

UNC Workgroup 0531 Minutes
Provision of an Industry User Test System
Tuesday 10 May 2016
31 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3LT

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Helen Cuin (Secretary)	(HCu)	Joint Office
Andy Clasper	(AC)	National Grid Distribution
Bobbie Gallacher*	(BG)	Scottish Power
Chris Warner	(CWa)	National Grid Distribution
Colette Baldwin	(CB)	E.ON UK
David Addison	(DA)	Xoserve
Ed Hunter	(EH)	RWE npower
Emma Lyndon	(EL)	Xoserve
Hilary Chapman	(HCh)	Scotia Gas Networks
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	DONG Energy
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE
Michele Downes	(MD)	Xoserve
Mike Fensome	(MF)	RWE npower
Naomi Nathanael	(NN)	Utility Warehouse
Phil Lucas	(PL)	National Grid NTS
Rachel Duke*	(RD)	EDF Energy
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	Gazprom
Sue Cropper	(SC)	British Gas

*via teleconference

Copies of all papers are available at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0531/100516>

The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 19 May 2016.

1.0 Introduction and Status Review**1.1. Approval of Minutes (12 April 2016)**

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

1.2. Actions

None outstanding.

2.0 Amended Modification/Business Rules

MJ confirmed that he had amended the modification and began to summarise the changes made. The Workgroup reviewed the proposed changes.

CB asked what ANS was and why it was excluded. DA clarified the ANS system is referred to in the UK Link Manual and it stands for Active Notification System, which is text, based system used by NTS and therefore along with Gemini is out of scope of this modification.

DA explained his expectation that the testing environment would cover two testing abilities one for industry systems testing when considering modification amendments to code and one specifically requested by users for individual testing needs. He clarified within the subsidiary document that the two different instances are outlined.

The Workgroup considered the business rules in relation to defining the system software. SM suggested a reference ought to be made to “the relevant system” to allow for flexibility within the UNC, He suggested it would not be appropriate to define the technical solution within the modification and keeping the business rules to high level principles would keep the legal drafting simple and each scenario would then be considered on its merits .

CB believed differing organisational requirements for testing would make it difficult to define the technical solution. DA agreed to keep the description to “the relevant system” and avoid descriptive text, as this would support allowing the UK Link committee to consider and make decisions on user testing requirements.

The Workgroup considered the use of data within the testing environment. DA noted to the Workgroup that manufactured data sets may not be representative of the live environment. SM suggested the industry might want to use manufactured data or live data dependent on what is being tested, as change of supplier scenarios would need data not currently in the Shippers portfolio. DA explained that Xoserve have been looking at using a set of production data from a chosen LDZ, this would be a manufactured data set, with sections for parties to interact with to test change of supplier scenarios. This would use data, for example, where sites have already transferred between parties and used in the future to re-test change of supplier with suitable oversight to ensure confidential live data was not provided. This would protect the exchange of commercially sensitivity of data.

CWa requested further clarity on what elements should be included within the UNC and what should be incorporated into the subsidiary document. He stressed this needed to be clear for the provision of legal text.

CWa also emphasised that the UNC Funding, Governance and Ownership (FGO) Workgroup and Modification 0565 would have some impacts as to the likely structure for governance as FGO would impact UK Link Committee and other UNC governance processes.

The reference and consideration of pseudo shipper (manufactured data) was clarified, in that this was to create a pseudo shipper in the system to allow supply point activities such as supplier transfer to be tested without the need for two shippers to be involved in testing. DA confirmed this was covered within the guidance documents.

3.0 Subsidiary Document

DA re-emphasised the point about the testing environment having two distinct purposes and explained the definition for industry testing required for UK Link Modifications or releases. Any other testing outside of this would be considered a user-testing requirement. He explained that the document tries to differentiate between the two scenarios, and user testing will be subject to agreement and the availability of systems to do so, there may need to be a need to prioritise industry testing over user testing for example.

DA proposed that the subsidiary document would need to refer to another sub-document for the purpose of allowing Users to request testing access and for this to be assessed and agreed via the UK Link committee depending on the availability and arrangements for User testing. He explained that the UK Link committee will need to make a judgment of which processes are to be included within the testing environment, and parties will need to make representations to the UK Link committee as the scope of the system required which could elevate the cost of the testing environment.

SM asked about a clear definition of what would be considered User Testing. DA confirmed that User testing would be provided on a bi-lateral agreement whereby the User is wishing to undertake individual testing, perhaps to support an internal software update.

DA clarified that any change to the UNC, which results in a UK Link system change and by definition is a UK Link modification would be considered industry testing. The

Workgroup considered such changes as platform refreshes which may not require a UK Link Modification. SM was concerned about the limitations of the current definition and that the scope of what user testing could creep and start to include what should be industry testing. CB wanted to ensure that the definition of industry testing should necessarily be applied to all cases where more than one user was impacted, as osme parties may then need to fund testing for processes they do not operate.

DA explained that if the industry came to Xoserve requesting a testing environment, and the Transporters declined the request based on the justification that the request would be considered a Class 3 UK Link Modification, then a modification would be required to consider the changes to the system and user pays costs apply for testing on an industry basis.

The Workgroup considered how the UK Link committee would determine what would be considered an Industry Testing and User testing.

DA wished to understand the consideration of testing and costs. He suggested this needs to be considered as part of the modification process going forward, and that Xoserve would need to formally factor in User Testing requirements in any cost estimate. He recognised that the recovery of testing costs would need to be recovered through a User Pays mechanism, however it should be noted that this would be impacted by FGO.

The Workgroup discussed the need for costs to be considered and allow consultation on how testing costs should be managed going forward. The Workgroup considered how this would be managed within the Modification process and whether the Modification templates needed refinement. BF suggested as the UNC Modification templates are currently being considered this could be incorporated as a required change to the Modification templates.

The Workgroup considered the requirement to report to Panel and the position no further extensions were going to be allowed. The Workgroup agreed to review the subsidiary document and feedback any concerns to the proposer otherwise the documents will be appended to the Modification and considered fit for purpose, it should be noted that it is proposed that UK Link committee could amend the documents and therefore any omissions at this time could be managed through this route.

Action 0501: All parties to review the subsidiary document and feedback to the proposer of any material changes required.

The Workgroup considered the management of defects, sharing information on the discovery of defects and if this would be appropriate where this was a user requested test.

The Workgroup considered the management of industry changes such as software version updates and that if Xoserve were to update software whether this would be considered an industry change. It was considered that a system update for user software would be considered User testing not industry testing.

The Workgroup considered a clause that User testing will be facilitated and Users will enter a bi-lateral agreement for User testing and there should be principles within the subsidiary document. SM was keen for the subsidiary document to clarify that a test environment should not be unreasonably withheld. DA confirmed Section 10 provided clarification. However, it was considered whether this ought to be captured in the UNC. BF suggested that the User Pays services should be defined in the Modification to ensure it is clear as to what is being requested. The provision and timing of Legal Text for amended modification was considered.

MJ considered whether splitting the modification would speed the process, with this version setting out industry testing requirements and a further modification being raised for User Testing services. The Workgroup considered the concept of Industry and User testing and whether this definition needed to be clearer in the UNC or whether it was sufficient to be defined in the subsidiary document. Without it being defined in the UNC it was challenged if there would be an obligation to provide User testing.

The Workgroup considered whether a definition was required in the UNC, subsidiary document or both. It was believed the UNC legal text should create an obligation to provide a Test environment and that the services should be defined within the subsidiary document. It was agreed to proceed and that it was acceptable to provide detailed definitions within the subsidiary document governed by the UK Link Committee. It was agreed that the UK Link Committee would be responsible for the subsidiary document and any user request sub documents.

SC asked about the definition of critical process and which elements would be considered out of scope for testing. DA clarified if a change only affected SPAA processes would this be considered out of scope, he confirmed the UK Link committee would consider this as part of any request for testing, whether it is within scope or not.

The Workgroup considered the critical path and support analysis. SC asked about requirements and testing and classifying changes for example as “must haves” DA confirmed it was previously agreed to take this element out and allow the UK Link Committee to consider.

The Workgroup considered the User Pays service and where the definition of the service is defined. CWa believed this would be set out in the standard User Pays terms.

The Workgroup considered whether this modification was suitable for self-governance. SM believed that this could not be justified as an immaterial change as setting up testing environments could include significant costs. BF agreed costs would be a factor of the change, however the modification would meet the self-governance criteria as overall it is not likely to have a material impact on competition of consumers for example. The Workgroup felt the Modification should be considered suitable for self-governance but suggested views were sought from the industry.

Based on the evidence of progress and considerations that need to be taken, the Workgroup considered whether it was suitable to conclude the report. It was agreed that as the modification, subsidiary document, legal text and cost information required to be amended or provided, that Panel should be requested to allow a further period of assessment, particularly as the modification was proposing to be a post Nexus implementation.

The Workgroup considered that a rough magnitude of cost should be included. DA confirmed Xoserve would review the requirements document, which was previously provided, and consider if a view on costs can be provided.

4.0 Legal Text

Consideration deferred until 06 June 2016.

5.0 Development of Workgroup Report

Deferred until 06 June 2016.

6.0 Next Steps

It agreed that one further meeting would be required in June to finalise the Workgroup Report.

7.0 Any Other Business

None.

8.0 Diary Planning

Further details of planned meetings are available at: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Diary

Workgroup meetings will take place as follows:

Time/Date	Venue	Workgroup Programme
Monday 06 June 2016	6 Homer Road, Solihull. B91 3QQ.	Amended Modification Consideration of Legal Text Completion of Workgroup Report

Action Table

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
0201	23/02/16	2.0	Xoserve to provide further clarity on what is meant by SAP stabilisation.	Xoserve (DA)	Closed
0501	10/05/16	3.0	All parties to review the subsidiary document and feedback to the proposer any material changes required.	All	Pending