MHHS Programme Steering Group (PSG) Headline Report

Issue date: 04/11/2022

Meeting Number	**PSG 014**	Venue	**Virtual – MS Teams**
Date and Time	**02 November 2022 1000-1200**	Classification	**Public**

Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due	Update
M5 decision	PSG14-01	Highlight to the Design team areas of priority or concern for consideration in the approach to work-off planning/scheduling	PSG Constituency Representatives	09/11/2022	
	PSG14-02	Communicate the timeline for sharing the plan for delivering the migration design	Programme	30/11/2022	
Phasing	PSG14-03	Review attendance to DNO monthly delivery meetings to ensure the role of different DNOs and participation in SIT are appropriately considered	Programme (Keith C)	30/11/2022	
M3 and Programme replan	PSG14-04	Develop a plan to target engagement with Participants that did not submit required evidence against M3 criteria as part of RA2. Share this plan at next PSG (e.g. to determine why they have not engaged, when they will be ready for DBT and how the Programme can support)	Programme (Keith C, PPC)	30/11/2022	
	PSG14-05	Develop revised criteria for M3 (conditions to be met for full M3 approval) and how this will be assessed via the Round 3 replan consultation. Share this approach and the timeline/requirement for a full approval of the M3 milestone at PSG	Programme (Keith C)	30/11/2022	

	PSG14-06	Share updated interim plan (to include replan extension and migration design) for PSG decision at December PSG	Programme (Keith C)	30/11/2022	
	PSG14-07	Share the expected date for Round 3 consultation documentation	Programme (Keith C, Giles C)	30/11/2022	Target date of 14 December, subject to decision at December PSG
RECCo Change Request	PSG14-08	Raise the RECCo consequential change Change Request to Impact Assessment	Programme (PMO)	03/11/2022	Raised to Impact Assessment on 02 November 2022
Other	PSG14-09	Review large supplier SPOCs	Programme (PPC, Graham Wood)	07/12/2022	
	PSG14-10	Support the Programme to identify Large, Medium and I&C Supplier seats at TMAG	Relevant Supplier Representatives (Graham Wood, Gareth Evans, Vladimir Black)	07/12/2022	

Decisions

Area	Dec Ref	Decision
Minutes	PSG-DEC25	The PSG approved the minutes of the 07 September PSG
M3 decision and Round 3 replan consultation	PSG-DEC26	• The PSG conditionally approved Milestone M3 on the condition of further evidence to be provided by the Programme Participants through Round 3 of consultation on the Programme replan. All Programme Participants should continue with their DBT activities if they have already started and start DBT activities if not yet started. Evidence will be against revised M3 criteria (to focus on participant delivery plans for Design and Build) and there will be targeted PPC engagement with Participants that did not provide required evidence against the M3 criteria through Readiness Assessment 2 to ensure that no one is left behind. Full M3 approval will take place following Round 3 of consultation on the Programme replan. • The PSG agreed Round 3 of consultation will commence once a decision is made on the migration/go live approach - targeting mid-December to start consultation and to complete at the end of January, with early mobilised participants (potential SIP participants) being asked to provide their responses by mid-January. Round 3 will be a full consultation.
RECCo Change Request	PSG-DEC27	The PSG agreed to raise the RECCo consequential change Change Request to Impact Assessment.

Key Discussion Items

Area	Discussion
M5 decision	The Programme provided an update on the M5 decision from the Design Advisory Group (DAG). On 31 October 2022 the DAG had decided to baseline the MHHS Design subject to a work-off list to be delivered within three months. A schedule for the work-off plan was being created and would be agreed at DAG 09 November 2022. Fortnightly reporting against the work-off plan would be made available. PSG members queried: • How items on the work-off list would be prioritised, given the varying scale and complexity of different items and the dependencies for items across industry parties. The Programme clarified that the scheduling process was being informed by various inputs (such as priorities from Programme Participants and scale of work required, **see action PSG14-01**) and would be agreed by the DAG to ensure the schedule delivered the best approach for competing priorities. • If the Programme had considered the Christmas period in the three-month delivery window. The Programme confirmed the timeline took Christmas into account • The link to the migration design plan. PSG members noted it was important to be deliver this alongside the design work-off list. The Programme confirmed these activities used separate resource and that the plan for delivering the migration design was under development (**action PSG14-02**) • The approach to delivering the work-off list and managing change. The Programme confirmed the approach would be the same as the design so far (via working groups, consultation, dissensus and DAG) and that if parties believed a change control process was required for contentious items, they should raise this to the Programme • The need for Participants to have the full design to be able to fully deliver DBT (and full plans for DBT) The IPA noted they had not picked up any issues that prevented M5 being baselined at this time and reiterated that a clear work-off schedule to be delivered as soon as possible was important.
M3 decision and the Programme replan	**Discussion on the M3 decision** PSG Constituency Representatives provided their views in turn on approving the M3 milestone. Feedback was consistent across representatives that their constituents felt comfortable signing off M3 and were ready to start Design and Build (DB). Some representatives noted they felt the milestone was 'administrative', did not impact their constituents' plans (constituents will continue with DBT activities as planned), and that there were more important priorities (e.g. the Programme rebaseline plan, the M5 work-off list or wider market conditions). The Programme and the IPA highlighted that the lack of evidence provided by Programme Participants against the criteria for M3 meant that M3 should not be signed off from a governance perspective. The IPA noted that the lack of evidence posed risks for DB

and the start of Systems Integration testing (SIT) at M9 and suggested that a further Readiness Assessment should be undertaken in January to collate necessary evidence to then approve the milestone. PSG members:

- Challenged whether another Readiness Assessment would be best use of resource and time

- Noted the Programme may be unlikely to receive more or better information through another Readiness Assessment so soon

- Highlighted that it was most important to prioritise and engage with those Participants that did not provide evidence as part of Readiness Assessment 2 (such as software providers) and that the PPC could provide tailored engagement and support to those parties

- Noted that the criteria for M3 may have been too broad given the nature of the milestone assessing a wide range of participants. A proposal was that the criteria should be adjusted to make the milestone more targeted and appropriate against what it was trying to achieve

- Noted there was a significant risk in giving off the wrong message to Participants, should the milestone be delayed. It was important to maintain momentum

- Noted that conditional approval may be the best approach, to recognise that in principle the Programme was confident the milestone could be passed at a high level, but that additional evidence was required to assure readiness for DB for parties who had not yet submitted it (and also to satisfy governance requirements)

- Noted that that important question was whether the participants that needed to be mobilised now were indeed mobilised. Parties that were not yet required to be mobilised could be assured at a later date (e.g. via later scheduled Readiness Assessments in DB). This linked to the following agenda item on phasing and Minimum Viable Cohorts (MVCs)

Discussion on the Programme replan

The Programme provided an overview of the proposal for Round 3 of consultation on the replan. There was a dependency proposed on a decision on the migration approach to start Round 3. The Programme was intending to issue a Programme Participant Information Request (PPIR) on 04 November 2022 with the analysis and outputs to come to December PSG for a decision. Round 3 of consultation could start immediately after this decision, however it was important that consultation commenced at a point when participants would be able to provide sufficient evidence against their plans for DBT, in order to inform the Programme plan. PSG members noted that:

- Round 3 of consultation should start as soon as possible but should take into account the Christmas period. It was likely that Programme Participants would only engage properly with a consultation in January

- A delay would be beneficial for reducing ambiguity in the plan for other areas (in addition to migration)

- Round 3 of consultation in January would mean more certainty would be known over the design work-off list and migration design

- The Interim Plan would need to be updated to reflect any change to the rebaselined plan timeline (**action PSG14-06**)

	• Earliest visibility on replan documentation would be appreciated
	• The earlier plans could be provided by Programme Participants, the better – the Programme would be looking for any volunteers who wished to participate in SIT to share this intention ahead of the end of January
	Conclusions for both the M3 decision and Round 3 of consultation on the Programme replan
	Considering all views presented on both the M3 decision and the Programme replan, the Chair summarised an approach that balanced the different viewpoints above and addressed both M3 and Round 3 together:
	• That M3 be conditionally approved on the condition of further evidence to be provided by participants through Round 3 of consultation on the replan on adapted M3 criteria focusing on Participant plans for DB. Conditional approval would ensure momentum was maintained as well as acknowledge readiness for DB by many participants, while also introducing the opportunity for further assurance on readiness for Participants yet to submit evidence. In addition to sourcing evidence through Round 3 consultation, the Programme would also have targeted engagement with Participants via the PPC to further understand risks to DB and identify any mitigating actions. Conditional approval felt appropriate in this instance, despite the milestone criteria not fully being met, and was not a precedent to take for future milestones. (**decision PSG-DEC26, actions PSG14-04 and -05**).
	• That Round 3 of consultation on the Programme replan be deferred until a decision on the migration option was made. The aim would be for the consultation to run from mid-December to the end of January, with an expectation that early mobilised participants will be able to provide their responses by mid-January. Round 3 would also be a full consultation. This would provide a delivery plan with more certainty and stability than the Round 2 plan, allow participants more time to consume the core design and develop their delivery plans, and give participants the opportunity to fully consult on the Round 3 plan. Actions were taken to provide further information to Programme Participants on the plan to deliver the Programme rebaselined plan (**decision PSG-DEC26, actions PSG14-06 and -07**)
	These proposals were supported unanimously by PSG members.
	The IPA noted the importance of good governance to document the conditional approval and conditions for final M3 sign off (see related actions above). The Ofgem Sponsor reiterated this and highlighted the importance of future milestone acceptance criteria accurately reflecting what was important for the milestone decision. It was noted by the LDP that this has been picked up in their Control Point 1 work.
Phasing	The Programme provided an overview of the proposed approach to phasing and the implications for the replan. The intention was to phase participants through Systems Integration Testing (SIT) and Qualification Testing allowing those progressing fastest to reach go live fastest (please review the meeting slides for full detail).
	A PSG member queried how MVC and non-MVC swim lanes would interact, such as if Participants would 'drop out' of the MVC if they were held up and how this may impact the MVC overall. The Programme clarified that the full detail of this was being worked through but that they expected some contingency to be built into the MVC to account for potential delays and dropouts.
	The DNO representative queried if the Programme had properly considered the role of DNOs in SIT. The Programme agreed to review the approach to DNO delivery management to ensure all DNO roles were appropriately considered (**action PSG14-03**)

RECCo Change Request	The RECCo representative provided an overview of the RECCo consequential change Change Request. The PSG agreed to raise the Change Request to Impact Assessment (**decision PSG-DEC27** and **action PSG14-08**).
DIP update	The Programme provided an update on the Data Integration Platform (DIP). The aim is to have the DIP provider appointed by the end of November 2022. The Programme proposed to bring future agenda items to PSG on the enduring modification for the DIP and to introduce the DIP provider (once appointed).
Delivery dashboards	The Helix representative noted they were heavily into DB and reliant on the M5 work-off list and migration design to deliver against current timescales. It was likely that increased costs were expected due to some rework.
Sponsor update	The Programme sponsor noted the importance of the Programme replan and the need for the replan to be properly informed by evidence from programme Participants. The Large Supplier representative highlighted that some of their constituents had not received the letter from Ofgem. An action was taken to review organisation Single Points of Contact (**action PSG14-09**)
AOB	The Programme raised that there were vacancies in TMAG for Supplier representatives and the supplier constituent reps agreed to take this back to constituents (**action PSG14-10**)

Date of next meeting: 07 December 2022