

## MHHS Programme Steering Group Minutes and Actions

Issue date: 15/06/2022

Meeting Number	<b>PSG 008</b>	Venue	<b>Virtual – MS Teams</b>
Date and Time	<b>08 June 2022 1400-1600</b>	Classification	<b>Public</b>

### Attendees

#### Chair

Chris Welby (CW) MHHS IM SRO

#### Industry Representatives

Andrew Campbell (AC)	Small Supplier Representative
Charlotte Semp (CS)	DCC Representative (Smart Meter Central System provider)
Chris Price (CP)	DNO Representative
Ed Rees (ER)	Consumer Representative
Gareth Evans (GE)	I&C Supplier Representative
Graham Wood (GW)	Large Supplier Representative
Joel Stark (JS)	Supplier Agent (Independent) Representative
Lee Northall (LN)	Elexon Representative (Central Systems Provider)
Neil Dewar (ND) (attending on behalf of Karen Lilley-Thompson)	National Grid ESO Representative
Paul Akrill (PA)	Supplier Agent Representative
Vladimir Black (VB)	Medium Supplier Representative

#### MHHS IM

Andrew Margan (AM)	Governance Manager
Chris Harden (CHa)	Programme Director
Charles Hyde (CHy)	Procurement Lead
Ian Smith (IS)	Design Manager
Jason Brogden (JB)	Industry SME
Keith Clark (KC)	Programme Manager
Kate Goodman (KG)	Testing Manager
Martin Cranfield (MC)	PMO Governance Lead
Miles Winter (MW)	PMO Governance Support
Warren Fulton (WF)	Outcome Assurance Manager

#### 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	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due	Update
<b>Programme Planning</b>	PSG08-01	Share Planning working group attendees with PSG members	Programme (PMO)	09/06/2022	Shared with PSG Headline Report

<b>Mobilisation and M3 (CR007)</b>	PSG08-02	Update CR007 as discussed in PSG. Raise for impact assessment	Programme (Jason Brogden, PMO)	10/06/2022	Raised for Impact Assessment on Friday 10 June
<b>Decision on CR008</b>	PSG08-03	Action CR008 (e.g. updates to governance framework)	Programme (PMO)	15/06/2022	Actioned with updates to be shared in the Clock 15 June 2022
	PSG08-04	Ensure all individual Change Request Impact Assessment responses are available to Programme Participants via the portal	Programme (PMO)	15/06/2022	
<b>Programme Outcomes and KPIs</b>	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	
<b>Dashboards</b>	PSG08-06	Add a 'forward look' to the L3 Advisory Group Dashboard	Programme (PMO)	06/07/2022	
	PSG08-07	Re-issue the PSG slide pack with updates	Programme (PMO)	09/06/2022	Shared with PSG Headline Report

## Decisions

Area	Dec Ref	Decision
<b>Mobilisation and M3 (CR007)</b>	PSG-DEC11	CR007 was approved to be raised to impact assessment, subject to updates as discussed in PSG
<b>CR008</b>	PSG-DEC12	CR008 was approved
<b>Independent Programme Assurance Framework (IPAF)</b>	PSG-DEC13	The IPAF was approved
<b>Programme Outcomes and KPIs</b>	PSG-DEC14	The Benefits Realisation Plan was approved subject to updates at the next control point as discussed in PSG
<b>Minutes</b>	PSG-DEC15	The minutes of 04 May 2022 PSG were approved

## RAID Items

RAID area	Description
<b>Design risks</b>	Following an ask to present design-related risks to the PSG, the design team provided an update on the progress of the design against the plan (please see Design Risks Deep-Dive agenda item below)

## Minutes

### 1. Welcome

CW welcomed all to the meeting (including three new Constituency Representatives) and ran through the meeting agenda.

## 2. Minutes and Actions Review

The minutes from PSG 04 May 2022 were **APPROVED**.

CW ran through the action updates as per the actions slide. CW invited comments on the actions. None raised.

## 3. Programme Planning

KC introduced the approach to delivering the re-baselined plan. Kick off meetings took place last week with two tracks of planning working groups. Track 1 includes delivery managers. Track 2 includes people who want to be more engaged from a top-down perspective. The groups and attendees will ensure the right SMEs are engaged in the right conversations at the right parts of the plan from the start. The intention of the groups is to build a re-plan strawman that will be more fit for consultation after M5. KC invited any questions on the approach.

PA asked if the Programme was able to publish a list of those who are on the planning working groups, to know who in their constituency (Supplier Agent) was attending. KC responded yes, attendees were fine to share.

### **ACTION PSG08-01: Programme to Planning working group attendees with PSG members**

KC presented the interim plan as per the slides. The aim is to report progress against the interim plan at each PSG. The Programme intend to bring the plan further to life and present back/walkthrough with Programme Participants, possibly at the next industry webinar/open day. KC invited questions. None received. CW noted that the Programme is open to any proposals on how best to deliver the interim plan walkthrough.

## 4. Design Risk Deep-Dive

WF introduced themselves and provided context that they have been working in the design team to help mitigate risks to delivering the design. At DAG there has been an intense lessons learned and a re-schedule process following previous tranche reviews. At this morning's DAG, it was discussed that Tranche 4 artefacts that were due to be released today will now be released in July. As a collective, the Programme and industry cannot compromise on the integrity of the design. It is important that industry buy in to the development and outputs of the design. WF noted that there was a significant increase in industry engagement during and after Tranche 1 artefact review. This has enriched the design, but has presented challenges:

- Managing and acting on the large volume of feedback has had an impact on resourcing. The design team have been less able to work on Tranche 4 artefacts.
- The process has uncovered additional complexity in the design which has taken more time to resolve.
- Aiming for consensus has been more difficult than anticipated and has required more Working Group review cycles.
- The approach of conditional approval was taken, but the Programme recognises it needs to communicate more effectively the way in which documents have progressed through to conditional approval and which conditions have been attached to it.

WF noted that the decision to delay Tranche 4 has led to a rescheduling of the residual issues from Tranches 1 and 2 into a revised schedule. This schedule will be assured by the IPA ahead of being shared with Programme Participants. The schedule takes into account industry concerns including to allow sufficient time for reviews and comments to be addressed, and to address lessons learnt from previous Tranches. The intention is to publish the schedule within the next two weeks. The belief is that this, together with enhanced processes and controls such as those seen in the fortnightly design dashboard, will lead to a higher quality design.

WF added that other design work will not stop. Tranche 3 will continue to be developed. Tranche 2 has been conditionally approved in DAG this morning with 6 reps for, 1 against, 2 abstained. Finally, WF noted that there had been 17 WGs and 60+ sub WGs with around 2300 comments received so far. Tranche 1-3 represents about 50% of the artefacts.

GW thanked WF for the update and queried if there is any view for target date for getting Tranche 4 out in July. WF responded that there is a schedule and a date, but it cannot be shared at this point. GW thanked WF and the Programme for listening to Participant feedback and for undertaking a re-plan.

JR echoed GW's thanks and felt it was good that there would now be time for network charging implications to be incorporated into Tranche 4 artefacts. JR queried if this delay would push out the M5 Milestone. WF responded that they

couldn't comment on this. CW added that the Programme feels quality is more important than hitting the date but that the Programme cannot comment on the impact on M5 at this point.

AC asked if the number of comments received so far has told the Programme anything about the design itself. WF responded that they aren't changing the integrity of the design and that the bulk of the comments (roughly 50-60%) are changing the artefacts themselves. Another chunk of comments are clarifications or questions, and around 10% are rejections. Finally, there are around 10% of comments that require an issue to be raised and discussed. IS added that the high-level commentary is that comments from industry have substantially enriched the design and have shone a light on some elements of the design that require changes. However, comments have not fundamentally undermined the design itself (i.e. nothing that would be termed severe or critical).

CP agreed with JR's comments from a DNOs and iDNO perspective. CP was supportive of this rescheduling given concerns that were being raised by their constituency.

PA asked whether the reschedule will be reviewed by DAG as well as the IPA, as creating a realistic plan would likely benefit from DAG's input too. WF confirmed yes and noted the importance of a second review process. PA noted the second review process would further alleviate concerns of their constituents.

CW invited final comments. None received. CW thanked WF for their contributions on Design, noting design processes had been significantly improved in the last few weeks. WF responded that the Design team have done and continue to do a lot of the hard work, often working over capacity.

## 5. Design Decisions

CW opened the item and asked GW if they still wanted to present. GW commented this had been covered under agenda item 4 and wider work ongoing on the design through DAG.

## 6. Mobilisation and M3

JB summarised that there were two actions at the last PSG. The first of which was for constituency reps to provide feedback from constituents on mobilisation, however none were received. The second was on defining mobilisation.

JB invited input on the first action. PA apologised for not sending over the feedback from his constituency as per the action. PA had two points:

- How do the Programme ensure everyone 'levels up'? Different parts of PA's constituency have worked on different workstreams and working groups, so they feel their understanding is patchy depending on what they've been engaged with. JB responded that Design playbacks are being planned for after M5. There's opportunity to do this on a constituency-by-constituency basis. JB asked if this would work for PA's constituents. PA responded that it would depend upon the depth of content covered in the sessions. KC noted the design playbacks are in the interim plan and as the Programme gets closer to M5, more detail about how the interim plan is executed will be developed.
- Logistically, as Programme Participants further mobilise and bring more people on board, more people are going to need access to the tools and services the Programme will be providing. Will this have an impact on software licensing? JB responded that licensing is something the Programme is aware of.

AM noted they had received feedback from constituency reps whereby CR007 created a fixed date for M3. Other change requests have pinned milestones around their dependent milestones, e.g. M5 + X months in CR003. JB noted that at the time of drafting, the MHHS Programme reflected the September date from the CR001 Ofgem decision and IPA recommendation, but both JB and KC suggested it was better to make M3 conditional on M5 delivery and that this would be two months following M5 in line with the dates in the CR001 decision.

CW noted there were two decisions for the PSG. First if the PSG is the right 'originating group' for CR007 and secondly if the Change Request could be raised to impact assessment. CW asked if PSG believed they are the relevant group to own CR007, or if CR007 should be owned by a lower L3 group. No comments received.

CW asked if CR007 should go out to impact assessment as is, or if it should be amended to be linked to M5. AC agreed that linking to M5 would make it more consistent. JR supported this. If M5 changes, it saves the Programme making another CR. GW agreed. JB agreed and noted that this would be included in changes to the CR before issuing for Impact Assessment.

JB asked if there were any additional discussions on the CR. CW invited those comments, provided they are on the CR itself rather than comments that might be better made as part of Impact Assessment. GW asked if the wording around dates sounds quite absolute, e.g. the minimum set of criteria *must* be met. Is this meant to be absolute or is it a case

that there will be some flexibility for PSG to sign off M3 even if all Programme Participants weren't ready? JB responded that the absolute nature was intended to make the CR as clear as possible on the criteria at M3 to be "fully mobilised". KC commented this was in line with IPA recommendations from CR001. GW asked how this is governed if a supplier is not mobilised according to one condition not being met, but knowing it will be done later in the year and won't stop the progression of the Programme. CW responded that the conditions set in CR007 would go into the next Readiness Assessment (RA2) and if some questions come back with a 'no', there would be discussions as to why that's the case and a reasonable plan for resolution within the Programme plan would be required.

JR asked if the title needed changing to make the CR apply not just to suppliers (assuming it applies to all parties). JB noted yes it should read 'Programme Participants' and that this will be included in changes to the CR before issuing for impact assessment.

JR asked about the impact on later milestones and whether the potential impact should be included in the CR. JB said CR007 is focused just on the M3 change that was impacted by CR001, and the Programme re-plan will look at later milestones. JR suggested the CR should also reference the re-planning exercise, to make this clear. JB agreed and noted that the Programme should highlight that CR007 is focused on the change to M3 required from the Ofgem decision on CR001 and that later milestones are subject to review as part of the Programme re-planning exercise. Impact assessment responses should be focused on the impact of M3 and not later milestones. JB noted that this would be included in changes to the CR before issuing for Impact Assessment.

**ACTION PSG08-02: Programme to update CR007 as discussed in PSG. Raise for impact assessment**

CW asked if PSG would approve CR007 to go to impact assessment once the changes discussed are made, without bringing it back to PSG. No objections received.

**DECISION PSG-DEC11: CR007 was approved to be raised to impact assessment, subject to updates as discussed in PSG**

## 7. Decision on CR008

CW opened the item and summarised the CR008 Change Request and its responses as per the slides. CW noted some specific comments that were received. CW invited comments before moving to a vote. None received.

**Parties in support:** GE, JR, CP, ER, GW, CS, LN, AC, PA, JS, ND

**Parties not in support:** None

**Abstentions:** None

JR queried if impact assessment responses for any CR001 were available for all Programme Participants to see, for example via the Portal. MC clarified that they should be and that the Programme would check.

**ACTION PSG08-03: Programme to action CR008 (e.g. updates to governance framework)**

**DECISION PSG-DEC12: CR008 was approved**

**ACTION PSG08-04: Programme to ensure all individual Change Request Impact Assessment responses are available to Programme Participants via the portal**

## 8. Independent Programme Assurer updates

CW introduced the item and handed over to RS. RS explained the intention to gain PSG feedback and approval to the Independent Programme Assurance Framework (IPAF). RS provided an overview the IPAF as per the slides. RS highlighted the approach documented in the IPAF (e.g. scoping, engagement process, ways of working with the Programme) and noted the approach to assurance such as stage-based assurance. RS explained the intention was to baseline the document in this PSG and review it at points throughout the Programme to ensure it maintains its relevance. RS added that the IPAF had been created in collaboration with the Programme and Ofgem. RS invited questions. None received.

RS asked for approval from PSG members. CW asked for any objections. No comments received.

**DECISION PSG-DEC13: The IPAF was approved**

RS gave an overview of the approach to Baseline Assurance Health Checks, explaining there are a number of work packages for the IPA to assess if the E2E Programme is set up for success. RS explained the four areas of Health Checks as per the slides. RS explained the IPA are halfway through their initial work and the outputs will be brought to

PSG at the beginning of August. RS noted the IPA are also meeting with Programme Participants as part of the work packages. RS invited comments. None received.

CW reiterated that the IPA are open to all Programme Participants and that Programme Participants should engage with them. The IPA are seen as a 'critical friend' to the Programme and have already been very helpful to the Programme and Ofgem. The Programme looks forward to continuing to work with them.

## 9. Programme Outcomes and KPIs

JB introduced the item and noted there was an attachment alongside the PSG papers detailing the full Benefits Realisation Plan. This is summarised in the PSG slides. One of the important elements is introducing the Benefits Realisation early in the Programme. JB commented that it is important not only to understand what the Programme can deliver, but also what can't be monitored and delivered. The majority of benefits detailed in the plan are due to be realised by industry after the Programme has been implemented and go-live has finished. JB added that the Benefits Realisation body of work gave the Programme the opportunity to review and expand on the framework and benefits set out in the Programme Initiation Document (PID) and charter. The content of the plan will be reviewed by the Programme at control points against the PID. JB presented the map created by the Programme to determine individual benefits and stages.

GW queried how consequential impacts that do not have positive benefits are captured by the Programme, for example if something being done in the Programme is at the detriment of processes elsewhere in industry. JB answered that this was not explicitly covered and could be introduced in the next control point review. The Programme started from decision documents from Ofgem that would drive outcomes, but there was nothing in the Ofgem documents on consequential detriment. KC commented that the business case did not highlight any dis-benefits of the change. JB added that the benefits here have been mapped against the PID Impact Assessment.

JS queried what the success measures that were to be 'further quantified' meant. For example, the MPAN success criteria cannot be based only on *if* MPANs are moved. JS added that a measure of a number of MPANs driving half hourly settlement was needed below this criteria to further quantify success, and that 'MPANs moved' was not the right measure. CW noted that it was not on the Programme to get customers to use the new systems. JS responded that the Programme needs to have a more quantifiable measure using a technical platform that delivers robust data, and that the success criteria need to be more data driven. JB replied that this could be addressed at the next control point but that the Programme do need to consider what is or is not in the Programme's control.

JB introduced the Benefits Realisation methodology as per the slides. The Programme had mapped success measures to final programme outcomes in a tabular way and in a pictorial representation to allow Programme Participants to visualise the benefits and their progress.

JB moved to ask for approval of the Benefits Realisation Plan by PSG. JB summarised that the next steps for Benefits Realisation had been laid out in the PID, included a strategy review at each control point. The next review will include the points raised today at PSG and will be updated in relevant PMO tools and processes. The Programme will also look at how adaptability will be represented in future Programme outcomes, such as how platforms put in place now should be adaptable for future change. JB asked for PSG approval on this basis.

CW invited PSG members to outline why they would not like to approve the Benefits Realisation Plan.

CS endorsed JS's comments on data accuracy. This was because DCC will need to provide Half-Hourly Settlement data and it is important this is in the Benefits Realisation Plan. Otherwise, CS was happy to approve. No other comments received.

**ACTION PSG08-05: Programme to 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)**

**DECISION PSG-DEC14: The Benefits Realisation Plan was approved subject to updates at the next control point as discussed in PSG**

## 10. Overview of E2E Testing and Integration Strategy

KG introduced themselves as the lead test architect on the Programme. KG's role is to ensure testing is robust and fit for purpose, done in a cost-effective way, and exhaustive of required testing activity. KG noted they lead in TMAG, which has developed and approved a number of documents including the Test Data Strategy. KG commented that the Data Working Group (DWG) and Migration Working Group (MWG) are stood up under TMAG. In July, the Environments and Configurations Management Working Group (EWG) will be stood up, and in August the Qualification and E2E Sandbox

Working Group (QWG) will be stood up. KG invited PSG members to find constituency reps for TMAG, with medium, Small and I&C supplier seats still open.

KG moved to provide an overview of the E2E Testing and Integration Strategy, the purpose of the document is to set out phases and stages of testing, who participates in each stage, and what the dependencies are. There are no dates in the document, but it does feed into the Programme re-plan. The strategy has introduced a few changes to Ofgem Transition Timetable. KG talked through the diagram of the MHHS TOM and provided an overview of what MHHS covers, and also what testing covers.

KG talked through the phases and stages of testing. There are three test phases: Pre-Integration Test (PIT), Systems Integration Test (SIT), and User Integration Test (UIT). Each of this will have one or more stages. SIT has a number of stages within which all participants will need to do testing but the Programme will organise the coordination. UIT requires Qualification testing and E2E sandbox testing which will be a testing service where participants can connect to an environment and conduct their own testing.

LN asked if the dependencies on different phases would be gone through. KG responded yes and that this was covered in the following slides.

KG explained the routes Programme Participants can go through to get to UIT. One route is to be involved in SIT and Programme Participants would be considered qualified if they went through this. The other option is to go through Qualification (if not involved in SIT). The first deviation from the Ofgem timetable is to replace the stages called connectivity and basic integration. The intention is to do these in steps, rather than testing components all in one go. The second change is to test Migration. This will mostly be non-functional testing as the intention is to test whether migration can be done in the time allowed. KG noted some test stages can run in parallel. The intention is to finish all functional testing successfully before qualification can start up. A bit of migration, non-functional testing and operational testing will be done before qualification is started so that Programme has confidence in these elements working well. KG invited questions. None received.

KG outlined the role for each market segment that Programme Participants would be expected have (i.e. to test or not test) across the test stages. Some participants are expected to test in SIT, whereas others would be expected to participate in PIT. Data services providers can participate in SIT, and if they do so, they can go straight into the E2E Sandbox.

GW asked if the comment 'selected' implied a selection of Programme Participants would participate in a test phase, or if it would be specific selected Programme Participants. KG said it referred to selected Programme Participants. A Participant either does or does not participate in SIT. If you do, as a selected participant, you need to do all the testing that is required. If you are not selected, you do not do any testing. GW asked if there were going to be some mandatory, some required etc. testing for Participants. KG responded that the selection process had not yet been decided and what would be ideal would be 2-3 participants representing each role in each of the market segments.

AC asked if PKI is under DIP (assuming this is Public Key Infrastructure – KG confirmed yes) and asked if this is how DIP is being secured. KG confirmed yes and that the intention was to highlight that PKI exists and needs to be considered in testing.

CW commented that there are a range of Working Groups below TMAG. These are all two hours or less and occur once a month. CW invited prospective attendees to reach out to [PMO@mhhsprogramme.co.uk](mailto:PMO@mhhsprogramme.co.uk) who will share the meeting invites.

## 11. Programme Dashboards

CW invited questions on the Programme dashboards by exception from PSG members. CW highlighted the new finance dashboard for Central Parties. KC noted the milestone dashboard had been updated to align the status of M5 to the description provided by WF.

GW asked for a forward-looking view on the Advisory Group updates (as well as the backward look already provided)

**ACTION PSG08-06: Programme to add a 'forward look' to the L3 Advisory Group Dashboard**

**ACTION PSG08-07: Programme to re-issue the PSG slide pack with updates**

## 12. Summary and Next Steps

MC summarised the actions from the meeting as per the table above.

AM clarified that Change Requests Impact Assessments should be shared via the Portal (action PSG08-04).

CW provided an overview of next PSG agenda items as per the slides and invited any items to go to [PMO@mhhsprogramme.co.uk](mailto:PMO@mhhsprogramme.co.uk) ahead of paper day (5 working days). CW invited any other business, none received. CW closed the meeting.

**Date of next PSG: 06 July 2022**