UNC DSC Change Management Committee Minutes

Wednesday 10 May 2017

Lansdowne Gate, 65 New Road, Solihull B91 3DL

Attendees

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

Shipper User Representatives

James Rigby	(JR)	Npower	Class A - Voting (C)
Kishor Mistry*	(KM)	E.ON	Class A - Voting Alternate
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	DONG Energy	Class B - Voting (B/C) & Alternate
Oorlagh Chapman	(OC)	British Gas	Class A - Voting Alternate

Transporter Representatives

Chris Warner	(CW)	Cadent	DNO - Voting
Richard Pomroy	(RP)	WWU	DNO - Voting
Beverley Viney	(BVi)	National Grid NTS	NTS - Voting
Sean McGoldrick	(SMc)	National Grid NTS	NTS - Voting
Kishan Nundloll*	(KN)	ESP	iGT - Voting Alternate (2 votes)

CDSP Change Management Representatives

Dave Turpin	(DT)	Xoserve	Non-Voting
Matt Smith	(MS)	Xoserve	Non-Voting

Observers

Arun Peeyen	(AP)	Xoserve	Non-Voting
Balint Vizi	(BaV)	Xoserve	Non-Voting
Bob Broadhurst*	(BH)	British Gas	Non-Voting
Christine Francis	(CF)	Xoserve	Non-Voting
David Hipwell*	(DH)	British Gas	Non-Voting
Emma Smith	(ES)	Xoserve	Non-Voting
Gavin Anderson*	(GA)	EDF Energy	Non-Voting
Hilary Chapman	(HCh)	Scotia Gas Networks	Non-Voting
Joanna Ferguson*	(JF)	Northern Gas Networks	Non-Voting
Lee Chambers	(LCh)	Xoserve	Non-Voting
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE	Non-Voting
Osman Hamil	(OH)	Xoserve	Non-Voting
Rachel Hinsley	(RHi)	Xoserve	Non-Voting
Shanna Key	(SK)	Northern Gas Networks	Non-Voting

Apologies

Alison Neild	(AN)	Gazprom	Class B - Voting
Andrew Margan	(AM)	British Gas	Class A - Voting
Colette Baldwin	(CB)	E.ON	Class A - Voting
Nicky Rozier	(NR)	GTC	iGT Representative (2 votes)

1. **Introduction**

RHa welcomed all to the meeting.

1.1. Apologies for absence

See above table

1.2. Alternates

Lorna Lewin for Alison Neild

Oorlagh Chapman for Andrew Margan

Kishan Nundoll for Nicky Rozier

Kishor Mistry for Colette Baldwin

1.3. Confirm Voting rights

RHa confirmed the voting rights carried by each member.

1.4 Approval of Minutes (12 April 2017)

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

2. **UK Link Future Releases**

2.1. Release Management Prioritisation and Scoping Approach

BaV referred to the Release Management Prioritisation and Scoping Approach document published ahead of the meeting and explained its purpose was to describe the approach proposed by Xoserve. He explained his intention not to review the paper line by line but to refer to critical points.

The document focused on specifying the prioritisation process through which all change proposals and backlog items will be taken through in order to determine their relative priority of implementation. This priority will be considered in conjunction with the impact of the change (classified via an Impact Assessment carried out by Xoserve and relevant 3rd parties) to determine the proposed scope of future releases.

Xoserve's intended approach is to deliver multiple major releases of functionality a year, alongside a stream of minor enhancement work. The first major releases are anticipated to be 'Release 2' and 'Release 3', with estimated delivery dates in Q1 and Q4 2018 respectively.

The document outlined the: Scoping Process; the Impact Assessment Approach; the Prioritisation Approach; the Proposed Scope Selection & Industry Review.

BaV referred to the proposed Key Scoping Factors on Page 7, these were:

Magnitude and Criticality of Change – high priority/criticality changes (such as emergency defect fixes) will be ideally processed as Minor Enhancements or Extraordinary Changes. For other changes, priority will influence which release it is selected for.

Existing Delivery Commitments – changes will be assessed relative to other changes already within a release's scope and against other changes in the 'change pot'.

Benefit / Cost Reduction – the benefits case and priority attributed by the industry collectively. This input will be driven primarily by the Change Committee.

Technology Roadmap Drivers – Central Systems and wider industry technology roadmaps will influence what changes are selected for delivery and in what order.

Delivery Capacity – one of the key approach principles is for delivery capacity to drive release scope. Capacity to deliver should be viewed both from the CDSP and industry's

perspective. This, along with the average delivery lifecycle of circa 8-months per release will be a major factor in defining how much change can be grouped.

RP expressed concern that the CDSP Service Document - Change Management Procedures, does not take into account a lot of the points being made by Xoserve and he questioned how the priority scoping factors, provided on Page 7, would fit into the Priority Principles (Section 4.5). DT referred to Sections 4.5.1, 4.5.2 and 4.5.3 and the high-level priority principals. He explained that the key scoping factors would feed into the detail needed to help establish the priority. He suggested other factors may need to be considered above and beyond the standard Priority Principles. RP suggested that the Committee may wish to consider this approach further with a view to building Key Scoping Factors into the Change Management Procedures.

The committee considered whether there were more Scoping Factors that should be built into the Change Management Procedures for transparency on how changes can be further prioritised. It was suggested that the Governance Procedures should be clear for parties to fully understand how the committee will prioritise changes that do not fall into those outlined in the current Change Management Procedures.

CW suggested the Committee may want to keep the Change Management Procedures at a high level and not lock them down in too much detail.

KM expressed concern about the ability to rank priorities using the suggested Key Scoping Factors. He suggested that one of the key drivers would be maintaining the alignment on data views for Transporters and suppliers.

OC concurred with RP that it needs to be clear on the criteria for prioritising the workload.

Beverley Viney (BVi) enquired if Gemini was included within the scope. BaV confirmed Gemini was excluded. SMc requested that Xoserve clearly reflect within the provided document that Gemini Changes are excluded.

Referring to Figure 6: Release Scoping Process on Page 9, BaV outlined the changes in the impact assessment table.

JR enquired when the Release 2 Changes would need to be agreed and locked down. It was confirmed that July was the deadline for Release 2 (R2).

DT suggested the change scheduling may depend on the success of PIS, as the build design, testing and release cycles may be affected by PIS.

SMc expressed concern about the number of changes required and the challenges this presents. JR enquired about the alignment of the PIS release process and the management of the defects. LC explained the PIS release strategy had been shared with the Project Nexus Programme Board and that information is being fed to different forums. It was recognised there would be a need to align all system changes. LC was keen to make things easier for parties to ensure they are fully aware of all the changes, and he suggested that all the changes and the defects could be incorporated into one document.

LC explained that Xoserve are looking at the Project Nexus defects which need to be managed. Some defects will be included within the PIS period and others may need to be deferred and incorporated into a future release plan. It was acknowledged there may also be some additional go-live defects which will need to be considered.

The committee was keen to have one document with all changes/defects incorporated and a plan that clearly outlined the release programme.

LC offered to present the PIS release programme to the committee to provide them with a high-level overview at the next meeting.

JR was concerned about the technical challenges and decisions that may need to be made and that this committee may not have all the technical knowledge to fully understand the implications of some of the changes. He suggested that the Committee could form a Technical sub-committee to assess technical solutions/changes and inform the Change Management Committee of any recommendations. He suggested there would be some elements that Users will need to consider internally to allow any dependencies to be fully considered. The committee considered the ability to set up a sub-committee and if there was sufficient time.

KN confirmed that 60 deferred defects needed to be incorporated into the catalogue and prioritised. These had not been included into the change backlog spreadsheet for this meeting as they were only identified yesterday at the Project Nexus Programme Board.

SK enquired as to whether it was worthwhile reviewing the current backlog lists without considering the PIS defect list.

DT suggested the Committee should go over the listed changes today and overlay the PIS defects at a later point.

The committee considered the constitution and scope of a potential Technical sub-committee. It was agreed that a sub-committee should be formed to consider the proposals and provide recommendations to the DSC Change Management Committee on the prioritisation of technical changes.

RHi agreed to approach the current Solution Development Group that meets fortnightly to see if the group would be amenable to assessing technical solutions and future release capability.

Action 0501: Change Management Committee to prepare to establish a Technical Sub-Committee (including the scope, TOR and membership) for technical assessments of future release capability. The current Solution Development Group will be considered for their amenability/willingness to take on this role.

The committee considered the DSC Change Committee Priority Principles on Page 12 and the initial assessment to prioritise changes firstly in line with the DSC Change Management Procedures; to rank the changes with a category of high, medium or low; and how the voting mechanism could be utilised to challenge/change the priority of a change if there was a differing view from committee representatives.

There was some concern expressed that some changes may not be required as part of a modification but still considered a high priority. It was confirmed that the committee can challenge the priority of a non-modification change and still vote on its priority.

The committee agreed to work through the backlog considering the principles outlined to see if the priorities can be agreed.

2.2. Current Change Demand Backlog

LC presented the Change Demand Backlog spreadsheet. Xoserve recognised that whilst considering the priorities that some refinement may be required to the Change Management Procedures.

JF also highlighted that some changes may not appear on the list but these will need to be added.

It was agreed that the principles of prioritising needed to be considered. The Committee agreed to review the spreadsheet and attempt an initial assessment but this however may not necessarily be a final agreement on the change priorities as this may change. It was agreed that any initial assessments would be captured by Xoserve and the spreadsheet would be republished with the initial assessment. This will enable

Committee representatives to take this away and consider further. It was agreed there would be no formal vote on priorities at this stage.

SMc suggested that all the Change Orders should be made available to the Committee to clearly document the required change. ES clarified there will be supporting change documentation for each line on the spreadsheet however there may not necessarily be a formal change proposal document.

The committee considered some changes may not need a priority categorisation as some items had been recorded as a future requirement under PNUNC. These had been recorded to ensure these items were captured for further consideration in the future. It was agreed that any items should be suitably marked as either no-priority, TBC or another suitable flag, to keep visibility of these items with their future priority to be agreed.

It was agreed for changes that had not got a Change Proposal, that Xoserve would assess the delivery need and provide a view on the appropriate governance required to facilitate the change.

Concern was expressed that some of the changes had insufficient information to enable an informed decision on its initial priority assessment. CW suggested that the initial assessment was simply a building block to move changes forward and a worthwhile exercise to assessing if a Change Proposal is required to pursue the change.

SMc suggested that some items were more of a "wish list" which would be difficult to prioritise without any level of detail. He challenged the value of trying to prioritise such changes without the supporting governance to enact the change required. He believed there was little value trying to prioritise "nice to haves". The committee looked at a number of examples of these. It was challenged if some of the changes were still required.

RP suggested that if there was the impetus to progress with a change listed on the spreadsheet, any party who still required the change could raise the appropriate Change Proposal / Order, otherwise the change should be put aside until there is a Change Proposal.

BVi suggested that unless there is a Change Proposal/Order, the priority consideration should be deferred. JR concurred and suggested that the Committee should only consider those with Change Proposals and for Xoserve to provide a view on the appropriate governance for the other changes i.e. whether a UNC modification was required.

The committee also wished to understand how changes that have already been authorised would be captured. For example, Change Proposals being considered at the 11 May Change Management Committee. DT confirmed that a number of changes had been submitted with a view of a need for delivery. The changes being considered tomorrow have already been approved, some inflight and some need delivery before Release 2.

DT presented a number of Change Orders that he believed could be prioritised. These were: COR4186, COR4248, COR3283, COR3457, COR3287 and XRN4057, XRN4080, UKLP IAD81249 and IAD81273.

COR4186 DES Access Restriction and Audit. Change Order raised internally. This will require a Change Proposal and is related to modifications UNC0593 and iGT095. A provisional view is to be provided by the CMA. The system solution is to be assessed on whether to grant access to DES. At the moment, this change was considered to be a High Priority until the UNC modification dictates otherwise.

COR4248 Quarterly Smart Metering Reporting for HS&E and GDNs. External Change Order related to a legislative change. CW challenged there is not a current legislative

requirement, however this will become a formal licence obligation through Ofgem. At the moment, this change was considered to be a High Priority on the understanding this will be required.

COR3283 Recording DN Siteworks. This was considered a design fault within CMS and the change is still required. This change will help track siteworks completion, the traceability of siteworks reference numbers and MPRN creation. It was recognised this would avoid the duplication of MPRNs. It was agreed this would have a wider industry benefit and would be prioritised as Low as it was not a legislation or UNC Modification-related change.

COR3457 CMS role for DNs. DT provided a summary of the change to a new security role, and that one log-in would enable all activities to be undertaken. It was agreed this would have a wider industry benefit and should be prioritised as Low as it was not a legislation or UNC Modification-related change.

COR3287 Meter Asset (UNC 0455). DT confirmed this change relates to updating Meter Asset data by the Transporter when not updated by the Shipper. It was acknowledged that there is a manual workaround managed currently by Xoserve. This was a requirement under a UNC obligation, however compliance was already achieved with the manual workaround. RP suggested if an efficiency can be made to the process by introducing a system solution, and therefore it may be used more, it should be considered as a Medium priority. It was agreed that this should be prioritised as a Medium priority.

UK Link XRN4057 associated with UKLP IAD81244. This was considered to be a Low priority as the risk profile was low.

UK Link XRN4080 associated with UKLP IAD 81251, UNC 0520A. High priority assigned to enable the solution of Modification 0520A to be implemented.

UKLP IAD81249 and IAD81273. The Committee's initial assessment was that this may need to delivered earlier than Release 2. This was being considered by SPAA. The expectation is the system will need to be updated. This was considered to be a High priority as this would be required by SPAA governance, despite this not being a legislative or UNC Modification change.

It was agreed in the absence of details on the other perceived change requirements that these would not be prioritised until further detail was made available.

DT agreed that Xoserve would review all items on the backlog spreadsheet with a view to creating Change Proposals/Orders for the **service sustaining** changes.

The Committee briefly considered how the Backlog would need to incorporate all changes similar to the UK Link Implementation Plan. BVi also suggested that Xoserve should formulate a Change Project Plan to illustrate the programme of change. She suggested that if Xoserve could implement 10 changes but only 5 needed doing, the Committee may not need to prioritise changes.

DT explained some changes may be significant and it may not be as simple as a number count. Until the changes have been stacked, it was difficult to confirm pinch points. BVi suggested that a project plan release schedule ought to be devised by Xoserve to illustrate any pinch points and help the Committee understand when priority decisions need to be made.

The Committee also considered how the defects (left over from PIS) would be incorporated into the Backlog spreadsheet and project plan.

SMc suggested that if parties want changes progressed that do not have a Change Proposal/Order, these should be submitted to Xoserve for consideration. SMc suggested Shipper Contract Managers should review the backlog and consider if they

wish to sponsor the relevant change request. DT was keen to raise Change Proposals/Orders for service sustaining changes and where Xoserve have identified a business improvement. He confirmed these would be brought to the Committee for consideration.

Xoserve agreed to add further detail to the spreadsheet, raise change orders for service sustaining items and recirculate the list. Any changes not already prioritised or being picked up will be clearly marked.

Action 0502: Xoserve to update the Change Demand Backlog to include: all required changes/defects (particularly any identified Project Nexus defects), a column to confirm the appropriate governance for the change, and visibility of items without a Change Proposal or Change Order.

3.   Review of Outstanding Actions

All outstanding actions are Carried Forward and will be examined at tomorrow's 11 May DSC Change Management Committee Meeting.

4.   Next Steps

In light of today's discussions, it was agreed that Xoserve would update the Change Demand Backlog with additional columns to confirm if a Change Proposal has been raised, to provide a view on the appropriate governance for the change i.e. UNC modification or not, and to ensure all changes are included, particularly the 60 identified PIS defects.

5.   Any Other Business

5.1. Extraordinary Change Pack Approval

RHi reported a requirement for the Committee to approve the issuing of an extraordinary Change Pack. This was requested outside the normal Change Pack to communicate the need for representations with a reduced consultation period. RHi confirmed there were 5 Changes in the Change Pack. The committee approved issuing the extra-ordinary Change Pack.

6.   Diary Planning

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

Meetings will take place as follows:

Time/Date	Venue	Programme
10:15, Thursday 11 May 2017	Lansdowne Gate, 65 New Road, Solihull B91 3DL	PIS Release Programme Review of Change Demand Backlog
10:15, Wednesday 07 June 2017	Lansdowne Gate, 65 New Road, Solihull B91 3DL	*To be confirmed*
10:15, Thursday 08 June 2017	Lansdowne Gate, 65 New Road, Solihull B91 3DL	*Provisional - To be confirmed*
10:15, Wednesday 12 July 2017	Lansdowne Gate, 65 New Road, Solihull B91 3DL	*Provisional - To be confirmed*

			Action Table (as at 10 May 2017)		
Action Ref	**Meeting Date**	**Minute Ref**	**Action**	**Owner**	**Status Update**
080217-02	08/02/17	n/a	*Modification 0609* - DT to provide an update on proposed plans regarding the AQ issue for when the Joint Office takeover the meetings.	Xoserve (DT)	**Carried forward**
110117-04	11/02/17	n/a	*Elected Shipper – Change Order process* - DT and AM are to get together with the SSP team to establish what is happening and what reporting is required and what the current position is. Xoserve to write the change order and get a Network to sponsor.	Xoserve (DT/AMi)	**Carried forward**
0401	12/04/17	1.1	RH to check that the email permissions request has been sent to all appropriate parties (and if necessary, reworded and re-sent seeking an active formal response, i.e. yes or no).	Chair (RH)	**Carried forward**
0402	12/04/17	2.1	*DSC Committee Operation (terms of reference)* - DT to formulate a brief statement providing a clear explanation and references to appropriate documentation, for publication on the Joint Office website.	Xoserve (DT)	**Carried forward**
0403	12/04/17	2.1	RH to confirm that all relevant documentation relating to the initiation of FGO (UNC Modification 0565A) has been published on the Joint Office website.	Chair (RH)	**Carried forward**
0404	12/04/17	3.2	*DSC Change and Contract Manager Circulation List* - Xoserve to develop an appropriate circulation list.	Xoserve (DT)	**Carried forward**
0405	12/04/17	3.2	*Release 2 (R2)* - <u>As soon as possible in advance of 10 May 2017 meeting</u>, Xoserve to provide information on the backlog and any other known items (defects, modifications, Change Orders, etc) for the DSC Change Committee to review with a view to prioritising for R2.	Xoserve (LCh/JR)	**Carried forward**
0406	12/04/17	3.3	*How should central systems changes initiated by a Supplier be managed?* All parties to consider and provide views (for discussion at DSC Change Management Meeting Day 2 on 11 May 2017).	All Parties	**Carried forward**
0407	12/04/17	3.4.2	*Xoserve Report E* - Xoserve to separate this from Reports A - D, and include at the end of the Implementation Plan Summary.	Xoserve (SN)	**Carried forward**
0501	10/05/17	2.1	Change Management Committee to prepare to establish a Technical Sub-Committee (including the scope, TOR and membership) for technical assessments of future release capability. The current Solution Development Group will be	All Parties & Xoserve (RHi)	**Pending**

			Action Table (as at 10 May 2017)		
Action Ref	**Meeting Date**	**Minute Ref**	**Action**	**Owner**	**Status Update**
			considered for their amenability/willingness to take on this role.		
0502	10/05/17	2.2	Xoserve to update the Change Demand Backlog to include: all required changes/defects (particularly any identified Project Nexus defects), a column to confirm the appropriate governance for the change, and visibility of items without a Change Proposal or Change Order.	Xoserve	**Pending**