

MHHS Programme Steering Group (PSG) Headline Report

Issue date: 07/02/2025

Meeting Number **PSG041**

Venue **Virtual**

Date and Time **05 February 2025 10:00-12:00**

Classification **Public**

New / Outstanding Actions

Area	Ref	Action	Owner	Due
Settlement Analysis Model	PSG41-01	Helix to hold a pre-PSG session on the Settlement Analysis Model with LDSOs and industry (same attendees as the session in December) to take place in approx. 2 weeks' time.	Helix	05/03/2025
Go-Live Readiness	PSG41-02	Programme to hold a bilateral with the DNO and iDNO reps to discuss LDSO representation at the Get to Go-Live Group	Programme	05/03/2025
Go-Live Readiness	PSG41-03	Review and update the M10 Acceptance Criteria, specifically Criterion 4 on slide 15, to clarify the confirmation process for suppliers and contracted agents' qualifications, including the commercial arrangement between the two parties.	Programme	05/03/2025
Previous meetings	PSG34-01	Exelon Settlement Analysis model to be issued to Participants as soon as constructed and to update Participants on any changes to the 4-week construction timeline.	Programme / Exelon	07/08/2024
	PSG34-02	Programme to provide an update on post-M10 Change Management.	Programme	07/08/2024

Decisions

Area	Ref	Decision	Rationale
Headline Report and Actions	PSG-DEC98	The Headline Report of the previous meeting was approved with no amendments.	There were no amendments raised by PSG members.

Key Discussion Items

Area	Discussion
Minutes and Actions	<p>The PSG Headline Report from the December PSG was approved with no amendments (PSG-DEC98).</p> <p>ACTION PSG40-02: Programme thanked RECCo for its transparency in resolving the EMDS error, and RECCo similarly thanked the Programme and Electralink for their collaboration in resolving this issue.</p>
Sponsor Update	<p>A Representative from Ofgem provided a verbal update on the Regulatory Directions which will be issued to preserve CR055 timelines. The first step taken was issuing a consultation on the directions for the Implementation Manager (IM), which received 18 responses. These responses provided valuable clarity, highlighting themes such as the frequency of reporting, the feasibility of reducing the Migration window, and the complementarity of tasks assigned to the IM. The analysis of these responses is under internal review with an estimated publish date of approximately 2 weeks. Additionally, a joint letter from the Secretary of State and the Ofgem CEO is undergoing internal governance and is expected to be published within the next two weeks.</p> <p>The Chair asked about the timeline for the corresponding consultation on Ofgem directions for PPs. Ofgem estimated a 2-week timeline, noting that the feedback to the IM consultation led to a rethinking of the PP directions.</p>
Ofgem Regulatory Directions	<p>Programme opened the floor to questions regarding the Ofgem Regulatory Directions.</p> <p>Programme will publish a link to the Programme's response to the Ofgem consultation on the website and in the Clock and noted the Programme support for the intent behind these directions.</p>
Settlement Analysis Model	<p>The Helix Rep provided an update on the delivery of the CR013 Settlement Analysis Model. A third-party contractor has been employed to deliver the stakeholder feedback following the session with DNOs and Industry Reps in December 2024. The work is due to complete in February and will be ready for presentation at the March PSG. Helix will reach out to the same group that met in December to give sight before PSG.</p> <p>The iDNO Rep asked whether there was a date for the session with LDSOs and industry. Helix proposed to hold the session in 2 weeks' time and took an action to add in a placeholder (ACTION PSG41-01).</p> <p>The Supplier & Agent Rep asked if the model would include predictions on actual Settlement performance against the new Settlement timetable. Helix clarified that the model uses real-world meter data to produce outputs but if there are any more specific questions the Settlement Assurance team can provide an answer.</p> <p>Programme asked whether the model will be operational by the March PSG. Helix advised that the spreadsheet model has been created to produce the outputs and that the additional work which will be completed will be additional power BI reporting to provide better insights from the tool.</p>
Go-Live Readiness	<p>Management of Programme Readiness for Go-Live</p> <p>Programme provided an overview of the approach to tracking M10 Readiness which encompasses Testing but also readiness and preparation for Cutover, Transition (ELS), Service Management, Operational and Business Readiness and Migration.</p>

Programme provided an M10 Readiness PoaP and outlined the M10 Acceptance Criteria. Programme also introduced the new Get to Go-Live Group (GGLG) being mobilised which will convene fortnightly to track progress against the M10 Acceptance Criteria.

The iDNO Rep asked about the representation of LDSOs in the GGLG and proposed having a bilateral to better understand the rationale behind the system of representation. Programme advised that the default position was to have one rep per LDSO involved in SIT and Non-SIT LDSO testing. However, Programme wanted to offer the opportunity for LDSOs to present a more efficient approach. Programme took an action to set up a bilateral with the DNO and iDNO Reps to discuss it (**ACTION PSG41-02**).

The Medium Supplier Rep and DNO Rep asked whether the Terms of Reference (ToR) and the inputs and outputs from the GGLG would be shared more widely. Programme advised that this has been discussed at FTIG, and the ToR and other materials can be made public. Programme noted that there would be monthly updates provided at MCAG and PSG. Programme reiterated that not being a part of GGLG does not impact any PP's ability to reach Go-Live.

The Supplier & Agent Rep asked why the GGLG is needed given the success of FTIG. Programme advised that the focus of FTIG is testing, and this focus will need to remain on testing at least through SIT Operational and Non-Functional testing which complete in the Summer of 2025. Programme noted that there may be a point where the groups converge, and a potential merge may be considered at that point.

IPA added their support for the GGLG, noting its key role to play in addressing risks and blockers, and tracking progress to Go-Live.

The RECCo Rep praised the M10 Acceptance Criteria but noted the need for clarification on Criterion 4, slide 15, confirmation that suppliers and contracted agents are qualified. Code Bodies would confirm the Qualifications, but there was a nuance where the confirmation of a commercial arrangement between the two parties was not currently part of the process. Programme acknowledged the clarification and took an action to review and update (**ACTION PSG41-03**).

The DNO Rep asked whether further columns showing RAG Status and Target completion dates could be added to the M10 Acceptance Criteria. Programme advised that the tracker itself does include a RAG status and a commentary which would be updated by each member of the GGLG.

The I&C Supplier Rep proposed using well-established maturity models as a reference for assessing the readiness of participants. These models provide a good understanding of where PPs stand in terms of their maturity and can offer a head start in defining what "good" looks like. Programme acknowledged the value of using maturity models and aims to avoid reinventing the wheel where possible.

Programme outlined the current approach to the M10 Checkpoint, which is scheduled to review progress towards achieving M10, approx. 6 months in advance. The review will consist of two key questions:

Question 1: Are we on track to achieve the M10 date of 24-Sep-25?

Question 2: Can the downstream milestones (M14-M16) be brought forwards to conclude the Programme earlier than 31-Dec-26?

Programme advised the work undertaken to address Question 2 would be a feasibility study, and if feasibility was determined, further discussion would then need to be held with a wider stakeholder group. Programme outlined the approach, key stakeholders and workstream owners, the timeline, and PoaP for the M10 Checkpoint.

Programme advised that if M10 was going to move forward, testing would have to far exceed the execution model, going so far as to prove the execution model to have been inaccurate. Testing has not progressed at this pace, but the Programme must still undertake the exercise as part of the M10 Checkpoint to prove unequivocally that M10 cannot be moved forward.

The Large Supplier Rep acknowledged the Programme's response regarding bringing M10 forward and the need to undertake the exercise to prove it, noting the conversations that had been had in the background.

The DNO Rep raised a concern about the timing of a Data Load activity scheduled for the end of July, noting that it falls during the summer holiday season and proposed that moving this activity forward could help mitigate resource constraints and de-risk delivery, and whether there are any other similar activities. Programme advised that this point would be more appropriate for the Data Cleanse Working Group.

The I&C Supplier Rep raised a concern about the Knowledge Transfer process, particularly in the context of transitioning from Testing to Operations, noting the challenges when dealing with new technologies. Programme acknowledged the importance of Knowledge Transfer and confirmed that it is a critical element of the Readiness tracking process and is captured within the M10 Acceptance Criteria Service Delivery Model and the Self-Certification process, which ensures PPs understand their roles and responsibilities and that Knowledge Transfer has been undertaken.

The iDNO asked whether the GGLG will feed into the above Questions. Programme confirmed Question 1 would be the focus of GGLG.

Following a query from the RECCo Rep, Programme confirmed that the Migration envelope capacity will include central service providers looking at their ability to manage that capacity.

BSCCo Update

The BSCCo Rep provided an overview of Elexon M10 Readiness, a 2025 POAP and a more detailed view of Q1, outlining its core scope and the Helix 360 workshops.

The DNO Rep asked about the need for clarity on the governance of these activities. Helix acknowledged the point and explained that the governance control should be included in the DIP Readiness. Helix advised there is ongoing work to publish the governance structure without disturbing the current debt management structure, with plans to finalise details with the Programme and Ofgem, and communication expected to start next month.

Helix also advised that there will be detailed planning provided to GGLG and encouraged anyone with dependencies on Helix to reach out through GGLG or directly.

IPA Consequential Change

The IPA outlined the background and context of Consequential Change Assurance, the IPA's assurance activities, and next steps, as well as a view of the key principles and assumptions.

<p>Programme Update - Testing</p>	<p>Programme provided an overview of testing progress by the end of Cycle 3 Sprint 10 Week 1. The key headline is that performance against the CR055 models is now expected to track below 100%, as this model represents the theoretical maximum achievable if every cohort passed all in-scope tests (and none will need to do that). The focus has thus shifted to the actual remaining tests and timescales for each individual cohort, based on recent cohort velocities.</p> <p>Cohorts B and F are on track to exit SIT Cycle 3 within Sprint 14 (i.e. without using contingency), with a forecast based on 100% passed tests at that point (with >85% required without major defects).</p> <p>The majority of remaining SIT Functional tests are paired, longer, and more complex, requiring inter-working between two cohorts, which continues to challenge the test velocity for the leading cohorts.</p> <p>All unique SIT Migration tests have been passed by two or more cohorts, and Cohort H has now passed 100% of their SIT Migration tests, increasing confidence that all cohorts are likely to achieve 100% passed tests in SIT Migration before the end of Sprint 14, the desired Cycle 3 completion.</p> <p>Programme provided an overview of the Settlement Testing position which is on track to time-out in the agreed risk-managed manner at SITAG on 21 February 2025.</p> <p>Programme also advised that Operational Testing Theme 3 Batch 1 (Service Management) Readiness was approved at SITAG on 29 January 2025 and testing has begun execution as of 03 February 2025.</p>
<p>Migration Update</p>	<p>Programme provided an update on the Migration framework Consultation 3, the approval of which is scheduled for MCAG 25 February 2025. Programme also provided an update on Migration Schedule Submission 1 and 2 and provided a summary of the findings of the Migration Report which documents risks and opportunities. More detail can be found in the slides.</p> <p>Programme also provided an update on the MCC Readiness, noting the development of the MCC toolset has commenced.</p> <p>An overview of the Migration Milestone updates was also provided.</p> <p>The Large Supplier Rep inquired about the framework consultation, noting the performance metric of 90% within six months and ensuring it is appropriately worded from a reasonable endeavours perspective. Programme advised there has been feedback on this topic and a proposed approach which will be taken to MWG.</p>
<p>Post-M10 Change Management</p>	<p>Programme provided a progress update and next steps on the Change Governance Post M8/M10.</p> <p>It has been agreed that all MHHS changes post M8/M10 will be progressed through the existing BAU change governance process managed by the Code Bodies. The MHHS Programme will monitor changes and engage in the BAU process to provide impact assessment against delivery timescales. If a change is approved by the Code Body Panel that materially impacts delivery of MHHS, this will be escalated to Ofgem through Programme governance. To mitigate this risk, the Programme and Code Bodies have worked together to agree a collaborative process which takes into consideration the obligations on all parties to ensure there are no delays to delivery of MHHS.</p> <p>MHHS Change Board are carrying out a review of all deferred CR's to identify any required for implementation post M10 and agree handover with the relevant Code Body.</p>

	<p>Further engagement with the Code Bodies is ongoing regarding the ability to enact Emergency Change processes during the Early Life Support period. This will form part of the Transition Governance Arrangements which will be progressed through TORWG and approved by MCAG. Programme also provided a summary of Change Board Decision from On-Hold Change Request review at CB50 on 28 January 2025.</p> <p>The RECCo Rep added some clarity over the point regarding Ofgem having authority to overrule the panel decision under the SCR powers if there is material impact on MHHS delivery. Ofgem can suspend the progression of a modification under the REC if it feels it has an undue impact on the SCR. This can happen before the vote when the modification is raised. Additionally, Ofgem can raise its own modification and direct the timetable, overruling the panel decision to approve or reject a change proposal. For self-governance modifications, Ofgem can intervene upon receipt of an appeal. If the appeal window closes without an appeal, Ofgem's only mechanism to undo the decision is to raise its own change proposal to reverse the implementation.</p> <p>The RECCo Rep had a further clarification that changes to the interfaces and data items would not be progressed through a DIP change. Instead, these changes would be made to the relevant code, BSC or REC, depending on ownership.</p> <p>The DNO Rep asked about the timing of On-Hold CRs, specifically calling out CR044, <i>Implementation of 'Data Refresh' Message IF-051</i>, noting the potential risks if these changes are delayed until after M10. The Programme advised that the timing of these changes would need to be assessed from a Programme perspective, considering the impact on early life support. The normal BAU change process would be followed, and assessments would be made to determine the optimum time for implementation, ensuring that any defects are fixed during the early life cycle.</p> <p>The I&C Rep ask whether there are any specific risks that have been identified in the transition from Programme to Code Bodies Governance and whether those risks have been attributed to owners. Programme advised this work is currently ongoing.</p>
<p>Delivery Dashboards</p>	<p>The DNO Rep highlighted that while the Programme Status for Design is marked as green, there are ongoing activities and Design-related issues that could be potentially impactful, noting there is an open PPIR – 'New Connections Between M10 – M14'. Programme acknowledged that these ongoing issues could create risks or challenges that might change the status. However, Programme is aware of these potential issues and is monitoring them closely, and the outcomes of the PPIR are not yet known.</p> <p>IPA provided an update on assurance activities, noting Assurance P9 will be commencing soon. Programme emphasised the importance of transparency regarding interactions, inputs, and additional support needed as the Go-Live date approaches and stressed the need for clear communication to ensure everything aligns with the plan.</p>

Date of next meeting: 05 March 2025 at 10:00am

Attendees

Chair

Helen Adey (Chair)

SRO (Elexon IM)

Apologies

Andy Manning
Ife Garba (replacing
Keren Kelly)

Consumer Representative
NESO

Industry Representatives

Andrew Campbell
Chris Price
Elaine Eyles
Paul Daniels
Andrew Green (replacing Gareth Evans)
Graham Wood
Simon Harrison
John Abbott
Jenny Rawlinson
Del Kang
Jonathon Hawkins
James Murphy (Joel Stark)

Small Supplier Representative
DNO Representative
Medium Supplier Representative
Avanade Representative
I&C Supplier Representative
Large Supplier Representative
Supplier Agent Representative
Elexon Representative (Central Systems Provider)
IDNO Representative
DCC Representative
RECCo Representative
Supplier Agent Representative

MHHS IM

Andrew Margan
Jason Brogden
Keith Clark
Lewis Hall
Philip McCann
Roger Robar
Warren Fulton
Smitha Pichrikat
Paul Pettitt
Chris Welby
Chris Harden

Code Lead
Programme Industry SME
Programme Manager
Programme Delivery Manager
Governance Lead
Test Lead
Migration Lead
Client Delivery Manager
Programme Test Lead
Strategic Industry Advisor
Client Programme Director

Other Attendees

Laura Kennedy
David Gandee
Richard Stilton
Renata Yussapova
Andy McFaul
Fahreen Japp
Jenny Boothe

Code Bodies
IPA
IPA
IPA
Ofgem
Ofgem
Ofgem