

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

Issue date: 28/02/23

Meeting number	<b>TMAG 015 - extraordinary</b>	Venue	<b>Virtual – MS Teams</b>
Date and time	<b>28 February 2023 1000-1100</b>	Classification	<b>Public</b>

## Attendees

### Chair

Chris Welby (CW) MHHS IM, SME

### Industry Representatives

Dave Jones (DJ)	RECCo Representative
Geoff Matthews (GM) alternate for Ian Hall	Supplier Agent Representative
Ian Hatton (IHat)	DNO Representative
Lee Northall (LN)	Large Supplier Representative (co-representative, Testing)
Matt Hall (MH)	Exelon Representative
Naomi Walker (NW)	Large Supplier Representative (co-representative, Migration and Qualification)
Nicola Bumford (NBu)	National Grid ESO Representative
Nickie Bernsmeier-Rulow	DCC Representative
Shaun Brundett (SBr)	Small Supplier Representative
Stacey Buck (SBu)	iDNO Representative

### MHHS IM Members

Amy Clayton (AC)	PMO Governance Support
Jason Brogden (JB)	Industry SME
John Wiggins (JW)	Migration lead
Kate Goodman (KG)	Testing Lead
Keith Clark (KC)	Programme Manager
Martin Cranfield (MC)	PMO Governance Lead

### Other Attendees

Andy MacFaul (AMF)	Ofgem
Sajwal Dash (SD)	IPA
Saima Sabir (SS)	IPA
Sinead Quinn (SQ)	Ofgem

## Actions

Area	Ref	Action	Owner	Due	Update
None					

## Decisions

Area	Ref	Description
Data Assessment Report	TMAG-DEC22	The TMAG approved version 1.0 of the Data Assessment Report

## Minutes

### 1. Welcome

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

### 2. Data Assessment Report

JW explained that the extraordinary TMAG had been convened to seek approval to baseline version 1.0 of the Data Assessment Report. JW thanked participants for their feedback on the Report, noting this was helpful for refining the document. JW explained that most of the material feedback had been incorporated in the updated version of the document, with the largest update being clarification on the next steps to be taken by the Programme. In particular, this was a requirement to create a Data Cleanse Plan, as per BSC requirements, and the Report now included detail on the plan for this. JW noted the Programme would be looking to produce a draft Data Cleanse plan for review at the April TMAG, together with the initial analysis that had been used to inform the plan which would be developed via the Migration Working Group (MWG)). JW noted that producing the Data Cleanse plan would have require some significant effort by the Programme.

LN noted Large Suppliers were supportive of creating a baseline in this area. LN highlighted that Large Suppliers felt some material feedback they provided had not been updated in the document. LN noted Large Suppliers had highlighted responsibilities around R32 and Smart Meter data items that had not been incorporated, and that Large Suppliers felt there was some responsibility on the DCC. JW responded that additional detail had been provided on alternate routes in this area and that additional analysis would be done via the Data Cleanse plan. Development of the plan would include activity on the best and most appropriate means to address this feedback. The Programme would be taking this to the MWG (i.e. activity the Programme expected participants to do) and would then come to TMAG for approval via the Data Cleanse plan. JW added that the Data Assessment Report was an initial assessment of the state of data and that the material activity would be pulled out in the Data Cleanse plan itself, which the TMAG would be approving. LN was happy with this approach but added that they did not interpret this from the document and that the Programme needed to look at the most practicable and cost-effective way of addressing these issues. JW added that this would be discussed at the next MWG.

JW invited other comments. GM noted they were alternate to Ian Hall and that they were broadly supportive of the document, highlighting the next steps as important. GM noted the importance of baselining and progressing the document now.

CW moved to a vote. TMAG members unanimously supported baselining the document.

## DECISION TMAG-DEC22: The TMAG approved version 1.0 of the Data Assessment Report

### 3. Summary and next steps

MC summarised the decisions as per the table above, noting the document would be uploaded to the Testing Documents page of the Collaboration Base. CW provided an overview of upcoming meetings as per the slides.

CW invited any AOB. LN noted that concerns had been raised in the TMAG working groups on a change of scope of DBT1. Large Suppliers and other participants had raised through the Qualification and E2E Sandbox Working Group (QWG) and other groups that previous documented scope was now changing. LN explained that Large Suppliers felt the updated principles explained in the working groups were supported but had not been communicated early enough. Some of the scope changes would impact Large Supplier responses to the Round 3 consultation, as it meant some requirements for DBT had been brought forward and therefore more time would be required for Large Suppliers for DBT1.

JB thanked LN for their comments, noting this feedback had also been shared by other participants. The Programme were now working to make the expectations of each stage of DBT as clear as possible. JB noted that the best approach to do this was not to talk about systems but to talk about the interfaces and requirements of E2E tests in SIT

to send and receive messages as per the scope of the MHHS design (the Programme wanted to emphasise the need to prove the MHHS design, as this was what directed the requirements of systems and not vice-versa). JB noted the Programme agreed that they had not communicated as well as they could have.

LN added that the Programme needed to be clear on what was meant by E2E, with previous documentation suggesting E2E would only cover the touchpoint of systems with the DIP (and not back-end systems). JB responded that the scope was the MHHS E2E design and added that the Programme would be coming back with a clearer view, given confusion shared by some PPs. KG added that the Programme had been looking to clarify this through the latest Systems Integration Test Working Groups (SITWG) and that the Programme would shortly be issuing an updated version of the SIT scope document. This document would not be focusing on systems (e.g. CRMs) but instead would detail the functionality participants needed to demonstrate in SIT and this would therefore inform systems that would be required to generate messages in order to demonstrate this functionality. LN responded that this would invalidate Large Supplier responses provided in the Round 3 replan, as this brought forward changes that previously participants thought could be included in consequential systems in DBT2.

KG noted that not all E2E changes would be required for SIT – participants would only require systems within their estate for triggering the sending of messages. KG accepted that there had been mis-understanding but noted that the Programme had been clear that tests would be E2E and that this message had been misunderstood more recently. LN agreed this may be a misinterpretation but reiterated that participants would have responded differently as a result of this to the Round 3 consultation. JB responded that participants would have an opportunity to impact assess the plan and provide feedback through the replan Change Request. MC added that the Programme had been clear that the working groups were the place for developing certain elements of the plan following Round 3 of consultation and that the feedback provided now and via the working groups was feeding into the current planning activity.

NBR queried if a checklist would be useful for the requirements of each stage of testing, to make sure this was clear. KG responded that the SIT scoping document should fulfil this role, and if it did not, then it needed to be updated. NBR responded that they were happy if the next iteration of the document covered this.

CW invited any further AOB. None raised. CW closed the meeting

**Date of next TMAG: 15 March 2023**