

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

Tuesday 13 October 2015

31 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3LT

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Helen Cuin (Secretary)	(HCu)	Joint Office
Bobbie Gallacher*	(BG)	Scottish Power
David Addison	(DA)	Xoserve
Emma Lyndon	(EL)	Xoserve
Huw Comerford	(HCo)	Utilita
Jaimie Simpson*	(JS)	GDF Suez Energy
Jon Dixon*	(JD)	Ofgem
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
Richard Pomroy*	(RP)	Wales & West Utilities
Steve Mulinganie*	(SM)	Gazprom
Steve Rogers	(SR)	RWE npower
Sue Cropper	(SC)	British Gas

*via teleconference

Copies of all papers are available at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0531/131015>

The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 19 November 2015.

1.0 Introduction and Status Review

1.1. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

1.2. Actions

0401: Xoserve (DA) and SSE (MJ) to consider requirements for amending the modification.

Update: MJ confirmed a draft modification had been provided. **Closed.**

2.0 Review proposed amendments to Modification

The Workgroup considered the changes to the modification.

MJ explained that the intent of the modification had changed to place an obligation on Xoserve to provide a testing environment.

SM challenged whether the existing modification should be withdrawn and a new modification raised due to the extent of the changes. MJ was concerned with losing another month if SSE were required to raise a new modification. RP suggested that at the very least the Panel should be alerted to the extent of the changes.

BF explained that modifications can be amended under the current modification rules and that the rules are silent on the extent of changes acceptable. He clarified that there is no requirement in the modification rules, which stipulates that modifications should be withdrawn, and a new modification raised when a modification is amended.

MJ explained that SSE were concerned that the testing environment would be withdrawn post Nexus. He believed not having a testing environment would pose a significant risk to the industry as some parties may identify problems they need to resolve and require a testing environment to conclude any changes they may need to make. The modification would require Xoserve to manage and maintain a separate test environment on an enduring basis.

BF enquired whether the solution required a UNC modification or whether this could be addressed through guidance within the UK Link Manual.

JD enquired about the cost of such a test environment, recognising that test environments are expensive to maintain due to the resources required to support the process.

DA suggested that the requirement could be reflected in the UK Link Manual. However, it could also be considered a Class 3 UNC modification, requiring a change to Transporter systems and/or processes and needing to be funded as User Pays. He suggested the modification should continue to be considered. SM suggested that the UNC could reflect the obligation for a testing environment, which is enacted through the UK Link manual.

It was suggested that the Workgroup report should outline the governance options considered, as it is likely these could be challenged during the consultation process. The proposer agreed to consider the governance approach within the modification.

DA enquired about the requirement for regular data refreshes within the test environment and the attribution of old data. SM asked whether the test environment simply needs to be fully functional i.e. it mirrors the current functionality of the current system, rather than the need for it to use current and accurate data sets, which would need to be regularly refreshed. He suggested the test environment could utilise sample data, rather than actual data. DA suggested false data might cause problems with Shipper systems as they may be using real data, in addition it is the interaction between data sets that is being tested and sample data may not be able to fully test this functionality. He explained that the market trials identified some issues due to using pseudo data.

The data protection issues were also briefly considered. DA explained that the market trial teams have previously considered the data protection issues and are confident that their approach meets the requirements for data protection. SM suggested that the testing environment could be designed to interact with the live system and have the ability to load appropriate data as and when required.

SR believed that a data cut might be more appropriate as loading live data may cause complications, particularly if there are missing fields, which could devalue the testing. DA suggested a data cut could be targeted against the objectives of the testing and if only required for one party only one portfolio may need to be used.

DA expressed that the requirements for testing would need to be clear. He explained how the Gemini system is operated; how the testing environment worked and how test slots are booked. DA wished to understand whether parties would accept the principles of a booking system and the level of utilisation.

MJ agreed to consider the extent of the test environment, charging structure and how this could be incorporated into the modification.

MJ was keen to consider the costs of the solution options. DA suggested the Workgroup might want to initially consider the cost of a full-scale environment with outages to undertake data synchronisation and compare this to a low level test environment which used sample data.

SM suggested that Xoserve and SSE might wish to look at the ability for the testing environment to test different functions of code i.e. to test new functionality and new file formats.

DA agreed to work with SSE to further consider the scope of the modification, the requirements, and cost implications.

Action 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.

3.0 Next Steps

Modification to be formally amended and an extension will be requested to allow further assessment before reporting to Panel.

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 10 November 2015	31 Homer Road, Solihull. B91 3LT.	Consider modification amendment.
Tuesday 08 December 2015	31 Homer Road, Solihull. B91 3LT.	Development of Workgroup Report

Action Table

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
0401	07/04/15	2.0	To consider requirements for amending the modification.	Xoserve (DA) & SSE (MJ)	Closed
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)	Pending