

Change Overview Board (COB) Minutes

Tuesday 03 February 2015

at Energy Networks Association, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF

Attendees

Les Jenkins (Chair)	(LJ)	Joint Office
Mike Berrisford (Secretary)	(MiB)	Joint Office
Adam Carden	(AC)	SSE
Andrew Green	(AG)	Total
Angela Love	(AL)	Scottish Power
Andy Miller	(AM)	Xoserve
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Colette Baldwin	(CB)	E.ON UK
Graham Wood	(GW)	British Gas
Hazel Ward	(HW)	RWE npower
Jayesh Parmar*	(JP)	Baringa
Jeremy Adams-Strump*	(JAS)	Ofgem
Joanna Ferguson	(JF)	NGN
Jon Dixon	(JD)	Ofgem
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	DONG Energy
Martin Baker	(MB)	Xoserve
Peter Olsen	(PO)	Corona
Phil Broom	(PB)	GDF Suez
Rosie McGlynn	(RM)	Energy UK
Sandra Simpson	(SS)	Xoserve
Sean McGoldrick	(SMc)	National Grid NTS
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	Gazprom
Steve Simmons*	(SSi)	Scotia Gas Networks
Steve Strangeway*	(SSt)	Opus Energy
Sue Davies*	(SD)	Wales & West Utilities

*via teleconference

Copies of meeting papers are available at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/COB/030215>

1. Introduction and Status Review

LJ welcomed everyone to the meeting.

1.1. Review of Minutes

The minutes of the previous meeting (12 January 2015) were approved.

1.2. Review of Actions

COB 0907: UK Link Programme Plan - End Stage Assessments - Ofgem (JD) to set out a possible governance framework to manage the 'go/no go' UK Link Replacement criteria.

Update: See discussions at 4.1, below. **Closed**

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

Update: SSi suggested that there might be a benefit to all parties to utilise Xoserve's information relating to this matter.

SS indicated that she would discuss the matter with S Simmons offline and would look to provide an update at the next meeting. **Carried Forward**

COB 1203: Xoserve to further develop the Go/No-Go criteria.

Update: LJ pointed out that as this is now a 'standing' agenda item, the action should now be closed. **Closed**

COB 0101: *Gas Central Services Change Horizon (Zone 1)* - Review the event templates and provide any comments to MB by 23 January 2015 (to enable revisions to be made and published for the February meeting).

Update: MB reported that comments had been received and the events templates updated. **Closed**

COB 0102: Xoserve to circulate information and relevant point of contact for the Market Trials Working Group.

Update: LJ confirmed that this had been completed. **Closed**

COB 0103: *Nexus Modifications (Transition and Core)* - Xoserve to provide a summary table of those in scope and state which are essential to be approved prior to go live.

Update: CW provided a brief overview of the 'Modifications in/out of Scope of UK Link Programme' presentation table explaining that three (3) new Project Nexus Transition modifications would be raised in time for submission to the February 2015 Panel. In essence the three modifications are:

- 0527 'Implementation of Annual Quantity arrangements (Project Nexus transitional modification)', which has been raised as a separate modification at the request of the Project Nexus Workgroup in order to focus on resolution of backstop related concerns.
- 0528 'Implementation of Supply Point Administration, gas allocation and settlement arrangements (Project Nexus transitional modification)', which largely mirrors 0432 provisions, and
- 0529 'Implementation of Retrospective Adjustment arrangements (Project Nexus transitional modification)', which largely mirrors 0434 provisions.

CW then went on to explain that the three modifications would include indicative legal text and would be expected to follow a similar process to that followed by the (Project Nexus) enduring modifications.

Moving on, CW advised that it is his intention to invite Denton's lawyers to a forthcoming Project Nexus meeting to discuss preparation of more finalised legal text for the transitional modifications – LJ commented that the first Project Nexus Workgroup meeting where the new modifications would be discussed would be the March meeting and therefore it is highly likely that Denton's lawyer(s) would be in attendance at the April 2015 meeting.

As far as the matter of the iGT CSEP is concerned, CW is not expecting to need to raise a UNC Modification (at this time) as discussions remain ongoing with the iGTs. However, he does anticipate holding a discussion with the Joint Office (LJ) around the implementation of a voting iGT UNC Panel member. CW pointed out that the iGTs may decide to undergo some form of an election process, although this is uncertain at this stage. When asked what action would be taken should no iGT step forward to undertake the role, CW indicated that he would be discussing this possibility with the AiGT (iGTs) in due course. For completeness, LJ explained that there would be a further User Member appointed to the Panel to

maintain the balance of transporters to Users. As this would be effective in the next gas year, it would be reasonable to anticipate that the annual User elections would address this.

CW then went on to advise that there would possibly be two more transitional modifications, one looking at miscellaneous items whilst the other would look to resolve 'tidy up' matters (i.e. resolution of typographical errors etc.).

Focusing on UNC Modification 0445 'Amendment to the arrangements for Daily Metered Supply Point Capacity', CW reminded everyone present that whilst this modification had been the subject of two separate Ofgem send backs, it had been returned to Panel with additional evidence and a recommendation that it should be sent to Ofgem for a decision.

In considering iGT Modification 072, CB voiced her concern that questions previously asked in relation to the project plan had not been directly responded to by Xoserve, even though they now appear to be included within the modification. Responding, AM pointed out that the comments had not actually been lost, even though they had been deemed to be non-material to the raising of the modification, and he fully expects these matters to be discussed at forthcoming workgroup meetings.

When asked, CW confirmed that he expects that consideration of non-effective days would be included as part of the development of the 'core' 'Project Nexus – Transitional Requirements for Implementation of Supply Point Administration, Gas Allocation and Settlement Arrangements' transitional modification – he expects to see a reduction in iGT non-effective day requirements going forward. AM went on to advise that the iGT072 Workgroup is to consider UK Link File Formats at a forthcoming meeting. Thereafter, he would expect to provide a high level update at both the following Project Nexus Workgroup and COB meetings.

Discussions then moved on to consider why UNC Modification 0524 'Enabling the Use of Pre Nexus Meter Reads for the purposes of Post Nexus Rolling AQ Calculation' might potentially be 'out of scope', during which AM explained that it is because Xoserve do not believe they have the resources to develop the solution without potentially delaying the 01 October 2015 Project Nexus delivery date, allied to the fact that the modification has been raised after system design requirements had already been 'baselined'. **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: LJ explained that whilst the document had in fact been republished, the closeout date for receipt of industry feedback had now been extended to the end of next week (Friday 13 February). Please refer to item 4.2 below. **Carried Forward**

COB 0105: Go/No-Go Criteria Development: Regulatory Obligations - Ofgem to provide a view on what would be the regulatory implications of parties not being able to perform activities to meet their obligations.

Update: In line with his 'Project Nexus: Proposal to strengthen governance and increase confidence of delivery' presentation discussed under item 4.1 below, JD explained that he anticipates that Ofgem would be able to provide the industry with a degree of comfort around the regulatory implications of parties not being able to perform certain activities to meet their obligations. However, where other issues arise it could involve assessing prioritisation considerations and under certain circumstances it would not necessarily mean that any Licence Condition related matters would automatically take precedence. Whilst AL suggested that this ties in nicely with the GO/NO GO considerations, JD also noted that Ofgem flexibility around its SLA's might also bring benefits in moving things forward in a

timely fashion (i.e. undertaking key decisions in a timely manner in order to keep the project on track).

When asked for a view on how best to manage possible derogation requests, JD was hopeful that adoption of a common sense approach would prevail. **Closed**

COB 0106: Contingency Planning - Xoserve to explore “Plan B” if 01 October 2015 is unachievable, either on the part of Xoserve or the industry, and assess:

- a) what contingency dates are possible; and
- b) what is feasible for a partial deployment on 01 October 2015.

Update: LJ indicated that the action had been completed. Please refer to item 4.3 below. **Closed**

COB 0107: Baringa Report on Xoserve Readiness - Xoserve to share its view/actions against the risks and recommendations in the Xoserve UKLP Assurance Report.

Update: LJ indicated that the action had been completed. Please refer to item 4.3 below. **Closed**

COB 0108: Baringa Report on Shipper Readiness – JD to provide Ofgem’s view of this report and circulate Ofgem’s view on the role of COB.

Update: LJ indicated that the action had been completed. Please refer to item 4.1 below. **Closed**

2. Planning

2.1. Change Horizon

MB explained that there had been no further changes undertaken since the 12 January meeting. It was agreed that the ‘Zone 1 events’ could now be baselined before formal publication on the Joint Office web site.¹

Referring to his proposed additional candidates, SM advised that as far as GSOS was concerned, correspondence with Ofgem on the matter (i.e. concerns regarding the current changes to GSOS and to the proposed implementation in July 2015, as this is in the middle of Nexus testing). GSR on the other hand is a watching brief at this time.

LJ suggested that once the documents are officially published, they can be reviewed quarterly going forwards. In the interim, the new event templates for GSOS and GSR could be considered at the March meeting.

New Action COB 0201: Change Horizon - Xoserve (SS/MB) to document the new (GSOS and GSR) event templates.

3. In-flight Programme Overview

3.1. UK Link Programme – Dashboard and supporting information

Opening, SS explained that an alternative version of the UK Link Programme Dashboard Report had been provided as a discussion point, before returning to outlining the original report.

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.

¹ Please note that updated event description documents were published on the Joint Office web site following the meeting at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/GCSCHT>

Running through the Executive Summary and Recent Achievements several items were discussed in more detail and SS responded to various questions, as outlined below.

Market Trials - Market Trials Manager now appointed and so far 10 organisations have registered to undertake all levels of testing (i.e. not all processes, just all levels) – closeout for registering is end of February.

When asked, SS indicated that Xoserve remain confident that they can handle the anticipated testing workload and volumes. However, should the whole industry wish to commence full testing in August, it could potentially cause an Xoserve / industry wide problem; it is not simply a question of system capacity but also the industry's physical capability to complete the (whole) testing regime.

SS believes that, once everyone has registered, Xoserve would have a better view on industry readiness to participate in the market trials. When asked whether or not the Market Trials Manager would report directly to COB, SS pointed out that the Market Trials Workgroup had already scoped out the actual requirements, the results of which would be released soon – it is envisaged at this time that UKLIEF would be the 'hub' for release of information to the industry, with COB being a second line of release. In referencing the Ofgem '**Project Nexus: Proposal to strengthen governance and increase confidence of delivery**' presentation, LJ suggested that information could also be released through the proposed 'Steering Group' route.

Industry Dependencies - SS pointed out that UNC Modification 0445 'Amendment to the arrangements for Daily Metered Supply Point Capacity' is potentially a show stopper, should the modification be rejected by Ofgem.²

In briefly discussing the 'key milestones' and whether any new items need to be added, SS provided a quick overview of the revised version of the UK Link Programme Dashboard Report explaining that this attempts to provide a more streamlined view with past activities removed for clarity purposes, although additional information could be added in due course.

SM highlighted that at recent Project Nexus Workgroup meetings concerns have been voiced that the ongoing system build does not appear to 'match' the Business Requirements Documents (BRDs) in some of the key areas (i.e. meter reading and validation etc.) – this could bring into question whether or not the industry is actually ready for User Acceptance Testing (UAT) phases.

Responding, AM suggested that whilst there might be some (small) discrepancies he does not believe that these are material in nature. He went on to add that for the avoidance of doubt, the system design stage is now completed, although that does not exclude tweaks to various design elements to correct defects identified in the testing programme. Agreement on whether or not the discrepancies are material or non-material in nature was not forthcoming with some parties believing that there would be benefit in capturing the issues. When asked whether there was a need to reopen the detailed design stage, SS advised that this would not be necessary and any isolated (re)design work could/would be undertaken if deemed necessary – she agreed to add the issue to the RAID Log (which is presented to the UKLIEF) in due course.

When asked if there is a potential need for a regular Market Trials Review/Engagement Group to be set up, SS felt that this would depend on what is uncovered during the trials themselves before pointing out that PNUNC already has a governance role for the management of specific incidents. She then advised that, whilst the Market Testing Workgroup is closing down, consideration around establishing a similar role is being undertaken – it was requested that a

² UNC Modification 0445 is currently with the Authority (Ofgem) awaiting a decision. For more information please go to: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0445>

new milestone be added to the report to monitor this. SS highlighted that there is already a detailed project plan that is published before advising that she is more than happy to consider how best to synchronise milestone and key element tracking going forward. LJ suggested that the premise of this report is based around completed milestones being in the past and so further 'trigger' milestones in the forthcoming period should be added in their place. Parties liked some of the additional detail in the alternative report and suggested that a hybrid might be beneficial.

New Action 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.*

3.2. Change Portfolio – Timeline, Dashboards and Change Horizon

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) – SM pointed out that an issue had been raised at the Performance Assurance Framework Workgroup (no response to the outstanding action had been provided as yet) relating to user selection of reports facilities and enquired if Xoserve had a view on when this functionality would be available. Responding, SS pointed out that whilst Xoserve is looking to prioritise the provision of external facing reports, the provision of self-service reports is not the highest priority for delivery on 01 October 2015.

New Action 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.*

Gemini Consequential Change - Priorities For Next Month – In considering the potential impacts associated with the ACER consultation on the impacts of any potential changes to the new Gas Day arrangements, SS pointed out that in her view this is not a Gemini Consequential Change issue as it relates specifically to an EU change which would normally be covered under the EU Programme page of the report. She went on to point out that whilst many EU changes are being scheduled for 2015, she remains unclear as to what form any possible technical design changes would take. However, she did acknowledge that there is a potential risk and would therefore look to provide an update after this meeting. LJ advised that a more detailed update would be provided at the forthcoming European Workgroup meeting scheduled to take place on Thursday 05 February 2015.

New Action 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.*

3.3. 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.

Smart Portfolio DCC Day 1 and DCC Gateway – currently on hold.

3.4. Critical Path – Programme Update

No changes for discussion.

4. Issues for discussion

4.1. UK Link Programme Plan – implementation governance update

Project Nexus: Proposal to strengthen governance and increase confidence of

delivery – Ofgem presentation

Opening discussions, JD provided a brief explanation behind the rationale as to why the presentation had not been released to the 'wider' industry at this time – in essence, it is simply a draft discussion document at this stage which he expects to tweak further following today's discussions. Once he is happy that the document is suitable for the wider audience he would provide a copy to the Joint Office supported by an accompanying narrative to provide the reader with a suitable background.

JD explained that the evidence at hand suggests that at present the 01 October 2015 implementation date for Project Nexus is still achievable, although it is recognised that timescales are tight. The proposed dedicated Industry Steering Group is similar to the one established for RGMA. He went on to point out that the Independent Project Manager/Project Assurance (PM/PA) would be procured by Ofgem, and that it is expected that they would be funded mainly by Gas Transporters and/or Xoserve. Additionally, at this time it is not envisaged that a User Pays charge would apply.

In considering the need for reformed governance (slide 4), JD was clear in explaining that this should in no way be interpreted as Ofgem stepping in to manage the process. He then suggested that one area of concern is that there is no clear view around the project priorities and deadlines at this point.

JD suggested that the current Xoserve project plan focuses on system delivery that may not necessarily match Shipper's requirements in all cases. As far as industry feedback and provision of supporting documentation is concerned having only five responses in the Baringa report (EDF Energy, E.ON, SSE, CNG and Utilita) could be seen as a little bit disappointing.

In examining the follow up on the Baringa report recommendations and exploration of other options (slide 6), JD advised that a decision on UNC Modification 0514 'Extending the Daily Metered 'voluntary' service to Project Nexus Implementation Date plus six months' would be forthcoming soon.³ In considering the potential impacts associated with any delay in the implementation of Project Nexus, JD advised that he recognises that parties with a high number of SMART Meters within their portfolios could / would be significantly impacted by any delay.

JD suggested that perhaps the Independent PM/PA may be requested to look at Go/No Go aspects.

Moving on to consider the possible remit for the new Steering Group (slide 8), JD indicated that this would definitely not be the Change Overview Board (COB) as in his view their role is to focus on the strategic change requirements – they appear to have become side tracked in more recent times..

As a means of ensuring that Shippers remain 'on track' with their own preparations, one-to-one discussions may be required. In terms of the decision-making vires and especially where some decisions might need to be made (i.e. other bodies/groups etc.) in order to facilitate successful delivery of the project, Ofgem recognises that 'normal business' processes and approaches do not necessarily apply in the case of Project Nexus.

Moving on to consider the possible Steering Group composition (slide 10), JD advised that the inclusion of a Challenger supplier and an I&C supplier is/was based on some observations highlighted within the Baringa report. Additionally, the Ofgem appointed PM/PA would not be a decision maker type of role. Whilst the Joint Office has been identified for the secretarial role, this could easily be the independent consultant should the industry prefer.

³ Please note: The decision (to approve) on UNC Modification 0514 was provided by Ofgem on 04 February 2015.

Moving on to consider the next steps (slide 12), JD suggested that the 'Memorandum of Understanding' (MoU) could be signed on to at a Director Level within each company, and that as far as issuing a letter to the CEO of each respective company is concerned, this might take the form of more than one letter. JD indicated that Ofgem are keen that if possible, the Steering Group members have an input into the appointment of the PM/PA, so time is tight. The Easter date for the initial PM/PA deliverables seems like a natural watershed, being circa 6 months prior to the go-live date.

Focus then centred on whether or not anyone present had any questions (slide 13). In considering whether or not Xoserve should retain the right to veto (for programme decisions that it believes would render it incapable of delivering the project on 01 October 2015, JD suggested that this is really a 'check and balance' mechanism and how the Steering Group would make a decision is yet to be thrashed out and may require some form of voting facility. It was suggested that care would be needed to avoid creating a steering group that ultimately are unable to make a decision. It was also suggested that consideration of development of suitable mitigation strategies and mechanism would prove beneficial.

In voicing his concerns relating to the MoU aspects, SM indicated that Gazprom remains concerned about preventing legal challenge (he is of the view that more time is needed to consider the legal aspects tied in to the MoU (inc. indemnity aspects etc.)). He went on to advise that items such as the MoU, Steering Group composition (especially who are actually the challenger suppliers) and Trade Association aspects are due to be considered by the Gazprom lawyers in due course. At this point RM briefly outlined who EUK represents. Responding, JD explained that he (Ofgem) is looking for appropriate representation of ALL industry parties on the Steering Group and is largely unconcerned what title we give individuals / groups – in essence challenger suppliers are not the 'big six'.

PB suggested that a phased delivery window approach would potentially eliminate some soft landing concerns, especially as it could assist late adopters. He went on to suggest a split 'early and late' adopters approach. The point was acknowledged by JD who suggested that further investigations could prove beneficial. When asked, SS indicated that she does not think any phased delivery modelling has been undertaken as previous Xoserve deliberations concluded that a 'Big Bang' approach was preferable as it represents the least risk, least complex solution. She confirmed that it had never been envisaged that an approach whereby Part A goes early and Part B goes late would be needed and therefore no analysis has been done. She reminded everyone that Xoserve had stated early in proceedings that to hit the 01 October 2015 target date, they needed to focus on a single delivery approach.

PO pointed out that from a legal perspective the term 'reasonable endeavours' is a grey area and suggested it might be prudent to reword the statement. He went on to point out that for some parties, resourcing the project is a real concern and meeting the Project Nexus delivery timescales could impact on their customers – they may well do everything in their powers to be ready, but still fail which in his view means the MoU aspects need further development.

When asked, JD indicated that whilst he believes that the MoU would be embedded within the Steering Group Terms of Reference, he is more than happy to receive feedback on this. SM felt that the proposed Steering Group composition already infers a voting bias towards the Transporters and Xoserve. CB added that she remains concerned that the Steering Group could potentially introduce creep into the Project Nexus delivery. Responding, JD accepted that there might be a need to adapt some of the basic design aspects where technical issues are identified, but strongly believes it is not about re-opening core design

elements – in essence it is all about delivering Project Nexus BRD solutions. He added that in his view the Steering Group is not a technical workgroup.

PO suggested that the Steering Group would need very clear Go/No Go criteria establishing and that would then feed into identifying the Steering Group membership, although great care would be needed in considering these matters. In accepting that some aspects of the proposals might not be universally supported, JD felt that a technical feedback mechanism inputting in to the Steering Group would/could prove beneficial.

SMc suggested that parties need to make sure that any recommendations from the Steering Group also take into account that Project Nexus is not the only strategic rollout during 2015/16. He is also concerned at the apparent lack of consideration of financial consequences associated with any Steering Group decisions.

Culminating discussions, JD suggested that if parties wish the Steering Group to have input into the appointment of the Independent Consultant, we have to accept that there may be some unresolved areas, but he (and Ofgem) remain keen to adhere to the proposed timelines – the crux of the matter is identifying any potential ‘show stoppers’. However, he does accept that there might be some areas that need development, including indemnity considerations etc.

When asked, the general consensus was to look to develop the proposed approach.⁴

4.2. Go/No-Go Criteria Development

During a brief overview of the ‘UK Link Programme Industry Go/No Go Criteria’ presentation discussions focused on what potentially would form the basis of a Go/No Go decision – would it be based on an individual, or wider ranging industry view and would it be solely a technically based decision. In responding, SS explained behind previous COB agreements and directed everyone to the ‘Recap on Agreed Criteria’ slide.

During a brief review of the Gazprom ‘Project Nexus Go/No Go Criteria’ response document, SM suggested that COB needs to be absolutely clear on the definition for readiness. In examining the figures, HW indicated that she believes the Shipper/Suppliers ready figure of 65% is possibly too low. SS pointed out that it is really relating to organizations rather than specifically Shippers – in her view, having debated this internally within Xoserve, it is all about looking at items 2, 3 and 4 together. GW suggested that a single Shipper involved in items 3 and/or 4 could theoretically ‘stop the show’. LJ requested that parties provide additional information to SS by the end of the following week if possible.

New Action 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.*

CB then enquired as to what would be expected to happen in the event that the iGTs were not ready for the 01 October go-live date and wondered what potentially impacts would be on the iGT CSEPs.

When asked, SS pointed out that Shipper readiness includes consideration of their ability to receive invoices and that currently there is a contingency (manual) mechanism in place. AM pointed out that the first invoice would be due in November 2015, one month after go-live.

SMc enquired as to what is expected to happen now that we are porting

⁴ Please note, an updated version of the presentation (taking on board some of the points highlighted during the meeting) was issued immediately following the meeting and supported by the release of an Ofgem open letter on 06 February.

European aspects earlier and wondered whether there is now a dependency on Project Nexus as the EU aspects have to be in place on 01 October. Responding, SS advised that Xoserve are proposing to undertake a configuration exercise which is looking to provide a EU delivery (inc. Project Nexus knock on Gemini consequential changes impacts) in the event that Project Nexus does not go-live on 01 October.

When asked about the progress being made around key processes feedback, SS referred to the (July) 'Shipper Readiness Analysis' document which had been re-published prior to this meeting.

4.2.1 Key Processes

It was agreed that this item had already been covered elsewhere in the meeting.

4.2.2 Regulatory view

It was agreed that this item had already been covered within the Ofgem presentation under item 4.1 above.

4.3 Baringa Report on Xoserve Readiness - Xoserve's response

Opening, SS provided a brief overview the 'Xoserve Assurance Recommendations Updates' presentation explaining that the information had been extracted from the Baringa Report.

Focusing attention on the contingency planning risk/recommendations, SS provided an overview of the additional 'UKLP Contingency' presentation pointing out that this seeks to identify the timelines associated to the various possible scenarios. When asked, SS confirmed that the actual contingency date setting could become a Steering Group related decision in due course.

SS suggested that even though the Market Trials Workgroup had held its final meeting, she anticipates that its role would continue in some form or other going forward.

Examining the document, PO suggested that this once again raises the question as to who would make any Go/No Go decisions and under what conditions (inc. criteria) such decisions would be undertaken. SS suggested that whilst this could be the Steering Group, she believes there is an Xoserve input element involved and as a consequence sees Xoserve as being intrinsically involved in any decision making. She also pointed out that there are already in place proposed criteria for existing market trials.

Moving on, HW pointed out that the Baringa Report makes reference to a lack of traceability and documentation for all aspects of the Project Nexus design elements. Responding, SS did not necessarily support that view and advised that in terms of traceability, Xoserve has documentation from the requirements stage all the way through to the process models which they have already built into the tool (also have some offline items as well). SS highlighted to everyone that having traceability benefits Xoserve in the Post Nexus world whilst also helping to identify where any potential impacts to the models are involved.

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

4.4 Baringa Report on Shipper Readiness

LJ suggested and those present agreed that this matter had been covered under discussions on the Ofgem presentation under item 4.1 above.

4.5 Contingency Planning

Whilst no specific discussions were undertaken, it was agreed that this had been covered under item 4.3 above.

4.6 Market Trials Working Group - ToR

SS indicated that the ToR had been published for information only.

5. Any Other Business

5.1 iGT Data Release Delay

In explaining that UP007 provides for a monthly (January to September) portfolio release (as per UNC Modification 0467 'Project Nexus – iGT Single Service Provision; data preparation'), AM apologised that the January data was not provided.

5.2 Feedback on Questions & Answers Process

SM explained that his Gazprom Project Managers had voiced concerns around Xoserve's response rates and what appears to be an apparent closing down of items that in their view have not been completed. SS acknowledged that whilst this matter had been discussed at the 12 January UKLIEF meeting, mistakes had been made (especially file format consultation backlogs etc.). CB also advised that she was also concerned, but was working through these with Xoserve.

In closing, SS advised that she would be issuing a formal communication relating to the matter in due course.

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 Monday 02 March 2015	31 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3LT	<i>To be confirmed</i>
10:30 Tuesday 14 April 2015	Room 4, Energy Networks Association, 6 th Floor, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF	<i>To be confirmed</i>
10:30 Monday 11 May 2015	Room 4, Energy Networks Association, 6 th Floor, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF	<i>To be confirmed</i>
10:30 Tuesday 09 June 2015	Room 4, Energy Networks Association, 6 th Floor, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF	<i>To be confirmed</i>
10:30 Monday 06 July 2015	Room 4, Energy Networks Association, 6 th Floor, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF	<i>To be confirmed</i>
10:30 Monday 03 August 2015	Room 4, Energy Networks Association, 6 th Floor, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF	<i>To be confirmed</i>
10:30 Monday 07 September 2015	Room 4, Energy Networks Association, 6 th Floor, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF	<i>To be confirmed</i>

10:30 Monday 05 October 2015	Room 4, Energy Networks Association, 6 th Floor, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF	<i>To be confirmed</i>
10:30 Monday 02 November 2015	Room 4, Energy Networks Association, 6 th Floor, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF	<i>To be confirmed</i>
10:30 Monday 07 December 2015	Room 4, Energy Networks Association, 6 th Floor, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF	<i>To be confirmed</i>

Action Table – Change Overview Board					
Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
COB 0907	01/09/14	2.1.4	<i>UK Link Programme Plan - End Stage Assessments</i> - Ofgem (JD) to set out a possible governance framework to manage the 'go/no go' UK Link Replacement criteria.	Ofgem (JD)	Update provided. Closed
COB 1201	01/12/14	3.1	Xoserve to provide a guidance document confirming the differences between the "as is" and the new processes for both Transporters and Shippers. Xoserve to investigate whether any old to new data mapping documentation is available.	Xoserve (SS)	Carried Forward
COB 1203	01/12/14	4.2	Xoserve to further develop the Go/No-Go criteria.	Xoserve (JP)	Update provided. Closed
COB 0101	12/01/15	2.1	<i>Gas Central Services Change Horizon (Zone 1)</i> - Review the event templates and provide any comments to MB by 23 January 2015 (to enable revisions to be made and published for the February meeting).	All parties	Update provided. Closed
COB 0102	12/01/15	3.1	Xoserve to circulate information and relevant point of contact for the Market Trials Working Group.	Xoserve (SS)	Update provided. Closed
COB 0103	12/01/15	3.1	<i>Nexus Modifications (Transition and Core)</i> - Xoserve to provide a summary table of those in scope and state which are essential to be approved prior to go live.	Xoserve (SS)	Update provided. Closed

Action Table – Change Overview Board					
Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
COB 0104	12/01/15	4.2	<i>Go/No Go Criteria Development: Analysis of Key Processes</i> - 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)	Carried Forward
COB 0105	12/01/15	4.2	<i>Go/No-Go Criteria Development: Regulatory Obligations</i> - Ofgem to provide a view on what would be the regulatory implications of parties not being able to perform activities to meet their obligations.	Ofgem (JD)	Update provided. Closed
COB 0106	12/01/15	4.3	<i>Contingency Planning</i> - Xoserve to explore “Plan B” if 01 October 2015 is unachievable, either on the part of Xoserve or the industry, and assess: a) what contingency dates are possible; and b) what is feasible for a partial deployment on 01 October 2015.	Xoserve (SS)	Update provided. Closed
COB 0107	12/01/15	4.3	<i>Baringa Report on Xoserve Readiness</i> - Xoserve to share its view/actions against the risks and recommendations in the Xoserve UKLP Assurance Report.	Xoserve (SS)	Update provided. Closed
COB 0108	12/01/15	4.4	<i>Baringa Report on Shipper Readiness</i> - Provide Ofgem’s view of this report and circulate Ofgem’s view on the role of COB.	Ofgem (JD)	Update provided. Closed
COB 0201	03/02/15	2.1	<i>Change Horizon</i> - Xoserve (SS/MB) to document the new (GSOS and GSR) event templates.	Xoserve (SS/MB)	Pending
COB 0202	03/02/15	3.1	<i>Dashboard and supporting information</i> - Xoserve (SS) to consider how best to present milestone and key element tracking going forward for the next meeting.	Xoserve (SS)	Pending
COB 0203	03/02/15	3.2	<i>Change Portfolio</i> - Xoserve (SS) to double check with colleagues as to when provision of the self-service reports facility might be made available to users.	Xoserve (SS)	Pending

Action Table – Change Overview Board					
Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
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)	Pending
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)	Pending
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)	Pending