

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

Tuesday 23 February 2016

31 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3LT

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Helen Cuin (Secretary)	(HCu)	Joint Office
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Colette Baldwin	(CB)	E.ON UK
David Addison	(DA)	Xoserve
David Mitchell	(DM)	SGN
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	DONG Energy
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE
Mike Fensome	(MF)	RWE npower
Paul Carman*	(PC)	Scottish Power
Phil Lucas	(PL)	National Grid NTS
Rachel Duke	(RD)	EDF Energy
Rachel Hinsley	(RH)	Xoserve
Richard Pomroy*	(RP)	Wales & west Utilities
Steve Mulinganie*	(SM)	Gazprom
Sue Cropper	(SC)	British Gas

*via teleconference

Copies of all papers are available at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0531/230216>

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 (09 February 2016)

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

1.2. Actions

No outstanding actions to review.

2.0 Provision of an Industry Testing – Xoserve Presentation

DA provided a presentation including information following discussion at the Project Nexus Steering Group. He summarised that Modification 0531 proposes to provide a testing environment for Transporter/Shipper flows in three phases; Phase 1 – Conclusion of Market Trials (CoMT) phase to Project Nexus Implementation Date (PNID); Phase 2 – PNID to SAP Stabilisation; and Phase 3 – Enduring following SAP Stabilisation.

RD enquired about the distinction between Market Trials and Modification 0531 testing, suggesting there are blurred lines in relation to the possible extension of Market Trials testing and the availability of testing in this modification. A number of parties also asked Xoserve to explain what was meant by SAP stabilisation.

Action 0201: Xoserve to provide further clarity on what is meant by SAP stabilisation.

DA clarified that Xoserve were not able to provide a new environment for Phase 1. He explained that the testing modification was raised after environments were procured. This requirement had not been identified therefore no capability had been provisioned and as

the existing environment sits in a critical part of the infrastructure it is over specified for the role and is intended to be utilised for another role when Market Trials is completed. The provision of a new environment is unachievable due to time and resource constraints as the data team are focussing on data migration test cycles and bulk data loading which may require up to 7-8 weeks.

CB challenged the duration for the bulk data loading. It was suggested that the data loading would be achievable in less time. DA was asked to review this estimated time frame to establish if this was a realistic estimate.

SM asked if implementation could still be achieved with sufficient financial support, and if a new infrastructure could be purchased to meet the timelines.

MF enquired about the delayed Market Trial testing and challenged if the industry would have a test environment, which could be utilised if things go wrong and potentially allow an extra two months of testing.

SM understood the plan is to turn off the Market Trail testing area at the end of July and this modification can be raised to allow a testing environment being made available beyond this point. SM believed at some point there would be a need for a Go/No Go decision and additional testing capability may reduce the risk of a no go. The Workgroup also considered if a modification would actually be required and if an agreement could be reached to extend the availability of the existing testing environment.

The Workgroup considered the overlaps of the Market Trials and extending testing environments following successful L3/L4 testing and managing the cut-over to allow parties to continue testing where testing needed to be continued. CB explained that Shippers are not entirely satisfied with piecemeal testing. CB believed Phase 1 is being blurred by continuing Market Trials beyond the supported Market Trail testing as originally planned due to the late delivery of system functionality.

DA confirmed that the Project Nexus Steering Group (PNSG) would be making the necessary recommendations following a consultation with the industry on their requirements for Market Trials and the possibility of extending the Market Trial window. There was concern that as there is a delay with the delivery of RGMA this will eat into the testing period by 6-7 weeks.

CW highlighted that the provision of a new testing environment could adversely affect the 01 October 2016 Project Nexus Core delivery. CW expressed support for the testing environment, as it is a good idea, however he believed Transporters could not support the development of a new environment if this would impact the implementation of Project Nexus delivery. MF challenged that Shippers were having to provide additional testing environments due to the de-scoping of Retrospective updates and the delays in delivering other functionality, in addition there is a risk to 01 October delivery due to insufficient testing time to provide the confidence required.

MJ and CB both wished to understand the costs of procuring a new test environment and asked Xoserve to substantiate the costs to help the industry better understand the claims being made. DA explained Xoserve have a lot of work to do to create this environment and Xoserve have a finite amount of resources, which are required for loading data, and there is no provision to support another environment instead of the pre-production environment.

SM suggested the modification could be split into a pre-nexus and post nexus testing environment. However, the Workgroup did not consider the risk of separating the modifications a good idea if this would impact the delivery of Project Nexus as it would not be approved. RD wanted the workgroup to focus on achieving the benefits of Core delivery with sufficient assurance that testing environments would be available for Phase 2.

CW believed that the success of a pre-nexus modification would be very low compared to the potential success of a post Project nexus test environment. To enable a pre-nexus

test environment the Workgroup considered that an Urgent Modification would be required due to the tight timescales.

SM asked if a modification would be required for a Post Nexus testing environment or if this can be provided without a modification. DA supported the requirement of a modification for a post Project Nexus Testing Phase 2 environment. He explained the potential ability to use the data-loading environment, which is required to support Phase 1 implementation by reconfiguring it to support a test environment post Project Nexus.

The Workgroup considered the availability of a testing environment post Project Nexus implementation. RD requested clarification that if there are any Project Nexus delivery deferrals these elements are not referred for testing under Modification 0531's testing environment. CB concurred with this and believed that everything that is scoped within the original Project Nexus plan should be part of Nexus delivery and testing should be included and already funded. RD suggested, that the RAASP deferral testing also needs to be clearly defined. DA confirmed that Xoserve anticipate providing a testing environment for future releases. He had not anticipated excluding RAASP from the provision of future tests.

SP suggested that if Modification 0531 is to be considered a User Pays modification, late delivery of any aspect of Project Nexus, including RASSP and anything already included on the Requirements Log should not be charged under the 0531 testing environment. Shippers agreed that anything deferred from Project Nexus should be tested in a bespoke environment and not funded through this modification.

MJ asked for further clarification on the remit of the PNSG. CW explained that the PNSG was considering its future role and if it would continue to exist into Phase 2.

DA reported that the PNSG, PwC and Xoserve, are considering the possible programme contingency scenarios and actions. This includes whether Market Trails could be continued into August and any impacts this would have on transition activities.

3.0 Amended Business Rules

The Workgroup considered the amended modification.

CW suggested that following Workgroup discussions the Solution needs to be amended and set out the concise requirement for a testing environment. He believed the detail of the solution would then reside within a separate subsidiary document.

The Workgroup considered how to record the need for the provision of a test environment and the transitional rules for elements deferred under Project Nexus testing, as these will not be charged for.

DA believed the modification needed to set out the obligation to provide a test environment along with a justification for why this is required.

The Workgroup considered the distinction of how the environment is provisioned and paid for. The Workgroup briefly considered the potential utilisation of a new environment and how parties would pay for the services. It was recognised that not all parties may use the services on an equal basis, some may have very limited use or not at all and these parties would not want to support costs of a party who may wish to use the service multiple times a year.

RD suggested that some partitioning should be considered and a baseline established. She suggested parties should not be precluded from using the testing environment if they wish to invest in system changes and require testing.

CB asked how quickly Xoserve would be able to plan and set up the test environment.

The Workgroup considered the confidentiality of data and that parties would still have to comply with UK Law and whether this needed to be clarified in the UNC. There was a general agreement that it wasn't necessary to refer a requirement to comply with standard UK Law. However, RD suggested that it should be clear in the subsidiary document about

the population of test data. It was acknowledged that there would be a number of considerations for the subsidiary document.

The Workgroup considered whether Shippers would be happy populating data for the test environment. The Workgroup considered whether the Permissions section of the UNC needed to be reviewed.

It was agreed that the subsidiary document needed to be governed by the UNCC which could delegate considerations to the UK Link Committee and that the UK Link Committee should have an overview of all testing schedules. DA suggested that the UK Link Committee considers requirements outside of wider industry testing associated with a UNC change to ensure the best utilisation of the test environment.

SM asked about the availability of a testing environment and the likely implementation date. It was suggested that a date is not hard coded however the test environment is provided as soon as reasonably practical upon direction to implement.

The Workgroup reconsidered User Pays. It was anticipated that the configuration, set up costs and future utilisation costs would need to be considered. The technicalities first needed to be understood on the amount of the data, functionality and Pay as you Go arrangements along with potential annual costs for maintaining the environment.

DA also wished to consider the development of future modifications and the future use of the testing environment to allow extra time for pre-testing changes, and how this may impact UK Link change releases. He suggested that there might be a need to consider divorcing certain pre-tests and UK Link release testing.

It was agreed that the modification would be amended and equivalent industry documentation would be reviewed with a view to preparing a draft subsidiary document for the next Workgroup meeting.

4.0 Next Steps

MJ agreed to consider and amend the modification and business rules for a Post Project Nexus go-live environment. The requirement of the service would then be defined in a subsidiary document, with appropriate governance.

5.0 Any Other Business

None.

6.0 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 March 2016	31 Homer Road, Solihull. B91 3LT.	Consideration of: Amended Modification/Business Rules; Subsidiary Document; High level cost estimate and User Pays Development of Workgroup Report
Tuesday 12 April 2016	31 Homer Road, Solihull. B91 3LT.	Legal Text Review Conclusion of Workgroup Report

Action Table

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
------------	--------------	------------	--------	-------	---------------

Action Table

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
0101	12/01/16	2.0	Xoserve to clarify the plans for the existing test environment following L3/L4 implementation.	Xoserve (DA)	Closed
0201	23/02/16	2.0	Xoserve to provide further clarity on what is meant by SAP stabilisation.	Xoserve (DA)	Pending