

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

Issue date: 22/12/22

| | | | |
|----------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| Meeting number | TMAG 012 | Venue | Virtual – MS Teams |
| Date and time | 21 December 2022 1000-1200 | Classification | Public |

Attendees

Chair

Chris Welby (CW) MHHS IM

Industry Participants

Chandrani Ghosh (CG) as alternate to Matt Hall Elexon Representative
 Ian Hatton (IH) DNO Representative
 Jon Hawkins (JH) as alternate to Dave Jones RECCo Representative

MHHS IM members

Dominic Mooney (DM) SIT Manager
 Jason Brogden (JB) Industry SME
 Kate Goodman (KG) Test lead
 Martin Cranfield (MC) PMO Governance Lead

Other Attendees

Jenny Boothe (JeB) Ofgem
 Sinead Quinn (SQ) Ofgem

Apologies

Caroline Farquhar Consumer Representative
 Stacey Buck iDNO Representative
 Nickie Bernsmeier-Rulow DCC Representative

Observers

Santosh Vasudevan (SV) Elexon

Actions

| Area | Action Ref | Action | Owner | Due | Update |
|-----------------------|------------|--|---------------|----------|---|
| Round 3 replan | TMAG12-01 | Issue the Round 3 replan deck as presented in TMAG | Programme PMO | 22/12/22 | Now available alongside the 21 December 2022 meeting papers |

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------|---|-----------------------|----------|---|
| Consumption Data Generator | TMAG12-02 | Share concerns on DIP dependencies for delivering their PIT and schedule meeting with the Programme to discuss, if required | Elexon representative | 17/01/23 | |
| Open actions from previous meetings | TMAG08-02 | Respond to Programme replan consultation. Encourage constituents to respond to the consultation | TMAG members | 26/08/22 | Round 2 consultation closed at the end of September. TMAG members are encouraged to review the Round 3 consultation when released |

Decisions

| Area | Decision Ref | Description |
|----------------------------|--------------|--|
| Minutes and actions | TMAG-DEC16 | The minutes of the TMAG 19 November 2022 were approved |
| SITWG ToR | TMAG-DEC17 | The TMAG approved the SITWG Terms of Reference |

RAID items

| Area | Item |
|-------------|------|
| None raised | |

Minutes

1. Welcome

CW welcomed all to the meeting.

2. Minutes and Actions

DECISION TMAG-DEC16: The minutes of the TMAG 17 November 2022 were approved

MC updated on the actions as per the slides and invited comments. None received.

3. Programme Updates

CW noted the item as read and invited questions. None received.

4. Migration update

JB introduced the item and explained the decision at the Programme Steering Group (PSG) to progress with Migration Option 3. JB explained the detail of Option 3 as per the slides, highlighting the benefits of early migration for the Programme and consumers, as well as the challenges for suppliers in delivering reverse migration. JB noted activities to deliver the decision had been included in the plan for migration design activities. JB added that the rationale for the decision was available in the December PSG meeting papers.

JB provided an overview of the Migration Plan on a Page (POAP) as per the slides, highlighting timelines for the Migration, Cutover and Data Strategy as the next deliverable for the workstream. The Strategy would come to TMAG for approval at the end of April.

JeB queried the interactions between the Strategy and the Programme plan and asked if there were any dependencies between the two, particularly for timings for testing scenarios. JB responded that there were activities planned in SIT for migration testing activity and that this was detailed in the Programme plan. KG added that migration testing was a specific stage in SIT and occurred relatively late in the SIT timetable. This was deliberate to allow the Programme and participants to prepare and deliver Design, Build and Test (DBT) in time for testing.

SV queried the approach for participants to qualify for SIT testing. KG responded that participants needed to demonstrate through their PIT that they had completed their testing (the Programme would assure this). SV queried if participants needed to complete testing before coming into SIT. KG confirmed all participants would have to have completed PIT testing before SIT, except for their migration testing. JB added that participants could do their migration testing earlier if they wanted to, and this was encouraged if possible. The Programme were not imposing two releases but allowing flexibility due to the later delivery of the migration design. SV noted a dependency on the Data Integration Platform (DIP) to be in place before SIT for Elexon.

JB provided an overview of activity at the Migration Design Subgroup (MDSG) as per the slides. JB encouraged attendance from TMAG members and their constituents to the MDSG. SV queried timelines for delivering the migration design. JB responded that the intention was to deliver the design in mid-March, with MDSG meetings finished by February and then a consultation period. JB added that the MDSG was currently working on change of agent and then would move to the reverse migration design.

JB summarised the position of the MDSG in the MHHS governance structure, noting the MDSG sat under the Design Advisory Group (DAG) as design decisions were required. JB explained the migration terminology and scope across the Programme as per the slides. JB noted the importance of pre-migration execution activities such as reporting and data cleansing. JB summarised the Migration Design POAP as per the slides.

JH queried the where the approach for data cleansing would be set out. JB responded that the replan had identified activities for managing data population and cleansing. The Programme was reliant on industry to deliver activities to support this. KG added that there were two documents to be released early next year – the Migration, Cutover and Data Strategy and a Data Assessment Report. The Data Assessment Report would detail the quality of data and what cleansing would need to be done and where. A draft would be available in February (this would not have all the detail e.g. activities or responsibilities) and a final version in April or May. The Programme would work closely with code bodies on this to agree responsibilities, and this would come in the final version.

JB noted the next Migration Working Group (MWG) was on 12 January 2023 and the Migration, Cutover and Data Strategy and Data Assessment Report would be discussed.

5. Programme replan

JB noted a subset of the Round 3 replan documentation had been extracted for presentation to TMAG. JB provided an overview of the purpose and content of the Round 3 replan consultation as per the Round 3 replan slides. JB noted a SIT start date of 31 October 2023 in the Round 3 replan consultation as this was when the Programme, Elexon and the DIP would be ready to start SIT. JB added that the responses from Readiness Assessment 2 had given the programme confidence that there would be enough participants to make up a Minimum Viable Cohort (MVC) to be ready for 31 October. JB noted two Round 3 consultation deadlines – 31 January 2023 and an earlier deadline on 16 January 2023 for those participants that were intending to participate in SIT, to give the Programme information and confidence on the likelihood of achieving an MVC for SIT.

JB provided further context on the content of the Round 3 of consultation, noting the intention to set challenging but realistic timescales and deliver a credible and achievable plan. JB provided an overview of the Round 3 consultation artefacts, noting more detail was provided in the artefacts in Round 3 than for previous consultations and that additional artefacts were available, including an Implementation Approach.

JB provided an overview of the Implementation Approach and the Programme POAP. The POAP intended to show the paths for different groups of participants. JB noted the critical path was for the last parties to qualify and that two other paths were shown, one for the MVC who could migrate much earlier and would have much longer for migration, and one for the first parties who would be the first to qualify. The three paths showed the opportunity for participants to migrate earlier and take on consumers in the new arrangements as soon as possible. SIT was split into different test phases, with the staggered approach supported by the environment plan. JB explained the content of the Implementation Approach artefact as per the slides (e.g. RAID items, roles and responsibilities).

ACTION TMAG12-01: PMO to issue the replan deck presented in TMAG

SV queried if the roles and responsibilities in the Implementation Approach had been agreed with relevant parties. JB responded that this was the Programme's current view and that the Programme welcomed comments via the Round 3 consultation. SV queried sign-off date for the roles and responsibilities. JB responded this was part of the Round 3 consultation (it was not signed off yet). SV queried if the final roles and responsibilities would be published. JB confirmed they would, once the plan was baselined. SV queried what activities had Elexon Board included against the roles and responsibilities. JB responded that few activities involved the Elexon Board and that SV should review the full replan material to see where this was applicable.

CW queried if the code bodies included panels, where relevant. JB confirmed yes. Code bodies had been separated in the roles and responsibilities because these parties had delivery responsibilities as central parties that needed to be separated from the regulatory side of code governance.

6. Qualification/pre-qualification update

DM provided an update on qualification activities since last TMAG as per the slides. DM invited questions. None received.

7. Data Working Group (DWG) update

KG provided an update on activity on the consumption data generator as this was a key item from the last DWG. Test stubs were being developed for PIT, SIT and some for UIT. The Programme had been concentrating on PIT so far, where a number of simulators were being worked on with focus on a DIP simulator. Work had been ongoing on this by the development team who were hosting fortnightly show-and-tells following each two-week sprint.

KG explained that the requirements for a consumption data generator had been written and development work was beginning to deliver the generator by the end of May. KG explained the diagram in the slides. KG noted the data generator needed to be developed to create realistic data for IF-021. Further work needed to be done on reproducing data for other elements of the data flows. The Programme were intending to create a standard format to be used. Previously the Programme had talked about CSV files but given IF-021 and IF-041 messages were available, rather than try to replicate D flows, the Programme would produce data in the format of these messages.

CG queried availability of the DIP for participant's PIT and what participants could use for non-functional testing. CG did not believe the DIP simulator could be used for non-functional testing and queried if the testing could be done in SIT once there was a DIP integrated environment. KG responded that there were various open questions including how non-functional testing would work in SIT. The DIP performance was crucial for this. KG noted there may need to be a SIT non-functional stage in SIT to bring together components, however this may be difficult and unrealistic. KG added that there may be a performance test in SIT to test central systems together. KG added that a non-functional test expert joining the programme and that this would be bottomed out further in the New Year. At this point, it was likely the Programme would do as CG suggested – the DIP simulator was not formally there for performance testing, although it could be used if participants wanted to do some initial testing. CG agreed they could do some initial performance baselining. KG added that the DIP would not be available until SIT and so DIP performance testing could not form part of PIT.

CG suggested a conversation offline. KG noted the responsibility of participants to conduct their own PIT and demonstrate capability for functional and non-functional testing. Some performance testing would need to be demonstrated as part of this in PIT. SV noted a dependency on the DIP to do performance testing – if the DIP was not available, this would impact Elexon as a central system. KG explained that participants needed to provide assurance that their systems worked and performed ahead of SIT, and that it was the responsibility of participants to do this. This included creating their own systems and requirements to ensure they could satisfactorily deliver PIT – it was the responsibility of participants to demonstrate their delivery of PIT. KG noted all participants were dependent on the DIP and participants needed their own test harnesses to provide confidence that their systems would perform in SIT.

ACTION TMAG12-02: Elexon representative to share concerns on DIP dependencies for delivering their PIT and schedule meeting with the Programme to discuss, if required

KG explained the process for generating consumption data as per the slides. KG noted a requirements specification was under development internally. Once agreed, request parameters and MPAN details would be shared to participants to create a basis against which to work. The Programme would then generate period consumption data or register reads in quantity. This would be shared back to participants in the format of IF-021 or IF-041, depending on

what participants had asked for. This process may vary slightly for different participants (e.g. Elexon central systems vs data services).

8. SITWG update

CW introduced the item, noting two objectives: to give an update on the first Systems Integration Test Working Group (SITWG) and to approve the SITWG Terms of Reference (ToR). DM provided an overview of activity at the first SITWG as per the slides. DM noted the January SITWG would give a more detailed view of relevant content of the Round 3 replan consultation and further explore the items discussed at the first SITWG. DM requested approval of the SITWG ToR. The ToR had had no feedback when discussed at the first SITWG.

CW invited members to highlight if they did not want to approve the ToR. No comments received.

| |
|---|
| DECISION TMAG-DEC17 - The TMAG approved the SITWG Terms of Reference |
|---|

9. Working group report

CW introduced the item noting content the content as read. No comments received.

10. Summary and next steps

MC summarised the actions. CW noted the agenda items for January TMAG and invited AOB. None raised.

CW wished TMAG members a Happy Christmas and closed the meeting.

Date of next TMAG: 18 January 2023