



RAID area	Description
N/a	

## 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-DEC13: The minutes of the TMAG 17 August 2022 were approved

CW updated on TMAG actions as per the slides.

SBu noted there was some interest from their constituency group for a pre-meeting webinar, with regard to TMAG08-05. CW responded that more interest would be required from other constituencies too if the Programme was to consider scheduling these, but the option would be kept under review as it may be useful later in the programme.

### 3. Programme Updates

MW ran through Programme Updates by exception. The key update was the replan consultation Round 2. This was covered in greater detail under the next agenda item. No questions or comments received.

### 4. Programme re-plan

KG noted Round 1 of re-plan was intended to communicate indicative timelines to Programme Participants (PPs). Round 2 was intended to reflect some of the feedback received and was an opportunity for the Programme to challenge the timescales. Ofgem would like the Programme to get to a plan that delivers MHHS in the shortest realistic and practical timescale. Ofgem wanted to know that the Programme and PPs have a plan to deliver this as soon as possible, without the timeline becoming unrealistic and unachievable. KG noted there were two POAPs (Plan on a Page) being circulated, and the Programme would like as much information as possible to either validate whether POAP 1 works and why, or equally whether POAP 1 doesn't work and why.

KG stressed the Programme must have evidence for why PPs don't believe a plan works. Ofgem would also like to see PPs plans, accepting that these may be a work in progress at the moment. These plans need to have timings on them so there is a credible body of evidence for how long the Programme will take.

KG noted in Round 1 there were a significant number of consultation questions. There were fewer for Round 2, though responses to these questions needed to contain as much information as possible.

### POAP 1

KG ran through POAP 1. The main difference between POAP 1 and what was in Round 1 of consultation was a change in SIT. The Programme had explored ways to do SIT in a shorter timeframe as it was one of the longer periods in the plan. The intention was to get PPs through SIT and into live operation more quickly. The first swim lane on the slide acknowledged that the migration design was being worked out in November and December and would be confirmed by the end of the year. The next four swim lanes were relevant to parties involved in SIT. PPs that were part of SIT would have different start times for different participants. The intention was to monitor how quickly PPs were getting through SIT to get testing finished as soon as possible. KG noted that early on in SIT, progress would be evaluated and those PPs going fastest would be paired up so those working through SIT the fastest were paired together. There would need to be a 'Minimum Viable Cohort' (MVC) and these would be the first PPs to exit SIT. This would require a number of data services, suppliers, and at least one registrations provider, alongside the central systems. The typical path here would be to do Impact Assessment and planning, drop into DBT of services and supplier DIP interfaces, and then into SIT. Once these PPs have done this, they could then access the E2E Sandbox and enter go-live earlier. SIT participants who weren't in MVC would still be able to go-live when ready.

There would be a month's grace period to enter SIT, if PPs were not ready at the start of SIT. This approach was intended to mitigate individual PPs having issues with entering SIT on day 1.

The bottom two swim lanes applied to non-SIT participants. This was similar to Round 1 Consultation, but with slightly different timescales as the overall duration had been reduced slightly.

KGh asked for a DNO, if performing the role of registration service, they wouldn't be considered a central system, but would need to be in SIT. KG confirmed DNOs not regarded as a central party, but at least one DNO would be needed for SIT, and all DNOs would be needed for go-live.

KG noted the Programme assumption that all DNOs and iDNOs would be ready at the same time as central systems go-live, as they were an enabler for all other PPs.

KGh asked if there was potential that some DNOs would have to go through qualification testing if not going through SIT. KG confirmed yes. All parties would need to go through qualification as a procedural element, but qualification testing would only be for those not going through SIT.

DJ asked regarding the Component Integration Testing stage, would this just be for central systems integration testing. KG responded that it would be for all PPs. In the E2E Data and Testing Strategy there were some diagrams on this. With Component Integration Testing, the intention was to start adding items gradually in a phased start. This would begin with the DIP, then Elexon central systems, and so on to ensure a working network before functional testing was required. Not everyone would be required at the same point, as different components would be added at different points.

DJ asked if EES is a central system, and if this should be referenced explicitly. KG responded that on the latest system architecture diagram this was on there. The E2E Testing Strategy would be reviewed and revised once the planning is complete, and this would be based on EES being a central system.

DJ asked with regard to MPRS that in the POAP it states MPRS is a central party, but the QWG referenced MPRS as not being a central party. KG noted this was a mistake and references to MPRS as a central party were intended to be taken off.

SBr asked if suppliers in SIT would be matched to those not in their stack. KG responded that for SIT anyone who is able to turn up in time and has expressed interest would be welcome. You may not get all the right combinations of suppliers and their agents. The Programme would not restrict itself to saying these combinations must be valid. The intention was to get PPs co-operating in whatever partnership necessary to get through SIT tests, so this may mean PPs get paired with another PP who they have no existing commercial relationship with.

## **POAP 2**

This is a 'challenge' timeline. The intention was to get responses from PPs over whether this is feasible, looking for reasons why it would not work (as well as why it would work), with evidence for why a particular timeline is unrealistic.

The front-end of the process is compressed with shorter Design, Build and Test (DBT). To participate in SIT, PPs would need to be ready by end of M9, with no 1-month grace period as per POAP 1. The premise here was to incentivise hitting an early SIT date, which would allow early SIT exit and earlier realisation of commercial benefits.

NBR asked if the M9 dates were a reflection of M8 assumptions. KG confirmed yes, the M9 date was based on an assumption of pulling forward the M9 date as much as possible. If central systems say they can't be ready for M9 in time, then POAP 2 would not be feasible. M8 is code (legislation) being ready to go-live.

NBR queried if reverse migration was confirmed. KG said not yet, but that it was a working assumption. As PPs finish qualification, they can go-live on a continuous basis as they wish.

## **Integration testing**

KG noted slides were setting out expectations from PPs and from the Programme. When PPs are undertaking PIT, the Programme would ask for specific elements to be demonstrated. This applies to all participants. For central systems and other PPs taking part in SIT, the Programme would carry out assurance on PIT. All SIT participants would be assured by the Programme. A sample of non-SIT participants would be assured. For PPs going directly into qualification and not SIT, the BSC PAB would still require the evidence normally required by them. The MHHS Programme would provide some coordination on this, but the code bodies would need to define the qualification itself as they own these processes.

NBR asked how access to ADO would be managed for those with offshore support and if training would be provided for ADO as well. KG responded that this training would be tailored, and offshore support should be fine.

CG asked if there was consideration for establishing a standard way of working within ADO. KG confirmed this was intended so there wasn't scope for PPs to be doing things differently. This needed to be configured in a way that was constrained so PPs can't do off-the-wall testing unnecessarily.

## Qualification

KG noted qualification had a procedural element, the Self-Assessment Document (SAD), that BSC will need to amend to make relevant to MHHS. There were also other changes to back-end systems that need reflecting in the updated SAD process. All PPs would need to do this regardless of SIT involvement. The Programme would require evidence of back-end systems being tested.

## Migration

The Programme suggested PPs go through these parts of the plan and reach out to the Programme if they had any questions.

### 5. Working group updates

#### Data Working Group (DWG)

KG confirmed last DWG did not go ahead as the team were in the process of consuming the data model design. The October DWG was planned to go ahead and would discuss data cleansing and quality of data .

#### Environments and Configurations Management Working Group (EWG)

AS noted the Environments Approach and Plan draft document required more information in the planning and that the Programme planned to issue this next week. CG asked where this draft document was held. DM confirmed it's still in internal review.

#### Qualification and E2E Sandbox Working Group (QWG)

DM noted lots of discussion around procedural elements of qualification. The next QWG meeting would discuss the approach in more detail. Code bodies would also become more involved in setting out the procedural elements.

#### Migration Working Group (MWG)

The latest MWG had included the design team discussing the mechanics of migration and how this might work in practice. More of the same was planned for the MWG next month.

### 6. Summary and next steps

MW noted no actions recorded.

CW ran through upcoming agenda items and invited final AOBs. None received. CW closed the meeting.

**Date of next TMAG: 19 October 2022**