

**UNC Performance Assurance Committee Minutes**  
**Tuesday 17 May 2022**  
**via Microsoft Teams**

**Attendees**

Rebecca Hailes (Chair)	(RH)	Joint Office
Mike Berrisford (Secretary)	(MB)	Joint Office

**Shipper Members (Voting)**

Alison Wiggett	(AW)	Corona Energy
Anthony Diccio	(AD)	ESB Generation & Trading
Claire Louise Roberts	(CLR)	ScottishPower (Alternate)
George MacGregor	(GM)	Utilita Energy (Alternate)
Graeme Cunningham	(GC)	Centrica
Louise Hellyer	(LH)	Totalenergies Gas & Power
Sallyann Blackett	(SB)	E.ON
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	Gazprom Energy (Alternate)

**Transporter Members (Voting)**

Jenny Rawlinson	(JR)	BUUK (Alternate)
Shiv Singh	(SS)	Cadent

**Observers (Non-Voting)**

Anne Jackson	(ER)	PAFA/Gemserv
David Newman	(DN)	Correla on behalf of Xoserve
David Speake	(DS)	Engage – <i>item 6.1.1 only</i>
Fiona Cottam	(FC)	Correla on behalf of Xoserve
Jonathan Kiddle	(JK)	Engage – <i>item 6.1.1 only</i>
Kate Lancaster	(KL)	Xoserve
Martin Attwood	(MA)	Correla on behalf of Xoserve
Michele Downes	(MD)	Correla on behalf of Xoserve
Neil Cole	(NC)	Correla on behalf of Xoserve
Rachel Clarke	(RC)	PAFA/Gemserv
Sara Usmani	(SU)	PAFA/Gemserv

Copies of non-confidential papers are available at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/pac/170522>

**1. Introduction**

Rebecca Hailes (RH) welcomed all parties to the meeting.

**1.1 Apologies for absence**

Alex Travell, Transporter Member,  
Andy Knowles, Shipper Member,  
Carl Whitehouse, Shipper Member,  
Ellie Rogers, Xoserve,  
Lisa Saycell, Shipper Member,

Mark Bellman, Shipper Member, and Tracey Saunders, Transporter Member.

### **1.2 Note of Alternates**

Claire Louise-Roberts for Mark Bellman, George MacGregor for Andy Knowles, Jenny Rawlinson for Alex Travell, and Steve Mulinganie for Lisa Saycell.

### **1.3 Quoracy Status**

The Committee meeting was confirmed as being quorate.

### **1.4 Approval of Minutes (12 April 2022)**

The minutes from the previous meetings were approved.

### **1.5 Approval of Later Papers**

It was noted that there was one (1) late paper (relating to agenda item 3.1) and two (2) expected late papers (relating to agenda items 2.3 and 2.4) submitted ahead of the meeting.

When asked, PAC Members present agreed to consider the documents.

### **1.6 User Representative Appointment Process Update**

RH provided an overview of the User Appointment Process and the key dates, reminding current Shipper members of the process for ensuring a Single Point of Contact (SPoC) is registered for their organisation to enable Shipper membership Nominations.

RH also outlined the need for members and alternates to sign Confidentiality Assurance Documents.

The current registered SPoCs and related documents are published at:

<https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/elections>

## **2. Monthly Performance Assurance Review Items**

### **2.1 PARR Report Review – Dashboard update (PAFA)**

Sara Usmani (SU) provided the Shipper Performance Analysis PARR Dashboard update. PAFA supplied the following observations for this section:

#### **SHIPPER PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT PLANS**

- Performance Assurance Committee (PAC) members were informed that updates on all Shippers on improvement plans were available for view on the Gas Performance Assurance Portal (GPAP). There were five Shippers on performance improvement plans (not including those on Product Class 4 (PC4) monthly plans) and the Performance Assurance Framework Administrator (PAFA) presented updates on three Shippers.

- Shipper “Praia” was presented to the PAC, who are on a performance improvement plan for PC2, PC3 and PC4. A revised performance improvement plan was submitted to the PAFA in March 2022, following a request to the Shipper by the PAFA. The Shipper appeared to be performing above forecast for PC3, with April performance overshooting their forecast. However, PC2 performance (68%) came in below their forecast (97.5%) for April due to a metering issue which was currently being investigated. No materialisation from the latest performance improvement plan would have fed through the PC4 data due to the lag in reporting but would be visible in the April data which would be available in June. The Shipper had implemented a number of measures, including the appointment of a managed service provider to assist with meter related issues and improving data quality. Committee members discussed the advantages of providing Shippers with more guidance on a checklist of areas to consider tackling when embarking on a Performance Improvement Plan. This could include managed service providers, meter read rejections and relationships with Suppliers if Shipping for multiple parties. The PAC were supportive of an initiative and request the PAFA create a strawman for the next PAC meeting.

**New Action PARR0501:** *Reference Shipper Performance Improvement Plans - PAFA (SU) to draft a strawman on further guidance for new Shippers to consider when embarking on a Performance Improvement Plan.*

- Updates on Shipper “Manama” were provided to the PAC. The Shipper had been on a performance improvement plan on PC3 and PC4 Monthly since March 2020. Though performance had seen a sharp increase in PC3 and almost reached UNC target, there had been a downward decline in performance whilst sites had been increasing. PC4 performance remained stagnant. The PAFA had been monitoring the Shipper’s performance and they had been inheriting sites in both PC3 and PC4, along with joining the PC1 and PC2 market. The PAFA held a meeting with the Shipper in April, with a revised improvement plan submitted in May 2022. PAC members were informed of the issues the Shipper was facing across all product classes, including the management of faulty meters, internal system issues, meters on incorrect read schedules and non-communicating SMART meters. Resolutions and milestones were provided to the PAFA which Committee members were happy with.
- Performance of Shipper “Seoul” was presented to the PAC, who were on a performance improvement plan for PC3. The Shipper had seen significant improvements in read performance, from c.40% in July 2020 to 80% in March 2022, though the Shipper had been hovering around the 90% mark. PAFA had been liaising with the Shipper who had previously expressed that there were a number of non-communicating SMART meters on their portfolio affecting their performance. The PAC advised the Shipper to transfer these to the PC4 monthly market, which was successfully completed by 1st May 2022. The PAFA recommended to wait for further updates to the data and for the PAFA to liaise with the Shipper once the May statistics become available (not available until mid-June). The Committee commented that these were positive actions for the Shipper and agreed with PAFAs recommendation.
- Committee members discussed the non-communicating SMART meters within the PC3 market, commenting that it was an issue that had been explored before, whereby industry members were contacted, however not much feedback was received on that occasion. The PAFA noted that this would be covered under the next agenda item (Risks and Issues Update).

### **GB ENERGY CRISIS: SUPPLIER OF LAST RESORT (SoLR) AWARDED SHIPPER PERFORMANCE**

- Committee members were provided with performance and portfolio updates for the eight Shippers which had been awarded SoLR sites. The Shippers include: “Avarua”, “Brazzaville”, “Bucharest”, “Dili”, “Mogadishu”, “Nuuk”, “Paramaribo”, “Sukhumi” and “Wellington”.

- The vast majority of Shippers had had SoLR sites transferred onto their portfolio for five months, in some cases for fewer months and the PAFA had been monitoring performance for these Shippers since. The PAFA recommended next stages, which included contacting those Shippers whose read performance had worsened or not improved following the transfer of SoLR sites to understand their current position prior to potential PAC recommendations on further action. PAC members agreed with the PAFAs recommendation to contact Shippers.

#### PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT PLANS – FOR PAC MEMBER ATTENTION

- One Shipper “Monaco” was highlighted to the Committee for attention. The PAFA noted that this Shipper operated in the PC1, PC3 and PC4 market but had a low number of sites.
- PC3 remained the only area of concern on the Shipper Monaco’s portfolio, with read performance declining for the past six months and consequently, the AQ at risk increasing. At present, the AQ at risk accounted for 2% of the total risk in the PC3 market.
- The PAFA recommended that they contact the Shipper to hold an informal meeting with the Shipper to understand their current position. Committee members agreed with the PAFA recommendation.

*Post meeting note: Shipper scale for PC3 was displayed incorrectly and the number of sites were significantly lower. The scale incorrectly showed c. 250,000 but there were only 10 sites on the Shippers portfolio. However, performance remains low and continued to decline for a period of six months and on this basis the PAFA’s recommendation remains unchanged. A post meeting email informing Committee members of the error was circulated. An updated dashboard is now available*

## 2.2 Review of Outstanding PARR Actions

**PARR0401:** PAFA to write to Maputo requesting them to attend the June PAC meeting.

**Update:** SU advised that the PAFA had written to Maputo and were now in dialogue with them developing a plan of action in respect of their PC4 Monthly related issues.

RH suggested, and PAC Members agreed to, follow a similar path to the previous Bratislava escalation process and invite Maputo representatives to attend a ‘nested’ Performance Review meeting within the main 14 June 2022 PAC meeting.

It is envisaged that the ‘nested’ meeting would take place around 11:00 – 12:30 on the day and would be confirmed between the PAFA and the Joint Office in due course.

When asked, PAC Members agreed that the action could now be closed. **Closed**

**New Action PARR0502:** Reference ‘Maputo’ Performance Review meeting – Joint Office (RH/MB) to look to invite suitable company representatives to attend the 14 June 2022 PAC (nested) meeting to undergo a Performance Review exercise.

**PARR0402:** CDSP to inform members of the PC4 monthly read performance split by meter/equipment type.

**Update:** In referring to the ‘CDSP and PAFA responses to May 2022 PAC meeting on outstanding actions’ document, Fiona Cottam focused attention on the information provided in response to this action at the bottom of the page.

During a brief discussion Steve Mulinganie (SM) reiterated why he posed the question in the first place and observed that being able to distinguish between the various meter assets is beneficial. In noting that the ‘Smart’ meter performance percentages appear on the low side and not at all what would be expected, SM wondered what the underlying issue might be. Responding, FC suggested that by the time the June PAC meeting takes place, the additional April data set would be included which might improve the percentages.

When asked, the consensus amongst PAC Members in attendance was that provision of information relating to the breakdown of meters by asset type would enable a better understanding behind the poorer Smart meter percentages being observed.

When FC suggested that in order to obtain a better understanding of this matter (including interrogation of the PARR data), engagement with Shippers would be needed and that there could also be Supplier SoLR aspects to consider as well, Rachel Clarke (RC) proposed that this matter also potentially 'links in' with the wider industry concerns relating to Smart meter communication issues.

When PAC Members noted that the data would suggest that the physical meter read performance is exceeding the automated (Smart) technical read performance figures, FC also pointed out that there could be a Settlement / Customer Satisfaction incentivisation aspect at play as well that would need to be carefully considered. SM also suggested that there could possibly be a fundamental 'Smart' meter related educational aspect to consider.

Concluding the discussions, FC agreed to provide a further update at the 14 June 2022 PAC meeting. **Carried Forward**

### 2.3 Risk & Issues Register Update (PAFA)

In noting that additional information is also available on the GPAP portal, Rachel Clarke (RC) provided an update. PAFA supplied the following observations for this section:

- Performance Assurance Committee (PAC) members were presented with an update on several risks in relation to Read performance, Rejected reads and an update on Correction Factors. The PAFA (Performance Assurance Framework Administrator) noted that there were three areas for PAC attention.
- The PAFA presented the following risk updates:
  - **PC3 Read Performance:** The Value at Risk (VaR) decreased by 19% within the market over 2021-22, with the risk rating dropping from five to four (high risk). Over the year, read performance had improved by c.4% which was attributed to the average number of sites decreasing which was in turn, reflected in the decrease in energy impact of the risk. The PAFA added that a seasonal pattern had emerged in the data which was unusual for the PC3 market, as most meters would be Smart enabled or AMR. The PAC were informed that there had been a rise in Shippers reporting difficulties with non-communicating Smart meters, which the PAFA had brought into previous PAC meetings for PAC guidance. A PAC member recalled that a letter was issued to Shippers in the past to request information on any issues in the PC3 market. The PAC suggested approaching the DCC to gain insight into whether they had had a rise in reports of non-communication issues. The PAFA suggested approaching the Smart Energy Code Manager as a means of gaining contact with the correct person in the DCC and to initiate discussions.

**New Action PAC0501:** *Reference PC3 Read Performance* - PAFA (RC) to consult with Smart Energy Code Manager to obtain contact details of relevant persons in DCC to investigate any issues around non-communicating Smart Meters.

- **PC4 Monthly Read Performance:** The risk in this market decreased by 5% over the past 12 months, though the risk rating remaining at a level of five (Highest risk). Read performance across the year had improved around 1%, however, the average number of sites had increased by around one million sites (due to the implementation of UNC0692S) which is reflective in the net decrease in energy impact of the risk. PAFA recommended that the continued active engagement with those on PC4 monthly performance improvement plans was necessary to ensure parties are given support in the initial stages of UNC0692S implementation as this modification may have had a compounding effect on their portfolio.

- **PC4 Annual Read Performance:** The risk in this market decreased by 25% over the past 12 months with the risk rating remaining at the highest level of five. RC noted that the Read performance across the year had improved by 3.5% which was reflective in the decrease in energy impact of the risk. RC noted that the average AQ in this product class was currently 14,000 KWh and that the latest performance for this product class was 89% as an industry total and 60% industry average. The PAFA recommended no further action required for this risk until the next refresh.
- **AMR Monthly Read Performance:** The risk in this market increased by 18% over the past 12 months with the risk rating remaining at three (Medium risk). Read performance across the time period had dropped around 2.75% which was reflective in the increase in energy impact of the risk. The PAFA informed the committee that more information was needed in this area to understand some of the changes in the data as there seems to be large swings in data. More specifically, this was prominent in the AQ of AMR monthly sites. In May/June 2021 the AQ dropped from 86 million to 40 million on the DDP. This had been queried with the DDP team and the CDSP to understand whether there were any logic changes to the DDP at this time. The PAFA noted that there may be issues involved in the AUGU update later in the agenda which would complement any mitigations for this PAC risk.
- **AMR Annual Read Performance:** The risk in this market increased by 27% over the past 12 months with the risk rating remaining at three (Medium risk). Read performance across the year had dropped around 1% which was reflective in the increase in energy impact of the risk. The same request for further information from the CDSP as AMR Monthly and proposed the same recommendation.
- **Rejected Read PC4 Monthly:** The risk in this market decreased by 32% over the past 12 months with the risk rating remaining at three (Medium risk). The percentage of rejected reads across the period had decreased by circa 0.98% with February 2022 having the lowest percentage of rejected reads since May 2021. The PAFA noted that the number of MPRNs in PC4M had increased by 1m from January 2022 to March 2022, this resulted in a step change in the level of reads being accepted while the rejected reads level remained the same. The PAFA recommended no further action required for this risk until the next refresh.
- **Rejected Read PC4 Annual:** The risk in this market increased by 9% over the past 12 months with the risk rating remaining at three (Medium risk). The percentage of rejected reads across the period had increased by circa 0.24% (218,000 to 236,000) which was reflective in the increase in energy impact of the risk. The PAFA noted that there had been a drop in population which was likely a result of UNC0692S. The PAFA recommended no further action required for this risk until the next refresh.
- **Correction Factor < 732,000:** The risk in this market decreased by 7% over the past 12 months with the risk rating remaining at the lowest level of one. RC noted that there had been a decrease of 30% in the average AQ of sites that used a site-specific correction factor, however this was offset by an increase in the number of sites using a non-standard correction factor without a convertor fitter (up 309%) which was reflective in the decrease in energy impact of the risk. RC summarised that following a request for further information from the CDSP, the PAFA's understanding of the risk had changed and now included the added element of sites with a corrector fitted. The PAFA recommended no further action required for this risk until the next refresh.

## 2.4 Open / Meter By-Pass Update

Martin Attwood (MA) provided an overview of the '*Meter By-Pass Update*' presentation during which the following key points were considered (by exception), as follows:

By-Pass Consumption Adjustments – Summary of outcomes to date - slide 6

- MA confirmed that the 1 '*CA not yet invoiced*' equates to circa 814,000 kWh which due to being below the threshold could have gone unnoticed;
- Parties noted that several factors can, and often do, impact open by-passes, such as pipe diameter and maintenance plant status etc.;
- In noting that there is nothing too alarming in the data being displayed, MA pointed out that the further reduction in the figures continues the improving trend;
  - Parties in attendance agreed that the progress made to date had been excellent but questioned whether the point of 'diminishing returns' had now been reached on the potential cost benefits of continuing to closely monitor this matter;
    - One option put forward was to move from this monthly reporting model to an annual one, especially now that there are very few new by-passes coming on stream and the PAC (industry) are essentially monitoring a legacy problem;
    - Some parties however, believe that continuing to monitor this matter provides benefits, especially where by-passes might be set to an 'open' status and never closed thereafter;
      - One option suggested could be to involve a Contract Manager level prompt (triggered after a specified time limit has passed) to remind parties to investigate and consider resetting the by-pass status;
    - RH advised she would feedback PAC's comments and suggestions (inc. possibly expanding the current by-pass form to include a proposed close date) the 0763R '*Review of Gas Meter By-Pass Arrangements*' Workgroup at its forthcoming 26 May 2022 meeting;
- When FC indicated that a new topic could be added to the DDP update, PAC Members in attendance agreed that this item could now be removed from future PAC agendas going forward.

## 2.5 Measurement Error Risk Update

### 2.5.1. Measurement Error (*EM009 – Airewas EM MTD*) Update

In providing a brief verbal update, RH explained that the report from the 2<sup>nd</sup> ITE was nearing completion and is expected to be considered at the forthcoming Offtake Arrangements Workgroup meeting scheduled to take place on Wednesday 25 May 2022 after which a combined ITE Report (based on the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> ITE Reports) would be prepared and presented by both of the ITEs involved.

## 3. Matters for Committee Attention

### 3.1 Isolated Sites with Progressive Reads

FC provided a brief overview of the '*PAC Agenda Item 3.1 – Isolated Sites With Progressive Reads*' presentation prepared by her colleague Neil Cole during which she pointed out that the information displayed within the graph for '*Isolated Sites With Progressive Reads – May 2022*' links back to the work undertaken by the AUGÉ – there were no adverse comments forthcoming from PAC Members in attendance.

### 3.2 DDP Update

David Newman (DN) explained that the recent DDP Sprint had enabled all the User Stories to go live except DDP193 which had failed to install correctly and as a consequence, has been rolled back out and would now go-live at the end of May 2022 – a communication relating to this matter will be issued in due course.

In relation to the DDP User Story backlog, there are 9 User Stories in the backlog with a total cost of circa £100k - £175k). When asked whether there is a cost breakdown available for each of the 9 User Stories, DN explained that the cost indication relates to the combined figure but could be provided on a per User Story basis as part of the development of the accompanying Business Evaluation Report (BER). When RH advised that the proposed costs would absorb all of the current PAC budget provision (£125k), PAC Members in attendance were also asked whether they would support moving on to the BER stage in the process, at which point there were no adverse comments provided in response.

When asked, DN explained that to proceed, PAC simply needs to ask the DSC Change Management Committee for permission to 'draw down' from the change funding. SM suggested that perhaps there might be benefit in looking to group together some of the User Stories in order to maximise cost benefits and effectiveness – a point supported in general by PAC Members in attendance.

When Jenny Rawlinson (JR) enquired whether the DDP route is the only option under which to deliver these items of work and whether undertaking the BER analysis would add to the costs, DN responded by indicating that whilst he works for the DDP Team he is aware that there are alternative options that could be utilised to support delivery. However, he did remind PAC Members that the analysis would follow the defined (and agreed) industry process.

In considering the proposed DDP route, SM explained that he believed that the DDP was based around a self-service provision, to which FC responded by acknowledging that whilst DDP is not the only route available, it does provide an effective way of interrogating and servicing data items whilst at the same time 'tailoring' the information provided to User's needs (i.e. customers, Shippers, PAFA etc.) – in short, the attraction of the DDP stems from all parties being able to have access to customer driven requirements and services.

In noting SM's point relating to the DDP self-service aspects, DN pointed out that the DDP goes further than that basic concept and provides an analysis tool set which also happens to have a self-service function in order to gain access to pre-determined dashboard information.

When FC observed that the cost benefit analysis question was an interesting one and that she would look to identify settlement volume aspects in order to better assist PAC in assessment of any potential risks, DN pointed out that the User Stories had been re-evaluated in 2021. JR requested that the 9 User Stories in question are ranked according to importance and cost benefit return.

When RH suggested that it would be prudent for PAC to await provision of further information relating to the 9 User Stories before progressing matters via the DSC Change Management Committee, DN advised that he would look to provide a post meeting update in due course.

**New Action PAC0502:** *Reference DDP Update – 9 Backlog User Stories BER Development* – Correlá (FC/DN) to look to provide an update on the potential BER development aspects including initial cost benefit analysis and a potential ranking order.

### 3.3 PAC Budget and Spend Update

FC explained that whilst she did not have a specific update to provide at the meeting, she would double check with Ellie Rogers from Xoserve to clarify whether £125k is the correct figure and provide an update at the 14 June 2022 PAC meeting.

### 3.4 Standards of Service Liabilities Report (information only)

Report provided for information only, with no additional queries to report.

### 3.5 Strategic Workshop Update



Rachel Clarke (RC) provided a verbal update on the forthcoming 24 May 2022 Strategic Workshop 2 progress explaining that:

- Materials for consideration at the Workshop are currently being prepared and should hopefully be available later in the week;
  - Agenda due for release later in the day will include Performance Assurance Techniques and Targeting;
  - Correla (on behalf of Xoserve) are assisting in the preparation of the associated presentations;
- A Retail Energy Code (REC) representative (Jon Dixon) will be attending the Workshop, and
- RH confirmed that Workshop 2 will be convened as a 'normal' PAC meeting and would include voting where appropriate.

### **3.6 Annual Review**

Consideration deferred on the grounds that an update is due at the 16 August 2022 PAC meeting.

### **3.7 Line in the Sand Strategy**

#### **3.7.1. Strategy for 'Line in the Sand' 2022/23 Presentation**

RC provided an overview of the presentation during which the following key items were discussed and considered (by exception), as follows:

##### Proposal – slide 3

When RC thanked SM for his feedback on suggested changes to the draft letter, SM followed up by reiterating that he believes the letter as currently drafted is too combative and should instead focus more on settlement aspects as a more engaging style of letter (i.e. less of a stick and more of a carrot approach). He went on to add that in his opinion, the proposed 0% roll over for April 2023 proposal is unrealistic.

Responding, RC advised that after further consideration, the PAFA remain of the view that the letter as drafted is 'fit for purpose' and reflective of PAC aims.

At this point in discussions, RH reminded parties that in order to issue the letter, PAC Members would need to agree the content, realistic targets and recipients.

In noting that the Code obligation requires that each and every meter is read, Anne Jackson (AJ) explained that the PAFA's main concern relates to those sites for which a meter reading has not been provided for 4 years or greater, although it does believe that in many cases a reading is being obtained, but for whatever reason are not finding their way into the system.

SM indicated that he would be more than happy to share his change marked version of the proposed letter.

During a brief onscreen review of SM's proposed amendments, JR also advised that she would like to suggest some additional amendments which she would be happy to provide to the PAFA (RC) after the meeting, although she remains of the opinion that as currently drafted the letter is a good starting point.

In providing a brief overview of the various issues that parties appear to be experiencing in obtaining and submitting their meter readings, AJ asked whether there are any 'real' incentives for parties to make more effort. Responding, SM suggested that one potential option could be to emphasise the value (in equivalent £'s) in parties participating and how this would ultimately benefit them from a UIG perspective – highlighting a monetary value could incentivise involvement and engagement on the grounds that it also adds a level of gravitas to the matter.

When Shipper Members in attendance indicated that replacing the 0% target with a monetary value would certainly incentivise them to become more involved in addressing the matter, Louise Hellyer (LH) also advocated caution as UIG could always incur a cost and not just a benefit (it could be negative or positive), so care would be needed. She is also of the opinion that many Shippers would be keen to be involved anyway which potentially questions the need for the letter in the first instance.

Moving on, SM also suggested that multi-level engagement with Shippers (inc. consideration of vacant site elements etc.) could prove beneficial whilst George MacGregor (GM) wondered whether there could also be a Gas Safety aspect which would need consideration. Whilst acknowledging the point, PAC Members suggested that whilst essentially true, it is a very tricky aspect to address.

When RH enquired whether the PAFA could look at combining the two versions of the letter and also take into account any additional feedback provided outside the meeting, RC responded by suggesting that the engagement process could be developed whilst awaiting agreement on the letter content at which point FC also confirmed that resources would be available to support the industry, which could also be supplemented by the DDP provisions.

When GM suggested that PAC looks to engage parties in order to request their feedback, RH made reference to the Stage 3 part of the process flow map on slide 4.

#### Tackling 'Line in the Sand' – slide 4

SM suggested that the work being undertaken by the 2 UNC Review Workgroups: 0778R 'Gas Vacant Sites Process review' and 0783R 'Review of AQ Correction Processes', could also support PAC's aims (via removal of settlement risk / vacant sites related issues). RC responded by pointing out that whilst complementary to these PAC proposals, they should not be viewed as a replacement for the work PAC is undertaking, and therefore PAC still needs a plan of action for the next 12 months – it is acknowledged that regardless, any industry feedback on vacant sites is beneficial.

#### Next Steps – slide 5

When asked whether they are in a position (and able) to support the proposals as presented, PAC Members in attendance remained silent.

**New Action PAC0503:** *Reference Line in the Sand Letter* – PAFA (RC) to update the draft letter to incorporate feedback from the various PAC Members via ex-Committee means in order that an updated letter could be agreed at the 24 May 2022 PAC Strategic Workshop 2 meeting.

### **3.7.2. Draft Performance Assurance Committee – No Read – Line in the Sand Letter**

Please refer to the discussions on item 3.7.1 above for more detail.

## **4. Update on Potential Changes to Performance Assurance Reporting and PARR**

Mindful of time constraints, RH directed PAC Members to the Joint Office Events page for more information relating to the various Modifications listed below.

### **4.1 Modification 0763R – Review of Gas Meter By-Pass Arrangements**

Specific consideration deferred.

### **4.2 Modification 0674 - Performance Assurance Techniques and Controls**

Specific consideration deferred.

### **4.3 Modification 0734S – Reporting Valid Confirmed Theft of Gas into Central Systems**

Specific consideration deferred.

#### 4.4 Modification 0778R – Gas Vacant Sites Process review

Specific consideration deferred.

#### 4.5 Modification 0781R – Review of Unidentified Gas process

Specific consideration deferred.

#### 4.6 Modification 0783R – Review of AQ Correction Processes

Specific consideration deferred.

#### 4.7 Any Other changes

Specific consideration deferred.

### 5. Review of Outstanding Actions

#### 5.1 PAC Actions

**PAC0104:** CDSP (DN) to breakdown the Backlog User stories from a costing, timeline, development, and potential other barriers perspective.

**Update:** In noting that this action relates to the information provided under consideration of item 3.2 above, PAC Members in attendance agreed to carry forward the action. **Carried Forward**

**PAC0202:** *Reference Meter By-Passes with an 'Open' flag status* – CDSP (MA) to engage with the Meter Owners and their respective CAM's for the remaining 37 sites where there is an 'Open' status flag in order to ascertain whether these can be resolved.

**Update:** When MA provided an overview of his action PAC0202 update which he provided under consideration of agenda item 2.4 above, RH suggested that PAC should not allow parties who have not responded to emails or calls to "get away with it" – it was confirmed that there are 3 Shippers who are not engaging at present.

When Michele Downes (MD) advised that the CDSP Advocates are currently chasing Shippers, PAC Members in attendance agreed to carry forward the action. **Carried Forward**

**PAC0205:** *Reference Strategic Workshop 2* – Joint Office (RH/MB) to look to set up a 2<sup>nd</sup> Workshop meeting to take place before 01 April 2022, if possible.

**Update:** When RH advised that the Strategic Workshop 2 is scheduled to take place on 24 May 2022, PAC Members in attendance agreed to close the action. **Closed**

**PAC0302:** *Reference the Annual Review Awareness Day* - Joint Office (RH/MiB) to look to schedule a meeting for either 20 or 21 September 2022.

**Update:** When RH advised that she would look to confirm the date at the forthcoming Strategic Workshop 2 meeting, PAC Members in attendance agreed to carry forward the action. **Carried Forward**

**PAC0303:** *Reference the Proposed PARR Report Amendments* – Xoserve (KL) to provide an updated version of the PARR Report for consideration at the April 2022 PAC meeting.

**Update:** When Kate Lancaster (KL) advised that whilst this action is probably redundant now, discussion with the IGTs on an impending Theft of Gas IGT Modification remained ongoing, AJ indicated that the 'direction of travel' for the IGT Modification would mirror that of UNC Modification 0743S 'Revisions to User Termination Provisions' provisions. Thereafter, PAC Members in attendance agreed to close the action. **Carried Forward**

### 6. Any Other Business

#### 6.1 AUG Sub-Committee Actions

### 6.1.1. UIG causes related to performance failure

PAC Members welcome two AUGE representatives to the meeting. Jonathan Kiddle (JK) provided an overview of the '*PAC – AUGE issues reporting*' presentation where he outlined 8 groups of issues:

- AUGE 01-03 Theft of Gas
- AUGE 04-07 No Read at the Line in the Sand
- AUGE08 Consumption Meter Errors - Faulty meter
- AUGE09- 10 Incorrect Correction Factors
- AUGE11 Isolated sites
- AUGE12-13 Sites with a Meter Bypass fitted
- AUGE14-15 Unregistered Sites
- AUGE16-18 Site Classification

He noted that a new issue (AUG18) has been added to the Issues log table (slide 5) which links in with agenda item 6.1.2 below.

In considering the '*Theft of Gas*' statements, when asked, JK explained that the reference to REC is included on the grounds that REC works with TRAS, before he then indicated that he believes that they are also awaiting CAP Gemini work to be completed. Noting that Jon Dixon (REC representative) would be attended the PAC Strategic Workshop 2 on 24 May 2022, RH suggested that a suitable approach could be discussed / clarified with Jon at that meeting.

Moving on to next consider the '*No Read at the Line in the Sand*' statements, JK pointed out that the AUGE is currently unable to access more granular information to enable them to provide a more meaningful assessment of the 91GWh value for sites that are overdue a meter read. When FC pointed out that Shippers are able to access the data via the DDP facility, RH suggested that it might be useful to include this within the proposed '*Line in the Sand*' letters.

In considering the final bullet point, RH enquired whether this is something that PAC should be considering whereupon FC provided a view on the relevance of read rejection targets – in short, out of the four AQ validation reasons only one requires provision of a meter reading which means there are at least two ways in which to increase an AQ.

In considering the '*Incorrect Correction Factors*', when JK advised that these are over and above the previous ScottishPower Modification provisions, FC provided a brief resume of the provisions.

When asked, JK confirmed that allowances are made for sites where correctors are fitted.

Moving on to consider the '*Sites with a Meter By-Pass fitted*' statements, JK acknowledged the subtle differences between the AUGE's concerns relating to a mismatch in data versus what is actually happening and the information being provided as part of Correla's Meter By-Pass presentation information.

In reviewing the '*Sites Classifications*' statements, AJ suggested that in respect of the three sub bullets under the first statement, settlement accuracy is the 'hook' for PAC interest (i.e. sharing of UIG aspects etc.), even though there is no specific PAC risk identified at this time. SM also noted that whether AMR has been fitted (or not) does not drive Product Class decisions.

When asked, JK confirmed that the 18 issues are split across 8 groupings.

In reviewing the '*Next Steps*' slide, JK observed that how AUG and PAC interact going forward will be crucial.

RH thanked the two AUGE representatives for providing and presenting the information and confirmed that the AUGE would be invited back to attend a future PAC meeting, possibly in a few months' time.

**New Action PAC0504: Reference Settlement Risk** – Joint Office (RH/MB) to add a new item to the 14 June 2022 PAC agenda to cover the consideration of risk to Settlement arising from the topics identified by the AUGE in its presentation.

### 6.1.2. EUC08 sites in Class 3 (AMR data)

When asked (due to time constraints), FC indicated that she would be happy to defer consideration of this item until the 14 June 2022 PAC meeting – an approach supported by PAC Members in attendance.

## 7. Next Steps

### 7.1 Key Messages

Published at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/pac/summarykeymessages>

## 8. Diary Planning

### 8.1 2022 meeting dates

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

Time/Date	Paper Publication Deadline	Venue	Programme
10:00, Tuesday 24 May 2022	17:00 Friday 13 May 2022	Teleconference	Strategic Workshop 2 Agenda
10:00, Tuesday 14 June 2022	17:00 Monday 06 June 2022	Teleconference	Standard Agenda
10:00, Tuesday 12 July 2022	17:00 Monday 04 July 2022	Teleconference	Standard Agenda
10:00, Tuesday 16 August 2022	17:00 Monday 08 August 2022	Teleconference	Standard Agenda
10:00, Tuesday 13 September 2022	17:00 Monday 05 September 2022	Teleconference	Standard Agenda
10:00, Tuesday 11 October 2022	17:00 Monday 03 October 2022	Teleconference	Standard Agenda
10:00, Tuesday 15 November 2022	17:00 Monday 07 November 2022	Teleconference	Standard Agenda
10:00, Tuesday 13 December 2022	17:00 Monday 05 December 2022	Teleconference	Standard Agenda

PAC Action Table (as at 17 May 2022)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
<b>PARR Report Actions 2022:</b>					
PARR 0401	12/04/22	2.1	PAFA to write to Maputo requesting them to attend the June PAC meeting.	PAFA (SU)	Update provided. <b>Closed</b>
PARR 0402	12/04/22	2.2	CDSP to inform members of the PC4 monthly read performance split by meter/equipment type.	CDSP (FC)	<b>Carried Forward</b> Update due 14/06/22
PARR 0501	17/05/22	2.1	<i>Reference Shipper Performance Improvement Plans</i> - PAFA (SU) to draft a strawman on further guidance for new Shippers to consider when embarking on a Performance Improvement Plan.	PAFA (SU)	<b>Pending</b> Update due 14/06/22
PARR 0502	17/05/22	2.2	<i>Reference 'Maputo' Performance Review meeting</i> – Joint Office (RH/MB) to look to invite suitable company representatives to attend the 14 June 2022 PAC (nested) meeting to undergo a Performance Review exercise.	Joint Office (RH/MB)	<b>Pending</b> Update due 14/06/22
<b>PAC Actions 2022:</b>					
PAC0104	18/01/22	3.2	To breakdown the Backlog User stories from a costing, timeline, development, and potential other barriers perspective.	CDSP (DN)	<b>Carried Forward</b> Update due 14/06/22
PAC0202	15/02/22	2.5	<i>Reference Meter By-Passes with an 'Open' flag status</i> – CDSP (MA) to engage with the Meter Owners and their respective CAMs for the remaining 37 sites where there is an 'Open' status flag in order to ascertain whether these can be resolved.	CDSP (MA)	<b>Carried Forward</b> Update due 14/06/22
PAC0205	15/02/22	3.5	<i>Reference Strategic Workshop 2</i> – Joint Office (RH/MB) to look to set up a 2 <sup>nd</sup> Workshop meeting to take place before 01 April 2022, if possible.	Joint Office (RH/MiB)	Update provided. <b>Closed</b>
PAC0302	15/03/22	3.6	<i>Reference the Annual Review Awareness Day</i> – Joint Office (RH/MiB) to look to schedule a meeting for either 20 or 21 September 2022.	Joint Office (RH/MiB)	<b>Carried Forward</b> Update due 14/06/22

PAC0303	15/03/22	5.1	<i>Reference the Proposed PARR Report Amendments</i> – Xoserve (KL) to provide an updated version of the PARR Report for consideration at the April 2022 PAC meeting.	Xoserve (KL)	Update provided. <b>Closed</b>
PAC0501	17/05/22	2.3	<i>Reference PC3 Read Performance</i> - PAFA (RC) to consult with Smart Energy Code Manager to obtain contact details of relevant persons in DCC to investigate any issues around non-communicating Smart Meters.	PAFA (RC)	<b>Pending</b> Update due 14/06/22
PAC0502	17/05/22	3.2	<i>Reference DDP Update – 9 Backlog User Stories BER Development</i> – Correla (FC/DN) to look to provide an update on the potential BER development aspects including initial cost benefit analysis and a potential ranking order.	Correla (FC/DN)	<b>Pending</b> Update due 14/06/22
PAC0503	17/05/22	3.7.1	<i>Reference Line in the Sand Letter</i> – PAFA (RC) to update the draft letter to incorporate feedback from the various PAC Members via ex-Committee means in order that an updated letter could be agreed at the 24 May 2022 PAC Strategic Workshop 2 meeting.	PAFA (RC)	<b>Pending</b> Update due 14/06/22
PAC0504	17/05/22	6.1.1	<i>Reference Settlement Risk</i> – Joint Office (RH/MB) to add a new item to the 14 June 2022 PAC agenda to cover the consideration of risk to Settlement arising from the topics identified by the AUGE in its presentation.	Joint Office (RH/MB)	<b>Pending</b> Update due 14/06/22