

Project Nexus Workgroup Minutes

Monday & Tuesday 22 & 23 August 2011

at the National Grid Office, 31 Homer Road, Solihull. B91 3LT

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Mike Berrisford (Secretary)	(MiB)	Joint Office
Alan Raper	(AR)	National Grid Distribution
Brian Durber (23 rd only)	(BD)	E.ON UK
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Elaine Carr (23 rd only)	(EC)	ScottishPower
Fiona Cottam	(FC)	Xoserve
Graham Wood	(GW)	British Gas
Grace Smith (23 rd only)	(GS)	RWE npower
Jonathan Wisdom (22 nd only)	(JW)	RWE npower
Kirsty Fraser (22 nd only)	(KF)	ScottishPower
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	Shell
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE
Michele Downes	(MD)	Xoserve
Peter Thompson	(PT)	Customer Representative
Phil Blakeman	(PB)	British Gas
Sallyann Blackett (22 nd only)	(SB)	E.ON Energy
Sean McGoldrick	(SMc)	National Grid NTS
Steve Mullinganie	(SM)	Gazprom

1. Introduction

BF 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 NEX0046: National Grid Distribution (CW) to investigate the statistical information relating to identification of the root causes of derived / un-derived drift, and impact of failed reads (to understand the risk of associated to their errors) and establish an initial definition for what is meant by a 'derived reading'.

Update: CW indicated that National Grid are struggling to complete the action and based upon previous discussions within the workgroup he questioned the value in continuing to try and resolve the matter. In response, SM suggested that as the action came about from a challenge made at an earlier meeting, he would agree to the action to be closed as long as it was noted that no evidence had been forthcoming that this was an issue – as a consequence, the action is now closed.

Closed

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 06/09/11 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 06/09/11 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: MD advised an update would be provided at the 06/09/11 meeting.

Carried Forward

Action NEX07/10: All to consider in respect of the BRD what drivers and business goals are appropriate.

Update: BF suggested, and those present agreed, that as the BRD was on the agenda it made sense to close the action.

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: Update to be provided at 06/09/11 meeting.

Carried Forward

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

Update: Update to be provided at 06/09/11 meeting.

Carried Forward

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 06/09/11 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 06/09/11 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: Update to be provided at 06/09/11 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: BF suggested that whilst he believed that this action had been completed during a recent DNCFM meeting, it would be prudent to leave the action open until the 'owner' ST could confirm it had been completed.

Carried Forward

Action NEX08/05: All to consider the BRD Reconciliation - Review the data items listed and consider retention/ removal/further additions; return to next meeting with views/suggestions

Update: It was assumed that the action was complete.

Closed

Action NEX08/06: Joint Office (BF) in relation to AQ Overview - Contact the Proposer of Modification 0380 to discuss his intentions and the best way to progress this.

Update: BF confirmed he had subsequently contacted the proposer of 0380 to discuss the matter.

Closed

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: Update to be provided at 06/09/11 meeting.

Carried Forward

Action NEX08/08: Xoserve (SN/MD) in relation to the Supply Point Register - Review current Supply Point Register and list what fields are included (used and unused).

Update: MD confirmed that a list of the supply point register data items would be provided and discussed later in the meeting.

Closed

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

Update: MD confirmed that discussions are ongoing with Shell and an update would be provided in due course.

Carried Forward

Action NEX08/10: All Shippers in relation to the Resynch Transition Arrangements - Shippers to consider the position and return with views on whether to replicate the current DM market across 4 products or whether to go back to the last eyeball read regardless of Supplier.

Update: Parties agreed that this item had been sufficiently discussed during the previous day's (22nd) meeting

Closed

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

Copies of the documentation relating to this modification is available to view &/or download at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0380>.

CW provided a brief update on progress advising that discussions with Xoserve on the more complex aspects relating to the modification would be undertaken shortly and he expects to provide a more detailed update at the 06/09/11 meeting.

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

FC provided a brief overview of the topic workgroup timeline plan.

Parties briefly discussed what type of ‘knock on’ issues may arise in the event that product (process) 1, which is considered to be a monopolistic service, was subsequently moved into an unbundled commercially available service. In response, FC suggested that this would naturally align with the Nexus principles relating to the provision of meter reads. It was acknowledged that current thinking is based more on assumptions rather than detailed discussions. The main assumption is that Shippers would provide readings in future.

When asked, FC confirmed that in the Business Rules, DM mandatory reads could be provided by a Shipper’s own meter reading provider – this highlighted a ‘missing’ step within the current BRD processes which would need addressing in due course.

Project Nexus Workplan

FC provided a brief overview of the workplan, advising that completion of the Settlement area is key to staying on track.

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 Settlement & Reconciliation (22nd)

PN UNC Workgroup (Settlement topic) presentation

MD provided a brief overview of the presentation focusing attention on the last two slides. With regard to the BRD elements, the updates to the previous version of the document (v0.6) have been highlighted in the change tracking as red or green in latest version (v0.7) to be presented later in this meeting.

Settlement Issue Tracking – IRR Entries

FC provided a brief overview of the IRR items, the main focus of attention and discussion points being:

13.20 – communication formats to be identified in due course;

10.10 – when asked if any guidance had been provided to DESC, FC pointed out that she anticipates that several Nexus representatives would be attending DESC in due course, and

4.1 – questions remain as to whether or not a solution can actually be delivered for this point.

Summing up, FC advised that these items would now be added to the requirements register to highlight their consideration.

Settlement Issue Tracking – Business Issues

FC provided a brief overview of the business issues items, explaining that with regard to item 4, she believed that contractual considerations maybe required in due course whilst item 7 would undergo a 'minor' review today prior to being passed onto DESC.

In closing, PT voiced his ongoing concerns relating to the SSP category definitions (selection aspects) to which FC pointed out that there is continuity in the form of a common Joint Office Chair person.

PN UNC Workgroup (Settlement – Demand Estimation) presentation

Opening, FC suggested that it would be more appropriate if this matter could be referred to DESC with some element of notional support from the Nexus Workgroup.

In considering the 'Impact on Allocation' aspects, FC advised that products (process options) 1&2 would require some form of a scaling factor as part of the daily allocation process. Furthermore, she is of the view that correcting new cross subsidies in allocation by reconciliation potentially leads to an unfair outcome.

Moving on, FC is convinced that issues remain relating to the make up of the current WCFs & DAFs. In looking at the suggested approach to weather correction, SB questioned whether or not the proposal would/could work as she believes demand estimation is not just about weather impacts. She pointed out that previous work in this area (UNC modification 0177 – Rolling AQ Review.) did not fully address the issues. *Post meeting note: a copy of the documentation relating to this review can be found on the Joint Office web site at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0177>.*

Moving on to examine the 'Suggested Approach – Impacts' slide, debate centred on whether the proposed principle is sound, although consensus was not necessarily reached on this. FC advised that a 'balance' between what parties desire and what they actually need will need to be found. SM believed that being in a position to 'switch' between products (process options) in future would go part, or all the way, to mitigating risks and the issue boils down to introducing a process that is 'fit for purpose'. JW felt that tensions remain relating to the as yet unresolved aspects of future customer information permissions (within the domestic market in particular) and actual regulatory requirements.

In discussing the 'Suggested Approach – Nominations' slide, it was requested that zero nominations default assumptions should be excluded. In response, FC confirmed that an additional clause to this end would be added within the Settlement BRD to 'cover' this.

In considering the next steps, FC suggested that an important aspect of the subject relates to getting a 'true feel' for the scale of the proposed changes and identifying the business requirements, hopefully by the end of December 2011. SM went on to add that in his view, DESC may not be the only viable route for resolving this matter and that the AUGER could be utilised (especially for products 1&2) – parties acknowledged that the AUGER would possibly have no legacy baggage to resolve and furthermore, we may require differing methodologies for applying across the four products.

In briefly discussing unallocated gas, FC reminded parties that the BRD currently states that unallocated gas will be shared out based on throughputs and any suggested changes to this fundamental principle would need further discussion and agreement with possibly additional rules required to support a change. When asked about negative values, FC confirmed that it had been previously agreed that these could/should exist.

As a basis for progress, it was agreed that we now have a working assumption for the future world, which is superior to the current provisions. A comment relating to estimations within the nominations arena will now be added within the BRD.

Project Nexus Workgroup (Settlement) presentation

In providing a brief overview of the presentation, MD pointed out that it had been prepared in response to a question raised at a previous meeting.

Looking at the regime transfer read process (1&2 to 3&4) on slide 5, it was suggested that utilising the D-1 read as a transfer read and as the basis for estimations as well could provide a more accurate process in future. Consensus was to retain the D+10 window, but endeavour to utilise the most up to date readings – one alternative being that the default could always be to utilise the D-1 reading at D.

Moving on to look at the reverse process (3&4 to 1&2) on slide 6, it was agreed that the basic assumption should be that the 06:00hrs read would/could be utilised regardless of when it is actually delivered into the system. FC suggested that the aspiration is to NOT have to reconfirm for all changes of regime, but only for instances of a change of shipper or usage. However, she did point out that if parties wish to close out their energy on one product (process option) before moving over to another product (process option), we may need some form of reconfirmation mechanism. JW voiced his concerns over potential erroneous read and product transfer related issues that sit astride the four product options. However, some parties felt that the majority of these types of issue would be resolved through reconciliation.

BRD for Meter Read Submission and Processing and Settlement Arrangements for All Gas Meter Points (v0.7) Review

In opening, MD advised that the document had been updated to reflect comments received at the previous meeting. Furthermore, she believes that consideration of any highlighted (yellow) text had already been 'covered' in discussions already undertaken elsewhere in the meeting.

When asked if there were any additional items that parties would like including in the BRD, FC suggested that based on today's discussions a couple of nomination considerations plus transfer related information should be included prior to publishing the (final) version of this particular BRD for review/consideration and sign off. GW also suggested including a statement to cover bulk updates for read frequency notifications. Agreement was also reached to amend all references to the term 'process' or 'processes' to read as 'product' or 'products' where applicable.

Following a brief discussion, a review period of 15 business days, from the date of publication on the Joint Office web site, for review and final sign off of this BRD was agreed.

MD then provided a very brief update on the various process flow maps before advising that these would now also be included within the BRD.

In closing, a new action was placed against the Joint Office (BF) to ensure that consideration of the draft final Settlement Arrangements BRD is added to the agenda for the next DESC meeting.

Project Nexus Workgroup Reconciliation Meeting 4 presentation

MD provided a very brief overview of the presentation before handing over to FC to run through the 'As-Is' process flow maps which following this meeting will be included within the Reconciliation BRD.

BRD for Reconciliation (v0.3) Review

Reviewing the changes to the BRD since the last meeting, MD focused attention on a number of key items, as follows:

- Para 4.1 Industry Benefits, page 8 – whilst seeking initial views, debate centred on adding items to the list such as:
 - ensures that we charge energy to the right market sector(s);
 - inclusion of a reworking of the main drivers statements;
 - inclusion of some or all of the Settlement benefits (as it is deemed these are broadly similar);
 - incentivises parties to utilise reads to reconcile sites (as this minimises impact of inaccurate profiles);
 - provides for a level of clarity around Unallocated Gas (UAG);
 - enhances market transparency by ensuring a link between what you are being charged, and as a consequence, what you are charging your customers/consumers, and
 - resynchronisation and drift related benefits.
- Para 8.11.2, page 20 – in acknowledging that neither option is ideal, it was agreed by consensus that 'Option B – invoiced to the Registered Shipper' should be the adopted approach especially as it was felt that it would be extremely difficult to demonstrate any real benefits associated to option A. SM noted that perhaps this area could possibly be referred to the AUGE in future.
- Para 8.12 Reconciliation Communication, pages 20 & 21 – a common view was that the lists are fine as proposed. Although PT enquired if an imperial to metric flag could be added as well. When asked, MD confirmed that the next version of the BRD would identify the data items by product (process option) type.
- Para 9.1 Meter Point reconciliation for Smaller Supply Points, page 23 – it was noted that as these do not apply at site level, they are not expected to impact upon RbD.
- Para 9.2.3, page 23 – FC confirmed that in essence this could be seen as a 'split profile' across product options 3&4. SB noted that the proposal could potentially result in a delay of up to 5 years to resolve some reconciliation issues. JW wondered about a 'line in the sand' (deemed read) style approach. FC suggested that the crux of the matter relates to where do additional RbD charges go to and to this end she believes that there is potentially three options to consider, namely

- keep the last months RbD open (basically fix the market share and keep the pot open until all the RbD has gone); or
- share the RbD across the whole market (as per scaling); or
- share the RbD across the ongoing SSP market sector.

PT noted that ongoing meter exchanges would eventually minimise the number of sites that are not reconciled. In agreeing, FC pointed out that most sites are normally reconciled within a 12 to 18 month window, and it is the unknown sites that are the main concern. FC confirmed that resynch multiple records would be added to the BRD.

Following further discussion, Xoserve (FC/MD) agreed to undertake a new action to develop a pictorial representation of the three possible RbD solutions, including where possible supporting materiality considerations in time for consideration at the 06/09/11 meeting.

Concluding, parties briefly discussed CSEP requirements going forward into the new regime. It was pointed out that DECC are currently considering SMART U16 meter requirements as these have inadvertently been omitted from any considerations to date.

5.2.2 Retrospective Updates & Supply Point Register (23rd)

Project Nexus UNC Workgroup – Supply Point Register presentation

MD provided a brief overview of the presentation highlighting that four new items had been added to the possible areas for discussion list on slide 6 in response to points raised at the previous meeting. The four new items being, Unique Sites, CSEPs, Primes & Subs and LPG Sites.

When reviewing the consultation responses on slide 4, CW suggested that the main consideration should be what is provided for within the UNC to enable us to run the core supply point register system, and thereafter what to do with the 'grey non core area relating to items such as the DCC and SMART metering going forward. SM also believed that value could also be gleaned from focusing on the future infrastructure requirements and developments.

EC enquired as to what progress had been made with regard to CSEPs and the role of the iGTs. In response, CW advised that he believed that UNC modification 0392 "Proposal to amend Annex A of the CSEP NExA table" was looking into this area. FC wondered if the answer lay in defining a CSEP statement for presentation to the iGTs.

FC proposed two items of note, adoption of the same reconciliation process for CSEPs as for all meter points, which met with the approval of those present, and iGT sites should be included within the 'core' sites and meters database – CW felt a fall back position would be required in the event that this second point failed.

Moving on, CW believed that issues and questions remain around what to do with the iGT AQ (SSP) data once RbD is replaced by reconciliation. FC also suggested that consideration of the communication interactions between the supply point register and file flows would be needed. SM felt that the crux of the issue lay in relation to how we approach the issue of obsolescence. It was confirmed that data exchange communications within the electricity arena take the form of file format flows. GW felt that reinventing the

'data item wheel' would not serve a useful purpose and believes refinement of the data listing is the preferred solution. This was a view supported by others present.

Supply Point Register Data items presentation

Dovetailing with the above presentation, MD provided a brief resume of the list suggesting that this could be refined further over time. She also reminded those present that this list comprises those data items that are currently maintained by shippers. Some Shipper members preferred not to remove any items from the list, so that those that would no longer be applicable/utilised would simply lapse.

Several points were raised during discussions, such as:

- in future, it may be beneficial to hold details identifying the existence of, but not the commercial information for, interruptible contracts;
- may need to consider including items that are not directly updated by shippers;
- consensus view is that a review of the actual list would/could be better served towards the end of the respective BRD developments process;
- as reconciliation and settlement areas near completion, value may be gained in looking at what new data items maybe required (read attributes, must reads, check reads and multiple equipment scenarios etc.).

Parties debated how best to capture check reads with one view being that these are best 'linked back' to the meter asset and another being they are best 'linked' to the read type. Some preferred the read type solution, as they believe that it potentially avoids AMR visibility and modularity issues.

PT wondered if 'linking' check reads in with the frequency parameters maybe a better option, although some felt care would be needed to avoid invoking resynchronisations – it was felt that this could also potentially place an additional resource burden on the various parties involved. It was suggested that a flag to switch off a check read trigger maybe beneficial.

It was uncertain whether or not the current (wider) SMART metering industry debates would provide any additional clarity at this time. SM reminded parties that must reads do not place an obligation on a party to undertake a resynch, and neither do they necessarily reset the check read clock (window). Quickly revisiting the proposed 36 month check read window, a suggestion was put forward to amend this to 24 months, as it was felt that this would be more representative of operational requirements and parameters.

FC suggested that it really boils down to what meter read asset data we believe we require and wish to hold in future. Putting DCC considerations to one side, CW remained unsure as to whether or not the matter had been sufficiently resolved and went on to question the need to retain meter asset related data such as meter serial numbers etc. From a Transporter point of view, the information is only required to enable the generation of invoices. In response, FC pointed out that Xoserve are frequently asked to provide this type of information by interested parties

such as Ofgem – therefore regulatory requirements/aspirations would need to be catered for in the new world.

- based on the above discussions, the aspiration is to undertake check reads based on the must read type.

Thereafter, It was agreed to defer detailed consideration of the list until further work on the respective BRDs have progressed matters (more towards the end of the topic workgroups) to a point where more informed views could be sought.

A new action was placed against Xoserve (FC/MD) 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.

Concluding, MD pointed out that supply point register was to be discussed again in more detail at the 06/09/11 meeting. It was agreed to defer consideration until a later meeting.

Project Nexus UNC Workgroup – Retrospective Updates presentation

FC provided a brief overview of the presentation.

It was noted that UNC modification 0395 “Limitation on Retrospective Invoicing and Invoice Correction” raised by EDF Energy could/would have future Nexus ‘line in the sand’ impacts in due course.

Attention then moved on to the consultation responses. FC suggested that in most cases there is benefit in identifying the true ‘root causes’ of the problems.

The following key points being discussed:

Ref 9.2, ‘The ability to amend incorrect meter read data after the submission of a later read’ – it was agreed that the impact of this would need to be understood across all the four products (process options). AR voiced his real concern surrounding trying to develop a system to encapsulate correction factor requirements, as he believes that the historic data aspects are a dangerous area to get into. In essence, he is of the view that we need a simple solution that ensures that any monies find their correct home without the need to rewrite historical information. To this end Xoserve (FC/MD) agreed to undertake a new action 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) also agreed to undertake a new action to consider the ‘line in the sand’ roll forward retrospective update considerations and provide feedback at the next meeting.

Ref 13.2, ‘A thorough review of data flows and data validation’ – SM pointed out that previously the aspiration had been to provide ‘standard industry wide file flows’, but ultimately this failed. However, should we pursue a similar end game it could be a big win scenario, any solution would be heavily dependent upon Xoserve’s ability to handle standard industry wide file flows.

Moving on to consider the 'Impacts on Previous Invoices' slide, BD suggested that pressure changes at a site could not be catered for by retrospective updates.

In the end, it was felt that parties would need to adopt a realistic view of energy allocation in an RbD'less world, although it was acknowledged that obtaining accurate (energy) information as the incumbent shipper may prove difficult, especially any change of shipper aspects. One suggestion to resolve these concerns was to allow the Meter Asset Manager (MAM) to have direct access to Xoserve systems – this was not necessarily a universally supported view however. In response, FC advised that she would be terribly nervous of any proposal that would allow an incoming shipper (B) to make backward facing (reconciliation) adjustments that would potentially impact on the outgoing shippers (A) previous invoices.

5.3 Transitional Arrangements

Not discussed.

5.4 Issues logs (external and Project Nexus)

Not discussed.

5.5 Alignment of IRR requirements

Not discussed.

5.6 New Issues

Not discussed.

6. AOB

PB requested a progress update on UNC modification 0380 at the 06/09/11 meeting. CW advised that the system ramifications are extremely complex and the main consideration is whether or not to opt for (standalone) implementation prior to Nexus or inclusion within Nexus and discussions on the matter between Transporters and Xoserve are due to take place in the near future. Some Shipper members requested ROMs (to reflect the two options – legacy standalone or Nexus integration solution) and potential legacy impacts would be provided in due course, hopefully at the 06/09/11 meeting. FC wondered whether or not the ROMs were the correct tool to consider the complex system volume impacts with AR suggesting that some form of interim business rules approach maybe preferable as this would also cater for philosophy and impact considerations.

7. Workgroup Process

7.1 Agree actions to be completed ahead of the next meeting

The following new actions were discussed and assigned:

New Action NEX08/11: Joint Office (BF) to ensure that consideration of the draft final Settlement Arrangements BRD is added to the agenda for the next DESC meeting.

New Action NEX08/12: Xoserve (FC/MD) to develop a pictorial representation of the three possible RbD solutions, including where possible supporting materiality considerations in time for consideration at the 06/09/11 meeting.

New Action NEX08/13: Xoserve (FC/MD) to develop a presentation (based upon discussion points) on the 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.

New Action NEX08/14: Xoserve (FC/MD) 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.

New 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.

8. Diary Planning

Following discussion, it was agreed to make the following changes to the up and coming meetings:

- amend the 06/09/11 meeting agenda to just cover AQ:
- to merge market differentiation with supply point register from now on;
- at the 19/09/11 meeting cover Reconciliation & Invoicing, and
- at the 20/09/11 meeting cover Retrospective Updates & AQ

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

Title	Date	Location
Project Nexus Workgroup	06/09/2011	NG Office, 31 Homer Road, Solihull.
Project Nexus Workgroup	19 & 20/09/2011	NG Office, 31 Homer Road, Solihull. <i>Please note: a location for the 20th is to be confirmed.</i>

Appendix 1

Action Table

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
NEX0046	24/05/11	1.2	To investigate the statistical information relating to identification of the root causes of derived / un-derived drift, and impact of failed reads (to understand the risk of associated to their errors) and establish an initial definition for what is meant by a 'derived reading'.	National Grid Distribution (CW)	Update provided. Closed
NEX06/04	21/06/11	5.2.1	Consider and provide a set of business requirements (inc. the viability of) a bulk read upload facility.	British Gas (GW)	Update due at 06/09/11 meeting. Carried Forward
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 06/09/11 meeting. Carried Forward
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 due at 06/09/11 meeting. Carried Forward
NEX07/10	18/07/11	5.2	To consider in respect of the BRD what drivers and business goals are appropriate.	All	Update provided. Closed
NEX07/14	18/07/11	5.2	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 06/09/11 meeting. Carried Forward
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 due at 06/09/11 meeting. Carried Forward

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
NEX08/01	01/08/11	1.2	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 06/09/11 meeting. Carried Forward
NEX08/02	01/08/11	1.2	Understand what the capacity commitment would be for the SOQ charging factor if it were fixed.	ALL	Update due at 06/09/11 meeting. Carried Forward
NEX08/03	01/08/11	1.2	Xoserve to assess other process impacts and what was the most appropriate way to progress/bring in Modification 0380.	Xoserve (SN/MD)	Update due at 06/09/11 meeting. Carried Forward
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 06/09/11 meeting. Carried Forward
NEX08/05	01/08/11	5.2.1	BRD Reconciliation - Review the data items listed and consider retention/removal/further additions; return to next meeting with views/suggestions	ALL	Update provided. Closed
NEX08/06	01/08/11	5.2.2	AQ Overview - Contact the Proposer of Modification 0380 to discuss his intentions and the best way to progress this.	Joint Office (BF)	Update provided. Closed
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 due at 06/09/11 meeting. Carried Forward
NEX08/08	01/08/11	5.2.2	Supply Point Register - Review current Supply Point Register and list what fields are included (used and unused).	Xoserve (SN/MD)	Update provided. Closed

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
NEX08/09	01/08/11	5.2.2	Project Nexus consultation responses - Contact Shell Gas Direct to ascertain if their response retained currency.	Xoserve (SN/MD)	Update due at 06/09/11 meeting. Carried Forward
NEX08/10	01/08/11	5.3.1	Resynch Transition Arrangements - Shippers to consider the position and return with views on whether to replicate the current DM market across 4 products or whether to go back to the last eyeball read regardless of Supplier.	All Shippers	Update provided. Closed
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 due at 06/09/11 meeting.
NEX08/12	22/08/11	5.2.1	To develop a pictorial representation of the three possible RbD solutions, including where possible supporting materiality considerations in time for consideration at the 06/09/11 meeting.	Xoserve (FC/MD)	Update due at 06/09/11 meeting.
NEX08/13	23/08/11	5.2.2	To develop a presentation (based upon discussion points) on the 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 06/09/11 meeting.
NEX08/14	23/08/11	5.2.2	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	Xoserve (FC/MD)	Update due at 06/09/11 meeting.

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
			business rules would be needed to support the process in the new world.		
NEX08/15	23/08/11	5.2.2	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 06/09/11 meeting.