

Programme Steering Group

CR008 Impact Assessment Report & Recommendations

Headlines

Objective of this session:

PSG to review the outputs of CR008 Impact Assessment and SRO to make a decision to approve or reject the CR.

Headlines:

- A significant majority of respondents supported the request to add RECCo as a representative at Programme Steering Group (PSG), Design Advisory Group (DAG) and Testing and Migration Advisory Group (TMAG).
- The overall response rate for CR008 (11%) was lower than the last Impact Assessment for CR005 Programme Cooperation Principles in April (19%).
- The majority of responses (13 out of 18 with 2 abstentions) agreed with the change with unqualified support.
 - One respondent (Large Supplier) stated the change will allow better assessment of risks and issues outside of the MHHS scope and ensure alignment with current and future RECCo processes. This will benefit the programme as it will enable faster and more reliable decision making.
 - o One respondent (DNO) considers RECCo as an integral part of MHHS delivery and as such should be fully engaged in the decisions that they will be expected to deliver against.

We are bound to make a decision on the basis of the Change Request that has been raised, but there are opportunities to use Programme Participant feedback to inform future replanning activities if this change is approved.

- Two respondents (BUUK Infrastructure and DCC) supported the change, but highlighted the following considerations:
 - o Greater involvement of essential service providers (such as St Clements Services) that hold an expert role in the provision of MPRS services is essential to MHHS discussions.
 - o Clarification is needed regarding the process RECCo will follow in engaging with industry and REC parties to ensure that they are truly representing those stakeholders.
 - Any proposed changes to CSS will need to be impact assessed at a technical level. Whilst the programme is design led, these impact assessments will need to take place at the
 right time and RECCo involvement in the decision-making arrangements will support this.
- One respondent (Software Provider) rejected the change by supporting RECCo as a key stakeholder in the programme, but raised concern there is insufficient detail in the Change Request on the impacts to M5 (Physical Baseline Delivered) and how RECCo would support the milestone with late involvement.



CR008 Submitted Impact Assessments

Programme Parties
Large Suppliers
Medium Suppliers
Small Suppliers
I&C
DNOs
iDNOs
Ind. Agents**
Supplier Agents**
S/W Providers
National Grid
Code Bodies
Consumer
Elexon (Helix)
DCC
SRO / IM & LDP
IPA

CR005 Recommendations				
Yes	No	Abstained	Not Replied	
3	-	-	2	
1	-	-	5	
1	-	-	33	
3	-	1	37	
3	-	-	3	
1	-	-	12	
-	-	-	48	
-	-	-	5	
-	1	-	1	
-	-	-	1	
-	-	-	3	
-	-	-	1	
1	-	-	-	
1	-	-	-	
-	-	1	-	
1	-	-	-	

Market Share* (where applicable)					
Yes	No	Abstained	Not Replied		
59%	-	-	41%		
20%	-	-	80%		
0%	-	-	100%		
47%	-	0%	53%		
52%	-	-	48%		

*According to the latest Meter Point Administration Number (MPAN) data held by the Programme. Market Share has not been provided for constituencies where MPAN data is not currently available.

**The classification of Independent and Supplier Agents is maintained by the Programme Party Coordinator and is subject to change.

Rationale for being marked down as 'abstained'

- · One respondent declined to formally respond
- One respondent stated CR008 had no impact on their activities and therefore did not formally respond.



Public