

# MHHS Programme Replan Round 1 & 2 Consultation Q&A

## Table of Contents

1. QUESTIONS ON DESIGN, BUILD AND TEST (DBT).....	2
2. QUESTIONS ON SYSTEM INTEGRATION TESTING (SIT) .....	6
3. QUESTIONS ON DESIGN QUALIFICATION TEST .....	14
4. QUESTIONS ON MIGRATION .....	21
5. QUESTIONS ON THE OVERALL PROGRAMME.....	25

## 1. Questions on Design, Build and Test (DBT)

ID	Category	Question	Answer
Q001	Adapters	Has the Programme considered impacts on parties that require adaptors?	This will be up to Programme participants to consider through their DBT and implementation activities. It would be useful for the Programme to know if Participants plan to use adaptor services as this could help test and Qualification planning.
Q002	Code Drafting	Has the Programme made allowances in the plan for the possibility that participants will be required to rework elements of their design following the completion of code drafting?	There is a risk that design changes will be identified through the code drafting activity. Any required changes to the design will be managed via the enduring change management process. It is assumed that participants have provisions in place to rework elements of their design work if needed.
Q003	Code Drafting	Could more information be added into the next consultation pack around the code drafting and legal text updates to allow a better understanding of this phase in alignment with DBT delivery?	This has been included in Round 2 of the Replan. The low-level code development plan has been presented to and approved through the Cross-Code Advisory Group (CCAG) and can be found in CCAG papers.
Q004	Code Drafting	Throughout this Replan process we have been told it is design and industry-led with no final consultation; will this be the same for the codes? If they are updated to facilitate MHHS can the outcome be to reject the changes?	Code development and approval will be executed under the MHHS Programme governance through the CCAG. We expect Ofgem to use their regulatory powers (e.g. Smart Meter Act Powers according to our plan for M7) to implement change.
Q005	Consequential Change	How will consequential changes to the M5 baseline be managed during the DBT phase?	The nature of consequential change means that delivery responsibility sits with parties outside the MHHS Programme and we expect that to be delivered in the defined DBT2 activities and the Programme's associated assurance activities. If there is change that impacts the MHHS Programme Design Baseline, then that will have to be raised as a Change Request to the Programme and Impact Assessed appropriately.
Q006	Consequential Change	Is there an assumption / risk that all Programme participants can / cannot deliver consequential changes alongside core MHHS developments?	Yes, which is why we will assure in Pre-Integration Testing (PIT) and Qualification, and we are proposing to proactively monitor consequential change to manage this risk.

Q007	Consequential Change	How does the Programme intend to monitor participant delivery of consequential changes? Will this be through the Readiness Assessments or some other mechanism?	We are assuming that PIT exit / System Integration Testing (SIT) entry will demonstrate some evidence of consequential change testing, and Qualification will include assurance of it. The MHHS Programme is proposing to actively monitor consequential change through risk management and through Readiness Assessments.
Q008	Consequential Change	Has reasonable consideration been given to the impact of consequential change when deciding DBT timelines?	Yes, reasonable consideration has been given to the impact of consequential change when deciding DBT timelines. Code bodies have an option to manage consequential change alongside code drafting activities; this would require a formal change request to bring this within their direct purview.
Q009	Consequential Change	Why has the logic changed for removing 'Supplier Back-end Systems' from the critical path as this was not the case for previous projects e.g. Faster Switching Programme (FSP)?	This was not the case for FSP where back-office system development was left to the suppliers and a lot of this was done after User Entry Process Testing (UEPT). We learned the lessons from FMRS by assuring FMRS Target Operating Model (TOM) activities.
Q010	Consequential Change	Is there an assumption that Supplier Back-end Systems will not be included in the scope of SIT?	We are assuming that PIT exit / SIT entry will demonstrate some evidence of back-office system testing, and Qualification will include assurance of it.
Q011	Core capability systems	Will more detail / milestones be added to the plan around Central Parties' DBT activities for Round 3?	Yes, more information around Core Capability Systems' DBT timescales will be presented in the version of the Replan that will be shared as part of the suite of artefacts for Round 3 consultation.
Q012	Core capability systems (DIP)	Can details be shared on what type of platform the Data Integration Platform (DIP) is likely to be on (e.g. Cloud based platform) and do we have any expectations around what provider this is likely to be (e.g. AWS, MS Azure etc.)	The DIP provider has not yet been appointed, however it is expected to be a cloud-based solution. Further details to come once the DIP has been formally appointed.
Q013	Core capability systems (DIP)	Is the DIP currently able to issue the new interfaces, to allow participants to test the ability of their billing systems to read and use the new DUoS information issued?	With the DIP provider still to be appointed, the new interfaces are not yet available. The Sims & Ems team will be providing a data generator service in the future.
Q014	Core capability systems (DIP)	Are there any assumptions on the DIP interface ahead of the November contract resolution to ensure a limited impact on the design post-M5?	There are no assumptions; the interfaces and end-to-end functional requirements are detailed on the Collaboration Base. There is a risk that the DIP will generate changes to the design, but this is considered to be a low risk and has been captured in the Programme RAID log.

Q015	Core capability systems (DIP)	When is the DIP provider expected to be satisfied with the design? It would seem reasonable that the DIP provider would request changes, but this may require rework of already developed systems, risking the exit of DBT.	The DIP provider will deliver against the design. There is a risk that the DIP will generate changes to the design, but this is considered to be a low risk and has been captured in the Programme RAID log.
Q016	Core capability systems (DIP)	How accurate would the PIT simulator be if it is designed before the DIP provider is appointed, or will the PIT simulator be provided by the DIP provider?	The simulator is being developed according to the baselined design. The DIP service provider will be doing the same. The risk arises when both parties interpret the requirements and the design differently. Within the SI Design team, we will be looking to mitigate ambiguities within the design.
Q017	Data	What data will be required for test environments? How often will this need to be refreshed and are there any GDPR implications associated with this?	The data required for test environments will be described in the Overall Test Data Approach and Plan document which is currently in production. The principles of the Test Data Strategy are already described in the MHHS-DEL300 Test Data Strategy document, including the principle of only taking one data cut but reserving the ability to take another if the first becomes sufficiently out-of-date. Any GDPR issues are being addressed by our Information Security consultants. These InfoSec consultants are working with the team to produce the Overall Test Data Approach and Plan, and once this document is issued, they will carry out a formal Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA), as we acknowledge that we will be processing personal information.
Q018	Data	When will the expectations on data and metering services regarding PIT and the outcome evidence be set?	The Pre-Qualification guidance document, which is due for publication on 16th December 2022, will outline the test artefacts and evidence the Programme is expecting to receive from participants.
Q019	DBT for SIT Programme participants	What are the consequences for a SIT participant that meets the date for completion of core DBT but fails to meet the date for migration DBT?	A non-Central Party SIT participant will be at risk of falling out of the SIT route and continuing via the Qualification testing route, although the Programme would expect to work with the Participant to discuss options. The degree to which Code Delivery Bodies will accept SIT test evidence in support of their Qualification will be determined by the Code Bodies.
Q020	External considerations	Without an understanding of the future Performance Assurance Framework, participants' design could be flawed in that they may not deliver what is required by the Balance & Settlement Code (BSC). How is this risk being managed?	This will need to be defined by the Code Delivery Bodies.

Q021	MPRS	<p>How will the late delivery of functional specifications (e.g. Metering Data Retrieval System (MDR)) impact the development of the Metering Point Registration System (MPRS)?</p> <p>Will the Programme define drop-dead dates for the delivery of functional specs?</p>	<p>All of the artefacts including functional specification are due to be delivered by the SRO design team on the 16th Dec 22 for assurance review. These will be signed off by DAG on the 31st Jan 22.</p> <p>The Programme has delivered its design baseline at M5 with a set of work off plans under development in the Programme governance. The dates are addressed in this work for all related Programme design artefacts.</p>
Q022	MPRS	<p>There is an assumption that St Clements will require the full DBT period to develop MPRS which may prevent the early release of MPRS to (i)DNOs (who then do their own internal testing on the system before implementing to their MHHS test environment). This could therefore prevent early use of the system by early adopters. Is the Programme aware of this dependency and what is the associated risk?</p>	<p>MPRS is an essential component of SIT and therefore needs to be ready by the time SIT starts. We are assuming that St Clements will conduct SIT Functional on behalf of the (i)DNOs and any testing that the (i)DNOs wish to do separately on the completed MPRS can be done in parallel with SIT, so we do not see this as a risk to the overall timescale. The Programme are in dialogue with St Clements and the (i)DNOs</p>

## 2. Questions on System Integration Testing (SIT)

ID	Category	Question	Answer
Q023	Adaptors	As the Programme stands currently, there is no central adaptor, however the potential for one has been identified. Has the Programme considered the processes required to implement this across multiple systems as this had a strong impact on the Faster Switching Programme (FSP), however this affected fewer systems than this Programme is proposed to and as such would have a larger impact? Adaptor provision needs to be an early decision.	Whether to use an adaptor or not will be a decision for Programme participants, but we expect to be able to take some equivalent arrangements into account if an adaptor service has already completed testing for another party, either through SIT or Qualification.
Q024	Adaptors	How will the Programme accommodate the use of adaptors, and how will they be tested?	If you use an adaptor, then we would expect you to test it as part of your solution either in SIT or Qualification, depending on which route you take.
Q025	Consequential change	As 'back-end' systems, DBT is not on the critical path. Is there a risk of the Supplier End-to-end process not working but SIT and Qualification has been achieved? How will this be mitigated?	We are assuming that PIT exit / SIT entry will demonstrate some evidence of back-office systems testing and Qualification will include assurance of it. The MHHS Programme is proposing to actively monitor consequential change through risk management and through Readiness Assessments.
Q026	Core capability systems	When will each of the core capability systems be required to join SIT/ Component Integration Testing (CIT) (including the Central Switching Service and Electricity Enquiry Service)? Is the current sequencing the most logical for bringing the core capability systems into SIT /CIT, and what is the justification for discrediting other sequencing options?	There is a requirement for all Central Parties to join at the beginning of SIT. All possible options will be explored and discussed during the SIT Working Group (SITWG).
Q027	Core capability systems	What is the cost impact to core capability systems and volunteer participants if SIT is delayed?	The MHHS Programme is unable to comment on this. The cost implications will be dependent on the organisations involved. If there is a significant impact a Change Request (CR) will need to be considered.

Q028	Core capability systems	What is the impact of MP162 on Programme participants' designs and does this pose a risk for SIT?	MP162 delivers DCC's capability to support the Meter Data Retrieval Service (MDR) role, therefore is required to support MDR testing as well as testing DCC's own functionality. MP162 functionality will have to be available for DCC for SIT and this is captured as a dependency in the plan and being actively managed with DCC. MDR agents will have to deliver their service to comply with the MP162 design for SIT testing and Qualification.
Q029	Data	Is data cleansing required before SIT start?	This will be a consultation item to be discussed further at SITWG and/or Data Working Group (DWG).
Q030	Data	What data extracts are required for SIT?	This will be a consultation item to be discussed further at SITWG and/or DWG.
Q031	Environments	How does the Programme intend to mitigate against the requirement of multiple environments during testing?	Test environment requirements and plan are being discussed in the Environments Working Group (EWG) which we would encourage you to attend.
Q032	Environments	Will the SIT and E2E Sandbox testing environments contain real / live data, or will this be anonymised?	This is to be confirmed and will be added as an agenda item to be discussed further at the SITWG.
Q033	Environments	How are the risks associated with executing multiple test stages on the same environment being managed (e.g. functional and migration testing)?	The risks should cover environment management, release management, defect management, backup/restores aligned to the SIT plan and approach. Any additional risks can be raised at SITWG.
Q034	Environments	Have the environment requirements for SIT been made clear to participants?	Yes - the Environment Management Approach and Plan has been approved (as draft v2.1) which is to be published on the Testing page of the Collaboration Base. All remaining work off activities will be delivered for the February Testing and Migration Advisory Group (TMAG).
Q035	Environments	From a non-Central System perspective, SIT is role specific. Could there be multiple environments across the roles to allow Advanced or Smart for example to be done in isolation? Or will SIT be sequential and introduce roles as participants become available?	This will be a consultation item to be discussed further at SITWG.

Q036	Migration Design	How will a delay in publishing the Migration Design impact SIT? And is there contingency in the SIT plan to accommodate a delay?	Based on initial assessments and discussions with participants as well as information gathering exercises such as the PPIR, we do not anticipate the Migration Design timelines to impact the start of SIT. There will be an impact to the commencement of SIT Migration Testing which is being acknowledged and incorporated into the Round 3 Plan
Q037	Other	Is there any Disaster Recovery/fail-over testing planned?	Each individual party should ensure that they can demonstrate that their current or new systems have Disaster Recovery/ fail-over in place and this has been tested.
Q038	Qualification	Once a sufficient number of participants of each type have completed the SIT phase, could the Qualification work begin for any organisations of that type that are ready to start. i.e. if Elexon and the Performance Assurance Board are ready to undertake the Qualification work from that point?	The Round 3 Plan is based on the assumption that Qualification Test can commence once SIT Functional Testing is complete.
Q039	Qualification	For SIT participants, how much Qualification activity (e.g. Self-Assessment Document (SAD) process) is required? When does the Programme expect participants to carry this out and how long will it take? How does this change for SIT participants that are not required to complete all stages of SIT?	This will need to be agreed with the Code Delivery Bodies.
Q040	Qualification	How will the relevant code bodies (e.g. BSC) be engaged to ensure SIT provides sufficient evidence to qualify market participants that will bypass Qualification Testing?	There will be a set of agreed processes in place with regular meeting to review and ensure that SIT is sufficient to bypass Qualification testing.
Q041	Qualification	Is it anticipated that the SIT phase will capture all of the information and details that are currently included in the Self-Assessment Document (SAD) that market participants are required to submit during Qualification?	We expect that SIT will execute all testing that might be required for Qualification, but that the SAD information will be completed by Programme participants through a separate activity that is identified in the Round 2 Replan.
Q042	Releases	Could problems occurring in subsequent developments / environment upgrades nullify the approval of SIT participants thus causing subsequent development / testing to stay compliant?	Assuming SIT is complete, any major changes will need to go through re-Qualification testing as an enduring process.
Q043	Releases	What is the release process for releasing defect fixes during SIT and E2E Sandbox testing including the environments that the fixes would need to be released into?	There is a Release Management document which is being produced that contains the details of the standard MHHS Programme review process.

Q044	Releases	Has the need for regression testing by SIT participants been considered for situations where material changes are released into the SIT environment(s)?	Yes - this will be described in more detail in the SIT functional testing Approach and Plan document.
Q045	SIT organisation / management	Can the Programme provide more granular information on the proposed SIT execution schedule and when DNO-relevant testing activities are intended to commence within the SIT window, across different market segments?	Yes - this will be described in more detail in the SIT functional testing Approach and Plan document.
Q046	SIT organisation / management	Where are the milestones required to facilitate Programme governance of SIT preparation (including selection of participants) and execution?	Milestones and associated detail (including descriptions, dates, Critical Path/Thread relevance and party applicability mapping) will be captured in an updated draft of the Milestone Register, which will be shared with participants as part of the Round 3 Consultation suite of artefacts.
Q047	SIT organisation / management	Is there opportunity to compress the sequencing / overlapping of SIT stages to reduce the overall timeline?	We are in a process of developing the proposed scope and coverage for all the test stages, and when this is complete, we will be looking for opportunities to accelerate the plan whilst consulting with the SITWG.
Q048	SIT organisation / management	Can more information be made available to participants in Round 3 to more clearly define what each stage of SIT entails and what is required of participants?	The Programme Plan has a number of agreed deliverables which will clearly define what each stage of SIT entails and what is required of participants.
Q049	SIT organisation / management	Can the one month "grace period" to enter SIT for those participants not ready at the speed of the fastest be elongated?	This will be a consultation item to be discussed further at the SITWG.
Q050	SIT organisation / management	What SIT / CIT activities can be done early? If any, how early, and would this result in an overlap with DBT activities?	This will be a consultation item to be discussed further at the SITWG.
Q051	SIT organisation / management	What are the entry / exit criteria for SIT (e.g. what percentage of test scenarios need to pass to warrant SIT exit)?	This will be described in more detail in the SIT functional testing Approach and Plan document.
Q052	SIT Participation	What is the proposal for Change of Supplier events, where an Agent and Supplier work together on SIT, only for a customer to switch supplier?	We will include in our SIT planning the necessary "teaming up" of different parties and this scenario will be covered as part of that planning.
Q053	SIT Participation	Would the SIT be carried out between linked parties (e.g. Supplier to Agent via the DIP) or just between the Supplier to the DIP?	There will be an initial portion of testing which will concentrate on individual interfaces (e.g. Supplier to DIP) but later there will be end-to-end scenarios where the full range of interactions will be included.

Q054	SIT Participation	If no parties volunteer for SIT, what is the regulatory means that will be used to mandate participation?	We are working on the basis we will have parties volunteering for SIT. If that is not the case, we will need to discuss with Ofgem the measures that we would need to take.
Q055	SIT Participation	If there are more participants than required volunteer for SIT, what criteria will the Programme use to choose between the volunteers and by when?	We will take as many volunteers as there are.
Q056	SIT Participation	What benefits do you see for agents being involved in the SIT?	All roles need to be included in SIT to demonstrate that the design works.
Q057	SIT Participation	If there is a 'selection' element to identifying SIT participants, what criteria will be used to make the decision, whilst ensuring a level playing field, and how will the criteria be developed?	Azure DevOps will be used as the Test Management Tool. This will enable the Programme to monitor the speed at which participants are progressing through SIT and therefore, could be used to inform the selection of the Minimum Viable Cohort (MVC).
Q058	SIT Participation	For which Programme participants is SIT participation mandated by the Programme (e.g. Smart Data Services)?	<p>SIT participation is mandated for all of the providers of Central Systems, this includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Elexon (providing Elexon Central Systems, Data Integration Platform and Public Key Infrastructure as well as systems supporting existing settlement arrangements for migration testing)</li> <li>-DCC (providing Smart Metering and Central Switching Service)</li> <li>- RECCo (providing Electricity Enquiry Service (EES))</li> <li>- Electralink (providing the Data Transfer Network (DTN))</li> </ul> <p>We then need at least one participant from every role defined in the Target Operating Model (TOM) to constitute a Minimum Viable Cohort (MVC) to meaningfully test the full End-to-End (E2E) design and solution. These participants are expected to volunteer for SIT testing, as per the E2E Testing &amp; Integration Strategy, but if the Programme cannot get volunteers, we will have to consider how we might get SIT participants (e.g. any mandatory participation).</p>
Q059	SIT Participation	When will participants have sufficient information regarding the scope of both SIT and Qualification to make an informed decision about which route they choose?	This will be a consultation item to be discussed further at the SIT Working Group
Q060	SIT Participation	What are the consequences if a party falls behind or drops out during SIT?	This will need to be discussed and agreed with the Code Bodies.

Q061	SIT Participation	There is no mention of Electricity Enquiry Service (EES) in SIT, is it not expected be used for any of the SIT tests?	EES is included in the baselined design, and EES will also be part of SIT.
Q062	SIT Participation	Are non-MHHS Agents required for SIT migration testing (e.g. MOP, DC/DA agents required for migration / reverse migration testing due to their role of sending and receiving D-flows)	Yes, non-MHHS Agents are required for SIT migration/reverse migration testing due to their role of sending and receiving D-flows.
Q063	SIT Participation (LDSOs)	What stages of SIT do non-MVC LDSOs have to execute to reach M10 (assuming two routes – MVC and ‘Other’ – through SIT)?	The same activities will need to be carried out for all SIT participants.
Q064	SIT Participation (LDSOs)	How far into DNOs’ back-end systems will SIT reach (e.g. DUoS billing, Unmetered, etc)?	We will require SIT volunteers from the (i)DNO community so that we can exercise UMSSO and Network Operations systems interactions with the DIP and other participants.
Q065	SIT Participation (LDSOs)	Who is the Central Party for SIT? Licenced Distribution System Operators (LDSOs) and/or St Clements?	We are expecting St Clements to execute SIT testing on behalf of DNOs / iDNOs but this is to be developed further in the SITWG which we would encourage you to attend.
Q066	SIT Participation (LDSOs)	Can St Clements Services execute SIT Functional on behalf of LDSOs? Will all LDSOs be required to complete all DBT activity before SIT start?	St Clements can only represent DNOs in SIT in a Registration Service capacity. DNO volunteers will be required for SIT (preferably two per role) to ensure Network Operations and UMSSO representation. All LDSOs are needed for Go-live.
Q067	SIT Participation (LDSOs)	The approach described has LDSOs as mandatory in SIT. Although every LDSO needs to ready for the first day of migration, do they all need to be involved in SIT? Does this complicate SIT by having a larger number of parties involved?	We are expecting St Clements to execute SIT testing on behalf of DNOs / iDNOs for registration, but this is to be developed further in the SITWG which we would encourage you to attend. We will require SIT volunteers from the (i)DNO community so that we can exercise UMSSO and Network Operations systems interactions with the DIP and other participants.
Q068	SIT Participation (LDSOs)	How will new LDSO entrants to the market during test execution be handled by the Programme (e.g. if an LDSO joins the market during the latter stages of SIT but is required for M10)?	Any new entrant to the market will need to go through Qualification rather than SIT as SIT is already underway.
Q069	SIT Participation (MVC)	Will SIT participants be limited to the MVC, or will the Programme accept ‘Other’ (non-MVC) volunteers that can progress through SIT at a gentler pace (i.e. will the Programme restrict the number of SIT participants)? What is the rationale behind the decision / justification for rejecting the alternative?	Yes, the Programme will accept other non-MVC volunteers if they can demonstrate their readiness to enter the phase.

Q070	SIT Participation (MVC)	When will the Programme decide on SIT participants (and the MVC vs 'Other' split, if applicable)? This will determine participants' DBT timelines.	<p>The Programme will gauge interest for participation in SIT via Round 3 Consultation, requesting plans for participants to demonstrate that they can meet the SIT timeline. There will be a Tier 2 milestone under the purview of Testing and Migration Advisory Group (TMAG) to confirm SIT participants following a period of assurance of plans submitted as part of Round 3 consultation.</p> <p>The MVC approach options are currently under internal review and will in due course be socialised with the SITWG for consultation.</p>
Q071	SIT Participation (MVC)	If the MVC is identified based on participants that move the fastest through the early stages of SIT, there is an assumption they will be able to execute the later stages of SIT quickly too. Is that a fair assumption and is it appropriate to put all emphasis on the speed of progress through early SIT?	<p>MVC is a self-selection on the basis of their demonstration of readiness through the entry and subsequent completion of Component Integration Testing. MVC will be constantly monitored through the SIT phases to ensure momentum is maintained. Should a participant feel the need to drop out of the MVC for any reason, these will be discussed and managed based on the role they play.</p>
Q072	SIT Participation (MVC)	<p>How are we mitigating the risk that we do not get enough volunteers to form an MVC?</p> <p>What is the contingency plan (e.g. selection)?</p>	<p>The Programme has outlined the following actions which form the mitigation plan for this risk</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1)To engage in early dialogue with all parties to determine the best way of ensuring adequate participation.</li> <li>2)The plan needs to clarify all SIT requirements and activities</li> <li>3)The fact that Qualification testing will not be required of SIT participants, which needs to be formally confirmed</li> <li>4)Benefits of SIT need to be communicated to all Participants</li> <li>5)SIT should be set up in order that it may be executed with few Participants (where risk is manageable)</li> <li>6)Migration approach will influence appetite for Participants to volunteer for SIT</li> </ol> <p>For further details, please refer to R118 in the Programme RAID log.</p>
Q073	SIT Participation (MVC)	What LDSO representation is required in SIT to meet the MVC requirements (e.g. do we need the full national coverage)?	<p>The MVC approach options are currently under internal review and will in due course be socialised with the SITWG for consultation.</p>

Q074	SIT Participation (MVC)	What does “reduced support” for ‘Other’ SIT participants look like in comparison to the support available to MVC SIT participants?	All SIT participants will be provided with the same level of Programme support during their testing. However, during SIT, when MVC and other participants are executing test in parallel, resolution of MVC issues and defects will be prioritised.
Q075	SIT Participation (MVC)	Has consideration been given to the fact that the timing of the selection of the SIT MVC may have implications for Software Providers’ DBT timelines if they service suppliers that are intending to be part of the MVC?	The Programme will require further context regarding what implications they foresee in order to respond to this question.

### 3. Questions on Design Qualification Test

ID	Category	Question	Answer
Q076	Qualification - Approach	Please provide more clarity on the approach to Qualification testing.	The Programme has been discussing the roles and responsibilities for Qualification with BSC Co and RECCo in advance of providing further information to the Qualification and E2E Sandbox Working Group (QWG). This will be brought to the next QWG on 13 December 2022.
Q077	Qualification - Approach	When will the Programme provide participants with more information about the arrangements and requirements for Qualification (incl. Qualification preparation activities)? Will scripts be provided by the Programme?	We are sharing the proposals for Qualification with the Qualification Working Group alongside Code Bodies. There are a set of assumptions for Qualification set out in the latest replan Round 3 documentation.
Q078	Qualification - Approach	There is a lack of clarity on what the MHHS Programme means by 'Qualification' and there is a risk it does not map 100% to the existing requirements BSC Section J and BSCP537.	Clarifications required for Qualification and this needs to be discussed with the Code Bodies. This will be considered further in QWG.
Q079	Qualification - Approach	Will organisations with more than one MPID (Market Participant ID) be able to group MPIDs into a single Qualification application?	We will capture this as a question to be addressed in the QWG.
Q080	Qualification - Approach	Will Meter Equipment Managers (MEMs), Suppliers and the new BSC governed Data Services be required to become DIP users?	Yes, all of these roles have interfaces with the DIP.
Q081	Qualification - Approach	What are the arrangements for testing the exchanging of messages via the DIP?	This is in scope for Qualification Testing, there will be an integrated User Integration Testing (UIT) environment stood up to enable participants to test with the DIP.
Q082	Qualification - Approach	Is Qualification per Service, e.g. Smart Data Services, or broken down to Qualification per activity within that role, i.e. Meter Reading Service Provider or Processing Service Provider?	Our latest thinking is that Qualification will be needed for all three roles, but this should be tested in the QWG which we suggest attending.
Q083	Qualification - Management / Governance	How will each element of Qualification be evidenced (e.g. self-assessment vs submission of evidence to Code Body)?	We will capture this as a question to be addressed in the QWG.
Q084	Qualification - Management / Governance	When will a governance body for Qualification be set up?	We expect that this will be done via the existing Qualification Bodies and processes at BSCCo and RECCo.

Q085	Qualification - Management / Governance	How will the Programme identify lessons learned from SIT to take into Qualification?	We expect that SIT material will be a source for Qualification and therefore that lessons learned will be applied. We expect that BSCCo and RECCo will be engaged to transfer knowledge from SIT to Qualification.
Q086	Qualification - Management / Governance	Will the Code Bodies share submitted evidence to limit duplicated effort?	We will capture this as a question to be addressed in the QWG.
Q087	Qualification - Management / Governance	Are there sufficient expert resources within / available to all the bodies to perform this level of scale of Qualification Testing within the timescales set out? If not, how will the programme mitigate this?	The Round 2 Replan Consultation asked this question with no significant issues raised by the Code Bodies. We will be meeting with the Code Bodies to discuss this in advance of releasing Replan Round 3 so that the MHHS Programme is using the most up-to-date information and assumptions on Qualification execution.
Q088	Qualification - Management / Governance	Is the Programme aware of the challenges associated with scheduling and running Qualification and migration in parallel? How is this being managed?	We expect that this will be managed through the planned activities in the Programme. We would welcome a discussion on any particular risks and issues to highlight.
Q089	Qualification - Management / Governance	Does the Programme feel this will be centrally organised or will Qualification per body need to be progressed by each participant separately?	Currently, there is a joint run-book between the Code Bodies for Qualification and whilst Central Bodies will have their own responsibilities for Qualification for their Codes, we would expect some coordination.
Q090	Qualification - Management / Governance	Our understanding is that Qualification will be required for several code areas (e.g., BSC, REC, SEC). We need clear confirmation on whether one version will be required for MHHS in totality, or whether individual Qualification/ Re-Qualification will be required for each Code area. There is a requirement to ensure that all parties are aware of the requirement in this area.	We expect Code Bodies will have their own responsibilities for Qualification for their Codes, but that we would expect some coordination. To be considered further in QWG.
Q091	Qualification - Other	Will there be a sufficient amount of environments available to support QT?	A conditionally approved version of the environments plan is available to participants, which articulates the number of environments required, one of which is earmarked for QT.
Q092	Qualification - Other	Is there a dependency on M8, given Qualification is assessed against Code and Code subsidiary document requirements?	We have discussed this with Code Bodies and the expectation is that we do not need M8 as a dependency to execute Qualification.

Q093	Qualification - Other	In relation to the Smart Data Services function, is it still the intention that Qualification testing will be needed for all three roles that make this up, or can one qualify against individual roles?	Our latest thinking is that Qualification will be needed for all three roles, but this should be tested in the QWG which we suggest attending.
Q094	Qualification - Other	When will the interface design and BSC equivalent be made available so that Parties can plan their development work and more importantly secure budgets?	Parties should be impact assessing against the design baseline at M5 plus the Work-Off items and migration design that is in progress. This is a design-led Programme and parties should not wait for code development before securing budget or initiating DBT, as per the MHHS Programme Plan.
Q095	Qualification - Re-Qualification	The current process is quite detailed for Qualification, it would be useful to understand if this will be Qualification or re-Qualification.	Clarifications required for Qualification or re-Qualification. To be considered further in QWG.
Q096	Qualification - Re-Qualification	Will MEMs, Suppliers and the new BSC governed Data Services undergo some form of Qualification / re-Qualification to demonstrate that their systems and processes are fit for purpose in light of the new MHHS requirements?	Yes, as defined in the E2E Testing and Integration Strategy published on the MHHS website.
Q097	Qualification - Re-Qualification	Has the need to re-certify other related systems (e.g. asset management) been considered in the current timeline for Qualification?	We have only considered the services within the MHHS Target Operating Model, as defined in the E2E Testing and Integration Strategy published on the MHHS website.
Q098	Qualification - Re-Qualification	Is the requirement for DNOs and IDNOs to complete 'Re-Qualification Testing' or 'Qualification Testing'?	Clarifications required for iDNO, DNO and UMSO/UMSDS participation in Qualification. To be considered further in QWG
Q099	Qualification - Re-Qualification	Will parties need to fully qualify or re-qualify?	It is not yet determined whether participants will need to re-qualify or fully qualify again (more of a terminology difference than a fundamental difference to the activity required). Code Bodies are eager to identify efficiencies in the process to remove the need for a participant to fully qualify again (where possible).
Q100	Qualification - Re-Qualification	Will legacy roles may need to be requalified? As participants may be making changes to legacy systems to incorporate MHHS. Has this been considered? It will increase demand for Qualification resources	Clarifications required for Qualification and this needs to be discussed with the Code Bodies. This will be considered further in QWG
Q101	Qualification - Responsibilities	If DIP users will be required to demonstrate their ability to exchange messages via the DIP, who manages the scope and governance of this testing – MHHS or Elexon Central Systems (ECS)?	The Code Delivery Bodies will be managing the scope and governance of this testing.

Q102	Qualification - Responsibilities	Will RECCo be responsible for determining whether MEMs are qualified to deliver the new MHHS arrangements? (Further discussion required regarding the responsibility for Supplier and DNO Qualification)	The Code Delivery Bodies will be managing the scope and governance of this testing.
Q103	Qualification - Responsibilities	Who is responsible for managing / coordinating Qualification (e.g. are BSC Performance Assurance Board (PAB) and REC PAB co-responsible)?	The Code Delivery Bodies will be managing the scope and governance of this testing.
Q104	Qualification - Responsibilities	What BSCCo activities will KPMG be carrying out? Is there the option to scale up KPMG resource to facilitate a shorter Qualification timeline?	This is for BSCCo to determine.
Q105	Qualification - Responsibilities	Will Organisations be able to complete Qualification Testing on behalf of DNOs and IDNOs?	Clarifications required for iDNO, DNO and UMISO/UMSDS participation in Qualification. To be considered further in QWG.
Q106	Qualification - SAD Process	What Qualification prep activities are participants required to complete before the Self-Assessment Document (SAD) process can commence?	This is for Code Bodies to determine.
Q107	Qualification - SAD Process	How will the BSC / REC be engaged to determine the necessary level of detail required in the SAD?	The Programme and Code Bodies agreed to coordinate via a sub-group of the QWG, to discuss topics such as: preparatory activities required ahead of Qualification, tranching (e.g. some roles will need to be grouped in specific tranches), the split of responsibility across REC and BSC, test scenarios for Qualification Testing and SIT (to ensure code bodies' expectations are satisfied).
Q108	Qualification - SAD Process	Will the SAD process be updated following completion of code drafting? If so, who is responsible (does not currently feature in plan)?	Qualification is included as a Code drafting topic in the planned activities to deliver code documentation at M6.
Q109	Qualification - SAD Process	How long is the SAD process expected to take?	SAD processes are dependent on M6. The current assumptions relating to the SAD process – and the relationship to M8 – in the plan appear sound but need confirmation from the BSC. Participants will be able to complete the Qualification SAD process before they start Qualification Testing.
Q110	Qualification - SAD Process	Can the deadline for completion of the SAD process for SIT participants be extended to align with the deadline for non-SIT participants?	We will define timelines to support those who will be available early.

Q111	Qualification - SAD Process	When can participants begin the SAD process?	As soon as the Code Bodies make information and the process available.
Q112	Qualification - Scope	When does the programme expect to have a better understanding of the scope and roles and responsibilities of Qualification?	This will be progressed through the QWG, which we would suggest attending.
Q113	Qualification - Scope	Will REC requirements relating to new MHHS activities cover amended processes applicable to MEMs with associated amendments to Supplier and DNO processes and requirements?	The scope of REC Qualification will be a matter for RECCo. We expect MHHS Qualification to cover the scope of the MHHS Programme (i.e. the Design Baseline plus Work-Off items plus Migration design) and then it will be up to RECCo to determine whether any consequential change is part of their Qualification.
Q114	Qualification - Scope	For Qualification, which parties will need to qualify and what would the requirements be?	An early view of Qualification is provided in the E2E Testing and Integration Strategy and being further developed through the QWG.
Q115	Qualification - Scope	Can the full remit of Qualification be assessed in Round 2 of the consultation - as it seems to focus primarily on Qualification testing and does not cater for the wider assessments that the Code Bodies may wish to progress to assure themselves of the impact on settlement?	We have included assurance/assessment activities in the assumptions for Round 2 and have sought feedback from Code Bodies.
Q116	Qualification - Scope	Several of the webinars refer to Network Operations being included in the Qualification Testing process; however, this seems to be beyond the scope of BSCP537. Please can the Programme clarify the position?	Clarifications are required for iDNO, DNO and Unmetered Supplies Operator (UMSO) /Unmetered Supplies Data Service (UMSDS) participation in Qualification; to be considered further in QWG.
Q117	Qualification - Scope	Is unmetered supplies within the scope of Qualification Testing? At the Unmetered Supplies Deep-Dive session, the Settlements experts queried this approach	UMSDS is in scope in the E2E Test Strategy.
Q118	Qualification - Scope	Does Qualification cover SEC accession for the Meter Data Retrieval Service (MDR) role? What is the accession process for SEC for this role?	Yes, SEC accession and the SEC processes will need to cover the MDR role. To be considered further in QWG and with SECAS.
Q119	Qualification - Scope	Is the Programme working on the basis of the number of MEMs seeking to act in the new arrangements will broadly align to existing numbers (~60 MEMs)?	Yes, but it is for the Qualification Bodies to confirm that timings are appropriate.
Q120	Qualification - Timelines	Is it possible to begin Qualification Testing earlier, i.e., before the start date if the participant is not a SIT volunteer?	Qualification is planned to start after Functional SIT so that there is confidence in the functional element of the design before we move into Qualification. This is reflected in the Round 2 Replan.

Q121	Qualification - Timelines	Will the code bodies be 'validating' the adequacy of the amount of time for Qualification in the plan?	The Round 2 Replan Consultation asked this question with no significant issues raised by the Code Bodies. We will be meeting with the Code Bodies to discuss this in advance of releasing Replan Round 3 so that MHHS Programme is using the most up to date information and assumptions on Qualification execution.
Q122	Qualification - Timelines	How and where has the Programme built contingency into the Qualification timeline?	Qualification Testing Approach & Plan artefact will be used to set out Qualification requirements and responsibilities. This artefact is due to be made available to participants to review in Q1 2023.
Q123	Qualification - Timelines	Can Qualification be completed ahead of the M8 milestone if the code changes are not agreed?	We are assuming not, as Code will need to be enacted for Elexon and REC PAB to finally sign of programme parties but we will be testing that assumption.
Q124	Qualification - Tranches	Will there be a competitive advantage if some are qualified before others and Migration doesn't wait for everyone to be ready?	If participants are qualified and have the appropriate production arrangements in place then they will be able to start migration.
Q125	Qualification - Tranches	Where Network Operators have a number of systems required to go through SIT (e.g. MPRS, Network Operations, UMSO), Qualification of affected systems may be forced into a later tranche of Qualification on the basis that development was postponed due to SIT involvement. This poses a risk for M10. How is this risk being mitigated / managed?	We are considering the participation of DNOs and iDNOs in SIT currently and how we mitigate the risks highlighted. We will share the latest planning assumptions in Round 3.
Q126	Qualification - Tranches	If some LDSOs are required to be involved in Qualification testing, will they be expected to join early tranches (prior to central systems go-live)?	We are considering the participation of DNOs and iDNOs in SIT currently and how we mitigate the risks highlighted. We will share the latest planning assumptions in Round 3.
Q127	Qualification - Tranches	How will participants in the tranches be chosen?	Clarifications required for Qualification and this needs to be discussed with the Code Bodies. To be considered further in QWG.
Q128	Qualification - Tranches	How will the tranche-approach work?	Further details are to be determined in QWG
Q129	Qualification - Tranches	How long will each tranche have to complete Qualification?	Further details are to be determined in QWG, we have made assumptions that the planned timescales can be supported.
Q130	Qualification - Tranches	Has any modelling been done to determine appropriate tranche sizes (e.g. benchmarking against FSP where tranches were ~20 PPs; current average amount of time taken to qualify)	Further details are to be determined in QWG, we have made assumptions that the planned timescales can be supported.

Q131	Qualification - Tranches	Will tranche populations be managed to spread the load across the Qualification window? If so, how will the selection criteria be developed to ensure a level playing field (e.g. will Ofgem approve)?	Further details are to be determined in QWG, we have made assumptions that the planned timescales can be supported.
Q132	Qualification - Tranches	How far in advance will tranches be established?	Further details are to be determined in QWG, we have made assumptions that the planned timescales can be supported.
Q133	Qualification - Tranches	Where is the contingency for Tranche 4 (three months will be tight to execute testing, collate evidence and assess the evidence)?	Further details are to be determined in QWG, we have made assumptions that the planned timescales can be supported.

## 4. Questions on Migration

ID	Category	Question	Answer
Q134	Migration - Approach	What is the intended Migration process for “hard to read” meters where it is not feasible to install advanced or smart metering equipment?	This will need to be considered in Migration Working Group (MWG). We would appreciate your inputs here.
Q135	Migration - Approach	What is the expectations for Non Half-Hourly Data Collector (NNHDC)/ Data Aggregator (DA) agents who have suppliers at different stages of Migration e.g. are they expected to run and manage two independent systems / infrastructures? If so, what if any support would be available to agents to help manage this and potentially offset any costs?	Yes, we expect that old arrangements and new arrangements will need to be supported through the transition period until all MPANs have migrated. The SI team will manage the Migration centrally and we expect that agents will discuss their operations with the Suppliers as their customers and we will provide any central support from an MHHS Programme perspective only.
Q136	Migration - Approach	What is the dependency on P432 & P434 for determining how Migration is carried out?	P432 & P434 dependency presents potential change to the Programme if two BSC (CT Metering and Unmetered Suppliers) modifications are not approved. The active assumption is that these modifications will be approved. If not approved, these the existing position will need to be included into Migration and the Programme Plan.
Q137	Migration - Approach	What is the most logical sequencing for Migration, based on a segment-by-segment approach?	The sequencing of Migration is something to be determined further in MWG but it is likely that there will be flexibility for suppliers to determine their approach to Migration within certain constraints (e.g. any industry-wide volume constraints)
Q138	Migration - Approach	Will market participants, that are ready to commence Migration, be allowed to do so if other participants are not ready to migrate and will the same principle be applied to other defined check points?  If yes, will the “no backward step” also be applied to consumers?	The approach to Migration has changed in Round 2 with Programme participants able to start Migration when they are ready and with reverse Migration in place to support Change of Supplier for customers who wish to move from MHHS arrangements to a supplier not yet operating MHHS arrangements.
Q139	Migration - Approach	What is the plan to migrate the Elective Half-Hourly sites and should these sites migrate in an earlier tranche, if the risk to the customer is lessened due to already being settled in a similar way?	We expect that Suppliers will consider which sites they might want to migrate at what point as part of their Migration planning. The MHHS SI team will manage Migration to ensure that it is operated effectively.
Q140	Migration - Assurance	During Migration, will there be assurance in place to maintain settlement accuracy and prevent SVAA defaulting which could result in later corrections?	We would expect that to be part of normal 'business as usual' monitoring under BSCCo responsibilities, but to be discussed with BSCCo.

Q141	Migration - Dependencies	What is the Migration dependency on data cleansing – and how will this be managed?	The approach to data population and cleaning was set out by CCDG and there are activities that have been picked up in subsequent industry change (e.g. BSC CP 1558, REC CP R0032, BSC Mod P434, P432). The plan reflects appropriate dependencies into SIT for functionality and Migration for cleansing.
Q142	Migration - Dependencies	Has it been identified where suppliers are dependent on participants to progress their Migration (e.g. customers, Qualification of metering services, DNOs, agents)? What are the consequences if the dependency is not met – and how is this being managed?	Central participants (including registration) will be available at the beginning of Migration, as defined in the plan with M10 preceding M11. It will be up to qualified suppliers to ensure that they have appropriate qualified service providers in place to be able to migrate their customers.
Q143	Migration - DNOs / iDNOs	What is the role of DNOs / iDNOs in Migration and do we need all of them to go through Qualification / SIT before Migration can start?	The role of DNOs / iDNOs in Migration is defined the Migration processes. This was shared via the MWG on 8 September 2022.
Q144	Migration - DNOs / iDNOs	How do DNOs, and other participants, mitigate the increased costs associated with supporting an elongated Migration period (due to early adoption)?	All Programme Participants are obligated under the BSC to participate in the MHHS Programme activities as will be set out in any baselined plan. It will be for those Participants to consider how to best deliver what is required. The Programme has set out a view on the relative impact of Migration Options in the PSG papers for 7th December.
Q145	Migration - Other	What is the approach for the initial population of Meter Data Retrieval Service (MDR) agent appointments into Electricity Retail Data Service (ERDS) (approximately 30 million in total).	The Migration processes have now been published to Programme participants in the MWG.
Q146	Migration - Other	Will the Programme publish interim/transition business processes and related specifications/requirements documents, if such interim/transition processes are sufficiently different from the currently published end-state design artefacts?	The Programme has published process diagrams for Migration processes using Change of Agent and Change of Supplier events to migrate MPANs. The MHHS Programme has also published a process map for the reverse Migration process. The Migration Design work is now underway in collaboration with the Migration Design SubGroup with migration design artefacts due to be approved in March 2023.
Q147	Migration - Other	Is there a minimum number of suppliers who need to be ready in order for Go-Live to be achieved?	The number of suppliers who will start migration at M11 (the first live use of the new MHHS arrangements) will be driven by the Minimum Viable Cohort (MVC) composition that complete SIT and Qualification. The programme is encouraging as many participants as possible to join the MVC.

Q148	Migration - Other	Will updates to Electricity Enquiry Service (EES) and (Central Switching Service) CSS impact Migration?	The impact will be defined in the Migration Design deliverables.
Q149	Migration - Other	Could the Programme validate what would happen if a Supplier of Last Resort (SoLR) needed to be progressed in the Qualification or Migration periods?	We expect that Qualification will be executed on Programme participants on the basis of roles that are being applied for, If a supplier takes on a new SoLR portfolio of customers during Migration (or before) we expect that they would include those MPANs in their Migration plan.
Q150	Migration - Timescales	Why are the Smart Migration timescales shorter than Advanced and Unmetered Supplies when the volume of the former is much greater?	This is as per the Ofgem timetable and the MHHS Programme did not have any evidence to support different timescales. We will assess the responses to the Replan Round 3 Consultation to see if there is any further evidence.
Q151	Migration - Timescales	How long will the migration window be and how has this been calculated?	The Migration window will run between Migration start at M11 and migration end at M15. The Programme is currently revisiting migration assumptions and modelling as input to the round 3 replan.
Q152	Migration - Timescales	<p>What is the impact of a reverse Migration approach on the Migration timescale (e.g. legacy systems and processes, volume constraints, length of Migration window, rate of Migration given higher processing overload)?</p> <p>From a system perspective it is envisaged to be much simpler to have a one-way Migration rather than a reverse Migration, as defined in the MHHS TOM. Faster Switching had a concept that if suppliers were not ready at go-live then they could not gain registrations and only lose them. This approach was not deemed to be detrimental to the customers.</p>	The Migration Option will be determined at PSG on 7th December. Any volumes associated with reverse migration will be driven by BAU switching volumes for those customers who have been migrated to the new MHHS arrangements in advance of M14. Having reverse migration in place means that the MVC could commence migration earlier without restricting customer choice and can help create a smoother profile as well as an opportunity to iron out any early migration issues should they arise at minimal impacts to the wider industry.
Q153	Migration - Timescales	What is the risk / impact of running Qualification and Migration in parallel and how is it being managed?	There is an assumption that there is limited technical risk of running Qualification and Migration in parallel to the participants and that the Programme and Code Bodies will resource the parallel activities appropriately.
Q154	Migration - Timescales	How long will the parallel running period be and what will be required of participants during this phase (e.g. parallel running of systems and support processes during Migration)?	The Migration period will run from M11 when migration starts for the first Programme Parties to enter Migration and will end at M15. During this phase, participants will be required to manage systems in parallel.

Q155	Migration - Unmigrated MPANs at go-live	What is the contingency plan for MPANs that do not successfully migrate?	We recognise that this might be the case and we will consider whether there are exception processes required and how exceptions might be applied to the criteria for M15 in the Migration Working Group. The exit strategy for Migration should be included in the overall Migration strategy.
Q156	Migration - Unmigrated MPANs at go-live	How will the following be managed? - Participants who have not qualified at the start of Migration - Participants who have not completed Migration and transition activities at the point of Go-Live	Programme participants will not be able to start Migration without being qualified. As codified in BSC Co, M14 is a regulatory milestone by which all participants have an obligation to be qualified, failing which suppliers will not be in a position to gain new customers until they qualify (as defined in the BSC).
Q157	Migration - Volumes	Are there any Migration volume/throughput planning assumptions, such as by market segment, that the Programme has made, which could inform the Programme (and all participants) in assessing when M14 needs to happen to satisfy the current overall transition timetable.	The Programme has set M14 in the latest plan on the basis of the best information they have to hand at the time of planning, but M14 is the milestone where participants have an obligation to be qualified rather than complete migration. The end of migration at M15 will be based on latest migration modelling information.
Q158	Migration - Volumes	What factors are there to consider that could constrain Migration volumes (e.g. Participant constraints, Central Party constraints, Registration System constraints, intended Programme-imposed constraints, DIP non-functional requirements)?	The programme has considered central party constraints and BAU volumes whilst modelling out migration volumes and known non-functionals and this will be subject to ongoing discussions with the Migration Working Group. However, the detailed migration planning exercise will consider all aspects such as supplier portfolios, MVC composition, industry constraints etc to derive a robust and achievable plan.

## 5. Questions on the overall Programme

ID	Category	Question	Answer
Q159	Overall Programme - Change control	What is the change process post-M5 and will requirements be frozen leading into activity and within the plan?	The change process defined by the MHHS Programme remains the same. The Design change process is being taken to Design Advisory Group (DAG) on the 14 December 2022 and will be communicated to participants afterwards. There is currently no plan to freeze change requests (CRs) against the design, as these will follow the current CR process of being assessed and passed through DAG and Programme Steering Group (PSG) for approval.
Q160	Overall Programme - Consequential change	Is consequential change within the scope of the Programme? Noted that consequential change of Supplier Meter Registration Service (SMRS) exists in the plan but unsure how that differs to the registration services changes needed to be made in Metering Point Registration System (MPRS).	Consequential Change queries can be raised and discussed in Consequential Change Impact Assessment Group) (CCIAG) to ensure that they are developed by the appropriate responsible parties. RECCo has already raised a number of items for discussion in CCIAG. CR012 is seeking to bring the Code drafting of Consequential Change into the MHHS Programme and this will be considered at PSG on 7th December.
Q161	Overall Programme - Other	Has the Programme considered impacts to the Replan of not having Transition included in the design baseline, of Consequential Changes – potentially - not having been included within the design and of not having the detail of Migration/reverse migration fully understood, at Replan baseline?	Yes, we considered this in Replan Round 2 and made appropriate assumptions at that point which we continue to challenge and develop through to Round 3. The nature of Consequential Change means that delivery responsibility sits with parties outside the MHHS Programme and we expect that to be delivered in the defined DBT2 activities. Whilst the programme has made an assumption that the DBT2 phase will be used deliver consequential changes, participants could plan to undertake consequential change within their DBT1 phase, if that should suit their delivery approach. Migration design is included in both the Interim Plan and the Round 3 replan.
Q162	Overall Programme - Phasing	Subject to dependencies, will individual roles be released early throughout the Programme to optimise resource deployment and reduce potential Programme risk?	The approach to SIT evolved in Round 2 with the Minimum Viable Cohort and opportunities for Programme Parties to participate in SIT.
Q164	Overall Programme - Replan impact	What is the expected impact of the Replan on the overall MHHS budget, as the approved budget was based on the current plan?	The budget impact will be part of the impact assessment for the Replan Change Request (CR) and will be taken into consideration by Ofgem in approving the CR for the Replan.