

Project Nexus Workgroup Minutes
Tuesday/Wednesday 02/03 August 2011
31 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3LT

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Lorna Dupont (Secretary)	(LD)	Joint Office
Brian Durber	(BD)	E.ON UK
Cesar Coelho*	(CC)	Ofgem
David Godwin	(DG)	Xoserve
David Speake	(DS)	ES Pipelines (2 nd only)
Fiona Cottam	(FC)	Xoserve (2 nd only)
Gareth Evans	(GE)	Waters Wye Associates
George Glen	(GG)	ScottishPower (3 rd only)
Grace Smith	(GS)	RWE npower
Graham Wood	(GW)	British Gas
Joanna Ferguson	(JF)	Northern Gas Networks
Jonathan Wisdom	(JW)	RWE npower
Karen Kennedy	(KK)	ScottishPower
Kirsty Fraser	(KF)	ScottishPower (2 nd only)
Lisa Harris	(LH)	Shell
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE
Michele Downes	(MD)	Xoserve
Peter Thompson	(PT)	Consumer Representative
Phil Blakeman	(PB)	British Gas
Sallyann Blackett	(SB)	E.ON UK (3 rd only)
Simon Trivella	(ST)	Wales & West Utilities
Stefan Leedham	(SL)	EDF Energy (2 nd only)
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	Gazprom
Steve Nunnington	(SN)	Xoserve (3 rd only)
Will Guest	(WG)	Northern Gas Networks (3 rd only)

**teleconference*

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: In the absence of the action owner, consideration was deferred.

Carried Forward

Action NEX06/01: Gazprom (SM) to speak to the SMD group and ascertain their view on the future potential treatment of drift in the AMR market.

Update: SM reiterated that the majority of smart meters will not exhibit 'drift' as it is currently understood because they are encoded meters; the issue may remain on non-smart meters and may be considered as part of the Business Rules. **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: Consideration ongoing; update at September 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.

Update: CC advised that Ofgem had met with the iGTs recently. Discussions were continuing on what should go into the consultation document. An update would be provided at the September meeting.

In response to a request from GE, CC agreed to offer a view on iGT Modification 0039 (which made specific reference to Nexus) also at the September meeting; the action was extended to include this.

Carried Forward

Action NEX07/02: Joint Office (BF) to seek the (expert) view of the DESC members on the potential impacts of adopting a 'fixed' SOQ, but rolling (monthly) AQ regime on the winter load factor ratios (i.e. should SOQ be calculated on an annual basis).

Update: BF advised that this was now considered to be a charging issue and will be discussed at September's DNCFM. **Closed**

Action NEX07/03: GDF Suez (PBr) to analyse the potential effects a static SOQ but rolling AQ could have on WAR bands and EUCs in time for consideration at the next meeting.

Update: This had been passed to DNCFM for a view. ST suggested it should be discussed as part of Modification 0380. SB confirmed that a static SOQ makes no difference to EUCs. JW thought the issue was really what impact does the static SOQ have on a Shipper's ability to recover costs from the customer. ST stated that it affected capacity charging, not commodity. It may come down to whether it is thought there is a capacity commitment. JF referred to recent discussions on pricing stability and the view that a fixed SOQ is helpful. A moving AQ will have an improving effect on how energy is allocated. SB stated that EUC bands are reviewed each year by DESC, and if their appropriateness is to be questioned then this needs to be passed to DESC to assess within their programme of work; she did not believe it to be a 0380 question. In terms of this action SB believed that neither had an impact. **Closed**

GE then gave an example of a site steadily reducing consumption and potentially transferring into a new EUC band every month. SB pointed out that the chance of 100% accurate allocation on any one site was nil, but the aggregate would be improved. GE advised he would discuss further with PB.

New 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.

New Action NEX08/02: Understand what the capacity commitment would be for the SOQ charging factor if it were fixed.

Action NEX07/06: All parties to utilise the tolerance levels provided in the BRD (v0.5) tables under item 5.13 Shipper Read Validation, test the viability of the tolerance levels with examples taken from their respective portfolios and provide feedback on their findings.

Update: MD advised that this was covered in the Settlement BRD.

Closed

Action NEX07/07: All parties to consider whether or not a new Allocations/Nominations Regime is required in future, or stick with the current regime going forward.

Update: MD advised that this would be covered under ongoing Settlement BRD considerations.

Closed

Action NEX07/08: National Grid Distribution (CW) to seek a view from his Pricing team colleagues on the potential effects a static SOQ but rolling AQ would have on WAR bands & EUCs (ref: NEX07/03).

Update: Passed to DNCFM for a view.

Closed

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

Update: Ongoing.

Carried Forward

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

Update: Ongoing.

Carried Forward

Action NEX07/11: Xoserve (MD) to double check the origins of the 50 and 42 week consumption period windows and their potential impact on Supply Point isolations during these periods.

Update: MD reported that these figures had existed since the inception of Network Code (and were no doubt in prior existence). No original analysis could be found. SN suggested retaining these figures unless evidence could be presented to force a change. This was agreed.

Closed

Action NEX07/12: Xoserve (MD/SN) to seek to further develop the (existing) BTU form process suitable for future application.

Update: Presentation and consideration at this meeting.

Closed

Action NEX07/13: All parties to consider the suggestion for AQ Effective Day threshold (trigger point) requirements of three (3) consecutive calculations or one (1) year whichever is the sooner.

Update: Continual movement of a site because it had exceeded a threshold one month was to be avoided. This had been discussed previously under Modification 0209, and the sensible approach was that the site remained

where it was until equipment was installed. SM queried the over use of data across products to meet the varying obligations. ST suggested a leeway period (end dated) in which to discharge obligations. It was a system/process timing issue (to meet particular product timescales) rather than an asset issue. It was agreed that after 3 consecutive triggers the site would need to be moved to another Process 1 **Closed**

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

Update: This was Pricing related - to consider changes to DM regimes and BSSOQs – ST pointed out he has a similar action under 0329.

Carried Forward

Action NEX07/15: Xoserve (MD) to cross check the original UNC Modification 0209 WAR requirements.

Update: SB confirmed that under Modification 0209 the definitions of WAR bands were built in – The BRD to reflect the WAR band should change in line with the AQ. **Closed**

Action NEX07/16: Xoserve (MD) to consider potential NC Modification 0640 (End of Year Reconciliation for Threshold Crossers) impacts on the AQ calculation threshold cross over points.

Update: JW believed this only made sense if rolling AQ was to be brought in by 2013. GE suggested moving to the Distribution Workgroup for discussion. SB pointed out that Project Nexus planned a phased approach and this could be one of the earlier items. The possibility of bringing Modification 0380 forward was discussed as it was believed that it would need to be a later phase of Project Nexus due to the dependencies on other requirements. SB stated that Modification 0209 dealt with 0640, and SN offered to provide the 0209 ROM and Business Rules to the next meeting.

CC stated that Ofgem would like to see implementation of 0380 as quickly as possible, though there may be impacts. It would be helpful to have identified processes other than 0640 that may have to change if this is implemented. **Carried Forward**

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

Action NEX07/17: All parties to consider the identification of an appropriate ‘market breaker’ rule and associated threshold and its potential impact on the various market sectors.

Update: MD advised this was covered in the BRD. **Closed**

Action NEX07/18: Xoserve (SN) to provide a breakdown of the Annual AQ file(s).

Update: Completed. **Closed**

Action WG0377 05/01: First Utility (GE) to update the modification based on the comments received within the Workgroup.

Update: GE advised this would be completed at the end of the discussions.

Closed

Action WG0380 06/04: E.ON (SB) to look into the impact of weather correction on the daily read and submitted sites: AQ calculated monthly (last 365 reads) requirement and ascertain if it actually makes a difference.

Update: SB provided a scatter graph illustrating a subset of DM sites with rolling 12 month AQ/consumption against weather. She believed it clearly showed a weather impact on DM sites and gives some support to the view that these are weather sensitive. MD confirmed that the DM AQs were not used for any significant purpose, and there was no reason not to treat them consistently with others. ST confirmed that from a Transporter perspective the AQ was useful but had no financial impact. SB reiterated that she was convinced there was a weather impact on sites in her portfolio but others may perceive this differently. For DESC the question would be is the profile right, but for AQ this is different. In SB's view everything should be weather corrected, however MD saw this as added complexity. BF suggested costing both options and deciding was it cheaper to leave it in or take it out.

Closed

2. Modification Workgroups

Copies of the various presentation materials are available to view and/or download from the Joint Office of Gas Transporters web site: www.gasgovernance.co.uk.

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.

** denotes a status update only.*

3. Workgroup Approach and Plan

3.1 Project Nexus Workplan

FC advised that the plan was still achievable. BF observed that additional meetings might be required for the AQ topic. Re-planning if necessary would take place at the end of this meeting.

3.2 Topic Workgroup Timeline Tracking

FC gave a brief update, drawing attention to the need to demonstrate progress and that it would be good to get one topic completed and closed off.

4. Terms of Reference (issues and topics)

Not covered.

5. Issues and topics for discussion

5.1 High Level Workgroup Issues

No new issues for discussion.

5.2 Further Consideration of Meter Reading Arrangements

5.2.1 PN UNC Workgroup (Settlement and Reconciliation topics)

Reconciliation

MD gave a brief summary of the position (issues raised and areas remaining for discussion), the objectives for today and recapped on the key changes to the last version of the Business Requirements Document (BRD).

FC then gave a presentation (in response to Action NEX0053) on the Reconciliation Scaling Adjustment – Transportation Charging Issue: *How is transportation commodity charge applied to unidentified gas?* Having outlined the issue FC went on to offer 4 potential options that had been identified, (though others may be possible), and these were discussed.

JW thought it might be simpler not to charge transportation commodity for this unidentified gas. FC pointed out that reconciliation exposes the GTs to shifts between markets, and explained the details.

SM asked if the solution could be varied depending on the product (the type of customer using each product could be very different); or should there be a common set of rules for all.

SL pointed out that it involves a tiny amount of the GDNs' annual revenue.

FC asked what rate of commodity should we charge (levy at a portfolio level) or can we differentiate across processes?

GE believed simplicity and actual data was key. Option 3 works on actual numbers and may give an even smear- everything else requires guesswork. Other Shippers supported this view.

SL suggested that another option might be to have a commodity rate for unidentified gas, though this would not be his first choice. This could be set around an industry average so would be relatively neutral.

FC then outlined the impacts that removal of the commodity charge on unidentified gas might have. GE observed that large reconciliations could trigger large corrections anyway. JW did not really see this as material- it involved around 3.5%, which was not a large amount in terms of the entire market. SL pointed out that it might be a small amount but it might add to or exacerbate other issues, which in turn may trigger a price correction; in itself it was not a worry.

Asked for their views, Option 3, ie to cease charging commodity on the unidentified gas, and recover GT costs on the site-specific element only, was the preferred choice of the Shippers. ST then suggested that it should now be considered by the Pricing experts (DNs and Shippers) and agreed to raise it at the next DNCMF.

Action NEX08/04: Reconciliation – ST to raise for consideration of Option 3 at the next meeting of DNCFM.

Business Requirements Definition (BRD) - Reconciliation

MD pointed out additions in paragraphs 5.1, 6.1, and 8.1.6. There was a brief discussion on the inclusion/exclusion of estimated reads. Different views were expressed and no consensus was reached.

Paragraph 8.5.5 – Different options were discussed at the last meeting. FC explained that if it should always be billed it would potentially have a simpler rule where it was a small amount of energy – or everything could be reconciled. A number of Shippers were in favour of reconciling everything. MD summarised that it would be preferred to invoice everything and no rollover. FC observed that process 3 would create small value invoices. This was not a problem for some Shippers but may be one for others. JF added that if it became a high volume then it might become a management issue for a number of parties.

Paragraph 8.7 – To be discussed at DNCFM; 8.7.3 - a preference was noted for calculation monthly based on the latest measurements (Figure 3); 8.7.4 - a preference was noted for the adjustment to be billed at LDZ and Shipper level etc.

Paragraph 8.8 – FC pointed out there may be collateral damage if the AQ is very wrong, in the form of additional Reconciliation Filter Failures. KK asked if the Xoserve process would capture manifest errors. MD asked if the preference was for suppression or rejection. SL suggested mimicking what was in place for Settlement; the current USRV process could be maintained. It could be cross-referenced to the current rules on suppression, and then thought given to evolving other details.

Performance was briefly discussed and KK suggested a regime where at some point a party must reconcile. FC recommended cross-referencing to current rules with revised tolerances (what was done with suppressions could be dealt with separately), and added that if it was not working today then nothing in Project Nexus is going to improve it; now was the ideal opportunity for a significant data cleanse.

Paragraph 8.11 – FC gave a basic introduction to the data items included in the read communication, and asked all to review the lists, consider retention/removal/further additions, and return to next meeting with views/suggestions. PT pointed out a potential omission – metric/imperial flag and FC noted this. **Post Meeting Note:** *FC confirmed that the Metric/Imperial indicator does NOT currently feature in the file formats for each reconciliation transaction.*

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

Settlement

MD gave a presentation and drew attention to the objectives for the meeting. The process maps were then displayed and reviewed.

To-Be Process Flowmap presentations and reviews

a) NXTB Validate Meter Read process

DG suggested that Shippers might set an override (Y) flag on the first submission, and the implications of this were discussed. FC pointed out that in the monthly read regime there could be 600,000 filter failures a month, based on currently failure rates, which would have a significant effect on the systems and this needs to be addressed; 80% currently needed adjustment, either due to reads or asset. Flagging would indicate that a Shipper knew that it was out of tolerance but was warranting its validity and it would therefore pass through. Xoserve would validate everything flagged or not.

b) NXTB Manage Periodic Readings

Comments were noted and the chart will be amended.

c) NXTB Manage Batched Daily Readings

Comments were noted and the chart will be amended.

d) NXTB Manage Daily Metered Time Critical Readings

The time a read was to be taken should be specified and this was discussed, with the suggestion being that it should reflect the start of the gas Day. A change to the Business Rules might be required to reflect this.

Comments were noted and the chart and Business Rules will be amended.

e) NXTB Manage Daily Metered Not Time Critical Readings

Comments were noted and the chart will be amended.

Business Requirements Definition – Settlement Arrangements

MD drew attention to the following paragraphs.

Paragraph 5.1.1 – Xoserve to update.

Paragraph 5.10 - FC had addressed SL's previous concern; the drafted process shows no interaction with DCC. MD outlined options A, B and C and these were discussed. SM favoured option C. Product 4 has to accommodate dumb meters. MD explained the drawbacks.

Sending in an opening read unblocks/releases the Shipper's ability to send in the next reads according to his schedule. An incoming Shipper may nominate different read frequencies and MD explained how this would work.

Paragraph 5.13 – It was suggested the percentages be placed in square brackets, for analysis of the requirements at a later stage. The Table headings would be amended.

Paragraph 5.14.1 – MD to amend following comments received. Reference was made to logic checks and MD noted this for further consideration.

Concluding the review, MD confirmed the process flows and the BRDs would be amended for review at the next Settlement meeting on 22/23 August 2011, at which time it was hoped to conclude the discussions and sign off the requirements (BRD) and the process flows.]

5.2.2 PN UNC Workgroup (AQ and Supply Point Register topics)

The process maps were displayed and reviewed.

Process Maps

a) NXAI Appeal AQ process

The existing process was illustrated and explained by DG.

b) NXTB Calculate Monthly Rolling AQ

The proposed process was illustrated and explained by DG. Theoretically nothing is 'locked out' and all reads should be reusable; this should be more stable. It was commented that once all the rules have been decided we would be better placed to look at how we can move from one regime to another. MD confirmed that there would be no 'missing' reads for Processes 1 and 2 (gaps filled with estimates). DG noted the suggestion that the Market Breaker test be included in the process map.

AQ - Overview

MD presented an overview of the objectives, approach, scope, and the business issues raised that had required resolution.

Concerns were raised at the time being taken to progress Modification 0380 and BF agreed to contact the Proposer to discuss his intentions.

Action NEX08/06: AQ: JO to contact the Proposer of Modification 0380 to discuss his intentions and the best way to progress this.

BTU Process and Form

MD explained the use of the form, what information it included and how it was validated. It is a very manual process, dealing with about 50 forms a year.

The straw man (renamed as the AQ Correction process) was discussed. An automated process would be much quicker. It was suggested that a definition and a value for 'substantially' would be required, and it was questioned whether examples/reasons needed to be listed – how explicit should it be?

It was not required for Processes 1 and 2, only 3 and 4.

SM asked if this might potentially fix the static SOQ problem. MD confirmed that the BTU Form was never intended for use with vacant sites.

SB suggested removing the first bullet point and retaining the other four points.

The DNs did not require AQ referral.

SM observed that customers might want to move from one product to another rapidly.

Noting the suggestions and comments made MD will revise the rules and return to the Workgroup with further thoughts.

Mod 0209 Rolling AQ Business Rules and Validation Rules

MD had captured comments at the previous meeting and indicated areas still open for review and discussion (highlighted in yellow).

The group reviewed line by line and MD noted further comments and suggestions for removals and additions.

Discussing 'Thresholds' (Ref 46,47, and 48), SM indicated that he may raise a modification relating to DM Unbundling and the accessing of products/ selection of products.

It was agreed to review 'Publication of Information' (Ref 54 – 56.2.8) once the requirements have been defined.

It was suggested that MD first review and check the items under 'Data Missing or Inconsistent – General' (Ref 3) with the AQ Team to gain a greater degree of clarity, as the meanings were not clear.

Under 'Calculated AQ out of Tolerance' (Ref 5) it was suggested that 'equal to or' should be removed, and that it should be 'less than one (1) kWh'. MD noted this and would check. At this point MD displayed the table 'AQ Correction Tolerances (from Mod 209 AQ Validation Tolerances)' and the group discussed the content. ST suggested that it might be more appropriate to use values rather than percentages.

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

KK believed a manifest error scenario required consideration.

The Business Requirements Definition will be reviewed at the next meeting.

Supply Point Register

MD presented an overview of the Workgroup's objectives and the approach, and asked the Workgroup to consider the scope.

Following a brief discussion it was suggested that MD look at the current register and list what fields are included (used and unused).

Action NEX08/08: Xoserve (MD) to review current Supply Point Register and list what fields are included (used and unused).

Consideration could then be given to what else might be required, how it might be used, for what purpose and by whom and to what level, and how the data could be reviewed.

Consideration might also be given to inclusion/exclusion of Unique Sites, and iGT Supply Points and whether a system should be built to accommodate these and any other future identified categories, and also to incorporate enough flexibility to be able to include/exclude from various processes (such as billing) or to enable different treatment if appropriate.

The Project Nexus consultation responses were reviewed and it was suggested that MD contact Shell Gas Direct to ascertain if their response retained currency.

Action NEX08/09: Xoserve (MD) to contact Shell Gas Direct to ascertain if their response retained currency.

Other requirements to be considered might include market differentiation, data security/privacy, and the SOQ issue.

ST advised that he would bring information relating to Single Meter Point Supply Points to the next meeting.

5.3 Transitional Arrangements

5.3.1 Resynchronisation

FC gave a presentation outlining the background. Recognition of drift and apportionment over the period since the last resynch would be required in the new regime, and transitional business rules would need to be established to deal with the first resynchronisation following implementation of the new regime. Two options were put forward for discussion, and FC illustrated them graphically.

If moving to a regime of resynchs then periods will have to be closed out. SM asked what the consequences of flagging might be. Given an absolute read how would that be submitted to the GTs and how would it be dealt with? A read may create a rejection.

FC asked should resynchs be adopted in processes 1 and 2, and actuals in processes 3 and 4. Another suggestion was for a simpler cut down process and no going back over resynchs. BD commented that it may depend what is in process 3 and 4 – there could be one large site in there that would create an adverse effect. SM suggested that, rather than product specific, if less than X it should go down another route – a complex process for nominal volumes would not be welcomed.

Responding to a question from KK, FC confirmed there was a suggestion of rollover tolerances in the Business Requirements but an agreement had not been reached. JW commented that every site should be reconciled to the best level of detail possible. KK was concerned about different treatment for different sites; they should be treated the same for resynch purposes. Others suggested there should be a common rule, but with different treatments for less than/more than certain volumes. FC pointed out that there will not always be an accurate calculation of drift, eg if equipment fails.

Reiterating the issue, FC asked again how would the move from an NDM world be accomplished. JW preferred to keep it simple – an eyeball read should always be reconciled back to an eyeball read. GE pointed out that not all errors could be treated as resynchs and should be referred to and treated differently (different rules?).

There was still the question of how the first resynch should be treated. It was suggested going back to the first good read (actual). SM questioned why should a transition rule be any different to an enduring rule. BD pointed out that an incoming Supplier would pick up all the reconciliation on a new site. FC questioned how far back should a resynch go, reiterating that there were no facilities for resynch in the current regime – all reconciliation goes into that last live period.

SL suggested reconciling back to the last read submitted before the implementation date. From a prudent business point of view SM observed that Shippers could read all their meters prior to implementation and thereby lock out their positions.

A discussion on whether the incoming or withdrawing party would pay the charges and the potential Inter Shipper Disputes followed. PT suggested incentivising an eyeball read at the time of change of Shipper. GE thought that it was a change of Supplier issue and therefore much wider than first appeared; rather than a transition question it was an enduring question. It

should go back to the last eyeball read and then it's a question of who pays for it. Both Shippers should therefore eyeball read the meter at the point of changeover. It affects the adjustment of energy, allocation, and payment flows. It was noted that a Shipper may no longer have a contractual arrangement once it had withdrawn and this would make it difficult or impossible to return to the customer and recover charges.

Action NEX08/10: 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.

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. Any Other Business

None raised.

7. Workgroup Process

7.1 Agree actions to be completed ahead of the next meeting

See Action Table below.

8. Diary Planning

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

Title	Date	Location
Project Nexus Workgroup	22 & 23/08/2011	NG Office, 31 Homer Road, Solihull.
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.

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 to be provided in due course. Carried Forward
NEX06/01	21/06/11	1.2	Speak to the SMD group and ascertain their view on the future potential treatment of drift in the AMR market.	Gazprom (SM)	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 to be provided at the September 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)	Updates to be provided at the September meeting Carried Forward
NEX07/02	05/07/11	5.2	Seek the (expert) view of the DESC members on the potential impacts of adopting a 'fixed' SOQ, but rolling (monthly) AQ regime on the winter load factor ratios (i.e. should SOQ be calculated on an annual basis).	Joint Office (BF)	Closed
NEX07/03	05/07/11	5.2	To analyse the potential effects a static SOQ but rolling AQ could have on WAR bands & EUCs in time for consideration at the next meeting.	GDF Suez (PBr) <u>All</u>	Closed

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
NEX07/06	05/07/11	5.3	Utilising the tolerance levels provided in the BRD (v0.5) tables under item 5.13 Shipper Read Validation, test the viability of the tolerance levels with examples taken from their respective portfolios and provide feedback on their findings.	All	Closed
NEX07/07	05/07/11	5.3	To consider whether or not a new Allocations/Nominations Regime is required in future, or stick with the current regime going forward.	All	Closed
NEX07/08	18/07/11	1.2	To seek a view from his Pricing team colleagues on the potential effects a static SOQ but rolling AQ would have on WAR bands & EUCs (ref: NEX07/03).	National Grid Distribution (CW)	Closed
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 to be provided in due course. 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 to be provided in due course. Carried Forward
NEX07/11	18/07/11	5.2	To double check the origins of the 50 & 42 week consumption period windows and their potential impact on Supply Point isolations during these periods.	Xoserve (MD)	Closed
NEX07/12	18/07/11	5.2	Seek to further develop the (existing) BTU form process suitable for future application.	Xoserve (MD/SN)	Closed
NEX07/13	18/07/11	5.2	To consider the suggestion for AQ Effective Day threshold (trigger point) requirements of three (3) consecutive calculations or	All	Closed

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
			one (1) year whichever is the sooner.		
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 to be provided in due course. Carried Forward
NEX07/15	18/07/11	5.2	To cross check the original UNC Modification 0209 WAR requirements.	Xoserve (MD)	Closed
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 to be provided in due course. Carried Forward
NEX07/17	18/07/11	5.2	To consider the identification of an appropriate 'market breaker' rule and associated threshold and its potential impact on the various market sectors.	All	Closed
NEX07/18	18/07/11	5.2	To provide a breakdown of the Annual AQ file(s).	Xoserve (SN)	Closed
WG0377 05/01	24/05/11	3.0	Update the modification based on the comments received within the Workgroup.	First Utility (GE)	Closed
WG0380 06/04	20/06/11	4.1	Look into the impact of weather correction on the daily read and submitted sites: AQ calculated monthly (last 365 reads) requirement and ascertain if it actually makes a difference.	E.ON (SB)	Closed
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	Pending

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
NEX08/02	01/08/11	1.2	Understand what the capacity commitment would be for the SOQ charging factor if it were fixed.	ALL	Pending
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)	Pending
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)	Pending
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	Pending
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)	Pending
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)	Pending
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)	Pending
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)	Pending
NEX08/10	01/08/11	5.3.1	Resynch Transition Arrangements - Shippers to consider the position and return with views on whether	All Shippers	Pending

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
			to replicate the current DM market across 4 products or whether to go back to the last eyeball read regardless of Supplier.		