

UNC DSC Contract Management Committee Minutes

Wednesday 15 May 2024

At Xoserve Ltd, Lansdowne Gate, 65 New Road, Solihull, B91 3DL

And 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)			
Edward Allard as alternate for Sally Hardman	(EA)	Cadent	DNO Voting
Richard Loukes + alternate for Andrea Godden	(RL)	National Gas Transmission	NTS Voting
Charlotte Gilbert	(CG)	BU-UK	IGT Voting
CDSP Contract Management Representatives (Non-Voting)			
Jayne McGlone	(JMc)	Xoserve	
David Addison	(DA)	Xoserve	
Observers/Presenters (Non-Voting)			
Angela Clarke	(AC)	Xoserve	
Clive Nicholas*	(CN)	Xoserve	
Dean Johnson*	(DJ)	Xoserve	
Emma Smith*	(ES)	Xoserve	
James Verdon*	(JV)	Xoserve	
Lee Jackson*	(LJ)	Xoserve	
Lee Warren*	(LW)	Xoserve	
Marina Papatoma	(MP)	Wales & West Utilities	
Michael Osler*	(MO)	Xoserve	
Michele Downes*	(MD)	Xoserve	
Paul Orsler*	(PO)	Xoserve	
Sharon Dudley*	(SD)	Xoserve	
Simon Harris	(SHa)	Xoserve	
Steve Deery*	(SD)	Xoserve	
<i>*Some colleagues from CDSP joined the meeting for specific agenda items and were not present for the entirety of the meeting</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.

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/150524>

1. Introduction

Mark Cockayne (MC) as Chair welcomed all to the meeting and confirmed that it was quorate. He welcomed Clive Nicholas (CN) who wished to address the Committee regarding the strategy event all had attended that morning.

CN thanked the Committee members for their flexibility in agreeing to move the DSC Contract Management Committee meeting to an afternoon start time to enable the future strategy event to be held in the morning and acknowledged that he was very aware that the Committee had a busy agenda to address.

He asked if any Committee members had any feedback on the future strategy event.

Edward Allard (EA) remarked that he found the meeting valuable and shared his impression that he was fortunate in joining the Xoserve Customer relationship environment within the last six months as he understood there had been many more points of pain previously. He considered the opportunity to discuss areas of concern and where improvements could be made valuable and was keen for Xoserve to continue with the intended approach of transparency and share the feedback from other tables at the meeting, suggesting these be collated and published.

CN acknowledged the commentary, expressing awareness that his marketing colleagues were deciding the approach to collating the feedback, stating that he did not want to interfere with their work, but was pleased to hear that EA found the feedback on his table beneficial.

Andy Eisenberg (AE) agreed with EA's commentary, concurring that transparency was indeed a crucial consideration and suggesting in his experience a tendency towards defensiveness from Xoserve's engagement in the past. He stated that to continue so would not play well into Xoserve's case for being Code Manager, adding that he found the commentary around the Code Manager role and Trident interesting and was intrigued to see how they developed.

CN shared that he had received similar commentary in conversation from another party that morning and committed to taking this feedback away to look at Xoserve's commitment to doing the right thing in the context of the organisations' specialist knowledge and the impact they create when holding discussions, as this was clearly something they consciously needed to address.

AE acknowledged that commentary or feedback from customers could be seen as fair or otherwise but being defensive in response was counterproductive.

MC shared that he recognised a similar challenge in his role as he needed to balance his knowledge of Xoserve and its processes with the requirement to ensure neutrality, recognising the requirement to step back at times.

CN acknowledged the comments made.

James Verdon (JV) apologised that not all customers had the opportunity to attend his presentation and expressed thanks to those that had, adding that aspects like transparency were recognised as essential considerations on a day-to-day basis in Xoserve's ability to communicate with their customers and the wider stakeholder base to ensure both consistency and trust.

Steve Mulinganie (SM) noted that the meeting was the first time he had heard of Trident, adding that the positives to the session from his view were that so many parties from across the gas market were around the table which enabled a full discussion of past mistakes and how important it was to learn from them. He commented that whilst his organisation was supportive of Xoserve’s bid to become Code Manager he did not think the current commentary regarding both bidding to become Code Manager and being supportive of others that did so was wise and that Xoserve needed to commit to one intention or the other.

He expressed his disappointment in reviewing Xoserve’s presented bullet point list on Code Manager that there was no reference to their customers. He also observed that there were important lessons to be recognised from the Nexus project in which a good solution existed, but a poor outcome was delivered due to project deadlines.

CN thanked all for the comments made, adding that he was pleasantly surprised by the number of attendees present and noting that this did make it a challenge to speak to everyone. He asked that all feel welcome to provide feedback through whatever channels they prefer.

JV also offered to provide his presentation again in the Friday contingency meeting if it was held and customers wished him to do so.

CN then left the meeting.

MC looked to the agenda, and, mindful of the limited time available to the Committee for the reasons discussed, proposed that the Quarterly confidential reporting be considered first and deferring the monthly papers to later if time allowed, noting that the latter had been published for wider consideration. The Committee agreed with this approach.

1.1. Apologies for absence

Sally Hardman had provided apologies that she was unable to attend.

Oorlagh Chapman was unable to attend initially but was able to join later during the discussion of item 8 Contract Assurance Audit, which was reviewed earlier in the meeting following the commentary above.

1.2. Alternates

Edward Allard was confirmed to be acting as Alternate for Sally Hardman.
 Andy Eisenberg was confirmed to be acting as Alternate for Oorlagh Chapman until Item 8
 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
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		
Edward Allard as Alternate for Sally Hardman	DNO	1 vote
Richard Loukes + Alternate for Andrea Godden	NTS	2 votes
Charlotte Gilbert	IGT	1 vote

1.4. Approval of Minutes (17 April 2024)

The minutes of the previous meeting were considered and approved by the Committee.

1.5 Approval of Late Papers

Two papers had been provided for item 4.1 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. MC also apologised that the Joint Office had delayed publishing the paper for item 9.1.

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

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) presented the committee with a statement prepared by Michele Downes (MD) in response to this action, stating that Xoserve will be publishing a summary of the defects impacting customers, alongside the 'Customer Issue Register'.

The 'Customer Defect Register' will detail any current defects impacting processes (e.g. AQ, Amendment invoice, Supply Point updates etc.), their impacts, target fix dates and workarounds intended to minimize risk to Xoserve customers.

A post-meeting update provided by Xoserve confirmed that a formal communication would be issued within the week following that would provide a link to this reporting.

Action Closed

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:

Jayne McGlone (JMc) described that the intention was to enhance the detail provided in the quarterly updates to add interest and help bring matters to life. as part of this enhancement a Change and Investment Assurance report has been added to the agenda for this time this month explaining that for this meeting the item was listed under AOB initially.

MC asked if this was a request that the item be moved into the quarterly reporting in this agenda.

JMc explained that that seemed too bold a move for the first airing of the item and that they would rather review the item as an AOB today with the Committee and then seek views as to whether to include it in subsequent quarterly reporting.

Action Closed

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

Update:

JMc provided context to this item in that Xoserve had brought amendments to the MPidVAD document in the February 2024 meeting of the DSC Contract Management Committee, which the Committee had voted to accept on the condition of a subsequent holistic review of the document to reduce the need of further ad-hoc alterations to the document. She noted that it was subsequently agreed that the best way to do this was within the Market Domain Data Market Participant Identity Sub-Committee.

MC shared a screen view of the proposed Terms of Reference (ToRs) that had recently been provided to the JO by Xoserve.

JMc commented that the ToRs originated back in 2020 when Xoserve had brought the final version to a DSC Contract Management Committee meeting in which some amendments were subsequently made with the agreement that final version would be circulated after Feb 2020 meeting for electronic approval. She explained that the next meeting was in March 2020 immediately after the implementation of COVID lockdown and in the transfer to online meetings the necessary subsequent approval was missed.

JMc advised the Committee that the document has since been tidied and was to be made available for Committee members' review, noting that there were no approvals on this meeting's agenda, with the intent for members to review ahead of the June 2024 meeting.

MC summarised that the progress on the action to date was therefore that the ToRs were to be made available for review which the Committee should then agree if they were appropriate and then if the Subcommittee should be stepped up for this purpose.

Action Carried forward.

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

Update:

MC confirmed that the item 'DDP Data' had been added to the agenda as item 10.1

Action Closed

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.

Update:

AC confirmed that this action had been completed. She recapped previous events in which the April Change Pack had detailed an intended retrospective change to the CDSP Service Description document, which she stated was rightly challenged on the basis that retrospective

changes should not be made. As such a new document had been provided (CDSP Service Document CDSP Service Description v7) to the Joint Office to publish, all wording which requested that the CDSP Service Document CDSP Service Description Document be updated retrospectively had been removed from the Change Pack and a subsequent version 7.1 provided to show the proposed amendments as prospective ones.

Action Closed

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

Update:

David Addison (DA) advised that there was not a great deal of information from the event to provide specifically concerning Open Data. He explained that the discussions centred around vulnerable customer data and, in general, the prospective sharing of it, adding that nothing tangible had been produced yet. He shared that RECCo were approaching Ofgem on this and that Xoserve had offered to support RECCo, but as of yet, nothing else had happened.

Action Closed

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

Update:

JMc noted that this Action had come out of several recent discussions around Issues and Incidents and how they are identified and defined as Xoserve or Corella controllable or uncontrollable, noting that under the earlier Action **0206** Xoserve had looked at these and circulated a view on the definitions they were now looking to implement.

SM stated that he had reviewed the circulated document and did not think the reclassifications proposed as 'Corella Uncontrollable' purely on the basis that they were third party-provided services were appropriate. He commented that Corella should still control these services through the contracts in place wherever they decided to use third parties. He added that there were two specific cases, 1334 and 3414, which he agreed with but otherwise, he thought that Correla had been overly zealous in suggesting that contracting another party meant the services were in that party's control. In this context, he perceived that many things going wrong were actually in Correla's control, and as such, he added, this had proved to be a very useful exercise.

SM continued that it had been agreed not to change the definitions themselves and instead look at the application of these categories, adding that he thought that this approach had also gone too far.

MC asked if it would be useful to provide more information on the specifics of the services stated to be a third party, which whilst they should be managed under contract there was perhaps more to be understood within a narrative.

JMc concurred, citing the challenges of global Microsoft service issues and/or instances where 'Controllable' was allocated due to alternative providers being many times more expensive than the contracted service, citing the differences between 'gold' and 'platinum' service levels and the challenge in justifying great increases in costs. She also commented on the added challenge of tendering to unknown parties could make for a worse-case scenario.

MC noted that a new reporting year was about to start and as such was an opportunity to set a new slate, suggesting further information may be how some of the reclassifications could be justified.

SM asserted that whilst the case had been made for 1334 and 3414, it was not clear for the others.

JMc confirmed that she was keen to resolve the matter and suggested further discussion in June/July for which the relevant Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) could be invited.

DA shared his view that the discussion had provided useful feedback which he felt would benefit from a good counter-discussion within Xoserve to review and feedback to the DSC Contract Management Committee.

AE added that he thought the case was clear that a service provided by a third party was not in itself a reason for the 'Uncontrollable' classification but agreed that the example cited of global Microsoft service issues was being 'Uncontrollable' made sense.

JMc agreed to conduct a further review internally and would invite Trefor Price to discuss the matter further with the Committee at the June or July meeting.

Action pending

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

Update:

MC noted that the Contract Management Report provided for Item 4 featured the agreed statement on the first slide.

Action Closed

2. Approvals

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

3. Business Plan Updates

3.1. Efficiency Review

No Efficiency Review was provided at this meeting.

3.2. BP Update & Energy Code Reform

No BP Update or Energy Code Reform commentary was provided at this meeting, with all attendee's having attended the earlier strategy event provided by Xoserve that morning.

4. Monthly Contract Management Report

The full report is available for review at

<https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Contract/150524>

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 April 2024 on slide 4, which were all in the green.

4.1. KPM Update

Dean Johnson (DJ) provided the KPM Update, advising that of the 20 KPMs, 17 were achieved and 3 failed as detailed in the report.

For KPM.04 relating to the Monthly AQ Process, 99.99% of the 100% target was achieved, with over 16m AQs calculated. 120 exceptions occurred which were resolved in the day, of which 107 had a flag exception requiring a check that the AQs were calculated and were found to be completed. 13 needed calculations, which were done and on time, with all AQs issued correctly and on time.

KPM.07 Meter Read /Asset Processing achieved 99.99% of the 100% target, with 125.4m meter reads and 257k asset updates received. 1,576 reads (0.001%) and 206 (0.08%) asset updates were not processed due to the Exception process, with the main exception being due to Shipper-provided records omitting mandatory data for response file generation.

KPM.13 Invoicing DSC Customers achieved 99.94% of the 100% target with 1.2m created with exceptions encountered due to Primes & Sub related issues.

For the PIs overall summary in April of the 26 total, 15 were achieved, 9 were not applicable and 2 failed.

PI.02 with a target of 80% in 4 days saw a performance of 79.26%, which DJ explained was due to three identified root causes, including a large increase in RFA submissions, primarily from just two parties, with the highest number of RFAs submitted ever recorded, accounting for a 102% increase on Apr-23 figures. DJ shared that Xoserve were looking at options to enhance the process.

SM asked after this dramatic increase and what narrative was available to explain events, clarifying that he was interested in what the drivers were and if there was a User Performance issue. DJ explained that the two parties had operational issues that led to so many RFAs being submitted.

The second root cause was an unforeseen operational issue on the amendment invoice that pulled resources away from supporting RFA resolution. To mitigate this risk in the future a wider pool of resources was now trained in the RFA process.

Finally, gaps in internal communications between teams meant that the RFA team were not provided early warning of customer activity which resulted in additional RFAs. DJ advised that better ways of working had been introduced.

PI.06 achieved 99.24% to a target of 100% due to some data not being transferred from the new CMS to UKLink, resulting in a blank page. This had been raised with the CMS Project team who were investigating the options for a fix. In the interim, the CMS rebuild team contacted the iGT constituency group to discuss matters in more detail and confirm if the report is still needed.

4.2. KPM – Customer Relationship Survey Results CDSP

Hannah Brown (HB) the Xoserve customer insights lead, presented this item and explained how customer feedback for products had been sourced through a survey by the Institute of Customer Service (ICS), the independent professional body for customer service. HB shared that Xoserve had received its highest score to date at 81.2.

HB commented that they had received lots of feedback for improvement across the different constituencies and noted the score for 'how likely to recommend' had dropped slightly from last year's score so action plans were being developed to improve on this metric.

Customer Effort, where a lower score was better as it meant less effort required by the customer, scored 3.6 out of 10, an improvement of 0.2 on last year.

HB talked through Slides 9 and 10 highlighting areas that could be improved and noting Engagement was focused on easy access to the right people and communications, whereas for Support Requests the suggestions received were centred on resolution and speed. Understanding customers was, HB explained, how well Xoserve puts itself in its customers, and constituencies, shoes. The entry for Product included aspects such as additional functionality requests and performance. Third-party commentary was very focused on the Xoserve/Correla relationship.

HB shared that there were detailed ICS focus areas, with an emphasis on resolving complaints where significant headway had been made but further improvements were being developed and she advised Committee members that there was a possibility her team would be in touch to discuss and scope the requirements for these improvements. She also commented that as this work was completed, she would look to provide more "you said/we did" presentations on actions taken.

HB closed her presentation by thanking those who had taken the time to provide such helpful feedback.

4.3. Monthly Contract Metric Reports

The DSC Contract Management Committee acknowledged these reports, detailed on pages 11 – 14 of the pack.

4.4. Xoserve Incident Summary CDSP

DJ presented this item, describing to the Committee the 5 P2 incidents that had occurred in April, sharing how 4 were Gemini-related and adding that no incident resulted in a KPM breach and that all were resolved.

For the first entry, DJ advised that an automated alert was not available as the issue was within the Citrix Authentication Management system, which they had confirmed as a bug that they were working on. A manual restart and a parallel roll-back of two schedule updates were undertaken to confirm the root cause.

DJ advised that since the slides were published it had been confirmed that a Citrix fix had been put in place at the start of May.

DJ confirmed that the next three Incidents were similar, with automated failovers in Gemini initiated and restarts to the service resolving the matters. The dates and periods impacted are detailed on the slides and DJ noted the periods of impact were short.

DJ commented that he did not think more information would be available on these events as the setup of the fail-over processes was prioritised speed in the cutover and high system availability. Because of this, the crash logs do not detail the specifics for vendors, adding that Xoserve had since implemented more detailed logs but noted this added 10 minutes in the cutover process.

MC queried that if the root cause for these three instances could not be identified how would Xoserve be able to gain assurance that these incidents would not reoccur.

DJ committed to taking this query away to check.

ACTION 0501: CDSP (DJ) to give assurance on the non-reoccurrence of the three similar Gemini incidents identified in the May summary report given the lack of specifics in crash logs.

DJ then moved to the fifth Incident, which was within SAP PO and was defined as 'Controllable', during which Customers were unable to access the UK Link Portal during the full restart undertaken to restore the service. He added that this incident was still under investigation by the software analysis.

OC asked for the root cause analysis for this incident to be presented in the next meeting.

Action 0502: CDSP(DJ) to provide root cause analysis for SAP PO Incident detailed in May meeting

4.5. Customer Issue Management Dashboard

Lee Jackson (LJ) presented this item, advising that there were two Missing Secured Active Messages (SAMs) and asked if this was still an item worth including in the dashboard.

David Addison (DA) Observed that Modification **0836** *Resolution of Missing Messages following Central Switching Service implementation and integration with REC Change R0067* and **0855** *Settlement Adjustments for Supply Meter Points impacted by the Central Switching System P1 Incident* were due in the June release and would be finalised accordingly, adding that his suggestion was to pick SAMs up in the GRDA update going forward, and as such it was probably worth removing from the Dashboard report.

It was accordingly agreed to move reporting on this item from the Dashboard to the GRDA update.

LJ thanked the Committee for this steer and shared that he had a similar question about the next 3 Issue Areas, namely Portfolio Files, Meter Readings and Registration, noting that there had been no updates since the last report.

DA commented that he thought the 139 MPRNs impacted in registrations would need to be tracked as, in comparison with the cancelled switches that require no adjustments, they will require assessment using the mechanisms being introduced by Modification **0836** and as such he was inclined to suggest that Xoserve continues Dashboard reporting on this though July as the reads are loaded and on through the adjustments performed in October.

SM corresponded with this view that it seemed appropriate to keep Dashboard reporting until October, and not close the item until it is resolved. DA agreed, suggesting adding comments that the next update would be in October with the final adjustment.

MC acknowledged this commentary and suggested adding a guide to the Dashboard for each item as to what the next step expected was and when it was likely to occur. JMc agreed with this suggestion.

DA noted that the Dashboard entry for Meter Readings states a fix was applied on 6/7 April and asked if this meant that the issue was resolved or if there was still anything outstanding.

Michele Downes (MD) advised that the cause of the issue had been identified as a unique scenario, with 99% of the impacted meter points being with one Shipper. She continued that all the reads had been loaded and issued. DA asked if there was an ongoing manual workaround. MD confirmed that a fix in this regard was due by July. DA suggested noting on the dashboard that the item be retained on the Dashboard report noting that the next step would be the July fix.

Moving to the second slide of 'Open Issues Impacting Customers' LJ advised that DDP had a two-part fix planned on 09 and 22 July to populate the historic data and as a result of revisiting the DDP dashboard logic too, which the CDSP would monitor going forward. When Committee members asked for more detail on this item JMc advised that these would probably be best put to James Hallam-Jones (JHJ) as DDP SME when he reported on DDP Issues under **item 10.1** on the Committee's Agenda

LJ moved on to review the ASP and supporting information files issued that impacted the March 2024 Amendment invoicing and caused incorrect values. He shared that the invoices issued were correct but delivered later to allow time to amend them, though still within the SLA. The Support Information files were corrected and reissued within 24 hours. He also advised that the issue was pinpointed to a new automated job around Line in the Sand (LiS) issues which would now not be used for 12 months, and a fix was planned.

MC and DA asked a series of questions to clarify that the invoices were correct and that the only errors were in the supporting data. LJ confirmed this and that the Dashboard commentary had intended to spell this out, though he acknowledged that it appeared to have confused matters, for which he apologised.

LJ then discussed the entry for UIG Reconciliation for non-Meter Point and that he expected to attend the June DSC Contract Management Committee meeting with more information, sharing that a communication had been issued on this item on the previous Friday 10 May, noting that the impact would not be seen until Oct and essentially effected the Large LDZ Measurement Error reconciliations and Annual Shrinkage adjustments only for historical periods beyond 12 months. LJ advised that the issue was seen as fairly minor but that it would impact the invoice, hence the experts wanted to give an expansive report in June.

EA observed that if the issue affected the adjustment of the gas DNOs purchased gas and the invoice they pay there could well be further impacts.

Simon Harris (SHa) stated that imminent communications would provide more detail, and that early analysis suggested the impact to be effectively negligible.

EA asked if all parties would receive the communications, to which SHa responded that whilst it would be Shipper-focused it would go out to all. MC added that exited parties should also be on the communications distribution list.

SM observed that reference to UIG set 'hares running' and he had seen the communication sent at 16:00 on Friday 10 May but he had not passed it on internally yet as he wanted to get an understanding of the scale of the issue.

SHa confirmed more details would be provided, and it was suggested that Fiona Cottam attend next month's DSC Contract Management Committee meeting to present the details.

<p>ACTION 0503: CDSP SME (FC) to attend June DSC Contract Management Committee to provide specifics of UIG Reconciliation for Non-Meter Point Issue</p>
--

4.6. Gas Retail Data Agent (GRDA) Update

The Committee acknowledged this update had been provided in the Monthly Management Report

4.7. KVI Change Management.

The Committee acknowledged this update had been provided in the Monthly Management Report

5. Information Security Update

Lee Warren (LW) joined the meeting and provided an overview of the confidential report.

During the discussion, it was agreed that entries listed as 'Not rated' be recorded as 'Not applicable' to avoid any potential confusion.

LW was also asked how the Information Security and Business Continuity considerations were addressed in procuring new systems. LW confirmed his high levels of involvement from the outset and detailed some of the measures the team undertook to assess potential new providers and their systems.

6. Financial Information

James Madge (JM) joined the meeting and provided an overview of the confidential Financial Information report.

JMc suggested that it may be useful for the Committee to discuss the funding of telephony services and how well they are used up to enable views on whether there was an option to consider developing API services that may replace some of the existing telephone services. SM commented that any alternative should be appropriate for smaller parties and new market players, which JMC agreed with.

SM asked JM what information had been provided to DESNZ to support the closure of the EBRS and EPG schemes, noting that there had been a discussion of read performance when the figures should be based on consumption and not the number of meters. JM confirmed that Xoserve had not been asked for read performance figures.

7. Business Continuity Plan

Lee Warren (LW) provided an overview of the confidential report, during which no adverse comments were forthcoming from those parties in attendance at the meeting.

SM observed that as October was the start of the gas year when many contractual parameters changed, it would be best avoided in any BCP planning. LW acknowledged this commentary, as well as subsequent commentary regarding the added considerations for NGT for any work during the winter period.

8. Contract Assurance Audit

Hannah Hassanjee (HH) joined the meeting and provided an overview of the confidential report.

OC asked to clarify the purpose of the Committee receiving the report, to ascertain if they were expected to critique the details or to have oversight of the audit work that had been delivered.

MC shared his understanding that the critique of the audit process and the specifics delivered was the role of the Audit and Risk Committee (“ARC”), with this report intended to provide the DSC Contract Management Committee with assurance that the requirements of the DSC are being met, asking if the report was sufficient for this purpose.

OC confirmed that it was useful to understand in what context Committee members needed to review the reporting, and on the understanding given it was fine.

MC asked if it was possible in future reports to provide a comparison with the previous year’s figures. HH confirmed that she would look into this.

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/150524>

9.2. Retail Energy Code (REC) Updates

The full REC Change update is available for review at <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Contract/150524>, and further information on all the Changes can be found on the REC Portal at: <https://recportal.co.uk/recportal>.

10.

10.3. Change Investment and Assurance

Rachel Taggart (RT) presented this Confidential report out of sequence as part of the Day 1 events.

Discussion included reviewing the financial mechanisms available to Xoserve to recognise the failure of third parties when agreed milestone work was not delivered. It was agreed that the Change Investment and Assurance report would be added to the quarterly reporting pack for presentation in February, May, August and November going forward.

Day 2
UNC DSC Contract Management Committee Minutes
Friday 17 May 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
Transporter Representatives (Voting)			
Sally Hardman	(SH)	SGN	DNO Voting
Richard Loukes + alternate for Andrea Godden	(RL)	National Gas Transmission	NTS Voting
Charlotte Gilbert	(CG)	BU-UK	IGT Voting
CDSP Contract Management Representatives (Non-Voting)			
Jayne McGlone	(JMc)	Xoserve	
Observers/Presenters (Non-Voting)			
Angela Clarke	(AC)	Xoserve	
James Hallam-Jones*	(JHJ)	Xoserve	
Joanna Williams*	(JW)	Xoserve	
Marina Papathoma	(MP)	Wales & West Utilities	
Simon Harris	(SHa)	Xoserve	
<p><i>*Some colleagues from CDSP joined the meeting for specific agenda items and were not present for the entirety of the meeting</i></p> <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 this second part of the meeting detailed AOB items for information-only purposes.</i></p>			

10. Any Other Business

10.1. DDP Data

James Hallam-Jones (JHJ) provided an overview of the current DDP data issues, stating that an update on the AQ read performance issue had been sent earlier in the week. He explained that the issue remedy had been delayed due to the unavailability of key resources because of sickness, with the delivery dates now 21 June 2024 and 09 / 22 July 2024 to resolve the dashboard issues.

JHJ advised that, for completeness, the Legal Text and Business Rules for the DDP Dashboard had been revisited to ensure the intended fix to be deployed did not lose any mandated aspects.

Oorlagh Chapman (OC) expressed concern that the gravity of the issues was not sufficiently recognised, and questioned if any other issues had been discovered as part of the wider investigation.

JHJ confirmed that no issues other than those expected were found and that to address the matter Xoserve were reengineering the data model and the data stack, and so were effectively redesigning DDP. He shared that in the next two weeks the first year of data would be rebuilt.

Andy Eisenberg (AE) noted the delay in fix deployment and questioned the existence of a key point of failure on a single individual, stating that should his organisation fail to deliver on their requirements as a Shipper, such an explanation would not be well received. He also questioned if JHJ thought that a June fix for an issue raised in January was a reasonable timescale to resolve the matter.

JHJ shared that his understanding was that the issue was raised in February, and highlighted that every issue, by their nature, would need a different timeline. In the case of this fix, considering the age of the technology driving the data stack it was recognised the best solution was to reengineer the data stack, which took time. He stressed that the intention was to deploy the fix as quickly as possible but, due to unfortunate coincidental timing with a key resource being off sick, it had been delayed. JHJ expressed appreciation for customer patience, summarising that the complexity of the rebuild drove the time taken to deliver the fix.

OC asked about the erroneous reports that were sent to the Performance Assurance Committee (PAC) and, in the context of the 12-month historical data that was going to be re-produced, if the reports were going to be reissued.

JHJ responded that PAC had access to the DDP data and as soon as the data fix was complete Xoserve would liaise with PAC to ensure the data they had was correct.

OC asked what would be done if any customers had been negatively impacted, adding that she was not sure what the precedence was as this was not a normal process.

JHJ stated that his understanding was that PAC had not taken any enforcement action based on the data from DDP and as such it was not thought that any customers had been negatively impacted. JMc confirmed that this was her understanding too.

OC commented that she believed there would be additional issues when the data was corrected and that it was important to understand the possibility of significant issues for customer systems. She highlighted that the matter had not been a small issue but was instead a huge concern and that she wanted to ensure the minutes recorded how incredibly disappointed Shippers were.

JMc asked if this was stated on behalf of all Shippers, to which OC responded that she could only speak for Class A Shippers.

JMc asked if DSC Contract Management Committee was the correct forum for the management of the resolution and any impacts or was it more appropriate to be tracked in the DDP Forums.

OC replied that it needed to be discussed in the DSC Contract Management Committee as it was Contract-related and that it needed to be picked up in the minutes for those customers who did not attend. She added that she expected it to be discussed in every forum that DDP data was pertinent to.

AE shared that for him, the issue with the data should have been apparent from the outset before anything was reported to PAC, adding that he still retained a question mark over this impacting PAC decisions. He stated that the data could have an impact on Shippers in the future which may see PAC actions that result in Shippers taking on unnecessary costs.

He expressed concern that there was apparently no assurance performed on the data before it was provided to PAC. He made the comparison with his organisation receiving data RFIs from Ofgem for which they would take measures to check the data before dispatch, including manual spot checks, and observed that it appeared to be no such measures here, suggesting the difference may be because Correla is not impacted by errors in the same way a Shipper would be.

JHJ responded that the data within DDP was designed to refresh automatically and that there were measures to monitor and assure this. He explained that the problem was not spotted when it was introduced by a change in 2022. There was an omission in the data flow and a technical issue in 2023, JHJ explained, did not pick this up. He stated that Xoserve recognised its fault in missing this and explained that they had refocused procedures to ensure it would not reoccur and were monitoring a much more reliable data stack.

In respect to data sent each month to PAC, JHJ confirmed that Xoserve had a team who reviewed the data with PAC and he was not sure why they did not pick the issue, though he stated he could not speak for colleagues as to why this was the case. He added that the PAC dashboard had a different design and as such this may have been a consideration.

JHJ then sought to reiterate the apology and stated that Xoserve appreciated the potential for impact on customer organisations caused by incorrect data.

AE stated that he wanted an action placed on Xoserve to understand why this was missed and thereby gain reassurance it would not reoccur, adding that he would not be reassured until this happened.

MC summarised that there were three aspects to consider. Firstly, how were Xoserve looking to address single point of failure in terms of people.

Secondly, Xoserve should demonstrate that key controls were in place for BAU DDP Updates to PAC, such as the controls in place to validate and assure the integrity of the data and finally to advise what controls are in place around Change and/or system updates to assure the data is correct following system changes.

AE and OC confirmed this summarised their requirements.

JMc noted that DPP data was an agenda item for the foreseeable future.

Action 0504: CDSP (JHJ) to provide DPP Assurance around data in both BAU and Change, addressing the key three points raised in the May meeting discussion.

JHJ acknowledged that a visual presentation on the 3 points MC had summarised was required and added that the importance of this issue was recognised and reiterated the apology for this issue.

10.2. CMS Update

Joanna Williams (JW) provided an overview of the CMS rebuild delivery roadmap, stating that the final launch had been delivered in April and that all had gone well, noting that there had been a few minor bugs and some enhancements that customers identified. New functionalities were being added such as uploads.

JW explained that the Focus Groups would continue to be held every quarter to discuss enhancements and how customers are using the processes.

JW wanted to pass on a thank-you from the CMS team to those customers who have been involved in the process. The first forum was in November 2020, since which over 140 workshops have been held and, she noted, that there were still some people in the Workgroup now who were in that first forum.

Sally Hardman (SH) thanked JW, confirming that it had been a journey and asked about the subsequent decommissioning plans and when the old system would be decommissioned, and the website links removed.

JW shared that Xoserve was working on the website to identify what legacy needs to remain and what training links needed to be added, noting that this work should be completed by mid-June. She noted that access to legacy systems for customers was being phased out over the next few weeks and that before they started this they needed to archive systems, which was delaying decommissioning, but it should be done, nonetheless, by the end of July

JW confirmed that as part of this process, the aftercare was still in place which customers could reach out to through all the existing connection methods.

For full details, please refer to the published slides at <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Contract/150524>

10.3. User Representation Process for 2024/25

MC highlighted the User Representation process for 2024/25 was already underway and directed Committee members to review the slide pack published with the papers for this meeting, adding that the Joint Office would ensure these details were made available to all attendees of JO events and website visitors over the next few weeks.

10.5 CIX Update

JMc advised that Xoserve had successfully implemented CIX and that customers should receive communication about migrating IX from physical kit to cloud.

Simon Harris (SHa) advised that further updates would also follow as parallel running was utilised to hold CIX under observation for some weeks to ensure file processing times and the like are not adversely affected. He shared that file process times to date had been reduced and that it had held up incredibly well, even during unexpected volume peaks.

SHa explained that the next step in the process was the rollout, and the Xoserve team would look to start discussing transfers with customers and the considerations of their own architectures. He added that they were very happy with the progress to date and were keen to onboard customers.

JMc agreed, stating that Xoserve successfully migrated one customer last week with no issues and that subsequent file transfers were moving quicker.

OC asked that Xoserve produce some form of timeline documentation on the requirements for phasing out, noting that Centrica had security discussions underway it would need to feed into, adding that she thought the industry would also find a visual roadmap useful.

SHa confirmed that the plan was for more formal documentation to be produced.

JMc recognised that each customer would have specific requirements, but Xoserve would send some general documentation to explain and detail what is required, and then each customer would get more detailed plans depending on their requirements. She shared that there would be consideration given to the needs of customers when planning each migration, taking into account those customers who might need to move to PIX Option 4 in the near future. She asked customers to feedback if the communications proved insufficient or were as required.

JMc also noted that Online briefing sessions would be held, probably in June/July, and that the Customer Lifecycle Team would be sending out the communications on these.

She highlighted that LW would also feed into these discussions regarding security, and if separate sessions were required for specific organisational security discussions, they were happy to facilitate these.

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 19 June 2024	5 pm Tuesday 11 June 2024	Microsoft Teams	Standard 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
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	Closed
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	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	Pending
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	Closed
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	Closed
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	Closed
0404	17/04/24	10.4	CDSP (JMc) to review Issues and Incidents processes to confirm Xoserve/Correla responsibilities throughout.	CDSP (JMc)	May 2024	Pending
0405	17/04/24	10.4	CDSP (JMc) to add agreed statement to start of Monthly Reporting Pack template	CDSP (JMc)	May 2024	Closed
0501	15/05/24	4.4	CDSP (DJ) to explain assurance on the non-reoccurrence of the three similar Gemini incidents identified in May summary report given the lack of specifics in crash logs.	CDSP (DJ)	June 2024	Pending
0502	15/05/24	4.4	CDSP(DJ) to provide root cause analysis for SAP PO Incident detailed in May meeting	CDSP (DJ)	June 2024	Pending
0503	15/05/24	4.5	CDSP SME (FC) to attend June DSC	CDSP SME	June	Pending

			Contract Management Committee to provide specifics of UIG Reconciliation for Non-Meter Point Issue	(FC)	2024	
0504	15/05/24	10.1	CDSP (JHJ) to provide DPP Assurance around data in both BAU and Change, addressing the key three points raised in the May meeting discussion.	CDSP (JHJ)	June 2024	Pending