PROJECT NEXUS DOCUMENT REVIEW FORM V2

DELIVERABLE DETAILS	
PROJECT NAME: Project Nexus	**DOCUMENT NAME: BRD: Annual Quantity**
DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION: Business Requirements Document	
DATE: 21st November 2011	**VERSION: 0.6**	
AUTHOR: Xoserve	**WORKGROUP: PN UNC - AQ**
REVIEWER NAME: Various	**DATE OF REVIEW: 31/10/2011 – 11/11/2011**

REVIEW DETAILS	
REVIEW MEETING DETAILS: 21st November 2011	
COMMENTS DUE BACK BY DATE: 11th November 2011	

No.	Raised By	Document Ref	Comments Received	Workgroup Comments
1	Grace Smith, npower	General	The inclusion of SSPs into transitional arrangements is important, and npower agrees that a monthly rolling AQ is the best solution. As such, we are concerned that the biannual AQ review option may compromise Mod 380 and delay the implementation of rolling AQ. A review of AQs twice a year would create two peaks in workload and associated issues with managing these but would increase accuracy and efficiency above the current process. The feasibility of this option will be influenced by decisions about the appeal window. There is concern that these changes may not provide enough added value to justify the complexity of the solution when Mod 380 will replace it.	
2	Graham Wood, British Gas	General	We have a general view that whilst the BRD as drafted provides a fair summary of the discussions held to date, we believe that there is more detailed	Xoserve initial comments: Discuss at Workgroup Can we separate the Principle from the Practice? i.e. do we have the right framework although the

michele.downes 15/11/11 09:15
Formatted Table

michele.downes 15/11/11 11:14
Deleted: .

michele.downes 15/11/11 09:16
Formatted: Font:(Default) Arial, 12 pt

michele.downes 15/11/11 11:14
Formatted: Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Don't adjust space between Asian text and numbers

michele.downes 15/11/11 11:09
Formatted: Font:12 pt

No.	Raised By	Document Ref	Comments Received	Workgroup Comments
			analysis required before being able to finalise detailed business rules or the drafting of network code modifications.	values remain a matter for further discussion/analysis?
3	Graham Wood, British Gas	8.4 Validation	Another valid reason for an AQ value not being revised is if it is deemed to be erroneous after calculation (in comparison to a specific methodology) e.g. a sudden move from 20,000 to 200,000. However, there also needs to be a mechanism to permit a valid change of AQ such as the above i.e. the process may require shipper approval rather than automatic rollover at month 1 & 2 (with notification to supplier) and only default to new value at month 3 if no response provided by shipper.	Xoserve initial comments: Current principle of the business requirements is to perform validation at receipt of the read rather than later when the consumption from the read is used for different processes. If the AQ value is validated & suppressed it will create issues for other processes where the consumption has been used, e.g. reconciliation. The AQ Correction process is the mechanism to amend AQ's for certain scenarios.
4	Graham Wood, British Gas	8.4 Validation: Note	It is essential that the validation processes associated with the provision of meter reads are appropriate also for the purposes of AQ calculation. It may be useful for the project to undertake some analysis at some point to understand how validation rules impact AQ calculation under this new set of arrangements.	Xoserve initial comments: Discuss at Workgroup
5	Graham Wood, British Gas	8.9 WAR bands & EUCs	At some point this will require some further detail to explain what this will actually look like in practice.	Xoserve initial comments: Discuss at Workgroup
6	Graham Wood, British Gas	9. Transitional Rules	We agree that it is essential that transitional arrangements from current regime to new need to be fully assessed and the impacts/issues understood.	Xoserve initial comments: Discuss at Workgroup