

MHHS Programme Steering Group Minutes and Actions

Issue date: 20/07/2022

| | | | |
|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| Meeting Number | PSG 010 - extraordinary | Venue | Virtual – MS Teams |
| Date and Time | 14 July 2022 1500-1530 | Classification | Public |

Attendees

Chair

Chris Welby (CW) MHHS IM SRO

Industry Representatives

| | |
|---|--|
| Andrew Campbell (AC) | Small Supplier Representative |
| Andrew Green (AG) on behalf of Gareth Evans | I&C Supplier Representative |
| Chris Price (CP) | DNO Representative |
| Jonathan Hawkins (JH) | RECCo Representative |
| Joel Stark (JS) | Supplier Agent (Independent) Representative |
| Karen Thompson-Lilley (KTL) | National Grid ESO Representative |
| Lee Northall (LN) | Elexon Representative (Central Systems Provider) |
| Paul Akrill (PA) | Supplier Agent Representative |
| Richard Vernon (RV) on behalf of Charlotte Semp | DCC Representative (Smart Meter Central System provider) |

MHHS IM

| | |
|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Andrew Margan (AM) | Governance Manager |
| Chris Harden (CH) | Programme Director |
| Keith Clark (KC) | Programme Manager |
| Martin Cranfield (MC) | PMO Governance Lead |

Other Attendees

| | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Andy MacFaul (AMF) | Ofgem (as observer) |
| Rachel Clark (RC) | Ofgem Sponsor (as observer) |
| Richard Shilton (RS) | MHHS IPA Lead |
| Sinead Quinn (SQ) | Ofgem (as observer) |

Apologies

Charlotte Semp (DCC Representative)
 Ed Rees (Consumer Representative)
 Jenny Rawlinson (iDNO Representative)
 Gareth Evans (I&C Supplier Representative)
 Graham Wood (Large Supplier Representative)
 Vladimir Black (Medium Supplier Representative)

Actions

| Area | Action Ref | Action | Owner | Due |
|------|------------|--------|-------|-----|
|------|------------|--------|-------|-----|

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------|--|------------------------------------|------------|
| CR009 | PSG10-01 | Update CR009 with feedback from PSG (e.g. inclusion of RA2 timescales, context for the transition design) and issue for industry Impact Assessment | Programme (Keith Clark, PMO) | 15/07/2022 |
|--------------|----------|--|------------------------------------|------------|

Decisions

| Area | Dec Ref | Decision |
|--------------|-----------|--|
| CR009 | PSG-DEC17 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The PSG decided that CR009 was a PSG-owned Change Request The PSG decided that CR009 should be raised for industry Impact Assessment, subject to some small updates (action PSG10-01) |

Minutes

1. Welcome and objectives

CW welcomed all to the meeting and provided an overview of the meeting origin and objectives, noting PSG were not to re-open the content of CR009 but to agree whether it was owned by PSG and should be raised for industry Impact Assessment.

2. CR009 overview

KC explained that CR009 reflected the conversation from 06 July 2022 PSG, for M3 and M5 to be aligned at the end of October and the re-plan to continue per the interim plan. KC noted apologies from Graham Wood (GW) and provided an update on a conversation with Graham and large suppliers on 13 July 2022. KC stated that GW had said that large suppliers were comfortable with M3 on the basis that the Programme re-plan would accurately reflect the content of CR009 - including allowing time after M3 to accommodate participants completing activities such as high level impact assessments and sourcing strategies). KC also stated that GW had said that large suppliers may raise a Change Request to request elongation of the second consultation period for the re-plan by at least two weeks beyond M5, to allow for further input into the re-plan after the design is baselined. CW clarified that a Change Request relating to the re-plan would not change or form part of the discussion on CR009, should it be raised to the Programme subsequently.

CW invited comments. JH noted that while CR009 did not have the intention to impact the wider Programme schedule, it did have an impact on Readiness Assessment 2 (RA2). JH queried how the content of the current interim plan timelines for RA2 supported the proposal in CR009. JH highlighted that the submission of RA2 was planned in mid-September and the report available mid-November. CR009 stated a decision from PSG on 02 November, but the outputs of RA2 would not have been made available. Participants would also submit RA2 without having seen the outputs of the first consultation on the re-plan. KC responded that the revised interim plan will be presented at August's PSG together with the outputs of Impact Assessment on CR009. The interim plan will detail a plan to publish an interim report on RA2 in time to support any decision on M3/M5 in November by PSG. This detail could be added to CR009 for clarity. JH confirmed this would help parties with their Impact Assessments.

CP queried a possible mis-match in the dates in CR009 where M3 was quoted as being approved on 02 November (PSG) while M5 decision is 29 October. KC responded that DAG would sign off M5 on 29 October and the decision would be communicated to PSG for information on 02 November.

CP queried the approach to the transition design as this would now not be signed off under M5, and if the transition design could fundamentally influence the enduring core design. KC responded that M5 was the core design while the transition design sat outside that. KC queried if CP believed the transition design would impact the baseline design. CP confirmed this was his question. LN added if transition requirements would have an impact on code drafting as feedback they'd received was that a number of codes would be influenced. LN added that if the scope of M5 was changed as part of CR009, this should be clearly stated in the Change Request (as not just a date change). CW responded that the Cross Code Advisory Group (CCAG) were aware of the impact of the transition design - the code draft plan was still being finalised and the transition design needed to be considered in the drafting approach. KC noted the Change Request could be updated to reflect code impacts. JH responded that this was not just about code drafting but also the wider design, as the transition design impacts Programme Participants who need to consider the transition design in their own impact assessments and designs. KC noted this context could be added in CR009.

LN queried if there was anything else that was not considered in the design at M5 in CR009, such as Non-Functional Requirements. CH responded that he believed only the transition design was being changed. CH added that if the transition design is per the Target Operating Model (TOM) then it would not change the core build for Programme Participants. If the transition design needed to change to implement a 'revolving door' (accommodation to allow consumer switching from HH to non-HH arrangements during the migration window before M14), it may have an impact on the core design for Helix and possibly some Agents. This needed to be explored through the design workstream.

AC queried a point made at a recent planning show and tell that there was a mitigating action (such as an additional artefact or a set of assumptions) to support the delivery of the transition design at the end of December. KC responded that this may be the set of assumptions for the transition design that sit behind the re-plan, and that these would be shared through the re-plan consultations. These assumptions and their ambiguities would need to be explicit through consultation, and some of the assumptions would be dispelled or developed / made more accurate as a result of the consultations.

AG noted a desire for suppliers to have some time between the design baseline and M3 so that M3 followed M5, on the basis that to be 'fully mobilised and ready for DBT' parties required a baselined design. KC responded that when he spoke with Graham Wood and his constituents, their position was that there was no longer an intention to raise a Change Request on M3 as long as the re-plan clearly identified activities (such as sourcing strategies and high-level impact assessment) for Programme Participants that may not be completed at M3. This therefore did not impact CR009. KC noted that GW told him that a separate Change Request that may be raised relating to the re-plan, but that this was separate from CR009 (as per the position of the SRO).

CH confirmed that Non-Functional requirements were part of the core design.

3. CR009 decision

CW moved to make a decision:

- Firstly, given M5 is a level 1 milestone for Ofgem decision, CW asked PSG for a decision as to whether CR009 was a PSG-owned Change Request or if it should sit with an advisory group. No comments received.
- Secondly, CW asked whether any PSG members did not want to raise CR009 to Impact Assessment, following the updates as discussed (action PSG10-01). No comments received.

CW confirmed the decisions and associated actions and explained CR009 would go out 15 July 2022 for two weeks of Impact Assessment, to then come back to PSG on 10 August 2022 with the Impact Assessment report for a decision. PSG would then make a decision on whether to recommend approval of the Change Request to Ofgem. The Change Request requires an Ofgem decision as it proposed moving a Level 1 milestone by more than three months.

Action PSG10-01: Update CR009 with feedback from PSG (e.g. inclusion of RA2 timescales, context to the transition design) and issue for industry Impact Assessment

Decision PSG-DEC17: The PSG decided that CR009 was a PSG-owned Change Request and that CR009 should be raised for industry Impact Assessment, subject to some small updates (action PSG10-01)

4. Summary and Next Steps

CW invited final comments. None received. CW thanked all for their contributions and closed the meeting.

Date of next PSG: 10 August 2022