

UNC DSC Contract Management Committee Minutes
Wednesday 14 February 2024
Via Microsoft Teams

Attendees			
Mark Cockayne (Chair)	(MC)	Joint Office	Non-Voting
Ben Mulcahy (Secretary)	(BM)	Joint Office	Non-Voting
Shipper User Representatives (Voting)			
Andy Eisenberg	(AE)	E.ON Next	Class A & Class C
Oorlagh Chapman	(OC)	Centrica	Class A
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	SEFE Energy	Class Bx2 & Class C
Transporter Representatives (Voting)			
Helen Chandler	(HC)	Northern Gas Networks	DNO Voting
Sally Hardman	(SH)	Scotia Gas Networks	DNO Voting
Richard Loukes + Alternate for Andrea Godden	(RL)	National Gas Transmission	NTS Voting
Charlotte Gilbert + Alternate for Tom Jenkins	(CG)	BU-UK	IGT Voting
CDSP Contract Management Representatives (Non-Voting)			
Jayne McGlone	(JMc)	Xoserve	
James Rigby	(JRi)	Xoserve	
Observers/Presenters (Non-Voting)			
Amanpreet Dhesi	(AD)	Joint Office	
Dean Johnson	(DJ)	Xoserve	
Edward Allard	(EA)	Cadent	
Joanne Williams	(JW)	Xoserve	
Lee Warren	(LW)	Xoserve	
Marina Papathoma	(MP)	Wales & West Utilities	
Angela Clarke	(AC)	Xoserve	
Michael Orsler	(MO)	Xoserve	
Michele Downes	(MD)	Xoserve	
Paul Orsler	(PO)	Xoserve	
Sharon Dudley	(SDu)	Xoserve	
Simon Harris	(SHa)	Xoserve	
Steve Deery	(SD)	Xoserve	
<p><i>DSC Contract Management meetings will be quorate where: Committee Representatives of at least two (2) shall be Shipper Representatives and three (3) shall be DNO Representatives, NTS Representatives or IGT Representatives, are present at a meeting who can exercise six (6) votes.</i></p>			

Please note these minutes do not replicate/include detailed content provided within the presentation slides, therefore it is recommended that the published presentation material is reviewed in conjunction with these minutes. Copies of all papers are available at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/dsc-contract/140224>

1. Introduction

Mark Cockayne (MC) as Chair welcomed all to the meeting and confirmed the meeting was quorate.

1.1. Apologies for absence

Andrea Godden, NTS Representative
Tom Jenkins, IGT Representative

1.2. Alternates

Richard Loukes for Andrea Godden
Charlotte for Tom Jenkins

1.3. Confirm Voting rights

The voting rights were confirmed as below:

The Class C vote unallocated at the start of the meeting was assigned to Andy Eisenberg, for the remainder of the term, in a randomised process in accordance with the UNC (UNC GT Section D Annex D-2 Paragraph 2.2.9 (b))

Representative	Classification	Vote Count
Shipper		
Andy Eisenberg	Shipper Class A & C	2 votes
Oorlagh Chapman	Shipper Class A	1 vote
Steve Mulinganie	Shipper Class 2xB & C	3 votes
Transporter		
Helen Chandler	DNO	1 vote
Sally Hardman	DNO	1 vote
Richard Loukes + Alternate for Andrea Godden	NTS	2 votes
Charlotte Gilbert + Alternate for Tom Jenkins	IGT	2 votes

1.4. Approval of Minutes (17 January 2024)

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved, and MC advised that the requested amendment within the 20 December 2023 minutes had been made and they had been subsequently republished.

Approval of Late Papers

Two papers had been provided for items 4 and 9.1 after the Meeting Papers deadline but it is acknowledged that this was due to the nature of the data they reported, and they were thus not identified as 'late papers'.

1.5. Review of Outstanding Actions

0602: CDSP (DA) to undertake a case study into Governance between DSC Change Management and DSC Contract Management Committee interactions using recent Hydrogen Change XRN5531 and report back.

Update:

MC noted that the issue had been discussed at the January meeting and a detailed review provided by the CDSP had been published on the Joint Office January 2024 meeting webpage, as advised in the January meeting minutes.

Jayne McGlone (JMc) confirmed that the CDSP had received no subsequent commentary or concerns and the Committee agreed to close this action.

Action: Closed.

0101: CDSP (MD) to send out more details to Shippers around the Meter Read Issue once investigations have been completed and what the next steps are.

Update:

Angela Clarke (AC) advised that the details were sent to all parties on 18 January, and MC asked the Committee if there were any further concerns or if the issue was resolved. Andy Eisenberg (AE) asked if the pertinent controls had been tightened to prevent a reoccurrence of the issue. AC committed to confirm if this was the case and this was later discussed further under item 5.5 and verified sufficient to close this action.

Action Closed

0102: CDSP (DA) to arrange a meeting to discuss R0148 in more detail and to circulate the necessary documents.

Update:

Sharon Dudley (SDu) confirmed that the meeting had taken place shortly after the January DSC Contract Management Committee and that David Addison (DA) had also provided several online sessions and open meetings for customers to drop into to discuss R0148 in more detail. She reported that the CDSP had now submitted a response for the item and the action was thus agreed closed.

Action: Closed

0103: CDSP (JMc) to update the committee on a plan for in-person CoMC meetings.

Update:

JMc shared that last month's discussions had confirmed an appetite for some in-person meetings during the Committee year and that Xoserve's view was that there was value in such meetings. Accordingly, the schedule of events had been considered, and in particular, the quarterly updates provided in February, May, August and November.

AC shared a slide with the Committee that illustrated the DSC Contract Management Committee-related activities throughout the calendar year, which included BP24/25 milestones. Please refer to the published slide for full details.

JMc suggested to the Committee that an annual in-person meeting in May would have value with both the quarterly updates and the forward plan for the Principles & Approach documentation for the BP year under consideration at that time. She observed that if this was agreed in principle it would provide an opportunity for all parties to have sufficient notice to manage their calendars and organisational requirements.

Helen Chandler (HC) expressed support for this proposal. Andy Eisenberg (AE) asked that a process be put in place to not only confirm attendees but also to advise those who had already agreed to attend if it later proved that very few parties had agreed to be present.

JMc agreed, and MC observed that attending remote meetings had meant that the necessity of confirming attendance in advance was now greatly reduced but asked that all Committee members provide their intentions of attendance for such in-person meetings in advance to assist in this regard.

Oorlagh Chapman (OC) Suggested a second meeting in October, noting that this coincided with the changing of the gas year with potential new members joining the Committee who could then benefit from introductions in person. JMc agreed, adding that this could include a refresh of the DSC Contract Management Committee Terms of Reference (ToR).

MC acknowledged these points and committed to considering the Agenda for the October meeting, including a Pre-Meeting introduction, general direction and a run-through of the DSC Contract Management Arrangements.

<p>ACTION 0201: JO (MC) to produce an outline for a new members introduction for in-person October 24 DSC Contract Committee meeting</p>

Action Closed

2. Approvals

2.1. MPidVAD rule amendment

Michael Orsler (MO) presented this paper which sought approval to amend the Market Domain Data Market Participant Identity Verification Approach Document (MPidVAD) to enable Supplier Short Codes to be reassigned should Ofgem utilise this novation process (i.e. full transfer of historic rights and obligations) to an alternative Supplier entity.

DSC Contract Management Committee approval was sought for two distinct changes to the same paragraph in the MPidVAD to reflect two different potential Ofgem scenarios related to this License Transfer process.

In the first scenario, the current wording of the MPidVAD prevents the Ofgem permitted License Transfer, where the original legal entity has Supply Meter Points registered using the assigned MPid, meaning that consumers whose Supplier was subject to a License Transfer would be recorded against an unlicensed Supplier entity until any portfolio transfer took place.

The second scenario has come about through Supplier rationalisation, where a Supplier was seeking to novate between multiple companies under the same company group. Ofgem had granted a new licence based on a plan to transfer all customers from the existing, separate gas and electricity supply licenses to the new licensed party and would be engaging with the Supplier in relation to the transfer plan.

Please refer to the published slides for full details.

HC expressed concerns about this request setting precedence in approach wherein the rules were altered to meet an individual party's requirements, rather than reviewing the rules in general to ensure they remained fit for purpose, a view that AE supported. A separate Workgroup was suggested as necessary to do this with potential consultations on any proposed changes.

MO acknowledged this view and explained that Xoserve had split the issue into two parts in awareness of the pressing timing issue to enable this to be addressed whilst still allowing further discussion on the wider issue.

Sally Hardman (SH) agreed with fellow Committee members' concerns and asked if the changes were required by a Shipper or Supplier and if that party had made Ofgem aware of the issues created by these actions. MO confirmed that it was a Supplier only based request and suggested that the impacts related to short codes were not fully appreciated by Ofgem.

OC agreed that a Governance Workgroup was required to resolve such process issues, with this being a matter that needed to be addressed to resolve any potential mismatch.

AE agreed, sharing his understanding that this was more of a derogation type of request in that it was seeking a changing of the rules for this scenario, with an opportunity to raise concerns, adding that he did not think there was any real legitimate reason to prevent it. Ofgem has stated the Supplier can novate with this issue being a Shipper form preventing it. On this basis, he did not see any issue in letting this go ahead.

MC asked what the consequences would be if this request was not approved. MO advised that if the novation went ahead Xoserve would have an unlicensed supplier on their systems, meaning potentially a Shipper of Last Resort (SoLR), impacting the costs of the supplier systems.

HC stated that, in light of these potential consequences it seemed unwise to hold matters up but did want to push the point that it did not seem this approach was the right way to change the document, and was concerned the Committee would get more scenarios where issues do not fit the rules, and as such wanted to see a Governance Workgroup progressed to address the issue and stop further such instances.

MO added that his view was that scenario one was the right thing to do whereas scenario two would benefit from more discussion given it was about multiple legal entities and not really a novation.

SH asked if the vote could be amended to a derogation to allow a separate review and consultation, to which JMc replied that it was not clear if that would hold matters up and the first scenario was particularly time constrained. She suggested the Committee could give a caveated approval for the change on the basis that a workgroup is set up to review the document and go to consultation for any proposed changes.

MO noted that if the Committee did not act it could inadvertently create a wider risk, as if the Shipper were to fail it would necessitate a SOLR anyway.

Steve Mulinganie (SM) shared that he had previously had a long discussion with Dave Addison and colleagues at Xoserve, and in the context of those conversations, was comfortable with the first proposal.

Shipper, DNO, NTS and IGT Members were asked to vote to approve the First Scenario relating to the Ofgem-permitted License Transfer, with unanimous approval recorded as follows:

Voting Outcome:		
Shipper Representatives	Voting Count	For/Against
Andy Eisenberg	2	For
Oorlagh Chapman	1	For
Steve Mulinganie	3	For
Total	6	For
Transporter Representatives	Voting Count	For/Against
Helen Chandler (DNO)	1	For
Sally Hardman (DNO)	1	For
Richard Loukes (NTS)	2	For
Charlotte Gilbert (IGT)	2	For
Total	6	For

Shipper, DNO, NTS and IGT Members were then asked to vote to approve the Second Scenario relating to a Supplier seeking to novate between multiple companies under the same company group and on the basis that a Governance Workgroup review is undertaken on the document, with unanimous approval recorded as follows:

Voting Outcome:		
Shipper Representatives	Voting Count	For/Against
Andy Eisenberg	2	For
Oorlagh Chapman	1	For
Steve Mulinganie	3	For
Total	6	For
Transporter Representatives	Voting Count	For/Against
Helen Chandler (DNO)	1	For
Sally Hardman (DNO)	1	For
Richard Loukes (NTS)	2	For
Charlotte Gilbert (IGT)	2	For
Total	6	For

MO confirmed that the requested Governance Workgroup would be set up to review the Market Domain Data Market Participant Identity Verification Approach Document (MPIdVAD)

ACTION 0202: JO (MC) to set up a Governance Workgroup to review the MPIdVAD.

2.2. DRR – RECCo Proof of Concept to discount false flag Tamper Alerts

SDu presented this paper requesting Committee approval for a Proof of Concept conducted by RECCo, and related amendment to the Data Permission Matrix, to provide a sample of Supply Meter Point References and a date range within which the tamper alerts have been recorded.

She advised that RECCo was going through sampling with three suppliers and was looking to address the fact that some tamper alerts can be very sensitive and suggest a meter may have been tampered with when this is not the case. RECCo was undertaking this proof-of-concept project on the premise of removing such false flags to separate them and ascertain what can be used for theft investigation and what cannot.

The Committee were advised that a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) was not required as no personal data would be provided other than postcodes which the RECCo were already entitled to access. Similarly, it was noted that any subsequent work that saw RECCo requiring additional data would need further requests in the same manner. JMc added that the work would be done under an existing third-party agreement already in place with RECCo.

Please refer to the published slides for full details.

Shipper, DNO, NTS and IGT Members were asked to vote to approve the RECCo Proof of Concept to discount false flag Tamper Alerts request with unanimous approval recorded as follows:

Voting Outcome:		
Shipper Representatives	Voting Count	For/Against
Andy Eisenberg	2	For
Oorlagh Chapman	1	For
Steve Mulinganie	3	For
Total	6	For
Transporter Representatives	Voting Count	For/Against
Helen Chandler (DNO)	1	For
Sally Hardman (DNO)	1	For
Richard Loukes (NTS)	2	For
Charlotte Gilbert (IGT)	2	For
Total	6	For

SDu thanked the Committee for its approval and confirmed that Xoserve would commence work with RECCo accordingly.

3. Business Plan Updates

3.1. BP Update

James Rigby (JRi) provided a verbal update on the Business Plan (BP24) in which he advised that Xoserve would be publishing organisational charging schedules before the close of business on 16 February 2024 that week, being the last document in the BP24 cycle and as such they were moving into the initial stages for the development of BP25, with conceptualisation already underway.

3.2. Efficiency Review

JRi advised that the first advisory board was held the previous week, with good discussions and feedback adding value to the session. He cited examples of discussions around evidencing when activities happen to address the value for money review items, as well as how progress was tracked using a broader view of not just lowest cost solutions but also considering their efficiency and effectiveness.

JRi also provided details of discussions around reporting, which had been for consideration as a few had not favourably benchmarked back in August. The discussions proved a good indicator of how much value would be added, where some reports had legacy components of reduced value, for which JRi highlighted a steer from CAB to consider more ambitious approaches to resolution such as self-service and open data options for the future. He then asked if any other CAB members in the meeting had any feedback.

OC confirmed it was a good introduction to what the expectations were but could not gloss over the fact that CAB was disappointed with the lack of transparency where some decisions and projects closed without an opportunity for CAB to review.

SM agreed with this commentary, noting that the intent of the CAB was not to simply rubber stamp Xoserve actions, adding that he thought the progress had proven positive. He added that the CAB needed to see the process working rather than just being told it worked, and that such assurance work would develop trust. He shared that this pushback had been taken positively and that all parties had agreed on a constructive way forward.

JRi added that he would continue to bring BP updates to the DSC Contract Management Committee meetings and was happy to add monthly summary updates but, unless particularly noteworthy events occurred, suggested providing CAB updates quarterly.

MC acknowledged this suggestion and asked if JRi could provide a suggested format for such quarterly CAB Updates, which JRi agreed to produce.

ACTION 0203: CDSP (JRi) to produce a format suggestion for quarterly CAB Updates.

4. Monthly Contract Management Report

Please refer presentation published at:

<https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Contract/140224>

AC drew the Committee's attention to Slide 4 and that all Energy Performance Indicators and CDSP Performance Indicators (Cycle Time) were green, before handing over to Dean Johnson (DJ) to review the KPM reporting.

4.1. KPM Update

DJ summarised the KPMs and PIs for January 2024 providing information on the failures and remedial actions, noting:

KPM 07 was reported as failed, missing the Performance target of 100% with 99.99% of 153.5m reads and 254.1k asset updates received, explaining that several exceptions had occurred and citing examples including table locks that needed reprocessing, Prime/Sub exceptions and non-standard sites that all required manual processing. He added that some Shippers had provided files that did not have the requisite entries to allow responses to be generated.

DJ noted that KPM13 was, at the time of the meeting, still pending and was expected out later that day (14 February 2024) and advised that this measure was also to be reported as failed, again mainly due to matters relating to prime and sub-metering. Version 2 of the report was due to be published soon and would include this metric.

Moving to the PIs, PI.06 had failed, with a Performance of 99.20% against a Target of 100%. This resulted in 10 reports, 2 individual reports sent to 5 different customers, being sent outside of SLA.

DJ then advised that the figures for PI.09 in the appendix were inaccurate. With an actual volume of 4.5k and a result of 91.2%, which still exceeded the target. He added that this would also be corrected in the second version of the report.

For a detailed update, please refer to the published presentation.

4.2. KPM – Customer Relationship Survey Results CDSP

This item is due to be provided in April.

4.3. Monthly Contract Management Reports CDSP

AC provided the Committee with a review of the Communications Highlights for January 2024, detailing the Publications and events within the Month and noted the links within the report to provide the reader with further information on each.

AC shared that the Meter Count Report for the month had shown little movement from the December 2023 report and that 56% of the entire meter portfolio was now Smart.

Performance monitoring for January 2024 saw Gemini Performance and UK link Performance and Availability exceed targets with figures higher than 99%.

Please refer to the published slides for full details.

4.4. Xoserve Incident Summary CDSP

DJ presented this item, sharing that 4 P2 Incidents had occurred during the month, all of which were resolved and none of which resulted in a KPM Breach

- UKLink Portal/Contour/CMS were affected by Microsoft Multifactor Authentication (MFA) email failures which Microsoft subsequently resolved.
- Gemini was unavailable for 1hr and 6 minutes due to a manual error made following a planned change to increase storage space. DJ confirmed additional controls had been put in place to remove the risk of the incident being repeated.
- UK-Link access was affected for two within-day periods when a planned rebuild was identified as the cause of job performance issues.
- UK-Link and Legacy/CMS were unavailable for a within-day period for which an automatic failover was triggered, and a controlled restart restored the service.

For further details, please refer to the published presentation.

4.5. Customer Issue Management Dashboard

Michele Downes (MD) provided an overview of the Open Issues Impacting Customers. Please refer to the published slides for full details.

These included:

- Missing Secured Active Messages (SAMs) – from the original issue scope of 83k SAMs, there remained 1 outstanding message which was pending a customer response and one had been resolved in January.
- Consumer Contact Data – this is related to incomplete data sent in the portfolio files to IGTs and DNs, for which MD advised that a number of issues were identified and fixed, with further issues subsequently found which were expected to be fixed before the April issue of the Dashboard.

- Meter Readings – Class 3 and Class 4 meter reading batches failed to complete during December 2023 and on 01 and 02 January 2024. Although the meter readings were recorded in UK Link the energy consumption was not calculated – Communications were sent to the Shippers with meters involved and the meter readings were recalculated. There was no impact to PAF reporting.

AE observed that from last month's meeting, there had been a question regarding the delineation between Issues and Incidents, sharing that E.ON Next felt that this last discussed event had had an impact on them, and noted that it was customers that informed CDSP of its occurrence, which he felt cast themselves in a similar role to that of the CDSP when they highlighted detecting the recent CSS P1 incident to the REC, which had been missed by the CSS.

HC asked if there was value in the CDSP providing a refresher on what was considered an incident and what an issue, and the demarcation as to how these are characterised. MD explained that currently, P2s are not retrospective, adding that if an event is impacting a customer today it would be considered an incident. If a retrospective event is identified, possibly from a customer, then that would be classified as an issue, though she assured the Committee that it would be treated with the same attention.

Whilst AE acknowledged this commentary and that a P1 or P2 is a 'live' event that the CDSP needs to address urgently, he added that the events in question were 'issues' because the CDSP did not detect them at the time to make them P1 or P2 incidents, which they may well have been. As a customer his organisation had raised an issue at the time but experienced further failures, which were caused by the same issue being unresolved.

MC asked what came out of the remedial analysis, to which MD replied that the batch process had failed and, whilst there were alerts on the parent process which would be picked up, this was a child job that failed which did not have such alerts in place. The CDSP is now performing manual health checks until the long-term solution on child jobs is introduced.

SM cautioned against getting lost in the minutiae and observed that the inference seems to be that 'issues' need less focus than 'incidents' whereas customers want to see the same commitment and appropriate and right resources for both. He suggested that a presentation to detail that both events are dealt with at the appropriate level and resource and that issues are not deprioritised would be beneficial, with an understanding of the escalation process. MD agreed to take an action for the CDSP to present back to the Committee on this.

ACTION 0204: CDSP (MD & DJ) to provide a presentation detailing the demarcation between Issues and Incidents, detailing the commitments, resourcing and escalation process for each.

MC noted the commentary concerning the delay in submitting the Capacity supporting information files and questioned whether this meant that KPM12 showing 100% was correct. MD responded that she believed it correct as this was not subject to a KPM measure under the UNC but would take an Action to check.

ACTION 0205: CDSP (MD) to confirm the accuracy of the January 2024 KPM12 figure considering the reported Invoicing files issue.

4.6. Gas Retail Data Agent (GRDA) Update

Sharon Dudley (SDu) presented a status update on the Gas Retail Data Agent (GRDA) Performance, advising the figures given were based on a draft report due to Meeting Paper timings, with 7.1.1 reporting failure due to missing messages from CSS.

Please refer to the published slides for full details.

4.7. KVI Change Management.

CDSP (PO) provided a status update on KVI Change Management, sharing the KVI Change Management Survey results for October to December 23. Which included Xoserve's Change and Regulatory Support services.

Please refer to the published slides for full details

He advised the survey was sent out in December and had been extended to allow for the Christmas break. Three responses had been received, resulting in a Year To Date (YTD) Scorecard for customer satisfaction of 9.5 against a target of 8. Anecdotal feedback from customers was provided on the next slide.

PO commented that Xoserve were seeking further input from parties but noted that this was a response that echoed commentary within the Change space, which was much appreciated and valued, sharing his view that it was moving along nicely with some positive feedback.

He shared that the next survey was due in March and that they were very conscious of the limited response so looking to improve that for a truer image in the final survey of 2023.

At this point HC raised a question about the data provided in the appendixes of the Monthly Contract Management Report, noting the entries detailed on **Slide 32** and **Slide 33** that highlighted Incidents in which Correla had identified incidents that could have been avoided had Correla acted earlier and asked how Xoserve's contractor management responded to such metrics and suggested that this slide should be moved out of the appendixes and into the main meeting pack discussed during DSC Contract Management Committee meetings.

AE agreed, adding that the slide put a spotlight on issues that could have been identified earlier and tied in with earlier discussions regarding the meter read incident which would presumably be reported in the red box as '*Customer Identified the incident and the incident could have been avoided had Correla taken earlier action*'.

JRi responded that internal discussions were underway as to how to bring to life the contract management that occurs with the team in place and asked the Committee for the time to produce a guide as to what is being done and what Xoserve do to manage this, asking for an Action to come back to the next meeting with the right people from Xoserve.

HC emphasised that the commentary needed to come from Xoserve and not Correla, to which MC added that it would be appropriate to explore the key controls between both organisations.

JRi proposed that the issue discussed here would be used as an example in the response, with the Brief being to explain the control and bring it to life. He added that they had feedback around the BP, noting that DSC Contract Management Committee meetings often focus a lot on operational performance and this Action would enable contract management to get the same due airing.

SM suggested that initial comments from Correla would be useful as the data on the slide did tell a story that implied a failure of control unless there was something the Committee was missing as the figures, especially in aggregate, were quite significant.

ACTION 0206: CDSP (JRi / AC) to provide an insight into Xoserve's Contract Management of Correla including using the example of the concerns raised in regards to the Major Incident Reporting figures in the February Contract Management Report.

DJ recognised that 16 such incidents within the Financial Year to Date was a high figure to report but shared that it did come down, in part, as to how an incident is defined as 'controllable', giving as an example the Microsoft Multifactor Authentication (MFA) issue detailed under item 4.4 which was defined 'controllable', adding that you could ask how much control could Correla have of that.

MC highlighted how this discussion linked to considerations under **Action 0204** and suggested that DJ accordingly coordinate with MD to contribute to the response to that Action.

5. Information Security Update

The next update is due in March.

6. Financial Information

James Madge (JM) provided a brief overview of the confidential 'Q3 CoMC Finance Report FY23/24', during which no adverse comments were forthcoming from those parties in attendance at the meeting.

7. Business Continuity Plan

LW provided a brief overview of the confidential 'Business Continuity Update',

SM expressed an awareness that Market Wide Half Hourly Settlement (MHHS) delivery was underway with Switchstream applying to both gas and power from, he believed, around November and asked if the BCP was looking at this regarding potential conflicts or timing issues. LW confirmed that this was indeed the case and that he was working in cooperation with the Operations team to ensure testing did not impact Operations and providing assurance in that regard. He stated he would take an Action to provide further commentary on this.

LW then added that the Security Rota was delayed slightly on the Cybersecurity Framework as there had been several changes in September, adding that he would advise the Committee in the March meeting of the new scope resulting from the modernisation process.

ACTION 0207: CDSP (LW) to provide further commentary on BCP consideration of Switchstream implications and the new scope to the Security Rota.

8. Contract Assurance Audit

JMc provided a brief overview of the confidential Internal Audit Plan 2024/25 and its Progress Update as well as the Summary Audit Report for April 2023 to March 2024, during which no adverse comments were forthcoming from those parties in attendance at the meeting. JMc confirmed the proposed Audit Plan 2024/25 would be presented to ARC in April for approval.

9. Key Committee Updates

9.1. DSC Change Management Comm

Paul Orsler (PO) provided an overview of the DSC Change Management Committee held on 07 February 2024, and highlighted that the BP23 General Change budget position was adjusted to allow rebate from BP23 into BP24 and confirmed that there will be no constituency overspend in BP23.

PO shared that 2 small stand-alone projects had been delivered in January – XRN5690 Creating a loadable Billing Calendar File for DSC Customers and a reporting Change for DNs to enable decision refreshes for default Aqs as an annualised reporting service.

Key subjects for the meeting were a design decision for the Gemini Sustain Plus Programme (XRN5564) and the CMS Rebuild Must Read Process (MUR) which was deferred with a set of mitigation actions to an extraordinary DSC Change Management Committee meeting to be held on 20 February for a March implementation in the CMS Solution.

The Scope was also approved for XRN5711 June 24 Major Release to include the delivery of XRN5675 *'Implementation of 0836S Resolution of Missing Messages after CSS implementation and integration with R0067 and 0855 – Settlement Adjustments for SMPs impacted by the Central Switching System P1 incident'*.

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

9.2. Retail Energy Code (REC) Updates

CDSP (SDu) provided an overview of the ongoing REC Changes, with a summary of the Changes in progress and the related XRN Changes, including those under prioritisation review. An additional line had been included to inform the Committee of the expected impact of each change.

Developments for R0067 had progressed since the report pack was compiled and SDu advised the Change implementation went ahead on 08 February and was successfully deployed. The functionality had been manually tested and was now waiting for a missing message to come in to enable live testing.

Similarly, for R0148 there was an update since the report pack was produced, with the consultation response now submitted and now awaiting a response from the Code Manager.

GES Key Update highlighted that R0071 DCC access to EESA and GES now due for delivery on 23 February 2024.

Please refer to the presentation slides published for a detailed update.

Further information on all the Changes can be found on the REC Portal at: <https://recportal.co.uk/recportal>.

10. Any Other Business

10.1. CMS Update

Joanne Williams (JW) provided an overview of the CMS rebuild delivery roadmap and the current progress to date.

The Committee were informed that the next launch of version 1.7 was on track for 24 February 2024 with two new processes, Know Meter issue (KMI) and Shipper Agreed Reads (SAR) ready for launch, JW advised that demos and walkthroughs had been provided by the training teams in Customer Focus Group session.

The next version, V1.8, includes the Must Reads (MUR) process and is currently planned for 04 March and includes enhancements and tweaks to the files. It had been recently recognised from the Change Pack issued in January that a couple of organisations have system integrations with the legacy CMS that CDSP were previously unaware of. In recognition of this, the CDSP intended to provide free enhanced support and had already walked through the process with the customers who had raised concerns and added that the CDSP may now have another solution available after day 1 implementation and were considering the impacts and details of this. JW advised that as soon as the CDSP has these they would be communicated to customers.

Looking at the CMS Roadmap JW commented that V1.9 and V1.10 were likely to be April implementations but remarked that one of the processes included might be available to implement a little bit earlier and the CDSP will discuss this in more detail within customer focus groups. In summary, JW advised that all aspects were on track.

For full details, please refer to the published slides.

10.2. Asset Updates

~~MC noted that Charlotte Gilbert (CG) had asked to raise this subject as an AOB.~~ Kundai Matiringe and Cher Harris from the IGT Constituency meeting asked to raise this subject as an AOB. CG explained that whilst she and a colleague, who was not present, were happy to discuss the item, they would prefer to propose attending in March with submitted papers to present.

MC agreed and suggested an initial overview in this meeting may be helpful to prepare parties for the discussions in March.

SM shared his understanding that the item was related to the validation of data items where Xoserve validated the component elements but not the combined whole and suggested CG reach out to Xoserve to get a view as to solution proposals and impact details on aspects such as data quality and the 'shadow data' that existing around the matter, noting that with some items did not hold any relevance to settlement.

PO shared that he, David Addison, and MD were looking to collate the relevant details to scope the problem and evaluate which items were cosmetic and which were more critical to enable planning a potential solution. He added that a Change had been raised that was currently on hold. He asked if Meter Asset Managers thought there were actions the CDSP could proactively do to pick up on data issues for transference and was happy to discuss the issue with CG further and agreed to take an Action accordingly.

ACTION 0208: CDSP (PO) and CG-IGTs (KM/CH) to discuss the scope and potential Solution options in preparation for the Asset Updates item in the next meeting.

10.3. Energy Code Reform

SM raised this item observing that the Energy Code Reform would have major implications on Codes and Systems and its phasing would also need to be considered, With the consultation out until April, he felt that it would be helpful to get some views from Xoserve, noting the combining of IGTUNC into the UNC in Phase 2, and within Phase 1 BSC and REC would cut across MWHH with possible implications for budgets. He presumed that the CDSP would be responding to the consultation and stated some initial views would be helpful.

JMc confirmed that the CDSP was indeed currently considering the consultation and proposed adding this as an Agenda Item for future meetings.

ACTION 0209: JO to add Energy Code Reform to DSC Contract Management Committee agenda

10.4. Market Wide Half Hourly Settlement (MHHS)

SM raised this item, noting the extent to which this activity impacts the gas market and sharing his understanding that there was a code freeze already in place within the power market as MHHS was implemented, adding that as most Shippers operate in both markets it was likely to have a substantial impact and as such this was an item for consideration and to obtain thoughts from the CDSP on.

There was some discussion as to whether a code freeze was indeed already in place for power, with commentary to the effect that whilst it was, some urgent Changes were being progressed as requisites for the implementation of MHHS.

PO commented that MHHS was an important consideration for Changes when considering their impact, which SM agreed with, highlighting the importance of recognising the interaction between various activities to ensure avoiding unintended consequences.

JMc suggested that an entry be added as part of the update for each Change, and SDu advised that the CDSP would check for impacts with the REC when discussing deliveries.

11. Recap of decisions made during meeting

Angela Clarke (AC) provided an overview of discussions, decisions, and actions made during the meeting.

12. Diary Planning

DSC Change meetings are listed at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Change>

All other Joint Office events are available via: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/events-calendar/month>

Time/Date	Meeting Paper Deadline	Venue	Programme
10:00 Wednesday 20 March 2024	5pm Tuesday 12 March 2024	Microsoft Teams	Standard Agenda

DSC Change Action Table						
Action Ref	Meeting Date	Min Ref	Action	Owner	Reporting Month	Status Update
0602	14/06/23	1.6	CDSP (DA) to undertake a case study into Governance between DSC Change Management and DSC Contract Management Committee interactions using recent Hydrogen Change XRN5531 and report back.	CDSP (DA)	February 2024	Closed
0101	17/01/24	4.5	CDSP (MD) to send out more details to Shippers around the Meter Read Issue once investigations have been completed and what the next steps are.	CDSP (MD)	February 2024	Closed
0102	17/01/24	9.2	CDSP (DA) DA to arrange a meeting to discuss R0148 in more detail and to circulate the necessary documents.	CDSP (DA)	February 2024	Closed
0103	17/01/24	12	CDSP (JMc) to update the committee on a plan for in-person CoMC meetings.	CDSP	February 2024	Closed
0201	14/02/24	1.5	JO (MC) to produce an outline for a new members introduction for an in-person October 24 DSC Contract Committee meeting	JO (MC)	March 2024	Pending
0202	14/02/24	2.1	JO (MC) to set up a Governance Workgroup to review the MPIdVAD.	JO (MC)	March 2024	Pending
0203	14/02/24	3.2	CDSP (JRi) to produce a format suggestion for quarterly CAB Updates.	CDSP (JRi)	March 2024	Pending
0204	14/02/24	4.5	CDSP (MD & DJ) to provide a presentation detailing the demarcation between Issues and Incidents, detailing the commitments, resourcing and escalation process for each.	CDSP (MD & DJ)	March 2024	Pending
0205	14/02/24	4.5	CDSP (MD) to confirm the accuracy of the January 2024 KPM12 figure in light of the reported Invoicing files issue.	CDSP (MD)	March 2024	Pending
0206	14/02/24	4.7	CDSP (JRi / AC) to provide an insight into Xoserve's Contract Management of Correla including using the example of the concerns raised in regards to the Major Incident Reporting figures in the February Contract Management Report	CDSP (JRi)	March 2024	Pending
0207	14/02/24	7	CDSP (LW) to provide further commentary on BCP consideration of Switchstream implications and the new scope to the Security Rota.	CDSP (LW)	March 2024	Pending
0208	14/02/24	10.2	CDSP (PO) and IGTs (KM/CH) PO &	CDSP (PO)	March	Pending

			CG to discuss the scope and potential Solution options in preparation for the Asset Updates item in the next meeting.	and IGTs (KM/CH)P O & CG	2024	
0209		10.3	JO to add Energy Code Reform to DSC Contract Management Committee agenda	JO	March 2024	Pending