

Project Nexus Workgroup Minutes
Tuesday 10 February 2015
at 31 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3LT

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Mike Berrisford (Secretary)	(MB)	Joint Office
Alexa St Clair*	(ASC)	Opus Energy
Andrea Bruce	(AB)	ScottishPower
Andy Miller	(AM)	Xoserve
Brendan Cooper*	(BC)	GDF Suez
Carly Chambers	(CC)	Spark Energy
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Colette Baldwin	(CB)	E.ON
David Mitchell*	(DM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Debbie Draycott	(DD)	BP Gas Marketing Ltd
Edward Hunter	(EH)	npower
Emma Lyndon	(EL)	Xoserve
Gareth Evans*	(GE)	Waters Wye Associates
Glen Nixon	(GN)	Utiligroup
Graham Godsell	(GG)	Spark Energy
Huw Comerford	(HC)	Utilita
Isla Phillips	(IP)	Spark Energy
James Hardy*	(JH)	Wingas UK Ltd
James Hill	(JHi)	EDF Energy
James Kleiner-Mann*	(JK)	Wingas UK Ltd
Joanne Tedd	(JT)	Xoserve
Leigh Chapman	(LC)	first:utility
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	DONG Energy
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE
Michelle Downes	(MD)	Xoserve
Mike Fensome	(MF)	RWE npower
Richard Pomroy*	(RP)	Wales & West Utilities
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	Gazprom
Sue Cropper	(SC)	British Gas

* via teleconference

Copies of all papers are available at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/nexus/100215>

1. Introduction and Status Review

1.1. Minutes

The previous meeting minutes were approved.

1.2. Actions

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

Update: MD provided a brief overview of the 'Project Nexus Workgroup – Unidentified Gas' presentation (which had also been presented to recent UKLIEF and Gemini meetings) during which her colleague, JT provided a summary of how the LDZ Unidentified Gas Examples actually work.

During consideration of step 6, JT confirmed that the EUC Bands for Class 2 are used for nomination purposes, as the calculations are completed at the lowest levels.

JT advised that Users are able to download the 'Gemini Screen – Shipper Forecast UIG Share Report' via a *.CSV file from the Gemini system. When asked she also confirmed that a parties 'final' positions report (i.e. actuals after the day – D-1) is also available to download, but asked people to note that this does not use AQs to breakdown UIG and that UIG can be either a positive or negative value, even at a forecast level. It was also pointed out that UIG feeds into the energy balancing 'imbalance' calculations. **Closed**

NEX1104: Xoserve to confirm the outcome of discussions on file format with regard to Transmission sites.

Update: MD/EL explained that if the proposing user submits the request via the template (for SSMP) all SPA communications relevant to the transfer of ownership process will be the same emailed template communications as per input.

The only time files will be used is if an SMP is not currently registered as a SSMP and the proposing users request to be shared, any files to the current Registered User will be files based (as they submitted as file based requests initially). **Closed**

NEX1107: Xoserve (MD) to provide a plain English clarification and examples relating to the process relationship of R1/R2 and A1/A2 read usage.

Update: MD provided a brief overview of the update document and when asked confirmed that this represents the current approach mirrored within the modification. **Closed**

NEX1109: Xoserve (MD) to re-evaluate and amend the tolerance values for both the DM (classes 1 & 2) and NDM (classes 3 & 4) Supply Meter Points to kWh from percentages including a change to the (class 3 & 4) AQ band range from the current 0 – 15,000 to read as 0 – 20,000.

Update: MD provided an overview of the 'Project Nexus Workgroup Meter Read Validation' presentation.

In considering the 'Impact of Changing the Validation' slide, MD reminded everyone present that it was agreed at the December meeting that kWh and not the percentage of the AQ/SOQ, was agreed as the preferred option for Meter Points with an AQ less than 20,000 kWh, as kWh provides a more robust option.

In assessing that the design change to support this move cannot be made in time for Project Nexus go-live, Xoserve believe that it can be made post go-live. When asked, AM explained that this could be anything up to 12 months after go-live or later, due in part to the fact that no Impact Assessment on the change has been undertaken at this time and Xoserve is currently not in a position to support this requirement as all focus is on delivery of Project Nexus. Some concerns were voiced around the potential impacts of such a delay.

SC went on to advise that British Gas had undertaken some preliminary sense check work on their portfolio that indicated a 'rough and ready' estimate of circa 400 AQ corrections (for AQ's with a value of 1) would be required. AM suggested

that the industry has an opportunity to minimise the impact associated with AQs with a value of 1 during the next AQ review window. When asked whether or not Xoserve had any concerns relating to the potential volumes of corrections for these, AM indicated that he did not expect a figure of 400/month/Shipper would cause Xoserve a problem.

Moving on to consider the 'Tolerances being Delivered for DM Supply Meter Points (Classes 1&2)' slide, SM highlighted that the where tolerances are concerned, the higher the percentage, the higher the AQ and the associated risks.

Parties then discussed whether there would be any benefit in breaking down the AQ band 1 to 20,000 further in order to help address the really small AQs, or alternatively perhaps consider adding 'empty' bands to provide a level of flexibility.

When asked how easy it would be to add tolerance bands post Project Nexus go-live, MD suggested that whilst it is relatively easy to amend the actual percentages, it might be better to let the new parameters bed-in before making further changes.

During a brief discussion around how the Workgroup would expect any new tolerance bands to be validated, BF questioned whether the Project Nexus Workgroup was the correct forum under which to discuss the matter – the consensus of those present was that it is as there was no other group at this time. It was then agreed to hold a dedicated teleconference meeting¹ to commence at 09:30 on Wednesday 18 February 2015. **Closed**

New Action NEX0201: Xoserve (MD) to investigate whether or not it is feasible to break down AQ tolerance band 1 to 20,000 to identify the smaller AQ ranges, or whether adding empty bands is an alternative option.

NEX1111: Xoserve (MD) to ensure that the December UKLC are made aware of the Project Nexus Workgroup recommendation to retain the Spec Calc facility going forward.

Update: MD advised that following discussions (including the possible re-commissioning of file formats etc.) with her colleague, D Addison she can now confirm that the Spec Calc facility would not be available for the Project Nexus go-live date.

When asked for a view on how long it might be before the functionality would be made available (i.e. built within the new UK Link system), MD advised that she was unsure as it has significant Xoserve processing related ramifications, related in part, to the need to add new functionality.

MD also went on to point out that as the matter was not identified within the 'original' system design requirements, it would now become a User Pays service. BF indicated that if that was the case then any changes would require the raising of a UNC modification to address the matter. MJ then advised that he would discuss the matter with his SSE colleagues and provide an update on whether the requirement was still required. **Closed**

New Action NEX0202: All parties to confirm whether or not they believe they really need the Spec Calc provisions going forward.

NEX0101: Ofgem (JD) to issue an industry communication clarifying their position on the non-effective days provisions.

¹ Please note: the dedicated teleconference meeting scheduled for 18 February 2015 will be considering Read Validation (REQ31), AQ Correction (REQ38) and Consumption Adjustment.

Update: BF indicated that whilst he believes that Ofgem have provided a view at other industry for a (i.e. the iGT UNC Panel), he would contact J Dixon to chase a response.

CB suggested that now the iGTs had raised a new Non Effective Days modification (iGT072 'Non-Effective Days for Cutover to SSP'), it might be prudent for the Workgroup to consider aligning the two spheres (iGT/GT). This was not necessarily a universally supported view, with some parties believing that care would be needed to avoid building in potentially unnecessary non-effective days into the Project Nexus go-live process.

AM advised that Xoserve is currently considering the non-effective days requirements, before reaffirming his view that there may not be a need to utilise 6 non-effective days for the GT's side of the equation – it is not expected that there would be direct (Xoserve) alignment of iGT and GT non-effective days. He also suggested that if the Workgroup wished to amend the non-effective days provision, a UNC modification would be required. CW advised that he had deliberately included a 'place holder' within one of the transitional modifications.

When asked, AM explained that the non-effective days provision is primarily aimed at taking into account 'in flight' changes such as those relating to Change of Supplier requirements etc. (i.e. preservation of competitive market and associated data, including Gemini and Supply Point Register information etc.). He explained that further information would be available within a report to be published on the iGT UNC website alongside the iGT Modification 072 documents. **Carried Forward**

NEX0102: Xoserve (EL) to clarify what Performance Assurance related reports are being developed, what report generation facilities (including urgent generation) would be available to users.

Update: EL provided an overview of the 'Project Nexus Workgroup – Performance Assurance Reporting' presentation.

EL explained that development of the reports remains ongoing through the UNC Modification 0520 'Performance Assurance Reporting' Workgroup and consideration of what information (i.e. fields etc.) is required is being undertaken.

When asked, EL confirmed that it is very unlikely that the reports would be available to Users on Day 1 (Project Nexus go-live 01 October 2015), but anticipates that they would be made available within a short period of time following implementation, although this depends upon the complexity of the reports defined at the Performance Assurance Workgroup. She did point out however, that the existing Shipper reporting facilities would still be available from Day 1. **Closed**

NEX0103: Xoserve (MD) to investigate and provide an update on how flows are prioritised, including prioritisation selection criteria.

Update: MD requested that both NEX0103 and 0104 be carried over until the next (full) Workgroup meeting scheduled to take place on Tuesday 03 March 2015.

MD then went on to provide a brief explanation behind the action(s) advising that they relate to Product Class 3 batch processes.

CW enquired why these are being discussed under the Project Nexus Workgroup on the grounds that flow prioritisation and file formats and batch processing are not a direct Project Nexus requirement. In his opinion this is more a matter for the Change Overview Board. Responding, several parties disagreed, indicating that in their opinions, it is necessary to consider transition prioritisation (pick lists) and

what on any given day, any system limitations might be – as a consequence they are of the firm view that these matters do fall under the scope of this Workgroup as they potentially relate to the commercial, rather than technical debates.

SM voiced his concern that should (flow) volumes build up over time this could become a major issue affecting all Product Classes. MD agreed and (based on assumptions at previous meetings) suggested that if all SMART Meters were to be submitted as Product Class 3's, it could well result in a volume related issue. SM suggested that a Xoserve view on the theoretical system volume limits would prove beneficial. Responding, MD advised that she expects that one of her more technical colleagues would be coming along to the March meeting and would be able to provide more details around system volume capabilities etc. **Carried Forward**

NEX0104: Xoserve (MD) to confirm the outcome of discussions on file format with regard to Transmission sites.

Update: Please refer to action NEX0103 above for details. **Carried Forward**

NEX0105: *Reference REQ31* – Xoserve (MD) to consider whether the proposed solution for read validations would work, or whether a suitable alternative is available (i.e. add a new flag within the RGMA flows).

Update: Please refer to item 3.5 below for more details. **Carried Forward**

NEX0106: *Reference REQ32* – National Grid (CW) & Xoserve (MD) to consider what Primes & Subs information could be made available to users.

Update: MD requested that the action be carried over until the March meeting. **Carried Forward**

NEX0107: Joint Office (BF/MB) & Xoserve (MD) to consider the best option for providing a centralised BRD based repository for BRD related presentations going forward.

Update: BF explained the rationale behind the limited hierarchical work undertaken to the Project Nexus pages on the Joint Office web site since the last meeting. He explained that whilst little had been done to resolve the action, it would be relatively easy to incorporate the requirements (i.e. centralisation of BRD related presentations/documents) within the new hierarchy structure for the BRDs.

CB pointed out that items such as the Opening Meter Read Window period can be confusing as it appears that the BRD / legal text state conflicting views on whether these should be business or calendar days. CW advised that this would / could be addressed via his Project Nexus transitional 'sweep up' modification in due course.

MD suggested that it should all read as Business Days and that she would be adding this as a new issue on the Issues Log and at the same time would be looking to update the BRDs and issue a supporting communication. **Carried Forward**

1.3. Pre Modification Discussions

Opening, BF advised that the three new Project Nexus transitional modifications (0527, 0528 and 0529) along with new modifications 0530 and 0531 would be considered at the forthcoming 19 February 2015 Panel meeting.

1.3.1 0530 'Use of Supply Point Register data for Project Nexus 'Market Trials' Testing Phase'

CW provided a quick overview of the reasons behind raising the modification by explaining that it follows discussions with Xoserve and seeks to overcome potential information provision confidentiality issues.

CB informed everyone that her Data Protection colleagues at E.ON have voiced concerns relating to this modification whilst SM highlighted that he felt it would be a struggle to obtain customer approval to use the data. Regarding a question as to what happened at RGMA, AM advised that real data had been used in the old Transco Network Code days and perhaps full consideration of the Data Protection Act provisions had not been undertaken at that time. Whilst accepting that there are wider considerations, AM advised that this is exactly why the modification had been raised.

CB went on to voice additional concerns relating to the proposed timeline for the modification to which BF advised that it is expected that the first time the modification would be discussed would be the 26 February Distribution Workgroup meeting. There were a number of concerns voiced about the choice of the Distribution Workgroup to discuss this modification. SM enquired as to what the expected 'fallback' position would be in the event that the issues could not be addressed in one Workgroup meeting. Responding, AM explained that Xoserve is working on two approaches, the first being based around the fact that the modification requirements can be addressed using actual data, and the other option being based around the fact that the modification requirements cannot be addressed with actual data and would therefore utilise made up data.

CB felt it would be beneficial to consider an alternative to using live data, such as using anomalised data, to which AM advised that this is the second approach being developed.

Discussion briefly focused on whether or not, in potentially approving the modification Ofgem would be inferring they were happy with the data protection aspects – this was not a universally supported view and it was acknowledged that individual parties still have to abide by Data Protection requirements. CW advised that in being aware of these concerns he now expects to discuss the matter in more detail with his legal support team (and Ofgem).

In closing, AM asked that if anyone has any comments to please submit these to his colleague, D Addison as soon as possible.

1.3.2 0531 'Provision and Development of Industry Testing Prior to Nexus Go-live'

MJ provided a brief overview of this new SSE modification explaining that it assumes the use of 'dummy data'.

BF enquired whether or not the proposed timetable would actually work, especially the Workgroup development phase. When asked, BF confirmed that he expects that the February UNC Panel would refer the modification back to the Project Nexus Workgroup for development.

It was then agreed to try to squeeze in an additional Project Nexus Workgroup meeting between the Panel meeting and the next scheduled Project Nexus meeting on 10 March – in the end it was agreed to add an additional meeting on Tuesday 03 March 2015.

1.3.3 0524 'Enabling the Use of Pre Nexus Meter Reads for the purposes of Post Nexus Rolling AQ Calculation'

SM indicated that recent discussions with Xoserve have led him to consider withdrawing the modification.² (*Reference the more detailed discussions under item 3.2 below*)

2. Workgroups

There were no Workgroup meetings to consider.

3. Issues and topics for discussion

3.1. Provision and Development of Industry Testing Prior to Nexus Go-live

Not discussed specifically – please refer to item 1.3.2 above for details.

3.2. Project Nexus Workgroup – AQ Correction presentation

Opening, AM provided a brief explanation to the background to the AQ Correction, especially the AQ calculation debate around the pre / post Project Nexus go-live aspects.

With regards to modification 0524 and the general debate regarding the use of AQ backstop dates and the several options discussed in Autumn 2014, Xoserve had been considering a further option, which had been confirmed can be delivered for 01 October 2015. The concerns were all based around the use of pre Mod 0432 reads that will not have been subject to the Mod 0432 validation rules, within the AQ calculations. Xoserve has developed a validation rule to apply where a pre-0432 read is used in an AQ calculation, the AQ would be subject to a tolerance check that it would have to pass, before being sent live in UK Link. Where the AQ failed this check it would not be used. This would have a similar effect to the intention of mod 0524 and it would allow 'good' reads to be used and protect the Shipper/Industry from an AQ that does not reflect the actual consumption of the supply point. The tolerance values are still to be determined and will be presented and discussed at the Project Nexus Workgroup. Any AQ calculation that is only used post 0432 reads would not be subject to this tolerance check as the reads will have been subject to the 0432 read validation.

Some parties questioned whether or not backstop date provisions would be needed in the post Project Nexus world to which MD suggested that they would as other events (e.g. AQ Amendments) would create these within the 2015 AQ review.

AM then went on to explain that Xoserve would not do anything to the pre Nexus reads and the additional tolerance check would be made against the calculated Aqs only. When asked whether or not Xoserve would utilise a read that had led to a calculated AQ failing the tolerance check for reconciliation purposes, AM advised that the post 0432 reading is validated (in part) on the volume generated between the reconciliation reads. It is quite possible that an accepted 0432 read will be used for reconciliation but that the calculated AQ may be suppressed, this is because the AQ process requires reads that are at least 9 months from the submitted read, so reconciliation and AQ will on occasions (e.g. a Monthly Read Supply Point), use different reads. AM confirmed that the intention is to only tolerance out on the upward side.

MJ suggested that where you have both a pre and post Nexus read, you could utilise the retrospective adjustments mechanism to correct an anomalous read.

² Post meeting note: Modification 0524 was formally withdrawn by the Proposer (Gazprom) on 11 February 2015.

SM advised that he is happy to consider withdrawing Modification 0524 on the grounds that this proposed solution provides a suitable solution and he would provide a response prior to the February Panel.

Before handing over to MD to provide an overview of the presentation, AM confirmed that Xoserve would update the AQ BRD to clarify the new process.

In considering the recommended close out for submitting an AQ correction on the 'Timescales for Submitting an AQ Correction' slide, MJ suggested that aligning to the Rolling AQ timescales might be one option. Responding, MD suggested that the proposed solution provides a user with more time.

When asked whether the dates should read as calendar days or Business Days, MD agreed to double check and where appropriate update the various documents (i.e. BRDs and/or presentations etc.). MD also confirmed that it would be beneficial to identify timescales within the proposed transitional 'sweep up' modification in due course.

New Action NEX0203: Reference AQ Corrections - Xoserve (MD) to double-check whether these should be defined as calendar days or Business Days.

Moving on to consider the 'Validation of the Read following an AQ Correction' slide, some parties wondered if there was a risk that parties would get inadvertently stuck in a loop and whether it would be beneficial to raise a modification to look to change the 25 day window for the post Nexus world. MD suggested that even if a modification were raised, it would not resolve the issue of obtaining (and submitting) a read after an AQ correction (covered by current processes). It was recognised by those in attendance that it is the obtaining of the read that is the major issue.

MD moved on to point out that as this matter relates to a potential change to the file formats, it is not a solution that can be delivered for Project Nexus go-live, but could be resolved post go-live. When asked, MD explained that this requirement had been missed off the original design phase considerations. This has been added to the Issues Log, as it requires a BRD change. When asked whether a separate document to identify potential Release 1 changes would be beneficial, MD agreed it would.

New Action NEX0204: Reference AQ Corrections - Xoserve (MD) to update BRDs to reflect discussions and provide a summary of changes, plus identification of the place holder locations on the Joint Office web site.

Moving on to consider the 'Incorrect AQ Values Submitted on the AQ Correction Request' slide, MD pointed out that by the time users get their notifications in to Xoserve, it is often already too late.

In considering the issue of being unable to correct erroneous (AQ) values, AM suggested that whilst this would not necessarily stop the reads from entering the system, it could / would have reconciliation related issues – this was thought to be compounded by the system locking users into the 9 month delay for correcting reads.

When asked, MD agreed to add to the post go-live list of requirements. SM enquired whether or not a manual workaround solution could be provided in the interim as the issue can have a significant material impact of Shippers (it is believed that the Incumbent Shipper bears the brunt of the issue). Responding, AM suggested that as this is a well known issue, he would expect that a post Project Nexus go-live solution could be provided within the following 12 months, although at this time the first release post Nexus was unknown as analysis has not been undertaken at this time.

Parties felt strongly that this potential system limitation should be clearly communicated to the industry and at the same time should also be clearly marked within the respective BRDs. When asked whether or not a new transitional modification was required to address the issue, AM suggested that the matter may be raised within the Energy Balancing Credit Committee (EBCC) arena as it is related to energy, with a potential impact across the whole energy market (potentially harsh financial impacts on the smaller Shippers). SM advised that he is considering raising a new transitional modification to look to fix the bi-lateral correction of AQ issues via a manual workaround.

MD agreed to double check whether or not the 9 month AQ correction delay trigger is parameterised or not. AM advised that he believes that whilst it is the existing Shipper who can correct the AQ, they cannot then re-correct the AQ as only the new Shipper is able to re-correct the AQ. MD confirmed that this is a Code requirement and not a BRD one.

New Action NEX0205: Reference AQ Corrections - Xoserve (MD) to double check whether or not the 9 month AQ correction window delay trigger is parameterised or not and to also consider how current Code provisions might have an impact.

In recognising that there are several issues that need to be considered around this matter, SM suggested that it is what is done in the interim that is of major concern. Whilst CB suggested that this highlights a real concern around a potential 'miss match' between the BRDs and the legal text, SM felt that the BRD definition around re-corrections was acceptable as written, but the major concern relates to how to best protect the smaller industry players in the interim period.

Moving on to consider the final 'AQ Correction Timeline' slide, AM advised that Xoserve could look to provide an 'interim' workaround (manual) process relating to running a report to highlight anomalous reads, which they would support with a telephone call to impacted parties asking them to consider an appropriate action. However, he pointed out that this could only be provided at the AQ Correction Close-out point at Month -15 Business Days – consensus was that this would be helpful.

When asked, on what parameters any trigger criteria would / could be based, AM suggested that this could possibly be related to the magnitude of the increases involved – he will look to provide some draft business rules in due course.

New Action NEX0206: Reference AQ Corrections - Xoserve (AM) to consider provision of an 'interim' workaround (manual) process relating to running a report to highlight anomalous reads (inc. supporting telephone calls), plus look to provide some draft business rules around what parameters any trigger criteria would / could be based on.

When asked, MD confirmed that the proposed process is in essence an automated version of the existing BTUs process.

3.3. BRD Change Tracking update

MD provided a brief overview of the latest round of changes made to the Annual Quantity BRD document (v5.2, dated 28 January 2015) focusing on the 'tracking table' on page 6. Several suggestions were put forward on how to improve the table such as expanding the 'Date Agreed at PN UNC' to include the actual date, rather than simply the 'Clarification only' statement. It was also suggested that cross-referencing to the Q&A spreadsheet might also prove beneficial.

During a further discussion, MJ agreed to send his comments to Xoserve outside of the meeting. When asked how these comments would be communicated to the Workgroup, MD suggested that she could look to provide a BRD log where any

comments and Xoserve responses are highlighted – consensus was this was a good idea.

When asked how additions to the BRDs would be communicated after the Q&A process has finished, MD advised that this would be via the Joint Office (web site document update supported by a formal email communication (mailout)).

New Action NEX0207: Reference BRD Change Tracking - Xoserve (AM) to enhance the BRD tracking table provision in line with discussions and provide a BRD log where any comments and Xoserve responses are highlighted.

3.4. Project Nexus Workgroup – Retrospective Updates presentation

MD provided a brief overview of the presentation.

In considering the proposed solution for retrospective updates on a SSMP, MD confirmed that the assumption that one of the Shippers in the arrangement would submit an update on behalf of the other sharing Users, is a principle which exists already. When asked, parties indicated that they were happy with the proposals.

In considering the ‘Retro Update Request Received Prior to Shipper Transfer’ slide, MD pointed out that the current Uniform Network Code (UNC) still defines the Shipper as being either the Proposing or Registered Shipper and the second bullet point is really only a clarification around that fact. SM did not consider this to be a real issue and suggested that all it requires is a simple change to the wording. MJ thought that the proposal potentially contradicted previous Workgroup discussions on the BRD. Responding, AM pointed out that this is largely due to changes to the timelines in the intervening period.

AM went on to advise that if the outgoing Shipper tries to submit an AQ correction at D-2, Xoserve would stop it – the system solution is aimed at the Registered Shipper. MD explained that the system has been built in accordance with the BRDs and is consistent with current UNC provisions.

New Action NEX0208: Reference Retrospective Updates - Xoserve (MD) to provide some timelines around the Retrospective Update Request Received Prior to Shipper Transfer process and to confirm whether or not it is only the Registered Shipper that can make changes.

Moving on to now consider the ‘Retro Adjustment or Read Replacement during the Period of a Consumption Adjustment’ slide, some parties questioned how the retrospective asset updates (especially opening reads) would actually work.

During a brief discussion around how ‘suspect reads’ would be managed and how the start trigger would be expected to work, MD agreed to provide some examples (inc. how the system would validate a read following a consumption adjustment) for consideration at the 18 February Workgroup meeting.

New Action NEX0209: Reference Retrospective Updates - Xoserve (MD) to provide examples (inc. how the system would validate a read following a consumption adjustment) around how retrospective asset updates are expected to work, in time for consideration at the 18 February Workgroup meeting.

3.5. Nexus Requirements Clarification Log review

MD provided a brief review of the updated items during which those present approved Xoserve’s suggested approaches or highlighted possible alternative solutions.

The following areas were discussed and agreed:

REQ18 – AQ Backstop: will be closed as a modification has been raised by National Grid Distribution to cover this.

REQ31 – Read Validation: Proposal is to apply the Outer Tolerance (market breaker) test only and should the read fail, the update would be rejected.

MD explained that as this item relates to a file format change, it is too late for inclusion before go-live.

SM highlighted that the principle is that the market breaker is the absolute position and that is reflected in the fact that the whole idea is that the industry is protected from the effects of parties that are so far out of kilter.

AM pointed out that having considered some of the reasons behind USRVs, the closing asset read had often created a consumption that was not reflective of the actual consumption on the site, suggesting that the industry really does need this protection in place.

SM also suggested that identification of a means of getting out of the exchange meter related issues would be needed. In trying to assess the scale of the problem, CB questioned whether or not we are trying to find a 'fix' for what is potentially a relatively small number of occurrences – some parties suggested that the number of meter changes could increase in future, and the issue boils down to what level of correction is deemed appropriate.

In recognising that we need a market breaker tolerance, SM also suggested that we need a route around valid situations that the current proposals do not allow for (i.e. where a read is deemed to be correct even if it breaches the market breaker tolerance). AM suggested that this is really a read related matter.

It was agreed to revisit the requirement at the next formal Workgroup meeting.

REQ32 – Check Reads on P&S: CW apologised and explained that he had not had time to pursue this matter further.

It was agreed to revisit the requirement at the next formal Workgroup meeting.

REQ33 – Missing Class 3 Reads: MD explained that whilst this requirement had been closed, she would move it into the 'missing items pot' for inclusion within a future system release and add a footnote in the respective BRDs.

REQ34 – Read File Check: As per REQ33 above.

REQ35 – Read Validation: Already discussed in detail under item X.X above.

It was agreed to revisit the requirement at the next formal Workgroup meeting.

REQ36 – Priority Consumer & Vulnerable Customer: MD advised that this requirement had now been closed following agreement at the previous meeting.

REQ37 – AQ Correction: MD explained that whilst this requirement had been closed, it would also be included within a future system release.

REQ38 – AQ Correction: MD advised that this would once again be discussed at the 18 February 2015 meeting.

REQ39 – Re-confirmation: MD explained that the 'system' interprets these matters as a change in the contract. Those in attendance agreed with the proposal.

The Xoserve Customer Teams would be discussing the matter in more detail with the impacted parties in due course.

REQ40 – Correction Factor: MD apologised for the incorrect wording of this requirement before advising that she would make the necessary changes for consideration at the next meeting.

4. Any Other Business

4.1 Post Project Nexus Go-Live Read Validation Window Extension for Class 4

SC explained that currently there is no provision to extend the read window and requested that the Workgroup provides views on a possible extension to the current 25 day read validation window for Product Class 4 post Project Nexus go-live date.

AM advised that Xoserve are currently considering this, before confirming that it is only in relation to Class 4's. CW advised that he would look to include it within the transitional 'tidy up' modification in due course.

4.2 Aligning iGT Invoice Dates with Central System Dates

Whilst acknowledging that this is not specifically a Project Nexus Workgroup matter, MJ pointed out that he simply wishes to raise the Workgroup's awareness around this matter.

AM provided a brief explanation around the Xoserve iGT portfolio provisions and how these are sent to the iGTs – all end of month (data drops out of UK Link) processes are sent to the iGTs as soon as possible. CB suggested that separating out the Transportation Invoice aspects might prove beneficial.

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
09:30 Wednesday 18 February 2015	Teleconference.	Consideration of Read Validation (REQ31), AQ Correction (REQ38) and Consumption Adjustments.
10:30 Tuesday 03 March 2015	31 Homer Road, Solihull. B91 3LT.	Project Nexus Workgroup consideration of new Modifications 0527, 0528, 0529, 0530 & 0531).
10:30 Tuesday 10 March 2015	31 Homer Road, Solihull. B91 3LT.	Project Nexus Workgroup

Action Table

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
NEX0905	09/09/14	3.7	To provide a short presentation showing how unidentified gas is treated at nomination and allocation stages.	Xoserve (MD)	Update provided. Closed
NEX1104	04/11/14	3.3	To confirm the outcome of discussions on file format with regard to Transmission sites.	Xoserve	Update provided. Closed
NEX1107	09/12/14	3.2	To provide a plain English clarification and examples relating to the process relationship of R1/R2 and A1/A2 read usage.	Xoserve (MD)	Update provided. Closed

Action Table

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
NEX1109	09/12/14	3.3	To re-evaluate and amend the tolerance values for both the DM (classes 1 & 2) and NDM (classes 3 & 4) Supply Meter Points to kWh from percentages including a change to the (class 3 & 4) AQ band range from the current 0 – 15,000 to read as 0 – 20,000.	Xoserve (MD)	Update provided. Closed
NEX1111	09/12/14	4.2	To ensure that the December UKLC are made aware of the Project Nexus Workgroup recommendation to retain the Spec Calc facility going forward.	Xoserve (MD)	Update provided. Closed
NEX0101	20/01/15	1.2	To issue an industry communication clarifying their position on the non-effective days provisions.	Ofgem (JD)	Carried Forward
NEX0102	20/01/15	3.2	To clarify what Performance Assurance related reports are being developed, what report generation facilities (including urgent generation) would be available to users.	Xoserve (EL)	Update provided. Closed
NEX0103	20/01/15	3.2	To investigate and provide an update on how flows are prioritised, including prioritisation selection criteria.	Xoserve (MD)	Carried Forward
NEX0104	20/01/15	3.2	To provide a view on potential technical system volume requirements and solution v's cost to develop and deliver.	Xoserve (MD)	Carried Forward
NEX0105	20/01/15	3.5	<i>Reference REQ31</i> - To consider whether the proposed solution for read validations would work, or whether a suitable alternative is available (i.e. add a new flag within the RGMA flows).	Xoserve (MD)	Carried Forward
NEX0106	20/01/15	3.5	<i>Reference REQ32</i> – To consider what Primes & Subs information could be made available to users.	NGD (CW) & Xoserve (MD)	Carried Forward
NEX0107	20/01/15	4.1	To consider the best option for providing a centralised BRD	Joint Office (BF/MB) &	Carried Forward

Action Table

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
			based repository for BRD related presentations going forward.	Xoserve (MD)	
NEX0201	10/02/15	1.2	To investigate whether or not it is feasible to break down AQ tolerance band 1 to 20,000 to identify the smaller AQ ranges, or whether adding empty bands is an alternative option.	Xoserve (MD)	Pending
NEX0202	10/02/15	1.2	To confirm whether or not they believe they really need the Spec Calc provisions going forward.	All	Pending
NEX0203	10/02/15	3.2	<i>Reference AQ Corrections</i> - Xoserve (MD) to double-check whether these should be defined as calendar days or Business Days.	Xoserve (MD)	Pending
NEX0204	10/02/15	3.2	<i>Reference AQ Corrections</i> - Xoserve (MD) to update BRDs to reflect discussions and provide a summary of changes, plus identification of the place holder locations on the Joint Office web site.	Xoserve (MD)	Pending
NEX0205	10/02/15	3.2	<i>Reference AQ Corrections</i> - Xoserve (MD) to double check whether or not the 9 month AQ correction window delay trigger is parameterised or not and to also consider how current Code provisions might have an impact.	Xoserve (MD)	Pending
NEX0206	10/02/15	3.2	<i>Reference AQ Corrections</i> - Xoserve (AM) to consider provision of an 'interim' workaround (manual) process relating to running a report to highlight anomalous reads (inc. supporting telephone calls), plus look to provide some draft business rules around what parameters any trigger criteria would / could be based on.	Xoserve (AM)	Pending
NEX0207	10/02/15	3.3	<i>Reference BRD Change Tracking</i> - Xoserve (AM) to enhance the BRD tracking table provision in line with discussions and provide	Xoserve (MD)	Pending

Action Table

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
			a BRD log where any comments and Xoserve responses are highlighted.		
NEX0208	10/02/15	3.4	<i>Reference Retrospective Updates - Xoserve (MD) to provide some timelines around the Retrospective Update Request Received Prior to Shipper Transfer process and to confirm whether or not it is only the Registered Shipper that can make changes.</i>	Xoserve (MD)	Pending
NEX0209	10/02/15	3.4	<i>Reference Retrospective Updates - Xoserve (MD) to provide examples (inc. how the system would validate a read following a consumption adjustment) around how retrospective asset updates are expected to work, in time for consideration at the 18 February Workgroup meeting.</i>	Xoserve (MD)	Pending