

UNC DSC Change Management Committee Minutes

Wednesday 12 July 2017

Lansdowne Gate, 65 New Road, Solihull B91 3DL

Attendees

Rebecca Hailes (Chair)	(RHa)	Joint Office	Non-Voting
Helen Bennett (Secretary)	(HB)	Joint Office	Non-Voting

Shipper User Representatives

Andrew Margan*	(AM)	British Gas	Class A - Voting
Colette Baldwin	(CB)	E.ON	Class A - Voting
John Welch	(JW)	RWE Npower	Class A – Voting Alternate
Alison Neild	(AN)	Gazprom	Class B - Voting
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	DONG Energy	Class B - Voting

Transporter Representatives

Chris Warner	(CW)	Cadent	DNO - Voting
Richard Pomroy	(RP)	WWU	DNO - Voting
Beverley Viney	(BVi)	National Grid NTS	NTS - Voting
Sean McGoldrick	(SMc)	National Grid NTS	NTS - Voting
Nicky Rozier	(NR)	GTC	iGT - Voting
Katy Binch	(KB)	ESP	iGT - Voting

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

James Rigby	(JR)	Npower	Class A - Voting
Rachel Hinsley	(RHl)	Xoserve	Non-Voting

*via teleconference

Copies of all papers are available at: <https://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

John Welch for James Rigby

1.3. Confirm Voting rights

RHa confirmed the voting rights carried by each member.

Representative	Classification	Vote Count
Andrew Margan	Shipper Class A	1 vote
Colette Baldwin	Shipper Class A	1 vote
John Welch (<i>for James Rigby</i>)	Shipper Class A	1 vote (2.2.9 applies = Shipper Class C)
Alison Neild	Shipper Class B	1 vote
Lorna Lewin	Shipper Class B	2 votes (2.2.9 applies = 1xClass B + 1xClass C)
	Shipper Class C	
Chris Warner	DNO	1 vote
Richard Pomroy	DNO	1 vote
Beverley Viney	NTS	1 vote
Sean McGoldrick	NTS	1 vote
Nicky Rozier	iGT	1 vote
Katy Binch	iGT	1 vote

1.4. Approval of Minutes (07 June 2017)

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

2. Transitional Governance arrangements from Project Nexus

RSC started this section by explaining the Transitional Governance arrangements are to enable the handing back of responsibility from Ofgem to the Industry; to be able to close down the remaining project Nexus issues and for Ofgem to move the current Project Nexus governance to be part of the DSC Committee.

RSC confirmed the materials that have been circulated for this meeting help to explain the rationale behind the proposed Transitional Governance and confirmed that Ofgem would be seeking approval from the DSC Change Management Committee.

RSC handed over to SB for an introduction; she began by going back to the early days of Nexus and offering her view of what should have happened and some actions going forward:

1. Xoserve should have had processes in place, check points and skill sets etc. to make the Nexus project work or to recognise when external help was needed; Xoserve should have been the ones to request support from PWC.
2. The gaps in Xoserve skill sets are intended to be closed over the next 6-12 months so that Xoserve have the right skills and capabilities in the future.

SB confirmed that Xoserve are looking to bring the right skills set in via 3rd parties until such time Xoserve can provide them and she confirmed that the decision as to when Xoserve are ready to step back from utilising 3rd parties will be when they are hitting the required performance; this will be a performance driven decision.

Xoserve will also be looking at what skills and capabilities the organisation does not have and the DSC Committees will also have the challenge of how to manage things when they may not know that they do not know. SB stated her own opinion the DSC Delivery sub-committee needs to be manned by people experienced in large scale platform delivery, who are able to understand the serious consequences of making the decisions required of the DSC Delivery sub-committee. SB urged those staffing the DSC Delivery Committee to be very demanding and

dogmatic about the types of skills required and ensuring the right people are put in place. SB clarified that the DSC Delivery Committee needs to be permanent fixture to enable change to be delivered going forward.

SB then handed back to RSC who explained why the proposal for a DSC Delivery sub-committee was being made, why Ofgem stepped in last year and confirmed that this was only ever a temporary intervention for Ofgem. Ofgem involvement in the program was proportionate and it is keen to step back but recognises it must not be too soon; there are a significant number of ongoing issues under Project Nexus that need to be managed.

RSC explained that the right checks and balances need to be in place, it is Ofgem's preference to use a structure to give Ofgem the confidence that the Industry can manage the remaining issues.

RSC went on to clarify that the right way to go about this is to ask the DSC Change Committee to establish a DSC Delivery sub-committee so that the subcommittee can manage the issues that remain in Project Nexus.

Confirming that the new subcommittee will, initially at least, be formed of Project Nexus Steering Group members, who have the knowledge and experience of Project Nexus. JW asked and DT confirmed that those members have confirmed they are happy to come across. RSC also clarified that the DSC Delivery subcommittee will have a very defined role, and will have only a limited number of decisions in closing out project Nexus issues.

Finally, RSC made it clear to the committee that the setting up of the DSC Delivery sub-Committee does not mean that Ofgem will no longer be involved, Ofgem will attend the meetings as an observer/participant and it is expected that PWC will chair the meetings.

CB asked for clarification on the length of time PWC would be chairing the meeting for. DT clarified that this will be covered in the slides.

JS thanked the committee for their time and began an onscreen review of the rest of the slides beginning with the Lessons Learned from Project Nexus and explaining that there has been a set of defined clear guiding principles created to inform the proposal: -

- Simple;
- Scalable and Flexible;
- Low risk and will maintain industry buy-in;
- Allows for a quick transition

With those guiding principles, transitional arrangements are proposed: -

- Lift and shift transition of existing governance;
- Sub-groups modified as required to meet the needs of the industry under DSC governance;
- Target governance model implemented

Moving on, JS went through an onscreen view of how the current structure looks comparing it to what the proposed structure is intended to be. The future structure dovetails with arrangements that are already in place.

The new sub-committee will be absorbing functions of both the Project Nexus steering group (PNSG) and the Project Nexus delivery group (PNDG) with delegated authority from the DSC Change Management committee.

The full picture of the future structure can be seen on the slide titled Proposed transitional approach: Delivery Sub-committee under direction of DSC Committees.

The terms of Reference are organised under a number of headings:

- Functions
- Decision making and escalation route
- Inputs Frequency
- Chair

-
- Scope of delegated authority
 - Outputs
 - Format

It is proposed that, similar to current practice at PNSG, a broadcast via WebEx or teleconference is held 2 days prior to the formal meeting; this will take the format of listening-in rather than asking questions and it will be an information digest.

Handing over to DT, the group then looked through the **Proposed Governance Transition plan**. This showed the transition through August and then in to September; funding for Project Nexus expires on 01 September, therefore, any costs associated with continuation beyond 01 September will need to be funded through a decision by the DSC Change Management committee. If there is a budget change, this may need to be taken through to the DSC Contract Management Committee.

CB enquired about the funding arrangements and flagged the exit criteria that exists for the exit of PIS. DT confirmed that further discussion will be needed of what needs to be in place from 01 September and beyond.

Looking at the Draft Meeting Schedule and Administration Responsibilities, DT stated that the red stripe down the middle represents the cut-off point that DSC could assume responsibility (26th July) but this date might get pushed back to the 1st week in August. There is one more Project Nexus Steering Group (PNSG) under Ofgem leadership in August.

When asked by NR, it was confirmed that the Steve Mullins from PWC will step in to chair the new DSC Delivery sub-committee and this will be funded from Project Nexus governance.

CB asked for clarification that this arrangement only stands for 1 month, and asked what the enduring plan was, questioning also whether transporters funding must continue until the exit criteria are fully met for PIS. There followed some debate on this subject including mention of Retrospective Adjustments for Assets and Supply Points (RAASP) being part of the original scope for Nexus. It was commented that the Nexus program is not yet delivered and that there is concern that Ofgem are stepping away before RAASP is delivered. There is general concern that if Ofgem step away there is the potential that there will never be any hope of delivering RAASP

DT clarified that he was keen to make sure that the DSC Delivery sub-committee can take control of delivering Release 2.

It was confirmed that PWC would be the interim chairperson until 01 September. When asked, DT confirmed that the committee would need to decide on what the timescale would be if a new independent chairperson is needed post 01 September.

CB was keen to clarify that this is about Xoserve's capability gap and missing skill sets, rather than a question of whether an independent chair is needed; and the committee needed to keep those separate.

AM was concerned at the industry's ability to resource a new sub-committee.

RSC and the Committee agreed that the vote for this would be under simple majority.

Decision required and next steps:

Confirming what the vote before the committee was, DT wanted to clarify whether the committee was comfortable confirming this arrangement for 5 weeks or longer. The Committee decided the vote was to be for a 5-week period until end August 2017.

AM suggested it would be best if the committee knew what the enduring model would be. RSC suggested that it is good to have an interim step whilst the enduring model is considered.

CB expressed concern that having a transition for just 5 weeks is odd, the transition to BAU is not yet known and that the end of Xoserve PIS needs to be clarified. There was a nervousness that PIS was not sufficiently defined.

2.1. Approval

RHa asked for agreement to approve the creation of a DSC Change Management Delivery Sub-Committee (and sub-groups TPG; RIAG; DMG and DRG) up until 1 September 2017 only.

Committee Representatives approved the change with voting as follows:

Shipper Representative	Voting Count	For/Against
Andrew Margan	1	Against
Colette Baldwin	1	For
John Welch	1	For
Alison Neild	1	For
Lorna Lewin	2	For/For
Total	6	5
Transporter Representative	Voting Count	In Favour
Chris Warner	1	For
Richard Pomroy	1	For
Beverley Viney	1	For
Sean McGoldrick	1	For
Nicky Rozier	1	For
Katy Binch	1	For
Total	6	6

3. UK Link – Release Management Prioritisation

3.1. PIS Release Programme

SN advised the committee that the Solution Delivery Group (SDG) held a prioritisation process covering 70 change requests and prioritised them as High, Medium or Low. They were agreed using a process based on the Approach document (agreed by the DSC Change Committee at its 07 June 2017 meeting).

There was good collaboration within the group, who prioritised all 70 change requests with a few actions and reconvened on Monday of this week (10 July 2017) to follow up on those actions. A few change requests are set to low priority with a view to re-visiting in a few months.

All participants agreed the process used to prioritise the change requests is something that can be used in the future and were very pleased with the work done at the SDG.

It was confirmed that the DSC Change Management committee need to ratify the priority status of each change request by the end of July.

CB provided some feedback from the SDG meeting advising that it was not what it was expected to be, there was a lack of technical information and her feedback source felt that the prioritisation of the change requests was something that the Change Management committee should be doing. The expectation of the SDG was to look at the IT elements of each change. It was also felt that the follow up meeting held on Monday did not have enough engagement from the industry.

On the other hand, feedback from other group members that attended the SDG found it to be exactly what it was expected to be.

BVi and others expressed some frustration that some of the information on the changes appeared to be incomplete and appeared to be a wish list going back up to 7 years in some cases. LL stressed that there was a need to reach a point where some of these changes are taken forward or

they are not, and that there is a need for sponsors for each of them. The SDG work is valuable, but the committee needed to drive some of these changes forward now.

LCh confirmed that the intention was to prioritise the list, it took a lot of time for SDG to recommend their priorities but they managed to visit each change.

DT summarised that the prioritising at the SDG was a useful session, there may have been a misinterpretation of the technical level that would be discussed at that group for that meeting.

LCh stated that they need to lock down the scope of future releases and that the change requests cannot be approved until a technical assessment has been carried out.

DT stated that the committee needed to start making some decisions, CB suggested that a release strategy might be useful as some changes will be easier to deliver than others.

DT summarised the way forward:

1. Review SDG's priority recommendations
2. Then Xoserve release their view of deliverability for each release
3. Recognise that there are likely to be some of the 70 items that might not get fixed in PIS and there may be other defects still to come.

Action 0701: DT survey non-attendees of last SDG via email, asking why they didn't attend.

Post Meeting update: The SDG survey has been issued out 27 July 2017.

SN said that it would be good to set out what they intend to do within the SDG meeting as a technical sub-committee of this committee.

DT gave a very brief recap of the SDG prioritisation model.

BaV took the workgroup through a presentation which shows on the 10th slide the prioritisation and scoping process.

RP asked what would happen for a change with an implementation date if a decision in the latter part of the model could move a change from high priority back down to medium priority, ultimately missing the drop-dead date? BV confirmed he would expect this would go through stage 2 on the flow chart (Urgent Change) highlighting if it was a priority service or not priority service.

Referring specifically to Gemini, SM asked how a Gemini change is assessed for a constraint and wondered if it should be National Grid that assessed the prioritisation? It was confirmed that Gemini-only changes should be excluded from this model.

BaV stated that the proposal of the scope of the change, the process model process is not binding, and that changes that impact on Gemini are subject to discussions with National Grid. SM would like this made clear in the model.

Action 0702: for consequential change to Gemini-only change and Gemini impacted. Review with National Grid and LCh.

LCh confirmed the aim of this overall process is to produce a straw-man of what the release might look like for the next meeting (09 August).

SDG is diarised for every other week with the next meeting planned for next Monday 17 July.

LCh confirmed that Xoserve is looking to deliver some minor changes in November (R1.1) and there is a need to get priorities agreed today to be able to move forward.

Two items from today's agenda were moved to Day 2 of the Change Management Committee meeting on 13 July 2017, these were:

- 3.3 Gemini vs UK Link system change constraints (Action 0601)
- 6.1 Change Management governance and process arrangements

3.2. Review of Change Demand Backlog

The committee then went on to review the Change Demand Backlog spreadsheet starting with the CP Available (CDSP Proposed R1.1) changes and reviewed DDU and DDS changes.

XRN3830/ UKLP142 and XRN4288/ UKLP147

The Committee briefly considered 2 changes referring to Daily Delta Update (DDU) files and Demand Derivative system (DDS). Gas Transporters discussed whether they wanted a rebuild, given they had managed to work around this. JF stated she was satisfied with current DDU and DDS files, so any changes would mean a change request. CW and others agreed so these changes are not required.

Please refer to v4.0 of the Change Demand Backlog document here: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Change/120717> for the changes.

Action 0703: Xoserve (LCh) to bring a Release 2 schedule for approval at the next meeting on 09 August.

BVi questioned the funding for these changes, with all of these changes there will be a cost to Xoserve.

CB asked what the status 'Design Gap' meant; LCh confirmed this is where there is a requirement in the BRD that is not fulfilled in the design.

The committee agreed that there is a need to draw a line in the sand so that the list of backlog changes is finalised, then there is nothing added or taken away, the committee will then know the full scale of what needs to be dealt with.

DT stated that it should be very clearly articulated who is paying for what changes so that there is a clear understanding of what the cut offs are for future releases.

Final review and approval of the Change Demand Backlog is to be completed at 24 July 2017 meeting which will be held as a teleconference.

Action 0704: All to review the Change Demand Backlog prior to 24 July and send email to RH flagging which changes need discussing on 24 July. RH stressed that if nothing is received, the meeting will be cancelled.

HC stressed her frustration of this review process and stating that the Change Demand Backlog has been reviewed at several different groups with little movement forward.

4. Review of Outstanding Actions

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

Update: This action will be considered as part of Day 2 on 13 July 2017 (agenda item 9.4).
Closed.

5. Next Steps

Item not considered.

6. Any Other Business

None raised.

7. 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
10:00 Monday 24 July 2017	Teleconference	Review and approval of prioritisation of selected changes from Change Demand Backlog v5
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 – not required.
----------------	-----------	---------------------------

Action Table (as at 12 July 2017)					
Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
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	Closed 13/7/17
D1 0701	12/07/17	3.1	DT survey attendees of last SDG via email, asking why didn't attend.	Xoserve (DT)	Closed
D1 0702	12/07/17	3.1	Review the Change Demand Backlog For consequential change to Gemini-only change and Gemini impacted.	National Grid (SM) and Xoserve (LCh)	Pending
D1 0703	12/07/17	3.2	LCh to create a Release 2 schedule for next meeting on 09 August	Xoserve (LCh)	Pending
D1 0704	12/07/17	3.2	All to review the Change Demand Backlog prior to 24 July and send email to RH flagging which ones need discussing on 24 July.	All	Pending