

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

<b>Attendees</b>			
Mark Cockayne (Chair)	(MC)	Joint Office	Non-Voting
Ben Mulcahy (Secretary)	(BM)	Joint Office	Non-Voting
<b>Shipper User Representatives (Voting)</b>			
Andy Eisenberg	(AE)	E.ON Next	Class A & Class C
Oorlagh Chapman	(OC)	Centrica	Class A
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	SEFE Energy	Class Bx2 & Class C
<b>Transporter Representatives (Voting)</b>			
Marina Papathoma as Alternate for Helen Chandler	(MP)	Wales & West Utilities	DNO Voting
Sally Hardman	(SH)	Scotia Gas Networks	DNO Voting
Richard Loukes + as Alternate for Andrea Godden	(RL)	National Gas Transmission	NTS Voting
Charlotte Gilbert	(JR)	BUUK	IGT Voting
Tom Jenkins	(JR)	ESPUG	IGT Voting
<b>CDSP Change Management Representatives (Non-Voting)</b>			
Jayne McGlone	(JMc)	Xoserve	
David Addison	(DA)	Xoserve	
<b>Observers/Presenters (Non-Voting)</b>			
James Spicer	(JS)	Xoserve	
Angela Clarke	(AC)	Xoserve	
Dean M Johnson*	(DMJ)	Xoserve	
Emma Smith*	(ES)	Xoserve	
Emma Lydon*	(EL)	Xoserve	
Hannah Brown*	(HB)	Xoserve	
James Verdon*	(JV)	Xoserve	
John Welch*	(JW)	Xoserve	
Lee Jackson*	(LJ)	Xoserve	
Lee Warren*	(LW)	Xoserve	
Padmini Duvvuri*	(DP)	Xoserve	
Peter Dyer*	(PD)	Xoserve	
Rachel Taggart*	(RT)	Xoserve	
Sarah Carroll	(SC)	Xoserve	
Simon Harris	(SHa)	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>			

*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.*

*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/170724>*

## 1. Introduction

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

### 1.1. Apologies for absence

Helen Chandler

### 1.2. Alternates

Marina Papathoma for Helen Chandler  
Richard Loukes for Andrea Godden

### 1.3. Confirm Voting rights

The voting rights were confirmed as below:

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

### 1.4. Approval of Minutes (19 June 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

MC stated that Jayne McGlone (JMc) took an unrecorded action in the June DSC Contract Management Committee meeting relating to questions raised in respect to assurance and a request for a member of the Xoserve senior management to attend DSC Contract Management Committee meetings from time to time. Following up on this, JMc asked the Committee to consider if it would be useful to have an Xoserve executive team member attend meetings regularly on a quarterly basis and introduced James Spicer (JS), the Director of Finance and Shared Services at Xoserve, adding that as the Executive member for assurance and related activities he could provide a useful insight to the discussions around the management of Correla's role.

JS greeted the Committee and introduced Sarah Carroll (SC), Xoserve Board Member and the new Chair of the Audit and Risk Committee (ARC). SC shared that she was a member of the Board and attended ARC for more than five years before becoming Chair, and provided commentary on the

independence of the Audit functions the audit planning and the concept of the Audit Universe, as a list of everything that could be audited. She added that this enabled a risk-based approach to risk for each line in the Audit Universe and assessment of how often each line should be audited, which was reviewed and agreed by the ARC on a regular quarterly basis. She explained that the ARC also reviewed the results of each audit, noting the convention at the end of ARC meetings in which the function heads departed early to leave team members to confirm that there had been no pressure from leads to change the reporting of results.

JS described the Internal Audits performed on all customer journeys and activities within Xoserve and Correla, adding that KPMG assisted with this work by contributing extra capacity and an added element of expertise. He shared that as part of this work, Xoserve agreed with Correla on what audits they would perform on themselves, with Xoserve subsequently reviewing the results. JS continued that there were also External Audits and External Assurance activities undertaken, with Xoserve and Correla both ISO 27001 and ISO 9001 compliant and audited annually by BSI. He continued that there were NIST audits in addition to external Financial Audits, with the most recent completed before the end of the last financial year. Mention was also made of the audit services Kearney provided for the Efficiency Reviews and BP Rules.

JS described the work performed by Xoserve staff whose day-to-day roles were assurance-focused, with Lee Warren (LW) managing Information Security, Data Protection and Business Continuity Assurance Emma Smith (ES) Operational Assurance to ensure complete and efficient delivery and the Change Team ensuring value for money and within-budget delivery to customer requirements. JS noted that these functions all had monthly operational assurance meetings with escalation mechanisms built into the processes to ensure the inclusion of Chair and CEO engagement where appropriate.

JS then described the Procurement and Contractual 'levers' that were available should it be identified that improvements were required, or failures had occurred. He noted that the Performance Indicators (PI) and Key Performance Indicators (KPM) the DSC Contract Management Committee were familiar with were used to drive Service Improvement Plans and Service Credits where required, detailing the triggers for each, as well as those for both 'Step in Rights' and, ultimately, termination.

JS added that to increase the assurance over suppliers, the Xoserve Contracts and Procurement Team had been restructured to provide increased scrutiny and assurance over their supplier performance, with a new Contract Manager due to start on 22 July 2024.

Steve Mulinganie (SM) confirmed that the Committee was interested in understanding what Xoserve were doing, and had requested transparency, noting that this was now clearly happening. He noted that individuals who had been on the Xoserve Board for five years or more would be aware that this was not always the case and that it had not been ideal in the past. He commented that Board Members attending these meetings was very helpful and provided Committee members with an opportunity to see 'behind the scenes' at the CDSP. He highlighted that the Committee was a small subset of a larger community, suggesting that it made a good testbed for such helpful material before it was provided further afield to the benefit of the wider constituency. JS thanked SM for his feedback and commented that this was the first time this information had been provided in this manner, and added that if it was thought useful for the wider community this would be considered.

Oorlagh Chapman (OC) added that she too thought the presentation was positive but felt that there was something significant missing in recognition that the engagement role did not work sitting within Correla, commenting on the contrast with when it was previously performed by Xoserve staff. She observed that there were now Correla representatives discussing Correla's performance with customers which was at odds with it needing to be at the forefront of Xoserve's concerns. She shared that Shippers had felt a huge drop in performance in this area. As such, whilst this had been a really helpful presentation, it was important to note the need to see customer engagement lifted.

JS acknowledged the feedback, stating that it was understood and that Xoserve were looking at how to best ensure more of an Xoserve front piece on customer engagement.

OC shared her frustration that this request had been repeated over three years, stating that the KPM Customer Survey score had been abysmal, and she was determined to ensure that the request was heard loud and clear by Xoserve. Sally Hardman (SH) concurred with OC's commentary, with Andy Eisenberg (AE) adding his agreement via the meeting Chat function.

JS reconfirmed that the request had been heard, and by an Xoserve Director. ES also affirmed this was the case, adding as an example of the steps being taken, that she would now be Chairing all Constituency meetings from August 2024 forward to ensure an Xoserve presence and oversight.

JMc asked if it was thought it would be beneficial to the Committee for a member from the Xoserve Executive to attend the DSC Contract Management every quarter, which the Committee agreed to, noting that exceptions should be possible for earlier attendance should circumstances require it. JMc acknowledged this, advising that the Xoserve Director of Strategy would attend in October.

SM reflected on the commentary made concerning Procurement and its relevance to recent considerations at the Performance Assurance Committee (PAC), where an offer had been made by Xoserve to provide a workshop on the changes being introduced in Procurement Law in October 2024 and what could be procured as a Code Manager, including licencing and what aspects had to be retained. He thought the workshop idea a good one but suggested it should be broader than just PAC interest and asked how this could be accomplished, stating that it appeared to tick several boxes if Xoserve were intending to take this closer relationship forward and was a perfect opportunity to build an understanding of the complexities. Furthermore, he observed, that more of such information flowing to customers would help them to understand the parameters when discussing such matters.

JS acknowledged the procurement rules changes that were to come into effect in October and shared that Xoserve had just received their legal advisory report the previous day detailing the changes Xoserve needed to make to their activities. He added that he was aware of the offer of a workshop and the procurement requirements for the PAFA, which, as was the case for Xoserve's procurement of IT resources and the CDSP systems themselves, may have differing rules. As such, he explained, Xoserve would need to digest the report first, but emphasised that he was aware that it was very important for customers to understand what Xoserve needed to do regarding aspects such as, for example, required timelines, and as such did think a workshop detailing what Xoserve do on the customers' behalf and ensure value for money would be beneficial.

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

**Update:** MC reiterated that an update on this Action had been deferred to the August 2024 DSC Contract Meeting and confirmed that he had discussed the outline with JMc and Angela Clarke (AC) and was happy to share this in the next meeting.

MC then shared that there was more of a pressing concern regarding the recruitment of Shipper Committee members and shared a view of a slide to be presented in the UNC Modification Panel on 19 July 2024 demonstrating that of all the UNC Panels and Committees, the DSC Contract Management Committee was struggling the most, with vacancies for next year of one Class A Shipper, one Class B Shipper and both Class C Shipper seats.

SM remarked that the constituency format of this Committee was not working and did need to be addressed, adding that the recent mass exodus of the market did not help.

MC commented that he agreed, stating it was neither good for the individuals who were on the Committee who had to shoulder the additional load, nor the wider industry itself.

SM recalled that the format had been reviewed previously and whilst there had been some suggestions made, no actions had ultimately been taken. He commented that Committee members had been asked to persuade more to join but added the current Categories did not work and probably needed restructuring.

JMc agreed that the approach to voting had been previously considered, though she was uncertain if this had concluded with any actions taken.

AC stated that she was genuinely interested in getting ideas to seek further members as she was at something of a loss as to what to do to address the issue and would appreciate a steer.

JMc asked where the reluctance came from, and whether it was a capacity issue.

James Verdon (JV) echoed commentary that this was a question for those who were not present at this meeting, as it was attended by the most engaged members of the community. He commented that other Shippers had acknowledged the need to be present but explained that they did not have the capacity. He explained that his team were talking to other organisations about encouraging attendance and that such activities were a route to better engagement. He suggested that there was more that could be done with customers who were not present and confirmed that most recurrent feedback was indeed capacity.

MC advised that the JO had reached out to the industry with additional nomination windows available and that Steve Britton, CEO of Xoserve, had agreed to reinforce the need for attendance at such forums. MC noted that whilst such additional pushes were great, they were not getting the feedback.

AE shared his experience as a member of the Committee who had not put himself forward to attend next year. He confirmed that capacity was the issue, adding that his role had expanded, with additional responsibilities and that the agile approach his organisation was taking was perhaps becoming more common in other companies.

MC asked if capacity was the reason parties in other committees and forums had been stepping away, adding that the proposed outline document this Action centred on was probably not of great benefit to the two experienced Shipper representatives who remained on the DSC Contract Management Committee.

OC confirmed that the current Shipper Representatives undertook a lot of unrewarded work as Committee members and that whilst their organisations valued this, they also engaged with a lot of constituency members who then did not have to attend, with her and SM subsequently shouldering a lot of work on their behalf.

JMc recognised this as a valid point, adding her sadness that AE was unable to continue to hold his seat on the Committee. OC shared this sentiment.

SM suggested that the industry has seen the appointment of the Code Manager on the horizon and decided this meant that they did not need to be involved anymore, anticipating a stakeholder advisory activity in its stead. He asked how the Committee could persuade parties to become involved when they perceived this inevitable end game. He shared he was seeing such pressure within his organisation, which questioned his involvement in such forums as the future Code Manager would be taking on all the heavy lifting, necessitating engagement at only the higher levels.

JMc observed that until such future roles were formalised such views could result in nothing being able to be done in the interim.

SM continued that the organisations that provided the Shipper Representatives who were present were effectively 'funding' the governance, meaning others could save on the cost, and did challenge their Representatives about making such a commitment. He suggested that the DSC Contract Management Committee had less relevance to commercial positions and that he had a serious discussion about this within his organisation with the case for him to continue to attend proving marginal, the challenge being 'what is in it for us?'. He noted that even then it was easier for existing members to renew established commitments than for others to introduce new cost commitments.

MC observed that, except for DESC, all committees had vacancies.

JV agreed with SM's commentary and stated that it was consistent with feedback from other Parties. They did not have the resources and could not make the commitment, instead relying on the current members.

AE also agreed, adding that he was currently surrounded by a busy team of stressed colleagues that made it hard to justify spending two days on these calls a month that were not considered sufficiently commercial, suggesting that the meetings were more beneficial to the industry as a whole than individual Parties. He added he thought Gas was very committee-heavy.

MC noted the commentary about the business case for joining the Committee and asked if there was value in the CDSP and JO considering the agenda to make it an easier experience for the members.

SM asked if there was a need to consolidate, with the DSC Change Management Committee in the morning and the DSC Contract Management Committee in the afternoon. He added that AE was correct in that the time commitment was a consideration, as it was not just a full day for the meeting but a day before as well to prepare, and should a meeting take longer, such as Transmission this month (running over two days) then the 5% commitment of the month time resource available became 10%. He observed that the CEO of Xoserve speaking with organisation CEOs about the need for engagement was fine but someone within the business units themselves was the party whose budget was on the line to commit.

OC pointed out that an attempt had been made recently to consolidate the DSC Contract Management Committee with a morning CDSP engagement day in May 2024, which had resulted in the need to meet for a second day to complete the agenda. She added that there were times when Committee members had not had the opportunity to read all the meeting papers which meant more time was required to review the material in the meeting, as such she asked that condensing not be prioritised above all other concerns.

SM observed that some of the presentations shared in DSC Contract Management Committee meetings were more information-only content and asked if it was always necessary to spend half an hour of the meeting listening to these. He considered reviewing perhaps a recording of the presentation and even speaking to the provider in advance, though acknowledged it could mean the loss of some of the interaction that occurred in the meetings, though countered that this would probably be limited with currently only two Shipper Representatives registered in the next term anyway.

JV responded that his presentations have needed time to talk through and recognized that he could have pre-recorded them to then just field questions in the meeting afterwards.

SM mused that perhaps losing the engagement piece was undesirable but noted that sometimes the Committee spends 2 or 3 hours on the presentation of information, adding that prereading was an option but the Committee did need to have the conversations and as such the solution was probably a mix of these.

AC offered to review the suggestions made and consider the options, asking SM and OC if it was acceptable for her to reach out to them for further views, which both agreed to.

**New Action 0701:** AC to review and consider DSC Contract Management Committee format and structure to ensure best efficiency in time required of Committee members, including reaching out to members for views.

**Action 0201 Carried Forward.**

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

**Update:**

MC advised this action should have been closed following the June meeting, where there had been a lot of discussion around this leading to an agreement that an annual review of the document was the best solution. As the document had last had an update agreed in the February 2024 DSC Contract Management meeting it seemed appropriate to schedule this for January or February 2025.

**Action Closed.**

**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.

**Update:**

MC noted that the updated slides had been published on 27 June 2024 on the June DSC Contract Management meeting webpage.

**Action Closed.**

**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

**Update:**

It was acknowledged that this action had expired having a date-based requirement.

**Action Closed.**

**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.

**Update:** David Addison (DA) advised that Xoserve had now collated the data which resulted in a GDPR assessment of low risk, adding that the existing controls of the data matrix were managed through the REC, who Xoserve have been keeping updated and were now identifying the instances where personal data could be included in GES and removing it.

SM asked if the action response included sharing the details of the assessment or just the outcome, to which DA responded it was just the outcome, as the process was through REC, which he hoped was satisfactory for this Action.

SM believed the Committee had asked for the assessment to be shared but added that if the assessment is low risk and if it was recorded in the minutes that just the outcome was provided it was probably acceptable.

SH stated she thought it would be useful to have a document available if feedback from other industry parties was received and requested a copy of the assessment, noting this was changing a whole swathe of data within UK Link.

SM summarised the understanding that Xoserve was taking action to minimise the risk.

DA agreed but acknowledged that SH was asking if Xoserve was removing the right data, adding that he was happy to go through the detail with the DNs as they were the masters of the data. He suggested an offline meeting with the DNs to present the approach Xoserve were taking and provide information related to the data being deleted. He suggested closing this action as this follow-up was more operational to ensure the right approach and methodology was in place.

SH shared that discussions already held had noted that some names were valid, such as public houses and the like.

MC asked if this work fell into the scope of the assurance work JS presented earlier. DA advised that this related to the actual proactive steps taken and ensuring that the masters of the data were onboard with the approach rather than an audit, and committed to picking this work up in the appropriate forum

**Action Closed.**

**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.



**Update:** JV described how Xoserve had met with the RECCo a couple of weeks ago and held a very positive conversation, thanking SM for the suggestion. JV shared that there had been a lot of agreement and alignment around the central services, with no pushback at all from RECCo, noting that they were further along in progressing their side of things. He observed that as Xoserve were moving into the Business Planning cycle they would look for opportunities to align with RECCo and hold further discussions. He added that he had provided the RECCo with some of the materials previously presented to the DSC Contract Management Committee about developments in the CDSP space with an invitation for RECCo feedback. He committed to providing an update in the coming months.

**Action Closed.**

## 2. Approvals

### 2.1. CP 3275 LO-PO- Amendments to CDSP Service Documents

AC presented this item for DSC Contract Management Committee approval, noting that it had been a long time in the making as, per the Change Management arrangements, 60 days' notification had been provided with no feedback or comments made in response to the Change Pack. Similarly, it had been presented at DSC Change Management Committee with no comments either and had also gone to all DSC Contract Managers without comment. She explained that the amendment was to update the documents for future decarbonization of the gas system.

The full paper is available for review at <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Contract/170724>.

With no questions from the Committee, the Chair asked Shipper, DNO, NTS and IGT Members to vote, with approval by majority recorded as follows:

<b>Voting Outcome:</b>		
<b>Shipper Representatives</b>	<b>Voting Count</b>	<b>For/Against</b>
Andy Eisenberg	2	For
Oorlagh Chapman	1	For
Steve Mulinganie	3	For
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>For</b>
<b>Transporter Representatives</b>	<b>Voting Count</b>	<b>For/Against</b>
Marina Papathoma (DNO)	1	Abstain*
Sally Hardman (DNO)	1	For
Richard Loukes (NTS)	2	For
Charlotte Gilbert (IGT)	1	For
Tom Jenkins (IGT)	1	For
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>For</b>

\*The abstention vote was noted and recorded per precedent, (21 Dec 2021 DSC Contract Management Committee meeting).

#### Post Meeting Update

This Change Pack was out for a 60 day consultation period commencing 15/04/2024 with a closing on 5<sup>th</sup> July 2024, During this time Mod 841 was implemented which resulted in a revised version of the Budget and Charging Methodology being introduced and published as version 8 with an effective date of 20<sup>th</sup> June 2024, As a result of this the changes that were approved during this meeting will be incorporated into version 9 effective from 19<sup>th</sup> July 2024 as opposed to version 8 as stated within the Change Pack.

### 2.2. DRR – Release of Data to support Energy Efficiency/Net Zero Assessments

DA presented this item, requesting that the DSC Contract Management Committee approve this request to release data items to support Net Zero / Energy Efficiency Assessments by 'Energy Data Consultants'

He noted the increased demand from consumers for assessment of their existing energy consumption of premises and options regarding efficiencies in the movement towards Net Zero Carbon targets. Xoserve had been approached by Energy Systems Catapult (ESC) to support the provision of data related to NHS sites to support such work and had noted that REC had submitted changes to DAM to support the creation of the role of Energy Consultants.

Xoserve anticipated this would transition as a GES Standard Service and this Disclosure Request Report was expected to release several data items, the details of which, and their justification, are detailed in the paper which is available for review at <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Contract/170724>

SM questioned the inclusion of Meter Asset Managers (MAMs) in addition to Automated Meter Read (AMR) providers, which DA explained was in recognition that this may assist ESC should they wish to engage MAM's regarding connecting AMR equipment.

SM responded that he recognised this, and this was just as potentially true of Building Management Systems and was enquiring after the MAM rationale specifically, stating that as the work was based on consumption data, he could see why AMR providers were included but did not understand the MAM involvement.

DA explained that the approach that he had taken to set out the data in defined datasets (or payloads) to be available to similar parties, noting that it was anticipated that other parties might come to CDSP under wider energy data management and net zero areas, hence Xoserve were starting to look ahead and intended to speak to these parties about such defined payloads as a starting point. The following datasets had been defined:

- Verification / Supply Meter Point Base Data – will enable the Research Body to assess information pertaining to the physical site to allow verification
- Consumption Data – this will enable the party to assess the consumption at the site against recorded Meter Readings. It is expected that metered energy data would be provided.
- Metering Data – this will enable the party to review the physical set up at the Supply Meter Point, validate against the information recorded in UK Link.
- Pricing Information – part of the role is expected that the party will be able to assess the benefits case for undertaking energy efficiency recommendations. Provision of information related to data that is used to define charges is included in this dataset.

SM noted the intent of entries stating 'Not Applicable' in the Data Permissions Matrix meant that the extra information was not 'left in' which was a useful approach in retaining data that might then later see future data requests in their regard which could then be taken on their own merit. SM asked if there were any Class 1 Customers included in the data which DA confirmed was the case.

With no further questions from the Committee, the Chair asked Shipper, DNO, NTS and IGT Members to vote, with majority approval recorded as follows:

<b>Voting Outcome:</b>		
<b>Shipper Representatives</b>	<b>Voting Count</b>	<b>For/Against</b>
Andy Eisenberg	2	For
Oorlagh Chapman	1	For
Steve Mulinganie	3	For
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>For</b>
<b>Transporter Representatives</b>	<b>Voting Count</b>	<b>For/Against</b>
Marina Papathoma (DNO)	1	Abstain*
Sally Hardman (DNO)	1	For
Richard Loukes (NTS)	2	For

Charlotte Gilbert (IGT)	1	For
Tom Jenkins (IGT)	1	For
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>For</b>

\*The abstention vote was noted and recorded per precedent, (21 Dec 2021 DSC Contract Management Committee meeting).

### 3. Business Plans Updates

#### 3.1 BP25 Update

AC provided a verbal update on James Rigby’s (JRi) behalf, describing how the SPP set out Xoserve’s strategic principles of trust, innovation and delivery as well as the five supporting ‘journeys’ they saw as critical to their evolution. namely:

- Transparency to trust
- Assurance to confidence
- System custodians to transition facilitator
- Stakeholder servants to serving stakeholders
- Code delivery to code management

She shared the timeline for engagement, with the next event being 09 September, as a session on Project Trident and encouraged all parties to feedback via email or the dedicated portal. She added the intention was to publish the final SSP at the end of July with any updates required from consultation responses applied, noting that, to date, no responses had been received.

OC shared that her organisation was finalising their feedback which would be provided soon and expressed surprise that no other responses had been received. SM suggested that this was attributable to the tendency for responses to arrive at the last minute.

#### 3.2 Equitability Review

Pete Dyer (PD) introduced himself to the Committee and stated that when he joined Xserve in March 2024 his first task was to provide an Equitability Review as part of the BR.

He noted that the last Cost Allocation Review had been conducted as part of the FGO review seven years ago in 2017 and had been the basis for ad-hoc subsequent agreements made since. As such, he suggested, that there was a case for, whilst not necessarily a tree and branch review, a more complete review, and in the understanding of the importance of the DSC Contract Management Committee forum, Xoserve would present the findings at each stage and/or any areas thought of as candidates for change.

The full presentation is available for review at <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Contract/170724>.

As PD discussed the seven key objectives detailed in the presentation SM asked if stability was included as a requirement, sharing that Shippers wanted stability when pricing long-term contracts.

PD highlighted Objective 6, which sought to provide stability for customers through a set timeframe, which he suggested could be something of the nature of every 3 to 5 years.

SM observed that the stability alluded to in the objective was in the frequency of the review, whereas he was mindful that some reviews may prove to be more volatile than others, which the stability of a regular timeframe did not address. He suggested that reviews could be managed to be predictably volatile, citing as an example a recent UNC Modification that was introduced to flatten the volatility on transportation costs to help ensure changes did not occur that Shippers could not manage through their own risk management.

JS commented that this came down to how volatile a business could be in its costs, which he did not see Xoserve as being, with a lot of the costs relating to long-term contracts of their own.

SM agreed but cited the Trident project as a step-change in the industry, adding that such reviews could include such step changes adding a risk premium when such items could be managed more around Xoserve's scheduling. For him it was about managing volatility for Xoserve's stakeholders, acknowledging that whilst some volatility was unpredictable, some could be managed.

PD committed to taking this feedback away, adding that Xoserve was not looking for step change but to ensure the process was managed in a more complete way which should, in turn, reduce the risk of chop and change and thus help provide stability.

SM observed that ultimately it was about fairness and surprises were unwelcome.

PD stated that Xoserve was not going to make changes but propose them to the industry for views and feedback, which SM recognised was a commitment to an iterative process.

OC noted that if the intention was to review every 3 years it should bring about an 18-month cycle process as there was a lot to review and consider. PD agreed that a year and a year-and-a-half process might well be necessary as each was considered, adding that it may be that they looked to a five-year review cycle, adding that it had not been done for 7 years to date anyway.

As the item drew to a close PD advised he would return to present Stage 1 in September.

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

The full report, with presentations for all items under Section 4, is available for review at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Contract/170724>.

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 June 2024 noting that they were all met.

##### **4.1. Key Performance Management (KPM)**

Dean Johnson (DMJ) provided the KPM Update and summarised the 3 that failed.

KPM.04 failed with a score of 99.99% to a target of 100% - With 15.2m AQs processed with 715 AQs impacted due to exceptions being raised with no customer impact as all AQs were issued correctly and on time.

KPM.07 failed with a score of 99.99% to a target of 100% - with 119m meter reads and 200k asset updates received, 517 reads and 144 asset updates failed due to either mandatory data not being provided in Shipper files or due to prime/sub-meter exceptions.

KPM.13 failed with a score of 99.99% to a target of 100%, with 856k created and 853k resolved, with the exceptions relating to Primes and Subs where no coterminous read had been provided.

Moving to Performance Indicators (PIs), DMJ advised of the 26 total 20 were achieved, 3 failed and 3 were not reportable.

PI.06 failed with a score of 99.90% to a target of 100% with a report failing this month due to data not transferring from new CMS to a UK Link table. DMJ advised that a fix had been identified and implementation was due on 02 August.

PI.12 failed with a score of 88.66% to a target of 95%, which DMJ noted Hannah Brown (HB) was going to discuss in more detail later.

PI.28 failed with a score of 98.28% to a target of 99%. DMJ explained this was due to a P2 incident on 10 June where several DDP meter read-based dashboards were unavailable for Shipper and PAFA users which coincided with planned maintenance. Remedial work required that the platform was completely unavailable for 2.75 hours on the morning of 14 June, with the wider incident impacting data latency resolved later on 17 June. DMJ explained that root cause analysis was still ongoing with third-party provider Infor.

MC noted that some KPI and PI failures appeared month on month with the same recognised causes and asked if red was the right RAG status for these recurrently scoring 99.99%, suggesting amber may be more appropriate and asked the Committee if the reports were easy to divulge more uncommon issues from.

SM replied that he thought all failures need reporting, and whilst he was agnostic to colour it was a binary pass or fail metric, suggesting anything else would lean into perceptions that some fails were more acceptable than others, which would be inaccurate.

#### **4.2. KPM Customer Relationship Survey Results**

Hannah Brown (HB) presented this item, introducing herself as the Customer Insights lead at Xoserve, and explained that they provided reports on surveys issued every quarter with 4 key questions concerning KPM satisfaction scoring.

This quarter's score was reported as 88.66% which HB noted as a decrease from the December figure.

OC observed that respondent numbers have doubled, which was a good story, but also that there was a doubling of the number of respondents that were not happy, far more so than before.

HB acknowledged this and agreed the larger response was useful and appreciated. She advised of positive feedback in response to the Xoserve staff in their support and services.

HB then presented the Next Steps detailed on slide 9 and detailed the areas being focused on, the first relating to system issues and reliability with specifics about a DN referral issue within the UK Link

HB then discussed the Data Discovery Platform (DDP) and the data extraction and processing issues not reflecting the current information, with the platform being unavailable whilst this was resolved through work with the platform vendor. It also saw the Class 4 Read dashboard provide incorrect figures and that customers with larger portfolio data were unable to extract their data. HB advised there would be more of an update on these in September's DSC Contract Management Committee meeting.

JMc added that an alternate was attending today to present the DDP item and confirmed that Xoserve had heard that there are wider issues with DDP and how it is not really delivering. She shared that Xoserve was holding discussions with Correla for alternate options to present to the September meeting to find a way to improve matters.

OC stated that she was aware that DDP had proven contentious in DSC Change Management Committee recently, but she wanted to highlight that there had been agreement within the industry that the governance of DDP delivery would be via the DSC Change Management Committee and not that Correla could unilaterally make decisions. She felt there had been a 'snowballing series of calamities' that had continued to grow, and that the rage and ineffectiveness felt in the DSC Change Management Committee about this inappropriate decision-making had not been adequately captured in the records.

SH voiced her support for OC's commentary, stating that this accurately described the issues in the DSC Change Management Committee meeting with the DDP prioritisation very well. She asked if the CDSP were looking for a solution that only featured DDP or if they were going to look at alternate routes with a different solution and a different third-party provider.

JMc shared she was not aware if a different provider was being considered.

JS reflected that he was aware that an update of the existing system would be delivered before January, although this was notwithstanding it would address all the concerns that parties had raised.

SM asserted that some form of 'DDP Sustain' solution, akin to the 'Gemini Sustain' service was not wanted and that he did not wish to go back to Correla to fail again. He described how the REC had found that digitalisation was something of an art, and after making mistakes in this area they were now going out to procure a separate service. He observed the natural tendency of parties should they not have a skillset was to try anyway and keep trying to improve what would prove to be a fundamentally flawed system, which made for never-ending tinkering and frustrated customers. He stated he worried about Xoserve's reliance on the party that was failing to provide the answers.

Sally Hardman voiced her support for SM's comments.

OC commented that Shippers had one-on-one discussions on this issue with Correla and asserted that they should be fronting the funds to fix the problems. Clearly, she remarked, DDP did not work and was not fit for purpose and thus accordingly Shippers were ready to scrap DDP and go on to something else.

SM suggested that it was acceptable to learn this lesson, that Parties did not understand the requirements of digitisation and Correla had tried to provide an answer and will thus had kept trying to keep DDP alive. He highlighted that REC had grasped the nettle and stepped away and that gas should be doing the same, adding that it worried him that Correla was still being referred to find solutions.

JS asked if Xoserve was being asked to go to market and find an alternate provider.

SM replied with what digitisation required even the incumbent service providers have recognised that it was something they were not good at and thus if there are things that are better done elsewhere asked why would they choose to keep getting beaten up on the things they were not good at, with all the good stuff getting lost due to the parts that were not. He repeated that he did not want a 'DDP Sustain' in the way there was a Gemini sustain, which had been delayed and was being propped up. He commented that this was why DSC Contract Management Committee meetings were so useful but it did mean the Committee needed to see things happen as a result of discussions and justify the time and effort invested in the meetings.

Emma Smith (ES) suggested a positive step forward had been taken by Xoserve appointing a Data Service Manager who was starting in September and would be tasked with getting more control and understanding of the best options and thus not be led solely by external expertise. With DDP, she added, Xoserve would come back in September to discuss managing pain points, which would be funded by Correla and not the customers. She stated there would be tighter controls and KPIs so should the industry wish to look elsewhere this could still be in train whilst decisions were made about potential alternate options.

MC advised that the direction of travel in the Performance Assurance Committee (PAC) was to flex its muscles in reviewing the Performance measures for individual Shippers, with the inherent reliance on the DDP system this entailed meaning that the PAC needed confidence in the system, and advised Xoserve keep this in mind for the September presentation. ES acknowledged this.

HB resumed her presentation and discussed the entry for Understanding Customers, with the Customer Experience Team focusing on understanding business needs.

She next discussed Third parties and that more needed to be done with an 'Xoserve' lead, citing Xoserve now taking the Chair in customer constituencies.

Marina Papathoma (MP) asked if this would mean Xoserve employed Account Managers. ES replied she was uncertain and would need to take the question away to discuss it internally.

MP commented that whilst she did not think her organisation had said so in their survey response, they would be happy to pay for a specific customer service provider from Xoserve.

SM remarked that he did not think a system should be introduced where preferred services were available to those who could pay extra and not for those who did not have the resources.

MP confirmed they wanted an account manager from Xoserve and not Correla, which they had been requesting for some time now, adding that if it was an investment issue they were willing to pay for it. SM speculated that the current service was so bad that the customer was willing to pay to improve it.

DA interjected that he was aware of this commentary and that there was quite a detailed response around it, adding that Xoserve had heard the point and had been trying to provide the level of support required. He surmised that this feedback confirmed they have been failing and he needed to pick that up with all the DNs and committed to setting up a separate session for them specifically, adding that he was not trying to sideline the Shipper constituency in doing so and explained his direct involvement in the service delivery to DNs.

SM advised that Shippers were not happy with the service either and got around the issue by speaking directly with the individuals they knew were involved, sharing that they liked the model the REC used, which was the format Xoserve used to use, with key people who understood the processes. He advised that the account management people he said Shippers met with did not have that understanding, which led to Shippers 'giving up' and managing the relationship bilaterally.

OC shared that she was somewhat reassured to learn that Xoserve were equally failing their customers and it was not just a specific of the relationship with Shippers, noting that for a DN to state that they were willing to pay for a better service provision should not be part of the case and she felt that a focus on increasing service delivery would be a great place for Xoserve to start.

MC summarised that there has been a lot of emotion and long-term feedback provided in this discussion and Xoserve have confirmed that they have heard the Committee members on this issue and was starting to respond.

MP thanked DA for addressing her feedback, which she explained was in response to the Business Plan, adding that whilst DNs had heard that Xoserve would attend the constituency meetings it was not clear if they would provide Account Management.

DA noted that ES had spoken about the constituency chairmanship generically and added that he had been attending these meetings since March and had some useful conversations concerning development in the REC and UNC space which he hoped would add value to future engagements. He confirmed that Xoserve had heard feedback across the constituencies in that they want Xoserve people whose role is to support them directly.

HB concluded her presentation by advising that Xoserve intended to provide some 'you said and we did' presentations over the coming months as items were delivered and thanked all for their feedback.

#### **4.3. Monthly Contract Metric Reports**

AC presented these Highlights and suggested that as these were information only for which no comments or feedback had been forthcoming, asked if there were any objections to moving these to the appendixes of the Monthly report.

There were no objections to this proposal, which AC confirmed would be adopted from August forward.

#### **4.4. Xoserve Incident Summary**

Lee Warren (LW) provided a verbal update to the Committee on the recent data security incident communicated to the industry and apologised for the delay in reporting, explaining that it was attributed to a desire to have as clear a picture as possible before sharing the matter.

*Xoserve has requested that due to the confidential nature of this item, and in recognition of customer status as the Data Controllers, the minutes on this item are not formally published. As such only the discussion points around communication of the issue are included here.*

SM observed he had been in this meeting for over two hours and this matter had not been broached until he received text queries on the matter from colleagues within his organisation, stating that it should have been the first thing discussed. He noted that the communication released included a statement that put an obligation on customers to act quickly but also stated that it was relatively benign.

LW confirmed he had reviewed the email for approval and that there was an onus on customers, he agreed the notification came late but the intention was not to push it onto customers as a responsibility lay with Xoserve as the Data Processor and as such Xoserve wanted customers to understand the risk quickly.

SM responded that this did not help if it was not in the email, noting that Xoserve had the issue for two weeks and had today triggered a process with a fixed timeline and were talking to Committee Members as Contract Managers, which annoyed him more than the subject was not broached at the start of the meeting. He asked if it would help to have an open call that customers could drop into.

Committee members enquired who the emails had been sent to as not all had visibility of them. JS confirmed that the emails have gone out to customers' DPOs and where Xoserve did not have details of a customer's DPO they had been sent to Contract Managers, but only to customers who were affected.

SM expressed surprise, stating that all customers should know where they sat in regard to being affected or not. Other Committee members voiced concern, citing their organisations could be listed under different names. LW offered to have separate conversations with any concerned customers.

OC observed in the meeting chat function that Xoserve had been aware for two weeks, and that it felt that there was significant information missing from the communication. LW apologised, explaining that a lot of analysis had been required to avoid potential knee-jerk reactions.

MC suggested that an after-the-event lessons learnt was advisable regarding additional controls and the communication issues which LW agreed to provide next month.

**New Action 0702:** CDSP (LW) to provide a 'lessons learnt' briefing regarding additional controls and communications on the recent data security event.

DJ then presented the monthly Incident Summary report, detailing a P2 incident concerning the data loads for Infor Birst visualisations not processing as expected with an impact to multiple customer DDP dashboards, which saw a full resolution on 17 June, until when the dashboards reflected data from the 06 and 07 of June.

DJ explained how triage identified the fault within the Infor platform and how this initiated a high-priority call to the provider who worked closely with Xoserve to restore the service.

DJ shared that root cause analysis was still ongoing with the issue affecting the Infor platform for multiple customers across Europe, which made for a large data set which in turn slowed root cause analysis. He added that Xoserve were still chasing results and that any further information would be brought to the next DSC Contract Management Committee meeting. He highlighted that the incident was marked as uncontrollable as it occurred within a third-party service.

#### **4.5. Customer Issue Management Dashboard**

Lee Jackson (LJ) presented this item, starting with customer details in UKL (presented in GES) where he confirmed that Xoserve had just finished the data set review and removed non-relevant entries such as public house names. He added that further analysis was underway on the dataset to enable approval, meaning it would likely be August when Xoserve would be able to confirm when the communications would be issued.

DA added that the data will be shared with the DNs as the data masters and that Xoserve were speaking to them separately as part of that process, including agreeing on timescales.

Data displayed in DDP data was, LJ commented, a historical issue that dated back a few months that led to the two-stage deployment which would be covered later in item 11.1, adding that the first stage delivery scheduled for 05 July had been completed successfully with the second stage due on 22 July.

LJ noted the last entry on DDP availability & data latency had already been covered by DJ under item 4.4.

LJ then highlighted that several open issues had been greyed out in the report to retain a record of those where there had been no movement since the last update and to ensure they remained tracked.

#### **Gas Retail Data Agent (GRDA)**

DA provided the GRDA update and advised that Xoserve were changing the way they were to provide this reporting as missing messages were being recorded as their failing and as 100% rather than a reduced value.



DA shared that for June there were five missing messages over 4 days, 3 of which were attributed to the Shipperless issue discussed many times before and were resolved as cancelled switches with no settlement impact. The two other messages were not Shipperless and registrations had been resubmitted by the relevant Suppliers, they were legitimate missing messages from CSS which Xoserve would be able to determine the Settlement impact once a Service Ticket responses were received. Da concluded that he would share the new report's appearance next month.

**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/100724>

Rachel Taggart (RT) provided an overview of the current Change proposals, confirming the intent to review, around November, what development costs were anticipated to be allocated to this year's budgets and which from the next.

Moving to the Change pipeline RT confirmed that the June 24 release had been successfully implemented on 28 June.

RT advised that two new Change Proposals had been approved into development (XRN5806 and XRN5808) and one provided for information purposes only, XRN5809, which related to DDP Release 3 2024/2025.

Concerning Change updates, RT confirmed the CDSP recommendation to close XRN5719 as it was no longer required, though it could be opened again if the functionality became available.

RT also confirmed that one Change Pack had been issued, namely for 3275 – VO – LO – Notice of Amendments to the CDSP Service Documents, which had been discussed and given approval under item 2.1 in this meeting.

Change Documents included the BER for XRN5793, in which the PAC Budget for BP25 was to be considered to ascertain if it was sufficient.

Project updates confirmed that Minor Release 12 was now closed and thus no further updates would need to be issued. Conversely, the February 25 Major release Proposed scope would come back to the DSC Change Management Committee for approval.

A DDP Delivery update for releases 2 to 4 confirmed that due to the complexity of the Release 2 Hydrogen Dashboards, AQ at Risk and the Remaining Shipper Pack feature had been deferred.

OC expressed concern that the Governance of this project was not correct and she did not think Correla should make these decisions. She added that there was a process which had not been followed and stated the DSC Change Management Committee update presented did not capture this.

AE agreed with OC's commentary, as did SH, who added that the features selected to be pushed back to Summer 2025 had not been consulted on so was a complete surprise to her that the Hydrogen Dashboards had been prioritised over them. She observed that this should have been communicated as a proposal and any conflict or issue with delivery should be discussed at DSC Change Management Committee where a decision could then be made.

ES expressed her agreement to this.

OC stated that assurance was required from Xoserve that they will not let a third party dictate developments. She asked for an understanding of what Xoserve was doing, what the time frames were and how an appropriate decision-making process was to be included.

ES asked if this issue had been added to the next DSC Change Management Committee agenda, which RT confirmed was the case, and that it had been added to the issue log in DSC Change Management under DHM002.

SH also asked if an update would be issued in DSG on Monday 22 July, which ES agreed to provide.

John Welch (JW) commented that Correla was working with Xoserve to ensure such issues did not reoccur and were instead approached differently.

RT concluded this item by noting that a QR code was shared in DSC Change Management Committee meeting for the KVI survey but there had been no take-up on this.

## **10.2. Retail Energy Code (REC)**

The full REC Change update is available for review at <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DSC-Contract/170724>, and further information on all the Changes can be found on the REC Portal at: <https://recportal.co.uk/recportal>.

DA provided an overview on this item, directing Committee member's attention to R0148 'Introduction of classification-based access model into the REC in support of Open Data' and that a further update to the Meta Data Catalogue had been produced to round definitions up, for which Xoserve had repeated the need for further consultation, adding that they currently had no idea about timescales for this Change.

DA advised that Xoserve had attended the REC Change Issues Group run by the Code Managers in June (as introduced by R0167) and listened to any comments on questions or queries, adding that Parties could also attend to listen to the conversations around Change developed through this group.

SM advised that his Organisation had raised a question about R0120 which uses Meter Serial Number (MSN) searches which could produce spurious responses as the serial numbers themselves were not a robust dataset and could give access to the wrong data. The assumption in R0120 seemed to suggest that MSNs were reliable data.

DA considered this and acknowledged that MSNs were not unique, may be truncated and may be recorded incorrectly asked if the DSC Contract Management Committee wanted to direct Xoserve to respond as such on the Committee's behalf.

SM stated his organisation would provide a response opposing the Change, adding that the challenge was in the rate developments were occurring in the REC.

DA noted that there was already an MSN search functionality within GES online and was one of several searches that users could do as a supplemental search parameter where, for example, an address could not be found. He explained that because the CDSP was aware the searched value may not be unique they would not play back the payload if a unique identity was not found. He cited an example of a search looking for a meter in Bolton that was actually in Bournemouth, as an example of the peculiar information that was the nature of the gas industry data. As such, he stated, the search result had to be an exact match and not a fuzzy one. He advised that one of the suggestions that Xoserve had made in the development of the REC Change was an MSN with a partial postcode to support it. He added that he needed to look at the final solution produced to see if this suggestion was included but confirmed that Xoserve had discussed this as an outcome where a single unique response was not able to be provided.

SM acknowledged the point but suggested that replicating a bad solution because it existed in another place was not ideal and highlighted that as it impacted the MDD it impacted everyone present. As it was a REC Consultation that closed on Friday 19 July, he asked DA to provide a prompt update to inform the response SM planned.

DA confirmed he would put a paragraph together to send to all Committee Members in this meeting that would describe the solution that Xoserve was providing as part of R0120 and to consider the risks, adding that whilst Xoserve were originally not too concerned he did take SM's point regarding risk of data mining.

**New Action 0703:** CDSP (DA) to provide commentary on Xoserve recommended solution for R0120 and its risk assessment

## 11. Any Other Business

### 11.1. DDP Data

JW provided a verbal update on the Class 4 AQ issue, sharing that the update was nearly complete and was undergoing final live allocations and should be ready for customers with the historic data available for next week (W/c 22 July 20204).

OC suggested that JW review the minutes of this meeting on the subject of DDP. JW confirmed he had heard the feedback on Change Management under 10.1 but appreciated the advice and would review the minutes for the rest of the meeting.

### 11.2. CIX Update

JMc provided a brief update on this item detailing how Xoserve were engaging with customers for the migration to cloud CIX, advising of Engagement days scheduled for 25 July and 06 August, and asked Parties to register their interest with the customer life cycle team at [CloudIX@correla.com](mailto:CloudIX@correla.com) and confirmed that more information on CIX could be found at [Information Exchange \(IX\) \(xoserve.com\)](http://Information Exchange (IX) (xoserve.com)).

## 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 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	Pending
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	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	Closed
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) & CoMC Reps	July 2024	Closed
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 presented in GES.	CDSP (DA)	July 2024	Closed
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	Closed
0701	17/07/24	1.6	CDSP (AC) to review and consider DSC CoMC format and structure to ensure best efficiency in time required of Committee members, including reaching out to members for views.	CDSP (AC)	August 2024	Pending
0702	17/07/24	4.4	CDSP (LW) to provide a 'lessons learnt' briefing regarding additional controls and communications on the recent data security event.	CDSP (LW)	August 2024	Pending
0703	17/07/24	10.2	CDSP (DA) to provide commentary on Xoserve recommended solution for R0120 and its risk assessment	CDSP (DA)	August 2024	Pending