

Project Nexus Workgroup Minutes Tuesday 06 & Wednesday 07 December 2011

at 31 Homer Road, Solihull, B91 3LT

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Mike Berrisford (Secretary)	(MiB)	Joint Office
Alan Raper (6 th only)	(AR)	National Grid Distribution
Anthony Wright (7 th only)	(AW)	Shell
Brian Durber	(BD)	E.ON UK
Cesar Coelho (7 th only)	(CC)	Ofgem
Chris Booton (7 th only)	(CB)	RWE npower
Chris Warner (6 th only)	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
David Godwin	(DG)	Xoserve
Dave King (6 th only)	(DK)	Xoserve
Edward Coleman (7 th only)	(EC)	E.ON UK
Fiona Cottam	(FC)	Xoserve
Gareth Evans (6 th only)	(GE)	Waters Wye Associates
Grace Smith (6 th only)	(GS)	RWE npower
Graham Wood (6 th only)	(GW)	Centrica
Imtiaz Kayani (7 th only)	(IK)	E.ON UK
Karen Kennedy	(KK)	ScottishPower
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	Shell
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE
Michele Downes	(MD)	Xoserve
Naomi Anderson (6 th only, t/con 7 th)	(NA)	EDF Energy
Sean M ^c Goldrick (6 th only, t/con 7 th)	(SMc)	National Grid NTS
Sharon Broadley (7 th only)	(SB)	ScottishPower
Steve Mulliganie (6 th only)	(SM)	Gazprom
Steve Nunnington (7 th only)	(SN)	Xoserve
Wyn Hodgkiss (6 th only)	(WH)	Shell
Zoe Murphy (6 th only)	(ZM)	RWE npower

1. Introduction

BF welcomed all to the meeting.

1.1 Review of Minutes

The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted.

1.2 Review of Actions

Action NEX10/05: Xoserve (FC/MD) to consider Invoicing/Section 8/Table (Items 1 and 2) - Check with SPAA and UK Link for progress and any identified gaps.

Update: FC confirmed that there are some gaps and not all files will be going on-line in the foreseeable future, so this remains the aspiration. A statement to this effect would be added to the BRD.

Closed

Action NEX10/09: RWE npower (PR) to consider the Supply Point Register/IRR Ref 10.6 - Provide a User view on the potential benefits and risks of multiple licences.

Update: CB advised that as this was raised by a former colleague some 3 years ago, internal (npower) investigations have been unable to provide a clear view, and as a consequence he would suggest the action was time expired.

Closed

Action NEX11/04: Ofgem (CC) to obtain an Ofgem view on how best to deliver an impact assessment and provide feedback at the December meeting.

Update: CC questioned the action believing that it was more about what approach the industry should adopt, rather than specifically relating to Ofgem. BF pointed out that discussion elsewhere in the meetings had placed an action on all parties to prepare a list of questions to present to Ofgem to assist moving the assessment process forward. Please refer to item 3 and new action NEX12/01 for more details.

Carried Forward

Action NEX11/05: Joint Office (BF) to publish the AQ & Reconciliation BRDs on the Project Nexus 'Baselined Business Requirements' page on the Joint Office web site once provided by Xoserve.

Update: BF advised that this had been completed.

Closed

Action NEX11/06: All parties to consider what Market Sector Flags maybe required in future, and what if any, new flags would be required.

Update: MD advised that this would be covered under item 5.2.2 below.

Closed

Action NEX11/07: National Grid Distribution (CW) to provide further clarification on the flexible pricing facility to allow pricing functions to vary between Networks.

Update: CW apologised that work had not yet commenced on this matter.

Carried Forward

Action NEX11/08: Xoserve (FC/MD) to add a principle in the document regarding standard invoice naming and talk to the Customer department regarding training materials.

Update: MD advised that a new principle for a standard invoice naming convention had been added the BRD.

FC added that discussions with the Xoserve Customer Team has revealed that all the 'Discovery Day' training materials are available on the Xoserve web site at: http://www.xoserve.com/CRM_DiscoveryDay.asp.

Closed

2. Modification Workgroups

2.1 0380 – Periodic Annual Quantity calculation

Consideration deferred.

2.2 0377 – Use of Daily Meter Reads

Consideration deferred.

2.3 0359 – Use of Market Sector Flag to determine Customer Status

Consideration deferred.

2.4 0357 – Enhanced Supply Point Administration Process

Consideration deferred.

3. Workgroup Approach and Plan

Please note: this item was taken out of sequence during the course of the meetings.

Topic Workgroup Timeline Tracking

MD/FC provided a brief overview of the tracking document, which has been updated since the previous meeting. FC advised that the workgroup progress remains broadly 'on track' for completion by the end of January 2012, although resolving the remaining retrospective updates issues in time may be challenging.

Project Nexus Workplan

MD/FC provided a brief overview of the workplan, which has been updated since the previous meeting. It was also agreed to include additional Invoicing & Supply Point Register meetings on 10/01/12 alongside the Retrospective Updates & Non Functional meetings.

Project Nexus Next Steps presentation

FC provided a brief overview of the presentation on both days of the meeting.

FC indicated that formal signing off of the respective BRDs is expected on or around the 24/01/12 meeting.

SM voiced concern over the timing of the production of legal text for any Project Nexus related UNC Modifications, believing that commencement of preparation of legal text ahead of raising the modifications would be beneficial. CW suggested that robust business rules based on the signed off BRDs would be required before any legal text drafting could take place to avoid having to continually 'tweak' the text. AR was of the view that it is highly unlikely that preparation of the legal text would actually delay delivery of very complex systems anticipated in the project. Furthermore, he envisages a 6 month process would be necessary to ensure that we align outcomes and cost v's benefit analysis – this would need to be clearly defined within the project plan. SN advised that Xoserve are currently considering the 2012 plan, and that this would be communicated to the workgroup in due course.

Asked how she envisages the 'formal' consultation process working, FC suggested that a continuation of this Workgroup would seem appropriate and any issues (and polarised views) could be driven out as part of the consultation to help smooth the way for any subsequent UNC modifications.

CW advised that he envisages around 8 or 9 focused (based on Nexus requirements) modifications being required and sees value in one proposer raising these, although he acknowledged that this may be unlikely. In any event, these should really be 'industry owned' modifications to try to avoid alternate modifications being raised, which could potentially delay delivery.

Moving on, FC advised that Xoserve intend to provide a high level summary of the various BRDs prior to review by the workgroup, hopefully in time for consideration at the 10/01/2012 meeting.

Attendees noted that a low v's high product uptake comparison along with consideration of both the industry and Ofgem aspirations may prove beneficial (i.e. what each side wants, or is willing to accept).

In considering how best to raise the profile of the costs v's benefits debate (inc. linking to the four proposed product lines) with Ofgem, for utilisation in their Impact Assessment, it was agreed to draw up a list of questions (relating to matters such as transitional arrangements, SMART and product line take up etc.) to present to Ofgem for a view. A new action was placed against ALL parties to consider what

industry cost v's benefit questions would be appropriate to put before Ofgem for inclusion within the consultation process.

CC suggested that establishing a sub-workgroup / workshop to look at the financial (cost) assessments and process efficiency impacts could form the basis for developing the type of questions that would seek meaningful responses from Ofgem. In considering who would manage the workshop, post BRD sign off, BF suggested that the Joint Office could facilitate the meeting on behalf of Ofgem especially as holding the meeting at the Ofgem Offices in Millbank would ensure a wider 'across the whole market' participation.

CC also advised that Ofgem would be issuing a (formal / informal) request for information from Shippers and Suppliers (including costs and benefits analysis) in due course. It was then noted that some smaller organisations may be resource constrained in terms of undertaking analysis – a point acknowledged by CC who indicated that he would attempt to liaise with the smaller suppliers to obtain their views on how best to move forward.

Some individuals remained concerned that Ofgem may potentially focus attention on individual consultation responses, rather than considering an overarching industry view during their IA. When asked, CC confirmed that Ofgem would be considering all forms of information provided to them when they undertake their IA. However, he remains of the view that individual organisations may be best placed to provide a wider industry view, rather than seeking an Xoserve view, especially on cost and benefits. BD observed that individual organisational risk assessments would also have a bearing.

Moving on, CC indicated that in his view he did not think that Ofgem would conduct the industry consultation, believing this to be better suited to a Nexus Workgroup role – the Ofgem role sits later in the process. In response, FC pointed out that various parties have previously indicated a reluctance to release financial information within the public arena, preferring to discuss these sensitive matters directly with Ofgem.

New Action NEX12/01: ALL parties to consider what industry cost v's benefit questions would be appropriate to put before Ofgem for inclusion within the consultation process.

New Action NEX12/02: Joint Office (BF) & Ofgem (CC) to liaise on organisation of an industry workshop to consider the financial (cost) assessments and process efficiency impacts that could then form the basis for developing the type of questions that would seek meaningful responses from Ofgem.

Project Nexus Workgroup Outstanding Areas Log

Consideration deferred until the next meeting.

4. Terms of Reference (issues and topics)

No issues raised.

5. Issues and topics for discussion

5.1 High Level Workgroup Issues

No issues raised.

5.2 Further Consideration of Meter Reading Arrangements

5.2.1 Retrospective Updates & Non Functional

PN UNC Workgroup Non Functional topic presentation

DG provided a brief overview of the presentation citing that the intention is to identify the aspirations at today's meeting rather than resolve specific design aspects.

PN UNC Workshop Non Functional IRR Items presentation

DG provided a brief review of various IRR items with debate focussing on the following.

- 8.10 – Internet access to the supporting data behind any of the transportation invoices
 - Xoserve could provide information alongside invoices or users could go and get themselves;
 - file transfer v's direct access considerations - direct access validation would mirror current Xoserve validation mechanisms and further consideration of the impacts of where dependencies to data elsewhere in the system exist, is needed;
 - mirrors information that Suppliers are entitled to, and
 - preference for both a push / pull options for accessing invoice supporting data via the internet.
- 1.3 – Removal of restriction on bulk transfers
 - transfers in this instance refers to change of ownership, and
 - a need to identify realistic numbers involved, especially as SMART may have an impact (rapid switching etc.), and
 - new action on Xosere to consider (all) transaction volume caps for SOLR etc.
- 13.21 – No wholesale changes to file formats, file types and file flows
 - possible consideration of a move away from CSV (comma separated value) to XML/HXML – acknowledged that this is not an easy transition and involves changes to core file formats, therefore need to identify out of scope items and actual requirements prior to conducting a cost v's benefits analysis;
 - parties to seek views from their respective I.T. personnel on a move to XML;
 - file format compositions (data within the files) may require a 'middleware' to support requirements going forward, and
 - new action on Xoserve to document how we would possibly move towards a new flexible (FF) data provision via either XML or other more up to date mechanism to transfer data.
- 13.24 – Real-time file flows
 - consensus is to go for as near to real-time data as possible;
 - acknowledgment that specific processes could / would have their own timings, and
 - consensus that this is not about moving away from IX per se, rather about having options.
- 13.6 – Data formatting should be consistent.....and set data quality framework

-
- consensus that this is time expired and can be deleted.
 - 1.2 – Faster Enquiry and Nominations process + Improved timeliness of supply point transfers + Enhanced customer transfer process and timescales
 - relating to an updating frequency issue (synchronisation etc.), as previously discussed under AMR;
 - process 'to-be' discussions to date have not highlighted a live time requirement – statement relating to the need for a more flexible approach could be added to BRD if necessary;
 - acknowledgment that nomination and confirmation delays are a concern - a quick(er) turnaround would be beneficial;
 - the 7 day data integrity safeguard is not just a Gemini issue as it also relates to retaining accuracy and quality in the transfer of ownership process;
 - Xoserve to consider improvements to the nominations / confirmations processes;
 - recognition that the system should not be the delaying factor in information transfers of any kind, and
 - resilience and confidence levels relating to transfers are crucial.
 - 13.22 – Direct amendment of data held in Xoserve's database
 - users are not necessarily seeking direct automated interface with Xoserve's database, rather provision of more accurate up to date information.
 - 14.1 – Meter reading warehouse that is memory extendable
 - more of a data storage (read history) issue, rather than a simple warehouse consideration;
 - current data retention is based on a 4-5 year rolling – there is possibly a new UNC modification looking at reconciliation close-out and statute of limitations aspects;
 - consensus that the principle should be based on on-line access to historical data to an agreed timescale, with acknowledgment that requests for information further back would / could involve delays;
 - accessing data that relates to a time period prior to your ownership is subject to ongoing governmental discussions although the answer may lie in only being provided with non sensitive 'legacy' data, and
 - parameterisation of everything may benefit system flexibility especially when catering for future governmental initiatives and market changes – GE agreed to a new action to provide a copy of his list of potential future governmental and market issues.
 - 4.1 – Removal of volume quota and improved processing time
 - acknowledgment that Supply Point Register principle is that the system should be built to cater for all sites;

- system scalability design considerations need to id best / worst case scenarios (i.e. minimum / maximum requirements);
 - need to get a 'feel' for the number of potential system users requiring access – perhaps based on IAD numbers as a starting point;
 - it is not simply a question of the number of accounts required, it is also the frequency of utilisation, and
 - basic principle agreed, that whilst there could be tens of thousands of user accounts, not all would require access at the same time.
- 13.14 – Removal of volume quota and improved processing time
 - consideration of file format password protection aspects to be undertaken later at the design stage. There is a need to understand why they are currently protected and not in the public domain;
 - a new action on Xoserve to consider future data dictionary system documentation and training manual requirements, along with the associated costs of providing these;
 - concerns raised about potential overlap and impact upon the Gemini system – may be benefit in having a future debate on the impacts to Gemini including commercial aspects, EU changes etc, as (Gemini) funding considerations may also be impacted going forward;

In closing, Xoserve agreed to undertake a new action to develop a high level principles document based around these discussions for consideration at the next meeting.

New Action NEX12/03: Xoserve (FC/DG) to consider (all) transaction volume caps for SOLR etc.

New Action NEX12/04: Xoserve (FC/DG) to document how we would possibly move towards a new flexible (FF) data provision via either XML or other more up to date system.

New Action NEX12/05: Waters Wye (GE) to provide a copy of his list of potential future governmental and market issues to support consideration of future system flexibility requirements.

New Action NEX12/06: Xoserve (FC/DG) to consider future data dictionary system documentation and training manual requirements, along with the associated costs of providing these.

New Action NEX12/07: Xoserve (FC/DG) to develop a high level Non Functional principles document based around these discussions for consideration at the next meeting.

Project Nexus Workgroup – Retrospective Updates presentation

MD provided a brief overview of the presentation.

FC noted that as far as the 'Agreed Scope' was concerned, this does not mean that any of these items would automatically change.

In considering the 'Objectives for Today', MD warned that AQ and Settlement etc had only taken 7 to 9 meetings to resolve,

retrospective updates had already undertaken 5 meetings and was nowhere near completion.

Asked what parties are looking for, and at what cost, KK indicated that fundamentally parties are seeking an adjustment mechanism and methodology to ensure accurate data provision going forward.

FC pointed out that previous Workgroup discussions had advocated the principle that no automatic update mechanism would be required for the Change of Supplier process and that both parties (current & previous shipper) would need to agree any changes to be made (financial or otherwise).

Retrospective Updates: Supporting Document for BRD review

MD provided a brief overview of the document. There then followed a detailed debate on various key aspects culminating in the following key points being made.

- Meter Asset

It was suggested that some form of notification could be provided to the previous Shipper to identify when the present Shipper makes an adjustment, although this was not universally supported.

Whether a query resolution process would be required going forward depends heavily on what parties require for potentially changing reads and asset date considerations.

Consensus seemed to prefer going back to the change of ownership date as being the key point in answering who can, or cannot amend data for a site with the shipper who made the mistake in the first instance (regardless of the date on which it happened) being held accountable. Any adjustments (reconciliations) would only go back to the date of ownership. MD asked, and parties indicated that NO financial adjustments would be made to the previous shipper.

It was agreed to provide a caveat stating that where a shipper who previously owned and lost a site, then reacquires the site, the same rules would apply.

- Meter Reading

Where transfer reads are concerned, SARS requirements necessitate that both the current and previous shipper financial adjustments need to match up, subject to agreement of both parties. When asked, MD noted that as far as SARS is concerned a timescale for generating an estimate is required to ensure that close-out takes place. GW also pointed out that licence obligations state that a customer bill needs to be sent out within 43 days. KK also believed that some form of an estimation process would be required going forward with the ability to make financial adjustments (with agreement with a previous supplier) at any point (i.e. a line in the sand).

Looking at the start/fix reading aspects, MD advised that these may have a reconciliation impact on subsequent reads. FC wondered if the table required further review as it is currently based on a one shipper reading approach.

In considering the cyclic reading requirements, it was noted that any cyclic reading that is used as a transfer read is deemed to

be a transfer read. However, FC pointed out that in this instance, this is neither a transfer, nor a fixed meter reading. MD agreed to add a covering statement to explain what is meant by a cyclic read.

When asked about providing readings procured immediately following taking ownership of a site, CW advised that under Code only two definitions exist – monthly or annual.

In closing, MD agreed to amend the document in line with discussions.

BRD for Retrospective Updates (v0.2) review

MD provided a very brief review of the changes made to the document following the previous meeting focusing attention on item 6 – Assumptions and Concerns.

When asked, those present indicated approval of the various changes and specifically, inclusion of new paragraphs 6.2.6 and 6.2.7.

5.2.2 Invoicing & Supply Point Register

PN UNC Workgroup Invoicing presentation

MD provided an overview of the presentation.

Looking to consider the various consultation responses, and 8.2 – Introduce an invoice pre-validation process, it was agreed that in the absence of a response to Xoserve requests for clarification from (P Broom) GDF Suez, this item should be removed from the list and future consideration.

Moving on to consider 8.9 – Greater level of granularity in the supporting data for invoices, FC pointed out that whilst this relates to capturing invoice data at meter point level, where appropriate, it should be noted that an element of aggregation would still be needed in future. When asked, KK suggested that a supporting file format change could be needed to accommodate these requirements. NA remained mostly unconcerned about the need to change the file formats, especially for the better. BD suggested that the costs v's benefits analysis would need to be considered in due course whilst FC advised that any file format changes would require UKLink Committee approval. Summarising, FC believes that, we need to mirror the level of detail from the LSP market, down into the SSP market.

It was also suggested that these points should also be linked in to item 6.2 Process Assumptions within the Invoicing Business Principles document. Additionally, whilst considering the objectives for today, MD advised that provision of MPRN based invoices would significantly increase volumes.

Business Principles for Invoicing (v0.3) review

MD provided a brief review of the document highlighting the areas that had been amended since the previous meeting. Discussions then focused on the following key points (*please note these were not necessarily undertaken in sequence*)

In looking at item 6.2 – Process Assumptions, BD believed that paragraph 6.2.1 potentially introduces a radical step. FC also reminded parties of the previous ICoSS objection to this proposal. BD in support of GE's concerns in this area, noted that for I&C sites

calculating charges at a meter point level would mean that they could / would incur significant costs and disaggregation would become overly complex and expensive. He also noted that whilst capacity invoices are applied at a meter point level, commodity invoices are applied at supply point level. When asked, he also confirmed that NTS commodity invoices are also applied at a supply point level.

FC suggested that reconciling at the right level remains a challenge, as in essence, it operates at meter point level but is then aggregated up to supply point level – allocation also operates on an aggregated basis.

BD suggested that you can only ever ‘notionally match’ allocation to AQ. Quickly looking back at the Wales & West Utilities ‘Universal Single Meter Point Supply Points’ presentation provided at the 06/09/11 meeting, KK suggested that the sums of money involved are not significant and should WWU not raise a UNC modification in the area, the matter would need to be included in the current process and future requirements considerations. BD suggested that where an aggregated supply point is utilising an algorithm to calculate the AQ this would always generate a lower capacity value.

FC noted, and parties agreed, that no one had suggested doing energy balancing at either meter point or supply point level. However, KK remained concerned about providing suitable granularity at a meter point level and would like to be able to identify what actually goes in to supply point level based calculations (i.e. what MP information had been aggregated up to SP level) – she would also prefer to see this information to be provided by Xoserve. When asked if this would require an additional backup facility to be able to provide the information, FC indicated that it might well do so and that this only serves to highlight the ‘tensions’ between various parties aspirations. KK felt that a reconciliation invoicing style model could be replicated over to other invoices to deliver benefits.

Moving on to look at item 8 Business Principles, when asked if ad-hoc invoices would be built into the system, or remain a manual workaround process, FC responded by suggesting that whilst some may be integrated within a system solution, this would very much depend on supporting cost benefit analysis proving favourable. However, some specific ad-hoc invoices may be required in future although the aspiration is to integrate as many as possible. Furthermore, whilst more and more of these ad-hoc invoices are undertaken by electronic transfer via the IX, not all would be available in time for the implementation of new systems.

MD advised that paragraph 8.1.3 would be amended in-line with discussions before being moved to a different section.

Moving on to consider paragraph 8.2 Invoice Document, it was noted that it would boil down to provision of either Option A or B, but not both in respect of 8.2.1. Consensus was to opt for Option A with no change to the current ‘thick’ or ‘thin’ processes.

Looking at 8.2.2, and asked if we could consider scheduling some ad-hoc invoices, FC believed that this could be accommodated now via a UNC modification and would speak to Xoserve colleagues to identify any timing issues. She also advised that historically there had been some problems associated with scheduled ad-hoc invoices. Whilst happy to look to schedule more ad-hoc invoices in future, this would require a UNC change.

In attempting to summarise discussion on paragraph 8.2.2, MD suggested that whilst potentially difficult to achieve, the aspiration appears to be to schedule ad-hoc invoices wherever possible. CB thought that we simply need to note that the high level principle is to standardise ad-hoc invoices, with a view to identifying actual issue aspects at a later date – a view supported by the majority present. All parties agreed that supporting information was critical to the invoice process including ad-hocs.

Following a lengthy debate on the need to either delete or reword item 8.3 Invoice Segmentation, it was agreed to retain the section but amend the statement to identify that we may need new data items in due course. During discussions CC reminded those present that populating and maintaining the market sector code flags is a licence obligation.

Moving on to consider item 8.4 Invoice Charges, FC believed that this can only be an aspiration at this stage as it also relates to aspects of Gemini system resilience – a view agreed by those present.

Summarising, parties debated the most appropriate next steps and acknowledged that whilst publication of the document may be out of standards, it should now be amended and published in accordance with the following timetable:

Publication on Joint Office web site for comments.	12/12/11
Comments by no later than:	03/01/12
Publish supporting materials on Joint Office web site by:	04/01/12
Discussion (as a short notice agenda item) at January meeting.	10/01/12

PN UNC Workgroup Supply Point Register presentation

MD provided an overview of the presentation.

Reviewing the consultation responses, CB agreed to undertake a new action with regard to IRR 10.6 to seek a view from his npower colleagues and report back.

Looking at item 13.11, it was agreed that recent Workgroup discussions had ‘covered’ this matter in sufficient detail and in the absence of a response to Xoserve requests for clarification from GDF, it should therefore be removed from the list.

Looking at the ‘Scope’, MD observed that the 6 points are already identified in the current principles document.

New Action NEX12/08: RWE npower (CB) to seek a view from his RWE npower colleagues on IRR Ref 10.6 and report back at the next meeting.

Business Principles for Supply Point Register (v0.2) review

MD provided a brief review of the document highlighting the areas that had been amended since the previous meeting. Discussions

then focused on the following key points (*please note these were not necessarily undertaken in sequence*)

Agreeing that the new statement for paragraph 8.1.9 was reasonable, it was decided to opt for [3] months after the due date.

MD advised that should Wales & West Utilities raise their proposed UNC modification for 'Single Meter Point Supply Points' prior to completion of Project Nexus, paragraph 8.3 could be removed.

Moving on to consider paragraph 8.4.1 Proposed Process, BD suggested that this would need to be amended to reflect that domestic parties have a customer warrant to obtain the information via SEC.

When asked about the viability of retaining item 8.5 Market Sector Flag, SN advised that a recent ICoSS letter had suggested leaving this in, but applying parameters that would ensure that we retain the ability to enhance in future.

Moving on again to consider item 8.6 Consumer Classifications, BD asked if the Transporters hold this information (as he believes it is a licence obligation anyway) and whether it could be made visible (for safety purposes), via a central register – in the absence of a Transporter representative at the meeting, the consensus of those present was that there is no reason why this could not be done, especially at the supply point enquiry stage. In response, MD pointed out that vulnerable contact information is held within the UKLink system whilst priority contacts are held within a separate database. AW advised that there are actually two types of priority customer – hospitals & care homes being one, and financially vulnerable impacted parties being the other.

MD indicated that she would now amend the document in-line with discussions.

Considering more 'global' requirements, BD enquired where potential emergency contacts consideration resides, as at a previous meeting National Grid Distribution (AR) had stated he would look in to removal of the requirement to fax the information and replace it with a more suitable medium. In response, MD suggested that this possibly sits under Supply Point Register considerations. SN advised that he will raise the issue at a forthcoming meeting with the Gas Transporters and if they are amenable to its inclusion within the BRD, it would be included, and if not he would seek the reasons why.

BF enquired about whether or not C&D (connection and disconnection notices) interactions had been considered to which MD responded by saying that the data currently resides within UKLink via RGMA flows, but is not visible to Users. SN suggested that further discussion on whether to include C&D considerations, should only take place with Transporter representatives present, especially as currently no real validation takes place on this information. A new action was placed on Xoserve (MD) to investigate what actual data is contained within the C&D data set and to consider what issues may be present that relate to a lack of validation of the information.

In closing, BD asked if the next meeting could also consider what is there in the SPA arena that could / would potentially have a DCC impact (i.e. RGMA, referrals, switching issues etc.) A new action was placed against ALL parties to consider.

New Action NEX12/09: Xoserve (MD) to investigate what actual data is contained within the C&D (connection and disconnection notices) data set and to consider what issues may be present that relate to a lack of validation of the information.

New Action NEX12/10: All parties to consider what is there in the SPA arena that could / would potentially have a DCC impact (i.e. RGMA, referrals, switching issues etc.) and provide their views at the next meeting.

5.3 Transitional Arrangements

Not discussed.

5.4 Issues logs (external and Project Nexus)

Not discussed.

5.5 Alignment of IRR requirements

Not discussed.

5.6 New Issues

Not discussed.

6. AOB

Workgroup Retirement

BD thanked K Kennedy for all her hard work and contribution to the Project and wished her well in her new career.

Ofgem Workshop

BF advised that CC would be seeing if Ofgem are happy to host the workshop that could take place in early February 2012.

7. Workgroup Process

7.1 Agree actions to be completed ahead of the next meeting

The following new actions were discussed and assigned:

Action NEX12/01: ALL parties to consider what industry cost v's benefit questions would be appropriate to put before Ofgem for inclusion within the consultation process.

Action NEX12/02: Joint Office (BF) & Ofgem (CC) to liaise on organisation of an industry workshop to consider the financial (cost) assessments and process efficiency impacts that could then form the basis for developing the type of questions that would seek meaningful responses from Ofgem.

Action NEX12/03: Xoserve (FC/DG) to consider (all) transaction volume caps for SOLR etc.

Action NEX12/04: Xoserve (FC/DG) to document how we would possibly move towards a new flexible (FF) data provision via either XML or other more up to date system.

Action NEX12/05: Waters Wye (GE) to provide a copy of his list of potential future governmental and market issues to support consideration of future system flexibility requirements.

Action NEX12/06: Xoserve (FC/DG) to consider future data dictionary system documentation and training manual requirements, along with the associated costs of providing these.

Action NEX12/07: Xoserve (FC/DG) to develop a high level Non Functional principles document based around these discussions for consideration at the next meeting.

Action NEX12/08: RWE npower (CB) to seek a view from his npower colleagues on IRR Ref 10.6 and report back at the next meeting.

Action NEX12/09: Xoserve (MD) to investigate what actual data is contained within the C&D (connection and disconnection notices) data set and to consider what issues may be present that relate to a lack of validation of the information.

Action NEX12/10: All parties to consider what is there in the SPA arena that could / would potentially have a DCC impact (i.e. RGMA, referrals, switching issues etc.) and provide their views at the next meeting.

8. Diary Planning

The following meetings are scheduled to take place during January 2012:

Title	Date	Location
Project Nexus Workgroup	10/01/2011	NG Office, 31 Homer Road, Solihull.
Project Nexus Workgroup	24/01/2011	NG Office, 31 Homer Road, Solihull.

Appendix 1

Action Table

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
NEX10/05	24/10/11	5.2.1	Invoicing/Section 8/Table (Items 1 and 2) - Check with SPAA and UK Link for progress and any identified gaps.	Xoserve (FC/MD)	Update provided. Closed
NEX10/09	25/10/11	5.2.2	Supply Point Register/IRR Ref 10.6 - Provide a User view on the potential benefits and risks of multiple licences.	RWE Npower (PR)	Update provided. Closed
NEX11/04	21/11/11	1.2	To obtain an Ofgem view on how best to deliver an impact assessment and provide feedback at the December meeting – <i>now linked to actions NEX12/01 and NEX12/02.</i>	Ofgem (CC)	Update to be provided in due course. Carried Forward
NEX11/05	22/11/11	5.2.1	To publish the AQ & Reconciliation BRDs on the Project Nexus 'Baselined Business Requirements' page on the Joint Office web site once provided by Xoserve.	Joint Office (BF)	Update provided. Closed
NEX11/06	22/11/11	5.2.1	Supply Point Register: To consider what Market Sector Flags maybe required in future, and what if any, new flags would be required.	ALL	Update provided. Closed
NEX11/07	22/11/11	5.2.2	Non-Functional: To provide further clarification on the flexible pricing facility to allow pricing functions to vary between Networks.	National Grid Distribution (CW)	Update to be provided in due course. Carried Forward
NEX11/08	22/11/11	5.2.2	Invoicing: To add a principle in the document regarding standard invoice naming and talk to the Customer department regarding training materials.	Xoserve (FC/MD)	Update provided. Closed
NEX12/01	06/12/11	3.	To consider what industry cost v's benefit questions	All	Update to be provided in

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
			would be appropriate to put before Ofgem for inclusion within the consultation process.		due course.
NEX12/02	06/12/11	3.	To liaise on organisation of an industry workshop to consider the financial (cost) assessments and process efficiency impacts that could then form the basis for developing the type of questions that would seek meaningful responses from Ofgem.	Joint Office (BF) & Ofgem (CC)	Update to be provided in due course.
NEX12/03	06/12/11	5.2.1	Non Functional: To consider (all) transaction volume caps for SOLR etc.	Xoserve (FC/DG)	Update to be provided in due course.
NEX12/04	06/12/11	5.2.1	Non Functional: To document how we would possibly move towards a new flexible (FF) data provision via either XML or other more up to date system.	Xoserve (FC/DG)	Update to be provided in due course.
NEX12/05	06/12/11	5.2.1	To provide a copy of his list of potential future governmental and market issues to support consideration of future system flexibility requirements.	Waters Wye (GE)	Update to be provided in due course.
NEX12/06	06/12/11	5.2.1	Non Functional: To consider future data dictionary system documentation and training manual requirements, along with the associated costs of providing these.	Xoserve (FC/DG)	Update to be provided in due course.
NEX12/07	06/12/11	5.2.1	Non Functional: To develop a high level Non Functional principles document based around these discussions for consideration at the next meeting.	Xoserve (FC/DG)	Update to be provided in due course.
NEX12/08	06/12/11	5.2.2	Supply Point Register: To seek a view from his RWE npower colleagues on IRR Ref 10.6 and report back at	RWE npower (CB)	Update to be provided in due course.

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
			the next meeting.		
NEX12/09	06/12/11	5.2.2	Supply Point Register: To investigate what actual data is contained within the C&D (connection and disconnection notices) data set and to consider what issues may be present that relate to a lack of validation of the information.	Xoserve (MD)	Update to be provided in due course.
NEX12/10	06/12/11	5.2.2	Supply Point Register: To consider what is there in the SPA arena that could / would potentially have a DCC impact (i.e. RGMA, referrals, switching issues etc.) and provide their views at the next meeting.	ALL	Update to be provided in due course.