Round 2 replan consultation gave an indication on any central system constraints on MPANs that can be migrated in a single day. KG responded that the replan did not include this and that detailed migration design work would start in November (following M5 baseline). Work on the migration design would include these details – this was complex with many potential bottlenecks and so needed to be managed carefully.

KG provided an overview of the Programme Plan on a Page (POAP) from the Round 2 replan consultation. The POAP had different swim lanes for participants taking different pathways through the Programme. The blue swim lanes were for Participants doing DBT and going through SIT as quickly as possible to be part of the first cohort finishing SIT (with the overall purpose of SIT fulfilled once this cohort had completed the SIT tests). KG noted there would be different groups in SIT, with faster groups that could go live early. Participants going down the qualification route would start to go live slightly later than any SIT groups.

IHat queried where registration services would be considered. KG clarified the programme did not consider registration services to be central systems, however registration services were needed for go live and needed to be tested in SIT. SIT for registration services would most likely be done by St Clements on behalf of DNOs/iDNOs. Central systems would be needed for SIT and go live, but registration was slightly different as not all would be needed for SIT but would be needed for go live.

KG showed the dependencies and critical path through testing for a SIT participant in the Minimum Viable Cohort (MVC). The MVC would be the fastest moving group who would test together and get out of SIT and go live as early as possible. KG provided a summary of the POAP for MVC participants and outlined the approach and rationale for the sequencing, timeframes and dependencies for the steps in the POAP.

KG invited questions and queried if this POAP was useful (as it provided a participant view rather than a Programme view). MH confirmed this was a useful view. KG noted the Programme intended to publish different views for non-MVC and other pathways through SIT.

ACTION TMAG10-01 – Programme to share further SIT POAPs showing the path for remaining Programme Participant groups (e.g. non-MVC)

6.   Environments Approach and Plan

AS introduced himself as the environments lead and Environments and Configurations Management Working Group (EWG) chair. AS summarised the process for developing and approving the Environments Approach and Plan (EA&P) as per the slides. The Programme had begun drafting the EA&P in July and had progressed it through internal review. The intention was to baseline in November at TMAG, with a caveat that some information was still to be determined.

AS provided an overview of the steps taken so far on the EA&P as per the slide, noting feedback so far from Programme Participants had been very beneficial. Some comments received would have placeholders in the document to update in future while others would be addressed followed more detailed internal review. 99 comments had been received as of 17 October. The Programme was aiming to have a recommendation to TMAG from the EWG of 01 November 2022. The TMAG would be making a decision on the basis that the document was robust on the information that is currently available and any placeholders would be worked through in due course. AS invited questions. None received.

AS provided an overview of the proposed environment requirements as per the slide. AS encouraged dedicated environment representatives to attend the EWG. AS invited questions. None received.

CWe requested that TMAG members communicate to their constituents the importance of engaging with the EWG and EA&P.

> **ACTION TMAG10-02 – TMAG members to encourage their constituents to attend the EWG and engage with the review process for the Environments Approach and Plan**

7.   Working group updates

Data Working Group (DWG)

KG provided a summary of discussion at the last DWG. Recent items included what data items were required in data cuts and further progressing content of the Test Data Strategy.

Migration Working Group (MWG)

CWa noted the MWG update was as per the agenda item on migration (migration options and the length of the migration period). The next MWG would be on next steps for the migration options and the migration design.

Environments and Configurations Management Working Group (EWG)

AS noted this update had been covered in the agenda item on EA&P.

Qualification and E2E Sandbox Working Group (QWG)

KG noted the QWG were exploring what was in qualification, what the different roles and responsibilities were, and implications for qualification testing (e.g. SAD documents). This was a joint exercise between the Programme and code bodies (primarily the BSC). There were also SEC implications for parties undertaking the MDR.

8.   Summary and next steps

MC summarised the actions. CWe provided an overview of the agenda items for the next TMAG. CWe noted upcoming decisions on M5 at the Design Advisory Group (DAG) and M3 at Programme Steering Group (PSG). CWe invited AOBs.

MH highlighted that he was stepping down as Large Supplier TMAG representative at the end of the year and asked other members to support the Programme in finding a new representative. JB responded that this could be raised at the Programme Steering Group (PSG) and with the other large supplier representatives.

> **Action TMAG10-03 – Programme to raise the open TMAG Large Supplier Representative position with other large supplier representatives and at the PSG**

Date of next TMAG: 16 November 2022