

## MHHS PSG Headline Report

Issue date: 04/02/2022

Meeting Number	<b>4</b>	Venue	<b>Virtual – MS Teams</b>
Meeting Date and Time	<b>02 February 2022 1000-1200</b>	Classification	<b>Public</b>

	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date
<b>Actions</b>	PSG04-01	<p>Supplier mobilisation plans to be developed further:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme and supplier constituency reps to meet to develop the supplier change proposal further, exploring additional options and adding further detail. Benefits and costs of any options are to be assessed, with a further proposal and evidence base to be brought forward. Wider supplier programme participants (in addition to reps) are to be engaged in the discussion.</li> <li>• Programme to engage wider constituencies in addition to suppliers once the supplier proposal is developed further, to ensure the impacts on wider programme parties are considered</li> <li>• Programme and IPA to meet to discuss the evidence required to demonstrate that a change proposal is justified. IPA to join supplier discussions as required.</li> <li>• Programme to schedule ad hoc PSG as required to review new supplier proposal</li> </ul>	<p>Programme Supplier reps (Gurpal Singh, Graham Wood, Gareth Evans), IPA leads (Dave Gandee)</p>	23/02/2022
	PSG04-02	Develop a consumer log to track/flag consumer issues from advisory/working groups to the consumer constituency rep	PMO	02/03/2022

	PSG04-03	Develop MHHS Governance Framework as per governance arrangement proposals presented and discussed in PSG. New version of MHHS Governance Framework to be shared with PSG group for review by correspondence ahead of March PSG	Programme	23/02/2022
	PSG04-04	Raise migration membership and role at upcoming TAG (16/02) to determine how migration may develop within the TAG, including migration membership requirements	Chris W	09/02/2022
	PSG04-05	Discuss migration role in the TAG with TAG leads, Kate Goodman and Adrian Ackroyd	Jason B	09/02/2022
	PSG04-06	Review mobilisation of a 'Comms and Engagement' governance group in May PSG	Chris W	04/05/2022
	PSG04-07	Review RAID log to ensure that the open Small Supplier nominations are captured	PMO	02/03/2022

<b>Decisions</b>	<b>Governance Arrangement Proposals</b>	The governance arrangement proposals were signed off in principle with the Programme to update the Governance Framework and send to PSG members for review and approval by correspondence. Actions on migration are to be discussed in the TAG (see actions PSG04-03 and 04-04).
------------------	-----------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Key Discussion Items</b>	<b>Supplier Mobilisation Proposal</b>	<p>Medium, Large and I&amp;C Suppliers presented their proposal for changes to the programme timelines to M5, as per the Joint Supplier Constituency Response to action PSG02-03. Suppliers reiterated their commitment to the MHHS programme but reaffirmed concerns, such as changes to market conditions since the original plan was created, that have led to their proposal. Suppliers added that they believed the proposed delay could be prevented from impacting go-live by adjusting milestones later in the plan, such as migration.</p> <p>Other PSG members were given the opportunity to ask questions and provide their opinion in turn, before a wider group discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All PSG members were sympathetic with the supplier position, including the risk posed by low supplier engagement in the Design phase and the challenges faced by suppliers in providing resource against current timelines. Some reps agreed that some delay to current timelines may be needed, noting the number of artefacts to be completed by end of April for M5.</li> <li>• Constituency reps raised concerns about the costs of a delay and associated delayed benefits realisation, noting that a delay adds risks. Some reps also noted that they were already mobilised as per M3, and that work had already been completed/is in progress.</li> <li>• Some constituency reps raised concerns that the proposal lacked detail and did not effectively consider the impacts of a delay (including on their own constituencies). Reps also noted that some activities in the proposal could be completed in parallel and that the proposal had implications for later milestones.</li> <li>• The Programme noted that this proposal was a 7-10 month delay that would likely also cause a delay to programme go live. The Programme added that further detail was required, and that other options need to</li> </ul>
-----------------------------	---------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>considered and risk assessed, with evidence provided to justify a change. The Programme reiterated that, until a proposal is formally accepted, the programme was obliged to continue against the current timelines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ofgem reiterated the importance of the programme and that implementation dates could not slip, and that all Programme Participants had regulatory obligations to meet the timelines. Ofgem commented that it is up to the programme how it is delivered, as long as it is within the current timeline, and that any changes &gt;3mo to a Level 1 milestone need to be signed off by Ofgem and have had proper scrutiny.</li> </ul> <p>It was agreed that additional work was required at pace to develop the supplier proposal further. This includes: exploring wider options; gaining views of wider supplier Programme Participants; assessing the impact of any options; and building a more detailed evidence base to justify the proposal (see action PSG04-01). Outputs will be for review again by the PSG.</p>
	<p><b>Programme Dashboards</b></p>	<p>Four programme dashboards were presented by the programme: milestone dashboard, PPC dashboard, Design dashboard, and Risk Assessment. Some comments were raised regarding the content of the dashboards such as when the Risks and Issues would be made available for all parties to see and that the PPC dashboard reflected views of Programme Participants from PPC discussions and not PSG minuted discussions.</p>
	<p><b>Governance Arrangement Proposals</b></p>	<p>Proposals for updates to the MHHS Governance Framework were proposed by the Programme as per the meeting papers. Concern was raised on the inclusion of migration within the Testing Advisory Group (TAG) because testing and migration would require different experts. The benefits of including migration within the TAG were discussed. This included that there is need for close collaboration between these parties and that there would be a Migration Working Group operating below the TAG, with migration separating from the TAG in future. It was agreed to take to TAG the option of having additional migration expert reps to cover migration matters in the expanded TMAG.</p> <p>The proposals were agreed in principle, to be updated in the Governance Framework for review and approval by the PSG in correspondence.</p>