

UNC DSC Contract Management Committee Minutes

Wednesday 15 July 2020

Via Teleconference

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office	Non-Voting
Helen Bennett (Secretary)	(HB)	Joint Office	Non-Voting

Shipper User Representatives (Voting)

Stephanie Clements	(SC)	Scottish Power	Class A Voting
Clare Cattle-Jones	(CCJ)	SSE	Class A Voting
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	Orsted	Class B Voting
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	Gazprom Energy	Class C Voting

Transporter Representatives (Voting)

Helen Chandler	(HCh)	Northern Gas Networks	DNO Voting
Sally Hardman	(SHa)	Scotia Gas Networks	DNO Voting
Teresa Thompson (and alternate for Richard Loukes)	(TT)	National Grid	NTS Voting
Brandon Rodrigues	(BR)	IGT Representative	IGT Voting
Rebecca Cailles	(RC)	IGT Representative	IGT Voting

CDSP Contract Management Representatives (Non-Voting)

Jayne M ^c Glone	(JMc)	Xoserve
Michele Downes	(MD)	Xoserve

Observers/Presenters (Non-Voting)

Angela Clarke	(AC)	Xoserve
David Addison	(DA)	Xoserve
David Turpin	(DTu)	Xoserve
Dee Deu	(DD)	Xoserve
Denis Regan	(DR)	Xoserve
Fiona Cottam	(FC)	Xoserve
Guv Dosanjh	(GD)	Cadent
Kirsty Dudley	(KD)	E.ON
Leteria Beccano	(LB)	Wales & West Utilities
Linda Whitcroft	(LW)	Xoserve
Krupa Mistry	(KM)	Xoserve
Nick Stace	(NS)	Xoserve
Oorlagh Chapman	(OC)	Centrica
Peta Haworth	(PH)	Xoserve
Satpal Kalsi	(SK)	Xoserve
Simon Harris	(SH)	Xoserve
Surfaraz Tambe	(ST)	Xoserve

Copies of all papers are available at: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/dsc-contract/150720

1. Introduction

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

1.1. Apologies for absence

Richard Loukes, NTS Representative

1.2. Alternates

Teresa Thompson for Richard Loukes

1.3. Confirm Voting rights

Representative	Classification	Vote Count
Shipper		
Stephanie Clements	Shipper Class A	1 vote
Clare Cantle-Jones	Shipper Class A	1 vote
Lorna Lewin	Shipper Class B	2 votes
Steve Mulinganie	Shipper Class C	2 votes
Transporter		
Sally Hardman	DNO	1 vote
Helen Chandler	DNO	1 vote
Teresa Thompson + Alternate for Richard Loukes	NTS	2 votes
Rebecca Cailles	IGT	1 vote
Brandon Rodrigues	IGT	1 vote

1.4. Approval of Minutes (17 June 2020)

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

JMc mentioned there was an agreement to include some wording regarding the definition of costs for agenda item 14.2. It is hoped that this will be done as part of agenda item 3.4 for this meeting.

1.5. Approval of Late Papers

BF noted one late paper for agenda item 13.1 which was accepted.

1.6. Review of Outstanding Actions

0401: Xoserve (FC) to provide a paper on options how the industry can best use machine learning in NDM allocation at the July meeting.

Update: Fiona Cottam (FC) updated the Committee and advised she had hoped to provide an update at this but the paper is not quite ready in time for submission. She advised this will also feed in to DESC discussions. FC is now aiming to provide the paper in time for the publication deadline for the August 2020 DSC Contract Management Committee meeting. **Carried Forward.**

0601: Xoserve/CDSP (JMc/LW) to consider the best way to engage with customers to develop the Customer Effort measure and whether this should be conducted via a survey or Workshop.

Update: Jane McGlone (JMc) advised this is still action is still being considered and she provide the conclusion as part of the August DSC Contract Management Committee meeting. **Carried Forward.**

0602: Xoserve/CDSP (MD/DR) to provide more insight and visibility of the problems with AQs.

Update: MD advised this will be covered under agenda item 7.3.4. **Closed.**

A short discussion followed regarding the information only papers that are usually published for Agenda item 7.

SM agreed that it is a good strategy and use of time not to cover these agenda items on a regular basis, but for completeness, suggested that the Committee should review the items on a monthly rotation.

The Committee agreed with the suggested approach and Xoserve agreed to provide papers each month in the order listed in the Agenda. However, kit was noted that like today, items that need to be presented would not be held back.

2. COVID-19 Update

2.1. Customer Update

Fiona Cottam (FC) advised she was standing in for Andy Szabo and provided a brief verbal update.

FC advised there are no concerns to report at this meeting, all processes are running well and there remains a high level of staff availability.

FC proceeded to provide the following update:

- The high-level reports that are provided to the Performance Assurance Committee (PAC) each month for Modification 0722 (Urgent) - Allow Users to submit Estimated Meter Reading during COVID-19, and Modification 0723 (Urgent) - Use of the Isolation Flag to identify sites with abnormal load reduction during COVID-19 period, are not causing any system or process concerns.
- Modification 0724 (Urgent) - Amendment to Ratchet charges during COVID-19 period, the requests/work volumes are low and manageable.
- Modification 0726 (Urgent) - COVID-19 Liquidity Relief Scheme for Shippers has been implemented, there is a brief window currently open for applications to be submitted. Steve Mulinganie (SM) asked, because there is a level of mutualisation, in terms of the implemented Modification 0726, if the scale of risk is known or understood. FC advised she is aware and understands the Industry interest in this Modification and the aim is to provide updates on a regular basis. SM confirmed, for risk management purposes, he would like to see some aggregate reporting while the window is open.
- Modification 0730 - COVID-19 Capacity Retention Process had urgency status declined by Ofgem and is due to report to UNC Panel on 16 July 2020 for processing as a new modification. It is likely to be assigned to a Workgroup.

3. Approvals

3.1. Request for Additional Data Items for Shippers and Suppliers via API

Krupa Mistry (KM) the API Product Manager provided a view of the Disclosure Request Report (DDR) and advised this intends to make a number of data items available to both Shippers and Suppliers via a Portfolio and Community view.

Currently the data items are available to Shippers and Suppliers in two individual APIs, it is intended to merge the two APIs so that they only have to access one API.

No comments were made from the Committee Representatives.

Committee Representatives were asked to approve the DRR. DRR Approval was unanimously provided as follows:

Voting Outcome:		
Shipper	Voting Count	For/Against
Stephanie Clements	1	For
Clare Cantle-Jones	1	For
Lorna Lewin	2	For
Steve Mulinganie	2	For

Total	6	For
Transporter Representatives	Voting Count	For/Against
Sally Hardman	1	For
Helen Chandler	1	For
Teresa Thompson + Alternate for Richard Loukes	2	For
Rebecca Cailes	1	For
Brandon Rodrigues	1	For
Total	6	For

3.2. Twilio - consent to transfer data

JMc provided an overview of XRN4850 - Notification of Customer Contact Details to Transporters and explained that Committee members will be requested to provide consent, for data to be transferred to Twilio as their servers are based in the US.

Steve Mulinganie (SM) requested, due to the consequence of moving the data out of the EU, a walkthrough of the Change Request to provide the clarity of what is being asked of the Committee.

JMc explained that as part of XRN4850 - Notification of Customer Contact Details to Transporter, the solution delivers the mechanism for Transporters to communicate with specific consumers in an agreed set of circumstances. There are two proposed functions to allow Transporters to communicate with consumers. These are:

1. 'Broadcast' function
This allows Transporters to instruct the CDSP to send a communication (email or SMS) to a defined set of end consumers. The end consumers can be defined by address.
2. 'Extract' function
This allows Transporters to access end consumer details on a single MPRN basis via the UK Link Portal to communicate to the selected Customer.

This service will be used under the following circumstances:

1. Unplanned Interruptions
2. Planned interruptions
3. Gas Safety Regs Cut-off
4. Contact for Multiple Occupancy Building
5. Payment of Guaranteed Standard of Performance Payment

JMc went on to explain the reason why Twilio has been chosen to deliver the service, this is because they have the ability to include the function to allow customers to stop having messages sent to them concerning a specific event but not to stop all communications if that is their choice.

When asked, JMc clarified there are other companies that provide a similar service, but do not provide the selective stop functionality.

SM advised he is not sure why the data is being allowed to go outside the European Economic Area (EEA), other Members of the Committee agreed.

Dee Deu (DD) joined the call to provide the assurance that the solution design and Twilio service has been assessed by Xoserve Information Security and designed to ensure compliance with Information Security standards required, retention schedules and a number of other specific arrangements to ensure data is managed securely.

Clare Cattle-Jones (CCJ) raised a concern that at no point, as part of the solution, was the consideration to allow data to be sent off-shore or outside of the EEA considered as a risk.

In order to provide further clarification, JMc explained that, as part of the tendering process, Twilio were the only organisation that were able to provide the stop functionality which was part of the service description request agreed by the DSC Change Management Committee. JMc also agreed

with Committee members that Xoserve should have highlighted this to DSC Contract Managements Committee at the point when DSC Change Management Committee gave the instruction.

JMc confirmed that Twilio have met the requirements of the Privacy Shield which the EU has approved as adequate in terms of data transferring from the EEA to the US. Adding that Xoserve would not be suggesting Twilio for the solution if the organisation did not have the privacy shield requirements in place.

KD raised the concern that there does not appear to be any transparency on how the decision on the short listing for service providers was made. Dave Addison (DA) advised that discussions at DSC Change Management Committee highlighted they were very specific that the STOP functionality should be included as part of the requirements for the services. This led to Xoserve having to have a shortened candidate list and agreed that going forward Xoserve should be coming to DSC Contract Management Committee prior to this stage in order to give assurance and highlight any consequences.

CCJ agreed and added that at DSC Contract Management Committee there has been no visibility of the tendering process and that there could be other companies that can provide a similar or the same service which are based in the EU and might be known to DSC Customers.

Concerns were raised from a risk perspective; this could lead to massive reputational damage.

In terms of an alternative solution, SM suggested that Twilio should be asked if their product/services could be licensed for use in the EEA then there would not be an issue. CCJ agreed that the service should remain within the EEA.

The functionality was clarified in that the specific request is that the specific information is sent to Twilio, the message is distributed to a specific location and the data is then deleted.

JMc asked if it would help Committee members if Xoserve shared some of the high level clauses within the Twilio contract.

CCJ said that, from a tendering point of view, DSC Contract Management Committee members need to have more understanding of what process Xoserve follows and how data is security is managed in this process.

DA confirmed the specific areas that require clarification:

- Why Twilio is the only solution provider that meets the service description
- Why does the data have to move outside of the EU
- Why the stop functionality requirement is needed and is considered more important than data location
- What assurances have Xoserve received from Twilio and why were Xoserve satisfied. (Can Xoserve share with customers the same level of comfort that Xoserve have).

SM confirmed he will consider the evidence that Xoserve presents.

When BF suggested that as the Data Shield has an annual review process should this be considered for the contract. Surfaraz Tambe (ST) clarified there is an annual review within the contract.

New Action 0701: *Twilio Consent to transfer data* - Xoserve to review the UNC and DSC Contracts for any restrictions on data being sent outside of the EEA. In addition, consider any potential impacts on the DSC now the UK is no longer in the EU/EEA.

JMc clarified that whilst the UK is in a transition period, although it is not listed as one of the countries in EEA, the UK must comply with EU legislation. It is anticipated that the UK will adopt the GDPR following the transition period and this will become the 'UK GDPR'. Further development needs to be considered with regards to data transfers from the UK to the EEA once the transition period ends. At this point we will be able to understand what changes (if any) will be required to the DSC.

JMc suggested that Brexit impacts is added to the Agena as a standard item whilst we understand what the impacts of Brexit are to the DSC.

In terms of next steps relating to Twilio it was suggested that a paper is drafted by Xoserve and presented at SPAA Expert Group on 5th August clarifying the above points.

Members unanimously agreed to defer consideration of this item to the August 2020 Meeting.

3.3. MAP access to data

Simon Harris (SH) provided a view of the Disclosure Request Report (DRR) and explained proposed amendments to the Data Permissions Matrix (DPM):

- a) Add Meter Asset Providers to the “Portfolio Reporting” section of the DPM
- b) Allow access to data already available to Meter Asset Provider (via “API”) into the “Portfolio Reporting” section
- c) Allow access to additional data to be made available via both “API” and “Reporting” mechanisms
- d) Addition of Meter Asset Provider Short Code (MAP Id) and associated stakeholder information to the DPM as a new data items

Committee Representatives were asked to approve the DRR. Approval was unanimously provided as follows:

Voting Outcome:		
Shipper	Voting Count	For/Against
Stephanie Clements	1	For
Clare Cattle-Jones	1	For
Lorna Lewin	2	For
Steve Mulinganie	2	For
Total	6	For
Transporter Representatives	Voting Count	For/Against
Sally Hardman	1	For
Helen Chandler	1	For
Teresa Thompson + Alternate for Richard Loukes	2	For
Rebecca Cailes	1	For
Brandon Rodrigues	1	For
Total	6	For

3.4. Cost allocation Review

Nick Stace (NS) provided an overview of the cost allocation review and financial updates. He advised the Committee that he is looking for approval of the appropriate way forward with regards to either:

- (A) Managing Change included in the B&CM table (a more fixed approach)

This option replaces the current 22 service areas in the Charge Base Apportionment table with the proposed 15 Service Areas and % allocations.

The advantage of option A is the % allocations are fixed which will provide certainty to Customer .

The disadvantage of option A is that if there is a change in demand the % allocations could not be changed quickly.

In order to demonstrate the elasticity of change in the overall % allocation for Managing Change NS informed the Committee that if there is a 20% swing between Change Budget parties that would only translate to an approx. 4% overall movement between Customers
OR

(B) Managing Change excluded from the B&CM table (a more flexible approach)

This option replaces the current 22 service areas in the Charge Base Apportionment table with the proposed 14 service areas and % allocations.

The advantage of option B is this gives a lot more opportunity to reflect change in demand but there were issues around how any changes would be proposed (given the lack of time recording in place) and how the new % would be approved by Committee

Based on the pros and cons discussed, NS advised he recommends the Committee utilises Option A going forward.

Comments and/or challenges

Helen Chandler (HC) said that it is difficult trying to establish what is the best option to put in place when unknown changes are likely to occur at a later date, for example when there is unexpected spend for maybe a fundamental issue with a process or system that requires funding.

NS clarified that Option A assumes a steady state where there is no unexpected spends.

SM added that the Industry is soon to be moving into a possible unstable environment under the Retail Energy Code (REC), where the main changes will be driven through that environment, therefore he favours Option B as flexibility is needed from a forward looking environment.

Orlough Chapman (OC) asked, in terms of governance, have Xoserve followed the rules for how changes should be made to the Budget and Charging Methodology. If there is a change then the CDSP Service Documents should be amended. She said that she cannot see any change process where this has been clearly communicated and that it does not feel like the whole process has been followed.

JMc advised that by changing the Service Table, having a clear understanding by approving Option A or B that would be approving the whole change to all of the tables that are being put in the document.

OC mentioned there has been no consultation on this. JMc clarified that where there is no material change, this is the correct process to follow.

OC disagreed and mentioned that this feels like it is a material change to the CDSP service documents.

JMc clarified the changes proposed and explained that the cost allocation remains the same, changing the table means that it looks different but is not a material change in overall cost allocations and that this is in line with any change to any CDSP Service documents.

Sally Hardman (SH) said that the service areas that feed into this are not being approved until August 2020 and she thought it would be more logical that they are approved first.

HC said she is concerned that it is confusing when there are options and feels this could be two separate things, 1. vote on what is being done to consolidate service lines and 2. the options for managing budgets is a separate vote.

KD asked for confirmation that all customers have seen this and that all constituencies are fully informed. JMc clarified that a number of workshops have been held and all customers should have received invitations.

KD challenged that being invited to a workshop might not mean that the correct people are being invited to the meetings due to the nature of distribution lists being used.

Dave Turpin (DT) clarified what the Committee are being asked to do:

- First to Debate the change – and form a decision

- Agree overall the change package

In relation to REC and SPAA and the amalgamation of codes, SM commented that it feels like the Uniform Network Code (UNC) is likely to be more subservient to the REC and that the Committee may have to make changes rather than be in control of its own destiny in the future and this should be a feature of any choice.

SHa commented that her preference would be for Option A as this provides a set allocation by service line and allows the budget to be planned with more certainty.

NS provided the Committee with a 3rd option which could be to keep it fixed with option A and include in-year forecasts based on the development of different events.

SHa sought clarification as to why the maintain the business costs has been moved outside of the current process. NS advised this has been put in one of the two change tables and would still be visible.

DT clarified that in the absence of a decision the default position is in part Option A.

OC requested there is a consultation process or an open forum which will give transparency to the proposals. DT clarified that a consultation with industry customers has already been carried out.

On the principle of moving from 22 Service Areas to 14 Service Areas SM advised he has no concerns.

OC raised a concern that there is no actual proper process to provide feedback. If there is an intent to change the methodology there should be a clear process, she said that it feels like there is a governance step that is not being followed in terms of good governance and good practice.

SM agreed and added there has been no publication of notes from the engagement process and therefore wider industry views are not known or available to members.

JMc acknowledged there is no process and confirmed she will look at a proper process, in a similar way to the Change Proposal route where there is an opportunity for the Industry to provide feedback and this to be collated as evidence.

DT agreed that, to ensure all parties have had full opportunity to review, an urgent change proposal will be raised for moving to the replacement Service Areas (including Option A only), and if necessary, a further and separate change will be raised for the option to move to flexible charging for change costs (Option B).

New Action 0702: *Cost Allocation Review* - JMc to create a process for the inclusion or exclusion of Managing Change in the Charge Base Apportionment Table.

DT clarified that the default option will be Option A. There needs a clear and meaningful way for Option B in how it can be implemented.

In terms of timescales, it will still be within plan if this is further discussed at the next meeting in August 2020. NS added that given there was no objections in principle to the use of the new cost allocation model and 15 Service Areas (option A) this methodology would be used to prepare the charges for the first BP21 consultation round.

BF concluded that this will be added to the agenda for August 2020 in order to approve the replacement of 22 Service Areas to 14 Service Areas and consider the options as presented so they are clearly separated as decisions for the Committee.

3.5. XRN5199

Angela Clarke (AC) provided a view of the Change Proposal for Changes to the DSC Service Documents which is XRN5199 - Amendments to V12 of the SDT Service Description Table and explained that 46 out of 60 service line amendments are just changing the description to make it clear that Xoserve are acting as an agency of Transporters.

Committee Representatives were asked to approve the amendments to the Service Description Table. Approval was unanimously provided as follows:

Voting Outcome:		
Shipper	Voting Count	For/Against
Stephanie Clements	1	For
Clare Cattle-Jones	1	For
Lorna Lewin	2	For
Steve Mulinganie	2	For
Total	6	For
Transporter Representatives	Voting Count	For/Against
Sally Hardman	1	For
Helen Chandler	1	For
Teresa Thompson + Alternate for Richard Loukes	2	For
Rebecca Cailes	1	For
Brandon Rodrigues	1	For
Total	6	For

4. Retail Energy Code (REC) Update

4.1. REC UNC Data Items

DA provided an update of the REC/UNC Mastering and provided clarity that the output from the DSC Workgroup held 01 June 2020 has been shared with Ofgem.

DA advised that Ofgem may wish to talk to DSC customer representatives about individual data items and suggested the participants of the DSC Workgroup previously formed are used for this purpose.

SM advised there is a REC implementation coordination steering group being formed which will sit above the REC and will be used to bring together the relevant companies and deal with matters at that level.

DA advised he is proposing to leave Modification 0697S - Alignment of the UNC TPD Section V5 and the Data Permissions Matrix, as-is. When it is included as part of the Faster Switching significant code review (SCR), the requirement to raise a UNC Modification to add parties to the DPM will be removed.

No concerns were raised from the Committee.

5. Business Plan Updates

5.1. BP20 Centrica Appeal

JMc confirmed she has received an update from Ofgem advising they are considering issuing a minded to position by the end of September 2020.

DT reminded the committee that in order to deliver the investments and benefits from the currently approved BP20 plan, that Xoserve are progressing with these investments whilst taking pragmatic funding decisions to limit future financial exposure should the appeal be upheld (e.g. short-term contracts, temporary resourcing etc.)

5.2. BP21

Peta Haworth (PH) provided a verbal update relating to the draft Principles and Approach consultation. She confirmed that feedback will be provided via a Q&A response and where appropriate reflected in the final Principles & Approach document, Investment Business Cases, Deep Dives and BP21 document.

PH advised that as part of the feedback received, comments were made that the consultation this year was for a 2 week period, whereas the consultation period for 2019 was for 2.5 weeks. PH apologised and advised this was unintentional and is noted for future stages that the process should be consistent.

In summary the changes reflected in the updated Principles and Approach document are as follows:

- Clarification of what Xoserve means when it makes reference to the Energy Market Reform
- Further information on the open data governance framework and how it will be accessed
- Clarification of Technical Debt and a further explanation on the Xoserve approach to managing it
- It will address queries raised regarding REC and the impact its introduction will have on efficiencies and cost reduction

PH confirmed the final version of the Principles and Approach document will be published this month alongside the responses to the questions that have been raised and / or an indicator on where they will be reflected (as appropriate).

The Committee were advised that during July and August, the detailed investment business cases are being developed along with deep-dive presentations. The presentations will be recorded at the end of August for issue alongside the first draft BP21 document to provide additional clarity and a greater level of detail about the areas in which investments are currently being made and being proposed.

6. Key Performance Measures Review

Linda Whitcroft (LW) provided an overview of the Right First Time / Quality Key Performance Measures (KPM) which provides a view of the percentage score for April 2020 and May 2020 and where and highlighted the areas where the KPM has not been met.

LW advised they have started to populate targets for individual months as well as an annual target and have introduced the volume of AQ at risk, taking AQ prior to calculation as an additional measure.

LW highlighted that the measure for Manage Shipper Transfers is currently showing as Amber due to the MI being unavailable. This is being worked on internally.

LW then provided an overview of the KPM for Cycle Time / Delivery and highlighted the measures for CMS contacts and Management of Customer Issues.

When asked, LW advised they are trying to put in measures that are reflective of how customers are feeling about services and agreed that more comments are required against the measures and reasoning for the outcome of the scores.

LW explained the August 2020 Customer meetings will be held to run through examples where a target has not been met.

7. Monthly Contract Management Report (KPIs)

7.1. Contract Metrics including Invoicing

Paper published for information.

7.2. Xoserve Incident Summary

Paper published for information. No discussions held.

7.3. Issue Management Updates

7.3.1. Issue Management Dashboard

Paper published for information. No discussions held.

7.3.2. Amendment Invoice Taskforce Update

Paper published for information. No discussions held.

7.3.3. Enabling large scale utilisation of Class 3

DA provided a brief verbal update and explained that the migration is near to 4.3million Class 3 sites and he believes that is the conclusion of the majority of expected Class 3 site migrations.

Now the migration is predominately complete, DA asked the Committee what level of update is required going forward. The Committee agreed this can be removed from the DSC Contract Management Committee agenda and if there is anything substantial to report in the future, this can be included on the agenda on an adhoc basis.

7.3.4. AQ Taskforce Update

Denis Regan (DR) provided an update with regards to the current AQ defects position and advised that the number of AQ defects continues to fall with only 12 open and being worked on.

DR confirmed that the CDSP continues to focus on the defect position, and that AQ defects are getting the right level of resources applied to them.

Core focus this month has been to undertake a re-assessment of the internal processes to ensure that all necessary financial adjustments post the correction to Defect 61866 – Incorrect Formula Year AQ values applied, are completed.

DR advised that a Financial Development Principles document has been developed and more information on this will be provided at the next meeting in August 2020.

DR then continued to provide an overview of AQ Defect Status; Formal Root Cause Analysis, and AQ Defects – Historic Capacity Adjustments.

SM asked if there is a feel for the scale of energy value. DR advised that this is around 4-6 weeks away from being able to give the clarity.

CDSP continues to focus on the defect position, he provided a brief overview of the open AQ defects.

7.4. KVI Summary

Paper published for information. No discussions held.

7.4.1. June KVI Summary

Paper published for information. No discussions held.

7.4.2. June KVI Scorecard

Paper published for information. No discussions held.

7.4.3. June KVI Customer Service

Paper published for information. No discussions held.

7.4.4. KVI Relationship Management presentation

Dionne Thompson (DT) provided an overview of the KVI Relationship Management scores for Quarter 1. She clarified that the survey was issued in June 2020 and the results of that survey are used to measure trust against Strategic Decisions; Operational Services and Customer First.

The overall trust score is currently 85.2% which is great progress but confirmed there is a long way to go to reach the target of 95%.

DT went on to show the Committee a number of initiatives that are being considered and are in progress:

Required / in progress improvements:

- Operational issues
 - Proactive communications
 - Timely resolution
 - Understanding of customer impacts
- DDP developments and access to self-serve data for all customer segments
- Customer Experience Contact Transformation
- Customer Journey/Process Improvements
 - Change Management
 - New Entrants (Join)
 - Invoicing
 - CMS processes

SM asked where the work on the highlighted initiatives will be shown, so as to give the Committee confidence in what progress is being made, particularly as in some categories performance has not improved. DT confirmed this will be in the Business Plan.

Michele Downes (MD) highlighted where customer pain points are logged and what Xoserve are doing about them on the website, You Said, We Did: www.xoserve.com/news/you-said-we-did/

KD commented that the Xoserve website is sometimes difficult to navigate and that the website may need a specific customer area. DT will refer the suggestion back to the team.

8. CSS Update

Paper published for information.

In terms of future meetings, SM requested that now that the program has been restarted, it would be useful to have a more formal update to be provided from August 2020.

9. Information Security Update

DD presented this item in relation to the paper circulated to members on 03 July 2020.

KD commented that Customers should be engaged throughout the Information Security and Privacy strategy delivery, with consideration of Customer requirements throughout decision making, there was a suggestion to have CoMC representation at the Project Board, DD confirmed that this was being considered and planned, DD would liaise with JMc to confirm the best way forward once the Projects are initiated.

10. Financial Information

NS provided a brief verbal update and advised his team are currently finishing the Quarter 1 forecasting and that at the moment, he is not looking to update the charges at this point.

NS will provide an update to this at the end of this month when the Q1 forecasting is complete.

11. Business Continuity Plan

Due August. No discussions held.

12. Contract Assurance Audit

Due August. No discussions held.

13. Key Committee Updates

13.1. DSC Change Management Committee

Angela Clark advised the Committee that the update has been published for information

KD asked for an update relating to the Change Committee finances and a question that was raised with regards to the CDSP potentially having their own ring fenced set of funds, KD added that she was unsure how that would link into the budget and the contract.

New Action 0703: *DSC Change Management Committee update:* Xoserve (AC) to discuss with James Rigby for an update relating to the DSC Change Management Committee finances and a question that was raised with regards to CDSP potentially having their own ring fenced set of funds for business change.

14. Any Other Business

14.1. Xoserve IX refresh update

Paper provided for information. No discussions held.

14.2. DPM update

DA provided an update on the Data Permissions Matrix (DPM) and advised that Modification 0697S - Alignment of the UNC TPD Section V5 and the Data Permissions Matrix, will remove the service types from the DPM and these will be managed separately by a Service Catalogue which will be maintained by the CDSP.

DA sought a view from the Committee with regards to Protected Information not including aggregated data or unclear data. He went on to advise that when discussing this, he believes where data is not attributable to a Shipper or a Consumer, he does not believe the DPM should specifically try to control that.

No further comments were provided.

14.3. Action 0606 from Distribution Workgroup

SM advised that in relation to the Distribution Workgroup action 0606: *Mod 186 Reporting at DNCFM:* Xoserve and Gas Transporters to investigate the matter and provide a statement to the Joint Office for publication to the Workgroup by 10 July 2020, that only a holding statement from the Gas Transporters has been received so far.

SM clarified that, although at this point there is a need to wait for the outcome of the review, he wanted the subject to be logged at the DSC Contract Management Committee for future consideration once the results of the investigation is known. Subject to the outcome of the investigation it may or may not need further action.

BF advised that he was not sure at this time if this is an issue for this Committee. However, this will be placed on the agenda for the August 2020 meeting.

15. Diary Planning

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

Meetings will take place as follows:

Time/Date	Venue	Programme
09:30 Wednesday 19 August 2020	Microsoft Teams	Standard Agenda
09:30 Wednesday 16 September 2020	Microsoft Teams	Standard Agenda
10:30 Wednesday 14 October 2020	Solihull	Standard Agenda
10:30 Wednesday 18 November 2020	Solihull	Standard Agenda

10:30 Wednesday 16 December 2020	Solihull	Standard Agenda
-------------------------------------	----------	-----------------

Action Table (as of 15 July 2020)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
0401	15/04/20	1.6	Xoserve (FC) to provide a paper on options how the industry can best use machine learning in NDM Allocation at the July meeting.	Xoserve (FC)	Carried Forward
0601	11/06/20	6.0	Xoserve/CDSP (JMc/LW) to consider the best way to engage with customers to develop the Customer Effort measure and whether this should be conducted via a survey or Workshop.	Xoserve (JMc/LW)	Carried Forward
0602	11/06/20	7.3.4	Xoserve/CDSP (MD/DR) to provide more insight and visibility of the problems with AQs.	Xoserve/CDSP (MD/DR)	Closed
0701	15/07/20	3.2	<i>Twilio Consent to transfer data:</i> Xoserve to review the UNC and DSC Contracts for any restrictions on data being sent outside of the EEA. In addition, consider any potential impacts on the DSC now the UK is no longer in the EU/EEA	Xoserve (JMc)	Pending
0702	15/07/20	3.4	<i>Cost Allocation Review:</i> JMc to create a process for the inclusion or exclusion of Managing Change in the Charge Base Apportionment Table.	Xoserve (JMc)	Pending
0703	15/07/20	13.1	<i>DSC Change Management Committee update:</i> Xoserve (AC) to discuss with James Rigby for an update relating to the DSC Change Management Committee finances and a question that was raised with regards to CDSP potentially having their own ring fenced set of funds for business change.	Xoserve (AC)	Pending