

MHHS Qualification Advisory Group (QAG) Headline Report

Issue date: 21/10/2024

Meeting number	QAG 009	Venue	Virtual – MS Teams
Date and time	17 October 2024 10:00-12:00	Classification	Public

Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date	Update
CR055 Update	QAG09-01	Programme to provide an update on the request to ask parties to give consent for publishing their wave allocation and migration dates.	Programme	21/11/24	NEW
Updates from QWG	QAG09-02	Programme to include status of qualification artefacts from within the QWG pack in the QAG pack going forwards.	Programme (PMO)	21/11/24	NEW

Decisions

Area	Decision Ref	Description	Rationale
Headline Report and Actions	QAG-DEC36	The headline report of the previous meeting on 19 September 2024 was approved.	The Programme invited objections to the approval of the document, to which none were received.

Qualification Documents	QAG-DEC37	The Chair, acting with delegated authority of the MHHS Senior Responsible Owner (SRO), approved the Self-Qualification Assessment Document (SQAD) to go to BSC PAB on 31 October 2024.	The document went out for consultation last month, but no comments were received. The Chair invited objections to the approval of the document, to which none were received.
--------------------------------	-----------	--	--

Key Discussion Items

Area	Discussion
Headline Report and Actions	DECISION: The headline report of the previous meeting on 19 September 2024 was approved (QAG-DEC36 – recording timestamp 00:02:50).
CR055 Update	<p>Programme provided an update on CR055 and the proposed plan for PSG.</p> <p>The Programme provided an update on the proposed M10 timeline and the main changes to the critical path. They requested participants to provide their input and feedback, highlighting that Ofgem has explicitly asked for quantitative evidence to support the plan. The Programme will be providing additional guidance to support the evidence that Ofgem wants to see.</p> <p>The DNO representative raised a concern about the period between 16 May and 22 August, questioning if people would just be sitting around and if they would be paying people to do nothing. Programme responded that by that time, testing should be completed, and the remaining task would be plugging the test completion report into the QAD and waiting for the MVC. Programme noted that participants may need to review their resource levels at this point for their own testing programmes, but funding for St. Clements through the SIT environments would continue. Programme acknowledged that there could be opportunities for efficiencies during June, July, and August.</p> <p>The DNO representative also asked if there was a risk that something going wrong in SIT could impact qualification testing. Programme confirmed that there is a risk and suggested capturing it as a risk. Programme explained that the benefit of getting the testing done upfront while the Programme is mobilised outweighs the risk of any exceptional testing that might be needed later.</p> <p>The Independent Supplier Agent representative asked about the PIT approach and plan dates, inquiring if the dates were still expected on the original schedule. The Code Bodies confirmed that the dates had not been moved and they were still aiming to have the PIT approach and plan dates as originally scheduled.</p> <p>The Supplier Agent representative inquired about the recommendation to PSG and the potential impact if Ofgem did not approve the plan. Programme confirmed that they would need to reassess the plan if Ofgem was not comfortable with it. Programme mentioned that they would have a good idea from Ofgem well in advance of their decision and would undertake necessary preparatory activities.</p> <p>Ofgem added that if there were information gaps, they would write to the Programme to request more information. Ofgem emphasised that they would not wait for six weeks to express dissatisfaction but would work with the Programme to ensure they have enough information to make a robust decision.</p>
Wave Allocation Update	Code Bodies provided an update on whether Wave Reallocation can be supported with the outcome of CR55 and the potential next steps. The Medium Supplier representative mentioned that medium suppliers raised no concerns with the process.

	<p>The Supplier Agent representative discussed the feedback on qualification wave dates and migration pockets. They noted that participants supported the proposal to allow requests for moving waves, with no objections to excluding wave one from this proposal. However, agents expressed the need for visibility into the wave allocation and qualification process, as they might not always be informed by suppliers. They emphasised the importance of agents being involved from the beginning and throughout the process to manage their resources effectively.</p> <p>ACTION: Programme to provide an update on the request to ask parties to give consent for publishing their wave allocation and migration dates (QAG09-01).</p> <p>Programme responded that they would check in with the PPC for an update on this matter. A member of the PPC team mentioned that they were working on the final piece of drafting the consent forms for sharing qualification wave dates and migration pockets dates.</p> <p>The I&C Supplier representative highlighted the uncertainty participants faced with two sets of dates in their diaries and stressed the need for quick action. Code Bodies assured that they aimed to move as quickly as possible, considering the extra six weeks in the plan. They would review the wave dates alongside the new plan and draft the PPIR accordingly.</p> <p>Programme added that they were waiting for the CR55 plan and the analysis of migration submissions. They were considering asking Programme-related questions to make the best use of migration capacity and ensure a consolidated PPIR.</p> <p>The Programme mentioned that participants had raised questions about the migration schedule, with some indicating a desire to move into an earlier wave.</p> <p>Code Bodies confirmed that from their perspective, they were comfortable supporting participants through wave two at pace to hit the same migration date.</p>
<p>IPA Period 8 Assurance</p>	<p>IPA provided an overview of the IPA's period 7 end-of-period reporting and period 8 planning, which covers planning and mobilisation.</p> <p>The DNO representative raised a concern about the potential repetitiveness of period 8, given that not much has changed since period 7. IPA assured that they would not sample the same participants and would use a randomised sample with different exam questions based on new information from the recalibrated timelines.</p> <p>The Large Supplier representative asked about the opportunity for early informal reviews of QAD submissions to de-risk the process. Code Bodies responded that while they were open to providing guidance and support, they were hesitant to do full informal reviews before the QAD windows opened. However, they would host a QAD webinar on 14 November 2024 to discuss the level of detail expected and offer tips for participants.</p>
<p>Qualification Documents</p>	<p>Code Bodies provided an update on the Self-Qualification Assessment Document (SQAD) and sought QAG approval for SQAD to go to BSC PAB.</p> <p>Code Bodies provided an update on the SQAD. This document is set to be presented at the BSC PAB on the 31 October 2024. It went out for consultation last month, but no comments were received, so there was no need to republish the document.</p> <p>DECISION: The Chair, acting with delegated authority of the MHHS Senior Responsible Owner (SRO), approved the Self-Qualification Assessment Document (SQAD) to go to BSC PAB on 31 October 2024 (QAG-DEC37 – recording timestamp 00:44:35).</p>
<p>Non-SIT LDSO QT Readiness</p>	<p>The Programme provided an update on Non-SIT LDSO QT Readiness.</p>

	No comments or questions raised from participants.
Updates from QWG	<p>The Code Bodies provided an update what was covered at QWG.</p> <p>The Large Supplier representative noted an update on the qualification requirements to the RTTM templates, mentioning that there had been requests for redline versions and other details. They asked for clarity on some tests that were excluded from role-specific RTTMs and the rationale behind these exclusions.</p> <p>Code Bodies responded that part of this had been addressed. They had redlined the document to show where testing was no longer required and released both redline and clean versions. The Clock explained the updates and the rationale behind them. Code Bodies mentioned that if there were any individual requirement questions, parties could email in for clarification.</p> <p>The Large Supplier representative also raised another question flagged by a large supplier regarding the visibility of the status of qualification artifacts within the QAG pack. They suggested including some slides from the QWG pack that show the red, amber, green status of various processes and artifacts for better visibility.</p> <p>ACTION: Programme to include status of qualification artifacts from within the QWG pack in the QAG pack going forwards (QAG09-02).</p>
Programme Milestones related to QAG	<p>Programme provided an update on milestones related to QAG.</p> <p>No comments or questions raised from participants.</p>
Top Programme Risks Related to QAG	<p>The Programme provided an update on the Top Programme Risks Related to QAG.</p> <p>No comments or questions raised from participants.</p>
Summary and Next Steps	<p>The Secretariat confirmed the actions captured in the meeting.</p> <p>No comments or questions raised from participants.</p>

Date of next meeting: 21 November 2024

Attendees

Chair

Chris Welby (Chair)

MHHS SRO

Apologies

Tom Jenkins

Seat vacant

iDNO Representative

Small Supplier Representative

Industry Representatives

Andrew Wallace

Clare Hannah

David Yeoman

Gareth Evans

Graham Wood

Helen Clarke

Laura Kennedy

Sarah Ross

Rachel Stringfellow

RECCo Representative (as Qualification Agent)

Supplier Agent Representative

DNO Representative

I&C Supplier Representative

Large Supplier Representative

Supplier Agent Representative (Independent)

Elexon Representative (as Qualification Agent)

Elexon Qualification Team

Medium Supplier Representative

MHHS IM

Adrian Ackroyd

Anne Robinson

Jason Brogden

Kaitlin Jones

Nicola Farley

Smitha Prichrikat

Warren Fulton

Client Test Programme Manager

PMO

Programme Industry SME

PPC

Qualification Test Manager

Client Delivery Manager

Migration Lead

Other Attendees

Fahreen Japp

James Stokes

Jenny Boothe

Liam Evans

Matt Cogram

Vaishnavi Sharma

Ofgem

DIP Manager

Ofgem

IPA

Elexon Qualification Team

REC Code Manager