

UNC DSC Change Management Committee Minutes

Wednesday 07 June 2017

Lansdowne Gate, 65 New Road, Solihull B91 3DL

Attendees

Rebecca Hailes (Chair)	(RHa)	Joint Office	Non-Voting
Helen Cuin (Secretary)	(HCu)	Joint Office	Non-Voting

Shipper User Representatives

Andrew Margan*	(AM)	British Gas	Class A - Voting
Colette Baldwin	(CB)	E.ON	Class A - Voting
James Rigby	(JR)	Npower	Class A - Voting
Alison Neild	(AN)	Gazprom	Class B - Voting
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	DONG Energy	Class B - Voting

Transporter Representatives

Hilary Chapman	(HCh)	Scotia Gas Networks	DNO - Voting Alternate
Nicky Rozier*	(NR)	GTC	iGT – Voting (2 Votes)
Richard Pomroy	(RP)	WWU	DNO - Voting
Sean McGoldrick	(SMc)	National Grid NTS	NTS – Voting (2 Votes)

CDSP Change Management Representatives

Dave Turpin	(DT)	Xoserve	Non-Voting
Lorraine Cave	(LC)	Xoserve	Non-Voting
Matt Smith	(MS)	Xoserve	Non-Voting

Observers

Alex Stuart	(AS)	Xoserve	Non-Voting
Andy Clasper	(AC)	Cadent	Non-Voting
Balint Vizi	(BaV)	Xoserve	Non-Voting
Christine Francis	(CF)	Xoserve	Non-Voting
David Addison	(DA)	Xoserve	Non-Voting
Emma Smith	(ES)	Xoserve	Non-Voting
Hilary Chapman	(HCh)	Scotia Gas Networks	Non-Voting
Joanna Ferguson	(JF)	Northern Gas Networks	Non-Voting
Lee Chambers	(LCh)	Xoserve	Non-Voting
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE	Non-Voting
Rachel Hinsley	(RHl)	Xoserve	Non-Voting

Apologies

Beverley Viney	(BVi)	National Grid NTS	NTS - Voting
Chris Warner	(CW)	Cadent	DNO - Voting

*via teleconference

Copies of all papers are available at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Change>

1. Introduction

RHa welcomed all to the meeting.

1.1. Apologies for absence

See above table.

1.2. Alternates

Hilary Chapman for Chris Warner and Sean McGoldrick for Beverley Viney.

1.3. Confirm Voting rights

RHa confirmed the voting rights carried by each member.

1.4. Approval of Minutes (10 May 2017)

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

2. UK Link – Release Management Prioritisation

2.1. PIS Release Programme

AS provided a short notice presentation on the UK Link Programme Post Implementation Support (PIS) Approach that has been agreed as part of the Project Nexus Governance Group (PNSG). The presentation explained the proposed method of Defect Fix Prioritisation and AS confirmed that this had been considered by the PNSG in order to ensure any defects are managed appropriately.

AS explained that each defect will, in isolation, be assessed against a number of pre-defined severity and priority variables to determine an overall “Fix Priority Score”. It is this score, along with an understanding of the fix effort associated with each defect (set by the relevant Application Resolver Group Fix Lead) which will enable the Xoserve Post Implementation Support (PIS) Defect & Release Management team to propose the allocation of defect fixes to production release pots.

It was proposed that all defects in the PIS arena would undergo this “Fix Priority Score” determination to confirm the most suitable Release.

AS confirmed that the proposed release of PIS defect fixes will be circulated in advance of the weekly Defect Release Group (DRG) meetings, whereby defect fixes allocated to a release may be challenged.

RP asked about the direct external impacts and what engagement there would be for solutions having a direct impact upon Xoserve’s customer base.

AS confirmed that critical changes would be managed within the first six weeks to ensure code stability. He also confirmed that 9 of 130 Post Go Live defects will be undergo external testing as requested by the industry. These 9 would effectively form drop 1 of the five drops which will run from mid July – August.

2.2. Approval of the proposed UK Link Future Release Prioritisation Approach

BVi provided an update to the approach following last month’s meeting.

CB asked if the document could be changed marked or if committee members could be provided with a summary page to pinpoint the changes. CB asked if an email could be forwarded to committee members and if this could be published alongside the approach.

RP asked Xoserve to summarise what key changes had been made. BVi clarified that the approach does not include Gemini, and that Xoserve only changes may not need to be included within the scope.

AM enquired about future changes/releases that would happen under SPAA and MRA (page 4). This suggested that there would be a release/go-live in December. AM asked if December could be avoided and if these could be tied into the November release. BVi explained Xoserve do not have a Release 2 plan as of yet.

DA confirmed the SPAA release schedule dates and that Xoserve have historically set the dates and that SPAA follow the same schedule.

CB highlighted that a number of changes will coincide with electricity industry changes, she suggested that the MRA and BSC changes should be co-ordinated at the same time. CB emphasised having a release schedule which coincides with the electricity release schedule would be helpful. AM acknowledged that there would be some special releases in the interim but going forward concurred that the releases would be best aligned with the electricity industry.

It was agreed that the December release schedule would be moved into November and Xoserve agreed to modify the diagram (though it is indicative only). The committee also considered the schedule for Release 2 and whether this should be in April or June 2018.

SMc challenged discussing and approving the actual release schedule dates, and suggested that the committee should concentrate on approving the approach, and consider when releases should be scheduled dependent on the criticality of the changes required.

JR expressed the need to understand the variables and how many change proposals there are, including the PIS release schedule.

DT suggested that the release should be considered and challenged when the scope of the release and its complexities are fully understood. It was believed a 3-staged release schedule would be better and this should only be deviated from by exception. The principle was agreed that there should be an aim for 3 Releases and deviate only if necessary.

CB also emphasised that the size of changes would also need to be considered for the release schedule, DA concurred that the committee should get the priorities reviewed and then have a more informed discussion around actual Release Schedules when the size is known. The committee agreed to the approach and framework.

Xoserve agreed to revise and republish the framework and a summary of changes. The Joint Office will publish these on the webpage for this meeting (<http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/dsc-change/070617>). It was agreed that all parties would review the publication and any concerns should be raised. It was agreed that the framework would not be appearing on the next agenda unless any concerns are raised.

JR asked about the management of any disputes and if the decision to implement needed to be a unanimous or majority agreement. BVi confirmed that changes needn't necessarily be unanimous. DT suggested that where there was a hung vote the change would not be scheduled.

SMc asked how Xoserve will manage constraints with Gemini and UK Link. DT explained that this is covered within the Change Management Procedures (available at: <http://www.xoserve.com/wp-content/uploads/CHANGE-MANAGEMENT-PROCEDURES.pdf>). SMc asked Xoserve to explain in more detail how constraints would be managed between required Gemini and UK Link changes at the next meeting.

Action 0601: Xoserve to explain how Gemini verse UK link system change constraints would be managed under the Change Management Procedures.

Post meeting update: This has been added to the agenda for 12 July and will be considered under item 2.0

RHa suggested that it would be appropriate to consider Action 0501 at this point.

0501: Change Management Committee to prepare to establish a Technical Sub-Committee (including the scope, TOR and membership) for technical assessments of

future release capability. The current Solution Development Group (SDG) will be considered for their amenability/willingness to take on this role.

Update: RHi highlighted the assumption that this request was intended to be a distinct transitional role for UKLP change backlog assessment but could also be an enduring option. RHi explained what was in the current SDG TOR. RHi confirmed that the SDG welcomed the opportunity and the group were amenable to supporting the prioritisation assessment. RHi enquired if the DSC Change Management Committee would want all changes referred to the technical SDG or if referrals would be limited to the technical assessment of potential impacts to User systems.

RP explained that the Committee had identified that there is a need for some technical input on whether changes are still required and what the impact is. He stressed that the Change Management Committee are looking for advice on the technical aspects, not for a recommendation on release approval. RHi emphasised that the intention was for the technical SDG to look at the potential solutions and provide recommendations to the Change Management Committee.

CB emphasised that she would be nervous about handing over entire assessments to the technical SDG as there are wider considerations to be taken into account such as compliance with the UNC and commercial considerations. CB stated it was important not only to consider the technicalities of a change but what is required by the industry. DA explained how Xoserve had envisaged the technical assessment of solutions working. DA envisaged the Change Management Committee referring some changes to the technical SDG, the sub-committee would consider solutions and present information back to the Change Management Committee to help it make more informed decisions. CB made it clear that she did not want the Change Management Committee to delegate any of its responsibilities to the technical SDG and that it should only be used as a consultancy role to better inform the Change Management Committee. HCh concluded that members appeared to be in agreement that the technical SDG would be used to undertake technical solution assessments and act as an advisory body. The committee agreed to this approach and that the technical SDG would function in this transitional role for UKLP change backlog assessment.

The committee considered the formation of the technical SDG sub-committee, its membership and whether it would need to be formally established with a TOR and appointed members. RHi suggested that there would need to be a new Terms of Reference. The committee suggested there should be some flexibility as to whether to hold meetings face-to-face and by teleconference, with the chair and secretary provided by Xoserve and that it would be an open membership with the right expertise volunteering to attend meetings. RHi suggested a meeting could be organised on 28 June to consider any recommendations referred to them regarding the change back-log.

JR enquired how this technical SDG would tie into the post go live (PGL) set up information which was expected from Chris Shanley at day 2 of this month's DSC Change Management Committee on 08 June 2017. DT explained that there is a gap that potentially needs filling to do the work to understand if all changes are actually still required but this was in addition to the technical SDG role.

AM expressed concern at the number of technical groups. DA acknowledged that Chris Shanley will be presenting a proposal tomorrow for 3 DSC Technical Committee groups. Concern was expressed at this number and the ability to channel business into the correct forum notwithstanding industry's ability to resource each committee.

It was agreed that the Change Management Committee would establish a DSC Change Management Technical sub-committee (SDG) with a terms of reference and open membership to consider technical solutions for the Change Demand Back-log. Any future

role was not yet agreed, pending further information from Chris Shanley tomorrow 08 June 2017.

It was made clear that any business that is to be considered by the DSC Change Management Technical sub-committee would be discussed and agreed by the Change Management Committee first. DA enquired, for clarity, how the Change Management Committee wanted information presented. AM suggested that an issue should be raised with the Technical sub-committee and they would be asked to consider the solution to address this issue; the Technical sub-committee should then look to present options/solutions. DA expressed that there can be circumstances where there is not always a clear conclusion within such a technical sub-committee. CB suggested that if the Technical sub-committee have considered 3 solutions, views should be provided on the pros and cons of each with any recommendation but if there is a difference in opinion/recommendation this should be made clear too. It was clarified that this role was only for the back-log. **Closed.**

2.3. Review of Change Demand Backlog

LC presented a revised Change Demand Backlog spreadsheet.

She confirmed that the proposed changes have been documented on the official Change Proposal forms and these have been published on the Change Proposal Share Point Xoserve website. Some concern was expressed about accessing the documentation on a password protected shared area.

LC proposed that these Change Proposals needed to be prioritised and an assessment made on how this fits into the governance.

AM expressed concern about scheduling the releases at this stage. LC explained Xoserve have a capacity for releases and if changes are prioritised it can then be considered how much can be released in the change release programme. It was agreed that there was a need to share the release change programme and how to manage the backlog. It was intended to present the options for managing the backlog and for this to feed into an overall change programme with a split into 3 releases if sensible.

LC highlighted that some of the backlog changes might have an impact on shipper systems and these are being worked on to understand the impacts and options.

AM asked if Xoserve could include another column within the spreadsheet to provide an explanation of why it should be included in certain Releases i.e. what should be included in Release 1, 2 or 3. CB also asked about any relationships between certain changes that rely on each other to enable implementations and that some changes may need to be implemented together or in a certain order to enable subsequent changes.

DT confirmed that Xoserve have drafted Change proposals for each line on the Change Backlog spreadsheet and these have been published on the Xoserve secure area. For some of these changes, Xoserve would be looking for a sponsor to ensure each change proposal was still required. It was agreed that draft Back-log Change proposals would be made available on the Joint Office website for visibility (at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Change-Proposals-Backlog>).

The committee agreed to consider changes that now have Change Proposals, beginning with this which Xoserve have suggested should be in Release 1. With this in mind the spreadsheet was shown filtering on "release 1".

Release 1:

UKLP113 – EM explained that there was a design gap with UK Link and the design doesn't use the full set of files to complete the AQ / SOQ calculation and allow new formula year AQ and SOQ values to be communicated when issuing the new AQ and

SOQ values. This has been suggested for Release 1.1 to ensure the system is ready for the notification files due on the 01 April 2018. It was agreed this would take a high priority as it would become a much more complex change if delayed beyond Release 1.1.

UKLP142/ XRN3830 – EM explained that this relates to the field items for DN files, and the additional data fields required for .DDU; .DDS; and .CPM files. JF suggested that this may need to be re-examined to establish the level of urgency for this change as there is a current manual work around. It was agreed that the DNs would re-assess the Change Proposal. The scope will need to be defined for the next meeting to enable the priority to be agreed.

UKLP147 – ES explained that this relates the DDS/DDU file amendment relating to twin stream and rolling AQ updates. DNs would re-assess this Change Proposal. The scope will need to be defined for the next meeting to enable the priority to be agreed.

UKLP159 – LCh explained that this change may need to move to a future release as it needs a further update before prioritisation approval.

UKLP249 – ES explained there have been wider industry discussions led by Ofgem to add vulnerable needs codes to align with electricity. Xoserve made a commitment with Ofgem to have the additional needs codes in the system as soon as possible after the PNID. This is purely to add the codes. JF suggested that this is mapped as an allowable value change dependent on the outcome of the SPAA discussions. It was agreed that until the outcome is known for the SPAA change, this should be deferred to Release 2 until further information is available. JF explained commitments have been made with Ofgem along with licence requirements and she suggested this may become a high contender for an exceptional release outside the normal release schedule. It was agreed to reconsider the change at the August Change Committee after SPAA committee consideration early August but with a proposed plan to include within Release 1.1, with a high priority though this can be removed if not required. LH referred to a related change UKPL273 (mapping) which was not a backlog change but also needs to be assessed in relation to SPAA change 370/370A and 370B.

UKLP272 – ES explained that there is an error in the system for the capacity referral process, which results in the system referring everything. This is to change the rules only to refer those that need to be referred. This was considered a High priority by Xoserve. JF explained DNs have a particular concern with this as liabilities are associated with this process and a high influx of referrals could detract resources. DT emphasised that there is a risk that legitimate referrals could be missed. It was agreed that this was High Priority.

UKPL279 – ES explained capacity amendments pending, should the ratchet be less than capacity referral, is pulling the SOQ back down rather than keeping it at the referred value. This change is required to ensure the correct SOQ is maintained and prevent the potential for a further ratchet. CB enquired about the likely frequency of this occurring. This was considered to have enough significant effect to agree a priority within Release 1.1, however it needn't be a high priority if something was more important. DT explained that high value charges could be associated with the Ratchet and there could be some issues manually amending occurrences. The committee considered if this could be delayed if a higher priority change was required. It was agreed under the circumstances this would be a Medium priority based on the likelihood of it occurring.

UKLP305 – ES explained this is related to UNC 0431, where an issue has been identified around the SPI file flows. Within the SPI file, the system is allowing the Shipper Short Code to differ to that which is in the SPI file header, (this can occur when

the Shipper has multiple shipper short codes). It was agreed that a breach in code would make this a high priority for Release 1.1.

The spreadsheet was then shown filtering on “bubbling under”:

UKLP060 – This relates to the banding/splitting of AQs following the AQ test to try and reduce read tolerance rejections. This requires a change to the read validation UNC related document. It was agreed to defer consideration of the requirement for this change and for the committee to review in September. If it is not seen to be a problem by September then there should be a review as to whether a sponsor is required or whether to remove the item (or move to another tab within the spreadsheet).

UKLP065 – This relates to the Correction Factor Application for threshold crossers and to apply a more automated process to comply with Thermal Energy Regulations. ES explained that this was about a more automated process to automatically notify parties if an AQ crosses the 73,200 kWh threshold. CB enquired/challenged for threshold crosses that, for up to 73,200 kWh threshold the standard correction factor would be applied, but if it increased and went above, it would require a site-specific Correction Factor. CB believed this need to be processed to ensure Shippers are not in breach of the Thermal Energy Regulations. CB also expressed concern about the potential to over allocate energy. ES explained that Shippers are informed of threshold crossers and have the ability to amend the Correction Factor so there is not a regulatory failure however there is a means of making the process more efficient. AN agreed to sponsor this particular Change Proposal. It was agreed to be a medium priority initially.

UKLP071 – This relates to the provision of the Formula Year AQ and that Shippers taking on a new site need to be notified of the Formula Year AQ. This was considered high priority. In the absence of a party sponsoring this change, DT suggested Xoserve would endeavour to update the draft Change Proposal.

UKLP112 – This relates to missing plot data for iGT Meter Points. The Plot Number is entered into a specific field within UK Link. It was deemed worthwhile reviewing if there was a better means of recording the plot number. DT explained that the AES file does not contain the plot number for iGTs. DT confirmed this would be investigated further to understand it more fully. This was considered a high priority and Xoserve agreed to pick this change up.

UKLP152, UKPL154, UKPL155, UKPL189 and UKLP319 – All five changes are related to RAASP retro –delivery (UNC 0434). The consideration of these Change Proposals was deferred until September or until a UNC modification is raised.

UKPL162 – This relates National Grid NTS’ obligation to publish Daily LDZ Unidentified Gas Operational Data. It was agreed to consider this item and the obligations further, before agreeing any priority.

UKPL192, UKPL233, UKLP262, UKLP273 – considerations deferred on all four changes.

UKLP281 – This relates to the sale of National Grid Gas Distribution (Cadent), consideration deferred to the next meeting.

Consideration of the remaining Change Proposals was deferred to the next meeting (12 July 2017).

3. Next year’s change budget finance sheet (MP)

Item transferred to be considered as part of the business of day 2, 08 June 2017 meeting.

4. How should central system changes initiated by a Supplier be managed

RHi explained how the CDSP can deal with changes requested by suppliers. RHi explained that Xoserve can contract directly with a supplier through SPAA, however not all suppliers are signed up to SPAA. It was clarified that a Change Proposal could be raised as part on the UNC Modification process and that the Change Proposal would be connected to a modification.

5. Review of Outstanding Actions

0501: Change Management Committee to prepare to establish a Technical Sub-Committee (including the scope, TOR and membership) for technical assessments of future release capability. The current Solution Development Group will be considered for their amenability/willingness to take on this role.

Update: See item 2.2. **Closed.**

0502: Xoserve to update the Change Demand Backlog to include: all required changes/defects (particularly any identified Project Nexus defects), a column to confirm the appropriate governance for the change, and visibility of items without a Change Proposal or Change Order.

Update: See item 2.3. **Closed.**

6. Next Steps

Item not considered.

7. Any Other Business

None raised.

8. Diary Planning

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

Meetings will take place as follows:

Time/Date	Venue	Programme
10:15, Wednesday 12 July 2017	Lansdowne Gate, 65 New Road, Solihull B91 3DL	Review of Change Demand Backlog, and any other matters arising
10:15, Thursday 13 July 2017	Lansdowne Gate, 65 New Road, Solihull B91 3DL	Standard Agenda items, and any other matters arising
10:15 Wednesday 09 August 2017	Lansdowne Gate, 65 New Road, Solihull B91 3DL	Standard Agenda items, and any other matters arising
10 August 2017	Cancelled	Cancelled

Action Table (as at 07 June 2017)					
Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
0501	10/05/17	2.1	Change Management Committee to establish a Technical Sub-Committee (including the scope, TOR and membership) for technical assessments of future release capability. The current Solution Development Group will be	All Parties & Xoserve (RHi)	Closed

Action Table (as at 07 June 2017)					
Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
			considered for taking on this role.		
0502	10/05/17	2.2	Xoserve to update the Change Demand Backlog to include: all required changes (particularly any identified Project Nexus defects), a column to confirm the appropriate governance for the change, and visibility of items without a Change Proposal or Change Order.	Xoserve	Closed
0601	07/06/17	2.2	Xoserve to explain how Gemini verse UK link system change constraints would be managed under the Change Management Procedures.	Xoserve	Pending