

MHHS Programme Steering Group Headline Report

Issue date: 07/04/2022

Meeting Number	PSG 006	Venue	Virtual – MS Teams
Date and Time	06 April 2022 1000-1200	Classification	Public

Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date	Update
CR001 and CR002	PSG06-01	In future, when presenting views of programme participants provide market share weighting for DNOs, I&C Suppliers and Small Suppliers	Programme	N/A	
	PSG06-02	Provide next steps for the IPA recommendations on CR001 and CR002 at May PSG	Programme (PSG leads)	04/05/22	
	PSG06-03	Action PSG-DEC10, including submitting CR001/CR002 recommendation to Ofgem for decision	SRO (Chris Welby)	08/04/22	
Readiness Assessment	PSG06-04	Incorporate PSG member feedback in the final Readiness Assessment report including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure the full report represents programme health and presents insights and action plans • Clarify average scores and percentages presented in the slides • Use of 'Agents' and not 'Supplier Agents' • Adjust programme participant representation to reflect market share weighting (as per action PSG06-01) 	Programme (PPC leads)	04/05/22	
Programme updates	PSG06-05	Work with DCC, Exelon and RECCo to bring monthly finance reporting to PSG. Include a month-by-month view, how budgets	Programme (Chris W)	08/06/22	

		change with Programme changes (e.g., new CRs), and budget performance against plan			
Programme dashboards	PSG06-06	<p>Continue to improve the PSG dashboards, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Milestone dashboard: add further detail on the impacts and mitigations of risks/delays Finance dashboard: add commentary and further detail on what the figures show/indicate PPC: expand on the meaning of the data presented and incorporate insights 	Programme (PSG leads)	04/05/22	
Other	PSG06-07	Provide an update on expanding Programme distribution lists to include more than one Principal Contact per organisation	Programme (Andrew M)	04/05/22	
	PSG06-08	Add Open Day outputs to May PSG Agenda	Programme (PMO)	04/05/22	

Decisions

Area	Ref	Decision
CR001 and CR002	PSG-DEC10	The SRO decided to recommend that Ofgem approve CR001. The SRO decided to recommend that Ofgem reject CR002.

Key Discussion Items

Area	Discussion										
CR001 and CR002	<p>The Programme presented the outputs of the impact assessments on CR001 and CR002 as per the PSG papers. The IPA provided their view and recommendation as per the PSG papers. Each constituency representative provided their view on the Change Requests including which Change Request(s) they supported.</p> <p>Note: X denotes support for a CR. Where X is indicated for a CR <i>and</i> for Both CRs, the constituency representative expressed support for both CRs but also had a preference for one CR.</p>										
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Constituency</th> <th>CR001</th> <th>CR002</th> <th>Both CRs</th> <th>Constituency Representative Comments</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Supplier Agent (Independent)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>X</td> <td>The rep noted that Supplier Agent (Independent) constituents were split and that their main concern is how future milestones may be compressed to maintain the Programme end date.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Constituency	CR001	CR002	Both CRs	Constituency Representative Comments	Supplier Agent (Independent)			X	The rep noted that Supplier Agent (Independent) constituents were split and that their main concern is how future milestones may be compressed to maintain the Programme end date.
	Constituency	CR001	CR002	Both CRs	Constituency Representative Comments						
Supplier Agent (Independent)			X	The rep noted that Supplier Agent (Independent) constituents were split and that their main concern is how future milestones may be compressed to maintain the Programme end date.							

Supplier Agent			X	The rep reiterated the Supplier Agent (Independent) rep's comments and stated support for both CRs. The rep added that their constituency would side with suppliers.
Elexon		X		The rep stated support for CR001, noting Elexon were already mobilised. The rep added there was not enough information in CR002 to inform their impact assessment and so they abstained from expressing support for CR002.
National Grid ESO		X		The rep was supportive of CR001. The rep reiterated the Elexon rep's view that CR002 did not have enough detail and so they abstained from expressing support for CR002.
iDNO		X	X	The rep noted their constituency was split and that there was support for both CRs. For CR001, iDNOs were concerned about a lack of supplier engagement. For CR002, iDNOs were supportive of suppliers and could see that they are not able to engage sooner. Based on feedback from constituents, the iDNO rep expressed a preference for CR002.
DNO		X		The rep noted they had a split constituency, with no engagement from 2/6 DNOs. The rep voted in support of CR001, as DNOs are a mobilised party and engaged in Programme working groups. The DNO rep abstained from expressing support for CR002.
I&C Supplier		X	X	The rep stated support for CR001 on the basis that the Programme is not working to current plan and so M5 needs to be moved anyway. The rep noted a preference for CR002 as the CR is seen as solving the problem that exists (supplier engagement), and that CR001 does not solve this problem.
Small supplier		X	X	The rep stated support for both CRs with a marginal bias towards CR002.
Medium Supplier		X		The rep stated support for CR002 as this reflected all of their constituents' views. The rep was not supportive of CR001 as they believed the CR does not solve medium suppliers' priority conflict.
Large Supplier		X	X	The rep noted that they do not represent all large suppliers. The rep stated support for both CRs noting that CR001 is more of a governance modification as the existing timelines can't be met. The rep added that CR001 does still have challenges to meet its timelines. The rep added a preference for CR002, noting that individual large suppliers do have different views on their ability to engage.
Consumer		X		The rep stated support for CR001 as it minimises delay. The rep rejected CR002 due to the risk of increased cost and delay, and the impact on consumers. The rep stated they were not convinced on the need for further engagement given the Programme's confidence in current engagement levels and that some Suppliers are already engaging. The Programme should not move at the pace of the slowest.
DCC		X		The rep stated support for CR001. The rep did not believe CR002 provided enough evidence and saw no significant reason why CR001 can't be met by suppliers.

	<p>There was no consensus for either CR. The SRO made a decision (as per arrangements in the MHHS Governance Framework) to recommend to Ofgem approval of CR001 and rejection of CR002 (decision PSG-DEC10). This was based on the outputs of Impact Assessment and the views of constituency representatives:</p> <p>SRO rationale for recommending CR001 is approved by Ofgem:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Programme is not going to meet the current April 2022 M5 date and therefore an extension to M5 is required. The Programme believes 29 July 2022 is achievable. • All but one of the PSG members were supportive of CR001 (although some supported both CRs). • Balancing the risk of changes that may be required to the design against the risk of delayed benefits to consumers, CR001 presents a lower risk than CR002. This has been confirmed by the Independent Programme Assurer (IPA). This risk will be reduced further with the recommendations made by the IPA. <p>SRO rationale for recommending CR002 is rejected by Ofgem:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fewer PSG members were supportive of CR002. • There was a lack of supporting evidence for CR002. Several PSG members felt CR002 did not have sufficient detail to make a decision. • The challenges causing low supplier engagement in the Programme are unlikely to be resolved by September (the point at which CR002 proposes suppliers would start engaging). There was limited firm commitment from suppliers to review the design at this point. • Suppliers have raised concerns about market conditions. The scheduled Programme replan will help address these concerns. It would be beneficial for all parties to reach an earlier baselining of the design (M5) so the scheduled Programme replan can take place sooner. • CR002 creates a greater risk than CR001 that there will be a delay to the Programme end date and realising benefits for consumers. <p>The SRO will now submit this recommendation to Ofgem to make a decision.</p> <p>The Programme also took further actions including that future CRs should represent Programme Participant views based on market share rather than by license (action PSG06-01) and taking action on the recommendations provided by the IPA (action PSG06-02).</p>
Readiness Assessment 1	An update was provided on Readiness Assessment 1. Feedback was provided by PSG members that will be incorporated in the final Readiness Assessment report (action PSG06-04).
Data Integration Platform (DIP)	The Programme provided an update on the Data Integration Platform (DIP) and its procurement approach.
Further Programme Updates	<p>Several small updates were provided, on the status of other Change Requests (e.g., CR003-05), a reminder on the MHHS Open Day, and an update on Central Party finances.</p> <p>The Programme asked for volunteers to input into Programme replanning activity taking place ahead of M5. Some PSG members were concerned about how the Programme would ensure these volunteers represent all Programme Participants. The Programme confirmed that all Programme Participants would be engaged via consultation on the replan, and that the engagement of volunteers ahead of this was intended to de-risk the consultation process.</p> <p>PSG members provided feedback on Central Party finances. The Programme took an action to provide further detail (action PSG06-05).</p>

Programme Dashboards	Questions were taken on Programme Dashboards. Some dashboards will be updated following feedback (action PSG06-06).
-----------------------------	---

RAID Items Discussed/Raised

RAID area	Description
Supplier Engagement	The majority of discussion focussed on actions to resolve risks related to supplier engagement with the design via a decision on CR001 and CR002 (see PSG-DEC10).
Data Integration Platform (DIP)	A risk was raised on the DIP that the timelines were both ambitious and dependent on a July M5 date as per CR001.