

UNC DSC Contract Management Committee Minutes
Wednesday 19 June 2024
Via Microsoft Teams

Attendees			
Mark Cockayne (Chair)	(MC)	Joint Office	Non-Voting
Harmandeep Kaur (Secretary)	(HK)	Joint Office	Non-Voting
Shipper User Representatives (Voting)			
Andy Eisenberg	(AE)	E.ON Next	Class A & Class C
Oorlagh Chapman	(OC)	Centrica	Class A
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	SEFE Energy	Class Bx2 & Class C
Transporter Representatives (Voting)			
Helen Chandler	(HC)	Northern Gas Networks	DNO Voting
Sally Hardman	(SH)	Scotia Gas Networks	DNO Voting
Richard Loukes + Alternate for Andrea Godden	(RL)	National Gas Transmission	NTS Voting
Charlotte Gilbert	(JR)	BUUK	IGT Voting
Tom Jenkins	(JR)	ESPUG	IGT Voting
CDSP Change Management Representatives (Non-Voting)			
Jayne McGlone	(JMc)	Xoserve	
David Addison	(DA)	Xoserve	
James Rigby*	(JRi)	Xoserve	
Observers/Presenters (Non-Voting)			
Angela Clarke	(AC)	Xoserve	
Charlotte Gilbert	(CG)	BU UK	
Dean M Johnson*	(DMJ)	Xoserve	
Emma Smith	(ES)	Xoserve	
Fiona Cottam*	(FC)	Xoserve	
James Hallam Jones*	(JHJ)	Xoserve	
James Verdon*	(JV)	Xoserve	
Laura Edwards*	(LE)	Xoserve	
Lee Jackson*	(LJ)	Xoserve	
Marina Papathoma	(MP)	Wales & West Utilities	
Michael Osler*	(MO)	Xoserve	
Padmini Duvvuri	(DP)	Xoserve	
Paul Orsler*	(PO)	Xoserve	
Simon Harris	(SHa)	Xoserve	
Sophie Purdy*	(SP)	Xoserve	
Steve Deery*	(SD)	Xoserve	
<i>*Some CDSP colleagues joined the meeting for specific agenda items and were not present for the entire meeting</i>			
<i>DSC Change 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>			

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/190624>

1. Introduction

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

1.1. Apologies for absence

None

1.2. Alternates

Richard Loukes 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		
Helen Chandler	DNO	1 vote
Sally Hardman	DNO	1 vote
Richard Loukes + Alternate for Andrea Godden	NTS	2 vote
Charlotte Gilbert	IGT	1 vote
Tom Jenkins	IGT	1 vote

Helen Chandler asked that Tom Stuart and Marina Papatoma from Wales and West Utilities be recorded as her DNO vote alternates. MC agreed to update the alternates on the Joint Office records.

1.4. Approval of Minutes (15 May 2024)

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

1.5. Approval of Late Papers

The Committee accepted two late papers for items 4.0 and 10.1. MC acknowledged that the papers were late due to the timing of the data they reported.

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.

Update: An update on this Action has been deferred to the August 2024 DSC Contract Meeting.
Carried Forward.

0306: JO & CDSP (MC & JMc) to publish Terms of Reference for MPidVAD Review Subcommittee.

Update: Please refer to agenda item 2.1 for the update on this action. **Carried Forward.**

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

Update: MC provided some background information in relation to the action and explained that this action had been carried forward from **Action 0206** which was closed on 20 March 2024.

Jayne McGlone (JMc) advised that Xoserve is still looking at this action and further to the feedback provided in the previous meeting, Laura Edwards (LE) who is an expert on the subject matter, has joined the meeting to explain the definitions of controllable and uncontrollable incidents. JMc explained that the definitions were set a while back and the rationale behind them may have been lost so LE will look to clarify the definitions and provide extra clarity. JMc suggested that after the discussion, the Committee looks at the action and decides how it would like Xoserve to proceed with the action. JMc suggested closing this action and replacing it with a better-articulated action.

Oorlagh Chapman (OC) queried whether any slides would be provided. OC expressed that she would like to see what is being updated in the presentations. JMc clarified that the Committee has seen the slides being presented on a couple of different occasions, however, they intend to have the expert explain the definitions and clarify what the ask with the action is. The slides presented can be found at <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Contract/170424> and <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Contract/200324>.

Steve Mulinganie (SM) noted that LE has not been a part of the previous discussions and invited LE to express her opinion about how the incidents are classified and what the best way of classifying them is. LE responding to OC's comments in relation to the presentation stated that the same slides are being presented because the definitions remain the same. LE added that she intends to clarify what the definitions mean and ensure that parties are clear on how incidents are classified. SM noted that there was pushback in the DSC Change Meeting about how Corella split the incidents and that the definitions remain the same.

LE confirmed that the definitions remain the same. LE explained that controllable incidents are issues that arise within Correlas systems and processes. These are incidents that Correla can control or influence. One example of this is where a timely software update could have stopped the incident from happening, however, Correla failed to do the update for some reason. LE noted that Correla will be discussing an incident from last month further in the meeting where an incident could have been avoided with a timely update. LE added that an incident is classified as controlled where Correla could have done something to avoid the incident from occurring.

LE explained that uncontrollable incidents are ones where despite best efforts and preventative measures in place, Correla could not have done anything to avoid the incident. These are issues outside of Correlas direct control. LE provided the example of recent issues with Microsoft experiencing a multi-customer-impacting incident. Correla system identified the issue promptly, however, Correla does not have any control over Microsoft's operations and infrastructure, therefore, this issue is identified as uncontrollable. LE clarified that although they select reliable vendors, their operations are managed by the vendors themselves, therefore, any such issues are out of Correlas direct control and are classified as uncontrollable.

LE emphasised that Correlas goal is to ensure transparency with the Committee Members and manage the incident efficiently regardless of whether the incident is controllable or uncontrollable. LE assured parties that the outcome of the incidents in both categories remains the same. They evaluate the incident from start to finish, look at lessons learned, and evaluate any contingencies regardless of whether the incident is controllable or uncontrollable. JMc highlighted LE's point that both controllable and uncontrollable incidents are treated with the same level of priority and urgency.

SM queried what the point of categorisation is if the incidents are all treated the same way. SM acknowledged that whatever route is taken with an incident, the way the incident is treated does not change. SM wondered where these discussions will go from this point onwards and asked whether quality reporting is needed so that the customers can see how Xoserve is managing their relationship with Correla. SM noted that the main point for him is that incidents are treated the same regardless of their category.

Helen Chandler (HC) agreed with SM's remarks and highlighted that this point was initially raised to have extra dialogue around what Xoserve is doing with Correla controllable incidents as they are Xoserve's third party. SM added that customers want to see a narrative around Xoserve's performance management of Correla. SM noted that metrics do not help as they invite a lot of questions and highlighted that the important thing is to get a summary of how Xoserve manages and improves its relationship with Correla in a more subjective report.

JMc explained that they meet and work with Correla regularly, and noted the struggle with picking out topics that are interesting and useful to be reported every month. SM advised that the main point is to demonstrate that Xoserve has control of the work Correla is doing by being able to speak to the things Xoserve is doing to manage the relationship and the steps it is taking.

JMc noted she understands that customers wish to see an executive-level summary information around how Xoserve manage Correla and agreed to look into this.

OC believed that the discussions held on this topic so far have been useful and have led to a good point. OC noted that the numbers were high at the beginning of the discussions and the discussions have shown the correct numbers. Now, decisions are being made in relation to communications, management, and how Xoserve is managing its contracts and customers.

HC reiterated that the narrative in relation to any incidents within the Correla space needs to be what the issue was; whether the root cause has been found; and what has been done to mitigate the issue. HC suggested that this information could go on the next slide.

Emma Smith (ES) acknowledged HC's suggestion and agreed to work with JMc on this. JMc noted that there are two main things to take away from the discussion with the first being to provide more narrative around the Correla controllable and uncontrollable incident and to provide an executive summary of how Correla is managed by Xoserve. JMc agreed to add this point to the meeting pack or to provide an update as an opening statement to the meeting.

The action was closed on this basis.

SM suggested getting the CEOs of Corella and Xoserve to come to the DSC Contract Meeting occasionally to brief on the relationship between the two organisations and to provide assurance and a sufficient level of information. **Closed.**

0501: 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.

Update: Please refer to agenda item 4.1 for the update on this action. **Closed.**

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

Update: Please refer to agenda item 4.1 for the update on this action. **Closed.**

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

Update: Fiona Cottam (FC) provided an update on the UIG Reconciliation for Non-Meter Point Reconciliations Issue. FC provided the background information as to why the action was raised. FC presented slides that provided information on the below points:

- UIG Reconciliation and Sharing Rules.
- Treatment of UGR from Meter Point Reconciliations.
- Treatment of UGR from LDZ Reconciliations.
- Calculation of Weighted Throughput for UIG Sharing.
- The issue.
- The impact of the issue.

During the discussions of the impact of the issue, SM queried whether the September Shrinkage Annual Adjustment was the erroneous one and whether that had been corrected in the later months. FC explained that Shrinkage happens daily and daily Shrinkage quantities are calculated in Gemini and these calculations are fine. The network does the annual calculations and comes up with the adjustments which generally comes in September. The adjustments are applied to the latest market shares. The Shrinkage position is corrected at the request of the networks and there can be a slight misallocation in the last few months. The LDZ Shrinkage adjustment is always the previous year and the LDZ Meter error can be anything. The issue is often highlighted within 12 months as it is identified during the next site visit. FC confirmed that most of the energy value would have been processed across PRDQOs which have not been kept up to date.

- Can the Exact Impact be quantified?

SM queried whether there is a bias rule to the error impacting smaller NDM because they are less likely to be submitting reads. SM questioned whether there is a small pool of meters in NDM that proportionally takes a bigger hit. FC explained that there are several variables to this. Factors such as the read history that is taking longer than a year and how much movement is there at the site all play a part. If a site is only getting one read a year, however, it is predictable, there will not be a big impact. FC added that a larger site could have more of a potential to have a significant reconciliation.

SM asked whether submitting frequent valid reads makes them less exposed to this risk. FC confirmed that is correct, however, the exposure is greater if there is anybody else in the market in that LDZ that is behind with their meter readings. FC clarified that they cannot go back and update historic PRDQOs and re-run UGR. FC confirmed that the numbers being discussed are percentages of a percentage. If 2.5% was effective, it is 2.5% of all the UIG that was shared. FC confirmed that there is no impact on DN income/revenue because there is no transportation income on UIG.

- Fix implemented on 17 May 2024

SM noted that historically, PRDQOs have evolved and changed. FC confirmed that PRDQOs can evolve and change and even if your PRDQOs have not changed, your market shares can change based on what others have done in LDZs. FC advised that the next time the change can be seen in September or October 2024 when the 2023-2024 Annual Shrinkage Adjustment is done.

- UIG Reconciliation in the context of Modification 0862.

Please refer to the published slides for the full details.

SM suggested adding information in relation to UIG Reconciliation to Modification 0862 to explain that an issue with UIG Reconciliation was identified during the process of this Modification, however, this has now been resolved. SM asked FC to clarify whether the risk range is between 2.5% and 0.3%. FC further asked whether there is a risk of 2.5% or whether the maximum risk is 14% of 2.5% which would be 0.3%. FC clarified that if you said on average 14% of the energy should be charged and if all of that energy is related to one shipper, they potentially might have been picking up 14% of 2.5%.

SM explained that he wants to understand whether there is a material impact on them. SM asked FC whether she could confirm that the worst-case scenario is 14% of 2.5% and highlighted that getting this information is very important. FC clarified that she is discussing 2.5% of UIG and not of throughput. FC confirmed that the worst-case scenario would be 20% of 3% of the UIG that was shared if only one shipper did those reconciliations, which works out to be around 0.6%.

OC expressed appreciation for SM asking the correct questions to get the important details about this issue. SM thanked FC for the presentation and noted that it has been very helpful in understanding the scale of the issue.

FC pointed out the website link to the UIG training material which has been included in the slides and to Modification 0862 material which provides more detail on the Modification and the current UGR sharing. FC noted that the link to the Modification is not working and agreed to share updated slides with the updated link.

New Action 0601: CDSP (FC) to share updated slides for Action 0503 in relation to UIG Reconciliation for Non-Meter Point Reconciliations Issue, to include the updated Modification 0862 link.

FC suggested a webinar explaining the information presented in this meeting if similar questions are repeatedly being asked. The Committee Members supported FC's suggestion and noted that a webinar would be very useful as they could circulate it within their teams. **Closed.**

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.

Update: Please refer to agenda item 4.1 for the update on this action. **Closed.**

2. Approvals

2.1. MDD MPid ToR

MC advised that the Market Domain Data Market Participant Identity Committee Standard Terms of Reference (ToR) were previously discussed in a meeting before COVID-19, however, these were never officially approved. JMc added that the ToRs were presented in the February 2020 DSC Contract Committee meeting, just before the COVID-19 lockdown. JMc presented the ToRs to Committee Members.

Please refer to the published papers for the full details.

SM queried the quoracy and the decision-making process of the Committee. JMc advised that if this information is not clear, they can take this back and provide an update. David Addison (DA) added that, at the time, the MDD MPid Committee intended to be a group that would support the DSC Contract Committee. Formal voting rights were not envisaged. The new Committee would bring its views back to the DSC Contract Committee who would come to their views before reaching a decision. SM agreed that the Committee was meant to act as a 'soft play area'.

The Committee Members discussed whether this would be a sub-committee and the frequency of the meeting. SM advised that the group can still be created as an advisory Committee even if it does not vote and it can be set up as an ADHOC meeting. DA suggested that the Release Schedule is built to meet annually on a minimum basis which can be dropped to less in the future if required. The group would inform the DSC Contract Committee a month before it intends to meet, and a post-meeting update would be provided to brief on what was discussed in the meeting.

Committee Members agreed with DA's suggestion. MC asked DA to have a think about when he would like for the review meeting to be arranged so that this can be scheduled on the JO side.

An approval vote was not taken.

3. Business Plans Updates

3.1 Efficiency Review

No efficiency review was provided at this meeting.

3.2 BP25 Update

James Rigby (JRi) provided an update on the Statement of Planning Principles (SPP) confirming that it will be published in the next week. JRi advised that there will be a consultation period which runs for 2 weeks and invited parties to read the documents and provide feedback. JRi confirmed that a feedback table is being set up for 4 July 2024 between 9 am and 10 am and the meeting invitations will be shared on Saturday 22 June 2024. JRi advised that a bilateral meeting can be arranged if parties cannot attend the 4 July 2024 meeting. SM expressed interest in the bilateral as he is not available on the day of the original meeting. JR took note of this and agreed to arrange the bilateral.

New Action 0602: CDSP (JR) CoMC members to contact James via his e-mail address at James.Rigby@Xoserve.com if they are unable to attend the meeting on 4th July 2024 and he will set up a bi-lateral meeting to discuss the Statement of Planning Principles

In regards to BP25, JRi confirmed that a BP25 portal has been set up that houses all the contents and engagement documents. JRi advised that he will be arranging the pre-engagement activities in relation to BP25 investments. JRi noted that they recognise the value of being proactive with engagement and engaging before the documents are published. The main points of discussion in the pre-engagement workshops will relate to Project Trident and Code Management. JRi asked parties to confirm where they would prefer the Workshops to take place.

In relation to the assurance activity, JRi informed the Committee that they have procured a third party for the assurance activity. Kearney has won the tender and will be onboarded by the end of July. JRi advised that Kearney will be assessing each part of the process while the three drafts are being prepared.

4. Monthly Contract Management Report

The full report is available for review at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Contract/190624>.

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 there was a dip in the cash collection payment due to three of the invoices being paid late. As one of the invoices was quite large, it impacted performance, however, all the invoices have not been paid, therefore, the situation was identified and rectified. AC confirmed that they were above targets and in the Green on all other measures.

4.1. Key Performance Management (KPM)

Dean Johnson (DJ) provided the KPM Update and summarised the 3 failures:

- KPM.04 – *Percentage of AQs processed successfully* was at 99.99%, below the target of 100%.
- KPM.07 - *Percentage of requests processed within the Completion Time Service Level in DSC* was also at 99.99%, below the target of 100%.
- KPM.13 - *Percentage of exceptions resolved within 2 invoice cycles of creation date* was at 99.99%, below the target of 100%.

For the PIs summary, DJ explained that of the 26 total measures, 5 did not apply to the reporting month and 1 had failed.

PI06 - *Percentage of reports dispatched on due date against total reports expected.* One report failed to be sent on SLA due to data not transferring from the new CMS to a UK Link table which feeds the report resulting in the report being blank. The second reported failed SLA due to an invalid email address being used resulting in a delivery failure and the report being issued outside of the SLA.

4.2. KPM Customer Relationship Survey Results

This item is due to be provided in August.

4.3. Monthly Contract Metric Reports

AC presented these three slides, confirming the Meter Count Report (with 58% of the meter portfolio now Smart), the Communication Highlights for May 2024, and the Performance Monitoring figures.

4.4. Xoserve Incident Summary

DJ provided an update on Action 0501 and 0502 as below.

Action 0501: This action is related to the three similar Gemini incidents identified in May 2024. DJ explained that as the root cause of the incidents could not be determined, they are not able to guarantee this exact event won't happen again. DJ assured that issues with Gemini are rare and they have not seen any occurrence of the 3 issues since they happened. The changes introduced because of these incidents will allow for root tracking in the future monitoring and alerting are in place to enable them to act quickly and the failover is automated to reduce the impact on service.

Action 0502: This action was raised to provide the root cause for INC0466452 which relates to connectivity issues affecting SAP Process Orchestration which resulted in customers being unable to access the UK Link RCA. DJ confirmed that the issue has been finalised. Microsoft confirmed that the application process was creating high memory leakage and usage which was leading to resource exhaustion and subsequent server boots. DJ advised that this has now been disabled to prevent recurrence.

DJ presented the incidents that were seen in May 2024:

INC0466452 - Periods of unavailability were observed across the UK Link Portal, and New CMS services through the automated monitoring. Technical teams monitored the availability of systems whilst awaiting the deployment of a configuration change by Microsoft to return service to normal.

INC0473458 - Errors were identified when processing outbound Switch Stream files via the Electronic File Transfer (EFT) service through automated monitoring. a manual contingency process was initiated within 90 minutes of the P2 being triggered to process the outbound files. This was subsequently automated while an enduring solution was developed and tested prior to deployment.

4.5. Customer Issue Management Dashboard

Lee Jackson (LJ) discussed the Open Issues Impacting Customers as detailed on Slides 20 and 21. Please refer to the published slides for detailed information.

In the case of Customer details in UKL address field, LJ advised that a customer name present within the address details held in GES which was identified and removed. Subsequently, a search was conducted across all MPRNs held in UK Link. As a result, circa 15k records were identified as potentially containing customer details, although this does include legitimate data i.e. Public House names. A further analysis is to be conducted to identify those MPRNs where data does need to be removed. LJ confirmed that this is a pre-NEXUS issue and that the current system validation protects from the issue being repeated.

SM queried whether an assessment has been completed in relation to any GDPR concerns and whether the assessment is available to the customers. DA advised that they could share something with the customers.

Sally Hardman (SH) noted that GES is provided by RECCO and asked whether they have been informed. DA confirmed that they have been informed. SH asked DA to provide an assessment of the GDPR at the next meeting. DA advised that he would be hesitant to share it on a wider platform and agreed to share the assessment with the Contract Managers.

New Action 0603: CDSP (DA) to share their GDPR assessment with the Contract Managers further to the issue with customer data in UKL address field presented in GES.

LJ provided a verbal update further to the DDP issue where it was identified that some Meter Points captured in the AQ Read Performance dashboard had accepted reads within the expected time standard and so should not be included. LJ explained that an impact on DDP was experienced around 10th to 17 June 2024 and it was fully resolved on 17 June 2024. The impact was that there were missing Meter Read dashboards. This issue is related to a vendor issue at the back of a maintenance update. LJ advised that this was managed very closely with the vendor with daily interactions and calls at the Director level. The vendor issue impacted multiple users.

Andy Eisenberg (AE) noted that the DDP issue will be covered further under Agenda Item 1.1.

Regarding the issue related to the incorrect charges issued on Amendment Invoice, SH queried when the fix date will be. LJ advised that the fix date has not been planned yet as the automated line runs annually, therefore, the fix date will come further down the line. SH noted that this issue had not happened in the previous years and asked what changed. LJ advised that this was a new job, and a workaround is not required because it is not due until next year. DA explained that the plan is to fix the issue before the next sand in line. DA advised that the materiality update will be provided in due course and suggested either taking the issue off the register and remembering to bring it back when an update is due or adding a note to the register to say that the update is due in October 2024. OC asked Xoserve not to remove the issue from the register and suggested adding a column that will say when the update is due.

4.6. Gas Retail Data Agent (GRDA)

DA provided the GRDA update. DA explained that the format of the update has been changed further to a GES performance deep dive they completed. Xoserve saw how the reporting was being discussed at PAB and was concerned that it inferred that Xoserve was not delivering the required performance. DA explained that previously with missing messages, the gate closure was downgraded to say they had not met the target, however, DA was worried that it was being lost in translation. Going forward, they will report it as 100% as if they received the messages and responded within the relevant timescales, these should be recorded as green. DA provided the example of 7.1.1 from the slides presented.

DA confirmed that there was one incident of missing message on 6 May 2024 which was a Shipperless scenario and was resolved with no settlement impact.

SH asked whether REC received the actual value and the performance level. DA explained that Xoserve provides the commentary in two places to RPA. There is a place to provide commentary at the bottom of the report which they will use to explain 7.1.1. DA confirmed that some of the details will be provided verbally.

5. Information Security

No update was provided on this item.

6. Financial Information

This item is due to be provided in August.

7. Business Continuity Plan

This item is due to be provided in August.

8. Contract Assurance Audit

This item is due to be provided in August.

9. Change Investment and Assurance

This item is due to be provided in August.

10. Key Committee Updates

10.1. DSC Change Management Committee

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

<https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Contract/190624>

Paul Orsler (PO) provided an overview of the Change Proposals that were reviewed at the DSC Change Committee meeting. PO advised that the Change Development of XRN5793 was approved. The Change Development of XRN5778 and 57795 was presented to the Committee for information. PO confirmed that the Design and Delivery of the all three XRN5778, 57795 and 5793 presented to the Committee were approved.

For full details, please refer to the published slides.

10.2. Retail Energy Code (REC)

The full REC Change update is available for review at <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Contract/190624>, and further information on all the Changes can be found on the REC Portal at: <https://recportal.co.uk/recportal>.

DA provided an overview of the PAB response to the DCC Service Management Issue. PAB advised that DCC needs to present a quarterly deep dive on performance to PAB and since the Financial Incentives were introduced in April 2023, they have observed a significant improvement in the performance of DCC. PAB advised that they are directly assuring this performance. PAB agreed with DA's suggestion of any missing messages not being less than a P3. PAB also agreed to look at DCC Processes as part of the P1 Incident review with RECCo.

11. Any Other Business

11.1. DDP Data

James Hallan Jones (JHJ) provided an update on ongoing data assurance, change assurance, and defect fix replan timelines.

Please refer to the published slides for the details.

Andy Eisenberg (AE) noted that they understand that the issue with the data should have been obvious. AE queried what went wrong that allowed for this to be missed. AE expressed the need for reassurance that it is recognised that the data assurance was not to the level it should have been and asked for assurance that it will not be raised again. JHJ advised that the specific issue of certain sites going missing from the AQ Read Performance Dashboard resulted from that feature being amended and one of the amendments not being designed correctly. When the testing went through, the validation step did not take place. JHJ advised that they have enhanced the traceability so that when the test cases are designed, the validation is part of the process. JHJ explained that he had passed the feedback to the relevant team and flagged to the team that the data looked low. The issue originated from a miss at the original design point which drove this particular error.

AE summarised and asked whether the data assurance was being carried out properly. JHJ confirmed that was correct and that part of the fix was to go back and re-validate the entire data set. JHJ advised that they communicated the Business Rules to the Stakeholders to communicate what was meant to be in there. AE asked that this part be recorded in the minutes in case the issue happens again, and they can refer back and say that they were provided all the assurance that this should not happen again.

SM expressed concern about the continuous issues with what is being given to performance and used to engage with customers and the reality. SM noted that the design was signed off incorrectly and that JHJ seems very dependent on the individuals. SM enquired about the sign-off process and whether there is no second check of the design. JHJ explained that the current design is completely new, and they have had 8 people reviewing the design. SM was comfortable that this design would be correct and asked whether the same sign-off process is being followed in the future so that the likelihood of this happening again is lower.

JHJ explained that this is a very old dashboard, and the issue was not rectified. The processes have moved on since then and Xoserve has enhanced how it describes features. JHJ advised that they have done a lot of work to move away from single SMEs to ensure that that is no longer one-person approval.

JHJ provided an update on the DDP Issue explaining that there were issues with availability and visualisation with DDP last week. JHJ provided some background information in relation to the incident. Please refer to the published slides for full details.

Concerns were raised by several Committee Members regarding DDP and the Service Provider supporting it. SM noted that issues with DDP keep coming up. OC noted that they have been raising the same question for 3 years and there is a significant issue that has not been dealt with. Helen Chandler (HC) thought that DDP has been pushed to an avenue that it was not designed for because the customers have several reporting requirements which DDP was not designed to do. HC had serious doubts about whether DDP could achieve all the requirements. Other Committee Members agreed and noted that DDP may not be fit for purpose.

JMc advised that Xoserve is in early discussions with Correla where they are discussing an update to the DDP. They are also employing a Data Expert who will look at how the data reporting works. JMc noted that they are not at a stage to provide a solid update on this.

The Committee Members strongly recommended that Xoserve explore alternative solutions. OC was of the opinion that Xoserve should stop investing further funds in a system that is not fit for purpose as when an upgrade has been requested, it has not been delivered and if delivered, it has not been up to the mark. OC suggested that a suitable alternative route be explored.

Xoserve agreed to take the note away.

11.2. CDSP Document Updates

JMc presented a summary of the documents that have been amended further to the approval of Modification 0841 for information. JMc noted that the documents have been published with Tracked Changes. JMc advised that the documents have been included here so that they have a clear audit trail of what amendments have been made.

11.3. CIX Update

Simon Harris (SH) provided an update on CIX further to the last meeting. SH confirmed that a communication went out on Monday (17 June 2024) providing a marketing pack on CIX and information customers need along with contact information to transition to CIX. SH confirmed that they have had a number of customers move over to CIX and so far, the process has gone smoothly. SH advised that there will be follow-up sessions with the next one being held on 26 June 2024 and another 2 sessions in August and 1 in July.

SH invited parties to contact them if and when they wish to move to CIX and if they have any questions about the portal.

OC noted that Centrica had some concerns about the security of the platform which they have already discussed with JMc. Xoserve will be drafting a SOC2 for the provision of security. OC explained that they would like something demonstratable that shows security requirements have been met. OC confirmed that a Change Proposal will be raised and discussed. OC advised that the issue was identified further to their internal security team doing some tests on the system and it not meeting their security requirements. The technical experts are reluctant to do anything until they have the security information.

HC advised that their security team has not identified any issues, however, visibility of issues picked up by others will be useful for them to see as well. OC advised that this is a heads up as this topic will be coming back. OC noted that the certificate cannot just be provided to Centrica as it is an industry platform.

11.4. CIX Update

James Verdon (JV) provided the Customer Experience Update by sharing information in relation to the CX Engine. JV advised that the goal with this engine is to provide enhanced CDSP customer experience for the industry where the benefit and value-add can be felt.

JV provided an overview of how the data for the engine would be collected confirming that the data comes from the interactions a customer has with Xoserve directly via calls, emails, and meeting the representatives; and their digital interactions when they look at a digital service, their subscriptions, and tickets raised. JV provided an overview of how the customer profile will be set up and how their services will be curated according to their specific profile.

SM advised that a REC Committee is looking at digital services and the Committee’s view is that incumbent cannot manage digital services. SM highlighted that there is an opportunity to cross-check with this Committee to ensure consistency of arrangements and learning from others. JV noted that SM is referring to fragmentation across different central services. JV advised that the themes they have identified are common across central services and agreed that there is an opportunity to synergise with other central services.

SM noted that lessons could be learned from the other discussions that are happening and provided the example of a discussion he had in the other Committee about designing the digital service to accommodate translation into different languages to cater to German and French colleagues. SM highlighted that these conversations are happening everywhere so there is benefit in cross-checking. JV advised that the language element is a couple of stops on, however, curation is key and the power and material available to customers through digital experience is through content management and content curation. The content curation allows them to create personas that allow for content management on different levels.

SM queried whether this JV is referring to one persona with flavours of access. JV explained that the personas included in the presentation are focused on Contract Managers, however, Contract Managers can also be LSOs and different personas are interested in different topics. JV explained that as the digital service develops, the personas will vary from people with basic profiles to very complex profiles. There will also be other personas for non-DSC core customers, however, the primary focus is Xoserve’s customer base.

SM noted that they have learned from REC that the incumbent did not have the capability for digitalisation which is why external experts were brought in by REC. SM expressed concern about seeing the same mistake being repeated in this case. SM stated that he would like to see the cross-check with REC completed to ensure the same mistakes are not being repeated. SM suggested that JV can sit in the Committee meetings and ask parties to share some of the strategies they are benefitting from. SM agreed to share the contact details of the relevant people with JV. JV agreed to contact other central services.

New Action 0604: CDSP (JV) to connect with REC to explore the lessons learned around digitalisation and learn from the strategies that other central services are benefitting from.

11.5. Joint Office Website Re-platforming

MC advised that since re-platforming, some of the historic Modifications on the Joint Office website have been lost. MC asked parties to contact the Joint Office directly if they require any information regarding Modification 0 to 0681 while the service providers work to rectify the issue.

12. Recap of decisions made during meeting

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

13. Diary Planning

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

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 17 July 2024	5pm Tuesday 09 July 2024	Microsoft Teams	Standard Agenda
10:00 Wednesday 14 August 2024	5pm Tuesday 06 August 2024	Microsoft Teams	Standard Agenda

10:00 Wednesday 18 September 2024	5pm Tuesday 10 September 2024	Microsoft Teams	Standard Agenda
10:00 Wednesday 16 October 2024	5pm Tuesday 08 October 2024	Microsoft Teams	Standard Agenda
10:00 Wednesday 20 November 2024	5pm Tuesday 12 November 2024	Microsoft Teams	Standard Agenda
10:00 Wednesday 18 December 2024	5pm Tuesday 10 December 2024	Microsoft Teams	Standard Agenda

DSC Change 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 to August
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	Carried Forward
0404	17/04/24	10.4	CDSP (JMc) to review Issues and Incidents processes to confirm Xoserve/Correla responsibilities throughout.	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	Closed
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	Closed
0503	15/05/24	4.5	CDSP SME (FC) to attend June DSC Contract Management Committee to provide specifics of UIG Reconciliation for Non-Meter Point Issue.	CDSP SME (FC)	June 2024	Closed
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	Closed
0601	19/06/24	1.6	CDSP (FC) to share updated slides for Action 0503 in relation to UIG Reconciliation for Non-Meter Point Reconciliations Issue, to include the updated Modification 0862 link.	CDSP (FC)	July 2024	Pending
0602	19/06/24	3.2	CDSP (JR) CoMC members to contact James via his e-mail address at James.Rigby@Xoserve.com if they are unable to attend the meeting on 4th July 2024 and he will set up a bi-lateral meeting to discuss the Statement of Planning Principles	CDSP (JR)	July 2024	Pending
0603	19/06/24	4.5	CDSP (DA) to share their GDPR assessment with the Contract Managers further to the issue with customer data in UKL address field	CDSP (DA)	July 2024	Pending

			presented in GES.			
0604	19/06/24	11.4	CDSP (JV) to connect with REC to explore the lessons learned around digitalisation and learn from the strategies that other central services are benefitting from.	CDSP (JV)	July 2024	Pending