

UNC Performance Assurance Committee Minutes
Tuesday 12 January 2021
Via Microsoft Teams

Attendees

Rebecca Hailes (Chair)	(RH)	Joint Office
Helen Cuin (Secretary)	(HCu)	Joint Office

Shipper Members (Voting)

Alison Wiggett	(AW)	Corona Energy
Carl Whitehouse	(CW)	Shell
Lisa Saycell	(LS)	Gazprom
Louise Hellyer	(LH)	Total Gas
Graeme Cunningham	(GC)	Centrica/British Gas Alternate
Mark Bellman	(MB)	ScottishPower
Sallyann Blackett	(SB)	E.ON

Transporter Members (Voting)

Alex Travell	(AT)	BU UK
Leteria Beccano	(LB)	Wales & West Utilities
Shiv Singh	(SS)	Cadent

Observers/Presenters (Non-Voting)

Fiona Cottam	(FC)	Xoserve/CDSP
Helen Field	(HF)	Xoserve/CDSP
John Welch	(JW)	Gemserv/PAFA
Lee Greenwood	(LG)	Observer, British Gas
Martin Attwood	(MA)	Xoserve/CDSP
Neil Cole	(NC)	Xoserve/CDSP
Sara Usmani	(SU)	Gemserv/PAFA
Shelley Rouse	(SR)	Gemserv/PAFA

Apologies

Oorlagh Chapman	(OC)	Centrica/British Gas
-----------------	------	----------------------

Copies of non-confidential papers are available at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/pac/120121>

1. Introduction

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

RH advised following the recent invitation for the nomination of additional Committee Members, that Andy Knowles from Utilita Energy Limited will be joining PAC from February, once the confidentiality documents have been signed and returned.

Graeme Cunningham (GC) enquired about the steps undertaken to allow himself to become a formal member, replacing Oorlagh Chapman. RH confirmed that the Joint Office could trigger a further request for nominations to allow British Gas to nominate Graeme Cunningham and for Oorlagh Chapman to formally retire as a member. RH agreed to discuss this offline with Oorlagh and Graeme.

1.1 Apologies for absence

Oorlagh Chapman, Shipper Member.

1.2 Note of Alternates

Graeme Cunningham standing alternate for Oorlagh Chapman.

PAC Members approved the attendance of pre-advised Observer/Alternate Lee Greenwood.

1.3 Quoracy Status

The Committee meeting was confirmed quorate.

PAC meetings will be quorate where there are at least four Shipper User PAC Members and two Transporters (DNO and/or IGT) PAC Members with a minimum of six PAC Members in attendance.

1.4 Approval of Minutes (14 December 2020)

The minutes from the previous meeting were approved.

RH confirmed that the minutes from the 06 January needed to be finalised and approval would be sought at the February meeting.

1.5 Approval of Later Papers

RH advised of the late papers published, these were accepted.

2. Monthly Performance Assurance Review Items

2.1 PARR Report Review - Dashboard update (PAFA)

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

- **COVID-19 Modification: PARR Reporting**

- The Performance Assurance Framework Assurance (PAFA) presented the impact of UNC Modifications 0722 and 0723 on the market to the Performance Assurance Committee (PAC).
 - The data suggests that there is little evidence of either Modification being utilised at scale within the PC3 or PC4 markets.
 - The first round of PC4 monthly Performance Improvement letters have been issued and as a result there have been some enquiries from Shippers relating to the utilisation of the COVID related Modifications to enable UNC obligations to be met. Shippers have been discouraged in using the Modifications to resolve long term performance issues and that the PAC seek to ensure that Shippers provide a performance improvement plan that results in an enduring solution to poor performance.
 - PAC members discussed the movement of sites between the product classes and whether there is an overall reduction of sites across the market.

New Action PARR January 01: CDSP to analyse the movement of sites between Product Class 3, Product Class 4 Monthly and Product Class 4 Annually.

- **Shipper Performance Improvement Plans**

- The Performance Assurance Committee (PAC) were provided with updates on the Shippers with open improvement plans. PAC were broadly happy with the progress being made.
 - The PAFA informed PAC members that Washington had achieved UNC target, which is in line with the ongoing communication between them and the Shipper. PAFA have recommended that the plan should remain open for the next few months for monitoring purposes to ensure the Shipper is able to maintain the level of performance set out in the UNC (90%). PAC members were in agreement of the recommendation.

- Tallinn are a Shipper who have been requested by the PAC to provide monthly updates to the PAFA. In the latest update, they had referenced some of the issues that had come to light due to the national lockdown in November, which they believe will continue to prevail with the restrictions most recently introduced by the Government. Along with the impact of the restrictions, the Shipper is also facing other issues which Committee members were informed of. Consequently, the Shipper has requested to be granted an extension of three months as they deem the March 2021 deadline to be no longer achievable. PAC members discussed the Shippers case and mutually agreed to the proposed extension but have requested for additional information to be provided.
- The PAFA informed the PAC of the latest development with Bratislava, who have been escalated to the final stage of the performance assurance process - a call in to the monthly PAC meeting to discuss their current level of performance and the measures that will be undertaken to improve read performance.
 - The PAFA reminded the PAC that this Shipper has not been engaged with neither the Customer Advocate Manager (CAM) at Xoserve nor the PAFA and that there is the possibility that they may not attend the meeting but reminded Committee members of the process which is to be adhered to before further action is taken.
 - Bratislava have previously been discussed anonymously but PAC members agreed that it would now be appropriate to reveal the Shipper's identity. The PAFA provided an overview of the Shipper to Committee members.
 - PAC members agreed that should the Shipper not turn up to the call-in meeting (scheduled for the February PAC meeting), the next stage of the process would be escalating to Ofgem.

New Action PARR January 02: PAFA to contact Tallinn and confirm that they have been granted an extension of three months and request the information PAC require in relation to the extension.

New Action PARR January 03: PAFA to contact Bratislava informing them of the details for the February PAC meeting which they are required to attend.

2.2 Review of Outstanding PARR Actions

PARR December 01: PAFA to issue letters to the six Shippers who have failed to comply with the requirements of submitting NDM Sample data. A refreshed report should be run in February for closer monitoring of the situation.

Update: See item 2.1. Letters have been issued and an update is anticipated in February. Neil Cole (NC) advised he will confirm the schedule for reporting in a post meeting update. **Carried Forward.**

PARR December 02: CDSP/CAMs to investigate why Shippers are struggling to submit NDM Sample data and provide feedback to the PAC on the issue

Update: See item 2.1. Customer Account Managers (CAMs) have been setting up meetings, with most taking place in the new year. An update will be provided next month. **Carried Forward.**

2.3 PAC Escalation Process (Performance and Anonymity)

Referring to Action 1201 RH confirmed that the Joint Office have considered their role for separate PAC Shipper Performance Escalation Meetings and advised the Joint Office will support and implement whatever process is necessary to support PAC. RH explained that under the PAC Terms of Reference (ToR) that PAC meetings not chaired by the Joint Office wouldn't be considered formal PAC meetings. Recognising that changes were underway through Modification 0674 - Performance Assurance Techniques and Controls, and a process was on its way, until this is in place RH advised PAC would need to work within the current rules.

Mark Bellman (MB) challenged the formality of PAC meetings not chaired by the Joint Office and if there were any concerns surrounding confidentiality agreements for Joint Office staff. The Committee considered the practicalities of inviting parties to a Shipper Performance Escalation Meeting, protecting anonymity and whether the Joint Office needed to chair/secretariat these meetings. RH explained that the Joint Office staff are already bound to confidentiality within employment contracts, and sharing commerciality sensitive information would be in breach of the contracts of employment. RH expressed in terms of good governance and to avoid potential future appeals/ disputes it would be advisable to appoint a neutral party to facilitate these meetings and to ensure impartiality.

The Committee further considered the management of meetings including invitations, the likelihood of positive engagement, the proceedings and the roles of PAC members, Xoserve and PAFA.

It was agreed that the minutes from these Shipper Escalation PAC meetings should not be published in the public domain. Further consideration was required on how the meetings would be administered, meeting records made and availability of material using a secured area such as Huddle.

MB briefly explained how this process operates in the Electricity Market and Alex Travell (AT) noted that SPAA also have a secure area on their website for the publication of confidential papers.

It was confirmed that Huddle could continue to provide the ability to share secure information.

The Committee considered the need for having separate meetings set up on Teams with a separate login to the main PAC meeting. An initial plan was discussed to organise these meetings on the same day as the standard PAC meeting with a defined timeslot.

The Committee considered the ability to enforce attendance, particularly if parties have not been engaged or responded to previous communication attempts.

Shelley Rouse (SR) noted in the case of Bratislava, Ofgem had previously limited certain Shipper/Supplier activities and wished to note that they have a history of not corresponding, despite numerous attempts to contact them. The Committee discussed the risk that invited parties may decline attendance.

SR confirmed that PAFA have a meeting with Ofgem to discuss the practicalities of engagement and would relay the concerns being raised about the ability to enforce attendance.

PAC considered if more work was required before undertaking any escalation meetings and whether the meeting should take place in February or March.

Alison Wiggett (AW) suggested having a closed meeting to discuss the performance of Bratislava. A separate closed meeting was held between 11:45 – 12:15 to discuss the performance and way forward for Bratislava. Confidential notes were recorded and will be available to PAC members upon request via Huddle.

In conclusion it was agreed that steps should be taken to invite Bratislava to a separate meeting with PAC and Ofgem in attendance where possible in order for them to provide a response to their performance issues. If Bratislava fail to attend, the next steps will be discussed with Ofgem.

It was agreed to set aside a 11-12 timeslot for Bratislava to attend the February PAC with a separate dial in and to invite Ofgem invited to attend.

2.4 Risk & Issues Register Update (PAFA)

John Welch (JW) provided a 6-month proposed milestone plan to outline the risk/issue related milestones, risk/issue updates, shipper dashboard updates and proposals for updating PARR.

JW confirmed Risk Workshops and informal sub-group meetings will be taking place with the aim of drawing the relevant risk related items together so the register and linked dashboards can be updated by May/June 2021. Some quantification of the risks will need to be undertaken at the informal workshops. The next workshop was taking place on 26 January 2021.

PAC provided positive support for the proposed plan.

2.5 AQ at Risk Update

Fiona Cottam (FC) provided a presentation outlining the background to the AQ at Risk and the breakdown/triggers for the different Classes of Meter Points.

The total AQ at risk as at 10 January 2021 was 54 tWh of AQ, a circa 10.6% of the LDZ portfolio, this was a reduction from 62 tWh in October. FC reported that Classes 1 to 3 and Class 4 Monthly have all shown significant improvements.

FC confirmed that the top 8 Shippers have 46% of the total AQ at risk. There are now only 2 Shippers with any overdue Class 1 AQ.

RH asked what may have driven the improvements. FC explained there could be various reasons, including better knowledge and more businesses moving out of lockdown.

FC outlined the current and future options for the AQ at Risk Reporting, these were:

- Modification 0672 Reports (Class 4 Read Performance as a % of AQ) now live in the PARR Report 2B.15
- AQ at Risk highlighting the residual unread portion similar to report 2B.7
- Further UNC Modifications potentially superseding current reporting:
 - 0664V Transfer Class 2/3 sites with low read performance to Class 4
 - 0691 CDSP to convert sites to Class 1 when qualifying criteria met takes read activity out of Shipper hands for DM sites

The future options were to:

- Continue with Solar Moon reporting
- Adding Reports to PARR to allow use of consistent code names
- Cease reporting where information is already covered/monitored elsewhere

Alex Travell (AT) believed it would be sensible to add the AQ at Risk Reporting to PARR for consistent use of code names. FC agreed to relay this to the DDP Sprint team and establish what manual workarounds could be used in the meantime.

2.6 Market Breaker Read Analysis

Shelley Rouse (SR) provided a presentation identifying Shipper behaviours for Read Rejections. SR explained the validation of Shipper submitted meter reads to ensure data quality and confirmed that reads can be rejected for a number of reasons, some of which can be resolved.

The analysis provided focussed on meter reads rejected for breaching 'upper outer tolerance', or 'Market Breaking reads' (Reason Code 1027).

SR explained that one way to resolve rejected meter reads for upper tolerance breach, is to increase the AQ of a meter, via an AQ correction, allowing the meter reads to pass tolerance checks. SR went on to explain that by not correcting AQs, reads will continue to reject but by not submitting the reads AQs would remain low and meter read performance will be impacted.

SR provided some background for Read Rejection Reason Code 1027 and what PAFA are looking for. These were:

- Consistent, above average levels of read rejections indicating that Shippers are continually submitting reads that are out of tolerance
- Steadily increasing levels of read rejections
- Shippers continually submitting reads that are out of tolerance, for an increasing number of meters
- Negative impact on meter read performance and/or a large number of meters that have not had a meter read for over a year.

An extract from PARR was provided for the percentage failing read submissions under Code 1027, detailing the level of rejections, increasing rejections, and where rejection levels are returning to normal.

SR further provided a case study to illustrate the typical management of read submissions. SR explained how PAFA overlay the rejected read performance levels and look at other indications of poor performance.

Lee Greenwood (LG) welcomed this overview confirming this format was better to understand and Lisa Saycell (LS) requested the reporting layout provided to be used in future dashboards.

2.7 Open / Meter By-Pass Update

Sara Usmani (SU) referring to Action 1204 to validate Shippers with a By-Pass Meter provided an extract from CDSP of 24 Shippers with an open By-Pass meter, of which 11 had previous communications from PAC. SU reported some Shippers have resolved queries, some have maintenance/performance plans and 2 Shippers have been issued letters relating to PC4 monthly sites.

SU explained the most concerning area is where Shippers with the most number of By-Pass Meters are also not achieving read performance. SU confirmed more analysis was needed on which Shippers pose the most concern. SU believed there was a total of 153 Open Meter By-Pass. AT asked if PAFA could provide more quantification perhaps understanding the AQs for sites to better understand the risk.

Alison Wiggett (AW) asked about progress of the work being undertaken by Xoserve. Martin Attwood (MA) confirmed a number of constituency meetings are taking place, over the next few weeks. Fiona Cottam (FC) explained having an open By-Pass is not necessarily a performance failure, as the By-Pass maybe necessary. However, some By-Passes which have been in place for years could be billing on estimates.

MA provided the updated position of Meters with a By-Pass:

Snapshot Date / Summary	July 2020	November 2020	December 2020	January 2021
Open By-Pass	153	149	149	147
Closed By-Pass	13,526	13,226	13,164	13,112
Total By-Pass	13,679	13,375	13,313	13,259

MA provided an update on the case study of MPRNs and changes being seen, confirming Open By-Passes have reduced from 153 to 147. MA assured PAC that work was being undertaken with Shippers to raise awareness and numbers are reducing through the processing of meter exchanges. It was noted that some Meter exchange updates are retrospective.

Mark Bellman (MB) suggested this maybe something the industry may wish to audit due to the potential value at risk. MB also suggested the industry may wish to consider the obligations set out in the UNC and if a Modification is required in this area.

Lee Greenwood (LG) enquired about the presence of a meter By-Pass flag and if there is an advance on an actual meter reading whether there is a challenge to ascertain if the meter By-Pass has been removed. LG asked if an advanced read would indicate a closed value.

MB wanted a definitive answer on what the criteria was for a Meter-By-Pass and how the By-Pass value actually works. Graeme Cunningham (GC) wanted to better understand the age profile.

FC explained that there is no system block on meter readings being provided and that meter reads are needed for consumption adjustments.

MA explained from the 4 cases studies, the 4 sites have not had a consumption adjustment but having looked at a desk top review of these sites' consumption adjustments were expected where read progression was evident.

Referring to action 1202 MA confirmed how UK Link deals with the presence of a meter By-Pass depending on how the Shipper processes asset/status updates.

Updates to asset/status information on UK Link are achieved via one of two RGMA files:

- ONJOB file: Required when a physical asset change has recently taken place
- ONUPD file: Required to update incorrect asset/status details (i.e. cosmetic update)

For the ONJOB file, when physical work had been undertaken an ONJOB file is submitted by the MAM to the Shipper. The Shipper then passes this onto Xoserve and this must contain details of By-Pass if one is present, if it doesn't UK Link will remove the By-Pass where it is not mentioned in the ONJOB file.

For the ONUPD file this must contain only the details which need updating. UK Link will make no changes to By-Pass unless mentioned in ONUPD.

MB asked if Shippers would know there was a By-Pass on site. It was recognised there was a number of complexities involved with the registration.

Louise Hellyer (LH) suggested Gas Safety visits may help identify sites. However, Lisa Saycell (LS) explained the safety visit requirements have changed to a risk based visit. Nevertheless, it was noted that a By-Pass requires an engineering visit and the check read process should pick up these sites.

MB enquired about the possibility/ease of erroneously submitting an ONJOB file stating a By-Pass is present but not physically there. MA explained the process and that it cannot be accidentally triggered as the process for adding the flag/status is quite convoluted.

It was noted there could be some unknowns where a By-Pass is in place but not recorded, LS explained the commissioning of a By-Pass and these cannot be added to a site without the reporting of site changes.

The Committee considered the governance of the end-to-end process and how best to raise this within the industry. PAC considered whether this required a Request Modification.

MA provided a statement taken from the 'Transporter Treatment of ONJOB files and transactions V5 Live' document, available in the 'UK Link Documentation' area (folder '4.Guidance') on page 6 of the presentation.

Referring to Action 1202 MA explained the intended approach for monitoring Consumption Adjustments (CA) following a By-Pass and asked for feedback on whether this approach was sensible. The approach outlined was:

- Xoserve to maintain list of MPRNs where a By-Pass has been closed
- After 15 business days Xoserve to check if CA has been received (a UNC requirement)
 - Where no CA has been received, Xoserve to contact relevant Shipper(s) to see if they've assessed the need for CA
- Unanonymised updates/reports to be provided to PAC and anonymised report to Shippers.

MA wished PAC to note that there is a 10,000kWh threshold for consumption adjustments and explained that Shippers do not have to submit a nil return. PAC briefly considered this in terms of reporting.

Referring to Action 1205 to look at the end-to-end process MA provided the UNC requirements Uniform Network Code (UNC) Section M2.3 and M2.4 and Energy Networks Association (ENA) Document GDN/PM/GT2. MA also provided a summary of the key points from these documents. This was a separate document in support of the agenda item entitled 'Meter By-Pass Process Overview'.

MA explained in more detail Sections M2.3 and M2.4 and the key requirements/obligations within the UNC. MA also explained the types of properties where a meter By-Pass can be installed, the process for installation and removal. AT noted some of these are governed by MAMCoP.

A number of actions were discussed and agreed to help the progress of this issue.

New Action 0101: Xoserve (MA) to explained what cross checks are done for Meter By-pass consumption.

New Action 0102: Xoserve (MA) to identify the number of sites where there is an Open Meter By-Pass and evidence of consumption to allow theses to be investigated.

New Action 0103: Xoserve (MA) provide an Age profile for all Open Meter By-Pass sites.

New Action 0104: Xoserve (MA) to provide a summary explanation of how a Meter By-Pass valve should work.

New Action 0105: PAFA (SR) to prepare a review mod proposal to kick off industry review for bypass.

2.8 Covid-19 Updates

2.8.1. Isolations Update

FC reported as at 11 January 2021:

- 27 Shippers have provided a response, who had submitted 4,752 Isolations.
- Of these, 2 Shippers have reported that they had submitted 20 'Modification 0723 Isolations', with only 5 remaining as Isolated.
- Remaining 25 Shippers who responded have confirmed they did not use the 'Modification 0723 Isolations' facility.

2.8.2. Other Updates

None

3. Matters for Committee Attention

3.1 PAFA Annual Review Response Summary

SR wished to note that PAFA had provided an update on the Annual Review for approval. The corresponding paper was published under item 2.2 entitled 2020 PAFA Annual review Response Summary. SR asked for Approval to close off the Annual Review Process and PAC members approved the document.

3.2 PAC/PAFA Access to Data / Dedicated Sprint Planning Update

FC explained following the detailed session on 06 January to prioritise requirements, Xoserve were working on the timetables and cost estimates and planned to provide a detailed update next meeting.

3.3 Sites with No Meter Read at Line in the Sand (potential risk flagged by AUGE)

FC explained this item came out of the AUGE Sub-Committee, where it had been observed that some sites had not been read since Project Nexus go-live. FC confirmed there are currently around 273k sites, all small supply points which have had no meter read since implementation of Project Nexus in June 2017. Some improvement has been seen in the AQ at Risk but there is concern that some reconciliation will become frozen and not processed.

FC confirmed that there is an AUGE sub-committee meeting next week. SR confirmed that PAFA are highlighting to Shippers the unread sites.

PAC considered the read rejections and AQs of 1 and also considered the incentive on Shippers to change the AQ. FC reported 34k Sites with an AQ of 1.

It was agreed that the next steps should be to focus on large sites, which have all been contacted, to look at AQs set as 1.

MB suggested there should be a requirement in the UNC to re-set AQ and believed a Modification should be raised to address this. It was noted that some sites may legitimately have an AQ of 1, but PAC believed that a review would be beneficial. FC offered to draft an outline of a potential Modification/Request for consideration by the industry.

3.4 Theft of Gas Update

FC confirmed that the monthly Theft of Gas Reports are provided on the Joint Office website at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/theft>.

JW confirmed a Sub-group was held in November and hoped to bring an update in the next couple of months.

3.5 PAC Budget Spend Update

FC provided a brief overview of the PAC approved budget. FC confirmed that the Current Year budget is £75k, with £100k next year and that the plan going forward will be to provide PAC with the actual and committed spend on a regular basis. FC noted that none of the budget had been spent as of yet.

FC explained that the PAC budget is ring fenced and that PAC approve spend against budget. Projects/assignments are presented at DSC Change Management Committee for confirmation, but the DSC Committee has no powers of veto. The dedicated DDP Sprint for PAC is under PAC's control to determine which areas are priority.

FC clarified that UNC Modification changes do not come out of the PAC ring fenced budget. These changes come out of the DSC Change Budget.

PAC members welcomed the update and supported future planned reporting.

3.6 Standards of Service Liabilities Report (information only)

The Standards of Service Liabilities report was provided for information. No questions were raised.

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

4.1 PAFA Industry Meeting Update

No discussion held.

4.2 Modification 0664V - Transfer of Sites with Low Valid Meter Reading Submission Performance from Classes 2 and 3 into Class 4.

RH confirmed that this Modification needed further consideration. John Welch (JW) believed there may be some consolidation/separation of changes and that another 4 meetings were expected before reporting to the UNC Modification Panel.

4.3 Modification 0674 - Performance Assurance Techniques and Controls (MB)

MB confirmed that there were no further amendments to Modification Version 15. Legal Text was being considered at the final meeting due 27 January with the intention of reporting to the February UNC Modification Panel.

4.4 Modification 0691S - CDSP to convert Class 2, 3 or 4 meter points to Class 1 when G1.6.15 criteria are met

FC confirmed this Modification had been directed for implementation and Xoserve are finalising the process and hope to recommend a suitable implementation date in due course.

4.5 Modification 0730 – COVID-19 Capacity Retention Process

RH confirmed that the Final Modification Report was due to be presented to the UNC Modification Panel on 21 January 2021.

4.6 Modification 0734S – Reporting Valid Confirmed Theft of Gas into Central Systems

Due to report to the UNC Modification Panel in February 2021.

4.7 Any Other changes

JW referred to Modification 0736S - Clarificatory change to the AQ amendment process within TPD G2.3 being implemented on 14 January 2021, with no change to PARR reporting.

5. Review of Outstanding Actions

0802: PAC informal sub-group to consider the Market Breaker Read analysis and what the next steps should be and PAFA (SR) to consider what information can be presented using Moon names.
Update: See item 2.6. PAC Members welcomed the revised PAFA Dashboard update. **Closed**

1002: Xoserve (FC/AG) to provide an Open/Meter By-Pass update including a snapshot of movements and a narrative of Shipper actions to progress.
Update: See item 2.7. It was agreed to close this action and provide updates under the agenda item. **Closed**

1101: Xoserve (MA) to provide a status update on the 4 recently closed Open-By-Pass, including details of the corresponding consumption adjustment.
Update: See item 2.7. It was agreed to close this action and monitor/provide updates under the agenda item. **Closed**

1106: Xoserve to provide a view on the potential impact to settlement and allocation for isolated sites.
Update: FC confirmed a financial assessment had been provided in last month's CDSP action update and an additional action had been taken to provide this information to Ofgem in relation to Modifications 0723 and 0730. **Closed**

1201: Joint Office (RH) to consider the ramifications of separate PAC Performance Assurance Shipper Improvement meetings, including JOs' role and assuring appropriate confidentiality.
Update: See item 2.3. **Closed**

1202: Xoserve (MA) confirm if Xoserve system automatically removes Meter By-Pass as a result of a shipper processing a Meter Exchange.
Update: See item 2.7. **Closed**

1203: Xoserve (MA) to provide confirmation that a consumption adjustment has been undertaken from closed meter By-Pass.
Update: See item 2.7. **Closed**

1204: Xoserve (MA) / PAFA (SR) to cross reference Shippers contacted in relation to meter By-Pass with other known performance issues.
Update: See item 2.1 and 2.7. Unanonymised IDs shared with PAFA in December. **Closed**

1205: Xoserve (MA) to look at the end-to-end process for a meter By-Pass and provide an overview.
Update: See item 2.7. **Closed**

1206: Xoserve (FC) to provide a PAC Budget spend update and confirm how the DDP Dedicated sprint will be funded.
Update: See item 3.5. **Closed**

1207: Xoserve (FC) to provide an update on Isolations in January.
Update: See item 2.8.1. **Closed**

1208: DNs to confirm which month the Yearly Offtake Meter Report will be provided to PAC.
Update: LB confirmed she is liaising with the Distribution Networks (DNs) to agree the month on which to provide the Yearly Offtake Meter Report and to consider a consistent reporting format.
Carried Forward

1209: PAC members to review the 2020 PAFA Annual Review Response Summary and send comments to PAFA to allow approval in January.
Update: See item 3.1. **Closed**

6. Any Other Business

6.1 Offtake Meter Validations Reports

See Action 1208 update. No further discussion.

6.2 Change of Supplier

Lee Greenwood (LG) wished to raise an issue relating to the change of Supplier, but due to internet connections and the ability to clearly hear the points being raised LG agreed to summarise the item for consideration next month.

7. Next Steps

7.1 Key Messages

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

8. Diary Planning

8.1 2021 meeting dates

Further details of planned meetings are available at: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/events-calendar/month

Time/Date	Paper Publication Deadline	Venue	Programme
10:00, Tuesday 16 February 2021	5pm Monday 08 February 2021	Teleconference	Standard Agenda
10:00, Tuesday 16 March 2021	5pm Monday 08 March 2021	Teleconference	Standard Agenda
10:00, Tuesday 13 April 2021	5pm Monday 05 April 2021	Teleconference	Standard Agenda
10:00, Tuesday 11 May 2021	5pm Monday 03 May 2021	Teleconference	Standard Agenda
10:00, Tuesday 15 June 2021	5pm Monday 07 June 2021	Teleconference	Standard Agenda
10:00, Tuesday 13 July 2021	5pm Monday 05 July 2021	Teleconference	Standard Agenda

For details of the informal sub-group meetings and topics please contact the PAFA directly.
PAFA@gemserv.com

PAC Action Table (as at 12 January 2021)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
PARR Report Actions:					
PARR Dec 01	14/12/20	2.1	PAFA to issue letters to the six Shippers who have failed to comply with the requirements of submitting NDM Sample data. A refreshed report should be run in February for closer monitoring of the situation.	PAFA (SR)	Carried Forward

PARR Dec 02	14/12/20	2.1	CDSP/CAMs to investigate why Shippers are struggling to submit NDM Sample data and provide feedback to the PAC on the issue	Xoserve CAMs PAFA (SR)	Carried Forward
PARR Jan 01	12/01/21	2.1	CDSP to analyse the movement of sites between Product Class 3, Product Class 4 Monthly and Product Class 4 Annually.	Xoserve (FC)	Pending
PARR Jan 02	12/01/21	2.1	PAFA to contact Tallinn and confirm that they have been granted an extension of three months and request the information PAC require in relation to the extension.	PAFA	Pending
PARR Jan 03	12/01/21	2.1	PAFA to contact Bratislava informing them of the details for the February PAC meeting which they are required to attend.	PAFA	Pending
PAC Actions 2020:					
PAC 0802	11/08/20	5.0	PAC sub-group to consider the Market Breaker Read analysis and what the next steps should be and PAFA (SR) to consider what information can be presented using Moon names.	PAC Members / PAFA (SR)	Closed
PAC 1002	13/10/20	2.8	Xoserve (FC/AG) to provide an Open/Meter By-Pass update including a snapshot of movements and a narrative of Shipper actions to progress.	Xoserve CAMs (FC/AG)	Closed
PAC 1101	10/11/20	2.7	Xoserve (MA) to provide a status update on the 4 recently closed Open-By-Pass, including details of the corresponding consumption adjustment.	Xoserve (MA)	Closed
PAC 1106	10/11/20	3.2	Xoserve (FC) to provide a view on the potential impact to settlement and allocation for isolated sites.	Xoserve (FC)	Closed
PAC 1201	14/02/20	2.2	Joint Office (RH) to consider the ramifications of separate PAC Performance Assurance Shipper Improvement meetings, including JOs' role and assuring appropriate confidentiality.	Joint Office (RH)	Closed
PAC 1202	14/02/20	2.7	Xoserve (MA) confirm if Xoserve system automatically removes Meter By-Pass as a result of a shipper processing a Meter Exchange.	Xoserve (MA)	Closed
PAC 1203	14/02/20	2.7	Xoserve (MA) to provide confirmation that a consumption adjustment has been undertaken from closed meter By-Pass.	Xoserve (MA)	Closed
PAC 1204	14/02/20	2.7	Xoserve (MA) / PAFA (SR) to cross reference Shippers contacted in relation	Xoserve (MA) /	Closed

			to meter By-Pass with other known performance issues.	PAFA (SR)	
PAC 1205	14/02/20	2.7	Xoserve (MA) to look at the end-to-end process for a meter By-Pass and provide an overview.	Xoserve (MA)	Closed
PAC 1206	14/02/20	3.7	Xoserve (FC) to provide a PAC Budget spend update and confirm how the DDP Dedicated sprint will be funded.	Xoserve (FC)	Closed
PAC 1207	14/02/20	5.0	Xoserve (FC) to provide an update on Isolations in January.	Xoserve (FC)	Closed
PAC 1208	14/02/20	6.1	DNs (LB) to confirm which month the Yearly Offtake Meter Report will be provided to PAC.	DN (LB)	Carried Forward
PAC 1209	14/02/20	6.3	PAC members to review the 2020 PAFA Annual Review Response Summary and send comments to PAFA to allow approval in January.	PAC Members	Closed
PAC 0101	12/01/21	2.7	Xoserve (MA) to explained what cross checks and done for Meter By-pass consumption.	Xoserve (MA)	Pending
PAC 0102	12/01/21	2.7	Xoserve (MA) to identify the number of sites where there is an Open Meter By-Pass and evidence of consumption to allow theses to be investigated.	Xoserve (MA)	Pending
PAC 0103	12/01/21	2.7	Xoserve (MA) provide an Age profile for all Open Meter By-Pass sites.	Xoserve (MA)	Pending
PAC 0104	12/01/21	2.7	Xoserve (MA) to provide a summary explanation of how a Meter By-Pass should work.	Xoserve (MA)	Pending
PAC 0105	12/01/21	2.7	PAFA (SR) to prepare a review mod proposal to kick off industry review for bypass.	PAFA (SR)	Pending