PROJECT NEXUS DOCUMENT REVIEW FORM V2

DELIVERABLE DETAILS	
PROJECT NAME: Project Nexus	**DOCUMENT NAME: BRD: Reconciliation**
DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION: Business Requirements Document	
DATE: 21st November 2011	**VERSION: 0.6**
AUTHOR: Xoserve	**WORKGROUP: PN UNC - Reconciliation**
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	npower are satisfied that the Business Requirement Document summarises the consensus of the workgroup.	
2	Grace Smith, npower	9.2.2	We believe that Option 1 of 9.2.2 represents the most efficient and least complex solution but look forward to the cost analysis and comparison.	
3	Xoserve	Page 15. Section 8.	Product 4, page 15 - the allocation is not an 'estimate' but an 'allocation of the share of NDM throughput, based on the site/meter's historical usage'.	Xoserve initial response: Change to 'Allocation Profiles and AQ'
4	Xoserve	Page 17, Section 8.2.2	Allocated energy isn't estimated - it's an actual allocation	Xoserve initial response: Remove "estimated" from the sentence.

No.	Raised By	Document Ref	Comments Received	Workgroup Comments
5	Xoserve	Page 17, Section 8.2.4	The RF is derived for a period as Act vol/Alloc vol. The 'Actual energy' is RF * Alloc energy. The Rec Quantity is Actual - Alloc energy. This is done for periods of constant commodity transportation rate to enable commodity rec. For energy, the cumulative SAP factors are used, which take into account daily changes in SAP. Description of periodic rec is incorrect: We don't actually derive daily rec quantity - it's for the rec (or variance) period. Rec volume is not used - it's the rec Quantity, in kWh.	Xoserve initial response: Text incorrectly copied from DM Rec section. Amend description as follows: Reconciliation quantities will be calculated as follows; Calculate a Reconciliation Factor (RF) for the period as Actual Volume/ Allocated Volume. Reconciliation Energy = RF*Allocated Energy
6	Xoserve	Page 18, Section 8.4.1	Allocated not estimated	Xoserve initial response: Remove "estimated" from the sentence.
7	Xoserve	Page 19, Section 8.5.4	Currently for a re-synch there is no allocated volume, it's a previous actual. Do we do RF etc. for re-synchs? Not my recollection, but detail is lost in history!	Xoserve initial response: In future may be resynching on all Products (1 to 4). Previous volume may be DM or NDM. Previous reconciliation may or may not have occurred. Suggest replace "actual volume" with "resynch volume" and replace "allocated volume" with "previous volume" throughout this section.
8	Graham Wood, British Gas	8.7 NDM CSEP Reconciliation	The harmonisation of arrangements for IGT supply points is clearly the goal that the industry should be seeking to achieve. Should this not be achievable then we do not agree, at this time, that Option E is the most appropriate solution and that further analysis would be required in order to agree the most optimal solution.	Discuss at Workgroup
9	Graham Wood, British Gas	8.9 Validation of Reconciliation values	We believe that more consideration and analysis will be required here to ensure that read validation processes are appropriate to balance the need	Discuss at Workgroup Can we separate the Principle from the Practice?

No.	Raised By	Document Ref	Comments Received	Workgroup Comments
			between protecting the industry from 'market breakers' and not over-loading the industry with USRV's. We are mindful that if USRV volumes today are consistent and extrapolated to future read volumes then volumes of USRV's would be intolerable.	i.e. do we have the right framework although the values remain a matter for further discussion/analysis?
10	Graham Wood, British Gas	8.11 Reconciliation 'Line in the sand'	There is a requirement to make it clear that there will be different rules for LSP's and SSP's (or those supply points which are currently reconciled against those that will be new to the process). e.g. for an existing LSP the line in the sand will be in accordance with their last rec, whereas for 'new' SSP's the line in the sand will commence from implementation date of the new regime.	Xoserve initial response: suggest clarification text in BRD
11	Graham Wood, British Gas	8.11 Reconciliation 'Line in the sand'	Wider consideration should also be given to alignment with back-billing rules.	Discuss at Workgroup – is this in scope? No items on Initial Requirements Register regarding Line-in-the-Sand or raised in Workgroups to-date.
12	Graham Wood, British Gas	8.14 Allocation of Unidentified Gas Expert (AUGE)	We are still giving consideration to the potential role of the AUGE under these new arrangements and do not agree with this statement at this time.	