
Change Overview Board (COB) Minutes Monday 04 August 2014

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

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Lorna Dupont (Secretary)	(LD)	Joint Office
Adam Carden	(AC)	SSE
Alex Travell	(AT)	E.ON UK
Andrew Green	(AG)	Total
Andy Miller	(AM)	Xoserve
Angela Love	(AL)	ScottishPower
Ed Beattie	(EB)	Baringa
Hazel Ward*	(HW)	RWE npower
Jayesh Parmar	(JP)	Baringa
Jon Dixon	(JD)	Ofgem
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	DONG Energy
Michael Harding	(MH)	Brookfield Utilities
Michael Painting	(MP)	Total
Richard Pomroy	(RP)	Wales & West Utilities
Sandra Simpson	(SS)	Xoserve
Sean McGoldrick	(SMc)	National Grid NTS
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	Gazprom
Steve Simmons	(SSi)	Scotia Gas Networks
Sue Cropper	(SC)	British Gas

*via teleconference

Copies of meeting papers are available at: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/COB/040814

1. Introduction and Status Review

BF welcomed participants to the meeting.

1.1 Review of Minutes

The minutes were accepted.

1.2 Review of Actions

COB 0701: *UK Link Programme (Stakeholder Engagement)* - Confirm when 'go/no go' dates/information can be published.

Update: See 3.1, below. **Closed**

COB 0702: *Industry Risk Register* - All to review the register published at www.gasgovernance.co.uk/COB/070714, and submit comments to SS (sandra.l.simpson@xoserve.com) before the August COB meeting.

Update: Completed. **Closed**

COB 0703: *Gemini and iGMS* - Clarify the dependencies/ interrelationships between Gemini and iGMS.

Update: AL clarified the previous discussions. SMc believed it was not relevant to the

UKL replacement programme. It was agreed to close the action. **Closed**

COB 0704: Clarify the basis upon which National Grid places a change freeze on iGMS for the winter period including, where relevant, specific obligations and/or risks that necessitate this.

Update: To ensure the safe running of its systems at a critical time, and as a general principle, National Grid NTS did not countenance any changes during the winter period (October – March). It was believed that any potential implications/impacts would not be clear until September, when aspects of the Detailed Design are known. It was agreed to carry this forward to the October meeting and assess whether there were any material impacts that should be addressed. It was suggested that this might be considered for addition to the Critical Path. **Carried forward**

COB 0705: *Shipper Readiness Analysis* – Confirm if there were likely to be any impacts on Meter Asset Managers (MAMs).

Update: It was confirmed that there would be no impacts. **Closed**

COB 0706: *Freedom of Information (FOI) requests* – Confirm the Transporters' status/position and Xoserve's status/position.

Update: See discussions at 3.2, below. The Transporters' position has yet to be confirmed and SMC undertook to clarify this. It was suggested that both Xoserve and the Transporters should confirm whether or not there was the possibility of information being obtained through a more circuitous route by going through one to reach data held by the other. SS will endeavour to provide a more complete statement to clarify Xoserve's position. Updates to be provided at the next meeting. **Carried forward**

COB 0707: Xoserve to provide clarity on assurance issues relating to information provision.

Update: See 3.2, below. Completed. **Closed**

COB 0708: COB members to review Terms of Reference prior to next meeting (04 August 2014) and provide any comments to the Joint Office (enquiries@gasgovernance.co.uk).

Update: See 2, below. Completed. **Closed**

2. Review of Terms of Reference

These were currently set at version 1.0. BF confirmed that no comments had been received.

SM reiterated his request for a structure chart illustrating how the various groups and authorities involved in these changes interlink and interact to clarify where the responsibilities for certain tasks/decisions actually lie. It would be helpful to include a narrative of what might be accomplished within each group. This was discussed. There were concerns that a vacuum existed in the decision making if no group had the vires. This was becoming a material concern because Shippers required decisions to inform their design builds. BF reiterated the objectives of this Overview Board and advised that more detailed discussions were under the remit of other arenas, eg Project Nexus via UNCC/UK Link Committee or the UK Link Industry Engagement

Forum (UKLIEF). SS gave a brief overview of UKLIEF's focus. BF confirmed that anything likely to lead to change to references in the legal text would require the formal raising of a modification. SM suggested that perhaps an enabling modification should be raised so that any such changes could be facilitated relatively quickly.

SS agreed to produce a draft structure chart/diagram and populate with what is currently known about roles and responsibilities.

Action COB 0801: Roles and Responsibilities - Produce a structure chart/diagram illustrating how the various groups and authorities involved in these industry changes interlink and interact, to clarify (where known) where the roles/responsibilities for certain tasks/decisions lie.

3. Planning

3.1 Short to Medium Term Planning Overview (*relates to deliverables that are essentially defined and due for delivery over the next 18 – 24 months*)

3.1.1 UK Link Programme - Dashboard and supporting information

Noting that the overall status was at amber, and was likely to remain so until 2015, 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.

SM observed that the need to have sight of the File Formats was becoming urgent. SS explained what would be communicated at the next UKLC meeting. It was expected to get the draft File Formats out in advance, ie this month.

The Risks had been discussed at UKLIEF and the Dashboard reflected the three top risks. These essentially remained unchanged and SS explained what actions Xoserve was taking to mitigate the degree of risk.

AG questioned that if everything was 'amber', how could items after the Detailed Design be shown as 'green'? This had been commented on at previous meetings, and SS explained the context and how a number of factors had to come together; at this overall Programme level it seemed more appropriate to apply this status as long as there was sufficient and correct commentary.

MH suggested it would be useful for the Board to understand how each status (red, amber and green) was defined/decided.

AL suggested that it would be useful to bring to the notice of this group any modifications that might potentially be presenting an impact on the delivery of Nexus. AM advised that he had noticed that the modification templates had been amended to include a question on potential impacts to Nexus.

Responding to a further question from AL, SS explained how the percentage of the functional fit was measured and arrived at.

3.1.2 Change Portfolio - Timeline and Dashboards

Programme Dashboards were presented.

EU Reform – EU Phase 2 and Gas Day Changes: SS gave a brief overview of the current position.

Smart Portfolio – DCC Day 1 and DCC Gateway: SS gave an overview, observing that the current planned date had been moved 18 January 2015; other dates had also moved to align with this.

Faster Switching (Modification 0477): SS confirmed that all was on track for delivery for November 2014.

3.1.3 Critical Path Overview

Referring to the illustrations, SS gave an overview and a brief explanation of the interactions. It was suggested that Gemini Consequential Changes, Data Enquiries, and CMS should also be shown on these illustrations; SS noted these for addition.

Action COB 0802: *Critical Path Overview –Add in Gemini Consequential Changes, Data Enquiries, and CMS.*

Critical Path Points 1 -13 were then reviewed, and specific items explained in more detail as necessary.

The points associated with data cleansing were of particular concern. Clean data was required by the end of December. Xoserve had noticed that although parties were submitting clean data, the root cause contributing to their pollution was very rarely addressed. SM observed that Gazprom was not disaggregating its sites until January and therefore its work would continue after this planned phase. SS commented that Xoserve 'expected' it would still be cleansing data beyond that point, and explained why it was on the critical path and the importance of it being as clean as possible for the testing phase. The degree of cleanliness impacts Xoserve's ability to deliver the system.

SM asked what the checkpoint was and who would be the assessor of whether it was in a fit enough state to be ready. Was it the view of the Data Cleansing Forum? What would the basis of the decision be? Who would take up any concerns/make decisions? SS confirmed that Xoserve did not have a Stage Gate at this point for this item, though they may reconsider this approach. SC asked if there should be, with a proper assessment.

AT noted that all the meter points from the iGTs are to be obtained and this was reassuring.

MH observed that both systems and data have to be fit for purpose, so who has the responsibility of assessing and agreeing that a milestone or condition has been met the criteria successfully. This must be ready by the market trial stage, so who is the 'enforcer' here? Who is in control to make sure that all parties are ready across all areas? BF suggested these concerns should also be taken to the Data Cleansing Forum, as they would be managing the detailed aspects of the process. AT indicated he would like to understand the position between Xoserve and the iGTS and how this was progressing – was this also a critical milestone? SS noted this. AT added that reassurance was required for parties to know that all meter points for all iGTs are going to be on Xoserve's systems. SM observed that an independent party was required to confirm this and Shipper readiness and referred to the letter sent by ICOS to Ofgem (see 5. Any Other Business, below).

Action COB 0803: *Critical Path Overview – Provide visibility of the iGT stream to help build industry confidence.*

AT and SM believed that Point 6 should be 'yellow'.

Point 7 - *Completion of UAT required to commence Market Trials.* SC reiterated her concerns regarding the lateness of the trials. SS reported that Xoserve was looking at what parts could be done earlier, eg connectivity and the sending of dummy files. SM asked if a testing environment could be left open for Shippers' testing until the last minute. SS thought if this was possible it would be on the understanding that once a critical point with the formal testing had been passed it would not be possible to immediately address any adverse findings/problems that surfaced within the 'additional period'.

Shippers wanted the testing period to be earlier and longer. Asked how many cycles might be run, eg Change of Supplier, SS explained how it was envisaged to work and what might happen across certain scenarios at certain points.

SS concluded by drawing attention to some critical path milestones and some important non-critical path points and related these back to the illustrations displayed at the outset of the presentation.

3.1.4 UK Link Programme Plan - End Stage Assessments

SS presented an overview of what must be in place at the end of the Detailed Design phase. If the File Formats/consultation result in a lot of 're-work' then some reassessment will be required.

SM observed that while there was confidence in Xoserve to assess its own readiness position, what about checkpoints that would confirm Shippers' positions, and potential timings to allow for any necessary interventions? SS recognised Shippers' concerns, but reiterated this was about Xoserve's readiness and not an assessment of industry readiness.

It was suggested that the appointment of an independent assessor was required to assess and evidence Shippers' states of readiness. JD noted that this common theme of 'appointment of an independent assessor' was becoming apparent through many different discussions.

SS highlighted three key checkpoints, which she suggested needed to have appropriate criteria developed by the industry. SS indicated she would put together and propose some draft criteria for review and discussion and appropriate additional criteria can then be developed and agreed.

Action COB 0804: *End Stage Assessments/Key checkpoints for the industry – Develop and propose draft criteria for review and discussion at the November meeting.*

MH asked if there was a 'post go-live plan', including testing and validation, eg for a 6 month period? SS confirmed that Xoserve was looking at the operating model that has to be in place on Day 1, and then what it should look like 6 and 9 months later. SM pointed out that there was no rollback to the legacy arrangements; any changes subsequently required would mean the raising of potentially urgent modifications. Parties will have to operate with the new system regardless of any problems. Potential business detriment will need close consideration. JD affirmed that he would expect to see a number of very quick modifications if all turned out not to be as anticipated.

It was suggested that Xoserve could set out some scenarios so the level of risk could be assessed, an acceptable level of 'pain' could be agreed and it was clear where boundaries should be drawn. There needed to be opportunities to escalate and action plans in place to address any shortcomings and offer assistance to parties who might encounter difficulties and then be struggling; expectations, options, and routes for the seeking of assistance needed to be clear. AL suggested looking at NETA and BETTA to see how they had coped with problems after the event of a big change (there would be 'lessons learned' documents available for review).

3.2 Medium to Long Term Strategic Planning Overview

EB gave a presentation on process clarifications for the Risk, Issue and Milestone Assessment approach outlined at the previous meeting.

Prior to commencing the pilot it had been requested that clarification should be provided on various details of the process and tools.

1. *How data confidentiality will be maintained within the process*

2. *The approach for maximising participation*
3. *Enhancements to the data capture form following the feedback in COB*

Data Confidentiality

Information presented at Change Overview Board (COB) meetings will be an aggregated, holistic industry view of risks, issues, and milestone progress without named references. It was noted that the information presented to the Change Overview Board would be published and therefore publicly available. EB confirmed that individual party data would not be published or used for any other purposes.

Xoserve confirmed it is not subject to requests under the Freedom of Information Act. When asked AM responded that details of the legal opinion could not be shared. Referring back to Action COB 0706, above, it was noted that the Transporters' position had yet to be confirmed and SMC undertook to clarify this. It was suggested that both Xoserve and the Transporters should confirm whether or not there was the possibility of information being obtained through a more circuitous route by going through one to reach data held by the other. SS will endeavour to provide a more complete statement to clarify Xoserve's position.

AC observed that he would like to see a formal 'data sharing framework' that would clearly set out how data was to be provided, managed and used. He believed a more formal approach was required to allay any legal concerns from the Shippers' perspectives.

Noting this was an apparent alteration in view, to the previous approach put forward through these meetings and accepted by the COB, SS asked if there was still a view that Xoserve should continue with progressing this work internally.

Reference was made to the comments made earlier at various points throughout this meeting, that the perception was becoming stronger across the industry that the appointment of an independent party was required to provide assurance and confidence in respect to data management and states of readiness, the reviewing of milestones, the appropriateness of planning and the achievability of the end result.

Industry Participation

EB continued with the presentation and the details of the pilot. Enhancements had been made to the data capture form, following suggestions made at the previous meeting. Industry parties would be requested to submit a completed data capture form to Xoserve by 15 August 2014. The data received will be collated and assessed. Xoserve then intended to present the assessed risk, issue and milestone information at the COB meeting on 01 September 2014.

Concerns were raised regarding the value of continuing with the pilot, the uncertainties surrounding data management and the appetite for moving towards appointment of an independent party to oversee and assess many different aspects. A discussion ensued. It was concluded that Ofgem would issue an email, via the Joint Office, to request participation in the pilot, clarifying the specific purpose the information was to be used for and confirming that it would be destroyed on fulfilment of that purpose. The data would be first anonymised by Ofgem and then forwarded to Xoserve, who would then process it and bring the results to the October COB meeting.

Action COB 0805: *Data Capture - Pilot Process*

- a) **Ofgem to issue an email (via the Joint Office) to request participation in the pilot.**
- b) **Ofgem to collate and anonymise the data received and forward to Xoserve.**
- c) **Xoserve to process the data received and present results to October COB.**

4. Issues for discussion

None raised.

5. Any Other Business

5.1 ICOSS Letter: Project Management and independent Project Assurance for Major industry projects

Attention was drawn to a letter sent to Ofgem at the end of the previous week, the substance of which had surfaced and been debated at various points throughout this meeting. JD indicated that Ofgem was sympathetic to the views put forward in the letter, but had yet to examine it more closely and consider what might be done. A high level discussion ensued to briefly consider the practicalities and timescales of initiating such an independent assessment.

At its conclusion the consensus was that it was an attractive course of action that should be considered subject to a response to the letter from Ofgem.

6. Diary Planning

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

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

Date	Time	Venue	Programme
Monday 01 September 2014	10:00	Room 4, Energy Networks Association, 6 th Floor, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF	To be confirmed
Monday 06 October 2014	10:00	Pink Room, ELEXON, 4 th Floor, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW	To be confirmed
Monday 03 November 2014	10:00	Room 4, Energy Networks Association, 6 th Floor, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF	To be confirmed
Monday 01 December 2014	10:00	Room 4, Energy Networks Association, 6 th Floor, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF	To be confirmed

Action Table – Change Overview Board (04 August 2014)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
COB 0701	07/07/14	2.1.1	UK Link Programme (Stakeholder Engagement) - Confirm when 'go/no go' dates/information can be published.	Xoserve (SS)	Closed

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
COB 0702	07/07/14	2.1.1	<i>Industry Risk Register</i> - All to review the register published at www.gasgovernance.co.uk/COB/070714 , and submit comments to SS (sandra.l.simpson@xoserve.com) before the August COB meeting.	All parties	Closed
COB 0703	07/07/14	2.1.2	<i>Gemini and iGMS</i> - Clarify the dependencies/interrelationships between Gemini and iGMS.	National Grid NTS (BV)	Closed
COB 0704	07/07/14	2.1.2	Clarify the basis upon which National Grid places a change freeze on iGMS for the winter period including, where relevant, specific obligations and/or risks that necessitate this.	National Grid NTS (BV)	Carried forward
COB 0705	07/07/14	2.1.3	<i>Shipper Readiness Analysis</i> – Confirm if there were likely to be any impacts on Meter Asset Managers (MAMs).	Xoserve (SS)	Closed
COB 0706	07/07/14	2.2.3	<i>Freedom of Information (FOI) requests</i> – Confirm the Transporters' status/position and Xoserve's status/position.	Xoserve (NS)	<i>Updates required at next meeting</i> Carried forward
COB 0707	07/07/14	2.2.4	<i>Way forward</i> - Xoserve to provide clarity on assurance issues relating to information provision.	Xoserve (SS)	Closed
COB 0708	07/07/14	4.1	COB members to review Terms of Reference prior to next meeting (04 August 2014) and provide any comments to the Joint Office (enquiries@gasgovernance.co.uk).	All parties	Closed
COB 0801	04/08/14	2.	<i>Roles and Responsibilities</i> - Produce a structure chart/diagram illustrating how the various groups and authorities involved in these industry changes interlink and interact, to clarify (where known) where the roles/responsibilities for certain tasks/decisions lie.	Xoserve (SS)	Pending
COB 0802	04/08/14	3.1.3	<i>Critical Path Overview</i> –Add in Gemini Consequential Changes, Data Enquiries, and CMS.	Xoserve (SS)	Pending

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
COB 0803	04/08/14	3.1.3	<i>Critical Path Overview</i> – Provide visibility of the iGT stream to help build industry confidence.	Xoserve (SS)	Pending
COB 0804	04/08/14	3.1.4	<i>End Stage Assessments/Key checkpoints for the industry</i> – Develop and propose draft criteria for review and discussion at the November meeting.	Xoserve (SS)	<i>Due at Nov meeting.</i> Pending
COB 0805	04/08/14	3.2	<i>Data Capture - Pilot Process</i> – a) Ofgem to issue an email (via the Joint Office) to request participation in the pilot. b) Ofgem to collate and anonymise the data received and forward to Xoserve. c) Xoserve to process the data received and present results to October COB.	Ofgem (JD) and Xoserve (SS)	Pending