

Bilateral Transaction Programme

Pathfinders Group Meeting 13 – Minutes – 20 April 2021 – 10:00-11:00

Attendees - MOSL:

Miles Robinson (MR)	John Briggs (JB)	John Gilbert (JG)
Pam Nash (PN)	Spencer Mattia (SMa)	Adrian Smith (AS)

Attendees – External:

David Moss (DM)	Anna Chuter (AC)	Nik Clay Michael (NCM)	Sian Forward (SF)
Elliott Holland-Kemp (EHK)	Nathan Morgan (NM)	Mark Franchi (MFr)	Tony Golder (TG)
Judith Gallagher (JG)	Michael Floyd (MF)	Russell Anderson (RA)	Karen Harkness (KH)
Darren English (DE)	Quentin Gallagher (QG)	Daniel Murch (DMu)	Martin Mavin (MM)
Chris Douglas (CD)	Chris Hailey (CH)		

Agenda items

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Review of previous meeting minutes/actions
3. Progress update
4. Programme plan updates
5. Assurance
6. AOB

Welcome and introductions

- MR welcomed everyone to the meeting and talked through the agenda items for this meeting.

Review of previous meeting minutes/actions

- MR talked through the actions from the last meeting and explained that there were two open actions from the previous meeting.
- **A10_02 – To provide a response to Northumbrian Water with regards to their feedback to the C1 Summary Pack.** MR confirmed that this action had been closed and this was confirmed by SF.
- **A10_03 – To review the membership of the Pathfinder Group.** MR confirmed that this action had now been closed and confirmed that the membership of the Pathfinder Group had been extended to include Anglian Water, South West Water and Everflow.
- With no further comments from Members, MR moved onto the next agenda item.

Progress update

MR invited each party to provide an update on their progress towards the first implementation and the status of any development work, including the progress they have made towards completing the Assurance Form.

- SMa provided a progress update from MOSL, confirmed that the Programme was still tracking amber for time, but not for quality or budget. Also confirmed that Sprint 16 had just completed and Sprint 17 was just beginning and that MOSL had not carried out as much work in Sprint 16 as desired.
- AC provided an update for Waterscan and confirmed that they have not yet begun work on the assurance form and are currently awaiting MOSL training materials and access to the web portal.

- CD provided an update for Anglian confirming that their third-party provider CRM Superstars had begun working on their integration and that Anglian had begun working on their assurance form and everything had been clear on the form so far.
- RA provided an update from Thames Water and confirmed that their testing with C&C is underway, they are changing their internal architecture to Salesforce and have made a successful connection to the Bilateral Hub.
- DE provided an update from Everflow and confirmed that they had started on the assurance form and had begun mobilizing their teams internally to prepare to use the LVI to begin with the aim to move to the HVI further down the line
- DM provided an update from Castle Water and confirmed that Castle Water would be looking to use the LVI to begin with and confirmed there are a few decisions that are currently underway and they would like to start work on the assurance form after these decisions were finalized.
- EHK confirmed that Gentrack would be able to provide an update from the development side but confirmed that Wave had started on their assurance documentation and didn't have any issues.
- NCM confirmed that Gentrack had an account set up and confirmed that blockers for Gentrack were around data, meaning that they would need to work much closer with Wholesalers and Retailers to avoid putting inappropriate data into the Bilateral Hub. NCM also confirmed that he was still having issues accessing documents on the MOSL website. MR confirmed they would take this away with the new website and see if anything could be done to help.
- KH provided an update from United Utilities, still working on the build at the moment and confirmed that they are tracking amber. Also confirmed that they were keen to understand when the LVI would be available and also asked whether there was an update on the assurance test pro-forma. MR confirmed that both of these questions would be covered in later slides.
- MM provided an update from Northumbrian Water and confirmed they had not been focusing on the assurance form currently as they had been focusing on the design of their internal processes after deciding to move from HVI to LVI. Asks from MOSL were around when they would be able to access the LVI and when they might see the assurance test script pro-forma.
- Went on to confirm that the B5 user requirements are underway and were looking to be able to share these soon.
- TG provided an update from C&C and confirmed that they had been working with some of their customers on the assurance form. TG confirmed that they had been advising their customers around defect management, confirming that they would be triaging defects prior to raising to MOSL. TG asked the question around the contact at MOSL during user testing for which issues should be raised. MR confirmed that MOSL were in the process of setting up a support mechanism and would confirm the exact process at a later date, but for the time being confirmed that all parties could email bilaterals@mosl.co.uk. TG went on to confirm that a number of C&C customers had now confirmed access to the Bilateral Hub.
- QG provided an update from Portsmouth Water and confirmed that as a late alternate to the meeting he was unable to provide an update on any progress on assurance. QG went on to confirm that they were reviewing their test process internally and asked when they would have access to the LVI.
- MR thanked all Members for their input and with no further comments, moved onto the next agenda item.

Programme plan updates

- MR handed over to JG to provide an update on the Programme Plan.
- JG provided an update to members on the programme plan explaining that timescales were still tight within the programme and that there was very little room for contingency, which in turn presents risk that MOSL has been working hard to mitigate. JG went onto explain that MOSL

hasn't been able to make sufficient progress to mitigate any timescale risks detailing that MOSL was about 2-3 weeks behind where they had aimed to be and had presented a potential change to the programme plan to the Programme Board on Monday 19 April explaining that MOSL had looked to take learnings from the opening of the NHH Water Retail Market and to ensure that quality remained the focus of the programme.

- JG explained that MOSL were proposing to push the mandatory go live date for the second programme phase from the 31 July to the first week of September to give more room for contingency for MOSL and to give more time for Trading Parties to test, train and assure.
- JG went on to detail that MOSL could not provide a certain date at this point in time but explained that MOSL would be looking to capture feedback from Trading Parties over the next two weeks and paused to open up to questions from Members.
- QG confirmed that the decision to review the timescales based on quality seemed like a sensible approach and asked whether this decision would affect the assurance timetable.
- JG explained that we would come onto assurance later in the slide deck and explain how those dates have changed.
- NCM asked whether MOSL would look to include additional requirements that were previously excluded from the July go live date and asked what the confidence level of delivery in September and also asked whether this would mean that future processes would be delayed as well
- JG confirmed that MOSL would be looking to keep the scope for the September delivery the same to ensure confidence in the September delivery date and also confirmed that when MOSL sets a new delivery date for the implementation of the second programme phase, MOSL would also be sharing the rationale behind this date. JG also confirmed that MOSL is looking at the delivery of phase three processes and is reviewing the delivery model to understand whether there is a more efficient method of delivery as opposed to the current phases and explained that Spencer would explain this in further detail.
- RA asked when it is likely that MOSL would have Ofwat's decision on a new timescale.
- JG confirmed that Ofwat were supportive of MOSL's review of timescales and explained the process that MOSL is looking to go through before understanding when the new go live date would be but did say that MOSL will look to share this in May.
- JG handed over to SMa to talk through the updates to the programme plan in more detail.
- SMa shared a view of the previous plan for the delivery of the C1 process and then showed a revised plan to highlight the delivery of specific items. SMa explained that the responsibility for the delivery of some requirements had been moved internally to aid the programme delivery time
- SMa went on to confirm that the LVI would be available to test from 10 May 2021 and that the assurance environment will be available to access by parties from 7 June 2021.
- SMa then shared a view of the high level programme plan for all phases as it was previously and again with a revised view showing the revised delivery date for the C1 process. SMa explained that the delivery timeline remains the same but this revised timescale enables additional time for contingency and additional time for Trading Parties to test, train and complete assurance.
- SMa went on to explain what this change might mean for the third programme phase, detailing that there were a number of non-process requirements to be delivered and that MOSL were currently working with the OAG to understand how these requirements might be prioritized alongside the phase three deliverables.
- SMa shared another slide to demonstrate some additional delivery models that MOSL is currently reviewing to understand how the delivery of future programme phases might be managed to provide flexibility to MOSL and Trading Parties.
- SMa shared the three potential delivery options that MOSL was considering:
 - Option A – Continue with current approach to mandating in phases

- Option B – Look to deliver and release processes and requirements as they are completed
 - Option C – Look to deliver processes and requirements in batches
- SMa talked through these options and explained the reasons for considering each option but also asked Members whether there were any other potential options that might be considered.
 - SMa then opened up for questions or feedback from Members
 - MM confirmed support for moving back the mandating of the C1 process but did ask for some time to review the options for the delivery of future phases to ensure that enough time had been given to each option, so long as Ofwat were comfortable with the delivery model.
 - JG responded by confirming that Ofwat had indicated their support for the review of the delivery model and were keen to consider options that provided more flexibility to the programme
 - NCM asked whether there was a risk to rework being generated by subsequent processes.
 - SMa responded to this by saying that there is a risk to rework but MOSL were looking to mitigate this risk by having robust regression testing processes in place.
 - KH confirmed that this is something they would look to discuss internally prior to providing their feedback.
 - MR and JG confirmed their understanding that parties may need to go away and discuss this but encouraged parties to come back and provide their feedback as it is key for MOSL to make the best decision.
 - With no further comments from Members, MR moved onto the next agenda item.

Assurance

- MR introduced the assurance part of the session by sharing the current view of implementation checkpoints and explaining that MOSL had been reviewing the third checkpoint and, as discussed with the Pathfinder Group previously, this checkpoint had been split into two: Checkpoint 3A, the assurance form and Checkpoint 3B, the assurance test script pro-forma and declaration.
- MR then shared a view of the Checkpoints 3A and 3B showing what would be required from Trading Parties for each Checkpoint and the due date.
- MR explained that based on the updates provided by JG and SMa, the due date for Checkpoint 3B had been reviewed with a deadline of 30 July 2021 and also went onto explain that the scope for assurance had also been reduced slightly.
- MR then shared a view with Members showing the revised scenarios included within the test pro-forma, explaining that instead of eight scenarios for testing, MOSL had made the decision to reduce the number of scenarios to five to ensure sufficient time for MOSL to deliver the requirements for assurance, allowing as much time as possible for Trading Parties to carry out any assurance.
- MR went on to explain that based on the remaining time in the meeting, MOSL would look to provide an update on assurance via email to Members offline as well.
- With no further comments MR moved onto the next agenda item.

AOB

- MR asked whether Members or MOSL colleagues had any AOB to raised.
- With no further comments, MR thanked Members for their attendance and closed the meeting.

Actions

No actions were raised during the meeting.