

UNC DSC Contract Management Committee Minutes
Wednesday 20 March 2024
Via Microsoft Teams

| Attendees | | | |
|---|-------|---------------------------|---------------------|
| Mark Cockayne (Chair) | (MC) | Joint Office | Non-Voting |
| Ben Mulcahy (Secretary) | (BM) | Joint Office | Non-Voting |
| Shipper User Representatives (Voting) | | | |
| Andy Eisenberg | (AE) | E.ON Next | Class A & Class C |
| Oorlagh Chapman | (OC) | Centrica | Class A |
| Steve Mulinganie | (SM) | SEFE Energy | Class Bx2 & Class C |
| Transporter Representatives (Voting) | | | |
| Helen Chandler | (HC) | Northern Gas Networks | DNO Voting |
| Sally Hardman | (SH) | Scotia Gas Networks | DNO Voting |
| Richard Loukes & Alternate for Andrea Godden | (RL) | National Gas Transmission | NTS Voting |
| Charlotte Gilbert | (CG) | BU-UK | IGT Voting |
| CDSP Contract Management Representatives (Non-Voting) | | | |
| Jayne McGlone | (JMc) | Xoserve | |
| James Rigby | (JRi) | Xoserve | |
| David Addison | (DA) | Xoserve | |
| Observers/Presenters (Non-Voting) | | | |
| Angela Clarke | (AC) | Xoserve | |
| Chris Dwyer | (CD) | Xoserve | |
| David Turpin | (DT) | Xoserve | |
| Dean Johnson | (DJ) | Xoserve | |
| James Verdon | (JV) | Xoserve | |
| Kundai Matiringe | (KM) | BU-UK | |
| Laura Edwards | (LE) | Xoserve | |
| Lee Jackson | (LJ) | Xoserve | |
| Lee Warren | (LW) | Xoserve | |
| Marina Papathoma | (MP) | Wales & West Utilities | |
| Michele Downes | (MD) | Xoserve | |
| Paul Orsler | (PO) | Xoserve | |
| Simon Harris | (SHa) | Xoserve | |
| Steve Deery | (SD) | Xoserve | |
| <p><i>DSC Contract Management meetings will be quorate where: Committee Representatives of at least two (2) shall be Shipper Representatives and three (3) shall be DNO Representatives, NTS Representatives or IGT Representatives, are present at a meeting who can exercise six (6) votes.</i></p> | | | |

Please note these minutes do not replicate/include detailed content provided within the presentation slides, therefore it is recommended that the published presentation material is reviewed in conjunction with these minutes. Copies of all papers are available at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/dsc-contract/200324>

1. Introduction

Mark Cockayne (MC) as Chair welcomed all to the meeting and confirmed that it was quorate.

1.1. Apologies for absence

Tom Jenkins, IGT Representative

1.2. Alternates

Richard Loukes for Andrea Godden

1.3. Confirm Voting rights

The voting rights were confirmed as below:

| Representative | Classification | Vote Count |
|--|-----------------------|------------|
| Shipper | | |
| Andy Eisenberg | Shipper Class A & C | 2 votes |
| Oorlagh Chapman | Shipper Class A | 1 vote |
| Steve Mulinganie | Shipper Class 2xB & C | 3 votes |
| Transporter | | |
| Helen Chandler | DNO | 1 vote |
| Sally Hardman | DNO | 1 vote |
| Richard Loukes + Alternate for Andrea Godden | NTS | 2 Votes |
| Charlotte Gilbert | IGT | 1 Vote |

1.4. Approval of Minutes (14 February 2024)

The minutes of the previous meeting were reviewed, and MC advised that an amendment request had been made by Charlotte Gilbert regarding those named in Item 10.2 Asset Updates and the related ownership of Action 0208, which were currently showing as tracked changes on the minutes published on the JO website. There were no objections from the Committee, and the minutes were accordingly amended.

Approval of Late Papers

Two papers had been provided for items 4 and 9.1 after the Meeting Papers deadline which MC acknowledged was due to the timings of the data they reported, and they were accepted. MC also noted that presentations provided to address Actions 0204 and 0206 had been provided after the deadline date but as they were intended to help address the questions raised by the Actions they were also accepted.

1.5. Review of Outstanding Actions

0201: JO (MC) to produce an outline for a new members introduction for an in-person October 24 DSC Contract Committee meeting

Update:

MC explained the rationale for this action was to consider the provision of informative guidance to future new Committee members, ideally at the beginning of their first term. MC had reviewed the Terms of Reference and the UNC, and in doing so found much was already provided in the Terms of Reference. After discussing this with Jayne McGlone (JMc) it was decided to produce a proposal for the August DSC Contract Committee that used a refined version of the current Terms of Reference.

Action: Deferred to August.

0202: JO (MC) to set up a Governance Workgroup to review the MPIdVAD.

Update:

MC provided an update on this Action under item 10.4 and proposed to create a Sub Committee of the DSC Contract Management Committee.

Action Closed

0203: CDSP (JRi) to produce a format suggestion for quarterly CAB Updates.

Update:

James Rigby (JRi) asked to defer this action as he was still working on a response and would talk more on the subject under item 3.

Action deferred.

0204: CDSP (MD & DJ) to provide a presentation detailing the demarcation between Issues and Incidents, detailing the commitments, resourcing and escalation process for each.

Update:

Laura Edwards (LE) introduced herself as Xoserve Incident Management lead and talked through the slide pack provided for this action, (which can be viewed at www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Contract/200324) detailing the differences between how Issues and Incidents are categorised and managed, and used some recent examples. LE also detailed the distinctions between P1, P2 and P3 Incidents, and how these are assessed, depending upon the significance of the impact, and whether services are degraded or unavailable.

Progressing to Slide 4 of the presentation LE described the Problem Management mechanisms used by Xoserve and how they had identified a further improvement in broadening the existing Priority Matrix from a 3x3 to a 5x5 to provide additional flexibility in the assessment of the severity of a problem, and its resultant Priority Rating.

Steve Mulinganie (SM) remarked that the language used to provide an understanding of the difference between 'Issues' and 'Incidents' was at this point becoming further confused with the addition of 'Problems' and commented on the need for a single form of referencing term and scale, adding that the impression given was of differing ways of looking at events that are treated differently. He observed that the descriptions given to date raised questions for the outside observer such as is an Issue a lower-level Incident before then adding Problems into the question which was proving very confusing.

LE replied that Issues were indeed on a lower scale than Incident', so were categorised as Issues on the Problem Record, with all subsequent actions coordinated out of that document. She added that a lower-priority Incident would still be managed with a level of criticality assigned to it.

Oorlagh Chapman (OC) added that she too was baffled by the descriptions given, agreeing that where there should be one scale with a clear process route, as opposed to what had been provided which she had very little confidence she could explain herself to colleagues in her organisation.

David Addison (DA) suggested that there was a timeliness element that needed to be considered that one continuous scale could not capture. He illustrated this with the difference between systems being completely unavailable to users, which would have a direct and immediate impact, and problems/issues that would not be visible to the User because a manual solution had been used to resolve an Incident. The latter would require follow-up actions to resolve, and he was not sure both could be put on the same continuous scale. He cited the example of the missing messages in the last month that would have been dealt with as an Incident with a workaround to resolve, with subsequent system changes needing to be managed as an Issue.

SM responded that matters pertaining to stakeholders' interests needed to be provided simply and consistently. He perceived these definitions as 'silos' where events were placed and not dealt with due regard because of their categorisation. He observed that if they were visible and relevant to Users they were all effectively Incidents for which a common language was required to enable Users to communicate onwards within their organisations.

Michele Downes (MD) concurred, stating that Problem records were for internal processes, whereas external communications matters were P1 or P2 Incidents and customer Issues.

Helen Chandler (HC) observed that for those immersed in managing the matters within Xoserve, it probably makes sense to have multiple terms such as Incidents, Issues and Problems, but for Users, they are effectively three words for the same thing, and needed to be presented in a simplified manner,

Andy Eisenberg (AE) stated he was hesitant to labour a point but noted that the issue that raised these questions stemmed from a concern his organisation raised in December, highlighting that in the Monthly Contract Management Pack for this meeting it was recorded as raised on 27 December 2023 and categorised as an Issue as things were, at that point, back up and running, but that this later became confused as there were subsequent further failures. He asked if categorising this as an Issue rather than as an Incident meant that it had been more likely to fail.

MD explained that the failures were not captured at the time due to the alert mechanisms that existed being assigned to the higher-level processes whereas the failures were occurring on lower levels where alerts were not in place.

MC presumed that this was why it was being dealt with as an Issue as the team were unaware of the lower-level failures, which MD confirmed.

Sally Hardman (SH) asked where these matters were published on the Xoserve website as she had looked to go over the details and could not find them. When MD advised that they could be found on the 'Issue List' on the Xoserve website, SH noted that that report had not been updated since last Autumn. MD advised that it had since been updated on the day before this meeting, 19 March 2024. SH commented that a weekly Defect Report used to be generated which she did not seem to be receiving that of late.

MD shared that Xoserve had previously monitored very little use of the report when it was produced and that its technical nature was thought to obfuscate matters for Users. SH advised that she found the report useful and did refer to it whenever Incidents occurred and tracked the Issues that were being addressed. MD agreed to review the options available to resume such reporting and provide a proposal as to how best to do this.

ACTION 0301: CDSP (MD) to provide a proposal as to how best to resume the provision of weekly Defect Report to Users

MC summarised that the distinction between the two categories appeared to be that an Incident is a current immediate concern, such as systems being down, whereas an Issue is an after-the-fact means to track resolutions looking to prevent the occurrence or reoccurrence of Incidents.

AE shared that he found the explanation quite useful and thanked LE for providing insight into how these concerns were responded to, before asking that if multiple Incidents were created by the same root cause how this would be categorised. LF advised that part of the Problem Management Assessment was a 'Lessons Learnt' review to ensure actions were undertaken to prevent such recurrences, such as adding alerts to lower-level processes. AE sought to clarify the process when a manual control was used as an Incident response. LE responded that this would be tracked as part of the Problem Management Assessment and its longer-term suitability considered accordingly.

MD added that one of the challenges Issues presented was in identifying the root cause, especially when they created intermittent impacts. This was often much harder to do than identifying the cause of an Incident where a system was down.

SM shared the view that there were two types of Incidents, current and historical, and he did not think it helpful to label the latter Issues, noting it was possible for a past Incident, currently called an Issue to reoccur as a new Incident if the original root cause was not resolved. He felt the language was very confusing and advocated cohesive management of all as Incidents rather than maintaining this added complexity of assigning confusing language based on criteria of timing.

DA contributed that he thought MC's summary of the distinctions was a good one and added that his concern was the baby was not thrown out with the bath water, feeling it was incumbent on the CDSP to demonstrate the validity of distinguishing the two processes, adding that the timescales were an important consideration. Issues were a means to ensure long-standing solutions to prevent recurrences, and this might take 12 months to achieve, adding that if there was no impact on the end Users in that time it would not be appropriate to consider this as Incident Management, as Incidents were where something was not currently working. He suggested the need to produce a couple of pithy sentences to clearly define this.

MC observed that at least one Committee member was expressing a desire for a single category, noting the possibilities for this with the Priority scaling with the steps involved in the resolution shown in Slide 5.

DA replied that the matrix was describing the impact to Users, adding such was a recognised scale as part of the industry standard best practice. He gave an example scenario of an annual process that is run and incurs an Incident, despite which, through Incident Management, the process is 'limped through' and will now not reoccur until next year. It is then picked up as an Issue, with no user impact, and dealt with. He conceded it was something of an extreme example but illustrated why Issues were needed as a category to clearly articulate how matters were picked up and the follow-on actions tracked. In comparison should a P1 or P2 Incident occur Xoserve staff would gather in an incident room, and nobody would then leave the office until a solution was found. He felt that Xoserve had not managed to hit the mark in describing the distinction in this meeting but was hesitant to start dealing with Issues as Incidents as they were very different processes.

The Committee noted that SM had posted in the meeting chat asking that whilst Past and Current had been discussed how was Future managed or if it was not relevant. He added that there were issues with SwitchStream licences, and shared a perception that external forces were now acting on the industry in a way never experienced in the past. He felt it important to have a common straightforward approach as to how best to manage the risk that may be generated, adding that the discussion to date suggested the processes only consider the current and the past.

In posting a response in the meeting chat, MD stated that she could not think of an example of such a scenario but assumed that if an Issue was known to impact a future process, perhaps an AQ on a particular day, then it would be treated as a P3 Incident with focus to resolve before it is impacted. If it proved to be the case that Xoserve was unable to resolve matters in time it would escalate to a P2. SM observed that this implied Incidents could be both Current and Future.

MC then commented that looking at section 4 of the Contract Management Report it was evident from comparing last year's figures that there were more customer-identified Issues than had been identified this year. MD confirmed this explaining that there had been a real drive in 2022/2023 to put alerts in place to pick these things up before the customer did, with some exceptions, such as those being discussed in this meeting.

Action Closed

0205: CDSP (MD) to confirm the accuracy of the January 2024 KPM12 figure in light of the reported Invoicing files issue.

Update:

Michele Downes (MD) explained that this Action related to a delay in issuing an Invoicing file that was normally issued within 5 days of the customer requesting it. She noted, however, that this file was classified as 'second level' and as such there were no KPIs affected.

Action Closed

0206: CDSP (JRi / AC) to provide an insight into Xoserve's Contract Management of Correla including using the example of the concerns raised in regards to the Major Incident Reporting figures in the February Contract Management Report

Update:

JMc presented the slide pack provided by Xoserve for this action, (which can be viewed at www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Contract/200324) to provide an update on what is meant by 'Controllable' and to demonstrate the controls that Xoserve has in place to manage the Incident Management Process provided by Correla under the DSC+. This was to provide context to the number of Correla controllable events conveyed in recent Contract Management Reports.

JMc explained that the definition of 'Controllable' predates the separation and DSC+ and included such measures as suggesting the appointment of an alternate supplier at a previous procurement stage may have meant a recent event may not have occurred, thus concluding this was a Controllable event. JMc highlighted how speculative this was in nature, given that it was impossible to measure or track an unappointed supplier's theoretical performance. As such she shared that the Definition of 'Controllable' was to be reviewed with the intention to present a proposal in more detail next month.

OC commented that she was somewhat concerned by the idea of amending the definition of 'Controllable', as it ran the risk of uncomfortable results driving redrafts to better fit. JMc apologised if this was the impression she had given, and that the intention was to consider if it was appropriate to include prospective different procurement choices.

OC added that it was important not to skew either the definitions or the reporting itself. JMc responded that the reporting criteria were set out in the UK-Link Manual and the intention was not to change this and just to consider what is controllable and what is not.

OC asked if this meant any such changes would not have altered the way those numbers had been reported.

JMc shared that there would still be the same number of incidents and P1s and P2s but that the figures currently implying that Xoserve had been complacent and needed to be more vigilant would be considered, as she did not think was a fair representation. SM suggested that this just meant that it was necessary to demonstrate such a suggestion was untrue.

JMc elaborated that P1 through to P4 Incidents were all set out with timescales, and she was not looking to move away from this. Recent reporting had seen 16 Incidents that were Correla Controlled which would remain the same if the definition were changed but explained that it currently suggested that Correla was not managing these. She shared that there have been a number of external audits (details of which were provided in the presentation) which JMc highlighted included ISAE and ISO standards, that were either instructed by Xoserve or under DSC+ management processes which had included Incident Management in their scope. She stated that the key takeaway from these audits for this discussion was that there had been no recommended changes to the Incident Management process.

OC commented that she still thought her point valid, and that, irrespective of whether the total figures were affected or not, she perceived removing or adjusting the definition of Controllable would result in not seeing the same details. She did not think there were doubts as to whether audits were taking place but was uncomfortable that the Committee would not be seeing the same figures. She added that whilst there were lots of Issues that are defined as Controllable it seemed to be that the attention was focused on how they were defined rather than on the Issues themselves.

SM asked if, as part of the audits detailed, it was asked if Correla could do the process better, as the implication here was that Correla could have done more to control these. He asked as to whether the audit would recognise if these issues were, or were not, in Correla's control and therefore was, or was not, required to mitigate them. Conversely, if an audit was checking if Correla was simply following the existing processes the audits would do just that with no wider consideration.

OC added that she felt the Committee needed to be concerned with how Xoserve performed Contract Management of Correla, and she could see that the audits are being instructed to ensure this, but she wanted a demonstration that Xoserve was managing the Correla contract, which did not necessarily mean another audit.

JMc responded that audits were the main tool used for this purpose and that definitions that included third-party alternatives from procurement points long in the past did not seem particularly reasonable.

SM responded that if a contract was agreed upon with a third party Correla is in control of that contract with the option to declare it breached and go elsewhere, noting that if Correla had the same contractual relationship with their third parties as Xoserve had in their contract with Correla he absolutely agreed that it was controllable.

MC shared an awareness that there may be some legacy contracts still in existence that might not have the controls in place expected to see in contracts today, adding that in looking at the slide from this time last year, there were 30 entries 11 of which were customer identified suggesting it was important not to lose view of the improvement.

SM questioned if such a comparison was valid, stating that there had been many parties leave the industry, as well as other huge changes that had seen the market fundamentally changed.

MC responded by asking if such changes had been within the last 12 months, with the events SM referring to occurring in 2021, and not 2023, adding it was still valid to recognise that there had been improvement in the last 12 months.

MC asked if this Action needed to be carried forward or if a new Action should be created to address the questions raised here.

SM suggested a new Action be generated, adding that the approach to the matter was never going to be straightforward forward and that there was always going to be pushback on it.

OC shared that she did not think the original question had been answered and that having an audit did not demonstrate Contract Management.

JMc stated that Xoserve has audit processes in the contract to ensure the processes are delivered, and that they also had the right to instruct audits outside of the usual annual process, asking what further measures or means the Committee want to suggest.

OC highlighted Item 10.2 DDP on the Agenda of this meeting and the concerns that data was not being reported accurately in that regard, stating she did not perceive a means presented today to measure Contract Management beyond and after an audit, asking if any Audit had seen an increase in performance. She reaffirmed that she was not convinced undertaking an audit was the correct answer.

JRi contributed that this discussion was focused on a set of very specific issues within Incident Management and using audits to manage it and that it risked getting lost in specifics. He added that there was more that Xoserve undertakes in managing such issues and it felt like there was a need to do more in the demonstration of what they did, which he shared he appreciated. He suggested that what was required was a more general brief in reporting that provided assurance that Xoserve was effective in its Contract Management. He stated that they were already looking to bring this to the DSC Contract Management Committee as part of the Quarterly reporting.

OC asked if this meant that the requirement to provide contract management assurance in the reporting did not currently exist. JRi replied that it did but conceded that Xoserve were not very good at telling the Committee about it, referencing the requirement given in the BP24 discussions that Users had requested better visibility of this.

MC asked when this would be available to the Committee. JRi responded that it should be available for the DSC Contract Committee in May 2024, which he understood would be a meeting in person, and he intended to talk more then about providing the assurance required concerning Contract Management. MC sought to clarify that the aim was to better articulate the Contract Management work that was done, which JRi confirmed.

HC commented that, in raising the initial point, she was aware that Xoserve used audits but wanted to see commentary around those items that are identified as Correla Controlled in the reporting that was provided, noting that currently there was no narrative around Xoserve's involvement, especially on anything that was trending.

JRi agreed that it was the case that they were showing the Committee the quantitative figures but there was a need to share the qualitative aspects behind them, adding that this was probably already shared elsewhere but the two needed to be tied together.

| |
|---|
| <p>New Action 0302: CDSP (JMc & JRi) to provide enhanced reporting in May to deliver required Contract Management assurance with a view to subsequent DSC Contract Management Committee consideration and potential suggestions for improvement.</p> |
|---|

Action Closed

0207: CDSP (LW) to provide further commentary on BCP consideration of Switchstream implications and the new scope to the Security Rota.

Update:

Lee Warren (LW) provided a verbal update following the BCP commentary on Switchstream and the related disaster recovery commentary in the last meeting.

He confirmed that there was no impact on the ability to respond on GES and SwitchStream technologies as they are Azure Cloud-based, though he shared that there was the consideration of periods of slight degradation possible due to the maintenance systems and the question of putting mitigating measures in place for laptop power loss-related issues. He shared his opinion that this was outside of the Xoserve remit and that a similar proposition existed for REC as a lot of their processes also used pass-through that he believed were run with Cap Gemini.

In summarising, for the ESC scope and Switchstream, LW stated it was very much 'business as usual' and suggested that if there were any questions on the RECCo commentary that Users should approach RECCo themselves to request this on a consumer/supplier basis as, whilst Xoserve could ask directly, their relationship was as a Data Provider.

LW then addressed the new scope for the Security Rota, adding that he had hoped to provide a pack but was still negotiating details due to some parties buying services directly from Correla which, as outside of Xoserve's remit, drew a complex line across a very complex jigsaw. He added that the audit would be in September for the reasons previously discussed but advised that the audit for 2025 would return to schedule in for March.

The Committee had no further questions and the Action was closed.

Action Closed

0208: PO & CG IGTs (KM/CH) to discuss the scope and potential Solution options in preparation for the Asset Updates item in the next meeting.

Update:

This Action was addressed as part of the Change update later in this agenda, and the slides used were later published on the meeting webpage at www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Contract/200324

Action Closed

0209: JO to add Energy Code Reform to DSC Contract Management Committee agenda

Update:

MC confirmed that Energy Code Reform now featured as item 9.3 on the agenda.

Action Closed

2. Approvals

2.1 XRN 5746 Updates to CDSP Service Description Table v33

The full Change Proposal is published and available for review at www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Contract/200324

Angela Clarke (AC) advised the Committee that this had been communicated to DSC Change Management Committee on 13 March 2024 and highlighted that a full copy of the Service Table was appended to the Change Proposal and an abridged version was repeated in the document itself.

AC explained that a new Service Line was proposed for UNC Modification 0811S *Shipper Agreed Read (SAR) exceptions process* under XRN5604 as part of the February 2024 Major Release. She confirmed that the release had been successful, and this approval request was to formally update the DSC Service Description Table.

The second change listed, AC shared, was to support the PIX to CIX migration project with the introduction of Service Reference SS-SA22-95, two existing service lines were to be removed as they were no longer required in that they related to physical tokens, and two other service lines were to be amended to enable remote configuration.

With no questions from the Committee, the Chair asked Shipper, DNO, NTS and IGT Members to vote, with unanimous approval recorded as follows:

| Voting Outcome: | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Shipper Representatives | Voting Count | For/Against |
| Andy Eisenberg | 2 | For |
| Oorlagh Chapman | 1 | For |
| Steve Mulinganie | 3 | For |
| Total | 6 | For |
| Transporter Representatives | Voting Count | For/Against |
| Helen Chandler (DNO) | 1 | For |
| Sally Hardman (DNO) | 1 | For |
| Richard Loukes (NTS) | 2 | For |
| Charlotte Gilbert (IGT) | 1 | For |
| Total | 5 | For |

AC thanked the Committee for its approval, advising that version 34 of the Service Description table would be produced and provided to the Joint Office for publishing.

3. Business Plan Updates

3.1. BP Update

JRi shared that BP25 was getting to an interesting phase, with the project well underway at the planning stage and though it had not yet come to the DSC Contract Committee there had been numerous dialogues with customers discussing strategy for the period and beyond. He stated that Committee members may have already seen commentary about 15 May 2024 when it was envisioned to meet to discuss strategy in the morning before DSC Contract Management Committee meeting in the afternoon, and asked if invitations had already been issued.

MC confirmed that invitations for the May DSC Contract Committee would be issued as part of the usual JO process and would reflect the agreed arrangements.

JRi stated that the intention was to 'reset the dial' somewhat compared to the previous year's BP process and that it felt like this had been successfully achieved, especially following UNC Modification 0841 *Introduction of cost efficiency and transparency requirements for the CDSP Budget* both in regards to its support within Xoserve and the support experienced in general from the industry. He acknowledged that UNC Modification 0841 was still awaiting an Authority decision, but this did not prevent progression with a good base to build the BP. He observed that if there was a big difference to BP24 it was that they were aiming with BP25 to go further and link it to the Xoserve strategic objectives, noting that this was where Code Reform fitted in and committing to go into more detail on 15 May.

Energy Code Reform

JRi then shared the Xoserve view on Code Reform using a slide deck on the subject (a copy of which is available at www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Contract/200324).

JRi stated that whilst the Energy Code Reform conversation has been underway for more than a year he felt it fair to say that matters seemed to have picked up momentum since the Ofgem consultations in January and the DESNZ & Ofgem documents that set out the attributes of the Gas Code Manager role. As such, Ofgem's position now seemed to be much clearer.

JRi commented that Xoserve had been digesting the information and formulating its strategic path to then talk with the DSC Contract Management Committee about the consultations and what Xoserve were perceiving from them, especially in reference to key takeaways and how they link so much into BP25 considerations.

JRi confirmed that Xoserve would be responding to both consultations, adding that they were looking to facilitate the process which was going to change the industry's landscape for all adding that Xoserve wanted to be enthusiastically engaged throughout. He acknowledged that once DESNZ and Ofgem reviewed the feedback received to the consultations the proposed mechanisms may change.

He described this presentation as more of a kick-off of a series of discussions and talked through the requirements of the Gas Network Code Manager, asserting that it was a role that Xoserve could perform. In terms of the first of these consultations, it was proposed that the first of the perceived phases would feature the consolidation of the UNC and IGT UNC, with subsequent later Phases proposed but currently with no allocated timeframe, with the selection of a Gas Network Code Manager to feature in Phase 2, which he suggested perhaps would be timed at the beginning of 2026.

JRi noted that the Gas Network Code Manager role had been defined, as had changes to the regulations, with Modification Panels being replaced by Stakeholder Advisory Forums and generally looking to set things up to allow interested parties access to Code development and making for a change in how all Parties interact with the Codes going forward. He added that the Energy Act that came into play last year introduced these changes and enabled potential interrupts to anybody performing a code administration role.

JRi reviewed the requisites that had been given for Gas Network Code Manager and noted that it was possible to be appointed to the role by a non-competitive process if an organisation existed that held the necessary requirements or could attain them, and this possibility existed to enable potential cost and/or time benefits to be realised. He also mentioned that there were talks as to the period each Code Manager would be appointed, but no 'minded to' basis had yet been issued, with both fixed and revocable scenarios discussed.

With the consultation closing out in early May, JRi shared the timeline of engagement, noting that decisions will be made before the start of the BP25 period so that there was a need for Xoserve to be ahead of matters and that he would talk some more on the matter in April.

JRI then explained that the next step was to further set out the case for Xoserve to perform the Gas Code Network Code Manager role and to bring the Committee along with that idea, in so doing providing the rationale as to why Xoserve would be suitable for that role. He then asked for questions or thoughts from Committee members.

SM commented that it had proved a useful summary, adding that his view was the appointment of the Gas Network Code Manager should be done on a competitive basis as it would produce a better outcome, and asked if Xoserve would share their submission or publish it on their website.

JRI stated it would not be a confidential response as they wanted to do it in collaboration with the industry.

SM then asked about the consolidation of the IGT UNC and UNC, as these were some 80% identical and if there was a view from Xoserve as to how to make it as painless as possible. JRI commented that they did have expertise in the area and would look to advise on it. SM commented that this would be useful and suggested retaining existing expertise was also worth considering.

OC commented that the presentation had been useful, and it was helpful to share this early complete with timelines and intentions.

JRI concluded that stakeholders have been invited to join a dedicated session on 15th May during which Xoserve will be presenting its strategy in some detail and encouraging discussion.

3.2. Efficiency Review

JRI advised this would be a shorter update, in part due to him not being able to be present at the last CAB meeting, and that he had obtained details on the ERIX activity and a summary of the key points from the meeting from fellow Xoserve representatives who had been present and invited Committee members who had been at the meeting to contribute to ensure accuracy.

JRI observed that there had been confused messaging regarding the ERIX work between Xoserve and customers with the intention believed to have been to make things cheaper. JRI advised that ERIX had never been about that, acknowledging that whilst it was of course natural to focus on the reduction of costs there were other as equally important things to consider. Efficiency was indeed similarly important, but Xoserve wanted to widen its scope as to what it could provide to customers and whilst that might not be a reduction of costs, economy, efficiency and evolution were all important.

He commented that Xoserve were not quite ready with the reporting format as they did not want to produce something like a one-page dashboard that did not tell the reader everything they were trying to do in that space.

Regarding the focus of the CAB meeting, JRI advised that there was a fair bit of focus paid to the Change process, especially given the monetary value considerations in Change, and he had feedback about good conversations on the subject, including around the number of stage gates and approval voting. Consideration had been given as to whether it should be an end-to-end discussion of the Change process as to ensure all parts were considered in context.

JRI shared his view that it was a space Users could be ambitious in, not just cutting costs, but leading to wider market value for money and a space to develop such intentions citing Open Data options as an example that was becoming more real for subsequent BPs.

James Verdon (JV) commented that he was going to touch upon some of these aspects in his later presentation for Item 10.4

4. Monthly Contract Management Report

The full report is available for review at

<https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Contract/200324>

AC commenced the review of the Monthly Contract Management Report by drawing the Committee's attention to slide 4 which showed that DSC Credit and Risk Performance Indicators were all tracking green for the period.

4.1. KPM Update

Dean Johnson (DJ) provided the KPM Update and summarised the four failures detailed: -

- KPM 1 (which KPM6 was also linked to) being the Manage Shipper Transfers – stood at 99.99% against a target of 100%, with 139 switches not going live in UK Link.
- KPM7 also failed, as it often did, due to a small number of exceptions in the asset update process. A Performance of 99.99% reported against a target of 100%.
- KPM13 failure due to Prime and Subs exceptions impacting the invoice cycle, reporting 99.99% against a target of 100%.

Moving onto PIs, DJ advised that 2 failed: -

PI08, % of valid CMS challenges received % (Previously Submitted Contacts) was reporting performance of 1.20% against a target of less than 1%, and DJ advised that a fix for the issue had been developed in January and then deployed on 17 February with the measure now returned to normal levels.

PI27, % level 1 milestones met (including Cyber), missed the target of 90%, reporting a performance of 83.30% with a milestone for the UK Link Sustain project being missed by a day. He shared that whilst the test project had been completed per the plan date the Test Exit report artefact upload had then been missed.

For a detailed update, please refer to the published presentation.

4.2. KPM – Customer Relationship Survey Results CDSP

This item is due to be provided in April.

4.3. Monthly Contract Management Reports CDSP

AC provided a brief overview of the content of this slide, detailing the Publications and Events that occurred during February 2024.

Please refer to the published slides for full details.

4.4. Xoserve Incident Summary CDSP

DJ presented this item, sharing that four P2 Incidents had occurred in February 2024, with the first two having the same root caused by a monitoring and alerting connectivity issue, he advised that they were still awaiting the full RCA but commented that thinking was that it was due to a resource capabilities issue. A restart of the SAP PO application resolved the matter.

The third incident affected Switchstream where duplicate switching and erroneous rejection messages were issued to customers. This related to certification renewals (which were completed successfully) SwitchStream had been paused, which stopped the messages, and then successfully restarted. DJ advised that impacted customers were contacted directly and informed of the issue.

The fourth Incident affected UK-Link where a data lock occurred, which was later found to be an SAP issue already known of by SAP (though not by Xoserve), and DJ noted that the full RCA was still pending. Customers would have been unsuccessful if they attempted to log into Legacy CMS or attempting a transaction on the UK Link Portal during the periods detailed in the report. The resolution took two restarts when the first did not fully resolve the issue, but the second was successful and released the locks.

Slide 15 shows the trends in Major Incidents over the last 12 months with these four incidents managed by Correla in February and a total of 20 within the FY to date.

For further details, please refer to the published presentation.

4.5. Customer Issue Management Dashboard

Michele Downes (MD) presented this item to the Committee, summarising the content of **Slide 19** and commented that in the case of missing Secured Active Messages (SAMs), only two remained outstanding, one of which had been awaiting a customer response since the summer of 2023. Two SAMs had occurred in February 2024, one of which had been resolved as cancelled.

For the entry on Portfolio files MD advised that the issues identified for January 24 were fixed, but whilst testing another issue had been identified and would be fixed ahead of the next file issue in April 2024.

For Meter Readings, MD noted that the slide showed the period given was from September 2023 but it was actually from June 23 to Feb 24, with a small number of estimated meter readings not calculated for the effective date. The actual figure (rather than that shown in the slide) was approximately 1,500 across six Shippers, with MD advising that 99% of these were with one Shipper and the rest amongst the five others.

MD stated that Xoserve had not been able to replicate the issue in testing, and because it was such a small number it was proving hard to identify, and they were currently talking with the Shippers affected, and in particular with the Shipper most affected by the problem. Xoserve would identify any transfer reads that were not calculated (MD highlighted that this can only be done after D+10).

MD also advised that some Registrations had not been made effective in the UK Link as discussed by DJ under item 4.1 earlier, with 139 MPRNs across 17 incoming/outgoing shippers impacted which were subsequently processed on 23 February 2024 and made effective on 24 February 2024.

SM asked if the problem had been fixed, noting it would be more of an issue for Shippers who Ship for other suppliers. DJ confirmed that it was due to a manual workaround that had been missed after CSS implementation which was now automated and had added reporting.

4.6. Gas Retail Data Agent (GRDA) Update

DA drew the Committee's attention to the commentary around missing messages, as he did not want to be disingenuous in reporting that on 13 February and 15 February, there was an average volume with at least 2 missing messages, advising that there was a REC Change underway to address this, recognising but there was also the 139 that had got lost in the UK Link, which, whilst not reported on the GRDA matrix on **Slide 21** DA had added commentary on **Slide 22** for purposes of even-handedness, repeating DJ's comments that there were plans in place to ensure that the root manual process is no longer used.

4.7. KVI Change Management.

This item is due to be provided in May.

5. Information Security Update

No update this month.

6. Financial Information

This item is due to be provided in May.

7. Business Continuity Plan

This item is due to be provided in May.

8. Contract Assurance Audit

This item is due to be provided in May.

9. Key Committee Updates

9.1. DSC Change Management Comm

The full DSC Change Management Committee update is available for review at

<https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Contract/200324>

Paul Orsler (PO) provided an overview of the Change Management presentation and confirmed the delivery of the February 2024 Major release.

For **Slide 2** PO highlighted that a lot of discussion had been anticipated around XRN5615 (UNC 0819 - *Establishing/Amending a Gas Vacant Site Process*) with the DSC Change Management Committee supporting Option 1 for delivery, featuring a workflow and UK- Link solution, rather than the CDSP suggested solution of a UK- Link file-based solution. Now, with the decision made, they were looking to a November 2024 target date.

XRN5616 CSEP Annual Quantity Capacity Management (Part A) had a solution option that was going to go to Consultation but was then deferred until April due to the consideration of being best applicable to a subset of DNOs.

PO noted that there were also a few Detailed Designs approved.

Costs for the XRN5711 June 2024 Major Release were approved, which included UNC Modifications UNC 0836S *Resolution of Missing Messages following Central Switching Service implementation and integration with REC Change R0067* and UNC 0855 *Settlement Adjustments for Supply Meter Points impacted by the Central Switching System P1*.

PO added that following last month's discussion about the Change pipeline and the current high levels of commitment that Shippers had within the half-hourly space (esp. the current MHHS Programme) Xoserve was responding by managing releases with this consideration in mind.

PO then moved on to present on **Action 0208** *PO & CG IGTs (KM/CH) to discuss the scope and potential Solution options in preparation for the Asset Updates item in the next meeting.*

PO shared that discussions had been held with IGT and Shipper parties regarding asset updates in their respective constituency meetings, and in particular asset data mismatches, so he would provide a context around the work that was planned to assess these.

The full presentation provided for this action (0208) is available to review at <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Contract/200324>

PO explained that three core threads had been identified and explored these in the third slide of the presentation. The Data Discovery Platform (DDP) had seen a series of exercises undertaken between March and April in which comparisons were made with recognised market domain data focused on three key attributes, Meter make, Meter Manufacturer and Meter Mechanism (such as Credit / Prepayment etc). PO explained that this was a one-off exercise and a repeat of one done some 12 months ago and would drive an assessment as to whether the exercise could prove of value as a more regular activity as part of the DDP scope of work. This was currently in flight and discussions were underway with the IGT groups.

Within UK Link RGMA Xoserve sought confirmation to ensure they were confident UK Link validations were in line with expectations and delivery was correct for their customers.

PO advised that a number of validations were performed before Project Nexus and doing these again Xoserve confirmed that they were providing the validation required. He added that there was potential for tightening of validation, and in particular with On-job files, adding it might be right and pertinent to do this using just the Market Domain data as the appropriate source as it was known that this was a tighter data set than the UK-Link data, and as such the Xoserve team were working to ascertain if there was something that could be brought to customers for their view as to its value.

SM commented that whilst he recognised that the legacy Shadow Logs should not be increased if such an exercise was undertaken it would have to be applied prospectively on new installations only, as applying it to older installations would be problematic, noting that the three data items given had no impact on Settlement and were pertinent only to MAMs commercial interests. DA replied that this was a valid challenge and something Xoserve were aware of.

PO continued that XRN5473 Meter Asset Data Proactive Management Service was raised on the same value-added thinking in that there was some value in the data being made available to the CDSP and if there was anything Xoserve could do to support users, particularly Shippers. He confirmed that this Change had been put on hold and remained so for the entirety of BP23 to prioritise regulatory and industry demand, but that now, approaching BP24 and in a good space in regards to the Change portfolio, there was potential to pick this Change back up with the suggestion made by Xoserve to run collaborative subgroup discussions and constituency meetings in April to consider this.

PO then summarised the next steps in the final slide, confirming that they were both awaiting outputs of the DDP-MDD analysis and the conclusions of the detailed UK Link analysis whilst progressing with customer discussions of the potential uses of the proposed Meter Asset Data Proactive Management Service

9.2. Retail Energy Code (REC) Updates

DA provided this Update, sharing that the presentation had been reduced to a single slide and acknowledging feedback received from OC that this was thought too brief and invited other Committee member commentary as to what to include.

DA highlighted R0067 – *Introduction of CSS refresh functionality* and that further updates had been implemented on 14 March which the Xoserve was testing, one of which, due to operational nervousness, they had deferred testing until a missing message actually occurred. He commented that this CSS work was now drawing towards an end,

Other aspects he wanted to draw attention to included R0148 where a lot of work had been done with Code Managers in consideration of Open Data.

He advised that there were several links on the left side of the slide, and noted that XRN5546 had no title showing on the slide so confirmed this should show as '*Resolution of Address Interactions between DCC and CDSP*' where address changes with low confidence scores were being deferred to Xoserve who was, in turn, trying to find an answer as to who the URLs could be correctly targeted to.

Please refer to the presentation slide published for the full update.

Further information on all the Changes can be found on the REC Portal at: <https://recportal.co.uk/recportal>.

9.3. Retail Code Reform

This Item was covered under Item 3.1 earlier.

10. Any Other Business

10.1. CMS Update

Richard Cresswell (RC) provided an overview of the CMS rebuild delivery roadmap and the current progress to date. Version V1.7 with new contact codes for XRN 5604 and 5605 ((Known Meter Issue and Shipper Agreed Reads (SAR)) was successfully launched on 24 February 2024 and Xoserve had processed around 200 contacts.

The enhanced Must Reads Process (MUR) was launched on 04 March 2024 as part of V1.8 with changes to 'must read' formats. Whilst considerable engagement had taken place with customers on the changes in file formats it was found that some customers were still using legacy contacts, so Xoserve were currently reaching out to them to provide any additional support needed.

RC shared that the options for the processes Managing Unregistered Sites (MUS) and the Gas Safety Regulations (GSR) were under development and would be discussed with constituency members in April.

For full details, please refer to the published slides at <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Contract/200324>

10.2. DDP Issues

Andy Eisenberg (AE) raised this item after speaking with other Shippers who had experienced the same issue. He stated that DDP was used to produce Performance measures where the granular level data within DDP was found not to correlate with the high-level figures DDP produced, for his organisation it was found specifically concerning AQ performance values, sharing that he found numerous meter points included that clearly should not have been. He was particularly alarmed that such data would be provided to PAFA, though shared that there were some suggestions that it was a different data set that was provided to them. His largest concern was that the discrepancies were so obvious, adding that the only party his organisation was talking to was Correla and they had provided no transparency as to how this played out with the PAFA and how it may impact other performance measures.

OC added that her organisation had raised the issue with Correla in January 2024, adding that discussions had started even further back with a lot of back-and-forth commentary and that it had been raised in Shipper constituency meetings where the responses received from Correla were discussed. She noted that this matched the concerns raised about Xoserve's Contract Management across the whole piece with Correla as discussed under **Action 0206** earlier, and as such she perceived there were two related key issues to explore, the DDP concerns raised and Xoserve's Contract Management.

David Turpin (DT) replied that this correlated with his understanding of the concerns and shared that the data discrepancy was identified as being around AQ at risk, and as such should not impact any other data, adding that Xoserve were doing checks that this was the case to confirm that there was no other data issue.

DT added that a fix was being applied in a couple of places, due to the architecture of DDP data flows moving through other systems as well as the DDP itself. In the meantime, there was some manual allocation of the data before those fixes were delivered, which, he advised should only be weeks away, and committing to double-check what was being provided to PAFA. DT continued that he had had it confirmed that Xoserve did not have a performance metric for the DDP on this.

MC asked if this had all been reported on the Issues log.

OC stated that this concern with DDP had not been reported by Xoserve as an Issue, Incident or even a Problem on the report, adding that whilst if Shippers had raised their concerns within the last month it would make more sense that mentions did not exist in the reporting, but stressed that they had been under discussion for a long time.

SM added that PAC had raised challenges about data quality, latency, and data accuracy before, and he had no memory of this concern being mentioned in PAC, stating that there should only be one version of the truth, and observed that this appeared to be a case of Xoserve throwing PAFA 'under the bus'.

AE commented that there seemed to be a real lack of data assurance, and unless Users invested a lot of time and cost undertaking the task of data analysis themselves, they were not able to ascertain the accuracy of the DDP data and the scope of the issue. He added that there was also the fact that it was only Correla talking to his organisation and that they had not advised they were aware of the issues already and that other conversations were occurring, adding it was only when he spoke to other Shippers that the fuller picture became evident. He stated that it went back to basic data issues that should have been picked up at the beginning.

OC confirmed that all the discussions had been with Correla and that it did not seem appropriate that there was no Xoserve involvement in customer assurance.

AE also asked how appropriate it was for Correla to communicate directly with PAFA.

DT advised that Correla was acting on behalf of Xoserve and that, in effect, it is all Xoserve from the User's perspective and that should always be the position customers should be able to expect. He stated that Xoserve would look at the conversations had and confirmed that he was aware that there had been discussions on this subject. He highlighted it was often difficult not to get mismatches in data with the information that goes to PAFA because of differences in the parameters, such as dates.

DT shared that this was the first instance he was aware of that the data had proven incorrect and this was being investigated, adding that they would also explore why this was talked about in isolation.

AE asked for insight as to what had been communicated to PAFA.

Committee members then discussed the Actions that should be raised in this regard.

Action 0303: CDSP (DT) to provide insight as to what had been communicated to PAFA regarding the DDP Data and its accuracy, especially AQ at risk.

Action 0304: CDSP (JMc & AC) to explain the absence of the DDP Data issue recorded in January 2024 from reporting issued up to and inclusive of March 2024

Action 0305: CDSP (JMc & AC) to provide insight as to the level of DDP data assurance performed

10.3. MPidVAD rule amendment

MC explained this Item related to **Action 0202** and the requirement to set up a Governance Review following the February 2024 DSC Contract Committee vote on MPidVAD rule amendments. This was deemed required by the Committee to produce a more holistic review of the document's suitability and mitigate the need for piecemeal changes being made for individual customer needs.

Referring to GTD 4.1.1 MC proposed a sub-committee be formed of the DSC Contract Management Committee, which in practical terms would see the Subcommittee pick up directly after a session of the DSC Contract Committee is adjourned. MC advised that an alternative route would be a sub-committee held under the DSC Governance Review Group but felt that the proposed route felt better suited.

DA asked if this was intended as a general timely review or if there was a specific issue and whether it was tied to considerations on voting. JMc confirmed it was the outcome of the discussions ahead of the vote.

OC advised that there had been a separate broader discussion at Change Management about how the voting worked. SH added that her understanding was that the voting discussion was a separate item under the DSC Governance Review Group whereas this discussion was specifically concerning the MPidVAD document, which other Committee members confirmed.

MC and JMc agreed to progress with the production of a set of Terms of Reference on the basis that the sub-committee would come under DSC Contract Management Committee.

Action 0306: JO & CDSP (MC & JMc) to publish Terms of Reference for MPidVAD Review Sub-committee

10.4. CoMC/ChMC Change and CX Engagement

JV presented this item, stating that most Committee members in this meeting had already been part of the process he was presenting on and acknowledged that many had already been given this presentation in other meetings, primarily the DSC Change Management Committee.

The presentation intended to provide a summary of the engagement activities that JV had been managing over the last few months. It provided a summary of the current customer pain points and collated Efficiency Review change opportunities.

JV highlighted that a lot of the recent feedback from the CAB aligned to the findings here which was perceived as positive and would help to tie these activities together. He reviewed the proposed Roadmap Options, sharing the feedback that nobody wanted to accept not making any changes, and the lack of short-term wins proposed suggested that Xoserve had done a lot of good development in focusing customers to identify the long-term issues.

JV shared that the largest pain points were around communications and their content, with Change and Engagement equally showing as the next areas to consider. Specific feedback was that information was not easy to find, the 'Spamming' of customer contacts and a lack of understanding of their customers.

JV noted a point that had been raised recently was the resource constraints being experienced by the majority of customers in a very active industry landscape that was likely to continue and as such there was an even greater need for Xoserve information to be quickly and easily consumed.

MC noted that this content was very much DSC Change-focused whereas this Committee's focus was the DSC Contract with most considerations relating to contract assurance. Whilst acknowledging this JV explained that he had brought the item to this meeting in recognition that whilst the issues manifested in DSC Change, they had a broader impact.

MC observed the smaller customer weighting given to Contract Assurance in the presentation and suggested it would no doubt be a bigger issue for the DSC Contract Management Committee. JV confirmed that he was certainly receptive to all views.

JV continued the presentation noting customer appetite for improvement in Proposals and that it was widely felt that communications needed improvement and overhauling. He also described how three proposed areas of improvement had already been agreed in principle, including DSG redesign, targeting customer SMEs to assure Change Managers on earlier stage gates and if Change Managers would be open to revising Change Governance. He confirmed earlier commentary that customers wanted added value over cost savings and as such Xoserve were looking to enhance their offerings, and not necessarily in just the efficiencies coming out of the Efficiency review.

JV shared the feedback received that the lived experience of the CDSP did not align with the reported Performance or the Efficiencies Review, meaning that customers did not themselves feel the benefit or have trust in consistent delivery, which demonstrated a disconnect between what is being reported and what the customers felt.

JV completed his presentation with the intended next steps for 2024, referring to the May events already mentioned and committing to come to the April DSC Contract Management Committee meeting with details on the strategic aspects, which he would follow up in the May meeting when he intended to talk about how Xoserve could improve their services and what customers should expect and how those improvements should feel, confirming that this would all then feed into BP development.

Additional AOB RECCo PSR Project

DA advised the Committee that Xoserve had been approached by RECCo to discuss some work on Priority Service Register (PSR) data and that there was a strawman proposal as to whether RECCo could help out with a centralised service for gas and electricity and, in time, water.

DA wanted to flag this to the DSC Contract Management Committee as such work would be a DSC service, as the data would be managed under DSC and, given its nature, he did not think it would happen quickly, but shared that discussions were already underway with the RECCo likely to pull together a Workgroup which Xoserve hoped to be included on and would therefore be able to flag its commencement to the DSC Contract Management Committee as well as, potentially, let other Users know.

SH asked for confirmation that this was to consider the Priority Service Register data and not the Large site Priority Customer Register. DA confirmed it was the Priority Service Register and that he was aware that ENA work was in a very similar place.

MC asked if the strawman Proposal DA had seen could be shared. DA replied that they had derived a UPRN that they think be leveraged and committed to write to them to see if there was a slide deck to be shared, adding that those he had seen to date had been in a state of flux.

11. Recap of decisions made during meeting

Angela Clarke (AC) provided an overview of discussions, decisions, and actions made during the meeting.

12. Diary Planning

The intent to hold the May DSC Contract Committee meeting as a face-to-face session in the afternoon after a morning strategy session was highlighted by the JO and CDSP.

OC observed that holding a strategy day and a DSC Contract Commitment meeting on the same day seemed a lot, especially as May would see the review of the Quarterly Contract Management Reports.

JMc explained that the original proposal had been to undertake the strategy update as part of the Contract Management Committee meeting, but that it had been recognised that there was value in opening out that strategy discussion to a wider audience, so had decided to deliver it as a separate meeting.

HC commented that whilst she could appreciate why it had been planned in this way and that it added value for Committee members attending in person, she also agreed that this was two very big meetings in one day, recognising that the Strategy meeting may well have some major conversation pieces. As such she thought a day should be set aside just for the DSC Contract Management Committee with its Quarterly reporting and that squeezing something else in on the same day was a big ask.

OC added that it did not feel possible for either meeting to be done justice, especially with all the Quarterly reports, noting that whilst this March meeting had not been a rushed session but had taken most of the working day, in comparison, as planned, the May meeting would likely be very rushed.

MC asked if it would be preferable to hold the meetings over two days with Committee members staying overnight, to which JMc asked if two days was too much.

OC commented that there were some considerable issues to explore and both meetings needed plenty of attention.

MC suggested deferring a decision until the end of the April meeting, which SH built upon suggesting that at that point the Committee would be able to take a view as to how many of the issues were resolved in April and the likely nature of the May Agenda.

JV responded that a review may need to be undertaken earlier as diaries needed to be considered.

SH proposed that if it proved that the Committee were unable to address the issues in the April meeting an additional remote session could be convened to cover the remaining items, timed dependent upon other industry meetings.

MC and JMc agreed to discuss what aspects of the DSC Contract Committee Agenda could be considered covered by the earlier Strategy meeting and consider a date for the additional meeting.

| |
|---|
| <p>Action 0307: JO & CDSP (MC & JMc) to review May Agenda and a potential date for additional May DSC Contract Committee should it prove required.</p> |
|---|

DSC Change meetings are listed at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Change>

All other Joint Office events are available via: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/events-calendar/month>

| Time/Date | Meeting Paper Deadline | Venue | Programme |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| 10:00 Wednesday 17 April 2024 | 5pm Tuesday 09 April 2024 | Microsoft Teams | Standard Agenda |

| DSC Contract Management Committee Action Table | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|---------|--|------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Action Ref | Meeting Date | Min Ref | Action | Owner | Reporting Month | Status Update |
| 0201 | 14/02/24 | 1.5 | JO (MC) to produce an outline for a new members introduction for an in-person October 24 DSC Contract Committee meeting | JO (MC) | August 2024 | Deferred |
| 0202 | 14/02/24 | 2.1 | JO (MC) to set up a Governance Workgroup to review the MPIdVAD. | JO (MC) | April 2024 | Closed |
| 0203 | 14/02/24 | 3.2 | CDSP (JRi) to produce a format suggestion for quarterly CAB Updates. | CDSP (JRi) | April 2024 | Pending |
| 0204 | 14/02/24 | 4.5 | CDSP (MD & DJ) to provide a presentation detailing the demarcation between Issues and Incidents, detailing the commitments, resourcing and escalation process for each. | CDSP (MD & DJ) | March 2024 | Closed |
| 0205 | 14/02/24 | 4.5 | CDSP (MD) to confirm the accuracy of the January 2024 KPM12 figure in light of the reported Invoicing files issue. | CDSP (MD) | March 2024 | Closed |
| 0206 | 14/02/24 | 4.7 | CDSP (JRi / AC) to provide an insight into Xoserve's Contract Management of Correla including using the example of the concerns raised in regards to the Major Incident Reporting figures in the February Contract Management Report | CDSP (JRi) | March 2024 | Closed |
| 0207 | 14/02/24 | 7 | CDSP (LW) to provide further commentary on BCP consideration of Switchstream implications and the new scope to the Security Rota. | CDSP (LW) | March 2024 | Closed |
| 0208 | 14/02/24 | 10.2 | PO & CG to discuss the scope and potential Solution options in preparation for the Asset Updates item in the next meeting. | PO & CG | March 2024 | Closed |
| 0209 | 14/02/24 | 10.3 | JO to add Energy Code Reform to DSC Contract Management Committee agenda | JO | March 2024 | Closed |
| 0301 | 20/03/24 | 1.5 | CDSP (MD) to provide a proposal as to how best to resume the provision of weekly Defect Report to Users | CDSP (MD) | April 2024 | Pending |
| 0302 | 20/03/24 | 1.5 | CDSP (JMc & JRi) to provide enhanced reporting in May to deliver required Contract Management assurance with a view to subsequent DSC Contract Management Committee consideration and potential suggestions for Improvement. | CDSP (JMc & JRi) | May 2024 | Pending |

| | | | | | | |
|-------------|----------|------|---|----------------------|------------|----------------|
| 0303 | 20/03/24 | 10.2 | CDSP (DT) to provide insight as to what had been communicated to PAFA regarding the DDP Data and its accuracy, especially AQ at risk. | CDSP (DT) | April 2024 | Pending |
| 0304 | 20/03/24 | 10.2 | CDSP to explain the absence of the DDP Data issue recorded in January 2024 from reporting issued up to and inclusive of March 2024 | CDSP (JMc & AC) | April 2024 | Pending |
| 0305 | 20/03/24 | 10.2 | CDSP to provide insight as to the level of DDP data assurance performed | CDSP (JMc & AC) | April 2024 | Pending |
| 0306 | 20/03/24 | 10.3 | JO & CDSP (MC & JMc) to publish Terms of Reference for MPidVAD Review Sub-committee | JO & CDSP (MC & JMc) | April 2024 | Pending |
| 0307 | 20/03/24 | 12 | JO & CDSP (MC & JMc) to review May Agenda and a potential date for additional May DSC Contract Committee should it prove required. | JO & CDSP (MC & JMc) | April 2024 | Pending |