

## MHHS Migration and Cutover Advisory Group (MCAG) Headline Report

**Issue date: 25/07/24**

Meeting number	<b>MCAG 005</b>	Venue	<b>Virtual – MS Teams</b>
Date and time	<b>25 July 2024 1400-1600</b>	Classification	<b>Public</b>

### Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date	Update
<b>Migration Framework Consultation Output Approval</b>	<b>MCAG05-01</b>	GW gather feedback from large suppliers on the six-month core Migration Window.	GW (Graham Wood)	02/08/2024	

### Decisions

Area	Decision Ref	Description	Rationale
<b>Headline Report and Actions</b>	MCAG-DEC13	Approval of Headline report from 04 June 2024.	The Programme invited objections to the approval of the document, to which none were received.
<b>Migration Framework Consultation Output Approval</b>	MCAG-DEC14	The Chair, acting with delegated authority of the SRO, approved the Migration Framework Consultation 2 Outputs.	The document had been recommended for approval by MWG. The Chair invited objections to the approval of the document, to which none were received. The MCAG noted the Programme would look to further clarify the migration success criteria and any tbc. The MCAG also noted the discussions with large suppliers about the six-month core migration window requirement.
<b>Migration Framework</b>	MCAG-DEC15	The Chair, acting with delegated authority of the SRO, approved Milestone T3-MI-0017, Migration Processes & Procedures, to move from 2 August 2024 to 22 October 2024.	The Chair invited objections to the approval of the date change, to which none were received, and the milestone

			change was accepted as necessary housekeeping to reflect the updated planning accuracy.
--	--	--	---

## Key Discussion Items

Area	Discussion
<p><b>Headline and Actions</b></p>	<p><b>DECISION:</b> Approval of Headline report from 04 June 2024 (<b>MCAG-DEC13</b>).</p> <p><b>MCAG02-01: ONGOING:</b> This action is part of PIT guidance, LDSOs need to take the relevant performance testing as part of their PIT.</p> <p><b>MCAG03-01: ONGOING:</b> MCAG will designate the Migration Framework, Migration Schedule and Migration Thresholds as "The Migration Plan" to align with the BSC.</p>
<p><b>Working Group Progress report</b></p>	<p>MB reported that recent data migration tests revealed significant data quality issues, necessitating a replan of the data cleanse process. The initial production data load set for 16 August 2024 may be rescheduled to early September, impacting the EES refresh planned for the end of September. An extraordinary data cleanse working group meeting might be scheduled soon to address these issues. Communications detailing the situation and next steps will be sent out next week to relevant contacts.</p>
<p><b>Migration Framework Consultation 2 Output Approval</b></p>	<p>The Programme requested recommendation from MCAG for the SRO to approve Migration Framework Consultation 2 Outputs, noting the recommendation to approve from the MWG assurance meeting.</p> <p>GW highlighted the complexities and constraints faced by large suppliers due to their extensive portfolios, which may hinder meeting the migration targets within the planned six-month window. He suggested that while the document could be approved with certain caveats, further discussions are necessary to clarify these points. The Chair inquired if this might require a change request as the 6-month period is defined in the Thresholds Document (MHHS-DEL1648) approved last November. GW responded that initial escalations would involve drafting a paper for PSG discussion.</p> <p>WF clarified that further details and clarifications, especially around the 90% and 95% migration targets, will be addressed in the Consultation 3 work with the MWG. Concerns were raised about the operational feasibility of completing migrations within six months, as previously modelled and approved. WF emphasised that changing the six-month period would require significant adjustments and a Change Request due to its impact on migration thresholds and central systems.</p> <p>DY sought assurance that comments from previous consultations would be addressed in upcoming consultations. WF confirmed that participants need to ensure their comments are considered and resolved in Consultation 3, with the assurance meeting serving as the final check.</p> <p>The Chair invited objections to the approval of the document, to which none were received. In conclusion, the Chair approved the outputs of Consultation 2, noting the need for further clarifications and ongoing discussions with large</p>

	<p>suppliers about the six-month migration period. WF stressed the urgency of addressing these concerns quickly to avoid delays.</p> <p><b>DECISION:</b> The Chair, acting with delegated authority of the SRO, approved the Migration Framework Consultation 2 Outputs (<b>MCAG-DEC14</b>).</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> GW gather feedback from large suppliers on the six-month core Migration Window (<b>MCAG05-01</b>).</p>
<p><b>Migration Framework</b></p>	<p>The Programme provided an update on the development of the Migration Framework and requested recommendation from MCAG for the SRO to approve Milestone T3-MI-0017, Migration Processes &amp; Procedures, to move from 2 August 2024 to 22 October 2024.</p> <p>The Chair asked WF about the approval timeline for October and whether it depended on the code documents being ready by August without needing further changes to the BSC (Balancing and Settlement Code). WF confirmed that the BSC already references the migration plan as a defined term, and no additional changes would be needed. JM added that the migration plan is also defined and referenced in the REC (Retail Energy Code).</p> <p>WF then addressed a milestone change, moving it from 2 August 2024 to 22 October 2024, to align with the updated roadmap. DY questioned the significant date change, to which WF explained that the initial plan from last year was based on preliminary thoughts about migration, and the new roadmap is now more accurate.</p> <p>No objections were raised, and the milestone change was accepted as necessary housekeeping to reflect the updated planning accuracy.</p> <p><b>DECISION:</b> The Chair, acting with delegated authority of the SRO, approved Milestone T3-MI-0017, Migration Processes &amp; Procedures, to move from 2 August 2024 to 22 October 2024 (<b>MCAG-DEC15</b>).</p>
<p><b>Programme Milestones Related to MCAG</b></p>	<p>The Chair and DY noted the presence of some red milestones in relation to SITAG. AR confirmed that the deck includes all relevant milestones from each advisory group, not just specific to the MCAG.</p> <p>GW, speaking as a SITAG member, agreed that having all milestones together is helpful for understanding the interconnected timelines and issues. He noted that parties involved in SITAG are aware of the reasons for the red milestones.</p>
<p><b>IPA Update- Consequential Change assurance approach</b></p>	<p>The IPA provided updates on the Consequential Change assurance approach.</p> <p>DY asked for clarification about the term "participants," wondering if it referred to everyone or specifically suppliers. He highlighted that as an LDSO they would already be several months into migration by the readiness assessment in August next year. RY confirmed that "participants" includes everyone, primarily suppliers, but also LDSOs who need to assess any impacts on industry processes outside DBT scope and report any changes they are implementing.</p> <p>DY then sought confirmation on the number of readiness assessments for LDSOs, which RY confirmed there is one in November. Selection for assessments will be based on risk or randomly, and volunteers are welcome.</p>

	<p>GW inquired about the governance and enforcement of the impact assessments. RY explained that while the programme can't enforce execution, it will use governance for updating assurance activities and intervening if participants fall behind. Readiness assessments will give a broad view of participant status, though the programme won't enforce changes but expects organisations to understand the implications of not implementing changes.</p> <p>GW expressed a concern that some parties might be reluctant to spend time on demonstrating their plans to a third party. RY noted that participants who are confident in their plans need to self-certify their readiness, outlining broad scopes and having a senior individual sign off.</p> <p>The MCAG noted that the IPA would bring back relevant updates to future MCAG meetings.</p>
<b>Top Programme Risks Related to MCAG</b>	The Programme ran through Top Programme Risks Related to MCAG, no comments or questions were raised.
<b>Summary and Next Steps</b>	<p>The Programme provided a summary of actions and possible next steps, no comments or questions were raised.</p> <p>The MCAG noted the date of the next meeting in August. Currently no items were due for MCAG consideration, therefore this meeting maybe cancelled.</p>

**Date of next MCAG: 27 August 2024 (TBC)**

## Attendees

### Chair

Justin Andrews                      Chair

### Industry Representatives

David Yeoman (DY)                      DNO Representative

Andrew Green (AG) (on behalf of Gareth Evans)                      I&C Supplier Representative

Graham Wood (GW)                      Large Supplier Representative

Jonny Moore (JM)                      RECCo Representative

Joanne Ashton (JA) (on behalf of Alexander Ashbrook)                      DCC Representative

Simon Harrison (SH)                      Supplier Agent Representative (Independent)

### Apologies

Andrew Dudkowsky (AD)                      National Grid ESO Representative

Sean Doughty (SD)                      Elexon Representative

Morven Hunter (MH)                      iDNO Representative

### MHHS IM Members

Matthew Breen (MB)                      Migration Analyst

Anne Robinson (AR)                      PMO Governance Support

Warren Fulton (WF)                      MHHS Client Delivery Advisor

### Other Members

Matthew Fradgley (MF)                      DCC

Liam Evans (LE)                      IPA

Renata Yussupova (RY)                      IPA