

Project Nexus Workgroup Minutes
Tuesday 10 January 2012
31 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3LT

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Lorna Dupont (Secretary)	(LD)	Joint Office
Alan Raper	(AR)	National Grid Distribution
Andy Miller	(AM)	Xoserve
Brian Durber	(BD)	E.ON UK
Chris Booton	(CB)	RWE npower
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Dave King	(DK)	Xoserve
David Godwin	(DG)	Xoserve
Edward Coleman	(EC)	E.ON UK
Elaine Carr	(EC1)	ScottishPower
Fiona Cottam	(FC)	Xoserve
Gethyn Howard*	(GH)	Inexus
Imtiaz Kayani	(IK)	E.ON UK
Joanna Ferguson	(JF)	Northern Gas Networks
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE
Michele Downes	(MD)	Xoserve
Peter Thompson	(PT)	Customer Representative
Sean M ^c Goldrick	(SMc)	National Grid NTS
Simon Trivella	(ST)	Wales & West Utilities
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	Gazprom
Steve Nunnington	(SN)	Xoserve
Zoe Murphy	(ZM)	RWE npower

*via teleconference

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 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: Ofgem representative not present.

Carried Forward

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: Covered under 5.2.4, below.

Closed

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

Update: No update available.

Carried Forward

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.

Update: No update available.

Carried Forward

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

Update: Covered under 5.2.4, below.

Closed

Action NEX12/04: Non-Functional: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.

Update: Covered under 5.2.4, below.

Closed

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.

Update: FC reported that a confidential response had been received.**Closed**

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.

Update: DG advised this was included in the Principles document (section 8.8).

Closed

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.

Update: Completed.

Closed

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.

Update: Confirmed requirement no longer valid.

Closed

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.

Update: Discussed under 5.2.2.

Closed

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.

Update: Considered under 5.2.2.

Closed

2. Modification Workgroups

2.1 0380 – Periodic Annual Quantity calculation

(Report to Panel 15 March 2012.) Consideration deferred.

2.2 0377 – Use of Daily Meter Reads

(Report to Panel 15 March 2012.) Consideration deferred.

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

(Report to Panel 15 March 2012.) Consideration deferred.

2.4 0357 – Enhanced Supply Point Administration Process

(Report to Panel 15 March 2012.) Consideration deferred.

BF drew attention to the number of Workgroups outstanding (see above) and due to make their reports to Panel on 15 March 2012, and noted that no withdrawal notices had been received to date.

CW indicated that National Grid Distribution would be happy to raise/progress any Mods that were required and offered an “all inclusive service”.

3. Workgroup Approach and Plan

3.1 Provision of iGT Agent Services

AM gave a brief presentation, outlining the background and illustrating the scope of the provision of the single interface for Shippers.

The Workgroup supported this approach.

SMc questioned if a risk existed in relation to the separate governances that existed such that Xoserve would be likely to encounter issues of prioritisation. AM responded that the provision of common services would entail changes being made to the UNC and the iGT UNC. ST added that the iGT 039 group was looking at reducing/removing areas that would be affected by dual governance; relevant areas of the iGT UNC could be stripped out and point to the appropriate part of the UNC. ST did not anticipate any significant delay to making the necessary changes and it was not believed that contingency arrangements needed to be considered.

The analysis on the seven existing Business Requirements Documents (BRDs) would take place in parallel with this work, but the fuller picture will not be available until the end of the iGT work is reached.

It will not hold up the consultation process.

The Workgroup agreed that the services, as indicated in the scope, should be provided by a common service provider and that an eighth BRD associated with the provision of iGT Agency Services should be developed.

A more detailed plan will be brought to the next PN UNC Workgroup.

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 Invoicing

PN UNC Workgroup Invoicing presentation

MD provided an overview of the presentation.

On reviewing the consultation responses, CW provided comments in relation to 8.4 – Pricing Module, which could be added to the main document. Flexibility was the key, with the invoice based on flexible charges. JF suggested that an in-depth discussion at DNCFM with the Charging Managers would be beneficial

It was agreed by the Workgroup that following the inclusion of an appropriate principle to cover the flexibility of the DN charging structure, the business principles document could now be baselined and published.

5.2.2 Supply Point Register including views on SPA Impacts & Connection and Disconnection (C & D Store) Considerations

PN UNC Workgroup Supply Point Register presentation

MD provided an overview of the presentation.

Reviewing the consultation responses, MD confirmed that RWE npower had agreed that 10.6 could be closed. No further comments had been received since the last meeting.

BD sought a view from the Transporters on the amalgamation of C&D data into one database for increased visibility and ease of access. Xoserve could include a principle to cover this. CW believed it required thought as to what should be included and how to do it. SN suggested that access could be given to the Shipper that supplies the MPRN, but pointed out that the accuracy of the data should not be relied on to drive any process.

It was agreed by the Workgroup that following the inclusion of an appropriate principle to cover the above, the Business Principles document could now be baselined and published.

5.2.3 Retrospective Updates

Project Nexus Workgroup – Retrospective Updates presentation

MD provided a brief overview of the presentation.

Reviewing the list of business issues raised from the IRR consultation MD clarified those issues that had now been included and those requiring further review and consideration.

Review of Process Maps

a) NXTB RETR – Manage Retrospective Data Change

DG described the process steps and guided the Workgroup through the illustrated map.

There was a brief discussion relating to clarification of audit trails and the closing of loops where, following a site visit, the GT has identified the asset data held is incorrect. It was agreed that a Shipper needs to support the resolution of any problem discovered and should provide a reason if it believed that no action was required. A response from the Shipper, to close the loop for the GT was required.

It was suggested that standards of service or timescales should be required for responses and that sufficient time should be allowed for a Shipper to carry out an investigation.

Acceptance of batch files was discussed. Shippers believed that a mechanism was required to facilitate both current and new interfaces; a cost/benefit analysis may also be required.

Amendments will be made to the process map and the BRD in light of comments received.

b) NXTB RETR – Manage Retrospective Read Replacement

DG described the process steps and guided the Workgroup through the illustrated map.

The process was briefly reviewed and amendments will be made to the process map and the BRD in light of comments received.

Updated Retro-Updates Scenarios

FC gave a presentation on four different scenarios, which had been updated in response to a request made at the last meeting.

Scenario 1A: There was a lengthy discussion on whether information received from Shipper A should be notified by Xoserve to Shipper B. DG pointed out that there was a danger of movement away from the formerly agreed principle that Shipper A does not notify updates to Shipper B, and questioned whether Shippers were now requiring a flow from Shipper A via Xoserve to Shipper B so that Shipper B could take action if it deemed appropriate. PT pointed out that Xoserve's interests were best served by having accurate and appropriate data and systems must facilitate this. FC reminded that if no consensus was reached then the status quo would remain in place. DG pointed out that using Xoserve to facilitate this would attract more cost and if the flow were agreed then updates would have to be formulated to facilitate this.

Action NEX01/01: Updated Retro-Updates Scenarios – Scenario 1A: Shippers to consult internally on this flow through Xoserve's systems (Shipper A to Shipper B to Shipper A) and provide a view on whether such flows were required.

Scenario 1B: This was reviewed and discussed; no extra requirements were identified.

Scenarios 2A, 2B, 2C and 2D were reviewed; no extra requirements were identified.

Scenarios 3A and 3B were briefly reviewed and a similar action was agreed as for Scenario 1A above.

Action NEX01/02: Updated Retro-Updates Scenarios – Scenario 3A: Shippers to consult internally on this flow through Xoserve’s systems (Shipper A to Shipper B to Shipper A) and provide a view on whether such flows were required.

Scenarios 4A and 4B were briefly reviewed. FC confirmed that the current requirement is that nothing that Shipper A can do would affect the billing position of subsequent Shippers.

Supporting Summary Document for BRD

MD advised that an additional column/field had been included, headed ‘BRD Section’ which will contain the detail for each data item/scenario.

Business Requirements Definition – Retrospective Updates

The BRD was briefly reviewed and MD urged members to read and review this BRD in more detail.

Page 10: Section 6.2 Assumptions – Xoserve to review batch/web and clarify wording at 6.2.9, eg ‘provide valid information/data’.

Page 11: Section 6.4 Risks/Issues – MD pointed out that there was only one entry here.

MD will update the BRD following today’s discussions and provide a new version.

FC pointed out that the last meeting was to be held on 24 January 2012 and this work needed to be finished – was there a need to schedule a further meeting, bearing in mind not many comments had been received.

BD pointed out that there were some outstanding questions, and suggested that MD collate these onto a slide for review/discussion. The Joint Office could publish it on the web (under the 24 Jan meeting date) and write out inviting comment.

Action NEX01/03: Retrospective Updates - Collate outstanding questions onto a slide for review/discussion and provide to Joint Office; Joint Office to publish on web and invite comment.

5.2.4 Non Functional

PN UNC Workgroup Non Functional topic presentation

MD provided a brief overview of the presentation.

DG introduced DK who was attending in order to gather more ideas of Shippers’ requirements. The objectives were to try and clarify the particular underlying business issue and establish an idea of its level of its criticality (high, medium, low). DG pointed out that anything assigned as ‘low’ priority may not get addressed in detail initially.

Business Principles for Non Functional Requirements

The review commenced at *8.1 Data Access*. Prioritisation was discussed and Shippers indicated their requirements for Real Time Data were for AQ and SOQ for Real Time quotes (AQ being the most important) for Products 1, 2, 3 and 4.

MJ commented that the difference between Real Time and D+1 is very little.

DG observed that the assumption was that in the future more frequent updates would be available. Business examples were required to illustrate why certain functionality was needed, and to get a flavour as to what is most important and critical to Shippers. Shippers indicated that everything was cost driven, and there was a suggestion that all could be signalled as Medium priority.

Reviewing *8.1.5*, DK asked what was meant by 'audit trail' in this context. SM indicated that a Shipper might need the data to be accessible in cases of fraudulent behaviour, ie a log of everything a user does and where the user makes a change. DK responded that this could mean all or nothing, or specific items/actions, and would like a degree of clarity on this aspect from Shippers. Did they want a record of what activities their staff members were carrying out on a service provider's system, ie a detailed record of a user's activities/views and/or specific changes actioned by the user?

Action NEX01/04: Business Principles for Non Functional Requirements 8.1.5 - Shippers to establish what data they want audited and what sort of tracking they want done to support an audit trail.

Reviewing *8.1.8*, it was questioned what data items would Shippers want to change. An example was the correction factor, and Shippers believed that anything they were responsible for should be capable of being updated individually. DG suggested removing the words 'on line'.

8.2 Data Transfer – The principles were discussed. SM commented that .csv is a legacy mechanism and .xml is to be preferred as the way forward. Continued support of legacy file mechanisms would be expected, as organisations will migrate at different speeds.

DK sought to clarify expectations. Shippers indicated it would be individually customer defined, bearing in mind that customers have said they did not want any changes to file flows. DK pointed out that re-engineering of the processes might inevitably result in file flow changes.

ZM observed that there was a need to know what DECC are doing and what they intend to use for DCC data transfers – they are probably not going to be using a legacy system. SM agreed that a view should be taken of the industry interactive landscape as a whole so that a better idea could be obtained on the level of integration that needed to exist to pass data between relevant parties. DG concluded that this would be included as a principle in the BRD.

8.2.3 and 8.2.5 – DK questioned whether parallel capabilities were required for every single file, and were these two requirements mutually exclusive. Should Xoserve and Shippers be able to transfer

via ftp? The review of 8.2.5 led to a request for the capability to do a bulk update under 8.1.8.

8.3 Data Custodian/Validation – It was agreed to reference to iGT issues in the iGT BRD, and remove reference from this document.

8.4 Data Update Lead Time – Reviewing 8.4.3, DK questioned the definition of ‘immediately’. BD observed that Ofgem had aspirations to achieve Real Time transfers. EU legislation refers to days, ie calendar days. SM believed that processing should be done immediately on receipt. EU pressures are likely to force moves to reducing transfer times even further, potentially as a 24/7 operation.

8.5 Data Retention – SM pointed out that the Statute of Limitations should be borne in mind, and a legal view may be required. It was a valid principle, and required more thought in respect of potential permutations.

8.9 Areas not yet considered – It was suggested that Shippers take these away to consider any principles or requirements they might now have in these areas that were not apparent in the IRR.

8.9.2 Numbers and peaks of transactions - This was discussed in greater depth. To achieve an even workflow would present one cost, to deal with a peak on the last day would be more costly. Should the objective be to smooth out across a period of be able to cope with ‘all on the last day’ peak volumes? An idea of some sort of parameters would be useful as a starting point.

Different products will have different delivery date profiles. FC pointed out that Product 3 could present more of a challenge – potentially all submissions would be made on the last possible day for use in the next month’s billing. It was acknowledged that Shippers were likely to follow a commercial approach to when and what was submitted and in what volume.

DG suggested there were a number of options that would have an impact on cost:

- A need to cater for a worst case peak at the end of a submission window
- Potential allocation of a defined submission slot to each Shipper - this may disadvantage some parties?
- Impacts of potential volumes on processing
- Drivers for submission patterns, eg AQ timetable
- Will all parties have the same capability to make their submissions in one go and submit potentially large volumes
- The availability of a greater degree of granularity may lead parties to identify that particular patterns of use may offer commercial advantage and will seek to use the systems to achieve that.

SM observed that smart meters give greater granularity and windows will become smaller and smaller. Volumes may even out as data accuracy improves and initial product switching settles down. The smart metering programme may indicate the volume expected. Scalability was an important consideration and the system should be able to manage this as appropriate.

DK questioned what sort of expectation was attached to the requirement to ‘process immediately’ – within an hour? Within a day?

FC suggested there might be a split with a peak on Day 09 to hit Day 10, and also at the end of each month. May be a solution that would require submission by a certain date? PT pointed out that Shippers would already know/be able to calculate what their AQ was because they will have been accumulating readings over the previous 30 days. The deadline of 10 days was not hard and fast – Shippers can derive their own AQ.

8.9.8 – DK pointed out that in the absence of any feedback it would be consistent with the new IAD and other products across Xoserve.

Action NEX01/05: Business Principles for Non Functional Requirements: 8.9 Areas not yet considered – Shippers to review these points internally in more detail and feedback views on inclusion/exclusion.

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. Any Other Business

None raised.

7. Workgroup Process

7.1 Agree actions to be completed ahead of the next meeting

The following new actions were discussed and assigned:

Action NEX01/01: Updated Retro-Updates Scenarios – Scenario 1A: Shippers to consult internally on this flow through Xoserve’s systems (Shipper A to Shipper B to Shipper A) and provide a view on whether such flows were required.

Action NEX01/02: Updated Retro-Updates Scenarios – Scenario 3A: Shippers to consult internally on this flow through Xoserve’s systems (Shipper A to Shipper B to Shipper A) and provide a view on whether such flows were required.

Action NEX01/03: Retrospective Updates - Collate outstanding questions onto a slide for review/discussion and provide to Joint Office; Joint Office to publish on web and invite comment.

Action NEX01/04: Business Principles for Non Functional Requirements 8.1.5 - Shippers to establish what data they want audited and what sort of tracking they want done to support an audit trail.

Action NEX01/05: Business Principles for Non Functional Requirements: 8.9 Areas not yet considered – Shippers to review these points internally in more detail and feedback views on inclusion/exclusion.

It was agreed to cover the following topics at the next meeting on 24 January 2012: iGT BRD, Retrospective Updates and Non Functional.

MD urged those present to review the latest version of Retrospective Updates & Non Functional BRD in advance of the next meeting so that these could then be agreed and formally approved at the next meeting.

8. Diary Planning

The following meetings are scheduled to take place:

Title	Date	Location
Project Nexus Workgroup	24/01/2012	NG Office, 31 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3LT
Project Nexus Workgroup	07/02/2012	Teleconference

Action Table

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
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
NEX11/07	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)	Closed
NEX12/01	06/12/11	3.	To consider what industry cost v's benefit questions would be appropriate to put before Ofgem for inclusion within the consultation process.	All	Update to be provided in due course. Carried Forward
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. Carried Forward
NEX12/03	06/12/11	5.2.1	Non Functional: To consider (all) transaction volume caps for SOLR etc.	Xoserve (FC/DG)	Closed
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)	Closed
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	Waters Wye (GE)	Closed

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
			requirements.		
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)	Closed
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)	Closed
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 the next meeting.	RWE npower (CB)	Closed
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)	Closed
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	Closed
NEX01/01	10/01/12	5.2.3	Updated Retro-Updates Scenarios – Scenario 1A: Shippers to consult internally on this flow through Xoserve’s systems (Shipper A to Shipper B to Shipper A) and provide a view on whether such flows were required.	Shippers	To be provided at next meeting.

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
NEX01/02	10/01/12	5.2.3	Updated Retro-Updates Scenarios – Scenario 3A:Shippers to consult internally on this flow through Xoserve’s systems (Shipper A to Shipper B to Shipper A) and provide a view on whether such flows were required.	Shippers	To be provided at next meeting.
NEX01/03	10/01/12	5.2.3	Retrospective Updates - Collate outstanding questions onto a slide for review/discussion and provide to Joint Office; JO to publish on web and invite comment.	Xoserve (MD) and Joint Office (BF)	As soon as possible.
NEX01/04	10/01/12	5.2.4	BP for Non Functional Requirements 8.1.5 - Shippers to establish what data they want audited and what sort of tracking they want done to support an audit trail.	Shippers	To be provided at next meeting.
NEX01/05	10/01/12	5.2.4	BP for Non Functional Requirements: 8.9 Areas <i>not yet considered</i> – Shippers to review these points internally in more detail and feedback views on inclusion/exclusion.	Shippers	As soon as possible.