

UNC Performance Assurance Committee Minutes
Tuesday 12 May 2020
Via Microsoft Teams

Attendees

Alan Raper (Chair)	(AR)	Joint Office
Helen Cuin (Secretary)	(HCu)	Joint Office

Shipper Members (Voting)

Karen Kennedy	(KK)	British Gas
Lisa Saycell	(LS)	Gazprom
Louise Hellyer	(LH)	Total Gas
Mark Bellman	(MB)	Scottish Power
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE
Sallyann Blackett	(SB)	E.ON
Sean Cooper	(SC)	npower

Transporter Members (Voting)

Alex Travell	(MB)	BU UK
Leteria Beccano	(LB)	Wales & West Utilities
Sally Hardman	(SH)	SGN

Observers/Presenters (Non-Voting)

Fiona Cottam	(FC)	Xoserve/CDSP
James Rigby	(JR)	Xoserve/CDSP
Jon Dixon	(JD)	Ofgem
Neil Cole	(NC)	Xoserve/CDSP
Rebecca Hailes	(RH)	Joint Office
Sara Usmani	(SU)	PAFA
Shelley Rouse	(SR)	PAFA

Apologies

Alison Wiggett	(AW)	Shipper Member
Carl Whitehouse	(CW)	Shipper Member

Copies of non-confidential papers are available at: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/pac/120520

1. Introduction and Status Review

Alan Raper (AR) welcomed all parties to the meeting.

1.1 Apologies for absence

Alison Wiggett and Carl Whitehouse, Shipper Members

1.2 Note of Alternates

None provided.

1.3 Quoracy Status

The Committee meeting was confirmed Quorate.

1.4 Approval of Minutes (20 April 2020)

Fiona Cottam (FC) noted 2 minor amendments on page 7 within the 3rd paragraph these were grammar mistakes and on page 9 the Action Update PARR Mar02 referred to SA. These had been pre-advised, and the minutes had republished on 11 May 2020.

The minutes of the previous meeting was approved.

1.5 Approval of Later Papers

AR advised of the later papers and all were accepted for discussion.

2. Monthly Performance Assurance Review Items

2.1 Risk & Issues Register Review (PAFA)

Shelley Rouse (SR) confirmed the addition of two new risks, these were:

- Risk 26 – relating to COVID-19 and the operations of the Performance Assurance Committee (PAC); and
- Risk 27 – relating to the impact of the urgent COVID-19 Modifications and changes to regimes

2.2 PARR Report Review - Dashboard update (PAFA)

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

May Industry Performance Observations:

- **PARR Reporting Methods**

- The Performance Assurance Framework Administrator (PAFA) presented analysis to committee members on the discrepancy between the two reporting methods (existing legacy reporting against the Data Discovery Platform (DDP)).
 - Read performance in PC1 appears to be reported higher in the DDP whilst PC2 read performance is lower on the same platform (when compared against the existing legacy reports).
 - Concerns with the number of sites remaining static between December 2019 and March 2020, particularly for PC3 where there are sites moving into this product class from PC4.
 - PAFA informed PAC members that they are working closely with the Xoserve/CDSP in getting to the root cause of the issue, with initial analysis indicating that performance statistics are skewed due to the calculation method being deployed for twin stream metering. It should be noted, there are not very many of these in the industry, therefore PAFA have highlighted that this should not be skewing results so much. Xoserve/CDSP are continuing investigations.
 - Xoserve/CDSP informed committee members the existing legacy reports are showing erroneous read performance and they are aiming to get to the bottom of the issue. This remains at the of priority list in getting this resolved.
- PAFA also highlighted an issue with the DDP itself. When looking at read performance statistics at different points in the month, it appears that the numbers change which should not be happening as the read performance figure should be static.
 - PAC members were made aware that whilst the variances look small on an industry level, when looking at the data on a Shipper level, the variances are quite large.
 - Xoserve/CDSP informed PAC members that this is also something that is being looked into and an update will be provided imminently.
- The PAFA stressed the importance of correct data, particularly when targeting Shippers on poor read performance.

- Xoserve/CDSP advised that prior to any PAC action, the PAFA and Xoserve/CDSP need to consult prior to taking action.
- PAC members raised concerns on the discrepancies and the duration it would take to deploy the fix. More specifically, members expressed concerns that it would be delivered as part of a drop.
 - Xoserve/CDSP confirmed that once investigations were complete, the fix would be implemented as a defect and would be resolved immediately.

Action PARR May 01a: Xoserve/CDSP to continue investigating the discrepancies between the existing legacy reporting and the DDP.

Action PARR May 01b: Xoserve/CDSP to examine the changing read performance statistics on the DDP with a fix to be deployed immediately.

- **Read Performance**

- The PAFA presented the quarterly read performance changes to Committee members for PC1-PC3. Members were informed PC4 will be presented next month as data for March is currently unavailable for this Product Class.
 - PAC members expressed concerns on PC3 read performance as there appears to be a process issue with some of the quarterly changes being drastic.

Action PARR May 02: Xoserve/CDSP to investigate MPRN level data for those Shippers exhibiting large variances in read performance, which may be due to migration turbulence.

- **Shipper Letter Responses**

- **Read performance:** Six Shippers were in receipt of letters from the PAC regarding their overall read performance in April. The PAFA presented the responses to PAC members
 - Generally, PAC members were happy with the responses and would like the PAFA to monitor these Shippers under the current climate (no milestones provided in any improvement plan due to pandemic).
 - PAC members have requested the PAFA to gain further information from Berlin and Manama due to the nature of the response provided. Committee members would like more clarity.
 - Roseau had not provided the PAFA with an improvement plan but had however acknowledged the email. PAC members have requested the PAFA to go higher up in order to get a response to the letter.

Action PARR May 03: PAFA to contact Berlin, Manama and Roseau to get relevant information as per the request of the PAC.

- **NDM Sample Data**

- PAFA provided an update on NDM sample data that was required to be submitted in April.
 - PAC members were informed that there were twelve Shippers who had not made a submission as per the requirement of the modification. Out of these Shippers, there were three Shippers (Bern, Luxembourg & Gaborone) who had not submitted data in the previous window.
 - PAC members highlighted that Luxembourg had appeared to be underperforming the industry in the read performance reports and discussed the possibility of a wider issued.

- The PAFA suggested that next month case studies on Bern, Luxembourg and Gaborone should be brought in to see how they are managing their portfolio which would then enable PAC to make a more effective decision.
- PAC members recommended the PAFA to liaise with the CAMs regarding the other nine Shippers in order to submit their NDM sample data, prior to further PAC action

Action PARR May 04: PAFA to produce case study analysis on Bern, Luxembourg and Gaborone for the June PAC meeting.

Action PARR May 05: CAMs to liaise with the nine Shippers who have not submitted their NDM Sample data to encourage submission and assist where necessary.

2.3 Review of Outstanding PARR Actions

PARR Mar 01: PAFA to write to Shippers Berlin, Tallinn, Manama, Brazzaville, Monaco, Roseau and Praia requesting the provision of improvement plans, and assurance of their ability to operate within each respective market

Update: SU confirmed that letters had been issued and follow up actions for Monaco undertaken. **Closed.**

PARR Mar 03: PAFA to write to Warsaw and Papeete requesting additional detail around meeting plan milestones

Update: SU confirmed that communications had been issued and a response had been provided from Warsaw and Papeete. SU clarified that Papeete have confirmed that check reads are currently not possible due to access restrictions. A watching to monitor performance will continue and an update will be provided on next month. **Closed.**

PARR Apr 01: PAFA to analyse the changes in meter read performance and number of MPRNs between both data sources.

Update: See item 2.2. No further discussions. **Closed**

PARR Apr 02: PAFA to contact Valetta to escalate the continued poor performance being exhibited.

Update: SU confirmed this was a PC1 Shipper with 4 meter points and there had been some difficulties initially encountered on establishing contact, as the details on records were incorrect. This had now been resolved, the contract details have been updated and access to Huddle granted. The Shipper has also provided a performance plan. SU confirmed PAFA will continue to observe performance and provide continued support. **Closed**

PARR Apr 03: WAR Bands – Xoserve/CDSP Customer Advocate Managers to provide a communication in July to remind Shippers to provide read submissions / consumption adjustments to ensure correct EUC band placement

Update: SR confirmed that communications had been issued, CAMs have been briefed and will continue to work with Shippers. Karen Kennedy (KK) expressed concern that where Shippers have reads these need to be submitted, highlighting that the calculations will be taking place at the end of May. FC confirmed that the next step will be for calculations to be undertaken, and as such a view of positions / calculations would be available at the next meeting. **Closed**

2.4 AQ at Risk Update (FC)

FC explained updates are not available each month for the AQ at risk statistics, however it is expected with volume of read submissions decreasing the AQ at risk will increase.

2.5 EUC09 Count by Class Update (FC)

FC confirmed that the EUC09 reporting had been changed in line with Modification 0690S - Reduce qualifying period for Class 1, an update will be available next month, and an increase in numbers is expected as the Modification makes the qualifying period shorter.

3. Matters for Committee Attention

3.1 Performance Assurance Reports Register (PARR)

FC provided an update on the review of the Performance Assurance Report Register (PARR) providing a clean and marked up version of the proposed changes.

AR clarified that the next steps will be to provide to document to the UNCC and obtain approval. Rebecca Hailes (RH) suggested both the tracked and clean version are provided for transparency.

FC provided an overview of all the changes, confirming feedback had been considered and captured. Lisa Saycell (LS) suggested PAC are provided with some additional time to undertake a final review of the changes with a view to submitting the document for UNCC approval in June. This was agreed.

SR enquired if the document would need further updates following the COVID-19 Urgent Modifications. The Committee briefly considered the potential updates and how any subsequent changes were going to be managed. It was envisaged that the approved document would provide the baseline which can be added to. It was envisaged the proposed version would be a living document that can evolve and incorporate subsequent required changes.

New Action 0501: PAC Members to review the proposed changes to the Performance Assurance Reports Register (PARR) by Friday 22 May to allow for the timely publication of the final document for PAC approval at the 09 June meeting and subsequent submission to the UNCC no later than 10 June.

3.2 Review PAC Document 4 PAFA Scope Definition

FC confirmed that a word version of the document had been circulated to members and feedback had been provided offline. AR confirmed this was a PAC controlled document and the next steps would be for PAC to vote to approve the new version.

FC explained the timescales required for PAFA procurement process and to provide a baseline for subsequent changes required for Modification 0674 – Performance Assurance Techniques and Controls. FC clarified it would be ideal to have this document approved in May / June.

MB was keen to have a baseline document which clearly allows readers to understand what is in the PAFA contract and what constitutes as a variation.

FC provided an overview of each of the changes.

Sally Hardman (SH) challenged the terminology used in Schedule 3,2 and suggested this needed an update to clarify the existence of the PAC constituency voting arrangements. PAC considered the voting arrangements within the PAC Terms of Reference.

SR wished to highlight the need to review the PAFA outputs for the next procurement process. SR suggested a separation session maybe required to discuss the next procurement phase in more detail. It was agreed a separate session should be organised offline.

New Action 0502: PAC Members to review the proposed changes to PAC Document 4 PAFA Scope Definition by Friday 22 May to allow for the timely publication of the final document for PAC approval at the 09 June PAC for approval.

3.3 Review of 'PAC Sponsor' role

FC confirmed the PAC Sponsor role had been included in the updates to the PAC Document 4 PAFA Scope Definition, within item 3.2 above.

3.4 PAC Budget Spend Update

James Rigby (JR) provided an overview of last year's budget spend which included the delivery of XRN4795. He confirmed most of the budget had been spent for the last financial year (£45k of the £50k budget).

JR also provided confirmation of additional spending relating to UNC Modifications - XRN4779 with a value of £32K which had not been taken from the ring-fenced budget. JR also referred to XRN5013.

JR clarified more had been spent from the ring-fenced budget last year than in previous years.

SR highlighted that the AQ reporting, as a result of a recent UNC Modification had not been taken from the PAC budget. JR summarised the various funding mechanisms and confirmed UNC Modification changes do not draw down from the £50k.

JR asked how PAC would like to see future budget spend information presented. It was suggested a simple table could be provided outlining: 1. What's been completed, 2. What's in progress, 3. What's on the horizon ("bubbling under").

New Action 0503: New PAC Budget Spend Report to be provided by Xoserve/CDSP (JR)

SR enquired about the allocation of charges for the recent Urgent UNC Modifications, which had not outlined the reporting requirements and how the cost of these would be covered, expressing concern that if the changes are to be funded by the ring-fenced budget, there is the potential to run out of available funds and the need to look for additional funding from the DSC budget.

Sean Copper (SC) expressed concern about the performance reports and the industry's expectation that the COVID-19 Modifications would require careful monitoring. RH's did not perceive there would be barriers, due to the nature of the Urgent Modifications it was envisaged that the changes to reporting was still be classified as a Modification change and this would be considered when drawing on budgets to support the changes.

3.5 Standards of Service Liabilities Report (information only)

The Standards of Service Liabilities report was provided for information.

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

4.1 COVID-19 and work of the PAC

FC provided a presentation on the COVID-19 Modifications, this included a summary of the Urgent Modifications and details of the anticipated reporting requirements:

Use of the Isolation Flag during COVID-19 period – Modification 0723:

FC provided an overview of the changes and explained there is no specific isolation flag to note an isolation as part of COVID-19. FC explained as various commercial properties will open at different stages there would not be a static date that all isolated sites should revert back and have the isolation flag removed.

Shippers asked about the current number of isolated sites, FC confirmed this information is available in the secure Xoserve/CDSP website by LDZ to help parties to understand the current situation. A monthly snapshot will also be provided.

FC provided an overview of the suggested reporting:

During Lockdown

- A monthly snapshot of Isolated sites will be provided on the % of sites by count and AQ by Shipper, and the report will build month on month
- Xoserve/CDSP are also now publishing LDZ level snapshots of count/AQ each month within the Xoserve/CDSP secured area

Post Lockdown

- A monthly snapshot will continue for foreseeable future (until the reported levels of isolation levels are close to pre COVID-19 reported levels.)

- Xoserve/CDSP are also engaging with Shippers to highlight individual sites and prompting reviews

FC explained that when sites are re-established, this will need to be done with the previous read, followed by the submission of an actual read, to avoid triggering an exception. It was noted that the system will not be able to recognise if the consumption was made during lockdown or post lockdown. FC confirmed that a change was being made to the system to reject incrementing reads submitted if the site is flagged as isolated.

It was questioned if there would be available information on the date the isolation is set, and if the date was set by the Supplier or from a Supplier transfer. Lisa Saycell (LS) believed the isolation status is not highlighted when a site transfer.

SR enquired about post lockdown activities, the potential need to investigate individual MPRNs and consumption monitoring. SR asked about the ability to previous years isolation trends. It was envisaged that historical levels of isolations would have limited benefit.

Jon Dixon (JD) enquired about the Supplier Transfer process and the inability for the system to accept meter readings until site have been re-established and how the acquiring Shipper would manage the opening read. JD was concerned about managing gas consumption during the outgoing shipper registration. FC explained that there is not a solution/process to manage this. It was suggested this would have to be a post consideration through the Shipper dispute process. LS expressed there will be a need to have information on sites that transfer in and the impact on consumption, to allow Shippers to consider how best to manage this.

Some concern was expressed regarding the potential mis-use this process. It was noted that isolation flags can be identified through a nomination enquiry.

JD envisaged that the industry would be aware of typical sites that will be re-activating and the predicted timescales. However, FC explained it may not be possible to identify every business or assume each type of business will act in the same manner.

KK enquired if there would be a report available on the rejections for submitted meter readings. FC believed there is a system change to be made to reject incrementing reads during the isolation period. KK suggested monitoring as a report on the rejections could provide an indication of sites consuming despite having an isolation status. It was suggested a report is produced on what read was submitted as part of the rejection.

SC also suggested reports should be produced on the number of isolations, against the number of sites that have been re-set to allow individual Shippers to investigate. FC explained that there were no easy off-the-shelf reports. SC was keen for Xoserve/CDSP to be able to commit to an absolute minimum reporting and enquired if the COVID-19 reporting would be added to the PARR monthly reporting.

FC explained there will be two levels of reporting, these would be LDZ level snapshots and the functionality to investigate individual MPRN reports.

Alex Travell (AT) understood this was a fluid information tool where Xoserve/CDSP would be providing monthly report data to assist. He envisaged there could be a dashboard which may need to flex each month as information availability becomes richer and more detailed.

Submit Estimated Meter Readings as Actuals during COVID-19 period - Modification 0722:

FC confirmed that during lockdown, Users will be able to provide an estimated meter read as an actual read but the process will not be able to identify where this has happened. FC clarified that reading will be treated as an actual read for Reconciliation and the Rolling AQ, but these will not be able to be marked as estimates. FC explained the unintended consequence of this activity is it would re-set the clock for the must reads.

FC provided an overview of the suggested reporting:

During Lockdown

- Existing meter read performance reporting

Post Lockdown

- Existing meter read performance reporting
- Existing report 11d –frequency of AQ calculation
- Xoserve/CDSP to track sites with “no read since end of lockdown”
- Must-read process trigger after 4 months for Monthly-read LSP sites.

Mark Bellman enquired about what information will be available and what PAC’s roles should be. He welcomed Xoserve/CDSP’s monitoring, but wanted assurance that the reporting was appropriate, to ensure the right level of control and visibility to assess risk.

SR expressed concern about undermining PAC’s role and the potential for confusion

AR asked if PAC needed to see the actual information or a sketched-out report. MB believed PAC needed to see real data as soon as possible.

Sallyann Blackett (SB) expressed concern about the impacts this would have on demand models, and the demand profiling. FC clarified that these reads will not be used in the demand estimation process. FC explained that the UK Link cyclic readings not used for the NDM modelling, reads are used from the read provider or submitted sample data.

Louise Hellyer (LH) noted that Shippers need to keep records of submitted estimates, and if it would be worth PAC asking for a count of the sites this is being used from these records.

SR provided a number of suggested additions that the industry may like, such as the AQ recorded against the sites where estimates had been submitted. FC reiterated that estimated reads submitted as actuals will not be flagged and the system won’t have a way of distinguishing if a real read or estimated read, flagged as an actual, has been provided. SR asked if there was plans to try adding an indicator in the short term. FC explained there is no lead time to do this type of change as this would need a system change and would take 6 months. JD asked if there was a subset date field which could be used to try and assist. JD thought there was an element/field available which could be used to flag as COVID-19.

AT recognised the need for Shippers to keep their own records and enquired how this could be used. FC explained that the Modification requires Shippers to keep a record but there was no mandatory obligation to provide this to Xoserve/CDSP, it would only be provided on request.

It was agreed that Xoserve/CDSP would start providing some metrics with a view to making refinements.

KK enquired what the timescales were for providing the reporting. FC hoped that at the next PAC, Xoserve/CDSP will be able to provide a snapshot for May and read level performance reporting at the June meeting.

It was agreed that the level of activity will be reported next month and PAC would consider what to do next, once the level of reporting could be assessed.

Use of AQ Corrections during COVID-19 period – Modification 0721

FC noted that Modification 0721 had not been directed for implementation at present. JD explained this Modification had the most concerns in terms of materiality.

FC explained the ability to flex an existing process, re-purposing the AQ correction reports available.

FC provided an overview of the suggested reporting:

During Lockdown

- Existing AQ Correction reporting with monitoring of the use of Reason Code 2
- New report for Reason Code 2 for NDM LSP, splitting counts between increases and decreases.

Post Lockdown

- New Summary Report: count of Reason Code 2 with “COVID” tag which have not had a subsequent AQ Correction
- Xoserve/CDSP to track Reason Code 2 sites with “COVID” tag engagement with Shippers to highlight individual sites and prompt a subsequent AQ Correction
- New Isolated Sites report to track total live non-isolated LDZ AQ (see 0723)

Amendment to Ratchet charges during COVID-19 period – Modification 0724

FC explained that this Modification allowed the relief from Ratchet Charges, for sites that meet the COVID-19 criteria during lockdown.

No reporting was suggested, as there was no direct impact on LDZ Allocation or Settlement.

FC went onto explain the Governance for the all the new COVID-19 reports and noted that if PAC wanted to see un-anonymised reports these would need to be included in the PARR (UNC V16.5.3) and UNCC approval would be required. FC explained that if these are not included in the PARR, the existing Anonymous Identifiers cannot be used in the new suite of reports as there is a risk that information could be decoded by PAC members.

FC suggested PAC could use a new set of anonymous codes for COVID-19 reporting only with a limited lifespan. SR asked if PAFA could assist with anonymising.

In view of the short timescales and the importance of anonymity, it was recognised it may not be feasible to include all the new reports and the datasets in the PARR and the report may have to come direct from Xoserve/CDSP.

PAFA challenged if PAC are satisfied with the level of information and when it will be available, and with increased focus on performance monitoring if PAC are able to assure the industry that performance is being appropriately monitored. SR was keen for the reports to be expedited now rather than delaying the production of reports and for PAC to provide reassurance to the industry. FC explained that information should start to be available for the June PAC meeting. MB was keen to demonstrate that PAC are in control and have reports have been requested.

AR noted from the Xoserve/CDSP proposal, and earlier discussions PAC, should have some high-level market activity data available next month to give an idea of the scale of the adoption of the COVID-19 modifications.

KK wanted assurance that the reports would have enough granularity. PAC members discussed the granularity of data, aggregate market activity data, and what existing reporting can be utilised going forward. AR understood the concerns about the ability to drill down and the potential level of issues, and how people may/may not use the new rules.

KK was concerned about the delay of data and ability to obtain/form a view. AR asked in there was anything available to provide an early view and to allay fears rather than waiting until the next meeting. FC explained that there is not off-the-shelf reporting but hopes to be able to provide a dashboard snapshot after a fortnight as a Stage 1.

FC suggested for Stage 2, PAC could consider utilising existing PARR reports to provide extra granularity and behaviours, and for Stage 3, PAC could consider what refinements are needed and how to include these in the Governance of PAC reports.

AR questioned if there was an extra piece of work for the DSC Change Management Committee to consider, and if PAC could provide some early views on the scope of any DSC Change.

SR also wanted to emphasise that these reports should become an official PARR Report.

PACs concerns were noted, and reassurance was provided on the work taking place. It was anticipated that next month Xoserve/CDSP would have more detail of reporting, with some initial views on feasibility of reporting basic market metrics, and what PARR reports can be provided in reaction to the nature of the fast-paced changes.

New Action 0504: Xoserve/CDSP (FC) to provide COVID-19 Report designs and available market metrics in the form of a simple dashboard to be assessed by PAC in June.

4.2 Theft of Gas Statistics

FC provided the Xoserve/CDSP Customer Expert Day Presentation which included a section on the Theft of Gas, pages 26 – 56.

FC explained that an action had been taken to provide PAC with an explanation of the available Theft of Gas material and current reporting, to help PAC better understand the process Shippers should be undertaking, what theft reports are provided and to ascertain if there are an appropriate number of AQ corrections for detected theft. FC explained the Theft of Gas reporting process, the investigations undertaken and provided further information on the data captured and reported, this included a sample report from the Theft of Gas Monthly Management Information.

The information presented illustrated which Shippers were actively engaging with the process and those with less activity.

4.3 Modification 0654S - Mandating the provision of NDM sample data

Neil Cole (NC) confirmed this agenda item had already been covered under item – item to be removed.

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

AR confirmed that following the consultation in March, the UNC Modification Panel had determined that new issues had been identified and had recommended that this Modification is returned to Workgroup for further assessment. A supplemental report is due to be presented to the July Modification Panel.

Mark Jones (MJ) provided a brief update on progress and AR referred to Action 0403 recorded in the April 0664 Workgroup Meeting under item 2 (page 3) for PAC to be approached on the level of reporting required: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0664/210420> - **Action 0403**: SSE (MJ) to ask PAC to confirm the Supplier/Shipper agreed performance level requirements.

New Action 0505: PAC members to provide SSE (MJ) with a view on the Supplier / Shipper performance level requirements for Modification 0664.

4.5 Modification 0672 – Target, Measure & Report Product Class 4 Read Performance (MB)

AR confirmed that the Workgroup Report had been concluded and provided to the April UNC Modification Panel. The consultation has now commenced and will close on 15 May 2020.

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

AR confirmed that at the April meeting, it had been agreed that the Workgroup should be extended until August 2020 due to the ongoing development of the associated documentation.

MB noted that Richard Pomroy had provided a useful explanation of the DSC Committees, which have defined powers and a level of autonomy that cannot be overwritten by the UNCC. This is currently being considered for PAC, and whether the constitutional detail should reside within a separate document or the UNC. MB hoped to incorporate the UNC approach into the Modification for further consideration by the Workgroup.

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

AR stated that he anticipated that the Workgroup Report being presented to the June UNC Modification Panel.

4.8 Any Other changes

No further items requested for discussion.

5. Review of PAC Outstanding Actions

0201: Xoserve/CDSP (JR) to provide additional analysis on Open Meter by-pass.

Update: James Rigby (JR) confirmed that Xoserve/CDSP have undertaken some analysis leading to a better understanding of the numbers involved. JR reported that there are 13,790 MPRNs that have a bypass recorded, with just over 1% (155 MPRNs) currently flagged as being 'open' in UK Link. The 155 MPRNs have a combined current AQ volume of 1.5 TWh. The 8 shippers with the largest number of sites recorded have been contacted to investigate. The number of MPRNs have been examined to see if consumption adjustments have been performed and it was stated that have not, but JR explained that there is no way of knowing if they should have been adjusted. More analysis is required as all of the meters are advancing and AQs are changing. In terms of the action, JR wished to understand what the next steps should be. KK suggested this needed further consideration but recognised the need site visits to validate what is on site against UK Link records, and in the current circumstances, this could be difficult. It was agreed this was not an essential activity at this time but PAC would log a standing agenda item to monitor. **Closed.**

0208: Xoserve/CDSP (FC) to query Sub-cap information within the Standards of Service Liabilities Report and check alignment with UNC.

Update: FC explained this was a minor discrepancy which required further consideration. **Carried Forward.**

0302: PAFA (SR) to arrange a workshop to review the 'User Stories' and establish next steps

Update: SR confirmed that the additional reporting requirements have been captured, however, the workshop originally due April had been deferred. A Meeting will be organised in due course. **Carried Forward.**

0304: Xoserve/CDSP (JR) to provide PAC with some additional industry performance read rejection analysis from the Shipper Performance Packs

Update: JR confirmed that initial meetings have been undertaken and that Xoserve/CDSP need another touch point with SC to discuss the requirements and develop a strawman for Market Breaking Reads analysis. **Carried Forward.**

0401: Xoserve/CDSP (FC) to review what reporting is likely to be needed and available for the Modifications being processed as a result of COVID-19.

Update: See item 4.1. Further to the discussions under item 4.1, MB wished to seek clarification about the estimated read submissions and if this will be flagged as an estimate. FC reiterated the earlier confirmation that as system changes wouldn't be possible, due to needing 6 months lead time for file changes, Shippers were being asked to keep records of these submission. JD sought further clarity on the possible use of existing functionality and submission codes that could be used to flag an estimate. FC explained the use of the different flags. JD asked if there was a current flag that could be utilised to signal an estimate. The committee reconsidered how this could be managed with the option of asking Shippers to report on sites where they have entered estimate reads. JD wanted to understand the extent that this was being used and allow some ability for reassurance this process wasn't being misused. JD was keen see accompanying material to allow meaningful tracking and enquired about the potential use of a best mix of current system capability to create a short-term solution. It was suggested that going forward, the industry should consider building into the system some generic exception codes which could be utilised for in the future for such eventualities. **Closed.**

0402: All PAC members to review the Performance Assurance Report Register (PARR) document and feedback comments to Xoserve/CDSP (FC) by 07 May 2020

Update: See item 3.1. See new action 0501. **Closed.**

0403: All PAC Members to review the PAC Document 4 PAFA Scope Document and feedback comments to Xoserve/CDSP (FC) by 28 April to allow approval at the 12 May PAC meeting

Update: See item 3.2 and new action 0502. **Closed.**

0404: PAC members to consider being a PAC sponsor/advocate to attend various industry meetings and provide Xoserve/CDSP feedback on the inclusion of this role into the Document 4 PAFA Scope Document by 28 April (see action 0403).

Update: See item 3.3 above. **Closed.**

0405: Xoserve/CDSP (NC) to provide more context on the Theft of Gas statistics, including the total number of cases and corresponding AQ corrections.

Update: See item 4.2. **Closed.**

0406: Xoserve/CDSP to provide an overview of Theft Gas Reporting at the May meeting.

Update: See item 4.2. **Closed.**

0407: Xoserve/CDSP (JR) to provide PAC with an end of Year Budget Spend and overview of monthly budget spend to keep a track of spending.

Update: An agreed way forward had been made. See item 3.4 - PAC Budget Spend Update. **Closed.**

6. Any Other Business

6.1 Volume of Market Breaking Reads – Shipper Performance Packs

See Action 0304. No further discussions held.

6.2 User Representative Appointment Process

AR referred to the provided presentation and advised Committee Members of the process for re-appointing PAC Members. AR reminded members of the importance of ensuring organisations have a registered Single Point of Contacts (SPoC) and that nominations are submitted when invited.

7. Next Steps

7.1 Key Messages – PAFA

The PAC Key Messages will be published at:

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

8. Diary Planning

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 09 June 2020	5pm Monday 01 June 2020 <i>Short notice for papers agreed (standard cut-off 29 May for publication on 01 June)</i>	Teleconference	Standard Agenda
10:00, Tuesday 14 July 2020	5pm Monday 06 July 2020	Teleconference	Standard Agenda
10:00, Tuesday 11 August 2020	5pm Monday 03 August 2020	Teleconference	Standard Agenda
10:30, Monday 14 September 2020 <i>(moved from 8th)</i>	5pm Friday 04 September 2020	Solihull venue to be confirmed	Standard Agenda

10:30, Tuesday 13 October 2020	5pm Monday 05 October 2020	Elexon, 350 Euston Road, London, NW1 3AW	Standard Agenda
10:30, Tuesday 10 November 2020	5pm Monday 02 November 2020	Radcliffe House, Blenheim Court, Warwick Road, Solihull, B91 2AA	Standard Agenda
10:30, Tuesday 08 December 2020 <i>*Provisional Date change to 15 December 2020</i>	5pm Monday 30 November 2020 <i>Short notice for papers agreed if meeting cannot be moved to 15th.</i>	Elexon, 350 Euston Road, London, NW1 3AW	Standard Agenda

PAC Action Table (as at 12 May 2020)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
PARR Report Actions:					
PARR Mar 01	16/03/20	2.2	PAFA to write to Shippers Berlin, Tallinn, Manama, Brazzaville, Monaco, Roseau and Praia requesting the provision of improvement plans, and assurance of their ability to operate within each respective market	PAFA (SU)	Closed
PARR Mar 02	16/03/20	2.2	Include detail on UNC0652 as part of the key messages and liaise with the CAMs for support on communicating with those Shippers yet to submit reads	PAFA (SU)	Closed
PARR Apr 01	20/04/20	2.2	PAFA to analyse the changes in meter read performance and number of MPRNs between both data sources.	PAFA (SU)	Closed
PARR Apr 02	20/04/20	2.2	PAFA to contact Valetta to escalate the continued poor performance being exhibited.	PAFA (SU)	Closed
PARR Apr 03	20/04/20	4.0	WAR Bands – Xoserve/CDSP Customer Advocate Managers to provide a communication in July to remind Shippers to provide read submissions / consumption adjustments to ensure correct EUC band placement.	CAMs	Closed
PARR May 01	12/05/20	2.2	01a: Xoserve/CDSP to continue investigating the discrepancies between the existing legacy reporting and the DDP. 01b: Xoserve/CDSP to examine the changing read performance statistics on the DDP with a fix to be deployed immediately	Xoserve/CDSP	Pending
PARR May 02	12/05/20	2.2	Xoserve/CDSP to investigate MPRN level data for those Shippers exhibiting large		Pending

			variances in read performance, which may be due to migration turbulence.		
PARR May 03	12/05/20	2.2	PAFA to contact Berlin, Manama and Roseau to get relevant information as per the request of the PAC.	PAFA (SU)	Pending
PARR May 04	12/05/20	2.2	PAFA to produce case study analysis on Bern, Luxembourg and Gaborone for the June PAC meeting.	PAFA (SU)	Pending
PARR May 05	12/05/20	2.2	CAMs to liaise with the nine Shippers who have not submitted their NDM Sample data to encourage submission and assist where necessary.	PAFA (SU)	Pending
PAC Actions 2020:					
PAC 0201	11/02/20	2.2	Xoserve/CDSP (JR) to provide additional analysis on Open Meter by-pass.	Xoserve/ CDSP (JR)	Closed
PAC 0208	11/02/20	5.4	Xoserve/CDSP (FC) to query Sub-cap information within the Standards of Service Liabilities Report and check alignment with UNC.	Xoserve/ CDSP (FC)	Carried Forward
PAC 0302	16/03/20	5.1	PAFA (SR) to arrange a workshop to review the 'User Stories' and establish next steps	PAFA (SR)	Carried Forward
PAC 0304	16/03/20	6.5	Xoserve/CDSP (JR) to provide PAC with some additional industry performance read rejection analysis from the Shipper Performance Packs	Xoserve/ CDSP (JR)	Carried Forward
PAC 0401	24/03/20	3.1	Xoserve/CDSP (FC) to review what reporting is likely to be needed and available for the Modifications being processed as a result of COVID-19.	Xoserve/ CDSP (FC)	Closed
PAC 0402	24/03/20	3.2	All PAC members to review the Performance Assurance Report Register (PARR) document and feedback comments to Xoserve/CDSP (FC) by 07 May 2020.	PAC	Closed
PAC 0403	24/03/20	3.3	All PAC Members to review the PAC Document 4 PAFA Scope Document and feedback comments to Xoserve/CDSP (FC) by 28 April to allow approval at the 12 May PAC meeting.	PAC	Closed
PAC 0404	24/03/20	3.4	PAC members to consider being a PAC sponsor/advocate to attend various industry meetings and provide Xoserve/CDSP feedback on the inclusion of this role into the Document 4 PAFA	PAC	Closed

			Scope Document by 28 April (see action 0403).		
PAC 0405	24/03/20	3.5	Xoserve/CDSP (NC) to provide more context on the Theft of Gas statistics, including the total number of cases and corresponding AQ corrections.	Xoserve/CDSP (NC)	Closed
PAC 0406	24/03/20	3.5	Xoserve/CDSP to provide an overview of Theft Gas Reporting at the May meeting	Xoserve/CDSP (NC)	Closed
PAC 0407	24/03/20	3.7	Xoserve/CDSP (JR) to provide PAC with an end of Year Budget Spend and overview of monthly budget spend to keep a track of spending.	Xoserve/CDSP (JR)	Closed
PAC 0501	12/05/20	3.1	PAC Members to review the proposed changes to the Performance Assurance Reports Register (PARR) by Friday 22 May to allow for the timely publication of the final document for PAC approval at the 09 June meeting and subsequent submission to the UNCC no later than 10 June.	PAC	Pending
PAC 0502	12/05/20	3.2	PAC Members to review the proposed changes to PAC Document 4 PAFA Scope Definition by Friday 22 May to allow for the timely publication of the final document for PAC approval at the 09 June PAC for approval.	PAC	Pending
PAC 0503	12/05/20	3.4	New PAC Budget Spend Report to be provided by Xoserve/CDSP (JR)	Xoserve/CDSP (JR)	Pending
PAC 0504	12/05/20	4.1	Xoserve/CDSP (FC) to provide COVID-19 Report designs and available market metrics in the form of a simple dashboard to be assessed by PAC in June	Xoserve/CDSP (FC)	Pending
PAC 0505	12/05/20	4.4	0505: PAC members to provide SSE (MJ) with a view on the Supplier / Shipper performance level requirements for Modification 0664.	PAC	Pending