

MHHS Programme Steering Group (PSG) Minutes and Actions

Issue date: 08/02/2023

Meeting Number	PSG 017	Venue	Virtual – MS Teams
Date and Time	01 February 2023 1000-1230	Classification	Public

Attendees

Chair

Helen Tipton (HT) MHHS SRO

Industry Representatives

Andrew Campbell (AC)	Small Supplier Representative
Andrew Green (AG) as alternate for Gareth Evans	I&C Supplier Representative
Caroline Farquhar (CF)	Consumer Representative
Chris Price (CP)	DNO 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 (KT)	National Grid ESO
Lewis Robertson (LR)	Elexon Representative (Central Systems Provider)

MHHS IM

Andrew Margan (AM)	Governance Manager
Chris Harden (CH)	Programme Director
Chris Welby (CW)	SME, former SRO
Giles Clayden (GC)	Deputy Programme Manager
Jason Brogden (JBr)	Industry SME
Keith Clark (KC)	Programme Manager
Martin Cranfield (MCr)	PMO Governance Lead
Warren Fulton (WF)	Design Project Manager

Other Attendees

Andy MacFaul (AMF)	Observer, Ofgem
Dave Gandee (DG)	MHHS IPA Lead
Jenny Boothe (JBo)	Observer, Ofgem
Mark Corley (MCo)	Exec Sponsor, Avanade
Paul Daniels (PD)	Delivery Lead, Avanade
Paul Brown (PB)	Lead Architect, Avanade
Richard Shilton (RS)	MHHS IPA Lead
Sinead Quinn (SQ)	Observer, Ofgem

Actions

Area	Ref	Action	Owner	Due	Update
Minutes and actions	PSG17-01	Hold discussion offline to provide clarity on the scope of the MHHS baseline and the requirements for making decisions on baselined artefacts and on issues that are deemed to fall outside of the baseline	Programme (Keith Clark, Jason Brogden), DNO Rep (Chris Price)	01/03/23	
Avanade introduction	PSG17-02	Share DIP contact details/point of contact	MHHS PMO	08/02/23	
M5 Work-Off Plan	PSG17-03	Discuss at DAG if the DIP design could result in changes to the MHHS core design, and if so, the likely timelines for changes to the core design to be delivered	Programme	01/03/23	
Replan	PSG17-04	Share how the Programme may communicate updates to the plan as a result of Round 3 consultation, to participants, ahead of any re-plan Change Request	Programme (Keith Clark)	01/03/23	
Benefits Realisation Plan	PSG17-05	Review the post-implementation approach to Benefits Realisation and how Benefits Realisation will be handed over to Ofgem at M16	Programme (Jason Brogden)	To be reviewed at Control Point 2	
Change Control	PSG17-06	Get DAG view on CR015 as input to any decision PSG may make	Programme	01/03/23	
Working Group engagement	PSG17-07	Discuss possible improvements to Programme approach to distribution lists	Programme PMO, RECCO Representative (Jon Hawkins)	01/03/23	
	PSG17-08	Discuss Small Supplier engagement with the Small Supplier Representative and Ofgem (e.g. engagement requirements, materiality/impact of low engagement, and ways to improve engagement)	Programme	01/03/23	
Open actions from previous meetings	PSG14-10	Support the Programme to identify Large, Small and I&C Supplier representatives for TMAG	Relevant Supplier Representatives	07/12/22	Large Supplier Representative seat resolved. Further action required for Small and I&C Suppliers
	PSG15-01	Progress work on customer segments in migration at the	Programme (Jason Brogden)	01/03/23	Incorporated in Migration Design activity and

Area	Ref	Action	Owner	Due	Update
		Migration Design Subgroup (MDSG)			expected to be brought to the MWG in February. Suggest kept open until there are conclusions
	PSG16-05	Speak to RECCo, Elexon and ESO to compare OSMs to the MHHS Programme's contact list	Programme PPC	01/02/23	PPC are in discussion with RECCo, Elexon and ESO

Decisions

Area	Ref	Decision
Minutes	PSG-DEC35	The PSG approved the minutes of the 11 January 2023 PSG
Benefits Realisation Plan	PSG-DEC36	The PSG approved version 0.7 of the Benefits Realisation Plan
Change Control	PSG-DEC37	The PSG approved Change Request CR013
	PSG-DEC38	The PSG agreed to raise CR015 to Impact Assessment

Minutes

1. Welcome

HT welcomed all to the meeting, noting Avanaide joining from the new DIP provider.

2. Minutes and Actions Review

DECISION PSG-DEC35: The PSG approved the minutes of the 07 December 2022 PSG

HT invited approval of the minutes of the previous meeting. CP noted a discussion at the last meeting where PSG had clarified that the TOM baseline was what the Programme was working to, and that everything else was under the Programme change control process. CP asked for a high-level clarification on what the change control process was and how changes were impact assessed and consumer impacts were considered. CP noted that the information shared by the Programme explained the approach to migration options while other decisions, such as Push/Pull decisions with the DIP, were unclear.

KC responded that the process for Change Control and impact assessment was clear and clarified that CP's comments were not referring to changes to the change process and how changes were made, but that there was still ambiguity as to what elements of the design were part of the original baseline and what were not. KC noted that this is design specific and could not comment fully. CP agreed and added that it would be helpful for the wider DNO constituency to know what process is going to follow in certain circumstances. CP highlighted the Push/Pull example could be useful to explore this. KC suggested to take this discussion offline. HT responded that the Programme would take this as an action, and highlighted even though she would have preferred this to have been resolved at DAG, it was important to have been raised now at PSG so an action can be taken and shared back, allowing for clarity and no ambiguity on the issue.

ACTION PSG17-01: Hold discussion offline to provide clarity on the scope of the MHHS baseline and the requirements for making decisions on baselined artefacts

CP noted that the same points had been raised at the DAG and that they did not want to let the issue lie if there was still remaining ambiguity. JH noted that not all artefacts were design artefacts and so this issue was relevant to other

areas of the programme (e.g. testing and code drafting artefacts), to ensure the governance groups knew what artefacts were baselined and how changes to these were being managed. HT agreed and noted this would be included in the action.

3. Sponsor update

JBo introduced the item noting she was currently filling the Sponsor role. JBo highlighted a number of key items in the Sponsor update slide. This included that BEIS had a key interest in MHHS as MHHS was seen as an enabler to a vast number of their strategic projects. JBo noted there had been significant engagement with BEIS and a quarterly HH Sponsor group had now been established to cover strategic thinking on the nature of the market the Programme will go live in. JBo noted the need to have certainty on the design and welcomed the progress of the design Work-Off Plan. JBo noted the importance of explicit Change Requests that progress quickly through the Programme Change Control process, in order to provide certainty to participants on the design baseline. Regarding the Programme plan, JBo highlighted the importance of industry engagement and detailed information to develop a viable, credible plan that was bought into by participants. JBo noted it was encouraging that there were a number of volunteers for Systems Integration Testing (SIT) and the Minimum Viable Cohort (MVC) already. This would help de-risk SIT.

4. Avanade introduction

CH noted that the Programme had signed the Data Integration Platform (DIP) contract and that they were pleased to announce that the DIP provider was Avanade. CH introduced members of Avanade.

MCo introduced themselves noting they were excited to join MHHS and deliver their DIP plan. MCo introduced Avanade and members of the Avanade team, as per the slides. MCo invited PSG members to engage with Avanade via the PPC. MCo noted the team had delivered similar projects several times and had extensive experience in Energy and Utilities.

PD introduced themselves and their role in the DIP as per the slides, noting they would be working closely with participants as well as the SRO and LDP. PD provided an overview of the DIP DBT plan as per the slides. PD explained that the DIP team had been working in the background across January, with 30 team members on board and well-mobilised. Kick-off sessions had been held and were ongoing. PD explained the team was split into distinct workstreams (e.g. securities team) that would be working together to deliver the design. The DIP design would be delivered by the end of April. Build activities would be kicked off in parallel. A key milestone was for the build of PIT testing at the end of July, with formal PIT being delivered in the following months ahead of the start of SIT in October. PD noted they were looking forward to working with the Programme and invited engagement from industry.

PB noted they had been working on the MHHS DIP journey since April 2022 and that it was exciting to now be working on the Programme properly. PB provided an overview of the DIP technology approach, noting Avanade were predominantly a Microsoft consultancy and so would mainly be using Microsoft Azure for the DIP. PB provided an overview of the technology approach as per the slides.

CH thanked Avanade for their overview and explained that the Programme were looking forward to working with them. CH noted Avanade had already begun work and were focused on M9. CH highlighted a webinar was planned for the end of February.

CP explained that there were a large number of questions from DNOs regarding the DIP and queried these should be raised, so these could be factored into the DIP webinar. Members from Avanade and the Programme felt this could be the PMO or PPC but noted it would be clarified. HT reiterated the welcome to Avanade and the plan to hit M9.

ACTION PSG17-02: Share DIP point of contact

PA queried if the webinar would go into the detail of how participants would interact and connect with the DIP, as this was not presented on the DIP DBT plan. PD responded that they were in discussion with the Programme on this and that they were currently intending to have two webinars, one introductory and one on the technical side (should there be demand). PD noted they would work with the programme to schedule these.

GW noted a question from Large Suppliers at what point programme parties would see amendments to the core design as a result of the DIP, as these amendments would be needed for their own design. GW asked for timelines.

ACTION PSG17-03: Discuss at DAG if the DIP design could result in changes to the MHHS core design, and if so, the likely timelines for changes to the core design to be delivered

5. Status updates

M5 Work-Off Plan

WF provided a status update of the Design Work-Off Plan as per the slides. WF noted that following the Work-Off Plan consultation, further activity had taken place via the comments process. WF highlighted that 102 comments had been received from participants and that the Programme had responded to them all and provided updates during the assurance review. WF added that all comments were available for participants to view.

WF stated the Design assurance review meeting was held on 27 January, where participants had the final opportunity to query the design. The assurance meeting was well attended (90+ participants) and comments were received on 11 of the Work-Off items. WF added that 80% of the Work-Off items had no comments, which was a positive outcome. After the meeting, the Programme shared a report on the discussion at the assurance review. WF explained the report detailed participant views on the 11 Work-Off items, and the Programme's suggested next steps and rationale.

WF explained that at DAG on 01 February the Programme would be asking the DAG to make a decision to sign off the Work-Off plan ahead of the full re-baselined artefacts to be released on 08 February. WF reiterated the importance of achieving a full baseline and moving the baseline into the Change Control process. WF added that after the Work-Off Plan was signed off, any further change to the design would be controlled by Programme change governance. WF explained this was to protect participants who had commenced DBT and maintain the integrity of the design. WF reminded meeting attendees that the Programme's role in not only facilitating the design but also to ensure it is integrated, holistic and in accordance to the Target Operating Model (TOM) in delivering long-term consumer benefits.

WF noted a lot of lessons had been learned through the design process that these had been transferred into the Migration Design work and the code drafting work. WF thanked industry for their engagement and challenge. WF noted that, due to the low number of comments, the Programme hoped the Work-Off Plan would be approved by DAG on 01 February and that they felt it was the right time to move the artefacts into Change Control.

CP agreed with WF's comments on sentiment and agreed that there would need to be a point where the Programme decided to baseline the design. CP noted that the Programme needed to be careful to move all of the design into Change Control at the right time. CP walked through a slide shared with the Programme and highlighted a number of queries and comments that St Clements required clarification on. CP explained that St Clements wanted the unresolved items to be quickly sorted, given the ambiguity there was now, and that it would be more efficient to resolve these queries now before the artefacts were baselined, rather than go through Change Control. CP noted a mis-match between the DNO view and the Programme. HT responded that it sounded like the content CP had shared was being worked on and was for DAG to discuss. HT thanked CP for their comments and for the visibility to PSG. CP added that there was some chunky detail to the information they were sharing which meant it was important to manage them carefully (rather than rush into baselining artefacts). JR added that iDNOs were supportive of the comments provided by CP and, while they were conscious this was a DAG matter, they wanted to reiterate the importance of visibility of these areas and that these are areas get resolved.

WF responded that the assurance meeting was the opportunity to raise these final challenges, and only 16 comments were raised by St Clements ahead of this. WF noted it was for DAG to unpick but that they would question the validity of each of the comments raised. HT noted the Programme needed to draw a line under the design at some point and that, if these things hadn't been uncovered yet, they did need to be addressed.

GW noted they supported CP's and JR's comments as Large Suppliers had some areas they were awaiting clarification on. GW added that it was important to learn lessons and baseline artefacts at the appropriate time. HT reiterated the importance of working at the 'lowest possible' working group and referred the discussion to DAG to explore further.

Round 3 replan consultation

KC noted the SIT status slide had been rapidly developed following close of the Round 3 consultation on 31 January. KC noted the 75 responses to the consultation was excellent and thanked participants. KC highlighted generally very good engagement across industry and explained that the Programme would be working through the responses in the coming weeks. KC noted there was a strong interest in SIT, with more participants expressing interest than expected (particularly at this early stage). KC explained the Programme was confident there would be enough participants for SIT. KC noted a large number of plans provided as part of the consultation that would input into the decision to unconditionally approve M3 at March PSG and these would be reviewed over the coming days. KC explained the Core Capability Provider status as per the slide, noting the RAGs related to the PSG dashboards and that the Programme continued to work closely with these providers. KC added that the Programme had added statements on the requirements for LDSOs and 'early adopters' and that this was being managed carefully by the Programme, included through RAID.

KC reiterated the positive picture from Round 3 consultation. KC added that the Working Groups were working through the detail of the plan and encouraged participants to engage there to develop the detail of the plan, inform their own plans, and provide confidence to Ofgem on the final plan.

KC provided an overview of the plan on a page for the next steps for delivering the replan. This included engaging Ofgem early, so they would be in a good position to review and approve the replan Change Request in April.

GW agreed that the response level was good and queried what could be expected and when in relation to further communications – when could participants expect to see further detailed output on what would be happening. KC responded that the Programme would be led to some extent by participant engagement through Working Group conversations. The Programme did not expect the delivery approach to change drastically (rather the detail of elements in the plan, developed via the Working Groups) and that participants needed to engage with the working groups to understand the detail of the plan through these. KC noted the Programme would be looking to share the plan at the earliest opportunity but that this depended on the outputs of the Working Groups where assumptions would be being tested. KC noted the Programme had been considering further methods of engagement with industry ahead of the replan Change Request. Hence, participants should engage via the Working Groups for now and the Programme would do further thinking on engagement sessions by constituency to explain the Programme plan closer to the Change Request.

ACTION PSG17-04: Share how the Programme may communicate updates to the plan as a result of Round 3 consultation, to participants, ahead of any re-plan Change Request

6. Benefits Realisation Plan (BRP)

JBr introduced the item and walked through the context for the Benefits Realisation Plan, the action taken on Benefits since last presented at PSG, and next steps for benefits realisation (including from the outputs of Control Point 1). HT invited questions.

JBo noted the content was very helpful and that a number of benefits were being realised post-M16. JBo queried if the Programme had a concept of hyper-care in a post-implementation phase, as some of the benefits may be realised in a phase after the milestone. JBo noted some benefits would require some time before they would be realised and that the nature of the market at the time of go-live was unknown. JBr responded that the majority of the Benefits Realisation Plan was facilitating benefits that would come later and it was highlighted in the BRP that discussion with Ofgem was required on how Ofgem would monitor the realisation of those benefits once the Programme was closed down. JBr added that Success Measure 4 was related to hyper-care and that the Programme was recognising that a hyper-care period should be entered after M16 (although this was not yet worked through).

KC added that the Programme scope was not to realise benefits, but the Programme had set up Programme outcomes for how benefits realisation may be enabled. KC added that the Programme was proposing methods to track benefits after the Programme was disbanded but realising the benefits themselves were out of scope. JBo agreed with KC's comments and noted their question was more on post-implementation hyper-care/wash-up, as this was not spelt out as a phase of the programme. JBr responded that some Success Measures could not be measured in an interim basis and so the Programme would be working with Ofgem on how these may be measured on an ongoing basis.

CP noted the plan made sense and could be understood. CP queried Programme costs and future costs after M16, and came back to their earlier points about change. CP noted that the benefits case was based on the original Ofgem documentation, and queried if future changes have a cost-benefit analysis and impact assessment that would be referenced back to this documentation, in a similar way to the Faster Switching Programme (FSP). KC responded that the Change Control process included Impact Assessment against Programme benefits, outcomes and costs, and so KC felt the change process covered these areas (and how it relates to the BRP). JBr added the Change Control process also considered consumer impacts. CP responded that the original assumptions in the Ofgem business case had low costs for LDSOs in the BRP and felt that this position had changed significantly.

JR queried the long-term benefits. Most benefits would be realised a few years after Programme go-live. JR queried how the £4.6b of benefits of the Programme from the original business case would be measured. JR queried if there would be tracking against the benefits. JR noted they had seen nothing had come out of FSP to demonstrate the benefits had been realised. JR added that it would be good as a Programme to be able to recommend some steps to ensure benefit tracking did not drop-off. JBo noted Ofgem were taking the tracking of benefits for FSP internally as the FSP Programme was now stood down. JBo explained this was a broader issue for how the regulator assessed the impacts of significant market change. JBo noted JR's point was valid and that there would need to be time for the

benefits to be included and the nature of the market may be different, with strategic discussions ongoing with BEIS. JBo noted Ofgem would be thinking about how benefits would be tracked/measured.

KTL queried how and when participants would be coming together to understand when and how benefits would be realised, particularly given the changing market. KTL noted some additional benefits highlighted by ESO that could be included. HT responded that there was a handover plan to Ofgem in the BRP.

ACTION PSG17-05: Review the post-implementation approach to Benefits Realisation and how Benefits Realisation will be handed over to Ofgem at M16

DECISION PSG-DEC36: The PSG approved version 0.7 of the Benefits Realisation Plan

7. Change Control

CR013

JBr walked through the outputs of CR013 Impact Assessment as per the slides. JBr walked through the Programme's response to the Change Request for a collaborative delivery approach via a Working Group. JBr highlighted additional scope requests received via the Impact Assessment process (e.g. DUoS billing and energy volume volatility) that should be considered by the Working Group. JB noted the proposal to PSG was to accept the change and to progress via the delivery approach. JB added that a concern was raised on the Programme having sufficient resources, and so the programme were suggesting an ask to industry for market analysis resource to be provided by industry to support the Working Group.

JBo queried what was being changed and what the change was delivering, and if this required changes to the governance structure. JBr responded that the Programme did not originally have in the scope of the Programme a piece of work to understand the commercial impacts of MHHS. JBr noted the work gave opportunity to understand the potential impact (e.g. materiality, volatility) so participants could prepare future positions (e.g. trading, forecasting) that may occur as a result of MHHS. JBr noted it was a risk mitigation. HT explained this was not a change to the governance arrangements. JBo responded that they believed this was the next level of detail beneath Ofgem's original costings and that they were supportive of the change. CW added that the Change Request was to scope the work (such as data requirements), and as a result of the scoping, there may be another Change Request to actually deliver the work (inc resources etc).

DECISION PSG-DEC37: The PSG approved Change Request CR013

CR015

GW explained that the Change Request had been raised last week and gone to Change Board on 31 January. The CR was requesting to change the load shaping service to detail with the impact of E7 and E10 customers. Change Board had discussed whether this was a DAG or PSG change and decided to bring it to PSG as there was a risk it could impact M9 and delay the start of SIT, and possibly by more than three months which would be an Ofgem decision. CW explained that the decision for PSG was to approve whether the change should go to Impact Assessment.

JH queried if the change would come back to PSG for decision regardless of the impact on M9. CW responded that it would be a PSG decision, based on current governance (i.e. should PSG agree they own the change and it should be raised to Impact Assessment). CW noted that PSG could push the Change Request down to DAG, if there was no impact on M9. CW added that the view of DAG could be gained. JH responded they felt it would be better to go to DAG and that the view of DAG would be useful. CW responded the programme could ask for DAG's input.

ACTION PSG17-06: Get DAG view on CR015 as input to any decision PSG may make

JBo queried why the Programme made the decision to do a Change Request, and not an impact assessment first. CW responded that it has been discussed at DAG and the outcome was that a Change Request needed to be raised. GW explained that DAG felt they had discussed as much as they could and needed a more formal impact assessment, hence agreed the change should be raised as a Change Request to take the work outside of the Work-Off Plan. GW added that this is the process the Programme has been advised to go down. CH explained that the baseline decision is to 'do nothing', however there were four or five options in the design discussions that had been consolidated into two options in the CR that have now been raised to go to impact assessment. JBo queried the Programme timelines with the Change Request and questioned whether the implications for the Change Request decision were factored into the plan. CW clarified that a decision will be made as a result of the Change Request on what to do.

CP noted several options originally discussed at DAG for the solution required in the Change Request. CP noted this was a supplier problem with a risk DNOs were also concerned about. The two solutions that were written in the

Change Request were either the suppliers do something, or it is collaborative with MPRS. CP noted they felt all options should be presented in the Change Request (not just the two solutions currently in it). CW noted this was the Change Request as raised and that CP's comments could be raised as part of their Impact Assessment of the change. HT noted this discussion may not be for PSG. GW responded that originally there was an expectation the Change Request would be raised by the Programme, but that once a Change Request was required to be raised by Large Suppliers, the change was created based on the options for the constituency raising it. GW noted others could raise their own Change Requests. CP qualified that this was an inherent challenge with the change process where the request was as raised by the raiser and could not be changed retrospectively. HT noted the Impact Assessment would consider these and others' views. HT noted the Independent Programme Assurer's (IPA) view would be useful.

DECISION PSG-DEC38: The PSG agreed to raise CR015 to Impact Assessment

CR016

CW explained the Change Request was for changes to the Change Control Approach to incorporate design change process, as per the slides. CW added the Change Request was had been implemented as a house-keeping change through Change Board. JH asked when the updated documents would be out. CW stated these were likely to be already on the Collaboration Base and MC highlighted they would be communicated via The Clock.

8. Working Group engagement

MC explained the summary of Working Group engagement analysis, as per the slide. MC added there was an amendment to the slide that while not all constituencies are expected to engage at every group, the Programme still believed under-representation of parties may be a concern. JR queried whether it would be useful for the programme to share evidence on the impact of constituencies not being at certain working groups. JR added that some iDNOs are small and therefore do not have resource to send to Working Groups. KC responded that the programme was generally not singling out certain constituency groups, however in this specific case more direct engagement between the Programme and LDSOs, via the Working Groups, would be helpful in managing risks in reaching M10.

GW queried if there was information on how long Working Groups were expected to be stood up for. MC clarified that this was available in a document previously shared.

JH queried if it was possible to rationalise and simplify the Programme distribution lists. MC asked if there is something specific to change and took an action to discuss this offline with JH.

ACTION PSG17-07: Discuss possible improvements to Programme approach to distribution lists

In reference to the above, AC noted that Small Suppliers were light on resource (e.g. their teams were not dedicated to MHHS, and being stretched by other government programmes and initiatives). Furthermore, AC highlighted issues with the Faster Switching Programme closure taking longer than expected and causing engagement at monthly Small Supplier calls to drop. AC added to JH's point on the simplifying of distribution lists that there was a large number of emails and volume of information from the Programme that was complex and hard to navigate. AC had the view that the Programme could simplify artefacts and provide summary positions. AC highlighted he would welcome engagement from the Programme and Ofgem to improve the engagement of Small Suppliers and understand the materiality of lack of engagement for Small Suppliers at some Working Groups. JH explained that it came back to what the potential consequences of Small Suppliers not engaging was.

ACTION PSG17-08: Discuss Small Supplier engagement with the Small Supplier Representative and Ofgem (e.g. engagement requirements, materiality/impact of low engagement, and ways to improve engagement)

9. Delivery dashboards

HT invited questions on the Delivery Dashboards. None received.

10. Summary and next steps

HT moved back to the actions table and updated against the open actions as per the slides. HT invited comments on the actions. None received.

HT noted the 01 March meeting would be in-person and an extraordinary PSG would be scheduled for 08 March on the replan, noting earlier discussion on early sight of the replan changes.

JH queried the agenda item on the governance of the Testing and Migration Advisory Group (TMAG) and if a Change Request would be raised. CW explained four options that would be going to TMAG and so the PSG should await the outputs of TMAG from which a Change Request may be raised, should a change to the governance framework be required.

CP noted a migration design plan had been released. CP noted this was important and that previously there were previews for what the design would look like but now there would only be five days to comment on the design ahead of approval. CP noted there were no iterative review/comment loops ahead of approval. CP noted it would be good to squeeze in either a preview or a way of seeing the outputs of comments and the changes that have been made. HT noted this would be considered.

HT wrapped up by highlighting there were many aspects from the meeting that the Programme would look to focus on to ensure smooth discussion at PSG, and that the Programme may look to the IPA for their viewpoints on this. HT also noted the Programme needed to be clearer on Change Control processes in order to reduce debate in decision-making forums and ended by re-emphasising the positivity in how many parties responded to the Re-plan consultation.

Date of next PSG: in-person, 01 March 2023 (note, extraordinary PSG also to be schedule for 08 March)