

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

Issue date: 16/02/23

Meeting number	<b>TMAG 014</b>	Venue	<b>Virtual – MS Teams</b>
Date and time	<b>15 February 2023 1000-1200</b>	Classification	<b>Public</b>

## Attendees

### Chair

Chris Welby (CW) MHHS IM, SME

### Industry Representatives

Dave Jones (DJ)	RECCo Representative
Ian Hatton (IHat)	DNO Representative
Ian Hall (IHal)	Supplier Agent Representative
Lee Northall (LN)	Large Supplier Representative (co-representative, Testing)
Matt Hall (MH)	Elexon Representative
Naomi Walker (NW)	Large Supplier Representative (co-representative, Migration and Qualification)
Shaun Brundett (SBr)	Small Supplier Representative
Stacey Buck (SBu)	iDNO Representative

### MHHS IM members

Adrian Ackroyd (AA)	Test Manager
Dominic Mooney (DM)	SIT Manager
Jason Brogden (JB)	Industry SME
John Wiggins (JW)	Migration lead
Kate Goodman (KG)	Testing Lead
Martin Cranfield (MC)	PMO Governance Lead
Nigel Hunt (NH)	Qualification Lead
Simon Berry (SBe)	Environments Lead

### Other Attendees

Andy MacFaul (AMF)	Ofgem
Anna Millar (AM)	Elexon Qualification Lead
Sajwal Dash (SD)	IPA
Saima Sabir (SS)	IPA
Sinead Quinn (SQ)	Ofgem

## Actions

Area	Ref	Action	Owner	Due	Update
------	-----	--------	-------	-----	--------

<b>Environments</b>	TMAG14-01	Discuss offline SIT scope and requirements for Elexon	Matt Hall, Simon Berry, Kate Goodman	15/03/23	
<b>Migration Design</b>	TMAG14-02	Include a Migration Design update in the Working Group Progress report	Programme PMO	15/03/23	

## Decisions

Area	Ref	Description
<b>Minutes and actions</b>	TMAG-DEC19	The minutes of the TMAG 18 January 2023 were approved.
<b>Environments Approach and Plan</b>	TMAG-DEC20	The TMAG approved the update draft version 2.2 of the Environments Approach and Plan
<b>TMAG governance</b>	TMAG-DEC21	The TMAG agreed to maintain the TMAG meeting but to split the meeting in two halves for Test and Migration, with the option of co-representation for each constituency (one representative for each Test and Migration respectively)

## Minutes

### 1. Welcome

CW welcomed all to the meeting and ran over the meeting agenda.

### 2. Minutes and Actions

**DECISION TMAG-DEC18: The minutes of the TMAG 18 January 2023 were approved**

CW noted one action that was recommend closed as per the slides. No comments received.

### 3. Programme Updates

MC highlighted that further Programme Updates were available in the Clock from last week. This included two consultations recently released on the Migration Design and code drafting. MH added that the DAG had not approved the Work-Off Plan on 01 February.

### 4. Data Assessment Report overview

JW introduced the item and the plan for delivering the Data Assessment Report as per the slides. JW provided context on the content of the document and the importance of delivering it to the quality required and within the timelines given, so that data cleansing activities could be delivered in advance of Systems Integration Testing (SIT).

JW provided an overview of the four key finding areas of the Data Assessment Report as per the slides. JW made reference to some changes occurring in wider industry that were relevant to the Data Assessment Report and how these related to Programme data cleansing activities. JW explained that some of the activities required for the key findings could require significant work from June 2023 ahead of migration.

LN noted the content of the report was welcomed by their constituency. LN added that there were concerns over R32 that would create a need for more site visits and hence additional costs for suppliers, and that they felt some of this work could be done via Smart Meters rather than site visits. JW responded that the feedback was welcome and invited the member to share feedback with [migration@mhhsprogramme.co.uk](mailto:migration@mhhsprogramme.co.uk) so this could be incorporated in the report ahead of the extraordinary TMAG. JW added that this was important feedback to include in the report, with any subsequent work required to be planned and approved via Programme governance. Follow-on work from the report

would be worked into a plan (such as on placing reliance on different parties). There would be some areas of focus following the report – so far the exercise had been desk-top via interviews with volunteer parties and the next level of detail needed to be developed in order to build the right next steps.

CW added that it was important for industry to provide feedback now so that it could be considered and incorporated in the report now (as this would be more difficult in future).

## 5. Environments Approach and Plan v2.2

SBe introduced the item and provided an overview of the background and next steps for the Environments Approach and Plan. SBe walked through each of the slides to provide detail on the updates that had been made to the uplifted version 2.2 of the document for TMAG approval (this included items in the work-off list as approved previously by TMAG). SBe noted further updates would be made to the document in the next iteration, as more information was made available.

SBe explained that changes were not fundamental but provided more information on content requested or already in the document. SBe explained it was appropriate to uplift the document now based on the information available now. As and when things changed (such as the Programme plan), an updated version of the document would be created. SBe noted the document was not yet signed off under change control, given the nature of the information and updates still to be made. The document was therefore an approved draft and could be approved now by TMAG.

LN noted the document uplift was welcomed and the dates provided were very useful for Large Suppliers. LN added that the dates in the document were important and therefore approving the document in the right way (e.g. via change control) was important so that participants could trust and be held to the dates (even more important if the dates were to be brought forward). SBe responded that they agreed this was important and that, as soon as updated dates were known, the document would progress through the working groups and an updated version of the document approved at TMAG. LN noted any changes to the dates and number of environments were important to know as soon as possible, given the high costs.

IHat queried the requirements for UIT environments for SIT participants, and if participants needed to be in both SIT and UIT. SBe referred to slides in the document providing detail on the environments required for SIT and UIT. SBe explained it was up to participants whether they were participating in SIT and UIT, although this was also dependent on the participant role. IHat noted this was important for Registration Services and that some DNOs would be required for each stage (but not necessarily their organisation).

MH explained that they needed to understand the detail behind the environments before they could say they were happy with the environment requirements (for example they did not know the detailed elements of SIT). MH noted this was not clear in the current version of the document. KG responded that the boundaries for ECS systems for SIT had been discussed via the working groups. The Programme stance was that SIT was verifying the E2E MHHS design, and so anything within the MHHS scope was required for SIT. KG noted that it had been highlighted that some elements of Elexon's design needed to be tested but was not covered in the MHHS design. MH responded that it was not clear what they needed to provide on 23 July 2023 (as per the replan in advance of SIT). KG explained the nature and content of two releases for SIT and the current plan for SIT entry and activity ahead of this. SBe added that the SIT/UIT tables in the slides were there to represent the principles for environments for SIT and UIT and when they would be required (if participants were participating in these areas), and not to provide the detailed environment requirements beneath this or specific for each organisation (this would come in future). MH agreed that the document gave the principles for the environments but not the practical detail, and this needed to be delivered soon given the timeline to 23 July 2023.

### **ACTION TMAG14-01: SB, KG and MH to discuss offline SIT scope and requirements of Elexon**

SBU queried why the environments were required for July, given a SIT start date of October and the cost implications. SBe explained the test plan from the Round 3 replan in the slides, noting this could change given the feedback from Round 3 of consultation. SBe highlighted that feedback from participants had suggested that the SIT participant connectivity proving stage of the plan was too early, too long, and started before it was required. SBe explained that the Programme was intending to make this period shorter and tied to participants' phased entry into CIT. SBU noted it was helpful to know the dates provided were not fixed.

CW moved to make a decision, explaining that v2.2 was a working draft. The document was unanimously approved. CW noted further updates would take place following the Round 3 replan and as and when further detail was known.

### **DECISION TMAG-DEC20: The TMAG approved the update draft version 2.2 of the Environments Approach and Plan**

## 6. The future of TMAG

CW introduced the item and ran through the options for the future of TMAG and their pros/cons as per the slides. CW noted the third option was the Programme's preference. CW invited comments on TMAG member's preferred option.

SBr noted lots of meetings at MHHS and that it was preferable to have fewer meetings, therefore their preference was Option B or C. IHaI noted preference for Option C. LN noted Option B was their current way of working and that Option C would be fine with no major impact (also with a preference for fewer meetings). NW added that the view of Large Suppliers was to work offline to manage voting rights to ensure, as joint representatives, they only had one vote, and so Option B was preferable as both representatives could stay for the duration of the TMAG meeting. IHaI noted a preference for Option B but added that Option C was similar.

CW summarised that Options B and C seemed preferable. CW proposed trying a combination of Option B and C to see how TMAG ran, with co-representatives able to join both halves of the meeting if they wished. It would be up to representatives to talk/vote in their own sections of the meeting. NW noted it would be helpful for representatives to listen in to both halves of the meeting.

**DECISION TMAG-DEC21: The TMAG agreed to maintain the TMAG meeting but to split the meeting in two halves for Test and Migration, with the option of co-representation for each constituency (one representative for each Test and Migration respectively)**

CW explained that they would inform PSG of the decision. MC invited participants to contact PMO if they wished to have co-representation for Test and Migration at TMAG.

CW added that the decision would come into place for the March TMAG and not the extraordinary TMAG for the Data Assessment Report on 23 February.

## 7. Working group progress updates

### Qualification update

AM provided an update on qualification activity at the Qualification and E2E Sandbox Working Group (QWG) as per the slides.

LN highlighted three queries from the Large Supplier constituency:

- 1) On placing reliance, LN explained Large Suppliers had a working assumption and were still awaiting clarification if any change was required from Code Bodies. LN queried when this clarification would come. AM replied that there was close alignment between SIT and qualification, and that the work the Programme was doing on SIT would link in closely to the work Code Bodies were doing (including on Performance Assurance). DM added that the Programme were aware of the importance of a reliance and equivalence policy following feedback via the replan and at the working groups. The Programme had developed some principles together with a timeline for reliance and equivalence, including how this would work for industry. DM noted some of these principles may change the approach to SIT. DM explained the detail would be provided at the SITWG on 16 February. DM added that assumptions had been made and that these needed to be validated so participants could update their plans. This was a Programme priority. LN highlighted that this could significantly change supplier plans for SIT. DM responded that some of the assumptions and principles behind the strategy for SIT had been adjusted following feedback in the replan, and that the Programme approach was different to the Faster Switching Programme (FSP).
- 2) LN noted some significant changes may have been proposed to the content of DBT1 and DBT 2 and that this could result in a significant change and cost for the participants. DM responded that this may have been a misinterpretation of information provided by the Programme, and that the Programme was going to be restating and clarifying this information at the next SITWG. LN noted several participants had interpreted the information in the same way and this could result in a significant change to plans. DM acknowledged the Programme were aware of this and that it needed to be addressed.
- 3) LN noted further guidance had been requested on the level of non-functional testing required as part of PIT. DM responded that there had been some development on this area in the SIT scoping document and that the NFTWG was just about to mobilise. KG added this was why the NFTWG had been stood up now. KG explained there were stated non-functional requirements and that the Programme had gone through to determine if each requirement should be either assured by looking at participant designs or be tested, or both. This would help participants see what needed to be tested in PIT and SIT and when. LN agreed this would

help and would give participants more of an idea of requirements to enter/exit SIT. LN queried if there would be a matrix of each requirement showing what would be expected through PIT and SIT. KG confirmed this was the case and added that there were some items that it did not make sense to test. KG noted the Programme were building test tooling to help participants, such as the DIP simulator (where many participants were already testing) and data generators, but the Programme never intended to provide performance testing simulators. This and other simulators required by participants in PIT would be up to participants to create. The Programme confirmed the first NFTWG was on 21 February.

#### Systems Integration Test Working Group (SITWG)

DM provided an overview of activity at the SITWG as per the slides. This included an update on agenda items for the SITWG on 16 February. DM noted that further work had been undertaken on entering the CIT phase and elements of readiness (such as PIT completion and environments requirements) following feedback via the replanning activity.

#### Non-Functional Testing Working Group (NFTWG)

NH provided an overview of mobilisation of the NFTWG and the agenda of the first meeting as per the slides, noting focus at first would be on PIT non-functional testing. CW invited attendees for the first meeting on 21 February, noting the meeting would be open to all.

### 8. Working group report

CW noted the item as read and invited questions. MH queried if a report on the Migration Design could be included, as this was relevant to topics discussed in TMAG. CW responded that the Migration Design sat under the Design Advisory Group (DAG) but added that it could be included.

<b>ACTION TMAG15-02: Programme PMO to include a Migration Design update in the Working Group Progress report.</b>
---

MH queried if a transition working group would be included under TMAG or under DAG. JB responded that the current proposal was for the Migration Design Subgroup (MDSG) to become a transition design group. The design element would sit under DAG. The Programme was working through extending MDSG meetings and transition work would follow, following the baselining of the Migration Design. There may also be a transition working group that would sit under TMAG and work in a similar way to the Migration Working Group (MWG) now.

### 9. Summary and next steps

MC summarised the actions and decisions as per the table above. CW provided an overview of upcoming meetings as per the slides. CW invited AOBs. None raised. CW closed the meeting.

**Date of next TMAG: 28 February extraordinary meeting**