

Change Overview Board (COB) Minutes

Monday 12 January 2015

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

Attendees

Les Jenkins (Chair)	(LJ)	Joint Office
Lorna Dupont (Secretary)	(LD)	Joint Office
Adam Carden	(AC)	SSE
Alex Travell	(AT)	E.ON UK
Andrew Green	(AG)	Total
Angela Love	(AL)	Scottish Power
Gareth Evans	(GE)	Waters Wye
Graham Wood	(GW)	British Gas
Hazel Ward	(HW)	RWE npower
Jayesh Parmar	(JP)	Baringa
Joanna Ferguson	(JF)	NGN
Jon Dixon	(JD)	Ofgem
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	DONG Energy
Martin Baker	(MB)	Xoserve
Mike Harding	(MH)	Brookfield Utilities
Nick Salter	(NS)	Xoserve
Peter Olsen	(PO)	Corona
Phil Broom*	(PB)	GDF Suez
Rob Cameron-Higgs*	(RCH)	Good Energy
Rosie McGlynn	(RM)	Energy UK
Sandra Simpson	(SS)	Xoserve
Sean McGoldrick	(SMc)	National Grid NTS
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	Gazprom

*via teleconference

Copies of meeting papers are available at: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/COB/120115

1. Introduction and Status Review

LJ welcomed everyone to the meeting.

1.1. Review of Minutes (01 December 2014)

The minutes of the previous meeting 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 4.4, below. **Carried forward**

COB 1201: Xoserve to provide a guidance document confirming the differences between the "as is" and the new processes for both Transporters and Shippers.

Update: SS had spoken with Steve Simmons who had made this request and had clarified that Steve's question had been whether the UKLP Project Team have any 'old to new data mapping' rather than processes. For clarity, the action will be reworded to "Xoserve to investigate whether any old to new data mapping documentation is available." **Carried forward**

COB 1202: AMi to investigate and advise the meaning of the asterisks shown against the baseline and current planned dates for cutover and implementation.

Update: SS explained that they highlighted the early effective date of the systems for the EU changes to recognise such things as nomination lead times in advance of go-live of the new arrangements. **Closed**

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

Update: A strawman for one of the criteria had been provided for discussion; see 4.2, below. **Carried forward**

2. Planning

2.1. Change Horizon

The Gas Central Services Change Horizon chart was displayed for review.

Zone 3

MB gave a brief overview of the current status of each event currently positioned in Zone 3.

Performance Assurance - SMc questioned the need for the formation of a Workgroup to be in place immediately following the implementation of Nexus. MB believed there was a need to have an arrangement ready to operate. AL added that it is intended to go live at Nexus, but with a soft landing (invoices 12 months later). SMc voiced concerns regarding the ability to deliver. SM queried whether this might a timing issue - does it need to be in place that early or can it be put back? AL observed it would depend on what else arises in the timeframe. MB questioned should we have things lined up or spread the approach; current thinking supports alignment of the Performance assurance regime alongside the Nexus regime. HW commented that there was a need to build up the data and therefore it should be aligned to go live with Nexus. It was observed that the Performance Assurance Workgroup presumably saw this as a critical delivery.

JD confirmed that Nexus could go live without Performance Assurance, but not vice versa. The aim was to try and maintain integrity of data and avoid any degradation; it should be seen as linked (it is about reports and was not changing systems per se). He observed that the deliverable was something that Shippers should want as it clarifies their position.

DCC Day 1 - The outcome of the meeting held at the end of 2014 was awaited.

MB then asked if any other events should be added to this Zone. SM suggested Demand Side Response (DSR), Gas Standards of Service (GSOS) and REMIT. MB believed REMIT to be included in EU Reform 2, however SM felt it was significant enough to warrant its own item. The suggestions were noted for consideration and the chart would be revised as appropriate for next month's meeting to review.

Zone 1

MB then drew attention to the events in Zone 1.

Energy Market Investigation - This event had been relocated from Zone 2.

Event templates had been provided for each of the other events positioned in this Zone 1 and MB requested that parties review these and provide any comments to MB before the next meeting in February; updates will then be published for the next meeting, with the intention of approving and baselining at the February meeting.

Action 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).

Zone 2

MB then drew attention to the events in Zone 2.

Switching Evolution and Registration Responsibility - At the previous meeting it was queried whether there were interdependencies between the two events. MB and NS have discussed this with Ofgem and the view is that the two events are interconnected.

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.

Key Dependencies were discussed in more detail and SS responded to various questions.

File Formats - There were four Shipper File Format products outstanding; these were to be considered at the January Uniform Network Code Committee (UNCC) meeting. Process walkthroughs had been completed. It was noted that this had been an enormous exercise that appeared to have worked well.

SM questioned if the UNCC approved the remaining File Formats was there any formal appeal route to contest the decision(s)? LJ confirmed there was no codified escalation route over and above the UNCC, other than to approach the Regulator.

System Testing - This was slightly behind schedule at the moment.

Market Trials - These will be launched at the end of the month; appropriate contacts will be sought together with indications of intentions to participate. SM voiced concerns regarding Xoserve's UAT overlapping into market testing and queried how it would be co-ordinated; would there be a working group that would manage this and address any problems? SS explained the purpose of the existing Working Group, which had never been supposed to represent the whole of the industry. SM reiterated that testing was the major concern, and it would be good to highlight the existence of that group and provide a contact name. SS agreed that market testing was of great importance to Xoserve as well as Shippers, and it will be a stream in its own right.

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

SS confirmed that connectivity testing had been advanced a month, explaining why this decision had been made. AL suggested this should be more widely publicised as it was not always clear what was happening. NS asked Shippers if Xoserve had the correct primary contacts to make sure the information is being communicated.

SS confirmed that market testing would be done in real time; three full cycles were envisaged. SM observed that the more times the cycle could be tested the better, and asked where there were longer processes if there might be a way of cutting back on 'dead' time? SS noted this and will feed back this query/suggestion to the Project Team.

SS then pointed out that if all parties decide to leave entry to the last minute and come on line for the third cycle (August) this will be a problem (it was discussed at the UKLIEF meeting) and will present difficulties in Xoserve resourcing/providing enough support; it would be less of a problem if it was an 'all on line' scenario happening at the first cycle. The registration process at the end of this month will provide a better gauge of the likely level(s)/time(s) of participation.

Transition Modifications - SS confirmed that if these were not approved by March Xoserve would still carry on as planned. NS added that those not yet approved appear to be 'on track' and the assumption is that they will be approved. It was noted some have yet to be raised. It was suggested that SS define the impacts (differences between the core and transition modifications) more clearly. It would also be useful to understand if they all need to be approved and why. SS referred to a Summary table already produced, which she would provide for publication.

Action 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.

LJ then displayed Modification 0523, drawing attention to Section 6, as an example of what information was now expected to be provided in relation to a modification having an effect on/being critical to Nexus implementation. This was briefly discussed. The Joint Office will ensure that any Nexus transitional modification raised will make clear in its content whether it is critical to the Nexus go-live and also what the consequences might be if the proposed change was not implemented.

Detailed Design - Responding to a question from HW, SS confirmed that this had been completed based on the assumption that the File Formats are approved and will not require any reworking; should this not be the case then this will have to be reviewed.

SS observed that the industry testing for CMS might be able to be brought forward (to beginning of July?) which would then align with Data Enquiry market trials, but this would have to be confirmed.

Dashboard Format

SS indicated that she might provide the Dashboard information slightly differently next month, as the current format no longer seems appropriate given the information that is being provided.

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. SM questioned the earlier time frame; SS confirmed the system changes for the EU programme were different to Nexus. The Gemini Consequential Change will be parameterised and rest dormant until the switchover. LJ reminded parties that if active at Interconnection Points (IPs) then they needed to become engaged with what was happening (if they had not already done so).

3.3. 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.

Smart Portfolio DCC Day 1 and DCC Gateway

SS reported that a number of changes had been received and assessed. Impact analysis was forcing a reconsideration of the position; given the current level of uncertainty with the DCC requirements further details when known would provide greater clarity, and when stability was more assured a better view could be formed on the best approach.

3.4. Critical Path – Programme Update

No changes for discussion.

4. Issues for discussion

4.1. UK Link Programme Plan - End Stage Assessments and Industry Governance

See discussions at 4.4, below.

4.2. Go/No-Go Criteria Development

At the December Change Overview Board it was requested that Xoserve do some further work to progress some of the industry go/no go criteria and propose a “straw man” for discussion. Reference was made to an email issued (09 January 2015) on Xoserve’s behalf. SS recapped on the aims set out in the email, i.e. to concentrate on agreeing the minimum acceptable criteria for “Shippers’ Systems Design, Build and Test Complete” which has been agreed as “partially” required to be met, and to consider whether the same criteria was applicable to “Shippers’ People and Process Change Complete”.

Some analysis on the various ways these criteria could be measured had been attempted, such as considering number of organisations, market share (coverage of meter points) and total gas throughput, and the impacts of each of these on different organisations within the industry. However the analysis showed that measuring any one of these to determine ‘go/no go’ criteria was not appropriate as it was likely to exclude some organisations or groups of organisations from playing a meaningful part in the readiness criteria.

It was confirmed that completely separate criteria would be developed for Shippers’ readiness, for GTs’ readiness, and for iGTs’ readiness. Shippers’ readiness criteria were to be considered at this meeting.

Shippers’ readiness criteria

Views were sought on:

- whether a combination of criteria should be used
- whether the proposed criteria (number of Shipper organisations and meter point coverage and total gas throughput) was the appropriate combination – are there any others which could be considered/measured?
- what are the appropriate levels for each of the combination criteria (SS suggested that a starting point for discussion could be to consider 65% of Shipper Organisations ready which cover 90% of Meter Points and 80% of Total Gas throughput).

A discussion ensued. There would be no legacy systems; it was to be a straight cutover. It was thought there may be a number of issues for a Shipper and its customers if not ready to switch over and access to systems was no longer available/imperfect, e.g. an inability to know if a customer had been lost/switched.

SM observed that COB cannot confirm percentages/figures - it did not have the authority to do this - but perhaps it could develop the principles and recommendations to be ready for approval by the proposed steering group once that had been formally constituted with sufficient powers.

Noting there were implications for key processes, LJ commented that perhaps further assessment of impacts on Shippers and their customers needed to be carried out before any further progress could be made. SS referred to the analysis spreadsheet that had been published at an earlier stage in the discussions in the previous year. It was suggested that this be revised and republished for the next meeting and that all parties review the information and feedback views to Xoserve before the next meeting.

Action 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).

It was also questioned what would be the regulatory implications of parties not being able to perform activities to meet their obligations? JD would provide a view.

Action 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.

4.3 Baringa Report on Xoserve Readiness

AL drew attention to the areas of interest that had arisen from a reading of Baringa's report, making brief reference to the issues that appeared to arise from its conclusions, and indicated that she was now seeking to know how industry expectations might be managed.

Contingency Analysis and Soft Landing Aspects

This was discussed. SS advised that Xoserve had been looking at contingency dates (the first of a month would be most appropriate), suggesting that 01 November 2015 might be a potential date, with an alternative being 01 February 2016. GW suggested these possibilities required wider publication (the sooner the better), and questioned who would take the decision(s). He would also like to better understand Xoserve's mitigation plans in order to be able to mirror/match these in his own organisation. SS responded that until Xoserve's Transition plan is confirmed (it is still under review, with a possible decision at the end of February) it would be difficult to do this. A phased approach and other options were being considered and analysed. The impacts, implications, feasibility, and practicalities of what areas (e.g. Retrospective Adjustments, Data Enquiry) could be taken out were being reviewed. A view was being established on whether it might be better to deliver a programme at an earlier date or to deliver fewer items. There might be a 'feasible/desirable trade off' to be made, with limited options for removal or later phasing.

PO suggested that February 2016 was a more realistic contingency date. The industry required a degree of certainty - in the event that the October date did not happen, it would take most organisations much longer than 4 weeks (if a November date was then applied) to reassess, analyse and react. SS suggested that the November date might apply as a fall back position if there were issues with actual implementation only, not other issues.

AL suggested that it needed to be made clear to the industry to make parties aware of what will happen in the event of a 'no-go' in October. At what point will it be known that

the October date will be in jeopardy? AC commented that it would cause significant ramifications for Shippers to have to unpick Nexus (alongside other changes) and then to regression test - as much notice as possible would be required. In the event of a 'no-go' SM believed a subsequent reset of at least 6 months would be more realistic, i.e. to April 2016 but, like GW, questioned who would be empowered to make any such decision, as all parties had differing commercial interests.

LJ suggested that Xoserve's Project Team should consider arranging a Contingency Planning Workshop as soon as possible to consider the various triggers/circumstances and the actions that may be required; SS noted this for further consideration with the Project Team. HW voiced concerns regarding delivery, in respect of traceability in particular, and the associated risks and questioned how these would be addressed. SS advised that traceability was not included in the tool at the present and explained in more detail. GW reiterated that he would like to see Xoserve's response to the Baringa report and its action plan, to give a better understanding of the position. It was suggested that this be covered at the next meeting and will be placed on the agenda.

Management of change Post-Nexus implementation (2015/16)

Referring to the suggestion of an embargo on change post implementation of Nexus that had been proposed in certain quarters, SM believed this was not sensible - it would be more appropriate for an embargo on change to be agreed prior to Nexus implementation. GW agreed this with view. SS added that Xoserve would be planning a release 6 months after go live, and was also in accord with that view. JP suggested the industry might agree to hold off on making certain changes in order to allow the most important changes to be implemented. SS observed that a position of stability might take some time to reach following implementation. HW added that the assessment of service levels post implementation might need to be included in the contingency planning. There needed to be confidence that all parties would have/maintain the ability to deliver on their Licence obligations.

Next Steps

Summarising the discussions, it was agreed that the following required further consideration by Xoserve:

- A Workshop on contingency plans
- Issues around traceability
- What would happen if the implementation date of 01 October 2015 was not met
- How to manage any changes post Nexus
- Potential impacts on Service Level agreements post go live.

Xoserve's response to the Baringa report and its action plan will be placed on the agenda for the next meeting.

Action 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.

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

4.4 Baringa Report on Shipper Readiness

JP gave an overview of the report, explaining the approach taken, the process followed, and detail of the responses received. From the assessments made of the information provided, it had been concluded that there was no clear evidence at this stage to suggest that Shippers will not be ready for go live by 01 October 2015. From the information provided, JP observed that Shippers' change programmes seemed to be starting late. Attention was drawn to several factors that should be taken into consideration when assessing the exercise. Confidence in an ability to meet the deadline seems to be high but the reality of demonstrated progress is low, with programmes running later than might be theoretically expected. From the information gathered the programme looks to be heavily 'back ended', leaving very little room/time for contingency. The report's conclusions were then discussed in more detail.

AG queried the statement that there was no clear evidence at this stage to suggest that Shippers will not be ready for go live by 01 October 2015. JP explained his views, observing that the information provided for assessment had to be taken at 'face value'. SM expressed concern that not a single respondent appeared to have started the High Level Design phase by the end of 2014. However other participants did not find this surprising and did not see this as a negative, as much of the information they required to get started was not yet available to them. AT indicated that they were waiting for the approval of the file formats. SS observed that the file formats had been provided to Shippers by 30 September 2014 and that this date had been preserved throughout, with iGT and GT file formats to be provided later because they were dependent on the Shipper file formats being approved. HW believed the report to be reflective of many parties' positions at the end of the year. PO observed that there was no evidence to support a conclusion either way.

The scope was clarified. JD confirmed that any organisation without a supply point portfolio was excluded; all others (circa 36) were invited. Some parties who had responded were subsequently deemed to be out of scope following more detailed conversations. Of more concern were one or two parties who professed not to know if they were impacted. Everyone received the invitation via the Joint Office; letters were sent to non-responders and JD was confident that all appropriate parties had been contacted. Surprisingly some major players, who had been expected to, did not participate. Looking at the number referred to in the report, around a third of the potential population did not take part. This was discussed. Various inferences could be drawn from non-participation; if looking for evidence of readiness any absence of response might give rise to concerns. JD indicated that he would be happy to speak to the nine parties who did not participate to ascertain their current position.

JP considered that the report had provided a baseline against which future assessments of progress could be made. MH observed that in his experience and taking a realistic view, project plans (and there were various ones going on at present) were not likely to be in a 'steady state'; the picture so far really does cause concern.

Next Steps

JD then clarified what action was to be taken in the immediate future. Ofgem proposes to appoint a Programme Manager on an enduring basis and will carry out the procurement (to be partly funded by Xoserve, the source of the remainder of the funding to be confirmed). The intention will be to appoint an individual to perform a similar exercise to this initial report, with ongoing dialogues with parties.

JD intended to seek the COB's view via an email (based on what was done for RGMA previously). The proposition was for COB or another group to act as a steering mechanism for Nexus; the appointed Programme Manager would then be expected to report with assessments/updates to the steering group, who would then take appropriate action if necessary. JD indicated that RGMA/IMSIF would be the example

for the composition of the group, e.g. I & C, Challengers, Big Six, etc. The eventual conformation would need to be accepted by industry as an appropriate body, and JD has drafted a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) for review and comment. He intended to write to senior levels in each organisation (attaching the MoU) in response to Baringa's report. GE requested that the letter include a strawman of the proposed composition of the steering group.

JD advised that draft papers would be circulated for review mid-week, and that any comments should be returned to him by the middle of the following week; it was expected that the letter would then be sent out within the next couple of weeks. The tender process will be started and it was anticipated that an appropriate person would be in place by the end of February.

These propositions were discussed. On the assumption the COB was to be assigned the role of steering group then this would necessarily involve changes to its current Terms of Reference. JD will circulate Ofgem's views on this.

A number of questions were raised. Should it be a Nexus steering group or maintain its overview role? Will it be empowered to make decisions to change implementation dates? JD expected there would be several tests to apply before reaching a decision to change implementation dates (seen as a last resort) and reasons for any such decision would have to be most clearly demonstrated. The report has made it relatively clear how little has been accomplished so far; there needs to be a heightening of expectations of what should reasonably have been done by now/as the implementation time draws nearer and the Programme Manager will be expected to encourage and motivate industry progress to achieve this.

SMc cautioned that the exercise of any power to change the implementation date should not be applied in isolation; wider implications for other change programmes should be taken into account before any such change was enacted.

PO, GE and AG evinced concerns that the positions of ICOS members had not been fully reflected within the Baringa report.

JD will provide Ofgem's view of the report and will circulate its view on the role of COB.

Action COB 0108: *Baringa Report on Shipper Readiness* - Provide Ofgem's view of this report and circulate Ofgem's view on the role of COB.

AG asked if the project assessment would also cover Xoserve; JD indicated this was already covered. SM questioned how this would fit together with assessment of Shippers' readiness, and suggested it would need an independent party to make these assessments.

AL was concerned that the report seemed to indicate that some parties might be reluctant to share information with Baringa.

Responding to a question from MH, JD confirmed that the vires (authority to act) would be conferred by the signing of the MoU.

RM suggested consideration be given to what is happening in the DCC arena and whether there are any parallels/precedents that could usefully be drawn upon. AT pointed out that the DCC is operating under a very clearly laid out timeline/licence obligations, whereas all that exists here is the UNC date. He suggested that the newly appointed Programme Manager report directly to Ofgem. It was recognised that there would be a polarisation of views; Ofgem was trying to ensure the process is robust and that any decisions taken are sound. The test might be, is it in the best interests of consumers to retain the current target date or to change it? Only Ofgem can make that judgement.

PO drew attention to potential reputational damage if Nexus does not implement successfully; there appears to be very little evidence to demonstrate much benefit to

consumers from the implementation of the UKL Replacement. There are concerns that the proposed steering group does not have sufficient time left to be set up and operate effectively. NS observed that if there was to be a change of date then the earlier that decision was made the better; the costs of change increase significantly the closer to the current date any such decision is made.

5. Any Other Business

5.1 Timing of changes to Standards of Service

SM raised concerns regarding the current changes to GSOS and to the proposed implementation in July 2015, pointing out this was in the middle of Nexus testing. Why was this not being mindful of the Nexus Programme? The impacts of this might prove detrimental for Nexus if parties were forced to accommodate this.

All were encouraged to respond to the consultation.

6. Diary Planning

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

At the previous meeting LJ had reminded participants to ensure they had notified the Joint Office by the required date of their intention to attend meetings to avoid disappointment and to avoid exceeding the maximum capacity of the meeting room. Today's meeting was oversubscribed in terms of room capacity and this was discussed.

While all are welcome to attend these meetings, and the Joint Office makes every effort to arrange appropriate meeting rooms with sufficient capacity to accommodate interested parties, space is often finite and has to be arranged many weeks in advance. Providing an appropriate space is often a finely gauged decision - sometimes having to be based on previous attendance for meetings in the absence of any firm numbers - and is made more difficult if prospective participants fail to register their intention to attend and still expect to be accommodated when arriving unannounced.

Responding to a suggestion that the moving agenda was a contributory factor, LJ explained that he could either finalise the agenda early or take a more flexible approach in an effort to facilitate as much as possible; it was up to participants. GE was of the opinion that the agenda should be locked down five days in advance of the meeting as this was the deciding factor in whether to attend. SM disagreed, explaining that there was often no time to defer important items such as the GSOS item, which he had raised as soon as the information was available. Participants generally agreed with the need for flexibility.

It was suggested that interest in the areas under discussion at these meetings may now be growing and that attendance might therefore increase to regularly exceed the capacity of the current arrangements.

Noting the difficulties in obtaining more expansive London facilities, it was suggested that meetings might be held in Solihull in the Joint Office meeting room at 31 Homer Road, as this could offer a greater seating capacity. Some parties had already made their travel arrangements for February and in order to honour these the February meeting will remain as arranged, i.e. 10:30 at the Energy Networks Association (Room 4 - maximum capacity 20 persons).

It was agreed that the March meeting would be held in Solihull and a reassessment of the position taken following this.

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

Time/Date	Venue	Programme
10:30 Tuesday 03 February 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 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 (12 January 2015)					
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)	Carried forward
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 1202	01/12/14	3.2	AMi to investigate and advise the meaning of the asterisks shown against the baseline and current planned dates for cutover and implementation.	Xoserve (AMi)	Closed
COB 1203	01/12/14	4.2	Xoserve to further develop the Go/No-Go criteria.	Xoserve (JP)	Carried forward
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	By 23 January 2015 Pending
COB 0102	12/01/15	3.1	Xoserve to circulate information and relevant point of contact for the Market Trials Working Group.	Xoserve (SS)	Pending
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)	Pending
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)	By 23 January 2015 Pending
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)	Pending

Action Table – Change Overview Board (12 January 2015)					
Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
COB 0106	12/01/15	4.3	<p><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:</p> <p>a) what contingency dates are possible; and</p> <p>b) what is feasible for a partial deployment on 01 October 2015.</p>	Xoserve (SS)	Pending
COB 0107	12/01/15	4.3	<p><i>Baringa Report on Xoserve Readiness</i> - Xoserve to share its view/actions against the risks and recommendations in the Xoserve UKLP Assurance Report.</p>	Xoserve (SS)	Pending
COB 0108	12/01/15	4.4	<p><i>Baringa Report on Shipper Readiness</i> - Provide Ofgem’s view of this report and circulate Ofgem’s view on the role of COB.</p>	Ofgem (JD)	Pending