

UNC DSC Change Management Committee Minutes

Wednesday 13 September 2017

Lansdowne Gate, 65 New Road, Solihull B91 3DL

Attendees

Rebecca Hailes (Chair)	(RH)	Joint Office	Non-Voting
Helen Cuin (Secretary)	(HCu)	Joint Office	Non-Voting

Shipper User Representatives

Andrew Margan	(AMa)	British Gas	Class A - Voting
Kirsty Dudley	(KD)	E.ON	Class A - Voting
James Rigby	(JR)	Npower	Class A - Voting
Alison Neild	(ANi)	Gazprom	Class B – Voting
Lorna Lewin *	(LL)	DONG Energy	Class B - Voting (2 votes)

Transporter Representatives

Chris Warner	(CW)	Cadent	DNO - Voting
Richard Pomroy	(RP)	WWU	DNO - Voting
Phil Lucas	(PL)	National Grid NTS	NTS – Voting (2 votes)
Nicky Rozier *	(NR)	BU UK	iGT - Voting (2 votes)

CDSP Change Management Representatives

Dave Turpin	(DT)	Xoserve	Non-Voting
Emma Smith	(ESm)	Xoserve	Non-Voting
Lorraine Cave	(LC)	Xoserve	Non-Voting

Observers

Andy Clasper	(ACI)	Cadent	Non-Voting
Jane Rocky	(JR)	Xoserve	Non-Voting
Kully Jones	(KJ)	Joint Office	Non-Voting
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE	Non-Voting
Matt Smith	(MS)	Xoserve	Non-Voting
Rachel Hinsley	(RHi)	Xoserve	Non-Voting
Shanna Key	(SK)	NGN	Non-Voting
Shane Preston	(SPr)	Scottish Power	Non-Voting
Steve Nunnington	(SN)	Xoserve	Non-Voting
Steve Mullins	(StM)	Xoserve/PwC	Non-Voting
Tahera Choudhury	(TCh)	Xoserve	Non-Voting

Apologies

Beverley Viney	(BVi)	National Grid NTS	NTS - Voting
Katy Binch	(KB)	ESP	iGT - Voting

* Via teleconference

Copies of all papers are available at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Change>

1. Introduction

RH welcomed all to the meeting.

1.1. Apologies for absence

See above table.

1.2. Alternates

Alison Neild for Lorna Lewin (whilst not present); Phil Lucas for Beverley Viney; and Nicky Rozier for Katy Binch.

1.3. Confirm Voting rights

The voting rights for each member were as follows:

Representative	Classification	Vote Count
Andrew Margan	Shipper Class A	1 vote
Kirsty Dudley	Shipper Class A	1 vote
James Rigby	Shipper Class A	1 vote (2.2.9 applies = Shipper Class C)
Alison Neild	Shipper Class B	1 vote
Lorna Lewin (Alison Neild appointed as alternate when not present)	Shipper Class B	2 votes (2.2.9 applies = 1xClass B + 1xClass C)
	Shipper Class C	
Chris Warner	DNO	1 vote
Richard Pomroy	DNO	1 vote
Phil Lucas (alternate for Beverley Viney)	NTS	2 votes
Nicky Rozier (alternate for Katy Binch)	iGT	2 votes

1.4. Approval of Minutes (09 & 31 August 2017)

The minutes of meetings on 09 and 31 August were approved.

2. Terms of Reference Review and Approval

ESm provided an updated version of the Terms of Reference (ToR), and explained the format had been adjusted to the style of the UNC Joint Office Terms of Reference, with added links.

AMa enquired if all the comments had been considered from previous discussions. AMa suggested there could be some missing details that could be incorporated to the ToR in relation to the Code Administrator responsibilities and the administration of meetings. He felt additional comments should be added to the standard meeting arrangements, and about how Change Proposals and meeting papers would be communicated.

RHa acknowledged that some comments had been provided by Angela Love from Scottish Power which needed to be considered. However, some of feedback/comments provided were considered a change to the current process and service descriptions and she believed some of the elements would be best considered under the governance review.

The committee considered whether to approve the current draft with a view to improving them and adding additional clarity in the future or deferring the approval until agreement could be reached as to what additional elements could be included.

PL enquired about the committee working without a ToR. RHa explained that the UNC and DSC Service Description Documents outlined the responsibilities of the committee and not approving the ToR wouldn't prevent the committee operating.

DT asked who would own and maintain the ToR. RP suggested that the UNCC would need to approve the ToR. The autonomy of the DSC Change Management Committee was considered; CW stressed that all of the DSC committees are sub-committees of the UNC.

It was unanimously agreed to approve the existing draft with a view these would be considered further and with the expectation that further clarity would be added following a review of the Code Administrator’s responsibilities.

3. New Change Requests

Copies of all new change requests for consideration at this meeting are published at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Change/130917>.

3.1. XRN4347 UNC Modification 0619 - Application of proportionate ratchet charges to daily read sites – Change Request Notification

RHi introduced the Change Proposal raised by Murray Thomson in relation to UNC 0619. She gave a brief overview explaining that the change was raised to progress the ROM. The ROM was expected to be presented to the UNC Workgroup.

LC confirmed that this change was a restricted change for Service Line 7 to be amended. DT further clarified that the invoicing service area is funded by Transporters and explained that the costing/funding was suggested as an invoicing change. However, the beneficiaries of the change would be Shippers and he suggested that perhaps the funding should include Shippers. NR enquired if the modification would also impact iGTs. KD clarified that ratchets do apply to iGTs. ESm confirmed this change impacted iGTs and they are within scope. CW suggested the Workgroup would need to check what is in the iGT UNC in relation to ratchets.

It was deemed that further assessment was required by the UNC Workgroup in terms of its scope and further clarity should be provided around the funding.

RHi agreed to ensure that the UNC 0619 Workgroup was made aware of the discussions held and would seek an action at the Workgroup to clarify the scope of the change and the expected funding requirements.

The committee representatives agreed to defer approving the ROM request until further clarity could be added to the Change Proposal on the scope of the change and funding. It was anticipated that approval could be made in October.

3.2. XRN4354 - Request for New DNO Report Nested CSEPs Hierarchy Report – Change Request Approval

ACI introduced the Change Proposal raised by Cadent. He gave a brief overview explaining that the change was required for DNs to model demand correctly and that this was a restricted Class change for DNs only.

The DN Committee Representatives considered approving the Change Request; and approved the Change Request as follows:

Voting Outcome:	XRN4354 - Request for New DNO Report Nested CSEPs Hierarchy Report – Change Request Approval	
Transporter Representative	Voting Count	For/Against
Chris Warner	1	For
Richard Pomroy	1	For
Total	2	2

3.3. XRN4360 - AQ of 1kWh - Change Request Approval

RHa highlighted that this item was provided at short notice. Committee Representatives agreed to consider the late paper.

RHi introduced the Change Proposal raised by Scottish Power, explaining that the change was required as an outcome of discussions held within the Performance Assurance Committee (PAC) in relation to the correction of AQs where it has been set as 1kWh, and that this was a restricted Class change for Shippers only.

RHi clarified that the Change Proposal was required to tie elements together and this had been referred to the UNCC for a 01 October 2017 delivery date to allow the change before the AQ run in October. RHi explained that there have been some legacy issues, however this was considered to be an enduring solution.

The Shipper Committee Representatives considered approving the Change Request; and approved the Change Request as follows:

Voting Outcome:	XRN4360 - AQ of 1 - Change Request Approval	
Shipper Representative	Voting Count	For/Against
Andrew Margan	1	For
Kirsty Dudley	1	For
James Rigby	1	For
Alison Neild	1	For
Lorna Lewin (ANeild)	2	For
Total	6	6

4. Approval of Change Documents

Copies of all change documents for consideration at this meeting are published at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Change/130917>.

4.1. XRN4340 - UK Link Future Release (1.1) – BER Approval

LC introduced the Change Proposal. DT gave a brief overview explaining that this change was related to vulnerable customers; and was required to administer the changes and approve the funds for delivery, within scope, under Release 1.1. He explained that new vulnerable customer codes (additional allowable values in the file formats) would be added where required.

ESm clarified that the delivery of CR249 is spread across GTs and iGTs and this change only delivers the requirements in option B. She explained that should option A be approved for implementation, the work completed for option B would still be usable for option A but there would be some additional requirements that would require further development.

AMa expressed concern about how this would impact Shipper file flows. AMa emphasised that Shippers would not be able to make the system changes for November. DT explained that the system changes would not be ready until February. AMa asked for Xoserve to clarify if this was something that sits in the background or just in the production environment. DT explained that this change would sit in the production environment until switched on, so there will be no impact to Shippers until February, the change will allow a new range of allowable values to be created, however the expectation is that the new values will not be required until February.

RP highlighted that another part of change is to undertake some data migration and data cleansing. DT clarified that Xoserve are not planning to do this element, within this Change Request.

DT explained that an alternative would be to not to make any changes until Ofgem have provided their decision. RP believed that Ofgem were expected to make a decision by the end of the week and he was uncomfortable approving Xoserve costs to progress with the BER ahead of the decision. KD also expressed concerned about approving spend which may need to be unpicked.

It was suggested that approval of the BER production was deferred until further clarity was available on the solution.

KD believed that the changes needed to align with SPAA and having readiness to move forward.

DT explained that there are five elements for Release 1.1. Four of these elements can progress for Release 1.1. However, this one element could not proceed without approving the spend for this change. This element of the change was for the vulnerable customer code elements. DT highlighted the risks to the committee is if this is not approved in time for Release 1.1. He explained that the next DSC approval opportunity in October would miss the Release 1.1 and the additional codes which may be required would not be available for February.

AMa stressed the importance of having lead times for Shippers to develop systems. DT enquired if the proposed dates required for implementation could be met within other Release Schedules. CW suggested that if the codes would be required in February the approval needs to be made to ensure the availability of the codes and included within Release 1.1.

SK expressed she was not comfortable approving Xoserve costs/spend for change, when the change is not fully agreed.

DT explained that this element could be taken out, but the next earliest implementation point would be Release 2 in June. Shippers would then have time to implement the change. SK enquired that if Ofgem are expected to provide a decision by Friday could there be an extraordinary committee meeting and vote to ensure that the approval could be considered.

DT explained that Xoserve need to understand the level of changes and allow Shippers to consider the changes for the UK Link Change.

It was suggested that the approval could be made with a caveat to carry on with the work with the design stage to build the Xoserve system functionality now to meet the February Release date and if the Ofgem decision changes the expected changes work could be altered.

The risk of not satisfying Ofgem's requirements and Shipper compliance with Ofgem was considered. DT explained that the first stage will be to look at the file flows, but nothing would go into production allowing Xoserve to re-assess any decisions made by Ofgem.

It was discussed whether to agree to authorise the change procedure to pursue with the first stage of the change required to keep the change on track if Option B was required. If, however it transpires Option A is required from the Ofgem decision with a different schedule, the work undertaken up to this point could be utilised for Option B.

AMa highlighted that Shipper compliance will be driven by UK Link only, and will decide what the implementation date will be.

JR stressed that Shippers would require six months to develop systems. The 6-month lead time for shipper development and the release schedule mismatch was discussed. It was considered that Shippers would not be able to meet the February deadline as the build requirements are not known and it was questioned why Xoserve would start building a system early.

JR enquired about the actual cost associated to this element of change. It was anticipated there could be a cost in the region of £27,000 for this element only. The Transporters considered the importance of the change and bearing the risk of incurring a cost for UKLP249 New Vulnerable Customer Needs Codes – Service Area 16, restricted class change to DNs and iGTs.

The DN and iGT Committee Representatives considered approving the BER; and approved the BER as follows, with AMa stressing the agreement that the change is not going into production:

Voting Outcome:	XRN4340 - UK Link Future Release (1.1) – BER Approval	
Transporter Representative	Voting Count	For/Against
Chris Warner	1	For
Richard Pomroy	1	For
Nicky Rozier	2	For (2)
Total	4	4

4.2. XRN4335 - UK Data Centre Clearance; Removal of Xoserve NTP dependency from Legacy Data Centres – BER Approval

LC introduced the Change Proposal which was a restricted class change for NTS.

The NTS Committee Representative considered the request to approve the BER; and approved the BER as follows:

Voting Outcome:	XRN 4335 - UK Data Centre Clearance; Removal of Xoserve NTP dependency from Legacy Data Centres – BER Approval	
Transporter Representative	Voting Count	For/Against
Phil Lucas	2	For (2)
Total	2	2

4.3. COR4246 UKDCC4148 – Xoserve Impact – Global Scape & BFTS Interfaces - Project Closure Approval

LC introduced the Change Proposal which was a restricted class change for NTS.

The NTS Committee Representative considered the request to ~~approve the BER~~ [approve the closure notice](#); and approved the ~~BER~~ [closure notice](#) as follows:

Voting Outcome:	COR4246 UKDCC4148 – Xoserve Impact – Global Scape & BFTS Interfaces - Project Closure Approval	
Transporter Representative	Voting Count	For/Against
Phil Lucas	2	For (2)
Total	2	2

5. Review of CDSP Change Management Reports

5.1. Service Changes and Key Project Dashboards

5.1.1. COR4216 API Platform Implementation

DT introduced the Dashboard Changes providing the overall Project RAG status for an API solution for the provision of data to Price Comparison Websites (PCWs).

DT explained that there are two separate pieces of work required; one to build the API capability and then design how to provide the data to price comparison websites. He welcomed JR who had joined the meeting as the Xoserve Project Manager.

It was clarified that a number of questions are being considered about the control and creating visibility of the changes required.

AMa expressed concern about Xoserve's engagement with its customers and that there is no visibility or paper trail for the change. AMa emphasised that Shippers want an open discussion on the system solutions, what the best solutions are for Shippers, and how to include Shippers in the considerations that need to be made.

DT explained that Xoserve have a generic development budget for business planned and this is being used to build the capability. He stressed that considerations are to be made about funding, the controls, the security and compliance with Data Protection Act (DPA) with whatever solution is put in place.

DT explained there are 3 routes to progress change within Xoserve

1. A change required via the DSC Change Management Committee
2. Internal driven changes, to sustain and build the business, which are funded from existing budgets
3. External driven changes

AMa highlighted that there is general support from the industry on building the system capability but there are concerns about the lack of paper trails. He was keen to see some documentation from Xoserve. DT explained that this change would not change a Shipper Service or a DSC Service line, as this will create a third-party service.

DT explained the intention will be to create a solution design and then demonstrate this matches with all the compliance issues that have been raised. DT suggested visibility of this work is provided to the DSC Change Management Committee. It was anticipated more information would be made available in October.

DT asked parties what the right vehicle would be for sharing information on this. Shippers were keen to see some outputs from Xoserve and to support Xoserve, with a feed into the build design.

JR asked what the requirements were from Shippers. JR explained that Xoserve were delivering a platform for the PCWs; it was perceived there would not be a need to raise a Change Proposal. AMa suggested that this would require a UNC modification and a Change Proposal. JR confirmed the process that would have been followed prior to FGO, where by the Transporters would have had the obligation set upon them and Xoserve would have received an instruction via a Change Request submitted by the Transporters to make the required changes. JR clarified that the CMA order had been placed directly onto Xoserve to deliver, and this was being managed as an internal strategic change. AMa expressed that Xoserve should always engage with its customers. JR explained that there is no issue with engaging with customers, work has started internally on the requirement to deliver a solution to meet the CMA order and she assured Shippers that Xoserve will share the design with reassurance it demonstrates the design requirements with the Data Protections Act (DPA) and outlines the funding routes. JR confirmed that Xoserve are trying to get to a solution as quickly as possible and are using the vehicles available to them; she stressed there is no desire to close-out Shippers and if Shippers feel they are being excluded this will be addressed. JR suggested presentations will be provided and a detailed design document will be created to record the technical design.

DT explained that the CMA order placed on Xoserve needs to be managed, and that the liability for any non-compliance will be with Xoserve if *they* do not comply. He stressed that any failure to comply would fall on parties that fund Xoserve. He confirmed that the funding of the solution needs to be considered.

AMa believed that this was a GT activity and understood this would be funded by GTs only. AMa expressed the opinion that the build solution maybe something that Shippers want to build upon, with a generic platform, that other parties may be able to utilise. DT explained that Xoserve will need to focus on the build required to meet the CMA order.

The committee considered the opportunity for the Solution Development Group (SDG) to be engaged with the process and kept informed. SPr confirmed he attends the SDG and would assist with keeping the group informed.

AMa stressed he would like a document that provides a background to the project, which should cover: What, Why and How, along with some project timelines. It was suggested an Xoserve BER document may meet the requirements of a document for Shippers. DT suggested that Xoserve would create some "Change Proposal-style" documents to keep Shippers informed and assured Shippers they would receive regular updates.

Action D1 0901: Xoserve to produce and provide Shippers with an API Platform Implementation Paper, and invite views ahead of the October DSC Change Management Meeting for further discussion.

5.2. UK Link inflight changes

5.2.1. Overview of Modifications impacting UK Link Systems

RHi confirmed no new UNC modifications had been raised with likely impacts to UK Link systems. She confirmed the following relating to UNC Modifications:

0625 - Extension of 4 months to 10 months to transfer non-mandatory sites from Class 1; had no expected system changes, and;

0619 / 0619A - Application of proportionate ratchet charges to daily read sites; had expected system changes.

5.2.2. Xoserve Reporting Update / Implementation Plan / UK Link Modification / Outages

RHi provided the Xoserve Implementation Plan:

UK Link Changes Awaiting Scheduling – In Analysis

COR4360 Release 1.1. RHi confirmed that this is still in analysis with a Change Pack expected for Release 1.1. AN asked Xoserve to provide further clarity on the description of the 5 items rather than to simply refer to Release 1.1.

UK Link Changes Awaiting Scheduling – Awaiting Approval

NXC File Format Version Confirmation. RHi confirmed that this had been raised during PIS due to a mismatch to file formats, she provided confirmation that this should be version 3.0, and this entry had been provided for information only.

Requirements Statement – Acceptance of Failed Readings after AQ Correction. RHi confirmed that this is linked to a change on the backlog (COR202). The purpose of the paper is to move the requirements to Release 2 for further discussion on Day 2 (14 September 2017). She reported that comments had been received and these were being worked on. Representations will be invited in the normal manner.

Current UK Link Changes – Approved – Scheduled For Implementation

RHi provided the release dates for information.

UK Link Changes – Implemented since last UK Link Committee Meeting

RHi reported the items implemented for information.

UK Link Changes – Withdrawn / Cancelled

None to report

Forthcoming Outage Notifications

RHi provided the new outages for CMS.

RHi provided a summary of the UK Link Changes awaiting scheduling. JR asked about the band width of Release 2 if changes drop out. It was confirmed that this would be discussed on Day 2, when approving the scope. The committee briefly discussed the scope of Release 2 and the approval process expected tomorrow. JR enquired about the production of BERs and the design elements being captured. DT explained that the release will still have to have the impact assessed to understand the interface changes and release dates. Further discussion was deferred until Day 2 (14 September 2017).

5.2.3. Amendments to Other CSDP Service Documents

No update.

6. Horizon Scanning: 'Bubbling Under' Report

RHi provided the Bubbling Under report and summarised the changes made since the last provided report, she highlighted there were no significant changes, and provided a brief summary of each change:

0594R – The probability had changed last month, reduced down to 10%.

0619 – The probability had been set at 50% with system changes for Class 1 and Class 2 supply points. An alternate has been raised by SGN and will be considered by UNC Panel in September. A new line will be added to the report.

Meter schedule 22 of SPAA – No system changes expected, Xoserve will be providing reports. A Change Pack is expected at SPAA in October.

RGMA Review Phase 2 – RHi proposed the removal of this item. The change was relating to the amendment of the MAP IDs and AMR, driven by MAMs, this had been deferred for 6-9 months. KD suggested a reference to SPAA is added to the report to add clarity and this is left on the report for visibility.

0624R – Rhi confirmed a review of arrangements is taking place at the Review Group. The agreed probability had been set at 0% at this stage, until it is clear if changes need to be made.

0625 – This had been allocated to a Workgroup and is currently being assessed. The probability was agreed to be 60% at this stage.

7. Finance and General Change Budget Update

7.1. Next year's change budget finance sheet

DT provided an overview of the Budget. He confirmed that the financial report will be provided to the DSC Contract Managers for visibility on how the change budget is being spent and how Xoserve are performing against the budget.

DT explained that not much has changed and the budget is currently well under spent.

LC asked for feedback on any additional items Shippers would like to see.

AMa referred to the external plan, and gave feedback on the predicted internal spend. He questioned the differences between the external and internal plans and the under spend. AMa also enquired about PWC and the PAFA administrator role procurement activities.

8. Future Industry Change Delivery Governance

StM from PWC provided a proposal for Enduring Delivery Governance for discussion:

The presentation provided the background reminding parties that Project Nexus governance has now been closed down but there was recognition that there needs to be some enhanced delivery functions established for the future. He confirmed that it was recognised by Xoserve, Ofgem and many market participants that the current DSC committee structure is lacking a delivery function. This document sets out Xoserve's initial proposals for establishing such a delivery function.

StM summarised the principles adopted in developing the proposals and the need/want to be clear on any delivery group, the hand-offs, and the scope. StM emphasised that they don't want to be over prescriptive.

StM summarised the proposal to establish a delivery committee and that this is proposed to be a sub-committee of the DSC Change Management Committee, with an independent chair appointed by Xoserve. The new DSC Project Delivery Committee would have responsibility for managing the delivery of changes for which the DSC Change and DSC Contract Management Committees had agreed the scope and costs.

CW suggested Xoserve could/should chair the meetings. DT explained the principle on landing on changes would require an independent chair. The committee considered the reason behind an independent chair and that the delivery programme may be impacted by the decisions made by this group. The cost of an independent chair would need to be attributed as an Xoserve cost. There would be voting, and any voting structure would mimic the Change Management Committee, there was also a question as to whether Xoserve would have a vote.

Participants considered the remit of the delivery sub-committee; considering Release 2 onwards, small projects and the ability to scale up for major projects. RHa questioned when the committee would be required. DT explained that there is no delivery phase, market trialling or plans, elements still need to be thought through for Release 2.

PL expressed concern about the chair having veto over ~~parties attending~~ nominations onto the Committee. PL stressed that if this were the case, there would need to be rules around how that power would be applied and rights of appeal etc. ~~StM explained the thought process about having control and ensuring the right people are at the meetings.~~ PL stressed the need for rules around how parties would be represented at meetings and how the chair would ensure the right people are attending. ~~StM explained that it was not intended for this to be a right of veto.~~ Alternatively, the intention was to provide for the Chair to have a discussion with parties regarding the mix of skill sets on the proposed Committee which did not extend to a formal right to veto a representative. To reflect this clarification, StM agreed to 'soften' the description of this in the slides which are formally presented to the Change Management Committee in October for approval. KD expressed concern about facilitating and encouraging the right attendees ahead of the meeting and the ability for the delivery sub-committee to make decisions or recommendations.

AMa suggested there could be an option to have a Committee on the same level as the Change and Contract committees if parties wanted it to have certain powers rather than having another sub-committee. However, he pointed out a Committee in its own right would need wholesale changes. The committee briefly considered any conflicts of interest.

KD expressed concern about the need and level of hand-holding and how onerous the proposals appeared to be. Comments were expressed that this proposal appeared to be over-engineered. KD suggested that the delivery sub-committee would not always be needed and business would only be deferred to such groups for large projects and this would also need a flexible membership dependant on the elements being considered and the ability to release that resource. KD challenged if the proposal is over-engineered. StM suggested a group is established in readiness for engagement with Shippers.

The committee considered if Release 2 would need this sort of arrangement when the size and scope of this is better understood and perhaps required again for a Release 3.

KD was keen to find a simple effective solution to deliver what is required without over-engineering. StM agreed to consider the feedback provided today and reconsider the proposals, testing it for Release 2 on a simple change to understand the principles.

It was suggested this could be set up as a tool to fall-back on but not required on a permanent basis.

RP asked about the make-up of the membership and if constituency groups would be required to attend.

ANi challenged the difference between the proposals for this suggested delivery sub-committee and the SDG. The committee considered whether this would over complicate the governance with splitting considerations into solution development and delivery development.

CW asked if the scope of the sub-committee is to set the governance, constituency of sub-committee and rapid formation of a sub-committee to be stood up / stood down as and when required to consider in detail future releases along with the need for an independent chair. AMA suggested there should be a less permanent structure with the ability to consider at short notice, a view of what are we doing / what do we need. CW asked if consideration could also be given to the cost to the industry.

It was agreed to defer further discussions on the proposals and for parties to consider the proposals further and allow future consideration at the October meeting.

9. Review of Outstanding Action(s)

0402: *DSC Change Committee Operation (terms of reference)* - DT to formulate a brief statement providing a clear explanation and references to appropriate documentation, for publication on the Joint Office website.

Update: See item 2.0. **Closed**

0603: Xoserve (LC/DT) to provide greater clarity on the budget details and the Business Change Process regarding cost allocation.

Update: See item 5.1.1. and new action 0901. **Closed.**

D1 0702: for consequential change to Gemini-only change and Gemini impacted. Review with National Grid and LCh.

Update: Deferred until October 2017. **Carried Forward**

D1 0801: Xoserve (DT) to send a communication to the Change and Contract Managers explaining that *XRN 4273 In-Home Display (IHD) Status – ROM Approval*, has been deferred until the September meeting to allow time for the feedback from the SPAA meeting.

Update: DT confirmed a SPAA meeting had taken place, and this change had been put on hold. The decision to approve the change had been deferred until a response is received from SPAA. Conversations have been taking place, and the ROM has been developed. KD confirmed an implementation date is being considered along with what can be delivered. SPAA voting saw some suppliers rejecting the approval but the overall position was that the change was accepted. As the SPAA change has now been approved, DT asked if the ROM should now be approved and moved forward to the next stage of the change process. AMA believed that this was going to be issued for consultation via the Change Pack process. DT confirmed the change document is available on the JO website, and representations will be invited with a 9-day representation window ahead of the next DSC Change Management Meeting with a view to seeking an approval in October. **Carried Forward.**

D1 0802: Xoserve (DT) to reformat the Terms of Reference (TOR) in the style of the UNC Joint Office Terms of Reference, remove legal text style by using plain English and add in links.

Update: See item 2.0. **Closed**

D1 0803: Xoserve (LCh) to send the scope of Release 2 for feedback from a low/medium/high perspective. The Committee to review 10-15 days prior to the Release 2 review meeting currently planned for 14 September 2017.

Update: Update deferred to 14 September 2017. **Carried Forward to Day 2.**

D1 0804: Xoserve (DT & ESm) to investigate hosting a pre-meeting Webex.

Update: Update differed to 14 September 2017. **Carried Forward to Day 2.**

D1 0805: Xoserve (DT) to circulated the responses from the SDG email regarding non-attending responses.

Update: Update deferred to 14 September 2017. **Carried Forward to Day 2.**

D1 0702: for consequential change to Gemini-only change and Gemini impacted. Review with National Grid and LCh.

Update: Update deferred to 14 September 2017. **Carried Forward to Day 2.**

D1 0806: Xoserve (AM) to write to all the Change Managers describing the remit of the Sub Group and what it entails. Asking for volunteers, explaining the Terms of Reference and associated expectations, with the outputs being reported back to the DSC Change Management Committee. **(Cross Code/Fuel).**

Update: Update deferred to 14 September 2017. **Carried Forward to Day 2.**

D1 0807: Xoserve (DT) to contact SM to discuss if the Teleconference call on Thursday 31 August regarding the formal exit meeting could be brought forward on that day.

Update: Update deferred to 14 September 2017. **Carried Forward to Day 2.**

10. Next Steps

Item not considered.

11. Any Other Business

11.1. CNF File Update

Item deferred to 14 September 2017.

11.2. Electralink proposal for feedback loop: SPAA/UK Link changes

Item deferred to 14 September 2017.

11.3. Xoserve Release Dates and Compliance with other Codes

Item deferred to 14 September 2017.

11.4. Schedule for issuing the Invoicing Supporting Information files (AMI, COI, & CZI)

Item deferred to 14 September 2017.

11.5. Customer Heatmap

Parties were asked to provide feedback to Xoserve on the aspects they do well and what they don't do so well. This activity took place with Steve Nunnington at lunchtime.

12. Diary Planning

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

Meetings will take place as follows:

Time/Date	Venue	Programme
10:15 Wednesday 11 October 2017	Lansdowne Gate, 65 New Road, Solihull B91 3DL	Standard Agenda items, and any other matters arising: Future Industry Change Delivery Governance
10.15 Thursday 12 October 2017	Lansdowne Gate, 65 New Road, Solihull B91 3DL	<i>(Meeting to be confirmed)</i>

Action Table (as at 13 September 2017)					
Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
0402	12/04/17	2.1	<i>DSC Committee Operation (terms of reference)</i> - DT to formulate a brief statement providing a clear explanation and references to appropriate documentation, for publication on the Joint Office website.	Xoserve (DT)	Closed
0603	08/06/17	2.3	Xoserve (LC/DT) to provide greater clarity on the budget details and the Business Change Process regarding cost allocation.	Xoserve (LC/DT)	Closed
D1 0702	12/7/17	3.1	Review the Change Demand Backlog For consequential change to Gemini-only change and Gemini impacted.	National Grid (SM) and Xoserve (LCh)	Carried forward
D1 0801	09/08/17	1.4	Xoserve (DT) to send a communication to the Change and Contract Managers explaining that <i>XRN 4273 In-Home Display (IHD) Status – ROM Approval</i> , has been deferred until the September meeting to allow time for the feedback from the SPAA meeting.	Xoserve (DT)	Carried forward
D1 0802	09/08/17	2.0	Xoserve (DT) to reformat the Terms of Reference (TOR) in the style of the UNC Joint Office Terms of Reference, remove legal text style by using plain English and add in links.	Xoserve(DT)	Closed
D1 0803	09/08/17	3.2	Xoserve (LCh) to send the scope of Release 2 for feedback from a low/medium/high perspective. The Committee to review 10 15 days prior to the Release 2 review meeting currently planned for 14 September 2017.	Xoserve (LCh)	Update deferred Carried forward
D1 0804	09/08/17	5.3.1	Xoserve (DT & ESm) to investigate hosting a pre meeting Webex.	Xoserve (DT & ESm)	Update deferred Carried forward
D1 0805	09/08/17	8.0	Xoserve (DT) to circulate the responses from the SDG email regarding non attending responses.	Xoserve (DT)	Update deferred Carried forward
D1 0806	09/08/17	10.3	Xoserve (AMi) to write to all the Change Managers describing the remit of the Sub Group and what it entails. Asking for volunteers, explaining the Terms of	Xoserve (AM)	Update deferred Carried

Action Table (as at 13 September 2017)					
Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
			Reference and associated expectations, with the outputs being reported back to the DSC Change Management Committee. <i>(Cross Code/Fuel).</i>		forward
D1 0807	09/08/17	11.0	Xoserve (DT) to contact SM to discuss if the Teleconference call on Thursday 31 August regarding the formal exit meeting could be brought forward on that day.	Xoserve (DT)	Update deferred Carried forward
D1 0901	13/09/17	5.1.1	Xoserve to produce and provide Shippers with an API Platform Implementation Paper, and invite views ahead of the October DSC Change Management Meeting for further discussion	Xoserve (DT)	Pending