
Change Overview Board (COB) Minutes
Monday 02 March 2015
31 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3LT

Attendees

Les Jenkins (Chair)	(LJ)	Joint Office
Lorna Dupont (Secretary)	(LD)	Joint Office
Adam Carden	(AC)	SSE
Alex Travell*	(AT)	E.ON
Angela Love	(AL)	Scottish Power
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Graham Wood	(GW)	British Gas
Hazel Ward	(HW)	RWE npower
Jayesh Parmar	(JP)	Baringa
Jeremy Guard	(JG)	First:Utility
Joanna Ferguson	(JF)	Northern Gas Networks
Jon Dixon*	(JD)	Ofgem
Liz Furmedge	(LF)	SSE
Nick Salter	(NS)	Xoserve
Peter Olsen	(PO)	Corona
Richard Pomroy	(RP)	Wales & West utilities
Sandra Simpson	(SS)	Xoserve
Sean McGoldrick	(SMc)	National Grid NTS
Steve Simmons	(SSi)	Scotia Gas Networks
Steve Strangeway*	(SSt)	Opus Energy

**via teleconference*

Copies of meeting papers are available at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/COB/020315>

1. Introduction and Status Review

LJ welcomed everyone to the meeting.

1.1. Review of Minutes

The minutes of the previous meeting (03 February 2015) were approved.

1.2. Review of Actions

COB 1201: Xoserve to investigate whether any old to new data mapping documentation is available.

Update: No further update; SS suggested that parties contact Xoserve individually if they wished to discuss further with the Data Architect. **Closed**

COB 0104: *Go/No-Go Criteria Development: Analysis of Key Processes* - Xoserve to revise and republish for the February meeting, and all parties to review the information and feedback views to Xoserve (by 23 January 2015).

Update: Xoserve had not received any further feedback. **Closed**

COB 0201: *Change Horizon* - SM to document the new (GSOS and GSR) event templates.

Update: No update provided. **Carried forward**

COB 0202: *Dashboard and supporting information* - Xoserve (SS) to consider how best to present milestone and key element tracking going forward for the next meeting.

Update: Bearing in mind that it was undesirable for Xoserve to produce two sets of Dashboards every month, parties were asked what additional/different information they would like to see. AL suggested that Shippers would like to see more detail on the interdependencies between the milestones. LJ suggested that perhaps the existing and draft Dashboard could be amalgamated to comprise the information included in the top half of one and the bottom of the other. Responding to an open question from SS, AL suggested that she could consider what information was needed by parties and discuss this offline with SS. **Carried forward**

COB 0203: *Change Portfolio* - Xoserve (SS) to double check with colleagues as to when provision of the self-service reports facility might be made available to users.

Update: SS indicated this was currently unknown, but would not be 01 October 2015; it was to be dealt with through gap analysis at the PNUNC. **Closed**

COB 0204: *Change Portfolio* - Xoserve (SS) to consider what, if any, potential impacts associated with further change to the start of the Gas Day might be.

Update: A clarification note had been provided and published. **Closed**

COB 0205: *Project Nexus Go/No Go* - Xoserve (SS) to collate responses (where provided) and provide a view on a possible definition for Shipper/Supplier readiness.

Update: Superseded by discussions (see 4.2 below) and the imminent formation of the Steering Group. **Closed**

COB 0206: *Baringa Report on Xoserve Readiness* - Xoserve (SS) to develop the 'UKLP Contingency' presentation with additional clarity around possible options (including a supporting commentary).

Update: Revised versions of the slides had been published to provide additional clarity. **Closed**

2. Planning

2.1. Change Horizon

The Change Horizon is reviewed quarterly. The next review will take place at the next meeting on 14 April 2015.

3. In-flight Programme Overview

3.1. UK Link Programme – Dashboard and supporting information

Noting that the overall status was at amber, SS provided an overview of activities and achievements, together with Programme milestones and Industry Engagement

communications, and a summary of Risks and Key Dependencies. Priorities for the next period were outlined. Several items were discussed in more detail and SS responded to various questions. SS noted there was a high degree of parallelism and associated risk during this phase.

Market Trials - To date 64% of portfolio Shippers, 100% of Transporters and 100% of current DMSPs have registered.

HW asked if there were exit criteria for Market Trials. SS responded that Xoserve had its own exit criteria but this had yet to be tied to industry exit criteria (which had yet to be agreed). Asked if there were any concerns regarding the 36% portfolio Shippers not yet registered, SS indicated there were a few, but the bulk of the non-registered parties had fewer sites, although they may be big sites. Xoserve had been actively trying to encourage these parties to register. It was noted that a couple of parties that were expected to register have not. SS clarified that 100% of the six largest parties had registered, 80% of I & C parties, and 55% of Others. HW thought that the failure to register might be a cause for concern in respect of the two parties that had been expected to register, and if that remained to be the case what effects that might have on particular processes and on customers, (I & C customers in particular), if Shippers were not ready on Day 1.

SIT Phase 3 - This had been commenced. SS reminded that SIT Phase 4 would include Retrospective Adjustments (Retro) and Unique Sites (lagging behind in the plan). HW asked if there would be a problem in meeting the completion date. If SIT was delayed was it likely to impact on UAT? SS believed this would depend on the effect of Retro and Unique Sites. UAT was to start this week and is being run in parallel (UAT will run to the end of June), but not all functionality had come through SIT yet. If SIT overruns, parallel running will still continue, and this carries an internal risk. AL asked if Xoserve had any view on how far SIT might slip before effects became serious. SS indicated she would check.

Action COB 0301: *Effects of SIT slippage* - Clarify at what point this would cause serious concern.

Expo Day - SS drew attention to a planned Expo Day for 17 April 2015, outlining details of what was to be included, and asked those present for their support. An invitation email had been issued the previous week, explaining that it was likely to be restricted to 100 persons, and a maximum of two from each organisation.

Data Provisioning - The data to be used in Market Trials is still under discussion. It is not possible to use real data for certain processes, so a 'collaborative' dataset needs to be provided that meets most requirements. A good start has been made on this.

Connectivity Testing - This will start on 05 May 2015. Interdependencies of connectivity and functional testing were briefly discussed. It was suggested that it would be useful to see the dependencies indicated on the Dashboard. SS referred to the 'alternative Dashboard' presented at the previous meeting, and indicated that a production preference would be 'either/or' and not 'both'.

The group briefly considered what information it would like to see, and suggested sight of risks and dependencies were important, to give an early warning indicator of risks starting to arise internally in Xoserve. Asked how visibility of that might affect/influence Shippers' programmes, it was suggested that it could help Shippers be more aware of any Xoserve internal risk that might not be mitigated and help Shippers to assess how it might affect their interactions and activities. It was agreed that none of this should give a party cause to 'hang back'; any delays would cause Shippers extra cost and Shippers needed to be aware of this as early as possible. SS observed that she believed that the 'alternative Dashboard' would better present that information.

Noting that this was a key stage (full integration in SIT and starting full UAT), this will give good information and an opportunity to identify whether there are any significant issues arising to give cause for concern.

Qs and As - Response Times

HW had been asked by her colleagues to raise certain points to Xoserve at this meeting. There was not enough detailed design information to start building. Lots of questions had been asked of Xoserve but response turnaround time seemed to be very slow and SLAs were not met? LF echoed this view. SS indicated she was aware of some outstanding issues, but believed that responses to Q/As have been improved recently. She would like to understand in more detail HW's and LF's outstanding questions. SS confirmed that responses to questions raised are published (Qs and As) for the benefit of all. Parties had commented that they had found this useful and in some cases this had obviated the need for them to raise similar questions.

Timescales for the Transitional Plan

Responding to GW, SS said the outage information was due out in March; the detailed cutover plan is planned for June. GW pointed out the detail needs to be mapped against design. LJ encouraged parties to be involved in the Project Nexus Workgroup and the UKLIEF to better understand the greater level of detail.

Industry Dependencies - Responding to questions, CW confirmed that the June date for Panel decisions on the Nexus transitional modifications was achievable and that these were not considered to be a high risk area, however if parties would be more comfortable with July this might be able to be accommodated. Rejection of a modification was always a risk, but in these cases it was considered to be highly unlikely. The AQ issue appeared to be settled now and no other issues appear to be of significance. Xoserve had it as a Programme risk on the UKLIEF log.

CW observed that Modification 0445 was the unknown; Ofgem had been provided with additional information/data on request. JD was unable to comment whether or not this was sufficient but would follow up internally.

HW questioned if more rework would be required should Modification 0432 be retained rather than either of the Modification 0473 alternatives, and a brief discussion ensued. While no precise date could be confirmed, an Authority decision on the Modification 0473 alternatives was likely to be before Easter; the Authority was likely to accept one or the other, not reject both.

3.2. EU Reform Programme – Dashboard and supporting information

SS gave a brief overview (recent achievements, priorities, risks and dependencies) updating the group on the current position. There was no cause for concern. When asked, NS indicated that from the point of view of a participant, he believed the recent NTS Expo Day had been very successful and well attended.

The likelihood of movement of the Gas Day back to 06:00 - 06:00 was queried. SMC confirmed that he had heard nothing to suggest this might happen. LJ added that the probability of this happening was extremely slim.

3.3. Change Portfolio – Timeline and Dashboards

SS gave a brief overview (recent achievements, priorities, risks and dependencies) updating the group on the areas of CMS Consequential Change, SAP BW (IP/DE), and Gemini Consequential Change.

SAP BW (IP/DE) – JF said that she would like to see the formats of the new reports; SS noted this.

3.4. Critical Path – Programme Update

No changes for discussion.

4. Issues for discussion

4.1. UK Link Programme Plan – implementation governance update

JD gave a brief update. Letters to CEOs and MDs were sent out on Friday confirming the establishment of a Steering Group and seeking expressions of support. Turning to the selection of a Project Assurance/Management (PA/M) organisation, the Invitation to Tender closed on Thursday; 9 expressions of interest (of good quality and a range of budgets) had been received. A short list is under preparation, which will be shared with the Steering Group at its inaugural meeting on Wednesday afternoon. It is expected that the appointment of a PA/M may be made by the end of the week.

Members of the Steering Group (SG) will be confirmed in the next day or two, and a further meeting of the SG is anticipated in a couple of weeks' time. JD confirmed it had been a fully inclusive exercise to cover all 'constituencies'.

JD was very clear that the establishment of this SG should not cause any impediments or delays; work should carry on across the industry. The 'Go/No Go' Framework will be clarified and presented for ratification.

Noting there was a number of 'engagement groups' (SG, COB, UKLIEF, UKLC, etc) it was suggested that it would be useful to understand which group should consider what.

In JD's view the SG would receive updates from the PA/M, and would play a role in planning and the establishment of readiness criteria, and would expect to have visibility of any interdependencies. COB has a value outwith Nexus; it would still receive regular reports (via the Dashboards, etc), but would not formalise the 'Go/No Go' criteria. The SG will formalise its Terms of Reference (ToR) and means of operation, and once that has been clarified the COB will need to dovetail with that appropriately.

Referring to the UKLC, LJ advised that as Chair he had drawn the scope back to reflect its ToR, where its role was to consider and approve change, but not to debate change. The forum for primary debate was the UKLIEF.

Asked if the SG members would be signing a MoU, JD believed it was not necessary. Appropriate treatment of confidential information would be routed/addressed through the Authority and the Project Assurance Manager. It was confirmed there was no indemnity provision for members. The ToR had changed, and the scope/level of decision-making had evolved, with the Authority reserving certain elements to its own discretion. No challenges to members would therefore be expected.

NS reiterated key points of the letter and questioned what level of decisions could be involved, i.e. that might affect dates, or was it just related to the readiness criteria? JD indicated it would decide on the framework and whether the agreed criteria had been met, and whatever steps might require to be done to move the project along. For instance, the SG would expect to discuss and verify why certain organisations have not responded to registration for participation in testing; this was an example of what the Project Assurance Manager would be expected to follow up. It was acknowledged that up to this point, Xoserve had been left, virtually in default, to take decisions that in truth may not have been within its sole responsibility to take.

JD thanked the COB for the contribution it had made over the past few months.

4.2. Go/No-Go Criteria

SS had not received any responses or further information to be able to progress the 'Go/No Go' criteria.

NS observed there might be some criteria, that could be deemed important but which for various reasons had not surfaced in the COB's discussions, the significance of which remained unknown at this point. It was hoped that the SG would be the catalyst to engender wider industry engagement. The timescales remained tight and this was of concern to NS. How a more active approach might be taken, and by which group, was then considered.

It was concluded that a separate dedicated meeting would be arranged by Xoserve to specifically discuss 'readiness criteria', to consider what are the key processes that all organisations need to be ready for. PO believed a rounded view needed to be developed, and gave an example of a similar experience when Corona sought to make wide ranging internal changes. Referring back to organisation readiness, system readiness, etc, Xoserve had put forward initial criteria for discussion but not many views had been expressed. NS believed that business process readiness was priority (technical readiness sits behind this). How important is it for a player/the market if not ready for one/more/any of the processes? Xoserve did not have a definitive view but could facilitate the discussions on commercial implications, and would also like the newly appointed Project Assurance Manager to be present.

LJ suggested it would be helpful to have some questions drafted that participants might think about. The draft criteria and spreadsheet previously provided could be reviewed with a view to identifying any gaps. Was 'Go/No Go' a matter of process questions or other things to do as well? Was there a data readiness question? Can every party do all these processes in the 'new world'? For each process, how critical is it if not all (certain percentage of?) parties are ready?

Documents to be reviewed:

[Copy of UKLP Industry 'Go/No Go' Discussion Framework \(provided by Xoserve\)](#)

[UKLP Industry 'Go/No Go' Discussion Framework \(provided by Xoserve\)](#)

[Shipper Readiness Analysis](#)

5. Any Other Business

5.1 Delivery of Scope - potential deferral of certain aspects

NS explained that Xoserve was seeking Shipper views on the potential for deferral of certain aspects of the delivery of the scope. It had been noted that Retrospective Adjustments (Modification 0434) and Unique Sites were running behind in terms of finalising Design Build; related to this were a number of testing scenarios (SIT, UAT) to be run through. Xoserve had looked at splitting these into phases and concluded it had to be an integrated approach.

Separating these aspects out for a later delivery would free up and increase Xoserve resource and ability to deal with the residual core delivery. When considering what could be separated, these aspects were the obvious candidates (highly customized, complex, and lagging behind in the core plan). There was very little opportunity to do anything with any other parts of the core. Shippers were asked for their views on what implications there might be if this were to be done.

HW asked what the timescales might be for a separate delivery. SS referred to the isolated contingency slide, suggesting it might be 3-6 months later, but this would require detailed analysis. NS explained that, to get the benefit, it would have to be delayed until at least 01 January 2016. GW asked if deferral would help Xoserve significantly and NS responded it would be quite beneficial. GW recognised that protecting the core delivery would be good, but it does not help Shippers much in reaching implementation for 01 October 2015. NS reiterated it would be useful for Xoserve to understand whether any such proposal would be beneficial or negative/more difficult for Shippers. To be of benefit to Xoserve it would be helpful to

make a decision as soon as possible, i.e. in the next 4 weeks, on whether these aspects could be deferred from the core scope.

How this proposal to defer part of the original scope might be formally addressed/accepted was then discussed. Any 'descope' from the original requirements might require the raising of an urgent modification. Absolute clarity on the ultimate delivery dates of any deferred aspects would be required, together with an understanding of how any subsequent issues or further slippage would be addressed; contingencies would be necessary. Three - six months might be unrealistic. HW pointed out the longer the period of deferral the more risk of it clashing with DCC testing.

Shippers really need some evidence/analysis that this proposal was the best course of action in the current circumstances. LJ suggested that NS develop the proposal in more detail, including criticalities, costs, implications, risks of doing/not doing, dates for delivery, contingencies, how issues might be addressed, etc, and perhaps a route to industry consultation.

HW commented that Shippers would need to consider the disbenefits from their points of view, how it might impact their abilities to meet the October implementation date and at what cost.

JD indicated it would be useful to confirm if this was going to be tabled for the SG's agenda at the first formal meeting, and suggested a paper might be provided for the Authority and the SG to review. Benefits of deferral to various parties would need to be clear. It might be that everyone could build their systems as planned, but not 'switch on' until some agreed date in the future.

Action COB 0302: *Potential deferral of delivery of certain aspects of original scope - Xoserve to develop a proposal and provide a paper for review/assessment by Ofgem, the Nexus Steering Group and the COB.*

5.2 Testing

LF explained that in January SSE had commissioned an independent impartial report (using PA Consulting), the summary of which had been shared with Xoserve, who had suggested that it would be useful to share with the COB.

LF outlined the objectives and scope of the report, and briefly described the key findings which highlighted a number of risks: Too early an entry into testing (may not give the best results; possible disruption to market); exit criteria should be in place; there should be a post 'go live' contingency plan; market trials not sufficiently rigorous because they were not mandatory (should be full industry testing); severity of customer impacts. The report advocated the adoption of best practice.

AC saw the report as an aid to the SG in establishing a way forward and assisting in devising the next steps. LF described in more detail what had been looked at and what might be considered to be best practice in terms of this scale of project. SS reiterated Xoserve's views on the position taken in respect of the scheduling of market testing (entry, exit, efficiency, risk rating, etc). Asked if Xoserve would take any action regarding the recommendations, SS pointed out that Xoserve had not yet had sight of the report itself and therefore was not in a position to confirm what might be done.

LF confirmed the report would be provided to Ofgem and to the Joint Office for publication.

LJ observed this could be a key document for the SG to review/address and accelerates the need for development of a readiness criteria framework at its first meeting.

6. Diary Planning

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

Unless otherwise notified Change Overview Board (COB) meetings will take place as follows:

Time/Date	Venue	Programme
10:30 Tuesday 14 April 2015	Rooms 3 and 4, Energy Networks Association, 6 th Floor, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF	To be confirmed
10:30 Monday 11 May 2015	Rooms 3 and 4, Energy Networks Association, 6 th Floor, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF	To be confirmed
10:30 Tuesday 09 June 2015	31 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3LT	To be confirmed
10:30 Monday 06 July 2015	Rooms 3 and 4, Energy Networks Association, 6 th Floor, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF	To be confirmed
10:30 Monday 03 August 2015	Rooms 3 and 4, Energy Networks Association, 6 th Floor, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF	To be confirmed
10:30 Monday 07 September 2015	Pink Room, ELEXON, 4 th Floor, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW	To be confirmed
10:30 Monday 05 October 2015	Pink Room, ELEXON, 4 th Floor, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW	To be confirmed
10:30 Monday 02 November 2015	Rooms 3 and 4, Energy Networks Association, 6 th Floor, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF	To be confirmed
10:30 Monday 07 December 2015	Pink Room, ELEXON, 4 th Floor, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW	To be confirmed

Action Table – Change Overview Board					
Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
COB 1201	01/12/14	3.1	Xoserve to investigate whether any old to new data mapping documentation is available.	Xoserve (SS)	Closed
COB 0104	12/01/15	4.2	Go/No Go Criteria Development: Analysis of Key Processes - Xoserve to revise and republish for the February meeting, and all parties to review the information and feedback views to Xoserve (by 23 January 2015).	Xoserve (SS)	Closed

Action Table – Change Overview Board					
Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
COB 0201	03/02/15	2.1	<i>Change Horizon - Xoserve (SM) to document the new (GSOS and GSR) event templates.</i>	Gazprom (SM)	Carried forward
COB 0202	03/02/15	3.1	<i>Dashboard and supporting information - Xoserve (SS) to consider how best to present milestone and key element tracking going forward for the next meeting.</i>	Xoserve (SS)	Carried forward
COB 0203	03/02/15	3.2	<i>Change Portfolio - Xoserve (SS) to double check with colleagues as to when provision of the self-service reports facility might be made available to users.</i>	Xoserve (SS)	Closed
COB 0204	03/02/15	3.2	<i>Change Portfolio - Xoserve (SS) to consider what, if any, potential impacts associated with further change to the start of the Gas Day might be.</i>	Xoserve (SS)	Closed
COB 0205	03/02/15	4.2	<i>Project Nexus Go/No Go - Xoserve (SS) to collate responses (where provided) and provide a view on a possible definition for Shipper/Supplier readiness.</i>	Xoserve (SS)	Closed
COB 0206	03/02/15	4.3	<i>Baringa Report on Xoserve Readiness - Xoserve (SS) to develop the 'UKLP Contingency' presentation with additional clarity around possible options (inc. a supporting commentary).</i>	Xoserve (SS)	Closed
COB 0301	02/03/15	3.1	<i>Effects of SIT slippage - Clarify at what point this would cause serious concern.</i>	Xoserve (SS)	Pending
COB 0302	02/03/15	5.1	<i>Potential deferral of delivery of certain aspects of original scope - Xoserve to develop a proposal and provide a paper for review/assessment by Ofgem, the Nexus Steering Group and the COB.</i>	Xoserve (NS)	Pending