

**Project Nexus Workgroup Minutes**  
**Tuesday 06 September 2011**  
**31 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3LT**

**Attendees**

Mike Berrisford (Chair)	(MiB)	Joint Office
Lorna Dupont (Secretary)	(LD)	Joint Office
Alan Raper	(AR)	National Grid Distribution
Cesar Coelho	(CC)	Ofgem
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Darren Lindsay	(DL)	E.ON UK
Gareth Evans	(GE)	Waters Wye Associates
Grace Smith	(GS)	RWE npower
Karen Kennedy	(KK)	ScottishPower
Kirsty Fraser	(KF)	ScottishPower
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	Shell
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE
Michele Downes	(MD)	Xoserve
Peter Thompson	(PT)	Customer Representative
Phil Blakeman	(PB)	British Gas
Sean McGoldrick	(SMc)	National Grid NTS
Simon Trivella	(ST)	Wales & West Utilities
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	Gazprom
Steve Nunnington	(SN)	Xoserve
Will Guest	(WG)	Northern Gas Networks

**1. Introduction**

MiB welcomed all to the meeting.

**1.1 Review of Minutes**

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

**1.2 Review of (consolidated) actions**

**Action NEX06/04:** British Gas (GW) to consider and provide a set of business requirements (inc. the viability of) a bulk read upload facility.

**Update:** Update due at 19/09/11 meeting. **Carried Forward**

**Action NEX06/05:** Ofgem (CC) to provide an update on Ofgem's work looking at the SMART rollout impacts on the iGTs; and offer a view on iGT Modification 0039.

**Update:** Update due at 19/09/11 meeting. **Carried Forward**

**Action NEX07/09:** Xoserve (MD) to investigate the effect that moving to a monthly regime would have on any Primes & Subs considerations.

**Update:** Presented at this meeting. **Closed**

**Action NEX07/14:** Transporters to consider views on rolling AQ proposals (inc. BSSOQs) v's fixed SOQ requirements across market sectors and the potential impact on future transportation charges (inc. changing rate impacts).

**Update:** On agenda for DNCFM 26/09/11 meeting with update following meeting. **Carried Forward**

**Action NEX07/16:** Xoserve (MD) to consider potential NC Modification 0640 impacts on the AQ calculation threshold cross over points.

**Update:** Presented at this meeting. **Closed**

**Action NEX08/01:** All to consider the (unintended) consequences of the rolling AQ affecting EUC bands, and the potential increase in the frequency of band transfer.

**Update:** Update to be provided at 20/09/11 meeting.

**Carried Forward**

**Action NEX08/02:** All to understand what the capacity commitment would be for the SOQ charging factor if it were fixed.

**Update:** Update to be provided at 20/09/11 meeting. **Carried Forward**

**Action NEX08/03:** Xoserve (SN/MD) to assess other process impacts and what was the most appropriate way to progress/bring in Modification 0380.

**Update:** CW reported that the DNs were fully engaged with Xoserve to assess what can be done. Xoserve understand what is being asked for and are aware of Shippers' views. Update to be provided at 20/09/11 meeting.

**Carried Forward**

**Action NEX08/04:** Wales & West Utilities (ST) to ensure that Reconciliation - Consideration of Option 3 to be raised at the next meeting of DNCFM.

**Update:** ST to confirm it had been completed; update to be provided at 19/09/11 meeting. **Carried Forward**

**Action NEX08/07:** Xoserve (SN/MD) in relation to AQ - Populate the table 'AQ Correction Tolerances (from Mod 209 AQ Validation Tolerances)' with appropriate values (rather than percentages) for discussion.

**Update:** Presented at this meeting. **Closed**

**Action NEX08/09:** Xoserve (SN/MD) in relation to the Supply Point Register: Project Nexus consultation responses - Contact Shell Gas Direct to ascertain if their response retained currency.

**Update:** MD reported that she was awaiting a response from Shell and an update would be provided in due course. **Carried Forward**

**Action NEX08/11:** To ensure that consideration of the draft final Settlement Arrangements BRD is added to the agenda for the next DESC meeting.

**Update:** Completed. **Closed**

**Action NEX08/12:** Xoserve (FC/MD) In respect of Reconciliation: To develop a presentation (based upon discussion points) on how best to manage the data items listing (content, time expiry, new additions, amendments, etc) including consideration of ASP data, for consideration at the next meeting.

**Update:** Update to be provided at 19/09/11 meeting. **Carried Forward**

**Action NEX08/13:** Xoserve (FC/MD) in respect of the Supply Point Register: To prepare example scenarios (including identification of root causes, what to do with erroneous reads, asset error related aspects,

reconciliation neutrality and energy smearing, throughput and refund timelines and mechanisms, contractual timelines) and what possible business rules would be needed to support the process in the new world.

**Update:** Update to be provided at 19/09/11 meeting. **Carried Forward**

**Action NEX08/14:** Xoserve (FC/MD) in respect of Retrospective Updates: To prepare example scenarios (including identification of root causes, what to do with erroneous reads, asset error related aspects, reconciliation neutrality and energy smearing, throughput and refund timelines and mechanisms, contractual timelines) and what possible business rules would be needed to support the process in the new world.

**Update:** Update to be provided at 20/09/11 meeting. **Carried Forward**

**Action NEX08/15:** Xoserve (FC/MD) to consider the 'line in the sand' roll forward retrospective update considerations and provide feedback at the next meeting.

**Update:** Update to be provided at 20/09/11 meeting. **Carried Forward**

## 2. Modification Workgroups

*Copies of the various presentation materials are available to view &/or download from the Joint Office of Gas Transporters web site.*

### 2.1 0380 – Periodic Annual Quantity calculation

Progress update provided by CW during discussion of Action NEX08/03 above.

### 2.2 0377 – Use of Daily Meter Reads\*

Consideration deferred.

### 2.3 0359 – Use of Market Sector Flag to determine Customer Status\*

Consideration deferred.

### 2.4 0357 – Enhanced Supply Point Administration Process\*

Consideration deferred.

*\* denotes a status update only.*

## 3. Workgroup Approach and Plan

### Topic Workgroup Timeline Tracking

SN confirmed that Settlement and Market Differentiation 1 were now complete, and that all was on track to complete the requirements gathering by the end of the year.

### Project Nexus Workplan

The next meetings were planned for:

- Reconciliation and Invoicing – 19 September 2011 at 31 Homer Road; and
- AQ and Retrospective Updates - 20 September 2011 (venue to be confirmed).  
*Post meeting note: The Holiday Inn, 61 Homer Road has now been booked to host the 20/09/11 meeting.*

## 4. Terms of Reference (issues and topics)

Not covered.

## 5. Issues and topics for discussion

### 5.1 High Level Workgroup Issues

No new issues raised for discussion.

## 5.2 Further Consideration of Meter Reading Arrangements

### 5.2.1 AQ

#### PN UNC Workgroup (AQ topic) presentation

MD provided a brief overview recapping on the objectives, scope, summary of four processes, together with the issues, three of which remained for resolution, ie maintaining a static SOQ; transition; and changes in regime (non daily metered to daily metered). Attention was drawn to the change in format of the Mod 209 business rules spreadsheet.

#### PN UNC Workgroup (AQ – Prime & Sub Issues) presentation

MD provided an overview illustrating the effects of moving to a monthly regime on a Prime & Sub configuration.

ST questioned whether there were any sub subs, believing this to be impossible.

**Action NEX09/01: DNs to double check to establish the existence of sub subs (and, if any existed, quantify how many).**

Post Meeting Update: The scenario of a sub-meter downstream of other sub-meters does not exist. All the prime sub configurations are 1 prime to 1+ sub-deduct.

MD then drew attention to areas for further consideration and these were briefly discussed. The DNs believed that co-terminous reads would continue to apply. DNs had no obligation to obtain reads for Primes and Subs, but do it because it is the most sensible action to take to assist Shippers. SM commented that different parties can collect data but it needs to be within the same 'Settlement Product'. Currently for reconciliation readings need to be obtained within a 5 day window. The expectation was that there would be very few of these sites in the future. GE questioned whether this would be worth accommodating in a separate process rather than including in a mainstream function. If moved into a daily 'Product there would be no problem. It might be appropriate to build for co-terminous reads from a system perspective, and consider the position from a commercial point of view. For the purposes of the current scenario co-terminous reads apply. Frameworks should not be adjusted to accommodate what may be very few sites.

#### PN UNC Workgroup (AQ – Mod 640 Impacts) presentation

MD presented some examples of how Mod 640 adjustments would impact on the AQ calculation threshold crossers, and the interactions with Meter Point Rec, both with and without Rolling AQ.

MJ did not feel there was an issue as long as Meter Point Rec was available, depending on when Rolling AQ was implemented and if times are out of synch. Rec variance would occur at the point where the AQ changed.

CW believed that in the cutover period reconciliation of energy might still be an issue. As soon as it goes into LSP reconciliation can be carried out; looking at the example, the steps where it crosses, and below, is the issue; in the new world it is not required.

KK questioned whether a scenario where Meter Point Rec might not exist should also be considered.

Noting there might be transitional issues, SN observed that cutover might lead to a 01 October 2011 implementation date.

PN UNC Workgroup (AQ Review, Regime Change) presentation

MD presented illustrations of how the transfers from Process to Process might work in the new regime.

There appeared to be no issues with transfers from Process 1 or 2 to either Process 3 or 4.

Transfers from Process 3 to Process 1 or 2 worked using 365 consumptions, but MD pointed out that there might be a timing issue if a batch of reads came in after the 10<sup>th</sup>. SM noted that this covered changing processes but not changing Suppliers; if a Supplier were allowed to fill in the data gaps there would be no problem. MD noted that if there was a different Supplier the current AQ may have to be rolled over.

Two scenarios were identified: Change of Supplier and Products, and Change of Products/Same Supplier.

This raised questions of access to appropriate information to fill the gaps.

MD asked if it would be an issue for a Supplier to wait a month for the new AQ to be defined. It might be an issue for Process 4, but not for Processes 1,2, and 3.

Transfers from Process 4 to Process 1 or 2 presented an issue, as 365 reads were not available. A Supplier may need to wait 12 months for the new AQ. PT thought this might be a real issue for transition. SN observed that AQ is not used for anything in Products 1 and 2. SM pointed out that the desire was for AQ to be dynamic and in Products 1 and 2 it may not be if waiting 12 months to update.

KK voiced concern regarding the extraction of, or access to, data prior to the incoming Shipper's ownership; the authority to recover such data might be in question.

AR suggested in this scenario where 365 reads were not available that the optimum reads be looked for

There appeared to be no issues with transfers from Process 3 to Process 4.

Transfers from Process 4 to Process 3 worked; MD pointed out that the optimum read might not be available.

PN UNC Workgroup (AQ Tolerances) presentation

MD presented two tables illustrating AQ Tolerance % based on EUC Band and sought views.

SM had thought it was just going to be a volume figure. MJ believed that if it reduces to 1 it will fail all the time; an absolute tolerance was required rather than a percentage figure. SM believed this might create a particular worry in the lower band; on smaller sites switching something on/off gives a quite dramatic effect. MD noted that for the AQ increase in Band 1 a figure was needed.

For other AQ bands switching off a process can make a significant difference, but can be managed if slowly reducing down through the Bands. MD commented that if daily reads were coming in this should be OK, but it could be more of an issue in Product 4.

SM reiterated that small volumes of error were not wanted.

Different scenarios in different Products were then discussed. It was suggested that some values/figures were needed for Product 4 sites. It was pointed out that Shippers' validations should be more aggressive than this validation – this should provide a 'long stop'. Automated systems should not be causing problems for other parties; values need to be set such that they are rarely invoked.

PT questioned if the information given at lines 7 and 9 in the second table should be the same.

SN sought views from Shippers present as to whether they thought the figures were set right, to avoid causing problems to other parties.

It was suggested that it should be made an absolute value for Band 1. Figures in other Bands were discussed. The test related to a dynamic AQ. Were Shippers convinced that these figures would make it a rare event? GE believed the system should be developed to make it easy to get the parameters changed at a later date, following experience. AR questioned if the bandwidths were a problem, did the Bands have to reflect the EUC Bands; perhaps these should be ignored and be parameterised as much as possible. It was suggested that a value and a percentage might be considered; ST preferred a value.

It was indicated that shifting sites into Product 1 might be problematic. The group was asked to consider the fixed value for Band 1 and agreed that 73,200 was appropriate, with percentages for the other Bands.

It was noted that any future adjustments to the table values would require justification for change and the raising of a modification; this was the backstop that protected the industry.

There was no appetite to reduce the Bands and make consistent with Settlement; the consensus was to leave them as they are.

#### PN UNC Workgroup (AQ ) – Business Requirements Definition (BRD)

MD reported that changes had been made following previous discussions. SN pointed out that there is only one further meeting of the AQ group and that conclusions needed to be reached. Following the final draft of the BRD it would be published for final comments which should be submitted 15 business days after publication; if any major issues were identified then the group would need to reconvene.

SM requested that a Word version be made available to assist Shippers' internal discussions and ability to provide comments to Xoserve. SN agreed to provide this individually on request.

**Action NEX09/02: Xoserve (SN) to provide a WORD copy of the BRD to individual Shippers on request.**

MD drew attention to specific sections of the BRD.

Section 4 – No further benefits identified.

Section 6.1 – In a leap year – will have to do 365 + 1.

Section 8.1.1 – No further comments.

Section 8.4.4 – Add in based on percentages/value.

Section 8.4.6 – The use of reads where it had failed the AQ validation for any other process was discussed. If it materially affects the market it should not be used for any other process e.g. reconciliation. It was questioned if AQ was the first process for which it might be used. The meter validation table test could be passed with a Shipper flag warranty. If the read validation flag is populated the system will not validate the read against the tolerances. KK raised concern regarding misalignment of recs and AQ calculations, and questioned if there should be a common set of entry rules; different rules for different things adds too much complexity. MD observed that flagging bypasses all validations – that was how the rules had been written. SM believed that a read that was a systemic risk should be rejected outright and not used elsewhere. It was suggested that tests at the beginning of the process should offer sufficient protection and the AQ validations would not be needed

It was noted that changes to the Meter Read BRD might need further consideration, and that AQ Market Breaker checks might require consideration at a later Workgroup.

SM observed that entry validation should be consistent.

SN agreed to produce a strawman/figures for a ‘market breaker’ read validation where the flag had been populated and present at the next meeting. This would be documented within the Settlement BRD

**Action NEX09/03: AQ BRD 8.4.6 - Xoserve (SN) to produce a strawman/figures for a ‘market breaker’ read validation and present at the next meeting.**

Section 8.7 – Brief discussion on defining Daily Read Requirement; concluded no cause for concern.

Section 8.12 – This had been based on what was currently included in the files. Any changes will affect file formats; it was believed all items were still required.

Section 8.12.2 – KK questioned if the reasons why AQ was not recalculated were given, and wondered if there was sufficient information given in the notification to generate an immediate action/response from a Shipper.

**Action NEX09/04: AQ BRD 8.12.2 – All Shippers to examine their processes to see what actions they might need to take in response to a notification of AQ validation failure/AQ not recalculated and provide views at the next meeting.**

**Action NEX09/05: AQ BRD 8.12.2 - Xoserve (MD) to provide a list of the reasons for current AQ validation failure/AQ not recalculated and present at the next meeting.**

**Action NEX09/06: AQ BRD 8.12.2 – All Shippers to consider what they would like to see included in the rejection file and provide views at the next meeting.**

MD stated that the reports were those listed in 0209 and that she would bring the current reports to the next meeting for review. She read out the list. It was assumed that all of these would be required in the future, and perhaps on a more frequent basis.

**Action NEX09/07: AQ BRD 8.12.2 - Xoserve (MD) to provide examples of the current AQ reports and present at the next meeting.**

It was assumed that monthly reports on the movement of numbers up/down and the values would be required, perhaps aligned by Product type, by volume band, and by Shipper. MD agreed to provide an example for review at the next meeting.

**Action NEX09/08: AQ BRD 8.12.2 - Xoserve (MD) to provide an example of a potential report and present at the next meeting.**

It was suggested that the frequency of other reports eg Mod 81 report, could be reviewed to assist in creating a more holistic view in a timelier manner where the future pace of the world was likely to increase.

It was also noted that managing adjustments for 0640 needed consideration.

SN added that this area would be looked at during analysis and should be discussed by the Workgroup once it was decided how AQ was going to be delivered.

### **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**

#### Universal Single Meter Point Supply Points

Indicating that this might be considered as a potential Workgroup and/or Nexus topic, ST gave a presentation on the potential limitation and conversion of all Supply Points to single meter point Supply Points (ie one MPRN per Supply Point). Potential benefits and disadvantages were highlighted; the number of potential sites affected (across the GDNs) was identified, and some analysis on the charge implications (specific to Wales & West Utilities) was presented. Views were sought.

It was suggested that from a Transporter's viewpoint this might result in more cost reflective charging in respect of the customer charge and transportation charges. Having mixed Supply Points can lead to the non-application of processes in the future and they may fall out of certain arrangements, which had been a previously highlighted concern of Ofgem.

SM referred to disaggregation may be more of a commercial issue than a domestic issue, and pointed out that any historical reasons for the initial decision to aggregate might need to be taken into account.

ST gave the example of a School and a caretaker's house, where disaggregation and treatment as a domestic property would result in a specific charge to the latter. GE observed that under the Supply Licence this could be treated as a non-domestic property. ST responded that for Code purposes and from a market sector standpoint it should be treated as a domestic site. Clarity was needed as to how to treat such sites should be treated under the UNC where it has a different definition, and depending on what service is being applied.

ST explained what increase/difference in charges might be seen, and believed it involved circa £3billion in transportation charges across all DNs. It was stressed that there was no additional income to the DNs.



Having confirmed it had previously been identified as part of the Supply Point Register work, the question was should it be done earlier or not? The benefits had not been fully assessed at this point. AR clarified that it was addressing the difference between how gas was supplied commercially and transported to these points, and perhaps this needed to be unpicked; PT supported this. The system is configured to supply aggregated Supply Points; every customer should have to take their gas on an individual basis. Some sites will see an increase and some a decrease in charges. PT believed that everyone should get a charge appropriate to his or her use of the gas. From an I & C perspective a site may see an increase.

GE pointed out that the Transportation Charging Model takes account of current configurations; it would change the base information. ST believed there was no impact on the charging methodology but recognised that it could feed into the customer charging debates.

DNs are revenue neutral and are concerned that charges are currently not cost reflective, eg 48 customers aggregated to 1 Supply Point would pay one customer charge. How customers are treated commercially was briefly discussed. A Shipper would have to handle more volume of data flows in relation to these sites (1 SPA flow per meter point) and there was a risk of greater error leading to potential data degradation.

AR pointed out that Transporters deal on a single MPRN level, and these Supply Points should have no dependence on each other. Shippers commercially link Supply Points and deal with this differently according to contract.

GE was concerned that only one solution had been proposed; was there an alternative, ie how to keep linked from a retail perspective but to be able to consider separately from a Transporter perspective.

KK observed that anything that simplifies or streamlines a process should be supported and given serious consideration; it should be part of the Nexus discussions. SMC confirmed with MD that it was originally put forward as part of the Nexus requirements. The workgroup agreed that this area should be discussed within Nexus under Supply Point Register.

AR stated that an understanding of any administration issues or charging issues should be developed, eg inability to transfer retail linked Supply Points at the same time.

SM had concerns relating to common curtilage rules.

**Action NEX09/09: In respect of the Supply Point Register: Universal Single Meter Point Supply Points - DNs to look at alternative ways to link/decouple/transfer Supply Points for consideration at the 25/10/11 meeting.**

MiB noted this item to be added to the next Supply Point Register meeting agenda (25 October 2011).

**Action NEX09/10: Joint Office (BF/MiB) to ensure that Supply Point Register: Universal Single Meter Point Supply Points is included on the 25/10/11 meeting agenda.**

Any other feedback would be welcomed by ST in advance of the next meeting.

## 6. Any Other Business

None raised.

## 7. Workgroup Process

---

**7.1 Agree actions to be completed ahead of the next meeting**

New actions were agreed and assigned as discussions progressed. See Action Log below.

**8. Diary Planning**

The following meetings are scheduled to take place during September 2011:

<b>Title</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Location</b>
Project Nexus Workgroup	19/09/2011	NG Office, 31 Homer Road, Solihull.
Project Nexus Workgroup	20/09/2011	The Holiday Inn, 61 Homer Road, Solihull.

## Action Table

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
NEX06/04	21/06/11	5.2.1	Settlement: Consider and provide a set of business requirements (inc. the viability of) a bulk read upload facility.	British Gas (GW)	Update due at 19/09/11 meeting. <b>Carried Forward</b>
NEX06/05	21/06/11	5.2.2	Provide an update on Ofgem's work looking at the SMART rollout impacts on the iGTs; and offer a view on iGT Modification 0039.	Ofgem (CC)	Update due at 19/09/11 meeting. <b>Carried Forward</b>
NEX07/09	18/07/11	5.2	To investigate the effect that moving to a monthly regime would have on any Primes & Subs considerations.	Xoserve (MD)	Update provided. <b>Closed</b>
NEX07/14	18/07/11	5.2	AQ: To consider views on rolling AQ proposals (inc. BSSOQs) v's fixed SOQ requirements across market sectors and the potential impact on future transportation charges (inc. changing rate impacts).	Transporters	Update due at 20/10/11 meeting. <b>Carried Forward</b>
NEX07/16	18/07/11	5.2	To consider potential NC Modification 0640 impacts on the AQ calculation threshold cross over points.	Xoserve (MD)	Update provided. <b>Closed</b>
NEX08/01	01/08/11	1.2	AQ: All to consider the (unintended) consequences of the rolling AQ affecting EUC bands, and the potential increase in the frequency of band transfer.	ALL	Update due at 20/09/11 meeting. <b>Carried Forward</b>
NEX08/02	01/08/11	1.2	AQ: Understand what the capacity commitment would be for the SOQ charging factor if it were fixed.	ALL	Update due at 20/09/11 meeting. <b>Carried Forward</b>
NEX08/03	01/08/11	1.2	AQ: Xoserve to assess other process impacts and what was the most appropriate	Xoserve (SN/MD)	Update due at 20/09/11

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
			way to progress/bring in Modification 0380.		meeting. <b>Carried Forward</b>
NEX08/04	01/08/11	5.2.1	Reconciliation - Consideration of Option 3 to be raised at the next meeting of DNCMF.	Wales & West Utilities (ST)	Update due at 19/09/11 meeting. <b>Carried Forward</b>
NEX08/07	01/08/11	5.2.2	AQ - Populate the table 'AQ Correction Tolerances (from Mod 209 AQ Validation Tolerances)' with appropriate values (rather than percentages) for discussion.	Xoserve (SN/MD)	Update provided. <b>Closed</b>
NEX08/09	01/08/11	5.2.2	Supply Point Register: Project Nexus consultation responses - Contact Shell Gas Direct to ascertain if their response retained currency.	Xoserve (SN/MD)	Update due at 25/10/11 meeting. <b>Carried Forward</b>
NEX08/11	22/08/11	5.2.1	To ensure that consideration of the draft final Settlement Arrangements BRD is added to the agenda for the next DESC meeting.	Joint Office (BF)	Update provided. <b>Closed</b>
NEX08/12	22/08/11	5.2.1	Reconciliation: To develop a presentation (based upon discussion points) on how best to manage the data items listing (content, time expiry, new additions, amendments, etc) including consideration of ASP data, for consideration at the next meeting.	Xoserve (FC/MD)	Update due at 19/09/11 meeting. <b>Carried Forward</b>
NEX08/13	23/08/11	5.2.2	Supply Point Register: To prepare example scenarios (including identification of root causes, what to do with erroneous reads, asset error related aspects, reconciliation neutrality and energy smearing, throughput and refund timelines and mechanisms, contractual timelines) and what possible business rules would be	Xoserve (FC/MD)	Update due at 25/10/11 meeting. <b>Carried Forward</b>

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
			needed to support the process in the new world.		
NEX08/14	23/08/11	5.2.2	Retrospective Updates: To prepare example scenarios (including identification of root causes, what to do with erroneous reads, asset error related aspects, reconciliation neutrality and energy smearing, throughput and refund timelines and mechanisms, contractual timelines) and what possible business rules would be needed to support the process in the new world.	Xoserve (FC/MD)	Update due at 20/09/11 meeting. <b>Carried Forward.</b>
NEX08/15	23/08/11	5.2.2	Retrospective Updates: To consider the 'line in the sand' roll forward retrospective update considerations and provide feedback at the next meeting.	Xoserve (FC/MD)	Update due at 20/09/11 meeting. <b>Carried Forward</b>
NEX09/01	06/09/11	5.2.1	AQ Topic: DNs to double check to establish the existence of sub subs (and, if any existed, quantify how many).	All DNs	Update due at 20/09/11 meeting.
NEX09/02	06/09/11	5.2.1	AQ: Provide a WORD copy of the BRD to individual Shippers on request.	Xoserve (SN)	As required.
NEX09/03	06/09/11	5.2.1	AQ BRD 8.4.6 - Produce a strawman/figures for 'market breaker' read validation and present at the next meeting.	Xoserve (SN)	Update due at 20/09/11 meeting.
NEX09/04	06/09/11	5.2.1	AQ BRD 8.12.2 – Shippers to examine their processes to see what actions they might need to take in response to a notification of AQ validation failure/AQ not recalculated.	All Shippers	Update due at 20/09/11 meeting.
NEX09/05	06/09/11	5.2.1	AQ BRD 8.12.2 - Provide a list of the reasons for current AQ validation failure/AQ not recalculated.	Xoserve (MD)	Update due at 20/09/11 meeting.

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
NEX09/06	06/09/11	5.2.1	AQ BRD 8.12.2 - Shippers to consider what they would like to see included in the rejection file.	All Shippers	Update due at 20/09/11 meeting.
NEX09/07	06/09/11	5.2.1	AQ BRD 8.12.2 Provide examples of the current AQ reports.	Xoserve (MD)	Update due at 20/09/11 meeting.
NEX09/08	06/09/11	5.2.1	AQ BRD 8.12.2 - Provide an example of a potential report.	Xoserve (MD)	Update due at 20/09/11 meeting.
NEX09/09	06/09/11	5.6.1	Supply Point Register: Universal Single Meter Point Supply Points - DNs to look at alternative ways to link, decouple, and/or transfer Supply Points.	All DNs	Update due at 25/10/11 meeting.
NEX09/10	06/09/11	5.2.1	Ensure that Supply Point Register: Universal Single Meter Point Supply Points is included on the 25/10/11 meeting agenda.	Joint Office (BF/MiB)	Update due at 25/10/11 meeting.

