

## MHHS Programme Steering Group (PSG) Headline Report

Issue date: 04/07/2025

Meeting Number	PSG046	Venue	Elexon Offices
Date and Time	02 July 2025 10:00-12:00	Classification	Public

### New / Outstanding Actions

Area	Ref	Action	Owner	Due
Change Request 62 (CR062) Decision	PSG46-01	Programme to arrange a follow up meeting with RECCo to discuss their outstanding concerns relating to CR062	Programme	11/07/25
M10 Checkpoint 2.0	PSG46-02	Programme to update the M10 Checkpoint Report 2.0 on the Collaboration Base to reflect the completion of SIT-A CoS Settlement testing	Programme	04/07/25
	PSG46-03	Programme to review comms options for directly notifying PSG members on the progress of the key milestones that support confidence in achieving M10	Programme	16/07/25
Central Party Readiness for Go-Live	PSG46-04	Elexon to address the queries around the SoLR process via email with the relevant stakeholders across MHHS, Helix and Code Bodies	Elexon	06/08/25
	PSG46-05	The Medium Supplier Representative to raise the proposition of a cross-code end-to-end SoLR process at the next SEC panel	Medium Supplier	06/08/25
	PSG46-06	Elexon to provide further clarity on the nature of the Risk Operating Plan and if required, confirmed the planned time for the consultation	Elexon	06/08/25
Programme Update – SIT Operational and Exit Reporting	PSG46-07	Programme to confirm that the SIT test evidence assurance activities align with each stage of the Exit	Programme	06/08/25
	PSG46-08	Programme and Helix to confirm that resource has been ring-fenced for Qualification given the delays to SIT and the redirection of time and effort to ensure milestones are achieved	Programme/Elexon	06/08/25

Previous Meeting	PSG45-04	I&C Supplier Representative to share their set of questions regarding DUoS billing with the DNO Representative, the Programme, and the Elexon Representative to initiate further discussion.	I&C Supplier	02/07/25
	PSG45-05	IPA to provide their wording for the summary actions from the IPA, Programme, Helix meeting 28 May.	IPA	11/06/25

Decisions

Area	Ref	Decision	Rationale
Headline Report and Actions	PSG-DEC104	The Headline Report of the previous meeting was approved with no amendments.	There were no amendments raised by PSG members.
CR062 Decision	PSG-DEC105	SRO recommended the approval to Ofgem who verbally approved CR062, 'Issue Resolution Group (IRG) – MHHS Programme Governance Framework Update'	The CR062 Impact Assessment was met with support and approval was endorsed by the Change Board and recommended by SRO.

Key Discussion Items

Area	Discussion
Headline Report and Actions	<p>The PSG Headline Report from the June PSG was approved with no amendments (<b>PSG-DEC104</b>).</p> <p>The Programme queried if there was a further update on action PSG45-04. Helix confirmed that a meeting has been set up to review the set of questions regarding DUoS billing.</p>
Ofgem Update	<p>Ofgem provided a verbal update on the proximity of M10, highlighting that all parties need to work as collaboratively as possible to mitigate against any risks that may cause a potential delay to M10.</p> <p>They confirmed that a Minister’s meeting will take place on 14 July 2025 where they will need to be transparent about the position of the Programme and also added if there is a potential delay this will be escalated to their Senior Executive who, alongside Elexon colleagues will need to justify the reason for the further delay to the Secretary of State.</p>
Programme and Parties’ Status and Readiness	<p>The Programme provided an update on the status of the Programme (by workstream), Critical Path POAP and Parties’ Readiness for M10, stating the key headlines, by exception.</p> <p><b>Programme Status (by workstream)</b></p> <p>They confirmed that SIT has moved from red last month (due to the extension of SIT-A CoS Settlement testing), back to amber this month as a result of that completing (all tests and no defects) within the additional two weeks. In the overview of testing update, they added that the Programme is moving into the final stages of Testing and are in the process issuing and getting Participant sign-off of QP Exit Reports to support their Qualification submissions, and also production of the SIT Exit Reports, which will need to be approved via programme governance, to formally agree the completion of SIT.</p>

	<p><b>Parties' Readiness for M10</b></p> <p>They highlighted that the two key things that are red are Elexon's SAT execution as well as their resource plan for M10, in particular resources for incident management and triage, which they stated they are currently reviewing with Elexon.</p> <p>They also added that although ORT was amber at the time of publishing PSG papers, the Programme's view is that it is now green based on Elexon reporting.</p>
<b>Change Request 62 (CR062) Decision</b>	<p><b>CR062:</b> 'Issue Resolution Group (IRG) – MHHS Programme Governance Framework Update'</p> <p>The Programme provided a summary of the responses received to the Impact Assessment for CR062, confirming some PPs who rejected the the implementation of the CR were in support of the IRG concept as a whole but requested amendments to the Terms of Reference (ToR) and noted concerns around the requirement for the IRG to be 24/7 and the impact this imposes on costs and resources. The Programme confirmed the ToR was updated to reflect the feedback and as a result the Change Board advises the SRO to approve the CR.</p> <p>The IDNO Representative expressed thanks to Programme for accommodating LDSO sessions and taking on board their concerns related to the ToR.</p> <p>The RECCo Representative confirmed they're in support of the need for an IRG, however, still voiced some concerns around the ToR and highlighted that Code change shouldn't be delayed for the Design or resolution of the technical change, noting the activities should be done in parallel. The Programme confirmed they would arrange a follow up meeting with RECCo to discuss their outstanding concerns.</p> <p><b>ACTION</b> – Programme to arrange a follow up meeting with RECCo to discuss their outstanding concerns relating to CR062 (<b>PSG46-01</b>).</p> <p>The CR062 Impact Assessment was met with support and although 12 respondents rejected the Change Request, there was support from these respondents on the principle of the IRG, with amendments requested to the Terms of Reference. The ToR has been updated in line with this feedback received and approval was endorsed by the Change Board. The SRO recommended the approval of CR062 (<b>PSG DEC-105</b>).</p>
<b>Readiness Assessment 5 &amp; 6</b>	<p>The Programme provided an executive summary update of Readiness Assessment 5 &amp; 6 (RA 5/6).</p> <p>They expressed thanks to all the PPs that responded to RA 5/6, noting a significantly high response rate of 94%, compared to RA3's response rate of 67%. They cited positive areas of assurance that came out of the survey, such as high levels of confidence across governance and planning, QAD submissions, completing Qualification and Code Body readiness. In addition, they also highlighted 5 key areas of concern that were observed from PP reports, including, Service Management Go-Live, Migration &amp; Early Life Support, Market-wide Participant MHHS Supporting Functionality Ready, Cutover Planning and Performance Assurance. The Programme outlined the next steps that will be put in place and suggested mitigations aimed at addressing the potential challenges.</p> <p>No questions or comments were received.</p>
<b>M10 Checkpoint 2.0</b>	<p><b>Programme Report</b></p> <p>The Programme confirmed that the M10 Checkpoint 2.0 report is a view of status based on recent progress, three months out from M10 and added that it is an uplift of the first report that was produced six months out from M10.</p>

	<p>The DNO Representative queried if the results from RA 5/6 been mapped across into the M10 Checkpoint 2.0. The Programme confirmed they have cross-referenced the findings from RA 5/6 to ensure they're fed into the report, noting that the self-assessment data from PPs will be used to inform the Programme's risk-based assurance that will be conducted between now and M10, to affirm PP readiness for Go-Live.</p> <p>The Programme stated that they consider M10 to still be achievable but highlighted there are significant associated risks and issues that could impact M10 if not properly mitigated. The outlined the three key issues that need to be addressed to provide full confidence that M10 can be delivered on time, which include the delays to SIT-A CoS Settlement testing (now completed), subsequent delays to SIT Regression, and also delays to Elexon Helix SAT. They added that the Elexon Helix SAT recovery plan that is in place needs to be delivered (Cycle 1 by 16 July per the Elexon plan) and resolved by 1 August 2025 (Cycle 2 delivery date) to ensure the new Helix Build can be deployed into SIT-A and be regression tested as required by the Programme.</p> <p>Considering the outlined risks, the Programme proposed an additional checkpoint at August PSG to review the status of the key issues, in particular Elexon Helix SAT and SIT Regression – i.e. if SAT delivery has been delivered on time and if SIT Regression has progressed satisfactorily. However, they acknowledged that these activities are reported and scrutinised daily, so confirmed there could potentially be a scenario where an ePSG is convened earlier than 6 August 2025, to review the viability of M10. They highlighted that end of SAT Cycle 1 on 16 July 2025 and end of Regression Cycle 1 on 18 July 2025 are two key dates that would indicate any potential delays and the possible need for an ePSG to be stood up.</p> <p>The IDNO Representative stated that the M10 Checkpoint Report on the Collaboration Base doesn't reflect the completion of SIT-A CoS Settlement testing as it does in the meeting papers. The Programme confirmed this was due to it completing after the report was finalised and will ensure it is updated to reflect this change.</p> <p><b>ACTION</b> – Programme to update the M10 Checkpoint Report 2.0 on the Collaboration Base to reflect the completion of SIT-A CoS Settlement testing (<b>PSG46-02</b>).</p> <p>The Programme provided an overview of the more granular details of the assessment, outlining the 'Off track' M10 Acceptance Criteria and proposed mitigations as well as the themes of the 'At Risk' criteria. They also presented a view of July's position compared to April's, highlighting the RAG status of the criteria and referenced key trends. They confirmed they've introduced a new reporting metric, in addition to tracking progress against the plan, they have also tracked the impact on M10 to distinguish which criteria you could go live with, with a certain level of work-off, versus those that would delay the milestone if not fully met.</p> <p>The DNO Representative queried if it would be better to schedule an ePSG and cancel if it's not needed, rather than stand up one at short notice given PSG members will likely have various amount of leave planned. The Programme confirmed if one was to be stood up, it would likely be between 16 July and 6 August 2025 and at short notice given the quick moving nature of Testing, however, explained it can't be scheduled until it's confirmed if one is required.</p> <p>The Medium Supplier Representative also added if an additional approach may be considered, such as ex-committee updates to inform PSG of any changes and provide an indication of when an ePSG may be stood up. The Programme confirmed progress update will be tracked through other governance channels such as GLIG and engagement with SITWG and SITAG and outlined the key milestone and decisions points that will assess the viability of M10. They agreed to review how they can best communicate updates directly to PSG.</p> <p><b>ACTION</b> – Programme to review comms options for directly notifying PSG members on the progress of the key milestones that support confidence in achieving M10 (<b>PSG46-03</b>).</p>
--	--

	<p><b>IPA Report</b></p> <p>The IPA confirmed their key findings align to what the Programme had identified in their own report and agree that M10 is still achievable but at significant risk. They noted that they will be tracking the outlined mitigations and recovery plan that has been put in place and highlighted that as M10 draws closer, the opportunity to mitigate against delays reduces. Similarly to the Programme, they outlined their priority risk areas to M10 as SAT, SIT-A CoS Settlement Testing, Impact of testing delays on other plan activities, such as Qualification and Elexon Operational Readiness.</p> <p>They recommended that an additional M10 Checkpoint is also held at August PSG and suggested scenario planning is conducted in the meantime to test what the outcome of further delays could be, noting continued monitoring and transparency in reporting is essential. They also provided an overview of their RA 5/6 Consequential Change Assurance and noted alignment with the Programme on their findings that were previously presented.</p> <p>No questions or comments were received.</p>
<b>SIT-A Settlement Extension &amp; Related Impacts</b>	<p>The Programme provided an update on the SIT-A Settlement Extension, confirming the completion of testing a day ahead of the scheduled extension window, with full passes across the board. In fact, the agreed exit criteria were met two days early.</p> <p>They recapped the discussions held over the past couple of weeks with SITWG and SITAG on the agreed approach to SIT-A Regression testing, highlighting the importance of SAT being delivered to time to ensure M10 Ready Pathway 2 and 3 are still viable since the window has shortened for Regression testing. They acknowledged there are still risks to the timely delivery of Regression but remain confident given the volume of SIT testing that has been conducted over the past year in addition to the absence of any material defects at the end of Cycle 3.</p> <p>The Programme also provided an update on the impact to the Qualification and PABs following the extension of SIT-A CoS Settlement testing. They assured PSG that they're working with the BSC PAB and REC Code Manager to prepare ahead of taking PPs on M10-Ready Pathways 2 and 3 through their respective PAB cycles. They added that they've scheduled additional PAB meetings to provide some contingency in the case Pathway 2 no longer becomes viable, in addition to increasing the number of PAB days for Pathway 2 to provide two days to take those PPs through.</p> <p>No questions or comments were received.</p>
<b>Central Party Readiness for Go-Live</b>	<p>Elexon Helix, DIP Manager and LDSO Reps provided an update on their Central Party Readiness for Go-Live.</p> <p><b>SAT Overview</b></p> <p>Elexon provided an overview of their SAT progress and POAP, stating that they have made further progress since the PSG papers were published. They gave a breakdown of the individual areas that have seen improvements and outlined some of the main blockers that are impacting their plan. They expressed confidence in their plan and that they're on track to complete Cycle 1 but will continue to monitor their progress with daily reporting.</p> <p><b>Critical Path to M10</b></p> <p>Elexon outlined their Critical Path to M10 and their implementation plan by workstream, highlighting a staggered approach to Cutover to ensure they derisk data concerns associated with Cutover.</p> <p><b>Business Readiness</b></p> <p>Elexon summarised the status of their Critical Path Readiness milestones. They confirmed that basis for which the 'SoLR and MDR process ready' activity is green is a result of the delivery element of the process rather than the steps that are required from LDSOs to achieve this.</p>

Commented [KC1]: @Katie Dyson (MHHSProgramme) can you check - was this Pathway 2 or 3?

Commented [KD2R1]: @Keith Clark (MHHSProgramme) double checked the transcript and confirmed it's Pathway 2 Jason is referencing on this second point.

	<p>The DNO Representative cited potential challenges with data mismatches that could arise from the new SoLR process and sought confirmation that the proposed approach aligns with design of the systems. Elexon suggested setting up an email chain with the relevant parties to discuss the DNO Representatives queries in more detail. The RECCo Representative clarified that the MHHS Programme would not make any material changes to the SoLR process as it is a switching process, whereas the Programme would look at how transfer of the DIP ID works during this process. The Programme echoed that the SoLR process is not an element of the MHHS Design.</p> <p><b>ACTION</b> – Elexon to address the queries around the SoLR process via email with the relevant stakeholders across MHHS, Helix and Code Bodies (<b>PSG46-04</b>).</p> <p>The IPA queried if the Critical Path Readiness activities that were targeted for 27 June 2025 such as 'MHHS knowledge transfer complete' and 'Business processes and LWIs defined' are now complete. Elexon confirmed they expect them to be complete.</p> <p>The Medium Supplier Representative highlighted the need for a cross-code end-to-end SoLR process to be mapped out as MHHS starts to transcend into the DCC and the SEC with the MDR role. The Programme agreed it is important to consider and also added that DCUSA is an area that also needs to be involved in this process given the consequences that LDSOs are observing due to the way that DCUSA roles are set up for billing. The Medium Supplier Representative confirmed they will raise it at the next SEC panel. The RECCo Representative also added that there is an ongoing lesson learnt review from the most recent SoLR which they can feed the request of a cross-code end-to-end SoLR process into.</p> <p><b>ACTION</b> – The Medium Supplier Representative to raise the proposition of a cross-code end-to-end SoLR process at the next SEC panel (<b>PSG46-05</b>).</p> <p><b>DIP Operational Readiness</b></p> <p>Elexon confirmed that there is ongoing conversation required around the DIP reporting solution between themselves and RECCo, noting that they have approximately 95% of the data RECCo would like within the core block, which they believe is enough for Go-Live. They also added that they're going to send through a daily pulse report to RECCo to provide assurance that the correct data is being received.</p> <p>The RECCo Representative queried when the daily pulse reports are expected to start. Elexon confirmed they are checking in with their lead PM after PSG about the daily pulse report. The RECCo Representative added they're happy the daily pulse reports are being set up and also highlighted the importance of ensuring the legal procedures are in place for the transfer of data.</p> <p>The Programme queried what the Risk Operating Plan is and if there is a planned consultation period given it is due to finish in August.</p> <p><b>ACTION</b> – Elexon to provide further clarity on the nature of the Risk Operating Plan and if required, confirmed the planned time for the consultation (<b>PSG46-06</b>).</p> <p><b>Service Management ORT Update</b></p> <p>To conclude, Elexon provided an update on ORT, confirming that as of this week all failed tests have been retested and resultingly all tests have now passed. They added that they have no concerns or issues with the progress of ORT testing and would expect to complete it on time.</p> <p>No questions or comments were received.</p> <p>The DNO and IDNO Representatives presented their Monthly Delivery Reports, respectively, to provide an update on the status of their Readiness for Go-Live.</p>
--	--

	<p><b>DNO Report</b></p> <p>The RECCo Representative highlighted that if it appears an EES solution may be more helpful in relation to the Ofgem reporting, they would be happy to support. Ofgem confirmed it needs to be talked through with their Market Monitoring and Data team and will advise they contact RECCo as they're changing the way data is captured.</p> <p><b>IDNO Report</b></p> <p>The IDNO Representative highlighted that following the data cleanse activities that have been ongoing for some time there is still a risk that some areas of the data cleanse may not be completed and some of the UMS data might need to continue post-M10, noting this is mostly related the P434 work rather than Market Segment. The Programme confirmed they've been speaking to Performance Assurance team in Elexon around P434 and have been sharing information on who the SIT PPs are to highlight where the focus may need to be for P434 migrations. They added that they've highlighted the potential strain on LDSOs in terms of volume that may come through, noting that although P434 isn't a Programme activity there is still a significant risk to migration that they're monitoring.</p>
<b>Programme Update – SIT Operational and Exit Reporting</b>	<p>The Programme provided an update on SIT progress, namely the progress the with SIT Operational testing and the choreography of SIT Exit Reporting.</p> <p>They confirmed SITWG on 3 July 2025 will address the position of SIT Operational testing in more detail but highlighted that the gap between planned and actual activity has closed considerably.</p> <p>They highlighted the importance of providing the Qualifying Participant (QP) Exit Reports to the relevant parties to support their QAD submissions and that it is paramount that timelines are adhered to. They confirmed most of the SIT Functional and Migration QP Exit Reports have been sent out, discussed and signed with PPs and expect a timely conclusion to that process. They added that the Non-Functional QP Exit Reports were sent out last Friday and those for SIT Operational will follow the exit of that related testing.</p> <p>The Programme noted there are compressed timelines for SIT Operational Pathways 2 and 3 and reaffirmed the importance of keeping to timelines.</p> <p>The Medium Supplier Representative queried if the SIT test evidence assurance activities align with the timing of the SIT Exit Reports. The Programme confirmed that as the tests are passed, they will also be assured and need to ensure that the test evidence on the latest passed tests and consistent with the test results.</p> <p><b>ACTION</b> – Programme to confirm that the SIT test evidence assurance activities align with each stage of the Exit Reports (<b>PSG46-07</b>).</p> <p>The I&amp;C Supplier Representative highlighted that a lot of resource and time has been focused into SIT to ensure key milestones are met which as a result has redirected resources away from other workstreams such as Qualification. They queried if the Programme foresees any knock-on impact in terms of quality and resource on subsequent activities. The Programme confirmed they're confident the quality of Qualification hasn't been jeopardised as the QAD process has been running in parallel but appreciate the need to provide some reassurance that resourcing has been ring fenced.</p> <p><b>ACTION</b> – Programme and Helix to confirm that resource has been ring-fenced for Qualification given the delays to SIT and the redirection of time and effort to ensure milestones are achieved (<b>PSG46-08</b>).</p>
<b>Cutover and Choreography</b>	<p>The Programme provided an update on the Cutover Plan and Choreography.</p>

Commented [KC3]: @Katie Dyson (MHHSProgramme) what does this mean, can you clarify the wording?

Commented [KD4R3]: @Keith Clark (MHHSProgramme) - missed the word reporting

Commented [KC5]: @Katie Dyson (MHHSProgramme) can we say 'confirm that' rather 'than confirm if' ?

Commented [KD6R5]: @Keith Clark (MHHSProgramme) of course

	They confirmed that a lot of work has been completed in the past month, and many activities have now been closed out. They added that the consolidated Programme Cutover plan was published on Friday 27 July 2025 for a two-week consultation alongside sharing individual Cutover plans with PPs. They highlighted the importance of ensuring all PPs have all the information they require to enable the success of their own individual Cutovers as they will look to re-baseline the document at the end of the month.
<b>Delivery Dashboards</b>	The IPA provided a brief overview of their Monthly Assurance dashboard and highlighted one of their work packages that looks at the controls that operate over the Separation Plan, noting they conduct a six-month review of the effectiveness of those controls which has completed and confirmed those controls are operating effectively.
<b>AOB</b>	

**Date of next meeting: 06 August 2025 at 10:00am**



Attendees

Chair

Helen Adey

Industry Representatives

Andrew Campbell  
Chris Price  
Carolyn Burns  
Gareth Evans  
Graham Wood  
Simon Harrison  
John Abbott  
Jenny Rawlinson  
Neil Dewar  
Geoff Hunt / Trisha Champaneria  
Jonny Moore

MHHS IM

Andrew Margan  
Jason Brogden  
Keith Clark  
Katie Dyson  
Roger Robar  
Will Miller  
Smitha Pichrikat  
Paul Pettitt  
Chris Welby  
Chris Harden  
Lewis Hall  
Lewis McKenzie  
Kiran Birring-Sandhu  
Chris Welby  
Stuart Scott  
Matthew Breen  
John Wiggins  
Deen Awan

Other Attendees

Laura Kennedy  
David Gandee  
Renata Yussapova  
Richard Shilton  
Jenny Boothe  
Sinead Quinn  
Fahreen Japp

SRO (Elexon IM)

Small Supplier Representative  
DNO Representative  
Medium Supplier Representative  
I&C Supplier Representative  
Large Supplier Representative  
Supplier Agent Representative  
Elexon Representative (Central Systems Provider)  
IDNO Representative  
NESO Representative  
DCC Representative  
RECCo Representative

Code Lead  
Programme Industry SME  
Programme Manager  
Governance Secretariat  
Test Lead  
PMO Change Control Lead  
Client Delivery Manager  
Programme Test Lead  
Strategic Industry Advisor  
Client Programme Director  
LDP Delivery Manager  
PPC Lead  
PPC  
SRO  
LDP SME  
Transition Lead  
Programme Industry SME  
Early Life Support Manager

Code Bodies  
IPA  
IPA  
IPA  
Ofgem  
Ofgem  
Ofgem

Apologies

Andy Manning  
Joel Stark  
Elaine Eyles  
Paul Daniels  
Neil Dewar  
Paul Daniels

Consumer Representative  
Supplier Agent Representative  
Medium Supplier Representative  
Avanade Representative  
NESO Representative  
Avanade Representative

Steven Page  
Victoria Moxham

Elexon CFO  
Elexon

