UNC Workgroup 0531 Minutes
Provision and Development of Industry Testing Prior to Nexus Go-live

Tuesday 10 November 2015

31 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3LT

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Helen Cuin (Secretary)	(HCu)	Joint Office
Blanka Caen	(BC)	British Gas
Bobbie Gallacher*	(BG)	Scottish Power
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Colette Baldwin	(CB)	E.ON
David Addison	(DA)	Xoserve
Emma Lyndon	(EL)	Xoserve
Emma Smith	(ES)	Xoserve
Huw Comerford	(HCo)	Utilita
James Hill	(JH)	EDF Energy
Jaimie Simpson*	(JS)	GDF Suez Energy
Leigh Chapman	(LC)	First Utility
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	DONG Energy
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE
Michele Downes	(MD)	Xoserve
Mike Fensome	(MF)	RWE npower
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/0531/101115

The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 18 February 2016.

1.0   Introduction and Status Review

1.1.   Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

1.2.   Actions

1001: SSE (MJ) and Xoserve (DA) to consider the scope of the modification, the requirements of the test environment, the potential cost implications of functionality, the charging structure and governance
Update: MJ confirmed a draft modification had been provided. **Closed.**

2.0   Modification amendments

DA believed the requirements had significantly changed from the original modification. He explained that the requirement is now for an enduring testing environment for use upon request.

SM asked if the testing environment would always available, DA explained that the testing environment would be made available on request and not permanently open for use.   DA explained the difficulties of data population and how it would be prohibitively expensive to maintain a link to live data. He explained what interaction would be required to set up the

environment for testing purposes. Xoserve would need to understand the test objectives and what data would be required.

DA had assumed single use of the testing environment to overcome complexities of multiple parties using the environment at the same time. SM challenged the possibility of blocking out the test environment for other users. SP suggested there might be an instance where the whole industry may wish to test.

Action 1101: SSE to consider the complexity of offering a test facility to more than one party rather than blocking testing for others if test environment being used (partitioning to be considered)

DA explained that for certain changes / developments, testing is undertaken, as per the current practice. He reassured parties that for wholesale changes and major projects, testing environments would continue to be built on a bespoke basis. DA understood the requirement was for a test environment to test specific releases/changes.

SM suggested there should be permanent testing environment, explaining the particular benefits for new entrants to test end-to-end processes. SM suggested the cost of a full testing environment against a selective test environment on request, needs to be understood.

The Workgroup considered that real data may need to be populated within the environment dependent on the nature of the testing as manufactured data may not be able to provide testing robustness on its own. DA anticipated that an obligation would exist within the UNC and Xoserve would provide from a variety of sources available, the provision of a suitable test environment.

CB asked the industry to consider the need of future functionality changes Post Nexus and the ability to provide a test environment.

DA anticipated the modification would not ring fencing what is to be provided. The principle is to obligate Xoserve to provide a test environment based on User requirements. SM suggested that consideration of a test environment should cover not only who pays, but the likely costs of replicating the test environment on a different supporting server.

The modification suggested the environment should be available after Project Nexus go-live. CB challenged the text environment will be required as Project Nexus is being implementing up to and beyond 01 October 2016. SM's understanding was that the existing Project Nexus test environment would be shut down at L3/L4 and this modification would be required from 01 August 2016 as there is likely to be a need for such an environment leading up to implementation.

CB suggested rather than providing an implementation date the modification should simply refer to the closure of current Project Nexus Market Trials as the point from which the environment should exist.

DA believed from the discussions that there were two sets of requirements needed. One for testing functionality for market testing requirements, and another for a 'sand-pit'. DA suggested, as the current test environment was not anticipated to be enduring solution there would be a cost associated with providing an enduring solution. DA suggested a release type approach maybe more efficient to test systems, for example market trials.

The Workgroup considered whether there was a potential for two modifications. One for a multi user scheduled testing environment for testing wholesale changes typically included within specific projects and another 'sand-pit / bespoke' environment for one off testing.

DA explained that the modifications would need be a Class 3 Modifications as the terms would need to be within the UK Link manual, in addition funding would need to be considered.

DA explained which testing environments should be excluded e.g. Gemini, as a separate Gemini Testing environment is already available. It was suggested it should also exclude ANS and the data enquiry service. The Workgroup suggested that the exceptions should be recorded.

The Workgroup suggested that the test environment might wish to be built not only to use actual Shipper portfolio data but also be capable of loading manufactured data.

The Workgroup considered testing the transfer of ownership and having appropriate data within the system to enable such testing and how a 'buddy system' may wish to be considered. SM suggested as part of the upfront agreement of data provision, and the agreed method of data provision, this could be part of the pre-testing set up/agreement.

SM was keen to see a UNC obligation to provide test capability, for Xoserve to maintain an appropriate portal (testing functionality), and provide Shipper access within a reasonable lead-time for access.

SM asked for the bespoke testing environment if the modification could provide an indication of the minimum lead-time required.

3.0 Next Steps

0531 Modification to be formally amended with further consideration on the requirement for an additional modification.

4.0 Any Other Business

None.

5.0 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
Tuesday 08 December 2015	31 Homer Road, Solihull. B91 3LT.	Modification 0531 Amendment Development of Workgroup Report Draft New Modification

Action Table

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
1001	13/10/15	2.0	SSE (MJ) and Xoserve (DA) to consider the scope of the modification, the requirements of the test environment and the potential cost implications of functionality.	Xoserve (DA) & SSE (MJ)	**Closed**
1101	10/11/15	2.0	SSE to consider the complexity of offering a test facility to more than one party rather than blocking testing for others if test environment being used (partitioning to be considered)	Xoserve (DA) & SSE (MJ)	**Pending**