

DSC Delivery Sub-Group Minutes

Monday 19th February 2024 at 10.30am

Microsoft Teams Meeting

<u>Industry Attendees</u>		
NAME	ORGANISATION	INITIALS
Kundai Matiringe	BUUK	KM
Oorlagh Chapman	Centrica	OC
Hayley Anderson Fisher	Corona Energy	HAF
Andi Toman	Ecotricity	AT
Nikhil Bradriprasad	ESP	NB
Slarma Akhtar	NGN	SA
Gareth Powell	NPower	GP
Angela Joyce	Octoenergy	AJ
Endre Merai	Octopus Energy	EM
Joanne Rush	SSE	JR
Helen Boswell	Utilita	HB
Kevin Clark	Utilita	KC
Paul Senior	Utilita	PS
Daniel Kearney	Utilita	DK
Sahim Ozan	UKN	SO
Tom Stuart	WWU	TS

<u>Xoserve/Correla Attendees</u>	
Paul Orsler (Chair)	PO
Loraine O'Shaughnessy	LO
Rob Westwood	RB
James Barlow	JB
Rajiv Patel	RP
Michelle Niits	MN
Michelle Kearney	MK
Tara Ross	TR

Slides available [here](#).

1. General Meeting Administration

1a. Welcome and Introduction

Paul Orsler (PO) welcomed everyone to the meeting and informed all attendees that this meeting is being audio recorded for the purpose of producing the minutes, each recording will be deleted once the relevant minutes have been signed off. PO informed the attendees of the following [agenda](#) items.

1b. Previous DSG Meeting Minutes and Action Updates

PO advised that no feedback had been received from the minutes from the previous Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) in January; and asked if anyone had any questions. No questions raised so minutes were approved.

PO provided an update on the open actions and shared the Action Log noting that the following actions can now be closed following resolution. These are: 23-0104 and 23-0105, 24-0106 and 24-0107. Details can be found [here](#).

2. Changes in Change Development

2a New Change Proposals – Initial Overview of the Change

PO confirmed that there are no new change proposals to discuss at this meeting.

2b. Change Proposals Initial View Representations

None for this meeting.

2c. Undergoing Solution Options Impact Assessment Review

2c.i. XRN5615 – Establishing/Amending a Gas Vacant Site Process (Modification 0819 – IGT168)

PO introduced the first of two solutions that were included in the February Change Pack for industry the first being XRN5615 to support Modification 0819.

Rajiv Patel (RP) provided an overview of the design options, which aims to create a new process for Vacant Product Class 4 Non-Daily Metered (NDM) sites which would allow Shippers to receive immediate commodity and performance relief and capacity relief (after 12 months at vacant status) for sites in their ownership.

RP went through the process flow diagram (PFD) on slide 12 noting that Shipper users will submit Vacant entry requests to CDSP and the Modification obligations are, that certain

validations are carried out by CDSP. RP explained that there are a number of computations in 3a and 3b carried out and there are reports that the Performance Assurance will require for certain performance obligations for industry to use on vacancy. The GTs and potentially IGTs will receive some information around visibility of sites entering and exiting vacancy site status. RP advised that the clock on the PFD, demonstrates that CDSP monitor daily in line with the requirements of the Modification to ensure that the correct actions are taken to resume charges once a site enters or exits vacant site status and the relevant process resumes.

RP presented two options for a solution design, which centres around how CDSP get information in and out of the process: -

Option 1, to use our existing Contact Management System (CMS), it offers a web-based solution and a visible view into making requests through to the CDSP. CDSP carry out various computations as per the Modification, and to get information out would also be via CMS to notify users of the status of sites and what is happening to the site. DDP chief Data visualisation and reporting platform CDSP will look also be looking to amend existing dashboards to provide the user community with a view of vacant site status.

Option 2, Same as Option 1, but the design will use traditional flat files into and out of the system so the user will send files through IX type of file flow basis and it is important to say that this is likely to have new file formats that will be required as well as amending existing file formats, so RP advised that this needs to be factored in. Everything else is the same as Option 1 - DDP is obliged to do this process.

RP explained that there was a 3rd option which has been discounted, this was considering using UK Portal to get data in and out, but there was too many cons, chief amongst these was that it is a screen-based system, but did not lend itself to bulk processing, but it was understood that this was something customers would want to have for vacant sites in the design feature to have this functionality for the vacant site process

RP shared the option comparisons for Option 1 and 2 for pros and cons from slide 13 and the associated costs.

RP asked if anyone had any questions at this stage. No questions raised. PO advised that there is still 5 days for industry to provide feedback on the consultation, then shared the assumptions, dependencies, and risks from slide 16.

Angela Joyce (AJ) advised what sort of volumes is expected? PO advised that there is no specific volumetrics as part of the modification development, and not certainly hundreds of 1000s, but would think somewhere in the region of 1000s, that would have a vacant site at a given any moment in time, but it is something to prepare for that sort of volume in the central systems. RP added that CDSP would most likely approach, one or two of the larger

potential users of the new process and have a conversation around what the uptake could be and then based on these conversations would make sure that the performance of the two systems was adequately scaled for the potential usage.

Oorlagh Chapman (OC) wanted to thank RP and PO for the information which was very useful and clear.

Kundai Matiringe (KM) thanked RP for the overview and asked a question around the process overview on slide 12 that it does not appear to show the notification going to the IGTs and GTs and wanted to ensure if the solution had considered this as part of the process. She can see where it enters but not exits and noted that in the change pack there is a could have customer requirement to provide a delivery mechanism for IGTs and did not know if this was a definite that CDSP are considering IGTs to get those updates against the sites in our portfolio and wanted to understand how to navigate this.

RP apologised that there was only so much information to show on the PFD but did confirm that information is being sent to the IGT and GTs on vacant sites, and this will be sent when the site exits and enters vacant site status, and this is included in the solution.

PO explained in terms of the 'could have IGT requirement', that RP has described that the process and the solution that CDSP has been sent out in the change pack, is, capable of meeting that requirement of delivering the IGT and DN notifications of changes to your portfolio wherever a vacant site is flagged, but via the CMS proposed solution. so vacant site data delivery via a DDP reporting option to shippers, DNs, IGT's and to the Performance Assurance committee, so effectively having the opportunity to use that visualisation tool given the expected volumes, which are expected to be in the low 1000s so we can still deliver that 'could have requirement', utilising the existing investment that has been made in the DDP solution option.

PO went onto say that what we can share with IGT customers, is the option and cost of delivery that requirement via an alternative mechanism such as a change to your delta file provision, but is not set out as a 'must have' for this change because it is not set out in the IGT UNC obligations either IGT or UNC as there is not a definitive use of that data for IGT as there is no obligation to incorporate, which is why DDP again, becomes quite a good option because it becomes more of an operational value add provision of data than a must have provision of data and use of data. KM was happy with this. PO explained, if IGT's are happy for using this data and if there is a specific business need to look at this for an obligated use, we can look at this functionality, but didn't want to inflate the cost of delivery the modification rules in order to incorporate a 'could have requirement' and functional change and hoped this had addresses this. PO explained that RP and PO have put some information together to discuss with IGT's to see what the appetite is like and more functional and more definitive data solution, and if it gives you enough information to

make a decision as to whether you wish this to be delivered in this or separately at another point in time. KD was happy with the answer to her question.

PO went through the assumptions, dependencies and risks slide 16 and asked if there was anything that needed to be called out. RP called out risk A1 around DDP changes can be accommodated in a prioritised Sprint, and the governance is by a community based. PO agreed it is important to call out the DDP Sprints and what level of priority and what decisions have been made to make decisions around the scope of DDP releases and the 6 releases in plan each year and will look to bring this to the ChMC from April onwards as part of the proposal to align the governance the transparency and scoping decisions and as this is a regulated change, it would take a priority unless customers felt there was a higher priority or urgent requirement, but this would be taken back to validate.

OC advised that she wanted to make sure that there is transparency and governance to those decisions and documented in the ChMC to understand these decisions. PO completely agreed that this needs to be in a governance route so we can see why a decision was made and by whom. OC advised that this is something that she has struggled with as there is not any documentation or paper trail for those decisions, and no one can really ascertain who decided or why those things have been decided. PO agreed and OC concluded that it does need to be documented and it does need to be done in a forum that is an official governance route for the delivery of DDP and we do need to have transparency so that everybody can see why a decision was made and by whom.

No other questions raised.

2c.ii. XRN5616 – CSEP Annual Quantity Capacity Management (part A)

Rob Westwood (RW) apologised that Benjamin Snell is on leave and would be unable to dial in as he is overseas, so he will provide an overview of the High-Level Solution (HLSO) on his behalf for XRN5615. RW explained that Distribution Networks (DN's) do not have visibility of IGT expansions, and this change is to provide a mechanism to allow DN operators to provide capability of reviewing the approval or rejection of applications for the creation or amendment of IGT CSEPs (Connected System Exit Points) to ensure compliance with obligations set out in IGTAD preventing CSEP AQs from being exceeded without the DN Operator being aware and this is the driver of this change.

RW advised that the changes from the solution overview are those highlighted in yellow square on the solution overview slide 19 and is where the changes exist. These changes will enable compliance with the obligations set out and enable the DN's to manage this. This change will provide through DN Portal new referral portal screens review, accept/reject CSEPs so new rejection codes are required and stored in UK link and communicated back to the IGTs.

RW advised from 'Option Slide, 20' the changes required to include changes to the DNO Portal, for UK Link a new table to store and manage data and changes existing programs to archiving rules supporting the new logic and status developments and in SAP BO new Proxy development. Further information on the pros and cons can be found on slide 20. RW advised that the estimated cost for delivery will be estimated at £340k to £465k.

PO advised that the Customer requirements slide 21 and how the option meets these requirements and has been around several rounds of discussions with the IGTs and DNs and how this would achieve this acceptance criteria, PO also briefly discussed, the assumptions and risks for parties to review and what these looks like, and asked RW and Tara Ross (TR) if anything needed calling out going into the next phase of the change.

RW said the one he would call out, is the risk around the CSEP amendment referral requests not going live on the anticipated or requested date due to the DNs needing some business days to review and assess the requests, but advised that CDSP are looking to communicate some clear guidance to the IGT's to mitigate this by agreeing the cut off time for the DNs to assess those referrals due to DNs needing some days to review, cutoff date to mitigate this, for the following business day but CDSP will need to communicate this with the DNs.

PO shared Appendix A provided early visibility of what the screens could look like and the introduction of those screens.

KM raised a question about the change summary which states that this change can impact the gas networks with low pressures, but I was not aware of this specifically causing any low-pressure incidents and had asked for some detail, but had not had this back and wanted some context around it and what this means with this change.

PO advised that this was a driver that the DNs had raised and welcomed Tom Stuart (TS) from Wales and West to provide some background to this issue on poor pressure, that if TS advised that GT development building over what we are aware of, could cause constraints in other areas of the network or low pressure in other areas of the network, we have found this on quite a few of our sites and is not necessarily linked directly to an IGT development, but could be another area of the network, but do have some examples and could redact some of that information and provide it at one of our next working groups if that would be useful and provide more context around the issue.

KM welcomed this at the workgroup. TS also mentioned around the risk that was raised about the time to assess the additional capacity and advised that we think this will be an exceptions process and for the majority of the time, the process would be that the IGT's demand would match the DN demand, and all the amendments and creations would just flow through the process as normal and therefore, this portal will just give us a bit more

clear visibility about highlighting these discrepancies to allow time to assess and if any additional capacity for us to allow the increased demand, but need to discuss the timescales but would think to think that a request would go through as normal.

PO advised that this is to introduce a checkpoint or control that capacity is being managed well rather so that these exceptional circumstances are being managed as its always a retrospective activity to try and recover he situation.

ACTION: CDSP requested if TS could provide some scenarios of low pressure or capacity constraints to share at the next Joint IGT/DN working group on this change to support and allows us to demonstrate that this is managed well and discuss with relevant parties.

PO welcomed any questions or feedback in the consultation to take forward from the change pack to determine what decisions and next steps to take forward.

3. Changes in Detailed Design

3a Design Considerations

PO provided an overview of the 3 design considerations as follows:-

3.a.i. XRN5615 Establishing/Amending a Gas Vacant Site Process

PO introduced this change which was discussed in point 2a.c.i. to run through with detailed design and what this is about.

RP outlined the 'Design Considerations' for XRN5615 'Establishing/Amending a Gas Vacant Site Process' for a to be process that will allow and aims to provide a process that allows Shippers to warrant certain sites as being Vacant and, thereby, attracting certain reliefs from charges and performance obligations. There is a part of this process to call out that interoperates with the current must read process. RP advised that Code asks us to put certain sites into the must-read process for a period of time and is about notifying users that a list of sites need to provide a valid meter reading, there is currently a report called the 'Notification Report issued on 20th business day of any given month. RP advised that there is another report that is sent prior to this on the 1st business day of the month and is a pre-cursor to the Notification report the 'Pre-Notification Report' explaining the concept of this report is to inform users on this report the 'Pre-Notification Report' could fall into the proper must-read process later in the month if reads are not received by 20th of the month, the ones after, have fallen into this process and the pre-notification are those that may fall

into the report, where the later report has fallen into the Must read process. It is this report that the design considerations are for when the vacant site process interacts with the must-read process'.

PO presented the design considerations for: -

- **Monthly Must-Read Notifications Report** - when the vacant site process interacts with the Must-Read process, and which reads fall into the Must-Read process should a valid meter reading not be provided within the month. CDSP then consider a site vacant, nothing in the system that can show this earlier in the report and if it shows on the Notification report, Vacant site not going to surrender a valid meter reading and over a period of time as more vacant sites get requested, that this report will continually show an increasing amount of vacant sites.

RP explained that Shippers have informed CDSP that a site is vacant, but yet CDSP at this point is replaying back to the shipper that this will fall into the Must read process and it seems unnecessary, so the design is to exclude vacant sites from the pre-notification report or we let them fall into this pre-notification report. RW advised that we are about to change XRN5605 Amendments to the Must-Read Process (IGT) must read process and there we have chosen to show sites where there is a known issue on this pre-notification report.

RP explained that the choice is to be thought of either we show the vacant sites but the downside being they will stay on there forever and a day, on this report or we can choose to exclude them from the pre-notification report and make sure they are excluded from the later report so meter readings are required so they are then excluded from the later report issued on the 20th of the month.

RP asked if any questions on this. KM asked if this would affect OC with regards to the Must-read modification, are we likely to get reasons for these metering issues for one and secondly are CDSP you proposing to include this on this report, we need to get visibility on the report as this report is for known metering issues for example; meters not working but then also the ones that will be vacant and to explain why it is being issued.

JB just wanted to clarify RP's point and stated that the report is not just for the known metering issues, it is the pre-notification report, it is everything that is potentially due a must read. KM advised that this is not how she understood this. JB advised that it is the Pre-Notification that comes out as standard now which has everything on and as RP called out and post Modification 0159 it will come out and then have everything on with no metering issues with things we are going to stop because they change to shipper and then

the notifications won't include that because they drop out, and we do not actually raise the must-read request. KM was happy with this explanation.

PO surmised that it is cleaner if we do not include on the Pre-Notification report, as ultimately those sites would not be in a position to obtain a must read, as the read agent on the basis, that the site could not be accessed because of the vacant status.

OC agreed with PO's assumption as we do not want to jump through quite a lot of hoops for a site to be put into the vacant process so have the justification for it to be excluded and should not be included in the pre-notification if it cannot be read, as long as we still need to demonstrate that a visit has been attempted in accordance with the guidelines for vacant site process, but would be happy to hear others views on this.

Angela Joyce (AJ) asked if CDSP are doing any audit on vacant sites with regards to sites showing on this report forever, as in the electricity world, it is audited once a year. PO said that this is not about the data that CDSP hold about vacancy it is about the pre-notification must read report that will or will not include sites that are vacant. AJ appreciated this but wondered if there was going to be any auditing on sites vacant, so they do not stay on the report forever and wanted to understand if there is auditing on Shippers to leave them on here indefinitely. OC advised that this is covered in the Modification and has strict rules on how long sites can stay in this position and PO and JB concurred with this and suggested AJ review the modification for further information.

PO advised RP that it is at solution stage and would like to get further information and feedback on whether to include or exclude on the pre-notification report.

No further questions raised.

3.a.ii. XRN5719 Provision of Consolidation Specific Services Invoice and Supporting Information

PO welcomed RW to provide an overview of this Change Proposal. RW advised that Michelle Kearney (MK) is online with any questions if required and provided an overview of the change and the background to the detailed design which is a value-add change raised by the CDSP and the Billing Operational Teams who administer the service invoices and impacts, Shipper, DNOs, NGT and IGT.

RW explained that currently at D+16, the CDSP issues customers with a PDF invoice attachment detailing the Specific Services that they receive. the purpose, of this change, is to develop a solution where the invoice and the supporting information files are sent in one email to avoid additional effort by customers and CDSP in validating charges using the supporting information which is supplied separately.

The change seeks to simplify the solution for CDSP and Customers to consolidate the information by attaching any supporting information files to the Specific Service Invoice into one email. RW summarised the solutions on slide 33, noting that emails will continue to be secure, password protected delivered to the existing distribution list, so current recipients will receive it and scheduled at the same time.

RW advised that the Detailed Design Change pack was issued on the 12th February and will be voted at the next Change Management Committee and therefore looking to implement as quickly as possible. PO noted the action against this Action that we did not have two different feeds of information but the distribution is the same, and the second one was on the option to opt in and out and there is no benefit in retaining this logic, but if any customers had a desire to have this for specific services if that is required on a case by case situation, this would be looked at, but CDSP are looking at a single solution and this is the recommendation for this design.

And the final question/action, was on whether we have considered any other delivery mechanism have we looked at any other method other than email, and the determination is that this is value add and if we were looking at a more file based delivery we would look to do this through a change management phase, with sufficient lead time for customers to prepare for this, but by retaining the existing mechanism and making enhancements to it is more beneficial and scaled solution for these invoices at present and have been working well and no plans to change to migrate at this time, and will remain on the SAP 4 HANA, PO also advised that there was a question offline on any GDPR supporting information or implications, PO advised that CDSP have within existing processes a number of controls and checks in place that GDPR is adhered to in the current system and enhances this so no potential risk

No further questions raised.

3.a.iii. XRN5573B – Updates to the Priority Consumer process (as designated by the Secretary of State for Business, Energy, and Industrial Strategy - BEIS)

PO advised Design change pack was issued in February Change pack for a June Release on how CDSP support the Priority Consumer Process as a result of statutory obligations introduced in 2023.

Michelle Niits (MN) introduced herself as one of the Business analysts for XRN5573, as there were some people on the call she had not come across before. MN provided an overview of the Change which was raised to implement the changes to the existing Priority Consumer process because the categorisations and qualifying criteria were amended in line

with governmental directive. MN providing a summary of the consumer categories A, B and C as detailed on Slide 36 explaining that due to the urgency of the change, that it was agreed at ChMC that Priority Consumer Category B changes would be applied as manual workarounds until this change XRN 5573 Part B is implemented and this change pack is what is being addressed.

MN went through the requirements summary, advising that the process will enhance the method of raising priority consumer requests to replace the existing priority consumer application form process to include a new portal screen to receive the priority consumer category updates from Shippers/and or DESNX to replace the existing priority consumer application form. PO explained that the full validations are included in the detailed change pack for review.

Enhanced method of raising priority consumer requests to introduce a new portal, validations are included in change pack and changes to UK to capture and store category B data. Slide 37 noting the changes to UK Link, new screen to receive the updates from shippers and/or DESNZ, migration activity for those Category B's held offline and automating the report to include allowable in GES online Portal and the S15 record used within the .TMC. TRF. And .TRS files.

PO added that this is a change to allowable records in these files. MN advised that it is advised to review the change pack and provided any feedback, as it be reviewed voting on at the March ChMC by Shippers, DNOs, IGTs and NGT will vote on the outcome of the DDCP consultation in March ChMC.

KM – Should IGT's not be included, MN advised that it is only Shippers and DENZ that can log them as priority consumers under this and is different from the priority register, KM asked if this is just so they can be sent the Portal as we currently send by Email and we get the report monthly and just wanted to confirm as the Change pack does not call them out. MN asked if this can be taken away as a question as it was believed that it is only Shippers and DENz that can do this.

PO confirmed that he will also review this with the this point will be clarified with the business teams and provided some background and advised there has been a lot of attention around the Priority Consumer provision and some of the rules and rationale on what can and can't constitute a category and has led to a lot of work and communication between the Network's ,IGTs and CDSP and that there may be still interaction when CDSP receive certain requests to validate them in certain circumstances, but what CDSP are looking to ensure shippers have capability to request the updates via an automated solution and recorded correctly in the Central systems and portal screens that should be visible to parties. PO advised that there is a separate table currently where, CDSP receive

templates from shippers, and these are processed internally which leads to offline checks with Networks before we refer back to shippers on the categorisation.

KM was happy that this be clarified offline and advised that IGTs do have to send this to CDSP when customers call up to be on the list via email and for CDSP to validate on the link, but we also receive the report monthly, PO confirmed that the report will still continue as we do provide to the DNs. The values are currently flowing in these reports but pulling from an offline database. KM would like this clarified.

ACTION: CDSP to confirm with relevant business teams, if IGT's should be identified as being an impacted party on this change proposal

PO asked if anyone else had any questions or Shippers had any questions to raise during the consultation so these can be discussed at the ChMC in March - no questions raised.

3b. Requirements Clarification

None for this meeting.

4. Release / Project Updates

PO advised that the updates for this meeting will cover an update on current position with November 2023 Major Release and provide an update on February 2024 Major Release.

4a XRN 5629 November 2023 Major Release

PO advised that November 2023 Major Release is currently drawing towards a conclusion and is coming to the end of Post Implementation Support phase, so we will be in a position by middle of February when this can be concluded. PO advised the changes implemented were, Modification 0701 (XRN5186) and XRN5482 replacement of reads associated to meter asset technical details change or update (RGMA) and reported feedback on the progress of this change which has seen a reduction in the RFA Process in the last two months, through a file-based automated solution and have seen this benefit reducing the need of adjustments over the past two months.

4b XRN 5682 February 24 Major Release

PO advised the February 24 Major Release is going live at the end of this week, the three changes in the scope are: -

1. XRN5604 UNC Modification 0811S Shipper Agreed Read (SAR) Exceptions Process
2. XRN5605 IGT Modification 159 – Amendments to the must read process.
3. XRN5607 Update to AQ Correction Processes (Modification 0816S)

There are no risks to report to customers and forecasted to implement at the end of this week and should receive some communication at the end of this week on the implementation.

Any further information on this release please contact us.

4c XRN 5629 June 2024 Major Release

PO advised that at the February ChMC agreed to include XRN5675 which is our settlement solution to support Modification 855 so any settlements required following the Central Switching impact last summer we will be looking to include this and it was also agreed to defer the scoping XRN5614 until November 2024 at the earliest in the coming weeks.

PO Summarised that the next Major release is February as discussed above, and next Major Release will include XRN5573b and XRN5675 and most pressing to draw your attention to as they move to delivery activities.

In terms of Minor Release Drop 12, we will be looking to implement on 17th May 2024 (Indicative date only) for Energy Invoice upload from UK link to Gemini and wanted to bring your attention of improved services and we are not expecting there to be any customer impacts as part of this change.

5. Change Pipeline

Change Delivery Plan

PO shared the Change Pipeline on slide 52 for January 2024 – March 2025, which has been mentioned above and some of these items in respect of the February Major Release due this weekend. Summary below: -

- XRN5658 – has been withdrawn from the delivery plan.

- XRN5665 and XRN5690 was delivered in January.
- Minor release Drop 12 has been defined for delivery in May.
- June, we have defined the scope as XRN5573b and XRN5675
- November 24 Major Release XRN5615 which was discussed as this is out in February Change Pack. XRN5720 which links to IGT173 and the gateway delivery of RPC Backing data and XRN5616a which we discussed today.

Change Backlog Details

PO went through the Change Backlog Details from slide 54 confirming that the Hydrogen Village Trial has now been withdrawn following government decision to not support hydrogen village trial at this stage so XRN5531 will be withdrawn from our change plans accordingly.

Latest corresponding updates are on this slide.

Change Backlog On Hold Details.

PO explained that the Change Backlog on hold slide 55 noting that CDSP are continuing to engage with customers and any new changes will be firmed up over the next few months.

Any views on backlog or on plan please contact me.

Change Pack Plan,

PO advised of the February Change packs on slide 56 which highlights the 5 Change Proposals out for consultation, 2 for solution 2, design considerations which we covered during the meeting today, and 1 for information XRN5556J CMS Rebuild and a decision on this will be reached at the XChMC on 20th February.

March Change packs should include 2 Design packs for consultation and 1 Solution design for consultation. XRN 5614, in design phase and Mod 855 solution to Shipper customers and on the CSEPS Part B Solution.

6. AOB

No items raised. Next Meeting is scheduled for Monday 25th March If you have any questions relating to the above meeting minutes, please email uklink@xserve.com