

MHHS Programme Steering Group (PSG) Minutes and Actions

Issue date: 17/08/2022

| | | | |
|----------------|---------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| Meeting Number | PSG 011 | Venue | Virtual – MS Teams |
| Date and Time | 10 August 2022 1400-1600 | Classification | Public |

Attendees

Chair

Chris Welby (CW) MHHS IM SRO

Industry Representatives

| | |
|---|--|
| Andrew Campbell (AC) | Small Supplier Representative |
| Charlotte Semp (CS) | DCC Representative (Smart Meter Central System provider) |
| Chris Price (CP) | DNO Representative |
| Ed Rees (ER) | Consumer Representative |
| Gareth Evans (GE) | I&C Supplier Representative |
| Graham Wood (GW) | Large Supplier Representative |
| Jonathan Hawkins (JH) | RECCo Representative |
| Jenny Rawlinson (JR) | iDNO Representative |
| Lee Northall (LN) | Elexon Representative (Central Systems Provider) |
| Neil Dewar (ND) as alternate to Karen Thompson-Lilley | National Grid ESO Representative |
| Paul Akkrill (PA) | Supplier Agent Representative |
| Richard Orna (RO) as alternate for Joel Stark | Supplier Agent (Independent) Representative |

MHHS IM

| | |
|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Andrew Margan (AM) | Governance Manager |
| Chris Harden (CH) | Programme Director |
| Giles Clayden (GC) | Deputy Programme Lead |
| Jason Brogden (JBr) | Industry SME |
| Martin Cranfield (MC) | PMO Governance Lead |
| Miles Winter (MW) | PMO Governance Support |

Other Attendees

| | |
|----------------------|---------------------|
| Angela Love (AL) | MHHS Executive Lead |
| David Gandee (DG) | MHHS IPA Lead |
| Jenny Boothe (JBo) | Ofgem (as observer) |
| Nicola Garland (NG) | Ofgem (as observer) |
| Richard Shilton (RS) | MHHS IPA Lead |
| Sinead Quinn (SQ) | Ofgem (as observer) |

Apologies

Karen Thompson-Lilley – National Grid ESO Representative

Joel Stark – Supplier Agent (Independent) Representative

Actions

| Area | Action Ref | Action | Owner | Due | Update |
|----------------------------|------------|--|---|----------|---|
| Minutes and actions | PSG11-01 | Discuss with other Level 3 Governance Group leads if pre-meeting webinars for Level 3 groups would be useful | Programme (PSG chair) | 07/09/22 | |
| Re-plan | PSG11-02 | Meet to discuss outstanding Helix queries on the Programme replan | Jason Brogden, Lee Northall | 28/08/22 | |
| | PSG11-03 | Consider scheduling further drop-in sessions later in the Round 1 replan consultation | Programme | 28/08/22 | |
| | PSG11-04 | Engage with constituents to encourage them to raise questions and provide feedback on the re-plan, and to do this as early as possible | PSG Constituency Representatives | 28/08/22 | |
| CR009 | PSG11-05 | Meet to discuss Programme approach to Consequential Change (this invite is open to any PSG members that wish to attend) | Programme (Chris Harden, Jason Brogden), Jon Hawkins, Andrew Campbell | 31/08/22 | Meeting held 16 August 2022 |
| | PSG11-06 | Action PSG-DEC19 and submit PSG recommendation on CR009 to Ofgem | Programme SRO | 12/08/22 | Recommendation submitted 12 August 2022 |
| Design update | PSG11-07 | Share the design plan to M5 (including the dissensus schedule) with PSG members | Programme PMO | 17/08/22 | Shared with meeting minutes |
| Other | PSG11-08 | Provide feedback from constituents on the Programme Digital Programme Management Office (DPMO) | PSG Constituency Representatives | 07/09/22 | |

Decisions

| Area | Dec Ref | Decision |
|---------------------|-----------|--|
| Minutes | PSG-DEC17 | Minutes of PSG 06 July 2022 and 14 July 2022 were approved |
| Interim Plan | PSG-DEC18 | The PSG approved the new version of the Programme interim plan, including associated withdrawal of CR010 |
| CR009 | PSG-DEC19 | The PSG gave unanimous support to submit a recommendation to Ofgem to approve CR009 |

RAID Items

| RAID area | Description |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Key Programme Issues | The PSG discussed in detail the Programme approach to MP162 and migration (please see key discussion items below) |

Minutes

1. Welcome

CW welcomed all to the meeting.

2. Minutes and Actions Review

DECISION PSG-DEC17: Minutes of PSG 06 July 2022 and extraordinary PSG 14 July 2022 were approved

CW updated on each action as per the actions slide.

JH queried on action PSG01-06 on the transition plan if this action had been closed, as the Design Advisory Group (DAG) had discussed requirements of the transition design and this suggested this action was still open. CH clarified that there was a difference between the Programme Plan and the Transition (migration) Plan, and that this action was specific to the Programme Plan rather than the Transition (migration) plan.

CP queried whether pre-meeting webinars would be implemented for other Level 3 Governance groups. CW proposed raising this internally with each group to see if a pre-meeting webinar would be useful.

ACTION PSG11-01: PSG Chair to discuss with other L3 Governance Group leads to suggest pre-meeting webinars as for PSG

3. Updated interim plan

GC opened the item, providing an overview of CR010 as per the slides. CW invited PSG members to comment on the Programme's approach to CR010. No comments received.

GC provided an overview of the interim plan as per the slides, noting updating the interim plan was a previous action from PSG. GC highlighted the updates to the interim plan as a result of CR009 and CR010 including:

- Move to M5 and related design activity, with all design artefacts released Monday 08 August 2022
- Revised assurance plan, including a final DAG scheduled at the new M5 and assurance activities aligned with new M5
- Code drafting activity that had been moved alongside M5 changes
- Adjustments to the participant engagement schedule
- The re-plan schedule remained unchanged except for the extra consultation as per CR010

CP asked with if the new interim plan meant that M5 and M3 occurred at the same time, noting the previous 2-month delay was not presented on the slide. JBr confirmed M5 is due to conclude at the end of October, and M3 is part of the Control Point in November. They were not totally concurrent (M5 needed to be completed before M3), after which M3 and hence Design, Build and Test (DBT) can begin.

GC asked for the interim plan to be approved on this basis. No comments received.

DECISION PSG-DEC18: The PSG approved the new version of the Programme interim plan, including associated withdrawal of CR010

4. Central Systems delivery plans

CW introduced the item and handed over to the relevant PSG representative.

Helix delivery plan

LN noted the Helix Programme was fully mobilised and was currently on track to deliver as per their original schedule. Helix had been working closely with the MHHS Programme, using the working design to support their DBT and had been sharing assumptions with the Programme where the full design was not available. Some elements of re-work had been coming through as the MHHS design had developed, with more rework expected once the design and transition design were fully baselined. LN noted impact of the re-plan may delay their internal testing (from April 2023 to the end of 2023) and so Helix had been looking at resource options to go longer and thinner. LN invited questions, none received.

DCC delivery plan

CS noted there were two phases of DCC's delivery. The first phase was governance related, with MP162 recently going to SEC change board and being rejected. MP162 would now go to Ofgem for a decision, and the outcome would either be that Ofgem overturn industry's decision or that the issue goes back to industry to revise and go through change board

again. CS noted conversations had happened with the DSP procurement team to make them aware of potential delays to release as a result. CS highlighted their plan currently scheduled delivery for February 2024, and that conversations had occurred to see the impact of a delayed June 2024 release date. This delay would result in an increased cost for service providers. CS noted service providers were ready to develop an uplift in capacity and that one of the biggest costs was to ramp up this capacity. DCC were exploring whether there was a cost change to delay this uplift by up to six months.

NG noted DCC had informed Ofgem of a need to have a decision by the end of August, and that Ofgem was considering all available options at this point.

RO asked if there was an incentive or benefit for a supplier to be involved in Systems Integration Testing (SIT), given the criticality of suppliers being able to give a test for an E2E test. CS responded that their lead analyst was fully available on the Programme to support testing. This included user-specific User Integration Testing (UIT) and wider-integration later with the Programme. RN queried if there was enough supplier involvement in SIT. JBr highlighted the distinction between Programme SIT and DCC SIT environments. CS agreed and explained that the SIT environments presented in the DCC plan were exclusively DCC SIT environments. CS added that users would not typically come into DCC SIT windows, and they were purely code drops from their Suppliers. CH added that the current programme plan for SIT was August/September 2023, and that at this point the Programme would be looking for volunteers to join SIT. Central systems (i.e. DCC, Elexon) would certainly be involved at this point, and the Programme would be looking for Suppliers too.

JBr added this also relates to conversations around migration and transition as to when suppliers would be ready to process. If suppliers were able to enter migration early post-SIT, this would have an incentive for early mover advantage. JBr suggested Programme Participants should engage with the Migration Working Group (MWG) to help assess different migration options. JBr added that the Programme was looking to have a clearer view on SIT, qualification, and migration for the next re-plan consultation.

JR noted the Target Operating Model (TOM) was modelled on MP162 being enabled, and queried how the outcome of MP162 may impact the rest of the Programme. CW suggested picking this up in a later agenda item on MP162.

GW queried Ofgem's position and timeframes. NG responded that they were looking to minimise the decision timeframe and that they knew the importance of a decision to feed into the Programme plan.

5. Programme Re-plan

GC provided an update on the Programme re-plan as per the slides, highlighting the four periods of industry engagement on the re-plan. This included pre-consultation rounds with volunteers, where feedback had been provided that had informed the plan going into consultation Round 1. GC noted Round 1 had involved a number of playback sessions which had been well received. The Round 1 plan had had a left-to-right focus in development, and later rounds of consultation would look to go right-to-left to bring in timelines. GC stressed the need for participant engagement in the re-plan now, as content would only become more specific in later rounds. GC invited questions.

LN thanked the Programme for the supporting documentation on the replan and queried if further drop-in sessions would be possible. JBr noted the Programme had not had any other requests for further drop-in sessions, and that they felt questions had already been answered in the original sessions. JBr added the Programme intended to publish an FAQ from the original playback sessions. JBr offered a further session with LN to review any remaining questions. LN accepted a one-to-one session may be better if no other parties had outstanding queries.

ACTION PSG11-02: Jason Brogden and Lee Northall to meet to discuss outstanding Helix queries on the Programme replan

ACTION PSG11-04: Programme to consider scheduling further drop-in sessions later in the Round 1 replan consultation

JH noted the time between Round 1 and Round 2 of the re-plan consultations was only 2 weeks and queried if this was enough for the Programme to digest and act upon comments. GC responded that the Programme felt current timescales were realistic, pending the scale and quality of responses from industry. CH added that if there were lots of questions coming through then additional drop-ins may be set up. JH noted this may be sensible as it could de-risk the timetable. CH reiterated that if Programme Participants have issues to raise, they should speak up early rather than wait three weeks. CH encouraged PSG representatives to ensure their constituents engage.

CP noted with regard to M3 and M5 being so close that there was concern that there was very little time to digest the design before M3. CP queried if there was anything that could be done to ensure maximum time was available to see any changes to the design. CH responded that the design artefacts were all available now, and that while the official start of commenting on Design artefacts wasn't until September, Programme Participants could begin reviewing now and provide feedback and comments as early as possible. CP queried further that if Round 3 re-plan consultation happened immediately after M5, how were Programme Participants supposed to deliver M3 without seeing the final Programme plan. JBr responded that the Round 3 consultation was not required in order to make a Programme decision on M3.

RS added support from the IPA perspective that it was good for PSG representatives to encourage Programme Participants to get comments on the re-plan and the design as early as possible. The better the quality of comments, the better they will help the Programme, and so Programme Participants should ensure those comments are fully QA'ed to help the Programme triage and act effectively.

ACTION PSG11-03: PSG Constituency Reps to engage with constituents to encourage them to raise questions and provide feedback on the re-plan, and to do this as early as possible

6. CR009 decision

CW ran through CR009 Impact Assessment Summary Report as per the slides. CW states this item was for a PSG recommendation to submit to Ofgem because the Change Request proposed a moved to a Level 1 Milestone (M5). CW invited comments.

JH highlighted a concern they held separate to their view on the recommendation relating to CR009 that they were uncomfortable about the approach of the Programme toward consequential change. JH noted they believed the Programme's position would cause problems and that Programme Participants had been raising concerns in various forums with a dismissive response from the Programme. JH added that they wanted to see recognition of different levels of Consequential Change – this included centrally governed systems and processes that Programme Participants relied upon, but the Programme had been bundling this in with other types of consequential change that were more clearly out of scope. JH felt more discussion was required.

CW responded that the Programme was not dismissive of consequential change as a concept. CH noted that if Participants felt the process the Programme had in place did not work for Programme Participants, then this needed further discussion. CH agreed that there were some areas of consequential change that sat outside of Programme, and that areas where ambiguity existed should be brought to Consequential Change Impact Assessment Group (CCIAG). This included if it was something that affected the whole market (such as EACs, as removing EACs made it hard for Programme Participants and so the Programme had said they would produce an EAC). CH invited PSG members to bring specifics to CCIAG and if this process wasn't working, they should then escalate it, such as to PSG.

JH responded that they felt a reticence when it comes to some elements of consequential change, and that there was not a universally agreed approach between Programme's position and what industry were wanting to see. This created a lack of certainty for industry.

AC noted there had been a CCIAG at the end of June, but there had not been a CCIAG since. This meant there would be two months between CCIAGs, despite questions raised about progression between CCIAGs, with no update on actions from the first CCIAG. AC expressed agreement with JH and felt consequential change was not being given prioritisation that it needs.

ACTION PSG11-05: Programme and relevant PSG members to meet to discuss Programme approach to Consequential Change (this invite is open to any PSG members that wish to attend)

CW invited PSG Constituency Representatives to indicate their position on CR009 by raising virtual hands.

11 In favour: AC, GE, CS, JH, ER, GW, PA, JR, ND, LN, RO

0 against

One abstention: NG

DECISION PSG-DEC19: CR009 to be approved and sent to Ofgem by end of week to make a decision.

ACTION PSG11-06: Programme SRO to action PSG-DEC19 and submit PSG recommendation on CR009 to Ofgem

7. Key Programme Issues

MP162

CW introduced the issue on MP162, noting SEC Change Board who represented the industry had rejected the proposal. CW invited questions. PSG members provided their view in turn:

- AC noted limited support in supplier community to use the MDR role, and that the rationale for rejection was that supplier's do not want to pay for what they won't use.
- GW agreed with AC's comments and queried if the TOM could be amended if the MDR role was not required.
- JH noted RECCo were agnostic and that the cost and perceived uptake of the service may mean it was not as good an idea as originally believed by the working group that created the TOM.
- JR noted that their constituency was neutral and wanted to avoid additional cost if there was an alternative solution, and if MP162 is rejected, there could be alternative solutions. JR added that there needed to be an assessment of impact on DCC performance and the wider Programme timeline, and queried if the Programme needed to revisit the TOM.
- GE added concerns over the Level Playing Field concept and the need to go back to the TOM to make this work. GE noted this would have implications on the Programme timelines and some assessment should be done now, while the re-plan is taking place.
- PA noted the Programme needed to be careful on the implications of MP162, and it was not just the MDR role but also the volume of data the DCC need to use (i.e. increased capacity). PA added a Cost-Benefit Analysis needed to be completed to look at the whole picture.
- ER added that the Programme's next step of waiting for Ofgem meant the Programme was on the back foot, and that the Programme needed to be more forward looking (without waiting for the decision).
- CP noted their position was as JRs, and that the impact of MP162 approval or rejection, and hence alternatives, needed to be known (i.e. implications of MP162 on the wider Programme).
- AC added that MDR role would be an agent for suppliers, but that there did not seem to be support for this element of the TOM, for which there is already an alternative in place in the TOM.

CW invited the DCC representative to comment. CS noted DCC were aware of all of these comments and that they were trying to decouple the MDR from the costs. The majority of costs (and enduring costs) were about supplier/MDR reading (i.e. capacity), and not the MDR role itself. CS added that the reason for the modification was the creation of the MDR role in the SEC and move the 20 second Target Response Time (TRT) into a scheduled read given the size and volume of data.

CW clarified that capacity would need to be increased regardless of introduction of MDR, and this would happen whether this was just Suppliers or wider. CS added that the settlement service itself should be delivered under a 24-hour window, and that any other reads for settlement purposes should be done through this 24-hour window, not the 20 second TRT. DCC intend to measure 20 second TRT rates presently versus future use, as Suppliers should not be using 20 second TRT for any settlement purposes as this would highly impact DCC if Suppliers began to do so.

CW summarised that the outcome would be a decision for Ofgem and may result in a change from the TOM. The Programme had brought this item to PSG to draw the attention of PSG members and provide a PSG view to Ofgem.

SQ noted they had received all the information required from various parties in order to make a decision by the end of August.

AC added to CS's comment on the DCC's expectation not to have any 20 second TRT as this would need correlation between half hourly settlement and billing. This would mean billing would need faster response and this correlation needed to be considered.

AL queried contingency actions for the issue, such as if the TOM drop the MDR role altogether JBr noted this was dependent on the Ofgem decision, and that this analysis would be required after the decision as the Programme could not justify using resource to deliver an impact assessment now on an unknown decision.

Migration

GC summarised the issue related to migration as per the slides, noting it as an area with a lack of clarity in the re-plan. GC summarised action being taken by the Programme through the re-plan. CW invited questions, particularly if reverse migration ("revolving door") was required.

JH noted discussion in DAG with a key consideration of the complexity of reverse migration that may result in delay in go live. JH noted they believed the option presented in the Programme plan was the Programme's 'preferred option', and that the impacts needed to be assessed with both lenses (one-way versus two-way gate), as a one-way gate may shorten timescales. CH responded that this was not the preferred option, but a working assumption for the re-plan.

JBr noted that solution complexity was a criterion for assessing migration options, and this would be discussed at the Migration Working Group (MWG) were migration options were being assessed. This built on work of the MWG previously and discussions with Ofgem. JBr noted options on the table include revolving door and others, and that these would be assessed against a set of criteria. JBr added that the original CCDG recommendation gave a different conclusion than where the MWG was now. CW added that a change would be a change to the Target Operating Model (TOM) and so would need to go through the formal Change Control Process. This meant that the decision would not be made in isolation by the Programme alone. JH noted this was aligned with their conversations with DAG.

CH added further complexities (e.g. how long revolving door is in place) and that a detailed design would be required to fully understand the solution to support an impact assessment, rather than making assumptions. JH noted this also would change the approach to code drafting and code release. CH agreed and added there would be further knock ons (e.g. for Helix and agents) and this needed to be worked through with Ofgem, with four options currently being explored,

CH queried if this issue had come up with suppliers, agents, DNOs or iDNOs. GW noted clarity was needed and this would feed into the second round of consultation on the plan. JBr responded that the intention was to resolve this ahead of round 2 of the plan consultation, and this was a risk to round 2 consultation release. CH responded that alternatively this would need to be made as an assumption. JR highlighted concerns on how migration may impact the design, their own DBT, and the programme plan. PA reiterated concerns of the impact on the design (i.e. tracking MPAN arrangement simultaneously) and that this would need a Change Request already on the new baseline. GE noted migration and cutover was one of the biggest concerns for their constituency, and that there was a desire to avoid parallel running of new and legacy systems and to make migration simple.

8. IPA Baseline Health Check

DG introduced the item, explaining that the Baseline Health Check assessed a number of areas within the scope of the Independent Programme Assurer (IPA) work packages, as discussed at PSG a number of months ago. To deliver the Health Check, the IPA had since been embedded in the Programme to provide real-time assurance on Programme activities through field work. The development of the Health Check had been collaborative with the Programme, with real-time discussion of challenges. DG noted many areas in the Health Check were already in progress or actioned by the Programme.

RS ran through the executive summary as per the slides, highlighting trust and collaboration across Programme parties as a key area for improvement. RS explained several key areas of focus for the Programme over the coming months as per the slides. RS highlighted proactive ownership of external change as being important, referencing the discussion held today on MP162. RS presented the key recommendations and invited questions.

AC queried how 'achievable and sensible' versus 'expedient' would be achieved in the Programme plan, highlighting previous Change Requests (CR001 and 002) than had favoured the latter and led to further delays in M5. AC queried how realism would be introduced into the plan so there would something achievable and deliverable. RS responded that a strong evidence-base was required in the re-planning exercise, such as through Impact Assessment for certain Programme phases, with clear and validated assumptions.

CW noted the Programme's management response to the Baseline Health Check would come in September and that the Programme's relationship with the IPA was working well.

9. Design progress

CH introduced the item noting that all design artefacts were released on Monday 08 August 2022. CH thanked all those who contributed at the DAG and the Design Working Groups to get these documents ready. CH explained that there was now a series of processes to collect Programme Participants' views and feedback.

The design team had begun hosting drop-in sessions. CH explained engagement so far had been very strong, with over 300 attendees on the first drop-in session and over 100 on subsequent sessions. The current design plan gave three weeks for a preview for Programme Participants before the official start of the Design review period to submit comments from 29 August to 16 September. CH invited parties to submit comments ahead of this time, should they have them. CH explained following industry review there was then a review of comments, an agreement on responses to comments and then the dissensus process. Feedback from industry on the dissensus process had been positive, and the Programme may look to extend this concept to the CCIAG. CH noted that all final Design Artefacts would be published on 21 October

with a view to getting the Design baselined on 28 October. Finally, CH explained that there were four open design issues at the moment and the Programme was looking to resolve these through the dissensus process. The aim was for the two artefacts related to these design issues to be issued on Monday 22 August 2022.

JH asked if there was a plan for Programme Participants to see the responses to their comments and how they have been addressed ahead of 21 October. CH responded that all comments would be reviewed and addressed by the Programme between 19 and 30 September, the responses to comments would then be reissued to Programme Participants for review. By 07 October, the Programme would then expect Programme Participants views back on whether they agree with the Programme's response to comments or not, and hence those that disagreed would then follow the dissensus process. CH noted this should be in the plan as agreed through DAG.

ACTION PSG11-07: Programme to share the design plan to M5 (including the dissensus schedule) with PSG members

CW invited further questions on the Design Progress update. None received.

10. Delivery dashboards

CW opened the item noting the dashboards as read.

GC presented the milestone Status updates, calling out the physical baseline and DB start for suppliers moving from Red to Amber since last PSG. GC provided an overview of Programme progress against the interim plan (updated with CR009), highlighting a number of RAG status moving from Red to Amber. Some areas had not changed from Amber due to ongoing uncertainty. GC gave an overview of the main Programme risk and issue themes, noting CR009 was the primary driver as to why the top risk on M5 delivery had changed from Red to Amber, and MP162 had increased following the rejection of MP162 at SEC Change Board.

11. Summary and Next Steps

CW moved to close the meeting. MC summarised actions and decisions as per the table above.

CW summarised proposed agenda items for September. JBr noted MP162 should be added to agenda.

CW invited AOBs. CH proposed one final action to PSG members relating to the Programme Digital Programme Management Office. CH noted they would like the dPMO to be used as much as possible by participants and to receive feedback on it. CW closed the meeting.

Date of next PSG: 07 September 2022