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

Issue date: 24/07/22

Meeting number	**TMAG 008**	Venue	**Virtual – MS Teams**
Date and time	**17 August 2022 1000-1200**	Classification	**Public**

Attendees

Chair

Chris Welby (CW)	MHHS SRO

Industry Participants

Chandrani Ghosh (CG)	Elexon Representative (as central systems provider)
David Yeoman (DY) on behalf of Ian Hatton	DNO Representative
Dave Jones (DJ)	RECCo Representative
Ian Hall (IHal)	Supplier Agent Representative (Independent)
Martin Hanley (MH)	Large Supplier Representative
Nicola Bumford (NBu)	National Grid ESO Representative
Nickie Bernsmeier-Rullow (NBR)	DCC Representative (as smart meter central system provider)
Shaun Brundett (SBr)	Small Supplier Representative
Stacey Buck (SBu)	iDNO Representative

MHHS IM members

Adrian Ackroyd (AA)	Test Manager
Jason Brogden (JB)	Industry SME
Noah Thorne (NT)	PMO Information Lead
Martin Cranfield (MC)	PMO Governance & Secretariat Lead
Peter Edwarde (PE)	PPC Lead

Other Attendees

Sajwal Dash (SD)	IPA lead
Sinead Quinn (SQ)	Ofgem (as observer)
Santosh Vasudevan (SV)	Elexon observer

Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date	Update
dPMO	TMAG08-01	Develop and share a how-to guide for logging into the Programme Collaboration Base	Programme (PMO/PPC)	15/09/2022	
Programme replan	TMAG08-02	Respond to Programme replan consultation. Encourage constituents to respond to the consultation	TMAG members	26/08/2022	

	TMAG08-03	Explore mechanisms of information sharing across working groups to ensure communication across groups on related/dependent topics	Programme	15/09/2022	
Working group updates	TMAG08-04	Publicise the extraordinary Migration Working Group (MWG) in The Clock to encourage increased participation and provide information on the importance of ongoing Migration activities	Programme	17/08/2022	Shared in The Clock 17 August 2022
	TMAG07-03	**Action updated**: Consider combining working groups to into a more efficient structure with fewer groups. Consider splitting sub-groups by relevant industry groupings to target discussion to most relevant parties	Programme	Ongoing	
Other	TMAG08-05	Consult with constituents to determine if a TMAG pre-meeting webinar would be useful for them (as per the PSG pre-meeting webinars)	TMAG members	15/09/2022	
	TMAG08-06	Share the following with TMAG members: - Link to RAID input form - Round 1 Programme re-plan consultation communication with link to replan documentation - Environments Working Group (EWG) papers and Headline Report - The Programme interim plan	Programme (PMO)	18/08/2022	Shared with meeting Headline Report

Decisions

Area	Decision Ref	Description
Minutes	TMAG-DEC11	The TMAG approved the minutes of the meeting held 20 July 2022
QWG ToR	TMAG-DEC12	The TMAG approved the Qualification and E2E Sandbox Working Group (QWG) Terms of Reference (ToR)

RAID Items

RAID area	Description
dPMO	The Programme presented the Programme Digital Programme Management Office (dPMO) and provided an overview of how it may be used to support RAID management.

Minutes

1. Welcome

CW welcomed all to the meeting and provided an overview of the agenda as per the slides.

2. Minutes and actions

CW invited comments on the minutes. None received.

DECISION TMAG-DEC11: The minutes of the TMAG 20 July 2022 were approved
---

CW updated on TMAG actions as per the slides. No comments received.

3.   Programme updates

MC provided an overview of the Programme updates, highlighting CR009, the Programme re-plan, and progress on the design.

NT introduced themselves as the information and data lead from the PMO attending TMAG to provide an overview of the Programme's Digital Programme Management Office (dPMO). NT noted this was a way to interact with Programme progress. The dPMO is a set of interactive PowerBI dashboards and also includes the Programme RAID log. This will improve accessibility to key Programme information and Programme Participants can tailor the filters to make the information as relevant as possible. NT invited TMAG members to log in, interact and provide feedback on what they would like to see on the content.

Accessing the tool

NT walked through the ways to access the dPMO through the Programme Collaboration Base via the Programme Information tab, including via the dedicated page on the Collaboration Base with information on the dPMO. This takes members to X Platform that contains the tool with a one-time authentication process via PPs MHHS email account. NT showed members how to access the content via the QIP tab in X platform. NT noted there were supporting step-by-step guides. SV noted they could not access. NT clarified that this needs to be an MHHS Programme address. MC noted the collaboration base is the Programme's interactive shared workspace with industry. It's where documents for review and comment are stored.

Using the tool

NT showed how PPs can navigate through the dashboards. The dashboards are currently focussed on RAID with more content to come. NT demonstrated how the dashboards could be filtered to provide more detail on individual items in the RAID log, including how content can be filtered and extracted. NT also showed 'focus mode' on tables and graphs, which displays the dPMO information in a more focused way for presentations or screenshots that PPs might need.

Supporting information

NT showed where the user guides and further information can be found to support users. NT invited questions to the PMO if more information was needed.

> **ACTION TMAG08-01: Programme to develop and share a how-to guide for logging into the Programme Collaboration Base**

4.   Programme replan review

JB introduced the item noting the slides those from the Round 1 Programme replan consultation. The re-plan was introduced in the programme to be delivered at a point once more was known on scope and approach. It was agreed to be delivered via consultations with industry for a final plan to be delivered end of 2022. JB noted Round 1 consultation was currently out with industry and that at this stage the replan was an unconstrained left-to-right plan to build out the activities, risks, dependencies, to be challenged with industry. The next activity would be a right-to-left exercise to deliver in required timescales (e.g through parallel running) and to define the critical path. JB asked TMAG members to input into the process and test the assumptions in the plan (e.g. in migration, testing) given their expertise and own plans, and to provide as much feedback as possible on the consultation questions provided by the Programme.

JB noted the back-end activities in the plan were most relevant for TMAG and that the current plan for this element largely followed the Ofgem transition timetable. Work was ongoing to define this further, including an analysis of migration options and timescales via the Migration Working Group (MWG). JB noted the deadline for consultation responses was the 26 August, with Round 2 coming 12 September and Round 3 after M5

JB walked the TMAG through the Programme's overall Plan on a Page (PoaP), highlighting testing activities in particular. JB noted a delay between the end of Systems Integration Testing (SIT) and the cutover to migration and live. This had been introduced through feedback from the Planning Working Group (PWG) on testing in E2E sandbox to prove back- and mid-office systems. This was important for TMAG members own planning and critical paths.

<u>Design and Build phase</u>

JB invited TMAG members to raise Design and Build content of the replan with the relevant leads in their organisations, noting the key RAID items underpinning the plan had been included in the content. JB invited TMAG members to challenge the assumptions in the RAID.

<u>Integration phase</u>

JB provided an overview of the integration testing phase as per the slides, noting there were no dates as this stage of planning was about activities and dependencies, and dates would have been likely to change as a result of consultation.

SV queried how participants would integrate with other target environments during industry testing. JB responded that the environments requirements were being completed by the Environments and Configurations Management Working Group (EWG). The EWG currently had a view on test environments. JB noted the Programme would be expecting Programme Participants to stand up environments for testing and for them to join through component integration test phase, with multiple environments required for different test stages.

Qualification phase

JB noted it was important to receive input from TMAG members into qualification given their expertise. JB highlighted some Red assumptions as currently being challenged by the Programme. JB invited questions.

DY noted a working assumption for DNOs that St Clements would be performing SIT on their behalf, and queried if they had been engaged or asked to comment directly. JB responded the Round 1 consultation had gone out to all of industry for individual and/or consolidated response. JB invited DY to prompt a response from St Clements, noting other important systems too (e.g. C&C and DUoS). SB responded they had shared the Round 1 consultation with C&C. CG queried when participants would receive the detailed test plan below the Programme plan. JB responded that timelines for this were available in the Programme interim plan.

Migration

JB again invited TMAG members to challenge the content of the migration plan, given the additional information TMAG members have from previous migration activities (e.g. on timelines, activities, dependencies, practicalities). JB highlighted some important assumptions and invited questions. CW invited challenge on timescales being both too long or too short (with evidence) to deliver benefits sooner to consumers.

DJ queried how the timeframes were so specific given the plan was based on assumptions. JB responded that this was built off a Microsoft Project plan and so the content shared was an extracted of a more detailed plan. This meant that the dates didn't necessarily result in 'clean' months.

CW highlighted the importance of TMAG members responding to consultation to create an evidence-based, robust and realistic plan that industry as a whole would sign up to and deliver.

> **ACTION TMAG08-02: TMAG members to respond to Programme replan consultation and encourage constituents to respond to the consultation**

5. PPC introduction

PE introduced the item, noting the intention to give constituency reps more information on the role of the Programme Party Coordinator (PPC). PE provided an overview of the PPC team, their vision and their role as per the slides. PE invited TMAG members to get in contact with the PPC should they have any queries. CW emphasised the PPC team were there to support TMAG members in engaging with the constituents.

6. Working group updates

AA provided an overview of activity at the TMAG working groups as per the slides.

Environments and Configurations Management Working Group (EWG)

AA noted attendance was low and encouraged representation. EWG was driving through environment requirements (e.g. approach, number, timeframes) and this had implications on budgets. Recent discussion had included scope, responsibilities, assurance, readiness requirements, environments monitoring, release management etc. NBR queried cross-collaboration across groups (e.g. input from security and MWG at EWG), how was the Programme ensuring cross-pollination. AA responded this was the purpose of this item, as well as information that is also provided through the Portal, such as Headline Reports. NB responded that more that could be done to ensure decisions across groups are considered. CW responded that the Programme would take an action and encouraged industry parties to also cross-pollinate and work together. MC noted the leads of each group in the Programme were in constant open dialogue. JB noted actions could be taken as part of this item if TMAG members had any concerns. MC noted this was related to the working group deliverables and dependencies presented at last month's TMAG.

ACTION TMAG08-03: Programme to Explore mechanisms of information sharing across working groups to ensure communication across groups on related/dependent

Qualification and E2E Sandbox Working Group (QWG)

Initial meeting held and TOR main point of focus. Some feedback had been provided to be updated. The group had had good engagement and a productive discussion around qualification and what's included in the qualification process. It was acknowledged qualification is not just BSC, but could require elements of REC and SEC too. This will be included in the guidance that is issued by QWG.

Migration Working Group (MWG)

MWG so far looking at characteristics of migration process, with analysis underway of four options: 1) M14 migration deadline, 2) early adoption when central systems ready after qualification, with one-way gate (no reversal), 3) early adoption when central systems ready after qualification, with two-way gate (reverse migration/revolving door option), 4) early adoption with mitigation for no reverse migration, with option for organisations to return to old systems but not as a revolving door. An extraordinary MWG had been scheduled to progress the options. CW noted the proposals (apart from option 1) are a change to the TOM and so the decision would be an Ofgem decision (not MWG or TMAG), following leg work developed by the MWG. Ofgem would take into account impacts on the customer and timeframes. The Programme would like the early-adoption idea, to help drive progress in the Programme. AA added the option has an impact on the overall Programme re-plan, with a number of important decisions linked to output from the MWG.

AA invited TMAG members to consider the appropriate input and resourcing to these working groups, noting the importance of these groups in the success of the Programme. AA welcomed additional input from industry members, noting it as important for the Programme and PPs own success.

SB queried:

1. What does the path look like for MWG, given guidance from Ofgem. AA responded design was ongoing for reverse migration, this would be updated and shared with the extraordinary MWG. The extraordinary MWG will make a recommendation, and this will go to Ofgem. SB queried if this would come to TMAG. CW responded it was more complex, and the route straight to Ofgem made most sense in this instance.

2. Who are the right people to send to these working groups. Different organisations run different software systems and would like these suppliers joining these groups, there will need to be more than one person across the groups and cannot have single person. AA noted the Level 4 Working Groups were open to all. SB queried if anyone could join, given the ask had been 'test leads'. AA responded that the ask was for specific knowledge or interested parties and was not meant to be a single representative but needs to be targeted to derive best outcomes from the group. SB responded it would be at least two people from their organisation.

3. What are the impacts on the plan, given the impacts the options may have on the design. Is it worth highlighting this further through the design newsletter and the Clock, given potential impact on design. CW responded the Programme are working hard to reach a solution, to then feed into the re-plan (and possibly the design). SB noted it was important that PPs were aware of this migration activity when inputting into their design and re-plan consultation responses. JB noted they would add a notification in the Clock

ACTION TMAG08-04: Programme to Publicise the extraordinary Migration Working Group (MWG) in The Clock to encourage increased participation and provide information on the importance of ongoing Migration activities

DY queried if there was an appetite/plan for focus sessions, as they were interested on impacts of the outputs of these groups on DNOs. This had worked well at FSP, where they had had their owns forums/sessions/working groups. Will the groups be broken up for the relevant constituency groups, otherwise the working groups will have too broad a focus. AA responded that at the moment there were no plans for this level of granularity but it may be considered in the future. DY noted a misalignment between what is and isn't impacting different parties, such as those in the design artefacts that were highlighted as impacting DNOs (70 from the programme vs 100 noted by DNOs). CW noted decisions on the Programme for discussion with more break out groups may result in lack of cross-pollination or siloed working.

ACTION TMAG07-03: Action updated: Consider combining working groups to into a more efficient structure with fewer groups. Consider splitting sub-groups by relevant industry groupings to target discussion to most relevant parties

7.   Summary and next steps

MC summarised the actions as per the summary table above.

CW noted an action from PSG regarding pre-meeting webinars to explore if Level 3 groups would also like this, noting they are broadcast only to provide information. CW invited feedback noting this required resource from the Programme and would only provide benefit if constituents joined the webinar (not just the reps). A webinar would be a walkthrough of the papers on the Thursday after paper date.

> **ACTION TMAG08-05: TMAG members to consult with constituents to determine if a TMAG pre-meeting webinar would be useful for them (as per the PSG pre-meeting webinars)**

CW ran through upcoming agenda items and invited final AOBs. AA noted a request for approval of the QWG ToR from TMAG, noting these were agreed at the inaugural QWG. CW invited TMAG members that did not want to approve the ToR. None received.

> **DECISION TMAG-DEC12: The TMAG approved the Qualification and E2E Sandbox Working Group (QWG) Terms of Reference (ToR)**

CW closed the meeting.

Date of next TMAG: 22 September 2022, afternoon