

Project Nexus Workgroup Minutes

Tuesday 04 September 2012

at 31 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3LT

Attendees

| | | |
|-----------------------------|-------|----------------------------------|
| Bob Fletcher (Chair) | (BF) | Joint Office of Gas Transporters |
| Mike Berrisford (Secretary) | (MiB) | Joint Office of Gas Transporters |
| Adam Pearce* | (AP) | ESP Pipelines |
| Alan Raper | (AR) | National Grid Distribution |
| Anne Jackson | (AJ) | SSE |
| Andy Miller | (AM) | Xoserve |
| Brendan Murphy | (BM) | Waters Wye Associates |
| Cesar Coelho | (CC) | Ofgem |
| Chris Warner | (CW) | National Grid Distribution |
| Edward Hunter | (EH) | RWE npower |
| Elaine Carr* | (EC) | ScottishPower |
| Gethyn Howard | (GH) | Inexus |
| Jenny Rawlinson* | (JR) | GTC |
| Joanna Ferguson* | (JF) | Northern Gas Networks |
| Katherine Porter | (KP) | EDF Energy |
| Lorna Lewin | (LL) | Dong Energy |
| Linda Whitcroft | (LW) | Xoserve |
| Mark Jones | (MJ) | SSE |
| Mike Payley | (MP) | Xoserve |
| Michele Downes | (MD) | Xoserve |
| Naomi Anderson | (NA) | EDF Energy |
| Sallyann Blackett | (SB) | E.ON UK |
| Sat Kelsi | (SK) | Xoserve |
| Steve Mullinganie | (SM) | Gazprom |
| Tabish Khan | (TK) | British Gas |
| Tim Davis | (TD) | Joint Office of Gas Transporters |

* via teleconference link

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 NEX04/02: National Grid Distribution (CW) to seek a legal view as to whether or not iGT (CSEP) Meter Points should be considered within implementation of a UNC modification.

Update: CW confirmed that a (external) legal view had been obtained and the matter would now be discussed in more detail at the forthcoming iGT modification 039 meeting scheduled to take place on 13 September. He expects to provide an update at the next Project Nexus meeting on 02 October.

Carried Forward

Action NEX06/02: All parties to review the Reconciliation Issues presentation and provide their views on the most appropriate reconciliation

scaling adjustment, market share and transition from RbD to meter point reconciliation approaches and finally the reconciliation invoice creation options.

Update: LW provided an overview of the 'Reconciliation Issues (Action: NEX06/02)' presentation, citing that the Xoserve preference is for 'Option C (2) – Defined 'Pot' post Meter Point Reconciliation Implementation' for which they also recommend basing the solution around a 12 month aggregate rolling pot – those present at the meeting agreed with the proposal.

Moving on to consider the 'Reconciliation Scaling Adjustment – Market Share', MD advised that Xoserve considers the AQ option as being the most robust of the three. LW pointed out that there remains a question over the ultimate accuracy of the 'initial throughput' solution, whilst the 'latest throughput' solution in essence results in a position where we would never truly close-out – those present supported adoption of the AQ option.

Finally, after a brief discussion in which LW pointed out that for product 3 the reads could not be input into the system following any commencement of reconciliation invoice process(es), those present acknowledged the three bullet points noted on the 'Option A – Month +10 Reconciliation Cut Off' slide.

Closed

Action NEX07/01: Xoserve (AM) to notify the Shipper/Supplier community of the presence of the BRDs as a means of kick starting the industry cost / benefits thought processes.

Update: AM advised that a letter to the Shipper/Supplier community had already been published and would now be utilised to notify the rest of the industry about the cost / benefits process.

Closed

Action NEX07/02: Xoserve (MD/MP) with regard to the Non-functional topic Issues presentation to provide a guidance document outlining the current governance and ownership provisions and to also provide a supporting questions matrix for the industry to consider alongside the presentation.

Update: MD advised that more detailed discussion would take place elsewhere in the meeting and as a consequence, in her view all aspects of the action had now been completed. Please refer to item 2.3.1 below.

Closed

Action NEX07/03: All to undertake consideration of the Non-functional topic Issues in time for consideration at the August meeting.

Update: Please refer to item 2.3.1 below.

Closed

Action NEX07/04: Joint Office (BF) to include General Principles on the agenda to consider any/all responses received in line with Action NEX07/03.

Update: BF advised that a new agenda item had been added, as requested.

Closed

Following a brief discussion it was agreed to review the 'Cost and Benefits' sub-group meeting minutes and actions under item 2.3.3 below.

2. Issues and topics for discussion

2.1 High Level Workgroup Issues

2.1.1 iGT Agent Services

Project Nexus iGT Agency Services BRD update

MD advised that the document had now been baselined as version 1.0 and published on the Joint Office web site at:
<http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/nexus/brd>

iGT pre modification consultation update

AM opened by providing a brief overview of the document and the rationale behind its preparation. In essence, it is seeking to align the cost and benefit analysis with the proposed UNC modification(s) and to this end any industry feedback would be welcomed.

Turning attention to Appendix 1 – Cost benefit, AM enquired whether or not anyone had a particular view or concern – at this point none were indicated. He went on to suggest that the document could/would be issued to a wider industry audience sometime towards the end of September.

GH indicated that he is struggling to provide meaningful feedback in the absence of a clearer view around the project costs. Responding, AM advised that the matter would also be discussed in more detail at a forthcoming meeting with the iGT's on 13 September, after which he expects to provide feedback on the outcome at a subsequent Project Nexus meeting – possibly the 02 October meeting.

When asked, those present indicated that they would be happy for any/all cost benefit information to be shared with Xoserve.

In considering the current list, it was suggested that the following items should also be added:

- customer benefit relating to iGT charges;
- benefits associated to customers having access to the whole market, and
- industry wide migration costs.

CC advised that he would have a closer look at the document before discussing Ofgem's perspective with AM in due course. AM advised that the document would be issued once this discussion had taken place.

CW requested additional 'transparency' around nested CSEP's, as in his experience, there are currently many issues in this area. Whilst advising that he believes that the bulk of these issues are 'covered' within the respective BRD's, AM did agree to add some additional clarity around the nested CSEP matter within the document.

When asked how long the industry would be given to respond to the consultation document, AM suggested that the project plan currently indicated that industry consultation would take place between November and January – a total of 3 months. However, he would support inclusion of an interim review meeting, if this were to be deemed necessary. SM enquired whether the intention is to align both the UNC and iGT modification consultation periods to which AM responded by indicating that he was unsure at this time as to whether or not the two processes would actually align in practise. CW added that in his opinion, and subject to no issues being raised at the forthcoming iGT modification 039 meeting, it may be possible to align the two processes and furthermore, he believes that we may be in a

position to beat the current predicted timescales. However, he remains uncertain that the draft UNC modification(s) would/could be ready in time for submission to the September UNC Panel for consideration.

In ascertaining why there could be differences between the UNC and iGT modification (consultation) process timelines, AM explained that the main differences relate to their respective governance arrangements and whilst he is not anticipating an iGT modification decision from Ofgem before April 2013, he would/could envisage provision of a 'minded to' indication so long as the cost benefit provisions 'match' Ofgem's requirements.

AM advised that Xoserve is currently working on the functionality release requirements – it is now looking increasingly likely that the iGT functionality would either be incorporated in the first instance, or at the end of the delivery process, but certainly not in any of the middle phases, although the actual (detailed) scheduling has yet to be decided.

Concerns relating to both the potential cost implications associated with any changes to the potential release schedules and the perceived risks in moving away from the current and broadly similar Code and iGT site approach, especially with regard to rolling AQ expectations, were voiced by several parties. SM suggested that additional clarity around the Project Nexus delivery assumptions and requirements would be beneficial, although he still firmly believes that the project should be looking to deliver both GT and iGT system functionality at the same time. Supporting this view, AJ indicated that she would not wish to see development of the UNC modification(s) potentially delaying delivery of iGT services functionality. Responding, MD voiced her concern around potential multiple process issues associated with up front (1st phase rollout) delivery of the iGT services functionality before reminding those present that the functionality packaging approach would be presented for discussion in due course. Thereafter, AM agreed to add some additional assumptions around the iGT services functionality delivery within appendix 1 to ensure that parties are able to identify their potential costs (based around either a first or last delivery assumption). SM then voiced additional concerns around the drop dead date should iGT services functionality be delivered in the first phase as this would need careful management to avoid inadvertently disadvantaging some iGT parties in terms of their potential market benefits. GH remained of the view that rolling out the iGT services functionality early in the delivery process made sense as it has the potential to reduce the iGT's costs although he did acknowledge that consideration of the (GT/iGT) licence aspects would be key to progressing matters. AM suggested that this level of detailed debate should form part of the pre-consultation process. However, he remains of the view that the pre-consultation process would hopefully support the smooth flow of any UNC modification(s) through the process, which would then have a reciprocal benefit on the respective iGT side of things.

In closing, two new actions were assigned to their respective owners, the first being on Ofgem (CC) to review the Project Nexus iGT Agency Services GT UNC and iGT UNC pre-modification consultation document with a view to providing Ofgem feedback (especially cost and benefit aspects) to Xoserve and thereafter the

Project Nexus Workgroup in due course, and the second on National Grid Distribution (CW) to provide a progress update on the 13 September iGT 039 meeting discussions and outcomes at the 02 October Project Nexus meeting.

2.1.2 General Principles

When asked, MD confirmed that the addition of this agenda item was to ensure that further information around the Supply Point Registration Topic is forthcoming in due course. An update can be expected at the 02 October meeting.

2.1.3 Indicative Project Plan

MD explained that no significant changes had been made to the plan since the last presentation.

2.2 Transitional Arrangements

No new items or issues to consider.

2.3 New Issues

2.3.1 Non Functional Updates

PN UNC - NFR presentation

SK provided a brief overview of the presentation.

Opening discussions on the proposed 'Real Time processing of Data' amendments, SM suggested that statement 8.1.2 should be retained because it provides for the provision of a suitable level of granular information required to support the introduction of SMART metering – it was agreed to keep a close watching brief on this.

Looking at statement 8.4.2, a detailed discussion took place around the true meaning of the phrase 'a working day' and whether or not the underlying principle remains suitable in this context. One suggestion was to change the phrase to 'Business Days' and thereafter make all days a business day. CW suggested that should the term be changed as suggested, the UNC would also need to be amended to ensure that the appropriate requirements are considered. At the same time, it was also recognised that a definition for 'Non Working Days' would still be required under Code for the foreseeable future. In the end it was agreed that further detailed consideration would be required during the development of the business rules.

A true consensus could not be reached at this time and consideration of whether or not 'within 24 hours of receipt' would be more suitable was proposed – it was suggested that this might impact upon the 'Gas Day'. It was agreed that Xoserve (SK) and National Grid Distribution (CW) should investigate the UNC definition requirements and impacts associated with statement 8.4.2 and thereafter, the Project Nexus Workgroup should consider the recommendations made as a result of their findings.

In considering statement 8.4.3, it was proposed that we keep the statement as-is for the time being.

Moving on to look at the two underlying principles for 'Online Updates to Single Data Items' (single data item change & single data item bulk change), it was proposed that both principles should remain in place especially for system design purposes. It was also recognised that whatever solution goes forward, it should not encourage

development of discriminatory processes or behaviours. SM suggested that the workgroup would also need to consider DCC flag requirements going forward. When asked if the (proposed) £20 million project cost included solutions covering either principle, AM confirmed this to be the case and that iGT aspects are also included.

Moving on to consider the 'Analysis and Report of Data', MP advised that the proposals are not seeking to exclude parties that may not have 'full' technical capabilities. Asked whether or not the common platform referred to in statement 8.1.4 would be achieved through the use of business tools, SK advised that the actual format has yet to be decided. MP confirmed that a decision over the type of reporting feature (either a user created, or default pre-defined suite of reports) would be taken once the architecture people had looked into it. When asked, parties indicated that they were happy with the proposals.

In considering the 'Standard File Transfer Mechanism', MP advised that whilst no clear view on which functionality (csv or xml) was superior, the consensus was that csv should be retained going forward to support legacy requirements. Asked if the cost of an xml based solution was included within the proposed £20 million cost figure, AM confirmed that it was not, and as a consequence would be considered as an extra cost item. SK confirmed that Xoserve would be asking their 'technical partners' to consider provision of both functionalities going forward, including an indication of how much it would cost to provide xml.

Looking at the 'Access to Historic Data' aspects, SM enquired at what point in time is the data deemed to be historic in nature (moving from being live information to being archive information - after 1 year, or longer perhaps) as he sees this as being a key issue. He also questioned whether or not the intention is to keep all data, or delete 'out of date' data. In responding, AM advised that currently Xoserve retains all data, with some elements migrating into the archive at different times and is now considering whether an actual archive would be needed going forward – in short, the definition of 'historic data' depends upon the type of data itself. When asked, parties indicated that they would support splitting data into operational and non-operational categories.

SK noted that (subject to statutory requirements) the issue is not just related to the storage of data, but also retrieval and access and with this in mind Xoserve would be undertaking further investigatory work. It was suggested that examining the back billing and statutory requirements could provide a useful guide to suitable retrieval requirements (4 – 5 years etc.).

Moving on to look at the 'Documentation Governance' proposals, it was suggested that under current Code governance arrangements management of the documentation remains with their respective owners. It was noted that improvements in access to, and the publication of, the UKLink Manual would prove beneficial. Additionally, MP voiced his concern around the data dictionary requirements. In the end it was agreed to keep a watching brief on the documentation governance matter.

Concluding, Xoserve (SK) agreed to a new action to provide some indicative costs based on the proposals within the presentation.

2.3.2 Retrospective Updates

MD advised that this matter had been considered at a previous meeting and at this time there are no further updates.

2.3.3 Costs and Benefit Analysis Subgroup Update

Project Nexus (Costs and Benefits) 17 August 2012 Minutes review

The minutes of the meeting were accepted, before moving on to consider the outstanding action items as follows:

Action NEX08/01: Xoserve (AM) to review the ROM model and advise if it can be refined to reduce the level of cost error for Project Nexus requirements.

Update: AM advised that he did not expect this information to be available until around the middle of 2013.

TD suggested that a previous information granularity request related more to the provision of types of cost (cost headings) rather than the provision of specific (AQ) solutions etc. He went on to advise that at a previous sub-group meeting, the adoption of a high/medium/low cost approach was discussed – this has now been incorporated into the ‘Costs and benefits Information Request Response’ document.

Asked whether or not a ROM for Project Nexus actually exists, AM confirmed that one does not and the proposed £20 million cost figure was derived at following extensive Xoserve debate on the matter.

CC advised that Ofgem is expecting a more granular breakdown of the proposed £20 million project cost figure – opinions remained divided with some parties questioned the true value of doing so.

Closed

Action NEX08/02: Ofgem (AW) to consider the additional information required to support evidence for costs and define appropriate questions for circulation.

Update: SM believes that this action is looking more at seeking to identify a high v's low cost breakdown and thereafter, what level of information Ofgem require to make an informed decision.

CC advised that whilst he would need to give the matter some thought before formally responding, he also needs to consider how best to understand the high level costs and also how these relate to incremental costs. He firmly believes that some level of cost / benefit justification would be required and would provide an indication of what level of granularity was required in due course.

Referring back to discussions on item 2.1.1 above and specifically the Appendix 1 table within the ‘Project Nexus iGT Agency Services GT UNC and iGT UNC modifications consultation’ document, CC believes that the workgroup may also need to consider what category of costs should be included within the table, as he does not think that simply populating the information in the two tables would be sufficient – it is the underlying assumptions and justifications behind the figures (including being in a position to identify the differing costs for various parties) that are of paramount importance in any decision making exercise. Some parties remain uncertain as to what Ofgem are actually seeking and believe that aligning Ofgems aspirations with parties’ ability to provide a suitable level of granular information is crucial. Furthermore, any guidance from Ofgem on how to determine the high and low cost analysis would be welcomed.

CC agreed to discuss the matter with his colleagues especially the various documentation involved (i.e. the Project Nexus iGT Agency Services GT UNC and iGT UNC modifications consultation & Costs and benefits Information Request Response documents) with a view to providing an update at the next meeting. He also went on to point out that accepting that there may be 'links' to the iGT's he sees the (detailed) iGT requirements as standing separately to the Project Nexus requirements.

Carried Forward

Action NEX08/03: All parties to review the questions raised by Ofgem and provide comments and clarify if more specific questions should be asked.

Update: BF advised that these would be provided in due course.

Carried Forward

Action NEX08/04: ICoSS (GE) to provide details of cost headings used to respond to Ofgem regarding smart metering implementation costs.

Update: SM advised that he expected to discuss this action in more detail with GE soon and would provide an update in due course.

Carried Forward

Action NEX08/05: Xoserve (AM) & ICoSS (RS) to provide estimate of potential change in settlement error for subsequent pricing by RS.

Update: AM advised that an estimate was being worked on and is expected to be ready by the end of October.

Carried Forward

Costs and benefits Information Request Response document

TD provided a brief overview of the rationale behind the document, focusing attention of the changes made to the document since the last sub-group meeting.

TD went on to suggest that with regard to costs and benefits analysis, the key issue is related to the potential level of benefits and how you quantify these.

Focusing on the 'Shipper / Transporter / Agency Proforma' on page 3, CC indicated that he would need to consider what level of supporting evidence would be deemed suitable and to do this he needs to better understand the scenarios, although he does believe it is for the workgroup to decide if the justification for the proposed £20 million project cost figure is suitable. TD responded by suggesting that interested parties are more concerned that the £20 million is spent efficiently being less concerned about being able to justify the figure to the nth degree. CW felt that the actual modification consultation process would help to tease out costs, benefit and justification information.

When asked, parties indicated that they are happy with the current wording in the document.

Draft GT and iGT UNC modification discussion

Opening discussions, CW advised that in his view there would/could be up to 5 distinctly separate modifications being raised, as follows:

- settlement, reconciliation, allocation and AQ;
- retrospective updates;
- non functional (UKL Manual);
- demand estimation, and
- iGT single service provision

CW went on to advise that work is underway on the main draft modifications and in his view we would need to break out any iGT elements from the proposed £20 million cost figure to ensure that we have an effective comparison. TD felt that based on the Xoserve quoted figures for the phased modular cost breakdowns it may not be possible to extract the iGT elements especially if rollout of the iGT functionality is to be deferred. However, this has to be tempered with an assumption that estimates may not reflect the actual costs. He also pointed out that a cost and benefit (inc. justifications) would be needed for each and every modification.

During detailed discussions, opinions remained divided over the benefit of having either a single 'global' modification or several 'targeted' modifications as is being proposed – some favouring a single packaged approach whilst others favour a more diversified approach. Concerns were voiced around how a packaged modification would impact upon any cost benefit justifications and the complexity involved in trying to develop a single all encapsulating modification, especially subsequent development of any business rules and legal text. Furthermore, some parties remained concerned that they would be unable to support certain elements associated to retrospective updates (i.e. the potential cost risks involved and a potential to inadvertently promote inappropriate behaviours), especially where these would be included within an all encompassing (packaged) modification. Additionally it was felt by some that identifying appropriate relevant objectives could prove difficult. To this end, it was suggested that further consideration of the merits of retaining and incorporating retrospective updates within the project would be needed – a new action was assigned to all parties to consider the relevance of retaining retrospective updates.

AM also pointed out that retrospective updates should not be seen as providing a suitable mechanism for resolving large errors.

Culminating discussions, it was agreed to re-open discussion of the retrospective updates work area at the 02 October workgroup meeting whilst CW would provide a draft UNC Settlement modification for consideration at the same meeting. Additionally, and subject to the outcome of the 13 September iGT 039 meeting, CW would look to provide a draft iGT modification for consideration also.

3. Workgroup Approach and Plan

Topic Workgroup Timeline Tracking

Consideration deferred until the next meeting.

Project Nexus Workplan

AM explained that the plan is outlined up to April 2013 having been briefly discussed at the 17 August meeting.

CC suggested that the plan should clearly identify deliverables and what is to be discussed in defining these, along with understanding agenda requirements for

any meetings. In agreeing to incorporate these requests within the plan, AM also pointed out that various demand allocation requirements are being discussed within DESC.

AM went on to suggest that there maybe merit in holding a mid term consultation review meeting sometime in January 2013 to assess progress – a view supported by those present.

When asked, AM confirmed that as far as the plan is concerned, the reference to iGT aspects are to those only relating to the UNC and exclude the iGT modification 039 considerations. However, it should be noted that the iGTs are able to feed into the UNC consultation process.

Project Nexus Workgroup Outstanding Areas Log

Consideration deferred until the next meeting.

4. Any Other Business

Monthly PN UNC Meetings for 2013

Following a brief discussion it was agreed that a new action should be placed on Xoserve (MD) to plan some 2013 Project Nexus review meetings.

5. Workgroup Process

5.1 Agree actions to be completed ahead of the next meeting

The following new actions were discussed and assigned:

New Action NEX09/01: Ofgem (CC) to review the Project Nexus iGT Agency Services GT UNC and iGT UNC modifications consultation document with a view to providing Ofgem feedback (especially cost and benefit aspects) to Xoserve and thereafter the Nexus Workgroup in due course.

New Action NEX09/02: National Grid Distribution (CW) to provide a progress update on the 13 September iGT 039 meeting discussions and outcomes at the 02 October Nexus meeting.

New Action NEX09/03: Xoserve (SK) & National Grid Distribution (CW) to investigate the UNC definition requirements and impacts associated with statement 8.4.2 and provide a view on a suitable recommendation.

New Action NEX09/04: All parties to consider the recommendations put forward as a result of Action NEX09/03 deliberations.

New Action NEX09/05: Xoserve (SK) to provide some additional indicative cost predictions based around the proposals (inc xml functionality provision) contained within the ‘PN UNC – NFR Update’ presentation.

New Action NEX09/06: All parties to review the appropriateness of retaining inclusion of retrospective updates functionality within delivery of Project Nexus (i.e. the viability of the BRD), in time for consideration at the 02 October workgroup meeting.

New Action NEX09/07: Xoserve (MD) to plan some 2013 Project Nexus review meetings.

6. Diary Planning

The following meetings are scheduled to take place:

| Title | Date | Location |
|-------|------|----------|
|-------|------|----------|

| | | |
|-------------------------|------------|---|
| Project Nexus Workgroup | 02/10/2012 | National Grid, 31 Homer Road, Solihull, West Midlands. B91 3LT or teleconference. |
|-------------------------|------------|---|

Action Table

| Action Ref | Meeting Date | Minute Ref | Action | Owner | Status Update |
|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--|---------------------------------|--|
| NEX04/02 | 03/04/12 | 4.2.4 | To seek a legal view as to whether or not iGT (CSEP) Meter Points should be considered within implementation of a UNC modification. | National Grid Distribution (CW) | Update to be provided in due course. Carried Forward |
| NEX06/02 | 13/06/12 | 2.4 | To review the Reconciliation Issues presentation and provide their views on the most appropriate reconciliation scaling adjustment, market share and transition from RbD to meter point reconciliation approaches and finally the reconciliation invoice creation options. | All | Update provided. Closed |
| NEX07/01 | 03/07/12 | 2.2 | To notify the Shipper/Supplier community of the presence of the BRDs as a means of kick starting the industry cost / benefits thought processes. | Xoserve (AM) | Update provided. Closed |
| NEX07/02 | 03/07/12 | 2.4 | With regard to the Non-functional topic Issues presentation to provide a guidance document outlining the current governance and ownership provisions and to also provide a supporting questions matrix for the industry to consider alongside the presentation. | Xoserve (MD/MP) | Update provided. Closed |
| NEX07/03 | 03/07/12 | 2.4 | To undertake consideration of the Non-functional topic Issues in time for consideration at the August meeting. | All | Update provided. Closed |
| NEX07/04 | 03/07/12 | 2.4 | To include General Principles on the agenda to consider any/all responses received in line with Action NEX07/03. | Joint Office (BF) | Update provided. Closed |

| Action Ref | Meeting Date | Minute Ref | Action | Owner | Status Update |
|------------|--------------|------------|---|--|--------------------------------------|
| NEX09/01 | 04/09/12 | 2.1.1 | To review the Project Nexus iGT Agency Services GT UNC and iGT UNC modifications consultation document with a view to providing Ofgem feedback (especially cost and benefit aspects) to Xoserve and thereafter the Project Nexus Workgroup in due course. | Ofgem (CC) | Update to be provided in due course. |
| NEX09/02 | 04/09/12 | 2.1.1 | To provide a progress update on the 13 September iGT 039 meeting discussions and outcomes at the 02 October Project Nexus meeting. | National Grid Distribution (CW) | Update to be provided in due course. |
| NEX09/03 | 04/09/12 | 2.3.1 | To investigate the UNC definition requirements and impacts associated with statement 8.4.2 and provide a view on a suitable recommendation. | Xoserve (SK) & National Grid Distribution (CW) | Update to be provided in due course. |
| NEX09/04 | 04/09/12 | 2.3.1 | To consider the recommendations put forward as a result of Action NEX09/03 deliberations. | All | Update to be provided in due course. |
| NEX09/05 | 04/09/12 | 2.3.1 | To provide some additional indicative cost predictions based around the proposals (inc xml functionality provision) contained within the 'PN UNC – NFR Update' presentation. | Xoserve (SK) | Update to be provided in due course. |
| NEX09/06 | 04/09/12 | 2.3.3 | To review the appropriateness of retaining inclusion of retrospective updates functionality within delivery of Project Nexus (i.e. the viability of the BRD), in time for consideration at the 02 October workgroup meeting. | All | Update to be provided in due course. |
| NEX09/07 | 04/09/12 | 4. | To look to plan some 2013 Project Nexus review meetings. | Xoserve (MD) | Update to be provided in due course. |