

MHHS Programme Steering Group Minutes and Actions

Issue date: 11/04/2022

Meeting Number	PSG 007	Venue	Virtual – MS Teams
Date and Time	04 May 2022 1000-1200	Classification	Public

Attendees

Chair

Chris Welby (CW) MHHS IM SRO

Industry Representatives

Andrew Campbell (AC)	Small Supplier Representative
Charlotte Semp (CS)	DCC Representative (Smart Meter Central System provider)
Ed Rees (ER)	Consumer Representative
Gareth Evans (GE)	I&C Supplier Representative
Gurpal Singh (GS)	Medium Supplier Representative
Graham Wood (GW)	Large Supplier Representative
Hazel Cotman (HC)	DNO Representative
Joel Stark (JS)	Supplier Agent (Independent) Representative
Karen Thompson-Lilley (KTL)	National Grid ESO Representative
Lee Northall (LN)	Elexon Representative (Central Systems Provider)
Paul Akrill (PA)	Supplier Agent Representative

MHHS IM

Andrew Margan (AM)	Governance Manager
Chris Harden (CH)	Programme Director
Jason Brogden (JB)	Industry SME
Keith Clark (KC)	Programme Manager
Martin Cranfield (MC)	PMO Governance Lead
Miles Winter (MW)	PMO Governance Support
Pete Edward (PE)	PPC Lead
Warren Fulton (WF)	Outcome Assurance Manager

Other Attendees

Andy MacFaul (AMF)	Ofgem (as observer)
David Gandee (DG)	MHHS IPA Lead
Rachel Clark (RC)	Ofgem Sponsor (as observer)
Richard Shilton (RS)	MHHS IPA Lead

Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due
Programme next steps	PSG07-01	Communicate M5 Acceptance Criteria to Programme Participants	Programme	01/06/2022

Readiness Assessment 1 (RA1)	PSG07-02	Speak offline regarding I&C engagement and forums to be established following learnings from RA1	Andrew Margan, Gareth Evans	01/06/2022
	PSG07-03	Provide a definition of mobilisation to inform PPs on expectations ahead of DBT	Programme	01/06/2022
	PSG07-04	Provide bullet points to the PMO on any additional support requested (above that already provided) by constituency members from the Programme that would further enable mobilisation and ensure Programme Participants are ready for their DBT	PSG Constituency Reps	08/06/2022
Change Requests	PSG07-05	Action the decision PSG-DEC11 including updating the MHHS Programme Governance Framework	Programme (PMO, Jason Brogden)	01/06/2022
Other	PSG07-06	Add the following items to the agenda for June PSG: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design risk deep-dive Programme outcomes and KPIs (enabling benefits realisation) Definition of mobilisation E2E Testing and Integration Strategy, including participant roles and responsibilities 	Programme (PMO)	01/06/2022

Decisions

Area	Dec Ref	Decision
Change Requests	PSG-DEC11	The PSG approved Change Request CR005 (Programme Cooperation Principles)

RAID Items

RAID area	Description
Design and M5	The PSG requested a deep-dive into risks related to the delivery of the Design and M5. This has been added to the agenda for June's PSG (see action PSG07-05)

Minutes

1. Welcome

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting and ran through the meeting agenda.

2. Minutes and Actions Review

The minutes from PSG 06 April were **APPROVED**.

The Chair ran through the actions as per the actions slide. The following actions had additional discussion:

- The Chair asked for PSG feedback on action PSG04-06, none given.
- The Chair noted that further detail under action PSG05-01 would be picked up in the CCIAG.
- On action PSG05.1-02, the Chair noted the Change Control process had now been signed off by Ofgem and the IPA and documents should now be uploaded on the [MHHS website](#).
- On action PSG06-07, AM clarified that organisations can have up to three principle contacts.

3. Programme Next Steps, including Design Workstream

KC ran through next steps for the Programme following approval of CR001 as per the slide. KC noted Ofgem's decision included two specific next steps for the Programme.

KC ran through the Programme's next steps for each of IPA recommendations related to CR001/2 as per the slide. IPA Overall Recommendation 1 - about 20 volunteers have come forward to support developing the strawman for the Programme re-plan. Overall Recommendation 2 - the CCIAG is due to be set up by the end of June. The Programme intends to publish the planning strawman at M5 with the eventual re-baseline plan published later this year following two cycles of consultation. KC noted on CR001 IPA Recommendation 1 and 2 that a fortnightly status report, tracking the progress of the design delivery, will be published. For IPA CR001 Recommendation 3, suppliers will be mobilised by September.

KC ran through the proposed approach to the MHHS re-plan as per the slide. KC noted parties had seen this slide before and further detail including dates had now been added following CR001 approval. KC highlighted a few items on the plan such as the steps required to deliver M5 and the move of M3 as per the IPA recommendations. KC also highlighted the position of RA2 in proximity to M3.

JS queried the exit/acceptance criteria for M5. KC noted this would be communicated to all parties well in advance of M5 to ensure confidence is in line with the criteria. JS queried the date the PSG would see this. KC responded that this would be communicated at the next PSG. KC noted next month there would be a plan of engagement ahead of M5 and up to M3, and that parties should not necessarily wait for the September M3 date given to be mobilised (i.e. mobilised parties should progress ahead of M3). GS queried if the M3 milestone was part of CR001 or CR002. KC noted M3 hadn't been changed and was not part of CR001 but that the September date given was the 'latest date' of M3 that should be agreed as per the IPA recommendations.

ACTION PSG07-01: Programme to communicate M5 Acceptance Criteria to Programme Participants

WF provided a high-level view of the status of the design against the plan in CR001 as per the slide:

- **On objective 1:** WF noted the new CR001 design roadmap had been issued. WF noted learnings from Tranche 1 and 2, specifically to move QA earlier in the process. WF noted Tranche 1 should be approved next week at DAG following the SI assurance report that identified no major issues. Tranche 2 statistics will be published next week (same format and content as those for Tranche 1 in this PSG pack). The bulk of Tranche 2 artefacts are on track. Tranche 3 is on track. Tranche 4 has some inherent risk due to optionality, with the critical path of artefacts being managed closely.
- **On objective 2:** WF noted development of the design is still seeing strong engagement from across industry with working groups continuing to be scheduled.
- **On objective 3:** WF noted it is important the design can be consumed by participants and assurance is underway through the design workstream to ensure this is the case. As per the IPA recommendations, a fortnightly status update will be provided.

The Chair asked for any questions. None received.

4. Readiness Assessment 1 (RA1)

AM thanked Programme Participants for their responses to RA1. AM explained that RA1 had tested five key areas: engagement, programme plans, points of contact, risks and mitigations, and business case approval. AM highlighted that the response rate metrics now incorporated market share. Most of the response rates were >90% engagement. AM noted there was generally strong support for MHHS given its contribution towards Net Zero targets.

GE asked about the market share adjustment, as many of the figures presented on the slides were below 90%. AM responded that many of the respondent groups that are below 90% are driven by less-impacted sub-groups. For example, some categories, such as software providers, have a number of constituents that are less critical to the programme, hence lower engagement, so this has been weighted. AM noted engagement from critical parties had been strong.

AM provided an overview of RA1 output themes. 20 parties took part in deep dive interviews which drew out the themes:

1. Reluctance to commit time and resources. AM noted this related to challenges previously discussed such as FSP commitments.
2. Strong awareness of the potential benefits of MHHS

3. A lack of communication between Suppliers and their Software Providers. AM confirmed that communication responsibilities does lie with suppliers and that targeted engagement is required to ensure the requirements of both groups are considered/addressed by the Programme.
4. Fears of a condensed delivery timeline.
5. A perception from a number of I&C Suppliers and MOPs that the Programme does not impact them. The Programme believes this is incorrect as a number of MOPs will still need to interface with the DIP. GE asked if a separate education piece would be done for suppliers with Profile Classes 5-8. AM confirmed yes this is planned, with various education forums TBC. GE asked if I&C Suppliers would be specifically called out,(i.e. those who only have a small number of sites that are directly supplied) and if the education forums should be directly aimed at those with different Profile Classes. AM agreed with this suggestion and proposed he and GE caught up offline to work through this further.

ACTION PSG07-02: AM and GE to speak offline regarding I&C engagement and forums to be established following learnings from RA1

RS asked if there were any actions for the Programme to take forward as a result for RA1, for example if there was anything further the Programme could be doing to improve responses to RAs. AM responded that a longer lead time for RAs would be helpful. MC clarified that a number of specific learnings and next steps from RA1 were in the appendix of the slide pack. AM provided some examples of actions being taken following RA1, such as the difference between Suppliers / Software Providers and their understandings of their obligations. PE added further specific examples, such as on the difference between types of Supplier Agents and how going forward these would be split out to target each group more appropriately.

CH noted the first theme on time and resource commitments was important, and that the Programme does not want to mobilise and then be in a position where DBT is not possible for participants. CH noted that once Participants are mobilised, they will be able to start their DBT. The Programme will run sessions to explain parts of the design so Participants are ready for DBT. CH asked PSG Constituency Reps to help the Programme by asking their constituents what they would like help with ahead of DBT, so the Programme can best support Programme Participants (e.g. through targeted sessions that build and maintain momentum). JB reiterated that with a design-led approach, it is important to keep parties engaged.

ACTION PSG07-04: PSG Constituency Representatives to provide bullet points to the PMO on any additional support requested (above that already provided) by constituency members from the Programme that would further enable mobilisation and ensure Programme Participants are ready for their DBT

JS gave feedback from their constituency that the frequency of L4 Design Working Groups (WGs) outside of central services had been raised as inadequate, with insufficient dialogue. This included comments not being accurately and consistently captured. Pre-DBT there are concerns that there is not enough Programme support for the facilitation of WGs and capturing of feedback from those. JB noted this was important. CH thanked JS for the feedback and asked JS for specific concerns to be shared and also raised at DAG.

GE commented that their constituents were unsure what the definition of 'fully mobilised' was, querying what Programme Participants are aiming for. GE noted that when it comes to DBT this is easier to define, but at this stage it's unclear. AM suggested it would mean a number of things such as having a programme plan, SPOCs ready, a risk register. GE asked for this to be written down and communicated. CH accepted this may mean different things to different people, and for smaller organisations this definition would be different. It would include things such as if an organisation is ready for DBT, has a programme plan in place, has individuals/teams actively engaged in WGs, has sufficient understanding of the Design/TOM, and has resource to deliver the Programme.

ACTION PSG07-03: Programme to Provide a definition of mobilisation to inform PPs on expectations ahead of DBT

The Chair invited any final questions. AM noted that the programme plans of those Programme Participants that provided them in RA1 were of a high quality. AM asked reps to communicate to constituents that if they have questions or would like clarifications on RA1, they should reach out to PPC who will set up sessions as required.

5. Change Requests

JB ran through the CR005 Impact Assessment outputs as per the slide Attachment 1. The intention for the change to the Ways of Working Principles is to improve Programme delivery and promote collaborative working. The principles

will enable Programme Participants to work more efficiently together. The Programme highlighted concerns raised by Programme Participants through Impact Assessment as per the slides and noted there are ways to mitigate these concerns. JB added that the concerns raised do not sufficiently suggest that the principles should be changed or the Change Request rejected, and therefore the set of cooperation principles proposed in the Change Request (CR) should remain the same until a further CR is raised.

GW asked about the potential for making further amendments in the future to address concerns that have been raised, and if updating the principles with the proposed amendments would be an ongoing action or if it would be for Programme Participants to bring forward a change. JB confirmed that approving the Change Request was a binary action. GW clarified whether the principles would be reviewed in an ongoing way or whether there would need to be a point at which they were called into question specifically. JB confirmed the latter, and that any new changes would need to have a CR raised. This CR would then be considered by the Programme and either approved or rejected.

The Chair moved to vote for support by a show of hands:

Parties that supported CR005: 10 parties (JS, GE, PA, HC, AC, CS, GW, KC, ER, LN)

Parties that did not support CR005: 1 party (KTL)

Abstentions: None

The Chair noted that, while the support had not been unanimous, there was an overwhelming consensus to approve CR005. As SRO, the Chair made the decision to approve the CR. The Chair noted the Programme can engage with KTL and KTL can raise a CR if they would like.

DECISION PSG-DEC11: The PSG approved Change Request CR005 (Programme Cooperation Principles)

ACTION PSG07-05: Programme to action the decision PSG-DEC11 including updating the MHHS Programme Governance Framework

CW provided an update on CR003. The CCAG voted in favour of recommending Ofgem approve this CR. Ofgem have agreed to endeavour to get a response to the CCAG by the next CCAG meeting in May. CW invited any questions, none received.

6. Open Day highlights

AM ran through the Open Day highlights as per the slides. AM noted the PPC team are looking to set up sessions to engage with Programme Participants to bring all parties up to speed as there were some Participants who were very knowledgeable about the Programme but some who were less so.

AM noted suppliers had voiced concerns over consumer impacts and that this sits with Ofgem and is outside the scope of the Programme. Concerns such as this can also be raised in CCIAG once mobilised. RC clarified on the statement that Ofgem are responsible for delivering consumer outcomes. Ofgem's decisions in establishing the Programme are geared towards delivering consumer outcomes, and in terms of messaging and engagement with consumers, Ofgem will lead on that. However, the Programme needs to be responsible for delivering consumer outcomes in that it is the Programme that will deliver the design, implementation etc. which will give the consumers the desired outcomes. AM agreed with the clarification. JB noted the Programme has an ongoing piece of work on benefits realisation and the outcomes as a result of the Programme. This work ensures that the enablers and facilitators for benefits will be there throughout the Programme. The Programme are working through this with the IPA over the next week or two and then will come to Ofgem. This can then come to PSG (see action PSG07-06).

RC noted there were a number of questions at the Open Day regarding the benefits to consumers. JB confirmed this was being looked at and is the focus of the Design. CW confirmed that benefits realisation gives something for the Programme to aim for as it provides focus as to the end goals of the Programme. CW noted benefits and outcomes for the consumer are at the heart of the Programme.

GW commented that it was great to see the playback from the Open Day and noted that having ways of mitigating consumers not engaging with the benefits (e.g., consumer comms risks) would be good. JB confirmed the focus at the moment is on Programme delivery, but that communications risks would be looked at further down the line.

AM commented there were plans already to hold another Open Day before the end of the year, as the Programme had found significant beneficial outcomes. AM added that over 100 questions were received from Programme Participants. The objective is to issue answers to these by Friday 06 May. AM noted a number of helpful comments and feedback from attendees for improving the next Open Day. CW invited Programme Participants to contact the PPC if they had any further feedback.

7. Programme Dashboards

The Chair invited questions on the Programme Dashboards. The Chair highlighted an error on the Finance dashboard regarding wording related to March 2023 figures including the contingency budget. Presentation of the contingency budget had been changed to give its own column.

GW commented on the milestone status dashboard that there was a question from their constituents on the RAG status for M5 - should this be Green or Amber as there were some previous issues that were Amber around the Design. On the risk themes for PSG, GW queried if there could be a deeper dive on risks that impact delivery of M5 milestone, for example if there are risks associated with engagement, technical elements of design or some of the qualitative issues around T2 documentation (see action PSG07-06). CH invited GW to pick this up with WF if they feel there are any elements of the design that need further attention.

GW asked with regard to the DIP Update dashboard that it would be helpful if the remit of parties engaging with that procurement process were wider than that of just the energy industry, as the processing of very large quantities of data may mean there are parties outside of the energy industry with valuable expertise here. CH confirmed there are ten bidders still left in the process and that there is a good spread of parties.

GW noted a comment from his constituents on the design dashboard about review cycles being staggered. So far, T1 and T2 have not been staggered but have overlapped. GW asked if T1's 5% of comments resulted in any substantial change to the design or if these comments were small. WF confirmed these changes are small changes that the team are comfortable and do not have a big impact on the design.

The Chair invited any further questions. None received.

8. Summary and next steps

MC summarised the actions from the meeting.

LN asked for an update on the Test Strategy, noting they wanted to understand target dates for Programme Participants to have DBT ready. LN queried if this could be brought to next month's PSG. JB confirmed the E2E Testing and Integration Strategy was approved by TMAG and published last Friday. JB noted content in the Strategy will provide structure for the replanning exercise. LN asked if this group should have a common understanding of key aspects of this. JB noted there is a table in the test strategy document that outlines the expectations for different parties in each test phase and that this could be brought to June PSG.

ACTION PSG07-06: Add the following items to the agenda for June PSG:

- **Design risk deep-dive**
- **Programme outcomes and KPIs (enabling benefits realisation)**
- **Definition of mobilisation**
- **E2E Testing and Integration Strategy, including participant roles and responsibilities**

The Chair highlighted that the next PSG is an afternoon meeting and is on the second Wednesday of the month due to the Jubilee bank holiday in early June.

The Chair invited any further comments or questions.

GS asked what the latest is on the Data Consent changes for obtaining and using consumption data. RC confirmed there was a statutory consultation due this week. GS asked if the results of these licence changes and getting consent from consumers, is it possible to use this consent for MHHS. RC confirmed these are separate and this is set out in the consultation.

The Chair noted this was GS's last PSG and thanked them for their contributions. The Chair closed the meeting.

Date of next PSG: 08 June 2022