

UNC DSC Contract Management Committee Minutes
Wednesday 17 November 2021
via Teleconference

Attendees			
Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office	Non-Voting
Karen Visgarda (Secretary)	(KV)	Joint Office	Non-Voting
Shipper User Representatives (Voting)			
Oorlagh Chapman	(OC)	Centrica	Class A Voting + Class C
Clare Louise Roberts (Alternate for Phillipa Burton)	(CLR)	ScottishPower	Class A Voting
Rebecca Greer	(RG)	Corona Energy	Class B
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	Gazprom Energy	Class C Voting + Class C
Transporter Representatives (Voting)			
Helen Chandler	(HC)	Northern Gas Networks	DNO Voting
Sally Hardman	(SHa)	SGN	DNO Voting
Andrea Godden	(AG)	National Grid	NTS Voting
Richard Loukes	(RL)	National Grid	NTS Voting
Brandon Rodrigues (Alternate for Kundai Matiringe)	(BR)	IGT Representative	IGT Voting
CDSP Contract Management Representatives (Non-Voting)			
Jayne McGlone	(JMc)	Xoserve	
Dave Addison	(DA)	Xoserve	
Observers/Presenters (Non-Voting)			
Angela Clarke	(AC)	Xoserve	
Clare Manning	(CM)	E.ON	
Dave Turpin	(DT)	Xoserve	
Ellie Rogers	(ER)	Xoserve	
Emma Haxton	(EH)	Bulb	
Emma Smith	(ES)	Xoserve	
James Rigby	(JR)	Xoserve	
Joanne Williams	(JW)	Xoserve	
Linda Whitcroft	(LW)	Correla	
Mark Pollard	(MP)	Correla	
Richard Pomroy	(RP)	Wales & West Utilities	
Simon Harris	(SH)	Xoserve	
Steve M Deery	(SD)	Correla	
Copies of all papers are available at: https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/dsc-contract/171121			

1. Introduction

Bob Fletcher (BF) welcomed all to the meeting, confirming the meeting to be quorate.

1.1. Apologies for absence

Phillipa Burton
Kundai Matiringe

1.2. Alternates

Brandon Rodrigues for Kundai Matiringe IGT Representative
Claire Louise Roberts for Phillipa Burton Shipper Representative

1.3. Confirm Voting rights

BF explained that the voting rights had been discussed in the previous meeting and under the UNC rules, where a constituency does not have votes allocated, as in this case Class C, this will be allocated and agreed with the remaining Shipper Constituents. This was confirmed at the last meeting as detailed below:

Oorlagh Chapman (OC) would take the Shipper Class C vote for the continuing period of the term.

Steve Mulinganie (SM) would take the Shipper Class C vote for the continuing period of the term.

Representative	Classification	Vote Count
Shipper		
Oorlagh Chapman	Shipper Class A + Class C	2 votes
Claire Louise Roberts (Alternate for Phillipa Burton)	Shipper Class A	1 vote
Rebecca Greer	Shipper Class B	1 vote
Steve Mulinganie	Shipper Class B + Class C	2 votes
Transporter		
Helen Chandler	DNO	1 vote
Sally Hardman	DNO	1 vote
Andrea Godden	NTS	1 vote
Richard Loukes	NTS	1 vote
Brandon Rodrigues (Alternate for Kundai Matiringe)	IGT	2 votes

1.4. Approval of Minutes (20 October 2021)

The minutes from the 20 October 2021 meeting were approved.

1.5. Approval of Late Papers

Two papers had been provided after the publication deadline. These had been pre-advised and were approved.

1.6. Review of Outstanding Actions

There were no outstanding actions.

2. Approvals

2.1. CMS Rebuild Options

Joanne Williams (JW) provided a summary of the Options for CMS as detailed below:

Option 1 – Platform as a Service

Xoserve propose to take a subscription with Correla who will provide the up-front investment in the development of a product that delivers the same scope of requirements as Option 2 and as identified in customer workshops. The subscription also provides for an identified capacity for modest enhancements under the annual subscription cost.

This delivery will follow an ‘agile’ methodology and the product will be developed and iterated upon through sprints with a high level of customer input and feedback, including customer testing, allowing the solution to be adapted to provide the best outcome for customers.

Option 2 – DSC Project

A standard DSC initiated Xoserve project will be undertaken to deliver the chosen solution architecture working alongside a delivery partner. This route will require DSC customers to fully fund the development and subsequent operate costs for the solution thereafter.

This option will be baselined at the end of design with any required change going through a change management process.

Option 3 – Do Nothing

This option is not recommended as the current CMS System is out of support and the longer it remains out of support the greater the risk of a catastrophic failure. This option would also restrict the number of improvements that are required to multiple processes that are currently in CMS and are a frequent pain point across the customer users.

JW provided the following overview of the recommended Option 1, as detailed below:

- *Throughout the build lifecycle there can be close collaboration to agree the priority and scope of releases and the requirements within them, providing high visibility and supporting adjustment of the features and design as the product development progresses. Further elaboration of processes can occur concurrently as required ensuring the configuration of the processes in the new tool is as up to date as it can be at release point. A user interface will be created with customers and will have a dedicated UI/UX team to build this collaboratively during the CMS workflow tool creation.*
- *In addition, the core tool UI/UX will continue to evolve over time after initial release with functionality added through ongoing releases based on requests for change (at an agreed level) all as part of the subscription cost.*
- *However, any subsequent, larger industry wide or customer specific changes requiring integration, customer specific reporting or changes in support of UK Link Major Releases can be accommodated through a funded Change Request.*
- *Xoserve are proposing 100 FTE days of change per annum but with a limit on how many days can be called off each time to enable small enhancements to be delivered. It is intended that the subscription shall continue with Xoserve and feed Xoserve’s systems regardless of who were to operate the DSC+.*
- *Once all required processes have been implemented, decommissioning of the current CMS solution will take place.*

JW explained the below table captured the differences for both options as a comparison:

Activity	Option 1 - Platform as a Service	Option 2 – Traditional DSC
Flexibility to adapt design during development cycle	Yes – small enhancements/improved UI throughout build phase	No. Requirements baselined at detailed design
Scope changes/new requirements during development lifecycle	Can be swapped in exchange for other functionality in the backlog equal in size, funded directly, or funded through adjusted subscription	Funded by customers through Change Requests
Technology maintenance	Subscription costs include cost of operation and technical upgrades e.g. for out of support components	Run costs include only the cost of operation and excludes technical upgrades e.g. for out of support components
Minor Changes & Enhancements post go live	Minor enhancements, small level of change included in subscription price	All change would require customer funding

Steve Mulinganie (SM) said that from a step change perspective there should not be any further changes in relation to Option 1. Dave Turpin (DT) said that this was not envisaged and that there would be any come back to fund a future step change as that would be the responsibility of the service provider.

Sally Hardman (SHa) questioned the 100 days per annum that had been built into Option 1 and asked if any minor changes would be included in the subscription fee? SHa added, would the subscription fee be fixed for the duration of the 5 years, or increased over this duration, if there was a need to re-platform. DT confirmed there would be no change in the subscription costs, however if a wholesale change was required, then that should be managed via the normal Change Control process, which may result in a higher subscription price. Oorlagh Chapman (OC) said that presently there were many expectations on the theories and there was nothing concrete in writing and that she was not comfortable with this aspect of the proposals.

DT said he appreciated her thoughts, but he had to put one of the models into the budget. SM concurred with OC comments and said that from the costing perspective, there needed to be a degree of certainty regarding the subscription. SM said he would like the subscription to be capped or a commitment that the £1.7million was the maximum in relation to the level of risk, especially regarding the number of days support for at the subscription based on the previous information and that a change of circumstance could increase the number of support days available. DT said once the design phase had been confirmed then the subscription might reduce, and he would confirm this detail in due course. Richard Pomroy (RP) commented that there may be changes required to CMS to support Decarbonisation and so he would challenge the thought process that no changes would be needed in the short term.

Linda Whitcroft (LW) explained that both options were at risk of change and that she could not confirm that all changes would be absorbed by the subscription cost and therefore she was unable to commit to say that any changes that happened in the future, would not have any impacts on the subscription or capital costs. SM said in respect of the 100 days, was this time period too long or too short and that the industry would be expecting stability in the CMS, hence he was questioning the overall time period for allowed development/fixing. LW said that the 100 days was to accommodate minor changes if required. DT advised the 100 days would give the opportunity to address any required tweaks and so no further funding would have to be requested via the DSC Change Budget, however this would not cover any fundamental changes to the system driven by changes to requirements.

SM added that the 100 days was represented in the £1.5 million subscription and would 10 days be sufficient for slight changes – he was unsure if the 100 days support constituted a material number in the subscription fee or if it was a de minimis element. Helen Chandler (HC) wanted to query the management system from the CMS and DDP perspective and she wanted to know the specification of the CMS. SM agreed and said that from a capital expenditure aspect, the 100 days equated to less than £50k in the subscription. Dave Turpin (DT) advised it would be less than that but agreed it would be De minimis. SM said he presumed this would be the route for capital expenditure, and that he did not need to understand the specifications in detail, he did however need to understand where the costs lie across the two platforms DPP or CMS. Emma Smith (ES) noted that Xoserve would always offer viable options that would include CMS and there would always be customer option as to what to choose for change (DDP, CMs, UK Link).

A general discussion took place regarding the fit for purpose of the CMS and the assurances required that it would be built properly and flexible enough to manage the needs of the industry going forward. SM added that the industry had the choice if they still wanted Xoserve to build the system and that the DSC could evoke the change and investigate a third-party option, if they were not comfortable with the assurances put forward for Option 1 and Option 2, from a customer obligation perspective.

LW advised it would be a workflow platform that would pull MI from the best source, i.e., the DDP, and noted it would be generic enough to pick up from various sources. She reiterated that Xoserve had conducted over 50 work flows with the customers on the requirements. JW concurred with this comment and added that the feasibility and detailed design aspects were captured and included.

SHa said from a design cycle flexibility aspect, at what point in Option 1, would the design move from an agile status. JW said this would be in the first delivery phase, LW added that as they moved through the cycle development this would be communicated with the customers. SHa asked why in Option 2, this could not be delivered until 2023/2024.

DT confirmed that the implementation for both options would be different as Option 1, would be via drops, but Option 2 would be a 'big bang' approach so finalised at the same time, however implementation would likely be the same overall duration. LW added that Xoserve were wanting to have minimal impact on customers and the changes would be forwarded to the new portal and that users would be guided to this whilst the old one was still live, to reduce the impact. SM said it had to be as pain free as possible.

Orlagh Chapman (OC) said that these types of assurances needed to be documented together with the principles. SM concurred with this comment and said a Board Statement was required to ensure commercial certainty. SM, OC, CLR and SHa noted that the request for approval was very premature, as there was no documentation as to why Option 1 was better than Option 2.

The DSC Committee advised they would be deferring approval until a Statement had been submitted, so the vote was deferred.

SM asked what the decision time was from a voting perspective and could an extraordinary meeting be arranged at a later date. DT said the decision was needed before the next draft of BP22 is published. SM advised that he was looking for a fair proportion of the costs, and he did not understand the 45% allocated to the Distribution Networks and he wanted to know on what basis this proportion had been made, as he felt it should be based on those that benefit the most. DT said he was investigating the logic for this split and he was looking into this area to understand the robust reason for this.

DT provided a summary of the CMS Rebuild Associated Costs schematic as detailed below. He advised the investment proposed the CMS split was 50/50% for Transporters and Shippers and run costs of 90/10% for the Shippers and DNOs. A general discussion took place regarding the split and who benefits from CMS. SM questioned the 50/45/5% split and said the split needed to be fair. DT said the split was in association of the usage matrix and that may not be the best way and that the split had been set looking at last years' BP process.

DT provided an overview of the CMS Rebuild Associated Costs as detailed below:

CMS Rebuild Associated Costs

Investment Funding Options							
Option 1 - Platform as a Service (£m 2021/22 Prices)	Spend Category	Year 1 2022/23	Year 2 2023/24	Year 3 2024/25	Year 4 2025/26	Year 5 2026/27	Total
Subscription	MTB	0.6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6.6
Savings from decommissioning old CMS	MTB			0.4	0.4	0.4	1.2
Total		0.6	1.5	1.1	1.1	1.1	5.4
Option 2- DSC Project Delivery (£m 2021/22 Prices)	Spend Category	Year 1 2022/23	Year 2 2023/24	Year 3 2024/25	Year 4 2025/26	Year 5 2026/27	Total
Build & Programme Costs	Investment	2.8	1.3				4.1
New CMS Run Costs	MTB		0.6	1.2	1.2	1.2	4.2
Savings from decommissioning old CMS	MTB			0.4	0.4	0.4	1.2
Total		2.8	1.9	0.8	0.8	0.8	7.1
INVESTMENT FUNDING SPLIT %	NTS	GDNs	iGTS	Shippers			
BP21 (2021/22)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
BP22 Option 1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
BP22 Option 2 *	0%	45%	5%	50%			

• Note – BP22 Funding split for Option 2 is assumed to follow the same split as the CMS investment line in BP22.
 • Note – the above costs do not imply that the preferred option will take longer to deliver, the difference is that with agile the milestones are not set in stone and can be flexed to support the right outcome, so it will be agreed with customers to deliver the right outcome at the right time, understanding that customers want to see benefit as soon as possible and Correlia are incentivised to deliver benefit asap in order to commence subscription charges.

For a detailed update, please refer to the published slides on the meeting page.

3. Approvals Business Plan Update

3.1. BP22 Update

DT advised the second draft version of the BP22 had been circulated and explained the closing date for comments was Friday 19 November 2021.

He advised that National Grid had now been removed from the split of the REC Change Budget and from the DDP funding split as neither of these are relevant to National Grid.

DT confirmed there was a Question-and-Answer document on the Xoserve website.

DT reiterated that all feedback relating to BP22 was welcomed and that to contact him directly: Dave Turpin dave.turpin@xoserve.com

The Draft Business Plan can be viewed at: <https://www.xoserve.com/news/we-ve-published-our-2022-draft-business-plan/>.

Formal rest break taken for 15 minutes.

4. Retail Energy Code (REC) Update

Jayne McGlone (JMc) provided an overview of the presentation which included a summary of the planned meetings, key milestones, and key dates for the Ofgem Consultation, and she focused on the next steps, as detailed below:

Next Steps

- DSC CP has been raised (XRN5352 – Development of the REC Performance Assurance reporting)
- CP raised to cover support costs to:
 - Perform analysis,
 - Verify accessibility of data
 - Generate sample reports (and redact / pseudonymise data until UNC / IGT UNC Mods approved)

- *Continue to develop final RPA reporting*
- *First set of reports to be issued in November 2021*
- *Discussions to be held with RECCo ahead of GES contract negotiations:*
- *DSC Customer access to gas enquiry services – provide verbal update following Ofgem conversations*
- *Scope of GES - verbal update following RECCo discussions to determine the scope of the Gas Enquiry Services RECCo will provide and the scope of the services Xoserve will provide to RECCo as the GES Provider.*
- *Consequential changes required to SDT as a result of V2 go live approved at October CoMC*
- *Xoserve to assess changes that will be required to the DSC at V3 go live*
- *Commence work to remove M Number Data File at V3 go live.*

JMc said she wanted to gain clarity on the definition of portfolio view and community view, so that it can be made clear to Ofgem what data should be accessed by DSC parties via the DSC. She advised that any data passed to the DSC under the requirement of the Uniform Network Code (UNC) there should be an option for DSC parties to access this.

JMc advised that a Change Request (CR) was being raised to look at providing a further service, a lite enquiry service. She added that investigations were taking place as to the feasibility of standing up a more tailored service from a user case based service which would be a simple front end powered by APIs. JMc confirmed this CR would be discussed and visible at next ChMC meeting (December 2021).

SM said that this needed to mirror the existing service and added that ideally, he would like a Shipper Enquiry Service in order to adhere to the UNC obligations, together with a Gas Enquiry Service to REC. Dave Addison said the Shippers were entitled to access the same data as today and it was about how best to provide this data.

JMc said she was investigating and assessing the changes that would be required to the DSC as a result of CSS go live. JMc advised that Ofgem has given directed the M Number DVD will no longer be a service that can be offered post CSS go live. This direction was part of REC V2 consultation. JMc wanted to notify CoMC that a change will be made in due course to remove the service line relating to the M Number DVD, from the DSC Service Description Table and asked if this would cause concern for any DSC parties.

A general discussion took place in relation to whether it would be available as a Shipper and not a Supplier. JMc confirmed that currently the information was sent out via a DVD, and it contained the data for around twenty-five million sites. JMc said the intention was to remove it in time for v2 but was deferred to v3 go live.

The DSC CoMC were all in agreement with the update on Change Management Assessments slide, so it was confirmed it would be included in future meetings.

SCR Impacts to UNC

Dave Addison (DA) provided a high-level overview of the associated impacts to the UNC, as detailed below:

- *SCR – Code Consolidation REC V2 (Sept 2021)*
 - *Amendments to UNC to align with REC (B;G;M; GT-D)*
 - *Modification submitted by Ofgem for presentation at Modification Panel on 20 May 2021 / IGT Panel 28 May 2021*
 - *Notice to implement Mod768 issued 2 July 2021*
 - *Implementation to take effect 01 Sept 2021*
- *SCR – Faster Switching REC V3 (summer 2022)*
 - *Queried consequential changes published – awaiting further update*

- *Xoserve have been asked by Ofgem to describe the changes at DWG and RDUG, we expect that Ofgem will publish the revised text 'for consultation' via RDUG*
 - *Xoserve presented at DWG – no issues arising*
 - *Xoserve plan to provide the same update to IGT WG on 11/11/21*
 - *Scheduled for discussion on 11/11/21 at RDUG*
- *Xoserve are not seeking to amend from the version produced and provided to Ofgem in March 2021*
 - *Potential change to GT-D*
 - *Some numbering clarifications*

DA noted that Modification 0784 – *Transition to the Central Switching Service and the Retail Energy Code v3.0* would be further discussed at the Distribution Workgroup in December 2021.

5. Class 1 Read Service

5.1. Procurement Exercise – Modification 0710

Ellie Rogers (ER) provided a further update and advised that Xoserve had sent a Request for Information (RFI), and parties were now responding to this.

ER advised the Request for Proposal (RFP) would be issued in January 2022 and the CoMC would be updated after this had taken place. ER said that at the next meeting she would be providing an overview of the Stakeholder Evaluation Panel Terms of Reference, and that the Stakeholder Evaluation Panel would be made up of different customer groups, to review the proposals.

Clare Manning (CM) wanted to know where to view the RFI. ER advised that it had been sent out via a Procurement Platform that can be found at the following link:

<https://www.find-tender.service.gov.uk/Notice/025268-2021>

6. Monthly Contract Management Report

6.1. KPM Update

Not discussed – deferred to the December meeting

6.2. KPM – Customer Relationship Survey Results (Q1)

Not discussed – deferred to the December meeting.

6.3. Contract Metrics

Paper published for information. No discussions held, deferred to the December meeting.

6.4. Xoserve Incident Summary

Not discussed – deferred to the December meeting.

For a detailed update, please refer to the published slides on the meeting page.

6.5. UK Link Flow PIR

Not discussed – deferred to the December meeting.

For a detailed update, please refer to the published slides on the meeting page.

6.6. Issue Management Updates

Not discussed – deferred to the December meeting.

For a detailed update, please refer to the published slides on the meeting page.

7. Central Switching Service (CSS) Update

Not discussed – deferred to the December meeting.

For a detailed update, please refer to the published slides on the meeting page

8. Information Security Update

Confidential paper circulated for information. No discussions held.

9. Financial Information

Paper provided for information. Deferred until December.

10. Business Continuity Plan

Paper provided for information. No discussions held.

11. Contract Assurance Audit

Paper provided for information. No discussions held.

12. Key Committee Updates

12.1. DSC Change Management Committee

Paper provided for information.

SM said he wanted more information on the change of implementation date for the November 21 Release, as he understood it had now been deferred until January 2022, which was not ideal at all, especially due to the SoLR activity presently taking place across the industry – he was concerned if this was the role of the DSC Change Management Committee. James Rigby (JR) agreed to provide an update to SM offline.

For a detailed update, please refer to the published slides on the meeting page

13. Any Other Business

13.1. Ofgem Green Levy API

Mark Pollard (MP) provided an overview summary to the Request and said that he would be happy to share more information if required.

Overview

To meet legally binding emissions reduction targets it is necessary to move away from using fossil fuels to heat buildings. Biomethane injection into the gas grid accelerates the decarbonisation of gas supplies, by increasing the proportion of green gas in the grid. This transition is a necessary step towards meeting carbon reduction targets, including the UK's net zero greenhouse gas emissions target.

To fund this transition it is proposed to impose a Green Gas Levy (GGL) on gas suppliers, to support biomethane production through the Green Gas Support Scheme (GGSS).

To support the implementation of the GGL Ofgem has requested aggregated MPRN and supplier data via a gas data API.

Solution

The API service will allow Ofgem to query gas data for all Suppliers within a date range.

The API will provide Ofgem with the Supplier name, short code, and the daily count of MPRNs for that Supplier within the date range.

Ofgem have requested for the service to be made available by February 2022, dependant on the legislation being approved.

13.2. ICoSS – DDC Invoicing Process

SM said at the most recent ICoSS meeting there was some confusion relating to the DDC invoicing process, as no communication had been issued to the Contract Managers.

DA explained that Paul Orsler (PO) would get some information out in the next week and would ensure a copy was sent to Gareth Evans (GE) for the next ICoSS meeting and he would also contact SM directly to discuss this matter.

13.3. API Migration Project

OC advised that there had been various issues regarding the recent API platforming, as there had been no formal communications about the project, and no formal governance had been followed.

Simon Harris (SH) said that it had been through the IA and that there were no impacts flagged from a customer facing perspective. OC said that it should be up to the DSC to determine if there were any impacts to the industry, not Xoserve and that she wanted the appropriate governance to be followed in the future. SH he would investigate this matter further.

14. Recap of decisions made during meeting

Angela Clarke (AC) provided verbal overview of the decisions made during the meeting and all agreed with her summary and next steps.

15. Diary Planning

Further details of planned meetings are available at: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/events-calendar/month

Time/Date	Venue	Programme
09.30 Wednesday 15 December 2021	Microsoft Teams	Standard Agenda

Action Table (as of 17 November 2021)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Target Date	Status Update
	17/11/21		<i>There were no new actions</i>			