****MHHS Programme Re-Plan****
**MHHS-DEL541 Questions for Consultation (Round 1)**
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# Scope and overview

## Purpose

This document is being provided by the MHHS Programme (MHHSP) team, for Round 1 of the formal consultation on the plan. It is one of a number of Round 1 artefacts:

1. Proposed draft plans-on pages (PoaPs) and associated high-level RAID information (risks, assumptions, issues, risks)
2. Proposed draft schedule (activities, durations, sequencing)
3. Proposed draft Milestone Register (including defined milestone dependencies)

## Objective of the overall consultation

1. To form a baseline programme plan, that can be approved by Ofgem, on the basis of consensus across all programme participants that the plan is credible, robust, achievable, and measurable.
2. To fully consult on and assess ways to ensure that the plan is set up to see MHHS implemented as early as possible and preferably no later than the date set out in the existing Transition Timetable.

## The consultation process

|  | Dates | Level of artefacts | Objectives |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Pre-consultation (volunteers)** | May-22 to Jul-22 | Various | * This process was based on contributions of volunteer PMs from participants and aimed to work with MHHSP on ‘left-to-right planning”, to remove major uncertainties where possible and to ensure that planning documents going out for formal consultation are more likely to be useable and helpful to participants in consultation
 |
| **Round 1** | 01-Aug-22 to 26-Aug-22 | High-level | * To improve consensus on the high-level plan structure, activity durations and sequencing – without focus on absolute dates
* To test high-level assumptions and related risks
 |
| **Round 2** | 12-Sep-22 to 07-Oct-22 | Detailed | * Scrutiny and consultation on a full, draft programme plan including all activities, activity durations, milestones and dates, sequencing and dependencies – and a full RAID summary
 |
| **Round 3****(subject to PSG approval)** | 31-Oct-22 to 11-Nov-22 | Detailed, final drafts | * Make a final check on the developed plan to maximise confidence in it

*Round 3 added to allow for a period 2 weeks after the core MHHS design being approved by 31-Oct-22 (M5)**Round 3 has been added in response to a request from some participants, and this is being accommodated with the revised interim plan, subject to approval by PSG in August* |

The questions contained in this document are intended to ensure that enough information is collected and subsequently considered, so that the plan is indeed developed ‘with industry’, rather than ‘imposed by the programme team’. Therefore, there are more questions that might otherwise be expected. Please take the time to provide high quality inputs.

The quality of the re-baselined plan will be strongly influenced by the effort that respondents apply, in answering and providing the thinking and detail requested. Without such input from participants, we cannot expect a delivery plan that is credible, robust, achievable, and measurable.

# Consultation questions

## Design, Build and Test

| Design, Build and Test (DBT) Phase |
| --- |
| Approach | Question | Response |
| We have separated DBT into:(1) Market Interfaces & Services (comprising the following: Metering Services, Data Services, Registration Services, Network Operation Services and UMSO Services)(2) Supplier Back-End Systems. This has been done to remove the Back-End Systems DBT from the critical path as far as possible.These activities are currently set out as being sequential – (1) completes before (2) begins. | 1. Do you agree with this approach (or not)?

Either way, please state your reasons. |  |
| 1. To shorten timelines, could these two activities be non-sequential, i.e. overlap to some degree?
 |  |
| 1. If your answer to (2) is ‘no’, please explain what prevents this.
 |  |
| 1. If your answer to (2) is ‘yes’, please state how this could be achieved, what time saving could be made - and any risks inherent in that approach. If there are risks, how would you mitigate them?
 |  |
| 1. Do you think participants’ DBT related to ‘Back-End systems’ – i.e. consequentially-impacted systems – is adequately accommodated in the plan?
 |  |
| 1. Could the period of time allowed for ‘Back-End’ DBT be shortened or is there any way you could de-risk completion by front-loading the activities?
 |  |
| 1. If your answer to (6) is ‘no’, please state your reasons and propose how you would improve the plan in this respect.
 |  |
| 1. Please also identify any risks related to the way the plan is handling consequential changes and how you think they should be mitigated.
 |  |
| It is assumed that the Transition Design (the design of the processes to be used during the migration period) will not be approved at M5 but will be in development at that time and is expected to be delivered within Nov-22 | 1. Please outline any potential or actual impacts you see on your DBT activities in relation to the Transition Design being delivered after M5 – and how you will mitigate or resolve those.
 |  |
| 1. What is the minimum information on the Transition Design that you would need to see at M5, to help to mitigate impacts?
 |  |
| 1. Please explain how you will address the short-term uncertainty of the Transition Design, to avoid (as much as possible) any negative impact on your expected DBT duration.
 |  |
| 5 months have been allowed after M5 for high-level impact assessments, planning and procurement activities (with the final 2 months overlapping with specific DBT activities).12 months of DBT (for SIT participants) or 14 months of DBT (for non-SIT participants) is then allowed for Market Interfaces and Services (comprising the following: Metering Services, Data Services, Registration Services, Network Operation Services and UMSO Services). | 1. How would you propose to shorten each of these timelines?

Please state any risks inherent in your approach. If there are risks, how would you mitigate them? |  |
| 1. If you feel that any of these timelines cannot be shortened, please state your reasons.
 |  |
| 1. Do you believe you will need to procure or build any adapters to ease / shorten DBT activities?
 |  |
| 1. If your answer to (14) is ‘yes’, please state what you need adapters for, and what impact you estimate this will have on your DBT timeline.
 |  |
| 1. If your answer to (14) is ‘yes’, when in the process would you be procuring or building adapters and what information would you need beyond that known at M5 (e.g. code of connection / security standards)?
 |  |
| The schedule for the delivery of test stubs for your Pre-Integration Testing (PIT) – i.e. DIP Simulator and Data Generator has been set out in the attached schedule documentation. | 1. Does this schedule enable you to start (and complete) PIT when you would need to (according to the proposed programme plan) – and what assumptions are you making about the programme plan in making that assessment?
 |  |
| 1. If your answer to (17) is ‘no’, please state your requirements to enable you to start (and complete) your DBT as you need to.
 |  |
| 1. If these test stubs were delivered earlier, could you start (and complete) your DBT earlier?

If so, please state how much earlier and why. |  |
| During the DBT phase, it is planned that Systems Integration Testing (SIT) preparation (environments and data preparation, test scripts preparation, test execution planning) can be done at the same time as DBT activity. | 1. Do you agree with this approach (or not)?
 |  |
| 1. If your answer to (20) is ‘yes’, please state your reasons.
 |  |
| 1. If your answer to (20) is ‘no’, please state your reasons and suggest alternatives.
 |  |
| During the DBT phase the Code drafting activities are completed as set out in the attached schedule documentation.At M6, updated industry code as a result of MHHS is approved by CCAG but this is not formally legal text. The proposed code is handed over to Ofgem for approval via SMAP (Ofgem consult, make a decision, and direct a release/implementation date). Code bodies deliver that decision on the release/implementation date, with a new baseline of their code containing MHHS changes as legal text.At M8, each individual industry code body has released the new code and it is formally legal text. Each code body has released their updated code to industry (i.e. there is a new legal baseline for each industry code). | 1. Do you agree with the approach to code drafting review for each topic area (whereby drafted code follows an internal review, a full industry consultation, and a working group review on the outputs of consultation)?
 |  |
| 1. Whichever answer you provide for (23), please state your reasons, and any risks you see as inherent in the approach. If there are risks, how would you mitigate them?
 |  |
| 1. Do you require new code to be released (at M8) to enable you to start qualification - or is the Cross-Code Advisory Group (CCAG) approval of the agreed changes (at M6) enough?

Please state the reasons for your response. |  |
| 1. If Cross-Code Advisory Group (CCAG) approval of the agreed changes (at M6) is enough, what do you believe is the latest acceptable point at which new code needs to be released (M8)?
 |  |

| Design, Build and Test (DBT) Phase |
| --- |
| **Questions from you to the MHHSP team (or clarifications needed)** |
| Please set out any questions you have, or clarifications you need from the MHHSP team, regarding the DBT Phase.These should include any questions or clarifications related to all provided planning artefacts. |  |
| **Response from the MHHSP team** |
| MHHSP responses to participant’s questions will be set out here. |  |

## System Integration Test (SIT)

| Systems Integration Test (SIT) Phase |
| --- |
| Approach | Question | Response |
| SIT is currently proposed to be completed in 18 months, including Component Integration Testing (CIT), SIT Functional and Non-Functional Testing, Operational Testing and Migration Testing. | For all participants:1. What do you think of the sequencing and durations proposed for each of the SIT activities – and for SIT overall?

Please state your reasons. You may reference experiences on other programmes if useful. |  |
| For all participants:1. How could you support SIT to be conducted in a shorter timeframe than that proposed?

(For example, please identify where additional resources and / or applying additional funding, or the provision of automation may help conduct and complete SIT earlier) |  |
| It is assumed that SIT participants do not have to also conduct Qualification Testing (QT). | For all participants:1. Do you think there are any problems with this approach?

If so, please state your reasons. |  |
| SIT participation is assumed to be voluntary, other than for Central Parties (Elexon Central Services, DCC, LDSOs, DIP) | For potential voluntary participants (suppliers, agents):1. What would encourage you to participate in SIT? (For example, early access to sandpit for testing)
 |  |
| For potential voluntary participants (suppliers, agents):1. What would discourage you to participate in SIT?
 |  |
| For potential voluntary participants (suppliers, agents):1. Do you currently expect to volunteer?
 |  |
| For all participants:1. When do you think the decision on SIT voluntary participants should be made?

Please state your reasons. |  |
| For all participants:1. If insufficient participants volunteer for SIT, what criteria do you think should be used to mandate participation in SIT?
 |  |
| The point at which SIT starts, is set out in the attached documentation, with clarity on prerequisite activities. | 1. In your view, can SIT start earlier - whilst ensuring we still get sufficient representation from volunteer participants?
 |  |
| 1. If your answer to (35) is ‘yes’, please state your ideas for starting SIT earlier, and any risks inherent in such potential approaches. If there are risks, how would you mitigate them?
 |  |
| 1. If your answer to (35) is ‘no’, please state your reasons.
 |  |

| Systems Integration Test (SIT) Phase |
| --- |
| Questions from you to the MHHSP team (or clarifications needed) |
| Please set out any questions you have, or clarifications you need from the MHHSP team, regarding the SIT Phase.These should include any questions or clarifications related to all provided planning artefacts. |  |
| **Response from the MHHSP team** |
| MHHSP responses to participant’s questions will be set out here. |  |

## Qualification Test (QT)

| Qualification Test (QT) Phase |
| --- |
| Approach | Question | Response |
| We have allowed an elapsed time of 12 months for Qualification Testing (QT). | 1. How would you propose to shorten this timeline?
 |  |
| 1. How do you feel this process could be made more efficient?
 |  |
| 1. Please state any risks inherent in your suggested approaches. If there are risks, how would you mitigate them?
 |  |
| 1. If you feel that any of these timelines cannot be shortened, please state your reasons.
 |  |
| 1. How long do you think it will take each participant to go through QT?

Please state your reasons and any related risks you see in completing QT expediently. If there are risks, how would you mitigate them? |  |
| We are assuming that participants will go through QT in tranches - to allow for any resourcing and capacity constraints – and for this to be led and managed by Elexon (BSC). | 1. Do you agree with this approach?
 |  |
| 1. If your answer to (43) is ‘yes’, when do you think tranches should be defined and operated (including how changes to tranche allocation should be managed)?
 |  |
| 1. If your answer to (43) is ‘yes’, what criteria do you think should be used to allocate parties to tranches?
 |  |
| 1. If your answer to (43) is ‘no’, what other options do you suggest – calling out any risks in any such options? If there are risks, how would you mitigate them?
 |  |
| 1. Do you feel that roles and responsibilities for QT are currently clearly defined and appropriate?

If not, please state your reasons, any related risks and how you feel those risks should be mitigated. |  |
| It is assumed that go-live preparation activities can happen in parallel to QT (for PPs in later tranches) | 1. Do agree that this assumption is reasonable?

If not, please state your reasons. |  |

| Qualification Test (QT) Phase |
| --- |
| Questions from you to the MHHSP team (or clarifications needed) |
| Please set out any questions you have, or clarifications you need from the MHHSP team, regarding the QT Phase.These should include any questions or clarifications related to all provided planning artefacts. |  |
| **Response from the MHHSP team** |
| MHHSP responses to participant’s questions will be set out here. |  |

## Migration

| Migration Phase |
| --- |
| Approach | Question | Response |
| The migration approach we have assumed for planning purposes is broadly based on the recommendations from the Code Change and Development Group (CCDG) report on “Transition Consultation on Market-Wide Half Hourly Settlement” dated 5th July 2021. Our approach shows the Advanced and Unmetered segments going live two months before the Smart/Non-Smart segment. However, there are issues yet to be resolved regarding the phased cutover to the new arrangements of participants in a given segment. There is currently no allowance in the Design of a facility to “reverse migrate” an MPAN from the new arrangements to the old. This means that once an MPAN has been migrated to the new arrangements, it can only be switched to a supplier already live on the new arrangements. This constitutes an undesirable restriction of consumer choice during the period where some but not all suppliers are on the new arrangements.For the purposes of this plan, to be consistent with the current Design, we have therefore assumed that all participants in a given segment will go live on MHHS at the same time. This means, for example, that M12 and M14 occur on the same date. | 1. Do you believe this approach is the best way to plan migration?
 |  |
| 1. If your answer to (49) is ‘yes’, please state your reasons.
 |  |
| 1. If your answer to (49) is ‘no’, please state alternative approaches you believe should be considered.

In your considerations we suggest you look at the impact of such an approach, including on consumers, incentives to start migration early, and on the risk of slippage of M14 due to participants not being ready to migrate as planned. |  |
| 1. 13 months has been allowed for Advanced and UM segment migration and 11 months for Smart segment. Please describe how you would propose to shorten these timelines.

Please also outline any risks inherent in your approach, and how you would propose to mitigate these. |  |

| Migration Phase |
| --- |
| Questions from you to the MHHSP team (or clarifications needed) |
| Please set out any questions you have, or clarifications you need from the MHHSP team, regarding the QT Phase.These should include any questions or clarifications related to all provided planning artefacts. |  |
| **Response from the MHHSP team** |
| MHHSP responses to participant’s questions will be set out here. |  |

## Overall Programme

| Overall Programme |
| --- |
| Approach | Question | Response |
| All activity durations and sequencing are set out in the attached schedule documentation. | It is the stated objective of this planning consultation to arrive at a credible, robust, and achievable plan that sees MHHS implemented as early as possible and preferably no later than the date set out in the existing Transition Timetable.1. Other than any options you may have set out earlier in this document, what ideas do you have to accelerate delivery of MHHS and to meet the stated objective?

This may include but not be limited to:* conducting activities in parallel
* resequencing activities
* removing activities
* changing activities (e.g. reducing scope)
* automating activities
* increasing, reallocating (to other parties) or sharing resources
* increasing funding
 |  |
| 1. Other than any specific or detailed comments earlier in this document - if your view is that the stated objective cannot be achieved, please set out your material reasons why not.

These reasons should be argued on both a qualitative and quantitative basis. Reasons not supported by specific and quantified evidence or information may not carry weight in any reconsideration or reiteration of the plan before it is baselined. |  |
| 1. Please explicitly define any material risks you see in meeting the stated objective and why these cannot be mitigated sufficiently to meet the objective.
 |  |
| The scope, objectives and timings for the programme’s Control Points are set out in the attached documentation. | 1. Do you agree with these, or if not, what changes would you suggest?

Please state your reasons. |  |
| The timings for Readiness Assessments are set out in the attached schedule documentation. | 1. Do you agree with the timescales and approach to conducting Readiness Assessments (or not)?

If not, please state your reasons. |  |

| Overall Programme Plan |
| --- |
| **Questions from you to the MHHSP team (or clarifications needed)** |
| Please set out any questions you have, or clarifications you need from the MHHSP team, regarding the overall programme plan.These should include any questions or clarifications related to all provided planning artefacts. |  |
| **Response from the MHHSP team** |
| MHHSP responses to participant’s questions will be set out here. |  |