MHHS Programme Steering Group (PSG) minutes and actions

Issue date: 18/01/2023

Meeting Number	**PSG 016**	Venue	**Virtual – MS Teams**
Date and Time	**11 January 2023 1000-1200**	Classification	**Public**

Attendees

Chair

Helen Tipton (HT)	MHHS SRO

Industry Representatives

Andrew Campbell (AC)	Small Supplier Representative
Caroline Farquhar (CF)	Consumer Representative
Chris Price (CP)	DNO Representative
Gareth Evans (GE)	I&C Supplier Representative
Graham Wood (GW)	Large Supplier Representative
Jenny Rawlinson (JR)	iDNO Representative
Joel Stark (JS)	Supplier Agent (Independent) Representative
Jonathan Hawkins (JH)	RECCo Representative
Karen Thompson-Lilley (KTL)	National Grid ESO Representative
Lewis Robertson (LR)	Elexon Representative (Central Systems Provider)
Paul Akrill (PA)	Supplier Agent Representative
Richard Vernon (RV) as alternate to Charlotte Semp	DCC Representative
Vladimir Black (VB)	Medium Supplier Representative

MHHS IM

Andrew Margan (AM)	Governance Manager
Chris Harden (CH)	Programme Director
Chris Welby (CW)	SME, former SRO
Giles Clayden (GC)	Deputy Programme Manager
Jason Brogden (JB)	Industry SME
Keith Clark (KC)	Programme Manager
Martin Cranfield (MC)	PMO Governance Lead
Warren Fulton (WF)	Design Project Manager

Other Attendees

Andy MacFaul (AMF)	Observer, Ofgem
Dave Gandee (DG)	MHHS IPA Lead
Jenny Boothe (JB)	Observer, Ofgem
Rachel Clark (RC)	Ofgem Sponsor
Richard Shilton (RS)	MHHS IPA Lead
Sinead Quinn (SQ)	Observer, Ofgem

Actions

Area	Ref	Action	Owner	Due	Update
TMAG reps	PSG16-01	Discuss steps for filling TMAG Large Supplier Representative vacancy	Graham Wood, Chris Harden	01/02/23	
M5 Work-Off Plan	PSG16-02	Update M5 Work-Off Plan Change Log with ISD and Operational Choreography document changes	Programme design team (Warren Fulton)	18/02/23	
Constituency rep role	PSG16-03	Share communication in the Clock to remind participants who their constituency reps are and what the constituency rep role is	Programme PMO	01/02/23	
	PSG16-04	Provide constituency reps with the contacts for the organisations within their constituency	Programme PPC	01/02/23	
	PSG16-05	Speak to RECCo, Elexon and ESO to compare OSMs to the MHHS Programme's contact list	Programme PPC	01/02/23	
Dashboards	PSG16-06	Add Work-Off Plan and migration design task items to the Interim Plan dashboard	Programme PMO	01/02/23	
Open actions from previous meetings	PSG08-05	Address comments received on the Benefits Realisation Plan (for example consequential impacts/dis-benefits and providing a more quantifiable measure under the MPAN success criteria)	Programme (Jason Brogden)	To be aligned to next control point	Updated version following Control Point 1 to come to February PSG
	PSG13-05	Set up a session to discuss the requirements (e.g. ToR) for an MHHS forum to discuss the commercial impacts on settlement from the MHHS Programme (taking learnings from Nexus). Session to include MHHSP members and PSG constituency reps as required	Programme PMO	14/11/22	Outputs of CR013 Impact Assessment to come to February PSG
	PSG14-10	Support the Programme to identify Large, Small and I&C Supplier representatives for TMAG	Relevant Supplier Representatives	07/12/22	No new nominations received. See follow up action PSG16-01
	PSG15-01	Progress work on customer segments in migration at the Migration Design Subgroup (MDSG)	Programme (Jason Brogden)	01/03/23	Incorporated in Migration Design activity and expected to be brought to the MDSG in February

Decisions

Area	Ref	Decision

Minutes	PSG-DEC34	The PSG approved the minutes of the 07 December 2022 PSG

RAID items

RAID area	Overview
M5 Work-Off Plan	The PSG discussed risks related to the delivery of the M5 Work-Off Plan
Core capability providers	The PSG discussed risks relating to delivery of the St Clements DBT plan in advance of SIT start

Minutes

1. Welcome

HT welcomed all to the meeting and ran over the meeting agenda.

2. Minutes and Actions Review

DECISION PSG-DEC34: The PSG approved the minutes of the 07 December 2022 PSG

HT highlighted updates for the open actions. This included action PSG14-01 where GW noted they would speak to the Programme following some feedback from Large Suppliers. I&C and Medium Supplier representatives had no further feedback. JB noted actions PSG08-05 and 13-05 would be agenda items for February PSG.

ACTION PSG16-01: GW and CH to discuss steps for filling TMAG Large Supplier Representative vacancy

3. Sponsor update

RC referred PSG members to the PSG pre-meeting webinar for a detailed run through of the Sponsor update. RC noted the majority of Sponsor update was related to ensuring participants were engaging with the Programme, including with the M5 Work-Off Plan and the Round 3 replan consultation. RC appealed to PSG members to encourage parties to volunteer for the Minimum Viable Cohort (MVC), given the benefits it could have to parties and the Programme. RC reiterated the strategic importance of the Programme to the government and BEIS. RC finished by saying that she is leaving Ofgem at the end of January and noted the MHHS Programme had been an enjoyable programme to work on. RC thanked PSG members for their contributions.

HT extended the gratitude and appreciation of the Programme in RC's active and challenging sponsorship, noting her helpful support to members across the Programme and industry in building a common purpose. HT wished RC the best of luck in future endeavours.

4. DIP update

CH explained that they had hoped to announce the Data Integration Platform (DIP) provider at PSG but that the Programme was still working through residual and minor elements of the contract. The Programme expected the contract to be signed before the February PSG, where the provider could then be introduced. Communications would be shared in the Clock when possible. CH noted that the delay in the DIP provider coming on board could raise concerns for participants relating to the DIP delivering against the Programme plan and being ready to start SIT in October. CH explained that the Programme had been having conversations with the provider on their design and the provider was currently working at risk, and is on track as per the plan to deliver their design by the end of January. The provider would be ready for SIT start.

HT reiterated CH's comments that the current position was due to legal negotiations and that it was not delaying Programme delivery.

5. Status updates

Work-Off Plan

WF provided an update on progress of the Work-Off Plan as per the slides, highlighting the deadlines for review comments and assurance. The headlines from the review comments were due to be shared this week via the design working groups. WF noted there were two Change Requests agreed through the Design Advisory Group (DAG) that the Programme were happy to support developing.

WF noted some queries had been raised on the Interface Catalogue artefact. This was a large Excel document and a number of changes had been made, so rather than red-lining the document the Programme had provided an audit trail with over 900 lines. The Programme felt this was a more streamlined approach than red-lining the full document.

GW noted Large Suppliers had seen the four Work-Off items had communications planned for this week and queried how this would be communicated and whether there would be further discussion on the outcomes of the items. WF responded communication would go to the working groups and that extensive discussion had been had on these items already. WF felt there had been enough engagement with industry and now the Programme would communicate the decision for transparency and auditability. GW queried what parties would do if they had queries with the outputs. WF responded that they would be surprised if there was any pushback as they felt consensus had been reached, and if there was still concern, it could be raised via DAG. GW responded that they were comfortable this approach. HT noted GW should ensure their constituents were on the working group distribution lists to receive any communications.

CP noted they had shared some slides related to the Work-Off Plan. CP explained the content of the slide that highlighted areas of work still to be completed in the design. Some original documents shared by the Programme design team were not change-marked and were password protected, and this made document review very challenging. This had been fixed quickly by the Programme, which was appreciated. CP noted the Work-Off Change Control log did not contain all of the changes made to documents, and so it was not clear what changes were made to some documents and why. CP noted that there were a number of open and not-completed documents related to MPRS. CP summarised that they wanted to add this information to the current status of the Work-Off Plan, to provide further context on the level of work left to complete.

WF queried if the point relating to change marking and password protecting was for documents in tranches 1-4 of the design work. CP confirmed this was the case and that they could understand the rationale behind the approach but that it was challenging for document reviewers. CP added that they would like the updated approach to be used for future reviews. WF responded that password protection had been done for internal change control and would not be used again for future documents. On the Interface Catalogue, the Programme had published an audit trail to support document reviews. On the ISD and Operational Choreography documents, these had had small changes that were change marked in the documents, and WF accepted that these may not have been captured in the Change Control log.

CP noted they felt it useful to highlight to PSG that, while the Work-Off Plan status update from the Programme was helpful, there were additional points to address that were important and related to progress.

ACTION PSG16-02: Design team to update M5 Work-Off Plan Change Log with ISD and Operational Choreography document changes

GW highlighted that Large Suppliers welcomed that the Work-Off Plan was on track but that the next thing was progress of the Migration Design. WF responded that progress was being made with good engagement. The draft design was on track to be issued at the start of February - this was for formal industry review and analysis following industry engagement through the subgroup.

JH queried the governance for signing off the Work-Off Plan. DAG were meeting on 31 January. JH queried if there could be plans to resolve any items that were not agreed as closed at the end of January (if DAG could not agree them then) and if these would become Change Requests. WF responded that items would not 'drop off' and it would be up to decision at DAG depending on risk. WF added that this could be discussed at DAG on 11 January and the intention was not to have any open items at the end of January (although it was important to have a mitigation in place). WF added that there had been ~70 comments on the Work-Off items and the Programme were eager to close the Work-Off Plan.

Round 3 replan

KC updated on progress of the replan as per the slides. Some early consultation feedback had been received which was helpful. The playbacks had been running well with additional content added following feedback. KC noted a lot of interest at the playbacks had been on Systems Integration Testing (SIT) and the Minimum Viable Cohort (MVC). The Programme had also been engaging bi-laterally with participants and there had been strong engagement with the planning. KC noted some early consultation responses had been received and that these were mainly reflecting positive interest in SIT participation. KC reiterated the deadlines for the consultation as per the slides and noted that the Programme would report to PSG in February on the level of response.

CP clarified the messaging was for 16 January to be an ideal response date, and that later response was acceptable. KC responded that the messaging had been clear through previous PSGs and the replan communications and confirmed that the Programme were flexible on the 16 January date – but that that earlier had been set to provide participants with an opportunity to indicate their expected readiness and strong intent in relation to SIT participation. The important thing was to receive as many responses as early as possible, but with high quality of response and supporting evidence.

Code drafting

AM explained that code drafting activity to translate the baselined design into code had started. The first 'topic areas' had begun code drafting in January 2023. AM explained the code draft plan as per the slides, noting this was the draft plan as per Round 3 replan consultation and that a consequential change topic had been added following CR012.

AM explained the code drafting status update as per the slides. The role of the Code Draft Working Group (CDWG) was to develop code pre-consultation and discuss the outputs of consultation before recommending drafted code to the Cross Code Advisory Group (CCAG). HT noted the dashboard was currently all on track. AM explained that this was as the drafting had just started. AM invited questions and concerns on code drafting to be fed in through Round 3 of consultation of the Programme plan.

6. RA2 non-responders

CW explained that Readiness Assessment 2 (RA2) had taken place pre-Christmas and that the responses had been very helpful. CW noted that a number of organisations had not responded and that the Programme was looking to improve response rates. CW highlighted two asks of PSG: firstly, for PSG reps to remind their constituents that licenced parties had an obligation to respond to MHHS consultations; and secondly that there would be some organisations that would be looking to work together and that it may be a risk and concern for those where their partners had not responded to RA2. Responses to Readiness Assessments were important for the Programme to be able to understand the level of each participants' readiness. This would become more important as delivery requirements transitioned from the Programme to participants themselves.

CF queried the implications for the Programme if they did not have this information (i.e., was it material, did it hold the Programme back). CW responded that a lack of response would not stop other parties going forward but created a risk of delay to later milestones including that, when the Programme came to the end of migration, there could be issues closing down old systems if parties were not ready to migrate. Currently this was an unknown as the Programme did not know the status of these participants. CW noted the Programme wanted to provide support to these organisations.

GE highlighted that, in relation to migration, there may need to be a default position for all Programme Participants once the Programme reached the end of migration. GE added that they did not have contacts for all of these organisations and queried if there was a way to notify organisations of their constituency representatives. GE explained that ~1/3 of the organisations in their constituency did not engage with them. The Programme offered support to improve knowledge of and engagement with constituency reps.

ACTION PSG16-03: Programme PMO to share communication in the Clock to remind participants who their constituency reps are and what the constituency rep role is

ACTION PSG16-04: Programme PPC to provide constituency reps with the contacts for the organisations within their constituency

JH offered that, if helpful, the REC could help provide their OSM contacts. JB noted this could be passed on to the PPC team who had spoken with Elexon.

ACTION PSG16-05: Programme PPC to speak to RECCo, Elexon and ESO to compare OSMs to the MHHS Programme's contact list

CW noted that Western Power had been included in the original slide and this had been removed. JS reiterated that GE's request would be helpful and any support was welcome. JS felt those listed on the slide were the 'long tail' of engagement and welcomed Programme support to publicise and increase engagement with reps. JS added that some organisations did not want to engage with reps regardless. JB agreed it was important to do this activity with all constituencies. KTL offered ESO support with supplier lists. HT thanked members for their support to increase engagement.

7. Governance group reminders

HT introduced the item noting it was important for participants to be reminded of the governance groups as they developed through DBT. MC provided an overview of activity at each of the three Programme workstreams. This included a walkthrough of code drafting via the CCAG, design activity (including on the Work-Off Plan, Migration Design, Design Change Management and Consequential Change) in the design workstream, and the deliverables coming through each of the testing working groups. MC invited PSG members to encourage engagement with their participants and for comments to come to the PMO.

GW noted the information was useful and queried if there was a location that had all the meeting dates in one place. MC signposted GW to two locations: firstly, a document on the website with a high-level overview of all groups and their generic regular timings, and secondly a calendar view of all groups available on the Collaboration Base.

AC queried if the groups relating to the baselined design would be stood down and when this would happen. MC explained that groups would stand up and down as required, depending on the requirement for them. AC noted their query was because they wanted visibility of how and when governance arrangements would change. CH noted groups would be stood down as-and-when agenda items ran out. The need was evolutionary as the needs from the Programme and participants adapted.

WF noted that groups relating to the design baseline had largely finished and were now only there for assurance. The future of these groups was tied to mobilisation of the Design Authority. MC noted mobilisation of groups was communicated via the Clock and other means over multiple weeks. HT noted it was important for participants to start at the lowest working group level as possible when raising queries.

8. Delivery dashboards

HT noted a reduced number of dashboards this month, and that the full set would return in February. HT walked through the dashboards at a high level and invited questions.

On the Interim Plan dashboard, GW noted large suppliers felt two important tasks were missing from the task list – completion of the Work-Off Plan and completion of the Migration Design. GW also queried if the Red RAG rated tasks were only Red due to the forecast date being different to the expected date. The Programme confirmed this was the case and agreed the two task items could be added.

ACTION PSG16-06: Programme PMO to add Work-Off Plan and migration design task items to the Interim Plan dashboard

GW noted large suppliers had identified a 4-month difference between the St Clements delivery plan and their ability to be ready to start SIT compared to the content of the plan in the Round 3 consultation. GW highlighted that there was a risk and queried what was being done. KC responded that the risk had been articulated in the Round 3 plan artefacts. The Programme were in conversation with St Clements and related parties on how this risk could be managed. KC explained there were nuances and ways for participants to enter Component Integration Testing (CIT) and therefore there were mitigations being actively discussed between all core capability providers and the Programme. KC added that the baselined plan would need more clarity on the risk and how it would be managed. KC explained that the majority of participants had suggested timelines in the Round 3 plan were achievable and hence it had made sense to present the Round 3 plan on this basis.

CP added that they supported KC's comments (from a St Clements perspective). DNOs, iDNOs and St Clements had submitted their dates and the Programme had elected to go for a slightly earlier date. CP explained this was why he had shared additional AOBs as it was important for issues to be addressed as soon as possible so St Clements could deliver in the timescales required. HT noted the positive attitude to bringing forward St Clements dates was appreciated by the Programme.

9. Summary and Next Steps

MC summarised the actions and decisions as per the table above.

CP highlighted an AOB that had been raised already with the Programme. CP noted the Programme started several years ago and that they felt there were a number of documents setting the Programme vision, strategy, and high-level principles, such as the Target Operating Model (TOM) and recommendations from the Architecture Working Group (AWG). The Programme was now working on the tactical implementation of these principles to clarify what was and wasn't needed to deliver these initial documents. CP asked for clarity that, if a principle set in one of these pre-Programme documents had changes made (or apparently made), what and when would the Programme's Change

Control process 'kick in'. CP walked through reverse migration, 24/7 operation and DIP connection as examples where they felt that changes had been made from these initial principles, but no Change Request had been raised.

RC responded that the position of the Ofgem sponsor was that the decision to progress with MHHS had explicitly referred to moving ahead with and implementing the TOM. Any changes to the TOM would require a Change Request and would need to go to Ofgem if it exceeded Ofgem decision-making thresholds (as this was endorsed by the Ofgem regulatory decision-making process). RC explained that the AWG recommendation was not endorsed or baselined by Ofgem. Ofgem's response to these recommendations was that there were several things (such as the absence of reverse migration) that would need to be worked through with the Programme and the impact on consumers considered. Therefore, these recommendations were not considered as not binding by Ofgem regulatory position, meaning they would not need to be managed through Change Control from Ofgem's perspective and rather controlled by the Programme's own governance. CP responded that this was helpful and that it was useful to clarify this position, given that AWG and TOM documents were being referenced as guiding documents in various forums. CP reiterated that the position was that the TOM was the 'master document' subject to Change Control and that AWG and other recommendations were a lower level and not subject to Change Control.

HT responded that RC's comments were useful for clarifying this and invited the IPA's view. RS noted that it was a good debate to have and should be up to PSG when it was useful to discuss, depending on the issue. The reverse migration option was a good example where a large process had taken place to consult and develop a solution despite a Change Request not being required. RS noted the guidance was useful to keep the Programme honest. HT thanked CP for bringing the item to PSG, noting this may have been more appropriate for DAG at first and that the clarity on the requirement for use of Change Control on AWG and TOM documents had been useful.

HT provided an overview of agenda items for February PSG and thanked all for their contributions.

Date of next PSG: 01 February 2023