

UNC DSC Contract Management Committee Minutes
Wednesday 19 February 2020
at 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 (Voting)

Stephanie Clements *	(SC)	ScottishPower	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	(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	(JM ^c)	Xoserve
Michele Downes	(MD)	Xoserve

Observers/Presenters (Non-Voting)

Angela Clarke	(AC)	Xoserve
Alan Raper	(AR)	Joint Office
Cerys Young *	(CY)	Wales & West Utilities
Dan Donovan	(DDo)	Xoserve
David Addison *	(DA)	Xoserve
David Turpin	(DT)	Xoserve
Dennis Regan	(DR)	Xoserve
Dionne Thompson	(DTh)	Xoserve
Dee Deu	(DDe)	Xoserve
Ellie Rogers	(ER)	Xoserve
Fiona Cottam	(FC)	Xoserve
Guv Dosanjh *	(GD)	Cadent (<i>Items 1 and 2 only</i>)
Leteria Beccano	(LB)	Wales & West Utilities
Kirsty Dudley *	(KD)	E.ON
Karen Thompson	(KT)	National Grid
Mark Pollard	(MPo)	Xoserve
Michael Orsler	(MO)	Xoserve
Oorlagh Chapman *	(OC)	Centrica
Simon Harris	(SH)	Xoserve

**Via teleconference*

Copies of all papers are available at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/dsc-contract/190220>

1. Introduction

Rebecca Hailes (RHa) welcomed all to the meeting and confirmed the meeting quorate.

RHa advised that following agenda items would not be discussed at today's meeting unless delegates had any specific questions:

- Item 09 - Business Continuity Plan
- Item 10 - Contract Assurance Audit
- Item 11 - Financial Information – Q3 Forecast Update
- Item 12 - Key Committee Updates - DSC Change Management Committee

1.1. Apologies for absence

Clare Cantle-Jones, Shipper Representative
Richard Loukes, NTS Representative

1.2. Alternates

Stephanie Clements for Claire Cantle-Jones and Teresa Thompson for Richard Loukes.

1.3. Confirm Voting rights

Representative	Classification	Vote Count
Shipper		
Stephanie Clements (+ Alternate Clare Cantle-Jones)	Shipper Class A	2 votes
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
Brandon Rodrigues	IGT	1 vote
Rebecca Cailles	IGT	1 vote

1.4. Approval of Minutes (15 January 2020)

Oorlagh Chapman (OC) noted a requested amendment within section 4.0 of last month's minutes. These had been re-published prior to today's meeting. The Committee reviewed the requested amendment and the Minutes were approved.

1.5. Approval of Late Papers

RHa advised of 2 late papers for agenda items 12 and 13.3 and 3 late paper amendments for agenda items 2.2, 4.3.1, and 13.2. These had been marked on the Joint Office website. The Committee agreed to accept the late amended and late papers for this meeting.

RHa also noted that agenda item 13.3 was a late requested agenda item which would be considered if time permitted (this item was later deferred).

1.6. Review of Outstanding Actions

0101: Electralink Update - Xoserve (DA) to capture risks and come back to the Committee with options and assess the viability of the tool - how much work is involved/impact assessment

Update: See item 6.0. **Closed**

0102: Xoserve IX Refresh Update - MPo to provide Project Costs relating to IX and provide costs on resources in regard to the extension of the project.

Update: See item 13.1. **Closed**

0103: MDD sub-Committee Terms of Reference: Xoserve (MO) to provide clarification and an updated document that refers correctly to points made by the Committee in that there is no mention of SPAA. Then an electronic approval will be sought via email

Update: See item 2.3. **Closed**

2. Approvals

2.1. DRR – XRN 5064 Meter Asset Enquiry API Enhancements

Simon Harris (SH) confirmed the intent of the Disclosure Request Report (DRR) explaining that this will amend the Data Permissions Matrix and permit additional data items.

Committee Representatives were asked to vote on the DRR to allow access to the additional data items. Approval was provided as follows:

Voting Outcome:		XRN 5064 Meter Asset Enquiry API Enhancements	
Shipper	Voting Count	For/Against	
Stephanie Clements (+ Alternate Clare Cattle-Jones)	2	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
Brandon Rodrigues		1	For
Rebecca Cailes		1	For
Total	6	For	

2.2. XRN 5097 Service Line Description Table Cosmetic Changes

Angela Clarke (AC) confirmed the intent of XRN5097 and explained that this will amend the Service Description Tables, these were all cosmetic changes except for ASGT NC SA9 01 which is a new entry. AC confirmed that the approval had also been made at 12 February Change Management Committee.

Teresa Thompson (TT) wished to note that there was a small number of other changes specific to National Grid which also needed to be picked up. Jayne McGlone (JMg) confirmed the additional cosmetic changes noted by National Grid will be processed in a subsequent tidy up of the document for approval next month.

Committee Representatives were asked to approve the changes to the Service description Table. Approval was provided as follows:

Voting Outcome:		XRN 5097 Service Line Description Table Cosmetic Changes	
Shipper	Voting Count	For/Against	
Stephanie Clements (+ Alternate Clare Cattle-Jones)	2	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
Brandon Rodrigues	1	For
Rebecca Cailes	1	For
Total	6	For

2.3. Request to set up a DSC Sub-Group

Michael Orsler (MO) provided a proposed Terms of Reference (ToR) that would apply to the Market Domain Data (MDD) Market Participant Identity (MP Id) Sub-Group. RH asked parties to note that it was a sub-group not a Sub-Committee which was being proposed.

MO explained that the purpose of the Sub-Group would be to oversee the Market Domain Data Market Participant Identity (MDD MP Id) process for gas market participants in accordance with the MDD MP Id Verification Approach Document. MO confirmed the Sub-Group would ratify any decision that sits within the Verification Approach Document, meetings would be set up on the same day as the SPAA Change Board and run by Xoserve/CDSP similar to the Delivery Sub-Group (DSG). Changes to the Verification Approach Document would be approved by the DSC Contract Management Committee.

Steve Mulinganie (SM) requested further clarification is added to the ToR to fully explain the scope of the Sub-Group.

Helen Chandler (HCh) enquired what would happen when SPAA falls away and what the voting arrangements would be. The Committee considered the concept of deemed approvals and how this would work in practice.

David Addison (DA) clarified that Xoserve was seeking approval from the Contract Management Committee to establish a Sub-Group outlining the broad principle of the Sub-Group and that the ToR would need to be ratified and approved by the Sub-Group.

SM supported the establishment of the Sub-Group on the understanding that the ToR would be amended in line with feedback provided and that any further changes required by the MDD Sub-Group would be notified to the Contract Management Committee.

Committee Representatives were asked to vote to establish the MDD Sub-Group. Approval was provided as follows:

Voting Outcome:	Request to set up a MDD Sub-Group	
Shipper	Voting Count	For/Against
Stephanie Clements (+ Alternate Clare Cattle-Jones)	2	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
Brandon Rodrigues	1	For
Rebecca Cailes	1	For
Total	6	For

3. BP20 Update

OC advised the Committee that discussions had taken place with Ofgem and that Ofgem expect all avenues to be exhausted before an appeal is lodged. The deadline for a Budget Appeal is 28 February 2020. In response to exploring all avenues, OC confirmed that a suggestion had been made to defer certain elements of the business plan.

Dave Turpin (DT) provided a brief overview to the Committee on the options to defer part of the activity 'moving UK Link to a cloud storage'. He confirmed that at Centrica's request, Xoserve/CDSP have considered options for deferring up to £6m of the proposed budget spend or deferring collection of the funds.

DT summarised that the budget for 'moving UK Link to the cloud' was £6m 1st Year (BP20), £6m 2nd Year (BP21), and £4m in 3rd (BP22) providing the background and decision drivers for the timing of investment and development. He confirmed that £1m of the first-year investment is associated with the continuation of existing programmes of activity to migrate away from physical hosting solutions and therefore had not been considered in the case for deferral. He wished for the Committee to note that moving UK Link to a cloud storage was not a fixed programme and the BP20 investments were estimates.

DT provided a table outlining the deferral decision driver's evaluation and summarised the considerations for delaying the movement to the cloud. He outlined the ongoing need for maintenance, service demands, and the need to not compromise developmental or functional requirements.

DT talked through a presentation slide to illustrate an overview of timelines and deployment windows. ~~(add slide number?)~~.

DT explained the complex programme of change and what could be deferred. He acknowledged the need for Xoserve /CDSP to consider the financial demands on customers and drivers for change.

DT outlined a number of options for the Committee to consider, these were:

- Option 1. **Do not defer:** Leave full £5m within FY2020/21
- Option 2. **Full deferral:** Defer £5m from FY2020/21 to FY2021/22
- Option 3. **Partial deferral:** Deferral of £3m from FY2020/21 to FY2021/22
- Option 4. **Deferred collection:** Leave FY2020/21 budgets as is, but only collect value needed if/when needed

DT explained that:

- Option 1. Gives greatest flexibility of delivery and ultimately achievement of benefits, however it does not enable Xoserve to support a customer's request.
- Option 2. Achieves a customer's request but Xoserve cannot proceed with cloud programme, even initial preliminary activities.
- Option 3. Provides a compromise with a 'firm' financial position, however until more detailed analysis is completed, Xoserve will not have refined cost estimates of the programme, nor an understanding of programme delivery timescales.
- Option 4. Provides a compromise position, potentially meeting the customer request. It enables commencement of the programme's preliminary activities, however there would be some ambiguity of financial position for customers and Xoserve.

SM wished to understand if Option 1 was the most efficient solution, and if deferral would allow any financial efficiency. He wished to fully understand if any of the presented options allowed a more financial efficient solution.

The Committee discussed the risks and opportunities and the ability to change the charging statement to collect cash later in the year.

DT explained that there will still be a need to spend the £6m but there is an opportunity to consider if this needs to be undertaken as early as first proposed. DT confirmed Xoserve's recommendation in light of the customer request would be to defer collection (Option 4) and only collect values needed if/when needed. He explained that Option 4 enables the work to commence and to determine the optimal technology architecture.

DT clarified that the difference between Option 1 and 4 is *when* the funds are collected.

Kirsty Dudley (KD) expressed concern about the potential for further deferral in a subsequent year and the potential for compromising systems.

SM challenged the rationale for deferring and wished to understand if the deferral delivers an economic efficiency which could justify a change to the arrangements.

KD asked what the minimum was and what the difference in the service would be. DT explained that Options 2&3 posed a significant risk. The information needs to move to the cloud at some point and deferring fully would pose a significant risk and this was not favoured. He explained that there is an opportunity to look for savings and defer components for the work changes, and defer when funds are collected. In response SM expressed concerned about setting a precedent for deferred payments and KD expressed concern that deferring the work could cause it to cost more in the future.

HCh enquired how the fund collection would work and if this would this lead to different amounts being requested each month. HCh explained the complexities from a Transporters perspective of collecting different amounts each month and expressed further concern around the potential of non-payment if values are disputed.

SM challenged if there was a viable case around the timing, expressing concern about potential and significant ramifications. He asked for a view as to whether Option 1 was prudent management. DT confirmed that the same prudent management would be applied within year for all options.

OC clarified that upon the submission of Centrica's first objection, additional cost benefit analysis was requested. It was hoped this information would have been available in November to aid the process. OC welcomed the breakdown of options, the additional information and the discussions held today. Given the information provided OC confirmed that Centrica would prefer Option 4.

HCh expressed that the debate today had provided clarity that the work needs to happen and there are options of when this is paid for. SM understood that ultimately what he had heard today is that the business plans are right, and that Option 1 is a way of managing this prudently. SM in response confirmed he did not support Option 4 on the basis one party had a price cap.

SM believed that there was no requirement of the Contract Management Committee to endorse another option and the information presented by Xoserve/CDSP was for information only to assist the decision for an appeal. SM wished to distinguish that the Budget approval follows a different process and does not require a view from the Contract Management constituency. If Xoserve did want a view this would need to be acquired from all Contract Managers engaged in the business plan.

Brandon Rodrigues (BR) acknowledged the discussions around an intent of an appeal and to avoid initiating an appeal. SM suggested following the discussions held at this meeting, the party intending to appeal should now consider the information, discussions and options presented. In principal, SM, HCh, BR, TTh and RC were in agreement with option 1 though acknowledged that Centrica may still appeal.

SM challenged if Xoserve/CDSP agree with the objection or the grounds for appeal on the basis of the budgeting process, noting that the Contract Management Committee have no right to vote on what the re-plan should be. SM suggested further reflection is undertaken on the options, on the understanding there is a fully defined process if there is going to be a change.

The Committee closed further discussions with no clear preference or any clear agreement on the need to make a change, noting that views have been heard and this now requires further consideration from Centrica.

4. Monthly Contract Management Report (KPIs)

4.1. Contract Metrics including Invoicing

Michele Downes (MD) provided the Contract Metrics update and highlighted that on the 17 January 2020, there was a delay in sending daily read files. These files are scheduled to be sent out by 2pm at the latest, the timescale had been missed and files were sent out to all customers by 3pm. Due to the schedule being missed the KPI failed. Investigation is currently taking place to understand why the files were delayed and steps have been put in place by the technical team to monitor and avoid any future failures.

4.2. Xoserve Incident Summary

Dennis Regan (DR) presented the Xoserve Incident Summary (<https://www.xoserve.com/news/read-our-incident-report-for-january/>) and provided an overview of P1 and P2 incidents, the high-level impacts, causes and the resolutions.

DR confirmed 5 P2s had been identified by customers this month. The root causes for these are being investigated, with some complex configuration changes which have caused a minor issue within the system misconfiguration. Some failures were as a result with the BT Communication Network. DR reassured the Committee that Xoserve are looking at the configurations to ensure these are robust and focus remains on ensuring controls are in place to avoid issues

4.3. Issue Management Updates

4.3.1. Issue Management Dashboard

Michele Downes (MD) provided a brief overview of the Customer Issue Management Dashboard, briefing the Committee on the key issues. In summary MD confirmed:

- Open customer issues increased from 7 to 10
- Open defects had decreased from 49 to 39
- No P1s
- P2s increases from 3 to 5 (see item 4.2)
- Amendment invoice related defects decreased from 12 to 9
- AQ related defects remained the same at 11
- UK Link availability incidents increased from 2 to 3
- Gemini availability incidents experience 2 incidents

MD provided a further table summarising Customer Issues detailing the customer impact and resolution plan. MD confirmed a new item had been added on resolving customer queries, not via CMS.

MD reported 5 defects for incorrect Aqs which are due to be resolved by 01 March.

SM enquired if the items transferring to a Taskforce would still be tracked and if the Committee would receive regular updates. MD confirmed this would continue, regular updates would be provided and further communication would continue with customers to support them with the issues to AQ defects.

4.3.2. Amendment Invoice Taskforce Update

MD provided an update from the Amendment Invoice Taskforce reporting 133 unique MPRNs with a mismatch affecting 13 customers. File merge activities have ensured that the mismatch data for the 133 MPRNs was included in the online ASP files to the relevant customers. The AML files were delivered earlier following improvements to the file generation process.

MD confirmed that the cataloguing of the exception resolution process was behind schedule and the revised plan for completion will be by the end of February 2020.

4.3.3. Enabling large scale utilisation of Class 3

Jayne McGlone (JMc) confirmed that the Product Class 3 migration is progressing. The Total Class 3 on the 01 January 2020 was 2,908,925. The Total Class 3 expected by the end of January is 3,316,652.

4.3.4. UIG Update

Fiona Cottam (FC) provided a progress update on the Unidentified Gas (UIG) Taskforce for information purposes and confirmed this was the same update as the one provided to the previous DSC Change Management Committee. FC confirmed the dashboard status was Green.

FC explained that the plan on a page focussed on closing down activities for the UIG Taskforce. This is due to close down by the end of March 2020 and transition to Business As Usual (BAU). FC confirmed that the close down paperwork is expected to be available next week, summarising the work and approving closedown.

SM agreed that the Contract Management Committee would need to approve the closedown of the Taskforce as this was related to a service line.

FC provided a slide summarising the recommendations. There were 95 recommendation lines, 75 of which are closed, 11 do nothing, 3 BAU, 21 completed, and 40 other options being progressed. She noted that some options were alternatives to each other.

It was also clarified that Modification 0699 - *Incentivise Read Submission Performance using additional Charges* had been withdrawn on 21 January. It was anticipated that this Modification would be adopted by another shipper.

FC confirmed that material will be published for next month's DSC Contract meeting for approval.

4.3.5. AQ Taskforce Update

DR confirmed that the AQ Taskforce had been established and was in the discovery phase, looking at the control mechanisms, data items, management information and the required resources to tackle issues. DR confirmed that the work on defects already identified continues.

DR believed this was not just an AQ issue and he was taking time to understand the root causes for the issues. He recognised there would be upstream issues affecting the accuracy of AQs and he would be looking for some quick wins, not just in the AQ space. He confirmed more information would be presented on the Taskforce findings and its plan of action next month.

KD challenged what the target was for March 2020. DR hoped by March 2020 Xoserve will be able to provide a plan on the priority items, quick wins and achieving the greatest value. KD asked Xoserve/CDSP to further challenge itself to be faster and with a better fix. KD expressed concern about the multiple Taskforces being in place and that this was not sustainable.

SM was keen to have a clear steer from Xoserve on the skill sets required when engaging with customers. DR invited further input from the Committee on what it would find useful.

4.3.6. Golden Principles of Customer Contact

Dionne Thompson (DTh) provided the golden rules Xoserve are adopting as a set of principles to provide the best experience for customers. Measures will be taken, and Xoserve will continually review feedback.

4.4. KVI Summary

4.4.1. KVI Summary

Michele Downes (MD) provided an update on the KVIs and briefly provided an overview of customer service, service delivery, data security, customer issue resolution and relationship Management.

4.4.2. Change Management KVI

James Rigby (JR) provided an overview of the KVI results survey which is undertaken each quarter on the change process. He confirmed this quarter 8 responses had been received and there was a positive response over 90%.

4.4.3. KVI Review Update

JMc provided an update on the KVI review which was looking at combining these with the top issues to be measured.

Existing KVI measures:

- Financial Reporting
- Customer Data Security
- Customer Relationship Management
- Change Management

Proposed Top Issues:

- Issue Resolution
- Communication
- Compliance
- Others

JMc provided the Committee with a straw person KVI for issue resolution. SM noted there was nothing in the straw person about providing a solution. SM asked Xoserve/CDSP to be more willing to bring forward suggested solutions and not just identifying the issues.

KD also suggested that Xoserve may have useful trend data which could be utilised to help consider an issue.

MD acknowledged the need for Xoserve/CDSP to be more pro-active.

MD provided a prioritisation framework for customer issues (slide 5) and asked for parties to consider the approach and feedback any views.

SM suggested the rating classifications for defining the priority of customer issues are reviewed, challenging the one definition “there is not a customer issue” which did not seem correct.

MD clarified that for high priority issues there will be an extra communication service. SM provided some feedback on the Communication table, asking for it to include BAU.

SM also enquired about the summary of customer contacts and the task of checking distribution lists are up to date. JMc confirmed that the Xoserve Customer Advocate Managers (CAMs) will be contacting customers and a general communication has been issued around cleansing distribution lists. SM encouraged Xoserve to use a template to allow bulk changes to distribution lists.

4.4.4. DSC and KPI Review Update

Angela Clarke (AC) provided an update on the KPI progress review, confirming over 380 service lines have been reviewed. AC hoped to be in a position next month to provide the Committee with a plan of action on the service lines.

5. Modification 0702S – Research Body Framework

Ellie Rogers (ER) provided an update on Modification 0702S – ‘Introducing ‘Research Body’ as a new User type to the Data Permissions Matrix and UNC TPD Section V5’.

ER recapped the update provided last month on the concept of adding a Research Body into the UNC, to enable the provision of data with defined objectives. ER explained that then when a Research Body requests access to data, this process will be monitored and managed by the Contract Management Committee.

ER provided the draft Framework to support the requirement of managing requests. It was recognised that this process would need to be flexible as at present (prior to this going live) it was difficult to predict the scope of potential requests. The timing of the Self-Governance Modification going live and readiness to respond to requests was considered. SM enquired about the governance and amendment of the framework relating this to established UNC Related Documents which require UNCC approval for changes.

The Committee also discussed how public the request assessment should be and any confidentiality issues with publicising the details of requests.

HCh enquired why this was different to the Data Permissions Matrix, ER explained that a new user type would be added to the Data Permissions Matrix, however this User category would be different to existing Users and have different considerations when requesting access to data.

ER explained the checks that would be undertaken to validate the organisation requesting data, the research purpose and how the data will be used.

The Committee considered measuring requests against a defined scope of objectives and grounds for accepting requests. The Committee also considered an appeal process and escalation point for parties whose requests have been rejected.

ER confirmed that the service will be a chargeable service.

The Committee considered that each request would have to be assessed on its merits including the reason for the request. It was clarified that if a 3rd party such as a consultant applied for access to certain data items this would not automatically entitle another 3rd party to the same data items. Access will be granted on a case by case basis and all requests will be logged and monitored.

Leteria Beccano (LB) enquired how access will be granted to data. It was anticipated this could be provided with a one-off portal or share-point link.

ER confirmed the next steps of the Modification including the approval of the framework. It was anticipated that the Contract Management Committee would be able to approve the framework next month.

It was suggested before approval is sought that Xoserve should seek a legal view around liabilities.

Alan Raper (AR) also requested if Xoserve can provide a template / assessment criteria for consideration at the next 0702S Workgroup meeting on 27 February 2020.

6. Electralink Gas Catalogue Update

JMc provide a brief update on the product being developed by Electralink and the need to assess the options for the data catalogue. JMc provided a presentation outlining two key actions. Action 1, to agree to publication of UK Link Manual and Action 2, to assess the options relating to the data catalogue.

Action 1 - To agree to publication of UK Link Manual.

DA explained the background to removing current access restrictions to the UK Link Manual. This was currently managed with password protection. There were no concerns expressed about removing the password protection, however Sally Hardman (SH) did enquire about the process for accepting the terms and conditions when accessing the UK Link. JMc confirmed that there are conditional terms of use which will still need to be accepted. DA explained Xoserve still needed to consider how it would ask parties to accept terms and conditions and avoid inherent IP issues.

Action 2 - To assess the options relating to the data catalogue.

The Committee considered the 4 Options for the data catalogue and the risks associated to each option:

- Option 1 – do nothing
- Option 2 – publish without validation
- Option 3 – publish, Xoserve validate
- Option 4 – publish cloned version

~~The Committee agreed to defer consideration and at present support option 1 'do nothing' with a view to reconsidering the other options at a later date.~~

[The Committee supported option 1 'do nothing' with a view to reconsidering the other options at a later date.](#)

7. CSS Update

Item not discussed. Update deferred until March 2020.

8. Information Security Update

Dee Deu (DD) provided an update on the ISO external audit which was undertaken in January. DD confirmed that the BSI auditor was onsite for 2 days. Interim observations had been made, overall the auditor was happy with progression of roadmap activities and the remit of security activities.

DD confirmed that there were no major or minor non-conformities and Xoserve/CDSP will be revisited in July 2020. It was anticipated that a re-certification audit would be undertaken next year.

9. Business Continuity Plan

At the beginning of the meeting the Chair advised that the material for this item was published on the Joint Office Website and would not be discussed at the meeting unless there were any specific questions. None were received and the next update is due April 2020

10. Contract Assurance Audit

At the beginning of the meeting the Chair advised that the material for this item was published on the Joint Office Website and would not be discussed at the meeting unless there were any specific questions. None were received and the next update is due April 200

11. Financial Information – Q3 Forecast Update

Item not discussed as material was circulated to the Contract Management Committee members on the 30 January for review and any questions arising have received a direct response.

12. Key Committee Updates - DSC Change Management Committee

Item not discussed.

- PAC's key messages are available at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/pac/summarykeymessages>
- DSC Change Management Committee minutes are available at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/dsc-change/120220>
- DSC Credit Committee minutes are available at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/dsc-credit/251119>

13. Any Other Business

13.1. Xoserve IX refresh update

Mark Pollard (MPo) provided an update on the IX Service Replacement and advised that the original aim was to migrate everyone to the new service by the end of February 2020. He briefly re-capped the difficulties encountered which had led to the February date not being achievable. He confirmed the target date for completion had been reset for August 2020.

MP confirmed there would be no impact to the financial forecasted spend of £930k.

MP confirmed regular updates will be provided for transparency.

13.2. Contract Management Committee (CoMC) Terms of Reference

JMc provided a draft Terms of Reference for the Contract Management Committee to review. The Committee agreed to the suggested additions.

HCh was interested in views from representatives around the decision-making process. Specifically, what the expectations are for approving or giving opinions at the meetings, and she wished to state that parties must have the appropriate level of authority to give Approvals where required at that meeting. TT was keen on having a clear understanding of the expectations from parties where Approval is required and encouraged Xoserve/CDSP to clearly indicate when Approvals are required when meeting papers are circulated. HCh concurred, clear indications need to be communicated possibly via email to prevent deferring decisions unnecessarily.

It was agreed that the Terms of Reference would be updated and recirculated for approval next month.

13.3. Data Flows – Treatment of Information post REC Implementation

Update deferred until March 2020. SM confirmed this is being discussed at the Distribution Workgroup Meeting on 27 February 2020.

14. Diary Planning

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

RHa asked all representatives for an early indication if they would not be available for April's DSC Contract Management on 15 April due to the Easter Bank Holiday with a view to re-considering the meeting date if deemed necessary. No initial requests were made to move to the meeting.

Meetings will take place as follows:

Time/Date	Venue	Programme
10:30 Wednesday 18 March 2020	Lansdowne Gate, 65 New Road, Solihull B91 3DL	Standard Agenda
10:30 Wednesday 15 April 2020	Lansdowne Gate, 65 New Road, Solihull B91 3DL	Standard Agenda
10:30 Wednesday 20 May 2020	Lansdowne Gate, 65 New Road, Solihull B91 3DL	Standard Agenda
10:30 Wednesday 17 June 2020	Lansdowne Gate, 65 New Road, Solihull B91 3DL	Standard Agenda
10:30 Wednesday 15 July 2020	Lansdowne Gate, 65 New Road, Solihull B91 3DL	Standard Agenda

Action Table (as at 19 February 2020)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
0101	15/01/20	3.0	<i>Electralink Update:</i> Xoserve (DA) to capture risks and come back to the Committee with options and assess the viability of the tool - how much work is involved/impact assessment	Xoserve (DA)	Closed
0102	15/01/20	12.1	<i>Xoserve IX Refresh Update: Xoserve IX Refresh Update:</i> MPo to provide Project Costs relating to IX and provide costs on resources in regard to the extension of the project.	Xoserve (DA)	Closed
0103	15/01/20	12.3	<i>MDD sub-Committee Terms of Reference:</i> Xoserve (MO) to provide clarification and an updated document that refers correctly to points made by the Committee in that there is no mention of SPAA. Then an electronic approval will be sought via email	Xoserve (MO)	Closed
			No new actions recorded		