

**UNC DSC Change Management Committee Minutes
Extraordinary Meeting Friday 16 June 2023
Via Microsoft Teams**

Attendees			
Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office	Non-Voting
Ben Mulcahy (Secretary)	(BM)	Joint Office	Non-Voting
Shipper User Representatives (Voting)			
Claire Louise Roberts	(CLR)	Scottish Power	Class A
Oorlagh Chapman	(OC)	Centrica	Class A & Class C
Ross Easton	(RE)	Total Energies	Class B
Lisa Saycell	(LS)	SEFE Energy	Class B & Class C
Transporter Representatives (Voting)			
Michelle Brown + for Kundai Matiringe	(MB)	Energy Assets	IGT Voting
CDSP Change Management Representatives (Non-Voting)			
Emma Smith	(ES)	Xoserve	
Observers/Presenters (Non-Voting)			
David Addison	(DA)	Xoserve	
James Barlow	(JB)	Xoserve	
Joanne Williams	(JWi)	Xoserve	
Kate Lancaster	(KL)	Xoserve	
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE	
Molly Haley	(MH)	Xoserve	
Peter Hopkins	(PH)	Xoserve	
Rachel Taggart	(RT)	Xoserve	
Rob Westwood	(RW)	Xoserve	
Sally Hardman	(SH)	SGN	
Simon Harris	(SH)	Xoserve	
Salma Khan	(SK)	Xoserve	
Apologies			
Kundai Matiringe	(KM)	BUUK	
<p><i>DSC Change Management meetings will be quorate where: Committee Representatives of at least two (2) shall be Shipper Representatives and three (3) shall be DNO Representatives, NTS Representatives or IGT Representatives, are present at a meeting who can exercise six (6) votes.</i></p> <p><i>Please note these minutes do not replicate/include detailed content provided within the presentation slides, therefore it is recommended that the published presentation material is reviewed in conjunction with these minutes. Copies of all papers are available at: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/dsc-change/160623</i></p>			

1. Introduction

Bob Fletcher (BF) welcomed all parties to the meeting and explained that as this was an Extraordinary DSC Change Management Committee meeting with an agenda restricted to items impacting only Shipper and IGT members. The standard quoracy requirements did not need to be met unless any party from another other constituency declared a wider impact upon which point the meeting would discontinue and a full DSC Change Management Committee would instead be convened to discuss the item. No such statements were made,

1.1. Apologies for absence

Kundai Matiringe, IGT Representative

1.2. Alternates

Michelle Brown for Kundai Matiringe

1.3. Confirm Voting rights

The voting rights were confirmed as below:

Representative	Classification	Vote Count
Shipper		
Claire Louise Roberts	Shipper Class A	1 vote
Oorlagh Chapman	Shipper Class A & C	2 votes
Ross Easton	Shipper Class B	1 vote
Lisa Saycell	Shipper Class B & C	2 votes
Transporter		
Michelle Brown + Alternate for Kundai Matiringe	IGT	2 votes

2. XRN5605 Amendments to the must read process (IGT159V) – Solution Review Extraordinary Change Pack

James Barlow (JB) talked through this Change, giving an overview, and highlighting that it included a must-read flag function to ensure meters are excluded from the must read process, whilst there is a known issue on site. In reviewing the presentation provided JB expressed concern over the accuracy of the Representation Summary totals as the figures given did not match his expectations (which he stated was 4 Representation supporting Solution Option 1b and 1 Representation that rejected all.) There was some discussion of this amongst CDSP Representatives, and BF asked that all Committee members be clear that the representation numbers onscreen were not correct and should not be considered when making any subsequent vote.

The presentation can be viewed at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/dsc-change/160623>.

As the discussion moved on to the Change itself, Lisa Saycell (LS) asked that because Solution Option 1b had a reliance on DDP, was there an intention to review how support can be provided to the larger Shippers that were encountering issues with DDP.

Emma Smith (ES) responded by proposing that whilst DDP worked for smaller Shippers, Business Warehouse (BW) reporting could be used for the larger Shippers, enabling the CDSP to progress with the design, committing to provide emailed reports with data from BW.

Oorlagh Chapman (OC) thanked LS for raising the issue and voiced her concern that this alternative process recognises that DDP is not fit for use as is for larger Shippers or anyone with a large portfolio and has significant issues that Centrica has raised in multiple forums and meetings. DDP not being fit for purpose is an issue for them as a paying customer, and the industry is being directed towards using the platform within more developments. She expressed frustration that they had raised this concern for a long time and that a decent baseline product still does not exist, stating that this needs to be a necessity. She advised that the CDSP has been shown DDP screens with rejection messages or hung for long periods of time. She added that she appreciated that the CDSP was providing an alternative resource for this Change that is workable but noted that this did not get away from the fact that DDP is currently not fit for use and no other Changes should be linked to its use.

Ross Easton (RE) asked if using the Information Exchange (IX) was an option for this Change that was going to be reviewed.

OC observed that she believed she was the only one that supported the IX option and did not want to cause others to use solutions they were not happy to do. She suggested that this Change is delivered for November as desired and that, whilst the IX route is preferable for Centrica because of DDP, she noted others do not have that problem, provided there are alternative resources available for reporting then it seemed workable. She added that her comments about DDP being an inadequate platform stand though and asked that the CDSP stop any further add-ons to DDP before the baseline is improved sufficiently to make it fit for purpose as the current situation did not seem fair.

Clare Louise Roberts (CLR) echoed OC's view and advised that Scottish Power are experiencing the same pain points, explaining that they were regularly asking the CDSP to run queries from the back of the DDP as they were unable to obtain data even when requesting volumes of less than half the stated 500k cap.

ES shared that she has had conversations with Paul Osler (PO) about DDP and stated that when it was first mooted, and investments subsequently made, it was only intended as a visualisation tool. The subsequent realisation is that it now needs to be able to do more as it crossed a boundary as to what it was originally supposed to be and is being used in other developments. She advised that there was currently lots of discussion between Xoserve and Corella about re-platforming DDP to provide a better capacity to download and provide data, and they are looking to talk to large customers about how to get the required baseline. She committed to talking directly with OC and CLR and stated that she absolutely heard their concerns, commenting that until it is right and meeting requirements further dependencies or add-ons should not be introduced to DDP.

OC responded that Centrica had been discussing these issues with Alison Jennings back in October 2022 and reaffirmed that they cannot support any further developments until DDP is in a fit state. She advised that they had meetings and agreed to action plans, but nothing had happened, stating that it was really frustrating not to be listened to.

CLR expressed surprise to hear DDP described as a visual tool, as her perception was that it was always presented as a reporting tool that parties can use to self-serve and use to drill down into their datasets.

ES reaffirmed her intention to be accountable for making progress on the issue, to which CLR offered her and OC's assistance.

BF asked for confirmation if this was to be an action allocated to the DSC Contract Management Committee, and as such was not a formal DSC Change Management Committee action, though it needed to have one here to link with the DSC Contract Management Committee.

New DSC Contract Action 0601: CDSP (ES) to collate Recognised DPP Pain Points through initial discussions with OC and CLR with a view to setting objectives to achieve the required DDP baseline for parties with larger portfolios.

BF asked if the Committee was now clear on the proposed vote for XRN5605, noting that most seemed supportive of Solution Option 1b, but that concerns had been raised about DDP.

ES confirmed this, stating to the Committee that Solution Option 1b will now include additional reporting that will be made available to parties that have issues with DDP. JB verified this, stating that this requirement would be added to the design with these minutes forming part of the Change Pack.

Accordingly, the Committee was requested to approve a Solution Option for XRN5605, with unanimous approval recorded as follows:

Voting Outcome:		
Shipper Representatives	Voting Count	For/Against
Claire Louise Roberts	1	For Solution Option 1b
Oorlagh Chapman	2	For Solution Option 1b
Ross Easton	1	For Solution Option 1b
Lisa Saycell	2	For Solution Option 1b
Total	6 Votes	For Solution Option 1b
Transporter Representatives	Voting Count	For/Against
Michelle Brown (IGT)	2	For Solution Option 1b
Total	2 Votes	For Solution Option 1b

The Committee was then requested to approve the proposed funding split for XRN5605 (90% Shipper and 10% IGT), with unanimous approval recorded as follows:

Voting Outcome:		
Shipper Representatives	Voting Count	For/Against
Claire Louise Roberts	1	For
Oorlagh Chapman	2	For
Ross Easton	1	For
Lisa Saycell	2	For
Total	6 Votes	For
Transporter Representatives	Voting Count	For/Against
Michelle Brown (IGT)	2	For
Total	2 Votes	For

3. Revised BER for XRN5567 Implementation of Resend Functionality for Messages from CSS to GRDA (REC CP R0067)

BF requested confirmation that Committee members were to see a late presentation as there was not yet a BER available to enable a vote on this item.

David Addison (DA) confirmed this was the case and that he had a presentation to show that had not been shared with the Joint Office in sufficient time for its publication ahead of the meeting. The intention of the presentation was to make sure DSC parties were aware of the current position, with the CDSP having provided an Impact Assessment to the REC, so he wanted to ensure that the DSC parties that were going to pay for the solution were satisfied with it. He explained that the design had changed and that he thought it useful that DSC parties are on board with the new approach the CDSP has taken as it is very different to the previous approach, thus making sure there are no fundamental objections. It was on this basis he wished to give the presentation to the Committee.

BF asked if Committee members had any objections to viewing the late presentation. There were none and DA subsequently talked the committee through his slides.

The presentation and specific slides can be viewed at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/dsc-change/160623>.

In Slide 2 DA gave a summary of the current situation and where the CDSP is at with the BER, explaining how urgent approval was needed at the June DSC Change Management Committee meeting to keep the integrated R0067 plan on track. DA emphasised that integration was the key element, with the Impact Assessment (IA) indicating development time was longer than given in the original. It had been aspirational that the analysis and internal design would be done before the 18 September test phase with the CSS but DA explained that planning is now being conducted on the basis that this cannot be achieved.

DA continued that to maintain an implementation date in December 2023 R0067 needed a different approach. If this is not achieved the unconfirmed expectation is that Market-wide Half-Hourly Settlement (MHSS) would push back R0067 until a late 2024 delivery.

LS asked if this commentary about not being able to deliver until late 2024 means that a REC-related code freeze is anticipated because of MHSS.

DA replied that was a possible interpretation, sharing that he had experienced in the planning calls he had attended there were numerous Landmark and DCC representatives who gave the impression that their environments seem to be very focused on MHSS and he had the sense that either CSS or DCC had challenges with their environments. LS acknowledged the response and stated that SEFE would ask some questions in the REC sphere.

Slide 3 was explained by DA to feature deliberately small text to enable the overall plan produced by the Code Manager to be visible, with the red vertical line showing the current date. The blue horizontal lines are Xoserve activities and DA highlighted it was important for the Committee to note that, as per this integrated plan, Xoserve would have done activities to date that would have been approved by DSC Committee members, yet, he stated, it felt wrong to start spending funds before the revised Change had been approved.

He observed that for the Integration test planned in September, there is a long 'CSS tail' between exit and integration testing for promotion of the tested code through environments to implementation in REC. He advised that Xoserve do not need to have that time so are proposing to shift planning back to the right. DA committed to talking about this in more detail at a later date but summarised that by dropping integration testing with CSS Xoserve can start later and thus does not need to push for urgent BER approval today.

In Slide 4 DA reviewed Xoserve's latest view of the GRDA plan, stating that there had been lots of activity to get to a position to review the state of play in this meeting. He advised there was insufficient time to get end-to-end (e2e) testing, so had met with CSS/DCC to detail the revised plan. DA shared that the REC Code Manger discussion had a multitude of CSS/DCC parties on the call as they tried to brainstorm alternate approaches, stating that the only 'Plan B' alternative that was found was to omit conducting the e2e testing, which was the only formal touch point. By omitting this step Xoserve can progress plans independently and will not start doing so until there is a baseline plan from the CSS which, he stated, was expected in the following week when Xoserve will review and feedback.

DA advised that it was important to note that the proposed approach is not without risk, but that he was of the view that Xoserve can mitigate this, with Slide 5 detailing all the caveats that they sent to the Retail Energy Code Manager Technical Services (RTS).

Because removing e2e puts a greater focus on CSS testing, DA stated that Xoserve expected this work to be performed in a collaborative manner and wanted to see outcomes planning for both unexpected and happy paths. He advised that they are also planning to use the RTS as arbitrator if it should prove required, stating that he had a good impression of the RTS as having a pragmatic approach and thus was hopeful that they would provide outcomes that Xoserve could ultimately accept.

DA also shared that they were expecting simulators to be updated so that they can conduct testing against revised code as he was mindful that everything was being promoted in their process loops so when Xoserve added any issue it may need to be addressed in production fixes. He also noted that RTS activities are to be completed in Week 18. Meaning that they can be as lean as they are able and thus would not need an extended plan to provide technical assurance.

In Slide 6 DA proposed that a risk margin is explicitly stated in the cost submitted for approval of 10%. He stated that if Xoserve look to later draw on that fund they will need to be clear on the basis on which they are drawing, and it would need to be a fundamental change in the design which would necessitate an explanation to customers detailing what was happening.

DA moved on to review the changes to the BER, stating that the costs shared of the previous quoted Development Cost was £73k, whereas now the revised Development Cost is between £149k and £173k, to which adding the proposed explicit risk cost of 10% takes the total to circa £190k.

DA acknowledged that the most obvious question would be why this Change has altered so materially. He explained that the original design was built within one of Xoserve’s environments using resources from their CSS programme early life team that were under-utilised due to how successful the CSS programme proved. However, in the plan received UPIS also get to receive responses back, meaning that they are effectively starting over.

DA then asked for a view as to whether Committee members were happy for the CDSP to keep going and noted that there were no objections to this course of action.

He then shared that he was expecting to get sufficient time to get a request for approval in the July DSC Change Management Committee meeting and was hopeful that the new BER will be available so that Xoserve can initiate this promptly after the July meeting. He warned that it would be highly problematic if the current planning changes and Xoserve are forced to start earlier. He committed to coming back to members should this be the case but was not expecting this scenario to happen.

DA then shared what he felt was good news in that having spoken with colleagues at the RTS he has been advised of a fundamental alteration coming to the REC Change process, in which a lead party would be nominated in any development who will then complete their design to distribute to the other parties involved to enable them to produce their detailed impact assessments. He commented that it would prove a longer process, but it was an essential improvement that would avoid repeating this current scenario.

4. Any Other Business

None.

5. Diary Planning

Time/Date	Publication Deadline	Venue	Programme
10:00 Wednesday 12 July 2023	5pm on Tuesday 04 July 2023	Microsoft Teams possible face-to-face	Standard Agenda
10:00 Wednesday 09 August 2023	5pm Tuesday 01 August 2023	Microsoft Teams	Standard Agenda

10:00 Wednesday 13 September 2023	5pm Tuesday 05 September 2023	Microsoft Teams possible face-to-face	Standard Agenda
10:00 Wednesday 11 October 2023	5pm Tuesday 03 October 2023	Microsoft Teams	Standard Agenda
10:00 Wednesday 08 November 2023	5pm Tuesday 31 October 2023	Microsoft Teams	Standard Agenda
10:00 Wednesday 13 December 2023	5pm on Tuesday 05 December 2023	Microsoft Teams	Standard Agenda

DSC Change Action Table						
Action Ref	Meeting Date	Min Ref	Action	Owner	Reporting Month	Status Update
New DSC Contract Action 0601	16/06/23	2.1	CDSP (ES) to collate Recognised DPP Pain Points through initial discussions with OC and CLR with a view to setting objectives to achieve the required DDP baseline for parties with large portfolios.	CDSP (ES)	July 23	Carried forward