

Project Nexus Workstream Minutes

Friday 30 October 2009

Energy Networks Association, Horseferry Road, London

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Tim Davis (Secretary)	(TD)	Joint Office
Alan Raper	(AR)	National Grid Distribution
Brian Durber	(BD)	E.ON UK
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Fiona Cottam	(FC)	xoserve
Gareth Evans	(GE)	Waterswye
Hazel Ward	(HW)	RWE npower
Jemma Woolston	(JW)	Shell Gas Direct
Joanna Ferguson	(JF)	Northern Gas Networks
Joel Martin	(JM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Graham Wood	(GW)	British Gas
Richard Street	(RS)	Corona Energy
Scott Miller	(SM)	Scottish Power
<i>(by teleconference)</i>		
Sean McGoldrick	(SM)	National Grid NTS
Shirley Wheeler	(SW)	xoserve
Stefan Leedham	(SL)	EDF Energy
Steve Nunnington	(SN)	Xoserve
Martin Brandt	(MB)	Scottish & Southern Energy

1. Introduction

BF welcomed all to the meeting.

1.1 Review of Minutes

Apart from correcting the meeting venue, the minutes of the meeting held on 23 July 2009 were agreed.

1.2 Review of actions

NEX0013: xoserve (SW) to develop a draft workgroup start/end date progress tracking report for consideration at the next Workstream meeting.

Covered on agenda. **Closed**

NEX0015: xoserve would consider the practicality of these suggestions and provide an update.

An updated proposal for making progress was covered during the meeting. **Closed**

2. Update on the Revised Workgroup Approach and Plan

SN presented xoserve's proposal for a revised way to take forward the development of Project Nexus requirements. The starting point would be to hold scoping meetings to agree what would be covered in the subsequent Topic Workgroup and Workstream meetings. MB questioned whether this first step was necessary and suggested the Workstream should be establishing principles and the direction each group should follow. The consensus was that establishing principles should be possible in a single meeting.

RS questioned what was meant by principles. SW said these were as set out in the Project Brief. The key was to establish the scope of each subsequent Topic workgroup and the range of workgroups that should to be arranged.

SL questioned what was meant by AMR. SW suggested that this was the kind of question that would be considered in the initial scoping meetings with a view to establishing principles and assumptions. RS felt the distinction between Advanced and Smart Metering was clear in DECC's documentation and was well understood by the industry.

MB questioned whether the references to consumption and reconciliation meant that the assumption was that settlement would remain with xoserve, which SN confirmed was the case.

SM asked why funding was not mentioned in the presentation, which SN said was deliberate as a means of making progress. However, it had not been forgotten and SW suggested adding a heading to the documentation to cover this.

Concern was expressed that the iGT area could be left and an opportunity be missed. If the Shippers supported a principle that any systems change was designed to accommodate iGTs, that would appropriately sit within the main scope of the project rather than being in a separate Workstream.

HW felt the governance slide was insufficiently clear and could usefully show the stages that were envisaged. SL added that it would be worth showing the PNAG role on the slide, and BF suggested referencing the Modification Panel.

It was clarified that the proposed principle establishing Workshops were not expected to produce detailed requirements which could form Modification Proposals nor systems requirement definitions. The aim was to address high-level principles initially and to understand inter-dependencies and what could be progressed on a no regrets basis.

HW suggested that supplier switching was beyond the scope of consumption and reconciliation and asked why it was included. RS felt this was appropriately included for AMR, although HW felt this meant it should emerge in the gap analysis. SN said this should be considered in the scoping meetings. MB suggested it was hard to see how this could be managed until it was clear what information/data was within scope.

It was agreed that all should consider the list of Proposed Principle Workgroups and respond with views on additions or deletions.

Action NEX0016: Consider the list of Proposed Workgroups and Principles in xoserve's presentation and respond with views on additions or deletions (see www.gasgovernance.co.uk/sites/default/files/23%20October%202009%20Project%20Nexus%20Workstream%20Presentation%20by%20xoserve.pdf).

There was general recognition that the suggested number of meetings for Stage 1 and Stage 2 was potentially unmanageable. SW emphasised that xoserve had deliberately put forward a plan which was subject to development in the scoping discussions. At the same time, it was recognised that any party was entitled to bring forward proposals to for consideration during the debates on the work plan.

Moving to the proposed AMR Workgroups, SN emphasised that the groupings and work plan were dependent on the conclusions of the scoping and principles workshops.

CW asked what process was envisaged if agreement was not reached, and SN said that xoserve hoped the Modification Panel would provide a way forward in these circumstances. At the end of the process, however, any change that required a change to the UNC would be subject to the established governance process, with Ofgem as the decision taker.

JW asked when the end date was envisaged for the process. SW indicated that this was uncertain and likely to vary depending in particular on other decisions emerging from DECC. JW suggested that if the Project Nexus implementation date was delayed, this could impact the scope, for example there may be no legacy AMR issue.

SL indicated that he had been anticipating an earlier gap analysis to be proposed, looking at the differences between AMR and Smart Metering. Without this, it was hard to define the appropriate scope and scale of Workgroups. DW indicated that xoserve felt this would be covered in the scoping meetings, although SL felt it should be complete before considering the principles.

SL suggested there would be value in the revised plan being debated at PNAG since it had not been approved, allowing for review and challenge. SW felt the papers as brought forward were consistent with the PNAG agreements, which did not call for ratification, and others were keen to see progress being made under the Workstream's remit rather than PNAG being involved. SL added that the output is not what EDF was expecting, and that he supported the note circulated separately by Jason Brogden. However, the explanations surrounding the presentation had been helpful and had clarified what was proposed and why. GW and HW suggested that the plan as written could not be supported, but that the presentation had helped to clarify expectations and that moving forward to the next stage would be worthwhile to establish principles and a clear way forward. GE and RS were keen the process should continue within the Workstream and were concerned notes were being discussed when the content wasn't available to all members of the Workstream. BD agreed that the presentation had helped - the gap analysis should be early in the process and progress should be made in areas where it is possible to do so.

Following this discussion, the consensus was that the plan should be followed as a starting point, and be refined following the scoping Workshops. MB added that developing the plan to incorporate timelines and milestones would be valuable.

It was agreed that xoserve would issue a revised Initial Requirements Register on 10 November and that comments indicating suggested additions, deletions and mergers would be welcome on this by 18 November, for discussion at the next Workstream on 23 November, which would be the first scoping meeting. All responses will be published on the JO website, alongside other material for the meeting.

Action NEX0017: xoserve to publish revised Initial Requirements Register by 10 November.

Action NEX0018: All to provide suggested additions, deletions and mergers within the Initial Requirements Register to the Joint Office by 18 November.

3. Workgroup Reporting

4.1 Start/end date progress tracking

SW put forward a model as a strawman for reporting, and this was supported by all present.

4.2 Topic workgroup reports

Attendees accepted the reports as written and published on the JO website.

4. Modification Proposal 0209 "Rolling AQ"

The Workstream supported the Proposal remaining with the Workstream for consideration as part of the broader Project Nexus development process. The Panel will therefore be asked to defer consideration of the Proposal.

5. Next Steps – diary / planning

It was agreed that the Workstream should meet on 23 November, 10:30, at the Energy Networks Association, with 14 December potentially available for a subsequent meeting.

6. AOB

None raised.

Action Table - 23 July 2009

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
NEX 0013	23.06.09	4.	Develop a draft workgroup start/end date progress tracking report for consideration at the next Workstream meeting.	xoserve (SW)	Closed
NEX 0015	23.07.09	5.	xoserve would consider the practicality of these suggestions and provide an update.	xoserve (FC)	Closed
NEX 0016	30.10.09	2.	Consider the list of Proposed Workgroups and Principles in xoserve's presentation and respond with views on additions or deletions (see www.gasgovernance.co.uk/nexus/301009)	All	
NEX 0017	30.10.09	2.	Publish revised Initial Requirements Register by 10 November	xoserve (SW)	
NEX 0018	30.10.09	2.	Provide suggested additions, deletions and mergers within the Initial Requirements Register to the Joint Office by 18 November	All	