**Change Request Form**

## Change Request details

|  |
| --- |
| Change Request details |
| Change Request Title | Programme proposal to restructure TMAG in the MHHS Governance Framework and other housekeeping updates |
| Change Request Number | CR035 |
| Originating Advisory / Working Group | Programme Steering Group (PSG)  |
| Risk/issue reference | N/A |
| Change Raiser | Amy Clayton, MHHS PMO | Date raised: | 13/11/23 |

***For further guidance on how to complete this document please see the supporting Change Request Form Guidance for Programme Participants. The guidance will support raising a change and responding to a change request via Impact Assessment. The Change Raiser should consider sharing the draft Change Request Form with impacted programme parties, prior to submission to PMO. The guidance, as well as other key documents are referenced below and can be found via the MHHS website.***

|  |
| --- |
| Change Request to be read in conjunction with: |
| MHHS Change Request Form Guidance for Programme Participants |
| MHHS Change Control Approach |
| MHHS Governance Framework |
| Ofgem’s MHHS Transition Timetable |

### Part A – Description of proposed change

**Guidance *– This section should be completed by the Change Raiser when raising the Change Request.***

|  |
| --- |
| Part A – Description of proposed change |
| **Issue statement:***(what is the issue that needs to be resolved by the change)*This Programme Change Request (CR) proposes updates are made to the MHHS Programme Governance Framework in relation to the following:1. Proposed restructure of the Testing and Migration Advisory Group (TMAG)
2. Addition of clarity on MHHS escalation and appeals processes

Issue statements for the proposed updates are detailed below.1. Proposed restructure of the Testing and Migration Advisory Group (TMAG)

TMAG currently covers Testing, Migration, Qualification, and oversees 8 L4 Working Groups. As SIT testing commences, there will be a greater need to focus on this with quick turn arounds needed on decisions. Migration will also increase in pace as M10 approaches and will require more dedicated Advisory Group time. Qualification will be running in parallel to testing and needs to move at pace to support those involved to hit timelines required of them. Therefore, TMAG is covering too much to be an effective governance forum and separating TMAG would be appropriate.1. Addition of clarity on MHHS escalation and appeals processes

At the Programme Steering Group (PSG) held 08 November 2023, the PSG agreed recommendations following a review of existing Programme appeals mechanisms. One recommendation was to update the Governance Framework to improve the clarity and visibility of escalation and appeals mechanisms in relation to decisions made via MHHS governance.  |
| **Description of change:***(what is the change you are proposing)*1. Proposed restructure of the Testing and Migration Advisory Group (TMAG)

The Testing and Migration Advisory Group (TMAG) is to be separated into three different Advisory Groups. The three Advisory Groups will be the SIT Advisory Group (SITAG), the Migration & Cutover Advisory Group (MCAG) and the Qualification Advisory Group (QAG). PSG has discussed and agreed this proposal in principle. The new Advisory Groups will be Level 3 groups, reporting into PSG, and will be decision-making groups. The SIT Advisory Group will focus on SIT Testing with the following L4 Working Groups under it: Data Working Group (DWG), Environments Working Group (EWG), Systems Integration & Testing Working Group (SITWG), Non-Functional Testing Working Group (NFTWG), and work closely with Fast Track Implementation Group (FTIG). It will include testing representatives only and be chaired by the Programme. The SITAG would have constituency representation identical to that of the current TMAG. The Migration and Cutover Advisory Group (MCAG) will focus on delivering the Migration and Cutover strategy, with the following L4 Working Groups under it: Migration Working Group (MWG), Data Cleanse Working Group (DCWG) and Transition & Operational Readiness Working Group (TORWG). This group will be chaired by the Programme. The constituency representation would be;* Domestic supplier
* I&C supplier
* LDSO
* Supplier Agent
* Elexon (Helix)
* DCC
* Elexon (code)
* RECCo
* and observers from IPA, Ofgem and a Consumer Representative.

The Qualification Advisory Group (QAG) will focus on delivery of Qualification with a L4 LDSO WG and First Qualification Tranche Working Group to be mobilised under it. It will include relevant Code Bodies and constituency representatives from parties who need to qualify (e.g. Suppliers, Agents, LDSOs) This group will be chaired by the Programme, but notes some decisions will sit with BSC and REC PABs. The Constituency representation would be;* Large supplier
* Medium supplier
* Small supplier
* I&C supplier
* DNO
* IDNO
* Supplier Agent
* BSCCo (Qualification Body)
* RECCo,(Qualification Body)
* and observers from IPA, Ofgem and a Consumer representative.

The MHHS Programme Governance Framework is to be updated with the new TMAG restructure of three different Advisory Groups and updates to the management of L3 Terms of Reference and meeting outputs.1. Addition of clarity on MHHS escalation and appeals processes

Updates will be made the MHHS Programme Governance Framework to improve clarity around escalations and appeals against decisions taken via MHHS governance. Updates will include reference to the Independent Programme Assurance (IPA) decision appeals approach and criteria and on the finality of appeals. The recommendations for the proposed updates were agreed by the PSG on 08 November 2023 and further information on the review of MHHS appeals mechanisms can be found within the PSG meeting papers [here](https://www.mhhsprogramme.co.uk/programme-information/programme-steering-group). |
| **Justification for change:***(please attach any evidence to support your justification)*1. Proposed restructure of the Testing and Migration Advisory Group (TMAG)

The approval of the TMAG restructuring must be reflected in the MHHS Governance Framework so that the Framework accurately defines MHHS Programme governance arrangements and Programme Participants can transparently see the purpose of each group. The separation will ensure the MHHS governance is less complex and makes the approval process more streamlined. 1. Addition of clarity on MHHS escalation and appeals processes

The addition of clarity within the MHHS Governance Framework on appeals supports the accessibility and visibility of the IPA’s appeals approach and supports due process regarding the rights of participants to challenge decisions made through Programme governance. The PSG have agreed the recommendation that updates are made to the MHHS Governance Framework and this must now be reflected within the document. |
| **Consequences of no change:***(what is the consequence of no change)*1. The MHHS Governance Framework will not accurately reflect the required governance structure needed to support Programme delivery – this could impact decision making ability and the capacity of the existing structure to support the Programme adequately. Additionally, the framework will not be fit for purpose, which could result in a lack of clarity among Programme Participants.
2. There will be a lack of visibility, accessibility, and transparency over the approach to appeals against decisions taken via MHHS governance.
 |
| **Alternative options:***(What alternative options or mitigations that have been considered)*To leave the MHHS Governance Framework, and TMAG structure, unchanged. |
| **Risks associated with potential change:***(what risks related to implementation of the proposed change have been identified)*1. Risk related to dual governance for Programme Artefacts that impact more than one of the new Advisory Groups and duplication between Advisory Groups.
2. No risks identified, the proposed updates provide additional clarity and certainty and support the visibility of due process.
 |
| **Stakeholders consulted on the potential change:***(Please document the stakeholders, or stakeholder groups that have been consulted to date on this change. The Change Raiser should consult with relevant programme parties in the drafting of the request, prior to submission to PMO).*PSG members and their constituents (via constituency reps at this group). |
| **Target date by which a decision is required:** | PSG on 06 December 2023 |

### Part B – Initial Impact of proposed change

**Guidance *– This section should be completed by the Change Raiser before being submitted to the MHHS PMO.***

***Please document the benefits of the change and to delivery of the programme objectives***

|  |
| --- |
| What benefits does the change bring |
| *(list the benefits of the change and how this improves the business case)*1. The separation of TMAG will enable the Programme to be more effective in governance, focus time on more specific areas and deliver at pace. By approving this change, the MHHS Governance Framework will accurately define the MHHS Programme governance arrangements and Programme Participants can transparently see the purpose and structure of each group.
2. The inclusion of clarity on appeals mechanisms provides enhanced transparency and certainty for participants who may wish to challenge decisions taken via MHHS governance.
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Programme Objective | Benefit to delivery of the programme objective |
| To deliver the Design Working Group’s Target Operating Model (TOM) covering the ‘Meter to Bank’ process for all Supplier Volume Allocation Settlement meters | Delivered to a higher standard than if the Programme did not update the MHHS Governance Framework to reflect the TMAG restructure.Supports the right of Programme Participants to appeal decisions made via Programme governance. |
| To deliver services to support the revised Settlement Timetable in line with the Design Working Group’s recommendation | This change does not impact this objective. |
| To implement all related Code changes identified under Ofgem’s Significant Code Review (SCR) | This change does not impact this objective.  |
| To implement MHHS in accordance with the MHHS Implementation Timetable | Delivered to a higher standard than if the Programme did not update the MHHS Governance Framework to reflect the TMAG restructure. Supports the right of Programme Participants to appeal decisions made via Programme governance. |
| To deliver programme capabilities and outcomes to enable the realisation of benefits in compliance with Ofgem’s Full Business Case | Delivered to a higher standard than if the Programme did not update the MHHS Governance Framework to reflect the TMAG restructure.Supports the right of Programme Participants to appeal decisions made via Programme governance. |
| To prove and provide a model for future such industry-led change programmes | Delivered to a higher standard than if the Programme did not update the MHHS Governance Framework to reflect the TMAG restructure. |

**Guidance *– Please document the known programme parties and programme deliverables that may be impacted by the proposed change***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Impacted areas | Impacted items |
| Impacted Parties | All Programme Parties participating in TMAG and associated governance groups. All Programme participants impacted by decisions taken via MHHS governance. |
| Impacted Deliverables | Updated Governance Framework.  |
| Impacted Milestones | *n/a* |

**Note *– Please refer to MHHS DEL174 Change Request Guidance for Programme Participants for information on how to score the initial assessment.***

|  |
| --- |
| Initial assessment |
| Necessity of change |  | Expected lead time |  |
| Rationale of change |  | Expected implementation window |  |
| Expected change impact |  |  |  |

**Guidance *– Please include a reference and link to any additional documentation which the change relates to.***

|  |
| --- |
| Change Request to be read in conjunction with: |
| **Title** | **Reference** |
| PSG 08 November Papers  | ***MHHS-DEL1874*** |
|  |  |

### Part C.1 – Summary of Impact Assessment

### Note – *This section will be completed initially by the Change Raiser and then by Programme Participants as part of the full Impact Assessment.*

### *All Impact Assessment responses will be considered public and non-confidential unless otherwise marked. If there are any specific elements of the response (e.g. costs) that are confidential, please mark the specific sections as confidential rather than the response as a whole. The MHHS Programme will publish all Impact Assessment responses and redact any confidential information as noted.*

**Guidance – Programme Participants are required to:**

**Respond with ‘Agree’, ‘Disagree’ or ‘Abstain’, deleting as appropriate. If the respondent agrees, they can provide additional evidence to further support the assessment. If the respondent disagrees or abstains, they should provide a detailed rationale as to why.**

**Add any additional effects that have not already been identified. In doing so, they should provide as much detail as possible to allow a robust assessment to be made.**

**Proceed to Part C.2 for Impact Assessment Recommendation response once completed.**

|  |
| --- |
| Part C.1 – Summary of Impact Assessment (complete as appropriate) |
| **Effect on benefits**1. *Positively impacted as outputs of TMAG and its effective governance are likely to be better than if it was not split.*
2. *No direct impact on benefits.*
 |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
| *Impact Assessment respondents to add supporting commentary to support their selection. Where possible, Impact Assessment respondents to identify and describe any further impacts.**Impact Assessment respondents should consider and provide detail of any additional effect e.g. whether there will be an impact on when a benefit will be realised; who will realise the benefit; the extent to which the benefit will be realised.* *Where possible, contextual information should be included e.g. the benefit will be delayed by X weeks; the change means Y population will also realise the benefit.* |
| **Effect on consumers**1. *Positively impacted as outputs of TMAG and its effective governance are likely to be better than if it was not split.*
2. *No direct impact on consumers.*
 |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
| *Impact Assessment respondents to add supporting commentary to support their selection. Where possible, Impact Assessment respondents to identify and describe any further impacts.**Impact Assessment respondents should consider and provide detail of any additional effect e.g. whether there will be an impact on service delivery to consumers; will there be a cost impact to consumers; will there be a choice impact to consumers?* *Where possible, contextual information should be included e.g. what is the scale of the effect? Will the effect be permanent?* |
| **Effect on schedule**1. *As there will be a greater number of Advisory Groups, Programme Participants may need to attend more meetings and their resourcing considerations may be affected as a result.*
2. *No impacts on schedule identified.*
 |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
| *Impact Assessment respondents to add supporting commentary to support their selection. Where possible, Impact Assessment respondents to identify and describe any further impacts.**Impact Assessment respondents should consider and provide detail of any additional effect e.g. will the schedule/milestones be directly impacted; will the schedule/milestones be indirectly impacted.* *Where possible, contextual information should be included e.g. the change will delay the project by X days; the change will require additional resource to complete (though detail resource in resource section); the delay can/cannot be recovered by condensing Y activity.* |
| **Effect on costs**1. *As there will be a greater number of Advisory Groups, Programme Participants may need to attend more meetings and their resourcing considerations may be affected as a result.*
 |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
| *Impact Assessment respondents to add supporting commentary to support their selection. Where possible, Impact Assessment respondents to identify and describe any further impacts.**Impact Assessment respondents should consider and provide detail of any additional effect e.g. will the change cause a loss of income; will the change cause additional cost; will the change cause a reprofiling of cost?* *Where possible, contextual information should be included e.g. whether it is capital or operating expenditure that will be affected; what period costs will be affected in; what the rough order of magnitude of the cost impact will be and if organisation will be able to absorb it?* |
| **Effect on resources**1. *As there will be a greater number of Advisory Groups, Programme Participants may need to attend more meetings and their resourcing considerations may be affected as a result.*
 |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
| *Impact Assessment respondents to add supporting commentary to support their selection. Where possible, Impact Assessment respondents to identify and describe any further impacts.* *Impact Assessment respondents should consider and provide detail of any additional effect e.g. will there be an impact on tools or equipment; will there be an impact on staff capacity; will there be an impact on staff skills or capability?* *Where possible, contextual information should be included e.g. the change will require X additional staff for Y period of time; the change requires Z training or support.* |
| **Effect on contract***It is not envisaged that this Change Request will have an impact on contracts.*  |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
| *Impact Assessment respondents to add supporting commentary to support their selection. Where possible, Impact Assessment respondents to identify and describe any further impacts.* *Impact Assessment respondents should consider and provide detail of any additional effect e.g. whether there will be an impact on contracts with sub-contractors; whether there will be an impact on contracts with vendors; whether there will be an impact on contracts with regulators/ESO.* *Where possible, contextual information should be included e.g. the changes will require new contracts to be created; the changes will variations to existing contracts; the changes will affect ability to meet contract requirements.* |
| **Risks**1. *There is a risk that creating more governance groups could impact PPs resourcing profiles and causes capacity issues.*
 |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
| *Impact Assessment respondents to add supporting commentary to support their selection. Where possible, Impact Assessment respondents to identify and describe any further impacts.* *Impact Assessment respondents should consider and provide detail of any additional effect e.g. will existing risks be affected; will new risks be created?**Where possible, contextual information should be included e.g. the change will affect the likelihood of a risk occurring, the change will affect the impact the risk would have, the change will require additional controls and mitigation.* |

### Part C.2 – Impact Assessment Recommendation

### Note – *This section must be completed initially by the Change Raiser and then by Programme Participants as part of the full Impact Assessment.*

**Guidance – The primary reporting metric of the Impact Assessment is the recommendation response. The consolidated response will be presented to the relevant governance group(s) and decision maker(s) with the totals for ‘Agree’, ‘Disagree’ or ‘Abstain’. As such, please ensure this section is completed before the form is returned to MHHS PMO. Provide detailed rationale and evidence in the commentary field.**

|  |
| --- |
| Part C.2 – Impact Assessment Recommendation (mandatory) |
| **Recommendation***Change Raiser to provide initial recommendation.***It is recommended by the Change Raiser the change is approved.** |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
| *Impact Assessment respondents to add supporting commentary to support their selection.* |

**Impact assessment done by:** <Name>

**Guidance*: If you are a third party responding on behalf of another Programme Participant, please state this in your response.***

**Impact assessment completed on behalf of:** <Name>

### Part D – Change approval and decision

**Guidance*: The approvals section will be completed by the MHHS PMO once the Impact Assessment has been reviewed.***

|  |
| --- |
| Part D - Approvals |
| **Decision authority level**<Based on the impact assessment, state who is required to make a decision concerning this change> |

**Guidance** - ***This section will be completed by the MHHS PMO and Change Owner following the review of the impact assessment and decision reached by the SRO.***

|  |
| --- |
| Part D – Change decision |
| Decision: |       | Date |       |
| Approvers: |       |  |  |
| Change Owner: |       |
| Action: |       |
| **Changed Items** | **Pre-change version** | **Revised version** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Part E – Implementation completion

**Guidance *- This section will be completed by the MHHS PMO at the end of the post-implementation process.***

|  |
| --- |
| Part E – Implementation completion |
| Comment |       | Date |       |

**Guidance *– The Closure Checklist in MHHS DEL175 Change Log must also be completed by MHHS PMO at this stage.***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|      Checklist Completed | Completed by      |
| Yes/No |  |

**Guidance – *This section will be completed by the MHHS PMO at the end of the post-implementation process and should be* used to add any appropriate references of the change once it has been completed.**

|  |
| --- |
| References |
| **Ref** | **Document number** | **Description** |
|       |       |       |
|       |       |       |