DSC Governance Management Review Group Minutes

Friday 01 September 2017

Lansdowne Gate, 65 New Road, Solihull B91 3DL

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Helen Bennett (Secretary)	(HB)	Joint Office
Andy Clasper	(AC)	Cadent
Andrew Margan	(AC)	British Gas
Beverley Viney	(BV)	National Grid NTS
Dave Turpin	(DT)	Xoserve
Emma Smith	(ES)	Xoserve
Katy Binch*	(KB)	ESP
Kirsty Dudley*	(KD)	E.ON
Kully Jones	(KJ)	Joint Office
Gavin Anderson*	(GA)	EDF
Hilary Chapman	(HC)	SGN
Lorna Lewin*	(LL)	DONG Energy
Mark Jones*	(MJ)	SSE
Matt Smith	(MS)	Xoserve
Nicky Rozier*	(NR)	BUUK

Copies of all papers are available at: https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Governance/010917

_____

1.   Welcome and Introduction

BF welcomed all to the meeting.

1.1. Confirm attendees, clarify roles

BF advised, that this group had been established by the Change Management Committee, however it did not define a specific terms of reference, membership or responsibilities, therefore one task for this group was to establish terms of reference and its role. .

Quoting from Uniform Network Code – General Terms, Section D – CDSP and UkLink, paragraph 4.1.4 *"A DSC Committee may establish a sub-committee for such purposes (within the scope of its functions, powers and duties) and comprising such members and on such terms as it decides; and references to a DSC Committee include any such sub-committee."* Reminding the attendees of the meeting that the DSC Change Management Committee should have directed the sub-committee responsibilities. BF suggesting the group structure has similarities to a review group.

When asked how a review group is defined in code, BF advised this is usually a request to UNC Modification Panel which then gets a reference number, the scope is confirmed and Terms of Reference are created, an example of which would be Request 0594R.

BF suggested that this meeting feels more like a Review Group rather than a Sub-committee and asked the attendees if they wanted a defined membership for this group. It was agreed by all that this meeting that it should be considered a Review Group and not a sub-committee.

BF suggested an amendment to the Agenda, recommending that Apologies for absence and Alternates are now removed.

It was agreed that only DSC parties should be in attendance but if anyone outside of DSC arrangements wants to attend then it will be at the discretion of the group.

AM suggested that it is worth considering if SPAA, from a cross-code perspective, should be allowed to attend as an observer, adding that there are no plans to invite them currently, and they would only attend if necessary/requested too. The review group may consider other third parties as and when they see fit.

1.2. Terms of Reference

DT talked the group through the material provided for the meeting, covering:

> Terms of Reference;
> DSC Governance Meeting Update;
> Governance Meeting Work plan.

Consensus of the review group was in agreement of the Terms of Reference.

The group agreed that the key focus of today's meeting was to identify key areas to be addressed.

It was agreed that Xoserve would have responsibility for creating a register of the key issues.

New Action 0901: BF agreed to draft the TOR in to the JO format and publish on the Joint Office website.

2.   Expectations

AM took the group through a presentation provided for the meeting, which can be found here: https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Governance/010917, this covered:

- Funding, Governance, Ownership (FGO) and DSC arrangements – background
- DSC Change Management Committee (ChMC) arrangement and observations
- DSC Change Management and Contract Management Committee roles and responsibilities
- DSC ChMC arrangements – Conclusion
- DSC ChMC arrangements – Information hierarchy
- DSC ChMC arrangements – Documentation and DSC change process
- DSC ChMC arrangements – UNC and DSC change process
- DSC ChMC arrangements – Development considerations
- DSC ChMC arrangements – Solution activity strawman
- CDSP Resources and Stranded Costs
- Industry impacts and Resources
- DSC Change Management Committee – Communications
- DSC Change Proposal Register
  Note: for completeness, the above list includes items discussed later in the meeting.

Discussion continued around the considerations presented. There was suggestion that Xoserve Resources and Stranded Cost should be added. It was agreed that the solution activity strawman would be reviewed at a later meeting.

BF clarified that the Nexus Post Implementation Support (PIS) was formally closed down 31 August 2017.

3. **Review and improve**

    3.1. **Change documents**

During general discussion, it was agreed that the Change Proposal form is quite long and therefore difficult to use.

HC and BV mentioned that, originally, as part of FGO development, they had worked with Xoserve to develop a Change Proposal form around 4 to 6 pages long. However, following internal review by Xoserve this was increased to 37 pages and they could not understand the logic for doing so.

BF advised, in terms of Code Administrator involvement including CACoP, the requirement is roughly the same sort of documentation across all Codes, i.e. standard template used in Joint Office, adding that modifications are in the same format across all codes and there is a standard template for things that sit outside of code changes. Asking the review group, it this falls under the scope of the Code Administrators Code of Practice (CACOP), the group agreed that it probably didn't, however the form required refinement to reduce complexity and length.

When asked, AM and KD suggested that a newly consolidated change proposal form should not need to comply with CACoP, it would sit along the same lines as change notices, therefore, can use what is suitable for the specific requirements in the DSC arrangements.

DT then went on to talk through an onscreen view of a blank Change Template.

DT summarised the design of the form lacks the intelligence to recognise any of the sections at any point and that the document could have an online format and provide more information/guidance to allow a new proposer to complete the form.

BF clarified that a proposer asks for a ROM before they raised before they need to raise a change proposal so why was this not reflected in the process.

The review group agreed that a much clearer process is needed, with clearly defined milestones and gateways, which will add clarity.

HC suggested a process flow diagram is produced as one of the outputs of this review.

BF thought it would be of benefit to also look at how communications are provided to the industry.

BV asked if Transmission only change proposals can be looked at as the process is restrictive in that the vote cannot be completed until the next ChMC meeting, therefore, can restricted Class CP voting process be looked at which allows a change to be progressed without waiting for a formal Change Management Committee meeting.

BV then moved on to talk the group through an onscreen review of the previously drafted design which was 5 pages long, and compared with the current template of 25 pages, highlighting areas of the form which would need further review.

There was discussion around Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) request and approval. BV suggested that some changes might not need a ROM, as they may need a detailed estimate of costs as the change has to be implemented (e.g. an EU change), therefore, there should be the option in the form to be able to jump the ROM stage.

DT added that if you definitely require detailed analysis, maybe a ROM is not necessary and might be slowing the process down.

A number of suggestions came out of this discussion which are summarised below:

BV suggested the form could have a tick box that says - ROM or cost estimate required as optional selections.

AM would like to see the Change Process being more aligned to the UNC process to ensure detailed design/solution information is available for consultation.

BF asked if the change is only an administration change, would a consultation be required?

AM mentioned that most shipper changes will be around central systems, there would be a need to consult to find out where other parties are, and that maybe needs to be improved, adding that a proposer can't see what others views are unless there is a consultation.

The review group agreed a revised Change Proposal form is needed to simplify the process for DSC Customers.

GA suggested that it would be useful to have guidance sitting behind the various sections as it is not clear who fills in what sections and why.

3.2.   Change reporting

AM began by saying that there are many reports that are change related and these are presented separately, such as the Bubbling Under report which are changes yet to be raised as Change Proposals – it would make sense to produce a consolidated summary in one report.

AM suggested that a summary of all the changes in on document would be useful, this is a requirement for a Change Proposal Register which would include a summary, status, impacted parties, estimated cost, delivery, predictability of whether the change will go through; other code impact. DT referred to the Change Proposal web page where each CP, however he agreed there was no summary and that it might prove useful to have one.

When asked, some of the attendees confirmed they use the cross-code register which is published by MRA.

AM asked if UNC Modification Reports should have detailed design included in the modification as there is a potential to avoid stranded costs if change fails to progress.

DT added that expectations need to be set of the timescale of change implementation.

Due to the high amount of backlog Change Proposals, DT suggested the review group need to be mindful of defining a BAU process when Xoserve are possibly not yet ready to be thinking of BAU.

3.3.   Change process

Discussion on this subject was covered in agenda item 3.1 Change documents and 3.2 Change reporting.

3.4.   Alignment with UNC Change process

Discussion on this subject was covered in agenda item 3.1 Change documents and 3.2 Change reporting.

4.   Next Steps

AM suggested the group create a list of issues to be considered which are categorised in to the following four areas:

- **Change documents**
Consistent format of the CP form
Diff between the original design of the CP form and the one in current use

- **Change Reporting**
DSC Change register to include summary status etc.
Xoserve resourcing

- **Change Process**
Change process – clarification around the process
End to end process flow required
Restriction of process (fluidity) waiting for the next meeting before the process can start
Bring the BER process forward to earlier in the process
Building in a consultation stage
Review of tech solution review and approval through various groups
Do we need to carve out NTS Change specifically?
Stranded costs
Change release approach
Change Communications: how do we get info out to proposers if they don't attend the meeting

- **Alignment with UNC Change process**
Duplicate governance – UNC/DSC how do we avoid it

It was agreed that the Change Process would be the most important to focus on first together with looking at the flexibility around the Change Proposal form, e.g. do you have to have a ROM if you know the CP is going to be implemented.

Any Other Business

None

5.   Diary Planning

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

Time/Date	Venue	Review Group Programme
10:00, Friday 06 October 2017	**Lansdowne Gate (Xoserve)**, 65 New Road, Solihull B91 3DL	Change Process
10:00, Friday 10 November 2017	**Lansdowne Gate (Xoserve)**, 65 New Road, Solihull B91 3DL	*Possible date change to 09 November 2017*
10:00, Friday 01 December 2017	**Lansdowne Gate (Xoserve)**, 65 New Road, Solihull B91 3DL	Finalising recommendations
10:00, Friday 15 December 2017	**Lansdowne Gate (Xoserve)**, 65 New Road, Solihull B91 3DL	*To be confirmed*

Action Table (as at 01 September 2017)

Action Ref	Meeting Date(s)	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
0901	01-09-17	1.2	BF agreed to draft the TOR in to the JO format and publish on the Joint Office website.	(BF) Joint Office	**Pending**