

Project Nexus Workgroup Minutes
Tuesday 04 November 2014
31 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3LT

Attendees

Les Jenkins (Chair)	(LJ)	Joint Office
Ian Hollington (Secretary)	(IH)	Joint Office
Alex Ross-Shaw*	(ARS)	Northern Gas Networks
Alison Neild	(AN)	Gazprom
Andy Clasper	(AC)	National Grid Gas Distribution
Andy Miller	(AMi)	Xoserve
Brendan Cooper*	(BC)	GDF suez
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Colette Baldwin (Part)	(CB)	E.ON
Elaine Carr	(EC)	Scottish Power
Emma Lyndon	(EL)	Xoserve
Emma Smith	(ES)	Xoserve
Huw Comerford	(HC)	Utilita
James Hardy*	(JHa)	Wingas
James Hill	(JHi)	EDF Energy
James Rigby	(JR)	RWE npower
Jonathan Hooper	JHo	SSE
Jon Dixon* (part)	(JD)	Ofgem
Karen Kennedy	(KK)	Npower
Leigh Chapman	(LC)	First Utility
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	DONG Energy
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE
Michelle Downes	(MD)	Xoserve
Richard Pomroy*	(RP)	Wales and West Utilities
Steve Mulinganie*	(SM)	Gazprom
Steve Nunnington	(SN)	Xoserve
Sue Cropper	(SC)	British Gas

* via teleconference

Copies of all papers are available at: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/nexus/041114

1. Introduction and Status Review

1.1. Minutes

There were no comments on the previous minutes and these were approved.

1.2. Actions

NEX0804: Xoserve (MD) to confirm whether or not, there are any other invoicing legacy (file) formats parties would need to be aware of.

Update: MD confirmed that she would provide a spread-sheet to be included with these minutes when they were published. **Closed**

NEX0901: Xoserve (AMi/MD) to provide portfolios to each shipper of the AQs (SSP and LSP) that were suspended from the AQ process by Xoserve.

Update: AMi confirmed that this had been done along with further information on backstop AQ's. He agreed to write to all concerned with the contact details of who this information had been sent to. **Closed.**

NEX0902: Xoserve (AMi/MD) to provide a profile for an AQ tolerance band with a range of 0 – 75,000 (to assist in assessing the proposed new (inner) tolerance band for 0 – 20,000).

Update: AMi confirmed that this was included in one of the presentations to be given in today's meeting. **Closed**

NEX0903: Xoserve (AMi) to provide an example of how a Class 4 prime with a Class 3 sub meter would actually work with regards to reconciliation.

Update: See item 3.5. **Complete.**

NEX0904: Joint Office (LJ/MB) to place an item on the next DNCFM agenda to highlight (Nexus) concerns to Transporters and seek a response and possible scenario examples.

Update: Undertaken. **Complete.**

NEX0905: Xoserve (MD) to provide a short presentation showing how unidentified gas is treated at nomination and allocation stages.

Update: MD requested this item is carried forward to the December meeting. **Carried Forward.**

NEX1001: Xoserve to produce and circulate a CSEP reconciliation explanation document.

Update: AMi confirmed that this had been done and published on the Joint Office web site. He explained briefly what it covered and where the live document would be kept on the web site. **Closed.**

NEX1002: DESC to consider the potential timing mismatch of WAR Band derivations and the impact on fixed SOQs.

Update: LJ advised that this was discussed at the last DESC meeting, with Fiona Cottam due to provide this forum with further information at their next meeting. **Carried Forward.**

NEX1003: All parties to provide views on the AQ Backstop date options by 21 October 2014.

Update: MD confirmed that some feedback had been received and this was included in one of the presentations due to be given at today's meeting. **Closed**

1.3. Pre Modification Discussions

There were no new items for discussion.

2. Workgroups

2.1. 0473/0473A: Project Nexus – Allocation of Unidentified Gas

(Report to Panel 16 October 2014) – Papers at:

<http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0473>

2.2. 0514: Extending the Daily Metered ‘voluntary’ service to Project Nexus Implementation Date plus six months

(Report to Panel 15 January 2015) – Papers at:
<http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0514>

2.3. 0515S: Resolution timescales for SRVs and USRVs following Project Nexus Implementation

(Report to Panel 15 January 2015) – Papers at:
<http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0515>

3. Issues and topics for discussion

LJ noted the submission of a number of late papers and asked the participants if they were willing to consider them at this meeting. There were no objections.

3.1. AQ Backstop Dates

MD outlined the background and the four options put forward which were: no backstop dates migrated to the new system: the Backstop Date currently applied during the annual AQ Review only is migrated: a Backstop Date is currently applied where an AQ has been revised following a successful Shipper Amendment or as a results of an Xoserve amendment: apply the same Backstop Date to all Supply Meter Points.

She explained the reasons behind the choices and advised that four responses had been received with a mixture of options supported, option 4 receiving the most.

JR explained Npower’s preferred choice which was a fifth option and in his opinion offered better protection to the market from old Backstop reads. KK pointed out that she would like to see sites move onto rolling AQ in the short term and that historical reads should be dealt with through the validation process. SM expressed concern about the effects of erroneous data and there was general agreement on this point.

The workgroup discussed the options and who was responsible for validation with Nexus being a safety net for flagging and correcting inaccurate data. SM made the point that information being input into systems should be subject to Nexus validation and he was thinking of raising a Modification to deal with it.

AMi advised that there was an obligation on Shippers to validate reads before passing them to Xoserve who do not have the capacity to carry out this validation exercise and cannot amend any reads that have already been used.

LJ summed up the discussion saying that we do not have consensus which meant that option 2 (as-is) would have to be used with CW confirming that there were no provisions in UNC concerning the AQ backstop date and therefore this was a process/systems issue. He went on to say that a Modification would be undesirable given that the principles of a backstop date would have to be established before even getting into a solution and this would be protracted and complex. However option 2 can be implemented without a code Modification and that would be the proposal if consensus is not achieved.

The workgroup agreed that this item should be listed on the agenda for the December meeting and MD agreed to republish the options, to take into account the variations discussed to option 4, and the fifth option that had been put forward by Npower for consideration by the participants.

New Action 1101: MD to republish the original options including the variations and the new option discussed on 04 November before the December meeting.

3.2. Meter Read Validation

MD explained the background to this piece of work and the main issues that have been identified which include concerns that the read validation tolerances were not appropriate particularly in regard to Smaller Supply Points.

She went on to discuss the tests that had been carried out explaining that test 2 gave more acceptable results. SC questioned whether the data used for both tests was from the same period. MD answered that it was not but as the reasons for the failures were the same this had not had any effect.

MD outlined the recommendations put forward by Xoserve which were to: allow zero consumption reads to be submitted without a need for an override flag: to lower the Market Breaker upper tolerances, especially for Class 2 as this currently allows a daily read to be accepted that is 7 times the SOQ: validate Class 3 meter points against the AQ not the SOQ: make the "Through the Zero" (TTZ) count mandatory on all read files: reads are validated against the last actual read not an estimated read: override flag not required for meter points with an AQ less than 20,000 kWh, Market Breaker tolerance only. In reply to a question from MJ, MD agreed with SM that these recommendations will take account of low reads and that this level of SOQ will remove the majority of errors. Following further discussion MD agreed to issue an update document regarding the proposed changes via the Joint Office who will advise the Nexus Workgroup members when it has been published

New Action 1102: MD to issue an update document regarding the proposed change via the Joint Office.

In response to a question from KK, AMi explained the AQ breakdown and how the figures were arrived at. These together with the bands proposed were discussed and it was decided that the Shippers representatives would check the cut off point for the lower tolerances band and that MD would update the slide accordingly. MJ and SC thought that another band was required due to the high percentages involved and further granularity being necessary. AMi and MD agreed to give this further consideration and LJ summed up the discussion by asking MD to provide further demonstrable evidence in support of the recommendation and for the Workgroup to come to a consensus at the December meeting.

New Action 1103: MD to revise the slide pack and send to the Joint Office for publication on the December meeting page on the web site and for inclusion on the December agenda.

3.3. Unique Sites

ES outlined the intention of the proposed changes to Unique Sites and which sites are included. She advised that it was planned for all Unique Sites to be recorded on one register and that all would be migrated to UK Link for Nexus Go Live.

SM asked about the logic behind keeping LMN on NTS sites and ES answered that this was due to the existing downstream systems which would cause the Shippers a significant amount of work if they had to be changed.

In response to a question about identifying which sites are telemetered ES advised that in the Unique Sites portfolio telemetered sites will continue to have a logical meter number. She agreed to provide an update on this for inclusion in the minutes.

SM queried the consistency of approach between LMN's on NTS sites and national MPRN's and EX advised that this was under discussion in another forum.

New Action 1104: Xoserve to confirm the outcome of discussions on file format with regard to Transmission sites.

ES then discussed the proposed changes to confirmations and RP asked if all sites that have NExA have been recorded. ES answered that they have and Xoserve hold a list of sites needing referral to NExA.

ES then went on to cover Supply Point Updates and Shared Supply Meter Points explaining how these will be managed differently. The discussion moved on to process walk through's and ES confirmed that these will include information on all of the processes for the benefit of any attendees who may not be familiar with all of them.

Shared and non-shared sites were also discussed along with the process for transferring sites between Shippers and ES confirmed that, if Xoserve received an incorrect notification regarding a shared site, they would process it and rely on the other party objecting to the withdrawal. In reply to a query from SM and SC she advised that up to D-2, cancellation is also an option. SM asked for this to be highlighted in the Unique Sites Process walkthrough.

Finally ES discussed Interconnectors and Transition Requirements with LL asking how long the notification would be. ES advised that this was currently unknown but will be made available.

3.4. Shared Supply Meter Points

SN discussed the number and make up of Unique Sites and advised that it was planned to deal with this via email. He explained the intention is to bring this in line with the faster switching process which he acknowledged will require a modification to be raised. LJ asked if it was ever intended for the scope of the faster switching modification to include Unique Sites. AMi noted that this affected the minimum time allowed, not the maximum and the benefit was that this is how the system works with Code needing to be amended to allow for it.

SN noted the difficulties encountered with current Modifications raised to address this issue and LJ advised discussing this further with the Governance Workgroup due to meet on 05 November.

SN discussed the proposed changes to allow for email to be used and the workgroup debated how the scope may affect existing Modifications under development and the email acceptance validation that would be in place. LJ asked about the controls governing emails that Xoserve send out and SN said that this was something that needed to be looked into.

SN moved on to the Revised SSMP Process and advised that point 3 on slide 6 regarding the deadline for objections is no longer relevant and will not be included.

Under the New Confirmation Process SN advised that any notification under SSMP will be made via email.

3.5. IGT Single Service Provision.

AMi outlined the requirements, the deadlines and the start time from old systems to new and the time needed for cut over. He covered the implications for faster switching, the dates for a change of Shipper event and updates to the Supply Point Register. He noted that there was no opportunity to backdate files and all files from 01 October will be processed and validated against the receipt date of the file.

AMi also advised that events started in the iGT system and ended in UK Link will be migrated with no impact to the event. He also explained the non effective days Xoserve need, including the latest date for sending confirmations. JH asked about taking faster switching into account and CB asked if this had been shared with Ofgem. AMi confirmed that the Authority has already been party to this presentation and as a Modification they would have to approve it. LJ asked if the six non-effective days could be split rather than running consecutively and AMi answered that they could not.

The Workgroup discussed the dates for submitting opening reads, who would create a read if not submitted by 01 October 2015 and how objections, appeals, new connections and asset information updates are handled. AMi agreed to update the presentation to aid clarity and provide further information on the issues that had been raised. He also agreed to give consideration to the Shippers operating normally during the transition period with Xoserve holding the information and inputting it when the new system goes live.

New Action 1105: AMi to update the presentation to aid clarity, provide further information and to give consideration to the Shippers operating normally during the transition period with Xoserve holding the information and inputting it when the new system goes live.

3.6. Adjustment Principles

MD provided an overview of current and proposed principles, which mainly included code rationalisation. KK asked about previous consumption adjustment and MD replied that this needed to be taken away for further consideration.

3.7. Transitional Requirements

When discussing transitional requirements KK asked about the situation where the meter history is listed on the old meter following a meter exchange. MD answered that any suspect reads can be marked and replaced and then reconciled via retrospective functionality. She advised that the retro reconciliation process will be included in the next walk through. In response to a question regarding the date that Shippers can continue to raise RFA/DSQ requests and whether this is up to the cut over period or the go live date, EL advised that this will be resolved in the cut over plan.

3.8. Requirements Log

MD discussed consumption adjustments and that Xoserve would like one principle. SC asked if a Shipper should submit data only for their own period of ownership and MD answered that yes they should but would check if it is to be quoted by volume (cubic metres).

3.9 Business Rules

EC asked for some changes to the Business Rules document. These included Page 13 item 7.1 where she asked when Shippers would be notified. EL advised that Xoserve were not intending to do this but would send a notification for classes 1 and 2.

Page 22, second bullet point should read 6 months, not 64 months, page 13 item 7.3 which covers transition,- MD agreed to check the wording. Finally Page 15 item 7.8, which deals with Shipper transfer - MD to clarify the reference to “no limit”.

4. Any Other Business

AMi confirmed that Xoserve intended to add information in the Shippers portfolio on sites that are telemetered.

5. Diary Planning

Further details of planned meetings are available at: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Diary

Workgroup meetings will take place as follows:

Time/Date	Venue	Workgroup Programme
10:30 Tuesday 09 December	31 Homer Road, Solihull, B91 3LT	AQ Backstop Dates Meter Read Validation Unique Sites Shared Supply Meter Points Adjustment Principles

Action Table

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
NEX0804	11/08/14	3.4	To confirm whether or not, there are any other invoicing legacy (file) formats parties would need to be aware of.	Xoserve (MD)	Closed
NEX0901	09/09/14	3.2	To provide portfolios to each Shipper of the AQs (SSP and LSP) that were suspended from the AQ process by Xoserve.	Xoserve (AM/MD)	Closed
NEX0902	09/09/14	3.3	To provide a profile for an AQ tolerance band with a range of 0 – 75,000 (to assist in assessing the proposed new (inner) tolerance band for 0 – 20,000).	Xoserve (AM/MD)	Closed
NEX0905	09/09/14	3.7	To provide a short presentation showing how unidentified gas is treated at nomination and allocation stages.	Xoserve (MD)	Carried Forward
NEX1001	07/10/14	3.1	Xoserve to produce and circulate a CSEP reconciliation explanation document.	Xoserve (AM)	Closed
NEX1002	07/10/14	3.2	DESC to consider the potential timing mismatch of WAR Band derivations and the impact on fixed SOQs.	DESC	Pending
NEX1003	07/10/14	3.6	All parties to provide views on the AQ Backstop date options by 21 October 2014.	All	Closed
NEX1101	04/11/14	3.1	MD to republish the original options including the variations and the new option discussed on 04 November	Xoserve (MD)	Pending

Action Table

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
			before the December meeting.		
NEX1102	04/11/14	3.2	MD to issue an update document regarding the proposed change via the Joint Office.	Xoserve (MD)	Pending
NEX1003	04/11/14	3.2	MD to revise the slide pack and send to the Joint Office for publication on the December meeting page on the web site and for inclusion on the December agenda.	Xoserve (MD)	Pending
NEX1004	04/11/14	3.3	Xoserve to confirm the outcome of discussions on file format with regard to Transmission sites.	Xoserve	Pending
NEX1105	04/11/14	3.5	New Action 1105: AMi to update the presentation to aid clarity, provide further information and to give consideration to the Shippers operating normally during the transition period with Xoserve holding the information and inputting it when the new system goes live.	Xoserve (AMi)	Pending