

MHHS Programme Steering Group (PSG) Headline Report

Issue date: 12/01/2023

Meeting Number **PSG 016**

Venue **Virtual – MS Teams**

Date and Time **11 January 2023 1000-1200**

Classification **Public**

Actions

Area	Ref	Action	Owner	Due
TMAG reps	PSG16-01	Discuss steps for filling TMAG Large Supplier Representative vacancy	Graham Wood, Chris Harden	01/02/23
M5 Work-Off Plan	PSG16-02	Update M5 Work-Off Plan Change Log with ISD and Operational Choreography document changes	Programme design team (Warren Fulton)	18/02/23
Constituency rep role	PSG16-03	Share communication in the Clock to remind participants who their constituency reps are and what the constituency rep role is	Programme PMO	01/02/23
	PSG16-04	Provide constituency reps with the contacts for the organisations within their constituency	Programme PPC	01/02/23
	PSG16-05	Speak to RECCo, Elexon and ESO to compare OSMs to the MHHS Programme's contact list	Programme PPC	01/02/23
Dashboards	PSG16-06	Add Work-Off Plan and migration design task items to the Interim Plan dashboard	Programme PMO	01/02/23

Decisions

Area	Ref	Decision
Minutes	PSG-DEC34	The PSG approved the minutes of the 07 December 2022 PSG

RAID items

RAID area	Overview
-----------	----------

M5 Work-Off Plan	The PSG discussed risks related to the delivery of the M5 Work-Off Plan
Core capability providers	The PSG discussed risks relating to delivery of the St Clements DBT plan in advance of SIT start

Key Discussion Items

Area	Discussion
Sponsor update	The Programme Sponsor reiterated the importance of engagement from industry with the design Work-Off Plan and Round 3 of consultation on the Programme plan. The Sponsor encouraged participants to join the Minimum Viable Cohort (MVC) to start SIT in October and explained that Rachel Clark would be leaving Ofgem at the end of January 2023.
DIP update	The Programme explained that the DIP procurement was in the final stages of contract negotiations and would be announced in the coming weeks. The provider has started working, was on track to deliver their design as per the plan and would be ready to start SIT against the current timelines. This meant there would be no delays to the Programme while contract negotiations were finalised.
Status updates	<p><u>M5 Work-Off Plan</u></p> <p>The Programme explained that the Work-Off Plan completion was on schedule. Updated artefacts were out for review and assurance forums would be scheduled in the coming weeks ahead of Design Advisory Group (DAG) approval at the end of January. The Programme provided some further context to the change-marking of some documents out for review, including the Interface Catalogue.</p> <p>The DNO Representative talked through an additional slide relating to some challenges with the document review process and the amount and importance of work still to be completed. The Work-Off Change Log will be updated to provide further clarity on document changes (action PSG16-02).</p> <p>The Large Supplier Representative queried the communications approach for four Work-Off items due to be shared and what parties should do if they were not comfortable with their outcomes. The Programme explained that communications would be shared via the usual channels (i.e. via the Working Groups, Design Newsletter and the Clock) and that they were confident sufficient engagement had been input into the solutions. The Large Supplier Representative also queried progress of the Migration Design. This was stated as on track, with the draft design to be issued at the start of February following work at the Migration Design Subgroup.</p> <p>The RECCo Representative queried the governance for sign-off of the Work-Off Plan, should the DAG deem any items not to be complete at the end of January. The Programme felt this was unlikely but noted it would be discussed at DAG.</p> <p><u>Round 3 replan</u></p> <p>The Programme explained that Round 3 of consultation on the programme plan had been going well, with strong engagement in planning activity and the Playback sessions were being positively received. Some additional content had been provided following early feedback.</p>

	<p>Some consultation responses had already been received, with some participants responding early to demonstrate their intention to participate in SIT. The Programme reiterated that ideally those interested in participating in SIT would respond by 16 January, but later responses would not exclude them from consideration.</p> <p><u>Code drafting</u></p> <p>The Programme provided an overview of the Code Draft plan and progress against it. Code drafting had commenced in January and would be delivered in topic areas moving through drafting, consultation and approval via the Code Draft Working Group (CDWG) and Cross Code Advisory Group (CCAG).</p>
RA2 non-responders	<p>The Programme explained that a number of organisations had not responded to Readiness Assessment 2. This was being highlighted to PSG as these organisations had licence obligations to respond and a lack of response could raise concerns for other organisations in industry that may rely upon their services.</p> <p>The Consumer Representative queried the impact of non-responders. The Programme explained that a lack of response did not prevent the Programme moving forward but did create an unknown. This could lead to organisations not being ready to migrate at the point the Programme was ready to stand down old systems. The Programme noted they would like to offer support to these organisations.</p> <p>Several Constituency Representatives expressed a desire for more and better engagement with their constituents and asked for support from the Programme in engaging them. PSG members also offered support to find the best contacts within organisations (actions PSG16-03 to -05).</p>
Governance group reminders	<p>The Programme provided an overview of the MHHS Governance structure and the activity of the workstreams and working groups within it. This included a forward look of new groups to come within Design Change Management and Testing. The Programme reiterated the importance of engagement from industry with the governance groups.</p> <p>The Large Supplier Representative queried where information could be found on the groups and their schedule. The Programme explained this information was available on the MHHS Website and Collaboration Base.</p> <p>The I&C Supplier queried when and how groups may be stood down. The Programme explained that groups would be stood down when there was no longer a need for them.</p>
Delivery dashboards	<p>The Large Supplier Representative noted the Interim Plan dashboard did not have task lines for the Work-Off Plan or the Migration Design (action PSG16-06).</p> <p>The Large Supplier Representative highlighted a difference in the timelines of the St Clements delivery plan and the Programme plan in Round 3 of consultation. The Programme clarified that the risk related to this had been articulated in Round 3 and that conversations were ongoing with St Clements and related parties on how the risk would be managed. The timelines in Round 3 had been developed as the majority of participants had suggested they were achievable. There were nuances in the ways that participants could enter SIT and therefore there may be possible mitigations for the risk with St Clements.</p>
Other	<p>The DNO Representative raised an AOB on the requirements for a Change Request when the Programme was seen to deviate from the Target Operating Model (TOM) or recommendations from the Architecture Working Group (AWG). The Representative provided examples where they believed the Programme had deviated but no Change Requests had been raised, such as the</p>

	<p>Migration Option decision and DIP PULL/PUSH connections. The Ofgem Sponsor clarified that the decision to progress with MHHS explicitly referenced moving ahead with the TOM, and so changes to the TOM would require a Change Request and would need to follow Ofgem decision-making thresholds. Recommendations from the AWG had not been endorsed or baselined by Ofgem and were not part of Ofgem's regulatory position, meaning decisions relating to these areas were subject to the Programme's own governance. The IPA noted it was good to have this debate to ensure the right decision-making route was always followed.</p>
--	--

Date of next meeting: 01 February 2023