

MHHS Programme Steering Group (PSG) minutes and actions

Issue date: 14/12/2022

Meeting Number	PSG 015	Venue	Virtual – MS Teams
Date and Time	07 December 2022 1000-1200	Classification	Public

Attendees

Chair

Helen Tipton (HT) MHHS SRO

Industry Representatives

Andrew Campbell (AC)	Small Supplier Representative
Caroline Farquhar (CF)	Consumer Representative
Chris Price (CP)	DNO Representative
Gareth Evans (GE)	I&C Supplier Representative
Graham Wood (GW)	Large Supplier Representative
Jenny Rawlinson (JR)	iDNO Representative
Joel Stark (JS)	Supplier Agent (Independent) Representative
Jonathan Hawkins (JH)	RECCo Representative
Karen Thompson-Lilley (KTL)	National Grid ESO Representative
Lee Northall (LN)	Exelon Representative (Central Systems Provider)
Paul Akrill (PA)	Supplier Agent Representative

MHHS IM

Andrew Margan (AM)	Governance Manager
Chris Harden (CH)	Programme Director
Chris Welby (CW)	Former SRO
Giles Clayden (GC)	Deputy Programme Manager
Ian Smith (IS)	Design Manager
Keith Clark (KC)	Programme Manager
Martin Cranfield (MC)	PMO Governance Lead
Warren Fulton (WF)	Design Project Manager

Other Attendees

Colin Bezant (CB)	MHHS IPA
Dave Gandee (DG)	MHHS IPA Lead
Jenny Boothe (JB)	Observer, Ofgem
Lewis Robertson (LR)	Observer, Exelon
Neil Dewar (ND)	Observer, National Grid ESO
Rachel Clark (RC)	Ofgem Sponsor
Richard Shilton (RS)	MHHS IPA Lead
Sinead Quinn (SQ)	Observer, Ofgem

Apologies

Vladimir Black (VB) Medium Supplier Representative

Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due	Update
Migration	PSG15-01	Progress work on customer segments in migration at the Migration Design Subgroup (MDSG)	Programme (Jason Brogden)	11/01/23	
	PSG15-02	Present the Migration Option Analysis to the Migration Working Group (MWG)	Programme (Jason Brogden)	11/01/23	Presented to the MWG on 08/12/22
Interim plan	PSG15-03	Action decision PSG-DEC31: issue the updated Interim Plan and begin Round 3 of consultation on the Programme replan	Programme PMO	14/12/22	Interim Plan issued on 07/12/22. Round 3 of consultation to start on 14/12/22
M9 status	PSG15-04	Increase frequency of meetings with St Clements to support Programme replanning activity and readiness for M9	Programme	11/01/23	
Change control	PSG15-05	Action next steps from CR012: incorporate CR012 within code draft plan and update CCAG Terms of Reference	Programme PMO	11/01/23	
	PSG15-06	Raise CR013 to Impact Assessment	Programme PMO	09/12/22	CR013 raised to Impact Assessment on 07/12/22
Other	PSG15-07	Extend PSG meeting calendar invites to 2.5 hours	Programme PMO	11/01/23	Invites extended by 30 minutes. Agendas will continue to be 2 hours, with the additional 30 mins as a cushion for any over-run
	PSG15-08	Share comms in the Clock on Programme activity and schedule for the Christmas period	Programme PMO	14/12/22	
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)	Following Control Point 1	To be updated after Control Point 1 and come to February PSG
	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	14/11/22	CR013 raised to impact assessment
	PSG14-10	Support the Programme to identify Large, Small and I&C Supplier representatives for TMAG	Relevant Supplier Representatives (Graham	07/12/22	No new nominations received

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due	Update
			Wood, Gareth Evans, Vladimir Black)		

Decisions

Area	Dec Ref	Decision
Minutes	PSG-DEC28	The PSG approved the minutes of the 02 November PSG
Migration option	PSG-DEC29	The PSG agreed to proceed with Migration Option 3
M3 milestone criteria	PSG-DEC30	The PSG approved updated criteria for the M3 Milestone
Interim Plan and replan	PSG-DEC31	The PSG approved the updated version of the Interim Plan and agreed to begin Round 3 of consultation on the Programme replan as per the Interim Plan
Change control	PSG-DEC32	The PSG approved Change Request CR012
	PSG-DEC33	The PSG agreed to raise Change Request CR013 to Impact Assessment

Minutes

1. Welcome

HT welcomed all to the meeting and ran over the meeting agenda. PSG members introduced themselves. HT reiterated the constituency model for PSG as per MHHS governance arrangements and asked PSG members to seek alternates if they were unable to attend a meeting.

2. Minutes and Actions Review

DECISION PSG-DEC28: The PSG approved the minutes of the 02 November 2022 PSG

HT provided a summary of progress against the key actions and invited questions. None received. JB noted that the updated Benefits Realisation Plan was planned to come to February PSG.

3. Sponsor update

RC summarised the sponsor message as per the slides. RC highlighted the completed design and delivering the replan as important. On the replan, RC noted this needed to be a credible and fastest possible delivery plan and would be subject to Ofgem decision pending sufficient evidence and information. RC noted interest from BEIS who have keen interest in the benefits of the Programme to consumers, the economy and the environment. RC added that the costs of delay were £90m/year and that there were further and substantial unquantifiable indirect benefits.

4. Migration Options

JB introduced the item, noting the majority of content in the slides as read. JB reiterated the importance of the decision on the migration option due to its impacts on the Round 3 of consultation on the Programme replan and on the migration design. The evaluation of the migration options had come through the Migration Working Group (MWG) and the Testing and Migration Advisory Group (TMAG) where there had been success with qualitative evidence against the options but not a weight of quantitative analysis. This was why the Programme Participant Information Request (PPIR) was issued – to build as much evidence as possible to support the decision. The Programme felt they had received as

much evidence as they would at this point in time and had now completed analysis of the impact of each of the options to macro- and micro-levels (e.g. costs) to develop a recommendation.

JB summarised that the Programme recommendation was to proceed with Option 3. JB explained the rationale as per the slides and how this aligned to the outcomes of the qualitative analysis from the evaluation framework and the quantitative outputs of analysis of the PPIR. The included a view of costs and impacts on programme timescales. Previous analysis using the evaluation framework had looked at individual Programme Participants timescales, but the PPIR analysis had shown that reverse migration would not be on the critical path and therefore delays to programme timescales were actually less than previously thought. Evidence from the PPIR on costs was weighted toward Option 3.

JB noted a question on the PPIR on excluding certain customer segments from reverse migration. There were variable responses from the PPIR on this so the Programme were proposing taking this into the migration design to explore further.

CP queried the assumption on slide 17 that reverse migration would only be triggered by a change of supplier event. CP queried what this meant – was this when an individual customer decided to go to a new supplier? JB confirmed reverse migration would only be initiated when a customer switched to a new supplier that was not yet in the new arrangements.

LN noted regarding RC's comments about the design being complete that for Helix the migration design was still representing a significant risk of re-work and this meant a key element of the design was still outstanding (noting work done to-date was appreciated). JB responded that the plan to deliver the migration design was covered in the Interim Plan. LN responded that the full detailed design could not be considered complete with this key element outstanding.

JS queried the rationale for eliminating Option 4. JB responded that the conclusion from MWG/TMAG was that the workaround had a material impact on settlement and would be difficult to operate, and so the impacts were too high and not worth pursuing.

GE queried how the customer segment work would be addressed. JB responded this would be an action from PSG to assess whether there were benefits of creating customer segments and would go to the new Migration Design Subgroup (MDSG) to determine. GE responded that this was important as it may have impacts. JB noted they had expected stronger evidence from the PPIR on excluding certain segments but there had not been significant evidence to make a recommendation. GE noted their constituents were busy with government requirements and their teams were being reprioritised, and so they were not surprised about a lack of evidence provided in the PPIR.

ACTION PSG15-01: Programme to progress work on customer segments in migration at the Migration Design Subgroup (MDSG)

HT moved to make a decision and invited views from representatives in turn:

- Small supplier: AC noted they supported the Option 3 recommendation and had had no feedback from their constituents.
- RECCo: JH noted they supported the recommendation and that a clear case had been put forward in the analysis. JH approved of transparency of the full analysis at PSG and asked that the full analysis also be walked through at MWG.

ACTION PSG15-02: Programme to present the Migration Option Analysis to the Migration Working Group (MWG)

- Helix: LR and LN noted they supported the Option 3 recommendation.
- DCC: HT noted the DCC representative was not present, and this would be followed up offline.
- Large supplier: GW agreed with the Option 3 recommendation, noting the work was now for the working groups to develop further.
- Medium supplier: HT noted apologies for VB. JB summarised a note from VB offline that the majority of their constituents supported the Option 3 recommendation. One constituent had not supported the recommendation.
- I&C supplier: GE noted they supported the Option 3 recommendation, subject to the work being done on customer segments.
- Supplier Agent (independent): JS noted they were appreciative of the new MDSG as there were concerns from their constituency that there was more complexity in the migration design to be worked out. JS was supportive of the Option 3 recommendation.

- Supplier Agent: PA noted mixed views in their constituency and that there were concerns that the complexity of reverse migration had not yet been determined. PA noted concerns that it may be up to Agents to work out these concerns and so a robust migration design was important. PA added that they understood why the Option 3 recommendation had been made and supported the recommendation.
- DNOs: CP noted that the DNOs did not support Option 3 as they felt it was a significant change to the Programme baseline, to Programme testing, and that it would add delay and significant complication. CP noted they felt there would be a 40-50% increase in migration testing in Option 3. Because of the existing complexity, St Clements had already split testing of the functional design and migration – this would reduce risk and DNOs were eager to avoid overlap of testing areas. CP added that their view was that the PPIR had not shown overwhelming support for Option 3 and that reverse migration would have an impact for MPRS functional changes. CP noted that these issues were also related to CR013, where impacts were still to be determined. CP summarised that DNOs would prefer Option 1 as this was simplest, cheapest and had least risk, but that DNOs recognised the rationale for why this exercise was being undertaken. DNOs and St Clements felt the functional design of Option 1 and 2 were the same, and the only caveat for supporting Option 2 would be delivery timeframe (this was not clear in the documentation provided) and ability to manage parties to deliver against timeframes. Between Option 1 and Option 2, DNOs would prefer Option 2. HT responded that the Programme were listening to these concerns.
- iDNOs: JR noted they had a similar position to DNOs when considering the risks relating to Option 3. While iDNOs were fully behind early benefits for consumers, they could not see the full rationale for Option 3 given its additional risk and cost. It seemed that Option 2 delivered in the same timescale and so this was the iDNOs preference.
- NGESO: KTL noted preference for Option 3.
- Consumer: CF noted they were supportive of the option that provided best consumer benefit, assuming the option was feasible. Recognising other responses in the room where drawbacks were highlighted, CF felt if Option 3 was feasible, this would be the option they were supportive of.
- IPA: DG noted the IPA were supportive of the Option 3 recommendation. DG added that the feedback received against Option 3 from PSG representatives was important to address through the MDSG where possible.

HT moved to make a decision. HT noted it was important for the Programme to achieve the fastest credible plan. HT was mindful of the cost and risk impacts for DNO/iDNOs but felt the support from other constituency representatives and the rationale determined from the PPIR meant that Option 3 was the best option to progress with.

DECISION PSG-DEC29: The PSG agreed to proceed with Migration Option 3

5. M3 criteria

KC introduced the item noting this was returning from November PSG where conditional approval had been made for M3 subject to conditions. These conditions included further evidence against revised M3 criteria to be sought through Round 3 of consultation on the programme plan. KC summarised the proposed revised M3 criteria as per the slides. This included explaining how and why the criteria had changed and why the simpler approach proposed was more likely to be achieved.

JR queried if the Programme would be sourcing the additional evidence that was not received in Readiness Assessment 2 (RA2) through Round 3 of consultation on the plan and asked if the programme was confident that they would receive the required level of evidence. KC confirmed the Programme felt the approach through Round 3 was sufficient. Previous experience suggested 30+ responses to planning consultations and the Programme would be looking for a simple majority from these. KC added that the change in criteria was much simpler for participants to respond to (rather than the detailed plans requested in RA2). This information would also provide a better view of information to inform the Programme plan. JR added that they were concerned that the same individuals who did not respond to RA2 may also not respond to the replan. KC responded that the programme were confident that they would receive enough responses to satisfy the criteria.

GW highlighted that large suppliers were concerned about having full and sufficient DBT plans to share during Round 3 replan given unknowns still ongoing in the Programme, such as the M5 Work-Off Plan and the migration design. KC responded that the criteria were revised to be targeted on high-level DBT plans / timelines and that the Programme expected participants to already have these to a sufficient level such they could respond in Round 3.

GW queried the dependency on the M5 work-off list noted in the slides and suggested that this dependency needed to be on delivery of the work-off list, and not just on there being a work-off list. KC agreed with this point. GW added that progress on the migration design was also important.

AC noted feedback from small suppliers was that they would not have this information (a DBT plan) available against the timescale required by the Programme and that they had a dependency on their software providers, both to receive required information from them and then to work it into a plan. KC responded that the M3 criteria were high-level and that the programme would be concerned if, at the time requested in Round 3, Programme Participants did not have basic information such as a high-level timeline.

HT moved to make a decision and invited PSG members to show their support for the revised M3 criteria. PSG members unanimously supported the revised criteria.

DECISION PSG-DEC30: The PSG approved updated criteria for the M3 Milestone

6. M9 update

CH introduced the item noting they felt it important to provide PSG members with a view of content of the programme replan to cascade to their constituents. CH explained that the current intention was for M9 to start on 30 October 2023 or shortly afterwards, with the first component of Systems Integration Testing (SIT) being Component Integration Testing (CIT). CH explained that the 30 October was not a binary date and that there would be opportunity for some participants to join SIT later. CIT would begin with Elexon and the Data Integration Platform (DIP) first, the other core capability providers and then Agents and Suppliers joining shortly after. CH added that there was still work to be done on the steps and sequencing to deliver M9 and that this would be worked through in the testing working groups (SIT Working Group had already started).

CP noted interdependencies on the timeline for M9 with the replan, with the end of January as the deadline for Round 3 consultation responses and delivery of the Work-Off Plan. If the Work-Off Plan was not fully available for impact assessment as part of the replan consultation, it was not clear to DNOs how the outputs of the replan would be sufficient. CP noted 50 of 70 of the current work-off items could impact MPRS (relevant to DNOs) and that there were a number of decisions still to be made. This created concerns for DNO on the programme plan and delivery of Design, Build and Test (DBT). CP added that the DIP provider had not yet been appointed and until they were, there were still many requirements that were currently unknown yet were key to participant DBT. CP added that DNOs and St Clements were targeting being ready as soon as possible but that October 2023 did look like a challenge to start SIT (DNOs / St Clements were looking to bring activities forward to achieve this). These uncertainties made it difficult to commit to the 30 October date. CP stated that more certainty was needed on these areas by Christmas.

JR reiterated complications for iDNOs relating to MPRS. GW added that large suppliers were on the same page and that the full design needed to be baselined before full DBT content and timelines could be finalised by large suppliers.

Regarding governance processes, JH noted that the criteria needed to be considered for M9 (as per M3) and that this affected the M9 date. The criteria needed to be clear as to whether M9 was the start of SIT with the DIP and Elexon, or if the criteria would be broader about wider Minimum Viable Cohort (MVC) readiness. CH responded that it was important for the M9 criteria to be clear and give a firm start point for SIT. The entry criteria would be worked up through the test working groups. CH added that the date was based on evidence from a number of central providers, suppliers and agents that said they would be ready to start for this date. CH added that the programme were aware of the importance of the baselined design and delivery of the Work-Off Plan to ensure the things that needed to be ready, would be ready at the right times. In response to CP's comments, CH noted it was important to work with providers on the critical path to support them to be ready in time and proposed more frequent meetings with St Clements to support their plan and DBT development.

ACTION PSG15-03: Programme to increase frequency of meetings with St Clements to support Programme replanning activity and readiness for M9

7. Interim Plan

GC introduced the item noting this was an action from the last PSG where decisions had been made that affected the timelines and activities in the current Interim Plan. GC walked through the key items in the Plan as per the slides. This included the steps and dates for Round 3 of consultation on the programme plan. Round 3 consultation would run to the end of January, with a 16 January 2023 requested response date for participants to demonstrate interest in participating in SIT (whilst responders by 31 Jan 2023 would not be precluded from potential SIT involvement). In February, the Programme would complete analysis on the Round 3 responses and then develop a Change Request

(that would move through the normal Change Control process). This Change Request would go to Ofgem in March (on the assumption that there would be Level 1 milestone changes that would require Ofgem escalation).

GC provided a short overview of the migration design plan and other ongoing programme workstreams as per the slides. GC reiterated that work was ongoing across programme workstreams in parallel to the replanning activity. GC invited questions.

CP thanked the Programme for the detail of the plan. CP noted a number of activities still to be resolved that could add development time to MPRS. CP queried what would happen if these activities (e.g. M5 Work-Off Plan and migration design) were not delivered in time for parties to respond to Round 3 of consultation at the end of January, and if there were subsequent changes required to the plan as a result of these activities, how these would be incorporated. CP queried if there was any contingency. KC responded that the Interim Plan was the reportable baseline for PSG and any material changes would be brought to PSG until the full plan was rebaselined. KC added that they would expect the PSG to be delivery-focused and to respond collectively to any escalations or risks that may impact delivery of the plan. If CP felt there were unmanaged risks, these should be raised through the appropriate governance forum (these could ultimately come to PSG by exception).

CP rephrased that they felt that the design was not stable at the moment and that there were unknowns that may impact the Interim Plan (and therefore the programme plan). CP queried if the intention was to resolve these by the end of January so they could be fed into the Programme plan or if there was intention to have a further work off plan for things to action on the programme plan. KC responded that the design Work-Off Plan had been created to mitigate risks (including those highlighted by CP) and that M5 had been approved on the basis that the content of the work-off was not material to prevent approval. Should there be concerns on the delivery of the work-off plan and its impact on the baseline design, this should be raised through the DAG and escalated to PSG as required. CP reiterated that their concern was that the scale of the work-off plan was large, that no decisions had been made so far, and that there was not a lot of time to deliver this by the end of January. CP queried if the outcomes of the Work-Off Plan would be input into the replan, as the replan and the Work-Off Plan were interlinked.

RS highlighted that the PSG required an update on the status of the Work-Off Plan.

WF queried what items were significant problems on the work-off list. CP highlighted several items relevant to DNOs on the work-off list that they felt were key items that needed to be worked through. HT responded that these were important issues to raise but with work ongoing offline and activity at the DAG, this should be raised through the DAG and then escalated to PSG if required.

GC provided an overview of the status of the replan as per the slides. GC highlighted that responding to the consultation should be easier for participants for Round 3 as the Programme would be using an online form. CF added that it was important to allow free-form responses in the form. GC responded that this is accommodated in the response questionnaire.

PA noted a challenge for providing adequate responses in Round 1 and 2 of consultation was a lack of information or detail in the information provided. PA queried if Round 3 would have more detail on the content of the tasks in the plan to allow participants to more adequately assess them. GC responded that the Programme was aiming for a step change in information provided in the artefacts, including in the implementation approach. KC added that the artefacts for Round 3 would be a lot fuller and more in-depth than previous rounds (this was the natural planning progression across the rounds of consultation, as more information becomes available and working groups progress). KC noted a responsibility of the programme to provide enough information in order to provoke better responses. While the content of Round 3 would not be fully complete, it would have significantly moved on since Round 2.

GC noted the programme had been engaging with the IPA throughout the development of the Round 3 plan.

Regarding the plan for delivering Round 3 of consultation, GC explained extensive stakeholder engagement and management (e.g. with Ofgem) was planned throughout the stages of the replan Change Request. This would start when feedback of the consultation responses started being received.

GC asked PSG for approval of the interim plan and to commence Round 3 of consultation on the Programme plan on 14 December. HT moved to make a decision and invited PSG members to show their support. PSG members unanimously supported the decision.

DECISION PSG-DEC31: The PSG approved the updated version of the Interim Plan and agreed to begin Round 3 of consultation on the Programme replan as per the Interim Plan

ACTION PSG15-03: Programme to action decision PSG-DEC31: issue the updated Interim Plan and begin Round 3 of consultation on the Programme replan

GE noted a supplier was listed in the MVC list in the previous agenda item and queried if there was a supplier who had already volunteered to be in the MVC. JB responded that there were some participants who had suggested an intention to participate in SIT through RA2 and that engagement with these parties and others was ongoing. The Programme was confident there would be a supplier for the MVC. HT added that these participants were self-selecting in terms of their participation in SIT.

8. Change Control

CR012

JB introduced the item and provided an overview of the outputs of Impact Assessment for CR012 as per the slides. JB noted a change had been made to the wording of the meeting pack as issued, as there was no extension of the powers required by Ofgem in order to enact consequential code changes. Regarding respondents who rejected the change, JB noted a lack of clarity on the code draft plan and how this would be delivered, and that further information on this would be shared through the replan.

JB noted two impacts on the Programme from CR012:

1. A new set of activities would be added to the programme plan for the Programme to undertake. This would push M6 back by ~8 weeks due to increased time for code development activities (no impact on critical path)
2. A change in wording of the terms of reference of the CCAG

DECISION PSG-DEC32: The PSG approved Change Request CR012

ACTION PSG15-05: Programme to action next steps from CR012: incorporate CR012 within code draft plan and update CCAG Terms of Reference

CR013

JB noted the decision was whether to raise CR013 to Impact Assessment. GE provided an overview of the detail of CR013 as per the slides.

MC noted a proposal to extend the Impact Assessment window due to compressed timeframes caused by the Christmas period.

JR explained that they had expected this work to have already been undertaken as part of the Programme and therefore queried if there was anything tangible that GE had already seen may have an impact. GE noted settlement profiling activity had not been looked at since pre-Covid and, while this was anecdotal evidence, the work proposed by the Change Request would look to determine if this was a problem. A good output of the work would be that there was no impact, but GE was concerned that would not be the case.

JS added that they had concerns about who would deliver the work and whether it was the responsibility of the Programme or Elexon. JS felt the work should have already been completed by Elexon prior to the Programme commencing. GE responded that they did not know the detail of work completed previously and that this could be part of the work. JS noted they fully supported the exercise, but they were surprised the information did not already exist and was not part of the original business case for MHHS.

AM noted items raised by PSG members were likely to be further explored through Impact Assessment. JB agreed and added that further work could be done as part of the Programme's Impact Assessment to determine if this data or modelling already existed. GE reiterated that it was important for the programme to own the activity, given their role as a central facilitator to Programme outcomes.

CP noted that at a high level the activity made sense but queried where the activity should sit (Elexon or the Programme design team) and if this should be a Programme RAID item to ensure the activity and consequences had been properly examined.

DECISION PSG-DEC33: The PSG agreed to raise Change Request CR013 to Impact Assessment

ACTION PSG15-06: Programme to raise CR013 to Impact Assessment

9. Control Point 1

KC introduced the item and explained that Control Points were points for the Programme team to take a step back and look at the overall health of the Programme and make a decision whether to move to the next programme phase. The

LDP had developed an in-depth report for Control Point 1 that had been presented and discussed at an internal review chaired by the Programme Director. KC provided an overview of the outputs of the review as per the slides. KC noted the IPA had provided assurance on the outputs. The output was a decision to 'continue' the programme into the next phase (DBT).

RS explained that the IPA had delivered an IPA view on the outputs from the Programme. The IPA had agreed with the majority of the content and the recommendations the Programme developed. The IPA had highlighted a number of priorities for the Programme, in addition to their detailed review.

KC added that, as the first control point, Control Point 1 was different to future control points where there would be both a baselined programme design and plan in place.

10. DIP enduring modification

JS introduced their role and provided an overview of the DIP enduring modification as per the slides. The modification was for the ongoing funding and operation of the DIP. This was being addressed by Elexon through Issue Group 101. JS provided an overview of the DIP enduring mod Plan on a Page. JS noted that Elexon were assuming that M9 was not the critical deadline for delivering the modification and that Elexon would be working closely with Ofgem to ensure delivery against required timescales.

GW queried the current status of the DIP procurement. CH responded that the Programme were in the final stages of negotiation. The first workshop had already taken place and that the DIP provider had begun working at risk. The Programme were hoping to sign the contract next week and to introduce the DIP provider at the January PSG.

11. Design progress

WF summarised that the Programme is on track to finish consultation on items on the Work-Off Plan and issue them for assurance review by 19 December. Industry would then have until the 13 January to respond to consultation. The process would follow the same as previously completed on the design before M5. The intention was to hold assurance meetings on 25 January. An extraordinary DAG would be held on the 30 January.

WF noted the status report was Amber not due to the effort relating to updating and completing the design but in achieving consensus with industry parties. So far, the Programme had had 15 hours of open meetings with 70+ attendees to each meeting with good discussion amongst participants, as well as further direct meetings with participants from the design team. WF reiterated comments from the Ofgem sponsor on the importance of delivering the Work-Off Plan and achieving a full baselined design. If industry were not aligning on a solution, the design team would look to make an informed recommendation based on evidence provided to DAG.

WF updated on the migration design. The status report was Amber due to the workstream being in its early stages. The first subgroup had now been held with over 50 participants. The migration design workstream was better set up taking learnings from the wider design work, such as in workstream controls. The migration meetings would run to mid-February where artefacts would then be issued formally for industry review, with an intention to agree the artefacts by mid-March. The DAG had agreed for a single review period of the design artefacts (rather than two as previously). Risks relating to a single review period were being mitigated by increased engagement and governance through the subgroups.

GW queried the date for releasing Work-Off Plan artefacts. WF clarified that the internal goal was the 16 December, but this may be the 19 December. 19 December was as per the Work-Off Plan.

12. Delivery dashboards

HT invited question on the delivery dashboards. None received. GW and GE noted their constituents welcomed the dashboards and the information in them.

13. Summary and Next Steps

MC summarised the actions and decisions as per the table above.

RC reiterated comments from CP on the need for design certainty and asked PSG members to take this away to ensure design stability was achieved.

JB highlighted that a number of risks and assumptions that had been raised across the agenda items and queried if these were captured. KC responded that these were captured by the Programme RAID management framework and invited interrogation of the RAID log by PSG members via the DPMO.

AC queried the availability of iServer. JB responded that this was in the Interim Plan for the end of January, to be aligned with completion of the design work-off. AC noted this had slipped and should have been brought to the PSG's attention sooner.

GW queried if the meeting needed to be extended to 3 hours, to allow additional time and prevent rushing through items (while keeping the meeting concise).

ACTION PSG15-07: Programme to extend PSG meeting calendar invites to 2.5 hours

GE queried activity over the Christmas period. MC explained that the governance schedule was available on the Collaboration Base. AM explained the Programme would be continuing over the Christmas period, taking into account annual leave. JB proposed sharing a further communication on activity.

ACTION PSG15-08: Programme to Share comms in the Clock on Programme activity and schedule for the Christmas period

HT thanked attendees for their contributions and closed the meeting.

Date of next PSG: 11 January 2022