

MHHS Programme Steering Group Actions and Minutes

Issue date: 09/03/22

Meeting number	PSG 005	Venue	Virtual – MS Teams
Date and time	02 March 2022 1000-1200	Classification	Public

Attendees:

Chair

Chris Welby (CW) MHHS IM SRO

Industry Representatives

Andrew Green (AG) (on behalf of Gareth Evans)	I&C representative
Charlotte Semp (CS)	DCC Representative (Smart Meter Central System provider)
Ed Rees (ER)	Consumer Representative
Graham Wood (GW)	Large Suppliers Representative
Gurpal Singh (GS)	Medium Suppliers Representative
Hazel Cotman (HC)	DNO Representative
Jenny Rawlinson (JR)	iDNO Representative
Joel Stark (JS)	Supplier Agent (Independent)
Jon Wisdom (JW)	National Grid ESO
Lee Northall (LN)	Elexon Representative (Central Systems Provider)
Paul Akrill (PA)	Supplier Agent Representative

MHHS IM

Andrew Margan (AM)	Governance Manager
Chris Harden (CH)	Programme Director
Fraser Mathieson (FM)	PMO Governance Lead
Jason Brogden (JB)	Industry SME
Keith Clark (KC)	Programme Manager
Lewis Hall (LH)	PMO Lead
Martin Cranfield (MC)	PMO Governance Lead
Miles Winter (MW)	PMO Governance Support

Other Attendees

Andy MacFaul (AMF)	Ofgem (as observer)
David Gandee (DG)	MHHS IPA Lead
Rachel Clark (RC)	Ofgem Sponsor (as observer)
Richard Shilton (RS)	MHHS IPA Lead

Actions

Area	Ref	Action	Owner	Due	Update
Minutes and actions review	PSG05-01	Discuss with supplier reps the process for capturing consumer issues, to ensure consumer issues are being noted and	Programme (Andrew M)	06/04/22	

		addressed (as a follow up to action PSG04-02)			
Supplier plan delay proposal	PSG05-02	Share information relevant to the supplier plan delay proposal (e.g. design roadmap and plan to July) with PSG members for consideration in preparation for upcoming Change Requests. Schedule sessions with PSG members as required	Programme (Keith C)	11/03/22	
	PSG05-03	Schedule extraordinary PSG for the 11 th March	Programme (PMO)	03/03/22	Update: scheduled for Friday 11 th March 2022 1400-1530
	PSG05-04	Share the Change Request impact assessment template with PSG members ahead of 11 th March PSG for information	Programme (Jason B)	11/03/22	Update: shared with PSG members alongside meeting agenda for 11 th March
	PSG05-05	Provide feedback to constituency members on planned next steps and relevant information for the upcoming Change Request. Advise constituency members to prepare to complete impact assessments	Constituency Representatives	11/03/22	
Programme Change Control Process	PSG05-06	Review representative attendees in the Change Board ToR (to justify or amend EDA Vendor)	Programme (Lewis H)	06/04/22	
Programme Cooperation Principles and Ways of Working	PSG05-07	Take the Programme Cooperation Principles and Ways of Working to CCAG. Ask code bodies to socialise with relevant parties	Programme (Andrew M/PMO)	23/03/22	
	PSG05-08	Provide feedback at April PSG on how the programme has done/is doing stakeholder engagement in relation to the Cooperation Principles	Programme (Jason)	06/04/22	
Programme Dashboards	PSG05-09	Review the format and content of the PPC status dashboard	Programme	06/04/22	
	PSG05-10	Circulate the full RAID Log to PSG members	Programme (PMO)	03/03/22	Update: shared with PSG members alongside the Headline Report
Other	PSG05-11	Collate views of PSG members on their preference for in-person attendance to PSG	Programme (PMO)	03/03/22	Update: views have been requested from PSG members alongside the Headline Report. For April PSG, the MHHS Programme team will be on site and PSG

					members can join if they wish.
	PSG05-12	Review PSG ToR to ensure ToR are 'delivery focused'	Programme (Jason)	06/04/22	
	PSG05-13	Move 1 st June PSG to following Wednesday PM (8 th June)	Programme (PMO)	06/04/22	Update: moved to Wednesday 8 th June 2022 1400-1600 (to avoid potential clash with DAG)

Decisions

Area	Ref	Decision
Supplier plan delay proposal	PSG-DEC06	The Programme will follow the proposed plan (as per the slides) for concluding the Supplier Plan Delay Proposal
Programme Cooperation Principles and Ways of Working	PSG-DEC07	The Programme approved the Programme Cooperation Principles and the approach for including these in the Programme Governance Framework via the Change Control process
MHHS Framework	PSG-DEC08	The new version of the MHHS Governance Framework was approved

RAID Items Raised

RAID Area	Description
Risk	Several risks in the Programme RAID log relate to the Supplier plan delay proposal, such as those referencing limited supplier engagement and the delivery of M5. The steps to resolve the Supplier plan delay proposal were discussed in detail, with a decision made to follow the plan as per the slides (PSG-DEC06) and several actions (PSG05-02 to 05-05).
Issue	An issue in the RAID log is that the Change Control process may be required for use before it is formally approved. Steps to sign off the process were discussed as part of the Change Control agenda item. The PSG also agreed that the process as-is will be used as part of the Supplier plan delay proposal.

Minutes

1. Welcome

CW welcomed all to PSG 5.

2. Minutes and actions

Minutes of the PSG 2nd February 2022 were **APPROVED**.

Action updates were provided by CW as per the actions slide.

GW raised a concern on Action PSG03-04 on the PSG comms approach, to be discussed outside the PSG. GW noted that suppliers in their constituency feel WebEX would be beneficial.

GW raised a concern on Action PSG04-02 on a consumer log. Suppliers feel that they do not have a view of the lens of the consumer and consumer impacts. CW commented that the Programme will take this offline. The Programme have

identified consumer impacts and welcome additional impacts to be raised. AM reiterated the Programme has gone through and identified known impacts, and would welcome further input. AM added the Programme did not see need for log as it does not add value and that the majority of consumer impacts are already known. The Programme acknowledges consumer issues are important but notes that there is not a huge number. GW reiterated a need to keep a view of the consumer and that this depends on scope of Programme areas, such as in technical element of designs and ensuring consequential change is at the heart of programme.

Action: Programme to discuss with supplier reps the process for capturing consumer issues, to ensure consumer issues are being noted and addressed (as a follow up to action PSG04-02)

GS noted that there is also interest from their constituency group for using WebEx.

3. Independent Programme Assurer (IPA) Introduction

CW welcomed the IPA to the Programme.

DG introduced the IPA and gave a brief overview of their work so far. RS presented the IPA introduction as per the slides. RS talked through the team structure and gave an overview of the members of the IPA and their role. RS spoke about the objectives and principles of assurance. This included introducing the Independent Programme Assurance Framework (IPAF), with RS suggesting bringing this to PSG in future for PSG members to review. RS invited any questions from PSG.

JW asked about introductory sessions with industry reps and how soon these would happen. RS confirmed the IPA would be reaching out in the next few days, and scheduling meetings for the next week.

DG added that the IPA have an 'open door policy' and any questions can be made offline.

4. Supplier Plan Delay Proposal

KC introduced the supplier plan delay proposal, providing context that this comes in response to supplier feedback on engagement and wider market conditions. KC thanked supplier representatives for their engagement and gave an overview of activity taken since last PSG as per the slide, such as sessions with various suppliers and detailed information sharing on Programme activities (e.g., supplier engagement requirements into design artefacts). KC presented a proposal for a compromise plan that gives a smaller delay than currently suggested. This plan would also require lower engagement from suppliers (only ~1/3 of design artefacts require supplier input).

KC ran through the key themes from the supplier sessions in detail, as per the slide. This included market conditions and resource conflicts with Faster Switching Programme. KC confirmed supplier engagement in the design is happening, as seen in that 3 out of 5 large suppliers did respond to design options presented at the last DAG.

KC presented the proposed next steps as per the slide, providing detail on each step for two scenarios: the Programme's compromise solution or the original supplier plan delay. The Programme aims to complete M5 as early as possible. The impact of MHHS on other systems and operations will be significant, so the earlier the design is completed the sooner planning can begin on those other systems. KC provided detail on why two CRs would be necessary and on the steps to raise and resolve any CRs, including scheduling an extraordinary PSG. KC outlined the requirements of PPs in the Change Request process, such as that suppliers would need to evidence why they can't meet a July 2022 deadline for M5.

LN asked what the timeline is for the impact assessments. LN noted that Helix is up and running and will have a cost of £1.7million a month if delayed, so even a three-month delay would be significant. KC recognised that this uncertainty is troubling for those parties who are already mobilised and reiterated that re-baselining of the plan will happen when M5 is agreed. LN asked if there are any indicative timescales of that? KC suggested a 3-month period from when M5 is agreed (milestone M5+3)

JR asked how confident the Programme is that sufficient supplier engagement will be given prior to a July end point, given this is still within the timeframe suppliers have given that they will be unable to engage? KC confirmed that there is engagement from suppliers, and this deadline is considered feasible. Suppliers have been given the elements of design they need to engage with. There is a risk, but this risk can be managed given the level of engagement from suppliers and ex-suppliers in the working groups. A risk assessment will be carried out at M5 to check if the design has had sufficient engagement and would not be likely to change significantly thereafter.

JR asked about the evidence that in the 4.5 months to M5 the design will be ready? JR noted that many issues still to be resolved are relevant to iDNOs. KC replied that the plan does include these iDNO issues and the Programme hopes to socialise the plans soon. KC added that walkthroughs will be set up with other PSG parties to go through the proposed compromise roadmap and plan, including why the Programme believes that July is a high-probability, low-risk date.

JR asked how this plan will affect other Programme functions such as testing? KC replied that the feedback is that the timeline between M5 and M9 is quite tight and that parties will have a lot to do to assess the impact of the design on their own systems. Some parties have lots of IT partners, so there will be pressure on M9. KC confirmed that any changes to M9 and wider re-planning would be consulted on in the programme replanning activity after M5.

GW thanked KC for the Programme team's efforts and engagement since the last PSG. GW noted the large supplier position has not changed from February PSG. KC recognised the desire to find a faster way to do this that was more practical and that the Programme is expecting each constituent to do an impact assessment rather than approving a central impact assessment. GW asked if there were specific templates for impact assessments and whether the timeframes for delivering these impact assessments were realistic, as constituents haven't seen how granular the impact assessments need to be. KC confirmed that 10 days is the standard time for impact assessments (11th-25th March as per the plan presented)

CW confirmed the Programme would go forward with the plan as per the slide. KC confirmed that the information regarding the plan to July would be shared with PSG members' constituents over the coming days ahead of the 11th March (where this had not already been done).

CW asked who would be raising the Change Request under Scenario 2? KC said this would have to be a supplier as it would be a supplier-owned change request.

GW asked when would parties expect to see the content of the impact assessment? KC said this is shared generically in this meeting (see slides on Change Control), and the specifics should be shared by the end of the week. JB confirmed this is being looked at and is currently in a draft form. The current focus is on specific questions that need to be asked in the Impact Assessment to help guide the Programme.

GS echoed the importance of having the Impact Assessment out ahead of the 11th March meeting.

AG asked what the process is for raising the second change request to November? KC confirmed both would be raised for Impact Assessment both at the same time and the Programme would assess the impacts of both change requests via the Change Control Process. A delay to November would require Ofgem approval as it's a delay >3 months. This is why it is important to gather the evidence for why July is not an option, as that can then be presented to Ofgem if required.

JW asked how confident the Programme is around the deliverability of the plan, mostly for suppliers to comment on. And to what extent will the delay affect the subsequent milestones and how much is that going to be looked at at this point? KC confirmed the subsequent milestones are going to be part of the re-baselining of the plan. AM confirmed the code changes shouldn't affect the milestones as they can happen alongside the DBT stage of the programme. CW confirmed that M6 may need to move, and M8 as a result of that, but that's a separate milestone to M5 so would be raised as a separate change request.

Decision PSG-DEC06 the Programme will follow the proposed plan (as per the slides) for concluding the Supplier Plan Delay Proposal

Action PSG05-02 Programme to share information relevant to the supplier plan delay proposal (e.g. design roadmap and plan to July) with PSG members for consideration in preparation for upcoming Change Requests. Schedule sessions with PSG members as required

Action PSG05-03 Programme to schedule extraordinary PSG for the 11th March

Action PSG05-04 Programme to share the Change Request impact assessment template with PSG members ahead of 11th March PSG for review

Action PSG05-05 constituency representatives to provide feedback to constituency members on planned next steps and relevant information for the upcoming Change Request. Advise constituency members to prepare to complete impact assessments

5. Programme Change Control Process

LH walked the PSG through the Change Control process as per the slides and asked for comments and feedback.

LH confirmed that the Programme would be working with the IPA and Ofgem to sign the Change Control process off. One of the guiding aims of the process is to make it as simple as possible and enable the Programme to make quick changes and informed decisions. The Change Control approach has built with learnings from the Faster Switching Programme. There are two main sources of change in the programme: a change to a programme success factor (time, cost, quality, scope) and a change to a baselined programme artefact. LH took the PSG through the guiding principles for change control and added that there is a detailed process map with clear decision points throughout the process to enable expedited changes or escalated changes to be made.

GW asked if we have anything in the plan for any review points for the change control process? And where there are programme party raised changes, what degree of support would those parties have in the progression of those changes? LH noted that we would always look to review every process in the programme to ensure that the process does what it needs to do, this will happen on an ongoing basis as part of continuous improvement. In terms of change request support, the PMO will take the operational lead on this to support the Change Raiser through the process. The change-raiser must keep the PMO informed on their intentions and the PMO will keep the Change Control process updated.

LH provided a high-level overview of the four steps of the change control process as per the slide.

GW noted the importance of having the transparency of all comments made during the change control process, regardless of how trivial they are, and that these comments are logged and answered so people have the full view of these. LH confirmed we are aiming for transparency, though if a party notes a comment as confidential this would be respected.

LH outlined the proposal for the change board to be governed through the existing governance framework with support from the SRO and PMO as well as the relevant advisory group. LH gave an overview of the Terms of Reference for the Change Board.

PA asked about the membership of the Change Board, and why some members of other groups are on the Change Board. LH made clear the Commercial Representative is intended from a Programme perspective, and not for decision making. The rationale was that by having the Change Board as a mostly internal group and by including the advisory group leads, it could be operationally focussed. LH noted an internal operational Change Board meant CRs could be shared out to Advisory groups where industry representation could undertake relevant problem solving and Impact Assessments. PA asks why the EDA Vendor Representative will be on the Change Board. LH acknowledged the point and offered to take this offline.

Action PSG05-06 Programme to review representative attendees in the Change Board ToR (to justify or amend EDA Vendor)

LH gave an overview of the change request form and the change request log. The long-term view is to integrate this with the Portal so PPs have ability to view the log. LH gave a view of the associated documents for the Change Control process (such as guidance doc, log, process map) which will give more detail on the Change Control approach. LH invited any questions. None received. CW asked if there were any questions or comments after the meeting, members should reach out to the PMO mailbox.

LH confirmed next steps would be to review these documents with the IPA and then go through the documents with Ofgem for sign off. CW confirmed that in the meantime this process would be used (such as for the change requests to M5 above) and that the intention is for the process to be signed off quickly.

6. Programme Cooperation Principles and Ways of Working

JB introduced the proposals for cooperation principles. JB noted that the rationale for setting these out is in the appendix of the meeting slides, and that this has been reviewed by central parties with further legal advice on how best to apply them. JB noted the Programme had explored writing the principles into BSC code but that there is already an obligation in the BSC for MHHS participants to follow the Governance Framework, so by incorporating the principles into the framework, this places an obligation on participants to follow these principles without changing code. JB asked the PSG to approve the principles.

JB noted that the programme is engaging with Electralink who are currently not an MHHS participant, but may be bound by SLC 37 as a supplier of the DNOs. CW confirmed that there is no issue with Electralink, merely that this was identified in the GAP analysis.

JW asked how we would make sure that we capture the views of all the programme parties and how the Programme is content it has had sufficient engagement? JB noted the pros and cons of the approach we're taking. The alternative would be to raise it as a BSC mod. JW noted that he approves of the flexibility, but how do we make this transparent to all parties and make sure we're incorporating feedback from all parties as a result of the BSC obligation? JB confirmed we do have an option where this is sent out for comment in advance of being approved by the PSG. The intention is that the Principles would go out as a change request, which would then put it through the Change Control process meaning it would go out for impact assessment to all parties. JW didn't have a problem with this in principle, but wanted to make sure that appropriate stakeholder engagement is achieved. The intent is to deliver against our obligations and these ways of working of setting out those obligations should make us work more efficiently. JB suggests the best way to ensure participants understand how the process is being applied is to go through the change control process.

GW agreed with JW's points on getting sufficient transparency and engagement, suggesting that the clearer we make these principles the less ambiguity there would be since these are going to be legally binding.

ER responded to JW's point by noting that getting BSC and SEC to share the principles through their communication channels would mean this information can be disseminated to participants in a 'low hassle' way.

CW asked PSG to approve the principles on the slide and invited anyone to confirm if they didn't want to approve these. JW confirmed they were happy to proceed on this basis but wanted feedback at the next meeting on how the stakeholder engagement was going to be approved.

Action PSG05-07 Programme to take the Programme Cooperation Principles and Ways of Working to CCAG. Ask code bodies to socialise with relevant parties

Action PSG05-08 Programme to provide feedback at April PSG on how the programme has done/is doing stakeholder engagement in relation to the Cooperation Principles

Decision PSG-DEC07 the Programme approved the Programme Cooperation Principles and the approach for including these in the Programme Governance Framework via the Change Control process

7. MHHS Governance Framework Approval

JB provided an update on action taken with the MHHS Governance Framework since last PSG. An updated framework was circulated last week and no further feedback were received. JB asked for the PSG to approve v2.4

GW provided some late comments received from one of their constituents:

- GW asked if there are any routes of appeal in relation to 3.6 if parties are unhappy with the decision reached by the chair? CW said no there's no formal route of appeal, but this could be taken up with the IPA if the Chair reaches a decision without consensus or escalated to higher levels of governance.
- GW commented that some of section 3.10 may be in the wrong section of the framework.
- GW asked if 6.7 regarding design working groups was flexible and whether setting out all the various working groups was the best approach in case those working groups change. Is it worth having an exhaustive list here?
- GW noted in 9.2 all change request decisions should be communicated with 10 WD of the decision, and that this seems like a long timeframe - why would the communication of the decision take so long? AM confirmed this was drafted last July and the intention will be to communicate much faster, but that this is the maximum timeframe.

CW asked if there were any other comments or questions before the PSG seeks approval of the new Framework. None received.

CW asked if any member of PSG did not wish to approve the Updated Governance Framework? None received.

Decision PSG-DEC08 the new version of the MHHS Governance Framework was approved

8. Programme Dashboards

CW invited questions on the dashboards.

KC noted that M5 and M5+3 should be marked red now on the milestone dashboard, and the IPA fully functioning could now be marked green through to blue, depending on the date the IPA considered to be fully functioning (now they're mobilised).

GW noted that there was a view from their constituencies that the financial dashboard was a work in progress as it was considered 'underwhelming'. GW's constituents would like to see something more akin to the Switching Programme with more detail.

GW added that the PPC status dashboard wasn't seen as a coherent picture of overall engagement and also questioned how the RAG statuses are attributed to different constituencies on the milestone dashboard, given the percentages of engagement on the PPC dashboard.

Action PSG05-09 Programme to review the format and content of the PPC status dashboard

GW asked when the RAID log would be visible for programme participants. KC confirmed this can be shared as it currently is. The Programme would like it to be accessible through the Portal but it can be shared in its current form.

Action PSG05-10 Programme to circulate the full RAID Log to PSG members

9. Summary and Next Steps

MC summarised the actions

10. AOB

GW asked about impact assessments for Change Requests. There is concern for some suppliers whether there is some duplication of work in the impact assessment with the Readiness Assessment. Is it wise to do both or are they achieving similar things? KC suggests there isn't duplication, the RA is a higher-level assessment of mobilisation, the Impact Assessment is more specific to M5. When the Impact Assessment is shared this will be evident. GW asked if there was a need for prioritisation - which once should be prioritised? AM confirmed the scale and complexity of the questions on the RA has been reduced, so this should be quite straightforward and isn't as complex as the Switching Programme RA.

GW escalated about DAG design principle decisions which were approved at last DAG, with the observation that all four supplier constituencies had either not been able to comment or provide specific approval and yet the design principles were then approved anyway. GW noted suppliers have been told to raise at PSG if suppliers are unhappy with that decision. CW confirmed that there were no objections at DAG, there were some abstentions. CW added there was engagement with suppliers directly in the consultation. KC noted that there was no other way to manage this, there was a decision on design approach, not specific artefacts being approved. The overwhelming responses was in support of these. GS noted that they had interpreted their supplier response as an objection rather than an abstention. AM commented that the governance framework was working in this scenario, i.e. the Chair has to make a decision where there isn't consensus. The IPA can review this decision, which can then be flagged to Ofgem. CW suggested raising any objections with the IPA, if participants feel the decision that was made was incorrect.

AG noted that it wasn't necessarily if there was an issue with the decision that this should be raised at PSG, but more that the risk associated with the suppliers not approving the decision that should be raised at PSG. GS confirmed that as suppliers haven't been able to approve this decision, there is a risk that Option 2 at DAG hasn't been fully engaged with.

CW asked if PSG would like to stick with current PSG format or if an in-person meeting would be preferred. CW confirmed attendees are welcome to join in-person and this would always be a hybrid meeting for those who wanted to remain virtual. CW noted this is more of a practical consideration in terms of how many people would be attending the office. GW noted that he was in favour of this, but wanted to be able to know in advance how many people were in attendance.

Action PSG05-11 PMO to collate views of PSG members on their preference for in-person attendance to PSG

LN suggested a review of the PSG ToRs as the PSG doesn't feel like a delivery focused forum. LN noted the PSG currently feels like a Regs forum and could be worth reviewing. LN raised this in reference to recent PSGs being heavily focussed on suppliers and the supplier plan delay proposal.

JB responded that the ToRs have been updated and if this is a reflection as to whether the PSG is performing in the way it's intended.

Action PSG05-12 Programme to review PSG ToR to ensure ToR are 'delivery focused'.

CW asked if PSG members are happy for June PSG to be shuffled due to the two bank holidays? General consensus is yes. This would need to be in the afternoon the following week, i.e. 2-4 or 1-3.

Action PSG05-13 PSG 6 on 1st June to be moved to 8th June. PMO to update meeting invite and confirm new date alongside the Minutes.