

PARR Dashboards

13th October 2020

PAFA


Gemserv

2A.1 Estimated & Check Reads - Product Classes 1 & 2

Report measures the percentage of each shippers portfolio where estimated reads were provided. Count of each shippers portfolio where check reads were not provided

PC1

Industry movement:

- ↓ 3.24% - Monthly change
- ↓ 0.30% - Annual change

Monthly changes:

- ↑ 2.15% Tehran
- ↓ 4.06% Papeete
- ↑ 3.36% Brazzaville
- ↓ 16.38% Washington
- ↑ 3.77% Ramallah
- ↓ 45.16% Valletta

PC2


Industry movement:

- ↓ 2.63% Monthly change
- ↓ 13.76% Annual change


Monthly changes:

- ↑ 1.92% Rome
- ↓ 4.34% Gitega
- ↑ 5.87% Thimphu
- ↓ 5.59% Brazzaville
- ↑ 24.19% Tiraspol
- ↓ 7.10% Luanda

2A.1 Percentage of Estimated Reads for PC1 & PC2



2A.1 Count of Check Reads not completed for PC1 and PC2




Observations:

- Estimated reads have declined over recent months for both PC1 and PC2
 - This has been driven by Shippers who are on improvement plans; they are now submitting more readings than previously which has led to a decline in estimated reads.
- The number of uncompleted check reads has stabilised for both PC1 and PC2, though there has been a slight rise for those Shippers in PC1.


2A.1 Estimated & Check Reads - Product Classes 1 & 2




2A.1 PC1 Estimated Read Totals




2A.1 PC1 Check Reads Total



2A.1 PC2 Estimated Read Totals




2A.1 PC2 Check Read Totals




2A.1 Estimated & Check Reads - Product Classes 1 & 2



2A.1- 12 Month comparison (Average of PC1 Estimated Reads)



2A.1- 12 month comparison (Average of PC2 Estimated Reads)



Observations:

- The 12-month comparison graphs above for both PC1 and PC2 illustrates the work of the PAC on meter read performance.
 - **PC1:** Performance has improved over the course of the year, with the estimated read performance across industry closer to 0% compared to the same period last year. Though there are a few Shippers who have an estimated read performance greater than 8% but these Shippers are on improvement plans. The PAFA expects this to improve over the remainder of the year as impacts begin to materialise.
 - **PC2:** Significant performance improvement has crystallised within this market, with only two Shippers with estimated read performance >50% in August 2020 (5 Shippers had >50% estimated read performance in August 2019). This is attributed to those who were issued with performance improvement plans at the end of 2019 which have now come to an end as they met their targets which were set out.

2A.2 – No Meter Recorded



Report measures the percentage of each shippers portfolio where no meter recorded in the supply point register

PC1

0% for all shippers

PC2

0% for all shippers

PC3

Highest shippers:


Praia **0.39%**
Lisbon **0.10%**

PC4

Highest shippers:

Belmopan **3.39%**
Oranjestad **2.61%**
Valletta **1.83%**

2A.2 Percentage of No Meter recorded by Product Class



Observations:

- The % of no meter recorded has seen a steady increase since September 2019 in PC4.
- The PAC, PAFA and CAMs at Xoserve are working with the relevant Shippers in this area who are driving the increase in the number of no meters recorded

2A.3 No Meter Recorded and data flows received



Report measures the percentage of each shippers portfolio where no meter recorded in the supply point register and data flows received

PC1 & PC2
0% for both product classes


PC3

Highest shippers:
Praia **0.10%**

PC4

Highest shippers:
Roseau **0.45%**
Willemstad **0.61%**
Oranjestad **0.25%**

2A.3 No Meter recorded by Product Class and data flows received



2A.4- Shipper Transfer Read Performance

Report measures the percentage of Shipper portfolio of opening meters reads provided following confirmation


Industry movement:

- ↓ 5.76% Monthly change
- ↓ 1.23% Annual change

Monthly changes:

- ↑ 20.74% Reykjavik
- ↑ 21.43% Taipei
- ↑ 32.15% Papeete
- ↓ 60.81% Willemstad
- ↓ 62.88% Wilnius
- ↓ 76.55% Paramaribo

2A.4 Percentage of opening meter reads provided by industry total




Observations:

- The number of transfer reads being submitted within the relevant window are still well below the requirements of the UNC

Recommendations:

- Continued industry education on obligation to provide opening meter readings following confirmation
- Continue to ask CAMs to maintain focus on this area when speaking to Shippers
- PAC will continue to monitor but will be considering focused Shipper targeting in the coming months

2A.4- 12 Month Comparison of Shipper Transfer Read Performance




2A.5- Read Performance


Report measures the percentage of Shipper portfolio submitting reads in August 2020

PC4 Monthly and Annually read measures the percentage of Shipper portfolio submitting reads in July 2020

2A.5 Percentage of Product Class read submissions



2A.5 Percentage of Product Class read submissions



Poorest performing Shippers:

PC1

- 84.68% Washington
- 90.07% Ramallah
- 91.02% Saipan

PC2

- 0.00% Praia
- 48.39% Athens
- 66.67% Washington

PC3

- 0% Tripoli
- 0% Luxembourg
- 0% Wellington
- 0% Oranjestad
- 0% Castries
- 0% Philipsburg
- 0% Washington

PC4 (Monthly)

- 0% Bern
- 0% Khartoum
- 0% Monaco
- 0% Bishek
- 0% Nairobi
- 0% Doha
- 0% Maputo

PC4 (Annual)

- 1.51% Bratislava
- 57.74% Bucharest
- 60.26% Bishek


2A.5- Read Performance (PC1)



Read Performance - PC1




2A.5 Distribution of percentage of PC1 sites providing meter reads




2A.5- Read Performance (PC2)



Read Performance - PC2




2A.5 Distribution of percentage of PC2 sites providing meter reads




2A.5- Read Performance (PC3)



Read Performance - PC3




2A.5 Distribution of percentage of PC3 sites providing meter reads




2A.5- Read Performance (PC4)




Read Performance - PC4



2A.5 Distribution of percentage of PC4 Monthly sites providing meter reads



2A.5 Distribution of percentage of PC4 Annual sites providing meter reads




2A.6 Meter Read Validity Monitoring



Report measures the percentage of Shipper portfolio where reads submitted failed validation

2A.6 Percentage of meter read validity by Product Class - August 2020






Product Class	Reads where logic check failed as a % of submitted readings	MRE01030	MRE01026	MRE01027	MRE01028	MRE01029
1	Reykjavik – 13.19%					
2	Praia – 40.24%	Thimphu – 4.36%	Papeete – 0.49%	Praia – 19.51%		Reykjavik – 1.47%
3	Manama – 58.23%	Monaco – 13.47%	Gitega – 0.37%	Saipan – 8.70%		Monaco – 38.92%
4	Thimphu – 82.19%	Valletta – 16.35%	Kinshasa – 7.64%	Valletta – 2.88%		Bissau – 33.36%

2A.7 No Reads Received for 1, 2, 3 or 4 years – Product Class 1







Report measures the percentage of Shipper portfolio in the specified AQ band without a meter reading for the specified period




EUC01 – EUC06 have no meters which have not been unread for a period less than one year in recent months







2A.7 No Reads Received for 1, 2, 3 or 4 years – Product Class 2







2A.7 No Reads Received for 1, 2, 3 or 4 years – Product Class 2






2A.7 No Reads Received for 1, 2, 3 or 4 years – Product Class 3






2A.7 No Reads Received for 1, 2, 3 or 4 years – Product Class 3






2A.7 No Reads Received for 1, 2, 3 or 4 years – Product Class 4



2A.7 No Reads Received for 1, 2, 3 or 4 years – Product Class 4



2A.7 No Reads Received for 1, 2, 3 or 4 years – Product Class 4



2A.8 AQ Correction by Reason Code

Report measures the count of Shipper Portfolio of MPRNs where AQ Correction process used

Changes in total number of AQ corrections used

Reason Code 01- Confirmed Theft

↑ **1** Monthly Change
 ↓ **4** Annual Change

Reason Code 02- Change in Consumer Plant

↑ **317** Monthly Change
 ↑ **887** Annual Change


Reason Code 03- Commencement of New Business

↑ **8** Monthly Change
 ↓ **34** Annual Change

Reason Code 04- Tolerance Change

↑ **123** Monthly Change
 ↓ **213** Annual Change

2A.8 Count of AQ Corrections used by reason code



Observations:

- The AQ corrections under “change in consumer plant” have reduced from the spike in June 2020.
- PAFA have referred this to the CAMs for investigation as the activity is focused on a smaller number of Shippers rather than across the industry
- PAC will continue to closely monitor this area

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

Report measures the count of sites with an AQ>732,000 kWh, but having a standard correct factor

EUC04

↓ 245 Monthly Change
↓ 639 Annual Change

EUC07

↓ 12 Monthly Change
↑ 3 Annual Change

EUC05

↓ 33 Monthly Change
↓ 102 Annual Change

EUC08


↓ 5 Monthly Change
↑ 1 Annual Change

EUC06

↓ 1 Monthly Change
↓ 15 Annual Change

EUC09

↑ 1 Monthly Change
↑ 1 Annual Change



Observations:

- EUC04 continues to have a significantly higher number of standard correction factors incorrectly used compared to other EUC bands
- Work with the CAMs continues in the area, but PAC are aware of the implementation of UNC681s and the potential impacts on the reports
- Monitoring will continue

2A.10 Replaced Meter Reads

Report measures the count of meter reading replacements which results in reconciliation adjustments

EUC01

↓ 3563 Monthly Change
↓ 143082 Annual Change

EUC02

↓ 176 Monthly Change
↑ 186 Annual Change

EUC03

↓ 80 Monthly Change
↑ 140 Annual Change

EUC04

↓ 44 Monthly Change
↑ 34 Annual Change

EUC09

No data recorded

EUC05

↓ 15 Monthly Change
↓ 3 Annual Change

EUC06

↓ 6 Monthly Change
↓ 10 Annual Change


EUC07

↓ 4 Monthly Change
↓ 3 Annual Change

EUC08

↓ 1 Monthly Change
↓ 1 Annual Change

2A.10 Count of meter reading replaced by EUC



Observations:

- Work with the CAMs has enabled the PAC to identify that in general, the spikes are due to Shipper’s cleansing their portfolio.
- The number of replaced meter reads has generally been trending downwards across all EUC bands over the last few months.

Appendix – PARR report details



Sr No	Topic	Details	Split By	12 Rolling Months	Format	e.g. For Nov Report	Condition	Comments
1	2A - Estimated & Check Reads used for Gas Allocation, and consumption adjustments for Product Classes 1 & 2	<p>Need to count everyday portfolio and count mprn where read has been estimated and no actual present on the same day .</p> <p>Check Read : For check reads we would need to check , as of reporting day how many class 1 & 2 MPRNs are present with DRE/AMR.</p> <p>For those MPRNs we have site visit read <=14 months and no subsequent site visit read . Those are outstanding ones per shipper.</p>	Class	Annual	Percentage	September	M-2	
2	2A - No Meter Recorded in the Supply Point Register	AQ Band wise , AQ band based on report run day . Class wise different table And AQ Band. Exclude NTS connected Sites & Telemeterd. Exiting SHPK - Topic - Confirmed No Asset Report	Class	Annual	Count & B - Percentage	Nov	M	
3	No Meter Recorded in the Supply Point Register and data flows received by Xoserve	Same as above but additionally need to check if for above MPRNs any Data Flow Means - > Asset Update , C & D Store & Reads received in that month	Class	Annual	Count & B - Percentage	Additional MPRNs		
4	2A - Shipper Transfer Read Performance	M-2 is considered – Open OPNT_REQ_FOLL_CON OPNT_RECEIVED_10	Class	Annual	Percentage	September	M-2	
5	Read Performance	As per frequency we need to check if we have received the read e.g. month read site will check if we have received the read in month .Class and shipper transfer are excluded .6 Monthly read site need to consider yearly ,it is not in UNC. It will be like MUR logic M-2 , exclude sites where class changes happened in M-2 , shipper changes	Class		Percentage	September	M-2	

Appendix – PARR report details



Sr No	Topic	Details	Split By	12 Rolling Months	Format	e.g. For Nov Report	Condition	Comments
6	2A - Meter Read Validity Monitoring	<p>MRE01026 :Reading breached the lower Outer tolerance. MRE01027 :Reading breached the Upper Outer tolerance. MRE01028 :Reading breached the lower Inner tolerance value and no override flag provided. MRE01029 :Reading breached the upper Inner tolerance value and no override flag provided. MRE01030 :Override tolerance passed and override flag provided</p> <p>We can build this from DUK_ARSR , by checking failed reads . DUK_READ = We can get how many successfull reads received based on Status =U . Failed once are with status =F</p>	Reason Codes		Percentage	October	M-1	
7	No reads received for 1,2,3 or 4 years (excludeds estimated	<p>Per class table , per AQ Band ,Need to ignore estimates for all classed Logic is similar to existing SHPK Logic - NO_READ_2Y_3Y_B73200 Here we would need to create 4 counts No reads received for 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 years sepeartely as per layout</p>	AQ Band	Annual	Percentage	Nov	M	
8	2A - AQ Corrections	<p>AQ correction by reason code : Switch Type = 50 , Switch View = 50 , Switch status = LI Reason code per table , Reason code is new field added in ISU BW - DS OUC_SWTDOC Switch Document new field added in DS - ZZ_AQ_REASON</p>	AQ Band	Annual	count	October	M-1	
9	2A - Standard Correction Factors for sites with AQ > 732, MWH	<p>Standard correction factor by AQ Band Count of meter points where replacement reads received by AQ Band ,only for class 3& 4 ,</p>	AQ Band	Annual		Nov	M	Report should only include AQs above 732000. Currently including >=732000
10	2A - Replaced Meter Reads	<p>Replaced meter reads are identified with DUK_READ where read reason = R , Upload Status = U , we would need to add AQ Band either in DUK_READ or consider while processing</p>	AQ Band	Annual		October	M-1	

PAFA@Gemserv.com

