MHHS Programme Steering Group Minutes and Actions

Issue date: 13/07/2022

Meeting Number	**PSG 009**		Venue	**Virtual – MS Teams**
Date and Time	**06 July 2022 1400-1600**		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)
Chris Price (CP)   DNO Representative
Ed Rees (ER)   Consumer Representative
Gareth Evans (GE)   I&C Supplier Representative
Graham Wood (GW)   Large Supplier Representative
Jonathan Hawkins (JH)   RECCo Representative
Jenny Rawlinson (JR)   iDNO Representative
Joel Stark (JS)   Supplier Agent (Independent) Representative
Lee Northall (LN)   Elexon Representative (Central Systems Provider)
Neil Dewar (ND)   National Grid ESO Representative
Paul Akrill (PA)   Supplier Agent Representative
Vladimir Black (VB)   Medium Supplier Representative

MHHS IM
Andrew Margan (AM)   Governance Manager
Chris Harden (CHa)   Programme Director
Ian Smith (IS)   Design Manager
Justin Andrews (JA)   DAG Chair
Jason Brogden (JB)   Industry SME
Keith Clark (KC)   Programme Manager
Martin Cranfield (MC)   PMO Governance Lead
Warren Fulton (WF)   Outcome Assurance Manager

Other Attendees
Andy MacFaul (AMF)   Ofgem (as observer)
Danielle Walton   Ofgem (as observer)
Rachel Clark (RC)   Ofgem Sponsor (as observer)
Richard Shilton (RS)   MHHS IPA Lead
Sinead Quinn (SQ)   Ofgem (as observer)

Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due	Update
Decision on CR007	PSG07-04	Provide bullet points to the PMO on any additional support requested (above that already provided) by their constituency members from the Programme that would further enable mobilisation and ensure Programme Participants are ready for their DBT	PSG Constituency Reps	10/07/2022	Action re-opened following discussion at PSG. Limited feedback received previously
	PSG09-01	Meet to discuss consequential change	Chris Harden, Small Supplier Rep (Andrew Campbell)	10/08/2022	
	PSG09-02	Action PSG-DEC16 including: • Create a new Change Request to cover the M3 and M5 proposal presented to PSG. Raise to the Programme Change Control process ready for extraordinary PSG • Schedule an extraordinary PSG for 14 July 2022 to make a decision whether or not to raise this Change Request for Impact Assessment • Adjust August PSG date to allow for any Impact Assessment window	Programme (Keith Clark, PMO)	10/07/2022	
Programme re-plan	PSG09-03	Meet to discuss Large Supplier concerns relating to the re-plan approach	Keith Clark, Large Supplier Rep (Graham Wood)	10/08/2022	
MP162 approval risk	PSG09-04	Undertake a 'lessons learned' exercise following resolution of the MP162 approval risk	Programme and relevant parties	Following resolution of MP162 risks	
Pre-PSG webinar	PSG09-05	Schedule enduring PSG pre-meeting webinars	Programme (PMO)	20/07/2022	

Decisions

Area	Dec Ref	Decision
Minutes	PSG-DEC15	Minutes of PSG 08 June 2022 were approved

CR007, M3 and M5	PSG-DEC16	Rescind Change Request CR007 and create a new Change Request to cover the M3 and M5 proposal presented at 06 July 2022 PSG. Progress this Change Request through the Programme's Change Control process and schedule an extraordinary PSG for 14 July 2022 to make a decision whether or not to raise this new Change Request for Impact Assessment (papers to be issued 12 July 2022). Adjust August PSG date to allow for any subsequent Impact Assessment window.

RAID Items

RAID area	Description
Risks related to M5, M3 and design	The Programme presented the revision of the design plan, including how that revised plan mitigated relevant design risks previously presented at PSG/DAG. The PSG discussed this plan and the related proposal for moving M5 (and M3).
IPA escalation - MP162 risk	The Programme presented the risk relating to MP162 approval and possible impacts on the Programme. The PSG discussed mitigating actions and next steps. This included planning a 'lessons learned' activity for how the risk has been addressed (action PSG09-04)

Minutes

1. Welcome

CW welcomed all to the meeting.

2. Minutes and Actions Review

DECISION PSG-DEC15: Minutes of PSG 08 June 2022 were approved

CW updated on actions as per the actions slide. CW invited comments. None raised.

3. M5 plan update

WF opened the item and provided a summary on the revised approach to the design delivery. This was shared on 22 June 2022 via the Clock, having gone through the Business Process and Requirements Working Group (BPRWG) and Design Advisory Group (DAG). WF explained the artefact and working group schedule was live on the artefact tracker together with the latest design risks from the RAID log. A dissensus register and open design issues/dependencies were also available, with more work planned to develop these and resolve snags going into July. WF noted there had been limited response to the revised approach via DAG and that the approach was well received. All artefacts (and therefore the whole design) were on schedule to be delivered by the end of July, with 15 artefacts delivered last week, 2 scheduled this week, and 6 next week.

WF provided a summary from the DAG on 06 July. Tranche 3 artefacts were unanimously supported in DAG, meaning 27 artefacts (48%) were conditionally approved. The remaining artefacts were on track for delivery against the new schedule. WF noted that the Programme will be supporting Programme Participants to review the design from the end of July, such as through Portal enhancements, Change Control management and design playbacks. WF added that the biggest risks to the 29 July delivery were resource capacity in the MHHS Programme design team, MP162 (which had good discussion at DAG and was on the agenda for PSG) and some specific areas of design work/design issues to address.

CW invited questions. CP noted feedback from DNOs had been shared with AM and JB already. Two points had been covered by WF with one remaining:

- DNOs would like the full end-to-end view of the design to be provided - this has been confirmed.

- A benchmarking exercise of Tranche 4 is required to ensure all elements of the design work together.

- CP had not seen feedback provided on the design plan revision that had been mentioned in the PSG pre-meeting webinar. WF noted an email from GW with a number of challenges and issues, such as if the design team had allowed enough time to review and respond to industry comments. WF noted all these comments

had been responded to directly including for this particular comment where the time period for review had been extended in the revised plan. GW responded that his comments had primarily been that it looked like there was a lot to do in the last six weeks of the process and that the Programme had now provided a clear opinion (and rationale) that there was enough time in the plan to deliver. WF added that a learning from Tranche 1 was dual running of Tranches and not allowing enough time to review and address comments, and so now more time had been added, with parallel running removed.

JH queried three artefacts on the tracker that were currently marked as 'Amber' and queried if these would be delivered in the 29 July timeline. WF responded that these artefacts would be delivered in the timeline, but it is not currently clear when this will be (but will be before 29 July).

GE queried what had happened to feedback from constituencies that had previously pushed back against an M5 date being after July (referring to CR001) and if there were any wider impacts identified to be considered. KC responded that that responses to this feedback were addressed in the agenda item on CR007 (and M3 and M5). GE added that he wanted to ensure these views were not lost, given their importance to the Programme when previously raised.

GW queried the stance on MP162 and if this had any impact on the 29 July timeline. CW responded that this would be covered in the MP162 agenda item. CW invited final comments. None received.

4. Decision on CR007

KC provided an overview of the CR007 Change Request and the respondent responses as per the slides. KC noted the Programme had found the impact assessments very helpful in formulating next steps. KC provided an overview of the number of respondents per constituency group and the detailed feedback provided per constituency through impact assessment as per the slides. KC noted the Programme agreed with the assumption that the Programme's Design, Build & Test (DBT) phase would be at least 12 months per the transition timetable (as highlighted in one impact assessment) but that this was still subject to confirmation via the Programme re-plan. KC noted the first Consequential Change Impact Assessment Group (CCIAG) had been held with positive feedback.

KC provided an overview of the Programme's view on the next steps to address points raised through the Impact Assessments and noted that it was important to review these in the PSG to ensure they were addressed by the Programme's proposal (below).

KC moved on to present the Programme proposal to rescind CR007 and issue one Change Request for changes to both M5 and M3. KC presented the background and changes since CR007 was issued as per the slides. KC noted the following additional rationale behind the approach:

○ Changed criteria for M3 slightly from CR007, i.e. high-level impact assessments, sourcing strategies and business cases should be progressing but may not be completed at M3 and therefore would be ongoing at M3

○ Per impact assessment responses, it was acknowledged that not all participants would be ready for detailed design at M3. This has also come out through the planning working groups

○ Design playbacks would take place leading up to M5 (rather than afterwards), as all design documents would be out by August ahead of M5. This would also allow participants to participate more strongly in the M5 decision

○ The Programme would continue along the Programme re-plan timelines per the previously published interim plan. Feedback from Impact Assessments was that this will inform Programme Participants' own plans ahead of and for M3. The Programme plan and Programme Participant plans should be being iteratively and collaboratively shared and developed, and the more they are shared ahead of any consultation and decision, the better. This approach would mean that at M5, M5 could be signed off, M3 could be assessed as reached (or not) supported by Readiness Assessment 2, and the re-plan would have been through two consultations ahead of Ofgem sign-off. KC summarised that this would mean that the Programme can remove ambiguity and finish the year in a stronger position with a baselined position from which to manage delivery.

AC queried where consequential change was addressed in the proposal. AC noted consequential change as essential for the Programme as it affects participant designs and having no timeline in place could affect the entire plan. KC responded that the Programme plan would cover all of the areas in the Programme but that consequential changes which are not part of the design scope at M5 would not be featured significantly. AC responded that consequential change was being 'kicked down the road' and not addressed. KC drew parallels with FSP that had a Programme plan

that was light on consequential change, only tracking some of those changes for Programme Participants. KC noted this was a conversation that should be covered through the re-plan and not this proposal on CR007. KC added that any changes proposed by industry as in scope (and which therefore would impact the plan) should be raised through CCIAG and accommodated within the design. The CCIAG would determine what is in and out of scope of the Programme, and then the Programme plan could be updated to reflect this decision, assuming any changes were accepted through the Change Request via the change control process.

AC queried how a plan for success could not have a process for identifying and addressing consequential change. KC commented that this is a topic for the design team, and that the design team need to define what is in scope (and therefore must be delivered by the Programme plan). From a delivery point of view, items out of scope and the process for managing them may need to be monitored by the Programme but should not be considered in the plan until they are in scope. AC commented that consequential change needs to be included and therefore he would raise it with the IPA outside of PSG. IS responded that the CCIAG had had an inaugural session where a number of topics had been raised by industry. Several of these were either already in scope and addressed previously or were now being considered by the Programme. IS noted that actions had been taken for these items to see if these should be included in the design baseline. IS added that this forum will continue pre-M5 and will become an input into the Change Control process after M5.

JR queried if M3 will follow after M5 (in this proposal). KC confirmed that M3 and M5 would be achieved at the same time and that this was a logic-based approach. The re-plan being available alongside M5 and M3 would mean that there is a plan in place at the same time as any decisions on M5. JR queried if some elements of M3 had already begun by September. KC responded that yes, some parties would already be more mobilised (and have started some DBT activities) by M3 while others would need more time. The amount of time being allowed was considered enough by the Programme and the requirements for M3 were relatively straightforward, per the criteria in the slides. JR queried if, by the end of August, Programme Participants would have seen the full end-to-end design, rather than individual artefacts, and if this would be presented as a single design/document, rather than lots of individual artefacts. IS confirmed that all design artefacts would be released covering the design in its entirety. KC added that the playback sessions would provide a top-down, holistic view of the design and the context, both through proactive sessions and 'drop ins'. IA added that the full design was broken into specific artefacts that together make up the whole design – therefore there would not be a single artefact but all together that make up the whole design. JR added that the playbacks would be key, and that the artefacts need to be able to go direct to design teams to fit together and work from. IA responded that the types of documents are consistent with those already in industry and once the design is baselined, it will be transposed to allow a single view that can be broken down for views for different parties.

RC noted that Ofgem were broadly supportive of this approach and (referring to AC and JRs points) queried whether the requirements of Programme Participants for M3 were sufficiently clear and documented or whether there was further information that Programme Participants required (e.g. AC needed more clarity on scope and JR required more detail on the design playbacks).

JH noted the revised M3 criteria were helpful and that it would be helpful for the revised Change Request to highlight the points between August and October when the re- plan and consultations would be coming through (e.g. consultation dates, release dates, governance). This would allow Programme Participants to see at what point they would see both plan and design, to inform their own plans. KC responded that the revised plan would come out at the beginning of August for the first consultation and that the Programme would aim to make this process as explicit as possible in the Change Request.

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

GW noted he was cognisant that parties will be mobilising at different times but for his constituents the 'lighter version' of the M3 criteria 'dumbs down' ticking the box for the Programme and may make it harder for organisations to properly mobilise with teams, resources etc. This may result in participant mobilisation being reached after M3. GW added that suppliers could only be mobilised in a 'light version' of M3, until they fully know the re-plan and design. KC responded that M3 was not about mobilisation but the start of DBT. The main concern from the planning working group had been the duration of DBT from M5 to M9, and not the start of DBT itself. The M3 criteria in the slides represented feedback from Programme Participants and the ways of meeting these criteria will be different for each party, depending on their approach (waterfall, agile).

CP highlighted that three agenda items at PSG were all to do with planning. DNO and provider feedback was that they fully supported all of the content in principle, but that there were lots of decisions being taken, with some things

online/offline and others in different meetings. CP noted it would be helpful to see how all these things fit together (e.g. which things are done/agreed and which are still to be done). This would provide more certainty and mean DNOs do not feel like their resource/time is being wasted. KC responded that this was the intention of the previously published interim plan, and that the interim plan would be revised and re-issued when a decision on these milestones was taken. KC noted that the new Change Request will also help to make this clearer.

CH noted that he would speak to AC on consequential change. CH asked reps to ask their constituencies what they need for DBT. CH noted the DAG and BPRWG chairs were asking this of their groups and PPC were doing this in their bilaterals.

ACTION PSG09-01: Chris Harden and Andrew Campbell to meet to discuss consequential change

---

CW summarised next steps as per decision PSG-DEC16 and action PSG09-02 below. CW asked if any PSG members did not want to rescind CR007. No comments received. CW asked if anyone did not agree in principle with a new M5 and M3 Change Request. No comments received.

LN queried timelines. KC responded that the Change Request needed to go to Change Board first and then would need to come back to PSG for a decision to raise and issue it for Impact Assessment. The aim for this was Thursday 14 July 2022. CW noted the process is that the PSG would need to see the Change Request ahead of an extraordinary PSG, and that papers may come later than usual on Tuesday 12 July 2022. GW noted the more time the better. JR queried if this would be a refreshed CR007 or a new Change Request. JB responded this would be a new Change Request.

GE queried what would happen to the feedback already provided through CR007 Impact Assessment. JB responded that this had been taken into account in the proposal today and would be reflected in the new Change Request. GE queried if people should re-state comments or refer to those made in CR007, should they have the same comments. JB responded that all feedback should already be taken into account in the Change Request. KC noted the Programme intend to make the new Change Request as comprehensive as possible, removing any concerns raised in the CR007 Impact Assessment.

CW added that the August PSG would need to be moved from 03 August to 10 August to allow for any Impact Assessment window, together with the addition of the extraordinary meeting. AM noted the programme would avoid any meeting clashes.

DECISION PSG-DEC16: Rescind Change Request CR007 and create a new Change Request to cover the M3 and M5 proposal presented at 06 July 2022 PSG. Progress this Change Request through the Programme's Change Control process and schedule an extraordinary PSG for 14 July 2022 to make a decision whether or not to raise and issue this new Change Request for Impact Assessment (papers to be issued 12 July 2022). Adjust August PSG date to allow for any subsequent Impact Assessment window.

ACTION PSG09-02: Action PSG-DEC16 including:

- **Create a new Change Request to cover the M3 and M5 proposal presented to PSG. Raise to the Programme Change Control process ready for extraordinary PSG**

- **Schedule an extraordinary PSG for 14 July 2022 to make a decision whether or not to raise this Change Request for Impact Assessment**

- **Adjust August PSG date to allow for any Impact Assessment window**

---

5. Programme re-plan

KC provided an update on progress on the Programme re-plan and planning working groups per the slides. KC thanked volunteers for their inputs as these had been both beneficial for the volunteers and for the Programme. KC noted all artefacts relating to the re-plan (from RAID inputs to slideware) would be shared with industry through the re-plan consultations. KC added that the Programme have been asking volunteers to do some 'homework' to provide more detailed information (confidential). The homework had been guided by questions from the groups and shared following each planning session, with feedback to be input into the re-plan.

KC highlighted an issue relating to the migration and go-live approach, with a number of assumptions going into this in the re-plan. KC noted that plans are live documents and are built on assumptions, and the Programme was working to reduce the number of assumptions. The important thing was to get to a plan with few enough assumptions that are understood by all. Once the re-plan is baselined, these assumptions may be tested and the plan may be changed later (as is normal in programme and project delivery) – the Programme is aiming to get to a validated timeline that has all in

industry on the same page so that delivery can managed effectively. KC highlighted a risk that the Programme is asking participants to participate in the design playbacks and consultations while also doing their own planning and preparation for DBT, which will create bandwidth challenges. KC noted it was important to get to a final Programme plan that was fully validated across industry, so the Programme has a proper reference to manage delivery.

GW agreed that they would like to get to a revised credible plan as quickly as possible. GW queried the two sets of industry consultation happening through August and September on the premise that design would be completed at the end of July. GW highlighted concerns in their constituency that there was no final consultation once the design had been baselined and that this was different to the existing approach. GW queried if the timeframe for consultation in the interim plan was going to stand or change. KC confirmed that the consultations would be the same as in the interim plan and that there were assumptions in the plan that can be revisited after the design is baselined (there would always be assumptions but the aim is to agree and reduce them). KC added that there was no technical dependency between re-plan and the baselining for the design, and that very detailed elements of the design are not expected to have a big impact on the plan. A programme plan could be written today, it would just have too many assumptions. At the time of re-baselining the plan, the Programme would look for consensus on assumptions and for these assumptions to then be tracked. Any subsequent changes would go through Change Control. Ahead of M5, participants would have enough understanding of the high-level design and where it impacts the Programme plan that a credible plan can be created with few enough and well understood assumptions that the Programme can then work from.

GW suggested a separate conversation and noted an expectation to have a design baseline signed off through governance before the re-plan was baselined. GW added that there was an expectation there would still be opportunity to engage and consult on the plan at the final hour (i.e. a final consultation) before the re-plan goes to be signed off. GW noted large suppliers would need a further conversation on this. KC responded that he had spoken to large supplier programme managers through PPC bilaterals and that these had fed into the re-plan and M3/M5 Change Request process. KC encouraged further participation at the planning working groups to get the best consensus on the approach. KC proposed a further conversation with GW outside the PSG.

> **ACTION PSG09-03: Keith Clark and Graham Wood to meet to discuss Large Supplier concerns relating to the re-plan approach**

JH queried if the assumption on the transition design would be reflected through a Change Request and hence if any impact to the implementation plan would be impact assessed at that point, or if this required more thinking by the Programme. KC noted the aim to agree in principle, the high-level approach to go-live and migration into the re-plan, and that there would be assumptions in the re-plan to be tested. If there were changes in the transition design this would be reflected in the plan at the appropriate time. JH noted two parts to transition – transition to go-live and the design implications of dual operations working together with lower-level design considerations. JH added the big dependency was on the second part and therefore any big decisions on this needed to be reflected in the re-plan. KC responded there will always be opportunities to consider changes to the plan and reiterated the need to get to an agreed baselined plan (with sensible assumptions) upon which to compare changes to be assessed through usual governance process. KC added that a lot of participants want to see the plan before baselining the design, and others vice versa, and hence the Programme are trying to release as much information as possible in parallel. Assumptions on migration and go-live would be detailed in the re-plan and would need to be clear.

6. MP162 escalation

JB introduced the item noting this had already been raised today, including at DAG. The Programme was raising MP162 at the PSG to consider the Programmatic risk (and not the merits of the MP162 solution) and hence the impact on the Programme plan. The nature of the issue and resolving it meant there was a risk of delay to the Programme if the modification did not get raised to Change Board, or if the modification went through the Change Board but did not get approved by Ofgem, or if another iteration of the modification was required meaning more loops of Impact Assessment and hence further delays in a decision. JB presented the proposed mitigations as per the slides and invited input from PSG members.

CW invited JA to comment on the outputs of DAG. DAG had agreed that the 24hr Target Response Time (TRT) met the requirements of MHHS, however there was still an issue with the solution proposed by SEC with respect to differential read windows and demand response timings. A DAG sub-group had agreed the response timing issue was not significant but the differential read window presented an issue. The DAG hence agreed actions to:

    a) put together options for the read window with input of experts from the DAG. Any solution here would have potential impacts on costs/commercials. Outputs of this action would go to DAG on 21st July for a decision

b) determine who in governance terms has the ability to make a decision. The current view was that this should be design-led

CW invited the IPA to comment. RS noted they had spoken to a number of parties and were currently defining a clear set of facts and problem statement. This included through attending DAG. The IPA wanted to see this moving forward to conclusion, as well as formulating their own opinion. JA noted the input at DAG from the IPA was very helpful.

GE queried why a code was able to make a change that had such a big impact on the programme and queried if there was not a way for the Programme to push back against the SEC or be more rigorous to avoid this risk and impact. CW responded that all code modifications go to Ofgem for a decision following panel decision, and that the Programme cannot make decisions on the behalf of Ofgem but can communicate and work with Ofgem to make sure the Programme's impact and position is considered. RC commented that the intention of the governance of the Programme was to have processes in place to be able to manage these kinds of risks, and that a lessons learned activity should be undertaken to ensure governance was working in a way to manage this. If the tools were not sufficient, they should be reviewed. RC reflected that there was an explicit requirement for all parties to operate in accordance with the Programme plans, decisions, governance etc, and therefore it should not be legitimate for parties on the SEC panel to pursue a decision that is not in the interests of the MHHS Programme. RC added that the CCAG should have highlighted any differences between SEC activities and the Programme, and that ultimately any decisions go to Ofgem for final decision/approval and as sponsors of the Programme Ofgem would exercise discretion to support delivery of the Programme.

RC reiterated that they believed the tools were there and questioned if they had been used appropriately, given how long the issue has been known. JB supported the proposal for a lessons learned exercise, noting MP162 was raised early given its lead times and the nature of its solution, and hence this has led to the risk presented at PSG associated with timescales.

ACTION PSG09-04: Programme and relevant parties to undertake a 'lessons learned' exercise following resolution of the MP162 approval risk

GW referred to WF's comments on the impact of the MP162 risk on the timelines for the design being released as per the timeline presented and queried if there was any impact. CW commented that he did not think MP162 had an impact but that he would check with the design team.

CS noted they had been working on this modification from the start and that the Programme, SEC and others had all been working collaboratively. The DCC had been working as fast as they could to deliver the modification and resolve any issues. CS added that the Programme were the lead governance party and SEC would follow the requirements as they come from the Programme. CS added that the DCC had been targeting a November 2023 release date and this has been pushed to February 2024, and so there was always a bit of leeway in the planning.

7. Webinar feedback

CW introduced the item and invited feedback from PSG members as per the questions provided in slides.

JH responded that the webinar was useful and that a dedicated timeslot for the webinar each month would be beneficial as this prompts participants to read the papers and engage in the webinar. JH noted that the delivery of the content assumed that individuals had an understanding of the content and that this is not always the case. It would be useful if the webinar took an approach that those attending are not familiar with the content.

CP responded that the webinar was very helpful and builds on the approach from the FSP. CP agreed a fixed timeslot is helpful and that the webinar provided helpful context and additional detail that was not in the slides, and that it would be useful if this was included in the slides. AM noted the Programme should take a step back when creating slides so that individuals who are not as close to the detail can understand the content. CW responded that the Programme does expect a certain level of understanding to be able to engage with the steering group, but that this feedback would be considered as it is important to bring parties up to speed, particularly as more parties come on board into DBT and testing. CH added it would be helpful for reps to help bring their constituents up to speed too.

GW noted the webinar was helpful and agreed with other points raised, adding that the more detail provided the better, particularly on the dashboards. CW queried if there were any particular dashboards Programme Participants would like presented. GW responded that it should be any particular points that warrant being brought to life across any of the dashboards.

ACTION PSG09-05: PMO to schedule enduring PSG pre-meeting webinars

8. Programme Dashboards

CW opened the item noting the dashboards as read and invited questions. None received.

9. Summary and Next Steps

CW moved to close the meeting and summarised actions and decisions as per the tables above.

AC queried progress on a consultation on consent raised at a previous PSG. RC responded that a statutory consultation had been published and the consultation closed a while ago. A decision was planned from Ofgem by the end of August. AM added that the Programme had responded to the consultation.

CW closed the meeting.

Date of next PSG: 14 July 2022 extraordinary meeting