

MHHS Programme Steering Group (PSG) minutes and actions

Issue date: 10/11/2022

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

Attendees

Chair

Chris Harden (CH) Programme Director

Industry Representatives

Andrew Campbell (AC)	Small Supplier Representative
Andrew Green (AG) (on behalf of Gareth Evans)	I&C Supplier Representative
Caroline Farquhar (CF)	Consumer Representative
Charlotte Semp (CS)	DCC Representative (Smart Meter Central System provider)
Chris Price (CP)	DNO Representative
Graham Wood (GW)	Large Supplier Representative
Jenny Rawlinson (JR)	iDNO Representative
Joel Stark (JS)	Supplier Agent (Independent) Representative
Jonathan Hawkins (JH)	RECCo Representative
Lee Northall (LN)	Elexon Representative (Central Systems Provider)
Neil Dewar (ND) (on behalf of Karen Thompson-Lilley)	National Grid ESO Representative
Paul Akrill (PA)	Supplier Agent Representative
Vladimir Black (VB)	Medium Supplier Representative

MHHS IM

Andrew Margan (AM)	Governance Manager
Giles Clayden (GC)	Deputy Programme Manager
Keith Clark (KC)	Programme Manager
Martin Cranfield (MC)	PMO Governance Lead
Pete Edwards (PE)	PPC Readiness Assessment Lead
Warren Fulton (WF)	Design Project Manager

Other Attendees

Andy MacFaul (AMF)	Ofgem (as observer)
Dave Gandee (DG)	MHHS IPA Lead
Rachel Clark (RC)	Ofgem Sponsor
Richard Shilton (RS)	MHHS IPA Lead

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	

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due	Update
	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), Large Supplier Representative (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,	07/12/2022	

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due	Update
			Gareth Evans, Vladimir Black)		
Open actions from previous meetings	PSG08-05	Address comments received on the Benefits Realisation Plan (for example consequential impacts/dis-benefits and providing a more quantifiable measure under the MPAN success criteria)	Programme (Jason Brogden)	To be aligned to next control point	To be addressed at Control Point 1 and reported back to PSG after Control Point 1 decision
	PSG13-05	Set up a session to discuss the requirements (e.g. ToR) for an MHHS forum to discuss the commercial impacts on settlement from the MHHS Programme (taking learnings from Nexus). Session to include MHHS members and PSG constituency reps as required	Programme PMO	14/11/2022	Session held 17/10/22. Possible Change Request to be raised to include consideration of commercial impacts within the scope of work on transition. CR would add this activity to the Programme plan, with Level 4 group subsequently established

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 some 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 SIT 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.
-----------------------------	-----------	---

Minutes

1. Welcome

CH welcomed all to the meeting and ran over the meeting agenda, noting that focus would be on M3.

2. Minutes and Actions Review

DECISION PSG-DEC235: The PSG approved the minutes of the 05 October 2022 PSG

CH noted the actions as read. CH highlighted action PSG13-05 as important and invited GW to comment. GW noted a session had taken place w/c 17 October with the outputs that it was appropriate to establish a group of experts on commercial impacts at the right time (this was not urgent) and to bring forward a Change Request (CR) to bring this into the scope of the Programme. CH queried if it was OK to push establishing this group to Q1/Q2 next year. GW confirmed yes.

CH invited comments on the other actions. None received.

3. M5 decision

WF explained that the Design Advisory Group (DAG) had voted to baseline the MHHS Design subject to a work-off item list to be delivered within three months. A schedule was being created per item to be published on Friday. The schedule would be agreed at DAG next Wednesday, with fortnightly reporting against the schedule (given there would be only 13 weeks to deliver it) that would be available to all.

CH invited questions. LN congratulated the Programme on delivering the milestone given the scale and complexity. LN queried if the schedule would be by item. WF confirmed it would be per item, grouped in themes and considering critical path and DAG members' priorities. LN noted 11 of 26 items on the list were required by Helix by end of November and that Helix had a clear view of what needed to be resolved and when. WF confirmed Matt Hall had shared these priorities and they were being fed into the schedule.

CP noted DNOs and St Clements had fed comments to DAG to be considered and queried how the work-off period spanning over Christmas would impact the plan. Additionally, CP queried if there be an announcement of plans for the Christmas period for the Programme (e.g. meeting cadence). WF confirmed the schedule included the Christmas period. The majority of work-off items were straightforward with only a few requiring working group involvement (and this would be kicked off imminently).

CH noted the Programme schedule for December and early January was available. MC added that meetings had been shuffled with no meetings during the week of Christmas, and most meetings in the first week of January pushed back. CP asked that any requests for information/consultation be shared with Programme Participants as early as possible and ahead of the Christmas period where possible, which CH agreed with.

GW noted large suppliers still felt they needed to see the next iteration of the Design to fully mobilise and start their Design, Build and Test (DBT). This would include migration options, and GW queried when this decision may be made, when the migration design would be seen, and if the plan for the migration design would be included alongside the 3-month work-off plan. CH noted this would be covered later in PSG as this was tied to the replan and M3 topics. GW added the late paper for IPA had had an ideal date for the work-off plan to be delivered by the end of year.

PA noted the work-off plan had a range of items varying in complexity and scale and queried what the process was for 'transacting' this into the baseline (i.e. the change process). WF responded that the artefacts were now under change control by the SI team and that proposed changes would be red-lined and recorded via a change log. The existing design team would continue to deliver the work, with various sub-groups established to focus on specific themes in the work-off list. The same model used to date would be used to develop and approve items on the work-off list. Once consensus was agreed, the artefacts would be updated and consulted on as per the previous process (including following the dissensus process and approval via DAG). CP noted some contentious items on the work-off may require a formal change process (e.g. E7/E10) and queried if the existing process was sufficient for significant change. WF

responded it would be helpful to know which areas were contentious and that the process so far had worked well, so the DAG did not feel that a change to the process (e.g. a need for change control) was needed.

ACTION PSG14-01 – PSG members to highlight to the Design team areas of priority or concern for consideration in the approach to work-off planning/scheduling

AC queried if there was confidence that the work-off list would not impact the transition design. WF responded that different resources were being used so no impact was expected.

LN queried if the one-way migration design was still due at the end of November. JB confirmed the programme was looking at the standard processes (e.g. change of agent) and that there wasn't currently a timeline for delivering this, although the Programme was aiming for the end of November/start of December. LN noted the interim plan had promised to deliver this by end of November. JB confirmed the Programme needed to plan this internally, including any consultation processes. JB did not know when this could be communicated.

ACTION PSG14-02 – Programme to communicate the timeline for sharing the plan for delivering the migration design

CP noted the migration design plan was important to get certainty on, as was the work-off plan. The work-off list was being informed by Programme Participants' priorities/issues (for example there were 6 key items for DNOs and St Clements, with only 50% of the design 'certain' for getting on with their DBT). CP queried how the work-off list was being prioritised (e.g. looking at collective priorities) or if this was viewed from the critical path or differently. WF responded that the design team were currently doing their scheduling based on inputs from Programme Participants – the Programme was considering a few dimensions including the items requiring the longest consultation, which items were most contentious, which items were simple updates that would be done quickly (while awaiting working groups etc). WF added the whole work-off list was considered to be urgent and that it would be up to DAG as to how they would prioritise items – the Programme would only propose the schedule and assumptions behind it, for DAG to then agree. WF added that some items were already being actioned. CH requested that CP take these comments to DAG to ensure they're addressed and confirmed that the migration design would be delivered in parallel.

RS updated on the IPA design report. This had been informed by IPA assurance activity since March. The IPA had picked up no issues that prevented M5 being approved. The IPA requested a clear schedule for the work-off list. The recommendation to get this completed by Christmas was more of a 'deliver the work-off as soon as possible' but the IPA were now comfortable with the 3-month timeline. The IPA noted that clarity on the migration approach was also an important issue, although this was not part of the M5 decision.

CH thanked members for their contributions across the design process.

4. M3 decision

CH introduced the item noting the papers as read and invited PSG representatives in turn to provide the views of their constituencies in relation to signing off M3.

GW noted the large supplier view for the last few months was that M3 was an administrative milestone and that it did not matter to large suppliers whether M3 was approved – large suppliers would continue on their own timelines. Having a 'full' design to deliver DBT and the Programme plan were seen as more important issues for DBT delivery, and it did not matter to large suppliers whether M3 was signed off.

VB agreed with GW's comments and noted no big concern from medium suppliers who would be continuing with their own plans.

AG echoed GW and VB's views. M3 was viewed as an administrative milestone and the consensus was to move forward. There were other things outside MHHS occupying the supplier market that were making it challenging for engagement with MHHS, but no views had been forthcoming that M3 shouldn't be approved.

PA noted agents had felt the design was enough to start DBT and therefore that passing M3 was ok. The concern was that more issues with the design may be identified from now that may have implications for DBT, but constituents were OK with passing M3.

JR agreed with previous points noting feedback from iDNOs was that they had started and were in a good position, although there were dependencies on certain things. Referring to the meeting papers, JR queried if the programme was concerned with the lack of evidence for Programme Participant readiness (noting this would be covered in the replan item) and queried if the PSG felt that the evidence (or lack of) was concerning.

CP agreed with comments made. MPRS/St Clements felt there was enough for them to start DBT - they could start but did not know the end, as this was dependent on the work-off plan. CP did not see a reason to not sign off M3, noting the priority should be the work-off list.

AC agreed with others' comments. AC noted competing priorities in the market and that there was a concern from small suppliers that M3 criteria should have been focussed on their software providers who they feel are not yet where they need to be.

CH noted Helix and DCC were already mobilised and that previous M3 milestones related to their readiness had already been passed, so they were not part of the M3 decision.

JH agreed with comments so far. RECCo felt there was enough to start with the M5 baseline (but not enough to complete). JH noted no other concerns with the M3 milestone and felt further assurance could be a waste of resource. JH added targeted engagement may be needed for any parties that were not yet mobilised.

CF noted they were a new representative and would go with the majority view.

ND noted they were happy to approve M3.

CH summarised that PSG representatives were comfortable to approve M3 however the evidence vs. the M3 criteria shared via Readiness Assessment 2 was not sufficient (only two organisations passed all five criteria in CR009). CH noted it was good that lots of Participants felt ready to go, but that there was a concern that the lack of evidence set a dangerous precedent for this kind of milestone and that those that were not ready may be left behind.

RS highlighted that the proportion of the market that had met the criteria was not enough to pass the milestone from a governance perspective. This however should not prevent people moving to DBT, and it was important to get clarity on when Programme Participants would be able to move to Systems Integration Testing (SIT) at M9. RS reiterated that it was important the PSG follow good governance while maintaining momentum. DG added that the evidence needed to be sourced to support a position of approval for the milestone, and therefore another assessment should be done shortly to collect this evidence.

CH queried if another readiness assessment should be done, given the other priorities coming out shortly from the Programme, e.g. Round 3 replan consultation or the Migration Options Programme Participant Information Request (PPIR).

AC noted the IPA recommendation for the PPC to focus on software suppliers was a recommendation that the small suppliers would support. CH responded that a number of software providers did not respond to RA2 and asked that suppliers also work to get their software providers engaged (together with efforts from the Programme).

GW noted they agreed it was not a good precedent to set to pass milestones without achieving the criteria. However, large suppliers would not welcome another readiness assessment and felt that more information would not be provided if this did happen – large suppliers would hit what they need to, when they need to, as determined by the Programme. GW added that readiness assessments require a lot of resource and that it was unlikely any additional information would be available in January.

JH noted there was always going to be an issue with the evidence for readiness for DBT given the timing of the readiness assessment, the M5 baseline and the programme replan. JH added that they were not convinced the Programme would get more evidence if the milestone was delayed. Instead, the delay of a milestone may signal that there was insufficient information for DBT to commence. JH noted two DBT readiness assessments were already planned, and that additional targeted assurance could be delivered to those that were not ready - there were options for how the Programme get their additional assurance (rather than delay the milestone with another blanket readiness assessment). JH added that there was a risk in messaging for Programme Participants that had not achieved M3 which may be more counter-productive than going down the governance route where evidence may not be found anyway.

JR noted they agreed with JH and GW's comments. If parties hadn't provided evidence yet, they would be unlikely to do so in another assessment and so soon. JR noted a conditional approval of the milestone may work well in that the Programme could assure on an ongoing basis by proactively engaging with the parties they had not received evidence from, and even help them put required evidence together.

CP agreed with JR and JH's comments. CP queried the 'so what' for the lack of evidence – did this matter? There may be a variety of reasons for the lack of evidence being submitted (such as that some do not need to be ready until later in the Programme). The Programme should focus on the important individuals who needed to be mobilised now. There was a lack of clarity on whether the lack of engagement/evidence was really an issue. CP noted the lack of engagement may be more important for other big Programme decisions (e.g. the replan or the design work-off list).

CH noted agenda items on phasing and the replan influenced the M3 decision so these would be covered first to return to the M3 decision.

AC agreed with JH's comments on messaging of an M3 delay. AC queried if there was still a PPC team focusing on software providers. CH confirmed there was a PPC team and JB added there were 12-15 software providers of focus for the PPC team. RS noted the IPA recognised that different Programme Participants were at different stages, and this was fine, but clarity was needed on who was/wasn't important at different times at the Programme (and therefore who was important to have at M3 at this time).

5. Phasing

GC introduced the item and provided an explanation of phasing per the slides. This included the proposed approach to phasing, three key benefits of phasing and four phasing enablers. GC provided an overview of the phasing plan per the slides. GC highlighted the two swim lanes for SIT Participants where there would be two phases – one for the Minimum Viable Cohort (MVC) and another for non-MVC Participants who may travel through SIT but at a slower pace. Participants that did not go through SIT would be grouped into qualification tranches depending on their pace, although all LDSOs would be required in tranches that enable them to deliver qualification ahead of M11. Migration would mirror the qualification tranches. Participants electing to go through SIT would be a core question in the Round 3 replan consultation.

AC queried the self-assessment document for pre-qualification and where this would be in the plan. GC confirmed this was not included in the slide, as this was a simplification purely to demonstrate phasing. Full detail would be shared in the Round 3 replan consultation.

JH noted there could be a bottleneck in the MVC SIT path and queried if there was an option for Participants to fall out of the MVC and into the other SIT swim lane (and vice versa). GC noted the second swim lane both provided contingency but also complications, and that moving organisations between swim lanes would require careful planning. The Programme was aiming to maximise the number of MVC Participants and to build contingency into the cohort. KC added that the MVC may not be quite a 'minimum' cohort, and may have additional parties in order to provide enough numbers to give contingency. JB added this could be discussed at the SIT Working Group being mobilised.

CP noted some discussion on phasing already and requested more discussion with DNOs to ensure they understood the thinking from the Programme (aims, expectations, Programme requirements etc.) and to ensure the Programme fully understood the role of DNOs in the existing and new worlds. CP noted the MVC might lead to a small number of DNOs in SIT, but this might not give full coverage of the role of DNOs. CH agreed this was important and that it was linked to the concept of 'central parties'. CH added that this conversation should be had as part of these bi-laterals (to determine the number of DNOs required in SIT and for go-live, and how this may be phased).

ACTION PSG14-03 – Programme to review attendance to DNO monthly delivery meetings to ensure the role of different DNOs and participation in SIT are appropriately considered

6. Programme replan

KC introduced the item and provided an overview per the slides, noting a dependency on the migration approach to make the Round 3 plan credible and achievable. KC explained that a PPIR would be issued this Friday with a two-week period to receive Participant views on the three options from the Migration Working Group (MWG). One migration option had been dropped as it was not seen as viable. Detailed discussion and evaluation had taken place via the MWG, but a PPIR was required to get a wider set of views on the options.

KC provided an overview of the plan to deliver the replan and migration PPIR as per the slides, highlighting that a decision would be made on the migration approach at December PSG following the PPIR and review of the PPIR with stakeholders (including Ofgem) on the PPIR outputs. Round 2 of consultation had been based on a reverse migration approach, and this was the basis on which the phasing discussed was made. Reaching the decision on the migration approach would remove the largest source of ambiguity in the Round 2 plan.

KC explained that it would be up to PSG as to when the Round 3 of consultation should start. Round 3 could start immediately after December PSG (assuming a reverse migration option was chosen) and could continue until end of January, but it was important that the Round 3 consultation commenced at the point when the programme could expect Participants to provide the required information (their plans for DBT) as part of the consultation, as this was one of the most important pieces of information still required for the Programme plan. This would enable these plans to be input

into the planning approach for SIT and for determine any MVC candidates (candidates who complete DBT earlier would be better candidates for the MVC). KC noted that Participants' plans for DBT was one of the criteria for M3 that was not well-served in Readiness Assessment 2.

KC summarised that there were two questions to PSG – one was whether to delay Round 3 of consultation until the migration approach had been agreed and the second to agree when Participants would be able to provide their plans as a response to the Round 3 consultation (by end of January if this was the timing the PSG thought most appropriate). KC added that the Programme was also suggesting that Participants that want to be in SIT have an earlier deadline in mid-January (these Participants would likely already have plans and so could respond earlier). This would provide required information earlier to the Programme and give real evidence for those who had an appetite to be in SIT.

GW noted they had not discussed this with their constituents. GW explained that they believed the consultation should be released as soon as it's ready, however the Christmas period should be considered. GW added that parties would still be thinking about things like design, DBT, procurement and SIT and therefore would not welcome a hard date on whether or not they want to be in SIT in early January.

JR agreed with the approach proposed, as long as the output was a robust plan that did not hold up DBT. JR agreed that Round 3 of consultation should not be issued until January (this would also allow some contingency for additional planning via the Planning Working Group). JR added that they believed Programme Participants would also be more informed in January.

PA noted agents could see the benefits of delay until the migration decision was made. PA noted agents had two further areas of ambiguity and asked if the delay could be used to also provide further clarity on these – the transition and qualification processes (there was an absence of detail on this in Round 2 consultation). There was also a benefit of delay in that the work-off list on the design would also be more mature by January, together with people's own DBT and plans. KC noted the Round 3 plan intended to dispel ambiguities found in Round 2, including the two areas raised.

CP supported the proposal to delay for the reasons given. CP wanted to avoid a replan of the replan, with the more uncertainty removed the better. By January, there would be a number of areas further progressed (migration, design work-off etc). CP clarified January was a good start point.

JH supported the approach and agreed with a January start to the consultation (a low response would be expected over Christmas). This didn't mean that available content couldn't be published in December. JH queried if there would be a revision of the interim plan. KC confirmed the Programme intended to bring this to December PSG and that this was dependent on the PSG decision today. KC added that the Programme intended to engage with the PWG close to the start of Round 3 to socialise Round 3 content.

LN agreed they would like visibility of the plan as early as possible as this would help inform Participant decision-making and DBT, noting Helix were already 6 months into DBT. LN queried when information on the Round 3 replan would be available. KC confirmed the Programme would be ready to share replan documentation after December PSG, if this was the PSG's decision.

RS noted the IPA understood the rationale behind the proposal and wanted to ensure the Programme had a clear plan to getting to the end of the replan. KC noted dates would be shared on when the replan documents would be available.

The chair noted the replan decision was linked to the M3 decision, and so moved to make decisions on both together.

CH summarised the conversation earlier was that the PSG felt they wanted to carry on (not delay M3) and to send a message to Participants that if Participants were going, keep going; if Participants were about to start, do start; and if Participants were soon to start, they should start as soon as they can. For Participants with no plan, the Programme should pick up with them through PPC bilaterals and ensure everything from a central Programme point of view was in place to support their move into DBT. CH added that, while some PSG members believed there was not enough to complete DBT (referring to the design work-off list and migration), there was certainly enough to start.

Referring to the M3 criteria, CH noted the key criterion from the five in CR009 on M3 was Participant plans. CH noted this linked to the replan decision, and therefore proposed that the consultation for the replan was issued in December, and then rather than wait until the end for all plans to be received, the Programme bring in an earlier milestone for those that were ready with their plans to share these with the Programme ahead of time. CH added that the replan could not keep being pushed until the Programme had certainty on everything and the plan needed to be baselined sooner rather than later. From conversations so far, the Programme was targeting the start of SIT in Q3 or the beginning of Q4 next year, and Participants looking to get started with SIT should plan based on this.

CH summarised that the approach would be to conditionally sign off M3 now, with a further checkpoint to properly sign off M3 once the Programme had plans (or enough plans) from everyone to satisfy some clearer criteria focussed on plans. Enough plans would be needed to credibly inform the Programme's replan. KC added that per earlier conversation, there did need to be another check on Participant readiness as this information had not been provided through Readiness Assessment 2. The Programme was suggesting that Round 3 consultation could be used as the vehicle to get the additional information on programme plans (rather than add the additional burden of another Readiness Assessment) and that this would make things more joined-up, as assessment of readiness could be made in the context of the programme plan. CH added that the various asks for information would take time for Participants to deliver (e.g. migration PPIR, Round 3 consultation), and there was a nervousness to do another readiness assessment so soon.

CH summarised that the approach for consideration by PSG was to conditionally approve M3, for the Programme to issue the replan in December and for the replan consultation to run until the end of January. Those that have plans and are ready to go, respond to the consultation by mid-Jan (with those that don't, being allowed up to the end of January).

JH noted the M5 work-off list was not due to be complete until the end of January, and the completion of the work-off list was required for parties to determine the end of their DBT (and hence their full plans). JH was therefore concerned that the full evidence may not be available by the middle of January, even for parties who were ready. CH responded that these discussions should be included in the bilaterals with core providers so the Programme could understand what things were holding up Participants and should be targeted by the Programme. JH noted this was most relevant for parties with some reticence to start now without the understanding of everything they needed to do (work-off list, transition design etc.) and this would add pressure to the proposed Round 3 timescales for the Programme to get the sufficient evidence required.

GW agreed with JH's comments and noted that large suppliers would be in a similar situation. The migration design and M5 work-off would be required as input into any consultation response. GW queried the proposal for parties that do/do not want to enter SIT as there may be parties that did want to enter SIT but would not be ready to share this information in January – would it be black and white as to whether Participants were in or out of SIT if information was not provided in the Round 3 consultation? CH responded that it was not this black or white but that the Programme did expect parties to know by now whether or not they wanted to participate in SIT.

DG provided the IPA perspective on the proposal. The IPA would endorse a conditional approval as long as a rationale for conditional approval was documented and recorded per good governance. DG agreed with comments relating to maintaining momentum but added that there needed to be consideration of the risk for those parties that have not provided evidence and therefore that a targeted approach needed to be developed to gain the evidence required from them.

JR noted that they agreed with conditional approval approach and added that the Programme needed to be more structured on the approach to engaging Participants. This should be every party that evidence was outstanding from so that gaps were known before Round 3 consultation started and the areas requiring additional effort could be addressed. CH agreed and noted this was essential for central parties and those on the critical path.

CH moved to make a decision (see below) and invited members to comment if they opposed the proposals. No comments received.

KC added that Round 3 of consultation would include some information collection type questions similar to Readiness Assessment 2, in order to take a risk-based approach to Participants that had not provided evidence yet.

MC queried which Participants would be in the mid-January and end-January groups. CH responded that this should be up to Participants. RS responded that clarity was required on which Participants required additional engagement through Round 3 and which Participants would be in which groups (mid- or end-January). KC responded that this clarity would be gained once Participant plans were shared.

In relation to the IPA's points on holding another readiness assessment, CH invited comments from the group on not holding another assessment (as guided by earlier comments in PSG) and that this was covered through targeted engagement with Participants and via questions in the Round 3 consultation. No comments received.

DECISION 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, Build and Test) 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.

ACTION PSG14-04: Programme to 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)

ACTION PSG14-05: Programme to 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

ACTION PSG14-06: Programme to share updated interim plan (to include replan extension and migration design) for PSG decision at December PSG

ACTION PSG14-07: Programme to share the expected date for Round 3 consultation documentation

7. RECCo Change Request

JH provided an overview of the CR. The CR proposed to amend the scope of the CCAG and the code drafting work being delivered through MHHS, namely so that code drafting would include all of the changes required to deliver the MHHS Target Operating Model (TOM). The majority of this would be through translating the design artefacts, but also consequential changes that are required to be implemented in the code to deliver the MHHS TOM that were not currently covered by the design artefacts.

CH invited any objections to the CR going to impact assessment. None received.

DECISION PSG-DEC27: The PSG agreed to raise the RECCo consequential change Change Request to Impact Assessment.

ACTION PSG14-08: Programme PMO to raise the RECCo consequential change Change Request to Impact Assessment

8. DIP update

CH provided a verbal update on progress of the Data Integration Platform (DIP) procurement. The Programme was aiming to appoint the DIP provider by the end of November. CH proposed adding the enduring modification for the DIP to the next PSG agenda, noting this was an important topic that would require a number of industry consultations with the aim of having the enduring modification published by April 2023. GW agreed this was an important topic.

GW queried if there would be impacts to the design based on the choice of DIP provider and if so, when Programme Participants would be informed of any changes to the design. CH responded they did not believe there would be impacts as the DIP provider would be building against the baselined design.

CH suggested the DIP provider come to PSG in future to introduce themselves and present.

9. Delivery dashboards

CH invited questions by exception. LN noted Helix were heavily into DBT and reliant on the work-off list to be published by end of this week if they were still to deliver by April next year. Delays in the design had resulted in some rework and Helix expected an increased cost as a result. The same applied for the migration design. CH confirmed the Programme understood Programme Participants' concerns with outstanding items and that the intention was to complete the work-off list items and remove ambiguity.

10. Sponsor update

RC noted the importance of the Programme replan and the need for this to be properly informed by information and evidence about Participant activity. Ofgem had recently shared a letter to this effect. A large number of responses have been received confirming organisations' willingness and intention to provide meaningful information to the Programme as it works through the replan.

RC noted the importance of effective governance in the Programme and reflected on the discussions around M3. Where individuals felt the criteria for the milestone weren't met, but the Programme should go through the milestone anyway, it indicates that the criteria may not have reflected what was important about the decision. Future milestone decision-making criteria should be developed to ensure they reflect this. CH echoed this. JB added this had been picked up in Control Point 1 activities around the importance of milestone acceptance criteria.

GW raised an issue with the letter RC referenced - one constituent could not find this letter, and a couple of others had to really look hard to find it, after it was drawn to their attention it had been sent out. GW suggested Ofgem review which contacts at each organisation they send comms to. RC said they used the details provided to them by the Programme, so had sent this information to the points of contact nominated to the Programme, by Programme Participants.

ACTION PSG14-09: Programme and Large Supplier Representative to review large supplier SPOCs

11. Summary and Next Steps

MC provided a summary of actions and decisions as per the table above. CH invited AOBs. JB noted a gap in supplier representation at TMAG and invited PSG supplier reps to look at finding TMAG reps within their constituencies.

ACTION PSG14-10: Supplier Representatives to support the Programme to identify Large, Medium and I&C Supplier seats at TMAG

Date of next PSG: 07 December 2022