



**MHHS
PROGRAMME**
Industry-led, Elexon facilitated

Migration and Cutover Advisory Group (MCAG) #26 – 23 June 2026

Version 2.0

MHHS-DEL4552

Agenda


#	Item	Objective	Type	Lead	Time	Page
1	Welcome	Chair welcome	Information	Chair		2
2	Headline Report and Actions	Approval of Headline Report of previous meeting and review of outstanding actions	Decision	Secretariat	14:00-14:05 5 mins	3
3	Settlement Timetable Work Update	Update on Settlement Timetable, STEG work and consultation outcomes	Information	Programme (Ian Smith)	14:05-14:25 20 mins	5
4	ELS Exit Recommendations Update	Update on ELS Exit Recommendations	Information	Elexon (Ian Giles)	14:25-14:30 5 mins	12
5	Migration Execution	Update on the progress of Migration Execution and Sprint 3 Planning	Information	Programme (Nicola Farley)	14:30-14:40 10 mins	16
6	Participant-Driven Migration Dependencies	Update on Migration dependencies on industry participants	Information	Programme (Nicola Farley)	14:40-14:50 10 mins	23
7	CR065 Next Steps Update	Update on CR065, alignment of Migration Baseline Documents to Mod P487 and approval of changes to the MHHS Migration Framework Foundations Document	Information	Programme (Joe Grisley)	14:50-14:55 5 mins	27
8	Migration Exclusion List	Update on the Migration Exclusion and Remediation list	Information	Programme (Joe Grisley)	14:55-15:00 5 mins	33
9	External Change Log	To provide sight and tracking of external change that is supportive to achieving M15	Information	Programme (Joe Grisley)	15:00-15:05 5 mins	35
10	MWG and Sprint 2 Retro Update	Update on MWG and Sprint 2 Retro activities and progress	Information	Programme (Joe Grisley)	15:05-15:15 10 mins	39
11	Programme Milestones related to MCAG	Overview of upcoming Programme Milestones related to MCAG and any milestone changes for approval	Information	Programme (PMO)	15:15-15:15 0 mins	43
12	Top Programme Risks related to MCAG	Overview of Programme Risks related to MCAG	Information	Programme (PMO)	15:15-15:15 0 mins	45
13	Programme Updates	Provide updates from L2/3 governance groups and wider Programme activity	Information	Programme (PMO)	15:15-15:15 0 mins	48
14	Summary and Next Steps	Summarise actions/decisions and look ahead to the next MCAG	Information	Chair and Secretariat	15:15-15:20 5 mins	51

Headline Report and Actions

DECISION: Approval of Headline Report of previous meeting and review of outstanding actions

Secretariat

5 mins



Headline Report and Actions

1. Approval of the Headline Report from MCAG meeting held [26 May 2026](#)
2. **Review outstanding actions** (actions will be discussed by exception. Please review the action updates ahead of the meeting):


Area	Ref	Action	Owner	Due	Latest Update
Headline Report and Actions	MCAG25-01	Programme to update the link to meeting papers in the MCAG meeting invite.	Programme (Malinsa Abeysundara)	23/06/26	RECOMMENDED CLOSED: Meeting invite has been updated to provide access to latest meeting papers.
ELS Recommendations Update	MCAG25-02	The DIP Manager to provide a summary of content presented at DCAB and TOG regarding the escalation process and consequences document at the next MCAG on 23 June 2026.	DIP Manager (Stuart Pitcher/James Stokes)	23/06/26	ONGOING: Content is being presented to TOG and DCAB 30 June 2026, with an update to be provided following this at the July MCAG.

Settlement Timetable Work Update

INFORMATION: Update on Settlement Timetable,
STEG work and consultation outcomes

Programme (Ian Smith)

20 mins




MCAG Update

1. Initial Consultation Document was issued on the 29th April and closed on the 26th May
2. Webinar 1 was held on the 29th April:
 - Over 150 Attendees present/11 Questions raised
3. M16 Settlement Timetable FAQs were produced on the 5th May and updated throughout the drop-in sessions:
 - See [Consultation Log doc](#)
4. First drop-in Q&A session was held on the 6th May:
 - Over 70 Attendees present/ 2 Questions raised
5. Second drop-in Q&A session was held on 13th May:
 - Over 50 Attendees present/ 4 Questions raised
6. Third drop-in Q&A session was held on 20th May:
 - Over 50 Attendees present/ 10 Questions raised
7. STEG meeting held on 10/06/26 (see next slides):
 - Overview of the RF consultation responses
 - Consultation themes presented with initial Programme views
 - Updated SVA & CVA Settlement Delta volume presented with Q1 '25 data; deltas still within tolerance

Overview of M16 Settlement Timetable Consultation

Graph below shows the number and type of constituents responding:

- 33 responses in total representing 8 different PP constituencies
- Thank you to everyone who responded





Note that some responses covered more than one constituency but to avoid double-counting discretion has been used to count in only one of those constituencies

M16 Settlement Timetable Consultation: Reduction in RF to 7 months

The first chart shows the breakdown of 'Yes' and 'No' for the first question: "Do you agree that the reduction in RF to 7 months should be applied to the Settlement Timetable from the Settlement Date of 1 October 2026 onwards...."



The second graph shows the breakdown of 'Yes' and 'No' per constituency for the first question.



M16 Settlement Timetable Consultation: Reduction in RF to 4 months

The first chart shows the breakdown of 'Yes' and 'No' for the second question: "Do you agree that the reduction in RF to 4 months should be applied to the Settlement Timetable from the Settlement Date of 1 April 2027 onwards..."


The second graph shows the breakdown of 'Yes' and 'No' per constituency for the second question.




Note that some responses covered more than one constituency but to avoid double-counting discretion has been used to count in only one of those constituencies

Responses by Total Number of MPANs per Supplier Response


Reduction to 7 months responses represented by number of MPANs




Reduction to 7 months responses represented by total number of MPANs percentages



Reduction to 4 months responses represented by total number of MPANs



Reduction to 4 months responses represented by total number of MPANs percentages



M16 Settlement Timetable Consultation – Key Themes on not agreeing to RF reduction to 7 months

'No' to RF at 7 months from October 26 themes:


- PAF and Supplier Charges impact is a potential significant increase:
 - Need further modelling, as third party modelling outcome not known
 - Will drive increase in Trading Disputes
 - Need change to PAF performance thresholds (100% Performance metric)
 - Need to look at Supplier Charges calculation
- Timing of decision and implementation from October 2026:
 - Some support in principle but change to later implementation date, e.g. Apr. '27, M15/M16 or % MPAN migrated trigger
 - PPs still migrating are impacted more and market unstable as still transitioning
- Settlement Monitoring:
 - Use of % v absolute Volume differences
 - Model individual supplier impacts and distributional impacts, import/ export
 - Lower % delta required e.g. 0.25%, 1% too high
 - CVA issues – resolution of metering issues, estimation issues, need greater assurance in reduced timetable
- Other Matters:
 - Increased financial risk/ exposure
 - Current economic and geopolitical climate
 - Benefits of reduction of window may not be achieved
 - More Trad Meters remaining than was envisaged (plus non-communicating smart/ advanced)
 - No GVC process under MHHS to correct issues
 - Reduced timeframes for resolution of CoS issues (D0300 process – noting this sits under REC)

ELS Exit Recommendations Update

INFORMATION: Update on ELS Exit
Recommendations

Elexon (Ian Giles)

5 mins



Progress against MHHSP ELS Exit Recommendations (1/3)

Confidential

Updated v2

#	MHHSP Recommendation	Response & Actions	Owner	Due	Latest Progress Update
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOG continues to run weekly for remainder of migration period (until M15) Service Management Forum continues to run monthly until end of migration period 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOG will meet weekly. TOG will incorporate regular industry touchpoints to refine the ToR including duration and cadence according to industry need. Service Management Forum will continue to run monthly, and future monthly sessions have now been diarised. 	<p>Karen Lavelle / Roger Harris</p> <p>Gary Leach</p>	Complete	<p>Complete</p> <p>Complete – Service Management Forums have been diarised up until December 26.</p>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same reporting as is currently provided to TORWG is shared with the Programme & Industry on weekly basis. Same analysis is undertaken by the reporting party to identify where remedial actions should be taken when performance dips – Completed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elexon will continue to produce and deliver performance metrics, incident updates, analysis, and continuous improvement progress through established governance forums. Reporting will be refined and matured over time, with direct engagement with industry to ensure it increasingly reflects user experience. Trend Analysis is not being prepared and presented in SM Forum 	<p>Elexon Value Stream Leads / Gary Leach</p>	Complete	<p>Complete – An updated reporting approach, incorporating this feedback, will be presented at the Service Management Forum on 10 March.</p>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DIP Manager to review arrangements for DIP Rules monitoring and the process for providing supporting guidance Post review, define the process for performance issue escalation to individuals and the MCC where failure to adhere to DIP rules could impact migration delivery plan Improvements to be embedded ahead of onboarding additional parties to DIP in Wave 1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DIP Manager has monitoring capability to identify participants not aligning to DIP Rules and the DIP Performance Assurance Framework will be live from April 2026. DIP Manager has committed to DCAB to share Performance Assurance approach and timelines at March DCAB, incl Risk Register, Risk Op plan against rules of DSD003 DIP Manager commits to advising and sharing the Performance Assurance Framework and agree on escalation pathways/controls with Code Bodies Assurance capabilities. Focus topic to describe the framework, escalation pathways and controls will be scheduled at a future TOG meeting (post Code Body alignment). 	<p>James Stokes</p>	<p>Next progress update 26/06/26</p>	<p>18th June – Guidance materials on track for June 30th to bring together the conclusion of handling compliance and escalations. Linked to HIGH Risk (R1250) in MHHS programme.</p> <p>Head of Data Products comfortable DIP Manager has the right capability to escalate with Code Bodies and Ofgem and has regular engagement with BSC Assurance and REC Assurance</p>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reconsider, address, and communicate Controls to ensure incident resolution and exception handling take place in timely manner (as part of Cross-Party Service Design ahead of Wave 1 qualification in April) – Ongoing - IPA Ensure parties have clarity on responsibilities across Industry including who is responsible for incident progression once raised – Ongoing – IPA Include guidance on what parties are expected to raise and when as they identify issues – Completed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing CPSD controls are being reviewed and re-communicated, alongside a review of internal processes to ensure they effectively support these controls. Consideration needs to be made if any additional cross industry controls are required Clear, end-to-end responsibility for incident ownership and progression will be defined and communicated across all industry parties once an incident is raised. This has been documented in the CPSD Approach Guidance has been issued via the CPSD Approach and Runbook with additional clarification currently under review Additional Industry workshops have been held 	<p>Gary Leach</p>	<p>Complete</p> <p>31/03/26 (progress on IPAService Assurance Activities will be reported on at Service Management Forums).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ All existing CPSD controls have now been re-validated. ✓ CPSD Approach and Internal Process have been shared with IPA for review ✓ New ServiceNow categories have been added to reflect CPSD ✓ New Priority (P5) has been implemented for CPSD • Awaiting IPA feedback for further action to be taken

Confidential

Progress against MHHSP ELS Exit Recommendations (2/3)

Confidential

#	MHHSP Recommendation	Response & Actions	Owner	Due	Latest Progress Update
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure controls in place to prioritise incidents correctly (ensuring parties have opportunity to recommend priority) – Complete Process to delineate service requests from incidents. Resource/SME in place to ensure timely resolution – Complete Make clear the escalation route that parties can follow if they feel the response is not appropriate/ query not dealt with in timely manner – Complete Proposed changes to be agreed with Industry and clearly documented in SM documentation – Ongoing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Controls are in place to ensure incidents are prioritised correctly with the Technical Triage function A clear process is in place to distinguish service requests from incidents, ensuring correct classification and handling, this is detailed in the Operations Manual A clear and documented escalation route has been communicated and will be presented at SM Forum on 10 February. Proposed changes will be agreed with Industry via the Service Management Forum and clearly documented within Service Management documentation. 	Gary Leach	<p>Complete</p> <p>Complete</p> <p>Complete</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Technical Triage (TT) continues to own initial impact assessment and priority. ✓ Parties are explicitly invited to recommend priority at case submission, within the free text box of the case for TT to review during impact assessment <p>Update 22nd May</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operations Manual v3.0, Onboarding Pack and Elexon Document links have all been released. Training sessions for Service Management have been booked with industry
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issues with the MHH TOM should continue to be raised and tracked via the Service Desk with regards to BSC processes – Complete Consider how issues which may not be considered major incidents but impact multiple participants should be communicated out to the wider industry and managed thereafter – Complete These open incidents, including detail on who is leading the resolution, should be visible to all impacted parties – Complete Increased transparency and reporting of issues and fixes that would historically have been internal to parties is required. This should also include incidents that are raised on other service desks which could impact multiple parties and codes – Ongoing Incidents spanning multiple codes should be addressed as part of the Cross-Party Service Design improvements. Joint guidance should be produced to ensure that participants know which organisation they should raise issues into – Ongoing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is agreed in the CPSD approach where Elexon will handle Incident actions but will not be subject to SLA Technical Triage will identify and manage issues impacting multiple participants and coordinate wider industry communications where MI thresholds are not met. Improvements to Incident and Case updates and quality is currently under review. We will report progress and improvement plans into the Service Management Forum and the TOG. Roles and Responsibilities workshops have been held internally Improved ways of working for Technical Triage have been implemented 	Gary Leach	31.3.26 (progress on IPA Service Assurance Activities will be reported on at Service Management Forums).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All MHH TOM-related issues continue to be logged and tracked via Technical Triage (TT) A validation process within TT confirms correct categorisation and routing before onward progression. Cross-checks are now in place to identify patterns where similar issues are raised. Visibility improvements are being developed to give more transparency on outstanding cases / incidents <p>Update 16th June:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> IPA tactical actions evidence has been reviewed by IPA, ongoing discussions regarding strategic actions. 3 pending Service Management tactical actions to be completed by end of June
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to document improvement activities and track and discuss with Industry through the monthly Service Management Forum – Ongoing Seek industry feedback and prioritise proposed improvement activities – Ongoing Present an update on outstanding/recently resolved closed problem records – Ongoing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All Continuous Improvements will be presented and tracked in the Service Management Forum Industry feedback will be collated within the Service Management Forum Problem Management updates will be presented in the Service Management Forum Phase 1 Continual Improvements have been completed. Phase 2 Improvements from Industry and Programme Feedback ongoing Problem Management ways of working has been improved and new Problem Manager is joining 26 March 	Gary Leach	Complete	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service Management Forum is tracking improvement activities with industry Feedback is received during Forum or through cases being raised Weekly Issues Log now contains Problem Management information

Confidential

Progress against MHHSP ELS Exit Recommendations (3/3)

Confidential

#	MHHSP Recommendation	Response & Actions	Owner	Due	Latest Progress Update
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DIP change and release management process to be reviewed and baselined as soon as possible Implement more structured release approach, where upcoming DIP changes are communicated in advance DIP users should be consulted to assess best time for DIP changes to be made This should be addressed ahead of more DIP users being onboarded in April 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DIP Manager has agreed processes through working groups and alignment with other code bodies. DIP Manager has amended approach to sharing forward schedule of change. DIP Manager has taken action to ensure pre and post change comms are issued. DCAB will be advised on DIP changes and releases notes issued 20 days ahead. 	James Stokes	Complete	<p>Updated 09 April.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change process baselined. Forward schedule of change on DIP website. Effective and operational release notes are in practice, consultation with MCC prior to planning outages is operationally effective. Issuing comms pre-deployment and post deployment operational. And agreement to issue further comms 10 days post change to confirm outcome operational.
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep log of all comms that have been sent via all channels in readily available location Implement a process to enable parties to check which comms they are signed up to receive Include straightforward guidance on how to sign up for different types of comms, along with the purpose for each comms channel, in the TOG pack on a regular basis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requirements are being gathered for communications improvement requests and will be reviewed with Elexon comms team for feasibility assessment. Elexon Comms team to report into TOG on delivery plan. Reconfirmation of the comms sign-up process to be communicated in TOG on 6 February and at regular cadence moving forward 	Kate Norton	27/06/2026	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formal handover of this to Elexon comms team is complete Implementation of the capability for self-serve of what lists are signed up to and by whom within an org is a long-term objective and will not be updated weekly at TOG, as it may take significant time to develop and deploy. To sign up for communications, go to: https://www.elexon.co.uk/news-insights/subscribe-to-our-newsletter-and-circulars/


Confidential

Migration Execution


INFORMATION: Update on the progress of Migration Execution and Sprint 3 Planning

Programme (Nicola Farley)

10 mins



1. As of 12 June 2026, a total of 11.4 million migrations have been completed. Please see the table below for progress against plan.
2. Sprint 3 started on 03 June 2026. 8.9 million MPANs are planned to be migrated which includes recovery of any missed volumes from Sprint 1 and 2.
3. Non-SIT Suppliers are now able to begin Migrations. Five suppliers started Migration before the end of Sprint 2. Six Suppliers are due to start Migration in Sprint 3.
4. Exception volumes remain low, with trends and preventative actions continuing to be reviewed through the MWG.
5. There have been no LDSO, DCC, or DIP threshold breaches.



Progress against Plan(s) as of 12 June 2026

	Planned Migrations	Actuals to Plan - % Delta
Actual migration completions	11,463,226	n/a
Current Sprint Plan (Sprint 3) – May 2026	11,576,626	- 0.98%
Original M11 Baseline – Oct 2025	14,486,631	- 20.76%

Total MPANs Migrated (as of 12/06/26)	Total MPANs in Legacy (as of 12/06/26)	Total Available Capacity (between 15/06/26-07/05/27)
11,463,226	22,381,996	59,640,000

- The majority of Suppliers are migrating to plan in line with tolerances set on the Migration Framework.
- All applicable Suppliers who started Migration in Sprint 1 and 2 have achieved their Supplier Ramp Up targets.
- Of the Suppliers who started in Sprint 2, two are on track to meet their Supplier Ramp Up targets. Two are at risk of not meeting this target due to facing internal issues which meant they had to reduce Migrations.
- All applicable Suppliers in Sprint 1 and 2 are on track to achieve their Core Migration Window Target. Progress towards this is closely monitored. Two Suppliers are expected to meet this target within Sprint 3.
- One deminimis Supplier and one small Supplier is expected to complete Migration of their current portfolio within Sprint 3.
- All Suppliers have a below 1% PUB-032 rejection rate and 'half' migrated MPAN rate.
- Engagement between Suppliers and MCC is working well; with Suppliers sharing information on progress and issues experienced in a timely manner.
- Supplier compliance rate varies mostly at the daily level and is higher at the weekly and sprint level. This is because Suppliers often catch up on volume on a weekly basis.

Plan Tolerances in Migration Framework	Description	Number of Suppliers	Comment
EMT-L3	Above Plan by greater than 10%	0	
EMT-L2	Above Plan by between 5% to 10%	2	These Suppliers are ahead of plan due to requesting unused capacity
EMT-L1/SMT- L1	On Plan within \pm 5%	6	
SMT- L2 -	Below Plan by between 5% to 10%	0	
SMT-L3	Below Plan by greater than 10%	3	One Supplier is in process of catching up volume in Sprint 3. Two Suppliers are newly migrating Suppliers who have faced internal issues. They are both expected to be back on plan within Sprint 3.


Key Supplier targets from migration framework:

- **Supplier Ramp Up Target** - Suppliers who follow envelop or deminimis rules need to migrate 5 to 10% of their portfolio within their first 22 migration days
 - **Core Migration Window Target** - Suppliers who follow envelop rules need to migrate 90% of their portfolio by the end of their core migration window
 - There are no targets set out in the framework for Suppliers who follow Small Portfolio rules
- Migration framework sets out 6 plan tolerance levels


- Non-SIT Suppliers were able to start Migration from 15 May 2026.
- Five out of seven Suppliers who were expected to start migrating in Sprint 2 have started migrating. The remaining two have moved their Migration start date to a later sprint.
- Of the five, four Suppliers started on their expected migration start date. One Supplier started later due to a combination of issues with DIP onboarding and agent readiness.
- Overall, Non-SIT Suppliers have started Migrations well. There have been some instances where Suppliers have had to reduce or pause Migrations to resolve internal issues. In instances there has been engagement with MCC to understand rationale and agree resumption plans.

Sprint 3 Baseline – Cumulative Forecast

- Sprint 3 baseline was published on 28 May 2026.
- Submissions were received from all but one Supplier. This remaining Supplier is being escalated in line with the Migration Framework.
- Sprint 3 includes approximately 8.9 million MPANs scheduled for Migration. This is higher than previously forecast, reflecting the catch-up of volumes from Sprints 1 and 2.
- If Sprint 3 volumes are delivered as planned, overall progress is expected to realign with the original M11 baseline by the end of the Sprint (July 2026).
- It is forecasted that approx. 80% of MPANs will be migrated by M14 (Oct 2026).




Sprint 3 Baseline – Weekly Forecast



- Sprint 3 has the most migration volume of all Migration Sprints
- Sprint 3 volumes exceed the 200k daily threshold on several days. The use of exceptional capacity has been approved by MCAG, with volumes of up to 280k permitted

Sprint 3 Baseline – Sprint Forecast

- Original M11 baseline – Oct 2025
- Sprint 3 plan – May 2026




- Sprint 3 volume is higher than previously forecast, reflecting the catch-up of volumes from Sprints 1 and 2
- Volumes in Sprints 4–6 are broadly aligned with the Migration Plan baselined at M11
- Sprint 7 volumes are approximately 400k higher than planned at M11, spread across eight weeks. This does not present a risk to the M15 milestone
- Sprint 8 (the final sprint) volumes are approximately 50k lower than the original M11 baseline. This is a positive development and is aligned with the MCC’s approach to reducing Migration volumes in Sprint 8, allowing additional time to address exceptions ahead of M15

Participant-Driven Migration Dependencies

INFORMATION: Update on Migration dependencies on industry participants

Programme (Nicola Farley)

10 mins



Core Migration Dependencies (1)

ID	Title	Description	Previous RAG	Current RAG	Forecast RAG	Commentary
D359	Supplier Migration performance	There is a dependency on Suppliers adhering to the Migration Framework and Migration Plan	G	G	G	Migrating Suppliers are compliant with the Migration Framework and Plan. Some Non-SIT suppliers had experienced localised issues which caused them to reduce migrations. The applicable Suppliers are in the process of agreeing recovery plans with MCC. Non-SIT Suppliers are still in Ramp up phase and in discussions to agree recovery plans, so this is not currently considered a material risk to completing their migrations prior to M15.
D419	Suppliers resolving problematic MPANs	There is a dependency on Suppliers to proactively identify, assess and resolve potential problem MPANs before M15 (noting D418 on Code Bodies)	G	G	G	There are no known issues affecting Sprint 3 progress.
D220	Supplier and Agent qualification	There is a dependency on Suppliers and Agents to complete Qualification in alignment with their planned migration start dates.	G	G	G	There are no known Supplier or Agent Qualification issues materially affecting the planned migration start dates.
D340	Qualification Testing performance	There is a dependency on Elexon's Qualification Testing capability for Participants to qualify in line with their planned Migration Start date	G	G	G	There are no known Qualification Testing performance issues affecting planned migration start dates.
D361	Agent dependencies	There is a dependency on Suppliers managing their agent dependencies to meet the agreed Migration Schedule	G	G	G	There are no known Agent Qualification issues affecting Supplier planned migration start dates.
D341	BSC Qualification Governance performance	There is a dependency on the BSC PAB governance process for Participants to qualify in line with their planned Migration Start date	G	G	G	There are no known BSC Qualification Governance performance issues affecting planned migration start dates.
D415	REC Qualification Governance performance	There is a dependency on the REC Code Manager governance process for Participants to qualify in line with their planned Migration Start date	G	G	G	There are no known REC Qualification Testing performance issues affecting planned migration start dates.

Core Migration Dependencies (2)

ID	Title	Description	Previous RAG	Current RAG	Forecast RAG	Commentary
D221	Service Activation performance	There is a dependency on Elexon's Service Activation capability for Participants to start Migration in line with their planned Migration Start	G	G	G	There are no known issues affecting Migration.
D342	DIP Onboarding performance	There is a dependency on Elexon's DIP onboarding capability for Participants to start Migration in line with their planned Migration Start	G	G	G	There are no known issues affecting Migration.
D417	Service Management performance	There is a dependency on Elexon Service Management adhering to SLAs for Participants to start Migration in line with their baselined Migration plans	G	G	G	There are no known issues affecting Migration.
D416	DIP migration performance	There is a dependency on Elexon DIP performance adhering to requirements and SLAs for Participants to start Migration in line with their baselined Migration plans	G	G	G	There are no known issues affecting Migration.
D343	Settlement performance	There is a dependency on the new MHHS settlement processes working as expected and not causing any reason for Migrations to be stopped	G	G	G	There are no known issues affecting Migration.
D373	LDSO migration performance	There is a dependency on LDSOs performing as per the agreed Migration Thresholds for Participants to start migration in line with their baselined Migration plans	G	G	G	We are observing sporadic LDSO issues; however, LDSOs are proactively informing the MCC and taking steps to resolve them. These appear to be isolated rather than widespread, and at this stage we do not consider an Amber rating to be necessary.

Core Migration Dependencies (3)


ID	Title	Description	Previous RAG	Current RAG	Forecast RAG	Commentary
D369	DCC migration performance	There is a dependency on DCC performing as per the agreed Migration Thresholds for Participants to start migration in line with their baselined Migration plans	G	G	G	DCC processed migrations in accordance with the Migration Design and Migration Threshold obligations.
D352	Industry change – Preventing Migration	There is a dependency on Code Bodies to ensure that industry change does not impede Participants from fulfilling their MHHS obligations and/or delay migration	G	G	G	There are no known Industry Changes affecting Participant Migration plans or performance.
D418	Industry change – Enabling Migration	There is a dependency on Code Bodies to implement changes to allow Suppliers to migrate MPANs on the Migration Exclusion list. (Noting the volume of affected MPANs is relatively low)	G	G	G	<p>The Programme continues to monitor the progress of CP1628 which is currently expected to be implemented in November 2026.</p> <p>November '26 is the latest viable implementation date for this change that will still enable Suppliers the required time to complete migrations for the impacted sites in sufficient time to meet the M15 milestone.</p>

CR065 Next Steps Update

INFORMATION: Update on CR065, alignment of Migration Baseline Documents to Mod P487 and approval of changes to the MHHS Migration Framework Foundations Document

Programme (Joe Grisley)

5 mins



Headlines:

- Overall: **There were 15 respondents, 13 supported the change; 0 respondents rejected the change; 1 respondent abstained, 1 stated no impact.**
- **Those who supported the implementation of the Change Request did so on the following basis. They stated that CR065:**
 - "The change is essential to ensure P487 operates fairly and predictably from its implementation date".
 - Reduces regulatory and operational risk.
 - Protects suppliers and consumers from unintended acquisition-ban consequences.
 - Supports M15 delivery while allowing flexibility for circumstances outside supplier control.
 - Creates clearer governance, transparency and appeal routes.
- **Further comments:**
 - Respondents raised several points for refinement including ensuring the exemption process is clear, controlled and proportionate, with defined evidence requirements, decision criteria, timescales and backstop dates. This included items such as:
 - Clear provisions for handling problematic MPANs
 - The BSC Section C wording needing to be more explicit
 - Respondents also highlighted the need to avoid unintended impacts on competition, customer switching and disconnection-related scenarios.
 - Respondents also highlighted that in order to avoid confusion, additional detail is required to clearly illustrate the applying and lifting of the Customer Acquisition Ban, along with the parties involved.

CR065 – Impact Assessment Summary (Page 2)

Headlines:

• **Implementation:**

- Implementation of CR065 will require one change to the Migration Framework Foundations document following Impact Assessment
 - Following IA, it was recommended that section 2.1 of the Migration Framework Foundations document was amended to be more explicit. This is in order to direct participants to the specific section of the BSC section C (Section 12.16.2) and to be more closely reflect the intent of P487. These changes have been made post IA.
- The Programme recognises responses from participants, however will not be making changes to the following:
 - The BSC section C wording approved as part of Modification P487 is out of scope of CR065. CR065 looks to make changes to the Migration Framework to align to Mod P487. Any changes to the BSC section C wording would require participants to raise a modification.
 - Problematic MPANs are currently being progressed via the Exclusion and Remediation List. The Programme recognises that to date, Item 1 and Item 2 of the Exclusion list contain MPANs that are not functionally migratable until the implementation of CP1628 in the November Implementation. Should, for what ever reason, CP1628 not be implemented and these MPANs were to remain unmigratable, this would qualify as circumstances outside of a suppliers control and would be legitimate grounds for an SRO exemption. All other remaining data cleanse activities accounted for within the Remediation List are BAU activities that are currently possible to cleanse. The SRO would not look to provide an exemption due to a supplier not completing their required data cleansing.
 - Ofgem withheld their decision on Modification P487 until the Migration Troublesome MPANs PPIR report was completed. It was agreed by Ofgem that these MPANs did not contribute material risk to a supplier completing migration by M15.
 - The Programme recognises that industry would benefit from additional detail to the choreography relating to the SRO exemption process and the Customer Acquisition Ban. This is being progressed via the programme separately from CR065 and will be shared with MWG and MCAG in due course.

Recommendation:

- Change Board recommended the SRO to approve the Change Request at PSG.
- Rationale: No respondents rejected the change request. Abstentions/no-impact responses were due to either limited/no direct impact or inability to assess specific change-freeze criteria. Implementing CR065 should strengthen programme governance, reduce risk of unfair supplier/customer detriment, and support P487/M15 delivery with proportionate flexibility.

CR065 – Submitted Impact Assessments

Programme Parties	CR065 Recommendations			
	Agree	Disagree	Abstain	No Reply
Large Suppliers	2	0	0	3
Medium Suppliers	0	0	0	5
Small Suppliers	0	0	0	12
I&C	8	0	1	46
DNOs	2	0	0	4
iDNOs	0	0	0	20
Ind. Agents	0	0	0	16
Supplier Agents	0	0	0	6
S/W Providers	0	0	0	20
REC Code Manager	1	0	0	0
National Grid ESO	0	0	0	1
Consumer	0	0	0	1
Elexon (Helix)	0	0	0	1
Elexon (DIP Manager)	0	0	0	1
DCC	0	0	0	1
SRO / IM & LDP	0	0	0	1
IPA	0	0	0	1
Avanade	0	0	0	1
Totals	13	0	1	140

CR065 Impacts – Views on the Proposed Approach (Page 1)

Programme Parties	Range of respondents' views on benefits and concerns (related to the approach in CR065)
Large Suppliers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Supportive of CR065 as a transparent governance route to operationalise P487 and protect suppliers from circumstances outside their control. ▪ Raised concerns that acquisition bans could reduce competition and customer choice if exemptions are not applied effectively. ▪ One Large Supplier noted implementation will require internal monitoring and final checks against EES data, creating a marginal resource overhead.
Medium Suppliers	<i>Did not respond.</i>
Small Suppliers	<i>Did not respond.</i>
I&C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Supported the SRO exemption process as fair, proportionate and necessary to reduce regulatory/operational risk. ▪ Raised concerns focused on exemption criteria being too narrow, particularly for problematic MPANs, and the risk that acquisition bans could create customer detriment, deemed tariff exposure, contractual risk and reduced competition.
DNO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Generally supportive, with minor impact expected. ▪ Requested controls to ensure suppliers cannot blanket-request MPAN disconnections outside existing BSC processes.
iDNO	<i>Did not respond.</i>
Agents	<i>Did not respond.</i>
S/W Providers	<i>Did not respond.</i>

CR065 Impacts – Views on the Proposed Approach (Page 2)


Programme Parties	Range of respondents' views on benefits and concerns (related to the approach in CR065)
REC Code Manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Supported the proposed amendments and recognised that CR065 is needed to align the Migration Framework with P487. ▪ Raised detailed implementation clarifications: REC Code Manager role in applying/lifting acquisition bans, data challenge responsibilities, EES data references, MPID-level sanction instructions, supplier notification timings, dry-run activity, defined terms, and ensuring sanctions/exemptions are tied to the baselined M15 date or MHHS Migration Plan rather than suggesting migration can occur post-M15.
National Grid ESO	<i>Did not respond.</i>
Consumer	<i>Did not respond.</i>
Elexon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Supported the proposed amendments and recognised that CR065 is needed to align the Migration Framework with P487. ▪ Raised a recommendation to updated the wording within section 2.1. This is in order to make the sign posting to the BSC Section C wording more explicit and to more closely align to the content within section C12.16.2.
SRO / IM & LDP	<i>Did not respond.</i>
IPA	<i>Did not respond.</i>
Avanade	<i>Did not respond.</i>

Migration Exclusion List

INFORMATION: Update on the Migration Exclusion and Remediation list

Programme (Joe Grisley)

5 mins



Migration Exclusions and Remediations Requiring Code Change Resolution

BSC					
Exclusion and Remediation Item	Code Change	CP	Target Implementation Date	Progress update	RAG
CSS Registration ID	BSC Change required to make conditionally mandatory CSS Reg ID field mandatory	CP1634	05-Nov-26	Consultation now closed. Scheduled for SVG decision in July.	
Traditional meters installed on CT connection types	BSC Change required to permit Traditional CT meters as a valid configuration	CP1628	05-Nov-26	CP1628 was approved at May SVG for a November implementation. Programme to track CP1628 until implementation.	
Related MPANs with different meter types					


**Full Exclusion and Remediation backlog list available within Appendix 1

External Change Log

INFORMATION: To provide sight and tracking of external change that is supportive to achieving M15

Programme (Joe Grisley)

5 mins



External Change Log – Update

There has been positive progress in the changes that are being actively tracked via MWG and MCAG. Over 90% of the changes being tracked have now either been approved or implemented. Approved Changes will be tracked via the External Change Log until they have been implemented.

Key changes (see next slides for implementation dates):

BSC

- [P487](#) Incentive of BSC Supplier Parties to meet the M15 MHHS Milestone – **Approved by Ofgem**

REC

- [R0317](#) Number of Displayed Register Digits Data Item linkage – **Approved following Consultation**

DIP

- [DCR0015](#) Introducing response codes into the DIP Rules to enhance DIP Message validations at Level 3 (synchronous) and Level 4 (asynchronous) – **Approved following Consultation at DCAB**

Note this is a subset of the Code Body Horizon Scanning Log which is available on the Collaboration Base [here](#).

These changes are not considered to be an external dependency on achieving Migration but are changes that the Programme believe are complementary to achieving M15.

External Change Log (1 of 2)

External Change Log									
CODE MODIFICATION			STATUS	OVERVIEW	IMPLEMENTATION				
Relevant Code	Reference	Title	Current Status	Summary	Release Date	Impact Type	Milestones Impacted	Commentary	
BSC	P487	Incentive of BSC Supplier Parties to meet the M15 MHHS Milestone	Approved	Under the MHHS Programme there is currently an incentive for Suppliers to become qualified to participate in the new arrangements by Milestone 14. This Modification seeks to replicate that incentive for Milestone 15. This proposal aims to incentivise Suppliers to meet the MHHS Migration Plan by restricting their ability to register new Metering Systems if they fail to complete migration on time.	25 June 2026	Critical Participant / System	M15	P487 Approved by Ofgem with an implementation date of 25 June.	
BSC	CP1632	Amending IF-031 validation rules to facilitate change of MPAN's Market Segment	Approved	Suppliers currently face avoidable rejections when trying to appoint Smart or Advanced Agents to 'meterless' Whole Current Metering Systems, due to validation rules that apply even when no meter is installed. CP1632 proposes targeted updates to SMRS validation and alignment logic so that Market Segment values are derived from Suppliers' intended installations rather than defaulted data. This removes friction during MHHS migration, reduces reliance on manual LDSO corrections, and ensures Market Segment classification reflects real-world metering scenarios.	05 November 2026	Document & Process	M15	Change Approved with a November implementation	
BSC	CP1622	Amendment of validation within SMRS for number of Meter Digits	Approved	A validation rule in the UK's smart meter registration system has left around 250,000 SMETS2 meters unable to report their register digits correctly, risking billing errors and data issues. This CP will update these rules, allowing a wider range of digit values and ensuring all meters are accurately supported for the upcoming Market-wide Half-Hourly Settlement.	25 June 2026	Consequential / Supporting	M15	Change Approved with a June implementation	
REC	R0317	Number of Displayed Register Digits Data Item linkage	Approved	A Data Integration Platform (DIP) Data Item, DI-091 'Number of Displayed Register Digits' that was implemented as part of MHHS has been incorrectly linked to the existing J0478 'Number of Register Digits' in the Energy Market Data Specification, instead of the existing J2313 'Number of Displayed Register Digits'.	25 June 2026	Consequential / Supporting	M15	Change Approved with a June Implementation date	
REC	R0300	Amendments to D0312 to align with BSC CP1622	Approved	Elexon have raised CP1622 to amend the validation rules within SMRS for the IF-005 to allow digit values from 1-9, ensuring accurate data and reducing exceptions. There are no validation rules related to the D0312 which need to be amended under the BSC, but the D0312 itself contains a Data Item Rule regarding the Number of Displayed Register Digits which needs to be amended in line with CP1622.	25 June 2026	Consequential / Supporting	M15	Change needed to remove the risk of data loss resulting from MPAN Migration where the number of meter digits is greater than 6 within legacy.	
REC	I0275	MHHS Related Metering Points across Market Segments	Assessment	It has been identified by the MHHS Data Cleanse Working Group (DCWG) that around 9,000 existing Metering Point Relationships include Metering Points that would migrate into different Market-wide Half Hourly Settlement (MHHS) Market Segments. The majority of these are where one Metering Point has a Traditional meter installed (Smart Segment) and a Related Metering Point has an Advanced meter (Advanced Segment). This situation is currently valid but in MHHS would cause two problems. - SMRS would not be able to align the agent appointments, leaving secondary MPANs without agents and MHHS Migrations unable to fully complete.	TBC	Consequential / Supporting	M15	Monitor Issue Group as part of ongoing monitoring of CP1628	

External Change Log (2 of 2)


External Change Log									
CODE MODIFICATION			STATUS	OVERVIEW	IMPLEMENTATION				
Relevant Code	Reference	Title	Current Status	Summary	Release Date	Impact Type	Milestones Impacted	Commentary	
BSC	P495	Allow Suppliers to retire MPIDs they do not intend to qualify prior to MHHS Milestone M14	Implemented	This modification aims to define criteria that permit a Supplier to continue registering new MPANs under qualified MPIDs linked to their Party ID after M14, where there is a live MPID which is not intended to be qualified under MHHS arrangements and will be retired. This approach enables Suppliers to retire specific MPIDs post M14, thereby addressing the potential for disproportionate suspensions at M14.	April 2026	Consequential / Supporting	N/A	Mod implemented	
DIP	DCR0015	Introducing Level 3 & 4 Response Codes into the DIP Rules	Approved	Introducing response codes into the DIP Rules to enhance DIP Message validations at Level 3 (synchronous) and Level 4 (asynchronous) by DIP Users	05 November 2026	Document & Process	N/A	Approved at DCAB	
DIP	DCR0019	Defining the Sender Unique References (SUR) in the DIP Rules	Consultation	To address this problem, it is proposed that the SUR requirements be defined in the DIP Rules (DSD002, Annex 2), mandating that only alphanumeric characters be used. This change aims to reduce the risk of validation failures. The implementation of DCR0019 is scheduled to occur as part of the DIP Manager monthly release in August 2026	13 August 2026	Document & Process	N/A	DIP Change currently out for consultation	

MWG and Sprint 2 Retro Update

INFORMATION: Update on MWG activities and progress

Programme (Joe Grisley)

10 mins



The Migration Working Group (MWG) Meeting 52, held on 11 June 2026, focused on:

- Migration execution summary, migration observations, and IF-032 rejection codes.
- Outcomes for Sprint 3 planning.
- Discussions on MPANs with a Trading Status of 'X' with an Active Supplier Registration, Meterless Export MPANs in a created status and Complex sites.
- Migration exclusions and external change.

Affected MPANs with a Trading Status of X with an Active Supplier Registration update:

- Industry made positive progress in reducing the number of these MPANs – reducing by approx. 45% over 2 months.
- Programme now views this as a BAU activity for Suppliers to manage as part of their Migration Planning.
- This is resolvable within the Migration timelines without any additional intervention required.
- This approach was supported by MWG (responses supported this view) whilst noting that in the event of a SoLR, the remediation of these MPANs may not be resolved within programme timescales.

MWG actions

- There are **no** open actions with MWG

MWG backlog

- MWG backlog remains unchanged from the last update to MCAG, see next slide

MWG Backlog – Outstanding Items and Activities Scheduled for Completion with MWG

ID	Name	Description	Update	Status
7	Framework Parameter adjustments	Potential changes to Parameters – based on findings from Supplier Submission 2	Standing item	Open
14	DIN-1189 - Thresholds Document update – CSS and DSP messages (item raised by a Participant)	Update MHHS Migration Thresholds Document - tables outlining the Migration Messages received and sent by the CSS and DSP.	The redlining has been completed and will be progressed along with other changes to the Migration Framework following the end of ELS	Open
15	Migration Capacity during SoLR	Discussion required to work through scenarios	<p>Scenarios agreed for how Migration Capacity will be managed during a SoLR. The SoLR volume will be ring fenced from the awarded Suppliers Migration volume and will be provided separate Migration capacity. The SoLR volume will require an independent Migration Plan.</p> <p>Ongoing discussions with Ofgem in relation to a SoLR with close proximity to M15. This is being progressed via Mod P487.</p>	Open
16	MPANs with a Trading Status of X with an Active Supplier Registration	Currently MPRS will reject an MPAN with an RMP Status of Terminated but as per the M15 Acceptance Criteria, these MPANs would not be acceptable at M15.	<p>Ongoing: The Programme believes that this is a BAU activity for Suppliers to manage as part of their Migration Planning and is resolvable within the Migration timelines without any additional intervention required. The Programme have confirm this assumption with the Migration Working Group. The Programme are however continue to engage code bodies around what controls need to be in place post-M15 in relation to any remaining risk to Legacy Terminated MPANs becoming operational in legacy post-M15.</p>	Open

Sprint 2 Retrospective: Lesson Learned

The Sprint 2 Retrospective was held on 15 June 2026. It focused on:

- Sprint 2 Progress
- Common issues & trends:
 - IF-32 rejection rates and scenarios when REG1032 error code is seen
 - Half migrated MPANs
 - Unused Capacity Requests
- Participant feedback and forward look

Points to highlight:


- REG1032 – Incorrect Market Segment remains the second highest rejection reason observed within Migration. The Migration team presented the 4 scenarios that they felt justified this rejection code. The view from the group was that Linked Import / Export with a data mismatch, where each linked MPAN is registered to a different Supplier, could be the driving cause. Most Suppliers shared that they were holding off migration meterless import until CP1632 was implemented, which suggested that the rejections must be as a result of Linked Import / Export. **The Programme agreed to take this away and discuss with constituency reps the options available.**
- Half migrated MPANs – Whilst there has been good progress on half migrated MPANs in Sprint 2, there are still a number that are aged. A Supplier raised that it would be useful to know if there had been attempts to rectify to understand if the issue is lack of Supplier rectification activity or if there are proving to be difficult to resolve. Supplier said they would share any findings back to MCC. **MCC considering if there are any next steps that can be taken to support mitigation of risk in later sprints.**
- Exception Management – As no single party sees all the messages within a Migration or has relationships with them this can prove difficult for exception management. **MCC considering if there are any next steps that can be taken to support mitigation of risk in later sprints.**

Programme Milestones related to MCAG

INFORMATION: Overview of upcoming Programme Milestones related to MCAG and any milestone changes for approval

Programme (PMO)

0 mins – to be taken as read and discussed by exception



Look Ahead – Key Milestones Status on 12 June 2026

To align to weekly reporting, the previous, current and forecast RAGs reflect milestone status from last week, this week and next week, respectively.


Milestone	Milestone Title	Forum	Baseline Date	Forecast Date	Responsible	Previous RAG	Current RAG	Forecast RAG	Commentary
T3-MI-0500	M16 Approach Approved at MCAG	MCAG	23 June 2026	23 June 2026	SRO	Green	Red	Green	11/06/26 - task date is contingent on addressing the issues raised during the initial Consultation. An update will follow. The aim is to circulate an updated set of decision criteria alongside the Consultation responses on 24/06. eMCAG is likely to be convened in early July.
T2-MR-0500	MCAG Endorses Assessment	MCAG	17 July 2026	17 July 2026	SRO	Green	Green	Green	12/06/26 - activity on track
T2-MR-0200	M14 milestone checkpoint - date approval	PSG	06 August 2026	06 August 2026	CPT	Green	Green	Green	12/06/26 - activity on track
T2-RA-0700	Readiness Assessment 8 - Ready for New Settlement Timetable - Completed (incl. Readiness Assessment Report approval)	PSG	14 August 2026	14 August 2026	CPT	Green	Green	Green	12/06/26 - activity currently under way to bring Consultation period forward. Update to be provided by the end of June.
T2-EL-0200	MCAG Approve Recommendation to change to RF 7 months calendar	MCAG	18 September 2026	18 September 2026	SRO	Green	Green	Green	12/06/26 - activity on track
T1-MI-5000	All suppliers must be able to access MPANs under the new TOM (M14)	PSG	28 October 2026	28 October 2026	CPT	Green	Green	Green	12/06/26 - activity on track

Top Programme Risks related to MCAG

INFORMATION: Update on the top Programme risks related to MCAG

Programme (PMO)

0 mins – to be taken as read and discussed by exception



Top Risks: Delivering Migration Successfully by M15

A new RAID item can be raised using the [RAID Log Input Form](#)

M15 Umbrella	Risk ID	Risk	Mitigation Plan	Latest Updates	Previous Score	Current Score	Risk Status
MHHS TOM Performance	R1250	The DIP assurance regime [Data Integration Platform assurance - Elexon] defines a process to follow to email non-compliant DIP Users, but there are no escalations, incentives, sanctions or performance board to answer to. This raises the risk that DIP Users continue to remain non-compliant with a consequential impact on DIP performance	Referenced in IPA MHHS TOM Service Arrangements and Operations Review as both a tactical (Ref 3.1 – high priority) and strategic (Ref 2.2) observation with associated recommendations. Updates will be tracked against IPA recommendations and Programme review progress. Latest Mitigation Plan: 1) DIP Manager Team to provide further detail within the overall assurance process 2) DIP Manager Team to provide updates on process / review with IPA and MHHS Programme following June PSG 3) DIP Manager Team alignment with Elexon BSc Assurance fortnightly on overall process implementation and refinement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DIP Manager noted access removal is the only formal sanction; no further escalation framework (criteria, triggers, or alternative sanctions) will be defined. Risk remains as loss of access would halt PP migration and impact M15 Cross-Code Body discussions in progress to clarify assurance boundaries and reduce ambiguity; further updates expected end June. Monthly DIP/REC/BSC assurance review established, alongside fortnightly DIP-BSC sessions to refine processes; risk remains pending outcomes of new governance forums TOG-93 / PSG actions: additional documentation being developed by DIP Manager for IPA and Programme review by end June to address identified gaps 	21	21	Risk remains high. Additional documentation updates being worked on by DIP Manager for presentation to IPA and the Programme by end of June
Migration Execution	R1275	There is a risk that some participants Migration Plans show planned volume up to the last week of the migration window, which means that there is little or no time available to manage exceptions before M15	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Programme to socialise risk via MWG for discussion to develop potential mitigation. Following working group, the programme will assess industry discussion and begin to develop mitigation plan. Once mitigation plan is drafted, the programme will report this back to the working group for consideration of implementing the proposed mitigating actions Supplier Migration Plans need to recognise this and demonstrate consideration of this risk and manage the risk accordingly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussed at MWG. Audience open to a window pre-M15 that is only for exception. MCC to develop thinking further and bring back to next MWG 	16	16	Risk score remains at 16, to be discussed further at next MWG
MHHS TOM Performance	R1264	There is a risk that resourcing across Programme, Central Parties and Central Capability Providers becomes constrained during the summer period due to leave peaks and competing organisational priorities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Forward-plan resource coverage for summer months and agree minimum service levels Cross-skill team members to ensure continuity of critical activities Use surge capacity or short-term contracted support where gaps are identified Actively monitor leave patterns against workload forecasts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per mitigation actions, prior update still stands Risk to be re-assessed at the end of June once we reach the summer period. Update to then be provided based on evidence 	16	16	Risk score remains at 16, continuing to monitor as we approach the summer period
Migration Execution	R1202	There is a risk that delays in closing out the items recorded on the "Migration Exclusions List", by the relevant owners and in line with the defined remedial actions dates will extend the migration timeline and potentially have an adverse impact on achieving the M15 milestone	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor Supplier progress in resolving Migration Exclusions List MPANs through regular reporting cycles, including review of remaining volumes and forecast completion dates, to ensure sufficient progress towards M15 is maintained Track delivery of approved industry changes required to support closure of exclusion categories and assess any impacts from changes not due for implementation until Nov 26 Analyse Supplier forecasts, PPIR outputs and emerging trends in "troublesome MPAN" volumes, escalating material delays or systemic issues through governance forums to agree mitigating actions and protect migration timelines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MCC looking to introduce a process to gather regular updates on progress to support monitoring and identify any timelines shifting as early as possible. Proximity score realigned to a value of 3 as there's still sufficient runway time to M15 All industry change to support the closure of items in the exclusion list have now been raised and approved. Some change is not due to be implemented until November. A regular cycle of asking Suppliers for updates for progress on their number of troublesome MPANs has started which will be used to identify where suppliers are having issues and if there are common trends 	15	15	Risk score remains at 15, continuing to monitor in-line with supplier updates on progress for troublesome MPANs
MHHS TOM Performance	R1220	There is a risk that the Service Delivery function, including Service Management, Performance Assurance, Market Design, OSMS, is unable to scale or operate at sufficient maturity to manage the increased volume and complexity of issues during peak migration periods impacting achievement of M15	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Elexon to ensure resourcing in place to support additional participants as they begin migration and ensure knowledge base is kept up to date through early weeks of migration and applying any lessons learnt. Monitor and review risk during peak periods (E.g., Sprint 3) in case it materialises 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress being tracked through monthly Elexon Service Mgt forum and TOG updates. Awaiting IPA feedback for further action to be taken (expected by 31-Mar) Probability reduced to 3 following RA7 responses. Score reduced from 19 to 15. Continuing to monitor Elexon Service Management Performance No further update, continuing to monitor Elexon Service Management Performance. Score remains Non-SIT suppliers have now started Migration activity; this is the period where the risk is expected to materialise. Continuing to review over the next 8 weeks, score remains. Reviewing at the end of Sprint 3 	15	15	Risk score remains at 15, continuing to monitor through to end of Sprint 3 04/08
MHHS TOM Performance	R1269	There is a risk that participant capability varies significantly across the industry, particularly as issue volumes increase during peak migration periods. Some participants may misunderstand processes, misroute incidents, or be overly reliant on Code Bodies for operational support	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure contingency measures are in place There are flexible resourcing models set out for operational teams and preparation should be made to trigger these early before back-logs build up. Additional measures such as extending contractor resource should be considered 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No additional updates to note outside of Mitigations noted. Continuing to monitor throughout Sprint 3. 	15	15	Score remains at 15, continuing to monitor
MHHS TOM Performance	R1154	There is a risk that Elexon may not have a robust enough Triage team in both capacity and capability when wave 1-4 PPs start migrating	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing review of triage capacity and capability, supported by Service Management enhancements (incident, problem management and continuous improvement) to ensure adequate support as Wave 1-4 migration volumes increase Active monitoring and use of operational data (incident volumes, resolution times, throughput and migration performance) to identify emerging constraints, assess control effectiveness, and inform risk reassessment through the migration period Delivery of ELS Exit Recommendation 7 actions and incorporation of IPA feedback (once received), including any additional measures required to strengthen triage arrangements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awaiting IPA feedback for further action to be taken - Expected - 31.3.26 (dependent on IPA Review Release). Continuing to monitor Triage process operating ok at present. Now approaching start of migration period for non-SIT Wave 1 participants from 15 May onwards. Key monitoring period through to end of June. Risk to be re-scored post this based on evidence Non-SIT suppliers have now started Migration activity; this is the period where the risk is expected to materialise. Continuing to review over the next 8 weeks, score remains. Risk to be re-assessed at the end of Sprint 3 (04 August). Programme awaiting IPA feedback 	15	15	Risk score remains at 15, continuing to monitor through to end of Sprint 3

Risk Assessment – M16

Risk ID	Risk Description	Mitigation	Previous Score	Current Score	Risk Status
R1254	There is a risk that when considering consultation responses to the pre M16 decision points being discussed by the Settlement Timetable Expert Group (STEG), that any objections raised by participants are not evidence based and don't clearly demonstrate appropriate rationale for the defined decision criteria (agreed via STEG) being not achieved or breached	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Being discussed with PPs as part of Settlement Timetable Expert Group prior to consultation being issued 	15	15	Risk currently under assessment following consultation period - TBC
R1237	There is a risk that there is not an agreed framework in place to support implementation and decision making for M16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> First Settlement Timetable Expert Group (STEG) Industry WG set up to discuss M16 approach / framework and support the decision-making process. Will meet every 2 weeks till end of March (min). 4th meeting today 	13	13	Risk currently under assessment following consultation period - TBC
R1242	There is a risk that the M16 approach, using the Transition Design, can't be agreed with Industry via STEG with enough time to successfully action the agreed approach and monitor the agreed approach and monitor the agreed data points ahead of Decision Point 1 in Oct '26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use the STEG WG to help mitigate this risk by socialising the decision points and associated approach to Decision making. Visibility and Transparency should make the Decisions more straightforward and mitigate some risk 	13	13	Risk currently under assessment following consultation period - TBC
R1243	There is a risk that the new MHHS arrangements are not operating steadily post migration of MPANs into MHHS which means that the market cut over from the legacy 14-month settlement timetable to the new four-month settlement timetable, aligned to the MHHS TOM, is not possible within the timelines set out in the Transition Plan and MHS Programme Plan, resulting in a delay to M16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring of the current Settlement performance is important via Elexon Performance Assurance colleagues and weekly Elexon TOG sessions, providing confidence or early warning markers 	11	11	Risk currently under assessment following consultation period - TBC
R1253	There is a risk that external parties who are exposed to Settlement risk of not reading traditional meters every 4 months will seek to delay or defer the reduction of the Settlement timetable from 14 months to 4 months	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference Ofgem directions which all parties need to comply with. Through STEG, ensure any valid barriers or blockers to M16 are understood and managed. Ensure the scope of STEG is focused on delivering M16 and not deferring or delaying M16 	11	11	Risk currently under assessment following consultation period - TBC
R1260	The NESO Manifest Error Process managed via BSCP014 has a timeline of 10 days for completion or 2 days before IR run. The M16 workstream will reduce IR timescales from 16 to 8 days. This means the current ME timescales are incompatible with the post M16 settlement timetable timescales	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NESO to engage Elexon change team to request change support, with the option to raise an issue or CP to amend BSCP014 Process 3.3 timescales to align with the MHHS Settlement Timetable timescales 	11	11	Risk currently under assessment following consultation period - TBC
R1256	There is a risk that the minimum number of MPAN volumes successfully migrated (or a representative split of MPAN types e.g. Market Segment, Connection Types) to allow/enable the Programme and Participants to make Control Point Decision 1 is not reached resulting in being unable to make the required decision to proceed. This would cause delays to the decision-making process and have a negative impact on the M16 timeline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring of the current Migration Execution results as part of the M16 Decision Monitoring process 	10	10	Risk currently under assessment following consultation period - TBC
R587	There is a risk that Programme plan Settlement Timetable Transition cut over date decision milestone (13/10/26) is not long enough notice period to enable all the governance approval	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The governance approval is part of the STEG scope and will need to ensure this risk is managed. Output from the group over Q1 will enable a better assessment of this risk 	9	9	Risk currently under assessment following consultation period - TBC


- No **Critical** or **High** Risks within RAID log
- All **Medium** Risks shown in table
- **Note:** A review of the M16 RAID landscape is currently underway following the M16 Consultation period. Updates to impacted risks will be incorporated into the next MCAG paper.

Programme Updates

INFORMATION: Provide updates from L2/3 governance groups and wider Programme activity

Programme (PMO)

0 mins – to be taken as read and discussed by exception



Governance Group Updates

Programme Steering Group (PSG)

PSG 03 June 2026

Ofgem Update: Ofgem confirmed MHHS's strong position and noted the shifting attention from DESNZ towards consumer benefits.

Mod P487 Next Steps: Ofgem has approved Mod P487. The Programme has raised CR065 for Impact Assessment closing on 12 June 2026.

Programme Status Update: RAG statuses were provided against each workstream, as well as an overview of key strategic risks.

Migration Update: 10.5+ million MPANs are now migrated. Non-SIT suppliers have commenced Migration.

Qualification Update: Qualification continues to perform strongly, with delivery on track across all waves and no material programme issues.

M16 Update: The RF Decision consultation has closed. Programme provided an initial high level view of responses.

Elexon Progress against IPA Tactical Actions: Elexon provided an update on the IPA's 17 tactical actions on Elexon's Service Management.

M14 Acceptance Criteria: Programme presented the criterion required to meet M14, as well as the update and status against each.

IPA Update: The IPA presented an assurance update, including assurance status overview and an assurance risk watchlist by workstream.

PSG papers available [here](#).

Migration & Cutover Advisory Group (MCAG)

MCAG 26 May 2026

Settlement Timetable Update: RF Consultation ends 26 May 2026 and outcomes expected in next MCAG.

Migration Framework – use of Exceptional Capacity Threshold (250-280k) for Sprint 3 Planning: An increase to Sprint 3 capacity was approved, with the understanding that volumes would be reconsidered if system issues arise.

ELS Recommendation Update: An update was provided regarding breach of DIP rules, IPA tactical actions and the comms log.

Migration Execution: 10 million MPANs have initiated and migrations are occurring in line with Sprint 2 baseline.

Participant-Driven Migration Dependencies: All core Migration dependencies are currently Green.

P487 Next Steps: A Programme Change Request is being raised to update the Migration Framework, with the Change Board on 26 May 2026.

Migration Exclusion List: REC CSS Registration ID is complete, BSC CSS Registration ID is Green and potential solutions for linked & related Import and Export MPANs with Export MPAN Missing meter data will be brought to 11 June 2026 MWG.

External Change Log: BSC, REC and DIP changes have been approved including P487, CP1622, CP1632, CP1682 and R0300.

MWG Update: Programme is taking a proactive approach to risk mitigation with related decisions expected in upcoming MCAGs.

MCAG papers available [here](#).

Qualification Advisory Group (QAG)

QAG 20 May 2026

Programme Milestones Related to QAG: Wave 3 QT Projected Execution End T3-QU-0056 milestone was approved.

MHHS Qualification Approach and Plan – Annex 4: Code Bodies highlighted updates made to QA&P Annex following P495, which is out for consultation and due 02/06.

M14 Acceptance Criteria: Programme outlined progress against M14 acceptance criteria.

Programme noted criterion #2 related to the Annex 4 process is tracking Amber due to an issue identified with BSC section C12.12.6, with a BSC Mod proposal underway.

QAG papers available [here](#)

Wider Programme Updates

Participant Checklist:

This week's Participant Checklist includes the following items for Programme participant review, feedback and awareness:

1. REMINDER: Change Request CR065 Impact Assessment – the deadline is **Friday 12 June 2026**
2. NEW! Migration Update

You can view the **Participant Checklist** on the respective **Planning pages** of the [Collaboration Base](#) and the [MHHS website](#). In the Participant Checklist you can view upcoming consultations and key deliverables, as well as the latest status of Change Requests in the **Master Change Request Dashboard** tab.

Upcoming Governance Meetings:

Here's what's coming up over the next week:

- **Wednesday 10 June 2026:** [Settlement Timetable Expert Group \(STEG\)](#) at 14:00
- **Thursday 11 June 2026:** [Migration Working Group \(MWG\)](#) at 14:00

Working Group Progress Report

Migration and Cutover Advisory Group (MCAG)		
	Migration Working Group (MWG)	Settlement Timetable Expert Group (STEG)
Upcoming meeting's agenda items	11 June 2026 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forward Look Summary of Migration Execution Migration Observations and Lessons Learnt Sprint 3 Planning Update Trading Status of X with an Active Supplier Registration Meterless Non-Registered Export MPANs Risks to Later Sprints Migration Exclusions External Change Log MWG Backlog Migration Issues and Blockers P487 Next Steps Update Top Programme Risks related to MWG Programme Updates 	10 June 2026 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RF Consultation Outcomes Settlement Monitoring: SVA and CVA Deltas Migration Reporting M16 Risks <p>The M16 Settlement Timetable Consultation ended 26 May 2026.</p> <p>Further information can be found here.</p>
Agenda items from last meeting	14 May 2026 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forward Look Summary of Migration Execution Migration Observations and Lessons Learnt Key Updates from MCAG Service Activation Journey– ISD/MDD Guidance Sprint 3 Planning Risks for Later Sprints Migration Exclusions External Change Log MWG Backlog Migration Issues and Blockers Top Programme Risks related to MWG Programme Updates 	13 May 2026 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RF Consultation Update CVA data and RF changes on Settlement monitoring MHHS Settlement Timetable and Performance Assurance Migration Reporting M16 Risks

Qualification Advisory Group (QAG)	
	Qualification and E2E Sandbox Working Group (QWG)
Upcoming meeting's agenda items	14 July 2026 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualification Wave Update Qualification Progress Update DIP Manager Checklist Progress DIP Onboarding Update QT Update Service Activation Journey – MDD/ISD Guidance MHHS Qualification Approach & Plan – Annex 4 QT Artefacts Qualification RAID Review
Agenda items from last meeting	04 June 2026 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualification Wave Update Qualification Progress Update DIP Manager Checklist Progress DIP Onboarding Update QT Update Service Activation Journey – MDD/ISD Guidance MHHS Qualification Approach & Plan – Annex 4 QT Artefacts Qualification RAID Review




Summary and Next Steps

INFORMATION: Summarise actions/decisions and look ahead to the next MCAG

Chair & Secretariat

5 mins



Summary and Next Steps

Next steps:

1. Confirm actions and decisions from meeting
2. Date of next MCAG: **28 July 2026 at 2pm**

Dates of next working groups:

- Next STEG: **24 June 2026 at 2pm**
- Next MWG: **09 July 2026 at 2pm**

Note potential eMCAG early July (TBC) for M16 decision approach work

Upcoming agenda items:

Meeting dates	
	28 July 2026
Relevant milestones or activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• N/A
Agenda items	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Summary of Migration Execution• Summary of Migration Dependencies• Migration Exclusion List• MWG Update• STEG Update
Standing items	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Programme Milestones related to MCAG• Top Programme Risks related to MCAG• Programme Updates

If you would like to propose an agenda item for the MCAG, please contact the PMO@mhhsprogramme.co.uk



**MHHS
PROGRAMME**
Industry-led, Elexon facilitated

Appendix 1 – Migration Exclusions and Remediation Backlog

Migration Exclusion List

Issue ID	Issue Type	MPAN Volume	Description	Migration Status	Migration Commentary	Remedial Action	Industry Owner (Responsible Party)	Responsible Code (Change)	Current Status	Target Date	RAID Item	Code Change
1	Traditional meters installed on CT connection types	6,000	The design does not support traditional meters installed on CT connections. Migration should not be attempted for these specific MPANs until this issue is resolved. The traditional meter should be exchanged for an advanced meter prior to migration; or, if the meter cannot be exchanged the MPAN should not be migrated until a BSC change to support this scenario is implemented.	Blocked	1.b Pot Unmigratable without change due to design. Only Blocked if you intend to migrate the traditional CT meter	1a. Supplier and MOP identify MPANs with a traditional meter on a CT connection and replace that meter for an advanced meter; or	1a. Supplier	BSC	In Progress		i217	YES
						1b. Supplier and MOP follow process set out within BSC change xxxx (when implemented); or	1b. Supplier & MOP	BSC	Blocked	Nov-26		
						1c. Supplier and MOP determine that connection is not CT and request LDSO amend the connection type to W	1c. Supplier & MOP & LDSO	BSC	In Progress			
						2. Following 1a or b MOP sends correct D0312 to MPRS	2. Supplier & MOP	REC	In Progress			
						3. Following 1c LDSO sends DB02 to MPRS, MPRS will re-evaluate the market segment from advanced to smart	3. LDSO	BSC	In Progress			
					4. Supplier can migrate the MPAN once correction made.	4. Supplier		Partially Blocked	Nov-26			
2	Related MPANs with different meter types	8,400	Related MPANs with different meter groups which create different market segments (e.g. smart and advanced) will cause exceptions if the MPAN migration is attempted. The design doesn't support related MPANs with two different market segments.	Partially Blocked	Trad CT scenario of related are currently UNMIGRATABLE in current stage blocked until code change implemented. Remaining scenarios defer until cleansing activity has been completed	1. Supplier unrelates MPANs if relationship not required for billing purposes, by sending the D0386; or	1. Supplier	REC	In Progress		i234	YES
						2. If required for billing purposes; Supplier must not migrate until:	2. Supplier	REC	In Progress			
						3. Meter exchanges are completed to align the meter group across all MPANs; or	3. Supplier	REC	In Progress			
						4. Industry change to MHHS design implemented to support different meter groups.	4. Code Body	BSC	Blocked	Nov-26		
						5. Supplier can migrate MPAN following step 1, 3 or 4.	5. Supplier		Partially Blocked	Nov-26		

Migration Remediation List (1 of 2)

Issue ID	Issue Type	MPAN Volume	Description	Migration Status	Migration Commentary	Remedial Action	Industry Owner (Responsible Party)	Responsible Code (Change)	Current Status	Target Date	RAID Item
3	CSS Registration ID	TBC	If Registration ID is not populated within the IF-031, the message will be rejected by the Registration Service. There is a potential issue that suppliers do not have complete Registration ID records. A conflict currently exists between the Registration Service functionality and the baselined design / codes.	Defer	Unmigratable in current stage. Defer until cleansing activity has been completed	1. Supplier to populate CSS Registration ID	1. Supplier	REC	In Progress		R1198
						2. Migrate MPAN	2. Supplier		In Progress		
4	Missing Meter Data (Energised) within MPRS	17,000	MPANs which do not have meter data populated within MPRS at the point of market segment population in September 2025 will be set to a market segment of advanced. In many instances a smart meter is installed on this site, unless the correct meter data is populated by the MOP in MPRS only advanced agents could be appointed when the MPAN is migrated. The Supplier should not attempt migration until the correct data is populated via the D0312 flow.	Defer	Possible to migrate, however it would have to be migrated within the Advanced segment. If this is incorrect, Supplier would be required to complete a change of segment	1. Supplier and MOP identify MPANs with missing meter data within MPRS. Utilising the REC performance assurance reporting and EES reporting.	1. Supplier	REC	In Progress		i145
						2. MOP sends correct D0312 to MPRS.	2. Supplier	REC	In Progress		
						3. If the D0312 meter type is smart or traditional MPRS will re-evaluate the market segment from advanced to smart.	3. LDSO (automated process)	REC	In Progress		
						4. Supplier can migrate the MPAN once correction made.	4. Supplier		In Progress		
5	SMETS 1 incorrectly configured	198,000	SMETS1 meters impacted by the incorrect recording of HH interval data	Defer	Possible to migrate however the HH settlement data may be incorrect	1. DCC to implement a fix to allow the reconfiguring of the SMETS1 Meters to resolve the identified issue to ensure all consumption data retrieved from these meters is accurate.	1. DCC	SEC	DONE	Jan-26	R1201
						2. Suppliers to Migrate impacted MPANs once fix has been applied	2. Supplier		In Progress		
6	CHECK meter types in MPRS	50	MOPs should not send CHECK meters within a D0312 to MPRS. CHECK meters are not supported within the design and will cause migrations to fail if attempted. CHECK meters will need to be removed via the D0312 prior to that MPAN being migrated.	Defer	Unmigratable in current stage. Defer until cleansing activity has been completed	1. MOP removes CHECK meter from MPRS via D0312.	1. Supplier	REC	In Progress		i230
						2. Supplier can initiate migration for MPAN once correction made	2. Supplier		In Progress		
7	Smart meters and CT connection types	600	It is not possible for smart meters to be installed on CT connection types, so a clear data quality issue exists. These MPANs will not migrate successfully and will cause exceptions if migration is attempted before they are fixed.	Defer	Unmigratable in current stage. Defer until cleansing activity has been completed	1. Supplier checks that smart meter installation is valid, if valid 2, if not valid 3	1. Supplier	REC	In Progress		i231
						2. Supplier raises a request with the LDSO to correct connection type to WC.	2. Supplier	BSC	In Progress		
						3. MOP correct meter type to valid value which is supported by CT connection type and send new D0312.	3. Supplier	REC	In Progress		
						4. Supplier can initiate migration for MPAN once correction made	4. Supplier		In Progress		

Migration Remediation List (2 of 2)

Issue ID	Issue Type	MPAN Volume	Description	Migration Status	Migration Commentary	Remedial Action	Industry Owner (Responsible Party)	Responsible Code (Change)	Current Status	Target Date	RAID Item
8	Linked import and export MPANs with different connection types	2,000	The design doesn't support linked MPANs within different market segments. Exceptions will be created preventing the successful migration of an MPAN if attempted. The data misalignment should be resolved if the linkage is correct, or the linkage should be removed if the data for the respective MPANs is correct.	Defer	Unmigratable in current stage. Defer until cleansing activity has been completed	1. LDSO check the connection types and amends if incorrect or de-links the MPANs if correct. 2. Supplier can then migrate the MPAN	1. LDSO 2. Supplier	BSC BSC	In Progress In Progress		i232
9	Linked import and export MPANs with different meter types	330	The design doesn't support linked MPANs within different market segments. Exceptions will be created preventing the successful migration of an MPAN if attempted. The data misalignment should be resolved if the linkage is correct, or the linkage should be removed if the data for the respective MPANs is correct.	Defer	Unmigratable in current stage. Defer until cleansing activity has been completed	1. Supplier investigates the linked MPANs and changes the meter type if incorrect, if the other MPAN is with another Supplier and that Suppliers meter type is incorrect then they should raise an SDEP to that Supplier to update; or 2. Supplier believes the MPANs should not be linked and requests, via SDEP, that the LDSO de-links them. 3. Following 1 or 2 completion the MPAN can be migrated.	1. Supplier 2. Supplier 3. Supplier	BSC BSC BSC	In Progress In Progress In Progress		i218
10	Related MPANs with different connection types	300	Related MPANs with different connection types will cause exceptions if the MPAN migration is attempted. The design doesn't support related MPANs with two different market segments.	Defer	Unmigratable in current stage. Defer until cleansing activity has been completed	1. LDSO investigates exceptions and corrects connection type if incorrect, or 2. LDSO raises SDEP and instructs the Supplier to unrelate 3. Supplier unrelates if instructed to by LDSO, by sending the D0386 4. Supplier can migrate MPAN following step 1 or step 3.	1. LDSO 2. LDSO 3. Supplier 4. Supplier	BSC REC REC	In Progress In Progress In Progress		i233
11	NHH unmetered MPAN	2,500	NHH MPANs cannot be migrated to MHHS, only HH MPANs can be migrated.	Defer	Unmigratable in current stage. Defer until P434 Obligation has completed	1. Change measurement class of MPAN from NHH to HH. 2. De-register any secondary unmetered MPANs 3. Migrate MPAN	1. Supplier 2. Supplier 2. Supplier	BSC BSC	In Progress In Progress In Progress		R897
12	Domestic Unmetered MPANs	50	~50 MPANs impacted Domestic Unmetered MPANs cannot be migrated to MHHS.	Defer	Unmigratable in current stage. Defer until cleansing activity has been completed	1. Change DPI to Non-Domestic as per process set out in REC 2. Migrate MPAN	1. Supplier 2. Supplier	REC	In Progress In Progress		i224
13	Linked & Related Import and Export MPANs with Export MPAN Missing meter data		MPANs which do not have meter data populated within MPRS at the point of market segment population in September 2025 will be set to a market segment of advanced. In the instance of linked or related Import and Export MPANs where the Export MPAN is missing meter data, the Export MPAN will default to the Advanced segment. This will result in the Import MPAN also defaulting to advanced even if it is correctly set to Smart.	Defer	Possible to migrate, however should the segment incorrectly default it would cause significant operational intervention to resolve within the MHHS arrange	1. Supplier and MOP identify Export MPANs with missing meter data within MPRS. Utilising the REC performance assurance reporting and EES reporting. 2. MOP sends correct D0312 to MPRS. 3. If the D0312 meter type is smart or traditional MPRS will re-evaluate the market segment from advanced to smart 4. Supplier can migrate the MPAN once correction made.	1. Supplier	BSC	In Progress		