

MHHS Testing and Migration Advisory Group (TMAG) Actions and Minutes

Issue date: 27/07/22

Meeting number	TMAG 007	Venue	Virtual – MS Teams
Date and time	20 July 2022 1000-1200	Classification	Public

Attendees

Chair

Justin Andrews (JA) MHHS DAG Chair

Industry Participants

Chandrani Ghosh (CG)	Elexon Representative (as central systems provider)
Chris Butterfield (CB) on behalf of Martin Hanley	Large Supplier Representative
Dave Jones (DJ)	RECCo Representative
Ed Rees (ER)	Consumer Representative
Ian Hall (IHal)	Supplier Agent Representative (Independent)
Ian Hatton (IHat)	DNO Representative
Nicola Bumford (NB)	NGESO Representative
Stacey Buck	iDNO Representative

MHHS IM members

Daniaal Choudhury (DC)	MHH PMO RAID manager
Dominic Mooney (DM)	Test Lead
Kate Goodman (KG)	Test Architect
Martin Cranfield (MC)	PMO Governance & Secretariat Lead

Other Attendees

Sinead Quinn (SQ) Ofgem (as observer)

Apologies

Adrian Ackroyd – MHHS Test Manager

Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date
Actions	TMAG07-01	Meet to discuss TMAG and clarify design assumptions	Kate Goodman, Dave Jones (/Jonathan Hawkins)	17/08/22
	TMAG07-02	Update the working groups deliverables and dependencies with further detail on	Kate Goodman	17/08/22

Working group deliverables		information flows between deliverables/working groups		
	TMAG07-03	Consider combining working groups to into a more efficient structure with fewer groups	Programme	17/08/22
RAID	TMAG07-04	Update content of the RAID with feedback from TMAG on the scoring and mitigations of the risks presented	Programme (Kate Goodman, PMO)	17/08/22

Decisions

Area	Decision Ref	Description
Environments and Configurations Management Working Group (EWG) Terms of Reference (ToR)	TMAG-DEC10	The TMAG approved the EWG ToR, noting potential changes subject to action TMAG07-03

RAID Items

RAID area	Description
TMAG-related risks	The TMAG reviewed the top five Testing and Migration risks in the Programme RAID log and provided feedback and comments on their scoring and mitigations (see key discussion items below)

Minutes

1. Welcome

JA welcomed all to the meeting and noted they were standing in for Chris Welby. JA gave an overview of the agenda as per the slides.

2. Minutes and Actions

The minutes of the TMAG 17 June 2022 were APPROVED.

JA invited comments on the actions. KG noted that they had not completed action TMAG06-05 and planned to speak with NB soon. DJ noted Jonathan Hawkins had also requested a catch up with KG for RECCo to clarify some design assumptions. KG responded that some design assumptions would be discussed later under the agenda item on working groups. This item now also included content from the planning working group that would benefit from discussion in this group.

ACTION TMAG07-01 – Kate Goodman and Dave Jones/Jonathan Hawkins to meet to discuss TMAG and clarify design assumptions

3. Governance Group Updates

MC provided an update from the Programme Steering Group (PSG) on 06 July and 14 July 2022. On 06 July, the PSG reviewed the outputs of Impact Assessment from CR007 (a Change Request proposing a move of M3) and the design re-schedule moving M5 to the end of October. The PSG agreed to schedule an extraordinary PSG for 14 July to discuss a new Change Request CR009 proposing a single change for both M3 and M5, taking into account feedback from CR007 and the design re-schedule. On 14 July 2022, the PSG agreed to raise CR009 to Impact Assessment. CR009 was subsequently formally issue to two-week Impact Assessment on 15 July.

4. Test data generator for consumption data

KG introduced the item and summarised previous discussions at TMAG where the Programme had highlighted that they intended to have a mechanism of creating a large volume of consumption data (e.g. for estimating MPANs) but not to create tools to inject that data into Programme Participant's systems. KG noted the Programme was seeking

confirmation from TMAG that, if the data was provided in a simple, digestible form (e.g. CSV), Programme Participants would then be able to transform, inject and test it. KG added that further information had been provided in the minutes from June TMAG.

CG queried if the consumption data would match the registration data, and if they would need to make any changes to the data. KG responded that to produce the consumption data, details about the meter would be required (to produce something valid and sensible). The Programme had been thinking of creating data for data services, and the same tool but with different configuration would be used for Elexon Central Systems. For Elexon Central Systems the process would be different as data would be sent via the Data Integration Platform (DIP). Therefore, this discussion was more for Programme Participants in the data service layer. KG added that this approach was a big change to industry Programmes due to the quantity of data to be used and that, while Programme Participants have capability to test, they may not have capability to create the volumes of data required. The data generator would be a general-purpose tool that would service both the data services and Elexon central systems. JA noted two scenarios – the programme creating test data to be used by the different services as well as for end-to-end data services.

IHal confirmed this approach would work for them and that they could utilise existing flows. In some circumstances, Advanced Data Services (ADS) would need to generate their own data, particularly for areas that require complex data. KG responded that Programme Participants could take the Programme's data and tweak it for different use cases. IHal responded that the volumes of data was the challenge for them so this was welcomed. JA queried if the volume of data could be worked with. IHal confirmed yes.

JA queried on the Unmetered side if the Programme needed a different type of test data. KG responded that IHal had talked the Programme through the Advanced approach and that they had also talked with Power Data Associates who had helped with Unmetered. Little was changing in the Unmetered area and the Programme felt that the organisations in this space had this under control. The Programme therefore did not intend to generate test data in the Unmetered side (only for Smart and Advanced). KG added that the form of data was still to be confirmed depending on format (CSV has been proposed so far as it is easy) and that the Programme's DevOps team had started putting together the detailed requirements under this, to be shared with TMAG in future. KG and IHal clarified that Advanced could be injected in the way described.

CB noted Martin Hanley had shared some questions on Smart Data Services. Because the proposed format was CSV, the data may need to be transformed into the form expected in the final design. CB added that they needed to understand how much transformation may be required (e.g. driving services from DCC) or if CSV would be enough. JA noted the form of data was not specified. KG added where a format is straightforward and specified, the Programme could support Programme Participants and reduce transformation requirements on Smart. CB added that the format of data needed to reflect the format that will come from DCC in final settlement data. KG responded that the Programme were considering service requests and could look to make the generated data in the format of a service request. CB noted the question needed to be asked across suppliers as different suppliers may approach this differently.

CG added that they had some further questions to raise offline.

5. Working group deliverables and dependencies schedule

KG opened the item and provided an overview of each of the TMAG working groups. KG noted a question from June TMAG on the dependencies between TMAG working groups which was now presented in the slides. KG provided an overview of the deliverables, their timelines, and their dependencies for each working group as per the slides, using the interaction between the Test Data Approach & Plan and the Migration, Cutover & Data Strategy as an example for how dependencies between groups may work in practice.

JA suggested that further detail was required on the specific interaction between different deliverables (e.g. what information is flowing and in which direction between different deliverables). KG responded that she would add further detail.

JA queried if the working groups should be independent or could be more efficient if combined. KG responded the number and setup of the working groups was as per discussion at last TMAG and invited comments. NB queried if there was commonality across the working groups and if they could be combined if possible e.g. between DWG and MWG. NB added there was overlap which complicated the groups and added admin. JA noted that there could be fewer working groups that are then split into different topics. Several TMAG members supported this proposal. IHal added that the dates for migration and data were similar, so these could be combined, but that they had separate resources working across environments and qualification, and so these were more separate.

MC queried the timing of dependencies and if these only occurred at the position of the arrows (as per the slides) or across the durations of the deliverables. KG confirmed only at the time of the arrows.

ACTION TMAG07-02 – Kate Goodman to Update the working groups deliverables and dependencies with further detail on information flows between deliverables/working groups

ACTION TMAG07-03 – Programme to consider combining working groups to into a more efficient structure with fewer groups

6. RAID review

DC introduced himself as the Programme Risks, Assumptions, Issues, Dependencies (RAID) Manager and explained the Programme's approach to active management of RAID. The intention at TMAG was to provide an overview of the main test and migration items in the RAID and how they were being managed. DC provided an overview of the slide, highlighting how the coloured risk assessment showed the initial (purple), current (green) and target (blue) scores for each risk. The score is built from the probability, impact and proximity of each risk.

KG talked through the risks in turn as per the slide.

R118 – a risk that there is a lack of service provider and supplier participant in Systems Integration Testing (SIT).

KG noted CCS, DIP and DSP were all required in SIT, as well as some other Programme Participants (e.g. metering services, suppliers). Some of the planning working group sessions had highlighted points in SIT such as overheads and timeframes that added complication. There was also a feeling from suppliers that it may be difficult to participate in SIT. Regarding the mitigations, KG noted the Programme wanted to avoid Ofgem mandating participation and that there were some other mitigations that could be raised, such as determining the points at which suppliers are required within SIT.

CB noted that, as per the planning working groups, there were broader questions about SIT to answer (e.g. timeframes) but until these were answered, it would be difficult to know how suppliers would engage. NB added they were keen to be involved in SIT but would first like to understand more detail. Their primary interface was with Elexon and a joint meeting could be beneficial. KG responded that they would prefer individual meetings at first.

JA queried why the current risk score was worse than the initial score. KG responded that this was as a result of learning more information. JA responded that once M5 and the plan are baselined, more information would be known to further quantify the risk.

KG highlighted that there was an activity in the re-plan for Programme Participants to decide whether to input in SIT, and that further outputs of the planning working group would come next month. JA responded this mitigation was missing (for the ongoing work in the planning working groups) and added that the Ofgem mitigation was already supported through requirements of Participants through the Balancing and Settlement Code (BSC) and the MHHS governance framework.

JA queried if TMAG members agreed with the risk score. CB confirmed the score felt right now and would be confirmed more through the re-plan. JA noted participation from service providers had been improving, and this would continue to improve through design playbacks. CG added that early engagement (e.g. walkthroughs) with SIT requirements would assist with participation in SIT.

R119 – a risk that there may be a drive by participants to constrain testing by providing too few environments.

KG summarised that this risk was present from learnings from previous programmes and that environments are expensive to provide. The Programme did not want to constrain testing nor ask for too many environments. This risk had also been raised and addressed through the planning working groups, with sequential activity planned to prevent the requirement on too many environments (such as by planning migration testing after SIT functional). A full risk/benefits analysis was also planned on which environments would be needed, and this would come ahead of the Environments Approach and Plan in October (target August/September). DC added these dates were captured in the RAID log. KG noted there were questions to answer, such as on St Clements involvement.

SB noted this was an area that DNOs and iDNOs differ, as DNOs have a cost recovery system but iDNOs do not. The number/requirement for environments therefore needed to be balanced against their high cost (e.g. re-using environments where possible). JA queried the cost recovery. NB responded this is based on DNO methodology for charging, and that iDNOs are restricted from charging rates above DNOs.

CB added that timing of environments was important because the number of participants was likely to cluster at different times in the Programme. Therefore, the environments plan needed to be developed earlier. This would also give more detail on supplier capability to engage. KG responded that the Programme would do a first draft in the next few months, to be reviewed in the middle of next year.

DJ queried the risk score assessment and how the target is derived and what happens once the risk achieves the target. KG reiterated the score was the impact, proximity and probability scored 1-5 and the target score was related to the mitigations and what they might do to the individual parts of the scoring to get to an acceptable level of risk.

R007 – a risk that migration is complex and very challenging which may make it difficult to estimate and plan.

DJ queried if the TMAG was comfortable with a target score of nine which was still in the medium risk area, KG responded that they still believed that migration would be challenging and that a further mitigation on assuring Programme Participants plans with respect to migration would support improving the target score. JA noted that migration was not simple and required careful management, and hence a high target score was reasonable and mitigations were required to support Participants to understand migration processes. JA noted a mitigation could be added on the transition requirements.

CB highlighted that the Programme could take lessons learned on migrations that have happened previously, such as change of agent. This could be done across Elexon and 3rd party participants.

R131 – a risk from the lack of clarity regarding the scope of MHHS and Performance Assurance Board (PAB) responsibilities.

KG noted some conversations had been held with the PAB that had resulted in an increased score because, while initially there was common understanding from CCDG recommendations on Programme and PAB responsibilities, there was now a less clear view, particularly with respect to data cleansing. JA added that they had held a conversation with Joe Deal (PMO planning lead) on additional mitigations to be included in the Programme plan, including draft steps in the plan relating to performance assurance techniques, data techniques, qualification, and to improve liaison between REC and BSC PABs. The Programme was also planning to get more clarity from code bodies on things that need to change to then present to the various PABs.

R181 – a risk that a lot of “manufactured” data must be used in DSIT because cleansed actual data is not available in time.

KG noted this had been raised in the Data Working Group (DWG) and that at the start of SIT it was likely there would not be much, if any, cleansed data. The Programme would look to align timeframes with testing activity and find datasets where data had already been cleansed (e.g. elective half hourly data). This would be reviewed in the planning. JA queried if this risk was a capacity/resource issue. KG responded that this was due to timeframes in the Ofgem transition timetable for data cleansing activities.

CB noted this risk this was a product of when you should do data cleansing, and that data cleansing should only be done once just-in-time for use, otherwise cleansing would need to take place twice. CB added that elective half hourly data could only work for some participants. KG responded that this needed to be explored further in planning.

ACTION TMAG07-04 – Programme to update content of the RAID with feedback from TMAG on the scoring and mitigations of the risks presented

7. Working group updates

KG noted the slide as read and invited questions.

JA asked for approval of the ToR for the EWG, subject to any changes to the working group schedule as per action TMAG07-03. No comments received.

DECISION TMAG-DEC10 – The TMAG approved the EWG ToR, noting potential changes subject to action TMAG07-03

KG moved to provide an update on outputs from the ongoing planning working group. These are groups of volunteers providing input into the Programme re-plan, and the Programme had an intention to update the E2E Testing and

Integration Strategy as a result of planning discussions. A number of items in the strategy had been tested as a result of the planning working groups, and these would be raised to TMAG in August.

One item that had been tested through planning was the approach to dependencies. This included the sequence of events following SIT functional, where the Programme wanted to prove that broadly operational, non-functional and migration were working ahead of qualification. The planning working group had identified that these elements of SIT could occur at the same time as qualification and sand box, and that the dependency may actually be on the functional stage. KG proposed a conversation on this in the next TMAG. CG responded that the entry/exit criteria for each stage was also important, including that the overall acceptance criteria for SIT could not be made until after operational, non-functional and migration.

KG noted there were further questions in SIT on the exit criteria for Participant Integration Testing (PIT) to get into SIT, and which SIT stages each participant would need to participate in. KG added they intended a discussion on this at the next TMAG, but that the re-plan would be issued ahead of the August TMAG. TMAG members should therefore be prepared for the re-plan to contain assumptions and dependencies different to the content of the E2E Testing and Integration strategy, and hence the second re-plan consultation may need to be updated with outputs of TMAG discussion on these assumptions and dependencies.

KG added that the planning working group had tested who was required for SIT Functional, with suppliers highlighting that it would be difficult for them to get involved in this stage. The Programme were proposed breaking down PIT into two areas to support exit criteria to SIT. This would mean some areas of PIT could continue once SIT had started. KG would be looking for agreement on some of these questions at the next TMAG ahead of the second re-plan consultation. JA queried if KG would like any feedback or sub-group discussions ahead of the TMAG to test this thinking ahead of time. KG clarified this was being tested through the planning working group.

8. Summary and next steps

MC ran through the actions as per the summary table above. JA invited comments on the upcoming agenda items, none received.

ER raised an AOB on cohorts of modifications coming through such as P432 and P434 where the relevant code panel had voted and rejected the modification, with Ofgem now to review the proposal. ER noted a Programme task to give Ofgem a view of work the Programme is doing on migration to inform Ofgem's response when reviewing these proposals. JA responded that this had also been raised through the design team, as these modifications had been intended to 'pave the way' for MHHS migration and implementation. There is an internal action to review the modifications and any further action the Programme needs to take, given the recommendations from the BSC panel.

KG introduced Dominic Mooney (DM). DM noted they had recently moved to the testing workstream and that their focus would be on the delivery of the test phases.

JA thanked all for their input and closed the meeting.

Date of next TMAG: 17 August 2022