

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

Issue date: 20/10/22

Meeting number	TMAG 011	Venue	Virtual – MS Teams
Date and time	16 November 2022 1000-1200	Classification	Public

Attendees

Chair

Adrian Ackroyd (AA) MHHS IM Test Manager

Industry Participants

Caroline Farquhar (CF) Consumer Representative
 Dave Jones (DJ) RECCo Representative
 Ian Hall (IHal) Supplier Agent Representative (Independent)
 Ian Hatton (IHat) DNO Representative
 Martin Hanley (MHan) Large Supplier Representative
 Matt Hall (MHal) Elexon Representative
 Nicola Bumford (NB) NGESO Representative
 Shaun Brundrett (SBr) Small Supplier Representative
 Stacey Buck (SBu) iDNO Representative

MHHS IM members

Adrian Samlal (AS) Environments Manager
 Dominic Mooney (DM) SIT Manager
 Jason Brogden (JB) Industry SME
 Martin Cranfield (MC) PMO Governance Lead
 Nnenda Chinda (NC) PMO Governance Support
 Nigel Hunt (NH) Test Lead

Other Attendees

Sajwal Dash (SD) IPA Lead
 Santosh Vasudevan (SV) Observer (Elexon)
 Sinead Quinn (SQ) Ofgem (as observer)

Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due	Update
Environments Approach and Plan	TMAG11-01	Provide any items to the Programme PMO that they believe should be in the Environments Approach and Plan document or its work-off list. The Programme will bring a list of any new items back to the next TMAG	TMAG members	14/12/22	

	TMAG11-02	Share the list of artefacts and their associated product descriptions to be completed within the Testing and Migration workstream	Programme (Nigel Hunt)	21/12/22	
Export MPANs	TMAG11-03	Share detail on export MPANs issue to the Programme PMO	Small Supplier Rep (Shaun Brundett)	21/12/22	
	TMAG11-04	Signpost to Programme Participants that the export MPANs issue will be addressed via the Migration Working Group (MWG)	Programme PMO	17/11/22	Signposted with TMAG Headline Report
Other	TMAG11-05	Share the Data Working Group (DWG) headline report with TMAG meeting outputs	Programme PMO	17/11/22	Available here on the Collaboration Base
Actions from previous meetings	TMAG08-02	Respond to Programme replan consultation. Encourage constituents to respond to the consultation	TMAG members	26/08/22	This action is remaining open ready for Round 3 of consultation on the replan

Decisions

Area	Decision Ref	Description
Minutes and actions	TMAG-DEC14	The minutes of the TMAG 19 October 2022 were approved
Environments Approach and Plan	TMAG-DEC15	The TMAG agreed that version 2.1 of the Environments Approach and Plan could be shared as a 'work in progress' document via the Programme Collaboration Base

RAID items

Area	Item
N/A	

Minutes

1. Welcome

AA welcomed all to the meeting, noting the usual Chair (Chris Welby) and the testing lead (Kate Goodman) were on leave.

2. Minutes and Actions

DECISION TMAG-DEC14: The minutes of the TMAG 19 October 2022 were approved

MC provided a summary of the actions as per the slides. JB noted an action had been taken at PSG relating to fill the open TMAG Supplier representative seats (against action TMAG10-03). No other comments were raised.

3. Programme Updates

MC highlighted the baselined design, the migration Programme Participant Information Request (PPIR) and that Programme replan as key Programme updates. No comments received.

4. Environments Approach and Plan

NH provided an overview of the work to date on the Environments Approach and Plan and walked through the open items on the plan work-off list as per the slides.

SV noted they were expecting to see how long the test phases for Systems Integration Testing (SIT) and User Integration Testing (UIT) would be in the document and that this was missing. NH responded that the length of SIT would be for the SIT working group (SITWG) to determine and that wider dates for testing were part of the overall Programme replan and not part of this document.

SV noted that the document did not specify entry/exit criteria for the stages of SIT. NH responded that this was not part of this document as per the agreed document criteria. NH agreed this needed to be known but would be part of the SIT planning that was still to be written. This content of the Plan was as per the product description. NH invited further conversations on this outside of TMAG.

SBr queried how the code of connection and test data configuration could be signed off when there was still significant information missing. These items were not due until 31st January but were marked as complete in the work-off list. DM noted this document had a high-level summary to signpost participants to the code of connection which would have detailed information in it. For this document, the Programme considered this was complete (with a summary in this document), with other deliverables signposted that were still to be delivered.

SD queried if the overarching plan for data governance for testing and test data that might be used would be part of this document or another document. NH clarified this would be in the overarching Test Data Approach and Plan.

SBU noted the TMAG was being asked to approve the document on the basis of there being a work-off plan still to be completed. SBU added that there had been internal feedback from their organisation on the process for approval and that the environments working group had highlighted that they felt they were being forced into a position to sign the document off when it wasn't ready. SBU could see the position was that this was a fluid document with acknowledged areas still to be refined and worked on but felt that learnings should be taken from the Faster Switching Programme (FSP) where participants had felt that things had been signed off in order to achieve milestones when they were not ready. SBU felt it was more important that documents were fit for purpose. It was good that the document had been developed early but there were still some fundamental things to be finalised. SBU queried how the TMAG could sign the document off when it still needed work (e.g. iDNO environments). SBU added they wanted to understand the plan to deliver the remaining content, given that Programme Participants had to comply with the content as final. Some elements were work in progress and Participants did not yet have to do this. NH responded that the Programme were looking to release the document with key principles, so Participants could begin their planning. NH noted there were a lot of components that needed to be finished but they were looking to get a baselined document now with the information available to then have a second stage of development and review ready for approval at the February 2023 TMAG. SBU responded that this satisfied their query.

AA noted they agreed with SBU's comments on learnings from FSP and noted they were endeavouring to get information out to Participants as soon as possible (including the work-off list) while acknowledging that not all information was available. AA added that the process was not a tick box exercise to meet a milestone and that the document would only have final approval when all agreed at TMAG.

MHal queried the purpose of a plan with no indicator of when Participants would need environments, how long they would be needed for, or how many were needed. MHal noted they needed these for their own planning. NH responded this document was the principles for environments and that dates would be available in a separate document. MHal queried how this aligned to the programme replanning. DM responded that dates were still dependent on the Programme replan and the dates in here were still subject to review. This meant that it was difficult to put dates against the document. MHal reiterated they wanted to know how many environments were needed and what they would be doing – Elexon felt this would be on their critical path. DM responded that a meeting was in the diary with Elexon for this.

NH summarised the next steps and approval approach as per the slides. AA invited participants to indicate approval for the document.

MHal queried what the TMAG were approving and asked why document could not be published as a draft, recognising that it is a work in progress, given that approval implies that everything that is in it is correct, . NH clarified that the Programme had gone through an iteration of this review process with a work-off list of outstanding items to follow the same review process – this is what the TMAG would be committing to: a review process and everyone’s inputs ahead of a final version. MHal then asked NH if he was asking for approval of all items that were not work-off items. MHal answered that this was correct, and although the work-off items were not complete, the aim was to get the document out at a baseline stage, so Participants understood what was agreed and what was still to be determined. MHal rebuffed saying he still did not understand what approval was achieving given the number of work off items. NH answered that it was the approval to sign off the version that the document is in, having gone through a full iteration of review with work-off items. SV was also in agreement with MHal’s reluctance to approve the document.

SBu noted they were supportive of seeing the document to share and disseminate. There was an uneasiness to approve something when not fully complete, and there may be little benefit in this. AA decided that the document would not be approved but will be returned to the lower-level working group, with the work-off items to completed and then re-presented. AA invited TMAG members support to share this version 2.1 of the document as a draft, work-in-progress to go on the Programme collaboration base for information, with the full version of the document to come back to February TMAG for final approval (following completion of the work-off list). All TMAG members supported this approach.

TMAG-DEC15: The TMAG agreed that version 2.1 of the Environments Approach and Plan could be shared as a ‘work in progress’ document via the Programme Collaboration Base

ACTION TMAG11-01: TMAG members to provide any items to the Programme PMO that they believe should be in the Environments Approach and Plan document or its work-off list. The Programme will bring a list of any new items back to the next TMAG

ACTION TMAG11-02: Programme PMO to share the list of artefacts and their associated product descriptions to be completed within the Testing and Migration workstream

5. Migration Option Analysis Update

JB provided an overview of the Migration Options Analysis process and Programme Participant Information Request (PPIR) as per the slides.

6. Export MPANs

JB noted that the issue of export MPANs had been raised in a number of forums (e.g. the Cross-Code Advisory Group and Migration Working Group) and that there had been good input from some participants already. JB noted they were looking to take this item into MWG for detailed discussion - information received so far would form the basis for these conversations. JB asked TMAG to agree the place for this to be discussed (which JB believed was MWG) for the working group to bring the outputs back to TMAG.

IHal agreed with the approach to take the issue to MWG. JB added that the Programme had initiated migration design activities with a new team of technical designers, with this development work soon coming to industry for review. Some work had begun, some was dependent on the migration option decision.

SBr noted they were dealing with some fallout from FSP on export MPANs. SBr had raised this but had been notified this may not be addressed given changes to be implemented through MHHS. SBr queried if this would be addressed in the TMAG workstream. JB responded that this was not directly part of the MHHS design and that it would be useful for SBr to set out their issue in an email and share with the Programme for where best this should be addressed within programme governance.

ACTION TMAG11-03: Shaun Brundett to share detail on export MPANs issue to the Programme PMO

SBu noted that it would be useful to highlight where this discussion would be addressed, such as through the Clock, so Participants know where it would be going.

ACTION TMAG11-04: Programme PMO to signpost to Programme Participants that the export MPANs issue will be addressed via the Migration Working Group (MWG)

7. SIT Working Group

DM introduced themselves as the SIT lead for the Programme. DM provided an overview of the plan to mobilise the SIT Working Group as per the slides. DM provided an overview of the planned agenda items for the first meeting and encouraged attendance of TMAG members and their constituents.

8. Qualification/pre-qualification

NH provided an overview of activity in the qualification workstream as per the slide.

IHal queried if there was a deadline the Programme were working toward. NH responded as soon as possible from the Programme perspective and that there were ongoing discussions with code delivery bodies to make the required decisions. JB noted an email received during the meeting noting Elexon had agreed to take on responsibility to draft qualification requirements for Elexon. Elexon had resource on board to deliver this. RECCo were the other code body and discussions were ongoing. SEC believed their requirements were all covered by MP162. MHal responded Elexon were committed to resolving this and starting work as soon as possible.

IHal queried when the next QWG would be. NH responded the next one was in December and the Programme were looking at bringing in an interim meeting at the end of November, should there be enough information to discuss. IHal responded they were keen for an interim working group. NH responded they were eager to ensure Participants knew what work was being undertaken as part of this.

9. Working group report

MC noted that the MWG, QWG and EWG had been covered by earlier agenda items, and that the lead for the DWG was not on the call. MC proposed sharing the DWG headline report with the TMAG meeting outputs.

ACTION TMAG11-05: Programme PMO to share the Data Working Group (DWG) headline report with TMAG meeting outputs
--

10. Summary and next steps

DJ queried a meeting with RECCo to discuss qualification that had been raised earlier as this was not in their diary. NH responded that there were ongoing discussions internally with subsequent meetings to be scheduled with RECCo.

JB noted the output of the migration option decision.

MC asked Elexon attendees to coordinate TMAG attendance in future, given that TMAG is a constituency-based group. JB noted good to have a small supplier rep/

AA thanked individuals for their attendance and for their engagement/comments as this was important for developing the Programme. AA encouraged further questions to come to the PMO.

Date of next TMAG: 21 December 2022