

MHHS Programme Steering Group (PSG) Actions and Minutes

Issue date: 24/01/22

Meeting number	PSG003	Venue	Microsoft Teams Meeting (Virtual)
Date and time	19 January 2022, 10:00-11:00	Classification	Public

Attendees

Elexon Representative (Central Systems Provider)	Lee Northall (LN)
DCC Representative (Smart Meter Central System provider)	Charlotte Semp (CS)
Large Suppliers Representative	Graham Wood (GW)
Medium Suppliers Representative	Gurpal Singh (GS)
I&C representative	Gareth Evans (GE)
Supplier Agent (Independent)	Joel Stark (JS)
Supplier Agent Representative	Paul Akrill (PA)
DNO Representative	Hazel Cotman (HC)
iDNO Representative	Jenny Rawlinson (JR)
National Grid ESO	Keren Kelly (KK) (on behalf of Jonathan Wisdom)
Consumer Representative	Ed Rees (ER)
MHHS SRO	Chris Welby (CW)
MHHS Governance Manager, SRO	Andrew Margan (AM)
Ofgem Sponsor (as observer)	Rachel Clark (RC)
Ofgem (as observer)	Andy MacFaul (AM)
MHHS PMO, SRO	Emma Sheppard (ES)
MHHS Programme Manager, LDP	Keith Clark (KC)
MHHS Programme Director, LDP	Rachel Eyres (RE)
MHHS PMO, LDP	Martin Cranfield (MC)
MHHS Programme Director, SRO	Chris Harden (CH)

Actions Summary

Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date	Update
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 M3 &	PSG Constituency Reps	14/01/2022	Action discussed in detail at PSG 19/01. Action detail has been updated to reference M3 and M5 (as opposed to M4 and M5). Follow up required for Large and Medium Supplier Constituent Representatives to

	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.			provide response to action for discussion at PSG 2nd February. Any content must be submitted to PMO by COP Tuesday 25thJanuary to be included in meeting papers
PSG03-01	Ensure Testing Advisory Group nominations are available via MHHS website	Programme PMO	02/02/22	Complete - please see TAG nominees here
PSG03-02	Programme session to be set up with Supplier Constituency Representatives (Large, Medium and I&C) w/c 24/01/22 to discuss Supplier mobilisation and wider programme plan.	Programme SRO	28/01/22	
PSG03-03	Share Ofgem baseline plan with PSG members	Programme PMO	02/02/22	Complete – shared with PSG members alongside Headline Report
PSG03-04	Consider the PSG communications approach going forward (e.g., pack issue to wider participants, use of WebEx)	Programme SRO	15/02/22	

Minutes

1. Welcome

CW welcomed all to the meeting and ran through the agenda for the meeting.

2. Minutes & Review of Actions

Minutes of the PSG meeting 15 December 2021 were APPROVED.

GE noted that he had already raised via email that whilst the minutes were technically correct, the wording and detail of actions should be considered.

Action updates provided as per the actions slide

GE asked for list of Testing Advisory Group (TAG) nominees. AW noted this is published on the website and that it is primarily Supplier reps awaiting nomination, while most other constituencies have reps. Consumer reps have suggested they do not need to attend for now.

KC noted that consumer rep is the only one outstanding for PSG02-07 (meeting with PDs).

ACTION: PMO to ensure TAG Constituency Representatives are available on the website (if not already) and share link to access

3. PSG Feedback (Action 02-03)

CW noted the main agenda item for today is for PSG constituent representatives to present their feedback to the action PG02-03, as set at the last PSG in December. CW thanked all for providing their written feedback and requested each constituent in turn to give 2/3 mins summary update, to then open floor for discussion.

DCC (C Semp) - Fully mobilised and in process of doing changes for MHHS service. Enabling changes through Sec Mod via Sec Governance and currently in refinement stage, with final Impact Assessment due 14/2/22. Release targeted for capability in Nov 23 and on target to deliver, and happy to align with any wider programme milestones for M4 and M5.

Elexon (L Northall) – Fully mobilised, suppliers commencing this week to deliver changes needed for start of Industry testing. Working to key milestone of changes to systems and processes for end of April 2023. Provided SPOC names

and quite a few teams supporting L4 WGs to get designs completed. Dependent on MHHS programme design to complete their own design.

DNO (H Cotman) – Majority are mobilised with named resources attending WGs. Named resources are also those working on FSP. Engaged technical service providers for applications shared across DNOs and these are remobilised and working.

IDNOs (J Rawlinson) – Similar to DNO – majority are ready and mobilising with individual plans in place. Same teams working on FSP and whilst ready and mobilised, this remains the highest risk.

National Grid (K Kelly) – resourced and mobilised and supporting the relevant L4 WGs & sub-groups (not all are applicable to NGESO). Recognise scale of IT change experienced by ESO is less than some other PPs.

Supplier Agents (P Akrill) – Independent SAs (data service providers) are very mobilised and taking part in L4 WGs. Metering agents less engaged but there is less impact to their business so not duly concerning. Inhouse agents within energy suppliers are not as mobilised and therefore are more concerned about the timeframes as their plans more closely linked to plans of host supply business.

I&C (G Evans) – Safe to say in comparison to parties without customer exposure, I&C suppliers are not mobilised, don't think they are mobilised and think there are a number of challenges in order to mobilise. Surprised at the action and the expectations on Supplier reps to go out to participants to understand their status. Some participants reticent to talk to him. Not mobilised due to dealing with critical issues in supply market and delivering FSP. Other reps do not have the same exposure to the supply market.

Large Supplier (G Wood) – advised that he agreed with GE and echoed his comments. Holds same view from his suppliers.

Medium Suppliers (G Singh) – advices they are still assessing and have requested resources to see what can get allocated and what is the art of the possible. Requested further time to formulate a response and allow request to go across organisation.

CW noted there was still not Small Supplier rep currently and that it would be fair to say their views will be the same as other supplier reps.

CW opened the item for discussion

GW raised that his suppliers would like to have some separate/additional engagement with the programme on the design roadmap that came out to get a better understanding of what its looking to achieve and how. PPs have some questions. Acknowledges there is info out there but asks if someone could assist with a session (possible Q&A) with the central team that would be helpful for suppliers and in conversations required internally. There are challenges for suppliers in engaging with designs, and they are still figuring out the right people to send to meetings, what is required of them, and how this maps to all other work going on.

KC advised already a session held with suppliers to ensure roadmap understood. Supportive of ensuring roadmap is well understood, although if you are in WGs you get better understanding roadmap and artefact pathways. The more you can engage, the better an understanding you get. If we can do sessions to enable understanding then we will, to support you to have a better idea on proposed timelines.

CH noted 2 sessions (one on 11th Jan with 37 attendees and one yesterday with 30 attendees) had taken place and another on 25th Jan specifically on change of agent. CH noted to GW that both Ian Smith and he are happy to do a session and explain the Design roadmap to PPs.

GW noted this would be helpful to have a session for programme leads to come and speak, to ensure PPs are talking within their organisations. Happy to have as an open supplier forum for all suppliers rather than separate. GS and GE's suppliers could therefore attend. GE noted he would like to attend. AM noted GE's constituents have also raised this and that the session should be open to all suppliers.

ACTION: Programme Session to be set up with Suppliers (Large, Medium and I&C) w/c 24/1/22 week to provide wider understanding of programme milestones and design roadmap.

CS noted it would be useful to have a visual representation and see the cross-functional milestones for the design roadmap, once everyone has crystallised initial thinking. This would help with alignment. KC noted he would like to see artefacts in a visual and see any critical pathway. This will allow better tracking to M5.

GE asked what are we attempting to achieve for the various groups? The concern is not IF we are going to deliver a set of artefacts, but that there is a lot of artefacts not getting scrutiny that people desire. Is that the sticking point? GE

gets the feeling the programme can and will continue whether it gets input or not, so what are we trying to get from people – delivery or commentary? Delivery is not in question but rather if we are comfortable with WHAT is being delivered.

CH responded that programme is delivery focussed. We want people to comment on the design. We will be moving toward design baseline in April and at that point we need to determine how much consultation we have had in certain areas, and therefore which options we have to go forward. For example, there are certain options in the supplier area around change of agent upon which we need to consult – there is an option for a solution so the question is, is that the option that suppliers want? Once we have baseline, we need to evaluate how much input we've had and the likelihood of change after that point, seeking preference from the Constituency Reps.

GE advised he agreed and says we need to be clear on problem. Problem is suppliers cannot provide scrutiny against the timelines issued, not if artefacts being delivered. This issue is not design delivery but the input of reps. Without scrutiny, the design will then be questioned and reevaluated at greater cost later down the line. KC advised we will have to do a risk assessment in the absence of any alternative proposal. Without a proposal we will continue to M5 and then compete a risk assessment to assess the input of reps.

CH advised we are getting some input, so we need to determine how much input is needed for making a decision on the baseline. GE advised programme are not getting the input you want from suppliers. This is because supplier have a set of challenges and other constituencies do not have same level of problems. Question is if the group will continue with this concern, or will the group start accept/believing we need to change the timeline to allow engagement with suppliers to occur? Believes this is where difference of opinion comes from.

GW noted that they definitely want time to answer the question and engage, however they need more time to consider the action. They need to answer the question 'if you can't engage now, when can you engage?'. GW understands KC's comment that if the programme does not have an alternate proposal and nothing else is on table then we carry on as we are. GW noted they were unable to respond to the action due to timeframes and that they need to develop a proposal for when they can engage. They are committed to providing this ahead of next PSG (February). CH noted this would be very helpful, rather than the programme imposing the plan on you. This proposal needs to reference the milestones and assessment against M3 and M5 (not M4 and M5 as was incorrectly included in the action, as highlighted by GS). CH noted M5 will be affected by what happens to M3. M3 requires everyone to be mobilised, and the programme is assuming you cannot input into the design unless your programme is mobilised. This means delays to M3 also delay M5. CH offered help to reps to detail exactly what this means for them.

GW noted it would be good to talk offline to answer the questions ahead of next PSG. A conversation on roadmap will feed into action responses. GW is committed to providing an answer over next couple of weeks. GE added he would like help too. CH suggests setting up an action for a session next week with Suppler reps.

ACTION: confirmation of above action - programme Session to be set up with Suppliers (Large, Medium and I&C) w/c 24/1/22 week to provide wider understanding of programme milestones and design roadmap.

KC added that the programme needs to know when each participant will be ready to do their own design, build, test as M3 and M5 are linked. This means conversation needs to be about both milestones.

GE noted that only so much can be done centrally when there is one rep to many participants (easy if one-to-one). Something we need to develop is how we bring all participants in to answer actions. Questions need to be direct and straightforward asks (e.g. q1, q2, q3, q4, not an essay question which can be difficult to interpret) shared in email. The programme should start pushing a formed set of questions out rather than using reps, as they then have to get 20/30 organisations to articulate what they think. Everyone does want to give answers as ultimately, we all have to deliver the programme.

CW queried 6 SPOCS received from suppliers through PPC engagement. KC noted he needed to check but did not think we have all yet and that this would help. KC noted PPC function is to allow point-to-point direct conversations with PPs and therefore this would support the reps too. In principle, if we have the right SPOCs then we can get right people to right debates.

GW raised meeting next week (action above), he will ensure right people at the session and not a waste of time. CH ask if everyone has seen the Ofgem transition plan (spreadsheet table, plan on a page) and requested suppliers review this ahead of the session. GW advised it would be good to send this out.

ACTION: PMO to share Ofgem baseline plan with PSG members

GW raised PM2 in the Ofgem plan. Programme re-baseline was talked about being done in Oct/Nov but after consultation it was agreed to be after design work. Question now is where PM2 happens and how it fits in to where we

are today. Ask to KC as part of mobilisation - at what point do we get a view? KC noted based on M5 baseline being end April then the PM2 activity will be May/June/July. Therefore, end of July is a period of consulting and re-baselining on re-baseline plan. GW asked if this means planning can happen between now and then, but physical plan wouldn't kick off until then? KC agreed and would want and expect to engage as we start to establish the baseline in advance of M5, and then once M5 is reviewed and approved we can review what the plan means for each of the PPS for DBT and consultation on the re-baseline plan.

JR noted we are still working to design baseline at end of April – is this realistic? KC noted there is some risk around it, a lot to do and in many conversations, risks have been raised about end of April. Final DAG is planned for May and may be earlier if we can. However, this remains the plan. JR noted there may be changes by Feb PSG and we might know more from supplier discussions. Understand we should work to original timelines until we know different. Would welcome to see as soon as programme if timescale is not doable, we need to know ASAP due to competing programmes. KC acknowledged request for earliest warning of any date changes.

GS questioned on Small Supplier rep and any insight/update on this. AM advised he'd spoken to ESG (IT infrastructure provider for smaller suppliers) on this as they have represented Small Suppliers on FSP. Small suppliers are at DAG and due to various commitments, this is currently the focus. They do want to send a programme person to PSG but have not recruited anyone yet. This will be reviewed once programme person is recruited. Therefore, requested to leave seat open for now while they work through this.

CW noted awaiting Small Suppliers to come forward and will fill position when they do. Also, no Small Supplier rep at TAG – we are conscious of it and need to resolve to ensure voice heard. If anyone comes forward the positions will be filled. PPC element is contacting Small Suppliers so initial contact has been made and we understand their position, so not completely blind. Fair to say not unreasonable that the issues for other suppliers (Large, Medium, I&C) are likely to be similar.

CW asked R Clarke as to whether she would like to comment on Constituent Mobilisation from Ofgem's view. RC noted that Ofgem have listened to what has been said and good to hear the debate. Interested to see how things develop at next PSG.

GW – asked on future comms of information from this group. The PSG packs have been issued to reps, however for FSP Delivery Group the information goes to wider audience direct and they have the benefit of a broadcast WebEx. He noted he was mindful it had been a light agenda this time but requested if in future the programme will 1) look to send PSG info to all/wider audience? 2) expect to do something similar to WebEx broadcast when have meaningful packs to walk through?

KC responded that the comms approach is in the process of being agreed and the programme will review. CW noted this will be taken on board. The information is currently shared on the website and via the Clock, but this not the same as sharing direct. Doing things direct will require key points of contacts within each PP (SPOCs) in order for the programme to ensure the comms are reaching the right audience. Original idea was to highlight in newsletter rather than send directly. Notwithstanding this, the programme will consider the requests and take onboard, particularly if WebEx may be useful for ad hoc, larger debates

ACTION: Programme to consider communications approach for PSG going forward (e.g., wider pack issue, WebEx)

CW- actions from the meeting were confirmed – see Action Summary above. Action PSG02-03 was agreed to be kept open for February PSG to allow for Supplier responses. CW asked for any agenda items for February PSG, none provided.

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