

**Project Nexus Steering Group Minutes
Monday 22 February 2016
via teleconference**

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Lorna Dupont (Secretary)	(LD)	Joint Office
Alex Travell	(AT)	E.ON (<i>Representing large, mixed portfolio shippers</i>)
Alison Russell	(AR)	Utilita Energy (<i>Representing small, new entrant shippers</i>)
Andy Sinclair	(AS)	PwC
Angelita Bradney	(AB)	Ofgem
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution (<i>Representing gas transporters, distribution</i>)
Gareth Evans	(GE)	Waters Wye Associates (<i>Representing industrial and commercial shippers</i>)
Gill Williams	(GW)	PwC
James Beverley	(JB)	Baringa
Jon Dixon	(JD)	Ofgem
Mike Harding	(MH)	Brookfield Utilities (<i>Representing gas transporters, independent</i>)
Phil Lucas	(PL)	National Grid NTS (<i>Representing gas transporter, transmission</i>)
Sandra Simpson	(SS)	Xoserve

Copies of papers are available at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/NexusSG/080216>

Key Messages from this meeting:

Overall Status		
Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programme risk for 01 October go-live has increased due to the late delivery of the full RGMA functionality and the subsequent impact on MT completion. • This may require change to the core MT plan and/or the identification of further contingency options. • 14 March 2016 PNSG meeting to be a key check point meeting with consideration of critical issues potentially impacting core delivery – with a progress update meeting being arranged for 07 March 2016. 	INFORMATION
Milestones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 key milestones in preparation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ M1.3c: Xoserve RGMA UAT Complete (due 29 February 2016). Milestone will not be met - move to 15 April, with a further sub-milestone for the earlier completion of UAT on AQ functionality. 	INFORMATION

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o M2.4c: L3/4 MT Core Start (due 01 March 2016). Move in line with M1.3c, though reflecting earlier availability of AQ functionality. o M3.2: Unique Sites Build and Unit Test Complete (due 04 March 2016) – Currently on target. 	
Market Trials		
MT L3/4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MT L3/4 is continuing on available functionality at lower levels than expected. 	INFORMATION AND ACTION
Unique Sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • US remains on track against its plan, although the delivery plan has a high risk profile. • Some PNSG members are minded to defer the US system solution to reduce the risk on Core delivery. However, this requires further impact assessment to definitively confirm that the interim arrangements needed would not add risk to Xoserve and participant plans. • PwC to seek participant feedback on any ‘big picture’ negative impacts of continuing with legacy systems or other interim arrangements to cover US. 	INFORMATION AND ACTION
RGMA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RGMA full functionality will not be available by 01 March, with this forecast for delivery on 15 April. • MTWG are considering how best to adjust the MT plans to accommodate options for testing RGMA, based on a phased or full functionality approach. • PNSG understand delivering full RGMA functionality by 15 April is critical path. Failure to deliver RGMA by this date is likely to compromise significantly a 01 October go-live. 	INFORMATION

1.0 Introduction and Note of Alternates

The ‘Chatham House Rule’ applies to general discussion.

BF welcomed all to the meeting.

1.1. Note of Alternates

Alison Russell for Jeremy Guard.

1.2 Apologies received

Jeremy Guard.

2.0 Review of Minutes (08 February 2016)

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

3.0 Programme Report (PwC)

The next update is due at the meeting on 14 March 2016.

4.0 Matters for consideration

4.1 Update on MT L3/4 Readiness

Reporting on participation levels and the number of files submitted so far (3,000), SS noted that the majority of these has been submitted by one organisation and have been successful. SS observed that this was far less than Xoserve had been expecting at this time and that it had ramped up to support. The rejections were briefly outlined. The possible (and various) reasons for unexpectedly low participation were discussed.

Having sight of individual test plans would help Xoserve greatly with its support/resource planning (only one organisation had made this available to date); being able to recognise and plan for some sort of 'demand path' would enable Xoserve to manage and deploy resources more efficiently.

SS then gave an overview of the defects position. The low level of defects to date may reflect the low level of participation. What has been submitted has been processed successfully and has given a good level of confidence.

SS summarised that the system was fully automated and operating to production timescales. File flows were operating as expected regardless of data type (real or dummy). The iGT MPRN creation issue had been resolved allowing participating iGTs to test all scenarios. The remainder of iGTs will be set up for 01 March 2016 when they have chosen to start Market Trials. It was observed that iGTs were reliant on the participation of other parties in order to test various areas.

4.2 RGMA Status Update

SS reported there was generally a good confidence level for 01 March 2016. Currently, slightly higher than 70% of RGMA related E2E milestones have been completed, with all other Target UAT tests and SIT tests for known RGMA functionality also completed.

Some specific scenarios have some issues, e.g. CND updates. Most issues have been in rejection/validation testing and this has highlighted a number of design and requirement queries that are currently being impact assessed (represents a relatively small proportion of the overall number of RGMA validation rules); the source system is being analysed to identify any gap. Some defects are outstanding which are preventing a clean entry to Market Trials; these either affect all processes that utilise a certain interface file, or a specific process. The impact of these defects on Market trials is being considered on a case by case basis.

The MTWG met to consider options to commence RGMA MT, the options being to commence RGMA MT on 01 March 2016 with available functionality and an agreed exclusion list, or to wait for more/all RGMA functionality to be available before starting Market Trials. Different opinions were expressed at MTWG, depending on how tightly a party's systems were integrated and the reduced efficiency in setting up test teams that were being partly utilised due to the reduced functionality being available. SS confirmed that Xoserve could support both options, where some participants choose to start on 01 March 2016 with available functionality and can also allow others to wait until more

functionality is available. Everything was being done to resolve the outstanding issues, with delivery expected for 15 April 2016.

A Shipper constituency representative was concerned that MTs were supposed to replicate production activities and should not be doing anything special in order to 'tick boxes'. SS advised there were some workarounds in order to test 01 March 2016; some can be tested as they are, and some are not ready to be tested. SS referred the Shipper constituency representative to the MTWG and the RAG status discussions.

The Shipper constituency representative noted that concerns regarding retesting and regression had been raised at MTWG. SS confirmed some regression testing might be necessary. The MTWG was looking at how long might be required in the cycle, assuming the date was pushed out to mid-April.

Responding to other questions, SS believed that RGMA could not be delivered in its entirety for 01 March, but there was good confidence for mid-April, with plans in place to address and prioritise outstanding issues (e.g. meter exchange for dead meter points would be a low priority issue). SS confirmed there were not many changes to RGMA in terms of requirements, but it did include some very 'odd' infrequent scenarios, which Xoserve would like to deprioritise these idiosyncratic items and to concentrate on delivering the more important areas to allow 95% of testing.

Concerns were expressed regarding the reduction in testing time, and it was asked if Xoserve could extend support to the end of Core testing? SS indicated she was not in a position to be able to confirm that at present.

Shipper constituency representatives observed that all parties' plans needed to be taken into account; no one wanted to reach mid-April to find another delay. How could Xoserve assure confidence in an April delivery without putting anything else at risk? AS confirmed that MTWG was meeting this week to decide on the best approach and how it can be delivered. Concerns were reiterated regarding the reduction in testing time; AS explained the contingency plans.

A discussion ensued. It was suggested that to meet the mid-April date consideration might be given to reducing the scope - a re-evaluation of what was essential - this might be a sensible approach to safeguard Core. GW suggested that a delivery plan for 15 April 2015 be developed (assumptions, progress made to date, Baringa's overall view) and brought to PNSG for assessment. A Shipper constituency representative observed that if any functionality was to be de-scoped it would need to be re-planned and parties made aware of when it was to be delivered/available for testing. Clarity on what was in/out would be paramount as this could impact what Shippers have built.

JD asked if Xoserve could provide further details/statistics on the 'odd, infrequent scenarios' referred to earlier, so that these can be assessed for potential de-scoping.

Action 0209: *RGMA potential items for descopeing* - Xoserve to provide further details/statistics on 'odd, infrequent scenarios' so that these can be assessed for potential de-scoping.

SS noted that Xoserve was looking at reducing priority levels rather than not delivering for 01 October 2016. The impact on other areas of any de-scoping/de-prioritising would needed consideration, and whether any workarounds might be required in the interim.

In summary:

- confidence was required on what Xoserve could deliver for 15 April 2016
- can the MT approach accommodate an adequate testing period to meet 'go live' (by existing proposed date, or by 31 July)
- if significant defects arise in the meantime how will these be treated
- can Xoserve deliver/maintain a test environment to 31 July or possibly longer.

If it cannot be delivered or testing cannot be done it will call into question what can be delivered on 01 October 2016. JD reiterated there was a need to prioritise essentials and de-risk the non-essentials. SS indicated that some parties were offering assistance and Xoserve was assessing what offers of help it was able to accept (taking into account confidentiality and commercial sensitivities); as much help as was possible would be accepted. It was suggested this should be shown on the Plan (when agreed) to demonstrate that all steps possible were being considered/taken to achieve delivery.

A Shipper constituency representative asked at what point should there be steps taken about getting UK Link ready to continue in operation if all else fails. SS indicated that Baringa was forming and would bring a view on robustness. AB asked what effect extending the testing environment would have on any transitional activities. A Shipper constituency representative observed that shrinking the testing periods for Shippers was increasing their risks and costs. SS explained that Xoserve continued to look at contingency plans (implications, mitigations, etc) for extending the testing period (until 31 August 2016). It was noted that an existing UNC modification currently in flight (i.e. 0531 - Provision of an Industry Test System) was clouding the position. GW asked if it was possible to know whether a testing environment (31 August 2016) might be available (perhaps to a limited extent/availability) at the next meeting.

BF summarised that clarity was needed on what will be available and from when/to, and what contingency arrangements could be called upon - can a physical environment be made available; can MTs be extended. The PNSG can then decide whether any extensions are appropriate, and the answers may then address the concerns that generated UNC Modification 0531. SS pointed out that Xoserve could not deliver the pre Nexus aspects of UNC Modification 0531 as written. It was recognised that UNC Modification 0531 was outside the scope of PNSG, however, the consideration of extending Market Trials was within scope.

A Shipper constituency representative reiterated that reassurance was needed and that it should be clearly understood what could be done to ensure delivery, i.e. if RGMA has to be delivered late can Xoserve extend support to 31 July (and as a contingency extend it to 31 August), and what are the considerations that need to be taken account of when doing so.

SS confirmed that MT was ending on 30 June currently; if RGMA is to be delivered late then by the next meeting (14 March) it should be known if this could be extended to 31 July for US MT (an impact assessment is being done, and contingencies investigated). The likelihood is that it will be extended to 31 July because of RGMA concerns. Xoserve is looking at providing core support to 31 July and contingencies after that.

It was concluded that Xoserve needs to think about everything that it needs to do to get RGMA delivered and that it should very clearly articulate and demonstrate what is going to be done, i.e. all the steps it is taking, including the acceptance of offers of help, etc. and confirm this at the meeting on 14 March 2016. At this meeting an assessment will then be able to be made to establish if 15 April 2016 was a realistic delivery date or not and the PNSG can then make an appropriate recommendation regarding the commencement of RGMA MT.

4.3 Unique Sites (US) - plan considerations

SS summarised the current position. The US plan is presently on track. It contains a high risk profile primarily driven by a number of factors as noted at the previous meeting. The impact of US on Core delivery could be significant but difficult to forecast, as it is greatly dependent on the level of defects (not seen at the moment) encountered on common objects within UAT and MT. In the event of MT defect resolution on common objects, it is assumed core MT will take priority over Unique Sites development. The US standalone

plan is deliverable but contains a number of risks, which, if they materialise, may make the US plan undeliverable.

The US plan was illustrated along with a high level commentary. SS explained in more detail, noting that, of the 30 common objects, 15 objects were of high complexity and 11 were of medium complexity; the remainder were considered to be low. Shipper constituency representatives were keen to know the key risks to Core and what mitigations were in place. SS explained these mostly involved data, observing that some things can be reversed but that others would involve 'regret effort'. A discussion ensued. There were no common resources between RGMA and US. RGMA was more important to market participants than US. At the moment there is no viable legacy solution in the 'future world'; impact assessments are being done; there may be an effect across all parties. A Shipper constituency representative asked if removing the need for Shippers to regression test would be a benefit to Shippers and Xoserve; SS affirmed that it would be to both. The Shipper constituency representative then asked if the MTWG realised that it might reduce/relieve the stress on MT if the need to regression test was removed; AS believed this had not been considered.

SS then explained the legacy arrangements contingency being looked at. An impact assessment is being done on whether the current offline database and processes could be sustained, and whether all parties involved can maintain the existing interfaces. This was discussed. A Shipper constituency representative observed that if US added any risk at all to Core it should be questioned why it was being done now (it only involved circa 70 sites). The Shipper constituency representative briefly explained how US were handled by the industry currently. Was the effort to keep it in greater than that to take it out? What are the justifications for retaining/excluding? SS responded that the impacts of any exclusion needed to be better understood.

What needs to be known to collectively continue with the current arrangements? An understanding of the effect of removal; an understanding of the impacts to other systems (leaving in/taking out); the magnitude of work for the UK Link Programme to remove/replace with other things; is it possible to leave it in but dormant and test at a later time. SS then drew attention to the proposed US delivery checkpoints, observing that by 04 April 2016 most of these questions will have been answered. By that time there will be an understanding with a high degree of certainty that US can be delivered without a high degree of risk to Xoserve. The PNSG can review at the checkpoints whether all is in line with MT results and assess the materiality of any risk.

SS reiterated that by 04 March Xoserve will understand what has to be done but may not know if it is viable or not. A Shipper constituency representative observed that the longer any decision on US takes, then a greater burden of regression testing is put on parties due to the need to confirm that code still works. Another Shipper constituency representative suggested there were two options, either to take it out now or to mothball it; this suggestion was broadly supported. SS pointed out that it was more difficult than RAASP to remove US from the 01 October delivery scope; a Shipper constituency representative observed that it would become increasingly difficult the longer it is left in.

A Shipper constituency representative asked if regression testing for parties was going to be worse if US was taken out or left in. SS indicated that Xoserve could give certain limited information but that parties would have to make that assessment for themselves, and the Shipper constituency representatives understood that. It was suggested that AS could seek views via the PwC portal and report back to the next meeting.

Action 0210: US Delivery (retention/removal) - PwC to seek participant feedback on any 'big picture' negative impacts of continuing with legacy systems or other interim arrangements to cover US, and report back to next meeting (07 March 2016).

A Shipper constituency representative suggested it should be decided at the next meeting if US should be deferred until after 01 October, and be brought in under a 'Release 2'. SS

confirmed that Xoserve was already starting to consider 'Release 2' and what should be included.

In light of these discussions, PNSG is minded to defer US from 01 October 2016 delivery, and anticipates forming a final view at the next meeting, based on the key information to be provided by PwC under Action 0210, above (views from parties submitted via the PwC portal). A gas transporter representative was of a different opinion, noting that at present the US delivery plan was on track (and is not in the same place as RAASP was) and that he was not therefore of the view that it should be deferred.

JD advised that parties should rethink their planning for the trials period on the basis that US will not be included, and reprioritisation needs to take place for Core. A Go/No Go decision should be taken at the next meeting (14 March 2016) regarding US.

AS summarised that the MTWG would be asked to look for reasons to justify retaining US in the Core delivery; in the event of US exclusion/deferral, to consider if MT can deal with any adjustments and how July MT would be reprioritised.

Action 0211: *US Delivery (retention/removal)* - AS to seek MTWG views on reasons to justify retaining US in the Core delivery; and in the event of US exclusion/deferral, to if/how MT can deal with any adjustments and how July MT would be reprioritised, and report back to the next PNSG meeting.

AB added that an idea should be provided of when US can be delivered if not 01 October 2016. SS indicated that Xoserve would be working on its contingency planning and options. A Shipper constituency representative observed that what needs to be done to be able to use UK Link from 01 October 2016 would also need to be clear. SS reiterated her understanding of what is happening in the legacy system after 01 October 2016. Another Shipper constituency representative pointed out that at the moment there is still some room/time for manoeuvre for parties to flex/build in any additional requirements regarding legacy systems/arrangements, but this time is rapidly diminishing.

4.3 Release 2

Referring back to an earlier point in the discussions in 4.2, above, a Shipper constituency representative asked when more detail would be available regarding 'Release 2'. SS explained the various constraints.

A gas transporter representative then queried whether 'Release 2' and its delivery would be within the vires of this PNSG or not. SS confirmed that 'Release 2' was completely separate from the activities/remit of the Xoserve UK Link Programme Team. The gas transporter representative then suggested it should be very clear as to when the PNSG's responsibilities ended, and which if any body/party then takes over responsibility for oversight/assurance of delivery under 'Release 2', and whether any sort of formal 'handover' might be required. Would new Terms of Reference be required? What would the industry be expected to sign up to?

On the assumption that the PNSG's role and responsibilities concluded by 30 September 2016, it was suggested that Ofgem should start to consider what, if any, formalised arrangements should then be in place to provide a continuing oversight/assurance of the delivery of 'Release 2' and to enable a seamless transition.

Action 0212: *'Release 2'* - Ofgem to consider what, if any, formalised arrangements should be put in place to provide a continuing oversight/assurance of the delivery of 'Release 2' and to enable a seamless transition.

4.4 DCC Contingency Request – *ongoing monitoring*

JD affirmed that no action had been identified for the PNSG to take, and there was nothing further to report.

5.0 Key Milestones

5.1 M1.3c: Xoserve RGMA UAT Complete (due 29 February 2016) - *preparation*

SS pointed out that this was not just RGMA, it should recognise other functionalities.

This milestone will need to be reviewed by SS and AS in light of today's discussions and may need to be adjusted.

5.2 M2.4c: L3/4 MT Core Start (due 01 March 2016) - *preparation*

This milestone will need to be reviewed by SS and AS in light of today's discussions and may need to be adjusted.

5.3 M3.2: Unique Sites (US) Build and Unit Test Complete (due 04 March 2016) - *preparation*

SS and AS reported that this was on track; approval of the milestone would be sought at the next meeting (14 March 2016).

6.0 Programme Risks and Issues for consideration (*by exception*)

6.1 Risks

AS had updated the register. New risks had been added relating to RGMA and its impacts. These will be discussed at the next meeting. New risks had also been added relating to Exception Management process (i.e. what happens after 'go live'), and iGT data quality. AS briefly outlined the latter; a gas transporter representative would welcome further discussions with AS and SS and offered to assist/facilitate as required.

A Shipper constituency representative referred to points regarding Risks R.18, R.24 and R.28.

R.18 - A challenger party was using dummy data but needed to acquire a revised set from Xoserve - this had been requested but the party was still waiting to receive it and cannot progress testing until it is received.

R.24 - Needs to be cross-referenced.

R.28 - It was questioned where this was being reported, what files did it relate to, etc? There appeared to be confusion regarding Release dates?

SS affirmed that there was a Release Plan but not all deliverable dates had been agreed yet. These are being reported in the PNSG pack each month ('pipeline changes' are still awaiting release dates). SS explained the process for reaching a release date. The Shipper constituency representative suggested that perhaps reporting might need to be done differently given the nature of the questions being received from constituents. SS summarised the UKLC discussions relating to the Release Plan/dates and recognised the concerns raised; a consultant had been appointed as Change and Release Manager to focus on a robust release plan. The Shipper constituency representative suggested that if SS would provide the relevant slide then it would be circulated to their constituents. SS noted this suggestion and indicated that any subsequent feedback would be welcomed. AS was concerned that market participants did not appear to be picking up on the information available. SS indicated the information would be shared at UKLIEF. It was

suggested that it should also be published on the PwC portal and that content could be adjusted once any feedback had been received.

Action 0213: *Risk R.28 Release Reporting (clarity on dates)* - SS to provide relevant Update Pack slide to Shipper constituency representatives(s) for circulation to Shipper constituents, and AS to publish relevant information on PwC portal.

Transition Group

A Shipper constituency representative observed that there should be recognition or a distinction between transition planning for Xoserve and transition planning for other market participants; it seemed to be Xoserve focused? AS confirmed the whole point of this group was to communicate what Xoserve was doing and to obtain input from other parties. It was an opportunity to influence certain areas, before such opportunities naturally diminished through progress. It was noted that some parties had indicated that they were not ready to contribute this forum.

6.2 Issues

None for discussion.

7.0 Any Other Business

7.1 ERR/FRJ Status Briefing

SS confirmed that most were in, and working, and there were no issues.

SS drew attention to and explained the five broader file level issues that had been identified in December, noting that Issue 2 (Rejection scenario is creating an FRJ rather than ERR in specific circumstances (error in file header/trailer, error in transaction type & error in single record contained in a file)) and Issue 4 (Legacy identifies 'text field issue' or 'numeric field issue', but Marketflow only identifies a generic 'field issue') were to be explored and discussed in more detail at the UK Link Committee (UKLC); it cannot be fixed for October and parties may need to consider what this will mean for them (they may wish to do some system impact analysis).

7.2 Unique Sites Workshop (Xoserve - 23 February 2016)

Responding to questions, SS confirmed this was going ahead. The US delivery plan was proceeding and the intent was to share the design and to understand if there were any other issues.

8.0 Outstanding Actions

The outstanding actions were reviewed.

0111: *Data Quality/Cleansing (Risk R.19)* - AS to liaise with SS to examine previous work carried out (by Emma Lyndon, Xoserve) in this area and ascertain if this can be built upon, and return to PNSG with a plan for a plan.

Update: AS confirmed this was to be included in the next Update pack. **Carried forward**

0112: *File Formats (Risk R.22)* - Xoserve to provide further clarity on this Risk.

Update: SS had provided further detail for inclusion. **Closed**

0201: *Market Trials* - SS to review impacts of RGMA testing not proceeding to plan, and whether MTs need to adapt to any identified consequences/deadline for RGMA.

Update: See discussions at 4.2, above. **Closed**

0202: *Market Trials* - AS to reconvene the MTWG to consider how best to adjust the MT plan to accommodate any potential late delivery of RGMA.

Update: Completed. **Closed**

0203: *US delivery to plan* - SS to review the delivery options from the central services' standpoint and establish whether the 30 Functional Specifications that impact Core are fundamental or minor changes (i.e. explain how US impacts on the current delivery plan).

Update: See discussions at 4.3, above. **Closed**

0204: *US delivery to plan* - The MTWG to review the delivery options from market participants' standpoint.

Update: See discussions at 4.3, above. **Closed**

0205: *US delivery to plan* - CW to assess effects on Modification 0432.

Update: Examination ongoing. **Carried forward**

0206: *Governance diagram* - AS to record the Transition Group.

Update: Recorded; updated document to be published on the PwC website shortly.
Closed

0207: *Programme Contingency* - AS and SS to reconfirm assumptions regarding (a) a fall back position (legacy systems remain available); and (b) a fall back position (legacy system(s) defunct).

Update: See Action 0208, below. **Closed**

0208: *Programme Contingency* - AS and SS to consider and determine (a) a 'point of no return' prior to 'Go Live' date; (b) potential scenarios following that point (in the 'immediate approach to landing' and appropriate reactions/management plans for industry; (c) which party or parties are best placed to take action(s), how and when.

Update: It was agreed that Actions 0207 and 0208 were superseded and that they should be combined into one new action. **Closed**

New Action 0214: *Programme Contingency* - SS and AS to look at appropriate options.

9.0 Key Messages and Items for Publication

The Key Messages were discussed and agreed and will be circulated. The table including the information, circulated by email following this meeting, is provided at the head of these minutes (see page 1, above).

Publication of meeting papers was agreed.

10.0 Next Agenda and Diary Planning

Further details of planned meetings are available at: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Diary

Next Meetings agreed: 07 March and 14 March 2016

07 March 2016

It was suggested that an interim 'progress checkpoint' meeting was required to ensure that sufficient pertinent information would be available for the PNSG to consider (and make appropriate recommendations) at its subsequent meeting on 14 March 2016.

It was agreed this will be held by teleconference from 10:00 - 10:30, on Monday 07 March 2016. The teleconference details will be: 0207 950 1251, access code 21870295#.

At this meeting the expectation will be to receive and assess the following:

- RGMA delivery - progress update
- US delivery - progress update
- Agree next steps.

14 March 2016

The next 'face-to-face' meeting will be held on Monday 14 March 2016 (as previously scheduled) at Ofgem's Offices, 9 Millbank, London SW1P 3GE, starting at 10:00.

At this meeting the expectation will be to cover the following (subject to change following the interim meeting on 07 March 2016):

- Review/approve minutes
- Programme Report (AS)
- MT L3/4 Progress Update (AS/SS)
- Unique Sites SAP delivery - assessment of viability (AS/SS)
- RGMA delivery - progress update (AS/SS)
- DCC Contingency Request – *ongoing monitoring (JD)*
- Key Milestones
 - M1.3c: Xoserve RGMA UAT Complete (due 29 February 2016) - *voting/approval*
 - M2.4c: L3/4 MT Core Start (due 01 March 2016) - *voting/approval*
 - M3.2: Unique Sites Build and Unit Test Complete (due 04 March 2016) - *voting/approval*
- Programme Risks and Issues for consideration (*by exception*)
- Review outstanding actions.

Attendance

It is assumed that all members will attend/participate unless the Chair is notified otherwise and that any meeting papers for publication should be provided to the Joint Office as soon as possible and in advance of each meeting.

Members are reminded they must formally notify the Joint Office of any absence and the attendance of their Alternate.

Unless otherwise notified, Project Nexus Steering Group meetings will take place as follows:

Time/Date	Venue	Workgroup Programme
10:00 - 10:30, Monday 07 March 2016	Teleconference: 0207 950 1251, access code 21870295#	<i>Interim checkpoint meeting</i>
10:00 - 13:00, Monday 14 March 2016	Ofgem, 9 Millbank, London SWIP 3GE	<i>Formal checkpoint meeting</i>
10:00 - 12:00, Tuesday 29 March 2016	Teleconference	<i>To be confirmed</i>
10:00 - 13:00, Monday 11 April 2016	Ofgem, 9 Millbank, London SWIP 3GE	<i>To be confirmed</i>
10:00 - 12:00, Monday 25 April 2016	Teleconference	<i>To be confirmed</i>
10:00 - 13:00, Monday 16 May 2016	Ofgem, 9 Millbank, London SWIP 3GE.	<i>Formal checkpoint meeting</i>
10:00 - 13:00, Friday 27 May 2016	Ofgem, 9 Millbank, London SWIP 3GE	<i>Formal checkpoint meeting</i>
10:00 - 13:00, Monday 13 June 2016	Ofgem, 9 Millbank, London SWIP 3GE	<i>To be confirmed</i>
10:00 - 12:00, Monday 27 June 2016	Teleconference	<i>To be confirmed</i>
10:00 - 13:00, Monday 11 July 2016	Ofgem, 9 Millbank, London SWIP 3GE	<i>To be confirmed</i>
10:00 - 13:00, Wednesday 27 July 2016	Ofgem, 9 Millbank, London SWIP 3GE	<i>Formal checkpoint meeting</i>
10:00 - 13:00, Monday 08 August 2016	Ofgem, 9 Millbank, London SWIP 3GE	<i>To be confirmed</i>
10:00 - 12:00, Monday 22 August 2016	Teleconference	<i>To be confirmed</i>
10:00 - 13:00, Monday 05 September 2016	Ofgem, 9 Millbank, London SWIP 3GE	<i>To be confirmed</i>

10:00 - 13:00, Monday 19 September 2016	Ofgem, 9 Millbank, London SW1P 3GE	Formal checkpoint meeting
---	------------------------------------	----------------------------------

Action Table (22 February 2016)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
0111	18/01/16	6.1	<i>Data Quality/Cleansing (Risk R.19)</i> - AS to liaise with SS to examine previous work carried out (by Emma Lyndon, Xoserve) in this area and ascertain if this can be built upon, and return to PNSG with a plan for a plan.	Xoserve (SS) and PwC (AS)	Due at 14 March 2016 meeting Carried forward
0112	18/01/16	6.1	<i>File Formats (Risk R.22)</i> - Xoserve to provide further clarity on this Risk.	Xoserve (SS)	Closed
0201	08/02/16	3.0	<i>Market Trials</i> - SS to review impacts of RGMA testing not proceeding to plan, and whether MTs need to adapt to any identified consequences/ deadline for RGMA.	Xoserve (SS)	Closed
0202	08/02/16	3.0	<i>Market Trials</i> - AS to reconvene the MTWG to consider how best to adjust the MT plan to accommodate any potential late delivery of RGMA.	Xoserve (SS)	Closed
0203	08/02/16	3.0	<i>US delivery to plan</i> - SS to review the delivery options from the central services' standpoint, and establish whether the 30 Functional Specifications that impact Core are fundamental or minor changes (i.e. explain how US impacts on the current delivery plan).	Xoserve (SS)	Closed
0204	08/02/16	3.0	<i>US delivery to plan</i> - The MTWG to review the delivery options from market participants' standpoint.	PwC (AS)	Closed

Action Table (22 February 2016)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
0205	08/02/16	3.0	US delivery to plan - CW to assess effects on Modification 0432.	National Grid Distribution (CW)	Due at 14 March 2016 meeting Carried forward
0206	08/02/16	6.1	Governance diagram - AS to record the Transition Group.	PwC (AS)	Closed
0207	08/02/16	7.4	Programme Contingency - AS and SS to reconfirm assumptions regarding (a) a fall back position (legacy systems remain available); and (b) a fall back position (legacy systems defunct).	PwC (AS) and Xoserve (SS)	Combined with 0208 to form new Action 0214 Closed
0208	08/02/16	7.4	Programme Contingency - AS and SS to consider and determine (a) a 'point of no return' prior to 'Go Live' date; (b) potential scenarios following that point (in the 'immediate approach to landing') and appropriate reactions/management plans for industry; and (c) which party or parties are best placed to take action(s), how and when.	PwC (AS) and Xoserve (SS)	Combined with 0207 to form new Action 0214 Closed
0209	22/02/16	4.1	RGMA potential items for descope - Xoserve to provide further details/statistics on 'odd, infrequent scenarios' so that these can be assessed for potential de-scoping.	Xoserve (SS)	Due at 07 March 2016 meeting Pending
0210	22/02/16	4.3	US Delivery (retention/removal) - PwC to seek participant feedback on any 'big picture' negative impacts of continuing with legacy systems or other interim arrangements to cover US, and report back to next meeting (07 March 2016).	PwC (AS)	Due at 07 March 2016 meeting Pending

Action Table (22 February 2016)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
0211	22/02/16	4.3	<i>US Delivery (retention/removal)</i> - AS to seek MTWG views on reasons to justify retaining US in the Core delivery; and in the event of US exclusion/deferral, to if/how MT can deal with any adjustments and how July MT would be reprioritised, and report back to the next PNSG meeting.	PwC (AS)	Due at 07 March 2016 meeting Pending
0212	22/02/16	4.3	'Release 2' - Ofgem to consider what, if any, formalised arrangements should be put in place to provide a continuing oversight/assurance of the delivery of 'Release 2' and to enable a seamless transition.	Ofgem (AB/JD)	Pending
0213	22/02/16	6.1	<i>Risk R.28 Release Reporting (clarity on dates)</i> - SS to provide relevant Update Pack slide to Shipper constituency representatives(s) for circulation to Shipper constituents, and AS to publish relevant information on PwC portal.	Xoserve (SS) and PwC (AS)	Due at 07 March 2016 meeting Pending
0214	22/02/16	8.0	<i>Programme Contingency</i> - SS and AS to look at appropriate options.	Xoserve (SS) and PwC (AS)	Due at 07 March 2016 meeting Pending