

# UNC0851R - EXTENDING THE ANNUALLY READ PC4 SUPPLY METER POINT (SMP) READ SUBMISSION WINDOW

WORKGROUP 23<sup>RD</sup> NOVEMBER UPDATE – DECEMBER PAC

WORKGROUP 11<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER UPDATE TO BE PROVIDED VERBALLY - DECEMBER PAC

ANNE JACKSON

PAFA

12<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 2023



**Gemserve**<sup>®</sup>

MAKING THINGS THAT MATTER WORK BETTER FOR EVERYONE

# REVIEW GROUP REQUEST SUMMARY



**Review Group** raised 10<sup>th</sup> July, Workgroup 1 – 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2023, Workgroup 2 – 11<sup>th</sup> December  
**Report to Panel date** 18<sup>th</sup> July 2024

## **Review Group – Specified Issue**

Code states that Shippers have 25 Supply Point Systems Business Days (SPSBD) after the read date to submit a read for settlement. Where there is an issue with the reading and time to resolve is needed, this requirement is problematic for Shippers.

### **Matters to be explored:**

- Understanding the objective (Why Change?)
- Assessment of alternative means to achieve the objective (some solutions suggested)
- Development of Solution (including business rules if appropriate)
- Assessment of Code-Specific Matters
- Assessment of the Solution (including business rules if appropriate)
- Assessment of impacts of the Request, including but not limited to Consumer and System Impacts
- Identification of potential impacts on other energy codes
- Consideration of potential performance assurance impacts
- Assessment of implementation costs of any solution identified during the Request

**Outcome requested:** Draft modification

# KEY MESSAGES

- Proposer sees the issue is mainly for small supply points.
- Solution suggestions from Parties are welcome.
- RFI's were suggested for evidence building
  - Suggested that a PAC RFI would likely have greater success.
  - The Proposer expressed interest in whether the PAC's recent RFI's produced evidence around the issue.
  - Shipper insights were requested.
- Financial incentives were ruled out as the Proposer deemed that a speedier resolution to the issue was needed.
- The Code requirements for reading submissions leading to performance publications were discussed.
- The current PARR review was highlighted and (subject to PAC's permission) whether any elements associated with the publication of performance data and its timeliness could be shared with the Review Group.
- Some Parties anticipated that the Review Group Report would also include or be supported by a PAC (PAFA) Commentary to be published alongside.
- The Workgroup considered how to feedback views relevant or pertinent to PAC re settlement accuracy.



# ACTIONS TAKEN

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Reporting Month	Owner	Status Update
0111	23-Nov-23	1	PAFA (AJ) to obtain PAC views on possible actions related to this Review group and on what they would wish to contribute.	January 24	PAFA (AJ)	Pending
0411	23-Nov-23	1	PAFA (AJ) to review PAC RFI data and ascertain if sufficient detail for Review purposes. If not ask if PAC would issue an RFI on behalf of the Review Group.	January 24	PAFA (AJ)	Pending

## PAC Decisions Required:

What views do PAC have in response to **Action 0111** and how should PAC views to be relayed to the Review Group?

The Review Group have requested that pertinent information from the PC3 and PC4 RFI's be shared with the Workgroup. Do PAC authorise this (with Party anonymity)?

If an RFI is deemed necessary, would PAC issue the RFI on behalf of the Review Group?



THANK YOU FOR YOUR  
CONTRIBUTION

---

ANY QUESTIONS:  
[PAFA@GEMSERV.COM](mailto:PAFA@GEMSERV.COM)

**INVESTORS IN PEOPLE®**  
We invest in people Gold

