

**UNC DSC Contract Management Committee Minutes**  
**Wednesday 17 Apr 2024**  
**Via Microsoft Teams**

<b>Attendees</b>			
Mark Cockayne (Chair)	(MC)	Joint Office	Non-Voting
Ben Mulcahy (Secretary)	(BM)	Joint Office	Non-Voting
<b>Shipper User Representatives (Voting)</b>			
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
<b>Transporter Representatives (Voting)</b>			
Helen Chandler	(HC)	Northern Gas Networks	DNO Voting
Sally Hardman	(SH)	Scotia Gas Networks	DNO Voting
Richard Loukes	(RL)	National Gas Transmission	NTS Voting
Charlotte Gilbert	(CG)	BU-UK	IGT Voting
<b>CDSP Contract Management Representatives (Non-Voting)</b>			
Jayne McGlone	(JMc)	Xoserve	
James Rigby	(JRi)	Xoserve	
David Addison	(DA)	Xoserve	
<b>Observers/Presenters (Non-Voting)</b>			
Angela Clarke	(AC)	Xoserve	
Dean Johnson	(DJ)	Xoserve	
Ellie Rogers	(ER)	Xoserve	
James Verdon	(JV)	Xoserve	
Joanne Williams	(KM)	BU-UK	
Lee Jackson	(LJ)	Xoserve	
Lee Warren	(LW)	Xoserve	
Marina Papatoma	(MP)	Wales & West Utilities	
Michele Downes	(MD)	Xoserve	
Paul Orsler	(PO)	Xoserve	
Sharon Dudley	(SD)	Xoserve	
Simon Harris	(SHa)	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> <p><i>Please note these minutes do not replicate/include detailed content provided within the presentation slides, therefore it is recommended that the published presentation material is reviewed in conjunction with these minutes. Copies of all papers are available at: <a href="https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/dsc-contract/170424">https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/dsc-contract/170424</a></i></p>			

**1. Introduction**

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

**1.1. Apologies for absence**

None

**1.2. Alternates**

Oorlagh Chapman confirmed to be acting as Alternate for Steve Mulinganie, who was absent initially but later joined the meeting at the start of Item 4.

Richard Loukes was confirmed to be acting as Alternate for Andrea Godden.

**1.3. Confirm Voting rights**

The voting rights were confirmed as below:

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

**1.4. Approval of Minutes (20 March 2024)**

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

**1.5 Approval of Late Papers**

Two papers had been provided for items 4.1 and 9.1 after the Meeting Papers deadline which MC acknowledged was due to the timings of the data they reported, and they were accepted by the Committee.

**1.6. Review of Outstanding Actions**

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

**Action currently Deferred to August 2024**

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

**Update:**

James Rigby (JRi) advised his intention to cover this Action under item 3 (see below), where the matter was discussed, and the Action agreed closed.

**Action Closed.**

**0301:** CDSP (MD) to provide a proposal as to how best to resume the provision of weekly Defect Report to Users

**Update:**

Angela Clarke (AC) advised that Michele Downes (MD) had work underway for this Action, and requested to defer a response until May, which the Committee agreed.

**Action Deferred**

**0302:** CDSP (JMc & JRi) to provide enhanced reporting in May to deliver required Contract Management assurance with a view to subsequent DSC Contract Management Committee consideration and potential suggestions for Improvement.

**Update:**

**Action currently Deferred to May 2024**

**0303:** CDSP (DT) to provide insight as to what had been communicated to PAFA regarding the DDP Data and its accuracy, especially AQ at risk.

**Update:**

Jayne McGlone (JMc) recognised the concerns regarding data affecting AQ-at-risk originating from DDP. The issue had resulted in a ticket being raised in February which was still under investigation by Xoserve. Although messaging in this regard was presented on the DDP website from an earlier date, JMc advised that the Performance Assurance Framework Administrator (PAFA) was formally notified on 11 March and that PAFA had confirmed that they had not made any recommendations to the Performance Assurance Committee (PAC) based on this data.

Andy Eisenberg (AE) commented that his understanding of PAFA's metrics was that the AQ at-risk data was a component of a total score, which ranged between 1 and 50. The AQ element contributed up to a value of 10 to this score, and as such was an appreciable measure. He asked how it was possible to be sure that the AQ performance element had not degraded or impacted Parties scores.

Ellie Rogers (ER) detailed the holistic matrix that PAFA and the PAC use to make decisions about Parties needing to be placed on Performance Plans, confirming that no Party had yet hit the threshold necessitating such. She shared that in the latest PAC meeting, 16 April 2024, the Committee confirmed directions that any scores impacted by AQ at risk would be further investigated to ensure that the underlying reasons for that impact were not a result of the DDP data currently under investigation.

AE confirmed that this provided some reassurance.

**Action Closed**

**0304:** CDSP to explain the absence of the DDP Data issue recorded in January 2024 from reporting issued up to and inclusive of March 2024

**Update:**

JMc acknowledged that the issue had been raised in February 2024 and so should have been detailed in the March 2024 DSC Contract Management Committee reporting. She recognised that this had been missed by Xoserve and apologised. As a result, she advised that Xoserve had looked at their process maps for adding issues to the relevant monthly reporting and training had been rolled out to ensure this would not reoccur.

**Action Closed**

**0305:** CDSP to provide insight as to the level of DDP data assurance performed

**Update:**

JMc responded to this Action, explaining that it was not necessarily the data items within the DDP that were causing the current issues cumulating in AQ at-risk data concerns discussed, as it was known that SAP, the means with which data is provided into DDP, did not have the requisite capacity to transfer the volumes of data that were now necessary. This was causing difficulties in that some items in the DDP were not fully populated. JMc stated that Xoserve were working to ensure the required capacity was possible and offered to provide a Subject Matter Expert on the issue in the next DSC Contract Management Committee in May if a more technical explanation was required.

JMc suggested that DDP be added to the DSC Contract Management Committee agenda as an item to ensure regular updates were provided, adding that this information was also being shared in the DDP Shipper Forum.

**New Action 0401:** JO to add 'DDP data' as a new Item on the DSC Contract Management Committee Agenda

Oorlagh Chapman (OC) asked if there was a summary text that Xoserve could provide or if this commentary was to be captured solely in the meeting minutes.

JMc commented that she was confident the Joint Office would capture the commentary given in the minutes but also advised that Xoserve had distributed an email on Thursday, April 11 2024, that summarised the issue and the way it was being addressed. She committed to providing a copy to the Joint Office to include in the meeting minutes: -

**Subject:** *AQ Class 4 Read Performance dashboards defect within DDP*

*Dear Customer,*

*We would like to make you aware of an issue within DDP which impacts the Class 4 Read Performance dashboard within the AQ Insights menu. This only impacts Shippers with Class 4 Supply Meter Points.*

*In early February 2024, it was identified that some Meter Points captured in the AQ Class 4 Read Performance Dashboard had accepted reads within the expected time standard, so should not have been included in the data analysis of sites without a valid reading. This means that AQ read performance analysed by the Performance Assurance Committee was understated and as a result did*

*not reflect Shippers' AQ actual read performance. There is no impact to actual settlement, the issue affects the AQ Class 4 Read Performance Dashboard only. The main Read Performance dashboards within the Read Insights menu are correct and not affected by this issue.*

*As soon as we were aware of this, we informed the Performance Assurance Framework Administrator (PAFA). PAFA have confirmed that they are using this data in their reporting however it has not resulted in any material impacts to their assurance work or erroneous enforcement actions taken against Shippers. This issue has also been raised within Contract Management Committee. Further*

*Further investigation has taken place to identify the best approach to fix the data, this has now been agreed and this will take approximately seven weeks to develop, test and deploy. Resolution of this issue will be mid-May. The Meter Read Experts in our Service Delivery Team will assure the logic used to construct the read dataset and the updated visuals in DDP to validate that the performance displayed matches Shippers' actual accepted read submissions, in AQ terms.*

*A similar issue was raised back in June 2023. We investigated and deployed a fix, and the issue was deemed resolved in August 2023, PAFA were also informed during this time. We now understand that the June 2023 issue was incorrectly identified as an isolated data replication problem rather than a symptom of the underlying issues we identified in the February 2024 investigation. As this was not identified at the time, the underlying issue was not resolved when the original fix was deployed in August 2023 and the AQ Read Performance dashboard continued to understate performance. We have now enhanced our processes to ensure upstream data sources are fully revalidated should similar issues happen again.*

*It is important to note that the read performance logic in the AQ Class 4 Read Performance visuals has different parameters to other read performance dashboards within DDP, so the performance is not directly comparable. It reports read performance in terms of the proportion of AQ that has had a reading, rather than the count of meter points that have had a reading. The AQ Class 4 Read Performance Dashboard has undergone a number of changes since 2020, following requests.*

*Updates on this issue will be shared within Contract Management Committee along with DDP Shipper Forums and Shipper Constituencies.*

*If you have any questions on this matter, please do not hesitate to contact the Customer Experience team on [customerexperience@xoserve.co.uk](mailto:customerexperience@xoserve.co.uk).*

AE confirmed that he had read the email, sharing that the data assurance specifics had gone a little over his head and as such a summary of that aspect would be handy.

He added that whilst it was uncomfortable to highlight failings, in summary, Xoserve had taken too long to act on concerns that had been raised last year, which it had then missed in its reporting to the DS Contract Management Committee, and was only discussed as a concern when it was raised by Committee members themselves, and as such it resulted in a general sense of unhappiness amongst the Committee.

JMc acknowledged this commentary, stating that Xoserve understood why such disappointment and frustration were felt. She proposed that adding DDP Data as an ongoing item on the DSC Contract Management Committee Agenda, as well as the other measures discussed and detailed in the above email, should help to alleviate the Committee's ongoing concerns in this regard.

AE reiterated the need for further visibility of the data assurance undertaken to ensure the correct measures are in place to prevent a reoccurrence.

JMc advised that the additional monitoring detailed in the email that can raise an alert should an issue be detected should provide assurance in this regard and demonstrate the importance Xoserve has placed on the matter.

### **Action Closed**

**0306:** JO & CDSP (MC & JMc) to publish Terms of Reference for MPidVAD Review Sub-committee

#### **Update:**

MC advised that he discussed with JMc and had agreed to reinstate the DSC Contract Management Committee's sub-committee to review the MPidVAD, and accordingly, the current Terms of Reference (ToR) needed to be reviewed to ensure it was still appropriate. As such the intention was to bring this document to the 1<sup>st</sup> meeting of the Subcommittee for review (to be held in May).

### **Action Deferred**

**0307:** JO & CDSP (MC & JMc) to review the May Agenda and a potential date for additional May DSC Contract Committee should it prove required.

#### **Update:**

MC confirmed this Action had been raised in response to feedback from the Committee, as the May meeting was to be held in the afternoon only on Wednesday 15 May 2024. This scheduling was to enable Xoserve to hold a Strategy meeting in the morning which was planned to end at 12 midday, allowing a period of refreshments and networking until the DSC Contract Management Committee commenced at 1 pm and concluded at 4 pm.

Accordingly, MC advised, a contingency had been made to hold a potential second-day continuance of the DSC Contract Management Committee meeting via Teams on the morning of Friday 17 May, adding that should the need for this extension arise invites would be issued to Committee members accordingly.

### **Action Closed**

## **2. Approvals**

There were no items for the Committee to approve at this meeting.

## **3. Business Plan Updates**

### **3.1. Efficiency Review**

JRi explained that he had not prepared any slides for this item as he felt it to be something of a constantly moving target that would see any slide-based commentary prove out of date by the time it was reviewed.

Providing an update on ERIX, JRi explained how the CAB had been stood down in April to focus attention on aspects that had benchmarked less favourably within the Efficiency Review, citing as an example that since March the DSC Change team had been looking in detail around items such as costings that needed more 'meat on the bone' and was producing some practical improvements and tangible outputs which he expected would be brought to the next CAB in May with materials to be walked through in the meeting, with further potential be included as initiatives in BP25.

JRi noted **Action 0401** taken earlier in this meeting to provide a monthly DDP data discussion and acknowledged this was echoed by themes around open discussion that had been benchmarked for BP reporting in the previous summer. He shared that this had been raised within CAB with discussions since March that had developed around aspects like increased functionality and reduced cost. He commented that the DDP platform was a popular product but was currently imperfect with large portfolios experiencing download restrictions, adding that Xoserve was reviewing this with their service providers and proposing moving to an Azure-based data feed, follow-up commentary for which would be provided in CAB in due course.

MC asked if such commentary would also be presented to the DSC Contract Management Committee.

JRi confirmed that it would, adding that he would provide updates to the DSC Contract Management Committee throughout, alongside discussion of Open Data for which he highlighted an Ofgem best practices letter that had been published recently.

In response to **Action 0203** JRi explained that he had considered the need this Action generated to provide a draft report to present to this meeting and shared his concern that doing so could miss out on allowing it to develop fully because of the work that Xoserve were doing. This included looking at the BP and using a 4e framework to articulate not just value for money but also recognise efficiencies and effectiveness, additional to that captured in ERIX, and beyond just cost reduction, but also added values which should then be included to the stated strategic objectives, which JRi committed to sharing more details of in the May strategy session.

JRi stated that they would look to ensure the CAB reporting provided insights into the progress made, where the benefits were economic, in efficiency, performance and/or qualitative whilst maintaining both an eye on the KPMs and in the overall evaluation of Xoserve as a company. On this basis, JRi asked that the Committee accept delaying a review of the details of the proposed quarterly CAB updates until being able to review them in the wider context of the discussion intended to be held in May, and confirmed he was amenable to **Action 0203** being held open until then.

MC asked the Committee if they preferred to hold the action open.

OC noted that there was not a CAB meeting in April and asked when the next was scheduled. JRi confirmed that one would be held in May. OC asked for confirmation that the meetings would be quarterly from that point forward. JRi confirmed this to be the case adding that he could bring documentation to the monthly DSC Contract Management Committee in the interim but was not sure if this would prove worthwhile.

OC agreed that matters would take longer to discuss and resolve than a monthly, so she was supportive of having the quarterly updates but wanted confirmation that the next meeting was scheduled for May and that subsequent meetings would then follow every quarter.

JRi confirmed this was correct.

OC asked if this meant a change in the Terms of Reference was required as she was aware that it originally specified that these would be monthly. JRi was not entirely sure, stating he was more a correspondent at the meetings, rather than the meeting owner.

OC clarified that she did not want to see CAB brushed aside, noting it was quite easy for such arrangements to move from monthly to quarterly to being discontinued and emphasised it was important to ensure they continued.

JRi agreed, stating that if anything the change would prove a widening of the meeting's coverage rather than kicking it into the long grass.

MC suggested that this was effectively a rethink of the CAB meeting. JRi acknowledged this and asked if the action was for him to report what the CAB will be covering and the strategy entailed, he believed he had done this, whilst committed to providing further details next month.

MC summarized that further detailed debate would occur in the CAB meetings and received no objections to concluding that **Action 0203 was closed.**

### 3.2. BP Update & Energy Code Reform

JRi described how BP25 was developing with initial documentation in the process of being created. He emphasised his view that the 15 May Strategy Meeting would prove an important event and provide a chance for all to share strategic objectives in the BP period. He compared the meeting to the roundtable events held for BP24 for which he stated the feedback received had proven positive, adding it was a chance for customers to hear Xserve's objectives from the team and several board members.

He confirmed the session would be held at Xserve's offices at Lansdowne Gate with remote access for those who cannot attend in person, adding his request that whenever possible customers should look to attend the event in person as it was kicking off BP25 with 2 hours of interaction before words were written for the first consultation, adding this was an important and fertile part of the BP's life cycle.

James Verdon (JV) echoed this encouragement for parties to attend in person.

JRi stated that Xserve would circulate an agenda, sharing that it will cover Code Management, Strategy, ERIX, Skill development, how to support Ofgem's plans as well as UK Link upgrades and will be looking for attendee's thoughts on what the priorities are, adding that interactions should feel more strategic, inciting group discussions.

JRi continued that all were no doubt familiar with Modification **0841** *Introduction of cost efficiency and transparency requirements for the CDSP Budget* which introduces rules Xserve will apply at each stage of the procurement plan and would need to appoint a third party to assure that the Business Plan Information Rules (BPIR) and the Budget requirement had been met. He noted that these were two separate things, with the second being, in effect, a financial audit.

In regards to the BPIR, JRi stated that Xserve were proposing to procure and put a third party in place to commence assurance from the very first steps of BP development. He noted that **0841** states that it is the final version of the BP that needs this assurance and reassured the Committee that he was not proposing the third party assure the first draft only, as he was very much aware that new aspects would likely be added to the BP as it developed from this point. Instead, the aim was to check for compliance from the outset, enabling follow-up discussions and activity on compliance with BPIR from the offset. The third party would then also assess the second drafting, which should result in less compliance work required later and consequently less risk at the end of the process, with the second and third drafts being assessed on their differences resulting in a full report against each BPIR and a full view of the whole BP.



JRi expressed the hope that the DSC Contract Management Committee members were supportive of this approach and if this were the case Xoserve would look to start the procurement process to ensure that they were ready for August. He was aware that Modification **0841** had not yet been approved but was mindful that this could happen soon, so it seemed sensible to get matters underway. He asked for comments and if any Committee members were uncomfortable with this plan.

MC asked to clarify the fact that JRi had mentioned two steps in the discussion, the first of which was this compliance process with the BPIR and the second was a financial audit and asked at what point would this take place.

JRi acknowledged that he was focusing on the BPIRs and was very much minded to approach these iteratively as parts of the same sum process, confident this could be done without prejudicing the intent of Modification **0841**. He added that they had not yet determined an approach to the financial part, commenting that doing this part iteratively did not seem appropriate and speculating that this was a step that would start when the second draft was completed.

JRi continued that a Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) for **0841** had put costs in place so action could be taken now. He stated that if the usual route through the DSC Change Management Committee processes, which he commented were usually more technical systems-related than information provision-orientated, it would likely not be possible to get the third party in the role for the first drafting of the BP. He explained that he was stating that Xoserve could see value in the rules within Modification **0841** and thus wanted to get things underway by way of accessing the BP24 Change Budget and then going through the Change Committee to approve the purchase, adding that he was not advocating bypassing the Change Approval process and that it would also be brought to the DSC Contract Management Committee as well to ensure good governance throughout. In closing on this proposal JRi confirmed that if the DSC Contract Management Committee did not object, he would look to start the process, advising that there would be further opportunities for customers to apply the brakes on this and review again through the governance mechanisms in place.

OC expressed her support for the proposal, with no other commentary from the Committee.

## Code Reform

JRi referred to his presentation in the last DSC Contract Management Committee meeting where he made the case for Xoserve to become the industry Code Manager last month, adding that he would provide more detail on this in the Strategy meeting on May 15. He confirmed that Xoserve had produced a response to the Ofgem Energy Code Reform Implementation consultation which closed on 23 April 2024 and stated that whilst he was not going to review it in full and would instead summarize, he would later share the response with customers when it was provided to Ofgem.

He stated that Ofgem was proposing a phased approach to the process of Code Reform and commented that the consolidation of the UNC and IGT UNC was currently listed as being part of the second phase. JRi shared that Xoserve were to suggest making this activity part of the first phase, noting the listed saving of £40m. He confirmed that Xoserve were supportive of consolidating these two Codes as they felt the alternatives listed in the consultation, including measures such as rationalisation and improving Code text, did not have the same benefits and, arguably, would not have the same impetus. He suggested other benefits from earlier consolidation would include consistency and certainty, with competition made easier as participants had just one Code to engage with, which he suggested was helpful when gas industry expertise was spread quite thin. He also thought moving the gas Code consolidation into the first phase would provide a robust platform for hydrogen developments and the system upgrades on the current horizon.

He added that he suspected the consolidation of the two gas Codes would prove easier than some of the electricity considerations currently listed in the first phase and asked DSC Contract Management Committee members to look out for the full Xoserve response which would be made available to all on a basis of full transparency.

MC asked when the Xoserve consultation response would be available.

JRi confirmed that the document was undergoing its final review on Friday 19 April 2024 which might necessitate a few final tweaks meaning that Parties should be able to see it by 24 April 2024, committing to provide the Joint Office a link to include in the minutes.

### **Post Meeting Update**

AC sent an e-mail to CoMC members on 23rd April with a copy of the Consultation Response from Xoserve.

### **3.3. CX Themes and Principles**

JV presented to the DSC Contract Management Committee on Improvement Themes & Principles, explaining how these aligned with items that JRi had discussed.

The full presentation is available for review at <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Contract/170424>

JV advised that this work was focusing on the recurring theme of Xoserve not understanding their audience, explaining that for whatever reason the perception of Xoserve was disconnected from what is reported, citing the example of the Contractual obligations shown in green on Slide 2 contrasting with the reputation aspects shown in amber, and in effect historically gravitating focus to the left of the details on the slide and thereby losing traction on customer experience and the added values. He suggested that meeting KPIs and contractual delivery targets was a Minimum Value Product (MVP), and that focus was required to improve trust and confidence. Xoserve needed to refocus on customer intelligence to understand customer needs better and improve its service. This included enhancing digital experiences with content management and architecture focusing on the information that is of value. He added it also required a change to communication strategies to stop spamming customers, which he noted was a constant in feedback gathered over the years.

JV shared that a key problem in getting traction with these concerns was that individually they were perceived as 'nice to have's that could be challenged as to the value of investing resources in. As such he believed they needed to be tackled in tandem, and that addressed together they would prove of greater value than the sum of their parts, having a much wider impact on customer experience.

A key consideration, JV stated, was the need to understand the right people to contact and the right time to do so for each of their customer organisations, with the digital service needing to be consolidated. One of the aims would be removing a lot of the current work customer representatives needed to do within their organisations to ensure the correct information had been registered by their internal stakeholders. JV acknowledged that any customer with a complex relationship with Xoserve was likely to have an experience that could feel quite siloed. He stated that Xoserve should be able to explain why specific individuals in customer organisations have received specific communications and thus address the perception of spamming.

In presenting the Venn diagram on Slide 5, JV explained that the overlaps were opportunities to enhance the Xoserve experience, such as using data subscription preferences to help understand customers' requirements, moving away from separate static lists for each communication stream and enabling customers to see why they have received a communication and who else in their organisation had received it.

JV advised that he had provided an Appendix in the presentation to explore the key points presented in more detail and asked that the DSC Contract Management Committee members review the information and feedback to ensure the analysis was hitting the right spots. He added that this feedback would flow into the BP25 conversations, and so asked that feedback be provided by 26 April 2024.

MC asked how feedback should be provided. JV confirmed his email address was in the presentation and he was happy to book separate sessions with individual customers to discuss the matter further.

David Addison (DA) asked that if Xoserve were asking for specific feedback how they would ensure it reaches all the people it needed to, noting that they would need to target communications to ensure they understand how people needed that input. He agreed that this was a great ambition but commented that he had been previously told Xoserve could not do that, asking how that input would be collated and shared.

JV commented that this presentation was high-level, though in terms of defining details and how they broaden things out, he gave the example of using specific XRN subscriptions as a template to understand what customers would want and that they similarly undertake this project through consultation with customers. He added that 'customers' was a broad term, describing that there were those customers who used their Xoserve login a couple of times a week through to those with much more complex engagements such as those of the DSC Contract Management Committee members, sharing that he thought Xoserve did well for the more simplistic relationships whereas the more complex ones were more challenging.

DA agreed this answered the question, though confided he was still nervous about some aspects, such as the number of communications he wrote to the industry and the propensity to include as many recipients as possible to mitigate the risk of missing key parties, and he asked for this to be flagged as a risk to be considered.

JV agreed that this was a good point, though it was at a level of detail he was not originally looking to cover in this meeting. He acknowledged that there was a tendency to use a 'safety net' approach to communications, in which everyone was included for fear of missing someone important and added that the communications network was a fundamental core to customer relationships. As such it was important to understand the communication needs of all DSC members, and who the representative from each was, so that Xoserve could see, and the customers could see, who had received such communications ensuring they were targeting the correct people.

JV reiterated the desire to see as many attendees on 15 May onsite as possible adding that he would be bringing a case study with the aim of making these discussion points more real to explore and help understand how they affect the day of their customers.

OC asked that there should be not just an opt-out option for communications but also an option to opt-in, referring to concerns about staff turnover she explained she would rather get everything rather than risk missing something, so wanted to ensure it remained possible to opt into everything without exception. JV acknowledged this, stating that Xoserve were including this requirement as they had customer organisations that insisted everything came to the same party.

#### **4. Monthly Contract Management Report**

The full report is available for review at

<https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Contract/170424>

Angela Clarke (AC) commenced the review of the Monthly Contract Management Report and drew the Committee's attention to the DSC Credit and Risk Performance Indicators for March 2024 noting that they were above targets and in the Green.

#### 4.1. KPM Update

Dean Johnson (DJ) provided the KPM Update, advising that of the 20 KPMs, 3 had failed their targets

KPM04, the *Monthly AQ Process* was at 99.98%, below the target of 100%

KPM07, the *Percentage of requests processed within the Completion Time Service Level in DSC*. Was at 99.99% – below the target of 100%

KPM13 *% of exceptions resolved within 2 invoice cycles of creation date*. was also at 99.99% – below the target of 100%

For the PIs summary, DJ explained that of the 26 total measures, 9 did not apply to the reporting month and 1 had failed.

PI06, *% of reports dispatched on due date against total reports expected*, failed to be sent on SLA due to a delay that required a rerun with two reports delayed by 3 days, for which DJ advised the root cause was still being investigated

#### 4.2. KPM – Customer Relationship Survey Results CDSP

This item is due to be provided in May.

#### 4.3. Monthly Contract Metric Reports

AC presented these three slides, confirming the Communications Highlights for March 2024, the Meter Count Report (with 57% of the meter portfolio now Smart) and Performance Monitoring figures.

#### 4.4. Xoserve Incident Summary CDSP

DJ presented this item, describing the two incidents detailed on **Slide 12** that did not lead to KPM breaches. He moved on to **Slide 13** which gives further details.

INC0450656 related to Microsoft Teams findmysupplier data search phone calls on 06 March being held in a queue due to a loss of Teams configuration. Backup installations resolved the matter within 2 hours.

INC450495 Switchstream issue in which 30 March was given on end-date files instead of 01 April due to a failure to consider the spring clock change. DJ advised each customer affected was contacted and a code switch was installed to prevent a reoccurrence.

MC asked after the colour coding on this slide, noting one Incident was green and the other red. DJ confirmed this alluded to the Incidents categorisation as listed on Slide 14, with Green being Correla identified and unavoidable, and red being Customer identified that could have been avoided had Correla taken earlier action.

#### 4.5. Customer Issue Management Dashboard

Before presenting this item to the Committee, Michele Downes (MD) advised that she was retiring in March 2025 and therefore to provide a smooth transition Lee Jackson (LJ) would take over leading the Customer Experience team, suggesting that it may be LJ that presents this section of the report from May forward. LJ greeted the DSC Contract Management Committee and explained that he had worked in customer advocacy and most of the deliverables sections of the business over the last 20 years and was looking forward to working with the Committee members.

Committee members asked that their thanks to Michele for all her help and support over the years be acknowledged in the minutes.

MD discussed the Open Issues Impacting Customers as detailed on Slide 18, advising that in the case of Missing Secured Active Messages (SAMs) all had now been resolved, including the one long-term instance that had now had a switch. In regards to Portfolio files MD confirmed that the file that was scheduled to be issued in April 2024 will have the issues resolved, noting that the January file did have missing records which were identified during the testing of the last fix.

MD also advised that the issues relating to Meter Readings were from June 23, not August 2023 as previously reported. She confirmed it affected 2k meters of which 98% were with one Shipper. She shared that it had been hard to identify the root cause, but this had now been done and a fix applied with communications issued throughout to those Shippers affected.

With respect to Shipper registrations not recorded on UK Link, MD explained that on 13 February 2024, the Central Switching Operator (CSS) notified the CDSP of registrations to become effective on 14 February 2024 which were not actioned on UK Link. This impacted 139 MPRNs across 17 Shippers. The Registrations were processed on 23 February to be effective on 24 February with estimated transfer reads issued on 22 March 2024.

DA explained that whilst Modification **0855 Settlement Adjustments for Supply Meter Points impacted by the Central Switching System P1 Incident** was specific to CSS and had a solution that was due to be deployed in June, XRN5675. It had been previously agreed with Shippers that they would wait until Xoserve implemented the solution and then re-issue the meter reads to ensure the meter read had not moved on, allowing for reasons like uploaded replaced meter reads, and were now planning to take this approach on this issue as well, which the DSC Change Management Committee had agreed with. Accordingly, Xoserve has issued estimated transfer reads which will be issued again in June to initiate the 3-month window for replacement reads.

MD then discussed Open Issues Impacting Customers and recognised that the issue surrounding incorrect data being displayed and reporting in DDP had been discussed earlier in this meeting as well as the fact that PAFA were aware of the issue and were not using the data.

Steve Mulinganie (SM) commented that this issue had seen communications within his business raising questions as to the credibility of PAC, which he had mentioned in the last PAC meeting to be presented with a statement from PAFA that they had not received the email. He observed that the lessons learnt in this instance were just how important communicating in a timely fashion and to the correct parties and the consequential impacts of not doing so was, and that this recent issue had undermined the credibility and reputation of PAC. JMc acknowledged these comments.

SM shared that the email went straight into his organisation, and as he was historically the first to call parties out internally on their PAC performance figures, he was the recipient of some pointed commentary on the issue.

MC asked if the communication issues described fed into the piece of work JV had presented on earlier which JMc confirmed and that Xoserve would pick this up and ensure that when communications are issued to PAFA or PAC the other receives it too and would feed back to JV to consider.

Returning to the reporting on **Slide 19** MD discussed the February 2024 Commodity Invoice issued with incorrect values, which impacted 18 shippers. The incorrect values were for NGN (Northern Gas Networks) and Cadent with the highest value to a shipper being £43 in credit. MD explained that this had occurred due to the pre-billing analysis being performed by a new team member which was then missed in validation. To prevent reoccurrence extra training has been performed and additional validation will now be performed by a senior team member with additional checks and overview internal reporting.

Helen Chandler (HC) asked if the Pricing Managers of the affected DNOs were aware of this issue. MD advised it had gone to just the Contract Managers and not Pricing adding that she could ensure this could be done. HC advised that if she had been sent the details that should be sufficient. SM asked when the communication had been sent out to the Shipper as he had not seen it, though MD advised that it had only been sent to the impacted Shippers.

#### **4.6. Gas Retail Data Agent (GRDA) Update**

DA drew the Committee's attention to the commentary on the Slide, adding that it included the standard update on missing messages, adding that there had been a slight error on the Slide's second bullet point being 1 of 13 days, not 18.

#### **4.7. KVI Change Management.** [OBJ]

This item is due to be provided in May.

### **5. Information Security Update**

Lee Warren (LW) joined the meeting and provided a verbal update, advising that he would provide a more in-depth update at the May meeting. He also addressed the provisions of assurance regarding CIX from Correla, adding that Xoserve were in discussions with Correla to provide this directly as Xoserve needed to provide that assurance equally to all and that he would be happy to discuss this further with anyone if so required.

May would see Xoserve provide the NIST testing schedule, which LW commented was normally performed in March but would be September this year as they resolved what was being assured and what was not, as well as the assurance measures Xoserve themselves are providing to Correla.

Addressing the provision of CIX additional assurance measures, LW appreciated this was a higher risk as it included exposing UK Link data to the internet directly so additional levels of assurance and comfort were certainly required.

LW brought his update to a close by mentioning Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery work for which he advised that there was a lot of assurance work done on this from Correla and Xoserve which would be presented in the May meeting.

### **6. Financial Information**

This item is due to be provided in May.

**7. Business Continuity Plan**

This item is due to be provided in May.

**8. Contract Assurance Audit**

This item is due to be provided in May.

**9. Key Committee Updates**

**9.1. DSC Change Management Committee**

The full DSC Change Management Committee update is available for review at

<https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Contract/170424>

Paul Orsler (PO) presented this item, stating that the most pertinent point to highlight was the recent discussions around voting and potential conflicts or disparities. He described how material produced last year had been shared with DSC Change Management Committee members alongside information about potential changes for Change Management processes.

PO explained that customers had asked about the most recent issues around funding relationships regarding regulatory Changes and how they are proposed to be funded, which worked on the presumption that the DSC Change Management Committee would not impend regulatory Change delivery. PO confirmed that Xoserve had been committed last year to provide clearer messaging where there was a cost, and they would seek clarification from the Modification process as to what those funding relationships are and what the intention of the Modification was regarding how it was to be funded.

PO advised that Xoserve had shared some options regarding funding splits, acknowledging that there was a lot of detail, and he was happy to discuss it in detail, confirming that it had been shared with the DSC Change Management Committee.

SM asked if the material had been published for DSC Contract Committee review. PO confirmed it had been published for DSC Change Management and was happy to provide it afresh for the DSC Contract Management Committee. SM asked if feedback was required before the next DSC Change Management Committee meeting on 08 May 2024. PO replied that there was no deadline for feedback which he was happy to receive.

PO highlighted in Section 3 of the presentation that the High-level costs for XRN5616 were in two parts, for which Part B had been collectively agreed to progress whereas Part A had been discounted due to a challenge around value for money and questions on the costs given. He added that Xoserve were to rationalise and present evidence costs for a more equitable delivery in the design phase.

Under Section 4 PO noted three detailed designs were all approved, and he described how the potential scope of the November 2024 Major release was under consideration with an action to review delivering a more economical delivery for some components in February 2025.

OC raised a question around the fact that customers had been told no Change Pack would be issued in April but one had subsequently been sent, within which a request was made for retrospective approval of an item from 2021 without providing rationalisation as to what the potential consequences were should approval not be granted, adding that it felt as if only half the story was provided.

PO confirmed that a Change Pack had been issued in April, advising that it was really a Contract Pack and related to the situation whereby some of the arrangements in the BP where resources costs were assigned as Decarb investment for National Gas Transmission (NGT) and the DNs were agreed to by the DNs but which NGT reserved right to keep funding as investment.

AC added that this had been agreed upon and documented.

PO concurred adding that they had agreed to a separate 100% funding area for DNs but were caught slightly on the hop on this issue so the narrative in the Change Pack was lacking, adding that there was not any impact for other customer groups.

AC further clarified the intent to amend the document retrospectively, explaining that when she undertook validation work to add two new service areas the document, she discovered that the document had not been updated previously with these live and agreed changes, hence the attempt to retrospectively update, though all in line with what had been previously agreed.

OC replied that she felt there was information lacking and noted that the intent was still to retrospectively update documents. She stated that there was a level of information in the document that she expected that was not present and she needed to understand more in regards to the ways and means to provide this additional information.

AC asked if an update to the Change pack was required. PO agreed that it was the case that the Change pack was missing a level of data necessitating it be republished. AC highlighted that it had a 60-day period of notice so there was sufficient time to do this which PO agreed meant they could update the document and advise parties.

SM asked if this was a normal process to approach this issue and if version control amendment notifications were used. He commented that retrospective amendments were not supported as a principle for this document, meaning that all amendments were therefore prospective. This ensured that the version looked at previously would still be valid, therefore in this instance, this process would create an updated version that would note that it should have applied to the previous version. A retrospective change would affect the previous version, which should not happen, a prospective acknowledges the issues but applies it going forward only.

AC recognised this commentary and stated that it would be best to get legal guidance on the issue adding that she was just looking to find the best route forward in an open manner as possible to rectify the omission

SM agreed, noting that this would produce a process that could be used should it happen again, and that this needed a narrative agreed to enable its application it is going forward.

Sally Hardman (SH) noted that Decarbonisation was listed as 100% DN still and asked if NG investment would now show. PO replied that NG did not agree to this funding structure.

**New Action 0402:** CDSP (AC) to obtain legal guidance on the best practice to address the approved, but previously omitted, Service Area amendments consulted on in the April Change Pack.

### **Post Meeting Update**

A copy of the Presentation is available as a post-meeting paper on the Joint Office webpage [www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Contract/170424](http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Contract/170424) entitled 'Change Management Procedure Review - Funding Splits Voting Arrangements and Options'.

### **9.2. Retail Energy Code (REC) Updates**

The full REC Change update is available for review at <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Contract/170424>



DA presented this update, stating that Xoserve had delivered what was required for R0067 and that the CSS had deployed all the necessary patch fixes by 14 March. He noted that whilst an explicit test for one of the scenarios that had been patch-fixed was undertaken, in general, the operational teams were nervous about undertaking live production service tests and creating conditions to generate missing messages.

Discussing R0092 Da noted that they had seen an approach proposal for R0092 and R0092a, explaining that R0092 was the DCC-requested softening of their SLAs and R0092a was the RECCo's alternative view, with R0092a ensuring the retention of hourly segment figures were as the DCC were trying to establish daily targets which would enable them to take a service out of use and still see later volume in the rest of the day allow the recovery of their position.

DA shared that Xoserve's view was very closely aligned with that of the RECCO and so they were supportive of R0092a. He advised that there would be changes to GRDA and GES impacts, but these were not yet clear yet, although they will be largely a minimal impact, he resolved that as soon as a clearer picture was possible it would be shared.

R0148 relates to Open Data, which DA noted was discussed in a DSC Contract Management Committee meeting back in the summer of 2023, and that other than the fact the DSC Contract Management Committee had highlighting Xoserve's understanding of the commerciality of the data was a bit flawed, which he thanked the Committee for, he stated that Xoserve have tried to play everything with a straight bat. They had yet to understand what processes RECCo are intending to have in place, with some of the data described as Open data being information that Xoserve had not previously appreciated would be available online.

DA shared that further discussion was scheduled to be held in the next month or so, and the current understanding was that any data published would not be at a meter point level but as a summary. He commented that the next challenge will be how to respond to these requirements, with his thought being that they will need to come as GES access requests. He reiterated the discussions needed to progress further, adding that next month he may have something more to discuss and that he welcomed any input in the interim.

SM asked in regards to R0105, which DA confirmed that Xoserve had stated to REC that they wanted to be involved in the discussions and that this had highlighted that they had not been included as it was not classified as impact the CDSP. He commented that the Code Manager did reach out to Xoserve for support, which they appreciated but confided that they wanted to be in REC impacts group on a more generic basis.

SM stated that it was positive that REC were undertaking Critical Friend work and having discussions at an early stage, but currently not everyone is allowed in, and asked if it was worth giving examples of why it is counterproductive to exclude parties from the discussions in a letter for the DSC Contract Management Committee. He added that whilst they were not expecting the Code Manger to understand histories and consequential impacts as that was Open forums should be held.

DA agreed, stating that he was finding it hard to pick up the breadth of the Change Register for the whole REC, and anything that can be done to get Xoserve into the issues groups would be beneficial adding that he thought that the RECCo would be open to such discussion as they have seen the benefit of Xoserve's involvement before. He offered to draft a potential letter on behalf of the DSC Contract Committee on the issue.

<p><b>New Action 0403:</b> CDSP (DA) to draft letter to RECCo on behalf of DSC Contract Management Committee advocating for CDSP attendance in early issues groups for REC Change</p>
---

DA also advised that he had written to the REC PAF on the DCC's ticket performance and whilst he was not aware of the extent to which his commentary was challenged the CDSP was asked to provide additional supporting information. He added that he was asked for this in January and that his response had only just been provided, but he was able to demonstrate that ticket response times in 2022 in some cases been, he believed, 200 Working days. In comparison he stated, it seemed now to be the case that the DCC was managing to their required timetable, with 80% of tickets closed within 10 days, though some were still in the '12 days and beyond' category as some technical challenges will still occur that took longer to resolve. He had feedback that the DCC are now doing better, adding that he noted 90% of tickets for missing messages are closed, but with nothing technical to do it was still taking up to 10 days for the DCC to look to see if an item has been progressed and close that ticket. In summary, he stated, the DCC do appear to have got their house in order and are now working to their SLAs.

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**

JW provided an overview of the CMS rebuild delivery roadmap, stating that V1.8 and V1.9 were successfully launched, with v1.10 being the very last drop, which will go on 29 April 2024, due to a minor delay.

JW highlighted the Gas Safety Regulation (GSR) and Managing Unregistered Sites (MUS) Transition Plan detailed in the presentation and advised that it had been issued to the constituency and focus groups, with the emphasis on the fact that MUS and GSR contact codes will be switched off in legacy CMS on 19 April 2024.

JW asked to be advised if any parties were still working on MUS and GSR and highlighted that Xoserve will be running Customer drop sessions daily, 11 am to 1 pm Monday to Friday of the first two weeks to assist users to navigate all the new sites, with NUS contacts generated in the new system from 01 May 2024

For full details, please refer to the published slides at <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Contract/170424>

### **10.2. Consider requirements for May 2024 Agenda**

MC noted this Item was to ensure the May 2024 Agenda was reviewed to take stock of the feedback from DSC Contract Management Committee members in response to the later starting time of the May meeting, especially as the May meeting included reviewing the quarterly reports. He confirmed the intent to hold the morning of Friday 17 May 2024 as a contingency day two for the meeting as required.

### **10.3. Consumer Data: Unlocking our path to tackling Key Industry Issue Together**

DA advised that RECCo were to run a session on 18 April 2024, in which he presumed Open Data would be discussed extensively, with further meetings expected. He shared that he and JMc were going to attend and wanted to highlight the event. He hoped that Committee members had been invited and that their colleagues from Shipper and Supplier organisations would also attend.

SM asked if DA would feedback about the event at the next DSC Contract Management Committee meeting, which DA agreed to do.

**New Action 0403:** CDSP (DA) to feedback on RECCo event on 18 April 2024 and Open Data discussions held.

#### **10.4 Update on Action 0206, Closed on 20 March 2024 DSC Contract Management Committee meeting.**

JMc advised the Committee that she had some updates on this issue that she wished to provide, particularly around incidents and how they were defined as 'Controllable' and 'Uncontrollable', as can be reviewed in **Slide 15** of the Monthly Management Report.

JMc stated that what is Correla identified had a very conservative definition, adding that the Committee had talked about these incidents and how they are assessed rather than changing the definitions, so she had asked Correla to do this which had resulted in the reclassification of some categories which she would share with DSC Contract Management Committee members after the meeting to discuss at the next meeting.

JMC noted that some Committee members had asked for wording about what was being reported, and whilst she was not certain the proposed text produced met the full requirements, it was a start and was, in effect, a statement that Xoserve monitor and review and discuss everything with Correla provides, to be included at the start of the report.

*This reporting pack is the Monthly Contract Management Report ("Report") that Xoserve is required to provide in accordance with the CDSP Service Document Contract Management Arrangements, paragraph 3.1. This Report is compiled by Xoserve to demonstrate its performance of the services listed in the DSC. Some of the performance data included in this Report is provided by Xoserve's third party supplier, Correla, under the terms of the outsourcing agreement between the parties. Xoserve has reviewed the data provided in the Report and is satisfied that this information included is an accurate reflection of the service provided for the relevant month.*

HC commented that she had been thinking more along the lines as to what the colours mean in the report, such as the Incident colouring in **slide 13** that needed some clarification as well as some detail as to the reason for the issue and what was required to resolve it. She added that it could be something short just to give assurance on each, citing MD's earlier commentary about new employee training under **item 4.5**.

SM asked why there was not a category for 'Xoserve controllable' and 'Xoserve uncontrollable' stating that only talking about Correla felt like there was a grey area as if these were non-Xoserve matters. He also what the revised values were

JMc advised the values to be 3, 7 and 14 but added that she wanted to explain things in detail and wanted to take away the commentary about Xoserve / Correla ownership to ensure that this was correct.

SM added for context that Xoserve have REC and service providers, adding that the question if there was anything that should be CDSP outside of Correla was one to consider.

MC asked if a table detailing what party provides what service would be beneficial. JMc commented that it should be clear what is provided by whom, with the service table showing what is provided by the various issues. MC shared the resumption that this meant that Incidents and Issues are only allocated to Correla.

JMc added that she wanted to check how Issues and Incidents are managed through to feedback, which MC acknowledged that there may be some overlap.

**New Action 0404:** CDSP (JMc) to review Issues and Incidents processes to confirm Xoserve/Correla responsibilities throughout.

JMc asked if the proposed statement added any value regarding the context of the Monthly Reporting pack.

HC confirmed it. SM commented that whilst there was a lot of text, it was the final sentence that was really needed. JMc agreed, suggesting that the rest just gave context as an addition to the start of the reporting pack. SM confirmed this was fine.

**New Action 0405:** CDSP (JMc) to add agreed statement to start of Monthly Reporting Pack template

### 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

MC confirmed that the May DSC Contract Committee meeting was to be held as an in-person meeting at Xoserve's offices.

JMc advised that the morning Strategy session invites had been issued and asked that Committee members respond as soon as possible as parking may be a challenge.

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
13:00 Wednesday 15 May 2024	5 pm Tuesday 07 May 2024	In-person at Xoserve offices, Lansdowne Gate, 65 New Road, Solihull, B91 3DL & Microsoft Teams	Standard Quarterly Agenda

DSC Contract Management Committee Action Table						
Action Ref	Meeting Date	Min Ref	Action	Owner	Reporting Month	Status Update
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)	August 2024	Deferred
0203	14/02/24	3.2	CDSP (JRi) to produce a format suggestion for quarterly CAB Updates.	CDSP (JRi)	April 2024	Closed
0301	20/03/24	1.5	CDSP (MD) to provide a proposal as to how best to resume the provision of weekly Defect Report to Users	CDSP (MD)	May 2024	Pending
0302	20/03/24	1.5	CDSP (JMc & JRi) to provide enhanced reporting in May to deliver required Contract Management assurance with a view to subsequent DSC Contract Management Committee consideration and potential suggestions for Improvement.	CDSP (JMc & JRi)	May 2024	Pending
0303	20/03/24	10.2	CDSP (DT) to provide insight as to what had been communicated to PAFA regarding the DDP Data and its accuracy, especially AQ at risk.	CDSP (DT)	April 2024	Closed
0304	20/03/24	10.2	CDSP to explain the absence of the DDP Data issue recorded in January 2024 from reporting issued up to and inclusive of March 2024	CDSP (JMc & AC)	April 2024	Closed
0305	20/03/24	10.2	CDSP to provide insight as to the level of DDP data assurance performed	CDSP (JMc & AC)	April 2024	Closed
0306	20/03/24	10.3	JO & CDSP (MC & JMc) to publish Terms of Reference for MPidVAD Review Sub-committee	JO & CDSP (MC & JMc)	May 2024	Deferred
0307	20/03/24	12	JO & CDSP (MC & JMc) to review May Agenda and a potential date for additional May DSC Contract Committee should it prove required.	JO & CDSP (MC & JMc)	April 2024	Closed
0401	17/04/24	1.6	JO to add 'DDP data' as a new Item on the DSC Contract Management Committee Agenda	Joint Office	May 2024	Pending
0402	17/04/24	9.1	CDSP (AC) to obtain legal guidance on the best practice to address the approved, but previously omitted, Service Area amendments consulted on in the April Change Pack.	CDSP (AC)	May 2024	Pending
0403	17/04/24	10.3	CDSP (DA) to feedback on RECCo event on 18 April 2024 and Open Data discussions held.	CDSP (DA)	May 2024	Pending

<b>0404</b>	17/04/24	10.4	CDSP (JMc) to review Issues and Incidents processes to confirm Xoserve/Correla responsibilities throughout.	CDSP (JMc)	May 2024	<b>Pending</b>
<b>0405</b>	17/04/24	10.4	CDSP (JMc) to add agreed statement to start of Monthly Reporting Pack template	CDSP (JMc)	May 2024	<b>Pending</b>