

MHHS Programme Steering Group (PSG) minutes and actions

Issue date: 12/10/2022

| | | | |
|----------------|----------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| Meeting Number | PSG 013 | Venue | Virtual – MS Teams |
| Date and Time | 05 October 2022 1000-1200 | Classification | Public |

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 |
| 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 |
| Karen Thompson-Lilley | National Grid ESO Representative |
| Lee Northall (LN) | Exelon Representative (Central Systems Provider) |
| Paul Akrill (PA) | Supplier Agent Representative |
| Sarah Jones (SJ) as alternate for Jonathan Hawkins | RECCo Representative |
| Vladimir Black (VB) | Medium Supplier Representative |

MHHS IM

| | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Andrew Margan (AM) | Governance Manager |
| Chris Harden (CH) | Programme Director |
| Keith Clark (KC) | Programme Manager |
| Martin Cranfield (MC) | PMO Governance Lead |
| Pete Edwards (PE) | PPC Readiness Assessment Lead |

Other Attendees

| | |
|----------------------|---------------------|
| Andy MacFaul (AMF) | Ofgem (as observer) |
| Dave Gandee (DG) | MHHS IPA Lead |
| Rachel Clark (RC) | Ofgem Sponsor |
| Richard Shilton (RS) | MHHS IPA Lead |
| Sinead Quinn (SQ) | Ofgem (as observer) |

Actions

| Area | Action Ref | Action | Owner | Due | Update |
|-----------------------------|------------|--|-----------|----------|--------|
| DBT and M3 readiness | PSG13-01 | Consider steps to ensure external factors impacting participant ability to deliver their plans are appropriately considered by the Programme (focussing on the | Programme | 02/11/22 | |

| Area | Action Ref | Action | Owner | Due | Update |
|------------------------|------------|--|---------------|----------|--|
| | | recent government direction on support schemes for current market conditions) e.g. consider via the Round 3 re-plan consultation or in Readiness Assessment 2 | | | |
| Replan | PSG13-02 | Confirm the governance/decision-making route for making a decision on a migration option, including how this relates to decision-making for the re-plan | Programme | 02/11/22 | |
| | PSG13-03 | Share the current interim plan timeline/dates for PSG decisions relating to the Programme re-plan following Round 3 consultation | Programme PMO | 06/10/22 | <p>The current interim PoaP suggests a date of 14 November 2022 for an extraordinary PSG where a decision to raise a replan Change Request to Impact Assessment would be made (following Round 3 of consultation on the Programme re-plan).</p> <p>Given PSG-DEC24, this date will likely shift to the end of the same week to accommodate the two-week consultation period for Round 3 of consultation. A firm decision on the date of the extraordinary PSG will be made at the 02 November PSG. The date will also be subject to the decision at the 02 November PSG on whether to progress to Round 3 of consultation.</p> |
| Design progress | PSG13-04 | Confirm the date for the full set of updated design artefacts to be shared | Programme | 06/10/22 | Updated design artefacts are planned to be released on 17 October 2022 |
| Dashboards | 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 MHHS members and PSG constituency reps as required | Programme PMO | 14/11/22 | Session scheduled for 17 October 2022 |

| Area | Action Ref | Action | Owner | Due | Update |
|------|------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|----------|--------|
| | PSG13-06 | Share updated finance data for Helix | Helix representative | 26/10/22 | |

Decisions

| Area | Dec Ref | Decision |
|-------------------|-----------|---|
| Minutes | PSG-DEC23 | The PSG approved the minutes of the 07 September PSG |
| Programme re-plan | PSG-DEC24 | The PSG agreed to make progression to Round 3 consultation on the Programme re-plan conditional on a decision at November PSG |

RAID Items

| RAID area | Description |
|-------------------------|--|
| Key Programme Issues | The PSG discussed two Key Programme Issues: MP162 and Migration. Please see key discussion items for full detail. |
| External market factors | The PSG discussed the need for a RAID entry on recent government direction to the energy industry on support schemes for current market conditions |

Minutes

1. Welcome

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

2. Minutes and Actions Review

DECISION PSG-DEC23: The PSG approved the minutes of the 07 September PSG

MC ran through the action updates as per the slides. CW invited comments. None received.

3. DBT and M3 readiness

Constituency representative feedback on M3 and DBT readiness

CW introduced the item as per the slides and invited each PSG rep in turn to update on action PSG12-04.

PA (supplier agent) noted 10 attendees at a recent constituency meeting, the majority of which were independent agents. No concerns or issues were raised by constituents - all attendees seemed happy that they were ready for M3. Constituents were invited to follow up offline, with no follow-ups received.

AC (small supplier) noted they had received no feedback from any small suppliers. One small supplier contact had attended a post-PSG meeting and they had responded that they had repurposed their MHHS team for 3 months to address challenges due to current industry conditions (e.g. energy bills).

CP (DNO) explained that their feedback was from DNOs and built on feedback for St Clements (as a large proportion of DNO DBT would be undertaken by St Clements). In terms of 'admin' type questions for M3 (e.g. teams, programme up and running, contacts shared with MHHS Programme), DNOs responded that they were up and running and mostly completely signed off. However, this did not mean that DNOs were fully ready for DBT, as DNOs felt they needed more information to get certainty (such as on the replan). In relation the RA2 questions, CP noted these were quite explicit (e.g. ready to do DBT against the replan) and needed to be considered in conjunction with any consultation responses on the replan. Referring to Round 2 consultation on the replan, CP noted that the 12-month POAP 1 (Plan on a Page) plan was reasonable but that DNOs did not believe the 9-month POAP 2 gave sufficient time to develop code to

sufficient quality. In addition, DNOs felt while reverse migration was functionally possible, it was not doable in the plan timescales as outlined (although one-way could be delivered against current timescales). With no baselined plan for a migration design it was difficult to know for sure.

In response to CP, KC noted that the programme was looking for high-level plans for M3. The Programme recognised that the transition timetable was being revalidated and it was not an expectation for Programme Participants to have a full plan at this stage – M3 would just require evidence that planning had been done as far as it could be at this stage, with uncertainties documented. CP clarified that that DNOs were ready to start DBT but did not have the full detail to complete DBT.

GE (I&C suppliers) echoed AC's comments. I&C suppliers were currently building their support schemes for delivering recent government requirements and this was being prioritised over MHHS. The general response was that I&C suppliers were broadly ready to start DBT but that it was hard to be fully ready without a baselined plan and design. I&C suppliers were waiting for more information to build confidence.

GW (large supplier) explained high level themes from his constituents were similar to GE and AC's comments. GW added that competition issues restricted feedback in constituent forums. Large suppliers were as ready as they could be given the current programme position and full feedback would be provided in RA2.

JR (iDNO) noted iDNOs recognise there are still some unknowns (replan etc) but that general feedback was that they were on track to meet M3.

KTL (NGESO) noted feedback from an internal group was that they were on track. This would be detailed in their RA2 response.

VB (medium supplier) shared that they had received limited feedback from medium suppliers. VB had received one response for a medium supplier that was ready for DBT. VB had received no wider feedback despite multiple chasers and understood wider medium suppliers would be submitting feedback in RA2.

CW summarised the discussion and noted other constituencies had already delivered M3 as required. CW invited comments and requested any suggested actions.

GE highlighted that a big new external issue that had come at short notice was the government support schemes currently being built that needed to be delivered in November (with inevitable back-end feedback and update after November). GE queried how this was being managed by the Programme, given it was a new problem that had not been around two months ago. It would be a natural distraction as it was a brand-new project requiring resource and time.

CW responded that this had been captured as a risk and was something for the Programme to think about but was outside the Programme's control. CW noted Ofgem had made clear that the MHHS Programme was a priority, and therefore resource should not necessarily be automatically reassigned – Programme Participants should consider what else can change so they can do both. CH added that the Programme understood many organisations have multiple resources delivering different things at the same time, but that it was up to Participants to consider how competing priorities can be delivered at the same time rather than dropping one.

CH noted it was positive that feedback was that most parties were ready to start DBT. CH added that there was not a dependency on the replan to start DBT – the replan was needed to know what would be delivered at the end of DBT but not to start at the beginning.

AC added that there was wider industry action/change affecting MHHS and that the Programme did not have the ability to assess the impact of wider industry change on MHHS. CH responded this could be only found by speaking to constituents.

CP agreed that their constituents would be 'ready to start' and noted that some of the RA2 questions implied some of the current uncertainties would be known at M3 (e.g. the Data Integration Platform). Programme Participants wanted to avoid rework - readiness to start was easy but knowing what you're doing with certainty was currently harder. Some Programme Participants were starting their design at risk. CH agreed that there were areas of uncertainty but that organisations needed some readiness to accept rework. GW requested a follow up conversation pending the content of the responses on RA2.

RC explained that from Ofgem's perspective the current market conditions were strengthening the need for MHHS and not weakening it, and therefore participants were expected to prioritise MHHS and its delivery.

GE agreed MHHS was a high priority but that it had a long timeline. The sudden unexpected and mandatory issue from the government required short term resource and capability to deliver. This meant that the current issue needed to be reviewed in those terms against MHHS (this was not a case of just 'get on with it').

RS noted there was a risk and the extent/impact of this risk needed to be explored further using the outputs of RA2 e.g. what the risk was causing and what could the Programme do to support Programme Participants. CH agreed and noted the Programme needed to know 'what can you do and when' supported by clear planning. This could be provided through RA2 and would be used in the replan. The Programme was looking at phasing so those that can go early, would – if participants were not able to hit early phases then they needed to call this out.

CP queried if the Programme could get feedback from Programme Participants to build a picture of who was/wasn't affected and how (as the issue would impact constituencies in different ways and therefore the Programme path). CH responded that this was a good idea, particularly for organisations with small teams. The Programme was not looking to move at the pace of the slowest and so the next round of the replan should ask these targeted questions to enable phasing. CP agreed but added that the more important consideration was for those on the critical path that do not have a 'go early' option – the Programme must look to speed things up for these participants where phasing was not an option. CH agreed and noted this was relevant to a later item on providers of core capabilities.

GE queried what action would be taken on this topic. CH responded that the next round of the replan would have targeted questions. RS added that constituency reps should encourage their constituents to call this out in their RA2 responses. CH queried the best way to get participant views, given it was difficult to get input for some constituents. GE responded that detailed answers to questions with an evidence-base would be difficult for many participants given resource challenges, but that bi-laterals may be more open for organisations to discuss their realities.

Action PSG13-01: Programme to consider steps to ensure external factors impacting participant ability to deliver their plans are appropriately considered by the Programme (focussing on the recent government direction on support schemes for current market conditions) e.g. consider via the Round 3 re-plan consultation or in Readiness Assessment 2

Readiness Assessment 2 (RA2)

PE introduced himself as the Programme's Readiness Assessment lead and provided an overview of the process for RA2 as per the slides. PE requested that PSG reps provide support to their constituents and reiterate the deadline.

CP queried the approach to RA2 by the Programme and the IPA. The Programme had asked for feedback from reps at PSG and had shared RA2, and now the IPA were asking for the same things. RS responded that the Programme were delivering RA2 and the IPA were doing their own independent activity to ensure the outputs of RA2 would be accurate and truly reflective of industry. PE noted that the Programme had taken some learnings recently on ensuring Programme Participants would not get selected for multiple deep dives by both the Programme and IPA. CW invited questions. None received.

M3 decision

KC provided an overview of the Programme's proposed approach to signing off M3 at November PSG as per the slide. KC noted that the feedback provided by reps at PSG today was helpful.

CP highlighted that the CR009 criteria included some elements of ongoing discussion and queried how these would be considered in the M3 decision. KC agreed with CP's comments from earlier that Programme Participants were expected to be ready to start DBT with some known uncertainties and documented risks. The criteria had already been adjusted to account for these, and M3 was more about the start of DBT than the finish. For example, there was no expectation on Programme Participants to have baselined their own content if this had not yet been baselined by the Programme.

4. Programme replan

KC provided an overview of progress of the Programme re-plan as per the slides, noting a new slide had been added to the pack on the detail of the responses. Round 2 consultation responses had been shared to the IPA (excluding those marked as confidential).

KC noted that the plan that would be released in Round 3 consultation was subject to broader stakeholder alignment and IPA opinion. KC invited discussion and opinion from PSG for whether PSG should decide in November for PSG whether or not to progress to Round 3 of consultation. This would give PSG adequate control and input, given some elements of the plan were still open.

LN queried how quickly Round 3 could be triggered after November PSG. KC confirmed all documentation would be ready and that the proposal of a PSG decision was more about higher-level alignment and ensuring the right stakeholders were involved in the process. Round 3 content would be provided to November PSG on the proposed plan.

GW responded that they were supportive and that they felt this was an important activity for steering group level. SJ queried the decision on reverse migration if this would be confirmed through the replan Change Request. KC confirmed the intention to reach a decision on migration this month. SJ further queried where the decision on migration would be made (e.g. DAG, MWG). CH noted the Programme had been having this discussion and that, as a change to the TOM and with an impact on the replan, it needed to be worked through by the Programme. CH added that the Programme was in discussion with Ofgem on the options and approval process. CW noted this was an item for TMAG with a decision on how to progress the option.

Action PSG13-02: Programme to confirm the governance/decision-making route for making a decision on a migration option, including how this relates to decision-making for the re-plan

LN queried when the extraordinary PSG would be following Round 3 of replan consultation. KC responded this was in the interim plan and would require a slight delay if PSG decides to make moving to Round 3 conditional on PSG decision in November.

Action PSG13-03: Programme PMO to share the current interim plan timeline/dates for PSG decisions relating to the Programme re-plan following Round 3 consultation

CP highlighted that migration and the 2 POAPs were big questions, and asked for clarity on how and when these would be finalised (i.e. the decision-making/governance process). KC responded that these subjects would be covered at November PSG.

JR asked that confirmation of the relationship between the migration decision and replan decision be included in the above actions.

KC provided a summary of the Round 2 replan consultation responses, noting there were fewer responses than Round 1 consultation which was disappointing.

CW moved to make a decision and invited any disagreements from PSG members on making Round 3 consultation subject to PSG decision at November PSG. None received.

Decision PSG-DEC24: The PSG agreed to make progression to Round 3 consultation on the Programme re-plan conditional on a decision at November PSG

5. Delivery of Core Capabilities

Providers of Core Capabilities

KC provided an overview of the item as per the slides. This included clarifying the distinction between “central parties” and “providers of core capabilities”. KC emphasised the importance of providers of core capabilities to the critical path and the Programme as a whole. The Programme were proposing having monthly delivery reviews with core capability providers, with ownership of each provider assigned to a member of the Core Programme Team to coordinate engagement/delivery with these organisations (account managers). The first meetings would be coming out in the coming days and would be used to make sure core capability providers’ plans could be reflected in the Programme plan, looking at providers’ E2E delivery plans and milestones. The Programme was looking to get under the skin of the industry dashboards provided at PSG so the Programme could fully understand the plans (and misalignment with the Programme’s plan) and the RAID items underneath them.

CP highlighted that there was a lack of consistency across naming conventions that led to confusion e.g. in relation to critical path and consequential change. CP noted that ‘core systems’ on the critical path was the most important part (rather than central parties, consequential change) and this should be emphasised in future. KC noted this could be included in the first discussions on providers of core capabilities.

RECCo delivery plan

SJ provided an overview of the RECCo plan as per the slides, noting a number of distinct workstreams. Within drafting, RECCo had been working closely with the Programme and Elexon via the Cross-Code Advisory Group (CCAG). The service provider workstream had more uncertainty with dependencies on outputs from the Programme. SJ noted a key concern was if there was a future requirement to deliver DBT in a shorter timeframe. SJ noted a number of RECCo

items were being taken through the Consequential Change Impact Assessment Group (CCIAG). The majority of CSS requirements had been captured. RECCo were working with the Programme on preparation and delivery of qualification, with the first step to define roles and responsibilities between the Programme and code bodies. Overall, RECCo were reporting “Green” against plan. SJ invited questions.

KC noted that when the Programme reach out to critical path providers of core capabilities, they would be looking for the earliest dates providers can deliver and not for alignment with replan POAP 1 and 2. The critical path parties needed to align as closely as possible to the existing transition timetable and the Programme wanted to support bringing dates forward where possible to start SIT as soon as possible. SJ responded that their Round 2 replan consultation response contained their timelines for elements to SIT from early conversations with their service providers. SJ noted it would be difficult to nail this timeline down until a baselined design was available.

6. Key Programme Issues

MP162

SC noted a working group earlier this week on the MP162 return. The DCC were continuing with the modification through to final Impact Assessment ready to go to a change board, with the MDR role costs separated to demonstrate the full functional requirement. The DCC were now confident for the full makeup to be delivered by the beginning of November. SC believed the DCC could still fit within current plan timescales. The capacity uplift was being received this week to send back to Ofgem and circulated with SEC industry members over October. The DCC were aiming to align agreements on both the MDR and capacity issues at the same time, to start work on delivery this calendar year. The DCC were conscious of their role on the critical path and still aiming to hit the current SIT target dates.

Migration

KC noted migration had been covered under other items and that there was an action to clarify the governance process. The broader intention was to resolve this issue within October.

7. Design progress

CW provided an update on the design as per the slides. SJ queried if there was a date for the full set of design artefacts to be published. CW responded this could be clarified. CH noted all design artefacts were currently available.

Action PSG13-004: Programme to confirm the date for the full set of updated design artefacts to be shared

CH thanked Programme Participants for their role in the design process noting there was only one item of dissensus where participants disagreed which was positive.

8. Delivery dashboards

CW invited questions by exception. KC noted the Programme had added detail to the risk dashboards in response to feedback (to include more detail on risks and mitigation activities) and invited further feedback. CW highlighted a new risk theme on industry change.

GW queried a question from the open day on knock on consequential impacts to settlement as a result of the migration options and how the Programme may learn lessons from Nexus (e.g. imbalances). GW queried if this was captured in the RAID log and how, when and who would be taking forward a look on this. This was not necessarily part of core delivery but should be considered now rather than later.

CH responded that this was important (particularly lessons from the end of Nexus). CH noted the Programme had considered a Level 3 group may be needed to discuss. GE agreed it was important and was not sure where this was being covered (e.g. in the MWG). GE added that there may not be a problem but it was important to have the conversation now. CW responded that the Programme would set something up and that it was important to include Elexon. SJ added that the migration approach had an impact and needed to be taken into account.

MC highlighted an action from a previous PSG on including commercial impacts in the migration options assessment. CH responded that this needed a wider audience that just migration as there may be components that are missed. CW suggested it could be a topic for the next open day (in addition to a specific group). CH agreed to establish a smaller group first to discuss group terms of reference and the problem the group is trying to solve and suggested bringing this back to the next PSG.

Action PSG13-05: Programme PMO to 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

GW queried why the Helix actuals and forecast on the central party budgets dashboard were not up to date. LN responded that this was a timing issue with sharing this information to the Programme, as their focus had been on delivery rather than on finance. GW noted it was positive their constituents were reviewing all of the dashboards.

Action PSG13-06: Helix representative to share updated finance data for Helix

9. Summary and Next Steps

CW provided an overview of the upcoming agenda items. CW asked for feedback on a December in-person PSG date. CP requested that this could also be hybrid. CW confirmed this could be the case.

CW invited AOBs. None received. CW closed the meeting.

Date of next PSG: 02 November 2022