

## Change Overview Board (COB) Minutes

Monday 07 July 2014

Energy Networks Association, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF

### Attendees

Les Jenkins (Chair)	(LJ)	Joint Office
Lorna Dupont (Secretary)	(LD)	Joint Office
Adam Carden	(AC)	SSE
Alex Travell	(AT)	E.ON UK
Andy Baugh	(AB)	RWE npower
Angela Love	(AL)	ScottishPower
Beverley Viney	(BV)	National Grid NTS
Ed Beattie	(EB)	Baringa
Erika Melen	(EM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Graham Wood	(GW)	British Gas
Jayesh Parmar	(JP)	Baringa
Joanna Ferguson	(JF)	Northern Gas Networks
Mike Hogg	(MH)	DONG Energy
Nick Salter	(NS)	Xoserve
Rosie McGlynn	(RM)	Energy UK
Sandra Simpson	(SS)	Xoserve

Copies of meeting papers are available at: [www.gasgovernance.co.uk/COB/070714](http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/COB/070714)

### 1. Introduction and Status Review

LJ welcomed participants to the meeting.

#### 1.1 Review of Minutes

The minutes were accepted.

#### 1.2 Review of Actions

**COB 0402:** Xoserve to clarify assumptions, core actions, and initial criteria for 'go' positions on the Change Programmes (for review at the June COB meeting, or earlier if possible).

**Update:** Completed. **Closed**

**COB 0501:** *New Modification and Workgroup Report templates* – Include the following question: "Does this proposed modification affect the Nexus delivery and if so, how?"

**Update:** Completed. **Closed**

**COB 0502:** Provide a strawman (defining which elements of Nexus are fundamental for every aspect to be ready, and which are not) for discussion at the next meeting.

**Update:** Completed. **Closed**

**COB 0503:** *UK Link Dashboard* - Add an appendix summarising other risks, including any major Xoserve internal risks identified.

**Update:** Completed. **Closed**

**COB 0504:** *Agenda* - Add a new item 'Issues for discussion'.

**Update:** Completed. **Closed**

**COB 0505:** *Change Portfolio: Timelines and Dependencies* – Add in the AUG modification.

**Update:** Superseded by change in circumstance. **Closed**

**COB 0506:** Produce a separate Dashboard to cover all other Change Programmes.

**Update:** Completed. **Closed**

## 2. Planning

**2.1 Short to Medium Term Planning Overview** (*relates to deliverables that are essentially defined and due for delivery over the next 18 – 24 months*)

### 2.1.1 UK Link Programme - Dashboard and supporting information

#### *Stakeholder Engagement*

SS provided a copy of the project plan and gave an overview of current progress. It was suggested a colour coding key would be a useful addition, as would an indication of key milestones and key 'go/no go' review points. SS said these and any publication date would have to be confirmed.

**Action COB 0701: UK Link Programme (Stakeholder Engagement) - Confirm when 'go/no go' dates/information can be published.**

#### *Dashboard Report*

SS provided an overview of activities and achievements, together with Programme milestones and Industry Engagement communications, and a summary of Risks and key dependencies. Priorities for the next period were outlined.

Referring to the Detailed Design phase, it was noted that there were still some pressures against achieving the delivery date, and that other less critical elements might need to slip in order to preserve delivery.

Commenting on the format and content of the Dashboard, it was suggested that completed phases might be shown in blue rather than red (or that consideration might be given to removing the completed parts) so that attention could be more focused on what is to come. It was also suggested that consideration might be given to adding subsets of critical items if these were known to affect progress.

Referring to the 'Transition Mods' milestone, LJ drew attention to and explained the time constraints inherent within the UNC Modification process. Proposed timescales might prove challenging and required closer consideration. AT suggested the inclusion of regulatory critical path information to capture any dependencies. SS explained that the detail of what might be required/achieved through the raising of transition modifications was under examination, and an understanding of the impacts if not achieved by 31 March 2015 needed to be gained. A brief discussion of potential timescales followed, and LJ reiterated the need to have in place good quality well developed modifications for submission to the October UNC Modification Panel.

The Risks had been discussed at UKLIEF and the Dashboard reflected the three top risks. SS explained what actions Xoserve was taking to mitigate the degree of risk.

**Risk 1 Industry Readiness** "Risk that there is insufficient time for industry participants to develop their changes between file formats being available in Sep 14 and Market Trials in June 15."

SS confirmed that Xoserve was considering the feasibility of releasing draft file formats (appropriately caveated) and making them available to view on line.

**Risk 2 Scope** "Raising of new mods which impact the baselined requirements will impact Oct 2015 delivery."

SS confirmed that this was being managed and will be an ongoing process.

*Risk 3 Market Testing* - Mitigating actions to address concerns raised at the last meeting were under consideration.

**Action COB 0702: *Industry Risk Register* - All to review the register published at [www.gasgovernance.co.uk/COB/070714](http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/COB/070714), and submit comments to SS ([sandra.l.simpson@xoserve.com](mailto:sandra.l.simpson@xoserve.com)) before the August COB meeting.**

Key dependencies were then reviewed. It was confirmed that readiness assessments (of participants and participation) would be carried out throughout the process. The market trials approach would make this clearer. It was suggested that the community or any part not engaging in market trials would exacerbate the risk. SS confirmed that individual monitoring of each party's readiness was being performed through various means (objective and subjective). There was no obligation to participate, but there was no indication to date of any non-participants. At a later date Xoserve would be seeking registration of parties to take part in the market trials and participation will be strongly encouraged.

### **2.1.2 Change Portfolio - Timeline and Dashboards**

Programme Dashboards were presented.

*EU Reform* - SS confirmed that all was progressing very well; the requirements were very clear. SS gave a brief overview of the risks. AL suggested adding clarity to the heading 'EU Reform'.

*Smart Portfolio – DCC Day 1 and DCC Gateway* – SS gave an overview. RM suggested that this success implementation should be highlighted at the Implementation Managers Forum (IMF), ie on the Joint Industry Plan, and suggested that Xoserve engage with the Scotia Gas Networks IMF representative.

*Faster Switching* – AL suggested adding a reference to Modification 0477 to the title. SS confirmed that all was on target for delivery for November 2014. NS confirmed the new UK Link system would be Modification 0477 compliant.

LJ drew attention to an Ofgem letter (24 June 2014), an item on Data Quality on July's UNC Modification Panel agenda, and a cross industry meeting that Gemserv would be hosting on or around 29 July 2014.

#### **General Comments**

MH reiterated that the group needed to know the key dates for decision-making. AL reiterated the need to have critical paths outlined.

Project Nexus delivery was briefly discussed. It was considered that any dependencies/interrelationships (stated or otherwise) between Gemini and iGMS needed to be more clearly defined and understood and who makes the decisions about the infrastructure, so that the reasons for and any potential consequences of the 'freeze' imposed by National Grid NTS could be better comprehended by industry.

**Action COB 0703: *Gemini and iGMS* - Clarify the dependencies/interrelationships between Gemini and iGMS.**

**Action COB 0704: Clarify the basis upon which National Grid places a change freeze on iGMS for the winter period including, where relevant, specific obligations and/or risks that necessitate this.**

### **2.1.3 Shipper Readiness Analysis**

The document was reviewed. SS reported this had been taken to the UKLIEF to consider what would be the impacts, against each of these processes, on one or more parties if a party was not ready (cumulative effects).

Xoserve had reviewed the end-to-end processes to identify any impacts. SS gave an

overview of the findings against Item 2 (Maintain Supply Meter Point Register), Item 3 (Predict , Allocate and Balance Daily Energy) and Item 4 (Settle Supply Meter Point Consumption) and these were discussed.

It was questioned if there would be any impacts on Meter Asset Managers (MAMs). SS agreed to confirm.

**Action COB 0705: *Shipper Readiness Analysis* – Confirm if there were likely to be any impacts on Meter Asset Managers (MAMs).**

It was suggested that Item 1 (Maintain Gas Industry Stakeholders) had an impact on competition market/materiality, but it was not believed that any would stall the programme. SS confirmed this was also the view at UKLIEF.

Discussion moved on to Smart versus legacy impacts on the market in relation to readiness and delivery. Additional aspects to highlight might be those relating to consumers. It was suggested that a view from UKLIEF might be sought to give comfort that these issues do not present an insurmountable obstacle.

## **2.2 Medium to Long Term Strategic Planning Overview**

NS gave a brief overview of the concept and the proposed approach to build up a sound picture across the evolving future spectrum, and introduced EB who then gave a presentation outlining the Risk and Milestone assessment process and tools in more detail. Feedback was to be sought on the tools and process used to capture information, the level of information parties would be willing to contribute, and views on the acceptability of a trial to assess value.

EB outlined the proposed tools (Change Horizon, Risk Management Framework, and Delivery Milestone reporting) and each was then considered in more detail.

### **2.2.1 Change Horizon**

EB explained the trend line, ie the firmness and proximity in terms of time. Principle drivers had been indicated in the key. This tool will set the scope of discussions for the COB.

GW suggested flagging items that had dual fuel dependencies/associations. AL suggested flagging items with legislative/regulatory aspects so that it might be easier to recognise where there were some elements of flexibility/discretion open to the industry should action be required, or where there was not. These suggestions might be more useful than the current high-level key, when considering what actions could be taken and whether areas of other interrelationship should be taken into account to assess any wider impacts. NS noted these suggestions for consideration.

### **2.2.2 Risk Management Framework**

EB gave a high level overview of the process and the risk parameters. All identified risks should fall into one of the three broad parameters. There may be other parameters that could also be employed and views would be welcomed.

### **2.2.3 Delivery Milestone Reporting**

EB gave a high level overview of the process and the information that may be required from respondents. Periodic updating of a party's progress would be required to provide a collective assessment of the state of readiness across the industry.

Concerns were expressed regarding what information a party might be expected to provide, its level of publication and the potential for individual attribution, and the use(s) to which it might be put. Clarity of context and purpose, and assurance of confidentiality would be important. JP confirmed that any information requested, provided and used would be reflected in an anonymised way and used to establish a holistic and collective view of readiness. RM suggested there should be a control framework in place, and asked if Xoserve was subject to/must respond to Freedom of

Information (FOI) requests, and also the Transporters. NS will confirm the Transporters' status/position and Xoserve's status/position in relation to FOI.

**Action COB 0706: *Freedom of Information (FOI) requests – Confirm the Transporters' status/position and Xoserve's status/position.***

MH observed that parties needed to be clear about the level of confidentiality and also recognise an agreed discipline relating to compilation and forwarding responses to requests for information (RFI) received from Xoserve; agreed timeframes on the turnaround of any RFI would be required. Suggestions that any such RFIs be channelled through various Energy Associations were considered unnecessary, as this would slow the process.

It was noted that provision of data might be quite challenging for parties, and might require business cases and extra resources. It may not be possible for some smaller parties. A lot may depend on the clarity of context and the detail of what may be required to be provided, ie how a question is framed.

## **2.2.4 Agreement on way forward**

JP summarised the group's views, recognising that further clarity and assurance was required regarding:

- Process of collection, intended purpose/use, intended publication, format and identification/anonymisation
- Legal questions, eg FOI
- Confidence that the data being collected continues to add value (a regular assessment)
- Response timeframes for RFIs
- Quality of information
- Direct collection by Xoserve favoured over involvement of a third party.

**Action COB 0707: Xoserve to provide clarity on assurance issues relating to information provision.**

EB summarised the key benefits of COB being able to establish a clear and consolidated view of industry readiness.

Parity of data sharing and reporting was considered, and assurance was sought that all stakeholders (Shippers, Transporters, Xoserve) would be asked/expected to contribute data to establish the view. It was noted that the level of response would affect the perception of the value.

LJ asked how parties not directly involved in the COB meetings would be engaged in this contributory process. NS responded that this would be accomplished through individual meetings and Xoserve will be monitoring/have a follow up programme. RM believed there was a specific risk in relation to new market entrants who may lack in resources, experience or understanding of what must be done and therefore not see the need for serious engagement. It was pointed out that Ofgem has a role in engaging with smaller parties.

RM also pointed out that, due to various internal constraints/checks, data gathering/contributing was not likely to be a quick process. JP did not expect it to be a particularly onerous activity on parties to retrieve and provide information.

It was agreed that, subject to achieving more clarity and assurance regarding the points raised in this discussion and confirming information controls, a pilot exercise should go ahead and that Xoserve would present an update on progress at the August meeting.

## **2.2.5 Data Capture Form**

EB explained the format and potential data inclusions. AC queried the 'Impact Assessment Rating', observing that parties may perceive this differently, depending on

their size and other factors (what may be a major concern for one may not be for another). JP observed the value would be very much dependent on the quality of the information provided. RM expressed concern that the assessed perception of the risks would drive the actions, and suggested that the criteria for completion of the form should be more explicit. Parties should be able to flag if the information provided was sensitive.

Submission/population of individual baseline data was discussed; updating by parties on a periodical basis was anticipated. LJ suggested that Central Programme baseline dates should also be populated for comparison.

### 2.2.6 General

The need for visibility of the industry critical path and the key 'enablers' for any of the 'go live' aspects was briefly discussed.

The frequency of the assessment and review of the Change Horizon content would be carried out on an 'as and when' basis; it was not anticipated that it would evolve that quickly.

The Medium to Long Term Strategic Planning aspects would be reviewed initially on a monthly basis, reducing to a quarterly basis once the approach was deemed satisfactory.

NS summarised that many good points had been raised in discussion, and it was recognised that there were reservations about the practical engagement of smaller parties, parity of information across the community, and concerns regarding the expected levels of detail, purpose, use and confidentiality. RM reiterated that confirmation on data control/data protection was required before initiating the pilot. Guidelines on compliance and aggregation would also be welcomed.

## 3. Issues for discussion

### 3.1 Terms of Reference

It was suggested that these should be reviewed.

**Action COB 0708: COB members to review Terms of Reference prior to next meeting (04 August 2014) and provide any comments to the Joint Office ([enquiries@gasgovernance.co.uk](mailto:enquiries@gasgovernance.co.uk)).**

## 4. Any Other Business

None raised.

## 5. Diary Planning

*Further details of planned meetings are available at: [www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Diary](http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Diary)*

Change Overview Board (COB) meetings will take place as follows:

Date	Time	Venue	Programme
Monday 04 August 2014	10:00	Room 4, Energy Networks Association, 6 <sup>th</sup> Floor, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF	To be confirmed
Monday 01 September 2014	10:00	Room 4, Energy Networks Association, 6 <sup>th</sup> Floor, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF	To be confirmed
Monday 06	10:00	Pink Room, ELEXON, 4 <sup>th</sup> Floor, 350	To be confirmed

October 2014		Euston Road, London NW1 3AW	
Monday 03 November 2014	10:00	Room 4, Energy Networks Association, 6 <sup>th</sup> Floor, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF	To be confirmed
Monday 01 December 2014	10:00	Room 4, Energy Networks Association, 6 <sup>th</sup> Floor, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF	To be confirmed

### Action Table – Change Overview Board (07 July 2014)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
<b>COB 0402</b>	07/04/14	4.0	Xoserve to clarify assumptions, core actions, and criteria for 'go' positions on the Change Programmes (for review at the June July COB meeting, or earlier if possible).	Xoserve (SS)	<b>Closed</b>
<b>COB 0501</b>	13/05/14	3.1.1	<i>New Modification and Workgroup Report templates</i> – Include the following question: "Does this proposed modification affect the Nexus delivery and if so, how?"	Joint Office (LJ)	<b>Closed</b>
<b>COB 0502</b>	13/05/14	3.1.1	Provide a strawman (defining which elements of Nexus are fundamental for every aspect to be ready, and which are not) for discussion at the next meeting.	Xoserve (SS)	<b>Closed</b>
<b>COB 0503</b>	13/05/14	3.1.1	<i>UK Link Dashboard</i> - Add an appendix summarising other risks, including any major Xoserve internal risks identified.	Xoserve (SS)	<b>Closed</b>
<b>COB 0504</b>	13/05/14	3.1.1	<i>Agenda</i> - Add a new item 'Issues for discussion'.	Joint Office (LD)	<b>Closed</b>
<b>COB 0505</b>	13/05/14	3.1.1	<i>Change Portfolio: Timelines and Dependencies</i> – Add in the AUG modification.	Xoserve (SS)	<b>Closed</b>
<b>COB 0506</b>	13/05/14	3.1.1	Produce a separate Dashboard to cover all other Change Programmes.	Xoserve (SS)	<b>Closed</b>
<b>COB 0701</b>	07/07/14	2.1.1	<i>UK Link Programme (Stakeholder Engagement)</i> - Confirm when 'go/no go' dates/information can be published.	Xoserve (SS)	<b>Pending</b>

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
<b>COB 0702</b>	07/07/14	2.1.1	<i>Industry Risk Register</i> - All to review the register published at <a href="http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/COB/070714">www.gasgovernance.co.uk/COB/070714</a> , and submit comments to SS ( <a href="mailto:sandra.l.simpson@xoserve.com">sandra.l.simpson@xoserve.com</a> ) before the August COB meeting.	All parties	<b>Pending</b>
<b>COB 0703</b>	07/07/14	2.1.2	<i>Gemini and iGMS</i> - Clarify the dependencies/interrelationships between Gemini and iGMS.	National Grid NTS (BV)	<b>Pending</b>
<b>COB 0704</b>	07/07/14	2.1.2	Clarify the basis upon which National Grid places a change freeze on iGMS for the winter period including, where relevant, specific obligations and/or risks that necessitate this.	National Grid NTS (BV)	<b>Pending</b>
<b>COB 0705</b>	07/07/14	2.1.3	<i>Shipper Readiness Analysis</i> – Confirm if there were likely to be any impacts on Meter Asset Managers (MAMs).	Xoserve (SS)	<b>Pending</b>
<b>COB 0706</b>	07/07/14	2.2.3	<i>Freedom of Information (FOI) requests</i> – Confirm the Transporters' status/position and Xoserve's status/position.	Xoserve (NS)	<b>Pending</b>
<b>COB 0707</b>	07/07/14	2.2.4	<i>Way forward</i> - Xoserve to provide clarity on assurance issues relating to information provision.	Xoserve (SS)	<b>Pending</b>
<b>COB 0708</b>	07/07/14	4.1	COB members to review Terms of Reference prior to next meeting (04 August 2014) and provide any comments to the Joint Office ( <a href="mailto:enquiries@gasgovernance.co.uk">enquiries@gasgovernance.co.uk</a> ).	All parties	<b>Pending</b>