

## MHHS Programme Steering Group (PSG) Headline Report

Issue date: 08/09/2022

Meeting Number **PSG 012**

Venue **Virtual – MS Teams**

Date and Time **07 September 2022 1000-1200**

Classification **Public**

### Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date
<b>Migration</b>	PSG12-01	Ensure commercial and operational impacts on the market are included in the assessment of migration options being considered in the Migration Working Group (MWG)	Programme (Jason Brogden)	05/10/22
<b>Readiness for M3 and DBT</b>	PSG12-02	Engage with constituents to determine if they are going to be ready for M3 as per the criteria in CR009 (see key discussion items for full detail on the ask to constituents). Provide a summary at October PSG	PSG constituency representatives	05/10/22
<b>Design progress</b>	PSG12-03	Include the transition design in design reporting to PSG	Programme (Warren Fulton)	05/10/22
<b>Industry change dashboard</b>	PSG12-04	Provide an indication of the magnitude of items reported in the industry change dashboard (e.g. scale and risk)	Programme PMO	05/10/22

### Decisions

Area	Dec Ref	Decision
<b>Minutes and action</b>	PSG-DEC19	The PSG approved the minutes of the PSG meeting 10 August 2022
<b>Programme re-plan</b>	PSG-DEC20	The PSG agreed that the round 2 re-plan consultation window would be shortened by one week and that the content of the consultation would include guidance on evidence requirements, draft dates, and targeted questions directing required evidence from respondents

<b>Control Point 1</b>	PSG-DEC21	The PSG agreed to move Control Point 1 to December PSG
------------------------	-----------	--

## RAID Items

RAID area	Description
<b>Key Programme Issues</b>	The PSG discussed two Key Programme Issues: MP162 and Migration. Please see key discussion items for full detail.

## Key Discussion Items

Area	Discussion
<b>Programme re-plan progress</b>	<p>The Programme presented an update on the Programme re-plan ahead of Round 2 consultation starting Monday 12 September. The Programme stressed that the draft plan being released in Round 2 would be a working draft, not approved by Ofgem - and that an important objective of this consultation round was to identify the best approaches, assumptions, and activity durations to support Ofgem's timetable (or to minimise variance to it) – to allow movement into a final Round 3 consultation period. Ofgem reiterated this point, noting that the Round 2 plan would not be one that had been agreed by Ofgem and that the content needed to be challenged by Ofgem and industry with evidence provided to justify any timeline changes from the Ofgem Transition Plan. The Programme noted they would provide guidance information on what constitutes the 'good evidence' that would be required to support consultation responses.</p> <p>The PSG agreed to shorten the consultation window by one week (to end 30 September) to allow for additional time for consideration of the content of the consultation responses and to reduce the impact of consultation responses being submitted on the final day of the window (<b>decision PSG-DEC20</b>). To alleviate the exercise being conducted in less time, the number of questions asked in Round 2 would be reduced and made more targeted and specific.</p> <p>The RECCo representative queried the likely level of change expected in the next version of the plan released in the Round 3 consultation. The Programme noted there was a risk of change and that reducing the length of the Round 2 consultation window would allow for further time to develop the plan and the assumptions and dependencies underpinning it ahead of Round 3. The Programme noted they were aiming to give PSG maximum confidence in the plan ready for recommendation to Ofgem for approval.</p> <p>Several PSG members queried how the ongoing discussions on migration would impact the re-plan. The Programme responded that any assumptions on migration would be made clear in the Round 2 re-plan consultation and its questions. The Programme is targeting mid-October to know further detail on the migration approach, meaning a Change Request to the TOM may be needed on migration separate to the Change Request required for the Programme re-plan. Programme Participants were encouraged to gain further context/detail on migration by attending the Migration Working Group (MWG).</p>
<b>Key Programme Issues</b>	<p><u>MP162</u></p> <p>The Programme provided an update on Ofgem's direction to the DCC on the MP126 capacity issues and letter to the SEC panel on reconsidering the MDR role, noting dates for resolution for these areas as 07 October and 31 October respectively.</p> <p>The Supplier Agent representative queried the communications approach for any proposals to resolve these issues. Ofgem noted the need for transparent and inclusive communications from the Programme and the DCC to provide sight to relevant parties so they could</p>

	<p>see and input into any response. The Programme and the DCC agreed, saying that they would continue to work closely together and ensure action was transparent and communicated.</p> <p><u>Migration</u></p> <p>The Programme provided an update on the assessment of four migration options via the MWG. The design team had been exploring revolving door options and had a potential solution with which they had had initial discussions with Helix and St Clements (as the most impacted parties). The Programme explained that the revolving door could be an enabler to delivering the Programme in shorter timescales, as those that wanted to 'go early' would be able to.</p> <p>The I&amp;C Supplier representative queried how commercial and operational impacts of the migration options were being considered via the MWG, as these could be just as important as any technical solution. The Programme agreed this was important to include (<b>action PSG12-01</b>).</p> <p>The RECCo representative queried if the MWG was considering the wider impacts of the migration options on the Programme and Programme plan, as the revolving door may add complexity that delays other elements of the Programme (and outweighs the benefit of some parties 'going early'). The Programme agreed this was important and that it would be considered both in the MWG and the Programme re-plan.</p> <p>Ofgem noted consumer impacts were important. The Programme confirmed this was a key assessment criterion.</p>
<p><b>Consequential change process</b></p>	<p>The Programme provided an overview of the recently improved process for managing consequential change via the Consequential Change Impact Assessment Group (CCIAG), noting some elements as ongoing as the CCIAG continued to pick up momentum. This item was brought to PSG to provide confidence to the PSG in the Programme's working practices following previous feedback. PSG members welcomed the improvements.</p>
<p><b>Control Point 1</b></p>	<p>The Programme provided an overview of Control Points at MHHS and the process for delivering Control Point 1. The Programme noted ongoing discussions to determine the approach to some elements of the Control Point (such as governance for the Control Point decision) and invited PSG to feedback on a possible move of the Control Point to December PSG. The move to December was proposed given November PSG was likely to be busy with a number of areas that would be beneficial to be delivered ahead of Control Point 1 (e.g. Readiness Assessment 2 (RA2), the Programme re-plan). The PSG agreed to move Control Point 1 to December (<b>decision PSG-DEC21</b>).</p>
<p><b>CR009 decision</b></p>	<p>The Programme highlighted that CR009 had been approved by Ofgem and that a new version of the interim plan had now been published (available <a href="#">here</a>).</p>
<p><b>Management response to IPA Baseline Health Check</b></p>	<p>The Programme presented their response to the IPA Baseline Health Check. All recommendations had been accepted except for one. This was for a formal checkpoint on participant readiness ahead of RA2. The Programme did not feel the additional workload related to this would be beneficial for the Programme or participants, and instead proposed an informal information gathering exercise on participant readiness via PSG Constituency Representatives (<b>action PSG12-02</b>):</p> <p>PSG Constituency Representatives were asked to gather feedback from their constituents on their readiness for M3 as per the criteria provided in <a href="#">CR009</a>. The Programme would like themes or challenges from participants in their delivery of these criteria to be presented</p>

	<p>by representatives at the 05 October PSG. Constituents may find it useful to refer the <a href="#">questions for RA2</a> to support this information gathering. Constituency representatives may ask their constituents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are you on track to deliver the criteria for M3?</li> <li>• Are there any criteria you are finding challenging? If so, which and why?</li> </ul>
<b>Design progress</b>	<p>The Programme provided an update on the progress of the design. All design artefacts were out for industry review. The design playback sessions had been well received and attended. The Programme encouraged industry to engage with the design and provide comments as early as possible. Further communications on next steps for the design following industry review was planned via the Clock and design newsletter.</p> <p>The Helix representative requested that design progress reporting also include the transition design (<b>action PSG12-03</b>).</p>
<b>Delivery dashboards</b>	<p>The Programme highlighted a new 'Industry Change' dashboard and noted an intention to add further detail on the magnitude of items reported in the dashboard (<b>action PSG12-04</b>). No comments were received on the Programme dashboards.</p>

**Date of next meeting: 05 October 2022**