

# Section C: DSG Discussion

## C2: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations

DSG Date:	03/06/2019		
DSG Summary:	<p>PO presented this agenda item and stated that internally this change is gathering some momentum forward and has had a Senior Project Manager assigned to the Change (Tracey O'Connor). Tracey is mobilising a team internally to assess the requirements that are documented in the original Modification and business requirements document. PO stated that Xoserve is looking to agree resource requirements with Xoserve's internal business operations team. Furthermore Xoserve is also looking at solution optioning and architecture space to evaluate what capability Xoserve has internally to help deliver the Change. PO informed DSG of discussions that were held with customers and a suggestion from those discussions were to perform some Proof of Concept analysis to understand and quantify the size of the retrospective data quality issues. The aim would be for this to take place ahead of any Data Cleansing exercise, and would shape the rules that should be applied to any data migration activity. Xoserve fully support this recommendation and is keen to get this started with willing Shipper customers. PO stated that at the next DSG a more quantitative update will be given.</p>		
Capture Document / Requirements:	N/A		
DSG Recommendation:	<input type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer
DSG Recommended Release:	Release X: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY		

## C3: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations

DSG Date:	01/07/2019		
DSG Summary:	<p>Tracy O'Connor (TOC) informed DSG that the requirements have been gathered for the proof on concept, furthermore those requirements have been issued out internally for discussion and internal review. TOC stated there are sessions internally being held to gain approval of the gathered requirements and also sessions to discuss ideas and solutions of how to deliver that proof of concept. TOC stated that discussions from those internal meetings will then be used to help define the high level solution options with the view that a turnaround of those solutions can be done next week and ready for internal review and update to be provided at the next DSG. TOC added there will be a few more further requirements sessions held to identify what to do when a mismatch occurs. TOC stated going forward for future DSG's, she will ensure the updates are highlighted for DSG to have a clear view of progression. PO also added that it would be great for customers for Xoserve to issue and present internal requirements once HLSO's that have been gathered and formulated. PO</p>		

	stated it would be ideal to share those ideas and added that Xoserve is still looking for volunteers (Shipper parties) to help with trials in regards to the proof of concept. This will help in being able to identify the differences in data held by Xoserve and Parties portfolios and then a second part of what those root causes could be causing mismatched data. PO stated that the plan going forward for DSG will be quite iterative in regards to what is asked of and shown at DSG.		
Capture Document / Requirements:	<Insert where appropriate>		
DSG Recommendation:	<input type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer
DSG Recommended Release:	Release: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY		

#### C4: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations

DSG Date:	15/07/2019
DSG Summary:	<p>Paul Orsler (PO) provided an update for XRN4914. PO outlined the key schedule dates and stages for the proof of concept.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 13<sup>th</sup> / 20<sup>th</sup> June: requirements gathered</li> <li>• 24<sup>th</sup> June: peer and first review</li> <li>• 25<sup>th</sup> June: issued for internal review</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> July: internal walkthrough and approval received; for all but 5 reqs</li> <li>• 2<sup>nd</sup> July: ideas/solutions initial discussion; identifying 3<sup>rd</sup> parties to engage with (3)</li> <li>• 3<sup>rd</sup> July: Wipro producing a HLSO and RFQ being produced</li> <li>• 4<sup>th</sup> July: Capture session to review 5 outstanding reqs and approval received</li> <li>• 10<sup>th</sup> July: NDA contract issued to 3<sup>rd</sup> parties; 1 received, 1 on-way, awaiting response for 3<sup>rd</sup></li> <li>• 12<sup>th</sup> July: RFQ reviewed by procurement and issued to 3<sup>rd</sup> parties</li> <li>• Planning continuing</li> </ul> <p>PO explained that the risks and issues on the project were around the project being behind in timescale compared to the original draft plan. Furthermore there are issues around the data/security team resources not allocated to the project. PO stated this is being discussed internally. Also and added risk is cost, the cost required to deliver the project is greater than project funding (2017 day rates used). In addition the availability of resources may impact the plan for Retro. PO stated that the key thing for DSG is the CDSP and Shippers working collaboratively and voluntarily to agree a mechanism to exchange data from the Shippers that can be tested and compared against the data held in UK Link. PO further went on to outline the context diagram shown in the slide pack. This involves using the check list at each stage or why those points are being done. PO then explained the stage 2 market &amp; materiality for the Proof of Concept, this involved identifying the differences between data sets and identifying the meaning of the difference. PO added that this will be used to define the business rules, so that meaning can be derived from the data.</p> <p>E.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• POC 1 Retro will involve billing critical and non-billing critical discrepancies</li> <li>• POC 2 BAU will involve billing critical and non-billing critical discrepancies</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• POC 3 – Data Integrity will involve looking at genuine misalignment for example compatibility of data with MDD/UKLINK/MAM. This will also involve Shipper not registered MPRN and credibility assessment.</li> </ul> <p>PO also gave a brief overview regarding the Data items. These were categorised into list with the minimum amount of data needed in each one to enable to data cleansing activities to be conducted. Therefore being optimum data items listed but also premium data items that would involve Shippers providing more data items to be used in further analysis of the data cleansing exercise. PO stated that in the slide deck the data items listed that are not bold or red in text are those extra data items. Regarding the Proof of Concept overview, PO stated that the CDSP would like to work with Shippers to try and get the files in the right structure to share outputs of any identified misalignments to the Shippers data. This would involve the CDSP requesting data from Shippers and Extracting data from UK Link into the project area and extracting data from the Shipper/s. The CDSP will then complete a comparison exercise within 20 days from receipt of the valid data. PO also presented a list of capabilities and requirements for both stage 1 and 2 of the Proof of Concept. These can be found in the slide deck.</p> <p><b>ACTION; DSG to provide a response for approval of Proof of Concept function requirements presented and non – functional requirements.</b></p> <p>Alison Neild (AN) asked PO if the idea of this was to do a data cleanse before a new functionality is added into the system. PO agreed and stated that this is the idea and exercise that will help in the future in regards to data cleansing activities. Ikram Bashir (IB) stated that there is a risk that if Shippers don't participate with the testing and analysis phase for the Proof of Concept how is the CDSP going to be able to gain data and understanding or data cleansing issues etc. PO responded that the CDSP has Shippers on-board who are participating at the moment therefore that risk has been avoided. PO asked AN if the explanation of the Proof of Concept was sufficient enough for understanding. AN agreed but asked how her organisation would get involved. PO stated that at the moment the CDSP is putting together an engagement plan for customers that will involve Customer Advocates coming out to customers to discuss the POC and the mechanism or getting them involved in the exercise.</p>		
Capture Document / Requirements:	<Insert where appropriate>		
DSG Recommendation:	<input type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer
DSG Recommended Release:	Release: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY		

## C5: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations

DSG Date:	05/08/2019		
DSG Summary:	<p>Paul Orsler (PO) provided an update for this agenda item. PO informed DSG that during procurement, NDA contracts have been issued to 3<sup>rd</sup> parties. PO stated that the proof of concept has been broken down into 2 stages. Stage 1 being the data mismatch stage whereby the CDSP would like Shippers to provide some data and the CDSP would provide some analysis of that data by comparing it to extracts of UK LINK data. This analysis can be used by the CDSP to minimise and rectify any data discrepancies issues.</p> <p>PO stated that stage 2 is more analytical and will involve analysis of the mismatches and delving into more detail to find out what business processes are impacted by the mismatched data. PO stated that these stages will aid in helping the CDSP to work out what an enduring solution might look like. Furthermore PO added that internally sign offs have been achieved around Capture of requirements and SME approval, with further outstanding approval being sought.</p> <p>PO outlined the risks and issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Issue: The project is behind the original draft plan</li> <li>- Issue: Data team / security team resources are not allocated to the project; therefore options are being discussed internally.</li> <li>- Risk: The cost required to deliver the project is greater than project funding (2017 day rates used)</li> <li>- Risk: Availability of resources (environments/people) may impact the plan for Retro.</li> </ul> <p>PO stated that in regards to project mobilisation, the project team are engaged with other programmes of work for consequential impacts / synergies such as CSSC, AML/ASP and UIG. PO further stated that SI has been agreed for data cleanse / Enduring solution of project. In addition, the engagement approach is yet to be agreed. This will be agreed in the following weeks and issued out. This plan will look to describe all the touchpoints between the CDSP and Xoserve. This plan might include customer awareness sessions and even roadshows for those that are providing support with the Proof of concept. PO asked Sally Hardman (SH) if there are any concerns or if they are happy with how Retro is progressing. SH responded that they are happy but are concerned with the risks regarding the resources being pulled all over onto other projects.</p>		
Capture Document / Requirements:	<Insert where appropriate>		
DSG Recommendation:	<input type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer
DSG Recommended Release:	Release: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY		

DSG Date:	18/11/2019		
DSG Summary:	PO presented slides to the group. Key points are that Xoserve are continuing with the Proof of Concept phase and the new Retro web page is now live. PO explained that we will continue to encourage customers to get in touch should they like to be involved. PO added that we are working with vendor on design and solution building, and we will be sharing test files to ensure this has been built correctly for customers to start sharing this data. We will continue to provide updates through the website and DSG.		
Capture Document / Requirements:	<Insert where appropriate>		
DSG Recommendation:	<input type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer
DSG Recommended Release:	Release: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY		

DSG Date:	02/12/2019		
DSG Summary:	<p>Megan Troth (MT) presented this agenda item. The overall project RAG status is amber. MT explained the design documents were finalised on 29<sup>th</sup> November. Furthermore, the business and validation rules for step 1 of PoC is now completed. File and connectivity testing to be completed w/c 2<sup>nd</sup> December ahead of step 1 execution by the 4<sup>th</sup> December. Furthermore, detailed requirements workshops for step 2 of data comparison and root cause to be scheduled w/c 2<sup>nd</sup> Dec.</p> <p>In regards to customer engagement, MT stated that there will be a fortnightly update provided on the Xoserve.com retrospective updates page which can be <a href="#">found here</a>.</p> <p>MT stated there is a risk that there will not be sufficient volume received from Shippers in the proof of concept to be able to quantify the size of the data mismatch activity. MT explained that since that point, the PoC is in a better position as there has been more interaction and Shippers showing interest. In addition, there is a risk that the amount of time to complete the proof of concept is not currently known; additional checkpoints 2 &amp; 3 agreed</p> <p>Cost: Approval has been received from DN's for BER of £270K for the proof of concept.</p>		
Capture Document / Requirements:	<Insert where appropriate>		
DSG Recommendation:	<input type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer
DSG Recommended Release:	Release: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY		