

Change Request Form

Change Request details

Change Request details			
Change Request Title	Proposal to include the Full Plan Review 'PM2' activity within Programme Governance		
Change Request Number			
Originating Advisory / Working Group	Programme Steering Group (PSG)		
Risk/issue reference			
Change Raiser	Graham Wood (Large Supplier Representative) on behalf of the Large Supplier Constituency	Date raised:	

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)

Due to multiple changes to the M5 milestone, there has been a lack of clarity and certainty surrounding the important Programme Full Plan Review process and the timing of this activity, specifically its' association with other key programme milestones including the delivery of a design baseline (M5) and programme party mobilisation (M3).

The Large Supplier Constituency remain of the view that in order to ensure the programme develops and ultimately approves a credible replan that can achieve cross—market support and buy-in, the Full Plan Review consultation period cannot be concluded until a point after the design baseline has been approved.

Description of change:

(what is the change you are proposing)

This change request proposes to:

- 1. Provide clarity for all parties within programme governance, of the revised date for the Full Plan Review 'PM2' activity
- 2. Maintain the principle of concluding the Full Plan Review once the full design is scheduled to be approved, as per the 11 August 2021 decision
- 3. Acknowledge the re-planning work already underway and ensure momentum of this work continues, whilst addressing points 1 & 2 above

CR009 is proposing to further amend the date for M5 to 31 October 2022. Alongside this, the programme is proposing to conduct and conclude industry consultation on the Full Plan Review by the end of October 2022 and therefore before formal approval of the design.

It is essential for programme parties to fully understand the approved design baseline before finally committing to their views on the Full Plan Review. The original principle of undertaking the Full Plan Review after the design has been approved, is detailed below within the 'Justification for Change' section and is also consistent with the approach that was going to be undertaken by the programme following the approval of CR001, which amended the M5 milestone date to 29 July 2022.

In order to maintain this principle, but also being cognisant of the work already being progressed, the following approach and indicative timetable is being proposed:

- Industry Consultation periods (IC1 & IC2) on the Full Plan Review is undertaken during August, September & October 2022, as currently proposed
- A further short Industry Consultation period (IC3) is subsequently undertaken immediately after milestone M5 has been approved (in early November 2022 on the assumption that M5 is achieved on or before 31 October 2022)
- The additional (IC3) period should be a minimum of 10 working days
- Following the completion of all Industry Consultation periods, the progression of a resulting Change Request in late November or early December 2022
- Ofgem CR decision in December 2022
- Exact timings for the additional, short IC3 period to be defined and agreed by the PSG

Justification for change:

(please attach any evidence to support your justification)

Ofgem published the MHHS Transition Timetable on 23 April 2021, along with Decision & Full Business Case. The timetable included an activity '*PM2 – programme re-baseline*' planned to occur in October & November 2021, prior to the design being baselined (April 2022 as per the timetable).

Further to the 23 April 2021 publications, on 11 August 2021 Ofgem published a document titled 'Implementation Arrangements for Market-Wide Half-Hourly Settlement: Decision Document'

Within Section 6 – Next Steps (Section Summary) of this document, in response to industry feedback, Ofgem note '...it would be preferable to run a single plan review exercise in the spring of 2022 when the detailed design has been settled.'

Extract from the document:

MHHS Transition Timetable

6.10 'Some respondents said it would be sensible to have a full plan review in spring 2022 when the full design is scheduled to be approved. We have discussed this with MHHS Programme, who agree that a plan review after finalisation of the design would be appropriate. We agree. We also consider that there would be little value in carrying out a full plan review in October 2021 if another is planned for the spring of 2022. We are therefore of the view that it would be preferable to run a single plan review exercise in the spring of 2022. We are not making a change to the baselined plan in respect of this, but we do recommend to MHHS Programme that it might want to consider proposing such a change through programme governance. We note that the plan review is not a level 1 milestone. As such, moving it by 3 months or more would not require Ofgem approval.'

A Change Request has not subsequently been progressed to amend the date of the PM2 Full Plan Review activity, further to the recommendation within 6.10 above.

Clarity and certainty of the Full Plan Review arrangements, how these are appropriately orchestrated alongside other key programme milestones and ensuring that this activity is conducted in line with existing principles, is essential to delivering a robust and credible replan output and ensuring market-wide confidence and buy-in.

The importance of approving a credible, revised programme plan has been recently proven by the Faster & More Reliable Switching Programme (FMRS), which underwent a similar replanning exercise in August 2020 and whom are now seeing the rewards of this with a smooth glidepath towards implementation in July 2022. If there is one lesson that the MHHS Programme should learn from FMRS, then this is it.

Consequences of no change:

(what is the consequence of no change)

If this change is not made:

- There will continue to be a lack of clarity and certainty for all Programme Parties associated with the timing of the Full Plan Review and its orchestration with other key programme milestones.
- The MHHS programme will not have acted upon the aforementioned Ofgem recommendation to amend programme governance.

Alternative options:

(What alternative options or mitigations that have been considered)

Whilst the programme has proposed revised Full Plan Review timeframes to align with changes to delivery of the M5 milestone, no alternate Change Requests have been raised or considered to formally amend the date of the Full Plan Review PM2 activity within programme governance.

Risks associated with potential change:

(what risks related to implementation of the proposed change have been identified)

No risks have been identified associated with the principle of revising the date of the PM2 activity given the date for Design Baseline has been amended.

There are no risks identified associated with the overall implementation timeframe of the programme, due to the progression of this CR.

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).

Conversations have taken place with the programme prior to CR009 being formally raised.

Target date by which a decision is required:

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)

- Provides clarity for all parties within programme governance, of the revised date for the Full Plan Review 'PM2' activity and the orchestration of this activity with other key programme milestones.
- Ensures that the revised plan has been fully considered in light of an approved design baseline, consistent with the 11 August 2021 Ofgem decision document.
- Improves the likelihood of the programme achieving a credible replan and market-wide confidence and buy-in at the earliest opportunity.

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	More likely to be delivered and to a higher standard by Programme Participants
To deliver services to support the revised Settlement Timetable in line with the Design Working Group's recommendation	More likely to be delivered and to a higher standard by Programme Participants
To implement all related Code changes identified under Ofgem's Significant Code Review (SCR)	More likely to be delivered and to a higher standard by Programme Participants
To implement MHHS in accordance with the MHHS Implementation Timetable	No impact on overall Programme timetable
To deliver programme capabilities and outcomes to enable the realisation of benefits in compliance with Ofgem's Full Business Case	More likely to be delivered and to a higher standard by Programme Participants
To prove and provide a model for future such industry-led change programmes	More likely to be delivered and to a higher standard by Programme Participants

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 that have an interest in the programme replanning activity
Impacted Deliverables	Any deliverables and/or milestones associated with the timeline and conclusion of the programme replanning

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	1 - Critical Change	Expected lead time	1 - <5 working days	
Rationale of change	Programme	Expected implementation window	1 - Imminent	
Expected change impact	Very Low			

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			

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:

- A. 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.
- B. 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.
- C. 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

Change Raiser to provide initial impact assessment.

<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

Change Raiser to provide initial impact assessment.

<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

Change Raiser to provide initial impact assessment.

<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

Change Raiser to provide initial impact assessment.

<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

Change Raiser to provide initial impact assessment.

<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

Change Raiser to provide initial impact assessment.

<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.

<u>Risks</u>

Change Raiser to provide initial impact assessment.

<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
N/a – the change request was rescinded by the change owner.

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:	Rescinded by the change owner	Date	28/07/2022
Approvers:		·	
Change Owner:			
Action:			
		Revised version	
Changed Items	Pre-change version		Revised version
Changed Items	Pre-change version		Revised version
Changed Items	Pre-change version		Revised version
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	