MHHS-DEL3105 Programme Planning Dialogue Session & Change Request 55 Q&A

Table of Contents

Change Record

Date	Author	Version	Change Detail
24 September 2024	Lewis Hall	V1.0	Initial Publication

Reviewers

Reviewer	Role
Code Bodies (BSC and REC) and MHHS Qualification workstream	Responsible for MHHS Non-SIT Supplier and Agent and LDSO Qualification
Migration workstream	Responsible for MHHS Migration

Acronym Glossary

Change Request – CR

Microsoft Project Plan – MPP

Interim Release – IR

Qualification Assessment Document – QAD

Qualification Advisory Group – QAG

Qualification Testing – QT

RTTM – Requirements to Test Traceability Matrix

1. Programme Planning Dialogue Session (Thursday 12 September)

1.1 General

Q1. Will these slides be made available on the Collaboration Base and MHHS website?

Yes, the slides and the recording of the session are available on the MHHS website here.

Q2. Will we have sight of all assumptions made based on the plan?

Yes. The Programme will issue all detail on assumptions, risks and dependencies out in line with the proposed plan. These are also included in the materials from the Dialogue Session found on the MHHS website (see link in Q1).

Q3. Will the re-baselined Microsoft Project Plan (MPP) contain only details for current/future activities, removing past completed tasks, or will it be an update of the current plan?

No, the updated Project Plan issued alongside the Change Request (CR) will be an updated version of the existing plan, including all completed tasks and past detail, as well as the future proposed plan dates.

Q4. What has Ofgem's view of this change proposal been, based on the engagement with them so far? Is there any indication of the decision timescale from Ofgem?

The Programme took Ofgem through the proposed approach and plan on 11 September which enabled us to have the Dialogue Session.

Ofgem has not endorsed the timeline, and this will only come at the end of process if they approve the new baseline.

Ofgem wants to stress that they want to see industry buy-in and thoroughness of evidence in the Impact Assessment in terms of implications on cost, resources and viability of achieving the new timeline.

The Programme would like to obtain a decision before the end of the year. When the Programme spoke with Ofgem on Wednesday 11 September, they were not able to commit.

1.2 All participants

Q5. What are the implications of this CR on milestones beyond M10. Are any of these milestones also moving?

All milestones linked to, or dependent on, M10 will move in line with the delay to M10. This detail will be captured in the MPP issued out along with the CR. Detail of the initial implications on the remaining Tier 1 Programme milestones can be found in slide 18 of the Planning Dialogue Session pack (see link in Q1).

Q6. Does the Programme feel that there will be an Interim Release (IR) 9 or is the endeavour to crystallise from IR8.x?

At this point, there is no IR9, or further IR, planned. Any defects found during Cycle 3 would be fixed as patches during the test cycle. On a case-by-case basis, if a design change is needed 'in-cycle' the Programme may explore individual deployments.

Q7. **What is the impact of reducing the Migration window by circa 6 months (i.e. moving M11/12 from April to September 2025)?**

The Migration window is not being reduced by 6 months. The Migration window will remain at 18 months. It will just be delayed in line with the M10 delay. M11/12 is now scheduled for 10 September 2025.

Q8. **Can the Programme provide updated dates for the draft and final Qualification Assessment Document (QAD) submission for SIT and Qualification Testing (QT) Waves? If not, will the CR provide these?**

The Programme will include detail on this in the plan that goes out for Impact Assessment on 23 September. A subset of Qualification milestones were presented to the Qualification Advisory Group (QAG) on 19 September to signal the date changes.

Q9. **What amount of contingency has been included within the proposed plan?**

The Programme believes this is an ambitious but realistic proposed plan. There is a level of contingency in some of these timelines if, for example, more time is required for testing.

The Programme has aimed to keep the gap analysis sprint at the end of Cycle 3 light on testing, so there is capacity in this sprint to undertake additional testing should it be needed.

The Programme is also looking to rationalise some of the SIT Functional and SIT Migration tests to ensure the tests are as efficient as possible, which may reduce the number of tests to be run.

Q10. **How does the start of M11/12 impact the documents shared by MHHS for completion for Migration submissions that are due back by 02 October 2024?**

As this activity is underway, these document submissions are still required by 02 October. These will be used by the Migration team to prove the Migration Framework and iteratively improve the process.

Q11. **If SIT participants can go faster and M10 comes forward, then will Qualification dates also move forward?**

Supplier and Agent Qualification Testing is dependent on SIT Functional completing. This is to ensure we have the confidence the systems are sufficiently stable to support testing.

As things stand, the Programme assumption is that in the event M10 moves forward, the remaining milestones will not move as those will impact a significant number of parties.

Q12. **Proposed M10 is now 13 August 2025, which is mid-week. As this involves major changes to production systems, should this not be over a weekend / start of the week?**

The Cutover weekend would take place the weekend beforehand and this is articulated in the M10/M11 Cutover Plan which has gone through TORWG and MCAG in recent months. This choreography of the cutover stands as it is being consulted on and it is only the dates that change.

The Cutover activities that need to take place would take place in the run up to and over the weekend prior. The M10 date on the proposed plan is the final approval by PSG.

Q13. **Interim Releases announced/published close to implementation dates can prove challenging. Are there plans to build in more time for participants to review impact prior to release?**

There are no further interim releases scheduled. If an IR needs to be scheduled the Programme will give participants as much advanced notice as possible.

Q14. **Would the M8 date also move, therefore moving Regs changes such as MPAN top line changes to later in the plan?**

Yes – the M8 date will move in line with M10, as per the current plan.

Q15. **How will a 2026 Christmas break impact milestones now rolling into 2027?**

A Christmas break will be built into the plan and this will be factored into the planning of any activities that carry over into the following year.

Q16. **Widespread impact across all roles in August due to annual leave makes it a difficult time for M10. Would September not be more sensible?**

The Programme appreciates the concern and the challenges around childcare and annual leave during August. The proposed plan is set out 11 months in the future, so the Programme believe this gives sufficient notice for participants to plan accordingly.

The Programme does not expect participants to work over the festive period. The Programme did consider the August M10 date in terms of holiday season, and the view is that there is sufficient time to make the right preparations.

Q17. **Will the Migration submission still be required on 02 October 2024, or will this now be pushed out? Will the Programme issue revised envelopes?**

Please see the answer to Q10.

Q18. **What does the proposed plan mean for documentation that is currently being progressed by participants to support Migration submissions? Will participants be given additional time now to complete a replan of these documents in readiness to submission? Are we correct to assume that Migration start is not going to impact the overall Migration submission timeline in terms of the time available?**

The Migration completion window will remain as 18 months so this window will remain the same, the timelines will just move. The first question applies to Migration as well as PIT evidence that many participants are working through. The Programme needs to work through the detailed changes, and these will be captured in the detailed plan that goes out with the CR. There is an assumption that participants will be given more time to respond to these preparatory activities that are currently being worked through.

Q19. **For impacts beyond M11 and M14, I am assuming these remain as they are?**

Slide 17 of the pack shared during the Dialogue Session contains the initial dates for M11 and M14 as a result of the plan re-calibration.

The start of Supplier and Agent Qualification Testing has been delayed by circa 5 months and this will move M14 by the same duration. The testing window and overall Qualification window remain the same duration.

M11 has also moved from 04 April 2025 to 10 September 2025. The Migration window remains 18 months.

Q20. How does the proposed plan impact the final implementation date?

The assumption in the detailed plan is that the timelines will all shift in accordance with the critical path timeline outlined. M16 is currently expected to be delayed by the same duration of time as M10.

Q21. The Programme is currently under a freeze in terms of post M10 processes, and I am conscious there are change mandates that are on hold consequently. Is there any thinking in this space to change this?

One of the key assumptions is that the change freeze will remain in place. Any CRs scheduled to be implemented after M10 will remain scheduled for implementation after M10.

Q22. There is a recognition that participants should not be doing any replanning until the CR is approved but this is a process that could take a couple of months, while some participants are in PIT and would expect to exit PIT before this gets signed off. What should participants assume for the interim period?

The Programme will propose that the plan reviewed at PSG and recommended for approval to Ofgem will become the interim baseline until a decision is formally provided by Ofgem.

Q23. In the CR, will you be sharing the set of assumptions that you've made in terms of this hockey stick approach? We tried this hockey stick approach a few weeks ago and are concerned if we are learning the lessons from this.

The CR follows more of an S-curve approach, but the Programme will share the assumptions that underpin the plan. Slide 17 of the Dialogue Session pack has the model and the proposed points per sprint that are needed.

The Programme has reviewed current test execution rates, general improvement sprint-on-sprint and has developed a model based on incremental and realistic growth in test velocity.

It is clear from the data across the sprints in Cycle 2 that test velocity is improving across all cohorts and we can be confident that it will get quicker still as core defects are fixed and central systems become more stable.

1.4 SIT participants

Q24. The Programme mentioned that all Cohorts did the modelling for the timelines but then it also said that it engaged the MVC. Did all Cohorts engage in this process or was it just MVC?

The Programme asked all eight SIT cohorts to submit individual test execution models and assumptions. We also had detailed sessions with the MVC cohorts.

Q25. What is the advantage in mixing up all the Cohorts for SIT Operational and SIT Non-Functional?

The SIT Non-Functional and Operational teams plan to choreograph testing differently to Functional and Migration, and the scope of these phases is significantly smaller.

The plan would be for all SIT participants to progress through testing at the same time and all complete within the windows outlined in the plan.

Q26. Why did the Programme not feel it was possible to keep contingency within CR022 (i.e. a July go-live?) As a SIT participant, we feel it would still be realistic.

Based on existing data and execution modelling (by SIT cohorts and the Programme), the Programme feels these dates balance ambition with realism.

The Programme has reviewed the spread of responses received from each individual SIT cohort, how this exercise has been approached, the underpinning assumptions and test points required per sprint to meet these trajectories – this is the model the Programme felt most comfortable with.

If SIT participants can go faster than these timelines and are able to demonstrate via robust assumptions and/or performance in the latest sprints, the Programme will endeavour to support that.

Q27. Will both SITA and SITB be upgraded to IR8.2 in the September/October 2024 maintenance window?

Yes. Both environments will be uplifted to **IR8.3** during the upcoming maintenance window.

The maintenance window in SITA will be 20 days in duration and in SITB it will be 10 days in duration. This is due to the additional data loading activities needed in SITA to support Cycle 3 of SIT Functional and Migration testing.

Q28. Is there risk in only having MVC involved in Non-Functional and Operational testing? How can this be mitigated?

All SIT cohorts will be involved in Non-Functional and Operational testing, not just the MVC.

Q29. What is the impact on PIT completion for SIT participants for Non-Functional and Operational as a result of SIT starting later?

The Programme wants to retain momentum and keep pace with these activities but recognises some flexibility can be offered to some of these preparatory activities. This will be incorporated into the plan issued on 23 September alongside the CR.

Q30. You have not defined the scope on regression testing but have put 7 weeks in it. Do you feel this is long enough given that we do not know what the gap is going to be at the end of Cycle 3? What has been your approach on this and why has this approach been taken?

The underlying assumption is that 7 weeks is sufficient – this is the current duration in the plan and there is no information to suggest more (or less) time is needed at this stage.

The Programme has been identifying candidate tests to feed into regression. Whilst the scope has not been formalised, a set of candidate tests have been able to feed into this analysis.

There is a certain level of risk here and the Programme does need to agree what the scope of regression is to ensure that the 7 weeks is sufficient.

There will be a component of the regression testing which is there to regression test to Central Parties, and we will spread this across the Cohorts. We will also need to identify on a market role basis what we need participants to cover.

The Programme acknowledges that there is a need to gain more maturity in this space but do think it will be fixed to this 7-week period. The Programme will keep participants informed as this develops.

Q31. The rationalisation that was mentioned between SIT Functional and Migration testing – when is this due to occur?

The Programme is working on this activity currently and expects to share the position of tests to be rationalised in advance of Cycle 3 starting.

1.3 Non-SIT participants

Q32. When will we understand what this means for all of the Code Body milestones leading up to the start of Qualification Testing?

The Programme will outline this in the detailed proposed plan that goes out for Impact Assessment on 23 September with the CR. It is safe to assume some of these preparatory activities will move in line with the new Qualification Test timelines.

Q33. Is there any consideration of shifting the dates to the right for PIT timelines due to the proposed delay in Non-SIT LDSO QT?

Yes. The Programme will outline this in the detailed proposed plan. It is safe to assume some of these preparatory activities will move in line with the new Non-SIT LDSO Qualification timelines.

Q34. Does this proposal have a knock-on effect on Qualification windows for Non-SIT participants? I.e. Wave 1, 2, 3 and 4 all pushed out by 5 months equally?

Yes. The expectation is that the Non-SIT Supplier and Agent qualification Waves will move by 5 months. Qualification Test start is dependent on SIT Functional finishing. So, the delay to SIT Functional will have a direct delay to the start of Qualification testing.

Q35. How will this impact Non-SIT participants and their Qualification currently scheduled for early next year?

The Programme will outline this in the detailed proposed plan. The Programme would ideally give people more time to complete PIT. Realistically, at this stage it does not make sense to ask Programme participants to work to tighter timelines than is needed.

Please see Q34 for an update on Qualification timelines.

Q36. How will this plan impact the first Qualification Assessment Document (QAD) submission that is due to open on 2 October 2024 and the final QAD submission that is due to open on the 2 December 2024?

It is expected that these dates will be delayed enabling more time to focus on testing. The Programme will outline these detailed dates in the plan issued alongside the CR. We would ask parties to focus on their testing rather than their QAD submissions at this stage.

Q37. Will the deadline for Non-SIT LDSO QT RTTM move also?

It is safe to assume more flexibility will be offered to the completion of these preparatory milestones, given Non-SIT LDSO testing has been moved to January 2025. The Non-SIT LDSO QT team will issue guidance on when this deliverable is needed by.

Q38. Does this mean that the PIT timelines for QT can also move so that QT participants get more time to complete?

The Programme will outline this in the detailed proposed plan. The Programme would ideally give people more time to complete PIT. Realistically, at this stage it does not make sense to ask Programme participants to work to tighter timelines than is needed. It is worth noting that for Non-SIT Suppliers and Agents, the Code Bodies still expect you to submit your final PIT Approach and Plan using the existing dates in the current plan.

Q39. The box on the bottom right (Slide 16) around Supplier and Agent Qualification, is this Non-SIT parties starting in July 2026 pre M11?

This box relates to Non-SIT Supplier and Agent Qualification Testing.

Q40. P434 for the Mandate for Unmetered Suppliers (UMS) – the deadline is aligned with M11. Will this be moving to reflect the new changes in the plan subject to this being accepted?

If it is aligned to M11, the assumption is that this will also move with the associated milestones.

Q41. Can we assume that PIT exit and Qualification entry dates move in line with the Qualification start date?

The Programme will confirm all these timelines in the proposed plan. It is a safe assumption that these timelines will move to enable more time for these PIT activities to complete.

Q42. On the Qualification area, the Programme is talking about MVC. Are Non-SIT Suppliers and Agents right to assume there will also be an impact on Wave Qualification dates?

For Non-SIT Suppliers and Agents, the Wave Qualification dates will change. To enable Supplier and Agent Qualification testing to start, SIT Functional needs to finish.

Initial proposals are that the first Wave of Qualification testing would start on the 14 July 2025, as articulated in the proposed plan. The dates for Qualification activities associated

with this for Non-SIT participants will also move, as Qualification testing is an input into the final QAD process. Waves 1-4 will move as per the proposed plan.

The Programme would like to stress that this will not constrain the Qualification window so it will remain as a 12-month window for testing. In the current plan there is a 2-month window after each Wave to complete the Qualification process, so this logic remains.

Q43. We have the critical path dates for the MVC QAD submission. What is the plan for Non-MVC SIT and Non-SIT participants?

This detail will be in the plan circulated with the Change Request. Please see response to Q42 for more information.

2. Change Request Webinar Q&A (Friday 20 September)

Q44. What costs should be considered to include in the impact assessment e.g. sunk, opportunity, etc?

Programme Participants should provide a forecast impact on your programme cost as part of this Impact Assessment; this should include any impact due to additional resourcing, extended implementation timeline, etc.

Q45. I assume you are looking for responses from software suppliers as well as market participants?

Responses will be requested from all Programme Participants.

Q46. Can you confirm the due date of the initial QAD submission for MVC? It is due in 2 weeks and is therefore an impending milestone.

The due date of the initial QAD submission for SIT participants (MVC and Non-MVC) is 13/02/25, with the window opening 06/01/25. This was communicated at QAG on 19/09/2024.

Q47. When will the outline plan MSP and milestone register be made available?

The updated outline plan MSP and milestone register were made available on 20/09/2024.

Q48. Can you confirm the initial QAD window for MVC/SIT?

Please refer to Question 46.

Q49. Do the key dates for PIT also move back 5 months alongside everything else

Please refer to the Programme Plan for detailed PIT activities and dates. Activities due imminently, or that are overdue are still expected to be completed to existing timelines. Some activities due in the next few months may be deferred to provide more time for participants to complete PIT.

Q50. Is this the interim plan we should be working towards until a new plan is approved by Ofgem?

Immediate and short-term focus of Programme Participants, whether in SIT or Qualification should not change as a result of this exercise.

The Programme will seek approval from PSG to work to the CR055 plan as an 'interim baseline' until Ofgem provide their decision on CR055.

Q51. **Visibility [quantify/qualify] on problems causing the extension, please? 5 months is significant. Transparency. Post-SIT review and learning points for Non-SIT PP.**

Fundamentally, a slower pace of testing than expected in SIT has required an extension to the M10 timelines. Further rationale for the delay, and information, is outlined in the Planning Dialogue Session slides, which are available on the Collaboration Base.

Q52. **Regarding movement to an earlier wave, noted regarding the need to discuss with code bodies. For responses should we assume we can or can't move as this drives cost impact etc?**

The Programme cannot confirm the Code Bodies position on this. For the purposes of this IA Non-SIT PPs should assume they stay in the same Qualification wave unless indicated by the Code Bodies.

Q53. **Please can you provide details of how the contingency referenced has been baked into the plan? Will this be clear in the supporting documents?**

The Programme has aimed to keep the gap analysis sprint at the end of Cycle 3 light on testing, so there is capacity in this sprint to undertake additional testing should it be needed.

The Programme is also looking to rationalise some of the SIT Functional and SIT Migration tests to ensure testing is as efficient as possible. This will likely reduce the number of tests to be run.

Q54. **What is the justification for moving all milestones by the same amount (5 months), rather than exploring whether pre-go-live milestone dependencies and windows (i.e. non-testing work) could be amended to maintain the current timescales as best as possible within Cr022**

The assumption at this stage is that M8 and M10 will go live simultaneously, as per the original plan. Completion of qualification activities and final QAD submissions are dependent on the completion of testing to provide the evidence base for qualification.

The Programme has worked on ensuring that the delays to M10 do not impact, or constraint, activity windows downstream and this has led to a direct movement of most key milestones by the same duration as M10 has moved.

Q55. **I'm interested to know the impact of the upcoming Readiness Assessment schedule.**

The Readiness Assessments are tied to key milestones, so will move in line with the milestone changes. Please refer to the programme plan that has been uploaded to the Collaboration Base on 20/09/24 for specific dates for future Readiness Assessments and Control Points.

Q56. The plan is a consistent shift right by 5 months for all milestones. The migration window stays the same. Wave allocations for QT remain as-is; we start 5 months later?

Qualification activities will be delayed by 5 months due to the dependency on SIT Functional completing. The Migration window remains as 18-months but will also move by the same duration. Qualification Testing is now scheduled to start for Wave 1 in July 2025, with the Migration window commencing in September 2025.

Please refer to the programme plan that has been uploaded to the Collaboration Base on 20/09/24 for specific dates.

Q57. In the event of responses across PPs being a majority "abstain" what steps will be taken to ensure a clear view is taken and a decision made?

Given the situation with SIT testing, it is clear that M10 will not be met, and therefore current timelines are no longer viable.

The Programme has focused on engaging with PPs as much as possible in the run up to this Change Request being issued to ensure feedback and comments can be incorporated in advance of the IA window.

Based on this feedback to date, the Programme does not anticipate a large volume of abstentions. Should a PP wish to abstain from making a decision they should clearly articulate the rationale for this, as well as any recommendations that would allow them to endorse the proposal put forward by the Programme.

Q58. Is there an expected level of granularity to be provided for cost implications? Would one value suffice to cover all impacted areas - resources, contracts etc

A single value covering the overarching cost impact on your organisation will be sufficient to understand the cost impact.

Q59. Is it mandatory therefore for all participants to respond to this CR based on these principles?

Response is not mandatory, but highly encouraged to allow the Programme to get an accurate understanding of the impact of the change. The more IAs we receive the greater evidence base we have for discussions with Ofgem.

Q60. As this delay is due to SIT taking longer than expected, why have the durations of each QT wave not been extended? What is the contingency for any QT delays?

The Programme believes the existing timelines for Qualification Testing are sufficient for PPs to complete the required activities.
The scope of SIT and Qualification Testing are very different and Qualification Testing is not as onerous as the end-to-end nature of SIT.
Furthermore, SIT Functional completing before Qualification Testing starts ensures central system stability is already proven. So many of the defects found during the earlier cycles of SIT will not occur in Qualification.

Q61. Will there be a minimum number of IAs required to support decision-making across all market roles?

There is no minimum number of IAs needed, but the more information the Programme receives the greater understanding of the impact the Programme will have. Additionally, more information provides a stronger evidence base to present to Ofgem for their decision.

Q62. **Which submissions are due ahead of the new plan becoming baselined and should we start using the new dates before Ofgem's decision?**

Please refer to Q50.

Q63. **Is there a firm line on what is happening with QAD/Migration env/data cleanse deadlines? are we submitting migration envelopes with no regard to CR055**

Please refer to the programme plan that has been uploaded to the Collaboration Base on 20/09/24 for specific dates.
If dates are imminent or overdue, there is an assumption these dates will be held as these activities should have been completed or sufficiently progressed to complete in the existing timelines. Future activity timelines may move to offer greater flexibility.

Q64. **For Non-SIT Suppliers what is the expected impact on upcoming PIT?**

Please refer to the programme plan that has been uploaded to the Collaboration Base on 20/09/24 for specific dates.

Q65. **Can Programme Participants change the Wave they are currently allocated to i.e. join an earlier wave?**

Please refer to Q52.

Q66. **What level of contingency has been applied to the proposed plan that accounts for other tasks to be completed not currently included, such as IR uplifts**

The Programme believes this is an ambitious but realistic proposal. There is a level of contingency in some of these activities if, for example, more time is required to complete testing.

Please refer to Q53 for more information.

Q67. **How binding are these documents legally? Is it acknowledged these are completed in good faith?**

Impact Assessment responses are not legally binding documents. It is acknowledged that the impact assessments are completed in good faith with the information available to Programme Participants at a moment in time.