UNC DSC Change Management Committee Minutes

Wednesday 10 January 2018

at Lansdowne Gate, 65 New Road, Solihull B91 3DL

Attendees

Rebecca Hailes (Chair)	(RH)	Joint Office	Non-Voting
Mike Berrisford (Secretary)	(MB)	Joint Office	Non-Voting

Shipper User Representatives

Alison Neild	(Ani)	Gazprom	Voting
Andrew Margan	(AMa)	British Gas	Voting
James Rigby	(JR)	Npower	Voting
Kirsty Dudley*	(KD)	E.ON	Voting
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	Orsted Sales	Voting (2 votes)

Transporter Representatives

Chris Warner	(CW)	Cadent	DNO - Voting
Debbie Brace	(DB)	National Grid NTS	NTS - Voting (2 votes, Alternate for B Viney)
Nicky Rozier *	(NR)	BUUK	iGT - Voting (2 votes, Alternate for K Binch)
Richard Pomroy	(RP)	Wales & West Utilities	DNO – Voting

CDSP Change Management Representatives

Dave Turpin	(DT)	Xoserve	Non-Voting
Emma Smith	(ESm)	Xoserve	Non-Voting
Rachel Hinsley	(RHi)	Xoserve	Non-Voting

Observers

Alex Stuart	(AS)	Xoserve	Non-Voting
Andy Clasper	(ACl)	Cadent	Non-Voting
Christine Francis	(CF)	Xoserve	Non-Voting
Chris Shanley	(CS)	Joint Office	Non-Voting
Deborah Coyle-Spencer	(DCS)	ScottishPower	Non-Voting
Hilary Chapman	(HC)	SGN	Non-Voting
Lee Chambers	(LC)	Xoserve	Non-Voting
Lee Foster	(LF)	Xoserve	Non-Voting
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE	Non-Voting
Michael Orsler	(MO)	Xoserve	Non-Voting
Padmini Duvvuri	(PD)	Xoserve	Non-Voting
Shanna Key	(SK)	Northern Gas Networks	Non-Voting
Shane Preston	(SPr)	Scottish Power	Non-Voting
Stephanie Catwell*	(SC)	ElectraLink	Non-Voting
Tahera Choudhury	(TCh)	Xoserve	Non-Voting

_____

Apologies

Beverley Viney	(BVi)	National Grid NTS	Voting
Katy Binch	(KB)	iGT Representative	Voting
Phil Lucas	(PL)	National Grid NTS	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 and introduced her Joint Office colleague, C Shanley, advising that Chris would be taking over as the Chair in due course.

RH moved on to thank Xoserve for their timely provision of the documents for today's meeting before explaining that, as previously agreed, the documents have been published in MS Word format.

When asked, parties in attendance welcomed the new 'zip file' approach before agreeing that any late documents in future (i.e. after the zip file is created and published) would simply be published alongside the zip file in order to avoid unnecessary confusion.

1.1. Apologies for absence

See above table.

1.2. Alternates

Alison Neild for Lorna Lewin (until Lorna arrived late) and Debbie Brace for Beverley Viney.

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	Shipper Class B / Shipper Class C	2 votes (2.2.9 applies = 1xClass B + 1xClass C)
Chris Warner	DNO	1 vote
Richard Pomroy	DNO	1 vote
Debbie Brace (and alternate for Beverley Viney)	NTS	2 votes
Nicky Rozier (and alternate for Katy Binch)	iGT	2 votes

_____

1.4. Approval of Minutes (13 and 15 December 2017)

An onscreen review of an amendment request to the 13 December 2017 minutes highlighted by DB was undertaken, after which the minutes of both previous meetings were approved.

2. New Change Requests *(items 2.1 to 2.5 are presented for Approval post consultation)*

Copies of all new change requests for consideration at this meeting are published at:
https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Change/100118

RH explained that there was only one late paper received for today's meeting and thanked E Smith for her hard work in supporting the timely provision of the meeting materials.

RH also advised that as far as the consultation responses are concerned, any received have been appended to their respective Change Proposals. When asked, RHi pointed out that there are no Xoserve responses to the consultation responses included in the appended tables, on the grounds that this was not the agreed approach.

2.1. XRN4044: Extension of 'Must Read' process to include Annual Read sites - *Change Proposal Approval*

When asked, AC explained why the Change Proposal was classified as a 'restricted' DNO class. In short, this reflects the Change Management procedures 4.1 and 4.2, and is simply an extension to current processes.

It was suggested and agreed that the term 'should' would be changed to read as 'will be' in the last line of the 'Reason(s) for proposed service change' statement on page 3.

Discussion moved to focus on the consultation responses summary table in Appendix One at which point SP confirmed that he was happy with the explanation provided by AC.

When JR outlined Npower's concerns around the must read costs, CW responded by explaining the Transporter obligations (or their rights to undertake must reads) and how they (the Transporters) make their decisions. He also suggested that what we need to avoid is a system solution that removes the flexibility necessary to support the must read decision process.

When JR remarked that in the end, the concerns boil down to how engagement with Shippers would take place, AC explained that the Transporters are keen that the proposals align with previous industry discussions / agreements.

JR explained that Npower believes that the circa £60 must read charge is excessive, to which RP commented that the charge reflects the process involved which could result in up to three site visits being undertaken. When JR requested provision of more supporting evidence behind the charges, AC pointed out that this has already been the subject of previous discussions with Ofgem whilst CW asked parties to note that Cadent is NOT looking to introduce a profit making mechanism.

When asked, ES confirmed that the must read requests (notices) are provided in the form of an email to shippers. AC explained that the change is not proposing to change this current provision.

AM enquired whether or not there are any shipper feedback mechanisms, as these would be extremely helpful, to which AC acknowledged the point.

KD once again voiced her concerns around a lack of detail within the Change Proposal itself and the other Change Proposals being considered at the meeting. Responding, ES and DT both acknowledged the point, but warned that care is needed to avoid constraining Xoserve's ability to progress system changes for insertion into releases – it is often a balancing and timing issue around continuing with the work in progress on a Change Proposal and adding new information as it becomes available. However, Xoserve acknowledges that more transparency would be beneficial to all concerned.

_____

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

Voting Outcome:	XRN4044: Extension of 'Must Read' process to include Annual Read sites – *Change Proposal Approval*	
DNO Representative	**Voting Count**	**For/Against**
Chris Warner	1	For
Richard Pomroy	1	For
Total	**2**	**2**

2.2. XRN4525: Transparency of the Rolling AQ Process - *Change Proposal Approval*

RHi introduced the Change Proposal whereupon attention focused on the consultation responses summary table in Appendix One, at which point SP confirmed that he would be happy to discuss matters with Xoserve with regards to whether the Npower comments could be included. It was noted that both responses are positive.[1]

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

Voting Outcome:	XRN4525: Transparency of the Rolling AQ Process - *Change Proposal Approval*	
Shipper Representative	**Voting Count**	**For/Against**
Andrew Margan	1	For
Kirsty Dudley	1	For
James Rigby	1	For
Alison Neild + L Lewin's vote	1 + 2	For
Total	**6**	**6**

2.3. XRN4534: Amendment to RGMA Validation Rules for Meter Asset Installation Date - *Change Proposal Approval*

RHi introduced the Change Proposal whereupon attention focused on the consultation responses summary table in Appendix One, at which point AM advised that he has spoken with G Anderson at EDF Energy who has indicated that EDF Energy are comfortable with the proposals, even though E Laurence has not formally indicated a view.

In referring to EDF Energy's comments, AM indicated he agrees with the sentiments but recognises that the proposals only come into effect when matters go wrong.

When SK enquired as to whether or not the PEMs files would be impacted, ES advised that this would be unlikely as the matter really relates to simply a process timing issue.

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

_____

[1] *Please note: that whilst L Lewin arrived towards the end of the discussions on Change Proposal XRN4525, she did not take part in the vote itself.*

Voting Outcome:	XRN4534: Amendment to RGMA Validation Rules for Meter Asset Installation Date - *Change Proposal 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	2	For
Total	**6**	**6**

2.4. XRN4542: Changes to the Portfolio Summary Report (new fields and removal of fields no longer applicable) - *Change Proposal Approval*

RHi introduced the Change Proposal whereupon attention focused on the consultation responses summary table in Appendix One, at which point SP suggested that perhaps a wider industry discussion was needed. In acknowledging the point, ES indicated that the matter could be tabled at a forthcoming DSC Delivery Sub Group (DSG) meeting for further consideration.

Referring to the Npower response, JR clarified that he also supports the change proposals.

NR then highlighted a potential concern whereby some iGTs have been confused by aspects of this Change Proposal (i.e. ONUPDs and ONJOB aspects etc.). However, following further discussions with both British Gas and Xoserve, the concerns have been allayed. DT advised that the confusion relates mainly to item 2.3 and that Xoserve would look to provide further clarification around the iGT position after the meeting.

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

Voting Outcome:	XRN4542: Changes to the Portfolio Summary Report (new fields and removal of fields no longer applicable) - *Change Proposal 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	2	For
Total	**6**	**6**

2.5. XRN4556: Process to provide a report when GSR requests return no MPRNs - *Change Proposal Approval*

RHi introduced the Change Proposal explaining that there had been no responses provided during the recent consultation.

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

_____

Voting Outcome:	XRN4556: Process to provide a report when GSR requests return no MPRNs – *Change Proposal Approval*	
DNO Representative	**Voting Count**	**For/Against**
Chris Warner	1	For
Richard Pomroy	1	For
Total	**2**	**2**

2.6. XRN4568: DSC Service Description Table cosmetic changes to Service Lines - *Change Proposal Approval*

ES introduced the Change Proposal and provided an overview of the cosmetic changes to the service lines in the DSC. She explained that the aim is to seek the DSC Change Management Committee's approval of the details before the matter is then considered at the following weeks DSC Contract Managers meeting, prior to the Change Proposal then going out to industry consultation.

When DB enquired as to why cosmetic changes such as these are being tabled for consideration by the DSC Change Management Committee, ES explained that this approach (around the treatment of simple cosmetic changes) had been agreed previously. AM felt that this highlighted his previous concerns around the suitability of some Change Proposals of similar ilk being presented for DSC Change Management Committee consideration. Responding, DT advised that these are basically 'housekeeping only' types of change, although he does have some sympathy for DB's concerns.

When ES made reference to the table in Appendix One, RH pointed out that all the DSC Change Management Committee is being asked to approve today, is that the Change Proposal needs to go to the DSC Contract Manager's for their formal approval, even if it is questionable whether this adds value. The Committee agreed to:

1. Consider sending this change proposal to DSC Contract for their approval and

2. Consider whether for this type of housekeeping change, such proposals should go straight to DSC Contract in the future.

The two votes were undertaken, as recorded below.

The Committee Representatives considered approving the Change Proposal; and approved the Change Proposal, as follows:

1. Voting Outcome:	XRN4568: DSC Service Description Table cosmetic changes to Service Lines – *This Change Proposal referral to the DSC Contract Managers Committee for 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	2	For
Total	**6**	**6**
Transporter Representative	**Voting Count**	**For/Against**

Chris Warner	1	For
Richard Pomroy	1	For
Nicky Rozier + K Binch vote	2	For
Total	**4**	**4**
NTS Representative	**Voting Count**	**For/Against**
Debbie Brace + B Viney vote	2	For
Total	**2**	**2**

2. Voting Outcome:	**XRN4568: DSC Service Description Table cosmetic changes to Service Lines -** *Change the process so that future 'housekeeping only' types of Change Proposals should to go straight to DSC Contract Management Committee for their approval in the future.*	
Shipper Representative	**Voting Count**	**For/Against**
Andrew Margan	1	For
Kirsty Dudley	1	For
James Rigby	1	For
Alison Neild	1	For
Lorna Lewin	2	For
Total	**6**	**6**
Transporter Representative	**Voting Count**	**For/Against**
Chris Warner	1	For
Richard Pomroy	1	For
Nicky Rozier + K Binch vote	2	For
Total	**4**	**4**
NTS Representative	**Voting Count**	**For/Against**
Debbie Brace + B Viney vote	2	For
Total	**2**	**2**

3. Approval of Change Documents

There were no documents submitted for approval at this meeting.

4. Proposed Cancellation of Historical Change Requests (see Appendix)

Opening discussions, ES provided a brief overview of the historical change backlog and suggested that now preparatory work has commenced on Release 3, that the committee could now look at what outstanding items could / should be closed.

RHi reminded everyone present that the consultation window for these change requests closes on Friday 12 January 2018.

4.1. Propose to close – Approval to be sought in February

When DB highlighted that discussions remain ongoing with regards to Change Request 3699, RH confirmed that the Committee would be asked to vote on these items at the February 2018 meeting.

_____

Post meeting update: National Grid NTS has formally requested that XRN3699 "IA for strategic solution options for the GDE offline database" remains open on the Change Request backlog. National Grid NTS is currently in discussion with Xoserve regarding the solution and the obligations from the Significant Code Review (SCR) Security of Supply.

4.2. Change requiring sponsorship to progress (discussion led by Emma Smith)

In considering the five changes still requiring sponsorship, ES advised that she has no more specific information to provide following the December 2017 update, however, she once again confirmed that should no sponsors step forward, the change requests would be closed and could always be re-opened at a later date.

There then followed a brief discussion around E.ON DSC Change Comments document provided by KD ahead of the meeting.

When asked if she would be happy for the Joint Office to publish the document under today's meeting papers, KD requested more time to review and finalise before agreeing to such a move.[2]

Focusing attention on section 5 (yellow) items onwards, DT advised that he has discussed the items with KD prior to today's meeting and would ensure that whilst Xoserve carry on delivering the changes, it would also look to back-populate the information contained within the associated Change Proposals in due course.

In considering the green items next, Xoserve are still looking at these although parties are asked to note that funding for these changes would not be coming out of the change budget, and as a consequence Xoserve does not plan to breakdown the information any further on the grounds that no formal approvals are needed for these items.

When KD pointed out that during previous discussions it had been agreed to enhance the cost (i.e. charges) information, including any XRN cross references, DT acknowledged that point and agreed to look at including the information in due course.

Moving on to focus on the three red highlighted XRN items, DT explained that these are de-scoped Release 3 items which would be scoped back into Release 3 once consideration of the design aspects has been completed. He advised that whilst there are no specific shipper impacts envisaged, there would potentially be some traffic flow increases involved. DT then explained that Xoserve would look at the items in more depth with a view to either bringing back into R3, or alternatively including in a smaller 'targeted' release in due course.

When KD suggested that more clarification around the potential release scope would prove beneficial, on the grounds that a lack of clarity around the design elements makes decision making difficult, DT acknowledged the point and advised that he expects that more detail would be provided within the associated Change Pack communication (i.e. more clarity around potential shipper system impacts etc.). LC also pointed out that Xoserve work remains ongoing for inclusion in a forthcoming change pack, and Xoserve are confident that there are no file format changes involved, as it is simply a data flow related matter. Responding, KD indicated that she would be happy if the change pack was provided by the end of January or early February (and before the February DSC Change Management Committee meeting).

KD then voiced her concern that some of the Release 2 related Change Proposals are still out for consultation at this late stage in the process. Responding, DT acknowledged the concerns before pointing out that where additional information becomes available it would be provided in a timely manner. He also looked to reassure parties that should Xoserve identify any concerns or issues, they would look to provide appropriate feedback to the DSC Change Management Committee as soon as practicably possible, even if this results in a potential de-scope of R2 / R3 elements.

_____

[2] *Please note: a copy of the E.ON DSC Change comments document was published after the meeting.*

_____

LC pointed out that XRN4513 and 4514 are already included within the forthcoming change pack communication due to be released later in the day, whilst XRN4249 would be included with a change pack communication due out before the end of the month.

When ANi suggested that it is not just these three (red) items that are a concern, as some of the primary R2 Change Proposals are still lacking supporting information, LC agreed to undertake an action to provide a table outlining the breakdown for inclusion as a new page in the Dashboard Report.

New Action 0101: Xoserve (LC) to provide a table outlining the breakdown of what Change Proposals are going into which Release, their status and which communication pack they relate to, for inclusion as a new page in the Dashboard Report.

5. Release Updates

5.1. Future Release 1.1

5.1.1. PIS Update

In providing a brief overview of the 'UK Link Future Release 1.1' slide, LF advised that the Change Completion Reports would be provided for the February 2018 meeting.

5.2. Future Release 2

LC provided a brief overview of the 'UK Link Future Release 2' and 'Release 2 – Plan' slides during which attention focused in the most part on the second slide whereupon LF indicated that he anticipates the two green scoping funding boxes would turn blue in due course.

LF went on to explain that as far as the detailed design aspects are concerned, consideration of these include elements from the change pack (consultation) responses. LF advised the current plan realisation date(s) reflect the additional decision point assessment although the date provided is wrong and should read as '07/08/18'.

5.2.1. XRN4361: Retail & Networks Platform UK Link Release 2 Delivery – *BER for Approval*

When ES explained that two changes still require approval for funding purposes, DT focused parties' attention on page 31 of the Change Proposal and specifically XRN3995 and XRN4299.

DT pointed out that the table is essentially the same as presented at the December 2017 meeting with updated cost information.

When SK indicated that she was under the impression that XRN3995 was already closed, ES responded by explaining that whilst COR3995 was in fact closed, XRN3995 remains open. When it was suggested that this could potentially lead to confusion going forwards, ES suggested adding an additional 'A' in order to better differentiate the items.

When asked, DT confirmed that COR's were a pre-Nexus document whilst XRNs are a post-Nexus document.

DT then moved on to explain that both XRN3995a and XRN4299 now have updated costing information split in a different mix. ES explained that as far as XRN3995a was concerned, the costs are now 100% attributable to 'DN Operators and Independent Gas Transporters' (based on transporter obligations) to the tune of £51,217 (the iGT proportion being circa £4k and 8% based on December 2016 market split information). As far as XRN4299 was concerned, the costs are now 100% attributable to 'Shipper Users' to the tune of £155,257.

_____

DT explained that the Committee needs to approve three elements for inclusion within R2 purposes (XRN4513, XRN4514 and XRN4249).

RH then undertook approval of the funding requirements for XRN3995a and XRN4299 and then inclusion of XRN4513, XRN4514 and XRN4249 in R2. The Change Management Committee members then considered approving the changes, as follows:

XRN3995a: Theft Risk Assessment Service Tip-off Hotline Data Provision – Enduring Solution

The Transporter Committee Representatives considered approving the Change Proposal; and approved the Change Proposal as follows:

Voting Outcome:	XRN3995a: Theft Risk Assessment Service Tip-off Hotline Data Provision – Enduring Solution – *Change Proposal Approval*	
Transporter Representative	**Voting Count**	**For/Against**
Chris Warner	1	For
Richard Pomroy	1	For
Nicky Rozier + K Binch vote	2	For
Total	**4**	**4**

XRN4299: Reports required under UNC TPD V16.1 in Nexus (reports required by MOD 520A)

When asked whether or not future reports might be cheaper under the proposed change, DT confirmed that he expects that this might be the case.

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

Voting Outcome:	XRN4299: Reports required under UNC TPD V16.1 in Nexus (reports required by MOD 520A) – *Change Proposal 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	2	For
Total	**6**	**6**

XRN4290: Billing History by all NTS capacity / commodity related charges (from Nexus implementation onwards)

The NTS Committee Representative considered approving the Change Proposal; and approved the Change Proposal as follows:

Voting Outcome:	XRN4290: Billing History by all NTS capacity / commodity related charges (from Nexus implementation onwards) – *Removal from Release 2 delivery*	
NTS Representative	**Voting Count**	**For/Against**
Debbie Brace + B Viney vote	2	For
Total	**2**	**2**

XRN4513, 4514 and 4249: CMS Address field validations against UK Link data; Provision of correct data in User Pays Invoice for Must Reads process from CMS to SAP; Address Validation Solution – Part A – reinstating the monthly GB Mailing address update file

DT explained that approval is being sought to bring these three Change Proposals back into R2 scope, on the caveat that the matter is reviewed again at the Change Pack stage in the process when Shipper system impacts are better understood, following completion of the Xoserve Impact Assessment.

ES pointed out that the three Change Proposals had previously been approved as 'in scope' at the November meeting and all that is needed today is to minute the decision trigger point. Responding, KD pointed out that whilst she provided caveated approval for their inclusion in R2, it is now the Change Pack decision point that needs to be considered.

When LF highlighted that there are 16 Change Proposals in the forthcoming Change Pack communication, ES enquired whether the Committee could provide caveated approval of the BER – SK suggested that this should be done under consideration of agenda item 9.5 below.

IHD SPAA 381 Change, Approval sought for inclusion in R2

NR confirmed the SPAA change number 381; ES advised that the corresponding XRN number is 4273. When RH noted that whilst the changes are approved at the SPAA, they are not currently in scope for R2, DT confirmed that whilst the Committee had approved adding the change to the register, it had not yet been assigned to either the R2 or R3 scope.

DT then went on to explain that Xoserve would need to undertake a design assessment that they currently do at the Impact Assessment stage, during which they (Xoserve) look to identify what is in scope and how it potentially impacts on the system. Whilst these three change proposals are notionally included within R3 at this time, their design assessment remains outstanding.

RH enquired whether or not it would be feasible to simply approve their inclusion within R3 in order to ensure that nothing is missed – a view supported by KD. Responding, DT accepted the points being put forward and agreed to formally include the three Change Proposals for inclusion in the November 2018 Release 3 delivery. LC noted that whilst November is the 'target' date for R3, it is subject to Committee approval of the full scope.

When asked, the Committee agreed that SPAA 381 (XRN4273) should now be included within R3 scope and requirements going forwards.

The Committee Representatives considered approving the Change Proposal; and approved the Change Proposal, as follows:

_____

Voting Outcome:	XRN4513, 4514 and 4249: CMS Address field validations against UK Link data; Provision of correct data in User Pays Invoice for Must Reads process from CMS to SAP; Address Validation Solution – Part A – reinstating the monthly GB Mailing address update file - *Change Proposal Approvals for inclusion in Release 2*	
Shipper Representative	**Voting Count**	**For/Against**
Andrew Margan	1	For
Kirsty Dudley	1	For
James Rigby	1	For
Alison Neild	1	For
Lorna Lewin	2	For
Total	**6**	**6**
Transporter Representative	**Voting Count**	**For/Against**
Chris Warner	1	For
Richard Pomroy	1	For
Nicky Rozier + K Binch vote	2	For
Total	**4**	**4**
NTS Representative	**Voting Count**	**For/Against**
Debbie Brace + B Viney vote	2	For
Total	**2**	**2**

DT then refocused parties' attention on Change Proposal XRN4361: Retail & Networks Platform UK Link Release 2 Delivery, reminding them that this also needs formal approval at the higher level.

The Committee Representatives considered approving the Change Proposal; and approved the Change Proposal, as follows:

Voting Outcome:	XRN4361: Retail & Networks Platform UK Link Release 2 Delivery – *BER for 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	2	For
Total	**6**	**6**
Transporter Representative	**Voting Count**	**For/Against**
Chris Warner	1	For
Richard Pomroy	1	For

Nicky Rozier + K Binch vote	2	For
Total	**4**	**4**
NTS Representative	**Voting Count**	**For/Against**
Debbie Brace + B Viney vote	2	For
Total	**2**	**2**

5.2.2. XRN4454: National Grid and Cadent Enduring Invoicing Arrangements – *Change Proposal Approval*

Opening DT enquired whether the Committee would be happy to approve the removal of this Change Proposal from the R2 scope on the grounds that it is far too complex a solution to include within the R2 delivery.

When asked whether Xoserve is confident that the change could be accommodated within R3, LC responded by advising that it is and gave a brief rationale as to why.

The Committee Representatives considered approving the Change Proposal; and approved the Change Proposal, as follows:

Voting Outcome:	**XRN4454: National Grid and Cadent Enduring Invoicing Arrangements -** *Change Proposal Approval, removal from R2*	
Shipper Representative	**Voting Count**	**For/Against**
Andrew Margan	1	For
Kirsty Dudley	1	For
James Rigby	1	For
Alison Neild	1	For
Lorna Lewin	2	For
Total	**6**	**6**
Transporter Representative	**Voting Count**	**For/Against**
Chris Warner	1	For
Richard Pomroy	1	For
Nicky Rozier + K Binch vote	2	For
Total	**4**	**4**
NTS Representative	**Voting Count**	**For/Against**
Debbie Brace + B Viney vote	2	For
Total	**2**	**2**

5.3. Future Release 3

5.3.1. Xoserve's Proposed Prioritisation Approach for Changes

AS provided a brief overview of the 'Proposed Benefit Prioritisation Approach' presentation, during which the focus of discussion centred on the 'Benefit Classification Variable (cont.)' slide.

AS explained that the background algorithm identifies the percentage values utilised for prioritisation purposes.

_____

Some parties felt that the 'Customer Financial Loss at risk?' should be a sliding scale to which AS responded by indicating that Xoserve might struggle with that approach and would probably need DSC Change Management Committee involvement to successfully achieve that aim.

As far as the 'Primary Impacted DSC Service Area' is concerned this is scheduled to be discussed in more detail at the next DSC DSG meeting. ES added that she would discuss the matter with DB offline after the meeting.

When asked whether or not this model has been tested, AS advised that it has been trialled for R3 and all unallocated elements have gone through prioritisation.

ES remarked that the calculation order of event prioritisations closely matched the original prioritisation views.

KD indicated that in her opinion whilst the concept is fine, clarity around the details behind the scope and delivery costs and effort, would benefit parties in assessing the changes. In acknowledging the points, AS reminded everyone that this is just the first stage 'initial' benefit assessment which supports the Impact Assessment process. So far 95% of the change register have had their variables set that have enabled the DSG to make informed recommendations.

5.3.2. R3 Scope and Delivery Timescales Proposal

PD provided a brief overview of the 'Release 3 Scope Selection and Plans' presentation and confirmed that the R3 high level delivery timelines are similar to the R2 approach, and would be developed further over time.

Focusing attention on the 'Release 3 Scoping and Funding Approach' slide, PD explained that as far as the first two steps in the table are concerned, Xoserve is looking for quick wins via the DSC DSG before returning these to the DSC Change Management Committee for approval. When asked whether an additional DSC Change Management meeting in January would be needed, PD indicated that in her view it would.

RH explained that unfortunately the Joint Office do not have the resource or time capacity to support such an additional DSC Change Management meeting, especially at such short notice. LF then explained why Xoserve are proposing an additional meeting to include a review of the notional scope of circa 17 changes, especially as the mix of changes would impact on funding aspects. In short, Xoserve is keen to avoid the mistakes experienced with R2.

When referring to the Unidentified Gas (UIG) work underway elsewhere in the industry, SP enquired whether there was any 'buffer' within R3 to cater for any unexpected modifications, to which LF responded by suggesting that should this prove to be the case, a different delivery strategy would be needed to cater for delivery of UIG related changes.

DT explained that Xoserve have already undertaken several internal discussions around 'buffer' requirements and UIG interactions, before suggesting that perhaps the industry needs to do some modelling in order to test potential R3 related impacts. However, he remains nervous about sitting on R3 items, whilst awaiting UIG – it was agreed that we need to scope based on what is known now and avoid trying to second guess requirements.

_____

KD voiced her concern that the proposals appear to lack any 'window' for industry consultation and the knock on impact to the 6 month change delivery notification timeframe. Responding, DT acknowledged that further consideration of these matters is needed and pointed out that Xoserve would look to refine the timelines around slide 3 in due course. KD suggested that provision of more information around slide 5 would be beneficial, especially relating to the industry deliverability aspects. DT suggested it all hinges on better identification of what is, or is not, in scope for R3 purposes.

Moving on to consider the 'Proposed Release 3 Scope & Funding Plan' slide, RH once again advised parties that it is highly unlikely that the Joint Office could support the proposed additional 'ChMC 29/01 – Agree Scope' meeting. An option considered was to have a 2 day DSC Change meeting in February. DT suggested that perhaps Xoserve could look to feedback the DSC DSG outputs via a WebEx on 24 January 2018 in order that committee members have sufficient time to consider the matter prior to the February meeting instead.

Moving on once more to consider the 'Scope Considerations' slide, JR explained that he does not recall a previous DSC Change Management Committee discussion relating to prioritisation of R3 items.

In trying to understand why RAASP has now been excluded from the R3 delivery, KD enquired as to what parameters Xoserve has used on which to base its view that this change would be 'too big' for inclusion within R3. Responding, DT explained that Xoserve's view reflects the potential magnitude of a RAASP related change and how this would potentially impact on its (Xoserve's) ability to deliver a full system solution. He wondered what parameters members would like Xoserve to utilise for assessing similar types of change in future.

New Action 0102: Xoserve (DT/ES/RHi) to provide a view on what parameters should be established in order to assess the potential magnitude of future changes and their suitability for inclusion within a particular Release.

AM explained that he shares KD's concerns around Xoserve's claims around deliverability constraints, especially when other Codes cope with much larger wholesale changes. Responding, DT accepted the points being put forward and explained how Xoserve adopts a slightly more cautious approach to establishing delivery inclusion/exclusion criteria. He also pointed out that Xoserve tries very hard to assess industries ability to cope with the system changes. In the end, DT advised that Xoserve would look to how best to articulate what parameters are taken into account when assessing what can, or cannot be considered in scope for R3 purposes.

In referring to UNC Modification 0624R discussions, CW highlighted that this is not just a simple change, but also involves User Acceptance Testing and Market Testing including 3rd Party support aspects. In his opinion it is doubtful that UIG would be a simple assessment that could be accommodated via an additional system delivery release. CW went on to state that to date, he has not seen any industry views on how best to fit in UIG requirements within either delivery of Release 3 or 4. Responding, LF explained how potential change prioritisation would be expected to work – in essence, it is not easy but is why the DSC Change Management Committee are being engaged in discussing the matter now.

In considering the final 'Release 3 Scope – initial view' slide, SK voiced her concerns that tracking down the information that sits behind these items is difficult as not all of them are available on the Joint Office web site.

New Action 0103: *Reference the DSC DSG meeting -* **Xoserve (DT/ES/RHi) to ensure that the supporting information and documentation is provided to the Joint Office for inclusion under the additional DSC Change Management Committee meeting papers.**

_____

In recognising that the Joint Office are unable to support an additional DSC Change Management Committee meeting on 29 January 2018, DT advised that Xoserve would look for approval at the 07 February 2018 meeting instead.

When RH enquired if anyone had any further comments on the presentation, SP enquired whether on the 'Release 3 Scope – initial view' slide, the Level 1 no customer impact really means no impact on parties in general, and if so, why are these included in an industry release when they would be better served by being processed within an internal Xoserve release. Responding, DT explained that it is all to do with complete and open transparency around changes, inline with previous discussions on this matter.

In noting the views being presented, LF agreed to investigate whether there should be two approval channels going forwards, one covering external IX changes for the industry and the other covering internal IX changes for Xoserve purposes. DT then suggested that Xoserve could possibly in future look to provide an assessment of whether any Xoserve internal changes would deliver an indirect industry benefit, LF requested that should parties have any additional items they believe should be added, they let him know sooner rather than later. When asked whether or not there might be some potential re-prioritisation aspects involved, LF confirmed that there could be.

When asked how many items (other than the recognised 17 changes) are there identified on the change register, AS advised circa 118 of which 50 – 60 are unallocated. DT pointed out that the spreadsheet would enable Xoserve to filter out what should, or should not be included in R3 in due course. LF then provided a brief onscreen overview of the 'change lifecycle status system' and explained that this is the tool that ultimately drives the Xoserve prioritisation figures.

AS also provided a quick onscreen review of the 'R&N delivery schedule forecast view' presentation during which DT observed that it is the visibility around the gaps relating to what is not being delivered in R3 that need teasing out.

New Action 0104: *Reference the R&N delivery schedule forecast view -* **Xoserve (DT/ES/RHi) to ensure that the R3 supporting documentation is published on the Xoserve.com web site in order to support the DSC DSG and Change Management Committees discussions.**

AM felt that this was possibly an unproductive exercise on the grounds that should the industry want a change they would raise a Change Proposal and that he was now under the impression that all backlog items have been covered off anyway. ES confirmed that all old UK Link backlog items should now have been cleared down.

In looking to summarise these extensive discussions, RH identified the following key items:

- DSC DSG to consider Release 3 change elements and how these impact them;
- DSC DSG information to be provided to the Joint Office for publication no later than 22 January 2018;
- Xoserve WebEx to take place on 29 January 2018 in order to review the DSC DSG outputs and recommendations;
- DSC DSG summary to be provided ahead of the February 2018 DSC Change Management Committee meeting, and
- EQR tabled for approval at the February 2018 DSC Change Management Committee meeting.

_____

6. Change Logs

6.1. Bubbling Under Report

RHi provided a brief overview of the report during which DT explained that the 'Probability' percentage index originates from an era where specific releases did not exist, so their effectiveness and value now is somewhat limited, although it does provide an 'heads up' facility for the reader. A review of the various percentage allocations was then undertaken with RHi agreeing to make the changes in a later iteration of the report.

In focusing attention on the Mod 0624R row, CW advised that the RFi consultation sought views and as a consequence, warned that the Committee should not jump to any conclusions around what Xoserve needs to do next.

When DT pointed out that Xoserve does not necessarily have a clear view on the most recent modification additions (0635, 0636, 0639R, 0640S (iGT106), 0641, 0642 (Urgent) 0642A, 0643 (Urgent) and 0644) at this time, LL voiced her concerns that the Committee needs to try to avoid being biased one way or another, especially when assigning the percentage probability values. AM outlined that he always attempts to judge his view on the appropriate percentage probability value based on Workgroup discussions and views.

RH pointed out that any new alternate modifications would be added to the report in due course (i.e. 0635A etc.) and that the Panel reporting date for 0636 is highly likely to be extended to March at the forthcoming January Panel meeting. AM then pointed out that an equivalent iGT modification for 0641 is likely to be raised within the next few weeks.

Focusing attention on iGT104, RHi explained that the Schedule 1 reports would be provided to the Performance Assurance Committee (PAC) once approved. She also pointed out that iGT105 mirrors UNC Modification 0637S (and 0422) provisions.

6.2. Xoserve DSC Implementation Plan

Opening, RHi advised that the style of the plan is likely to change for next month to better reflect the similarity between the plan and the change register going forwards.

UK Link Changes Awaiting Scheduling – In Analysis

No changes to the items on page 3 whilst the XRN4361 items on pages 4, 5 and 6 relate to R2 elements. RHi focused attention on the 'Changes Proposed for Removal from the Change Log' on page 6 and outlined its associated change pack communication aspects.

UK Link Changes Awaiting Scheduling – Awaiting Approval

RHi provided a high level summary of page 7 and 8 items, as follows:

- XRN4361 – forms part of R2 involving all file format changes. KD advised that most of the E.ON response comments were provided for the benefit of others, so she is not unduly stressed and is happy with the responses back from Xoserve. RHi explained that there had been multiple industry responses provided which were discussed at the recent DSG meeting which resulted in no adverse comments being raised and which was followed up with a communication to the industry issued last Friday.

  New Action 0105: *Reference XRN4361 Approval -* **Xoserve (RHi) to provide a summation of the industry responses provided, and Xoserve's subsequent response in return.**

  The Committee Representatives unanimously approved the change.

- XRN4368 – no industry responses with RHi also confirming the implementation date as being correct.

  The Committee Representatives unanimously approved the change.

_____

- XRN4361 – RHi confirmed the various change pack communication dates associated with this change. No industry responses involved with RH confirming this was discussed and voted on formally earlier in the meeting.

  The Committee Representatives unanimously approved the change.

- Data Enquiry Service – Permissions Matrix – RHi explained that this would now be published as part of the UK Link Manual. No industry responses.

  The Committee Representatives unanimously approved the change.

- 0634 – Rhi explained that this involves a change to Appendix 5B. No industry responses.

  The Committee Representatives unanimously approved the change.

UK Link Changes Awaiting Scheduling – Awaiting Approval

RHi provided a high level summary of page 9 and 10 items, especially the 'Impacted UK Link User Type' aspects.

UK Link Changes – Implemented since last UK Link Committee Meeting

It was noted that the title should really read as 'UK Link Changes – Implemented since last DSC Change Management Committee Meeting'.

RHi explained that all items formed part of R1.1.

UK Link Changes – Withdrawn / Cancelled

RHi pointed out that the change proposed for 'Options for UKLP CR065 – Correction Factor Application' had been withdrawn.

Forthcoming Outage Notifications

None to report.

6.3. Xoserve Change Register

RH advised that this had already been discussed elsewhere in the meeting.

7. Finance and General Change Budget Update

DT provided an overview of the Budget explaining that other than a £50k allocation of funding for PAC, there are no significant changes involved and the change funding remains within budget at this time.

DT the focused attention on the two yellow highlighted entries at the bottom of page 3 (MXT_1718_01) explaining that the 'Estimated Cost at Completion' value has increased to £420k from the previous £350k (i.e. £70k increase added for this year). In providing that rationale behind the increase, DT advised that (full) evaluation of this would not be undertaken until the ROM has been prepared. DT also pointed out that to date, no formal request for the UIG related modifications ROM has been made even though it is expected that legal text would be provided on Friday 12 January 2018.

New Action 0106: *Reference UNC UIG related modifications (0642 (Urgent) 0642A, 0643 (Urgent) and 0644)* **– Joint Office (RH/MB) to look to formally submit a ROM request in due course.**

8. Review of Outstanding Action(s)

1201: Xoserve (DT/ES/RHi) to look to provide a case study which the Change Management Committee could then examine in order to hopefully identify a 'best practice' which would hopefully improve the provision of high level ROMs going forwards.

_____

Update: RHi explained that consideration remains on going including discussions with S Mullinganie, at which point ES advised that the matter also falls under the informal DSC Governance workgroup. The next meeting of that group had not yet been agreed. AM then reminded everyone that the Governance meeting can only recommend and not approve items. **Carried Forward**

1202: Xoserve (RHi) to provide high level summaries of responses for any Change Proposals issued to consultation, to be published on the January 2018 meeting page.

Update: It was agreed that this action had now been completed. **Closed**

1203: Xoserve (ES) to add a new tab to the 'Proposed Cancellation of Historical Change Requests' documentation before issuing to the industry (via the Change Pack distribution list), requesting views on how best to progress any closures and indications of who would be willing to sponsor any change requests.

Update: It was agreed that this action had now been completed. **Closed**

1204: *Reference XRN4361: Retail & Networks Platform UK Link Release 2 Delivery* – Xoserve (LC) to provide additional supporting background information behind the costs and percentages presented on page 21 of the Change Proposal and add back in the UK Link funded elements.

Update: It was agreed that this action had now been completed. **Closed**

1205: *Reference the Finance and General Change Budget Update Excel Spreadsheet* – Xoserve (MP) to update the spreadsheet with the inclusion of a 'summary key' including new items added and items that have changed since the last review.

Update: It was agreed that this action had now been completed. **Closed**

1206: *Reference the DSC Change Budget – BP18 presentation* – Xoserve (MP) to provide an updated presentation outlining the potential UIG modification impacts and also the various release dates going forwards.

Update: When ES explained that an updated presentation had been issued, it was agreed that this action had now been completed. **Closed**

1207: *Reference PSR: SPAA CP 370A – implementation date and associated file format changes* – Xoserve (TCh) to issue a supporting email (including file format aspects) and table the item for consideration at the forthcoming SDG meeting, with a view to seeking formal approval at the January 2018 meeting.

Update: When ES pointed out that the change had been approved earlier in the meeting, it was agreed that this action had now been completed. **Closed**

9. **Any Other Business**

9.1. **1824 – IM – SN – UK Link Extraordinary Change Pack 15th December 2017**

ES pointed out that this matter had been discussed earlier in the meeting.

9.2. **Xoserve/Gemserv MIS collaboration (API Dashboard)**

It was noted that 'MIS' refers to Market Intelligence Service in this instance.

9.2.1. **Joint MIS Development Group (JMDG) update**

TC provided a very brief overview of the presentation during which she confirmed that a follow up JMDG meeting took place on Monday 08 January 2018.

In reviewing the 'Up and coming' slide, TC enquired whether someone would be willing to attend on behalf of the DSC Change Management Committee – whilst there were no obvious volunteers, KD did advise that she would feed back to her E.ON colleagues.

_____

New Action 0107: *Reference the Joint MIS Development Group* – **Xoserve (TC) to provide additional clarification on the MIS Project costs and links to both the Terms of Reference and the industry open letter.**

New Action 0108: *Reference the Joint MIS Development Group* – **All parties to consider volunteering to attend the Joint MIS Project Board meetings on behalf of the DSC Change Management Committee.**

9.2.2. Dual Fuel Energy Data Service (DFEDS) industry announcement (for PCWs)

When asked, TC agreed to carry over this items to the February 2018 meeting.

9.3. IX Network Partner Update

ES provided a verbal update explaining that an email communication had been issued on 04 January 2018 that outlined the move away from Vodaphone to Gamma for this service provision going forwards.

It is expected that Gamma would be contacting parties in due course in order to facilitate completion of the switch over.

9.4. Formula Year AQ/SOQ Amendment – Defect update

ES explained that an email communication was issued on 21 December 2017 that included an outline of the AQ opening read and incorrect parameter table values related error.

ES advised that a data set examination had revealed circa 65,000 AQs are impacted with a correction for the 01 April 2018 (inc, rolling AQ values) being undertaken. As at the end of December some 12,000 corrections had been completed with the remainder scheduled to be corrected by the end of January 2018. ES pointed out that whilst the rolling AQs are also being (re) calculated, the DSG had agreed that the rolling AQs would only include mandatory file changes.

RP observed that as far as the governance aspects are concerned, if it is deemed to be a 'defect' the DSG makes the necessary decision, whereas if it relates to a 'change' it comes to the DSC Change Management Committee and enquired as to who actually makes the decision. Responding, ES explained that in this instance it was defined as a defect in accordance with the required rules.

Moving on, ES advised that the rolling AQ changes would be included in the forthcoming 01 February 2018 report.

When JR enquired as to what volumes were involved, ES confirmed that this was circa 24 million.

MJ pointed out that the defect potentially 'disjoints' the Formula Year AQ Value and rolling AQ elements that he believes will need discussing elsewhere. When asked, MJ confirmed that he would like this matter adding to the February DSC Change Management Committee agenda on the grounds that it is clearly a material impact. When DT explained that Xoserve has been engaging with impacted parties to resolve the issues, ES reminded everyone that the 'Defect Governance process' is that the industry discussing the problem, approves the appropriate corrective actions and thereafter Xoserve makes the necessary (system) changes, where appropriate.

New Action 0109: *Reference Formula Year AQ/SOQ Amendment – Defect update* – **Xoserve (DT/ES) to look to clarify the Defect Governance Process and the Formula Year AQ/SOQ impacts.**

9.5. IHD SPAA Change, Approval sought for inclusion in R2

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

_____

9.6. **Update on Modification 0630R – Review of the consequential changes required in UNC as a result of the Ofgem Switching Program**

CW provided a brief overview of the presentation during which AM pointed out that the Review Group would welcome more technical and operation personnel involvement. When RP pointed out that there are potential timing and process related considerations, CS suggested that the Workgroup would need to 'tease out' various key items over the coming months and that Xoserve are heavily involved in supporting this Review Group.

New Action 0110: *Reference UNC Modification 0630R Updates* **– Cadent (CW) to provide a summary of the potential topic areas and Review Group discussion items.**

10. **Diary Planning**

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

During a brief discussion it was agreed that the February 2018 DSC Change Management meeting time duration would be extended to 16:00 (i.e. 10:15 through to 16:00).

Meetings will take place as follows:

Time/Date	Venue	Programme
10.15 - 16.00 Wednesday 07 February 2018	Lansdowne Gate, 65 New Road, Solihull B91 3DL	Standard Agenda items, and any other matters arising: Plus *Standing AOB items for updates:* Xoserve/Gemserv MIS Collaboration; API Platform Implementation Paper; Formula Year AQ/SOQ Amendment – Defect update

Action Table (as at 10 January 2018)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
1201	13/12/17	2.2	To look to provide a case study which the Change Management Committee could then examine in order to hopefully identify a 'best practice' which would hopefully improve the provision of high level ROMs going forwards.	Xoserve (DT/ES/RHi)	**Carried Forward**
1202	13/12/17	2.4	To provide high level summaries of responses for any Change Proposals issued to consultation, to be published on the January 2018 meeting page.	Xoserve (RHi)	Update provided **Closed**
1203	13/12/17	4.1	To add a new tab to the 'Proposed Cancellation of Historical Change Requests' documentation before issuing to the industry (via the Change Pack distribution list), requesting views on how best to progress any closures and indications of who would be willing to sponsor any change requests.	Xoserve (ES)	Update provided **Closed**

_____

1204	13/12/17	5.2.1	*Reference XRN4361: Retail & Networks Platform UK Link Release 2 Delivery* – Xoserve (LC) to provide additional supporting background information behind the costs and percentages presented on page 21 of the Change Proposal and add back in the UK Link funded elements.	Xoserve (LC)	Update provided **Closed**
1205	13/12/17	8.0	*Reference the Finance and General Change Budget Update Excel Spreadsheet* – Xoserve (MP) to update the spreadsheet with the inclusion of a 'summary key' including new items added and items that have changed since the last review.	Xoserve (MP)	Update provided **Closed**
1206	13/12/17	8.1	*Reference the DSC Change Budget – BP18 presentation* – Xoserve (MP) to provide an updated presentation outlining the potential UIG modification impacts and also the various release dates going forwards.	Xoserve (MP)	Update provided **Closed**
1207	13/12/17	11.2	*Reference PSR: SPAA CP 370A – implementation date and associated file format changes* – Xoserve (TCh) to issue a supporting email (including file format aspects) and table the item for consideration at the forthcoming SDG meeting, with a view to seeking formal approval at the January 2018 meeting.	Xoserve (TCh)	Update provided **Closed**
0101	10/01/18	4.2	To provide a table outlining the breakdown of what Change Proposals are going into which Release, their status and which communication pack they relate to, for inclusion as a new page in the Dashboard Report.	Xoserve (LC)	**Pending**
0102	10/01/18	5.3.2	To provide a view on what parameters should be established in order to assess the potential magnitude of future changes and their suitability for inclusion within a particular Release.	Xoserve (DT/ES/RHi)	**Pending**
0103	10/01/18	5.3.2	*Reference the DSC DSG meeting* - Xoserve (DT/ES/RHi) to ensure that the supporting information and documentation is provided to the Joint Office for inclusion under the additional DSC Change Management Committee meeting papers.	Xoserve (DT/ES/RHi)	**Pending**
0104	10/01/18	5.3.2	*Reference the R&N delivery schedule forecast view* - Xoserve (DT/ES/RHi) to	Xoserve	**Pending**

_____

			ensure that the R3 supporting documentation is published on the Xoserve.com web site in order to support the DSC DSG and Change Management Committees discussions.	(DT/ES/RHi)	
0105	10/01/18	6.2	*Reference XRN4361 Approval -* Xoserve (RHi) to provide a summation of the industry responses provided, and Xoserve's subsequent response in return.	Xoserve (RHi)	**Pending**
0106	10/01/18	7.	*Reference UNC UIG related modifications (0642 (Urgent) 0642A, 0643 (Urgent) and 0644)* – Joint Office (RH/MB) to look to formally submit a ROM request in due course.	Joint Office (RH/MB)	**Pending**
0107	10/01/18	9.2.1	*Reference the Joint MIS Development Group* – Xoserve (TC) to provide additional clarification on the MIS Project costs and links to both the Terms of Reference and the industry open letter.	Xoserve (TC)	**Pending**
0108	10/01/18	9.2.1	*Reference the Joint MIS Development Group* – All parties to consider volunteering to attend the Joint MIS Project Board meetings on behalf of the DSC Change Management Committee.	All	**Pending**
0109	10/01/18	9.4	*Reference Formula Year AQ/SOQ Amendment – Defect update* – Xoserve (DT/ES) to look to clarify the Defect Governance Process and the Formula Year AQ/SOQ impacts.	Xoserve (DT/ES)	**Pending**
0110	10/01/18	9.6	*Reference UNC Modification 0630R Updates* – Cadent (CW) to provide a summary of the potential topic areas and Review Group discussion items.	Cadent (CW)	**Pending**