

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

**Issue date: 01/05/25**

Meeting number

**MCAG 012**

Venue

**Virtual – MS Teams**

Date and time

**29 April 2025 1400-1600**

Classification

**Public**

### Actions

Area	Action Ref	Action	Owner	Due Date	Update
<b>Summary and Next Steps</b>	MCAG12-01	The programme to log a risk/issue and produce clear guidance for Suppliers to engage with all agents and identify DCCs prior to migration.	Programme (Warren Fulton)	27/05/2025	NEW

### Decisions

Area	Decision Ref	Description	Rationale
<b>Headline and Actions</b>	MCAG-DEC29	Headline report was approved with no comments or objections from MCAG members.	The Headline Report was approved without objections from PPs.
<b>Early Life Support Model</b>	MCAG-DEC30	The Chair, acting with delegated authority of the MHHS Senior Responsible Owner (SRO), approved the Early Life Support Model (v0.3) (to be uplifted to Version 1.0).	The Chair asked if there were any objections to approving the Early Life Support Model. None were raised and the approval of the document was accepted.
<b>Migration Framework</b>	MCAG-DEC31	The Chair, acting with delegated authority of the MHHS Senior Responsible Owner (SRO), approved the Migration Framework Consultation 4 outputs and baselining the Migration Framework artefacts.	The Chair asked if there were any objections to approving the Migration Framework Consultation 4 outputs and baselining the Migration Framework artefacts. None were raised and the approval of the artefacts was accepted.

<b>Transition Design Settlement Timetable</b>	MCAG-DEC32	The Chair, acting with delegated authority of the MHHS Senior Responsible Owner (SRO), approved the updated Transition Design Settlement Timetable Artefacts; MHHS-DEL1590: Transition to new Settlement Timetable v2.3 and the MHHS-DEL1593: Replacement RF Settlement Timetable RF Illustration v1.1.	The Chair asked if there were any objections to approving the updated Transition Design Settlement Timetable Artefacts; MHHS-DEL1590: Transition to new Settlement Timetable v2.3 and the MHHS-DEL1593: Replacement RF Settlement Timetable RF Illustration v1.1. None were raised and the approval of the documents was accepted.
---	------------	---	--

## Key Discussion Items

Area	Discussion
<b>Headline and Actions</b>	<p><b>DECISION:</b> Headline report was approved (with no amendments) with no objections from MCAG members (<b>MCAG-DEC29 – recording timestamp 00:06:45</b>).</p> <p>Action MCAG08-01 was discussed. DCC Representative mentioned that workshops have been held to discuss incidents requiring multiple service desks. Additionally, there is ongoing work on model office scenarios, including handling data breaches and other "unhappy path" situations. It was decided to close this action as regular updates are provided, and the work is ongoing.</p> <p>Chair noted action MCAG09-03 and acknowledged that some internal work on programme reporting and dependencies is still ongoing and aims to close it by the May meeting.</p> <p>DNO Representative inquired about the review of membership and attendees. Chair clarified that the action was to ensure the right people are reporting to the MCAG on the required MHHS work areas (such as Qualification and Performance Assurance) to make cutover and go-live a success.</p>
<b>Early Life Support Model</b>	<p>Programme provided an overview on the consultation for the Early Life Support Model. The ELS Model document underwent a two-week consultation in February and March. Received 312 comments from 18 responses. An assurance meeting was held to address further questions and clarifications.</p> <p>MCAG Chair asked if there were any further questions on the Early Life Support Model. Seeing no questions, MCAG Chair asked if anyone objected to approving v0.3 of the Early Life Support Model. With no objections, the SRO approved the Early Life Support Model, which will be uplifted to v1.0 and published on the Programme Collaboration Base. It will be managed via the TORWG.</p> <p><b>DECISION:</b> The Chair, acting with delegated authority of the MHHS Senior Responsible Owner (SRO), approved the Early Life Support Model (v0.3) (<b>MCAG-DEC30 – recording timestamp 00:16:54</b>).</p>
<b>Service Design Update (Elexon Helix)</b>	The recent updates on the service design and operational readiness testing were discussed. The cross-party service desk approach has been a significant focus, with the consultation process concluding yesterday. The team received around 230 comments, which they are currently reviewing. Updates based on these comments are expected to be

	<p>published by next Wednesday or Thursday. Some comments require further clarification, and the team will reach out to individuals for more details.</p> <p>In parallel, the operational readiness testing (ORT) approach was also released for consultation, ending yesterday with approximately 100 comments received. The team is working through these comments and plans to release updated documentation by the end of next week. A dedicated test manager has been onboarded to handle the ORT, and discussions have started with the Programme regarding the retesting of SIT. Participants from SIT have been invited to volunteer for ORT, and the team is working on test cases, which will be released for review next week.</p> <p>Engagement sessions have been paused temporarily to allow the team re-evaluate and update the schedule. A participant engagement session is scheduled for next Thursday to discuss more scenarios with cross-party elements. Activities around operational readiness testing will commence in early May, and the consultation around the scripts and readiness testing will also proceed.</p> <p>The Operations Manual version 1.2 has been published, and feedback is encouraged. Any changes will be documented in a feedback spreadsheet. The next version of the manual will be published next Wednesday as part of the TORWG papers. The baseline version required for go-live is aimed to be ready by July. It will go through governance and be presented to TORWG and MCAG for endorsement in July.</p> <p>DNO Representative acknowledged that comments were submitted in multiple formats, including the official process via a spreadsheet and an email with a Word document from a DNO. The representative wanted to ensure that all comments were captured and addressed. Elexon (Helix) noted that they preferred comments to be submitted via the official route (spreadsheet) as it helps track submissions and ensures everything is captured. Elexon as Helix confirmed that they would check with the team to ensure comments submitted via email and Word document were included.</p>
<p><b>Migration Framework</b></p>	<p>Programme provided an update on the migration framework and the process of baselining it. Programme noted that the assurance meeting for Consultation 4 lasted 16 minutes and there were no objections raised. The framework is now mature, and participants are planning their migrations according to its principles.</p> <p>Chair asked if any future updates to the migration artefacts would relate to lessons from the final supplier submissions. Programme confirmed that while the framework is being baselined, adjustments can still be made, particularly to parameters. These findings would be brought back through MWG and MCAG for approval.</p> <p>Programme sought MCAG approval to baseline the framework, make it operational and the obligations within live. They noted that any future changes would need to go through the CR process. The framework will become an obligation for programme participants, especially when the next supplier submissions are due.</p> <p>The supplier submissions window, initially set to open the next day, was moved to the following Wednesday based on feedback from certain participants, who preferred a two-month ramp-up period. Programme assured that envelopes would be recalculated accordingly.</p> <p>MCAG Chair asked if there were any further questions on the Migration Framework Consultation 4 outputs and the Migration Framework artefacts. Seeing no questions, MCAG Chair asked if anyone objected to approving the</p>

	<p>Migration Framework Consultation 4 outputs and baselining the Migration Framework artefacts. With no objections, the SRO approved the Migration Framework Consultation 4 outputs and baselining the Migration Framework artefacts.</p> <p><b>DECISION:</b> The Chair, acting with delegated authority of the MHHS Senior Responsible Owner (SRO), approved the Migration Framework Consultation 4 outputs and baselining the Migration Framework artefacts (<b>MCAG-DEC31 – recording timestamp 00:36:19</b>).</p>
<b>Migration Readiness</b>	<p>Programme provided an update on the migration readiness as the Programme heads towards M11.</p> <p>Programme provided a high-level summary of the status. The second supplier submission, initially scheduled for this week, has been pushed back to next Wednesday to allow for additional validations. This submission process will start on 07 May. Chair asked if programme participants had been notified of this change, to which Programme confirmed that this was the first notification.</p> <p>Programme also discussed key milestones, including the baselining of the first version migration schedule, which is linked to the upcoming submission exercise and remains on track. Sprint Zero, which involves daily planning for the early life support period, will kick off in September. Dress Rehearsal 1 has already started, engaging the MCC and suppliers to test new technology and processes. Dress Rehearsal 2, scheduled to begin at the end of July, will test monitoring and control processes and involve all participants.</p> <p>Chair suggested including a link to the PSG slides in the headline report for easy access (as these contained further Migration Readiness information).</p> <p><u><a href="#">PSG slides for 07 May 2025 can be found here.</a></u></p>
<b>Transition Design Settlement Timetable</b>	<p>Programme provided an update on the MHHS settlement timetable artefact. This artefact outlines the transition from the current 14-month to a four-month settlement timetable. Due to CR055 amending the programme timelines, the dates in the artefacts needed updating. The programme has updated these artefacts and presented them to TORWG and conducted a consultation. TORWG has recommended the updated artefacts for approval by MCAG.</p> <p>Key changes include extending the timeline over three financial years (instead of two) and mapping dates to milestones to future-proof the document. Changes were also made to the M16 readiness assessment timeline.</p> <p>MCAG Chair asked if there were any further questions on the Transition Design Settlement Timetable. Seeing no questions, MCAG Chair asked if anyone objected to approving the updated Transition Design Settlement Timetable Artefacts; MHHS-DEL1590: Transition to new Settlement Timetable v2.3 and the MHHS-DEL1593: Replacement RF Settlement Timetable RF Illustration v1.1. With no objections, the SRO approved the updated Transition Design Settlement Timetable Artefacts; MHHS-DEL1590: Transition to new Settlement Timetable v2.3 and the MHHS-DEL1593: Replacement RF Settlement Timetable RF Illustration v1.1</p> <p><b>DECISION:</b> The Chair, acting with delegated authority of the MHHS Senior Responsible Owner (SRO), approved the approve the updated Transition Design Settlement Timetable Artefacts; MHHS-DEL1590: Transition to new Settlement Timetable v2.3 and the MHHS-DEL1593: Replacement RF Settlement Timetable RF Illustration v1.1 (<b>MCAG-DEC32 – recording timestamp 00:46:58</b>).</p>

<p><b>Programme Milestones Related to MCAG</b></p>	<p>Programme provided an update on Programme Milestones Related to MCAG.</p> <p>Chair raised a question about the red milestone for M16 methodology approval, inquiring when it would come to MCAG for approval. Programme noted that the transition design work, which had been discussed during the session had a dependency on it. This dependency should be unblocked following the approval of the transition design settlement timetable (in the previous agenda item).</p>
<p><b>Top Programme Risks Related to MCAG</b></p>	<p>Programme provided an update on the risks related to MCAG, mentioning that there were no updates to the existing risks, but a mitigation had been added to risk R700. Additionally, a new risk 1099, had been raised.</p> <p>Chair asked for an explanation of the new risk. Programme explained that it was a theoretical risk related to a delay between qualification and migration start for two participants. While they do not currently see a need for additional controls, they will monitor the situation. If it becomes a trend, they may propose mitigations through MWG and bring them back to MCAG.</p> <p>DNO Representative raised a related concern about the short window for LDSOs between qualification approval and being ready for M10. Programme clarified the concern was specifically about the go-live period, whereas the new risk was about the entire migration period. Programme added that they would discuss mitigations for the concern in a follow-up meeting and provide an update.</p> <p>DIP Manager Representative confirmed that there would be an open day on 20 May 2025 to discuss the DIP onboarding process, which would include guidance and feedback opportunities. DNO Representative emphasised the importance of this session for LDSOs and requested that invites be sent out promptly.</p> <p><a href="#">Link to the DIP open day details can be found here.</a></p> <p>DCC Representative asked about the status of risk 828, specifically regarding regulatory mechanisms. Programme responded that they were working on the M15 incentive and exploring options for dealing with performance during migration.</p>
<p><b>Summary and Next Steps</b></p>	<p>Programme provided a summary of actions and decisions; no comments or questions were raised.</p> <p>Supplier Agent Representative (Independent) flagged a concern regarding potential nugatory migrations due to misalignment among suppliers about which agencies should be appointing and whether customers are in charge. Chair acknowledged the concern and noted that there would be offline conversations to address it. Programme agreed to review the concern, speak to the representative and, if necessary, take the issue to MWG. It was logged as an action to ensure it is tracked and addressed appropriately.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> The programme to log a risk/issue and produce clear guidance for Suppliers to engage with all agents and identify DCCs prior to migration (<b>MCAG12-01</b>).</p> <p>A piece of AOB was raised to inform MCAG representatives about an upcoming change. The programme is planning to raise a Change Request (CR) to move the M10 milestone earlier from September 24th to September 22nd. This change is intended to provide clarity to participants regarding when central systems will go live, as there has been</p>

	<p>some confusion with the original date. The move from Wednesday to Monday will not result in any material changes to participants' expectations.</p> <p>The reason for this adjustment is to align with the cutover planning requests and ensure there is no confusion among participants. The CR process will be followed, but it is expected to be a formality. This information was shared in the meeting before official communications are sent out by the programme.</p>
--	--

**Date of next MCAG: 27 May 2025**

## Attendees

### Chair

**Justin Andrews** Chair

### Industry Representatives

**Alexander Ashbrook** DCC Representative  
**Andrew Dudkowsky** NESO Representative  
**Andrew Green (on behalf of Gareth Evans)** I&C Supplier Representative  
**David Yeoman** DNO Representative  
**Graham Wood** Large Supplier Representative  
**Lijo Louis** Medium Supplier Representative  
**Mark Treanor** Small Supplier Representative  
**Michael Ceney** Elexon Representative (as BSC/BSCCo Manager)  
**Morven Hunter** iDNO Representative  
**Sarah Jones (on behalf of Jonny Moore)** RECCo Representative  
**Simon Harrison** Supplier Agent Representative (Independent)  
**Robert Golding** DIP Manager

### Apologies

**Sean Doughty** Elexon Representative (as central systems provider)

### MHHS IM Members

**Andrew Margan** Transition Design Lead  
**Anne Robinson** PMO Governance Support  
**Fola Oki** Transition Analyst  
**John Wiggins** Programme Industry SME  
**Matthew Breen** Transition Lead  
**Warren Fulton** Migration Lead

### Other Members

**Andy MacFaul** Ofgem  
**Ian Giles** Elexon (as Helix for Service Design item)  
**James Stokes** DIP Manager  
**Jenny Boothe** Ofgem  
**Joanne Ashton** DCC  
  
**Liam Evans** IPA  
**Mark Scott** Elexon (as Helix for Service Design item)  
**Paul Daniels** Avanade