

Project Nexus Workgroup Minutes

Tuesday 04 October 2011

at the National Grid Office, 31 Homer Road, Solihull.

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(TD)	Joint Office
Mike Berrisford (Secretary)	(MB)	Joint Office
Brian Durber	(BD)	E.ON UK
Cesar Coelho	(CC)	Ofgem
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Dave Godwin	(DG)	Xoserve
Elaine Carr	(EC)	ScottishPower
Fiona Cottam	(FC)	Xoserve
Gareth Evans	(GE)	Waters Wye Associates
Grace Smith	(GS)	RWE npower
Graham Wood	(GW)	British Gas
Ivalene Bramble	(IB)	British Gas
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	Shell
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE
Michele Downes	(MD)	Xoserve
Naomi Anderson	(NA)	EDF Energy
Paul Russell	(PR)	RWE npower
Peter Thompson	(PT)	Customer Representative
Sean McGoldrick*	(SMc)	National Grid NTS
Sharon Broadley	(SBr)	ScottishPower
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	Gazprom

* denotes via teleconference link

1. Introduction

BF welcomed all to the meeting.

1.1 Review of Minutes

Xoserve (FC) and National Grid Distribution (CW) requested several amendments. BF advised that a change marked version (v2.0) of the minutes would now be prepared and published on the Joint Office web site ready for approval at the next meeting.

1.2 Review of 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: It was agreed that this matter had been sufficiently discussed during development of the Settlement BRD (section 6).

Closed

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: CC pointed out that his colleague AW had provided an update at the 20/09/11 meeting and the action had already been closed as a consequence.

Closed

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

Update: Consideration deferred until the 24/10/11 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 due at 24/10/11 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 due at 24/10/11 meeting.

Carried Forward

Action NEX08/12: Xoserve (FC/MD) in respect of Retrospective Updates: 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 due at 25/10/11 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 due at 25/10/11 meeting.

Carried Forward

Action NEX09/09: All DNs in respect of the Supply Point Register: Universal Single Meter Point Supply Points - DNs to look at alternative ways to link, decouple, and/or transfer Supply Points.

Update: Update due at the 25/10/11 meeting.

Carried Forward

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

Update: Update due at the 25/10/11 meeting.

Carried Forward

Action NEX09/11: Xoserve & National Grid Distribution (FC/CW) to investigate the feasibility of providing a common system solution incorporating iGT Supply Points, or tweaks to Nexus to achieve a similar result.

Update: FC pointed out that she believes that this action has been covered under the amendments undertaken on the minutes of the 19 & 20/09/11 meeting – *Please refer to v2.0 of the minutes published on the Joint Office web site at:*

Closed

Action NEX09/12: Xoserve (FC/MD) to consider various tolerance requirements for both settlement and reconciliation to ensure that smaller erroneous errors are captured, including the possible adoption of an 'absolute value' for the 0-73,200 AQ band.

Update: Please refer to item 5.2.1.X below.

Closed

Action NEX09/13: All parties to consider their reconciliation communication - data communication requirements especially how data updates (asset changes etc.) would be managed.

Update: FC advised that this matter would be discussed under development of the Retrospective Updates BRD in due course.

Carried Forward

Action NEX09/14: Xoserve (FC) with regard to invoicing to contact all the original (2008) consultation response owners (where possible) to ascertain if the requirements are still valid.

Update: FC advised that she had contacted the various parties and received several responses.

Closed

Action NEX09/15: Waters Wye Associates (GE) to provide a copy of the ICOS letter relating to Meter Point aggregation issues.

Update: GE advised that a copy of the letter had been subsequently provided to the Joint Office

Closed

Action NEX09/16: Xoserve (FC/MD) to provide some worked examples for CSEP SSP reconciliation options A & B.

Update: Update due at 24/10/11 meeting.

Carried Forward

Action NEX09/17: Ofgem (CC) to ascertain the Authority view on the potential decoupling of some AQ aspects from an integrated Nexus system implementation approach, including potential cost considerations.

Update: CC suggested that this matter would be considered under the proposed AQ discussions scheduled to take place at the 24/10/11 meeting.

When asked for a view, CC stated that whilst he currently does not have a specific view on the matter he did question whether or not Nexus was the most appropriate vehicle to address the issue of potentially decoupling aspects of the AQ regime, as he sees the raising of UNC Modifications as being a preferred means. He went on to suggest that more information surrounding the potential costs and benefits would be need before really deciding on the most appropriate way of progressing the work (under the Nexus banner or via a.n.other UNC Workgroup(s)).

CC advised parties that it is their (Ofgem's) intention to engage with Xoserve and the Nexus Workgroup to seek view on what may be the preferred way forward in due course – whilst it is anticipated that the Nexus Workgroup would provide their report by the end of 2011, he felt that an Impact

Assessment would/could be undertaken in early 2012. Furthermore, he expects to be in a position to set out Ofgem's expectations surrounding data and analysis requirements in early November.

Debate then centred around possibly combining all the BRD's under one single modification with any early delivery (aspects of AQ for instance) being dealt with separately. In response, CC indicated that Ofgem would prefer to 'group' together all subsequent modifications to enable consideration of the total impacts as one. Views remained polarised on how best to approach the raising of Nexus related modifications although GW highlighted the need for careful consideration for the raising of a single 'super' modification as he believes the anticipated range of views and commercial positions may make Ofgem's decision on such a modification nigh on impossible. One suggestion was to raise a high-level modification supported by further lower-level (detailed) modifications. PT observed that further discussions about the detailed aspects of Nexus implementation, including agreement on how we would rollout Nexus, is needed in due course.

When asked, FC indicated that Xoserve is looking to understand a complete picture of any proposed changes, via the BRD's with the aim being to provide a view on the I.T. system implementation requirements in due course. However, it should be noted that further discussions may be required to 'tease out' any unresolved issues. She went on to advise that Xoserve and the Transporters are currently discussing implementation and expects that the Transporters will give permission for Xoserve to start analysis in parallel with the ongoing workgroup work – this is already highlighted as a critical path on Xoserve project plan.

FC reminded those present that none of the BRDs have been formally approved as yet and until such a time that this takes place it is extremely difficult to assign resources. Additionally, Xoserve have on several occasions requested that parties provide an indication of the potential benefits and perhaps we need some specific meetings to investigate this further.

In closing, it was agreed to close the action with a view to raising a new one at a more appropriate time in the future.

Closed

Action NEX09/18: Xoserve (NS) to formulate a potential change to the AQ review process that could be effective prior to delivery of the full Nexus solution, while avoiding any significant adverse impact upon the Nexus project as a whole.

Update: Update to be provided in due course.

Carried Forward

Action NEX09/19: Xoserve & Transporters (SN/CW) to consider what transitional arrangements would be required to support a regime change from annual to rolling AQ.

Update: Update to be provided in due course.

Carried Forward

Action NEX09/20: Joint Office (BF/MB) to ensure that further consideration of the AQ BRD is placed on the agenda for the 25/10/11 meeting.

Update: Update to be completed in due course.

Carried Forward

2. Modification Workgroups

2.1 0380 – Periodic Annual Quantity calculation

Consideration deferred.

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.

3. Workgroup Approach and Plan

Topic Workgroup Timeline Tracking

FC provided a brief overview of the topic workgroup timeline plan summarising as follows:

- Settlement would need at least one more meeting to bottom out the tolerances, and
- Reconciliation, AQ, Invoicing and Retrospective Updates may need possibly two more meetings apiece, especially to reflect (settlement) tolerance requirements.

In essence, there are seven more meetings scheduled through to the year-end, so the work could be completed. When asked, those present supported delaying consideration of the non-functional elements.

In explaining the timeline (15 business days) associated with the review and approval of the respective BRDs, FC suggested that completion of this aspect of work would/could creep over into Q1 2012. SM believed that there may be benefit in extending the end date of the project plan to end of January 2012 rather than attempting to try to squeeze matters to reach an end of 2011 date.

A new action was placed against the Joint Office to look to schedule two new meetings for January 2012.

Project Nexus Workplan

MD provided a brief overview of the workplan, which has been updated since the previous meeting.

Following a brief discussion it was agreed to amend the workplan as follows:

- 24/10/11 – cover reconciliation and invoicing;
- 25/10/11 – cover AQ and supply point register, and
- 01/11/11 – cover settlement and retrospective updates.

Project Nexus Workgroup Outstanding Areas Log

Consideration deferred until the next meeting.

4. Terms of Reference (issues and topics)

No issues raised.

5. Issues and topics for discussion

5.1 High Level Workgroup Issues

No issues raised.

5.2 Further Consideration of Meter Reading Arrangements

5.2.1 Settlement

PN UNC Workgroup Settlement topic presentation

MD provided a brief overview of the presentation.

Workflow Process Map presentations

DG provided a brief overview of the five proposed process flow maps.

Starting with consideration of the 'NXTB Validate Meter Read' process flow, DG pointed out that this could be seen as the 'generic' process. It was confirmed during discussions that with respect to the SMART world and the 30 minute read provision, the 06:00hrs read equivalent would be utilised.

When considering the 'NXTB Manage Daily Metered Not Time Critical Readings' process flow, PT questioned whether or not the estimated read would be subjected to the market breaker tolerances to which SM advised that as the estimated read would be based on a previous validated reading, it only becomes an issue when the (equivalent) 06:00hr read is corrupt. FC advised that Xoserve had provided a presentation relating to this matter for consideration later in the meeting. DG suggested that one option would be for Xoserve to validate the estimate and utilise it regardless of the fact that it failed the market breaker tolerance test and thereafter they could notify the shipper concerned of this fact. SM voiced concern that where the time critical process was concerned, there may be issues around potential jamming up of the system. A new action was placed on Xoserve (DG/MD) to consider whether or not the estimated read should be subjected to the market breaker tolerance test and what should be the outcome.

PN UNC Workgroup Read Validation presentation

MD provided a brief overview of the presentation.

In considering the current tolerance proposals for processes (products) 1, 2 and 3, FC indicated that the aspiration should be to have only one suite of tolerances rather than the three alternative options presented and to avoid system hard coding of the tolerance levels thereby making subsequent amendments easier in future.

It was also noted during discussions that low volume process load switch offs (i.e. for maintenance purposes etc) could possibly trigger a market breaker validation failure, whilst DM sudden loads (i.e. Infrequent aero engine tests etc) could cause issues. Looking at the 'Alternative Read Validation Example' MD advised that where the read is rejected (either <0% or >650% in the example) this reflects the fact that the market breaker has been triggered and the AQ would also need recalculating.

Examining the 'Strawman GT Read Validations: Daily Read following an Actual Read' example, which does not allow for negative values, MD suggested that from a system design perspective you would undertake the market breaker tolerance test first because if this fails then the whole process stops. BD felt that % of SOQ is preferable to utilising the % of AQ. When asked, parties agreed that from a BRD progression perspective, the principles provided for in the examples are sound and only the actual tolerance percentages need identification, in due course.

Moving on to consider the 'Strawman GT Read Validations: Periodic Read' example, MD confirmed that the high level principle is that a shipper and GT validate the read after which it is utilised for all process requirements.

When considering where best to present the (entry) validation requirements, it was agreed to append these to each of the respective BRDs.

Project Nexus Document Review Form discussions

MD provided a brief overview of the presentation advising that it had been prepared following collation of all comments received to date on the Settlement BRD review.

Item 1 EDF Energy comment - in the absence of an EDF Energy representative, FC suggested that future charging processes may be better protected by having specified frequencies. Furthermore, where product 4 is concerned, the BRD currently requires that a party specifies their read frequency up front and that this would also aid Xoserve to understand the system capacity requirements when undertaking the design stages.

In recognising that the EDF comment seems to highlight a product 4 read frequency issue, FC wondered whether or not a minimum/maximum cap business rule for the number of reads allowable would benefit operational planning and submission requirements. This also brings in to question whether there are any real cost benefits to provision of excessive reads. SM anticipates a large number of SMART meters being aligned to product 4 in future and sees the issue boiling down to how often you would allow monthly read submissions under a rolling AQ regime – FC suggested that a business rule constraint that prevents system overload (based on product) and incentivises parties to select the most appropriate product lines may prove beneficial.

When discussing a possible future differential charging based approach, FC informed parties that Xoserve do not have such a system already available with this already built in. Furthermore, when considering system requirements, there are two main components to consider, namely (system) capacity and storage.

In acknowledging the outstanding questions and the various parties positions in this area, CC advised that Ofgem still have real concerns around potential gaming opportunities, especially related to product 4 in a future SMART world. In response, SM suggested that possibly the answer lies in restricting SMART meters to product lines 1, 2 or 3 only. FC suggested that the real answer, however unsavoury, could possibly lie with the provision of reads direct from the DCC.

PR went on to suggest that reconciliation profiles could support the read frequency and settlement processes, although FC was unsure about possible utilisation of a whole 'raft' of commercial profiles, but did wonder if provision of an I&C and domestic profiles could/would work in future especially when we have enhanced market flags available. PT believes that the answer could be to specify a defined set of frequencies (range) specific to your actual selected frequency, and that this is preferable to a 'default' style approach, as it could result in more accurate charges and billing of customers.

CW suggested that with regard to product 4, the maximum number of reads relates to the maximum number of reads that you can send,

whilst the minimum number of reads relates to the minimum number of reads you MUST send.

FC then provided the following example on the flipchart for further discussion.

Frequency	Gap Since Last Read (calendar days)	Must Read
Weekly	3 days	4 months
Monthly	7 40 days	4 months
Quarterly	25 days	24 months
6 Monthly	25 days	24 months
Annually	25 days	24 months

Following further lengthy debate, CW reminded parties that currently only monthly and annually are specified within Code. CC then voiced concerns relating to potential price volatility and questioned whether or not this would incentivise shippers to reconcile on a more regular basis. PR was unsure as to whether or not product 4 proposals raise any price volatility issues and would seek guidance from his colleagues within npower.

Concluding discussion on this item, it was agreed to delete weekly, quarterly and 6 monthly and opt for a 7 calendar day gap since the last read for monthly and 25 calendar days for annual, but only in relation to product 4.

Item 2 British Gas comment – GW believed that there had already been sufficient debate but went on to suggest that the issue would boil down to (volume) design considerations. MD noted that a more detailed appreciation would be required for the design elements within the respective BRDs.

Item 3 British Gas comment – GW was happy this had been discussed earlier.

Item 4 British Gas comment – as with item 3 above GW was happy that this had now been discussed sufficiently.

FC advised that now parties have agreed to a change in the tolerance range to read as 0% – 100% for the SSP market, she would double check if this was acceptable to NA prior to the next meeting.

Item 5 British Gas comment – whilst accepting that the necessary figures had been included within the BRD, GW is concerned about an apparent lack of supporting data, a point which MD accepted.

Item 6 British Gas comment – having agreed that the 40 or 56 day period would be in respect of calendar days, GW referred to recent DCC Service Level Agreement (SLA) discussions and highlighted his concern that 40 days may be too tight for parties to process their monthly read batches. SM pointed out that the DCC is a licenced entity and service provider (conduit) that would need to comply with prescribed industry standards and perhaps it might be beneficial to

put a date such as 40 days in [] brackets. It was agreed to insert [40] into the appropriate BRD.

Item 7 British Gas comment – when asked, parties agreed that this should simply be 24 months with no [] brackets.

Item 8 Xoserve comment – it was agreed to include this in the non-functional requirements in due course.

Item 9 Xoserve comment – a consensus was reached that the rejected read notification should include the current system data utilised to calculate the volumes, subject to no cost constraint implications. FC noted that this could/would necessitate a change to some file formats.

Item 10 Xoserve comment – parties were happy with the proposal.

Item 11 Waters Wye Associates – parties supported the comment provided.

MD then went on to highlight three additional comments received after the document was collated and published, as follows:

Addition of a definition of the AUGE Role – views differed as to whether or not an AUGE would be required going forward and SM suggested that the crux of the matter relates to whether we have an automated smearing process, as advocated in BRD discussions to date, or alternatively opt for a manual AUGE process, or a combination of both possibilities.

SM felt that it was important to record the fact that there may be a role for the AUGE in future for dividing up the reconciliation pot. In response CW suggested that if Nexus is advocating a new reconciliation regime then it should be considered in more detail at the next reconciliation meeting in a few weeks time. A new action was placed on all parties to consider what potential role would be required to be undertaken by the AUGE in future, and to what this role would include.

Two new additional points – MD advised that these would be highlighted within v0.9 of the Settlement BRD for consideration at a future meeting. Asked whether a second formal review of the Settlement BRD would be required in light of the discussions and proposed amendments, it was agreed that this would not be necessary and consideration could/should be kept in-house. The BRD would next be considered at the 01/11/11 meeting.

BRD for Meter Read Submission and Processing and Settlement Arrangements for All Gas Meter Points (v0.8) Review

It was agreed that this item had already been covered sufficiently and the BRD would now be amended to reflect the above discussions.

Please note: the following two items were taken out of sequence during the meeting.

5.2.2 Invoicing

When asked, parties were happy to go straight to considering the various consultation responses and to focus attention on only those where a representative was still in attendance.

Ref 8.1 E.ON UK response – BD provided a brief summary of the following email communication:

“This point relates to the number of different types of Ad Hoc invoices that exist and the supporting data that is sent to us for them. Currently there are approximately 15-

20 different types of ad hoc invoice that are issued. They mainly relate to different types of offline adjustments such as DM Reconciliation, Prime Reconciliation etc.

The issue we have managing these invoices relates to the fact that the supporting data for each of the Ad Hoc comes to us in varying ways and formats – our preferred method would be to receive the supporting data electronically in a predetermined format thus enabling us to ensure the data automatically loads into our system and can therefore be validated more easily.

We only receive electronic supporting data for approximately 4 of the Ad Hocs though, the remainder of the data is sent to us via spreadsheets which essentially have few agreed/predetermined fields so the formats of the files sent for each ad hoc will vary – this is difficult to manage and means we have difficulty validating many of the Ad Hocs that are sent to us as there is no consistency. For instance we are being sent monthly invoices for retrospective commodity charges for some sites, charges relating to an issues with an RGMA flow and charges relating to DM Recs that all have differing formats.

I appreciate that the same format may not be applicable for every type of Ad Hoc but think a review of the different types of invoice and the supporting data issued for them would be beneficial to highlight any instances where the same format could be used if it isn't currently, or possibly a new format being created that caters for a number of the invoices with fields nulled in instances where they are not applicable – then looking into making these electronic would be the ideal solution for us.

There is also an ongoing issue regarding the mismatching of meter points from an IGT/CSEP point of view, I'm not sure if IGTs are in the scope of the meeting you're at tomorrow? The issue is IGTs invoice us transportation charges at MPR level but the transporters invoice CSEP charges at LMN level which can create all sorts of problems when trying to match the data together in order to validate it - this is something that has been discussed at length at the CSEP Rec workshops."

In response, FC suggested that this also relates to wider ranging iGT discussions, which she believes to be flushing out some of these issues anyway. She went on to add that a lot of this revolves around the future adjustment mechanisms and the possible easing of current system constraints – could investigate the possibility of standardized backup facilities etc.

Ref 8.3 British Gas response – IB was unsure as to the exact nature of their (BG's) response but did mention the fact that British Gas has issues differentiating between their NDM domestic and business sites as all of their domestic invoices are rolled up by LDZ. BD suggested that the developments within the market sector code (flag) arena could go some way to resolving these issues in future. FC wondered if invoicing on a shipper/supplier i.d. basis would be beneficial.

Ref 8.4 National Grid Distribution response – FC advised that A Raper had written back explaining how prices may flex in future, along with what type of pricing module requirements may be required to support these changes.

Ref 8.6 British Gas response – IB explained that British Gas are currently engaging with Xoserve on User Pays related matters and she expects to provide feedback on progress in due course.

BD suggested that as far as Ad-Hoc invoices are concerned, being able to easily see what you are being charged for would be beneficial. IB also suggested that a UP audit trail back to the requester would/could prove helpful in focusing attention where it is best needed and utilised.

Ref 8.9 npower response – GS suggested that this relates to the provision of data and clarity of information at a meter point level, even for SSPs. FC pointed out that this is an awful lot of data !

Ref 8.10 npower response – GS indicated that if this related to read-only information she would not have an issue.

IB observed that depending on the future information granularity provisions, these could/would supplant the IAD service in due course. FC believed that this also goes hand-in-hand with future meter point reconciliation and validation discussions and requirements. GS indicated that she would discuss the matter with her colleagues and provide an update in due course.

5.2.3 Retrospective Updates (inc. market breaker presentation)

In debating the various scenarios, it was noted that whatever regime is employed Shipper A should be sufficiently incentivised to undertake an appropriate hand-over at the Change of Shipper (CoS) point in the process. Furthermore, it was felt that any changes, retrospective or otherwise, should only be made in agreement of both parties (Shipper A and Shipper B) and where no agreement is reached then no changes are made and the appropriate dispute process would be invoked. It was also suggested that this matter relates to commercial protection issues and therefore some felt that the Code should state that Shipper B can only make a change on the approval of Shipper A.

MJ enquired whether it was envisaged that all the issues relating to the various scenarios would be incorporated under one (super) modification to which CW suggested that multiple modifications would/could be a better option. FC believed that once we start to document requirements in more detail we would identify that in reality we are only able to go back and change the CoS reads.

It was acknowledged that Nexus presents an ideal opportunity to seek to address some of the longstanding change of supplier/shipper industry issues, especially from a possibly automated system solution perspective.

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

None.

7. Workgroup Process

7.1 Agree actions to be completed ahead of the next meeting

The following new actions were discussed and assigned:

Action NEX10/01: Joint Office (BF/MiB) to schedule in two new meetings during January 2012.

Action NEX10/02: Xoserve (MD/DG) to consider whether or not an estimated read should be subjected to the market breaker tolerance test and what should be the outcome.

Action NEX10/03: All parties to consider what potential role would be required to be undertaken by the AUGE in future, and to what this role would include.

8. Diary Planning

The following meetings are scheduled to take place during October/November 2011:

Title	Date	Location
Project Nexus Workgroup	24 & 25/10/2011	NG Office, 31 Homer Road, Solihull.
Project Nexus Workgroup	01/11/2011	NG Office, 31 Homer Road, Solihull.
Project Nexus Workgroup	21 & 22/11/2011	NG Office, 31 Homer Road, Solihull.

Appendix 1

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 provided. Closed
NEX06/05	21/06/11	5.2.1	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.	Ofgem (CC)	Update provided at previous meeting. Closed
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 24/10/11 meeting. Carried Forward
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.	E.ON UK (SB/BD)	Update due at 24/10/11 meeting. Carried Forward
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 24/10/11 meeting. Carried Forward
NEX08/12	22/08/11	5.2.1	Retrospective Updates: 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 25/10/11 meeting. Carried Forward
NEX08/13	23/08/11	5.2.2	Supply Point Register: To prepare example scenarios	Xoserve (FC/MD)	Update due at 25/10/11

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
			(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.		meeting. Carried Forward
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. Carried Forward
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/MB)	Update due at 25/10/11 meeting. Carried Forward
NEX09/11	20/09/11	1.2	Investigate the feasibility of providing a common system solution incorporating iGT Supply Points, or tweaks to Nexus to achieve a similar result.	Xoserve & National Grid Distribution (FC/CW)	Update provided. Closed
NEX09/12	19/09/11	5.2.1	Consider various tolerance requirements for both settlement and reconciliation to ensure that smaller erroneous errors are captured, including the possible adoption of an 'absolute value' for the 0-73,200 AQ band.	Xoserve (FC/MD)	Update provided. Closed
NEX09/13	19/09/11	5.2.1	Retro Updates: To consider their reconciliation communication - data communication requirements especially how data updates (asset changes etc.) would be managed.	All	Update due at 01/11/11 meeting. Carried Forward
NEX09/14	19/09/11	5.2.1	With regard to invoicing to contact all the original (2008)	Xoserve (FC)	Update provided.

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
			consultation response owners (where possible) to ascertain if the requirements are still valid.		Closed
NEX09/15	19/09/11	5.2.1	To provide a copy of the ICOS letter relating to Meter Point aggregation issues.	Waters Wye Associates (GE)	Update provided. Closed
NEX09/16	19/09/11	5.2.1	Reconciliation: To provide some worked examples for CSEP SSP reconciliation options A & B.	Xoserve (FC/MD)	Update due at 24/10/11 meeting. Carried Forward
NEX09/17	20/09/11	5.2.2	To ascertain the Authority view on the potential decoupling of some AQ aspects from an integrated Nexus system implementation approach, including potential cost considerations.	Ofgem (CC)	Update provided. Closed
NEX09/18	20/09/11	5.2.2	AQ: Formulate a potential change to the AQ review process that could be effective prior to delivery of the full Nexus solution, while avoiding any significant adverse impact upon the Nexus project as a whole.	Xoserve (NS)	Update to be provided in due course. Carried Forward
NEX09/19	20/09/11	5.2.2	AQ: To consider what transitional arrangements would be required to support a regime change from annual to rolling AQ.	Xoserve & Transporters (SN/CW)	Update to be provided in due course. Carried Forward
NEX09/20	20/09/11	5.2.2	To ensure that further consideration of the AQ BRD is placed on the agenda for the 25/10/11 meeting.	Joint Office (BF/MB)	To be completed in due course. Carried Forward
NEX10/01	04/10/11	3.	To schedule in two new meetings during January 2012.	Joint Office (BF/MiB)	Update due at next meeting.

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
NEX10/02	04/10/11	5.2.1	To consider whether or not an estimated read should be subjected to the market breaker tolerance test and what should be the outcome.	Xoserve (MD/DG)	Update due at next meeting.
NEX10/03	04/10/11	5.2.1	To consider what potential role would be required to be undertaken by the AUGÉ in future, and to what this role would include.	All	Update due at next meeting.