UNC Workgroup 0531 Minutes
Provision of an Industry User Test System
Tuesday 12 April 2016
31 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3LT

Attendees

Les Jenkins (Chair)	(LG)	Joint Office
Helen Cuin (Secretary)	(HCu)	Joint Office
Andy Clasper	(AC)	National Grid Distribution
Brendan Cooper*	(BC)	Engie
Chris Warner	(CWa)	National Grid Distribution
David Addison	(DA)	Xoserve
Ed Hunter	(EH)	RWE npower
Emma Lyndon	(EL)	Xoserve
Fiona Cottam	(FC)	Xoserve
Huw Comerford	(HCo)	Utilita
Jon Dixon*	(JD)	Ofgem
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	DONG Energy
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE
Michele Downes	(MD)	Xoserve
Paul Carmen*	(PC)	Scottish Power
Phil Lucas	(PL)	National Grid NTS
Rachel Duke*	(RD)	EDF Energy
Rob Cameron-Higgs	(RCH)	Good Energy
Steve Mulinganie*	(SMu)	Gazprom
Sue Cropper	(SC)	British Gas
Sue Hillbourne*	(SH)	Scotia Gas Networks

via teleconference

Copies of all papers are available at: http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0531/120416

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 (08 March 2016)

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

1.2. Actions

0201: Xoserve to provide further clarity on what is meant by SAP stabilisation.
Update: DA anticipated that the newly amended modification would clarify the position.
Closed.

2.0 Amended Modification/Business Rules

MJ confirmed he had amended the modification. It was anticipated that a formal legal text request would be made at the April UNC Panel meeting with the possibility of concluding the Workgroup report in May.

DA explained that Xoserve have been going through a requirements exercise and will need to have the ability to prioritise testing. SMu asked in the context of what was being requested if Xoserve could go through what they will be able to deliver (critical and non-critical).

DA explained that the intention will be to utilise an existing environment that could be made available, however this may have to be pushed back if the current test environments are required for a longer period. He emphasised the need to make sure Xoserve find the best fit with what is currently available – identifying what within the requirements document is reasonable and what provisions meet these requirements.

SMu enquired if there was a size issue or functionally richness issue. He understood the intention was not to replicate the live environment, but he wanted to understand if Xoserve had any scaling or functional issues. DA explained a number of discussions have been taking place and at the moment it is looking likely that a full-scale production capability will not be available. However a partitioned production type environment would be feasible to test code management functionality, this would allow patch fixes to be made in the testing environment; allow the use of testing by Xoserve and allow support. He explained the way the document is leaning towards the market trial testing and support approach, with the anticipation there will be a significant step down of market testing.

The Workgroup considered the scope of the modification and whether it should be limited to Shippers. SMu asked about the reference to stable state and if the stable state functionality is being made available on a continual testing. It was suggested that the modification should be made available for the use by iGTs and Transporters. SMu asked if extending the scope would cause any delays. The Workgroup recognised the current market trials includes Transporters interaction. LJ suggested the Transporters could, if they wished, commission a separate testing environment with Xoserve.

MJ asked for views on whether the Workgroup considered the modification to be self-governance. SMu challenged the significance of the modification. He explained he would not support self-governance as it would have a significant impact however LJ challenged what the modification would impact, he anticipated the nature of the modification would not significantly impact consumers.

The Workgroup considered the statement relating to the quality of data and challenged that the lack of a testing environment would not necessarily impact the quality of data. LJ challenged how the availability of a testing environment actually affects data quality, he suggested that the lack of a testing facility would not in itself impact the quality of data Shippers submit. It was suggested its possibly poor practice not to have a test environment in the UNC that allows functionality testing.

DA asked about a pre/post stabilisation environment post Market Trials. CWa suggested for the Solution further clarity would be required for the legal text. It was confirmed that this modification would be to test future environments and future functionality. SMu suggested there are two testing scenarios, one to test current functionality for new entrants or parties who may have functionality problems and future functionality testing to test new processes.

CWa questioned the use of certain terms and suggested the text uses should be future proofed to take into account changes likely whereby current references to committees such as the UK Link Committee may change.

PC enquired about the housekeeping of the testing environment – it was deemed this would be required as part of the requirements document and not necessarily set out within the UNC.

SMu asked about the manufacturing of test data and what the environment should include. DA explained this would be data equivalent to production data. DA explained that the majority of processes will need to relate to testing portfolios, and there is a need to replace the use of production data to aid protection and ensure commercially sensitive data is not provided to other users. Manufactured data will be required for the change of supplier process and new entrants. SP suggested Shippers might not want to "buddy up" as they have within the Market Trials and how the change of supplier process could be tested. LJ asked about the ability to create a pseudo Shipper within the testing environment if a buddy system may not be feasible.

_____

SMu challenged if the modification needs to explicitly set out compliance with relevant UK legislation in particular the data protection act. The Workgroup considered how the UNC currently manages its requirements. LJ suggested that the current obligations set out in the UNC should already cover confidentiality and use of data in line with relevant legislation.

The Workgroup considered the governance and compliance of the "Enduring UK Link Testing Approach" code subsidiary document. It was envisaged Section V12 would control this.

SMu asked for clarity to be added to the modification explaining what is meant by stable state. He explained that the creation of a test environment under the modification assumes there will be a stable state. Hinging the ability to provide an environment only when a stable state can be achieved creates uncertainty of when the test environment will be provided when it is not clear when a stable state position will be achieved. SMu was keen for the production environment to be made as soon as possible. The Workgroup considered the provision of the testing environment. LJ highlighted that implementation will be driven by the availability of systems. SMu was keen to have absolute clarity on when the environment will be made; LJ explained that ultimately that first iteration would be provided purely at the point when Transporters are able to deliver. Changes will be driven via the UK Link Committee.

LJ asked parties to have a realistic expectation about an absolute date of when the testing system would be made available and, as with all UNC modifications, changes are made on a date advised by Transporters. He explained that the UNC will create an obligation to provide a testing environment and Transporters will be obliged to provide an environment.

MJ explained the original intent of the modification excluded any costs of testing elements relating to Project Nexus go live testing, he believed this was still covered by the modification and emphasised any testing costs relating to Project Nexus should not be charged to Shippers if the new testing environments picks up any Project Nexus testing.

It was agreed that ANS and Gemini systems would be excluded from the scope.

SMu enquired about the go / no go decisions for implementation. DA confirmed Xoserve are working on developments and which environments can be used and how quickly these can be made available. The functionality will be made available as soon as possible. LJ asked if Project Nexus was delayed could this modification still be implemented. DA explained the testing environment stack is currently being used for Project Nexus Market Trails up until to go live. This modification will be a post Project Nexus environment. The Market Trials environment will be used to create the modification's new environment.

LJ summarised his view that the reality was that it was highly unlikely a test environment could be made available prior to go-live, and that it was advisable that the modification should focus on the enduring requirements the proposer sought.

To address the stability question, LJ suggested that the UK Link Committee UKLC) was best-placed to make decisions about when a particular environment was suitable for use in testing, as a view could be taken by shipper representatives on the inherent risks. It followed that each iteration could be treated as a change request to UKLC and only implemented into the test arena if suitable approved. Participants felt this would be a positive way of managing environments.

A number of clarifications and amendments were made to the modification for the proposer to consider. . MJ agreed to consider the amendments and submit a formal amendment to the modification to allow the production of legal text.

3.0   Subsidiary Document

The Workgroup considered the provided document and agreed it ought to be provided as an appendix to the modification. It was agreed to review elements by exception initially

and allow parties to review the document more thoroughly offline and for parties to provide any feedback in time for the next meeting.

DA highlighted that elements of the document had been lifted from the Market Trials Documents and may no longer be appropriate. DA and MJ agreed to review the document further and consider mirroring the requirements within the UK Link manual test environment.

LJ asked all parties to consider any other generic conditions or restrictions that need to be built into the document; environment-specific matters such as support level and availability would be a part of each UKLC change request.

LJ stressed that the documents will only be reviewed by exception at the next meeting and all parties would be expected to review the subsidiary document ahead of time.

It was suggested that the contents of the UKLC change request should be established within the document.

4.0 Development of Workgroup Report

Deferred until May.

5.0 Next Steps

LJ summarised that the Proposer will amend the Modification and Subsidiary Document in line with discussions and a formal request for legal text will be made at the April UNC Panel meeting.

It was envisaged that one further meeting may be required in June to finalise the Workgroup Report and it would be prudent for the UNC Panel to be approached to request a one month extension for the Workgroup Report. The intention will be to develop the Workgroup report in May and, only if necessary, conclude the Workgroup Report in June with a short notice Workgroup Report being provided to the UNC Panel.

6.0 Any Other Business

None.

7.0 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 10 May 2016	31 Homer Road, Solihull. B91 3LT.	Legal Text Review Finalise the Subsidiary Conclusion 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**