

## MHHS Programme Steering Group (PSG) Headline Report

Issue date: 02/02/2023

Meeting Number **PSG 017**

Venue **Virtual – MS Teams**

Date and Time **01 February 2023 1000-1230**

Classification **Public**

### Actions

Area	Ref	Action	Owner	Due
<b>Minutes and actions</b>	PSG17-01	Hold discussion offline to provide clarity on the scope of the MHHS baseline and the requirements for making decisions on baselined artefacts and on issues that are deemed to fall outside of the baseline	Programme (Keith Clark, Jason Brogden), DNO Rep (Chris Price)	01/03/23
<b>Avanade introduction</b>	PSG17-02	Share DIP contact details/point of contact	MHHS PMO	08/02/23
<b>M5 Work-Off Plan</b>	PSG17-03	Discuss at DAG if the DIP design could result in changes to the MHHS core design, and if so, the likely timelines for changes to the core design to be delivered	Programme	01/03/23
<b>Replan</b>	PSG17-04	Share how the Programme may communicate updates to the plan as a result of Round 3 consultation, to participants, ahead of any re-plan Change Request	Programme (Keith Clark)	01/03/23
<b>Benefits Realisation Plan</b>	PSG17-05	Review the post-implementation approach to Benefits Realisation and how Benefits Realisation will be handed over to Ofgem at M16	Programme (Jason Brogden)	To be reviewed at Control Point 2
<b>Change Control</b>	PSG17-06	Get DAG view on CR015 as input to any decision PSG may make	Programme	01/03/23
<b>Working Group engagement</b>	PSG17-07	Discuss possible improvements to Programme approach to distribution lists	Programme PMO, RECCO Representative (Jon Hawkins)	01/03/23

	PSG17-08	Discuss Small Supplier engagement with the Small Supplier Representative and Ofgem (e.g. engagement requirements, materiality/impact of low engagement, and ways to improve engagement)	Programme	01/03/23
--	----------	---	-----------	----------

## Decisions

Area	Ref	Decision
Minutes	PSG-DEC35	The PSG approved the minutes of the 11 January 2023 PSG
Benefits Realisation Plan	PSG-DEC36	The PSG approved version 0.7 of the Benefits Realisation Plan
Change Control	PSG-DEC37	The PSG approved Change Request CR013
	PSG-DEC38	The PSG agreed to raise CR015 to Impact Assessment

## Key Discussion Items

Area	Discussion
Sponsor update	The Programme Sponsor reiterated key messages including: the importance of MHHS to BEIS (where a Half Hourly working group had been established between BEIS, Ofgem and the SRO); the need to have certainty on the MHHS design; and the importance of the replan process to build a credible, achievable plan with industry buy-in.
Avanade introduction	The Programme introduced the newly appoint Data Integration Platform (DIP) provider, Avanade. Avanade provided a summary of their background, team and workstreams. Avanade walked through their DBT plan and their DIP technology approach.  PSG members queried the point of contact for the DIP ( <b>action PSG17-02</b> ) and possible impact the DIP design may have on the MHHS core design ( <b>action PSG17-03</b> ).
Status updates	<u>M5 Work-Off Plan</u>  The Programme updated on progress of the M5 Work-Off Plan, including the outputs of the assurance review meeting held 27 January. 11 topics had been raised at the assurance review for further action. The Programme was confident that all of the items on the Work-Off Plan could now be closed and the full design baselined at the Design Advisory Group (DAG) on 01 February. The Programme noted the importance of achieving the full baseline to provide certainty to industry and moving past the design phase of the Programme, with the baseline subject to the agreed change control process.  The DNO Representative raised concerns on the status of the design and presented a number of design queries and comments they felt were unresolved (both on items on the Work-Off Plan and on items baselined at M5). The Representative explained that, while they agreed there needed to be a point where the full design was baselined, they felt it would be more efficient to resolve DNO queries now rather than under Change Control. The DNO Representative noted they felt there was a mismatch between the Programme and DNO view. The iDNO and Large Supplier Representatives supported this view, noting other unresolved queries.

	<p>The Programme highlighted that this was an issue for discussion at DAG, although visibility to PSG was welcomed. The Programme noted that the supposed design issues raised by the DNO Representative needed to be reviewed and unpicked to determine their validity, particularly given the comments and assurance window had passed and only 16 comments had been raised by St Clements (and these had been addressed via this process). The comments and assurance window had been the opportunity to raise these final challenges. This would be further discussed at DAG on 01 February.</p> <p><u>Programme replan</u></p> <p>The Programme provided the Systems Integration Test (SIT) status following responses to Round 3 of consultation on the Programme plan. There had been an excellent response rate to the consultation and strong interest in SIT. The Programme explained the requirements on core capability providers (who were RAG-rated based on interpretation from continuing account management meetings between those parties and the programme and their delivery plans and reports), LDSOs and 'early adopters' for SIT entry. Based on initial scans of Round 3 responses, the Programme felt that M3 is likely to be passed unconditionally (at March PSG) given the number of delivery plans provided through the consultation (these plans will be scrutinised in the coming days).</p> <p>The Large Supplier Representative queried how outputs of the consultation and the next iteration of the plan would be communicated ahead of the replan Change Request. The Programme explained that the Working Groups were now the primary vehicle for industry engagement, to work through some of the more detailed elements of the plan ahead of the replan Change Request, and that seeking further opportunities for constituency engagement would be beneficial (<b>action PSG17-04</b>).</p>
<p><b>Benefits Realisation Plan (BRP)</b></p>	<p>The Programme presented the background, action taken, and next steps proposed for the Benefits Realisation Plan (BRP).</p> <p>The Ofgem Sponsor and other PSG members queried how Benefits Realisation would progress following closure of the Programme at M16 (e.g. if there would be hyper-care in a post-implementation phase). The Programme noted that it was not Programme scope to realise benefits but to facilitate benefits realisation through delivery of Programme outcomes. The BRP did consider how benefits may be monitored after the Programme, and further discussion was required with Ofgem on how this would be handed over and delivered.</p> <p>The DNO Representative queried how benefits were considered when changes were made to the Programme. The Programme clarified that this (together with other impacts such as on costs, outcomes and consumers) formed a core part of Change Control process. The DNO representative noted they felt assumptions on LDSO costs in the original Ofgem business case had changed significantly.</p> <p>The iDNO Representative queried if there would be any tracking to confirm if benefits were realised (e.g. the £4.6bn in the original Ofgem Business Case), noting they had not seen any such tracking following the Faster Switching Programme (FSP). The Ofgem Sponsor noted they were bringing tracking of benefits for FSP in-house and that the market had shifted significantly through FSP. The Sponsor explained that this was a broader issue for how the regulator assessed the impacts of significant market change, and agreed with the need to work alongside BEIS to understand the benefits of MHHS, once the benefits had had time to bed in.</p> <p>The PSG approved the Benefits Realisation Plan (<b>decision PSG-DEC36</b>), noting the post-implementation approach to benefits should be reviewed at the next Control Point (<b>action PSG17-05</b>).</p>

<p><b>Change Control</b></p>	<p><u>CR013</u></p> <p>The Programme provided a summary of the outputs of Impact Assessment for CR013 and the proposed delivery approach the Programme would take, should the Change Request be approved. The Programme provided some clarification on the change, noting it was not a change to the governance framework and was a request only to scope the work, with a further change to follow depending on the outputs of the scoping activity. The PSG approved CR013 (<b>decision PSG-DEC37</b>).</p> <p><u>CR015</u></p> <p>The Large Supplier Representative provided an overview of CR015, noting Change Board had agreed the change should come to PSG rather than DAG given possible implications on M9/Programme timelines (this was despite the content of the change being design-related). The Programme explained the decision was whether the change should go to Impact Assessment. The RECCo Representative requested DAG input in the final decision, given the nature of the change (<b>action PSG17-06</b>).</p> <p>The Ofgem representative queried why the change was necessary. The Programme explained the Change Control process and provided a summary of activity relating to the change that had taken place so far via DAG.</p> <p>The DNO Representative noted that originally DAG had discussed several options but only two were presented in the Change Request. The DNO Representative felt all options should be presented and Impact Assessed. The Programme noted that these views could be raised through the Impact Assessment process. The Programme clarified that the change was as created by the raiser and that anyone could raise a change. The Large Supplier representative noted the Programme had requested Large Suppliers raise the change, and hence the Change Requested was created based on the favourable options for the Large Supplier constituency.</p> <p>The PSG agreed to raised CR015 to Impact Assessment (<b>decision PSG-DEC38</b>).</p> <p><u>CR016</u></p> <p>The Programme explained that CR016 was a change to the Change Control Approach to reflect updates from the design change management process. CR016 had moved through the process as a house-keeping change. A new version of the Change Control Approach would be issued shortly and communicated via the Clock.</p>
<p><b>Working Group engagement</b></p>	<p>The Programme provided an overview of the outputs of recent analysis on the makeup of MHHS Working Group distribution lists.</p> <p>The iDNO Representative noted they felt it was incorrect to label iDNO representation at the Working Groups as ‘poor’, given good engagement of iDNOs in other areas of the Programme and that iDNOs engaged collaboratively/collectively with the Working Groups. The iDNO representative queried the impacts of under-representation. The Programme noted the importance of as much direct LDSO engagement as possible, with the Programme, given the critical need for all LDSOs to be ready for migration (at M10) – and that the majority of detailed preparatory work for testing and migration was being delivered via the Working Groups.</p> <p>The Large Supplier Representative queried if the likely end dates for each Working Group was shared. The Programme clarified this was available <a href="#">here on the MHHS Website</a>.</p> <p>The RECCo Representative suggested a review of the MHHS approach to distribution lists (<b>action PSG17-07</b>).</p>

	<p>The Small Supplier Representative noted challenges in Small Supplier engagement due to resource levels and commitments to other governments programmes. The Representative noted that MHHS was a large and complex Programme for those not regularly engaged or working in the detail. The Representative asked for further discussion on the role of Small Suppliers and for support in engaging their constituents (<b>action PSG17-08</b>).</p>
<p><b>AOB</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The DNO Representative raised that they felt there was ambiguity in what made up the MHHS baseline and that changes had been made to documents they considered part of the MHHS baseline outside of the formal Change Control process. The DNO Representative requested further clarity be gained, using a Push/Pull design decision as an example (<b>action PSG17-01</b>). The Programme noted this was not an issue with the Change Control process (which was clear) but with what made up the MHHS baseline.</li> <li>• The RECCo Representative queried the approach to decision-making on Testing and Migration governance. The Programme responded that options were being considered at the TMAG and the outputs would come to March PSG.</li> <li>• The DNO Representative raised concerns on a lack of iterative reviews on the Migration Design ahead of formal approval, highlighting the comment window was 5 days with no further comment review window (this was different to how other elements of the design had been delivered).</li> </ul>

**Date of next meeting: in-person, 01 March 2023 (note, extraordinary PSG also to be schedule for 08 March)**