



MHHS Programme Steering Group (PSG) Minutes & Actions

Meeting number **PSG002**

Venue **Microsoft Teams Meeting**

Date and time **15 December 2021, 10:00-12:00**

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, SRO	Andrew Margan
Ofgem Sponsor (as observer)	Rachel Clark
Ofgem (as observer)	Andy MacFaul
MHHS PMO, SRO	Emma Sheppard
Elexon Exec SRO	Angela Love
IAG Supplier Agent Representative	James Murphy
MHHS Programme Manager, LDP	Keith Clark
Engagement Partner, LDP	Rachel Eyres
MHHS PMO, LDP	Lewis Hall
MHHS Programme Director, SRO	Chris Harden

1. **Welcome**

CW welcomed all to the meeting and ran through the agenda items for the meeting. CW stated that the LDP for the programme had been formally appointed since the last PSG, Expleo, and welcomed them to the meeting and a formal introduction would follow as an agenda item.

2. **Review of Actions**

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.

COMPLETE: The Design Principles have been discussed in detail at DAG and have been made available to all. There are ongoing activities in relation to some of them.

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

COMPLETE: CW noted the general consensus of feedback provided on the first PSG was that it had worked well.

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.

UPDATE: Discussion item under Agenda Item 3 at this meeting.

PSG01-04: Headlines from each forum to be issued by Programme for awareness following each session.

COMPLETE: Headlines were issued after the meeting on 10 November and will be issued within 24 hours of each PSG going forward.

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

COMPLETE: One page on consequential change issued to PSG reps. Discussions on key design artefacts have been discussed in detail at DAG and documentation will be made available for review and communicated accordingly.

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

OPEN: This remains open and will do so until the replan, currently scheduled for Q2 2022.

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.

UPDATE: Discussion item under Agenda Item 3 at this meeting.

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.

UPDATE: Discussion item under Agenda Item 3 at this meeting.

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

UPDATE: CW noted that this is under consideration. The establishment of TAG will need to be brought to PSG for authorisation and this is planned for the January PSG. LN requested whether this could be progressed any quicker as Elexon Central Systems Design are looking to get suppliers on board in January. CW assured PSG that TAG would be progressed as quickly as possible but the nominations process was required and therefore requested PSG reps to consider appropriate nominations asap. CH noted that the Test Strategy is required by Milestone 5, which required programme participants involvement and the programme is therefore looking to establish the TAG before the end of January.

ACTION PSG02-01: PSG constituent representatives are requested to consider nominations for the proposed Level 3 Testing Advisory Group (TAG) and advise the programme by 6 January 2022.

ACTION PSG02-02: The Programme are to issue a specific Testing Advisory Group (TAG) communication (by 17/12/21) advising of the purpose of the TAG and the nominations process for this Advisory Group.

3. **PSG Feedback**

CW noted this agenda item was for the PSG constituent representatives to present their feedback to the actions set at the last meeting. CW noted some had submitted written feedback but that the meeting would appreciate a summary from each constituent representative.

L Northall (Elexon Central Systems Design): There are already a number of representatives involved in the governance forums. There is full awareness that there will not be a consultation at the end of the design and there are a number of SMEs involved in the Level 4 work groups.

In terms of participation at L4 Work groups it would be helpful to have a plan of which topics will be governed by which work group and when as that will help to inform programme participants own plans going forward. There is a need to deliver in line with when designs are already completed and therefore this plan would assist for a number of reasons. C Harden noted that this is being produced now and will be made available shortly.

L Northall noted that without a detailed design it is difficult to give an answer with a high degree of confidence and that the plan is for the CSD to have suppliers in early January.

C Semp (DCC): Overall supportive of all 3 actions. The SEC mod is progressing and already integrated into programme plans and testing plans. There is regular engagement in place with the programme team to ensure the SEC mod and wider programme is aligned. Consultation has been completed on Sec Mod so they are comfortable with all points currently.

G Wood (Large Suppliers) – A formal email response had been issued to the SRO on 14/12/21. GW noted overall large suppliers were generally supportive as a whole but are currently unable to support activities e.g. design work group with the right people and resources. This was due to massive pressure over the winter period and unprecedented position of Industry currently. Their priorities are to prioritise the needs of consumers. The current market is taking a huge toll on resources currently, in parallel to the request for suppliers to deliver the FSP during H1 2022. The view is that the landscape is preventing suppliers from meaningful engagement with MHHS design currently and is difficult to gauge when will change. Therefore Large suppliers are urging the MHHS programme to reconsider their approach and would welcome a more detailed conversation on this with the LDP at the earliest opportunity to discuss their concerns further (an email has already been issued to K Clark requesting this).

In terms of action 7 (M5 to M9 milestone) – it is difficult to provide view at this time. Require a much clearer view of the overall design and cannot guestimate at this time. They are supportive of the logical approach, agree the rebaseline phase should follow design and this should be amended in the overall plan. Suppliers do want a definitive view of design. There is also a requirement for a credible programme plan which needs to be robust left to right and underpinned by the end to end design.

CW raised a point about November raised in GW's email and GW noted this related to one supplier raising the piecing together of the physical design and legal text, this required further discussion with his constituency to understand further.

CW questioned G Wood as to whether the feedback provided was a consensus view of Large suppliers or an majority view. G Wood responded that it was a consensus view.

G Singh (Medium Suppliers) – Confirmed full understanding to there being no consultation at the end of design. There was some concern on this which would need to be addressed in order to ease this over the coming months.

Action PSG01-07 – It was noted that programme participants have had to prioritise current market conditions and therefore SMEs are not able to contribute to work groups currently. When market conditions stabilise, it will then be reassessed. GS requested it also be noted that some participants have had to remove resources from FSP to focus on market issues and it will be a priority call as to when to return to this. In summary they do not have any available resources and this will need to be reassessed next year.

Action PSG01-08 Again difficult to assess at this point in time, The consequential changes look significant and further discussion is required on the gaps. Where an assessment has been attempted, further information is required on the business processes in terms of how many data flows, what existing flows will be decommissioned, visibility of process documentation. Once the final detailed design is available at Milestone 5, participants will then need to take a holistic view and decide how to progress e.g. procure services or inhouse and that will take time. GS also raised market conditions and that FSP migration is at its peak during the current Milestone 5 MHHS plan and it is therefore not an appropriate time to complete a rebaseline assessment.

GS noted that he will also submit a formal written response detailing the above.

CW questioned whether this feedback represented a consensus view across the medium suppliers. GS advised not as some had not responded at all, it was the view from the responses received. CW therefore requested that GS be specific in his written response as to who had what views and who had not responded at all in order that the programme can follow up directly with those not engaging.

G Evans questioned the programme view with regard to consensus since it was unlikely the PSG constituency representatives would ever get 100% of their constituents engagement and that he had consensus across his group but did not have responses from all 40 constituencies within his group. CW responded that there is a programme concern currently on engagement and there is a need to ensure where there are diverging views further understanding is required of how many are in consensus and how many are not actually engaging at all. CW clarified therefore that all feedback should include any divergent views and who is and who is not engaging.

G Singh raised PSG01-09 – and queried the definition of M9 as a small number of suppliers had requested clarity on that and whether medium suppliers would be mandated to take part in SIT. C Harden noted this is part of the reason for participation in TAG as these are the entry criteria that need to be discussed and agreed as part of that.

G Evans (I&C) - this is not top priority currently, everyone wants programme to work and happen in a successful fashion however have FSP people in non domestic dealing with customers and also had new request from Ofgem on stress testing of suppliers from early next year. Will not get best SMEs in an organisation and that is clear and consensus view from 15/16 non domestic suppliers on call.

Acton PSG01-07 – with consultations not being done for M5, Concern if not suitable checkpoint then will work out something doesn't work in a year. Appreciate costs in slowing down but more to slow down now than fixing at the back end.

Action PSG01-08 – no idea as no ability to look at currently due to current constraints. Robust in stating don't know currently.

GE noted no one is able to give time and attention believed to be required and this needs to be reflected in next few months. One point made was people do keep asking is this one plan to be put on the list that will then be delayed by Ofgem. Right now it is not seen as an important priority.

RC responded to the comment on one to deprioritise and Ofgem delay list – she stated there is no interest in delaying this programme at all. Ofgem are clear that MHHS is required to deliver long term goals and it is essential they don't become less important or less urgent despite what the market is going through currently. The message is very clear, MHHS is progressing.

GE noted still interesting people are saying it is on the delay list and was safe to say if it was pushed back then it would be expected.

AL questioned RC as to whether there is any intention of pushing FSP back. GE advised understanding of priority list is key. FSP is top. RC responded that FSP will not be delayed.

GS – raised they had objective on blueprint for future – if the prog is supposed to be led by Industry then need to acknowledge programme plan and was kicked off and that it did not come from Industry and therefore had no buy in.

Principle about not moving at the pace of the slowest – accept that but careful on interpretation, don't see as a carte blanche to proceed at the pace if some are not able to engage e.g. a no of key suppliers.

GW – from LSP perspective FSP needs to be completed so can concentrate on other programmes. Conscious that when prices come down and consumer facing needs to be ready.

P Akrill and J Stark (Supplier Agents) – P Akrill noted on PSG01-03 & 7 there was good understanding amongst supplier agents of process going through, good engagement with working groups. Fair to say more engagement with independent agents rather than in house. More engagement with data services rather than metering services but they are making efforts to engage.

Understand continuous review, concerns on how working right now and clarity on what workgroups will be discussing in advance is a concern. Roadmap for design and how it will be worked through is needed, documentation needs to be well distributed and easy to see. Clarity is required on the review process. J Stark added visibility on design and boarder governance question – constituents are concerned that design related questions are being managed under SEC panel but are not following MHHS programme governance. Need to consider how it is best managed – is it being contested and discussed in the right manner. Concerns visibility and governance.

Action PSG01-08 – P Akrill advised maybe enough time but not quite sure yet, don't have anything that means it isn't but cannot confirm until baseline comes out. Concerns that some of the items the market need to deliver collectively will also need some time to establish before decisions can be made on components for delivery of own solution. J Stark confirmed this.

H Cotman (DNO) - 16 of her constituents responded. ENA also encouraging engagement.

3rd party providers already on journey. DNOs are focussed on FSP and cogniscent of transition phase in early March, critical no of resources and not a large no of SMEs so restricted. Concern some marketwide functionality will clash with their FSP functionality.

If all parties required to test then concern that 12 months a concern. They will be more relaxed if the approach to be taken is the same as the approach taken by FSP.

J Wison (National Grid) - Action PSG01-03 - understand approach. Noted when IA and process would take place, noted will happen through design process and need to bring other parties on the journey with us and will need to think about that at DAG. Otherwise happy.

Action PSG01-07 - worried central settlements activities not included in processes issued to date. Have raised as feedback to Design. Difficult to confirm can provide SMEs as no sight of process list. Do recognise the demand not as significant as on other parties.

Action PSG01-08 – think sufficient time and think ESOs overall process is able to cope with the indicated timescales.

J Rawlinson – overall supportive of programme, pleased to see it progressing and the recognition to take all parties with you. Good cover across all WGs, Do have concerns to approach of no full consultation, see why that is but in absence of full consultation before design baseline curious to understand how you are comforting yourselves that have all buy in and no parties are left behind that could risk in future.

PSG01-08 - far too early to take a punt on whether timescales are sufficient. JR highlighted the same expertise as required on FSP, biggest risk therefore.

CW thanked all for the feedback and advised in order to get to replan need to get to end of design. We need to consider further, would be helpful if get better understanding of if you cannot do it now is there something that you can state when you would be able to engage fully? When do you envisage the mobilisation of your constituents programmes being set up. PPC will be asking these questions on engagement with individual parties. CW also pointed out need to bear in mind a cost to delay, each month is approx. £1m so will cost suppliers and therefore customers so please bear in mind. Will be reaching out for more details.

CH noted it would be helpful for PSG constituency representatives to discuss with constituents as to when they can engage and mobilise – would like the view in early January and would be good to have that view by then. We need to know sooner rather than later if need to slow down. Understand suppliers having problems engaging with this and some Level 4 meetings are specifically being targeted for them.

We need to know by mid January for a view on the programme – if you have had views already let us know ahead of the meeting.

A Love raised the references to Ofgem prioritisation statement and whether this is being issued. RC advised a list of anything being paused is expected to be issued from Ofgem imminently, but noted it will be similar to information issued in October.

ACTION PSG02-03: PSG constituent representatives are requested to confirm the status of each of their constituency members programme status and in particular whether each participant is currently mobilised and resourced, or if not, when they intend to be so (and why they currently haven't been able to mobilise as per the baseline plan). If a significant proportion of the constituency participants haven't been able to mobilise, what is the constituencies proposal (including reasoning) for changes to the programme plan (specifically the M4 & M5 milestone and the re-planning exercise). In order to have a meaningful conversation at the January PSG meeting on the 19th January, we would like written responses to be submitted to the SRO programme mailbox by Friday, 14th January at the latest.

4. LDP Introduction & programme mobilisation plan

CW introduced the LDP, Expleo, who commenced on 1 December and had landed heavily with full mobilisation underway. CW reinforced the one team approach between the SRO and LDP and handed over to K Clark.

K Clark introduced himself as Programme Manager and Rachel Eyres as the Client Director and Lewis Hall as the LDP PMO.

The LDP had landed on 1 December and their focus is on building a partnership with SRO and operating as one team. The engagement process with programme participants has also started via informal conversations and there will be individual sessions scheduled following PSG as the programme is very keen to understand participants at a party by party level. There will be dialogue at a granular level in order to support programme participants and make the programme very real for all.

Walked through the team overview slide (xx). KC noted that quality will be key for the programme and the programme will be working closely with the IPA once they are onboarded early in the New Year.

On mobilisation – KC noted there is firm focus on the timetable and Milestone 4 being achieved by end Jan, reiterating the fact that Milestone 4 relates to mobilisation of programme participants as well. He noted the importance of making

the programme information easy to access and that programme participants tasks would be easy to understand, The programme portal is a priority in this respect in order to make the programme easy to work with. Technology will be large enabler to the programme moving forward together.

By the end of the January the governance proposals will be agreed, ways of working with the IPA established along with clear programme participants contacts. A number of programme participants launch events are also planned after Milestone 4 with all preparation completed by the end of January.

KC noted all the feedback provided earlier and advised the PPC function is there to listen and understand the granularity of the information in order to assist programme participants. The PPC will be engaging with representative to understand how they are completing their role and providing support to them to ensure engagement at multi levels.

G Wood noted in terms of planned engagements with programme participants, the earlier an agenda for these could be provided the better as they needed preparation time. KC advised this would be provided and that the programme will also work closely with the IPA to ensure no duplication in engagements and minimize disruption.

5. Draft MHHS Budget

CW advised the programme have a formal obligation to consult PSG on the budget. A Love, Elexon Exec, walked through the slide presented to the meeting.

A Love advised earlier in year Elexon had formally consulted on the programme budget. AL ran through the budget slide, this year was forecast £8.5m due to procurement of LDP we are underspent this year so have returned £4m this year. Unusual as would normally wait until end of year, but given the market situation we decided more prudent to return to suppliers asap. Therefore reduced the rate of funding from suppliers from April 21, it is not a reduction of the £90m total programme budget but is it a phasing issue which had now been addressed.

A Love noted there is agreed contingency included in the programme budget. Following the procurement of the LDP, those costs are now known. The IPA procurement is nearing completion and the costs will then be known and the EDA procurement is about to commence therefore will be rebaselining that £90m into early next year to ensure enough funds and contingency.

A Love reiterated as CW had stated earlier that an estimate for any delay in the programme was approximately £1.2m per month and this will impact suppliers and therefore ultimately consumers.

The finances are therefore being reviewed and carefully monitored.

G Wood requested that the MHHS budget be reconsidered as standard agenda item at PSG each month from an agreed appropriate time.

ACTION PSG02-04: The Programme Budget update to be added as a standard PSG agenda item from an appropriate point in time – TBD with PSG.

6. Programme Update

CW updated PSG on progress since the last PSG in terms of the overall programme, with DAG forums in place, two Design working groups and a number of sub groups now having been established.

The Business Separation plan, relating to concerns on conflict of interest, had been formally approved and published by Ofgem on 19 November 2021. COI awareness communications had commenced and all Programme and Elexon staff would be completing a formal online training course, which is due to commence end of December/early January.

The IPA procurement is expected to complete shortly. RC advised that Ofgem are currently in discussions with he preferred supplier and an announcement will be made in early January.

CW raised participation in L4 Work Groups – there is a concern within the programme on current participation at these and he requested that the PSG constituency representatives assist in ensuring participation from the right SME's at these in order to assure the design and ensure the quality of the detailed design. L Northall raised the fact that feedback from representatives attending from the CSD was that participation needed to improve. It was considered that the correct process was in place, the level of contributions from participants needed to increase. There had also been a query raised as to whether a monthly DAG was regular enough given the artefacts requiring approval. C Harden responded to advise if DAG was required more than monthly once artefacts required approval then they would be held as required.

C Harden raised the concept on non-consultation which had been a thread of some feedback received from PSG. He noted that there was clear understanding of the design approach within the Level 3 and Level 4 governance groups. He reiterated there is a day to day consultation process through to the end of design. Participation in this does not have to be at DAG or via the work groups, any programme participants can review the artefacts. C Harden advised there was an article being published in The Clock to promote awareness of this and anyone requiring sight of design artefacts could email Design@MHHSProgramme.co.uk to request access.

G Evans raised that given the feedback provided from PSG on the actions and that this had been acknowledged by the programme, then at what point will it be determined if the programme timelines requires review. How will the process work? CH noted that from the feedback received, the PSG representatives are almost suggesting a replan for mobilisation now, to consider this hard evidence needs to be provided by the programme participants as per the action requested earlier in the meeting. In the meantime the programme has to continue. GE questioned whether then that January is the time to focus on the question and the evidence from the programme participants will identify whether something needs to be actioned or not. CH confirmed that if participants can't engage now then what is their clear proposal as to when they will be able to.

C Harden proposed that both K Clark and himself will meet with each of the PSG constituent representatives individually to complete a more granular discussion on delivery and answer any specific questions they may have. CW will also discuss this further with the DAG chair as to whether any further engagement is required with them.

ACTION PSG02-05: The Programme to provide a Design roadmap for Working Groups up to delivery of detailed design; including what artefacts will be available when and which subjects will be tabled at which working groups.

ACTION PSG02-06: PSG constituent representatives to support the programme in encouraging full participation at the Design Working Groups

ACTION PSG 02-07: MHHS Programme Directors to meet with the individual PSG constituent representatives over the next few weeks (before 19 January PSG) as a formal introduction in order to fully understand constituency concerns and answer specific questions constituent representatives have. The SRO will also discuss this with the DAG chair regarding any further meeting requirements.

7. SEC 162 Update – C Semp

C Semp provided an update on the mod. Consultation had just completed, with IAs returned from Service Providers. This had gone to Work Group and was due to go to the Change Board on 17/12 to determine whether a further IA was to be completed in January.

The most critical issue was around suppliers having 30 sec access vs access for MDR agents which is 24hr scheduled read. Concerns had been raised on this as no assumptions had been included for this.

CH confirmed for settlement purposes the requirement for MDR Agents to have 24hr access was sufficient.

SEC have therefore raised with Ofgem and requested they provide a steer on this and it is hoped this will be provided ahead of the Change Board on 17/12. C Semp noted it was believe that a lot of work would be required to put a business case together to consider this in further detail and this cannot be delivered to the current timescales but other options can be considered if there is a valid business case. She noted it was like that Ofgem will ask SEC to proceed and will look at the additional business case separately and request a further MOD is raised if required.

J Stark raised a concern that the mod does not address the disparity between suppliers and supplier agents in terms of speed of access. He raised the programme objectives and a clear principle about providing competitive access to data and the current approach needs to be flagged as there is a risk it is compromising those requirements. He advised he thought it was a governance issue and questioned why design principles were being determined out of the programme. If there are design questions, this should be progressed through DWG and the governance process.

C Semp noted it was not access to less data, it related to the speed of data.

R Clark, Ofgem, responded to note she had sympathy with the points raised. It was an MHHS question and in terms of not following the programme governance she noted the Sec had commenced before programme governance in place. She noted therefore that notwithstanding the SEC process, it must be subject to same process as the programme and must be open to all programme participants to ensure the issue is being heard and there is engagement. We therefore need to determine how do we apply MHHS governance to get to decision in right way without slowing down the process so do not impact critical path of the programme.

CW advised it is key that the Sec goes to Change Board which is a requirement to take for IA and this will not stop mod changing slightly. We can then discuss further regarding what else needs to happen.

J Stark advised to take IA as it currently stood would be to start undermining a fundamental principle of the programme on competitive access and overturning it for the want of a brief replanning exercise. To park as a problem for later that it is ok to architect to favour one party over another is not acceptable and is in keeping with programme principles.

RC reiterated no decision has been made, the SEC mod going through a process and we (together) need to reach eventual path through this that respects the programme principle. There needs to be a clear determination that if there is a no regrets decision that can be made i.e. postponing the decision. If not hearing a no regrets then not wise and any substantive concerns then Ofgem will not approve if IA not appropriate. A way through this needs to be identified which is least damaging to the programme. As this is a threshold issue, Ofgem have to be involved and detailed analysis needs to be provided.

CS confirmed SEC is not saying 30 sec won't be delivered, it will not be delivered under MP162. Where requirement is different, a parallel process can be run and DCC can deliver in parallel if approved.

P Akrell noted he appreciated R Clark's response on this to ensure fair competition is enabled. He noted the issue has been raised every step of the way, feels concern not taken seriously and should all have been dealt with in one MOD. We need to learn from this and to actually look at what want to achieve overall.

CW noted as programme we will take concerns on board and will work on optimum solution whilst not impacting the programme itself.

8. Next Steps

Actions from the meeting were confirmed – see Action Summary.

Next Meeting was agreed to be **19 January 2022 from 10:00-11:00**, specifically to review progress on the actions assigned at this forum.

The next full PSG meeting will be **2 February 2022**.

Actions Summary

Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date
PSG02-01	PSG constituent representatives are requested to consider nominations for the proposed Level 3 Testing Advisory Group (TAG) and advise the programme by 6 January 2022.	PSG Constituency Reps	6/1/22
PSG02-02	The Programme are to issue a specific Testing Advisory Group (TAG) communication (by 17/12/21) advising of the purpose of the TAG and the nominations process for this Advisory Group.	Programme PMO	17/12/21
PSG02-03	PSG constituent representatives are requested to confirm the status of each of their constituency members programme status and in particular whether <u>each</u> participant is currently mobilised and resourced, or if not, when they intend to be so (and why they currently haven't been able to mobilise as per the baseline plan). If a significant proportion of the constituency participants haven't been able to mobilise, what is the constituencies proposal (including reasoning) for changes to the programme plan (specifically the M4 & M5 milestone and the re-planning exercise). In order to have a meaningful conversation at the January PSG meeting on the 19 th January, we would like written responses to be submitted to the SRO programme mailbox (SRO@mhhsprogramme.co.uk) by Friday, 14 th January at the latest.	PSG Constituency Reps	14/1/22
PSG02-04	The Programme Budget update to be added as a standard PSG agenda item from an appropriate point in time – TBD with PSG.	Programme SRO	30/1/22
PSG02-05	The Programme to provide a Design roadmap for Working Groups up to delivery of detailed design; including what artefacts will be available when and which subjects will be tabled at which working groups.	Programme PMO	23/12/21
PSG02-06	PSG constituent representatives to support the programme in encouraging full participation at the Design Working Groups		23/12/21
PSG02-07	MHHS Programme Directors to meet with the individual PSG constituent representatives over the next few weeks (before 19 January PSG) as a formal introduction in order to fully understand constituency concerns and answer specific questions constituent representatives have. The SRO will also discuss this with the DAG chair regarding any further meeting requirements.	Programme PMO	19/1/22