



MHHS Programme Steering Group (PSG) Minutes & Actions

Meeting number	PSG001	Venue	Pink Room, Elexon, 350 Euston Rd, London NW1 3AW, & Microsoft Teams
----------------	---------------	-------	--

Date and time	10 November 2021, 15:00-17:00	Classification	Public
---------------	--------------------------------------	----------------	---------------

Attendees:

Elexon Representative (Central Systems Provider)	Lee Northall
DCC Representative (Smart Meter Central System provider)	Charlotte Semp
Large Suppliers Representative	Graham Wood
Medium Suppliers Representative	Gurpal Singh
I&C representative	Gareth Evans
Supplier Agent (Independent)	Joel Stark
Supplier Agent Representative	Paul Akrill
DNO Representative	Hazel Cotman
iDNO Representative	Jenny Rawlinson
National Grid ESO	Jonathan Wisdom
Consumer Representative	Ed Rees
MHHS SRO	Chris Welby (CW)
MHHS Governance Manager	Andrew Margan (AM)
Ofgem Sponsor (as observer)	Rachel Clark
Ofgem (as observer)	Andy MacFaul
MHHS PMO	Emma Sheppard
Elexon Exec SRO	Angela Love
IAG Supplier Agent (Independent) Representative	Kristina Leary
IAG Supplier Agent Representative	James Murphy
IAG iDNO Representative	Stacey Buck
IAG DCC (Smart meter central system provider) Representative	Robbie McMillan
IAG DNO Representative	Matthew Alexander

1. Welcome & Introductions

CW welcomed all to the first Programme Steering Group and introduced himself as interim SRO for the programme.

AL introduced herself as Elexon Executive SRO and noted she was excited about MHHS and really looking forward to the programme and working with Industry on this. She noted there was an informal get together following the meeting and looked forward to talking to everyone further.

All attendees present then introduced themselves and noted their role on PSG.

CW issued instructions for all should the fire alarm sound during the meeting on whilst on Elexon premises.

CW ran through the agenda for the meeting before commencing the actual agenda items

CW walked through the overall MHHS Programme objective and North Star for the programme. He updated the programme was currently in mobilisation stage and then walked through the principles as outlined in the PSG pack.

CW set out the principle that the programme would be design-led not code-led, meaning the programme will complete the design and the code updates will be drafted following design completion. This differs from the typical approach of updating the code and using that as the basis for design. Therefore the intention for the programme is to adapt the code and make the required changes at the end.

The other programme principles were talked through:

- Minimising dependencies, the intention to keep dependencies to a minimum e.g. one Lead Delivery Partner procured to assist with programme delivery rather than a number of different supplier;
- Utilise resources with skills – the programme wants to utilise the best industry expertise from Industry and is encouraging participation in the programme;
- Efficient decision making, the programme will be moving at pace and therefore decisions are expected at the relevant forums (with the relevant information being provided to enable these)
- Not moving at the pace of the slowest – the programme is trying to be inclusive but we cannot move at the pace of the slowest. The PSG representatives need to assist with communicating this to programme participants, the programme needs to keep progressing. It is an industry-led programme not led by Ofgem or Government and this programme should provide a blueprint for programmes going forward and for how Industry will run their own affairs in the future.

The programme objectives were covered and CW noted that everything has to be of benefit to the Industry and ultimately to the customer. The programme needs to be transparent and the PSG is a key part to this. In terms of a blueprint, the programme has completed a lot of research in terms of lessons learned from other Industry programmes, and are trying to bring that into this programme.

G Wood (Large Suppliers) raised a comment received from constituents, which he believed was covered under collaborative working, regarding ensuring that the programme maintain clear and efficient communications with Programme Participants. This is deemed important. CW acknowledged this and responded that the Programme Communications Strategy was in place and the programme is looking at how information is provided and that this is easily accessible. AL noted that MHHS is a collaborative programme and will be looking for feedback on what all want to see and what not so the programme can address. CW noted the intention for regular surveys and feedback questionnaires in order to get programme participants feedback. There will be continuous feedback requested and the IPA will also provide the critical friend assurance.

G Wood (Large Suppliers) noted it was all good stuff and recognised the challenge in terms of the different levels of engagement. GW noted he has 5 constituents that will be very engaged but noted other constituent representatives may have constituencies who may not be as engaged.

G Wood (Large Suppliers) raised an observation on programme objective, ensuring that as the programme, we have a robust design but not overly engineered. CW responded that the TOM is moving to detailed design and we have requested programme participants participation in Level 4 working groups. The point is taken and we all, across Industry, need to ensure we don't over engineer the design.

L Northall (Central System Provider) noted that every programme starts with not wanting to over engineer and it does tend to happen. All need to note a reminder to deliver the minimum required. L Northall suggested some programme design principles would be welcome. AM advised the principles will be a discussion item at the Level 3 DAG and those principles will then be rolled out to the Level 4 working groups. LN requested that PSG also have sight and buy in to these. AL noted it was welcome that PSG would be challenging on these items and should have sight.

ACTION PSG01-01: SRO to discuss Design Principles with the DAG Chair and ensure the principles are made available to all and communicated well. To also ensure that the programme is not overworking the design.

On the clear comms point, CW responded that the Programme Communications Strategy was in place and looking at how we provide information and that it is easily accessible. AL noted that it is a collaborative programme and will be looking for feedback on what want to see and what not so can address. CW noted there will be regular questionnaires, surveys to get programme participants feedback and the programme will be requesting continuous feedback on how we are doing. The IPA will also provide critical friend assurance.

ACTION PSG01-02: All to provide feedback on the first PSG in terms of how it went, any improvement recommendations or other comments.

2. Progress Made, what we have achieved so far

CW noted that the programme had made good progress to date.

Programme structure: CW walked through slide 10, programme structure definition, noting Ofgem as Sponsor, with Elexon as SRO and IM and supported by the Level 2 PSG. The Lead Delivery Partner (LDP) are the next level who will run the Central Programme team comprising of the PMO, PPC and SI. The Design work stream which Elexon as SRO

will keep control of, as it is their area of expertise. CW noted that Elexon had seconded SMEs into the programme from Elexon, supplemented by Industry SMEs in the design area. IPA will then act as a critical friend to assess the programme and ensure we are delivering.

Ofgem's role as Programme Sponsor - R Clark reiterated that the MHHS Programme is part of the critical path to Net Zero and Ofgem are committed to deliver the benefits of MHHS to the timetable set out. Ofgem are passionate about success and know many of the programme participants are all involved with Faster Switching Programme too. She noted that the MHHS programme is a different approach so Ofgem have very consciously taken the approach for this programme that is Industry-led in a way that works with Ofgem. Ofgem are committed in their role as sponsor and do not expect to get involved in the day to day operation of the programme.

RC advised the thresholds have been established for Ofgem involvement e.g. adherence to the TOM, impact on competition or market stability, or consumer impact, or Level 1 milestones moved by 3 months or more. She reiterated Ofgem are passionate about programme delivery as early as we can.

Ofgem will be present, attending PSG and Level 3 governance meetings, but in all cases they will be doing so as observers to ensure they are sufficiently well informed to take decisions when required without holding up timelines. RC noted Ofgem will not be intervening below their jurisdiction and are not expecting to see a number of thresholds crossed. RC advised that although CW had stated the programme was design-led, code changes will have to be submitted through Ofgem and will need to be approved.

Ofgem will be supported in the Sponsor role by the IPA. In terms of the IPA, RC advised that Ofgem are in the middle of the procurement process. The IPA will report to Ofgem as Sponsor but also to the PSG and the SRO as IM. The role of the IPA is primarily to provide confidence to all of the programme participants. The IPA must be utilised to give all programme participants confidence that they are being given all information they need and that the way the programme is conducting is set up for success. The IPA will also be given confidence that all programme participants are doing what they should be doing in order to deliver MHHS. RC noted that the IPA will be around a lot as a constructive, forward looking assurance role. The expectation is they will be providing real time advice or recommendations. The IPA are not a decision authority but can provide feedback and make recommendations and will support Ofgem in all roles including COI. RC noted that Ofgem are hoping to have the IPA provider in place by the end of the year.

J Rawlinson (iDNO) raised a question – she had heard how the programme will move at pace and that it is working to a left to right plan rather than an end date at all costs. RC responded that the intention is to keep to the programme timescales, bearing in mind FSP coming to a head and that will be key for this programme too and if there is a need to change dates then Ofgem will be receptive to that. RC advised that she will expect the programme to make recommendations and that there is a consequence if a date pushed out. As long as Ofgem are convinced everything is being done to make it happen we will be receptive to well evidenced, well-argued and assessed information. She reiterated that Ofgem are keen for the programme to move at pace.

AM noted the need for robust evidence for any changes to the programme plan and if programme participants do not have that then the programme cannot relay to Ofgem. J Rawlinson (iDNO) noted consideration was also required to the fact that if you wait until you get evidence it may be too late.

CW noted it was key that programme participants started thinking about MHHS now and the activities their organisations needed to undertake in order to deliver. The design completion is due in April 2022, the TOM is available now and programme participants need to start considering MHHS now in terms of understanding the consequential change to their organisation e.g. opt out consent. CW noted don't wait until May/June next year, participants need to start understanding the impact throughout the business now.

G Wood (Large Suppliers) – He advised he understands the requirement for a challenging plan and not working at pace of the slowest. A credible plan is very important and one that the majority of programme participants can believe in. He noted that the FSP replan last year really changed programme participant's belief in achieving the plan.

LDP procurement: CW noted a very robust process had been followed with 6 proposals submitted. Following review, 3 had been shortlisted and BAFOS submitted. Dialogues and follow up sessions had been completed and a recommendation presented to the Elexon Board. Elexon Board have now approved the recommendation and the programme is now into the legals stage with the preferred supplier. An announcement cannot be made until contracts are signed. CW advised we hope to have the LDP on board in December and fully mobilised during January 2022.

AL noted there were 3 credible BAFOS submitted, so if in any event the programme got to a stage it was unable to progress with the preferred bidder, then there were two other possibilities which were also in line with the cost expected. CW noted that all three BAFOS were very close on scoring.

J Murphy (IAG Supplier Agent) questioned interaction with the programme and the LDP. AM advised the programme will be one team including the LDP, i.e. whether it is Elexon or the LDP for programme participants it is one programme team and there should be no differentiation apparent.

L Northall (Central Systems Provider) raised the EDA decision due to the fact that all programme participants have been formally advised not to enter into any new contracts until there is a final decision made. LN noted Helix are at tail end of their procurement and would like to progress. CW advised that the Ofgem final decision is due mid-December, RC stated the advice to programme participants was no contracts in relation to EDA not for all programme contracts. There are clarification questions on EDA and once these are answered then a decision will be made.

Design: CW stressed the need for programme participants to be involved in this now, involvement in the Level 4 workings groups is key. As stated earlier the programme is design led and code changes will follow.

L Northall (Central Systems Provider) questioned how the programme are prioritising which elements of the design is being focussed on first. CW advised all elements are interlinked, further detail on this will be provided at DAG. L Northall (Central Systems Provider) noted he was progressing at pace within Helix, looking to get solution providers on board at beginning of January so having an update as to what to test first during Industry Testing would be helpful. CW advised this needed to be fed back through the design working groups and they be requested to advise if there is anything the programme participants need to complete with regard to what elements they should be testing first. AM noted a Level 3 group for testing was also under consideration so testing is considered as well as design this was a learning from Nexus.

CW noted design started in 2017 with DWG, CCDG and AWG then commenced and those groups will be absorbed into the design work stream which will allow continuity and a more detailed level.

Approach for detailed design – CW noted that the programme appreciate there are constraints on programme participants time. DAG will oversee the design and there are a number of Level 4 working groups and it is key for programme participants involvement in these. CW walked through the design flow on slide 18.

CW advised there will be no Industry consultation at the end of design, there will be continuous review through the design as part of the level 4 workings groups and therefore it is key to get involved now. If participants want to influence the design then they need to ensure input to the L4 working groups. If participants just need to know what they need to do then they can wait for the detailed design but don't expect to get it and then feedback.

ACTION PSG01-03: PSG Constituency reps need to engage with their constituencies and confirm they understand there will be no consultation at the end, involvement in Design is required now at the Level 4 work groups for continuous review. We require confirmation from you that your constituents understand this at next PSG.

J Rawlinson (iDNO) questioned how will the programme ensure that you don't get to baseline and are then getting feedback on the design. AM advised regular engagement and review will take place at Level 4 working groups and sign off with transparency throughout and documentation published on the website. J Rawlinson questioned any programme participant that had not fed in and AM advised that the Level 4 working group constituency is checked and the PPC will also check if messages are being heard and ensuring messages understood. If there are gaps then the programme will address.

CW advised PPC will identify who is not engaging and touch base with them to ensure understand consequences of this.

G Singh (Medium Suppliers) raised that constituency concerns had been raised on the final bullet on slide 28 "The programme will not be consulting at the end of the design". He noted that AWG had gone out to consultation and that this was of less importance than this programme so were expecting consultation and therefore there is a risk here to getting the best or appropriate product if there is not a consultation.

AM reiterated the design will be a continuous review process throughout the design. The danger of large consultations at the end is that it doesn't drive the design and extends programme timelines. AM noted design feedback has been that this is welcomed and what design experts expected. The programme understand this is different to how other Industry programmes have progressed. CW noted there is a need for continuous involvement from PPs during the design process and this is the ask. The PPC will check in with programme participants if they are not sending representatives to the Level 4 working groups. CW noted if the process is not working then it will be reviewed.

R Clarke questioned iterative development and whether the programme is anticipating doing a final review once have all that it all hangs together as expected i.e. looking at the design in the round and verifications that all fits together. CW responded that this will be a key role for DAG, assured by the LDP and the IPA will ensure all criteria are met. There is no reason currently to have a consultation at the end. The continuous review throughout is key for this design.

L Northall (Central Systems Provider) noted this is a different approach for Industry change, but if a fairly normal approach for large programmes and is still a very clear robust engagement model. The programme appears to have a process for dealing with those that are not engaging as well as those that are engaging. AL noted it was a new process for Industry and we need to suck it and see. We will review and monitor.

G Singh (Medium Suppliers) advised if this is the approach being stuck to then the programme needs to be very loud and clear on this – he expressed nervousness on L4 working group participation given where the supply community is currently and it being a very challenging time. Suppliers need to be involved in the design. AL responded that the programme do not underestimate suppliers positions at the moment, appreciate adding to current workloads and the programme do need to flag clearly what we need programme participants to do and what items they need to review/be involved with. The programme will emphasis and will signal what is happening and keep programme participants up to speed and it is also the responsibility of constituency representatives to keep their constituencies up to date.

G Wood (Large Suppliers) raised if there is an iterative process and as look at certain elements there is a process that checks everyone has fed in and this is provided for visibility then this was key. The programme needs to ensure engaging all relevant parties – e.g. those not able to get to working groups are able to have sight of the artefacts.

G Evans (I&C) raised that CW has stated 'checking in with programme participants' - do you have a list of people? AM noted there is a list of 180-200 programme participants and the PPC will engage with each, as well the Level 4 working groups are trying to ensure there is a constituency representative at each.

CW advised that the programme has ensured through the LDP that they are full resourced to reach out to all programme parties.

G Evans (I&C) raised if one I&C party turns up to a working group and 15 turn up on the call but don't say anything then is that seen as box ticked or will you reach out to the others and see what is going on. AM noted the programme will reach out to those not speaking to check views but constituency representatives have a responsibility to represent their views.

AL noted in other forums one of the challenges with remote meetings is that you can't see who is engaged. Headline reports issued after meetings to highlight key decisions etc. have been useful and would welcome any thoughts PSG representatives have on this or other suggestions. G Evans advised the programme needs to be careful not to shoot from the hip. If you pester programme participants all the time then they will switch off. Note this is not the only Industry project and there are only limited SME's. When do the group which is developing and deploying get to sit down and review otherwise will find gone wrong 6-12 months down the line?

CW advised PSG reps need to go back to their constituents and get view on how it will work – if not happy, why not? As the programme progresses, if we have programme participants who are not comfortable then then you as PSG representatives need to feed back in. Trying to do a new blueprint, if struggling with it then do feedback so we can address.

AL advised the programme is a new way of working for Industry and if it's not working then feedback and the programme will facilitate.

G Wood picked up on the point made about 60 plus PPs in DWG's – numbers don't necessarily mean engaged and need to be careful of that. CW noted feedback from PPs will be key.

G Evans (I&C) advised wide constituency based – everyone needs right voice and need to flag concerns.

ACTION PSG01-04: Headlines from each forum to be issued by Programme.

CW noted L4 Working groups are underway and will pick up on Headlines request with those forums too. CW noted the website will also be progressed with the LDP to ensure information is easily located.

G Evans (I&C) advised it was very important to have very clear structure of design documentation. In FSP there were problems on getting design clarity when trying to provide to suppliers etc. Really important. Need to be able to pick up and see how gel together.

Comms Strategy: CW walked through the update slide noting that the programme website will be the single source of truth, with easily available info. Programme is also communicating weekly via the Newsletter "The Clock" which is being well received and requested all encourage constituents sign up to this if they are not already.

CW mentioned SRO roadshows are taking place. AL questioned agent engagement with P Akkrill. P Akkrill noted already engaged with AM on this AM noted broadcast comms would be a way to work with them.

Separation: CW noted we have listened to Industry re Elexon as PM and Conflict of Interest and a formal Business Separation plan has been agreed with Ofgem and Elexon Board. Formal approval due imminently. CW walked through the update on the slide on this and noted that the IPA will also check COI being followed.

J Wisdom (National Grid ESO) raised the only concern is Elexon have been given the programme and the risk with COI of not being able to collaborate and yet they have the expertise. CW advised a number of SMEs have been seconded over and we can discuss items if in the programme interest overall for all programme participants as we would with any programme participant. If there is a meeting it will be minuted and full disclosure. AL noted K Spencer seconded to the programme but will be able to provide expertise but all engagements will be formally audited.

Governance: AM walked through framework. Key message is f/w important to aid effective decision making. PSG most important. Only if L1 threshold. Key message is you will be first to know of any escalations at L. PSG can delegate decisions to L3, up to L3 how they delegate to L4. Review of the framework will be completed by IPA. JW questioned levels of delegation. AM noted P423 for overall governance. Lower level governance – looking to approve at this meeting. Delegation – some areas to be agreed on framework, will need to be approved at later date.

3. Plan Updates

LDP will be fully functioning in January, IPA due to be appointed in December and in place in January.

Plan rebaseline – as per slide, One of key elements is understanding what people need to do to deliver design, so have agreed to a plan review. Important point that parties need to think about what they need to have in place for MHHS when it commences e.g. consent management before moving people over, impact on amount of data to be transferred. It is not just a settlement issue it is a significant change to where retail works. We need the evidence to support views.

L Northall (Central Systems Provider) noted challenge currently trying to deliver for April 2023 and if that plan moves out then there will be a very different way of engaging with suppliers. CW noted not looking to push out majorly. L Northall noted he would be comfortable with an indication of a landing zone. L Northall noted agreed having design finalised is a good checkpoint date.

Code changes – Plan milestone was April but don't want to make code changes too early or too late so the programme needs to find the sweet spot to start. There will be no code change freeze, so we need to determine best point for this.

JR advised ensuring getting sign off on designs going through, code changes could highlight issues with design as not yet seen. CW noted CCAG will be considering. Will get their input into this at the forum regarding dates. CW was confident design first is better but we need to allow time for code changes, still a process to go through. This will be part of rebaseline exercise.

J Wisdom (National Grid ESO) asked if in April 22 will the programme also be doing a horizon scan of all other items going on in Industry. AM noted will be an action for CCAG. Consulting you at PSG to review and advise and need to cogniscent of all changes. CCAG needs to assist in provide clear understanding.

Request for action for active engagement early, L4 WGs etc. Design and build – is there enough time in plan – start thinking about it now. As per actions on slide.

G Evans (I&C) – observation already on is time enough – you need to really understand the design to see what can do, can do some as it comes along but need detailed design to get absolute answer to the exam questions. CW advised if looking at TOM now, could have a view of whether timescale enough or not. E.g. consequential changes like consent management tool can that be done within the timescale. GE noted they will definitely have views to feed in on that.

J Murphy (IAG) – greater clarity on EDA would help to answer that question. Key aspect of how participants will interact under the TOM. CW noted decision due mid Dec from Ofgem.

G Singh (Medium suppliers) raised feedback from Medium Suppliers is that they don't really know what estimating for so difficult at this time and with what else is going on in the market at this time. Programme could help with issuing any artefacts that would assist with that.

AM questioned whether PSG representatives constituents are considering the consequential impacts – tariff setting, billing etc. If they are then what is the knock on impact to those other areas? That's the feedback the programme needs.

1) Is the timescale enough?

2) Have they scoped the consequential impacts and addressed what they think they need to do?

E.g. on days when things are different – e.g. the final England/Wales Rugby match then usage would be different. Currently this gets profiled out. How would they be forecasting to do that etc? Have they started to think about these items – these are consequential changes from MHHS.

AM noted some constituents are engaged and others not aware – we are asking you as constituent representatives to ask your constituents and come back with a view.

ACTION PSG01-05: Programme to outline key design artefacts and provide a 1 pager on examples of consequential impacts for consideration by programme participants.

G Evans (I&C) noted bandwidth issue – how much is still to be done in first half of next year with FSP. Would like to do deep dive on intra consequential changes – will feedback in due course.

J Murphy (IAG Supplier Agent) raised SEC MOD MP162 – looking to implement in November 23 so doesn't align with start of SIT. C Semp (DCC) advised that MP162 will be in by August so will be in SIT and through before November.

L Northall (Central Systems Provider) advised he did not fully understand the transition plan and that lower level detail is needed, e.g. what does SIT really mean, He has the milestone descriptions and the programme activity descriptions from the transition plan but needs further detail for a clearer understanding. AM noted that the next level of planning would be undertaken with the LDP and more detailed milestones then provided.

ACTION PSG01-06: Programme to provide a more detailed understanding of the transition plan to Programme participants.

ACTION PSG01-07: Milestone 5 Physical Baseline delivered - In order to deliver the physical baseline in April 2022, we would like your inputs now with the right SME's involved with the Level 4 Work groups from now until completion of design. The programme will not be consulting at the end of the design, there will be continuous review throughout the design stage. Note: Slide 28 in the PSG Meeting pack contains further detail.

ACTION PSG01-08: Milestone 9 System Integration Testing Start - Can you check with your constituents and get an early view on whether the timeline is sufficient between M5 and M9. Note: Slide 28 in the PSG Meeting pack contains further detail.

4. **PSG Terms of Reference**

AM advised the Strawman Programme Governance Framework had been issued to Industry for consultation and approximately 17 responses had been received. Overall there was no issues with it and it aligned to the Ofgem framework. Therefore he was looking for the PSG to ratify the approval of the Programme Governance Framework, which also included the PSG TOR that required ratification by the PSG (remove the Strawman reference). No comments had been received in response to the PSG pack being issued for review ahead of the meeting.

AM noted there were some areas of the governance that required further detail and this would be provided at a later date as the programme progressed.

DECISION PSG-DEC01: The Programme Governance Framework and the PSG TOR were approved.

G Wood (Large Suppliers) raised the fact that there was one comment from his constituency. The comment related to the TOR and they were cognisant of the fact that they had not had a chance to have a discussion as a constituency on the TOR ahead of PSG but that this did not stop approval. He just requested that the programme be mindful that there may be feedback comments on the PSG TOR in the next couple of weeks. AM noted the PSG TOR was not static and would change and any future changes would be considered as requested.

Constituency responsibilities – AM advised the programme wanted to ensure all PSG constituency representatives their responsibilities as stated on the slide. AM stated the programme will not be deferring decisions and PSG constituency representatives are expected to attend all meetings. If a PSG constituency representative is unable to attend, it is their responsibility to identify and send a designated alternate.

It was emphasised that the programme really need PSG constituency representatives at the meeting to support programme decision making. If there is not consensus in their constituency then the PSG need to ensure all their constituents views are represented in order to enable to SRO to make a decision.

PSG constituency representatives need to be meeting ready as decisions will be made at the meeting so all need to have prepared accordingly. Meeting papers will be issued ahead within agreed timescales and PSG will avoid issuing late papers or adding AOB items.

All PSG papers requiring a decision will be concise, 2 pages maximum with appendices containing additional detail if applicable.

J Rawlinson (iDNO) advised if decisions are required at the PSG meeting then the papers are required well enough in advance to allow preparation. AM responded that the proposed meeting cycle and timelines will allow for this.

G Evans (I&C) raised the point that in Faster Switching Programme there is a WebEx broadcast which allows all parties in the programme to listen to the full detail if they wish to, therefore when PSG constituency representatives contact their constituency members they have already had some prior notice. AM responded that the programme are considering planning a similar model for MHHS, following lessons learned feedback and this could be implemented but not until the LDP is on board due to resource constraints. CW confirmed this was the programme's intention. This was accepted.

Future meeting dates: AM noted this slide referenced the scheduled for next meetings and the frequency. The proposal was as denoted on the slide, PSG the first Wednesday of each month. There was also a question as to when to stand up IAG – currently of the view not enough of an agenda to have a separate meeting. New model for this programme so the intention is IAG will not be stood up until required.

J Murphy (Supplier Agent) questioned PSG & IAG members at PSG on this basis or just PSG members. AM advised PSG members only. J Murphy questioned whether the programme would engage IAG reps on IAG agenda items at PSG? CW noted if feedback is IAG needs setting up then it will be set up. In meantime the programme do not envisage sufficient items to do so

G Evans (I&C) – Feedback is yes seems reasonable to continue as is currently and evolve as required when IAG needed. One observation – when the programme gets into proper drumbeat then a month can be a long time but need to be conscious that not waiting a month before picking items up – will find own rhythm but for now it is reasonable.

DECISION PSG-DEC02: No IAG to be stood up currently, will be kept under review by PSG and stood up if/when required.

DECISION PSG-DEC03: PSG to be held on first Wednesday of each month going forward.

AM advised the next meeting would be 1 December and the other governance groups would shift for December due to the Christmas break and resume as per schedule in January 2022.

5. Level 3 Governance Groups

AM requested that the PSG formally ratify the Level 3 Working Groups, DAG and CCAG being stood up.

DECISION PSG-DEC04: Level 3 Work Groups (DAG and CCAG) APPROVED to be stood up.

GE noted a constituent had raised a concern on what they were being asked to ratify. AM noted it was the formation of the Level 3 Working Groups as denoted in the PSG pack.

AM reiterated the note in the PSG pack of a likely request to PSG for another Level 3 Working Group to be established, the Testing Advisory Group (TAG). LN noted this TAG would help from Helix perspective too and requested timescales. AM advised an approximate timescale was January/February 2022 but this could not be confirmed at this stage. LN requested TAG be established as early as possible and requested the programme to consider this.

ACTION PSG01-09: SRO to request programme considers timescales for set up of TAG and confirm to PSG.

6. Next Steps

Actions from the meeting were confirmed – see Action Summary.

Next Meeting was agreed to be 1 December 2021. This will be to seek views on the Budget and to introduce the LDP (subject to contracts being signed).

7. AOB

A Love advised that a paper was being presented to the BSC Panel on 11/11/21 in respect of a proposed revision to the MHHS Implementation Monthly Specified Charge for Year 1. A Love noted that this was due to the LDP and IPA not being on boarded until December 2021. This paper addresses that situation and if the paper is formally approved then supplier will see a reduced charge for this year. Overall the total programme funding will not reduce, it is being reallocated within the overall forecast. AL will confirm the BSC's decision on the paper following the meeting on 11/11/21. CW advised beneficial to get reduced charges now given current situations.

Actions Summary

Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date
PSG01-01	SRO to discuss Design Principles with the DAG Chair and ensure the principles are made available to all and communicated well. To also ensure that the programme is not overworking the design.	SRO	30/11/21
PSG01-02	All to provide feedback on the first PSG in terms of how it went, any improvement recommendations or other comments to note.	ALL	30/11/21
PSG01-03	PSG Constituency reps need to engage with their constituencies and confirm they understand there will be no consultation at the end, involvement in Design is required now at the Level 4 work groups for continuous review. We require confirmation from you that your constituents understand this at next PSG.	PSG Constituency Reps	15/12/21
PSG01-04	Headlines from each forum to be issued by Programme for awareness following each session.	Programme PMO	11/11/21
PSG01-05	Programme to outline key design artefacts and provide a 1 pager on examples of consequential impacts for consideration by programme participants.	Programme PMO/SRO	30/11/21
PSG01-06	Programme to provide a more detailed understanding of the transition plan to programme participants.	Programme PMO	Qtr2 2022 (part of rebaselining exercise)
PSG01-07	Milestone 5 Physical Baseline delivered - In order to deliver the physical baseline in April 2022, we would like your inputs now with the right SME's involved with the Level 4 Work groups from now until completion of design. The programme will not be consulting at the end of the design, there will be continuous review throughout the design stage. Note: Slide 28 in the PSG Meeting pack contains further detail	PSG Constituency Reps	15/12/21
PSG01-08	Milestone 9 System Integration Testing Start - Can you check with your constituents and get an early view on whether the timeline is sufficient between M5 and M9. Note: Slide 28 in the PSG Meeting pack contains further detail	PSG Constituency Reps	15/12/21
PSG01-09	SRO to request programme considers timescales for set up of TAG and confirm to PSG.	SRO	30/11/21