

UNC Performance Assurance Committee Minutes

Tuesday 10 September 2019

at Radcliffe House, Blenheim Court, Warwick Road, Solihull B91 2AA

Attendees

Alan Raper (Chair)	(AR)	Joint Office
Mike Berrisford (Secretary)	(MiB)	Joint Office
Brett Court	(BC)	Observer, Xoserve
Carl Whitehouse	(CW)	Shipper Member
David Newman	(DN)	Observer, Xoserve
Fiona Cottam	(FC)	Observer, Xoserve
James Rigby	(JR)	Observer, Xoserve
Jayne Goodge	(JG)	Observer, Xoserve
Karen Kennedy	(KK)	Shipper Member
Kirsty Dudley*	(KD)	Shipper Alternate
Lisa Saycell	(LS)	Shipper Member
Louise Hellyer	(LH)	Shipper Member
Mark Bellman	(MB)	Shipper Member
Mark Jones	(MJ)	Shipper Member
Max Pemberton	(MP)	Observer, Xoserve
Neil Cole	(NC)	Observer, Xoserve
Sally Hardman*	(SH)	Transporter Member
Sara Usmani*	(SU)	PAFA
Sean Cooper	(SC)	Shipper Member
Shanna Barr*	(SB)	Transporter Member
Shelley Rouse	(SR)	PAFA

Apologies

Alex Travell	(AT)	Transporter Member
Sallyann Blackett	(SB)	Shipper Member

* via teleconference

Copies of non-confidential papers are available at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/pac/100919>

1. Introduction and Status Review

1.1 Confirm Quorate Status

Alan Raper (AR) welcomed everyone and declared the meeting as being quorate.

1.2 Apologies for absence

As above.

1.3 Note of Alternates

As above.

1.4 Review of Minutes (13 August 2019)

The minutes of the previous two meetings were approved.

2. Review of Outstanding Actions

PAC0502: *Reference Broken / Faulty Meter Flags Information Provision* – PAFA (SR) to investigate whether the associated information (split by AMR and SMART) can be teased out of the system and reported to the PAC (accepting that there may also be some commercial sensitivity issues involved).

Update: In explaining that investigations remain ongoing, JR undertook a quick review of the Xoserve 'Faulty Meters Analysis' presentation provided immediately ahead of the meeting.

When JR advised that the CAMs had already commenced engagement with Shippers on these matters, Members debated whether sites would remain under the same ownership and whether the large volumes (and associated timelines) being witnessed relate to the complex nature of the issues – it was suggested that some of the reasons behind the (volume) issues could be related to records / equipment information being out of date and that perhaps a 'one-off' tidy up exercise might be beneficial.

JR went on to explain that Xoserve had been in discussion with the PAFA over a possible AQ volume / meter type split, especially bearing in mind that the suspicion is that a large proportion of the volumes being observed could be AMR related. When asked, SR confirmed that the PAFA had originally focused attention on the larger sites and that from a historical perspective, issues with Product Class 1 meters appear to take circa 12 months to resolve. However, it was felt by some Members that this is an indication that the industry is not managing 'fault flags' effectively.

In referring to UNC Modification 0664 'Transfer of Sites with Low Read Submission Performance from Class 2 and 3 into Class 4', KK enquired how faulty meters would be managed and wondered if these would simply be pushed back into PC4 and whether there is a need for an industry wide educational piece – in response, MJ noted that if a meter is found to be faulty, the industry party concerned should ensure it is fixed (or replaced) or it would move to PC4.

Concluding discussions, JR advised that Xoserve intends to keep running the reports, maintain CAM engagement and monitor the situation going forwards.

Thereafter, Committee Members agreed to close the action. **Closed**

PAC0705: Xoserve (NC/FC) to provide information regarding the Class 3 AQ calculation issue affecting 177,000 Meter Points that have moved into Class 3, where the AQ has been understated.

Update: In noting that this action is due to report to the 08 October 2019 meeting, Committee Members agreed to carry forward the action. **Carried Forward**

PAC0706: Xoserve (NC) and the PAFA (SR) to ascertain if the Top 3 Shippers are the same in both of the Class 4 data extracts, of 293,000 kWh and above, and the Customer Advocate Managers (CAMs) to contact each Shipper regarding their performance.

Update: In noting that a previous update had been provided on this matter, FC went on to confirm that the majority of issues relate to the PARR report low performers and that engagement via the CAMs with these parties is ongoing.

Thereafter, Committee Members agreed to close the action. **Closed**

PAC0707: Xoserve (NC) to confirm if the Top 3 Class 1 Shippers presently have a MAM allocated to them or potentially a MAM in common.

Update: In noting that a previous update had been provided on this matter, FC went on to suggest that this is not something that the PAC could resolve as it primarily relates to a Shipper / Supplier contractual matter.

Thereafter, Committee Members agreed to close the action. **Closed**

PAC0708: Xoserve (NC) to include the data for the Top 3 Shippers in each category as an update each month from now on, as a standing agenda item.

Update: When FC highlighted that this is due to become a 'standing' agenda item going forwards, Committee Members agreed to close the action. **Closed**

PAC0709: Xoserve (NC) to arrange for the CAM's to contact the Shippers that had not responded to the NDM Sample data request and for this data to be refreshed and re-presented at the September PAC meeting.

Update: When NC pointed out that this would be covered off under consideration of agenda item 3.5 later in the meeting, Committee Members agreed to close the action. **Closed**

PAC0710: PAFA (SR) to contact SPAA and MRA regarding the dispute process and provide feedback on findings at the August meeting.

Update: SR explained that the SPAA feedback on the Shipper read process and supporting administration related processes provided to date on this matter had been very useful. Furthermore, discussions with a SPAA Representative confirmed that there are remaining Supplier/Shipper communications related issues, especially with SARs communications when supply points transfer from larger to smaller Supplies.

SR also confirmed that the SPAA Representative had stated that whilst the SARS system is not currently broken, it is creaking under the strain.

When SR then pointed out that some Shippers that have relationships with multiple Suppliers and this could cause issues, LS explained how Supplier to Supplier communications and associated processes are not provided to the Shipper. When asked what industry governance applied, SR advised that the Gas Forum (i.e. Code of Practice Group) used to cover this but it no longer exists.

In noting that from a Supplier perspective there are also licence obligations to consider and that on top of these there is the fact that the communications between Supplier and Shipper should be 'covered' under any commercial agreements and processes, KD advised that she does not necessarily support the SPAA Representative's view that matters have become worse – in short, whilst performance dipped it has subsequently recovered. Furthermore, it should be noted that the SARS Technical Group can help to manage resolution of these types of issues.

Committee Members noted that the agreement of reads between Suppliers process appears to be working at an adequate level and that the real issues appear to stem from the 'tail end' of the process. It was briefly debated as to whether changing the responsibility for the ongoing (transfer) reads provision could help – in the end, it was agreed to consider the matter offline.

When FC questioned whether the Committee believe that SARS unavailability is the (real) underlying issue (i.e. volume related discrepancies), SC responded suggesting that perhaps the industry simply needs to accept that the market has moved on and that the opening read performance(s) simply reflect market practises. SR pointed out that the Committee could always consider utilising alternative sources of information.

Thereafter, Committee Members agreed to close the action. **Closed**

Post Meeting Note: Please refer to the 12 November PAC Minutes for a correction to this Action Update. The SPAA Representative has provided further clarity as the information recorded above did not appear accurate.

PAC0711: Xoserve (NC) to investigate the Replacement Read process and the associated impact on the PARR Reports and provide feedback.

Update: In explaining how both the replacement reads process and PARR Reports work to capture the count of replacement reads in a calendar month, NC suggested that Xoserve could potentially provide additional supporting information if deemed necessary. However, he asked the Committee to note that this would require a change to the current (PARR) reporting suite in order to enact.

When KK outlined her concerns relating to the opening reads and SARS information outputs compared to the apparent lack of detail in the respective PARR reports (i.e. the potentially

misleading relationship of the replacement reads and skewed PARR Performance Indicators), SC provided a brief outline behind the processes involved. It was suggested that the real issue might be related to the opening read submission window, rather than any settlement related aspects – in short, the problem could stem from the delayed correction between Shippers (a phasing related issue).

When AR enquired whether the information would be included in the PARR Reports going forwards as it appears that this action is simply seeking to tease out more accurate information, SR responded by pointing out that the PARR Reports reflect UNC obligations and that delving down to identify the additional underlying (granular) detail, remains the difficult part of the process.

When KK enquired whether there is a possibility to tease out (extract) opening reads information from the SARS system. When FC went on to question what the real aim behind the current PARR Read Replacement Report was anyway, on the grounds that it remains unclear what it is trying to achieve / deliver, some parties felt that there might be benefit in considering the matter in more detail at some point in the future, possibly via the establishment of a workshop to review PARR Report outputs etc. – it was also noted that there is a DSC Change Request currently in flight that is looking to amend / enhance PARR Reporting aspects.

New Action PAC0901: *Reference PARR Reports - PAFA (SR) and Xoserve (FC) to discuss the establishment of a PARR Reporting Workshop in order to review the outputs.*

Thereafter, Committee Members agreed to close the action. **Closed**

PAC0712: Xoserve (DN) to inform the PAFA when the 2A.5 PARR Report will be delivered with PAFA access.

Update: When DN made reference to the Xoserve presentation covering agenda items 3.4 and 3.7 later in the meeting, Committee Members agreed to close the action. **Closed**

PAC0713: Xoserve (DN) to inform the PAFA when the 2A.5 PARR Report will be delivered and how this interacted with the Shipper MI tool.

Update: When DN once again made reference to the Xoserve presentation covering agenda items 3.4 and 3.7 later in the meeting, Committee Members agreed to close the action. **Closed**

PAC0801: Xoserve and PAFA to re-assess Read Performance for PC1 and update at the next meeting with the top poor performers.

Update: When FC explained that work remains ongoing in respect of the issue of outstanding read performance reporting, SR made a brief reference to the 2A.5 information to be considered under agenda item 5.2 later in the meeting.

Thereafter, Committee Members agreed to close the action. **Closed**

PAC0802: Xoserve to confirm if the Faulty Meter Flag is automatically removed upon a meter replacement and the registration of a new Shipper.

Update: JR confirmed that the Faulty Meter Flag is automatically removed when a new meter is installed. Thereafter, Committee Members agreed to close the action. **Closed**

PAC0803: CAMs to enquire on the circumstances for using a faulty meter flag and proactively engage with parties with the oldest and largest faulty meter flags.

Update: JR confirmed that engagement is underway. Thereafter, Committee Members agreed to close the action. **Closed**

PAC0804: Xoserve to engage with Shippers to understand the correct use of flag.

Update: In noting that this matter relates to concerns raised at previous meetings by SC, Xoserve gave a commitment to look to provide a progress update in due course, at which point FC also provided a brief explanation of the associated reconciliation related aspects.

When asked, FC confirmed that in essence the adjustments undertaken for a faulty period are undertaken via a consumption adjustment and are dependent upon the Shipper flagging the issue.

When some parties voiced concerns that the first reconciliation after replacement / resolution of a faulty meter could potentially lead to faulty meter readings impacting upon reconciliation, FC responded by advising that she does not believe that this is an issue as she expects that there would be both 'closing' and 'opening' reads involved and that 'the system' would not reconcile on a faulty meter flag anyway.

It was noted that PAC have previously considered how consumption adjustments could impact across product classes.

Thereafter, Committee Members agreed to close the action. **Closed**

PAC0805: Xoserve to confirm what Faulty Meter Flag reports are available and consider inclusion of this functionality within the Data Discovery Platform (DDP).

Update: JR advised that following discussions within Xoserve it has been concluded that the Faulty Meter Flag functionality would not be included within the DDP at this time.

When SR enquired whether the PAFA would be able to find out who the PC1 Shipper involved is / was, Members were asked to consider releasing access to this information to the PAFA going forwards (subject to addressing any potential confidentiality issues) – the consensus amongst Committee Members being to allow the PAFA access to the information.

Thereafter, Committee Members agreed to close the action. **Closed**

PAC0806: Xoserve (DN) to provide an update on DDP Drop 2.

Update: In noting that this action would be covered during consideration of the Xoserve presentation covering agenda items 3.4 and 3.7 later in the meeting, Committee Members agreed to close the action. **Closed**

PAC0807a: Xoserve to confirm that the PAFA can provide a response to XRN4991, on behalf of PAC.

Update: When JR confirmed that the PAFA are able to provide a response to XRN4991 (on behalf of PAC), Committee Members agreed to close the action. **Closed**

PAC0807b: PAFA to submit a response to XRN4991 consultation to highlight the requirement that there should be no impacts on the PARR Reports.

Update: When SR explained that following an informative meeting with interested parties that this had been completed, Committee Members agreed to close the action. **Closed**

PAC0808: PAFA to address the 7 draft risks within the Risk & Issues Register.

Update: When SR confirmed that a revised Risk Register had been uploaded to the Huddle pack for consideration at the October meeting, Committee Members agreed to close the action. **Closed**

PAC0809: Xoserve to consider what additional reporting could be undertaken to provide a better understanding on the materiality of non-calculating AQs.

Update: In advising that the monthly AQ process related statistics are already published on the Xoserve web site, FC pointed out that whilst there are somewhere in the region of 100k out of circa 1 million sites that are currently not calculating, this remains a relatively small issue.

When KK suggested that the issue relates in part to an 'aged' (no reads) AQ recalculation concern, whereby there are no mechanisms other than the AQ amendment process to correct the AQ. In short, it is believed that this is a technically incorrect way in which to address the issue but at least the AQs become more reflective of site consumption.

When it was suggested that perhaps one option would be to consider the historic AQ aspects, FC responded by explaining how an Xoserve 'fix' seeks to avoid carrying over zero value AQs before agreeing to provide a link for inclusion within the minutes after the meeting.

Thereafter, Committee Members agreed to close the action. **Closed**

PAC0810: Xoserve to circulate the Specification of the AQ at Risk report for consideration as a new PARR report.

Update: When it was noted that this action would be covered during consideration of agenda item 3.6 later in the meeting, Committee Members agreed to close the action.
Closed

PAC0811: Xoserve to provide PAFA with the identification of Shippers from the Faulty Meter Report to review if there is a correlation in poor performance. *(AQ at risk report will be used as supporting evidence)*

Update: When MP explained that investigations remain ongoing, Committee Members agreed to carry forward the action. **Carried Forward**

PAC0812: *EUC09 and PC4* - Xoserve to request information from CAMs on what action is being taken by Shippers to address "Red" sites.

Update: In providing a brief overview of the '*EUC09 Sites not in Class*' presentation, FC outlined how the action 'links in' to UNC TPD Section G1.6.15 requirements before then focusing attention on slide 5 '*EUC09 sites as at 1 Sept. 2019 – COUNT, by Class*', and explaining that as far as the data for 'Luna' was concerned, this may be due to faulty equipment. Furthermore, engagement with the Shippers remains ongoing.

Thereafter, Committee Members agreed to close the action. **Closed**

3. Committee Matters For Attention

3.1 Modification 0664 – Transfer of Sites with Low Read Submission Performance from Class 2 and 3 into Class 4 (MJ)

In pointing out that the modification was the subject of recent discussions at the UIG Workgroup meeting, MJ advised that as a consequence he would be looking to provide an amended modification in due course after undertaking some discussions with Xoserve in order to avoid inadvertently 'locking out' Shipper reads.

3.2 Modification 0674 – Performance Assurance Techniques and Controls (MB)

MB explained that he has undertaken discussions with the lawyers (Dentons) in order to look at how best to incorporate some additional items within the modification, including ancillary document aspects.

The modification is due to be considered further the next 0674 Workgroup meeting.

3.3 Modification 0677R – Shipper and Supplier Theft of Gas Reporting Arrangements (CW)

CW explained that he would look to provide a copy of the Workgroup Report for consideration at the October PAC meeting.

3.4 PAC Reporting Change Proposals Update (JR)

Please refer to the discussions under item 3.7 below for more details.

3.5 NDM Sample Data Update (FC/JR)

NC provided a brief overview of the '*MOD654s – NDM Sample Data*' presentation, during which attention focused on the '*Revised Position – September 2019*' slide.

In considering the 'Marigot' and 'Baghdad' information, NC explained that one party has responded questioning the objectives and the other party has not replied as yet.

As far as 'Apia', 'Papeete', 'Berlin', 'Suva', 'Bern', 'Luxembourg', 'Gaborone' and 'Casteries' are concerned, there have been no responses received from these parties to date even after five (5) months of chasing – the consensus amongst PAC Members in attendance was to ask the PAFA to write to these parties outlining the (no read submission) problems and educational options available to them and request formal responses by no later than 05 October 2019. Members also requested that SR ensures that this concern is also highlighted in the PAFA Key Messages.

Concluding discussions, NC noted that the data should be submitted monthly unless otherwise agreed whilst FC advised that Xoserve are also looking for daily meter read history (across Product Classes 3 and 4), which they do not 'normally' have access to.

3.6 AQ at Risk Breakdown (FC)

In providing an overview of the '*PAC Action 0810*' presentation, FC confirmed that the supporting reports would be provided on an anonymised basis, although she is unable to provide any further detail at today's meeting – more information would be provided at the October PAC meeting.

FC then pointed out that a new supplemental report would be provided as part of the PARR reporting suite going forwards (i.e. to compliment the % read performances report) – it was suggested that a view of the % of volume assessment would also prove beneficial.

Concluding discussions, it was agreed that this agenda item should be retained for the October PAC agenda.

3.7 PARR Reporting Data Discovery Platform (DDP) Drop 2 Update (DN)

In providing a brief overview of the '*Data Changes: Agenda*' presentation, DN advised that the slide pack would also be presented at the 11 September 2019 DSC Change Management Committee meeting, including more clarity around the data and prioritisation aspects.

When asked how the items were prioritised for inclusion within the Drop 2 Scope, DN explained that this was based around both industry and DSC Change Management feedback and inputs, especially in respect of identified key deliveries.

DN went on to suggest that should any Shippers wish to take part in the Beta Testing Team, please make Xoserve aware of the fact. In acknowledging that progression of XRN's has not been ideal in the past, parties recognised that this is a new area that is continuing to develop, and until Xoserve has a fully functioning system, there could always be questions asked around transparency and prioritisation mechanisms.

Focusing attention on the '*Data Changes: PAFA XRN's*' slide, JR provided a more in depth explanation behind the respective XRN's and Options 1 through to 3 during which questions were asked as to whether or not the additional costs associated with Option 3 are really worth it, even if it does get data into the DDP faster – it was noted that the finer points around funding of the various options needs further consideration. However, it was pointed out that funding comes from the same source and should not be seen as a potential barrier to progressing matters.

When asked, DN confirmed that Xoserve are already considering how best to avoid a potential mismatch between the Shipper pack communications and PARR reports.

Moving on to consider the '*Data Changes: PAFA Options: DDP Access*' slide, JR pointed out that the legal sign off aspects outlined under Option 1 had now been resolved and that Option 2 would require a standalone delivery requirement.

Whilst Members noted that getting the PAFA access to the information is a priority, care is needed in ensuring that only the relevant data for them to successfully fulfil their role is made available to them – the issue of providing the appropriate level of information to the PAFA has been a concern for some time.

When MB voiced concerns around the prioritisation of PAC related items at the DSC meetings, KD also noted that this presentation item was not visible on the 11 September 2019 DSC Change Management Committee meeting agenda. Responding, JR advised that it is his intention to ‘table’ the presentation as a late (possibly AOB) item at the meeting – to support this proposed approach he would be writing to the Change Managers following the PAC meeting to draw their attention to these facts.

When it was requested that the DSC Change Management Committee should focus on undertaking the most appropriate decision(s), rather than concentrating solely on funding related aspects, SH observed that some of these ‘data drops’ are potentially very expensive exercises. DN pointed out that whilst the predicted costs are associated with providing access for the PAFA, there could be additional costs involved if additional work is required. The extent of these costs at time remain unclear – in short, the aim is to get the PAFA access to the DDP as soon as possible with a view to considering any enhancements at a later point.

When asked whether the initiative had gone through the DSC Contract Management Committee processes in order to consider the Data Permissions Matrix (DPM) aspects, DN responded by indicating that he was unsure, although he is aware that a DPM update has to be included within each respective (data) drop. In noting that the cut-off date for submissions is 10 September 2019, it was suggested a steer from the Committee could help expedite the matter.

DN advised that should PAC prefer Option 2, then this would be picked up in the following months Contract Managers meeting.

New Action PAC0902: *Reference PARR Reporting Data Discovery Platform (DDP) Drop 2 – Xoserve (DN) to double check what Data Permissions Matrix changes could / would be required in order to support granting the PAFA access to the DDP.*

Discussions then focused on Option 2 (which is basically a backfill for Option 1 and resolves some previous concerns) and what potential resourcing recruitment period impacts are involved.

In noting that funding is no longer a major concern, Members believed that a view on an appropriate delivery date and supporting benefits analysis would be valuable.

When asked, Members indicated a (consensus) preference for adoption of Option 2, subject to provision of an indication of a delivery date and addressing of any DPM supporting aspects.

3.8 Standards of Service Liabilities Reporting (verbal update for information only)

AR advised that the report had been published ahead of the meeting.

4. Committee Matters For Decision

4.1 Agenda items to be confirmed

None.

4.2 Approach to Procurement of a New PAFA for July 2020 (FC)

In providing an overview of the 'Approach to Procurement of a Performance Assurance Framework Administrator (PAFA) for July 2020' presentation, FC reminded parties that the scope of PAFA responsibilities is included within the Framework document, rather than the Uniform Network Code (UNC) per se, before then moving on to focus attention on the 'Approach to Procurement' slide and highlighting the key question around whether PAC would wish to adopt the same approach again.

During consideration of the 'Implications of Brexit' slide, FC agreed to take a new action to double check the Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU) aspects in respect to renewing the (current) Gemserv (PAFA) contract for a further year.

New Action PAC0903: Reference Approach to Procurement of a Performance Assurance Framework Administrator (PAFA) for July 2020 – Xoserve (FC) to double check OJEU aspects in respect to renewing the (current) Gemserv (PAFA) contract for a further year.

Discussion then moved on to focus on the 'Alternative Approaches' slide whereupon MB questioned whether appointing a new PAFA party would really deliver a real benefit at this time, especially as it appears that Gemserv are now beginning to better understand the (PAC) requirements and deliver a good service – in short, he would support a further year extension to the current PAFA contract.

A brief discussion was then undertaken which centred on the role of the CDSP post cessation of the UIG Taskforce / Workgroup alongside other potential market changes – it was also suggested that if the PAFA could become more proactive around provision of information within the PARR reports and help identify additional trigger points, that would prove extremely beneficial in the longer term.

It was noted that whilst the PAC consensus aligns with MB's suggestion, it is caveated with the expectation that the PAFA undertakes a more proactive role in identifying and resolving potential issues and looking into (new) potential areas of interest.

New Action PAC0904: Reference Approach to Procurement of a Performance Assurance Framework Administrator (PAFA) for July 2020 – All Members to consider what their expectations are in respect of the PAFA undertaking a more proactive role in identifying and resolving potential issues and provide a guide as to the (new) potential areas of interest/innovation they would like highlighting.

Moving on to consider the 'PAFA Procurement – Next Steps' slide, FC pointed out that should PAC favour appointing a new PAFA party this could potentially introduce a one (1) month hiatus in respect of the PARR reporting.

Concluding discussions, it was noted that the Committee needs to be clear on the scope and nature of the innovative ideas it could reasonably expect the PAFA to explore.

5. Monthly Review Items

5.1 Risk & Issues Register Review

In noting that there are no specific updates to provide at this meeting, SR advised that she would be adding the new risk(s) outlined earlier in the meeting to the register in due course.

5.2 Review of Monthly PARR Reports (inc. Dashboard update)

During consideration of the 'PARR Dashboards' presentation attention focused on the smaller 'Shipper Performance Analysis' presentation that contains commercially sensitive information extracted from the Huddle system.

As a consequence of the fact that the subsequent discussions relate in the main, to sensitive information, only the key PAC decision items have been recorded within these minutes, as follows:

5.2.1. 2A.5 Read Performance

Committee Members supported a continuation of the meter read performance monitoring exercise for a further month.

5.2.2. 2A.9 Standard CF AQ > 732,000 kWh

Committee Members supported passing the three (3) poorest performing Shippers to the CAM team to ascertain whether any guidance / training is needed.

6. Any Other Business

6.1 Transporter Membership Change (SBa)

AR explained that Shanna Barr would be stepping down as a Transporter Member with effect from 30 September 2019 and would be replaced by Leteria Beccano from 01 October 2019 onwards.

6.2 Meter Read Capacity for Class 3 Supply Points Update (JR)

In apologising for the late submission of the presentation in support of this agenda item, JR provided an overview of the 'MOD0700 – PARR Reports' presentation during which attention initially focused on the new status of 'A' and 'N' on the 'UBR Status' slide.

Moving on to consider the 'Scenario 1: First Read Accepted' slide, BC confirmed that this scenario would always utilise the latest read.

While explaining the 'Scenario 2: First Read Failed, Second Read Accepted' slide, BC highlighted that this relies on either the latest read, or next latest read and is under pinned by the existing validation rules.

However, BC did point out that this scenario is heavily dependent on how the reads are submitted and begs the question on whether the inner tolerance flags are still needed – it is expected that this would be considered further within the DSG.

Some parties wondered whether having the reads validated against the last submitted read in order to establish if the flags are set correctly might be an option. Responding, BC acknowledged the point before pointing out that Xoserve is still considering the potential options (i.e. flat profiles etc.).

In moving on to consider the 'Scenario 3: Two Selected Reads Fail' slide, (EUC Band 1 only), it was noted that this primarily represents the 'worst case scenario'. In referring to the 'checks and balances', FC suggested that the override flags might well reflect actual usage changes.

Examining the 'Implementation Impacts to PARR reports' slide, BC pointed out that at the 28 September 2019 date, some M-1 reports would include three (3) days where the new reads status would not be recorded – as a consequence Members are asked to note that there could be some PARR Performance Reporting related impacts as well as some possible read rejection related impacts. At this point BC provided a brief explanation behind how reads submitted after 28 September 2019 would be treated.

When asked about the proposed 10 (business) day limit (which some parties believe constrains their ability to submit timely reads), BC explained that this is seeking to avoid potential capacity related concerns / issues. Members were reminded that as the 10 day period is specified within the implemented modification, as such, amending it would require a new modification.

In noting the concerns being voiced, FC pointed out that the proposed approach is simply an 'interim' solution for EUC 1's only, whilst settlement would be 'balanced out'. FC went on to advise that where no reads are submitted for a given week, point to point reconciliation would still take place back to the last good reading. MJ also reminded parties that the system only needs one (1) read for reconciliation purposes.

Moving on to consider the 'Review of PARR Reports' slide, BC confirmed that as far as the 'Meter Read Validity Monitoring' was concerned this would be an enduring solution.

When SR then explained how the PARR reports would cater for the two new proposals (i.e. Read Performance and Meter Read Validity Monitoring), FC also explained that the PARR reporting would be expected to reflect the three (3) potential scenarios. When SC enquired whether it would be preferable to include ALL reads so that his performance position is not skewed, BC responded that the implications would need to be checked before a formal response is provided.

New Action PAC0905: Reference the Review of the PARR Reports - Xoserve (BC) to ascertain whether 'assured' reads could provide a feasible alternative solution and how this would be identified (i.e. a separate column added) within the Class 3 report.

7. Next Steps

7.1 Key Messages – PAFA

SR said she would develop an overview of the Key Points from the meeting and this would be provided by the PAFA in due course.

8. Diary Planning

Further details of planned meetings are available at:

<https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/events-calendar/month>

Time/Date	Venue	Programme
10:30, Tuesday 08 October 2019	Elexon, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW	Standard Agenda

PAC Action Table (as at 10 September 2019)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
PAC 0502	11/05/19	2.	<i>Reference Broken / Faulty Meter Flags Information Provision</i> – PAFA (SR) to investigate whether the associated information (split by AMR and SMART) can be teased out of the system and reported to the PAC (accepting that there may also be some commercial sensitivity issues involved).	PAFA (SR)	Update provided. Closed
PAC 0705	09/07/19	2.0	Xoserve (NC/FC) to provided information regarding the Class 3 AQ calculation issue affecting 177,000 Shippers that have moved into Class 3, where the AQ has been understated.	Xoserve (NC/FC)	Carried forward Xoserve Update due 08 Oct 19
PAC 0706	09/07/19	2.0	Xoserve (NC) and the PAFA (SR) to ascertain if the Top 3 Shippers are the same in both of the Class 4 data extracts, of 293,000 kWh and above, and the Customer Advocate Managers (CAMs) to contact each Shipper regarding their performance.	Xoserve (NC)	Update provided. Closed
PAC 0707	09/07/19	2.0	Xoserve (NC) to confirm if the Top 3 Class 1 Shippers presently have a MAM allocated to them or potentially a MAM in common.	Xoserve (NC)	Update provided. Closed
PAC 0708	09/07/19	2.0	Xoserve (NC) to include the data for the Top 3 Shippers in each category as an update each month from now on, as a standing agenda item.	Xoserve (NC)	Update provided. Closed
PAC 0709	09/07/19	2.0	Xoserve (NC) to arrange for the CAM's to contact the Shippers that had not responded to the NDM Sample data request and for this data to be refreshed and re-presented at the September PAC meeting.	Xoserve (NC)	Update provided. Closed
PAC 0710	09/07/19	2.0	PAFA (SR) to contact SPAA and MRA regarding the dispute process and provide feedback on findings at the August meeting.	PAFA (SR)	Update provided. Closed
PAC 0711	09/07/19	2.0	Xoserve (NC) to investigate the Replacement Read process and the associated impact on the PARR Reports and provide feedback.	Xoserve (NC)	Update provided. Closed
PAC 0712	09/07/19	5.5	Xoserve (DN) to inform the PAFA when the 2A.5 PARR Report will be delivered with PAFA access.	Xoserve (DN)	Update provided. Closed
PAC 0713	09/07/19	5.5	Xoserve (DN) to inform the PAFA when the 2A.5 PARR Report will be delivered and how this interacted with the Shipper MI tool.	Xoserve (DN)	Update provided. Closed

PAC 0801	13/08/19	1.4	Xoserve and PAFA to re-assess Read Performance for PC1 and update at the next meeting with the top poor performers.	Xoserve (FC) PAFA (SR)	Update provided. Closed
PAC 0802	13/08/19	2.0	Xoserve to confirm if the Faulty Meter Flag is automatically removed upon a meter replacement and the registration of a new Shipper.	Xoserve (JR)	Update provided. Closed
PAC 0803	13/08/19	2.0	CAMs to enquire on the circumstances for using a faulty meter flag and proactively engage with parties with the oldest and largest faulty meter flags.	Xoserve (JR)	Update provided. Closed
PAC 0804	13/08/19	2.0	Xoserve to engage with Shippers to understand the correct use of flag.	Xoserve (JR)	Update provided. Closed
PAC 0805	13/08/19	2.0	Xoserve to confirm what Faulty Meter Flag reports are available and consider inclusion of this functionality within the Data Discovery Platform (DDP).	Xoserve (JR)	Update provided. Closed
PAC 0806	13/08/19	2.0	Xoserve (DN) to provide an update on DDP Drop 2.	Xoserve (DN)	Update provided. Closed
PAC 0807a	13/08/19	4.1	Xoserve to confirm that the PAFA can provide a response to XRN4991, on behalf of PAC.	Xoserve (JR)	Update provided. Closed
PAC 0807b	13/08/19	4.1	PAFA to submit a response to XRN4991 consultation to highlight the requirement that there should be no impacts on the PARR Reports.	PAFA (SU)	Update provided. Closed
PAC 0808	13/08/19	4.1	PAFA to address the 7 draft risks within the Risk & Issues Register.	PAFA (SU)	Update provided. Closed
PAC 0809	13/08/19	5.3	Xoserve to consider what additional reporting could be undertaken to provide a better understanding on the materiality of non-calculating AQs.	Xoserve (FC)	Update provided. Closed
PAC 0810	13/08/19	5.3	Xoserve to circulate the Specification of the AQ at Risk report for consideration as a new PARR report.	Xoserve (FC)	Update provided. Closed
PAC 0811	13/08/19	5.3	Xoserve to provide PAFA with the identification of Shippers from the Faulty Meter Report to review if there is a correlation in poor performance. <i>(AQ at risk report will be used as supporting evidence)</i>	Xoserve (FC)	Carried Forward

PAC 0812	13/08/19	5.4	<i>EUC09 and PC4</i> - Xoserve to request information from CAMs on what action is being taken by Shippers to address “Red” sites.	Xoserve (FC)	Update provided. Closed
PAC 0901	10/09/19	2.	<i>Reference PARR Reports</i> - PAFA (SR) and Xoserve (FC) to discuss the establishment of a PARR Reporting Workshop in order to review the outputs.	PAFA (SR)	Pending
PAC 0902	10/09/19	3.7	<i>Reference PARR Reporting Data Discovery Platform (DDP) Drop 2</i> – Xoserve (DN) to double check what Data Permissions Matrix changes could / would be required in order to support granting the PAFA access to the DDP.	Xoserve (DN)	Pending
PAC 0903	10/09/19	4.2	<i>Reference Approach to Procurement of a Performance Assurance Framework Administrator (PAFA) for July 2020</i> – Xoserve (FC) to double check OJEU aspects in respect to renewing the (current) Gemserv (PAFA) contract for a further year.	Xoserve (FC)	Pending
PAC 0904	10/09/19	4.2	<i>Reference Approach to Procurement of a Performance Assurance Framework Administrator (PAFA) for July 2020</i> – All Members to consider what their expectations are in respect of the PAFA undertaking a more proactive role in identifying and resolving potential issues and provide a guide as to the (new) potential areas of interest/innovation they would like highlighting.	Members	Pending
PAC 0905	10/09/19	6.2	<i>Reference the Review of the PARR Reports</i> - Xoserve (BC) to ascertain whether ‘assured’ reads could provide a feasible alternative solution and how this would be identified (i.e. a separate column added) within the Class 3 report.	Xoserve (BC)	Pending