

**UNC Performance Assurance Committee Minutes**  
**Tuesday 08 May 2018**  
**at Elexon, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW**

**Attendees**

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Karen Visgarda (Secretary)	(MB)	Joint Office
Andy Clasper	(AC)	Transporter Member
Carl Whitehouse	(CW)	Shipper Member
Fiona Cottam	(FC)	Observer, Xoserve
Graham Wood	(GW)	Shipper Member Alternate
John Welch*	(JW)	Shipper Member
Lisa Saycell	(LS)	Shipper Member
Mark Jones	(MJ)	Shipper Member
Nirav Vyas	(NV)	PAFA
Rachel Hinsley	(RHi)	Observer, Xoserve
Rob Johnson*	(RJ)	Transporter Member
Sarah Gratte	(SG)	PAFA
Shanna Key*	(SK)	Transporter Member Alternate
Shelley Rouse	(SR)	PAFA

**Apologies**

Hilary Chapman	(HC)	Transporter Member
Richard Pomroy	(RP)	Transporter Member
Mitch Donnelly	(MD)	Shipper Member

\* *via teleconference*

Copies of non-confidential papers are available at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/PAC/080518>

**1. Introduction and Status Review****1.1 Confirm Quorate Status**

BF welcomed everyone to the meeting and declared the meeting as being quorate.

**1.2 Apologies for absence**

Apologies were noted as above.

**1.3 Note of Alternates**

Shanna Key for Hilary Chapman  
 Graham Wood for Mitch Donnelly

**1.4 Review of Minutes (10 April 2018)**

The minutes of the previous meetings were approved.

**2. Monthly Review Items****2.1 Risk Register Review**

NV explained that two new risks had been raised regarding Correction Factors and that the proposer is willing to present these at the June Meeting.

PAF Risk and PARR Mapping

NV then introduced the PAF Risk and PARR Mapping presentation and he explained that an exercise had been undertaken to map the PARR reports to the PAF Risks and that not every PAC Risk had an associated PARR report either associated with it, or produced presently. He then said he was keen to explore how the PAC wanted to address this matter. He then provided an overview of the specific Risks as detailed below:

PAC Risk	Risk Title	Source of UIG in 2017/18 AUGS	PARR Report	Notes
PACR0001	Theft of Gas	Permanent/Temporary AUGS Element 4, 6 (Balancing Factor)	To be created	Request data from AUGS and TRAS
PACR0002	Use of the AQ Correction Process	Temporary (until Reconciliation)	2A.8, 2B.8	
PACR0003	Estimated reads used for daily metered sites (Product Class 1 and 2)	Temporary (until Reconciliation)	2A.1, 2B.1	
PACR0004	Identified LDZ Offtake Measurement Errors	Temporary (until Reconciliation)	To be created	Can use Measurement Error Notification data
PACR0005	Incorrect or missing asset data on the Supply Point Register	Permanent/Temporary (if identified and corrected)	2A.9, 2B.9 2A.2, 2B.2 2A.3, 2A.3	
PACR0006	Use of Winter Annual Ratio (WAR) for End User Category (EUC) 03-08	Temporary (until Reconciliation)	2A.5, 2B.5	
PACR0007	Undetected LDZ Offtake Measurement Errors	Permanent	To be created	Reference UNC OAD C3.2 obligation
PACR0008	Unregistered Sites	Temporary (if identified and corrected) AUGS Element 1, 2 (for iGT sites)	To be created	Data request from Shipperless and Unregistered Sites Workgroup
PACR0009	Shipperless Sites	Temporary (if identified and corrected) AUGS Element 1	To be created	Data request from Shipperless and Unregistered Sites Workgroup
PACR0010	Meter readings fail validation (Product Class 3 and 4)	Temporary (until Reconciliation)	2A.6, 2B.6	
PACR0011	Late check reads on meters that derive a read	Temporary (until Reconciliation)	2A.1, 2B.1	
PACR0012	Meter read submission frequency for Product Class 4 meter points	Temporary (until Reconciliation)	2A.5, 2B.5	
PACR0013	Estimated reads at Change of Shipper	Temporary (until Reconciliation)	2A.4, 2B.4	
PACR0014	Failure to obtain a meter reading within the settlement window	Permanent	2A.7, 2B.7	
PACR0015	Consistent approach to retrospective updates	Perm/Temporary (if identified and corrected)	2A.10, 2B.10	

JW commented that with regards to Risk PACR009 Shipperless Sites that following the latest AUG Statement, that the latest Modifications concerning this area had had a positive affect with a reduction in the amount of sites potentially impacting UIG. He added that data was sent regularly to the Shippers and that it might be a useful exercise to monitor the risk.

FC added that this information was already published on the Joint Office Website and that rather than creating a new report, the AUGS data could be cross referenced against the probability concerning the UIG Risk. NV and GW both said that as the AUG report was only produced annually that other discussions were needed about the potential for a more frequent report instead.

GW also made reference to the Theft of Gas issue and NV said that ElectraLink and TRAS were both presently working on this matter, although there might be inconsistencies in the information presented when compared to the descriptions used in UNC meetings. . GW said that he appreciated there was a vast amount of data, but he suggested a focused approach as to exactly what data was required to provide the correct and most useful information, in line with the Licence conditions and obligations which then related to UIG. FC said that the AUGS analysed the data in the first instance that was publicly available from TRAS then only had the data that was contained in the 33 Schedule. NV said that the Theft of Gas was the highest risk on the overall Risk Register and a general discussion took place regarding this extensive topic and how this was linked to the MPRN's, along with if incentives should be introduced to monitor and police this area in a more cohesive and formal way. It was subsequently agreed that FC would investigate the Schedule 33 and discuss this with ElectraLink/TRAS, for Xoserve to obtain and cross match the data.

**New Action PAC0501: Xoserve (FC) to investigate Schedule 33 data with Electralink/TRAS and see if this data could be shared with Xoserve.**

FC said that she understood there used to be a forum regarding Measurement Errors and other related issues’ and GW said it used to be quarterly, but it was no longer an active forum. GW noted that significant errors were investigated by one or more individuals who were listed as Industry experts that were called upon periodically to analyse information related to such errors.

FC said from the Transporters perspective that there was a forum where the Transporters were kept up to date and that there was an Audit Schedule. NV said this area needed to be further investigated by the PAC to ensure all the processes were being undertaken in the correct process.

AC said that there were Measurement Error Reports that were produced on an as needed basis and that he had drawn attention to this in the previous December meeting, and it was on the meeting page for the 12 December 2017. NV said that these reports were helpful to the PAC to assist with analysing the risks and he asked if the PAC felt that would be sufficient to manage that specific related risk. All were in agreement with this and felt the this would be appropriate. BF said that not all the errors would be captured in that report or on the Maintenance Plan and FC said that those errors would be recorded as in, site set ups etc and this data could be extracted for analysis purposes.

NV said that 3 reports were completed and published on Huddle and these were; 2A.2, 2B.2 - No Meter Recorded, 2A.7, 2B.7 - No Reads received for 1, 2, 3 or 4 years (excludes estimated transfer readings) and 2A.9, 2B.9 - Standard Correction Factors for sites with AQ > 732 MWH

He said the remaining seven reports creation process was to be started by Xoserve following the Nexus Release 2 after June 2018.

NV also drew attention to the fact that there 5 additional reports that need to be created to ensure the appropriate monitoring and controls of the PAF Risks, as detailed below and these still needed to be defined and created.

PAC Risk	Risk Title	PARR Report	Notes
PACR0001	Theft of Gas	To be created	Request data from AUGÉ and TRAS
PACR0004	Identified LDZ Offtake Measurement Errors	To be created	Can use Measurement Error Notification data
PACR0007	Undetected LDZ Offtake Measurement Errors	To be created	Reference UNC OAD C3.2 obligation
PACR0008	Unregistered Sites	To be created	Data request from Shipperless and Unregistered Sites Workgroup
PACR0009	Shipperless Sites	To be created	Data request from Shipperless and Unregistered Sites Workgroup

PRIDE Techniques – Low Level Example

NV provided an overview of the PRIDE Techniques – Low Level Example presentation and said that the low level process that encompassed the PRIDE PAF techniques were for the PAC to use as a tool set to manage risk in the Gas Settlement arrangements. He added that this was based on the assumption that this was used regarding the DM Meter Read issue, and that this example assumed that the Market Participant had confirmed their agreement with the PAF and the use of techniques in order to mitigate industry risks and manage performance.

He went on to explain that the example used in the lag schematic flow chart was the DM Read submission progress and the risk related to the use of estimates for DM sites which were not reflective of actual consumption, and for sites reporting against the risk there was a lag in adjustments as there was no incentive for shippers to update the reads, with a risk that this lag in submitting reads could lead to an inaccurate adjustment. NV then provided a detailed overview of the process flow diagram drawing attention to specific areas or stages in the overall process and explained how the PRIDE techniques were defined in relation to the DM Read submission progress.

LS said that the process flow diagram was adequate from the PAFA and Transporters perspective, but that it did not encompass the Shippers even though they are on the outside of the process itself. NV said there was regular engagement with the Shippers and LS said despite that, the Shippers should still be represented within the process flow itself.

A lengthy general discussion then took place regarding the appropriate escalation process and what other areas should be included; for example; Appeals and liquidated damages/incentives process and GW asked if this would be codified to follow the process from a Shipper perspective.

BF explained how the Energy Balancing Credit Committee (EBCC) process worked from a Transporter and Shipper perspective and how this was in Code and that the process was very clear in terms obligations. NV said that the process would depend on the severity of the risk itself and that the PAFA would continue to work on a Guidance Document and evaluate what new Modifications might be required. He added the PAFA would produce a Milestones Plan in conjunction with the Guidance Document.

SR said that the PARR reporting had anonymised and non-anonymised data as approved by industry and that Ofgem had given a clear steer at the implementation of UNC Modification 0520, that 'naming and shaming' was an appropriate incentive. She also asked the PAC what they intended to do with the non-anonymised data from the PARR reports if they were not going to name the poorly performing organisations? She then said that the Industry had agreed that the PARR reports would show the performance area and BF said that those specific reports should be available to everyone detailing the actual performance in an anonymised format and only PAC would see un-anonymised reports.

FC explained that there were currently 3 levels of reporting and that the anonymity of the reporting could not be decoded, hence why they had to be reported using Solar Moons for example or something similar and this still seemed to working well. She explained the second level was in the PARR reporting and the third level didn't presently exist as that would be open data, possibly to all industry participants. GW said in that case a new Modification was required and FC said that might change the existing soft landing approach within the PARR reports. SR said that the PARR reporting had anonymised and non-anonymised data and that a decision was still yet to made by Ofgem on this matter. GW proposed the parties that were presently not adhering to process in relation to performance, should be written to with a call for action to be undertaken to address this matter.

NV then presented the Questions for consideration as detailed below:

Can you incentivise via name and shame?

Does the liability represent the risk incurred?

How would this be quantified?

Who pays who?

How would cash flow be managed and redistributed?

What happens if a Party doesn't pay?

Escalation action?

What if the fine is less than the cost of the benefit?

Fit for purpose?

Mechanism for model adjustment?

JW proposed a way to test the process would be to go through a live issue to see what was needed and to use the low level example. He said that a specific set of Tool Kit Actions would also be required to use in the short term. He said the live issue

could then be mapped against the process flow chart to see if it provided a sufficient robust procedure. All PAC members were in agreement with this suggestion and it was agreed the DM adjustments and Correction Factors should be used for this test case. NV agreed to produce a milestone plan as to what risks should be tracked against the process flow chart. NV also agreed to add into the process flow chart the Appeals Process.

**New Action PAC0502: PAFA (NV) to produce a milestone plan of which live risks should be tracked by use of the process flow chart.**

**New Action PAC0503: PAFA (NV) to add the Appeals process into the process flow chart.**

## 2.2 Issues Register

BF overviewed the existing issues as detailed below:

### 2.2.1. PAC09 – Data quality and issues with the submission of readings result in higher levels and fluctuations in unidentified gas.

BF said that in relation to PAC09 a decision from Ofgem was still needed in terms of the Urgent UIG modifications.

### 2.2.2. PAC10 – Product Class 2 and 3 Meter Read Submission Performance

JW said that a new Modification was presently being explored to escalate this matter and he provided an overview of the detail in the proposed Draft Modification - Transfer of sites with low read submission performance from Class 2 and 3 into Class 4, as detailed:

He explained the purpose of the Modification was to create an obligation for shippers to move sites with poor meter read submission performance from Class 2 and 3 into Class 4.

He further explained it was proposed that a new obligation was created in section M of the UNC that would set a minimum level of read submission performance that set out in UNC (for Class 2 and 3 meters). This would provisionally be set at [60%] for Class 2 and [50%] for Class 3 – if read performance was lower than [60% and 50%] for longer than [4] consecutive months, then the obligation would be triggered for that Shipper to begin moving sites into Class 4. If sites had not been moved into Class 4 [2] months after the trigger point, then an obligation placed on the CDSP would enable them to move the affected sites into Class 4. The level of minimum read performance would be set in such a way that poor read performance below a certain level did not continue indefinitely, but also did not discourage parties from using these settlement Classes in the appropriate way.

Furthermore, the obligation would be extended so that the affected shipper would not be able to move further (or move back) sites into Class 2 or 3 until the minimum read submission level had been reached for [2] consecutive months.

In addition, the solution would not seek to prevent shippers trialling meters in Class 2 and 3 in order to be able to meet the read submission performance targets when testing new systems. For this reason, the obligations above would not be applicable where a party had a population of meters in this class of less than [30] meters and [500,000 total AQ].

JW explained that certain areas were in square brackets [ ] which denoted further discussions were needed with the PAC members, especially in relation to the minimum level of performance.

A lengthy general discussion took place and it was agreed that the Industry should have a very clear steer and there should not be two different percentage values. BF proposed that the percentages as listed in the Code should be used, and if there was a 'dip' in performance then an incentive payment should be paid or they should be moved to Class 4. MJ proposed perhaps it should be monitored on a site by site basis. FC said that within Class 2 the percentage was set at 97% and in Class 3 it was set at 90% and that there were existing complex business rules over and above the Gemini rules and so she proposed to keep it simple, using the existing pre set percentages.

GW said he agreed with MJ and his suggestion of monitoring site by site and he said that perhaps 2 new Modifications might be needed, one to address Product Class 1 and the other to address Product Class 2, and that he said these would be first the two Modifications to be submitted by the PAC, so this would make a clear statement about the escalation process. BF and RHi said this would not have to go into a Release, as it would be managed as some extra internal reporting, and FC said that it should be added to the PARR reporting to ensure it was monitored correctly moving forward. JW confirmed he would amend the modification accordingly and so it was ready for submission to the June Panel.

**New Action PAC0504: Shipper Member (JW) to amend the new Modification in readiness for submission to the June Panel, for further development within the Distribution Workgroup.**

### **2.2.3. New Issues**

None raised.

## **2.3 Project Plan**

NV said that as part of the PAC Project Plan the PAFA were now starting to look at the Annual Review process and that he would be contacting people for feedback in due course.

## **2.4 Assumptions Register**

Consideration deferred until the 12 June 2018 meeting.

## **2.5 Ofgem Update**

There was no formal update submitted by Ofgem and no representative present.

## **2.6 Review of Monthly PARR Schedule 2 Reporting Update**

JW said he had been looking at the AQ Reporting for the May Panel and had updated the Draft Modification - Adding AQ reporting to the PARR reporting suite (PAC modification) and presented the data into the format of the PARR table, as detailed below and he wanted to know if the PAC was happy with this format. As detailed below:

It is proposed that the PARR is updated to add the AQ reports.

UNC Section V notes in 16.1.2 that "Any amendment to the Performance Assurance Report Registers shall be made in accordance with the Modification Rules and for such purposes the Performance Assurance Report Registers shall be deemed to be a part of the Code."

Reports to be based on the specifications below.

By Class and by MRF (where applicable)

Rolling AQ								
AQ Band	Percentage Portfolio Calculated in month							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Shipper A								
Shipper B								
Shipper C								
Industry								

Total Percentage Portfolio Calculated by Month (12 mths rolling)								
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug
Shipper A								
Shipper B								
Shipper C								
Industry								

Percentage Increased in month								
AQ Band	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Shipper A								
Shipper B								
Shipper C								
Industry								

Percentage Increased by rolling 12 months (total AQ)								
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug
Shipper A								
Shipper B								
Shipper C								
Industry								

Percentage Decreased in month								
AQ Band	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Shipper A								
Shipper B								
Shipper C								
Industry								

Percentage Decreased by rolling 12 months (total AQ)								
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug
Shipper A								
Shipper B								
Shipper C								
Industry								

Percentage of portfolio with AQ calculation 1 month, 4 months, 12 months, 12 months plus								
Month	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 etc.
Shipper A								
Shipper B								
Shipper C								
Industry								

Failure to calculate by rejection codes								
Rejection Code	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Shipper A								
Shipper B								
Shipper C								
Industry								

NV then provided an overview of the high-level PAC reporting as detailed below:

**2A-2 No Meter Recorded**

The PAFA described the report as measuring the percentage of each shippers portfolio of confirmed meter points with no meter recorded on the Supply Point Register as at the report snapshot date. Also described is the UNC requirement to fit a meter at every supply point (M2.1.1) and obligation to provide timely updates to central systems.

Highlighted as red in the report shows the top 10 worst contributing Shippers which decrease industry performance. The PAFA explained that the top 10 contributors remained consistent across the previous 12 months. The industry as a whole has seen a 50% improvement in performance in the past 12 months by reducing the number of no meter recorded on the Supply Point Register.

**2A-7.1 No Read 2 - 3 Years <732,000 kWh**

The PAFA described the report as measuring the percentage of a Shipper's portfolio in the below 732,000 kWh AQ band without a meter reading for a 2-3 year period as at the report snapshot date. Also described is the Shipper obligation to submit a read for either Monthly Read Meters at least every 4 months (M3.4.1) and Annual Read Meters at least every 24 months (M3.5.1).

The PAFA explained that the top 10 worst contributors remained consistent across the previous 12 months. The Worst contributor is Shipper Torquay that has 29.86% of their portfolio that hasn't submitted reads for March and has been the top worst performer for the past 12 months.

The industry as a whole has seen a drop in performance in the past 12 months from 0.61% in March 2017 to 0.89% in March 2018 of all Shipper portfolios submitting reads within obligated timescales.

**2A-7.2 No Read 2 - 3 Years >732,000 kWh**

The PAFA described the report as measuring the percentage of a Shipper's portfolio in the above 732,000 kWh AQ band without a meter reading for a 2-3 year period as at the report snapshot date. Also described is the Shipper obligation to submit a read for either Monthly Read Meters at least every 4 months (M3.4.1) and Annual Read Meters at least every 24 months (M3.5.1).

The PAFA explained that the top 10 worst contributors remained consistent across the previous 12 months. The Worst contributor is Shipper Walton-on-the-Naze that has 1.60% of their portfolio that hasn't submitted reads for March. Walton-on-the-Naze performance deteriorated between July-August 2017 which could indicate that the impact of project nexus implementation has had an effect on the Shipper's read submission performance.

### **2A-9 Standard CF AQ > 732,000 kWh**

The PAFA described the report as measuring the count of sites with an AQ >732,000 kWh, but having the standard conversion factor (i.e 1.02264) as at the report snapshot date. Also described was the Thermal Energy Regulations requirement to have a site specific conversion factor at all sites with an AQ > 732,000 kWh.

Highlighted as red in the report shows the top 10 worst contributing Shippers which decrease industry performance. The PAFA explained that the top 10 contributors remained consistent across the previous 12 months. The industry as a whole has seen a 50% decrease in performance in the past 12 months as the number of sites with an AQ > 732,000 kWh has increased from 2702 in March 2017 to 4124 in March 2018.

The industry saw a step change decrease in performance of 976 sites between the months of June to July 2017 which could indicate that the impact of project nexus implementation has had an effect on the Shipper's managing asset data on the Supply Point Register.

NV said he would supply a Dashboard format of the Reports versa the Risks for the next meeting in June.

### **New Action PAC 0505: PAFA (NV) to provide a Dashboard format of the Reports versa the Risks for the June Meeting.**

## **2.7 Review of PAC Terms of Reference**

BF provided an overview of the Terms of Reference (ToR) and explained the changes had originally been requested by Andrew Margan, Shipper Member, who had now left his company and the PAC, which he had wanted these submitted to the UNCC. He said the changes were in relation to the structure and a single majority vote for each party during the Election Process. GW confirmed he was now coordinating this matter and it was agreed these updated ToR's could be submitted to the UNCC in May.

## **3. Annual Work Plan and Budget**

### **3.1 Draft Work Plan and Budget Actions Update**

NV said there were no new updates and stated all was on track providing the PARR and AQ Reports including the incentivisation model. He reiterated the fact the Annual Review was soon to take place.

RHi said at the next meeting she would be providing further detail on the Double WBS Code in relation to the Budget process and a draft report that would make the whole process more agile.

## **4. Communications Plan**

NV said the main key messages from each meeting continued to be produced by the PAFA and were distributed via the usual channels.

## **5. Any Other Business**



## 5.1 Potential draft Nexus Meter Read Performance Modification (JW)

JW provided a brief overview of the Potential Changes to the Read Performance Section of the PARR document, and provided a high-level summary.

He explained the Modification 0570 and Modification 0633V introduced new read obligations that had not yet filtered through to the PARR.

Modification 0570

### SECTION M – SUPPLY POINT METERING

#### 5 – Meter Readings

5.9.9 Each User shall secure, in relation to Annual Read Meters, that a Valid Meter Reading is obtained and provided to the CDSP at least once in every 12 month period for each Annual Read Meter where the Supply Point has been in the Registered User's ownership for more than 12 months.

5.9.10 Where the Supply Point for the Annual Read Meter has been in the Registered User's ownership for less than 12 months, the User shall use its reasonable endeavours to secure that a Valid Meter Reading is obtained and provided to the CDSP at least once in the first 12 month period of ownership.

Modification 0638V

#### 5.9.2

(d) notwithstanding the above, where the Supply Meter Installation at a Supply Meter Point has or is comprised of a Smart or Advanced Meter, the Meter Read Frequency shall be no greater than Monthly in any case and the Shipper User shall take all reasonable steps to obtain and submit a Valid Meter Reading at least once per month.

JW also presented tables in relation to Read Performance, Smart Meter Reads Performance and AMR Meter Read Performance.

All were in agreement that this information should be included in the Modification and BF advised that the Modification is likely to be considered material and therefore requiring an Ofgem decision. He overviewed the existing EBCC process regarding making changes to the Credit Rules and said this was undertaken after a 2 months notice period that was submitted via the Appeals Process to the UNCC and perhaps something similar could be used for changes to the PARR Schedules.

JW said that the new Modification - Adding AQ reporting to the PARR reporting suite (PAC modification) was for Authority Direction initially and it would be for Panel to make the decision whether this was appropriate. GW agreed he would sponsor this new Modification and that he would ask Ofgem what their initial thoughts were on it from an Authority Direction or Self-Governance perspective. He said from a speed point of view, he would amend the wording as required then would accept feedback via email in order to be able to submit it to the June Panel.

## 5.2 Daily Meter read performance and consumption adjustments – draft Open Letter (FC)

FC said that RP and SK had provided feedback and now the letter had been updated to version 2 and that the letter would be sent from FC to the Contract Managers with a copy of the latest performance statistics with an issue resolution instruction needed to be in place by the end of May 2018. She added that if the matter was not resolved in that time frame, then perhaps a transition Modification might need to be raised to address these offenders using anonymised data. All were in agreement with this proposal.

### 5.3 Transfer Read Performance / AQs of 1 (RHi)

RHi said that the defect was not causing the issue and that this was being discussed with the DSG in relation to transfer Read Performance as this was still very poor. She said she would obtain a report regarding 2a4 and 2b4, but that there was still a technical issue presently.

### 5.4 Smart Meters (exchanges and read submissions statistics – (All) Consumption

JW said no one had provided any further comments or feedback and that he had presented a short overview of what was being undertaken within the Electricity sector presently. He said in the short term the focus was Meter Read Performance and that SMART Meters were not a very high priority right now.

### 5.5 Potential Smart Metering statistics Draft Change Proposal (RHi)

RHi said she had spoken to JW concerning the Shippers not submitting Meter Read and she said that GNG wanted a report and were happy with the reporting that was currently taking place and would progress this with the DSC Change Managers and then for the matter to be re-investigated again once RAASP had been implemented.

### 5.6 Consideration of UNC Modification 0647 Shipper Requirements (RP)

BF said that RP sent his apologies and that he wanted this discussed as it was a different regime for Class 1 Meter Reads only, and he wanted PAC to keep a watching brief on it.

### 5.7 UoM vs Reg Factor vs Reading Units (RH)

RHi said that she had been asked internally by the Xoserve Issue Management Team that they believed that there were circa 8,000 domestic supply points set up wrong and so the Units of Measure (UoM) were incorrect. She said the Issue Management Team wanted to propose that the PAC investigate this area in greater depth in relation to the RGMA flows having the wrong figure recorded. LS said perhaps this was an MDD validation issue and had maybe been flagged by the MAM's. NV said that any asset data could be captured and prioritised but that a process would need to be undertaken initially to see at what point it does need to be added into the Risk Register and if this was appropriate and valid.

## 6. Review of Actions Outstanding

**PAC 0202:** PAFA (NV) to produce a view in relation to the reporting of non-anonymised data formats to assist the PAFA with assurance work.

**Update:** NV explained this action could now be closed as the information had been produced and discussed. **Closed**

**PAC 0302:** Shipper Member (GW) to consider amending the PAC ToR in relation to increasing the Shipper membership numbers of PAC.

**Update:** GW said this action could now be closed as the PAC ToR would now be submitted to the UNCC in May. **Closed.**

**PAC 0303:** PAFA (NV) to provide a summary of what a low level process would look like by using the techniques presented in January 2018.

**Update:** NV said this action could be closed as the information had now been presented and discussed. **Closed**

**PAC 0308:** Shipper Member (LS) will investigate the Rejection Reads and Reasons codes to try to ascertain the issues the Shippers are experiencing.

**Update:** LS this action could now be closed as the issue was to with Class 2 and all was reporting as required. **Closed.**

**PAC UIG 1113:** Xoserve (FC) to meet with the PAFA to sense check the Risk Register and the PAFA Contract in order to determine materiality.

**Update:** NV said this action could now be closed as the materiality had now been determined. **Closed.**

**Class 2&3 Meter Reads PAC0302:** Xoserve (RHi) to investigate the read rejection reasons in more depth, especially regarding systems errors and *'Reading breached the upper Inner tolerance value and no override flag provided'*.

**Update:** RHi and FC said this action could now be closed as there are no system errors. **Closed.**

**DM Reads PAC0304:** Xoserve (FC) to investigate the weekly statistics on how the DM Reads were progressing and the level of engagement.

**Update:** FC said the letter had now be drafted and slow progress was now being made and that the action could now be closed. **Closed.**

**PAC0401:** Reference *'Nexus Meter Read Performance'* presentation - Xoserve (RHi) to request that her Xoserve colleagues provide an updated presentation in time for consideration at the May PAC meeting.

**Update:** RHi that this action could be closed and that she would have the information to present at the June meeting. **Closed**

**PAC0402:** Shipper Member (JW) to prepare a draft UNC modification for consideration at the May 2018 PAC meeting.

**Update:** Both RHi and JW said this action could now be closed. **Closed**

**PAC0403:** Reference the draft *'Adding AQ reporting to the PARR reporting suite'* modification - Parties to provide views to JW direct for possible inclusion in the (formal) modification going forwards.

**Update:** JW said this action could now be closed as the information had now been included in the Modification. **Closed**

**PAC0404:** Reference *Daily Meter read performance and consumption adjustments* – Xoserve (FC) to draft an 'open letter' (to be sent to offending parties only) for consideration at the May 2018 PAC meeting.

**Update:** FC said the letter was now drafted and would be sent to the Contract Managers from her and so this action could now be closed. **Closed**

**PAC0405:** Reference *SSP and LSP adjustments* – Xoserve (FC) to provide a high level view (from June 2016 to date and SSP from 'go-live' date).

**Update:** FC said the information had been supplied and so the action could now be closed. **Closed**

**PAC0406:** Reference *Smart Metering Statistics* – Xoserve (RHi) to provide a draft Change Proposal for consideration at a future PAC meeting.

**Update:** RHi and FC said that the paper had now been supplied on this matter and so the action could be closed. **Closed**

**PAC0407:** Reference *Smart Metering Statistics* – Xoserve (RHi) to provide a draft Change Proposal for consideration at a future PAC meeting.

**Update:** RHi said this action could be closed as it was agreed to wait until the RASP had been implemented. **Closed.**

## 7. Any Other Business

It was proposed that the PAFA should keep a record of what actions had been resolved and actioned with a date of resolution to act as an audit trail. NV agreed to produce a document to track these accordingly.

**New Action PAC0506: PAFA (NV) to track and record all actions that have been resolved and actioned by date to produce an audit trail.**

## 8. Next Steps

BF proposed that due to the amount of tasks that the PAC were presently in the process of addressing that a potential extra meeting should be arranged at the end of June, if certain areas had not be completed in the 12 June meeting.

### 8.1 Key Messages - PAFA

It was agreed the PAFA would provide the Key Messages communications for this and future meetings, as per the summary below:

- The Performance Assurance Committee (PAC) considered and agreed the proposed amendment to its Terms of Reference which will be taken forward to the Uniform Network Code Committee (UNCC) at its next meeting in May
- The PAC discussed the draft modification wording for transfer of sites with low read submission performance from Classes 2 and 3 into Class 4
- The PAC discussed the draft modification wording for adding Annual Quantity (AQ) reporting to the Performance Assurance Reports Register (PARR) reporting suite
- The Assurance Framework Administrator (PAFA) presented wording on a draft modification for the amendment of PARR permissions to allow update requests from PAC with UNCC approval
- Conversations were had by the PAC around incentivisation of positive performance in the industry and challenges to be addressed for an effective process to be in place
- The PAFA will provide a project plan for implementation of the presented PRIDE performance assurance approach
- Xoserve presented a draft letter to be sent to all Daily Metered (DM) Shippers still with outstanding actions relating to Pot 1 consumption adjustments for PAC consideration
- Xoserve provided an update on industry performance on lack of transfer read submission and resulting issue of AQs of 1
- The PAFA noted five Performance Assurance Framework (PAF) Risks that currently don't have assigned PARR reporting but do have working groups working in the related areas
- The PAC agreed that the PAFA should utilise the data from existing working groups associated with the five risks not assigned PARR reporting
- The PAFA presented the three finalised PARR reports with analysis on trends
- The PAFA announced the start of their annual review
- The next face to face meeting will take place on 12 June 2018

## 9. Diary Planning

Further details of planned meetings are available at: [www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Diary](http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Diary)

Time/Date	Venue	Programme
10.30, Tuesday 12 June 2018	Radcliffe House, Blenheim Court, Warwick Road, Solihull B91 2AA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monthly Review Items</li> <li>• Annual Work Plan &amp; Budget</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communications Plan</li> <li>• Smart Meter Exchanges &amp; Read Submission Statistics</li> <li>• PAC Related Modifications</li> </ul>
10.30, Tuesday 10 July 2018	Elexon, 350 Euston Road London Lon NW1 3AW UK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>To be confirmed</i></li> </ul>
10.30, Monday 06 August 2018	Solihull – Venue TBC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>To be confirmed</i></li> </ul>
10.30, Tuesday 11 September 2018	Elexon, 350 Euston Road London Lon NW1 3AW UK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>To be confirmed</i></li> </ul>
10.30, Tuesday 09 October 2018	Solihull – Venue TBC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>To be confirmed</i></li> </ul>
10.30, Monday 05 November 2018	Elexon, 350 Euston Road London Lon NW1 3AW UK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>To be confirmed</i></li> </ul>
10.30, Tuesday 11 December 2018	Solihull – Venue TBC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>To be confirmed</i></li> </ul>

**Action Table (as at 08 May 2018)**

<b>Action Ref</b>	<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>Minute Ref</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Status Update</b>
PAC 0202	05/02/18	4.0	PAFA (NV) to produce a view in relation to the reporting of non-anonymised data formats to assist the PAFA with assurance work.	PAFA (NV)	<b>Closed</b>
PAC 0302	05/03/18	4.1	Shipper Member (GW) to consider amending the PAC ToR in relation to increasing the Shipper membership numbers of PAC.	Shipper Member (GW)	<b>Closed</b>
PAC 0303	05/03/18	6.1	PAFA (NV) to provide a summary of what a low level process would look like by using the techniques presented in January 2018. Including adding into the Project Plan development of a low level impact investigation tool kit for April onwards with a summary of what the in-depth process will look like.	PAFA (NV)	<b>Closed</b>
PAC 0308	05/03/18	7.0	Shipper Member (LS) will investigate the Rejection Reads and Reasons codes to try to ascertain the issues the Shippers are experiencing.	Shipper Member (LS)	<b>Closed</b>
PAC 0401	10/04/18	2.2.1	<i>Reference 'Nexus Meter Read Performance' presentation</i> - Xoserve (RHi) to request that her Xoserve colleagues provide an updated presentation in time for consideration at the May PAC meeting.	Xoserve (RHi)	<b>Closed</b>
PAC 0402	10/04/18	2.2.1	To examine the Uniform Network Code for a system rule associated to Class 3 UIG aspects.	Xoserve (RHi)	<b>Closed</b>
PAC 0403	10/04/18	2.2.1	To prepare a draft UNC modification for consideration at the May 2018 PAC meeting.	Shipper Member (JW)	<b>Closed</b>
PAC 0404	10/04/18	5.1	<i>Reference the draft 'Adding AQ reporting to the PARR reporting suite' modification</i> - Parties to provide views to JW direct for possible inclusion in the (formal) modification going forwards.	All parties	<b>Closed</b>

**Action Table (as at 08 May 2018)**

<b>Action Ref</b>	<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>Minute Ref</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Status Update</b>
PAC 0405	10/04/18	5.2	<i>Reference Daily Meter read performance and consumption adjustments – Xoserve (FC) to draft an ‘open letter’ (to be sent to offending parties only) for consideration at the May 2018 PAC meeting.</i>	Xoserve (FC)	<b>Closed</b>
PAC 0406	10/04/18	5.4	<i>Reference SSP and LSP adjustments – Xoserve (FC) to provide a high level view (from June 2016 to date and SSP from ‘go-live’ date).</i>	Xoserve (FC)	<b>Closed</b>
PAC 0407	10/04/18	5.5	<i>Reference Smart Metering Statistics – Xoserve (RHi) to provide a draft Change Proposal for consideration at a future PAC meeting.</i>	Xoserve (RHi)	<b>Closed</b>
PAC 0501	08/05/18	2.1	Xoserve (FC) to investigate Schedule 33 data with Electralink/TRAS and see if this data could be shared with Xoserve.	Xoserve (FC)	<b>Pending</b>
PAC 0502	08/05/18	2.1	PAFA (NV) to produce a milestone plan of which live risks should be tracked by use of the process flow chart.	PAFA (NV)	<b>Pending</b>
PAC 0503	08/05/18	2.1	PAFA (NV) to add the Appeals process into the process flow chart.	PAFA (NV)	<b>Pending</b>
PAC 0504	08/05/18	2.2.2	Shipper Member (JW) to amend the new Modification in readiness for submission to the June Panel, for further development within the Distribution Workgroup.	Shipper Member (JW)	<b>Pending</b>
PAC 0505	08/05/18	2.6	PAFA (NV) to provide a Dashboard format of the Reports versa the Risks for the June Meeting.	PAFA (NV)	<b>Pending</b>
PAC 0506	08/05/18	7.0	PAFA (NV) to track and record all actions that have been resolved and actioned by date to produce an audit trail.	PAFA (NV)	<b>Pending</b>

**Action Table PAC – UIG DM Read Issues (as a 08 May 2018)**

<b>Action Ref</b>	<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>Minute Ref</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Status Update</b>
PAC UIG 1113	14/11/17	2.0	Xoserve (FC) Xoserve (FC) to meet with the PAFA to sense check the Risk Register against known UIG causes and the Performance Report register.	Xoserve (FC)	<b>Closed</b>

**Action Table from Teleconference (*Product Class 2&3 Meter Reads Submissions*) (as at 08 May 2018)**

<b>Action Ref</b>	<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>Minute Ref</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Status Update</b>
Class 2&3 Meter Reads PAC 0302	26/03/18	1.4	Xoserve (RH) to investigate the read rejection reasons in more depth, especially regarding systems errors and <i>Reading breached the upper Inner tolerance value and no override flag provided.</i>	Xoserve (RHi)	<b>Closed</b>
DM Reads PAC 0304	26/03/18	2.1	Xoserve (FC) to investigate the weekly statistics on how the DM Reads were progressing and the level of engagement.	Xoserve (FC)	<b>Closed</b>