

**Project Nexus Workgroup Minutes**  
**Tuesday 20 January 2015**  
**at 31 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3LT**

**Attendees**

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Mike Berrisford (Secretary)	(MB)	Joint Office
Alison Neild	(AN)	Gazprom
Andy Kelly	(AK)	ScottishPower
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Colette Baldwin	(CB)	E.ON
Edward Hunter	(EH)	npower
Emma Lyndon	(EL)	Xoserve
Graham Godsell	(GG)	Spark Energy
Graham Smillie	(GS)	ScottishPower
Huw Comerford	(HC)	Utilita
Jaimie Simpson*	(JS)	GDF Suez
James Hill	(JH)	EDF Energy
Jeremy Guard	(JG)	first:utility
Jon Dixon*	(JD)	Ofgem
Jonathan Hooper	JHo	SSE
Leigh Chapman	(LC)	first:utility
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	DONG Energy
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE
Michelle Downes	(MD)	Xoserve
Mike Fensome	(MF)	npower
Naomi Nathanael	(NN)	Plus Shipping Services Ltd
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/200115>

**1. Introduction and Status Review**

**1.1. Minutes**

The previous meeting minutes (09 & 23 December 2014) 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 explained that work remains ongoing and expects that documentation would be provided by the end of the week. **Carried Forward**

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

**Update:** SM explained that he had been in discussion with F Cottam, Xoserve who had confirmed that DESC members do not have any particular concerns relating to this matter and that the action was closed. **Closed**

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

**Update:** MD advised that the file formats had been agreed at the UK Link Committee and any file formats that could not be agreed were escalated to the UNCC for a decision. It was noted that the UNCC approved the 4 products escalated for approval at its 15 January meeting.

SM suggested that some concerns remain around the potential 'mixed use' file formats and whether or not manual workaround processes would be needed (i.e. which option do Shippers use and under what scenarios would they use them). Responding, MD confirmed that shared to no shared sites related communications would be via a file format. She will look to provide some examples of the various scenarios in due course. **Carried Forward**

**NEX1105:** Xoserve (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.

**Update:** MD advised that an updated presentation had been published on the Joint Office web site the previous day. EL explained that Xoserve had worked closely with the iGTs on their data preparation exercise and that all the iGTs had now submitted their CSEP sites related information to Xoserve. Following this, Xoserve would provide back to the iGTs their respective CSEP site i.d.'s.

A mapping exercise remains ongoing, and Xoserve is hoping to provide Shippers with their portfolio information in February – a communication relating to this matter would be issued in due course.

CB once again reiterated her concerns around non-effective days and suggested that a view from Ofgem might prove helpful. Responding, JD advised that whilst he would be discussing the matter at the following days iGT Panel meeting, he acknowledged that Ofgem need to take a pragmatic approach and a communication would be issued in due course. **Closed**

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

**NEX1106:** National Grid Distribution (CW) to provide clarity around what would be expected to happen to legacy read utilisation in the event that the proposed transitional arrangements did not work.

**Update:** CW reminded those present that a legal view on the transitional arrangements was provided at previous meetings and that it basically boils down to the fact that suitable transition arrangements must be in place to ensure the new settlement regime is put in place in a robust manner – to this end he is currently working on developing a set of draft transition modifications. **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 was under the impression that the information had already been provided, but agreed to provide a post meeting update. **Carried Forward**

**NEX1108:** Transporters to provide a legal view based on what is being built (in terms of the system) and how this could potentially impact upon any contractual aspects (i.e. any legacy system impacts etc.).

**Update:** BF suggested that having discussed the matter during the 23 December 2014 teleconference meeting it is now down to another party to raise an alternative modification if they feel it necessary. **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 explained that an amended set of data is provided in the presentation due to be considered under item 3.1 below.

When asked whether or not the 0 – 20,000 kWh tolerance band could/would be delivered in time for the 01 October 2015 Project Nexus implementation (go-live) date, MD advised that this is not necessarily 100% certain at this time, as a view from Xoserve's 3rd party service provider (Wipro) on whether it can be delivered is awaited. **Carried Forward**

**NEX1110:** Xoserve (MD) to provide an update against SSE's Non Functional Considerations questions at a subsequent meeting.

**Update:** Please refer to discussions on item 3.2 below. **Closed**

**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 she believes that this has been completed, but agreed to double check with her colleague, D Addison. **Carried Forward**

**NEX1112:** Xoserve (MD) to look to increment any affected Baseline BRD's to a new version and supported by a suitable high-level summary of change document.

**Update:** MD explained that the work on the BRDs had been carried out. **Closed**

### 1.3. Pre Modification Discussions

#### **Project Nexus Transitional Arrangements**

CW explained that National Grid Distribution remains happy to continue to be the main Proposer for Project Nexus transitional modifications and to this end, he is currently working on an initial set of five (5) draft transitional arrangements related modifications, split into three (3) core modifications and two (2) follow up style modifications, as follows:

*Please note that the following information relating to Panel submission dates is indicative at this point in time.*

#### **Core modification no. 1 - Settlement, Reconciliation & Supply Point Class**

It is hoped this modification would possibly be submitted to the February 2015 UNC Panel for consideration.

#### **Core modification no. 2 – Retrospective Adjustments**

It is hoped this modification would possibly be submitted to the February/March 2015 UNC Panel for consideration.

#### **Core modification no. 3 – AQ**

It is hoped this modification would possibly be submitted to the February/March 2015 UNC Panel for consideration.

Follow up modification no. 1 – **Miscellaneous Transition elements** (i.e. unique sites + any extra BRD requirements and anything not included in 0432 etc.)

It is hoped this modification would possibly be submitted to the March/April 2015 UNC Panel for consideration.

Follow up modification no. 2 – **Error Rectifications** (i.e. cross reference errors and general tidy up requirements)

It is hoped this modification would possibly be submitted to the March/April 2015 UNC Panel for consideration.

CW went on to advise that he would be attending a meeting the following day (Wednesday 20 January 2015) involving Dentons and Xoserve to look to develop the legal text (with the focus on the main core modification no.1) for these transitional arrangement modifications. It is his aim to have indicative text available for each modification prior to submission to the UNC Panel.

### **Post Project Nexus Go-Live Valid Meter Read Provisions**

SM advised those present that Gazprom had already prepared a draft modification to 'cover' this area of concern but had held back progressing it further until now at the request of other parties. SM believes that it is now time to move forward with the modification that is primarily aimed at validating read data provided prior to Nexus is to an acceptable standard in the post Project Nexus world.

During discussions there was a clear disagreement relating to the fact that some parties believe that Code already sufficiently defines the basis for valid reads. SM responded by pointing out that whilst Gazprom is supportive of the Rolling AQ Regime, it remains concerned about adopting suitable levels of validation for reads (inc. Shipper portfolio validation and Shipper resubmission criteria aspects) and avoiding potential for 'locking in' reads.

SM is convinced that this should be a separate modification that avoids getting lost in the 'backstop' debate and with this in mind, he is aiming to submit the modification for consideration at the February 2015 UNC Panel meeting.

## **2. Workgroups**

### **2.1. 0511: Introduction of an Enduring Solution for managing Advanced Meters in central systems post Nexus**

(Report to Panel 19 March 2015) – Papers at:

<http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0511>

## **3. Issues and topics for discussion**

### **3.1. Meter Read Validation presentation**

MD provided an overview of the presentation during which the main focus of the discussions centred on the 'Tolerances Agreed at PN UNC for DM Supply Meter Points (Classes 1&2)' slide during which several suggested amendments (to the values) were made.

Concerns were voiced with regard to how the override flag would work and the absence of an override flag for the band 1 – 20,000 kWh. Some parties also suggested adding a band for 20,001 – 40,000 kWh and MD indicated that she believes that the values would be reviewed once Project Nexus has gone live.

When asked what the expected 'backstop' position would be in the event that the values in this table were not implemented, MD advised that the default position

would be to revert to the values in the tables on pages 4 and 5 of the presentation. She indicated that a go/no go decision from Wipro on incorporation of the values for the 'Tolerances Agreed at PN UNC for DM Supply Meter Points (Classes 1&2)' and 'Tolerances Agreed at PN UNC for DM Supply Meter Points (Classes 3&4)' was expected within the next few weeks and a communication advising of the outcome would be issued in due course.

In discussing whether or not the lower tolerance values represent a potential breach of ratchet tolerances, it was acknowledged that this would/could be the case although it was also recognised that the idea is not to obstruct reads going through and that the ratchets mechanisms are the penalty for not doing things correctly in the first instance.

Closing, MD indicated that she would now amend the tolerances in-line with discussions in time for consideration at the next meeting.

### **3.2. Non Functional Requirements presentation**

MD provided an overview of the presentation with detailed debate taking place on various aspects of the presentation, as follows:

In respect of Performance Assurance Workgroup reporting perspective, some parties wondered how the PN Workgroup is expected to have confidence that Xoserve are able to provide the required reports. EL explained that Modification 0520 'Performance Assurance Reporting' raised by British Gas identifies various reporting requirements that Xoserve are currently working on with a view to providing feedback at the 24 February 2015 Performance Assurance Workgroup meeting. SM indicated that he is hoping that the developed solution would enable a quick and flexible report generation facility.

Whilst EL pointed out that discussions remain ongoing within the PA Workgroup around what report generation facilities are required and would be available to users, she also highlighted that not all reports would be available in time for the Project Nexus go-live date.

**New Action 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.**

In considering batch processing and visibility of data within 1 business day requirements, MD advised that batch processes would continue in the new world and the system is being designed in such a way as to be able to prioritise flows – a request was made to have access to the prioritised flows process information (i.e. what is chosen in what order and why). In considering why retrospective processes are run on a once per week basis, CB suggested that this is due in part to the batch processing related impacts, which have been discussed at great length within the UKLC meetings.

It was also suggested that dual flows may also need to be considered, especially the process decisions that sit behind them (i.e. exchange and read processes etc.).

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

Moving on to discuss 'Peak time volume requirements', MD indicated that the proposed (detailed) discussions around potential impacts would most likely be in the form of one-to-one meetings with interested parties.

Some parties indicated that they were of the impression that it had been previously agreed to ramp up volumes in accordance with DCC requirements, on the grounds that users should not be constrained by Xoserve's ability to cope (or

not as the case may be) with the potential granularity volume related and system processing related issues. MD responded by pointing out that the answer (and view points on the matter) are linked to the potential of Class 3 volumes between product classes that might be experienced. The numbers involved and the timing by which users choose to load their batch files would have a significant bearing on the systems ability to cope. MD went on to suggest that the cost of developing a system to cope with a 100% solution would be prohibitive and pointed out that during one-to-one discussions with various parties it was not envisaged to move the majority of their portfolio to Class 3 – CB suggested that it is highly unlikely that it would as the matter relates to commercially sensitive information and related decision making within respective organisations.

One option put forward was to consider adopting a phased delivery of data and how the costs stack up is of paramount importance – in essence, if it is a system volume related problem, what is required to resolve it.

**New Action NEX0104: Xoserve (MD) to provide a view on potential technical system volume requirements and solution v's cost to develop and deliver.**

Closing discussions, MD advised that she would look to invite a colleague to the next meeting to provide an update on the outcome of the 2014 Stakeholder engagement process.

### **3.3. Supply Point Register BRD Change Tracking update**

MD provided a brief overview of the latest round of changes made to the document and focused attention on the change capture table within new section 2.1. During discussions those parties present supported the proposed concept and requested some additional features, such as:

- Add a new column to identify the 'date of any change';
- Add a new column to identify whether or not a new UNC Modification might be required;
- Identify and update what sections of Code might be impacted;
- Provide more detail on what the actual change(s) were, and
- Introduce a communication facility (via the Joint Office) to notify the industry when any changes to the BRDs are made.

MD explained that she would make the suggested changes before the proposed approach would be mirrored across the other BRDs in due course.

### **3.4. 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:

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

When asked if solely relying on the market breaker test could/would result in potentially large errors being experienced, MD indicated that this could be the case. It was acknowledged that inputting asset related updates in to the system where a read has breached the market breaker tolerance would have a significant impact on AQ and reconciliation. One alternative suggested was to add a new flag within the RGMA flow. It was suggested by CB that the UKLC had not gone on record as saying that no more file formats could be added at this time.

MD confirmed that this could result in reads being in the system twice (removal and asset related reads etc.), although she pointed out that the assumption has always been that we would utilise the AQ that was live at the time of the update.

**New Action 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).**

REQ32 – Check Reads on P&S: Proposal is to introduce a new process to communicate when to do a check read for the Shippers on the Primes & Subs Meter Points within a set period (e.g. 5 days).

MD explained that the main risk is to the Shippers who hold the Prime meter and when asked provided the following breakdown, as at 19 December 2014:

Number of Prime & Sub Configurations	995
Number of Prime & Sub Meter Points	3177
Number of Prime Meter Points	995
Number of Sub Meter Points	2182
Number of DM Meter Points	68
which are Prime Meter Points	42
which are Sub Meter Points	26
Number of NDM Meter Points	3109
which are Prime Meter Points	953
which are Sub Meter Points	2156
Number of Shippers that have ownership of a Prime Meter Point	27

One option suggested was to mandate a co-ordinated check read although it was noted that a UNC modification might be needed as Code Subdeduct arrangements have not been changed.

When CW suggested that it is the Shipper's check reads that are the main problem (as the DNs already do the Class 1 reads anyway), one suggestion was to request DNs to undertake the check reads on behalf of Shippers – CW pointed out that this option is flawed on the grounds that the DNs do not wish to be responsible for managing Shipper obligations in particular for a contestable service.

In looking to try to assess how many P&S sites have check read equipment (i.e. data loggers etc.) fitted, SM suggested that whilst he expects that any drift on a derived U6 domestic meter would be a small value, information relating to this is limited at this time. BF pointed out that the P&S issues could be expected to be diluted somewhat with the introduction of SMART Metering provisions. However, any view on the Aqs for these P&S could help to identify the scale of the problem.

---

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

REQ33 – Missing Class 3 Reads: MD explained that the process would carry on based on read to read assessments and that no change to the BRD is required other than highlighting that the facility would not be available at Project Nexus go-live. When asked what happens when Shippers have submitted a read, but Xoserve has no trace of it (i.e. do we need an exceptions check process), MD suggested that these are covered within the acceptance/rejection communications mechanisms.

MD went on to suggest that this does not appear to be a big issue and perhaps could be included within a subsequent release. Parties agreed to this and requested that if Xoserve could provide a broad indication of when they think the system functionality could be provided, that would be extremely helpful.

REQ34 – Read File Check: It was recognised that this item is not a show stopper and agreed. Parties suggested that if Xoserve could provide a broad indication of when they think the system functionality could be provided, that would be extremely helpful.

REQ35 – Read Validation: MD advised that internal Xoserve discussions would suggest that this is only really a problem for AQ corrections, as the month on month AQ process should not see a significant change – the proposal is to only examine AQ corrections as the problem is one of timing.

MD believes that it might be possible to develop the solution in time for Project Nexus go-live (currently 01 October 2015), but would need to double check. She is under the impression that currently the associated system development aspects are not too far down the line. If a 01 October 2015 delivery is not achievable, the Workgroup would need to consider alternative options.

REQ36 – Priority Consumer & Vulnerable Customer: In outlining the proposal, MD suggested that there are potential data protection issues to consider. CB advised that this had also been discussed within the Electricity side and the conclusion drawn was that this is a Supplier obligation.

MD explained that the Xoserve internal view is to steer well clear of this matter and they are not proposing to deliver the system functionality to release any related information.

The Workgroup consensus was that this is not required from a systems development perspective and that should any party have major concerns on the matter, they could always raise a UNC Modification.

REQ37 – AQ Correction: MD reminded those present that this matter had been discussed at previous meetings and should anyone believe we need to have a facility over and above the current 9 month 'locked in' mechanism, the Workgroup could always consider it.

MD went on to advise that Xoserve are currently looking at how we could validate AQ corrections and she expects to be able to provide an update at the next meeting. It was suggested that having some form of materiality test could prove helpful in clarifying where and what the problem really relates to.

It was agreed to consider the matter in more detail at the next meeting.

REQ38 – AQ Correction: in briefly touching on what timescales (currently M+10) might be needed and recognising that the current BTU process has similar issues (i.e. reregistering related aspects etc.), MD suggested that the issue potentially



boils down to the question of volumes involved – these could be defined as either calendar, or business days.

It was agreed to consider the matter in more detail at the next meeting.

#### 4. Any Other Business

##### 4.1 Centralised Provision of BRD Supporting Presentations

A request was made by the Workgroup for a centralised provision for all presentations relating to the BRDs (preferably on the Joint Office web site). It is believed that this would make finding (historical) information, especially relating to BRD amendments, easier.

**New Action 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.**

##### 4.2 Phase out of RbD process audit and the adoption of a similar process for the new settlement regime

BF explained that the last ever meeting of the RbD sub committee took place on 06 January 2015, where members believed that new arrangements would need to be established through a post (Project Nexus) transition modification in order to appropriately close down the RbD process and ensure that the new settlement regime ‘beds in’ and thereafter processes the information correctly – this therefore poses the question as to whether or not this Workgroup consider that a new process is needed.

MJ wondered whether some form of an RbD close down process prior to Project Nexus go-live would be appropriate, whilst SM advised that he is impressed with the 3<sup>rd</sup> Part Risk Assessment Report developed by Engage Consulting as part of the Performance Assurance Framework considerations. In essence, SM believes that if the Workgroup thinks that there is an appropriate (PAF) process going forward, then the focus should be on how best to close-out the existing RbD process. CW suggested that this would boil down to whether we believe that Xoserve would be able to handle the associated number crunching exercise.

MJ enquired as to whether or not the industry could look to introduce a Final RbD Audit requirement as part of the Project Nexus transitional arrangements work – CW indicated that he would look to integrate the RbD close-out within one of the core transitional modifications.

##### 4.3 Component Testing Cycles & Data Item Discussions

When asked, Workgroup members present indicated that they would be happy to consider this matter under the auspices of the PN Workgroup. EL asked people to note that should a data cleansing issue be identified, this would be considered and resolved under the work of the Data Cleansing Workgroup.

##### 4.4 Timely Provision of Meeting Papers

MJ once again requested that all parties endeavour to provide meeting papers/materials at least 5 business days prior to a meeting taking place. SM also added that putting practicalities to one side, not giving Workgroup members sufficient time to consider documentation only serves to delay the process in the end – this appears to be becoming the accepted norm, which is wrong.

In apologising for the late provision of Xoserve related materials, MD stated that she would look to see if these could be improved going forwards.

#### 5. Diary Planning

Further details of planned meetings are available at: [www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Diary](http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Diary)

Workgroup meetings will take place as follows:

Time/Date	Venue	Workgroup Programme
10:30 Tuesday 10 February 2015	31 Homer Road, Solihull. B91 3LT.	Project Nexus Workgroup including consideration of any Transitional Modifications.
10:30 Tuesday 10 March 2015	31 Homer Road, Solihull. B91 3LT.	<i>To be confirmed.</i>

### 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)	<b>Carried Forward</b>
NEX1002	07/10/14	3.2	To consider the potential timing mismatch of WAR Band derivations and the impact on fixed SOQs.	DESC	Update provided. <b>Closed</b>
NEX1104	04/11/14	3.3	To confirm the outcome of discussions on file format with regard to Transmission sites.	Xoserve	<b>Carried Forward</b>
NEX1105	04/11/14	3.5	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)	Update provided. <b>Closed</b>
NEX1106	09/12/14	3.1	To provide clarity around what would be expected to happen to legacy read utilisation in the event that the proposed transitional arrangements did not work.	National Grid Distribution (CW)	Update provided. <b>Closed</b>
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)	<b>Carried Forward</b>
NEX1108	09/12/14	3.2	To provide a legal view based on what is being built (in terms of the system) and how this could potentially impact upon any	Transporters	Update provided. <b>Closed</b>

### Action Table

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
			contractual aspects (i.e. any legacy system impacts etc.).		
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)	<b>Carried Forward</b>
NEX1110	09/12/14	4.1	To provide an update against SSE's Non Functional Considerations questions at a subsequent meeting.	Xoserve (MD)	Update provided. <b>Closed</b>
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)	<b>Carried Forward</b>
NEX1112	09/12/14	4.3	To look to increment any affected Baselined BRD's to a new version and supported by a suitable high-level summary of change document.	Xoserve (MD)	Update provided. <b>Closed</b>
NEX0101	20/01/15	1.2	To issue an industry communication clarifying their position on the non-effective days provisions.	Ofgem (JD)	<b>Pending</b>
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)	<b>Pending</b>
NEX0103	20/01/15	3.2	To investigate and provide an update on how flows are prioritised, including prioritisation selection criteria.	Xoserve (MD)	<b>Pending</b>
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)	<b>Pending</b>

---

**Action Table**

<b>Action Ref</b>	<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>Minute Ref</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Status Update</b>
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)	<b>Pending</b>
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)	<b>Pending</b>
NEX0107	20/01/15	4.1	To consider the best option for providing a centralised BRD based repository for BRD related presentations going forward.	Joint Office (BF/MB) & Xoserve (MD)	<b>Pending</b>