

**UNC Performance Assurance Committee Minutes**  
**Monday 14 December 2020**  
**Via Microsoft Teams**

**Attendees**

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

**Shipper Members (Voting)**

Alison Wiggett	(AW)	Corona Energy <i>(joined at 10:15)</i>
Carl Whitehouse	(CW)	Shell
Lisa Saycell	(LS)	Gazprom
Louise Hellyer	(LH)	Total Gas
Graeme Cunningham	(GC)	Centrica/British Gas
Mark Bellman	(MB)	ScottishPower <i>(joined 11:30)</i>
Sallyann Blackett	(SB)	E.ON

**Transporter Members (Voting)**

Leteria Beccano	(LB)	Wales & West Utilities
Shiv Singh	(SS)	Cadent

**Observers/Presenters (Non-Voting)**

Amelia Gallini	(AG)	Xoserve/CDSP
Fiona Cottam	(FC)	Xoserve/CDSP
John Welch	(JW)	Gemserv/PAFA
Lee Greenwood	(LG)	Observer, British Gas
Liam King	(LK)	Ofgem <i>(joined at 12:00)</i>
Martin Attwood	(MA)	Xoserve/CDSP
Neil Cole	(NC)	Xoserve/CDSP
Sara Usmani	(SU)	Gemserv/PAFA
Shelley Rouse	(SR)	Gemserv/PAFA

**Apologies**

Alex Travell	(AT)	BU UK
Oorlagh Chapman	(OC)	Centrica/British Gas

Copies of non-confidential papers are available at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/pac/141220>

**1. Introduction**

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

**1.1 Apologies for absence**

Oorlagh Chapman, Shipper Member and Alex Travell, Transporter Member.

**1.2 Note of Alternates**

Graeme Cunningham for Oorlagh Chapman.

PAC Members approved the 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 (10 November 2020)**

The minutes from the previous meeting were approved.

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

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

#### **1.6 PAC Terms of Reference (Action 0901)**

Referring to Action 0901 RH advised that the amended PAC Terms of Reference (ToR) had been published for approval at the November PAC meeting however this was deferred until December due to restrictions on time. The changes related to Alternate PAC members being able to attend meetings to observe.

A minor amendment was also suggested to section 2.1 in relation to Ofgem attending meetings, to confirm 'Ofgem shall be allowed to attend the whole meeting'.

The Committee considered the marked-up changes and approved the ToR. It was then agreed to close Action 0901.

## **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. There is now four whole months of data available, which demonstrates that read performance continues to remain at pre-COVID levels.
    - Whilst there are site reductions in the PC4 market, the PC3 market is seeing increases which suggests that there are moves from PC4 to PC3 – this is supported by the information being relayed to the Customer Advocate Manager (CAM) from Shippers.
    - The PAFA informed PAC members that there is the potential that the Modifications could have been utilised during the second lockdown as Shippers were more aware of the option to use the Modifications. This data will be available next month, and an update will be provided to Committee members at the January PAC meeting.
    - Data on the PC1 and PC2 market were presented for completeness. There have been slight dips in read performance in October, which were driven by one or two Shippers within the market. The PAFA informed the Committee that this is something they are monitoring, and any concerns would be addressed at the PAC meeting if a trend develops.
- **Shipper Performance Improvement Plans**
  - The Performance Assurance Committee (PAC) were provided with an update on Valletta, a Shipper who had received an improvement letter in February 2020. The Shipper advised the PAFA that all outstanding issues were resolved at the end of July and they would be achieving 100% read performance. Following a few months of close performance monitoring, the PAFA confirmed that the Shipper had been achieving 100% performance

apart from a one month decline in September to c. 85% which was attributed to a new site on the Shipper's portfolio. It appears that the drop was a blip as the Shipper has been achieving 100% read performance since October 2020.

- The PAFA advised the PAC that the Shipper has achieved all milestones and are comfortable that they Shipper is maintaining performance. The plan should be closed, and Shipper should be thanked for their co-operation. PAC members agreed with the recommendation.
- Committee members were informed of the interim update for several other Shippers whose plans are expected to be completed by 2021 Q1.
  - PAFA met with Thimphu to discuss some areas of their provided performance improvement plan that raised concerns with the PAC. The Shipper was able to provide reassurance that their plan milestones would be met, which has been supported by the data in both the PARR and the DDP. Performance for the month overshoot the forecast by c. 20% and the Shipper does not expect the performance to drop in December to the level indicated in their plan.
  - The PAC were provided with progress reports on all other active performance improvement plans, with only Tallinn posing a concern. The PAFA informed the Committee that a meeting between the PAFA, Tallinn and the CAM is to take place in January where further information on improvements to their processes are to be discussed. Further updates will be supplied to the PAC once available to the PAFA.
- The PAFA presented its first potential Shipper escalation case to the PAC. Shipper (Bratislava) has failed to respond to the initial performance improvement letter that was issued to them in July 2020. Despite several other attempts to communicate with the Shipper including CAM communication, escalation to company director, as well as arranging an advisory session with the PAFA (which was not attended by Bratislava), no response to the performance improvement request has been received.
  - The next stage in the performance improvement process is to 'call-in' the Shipper, by inviting them to attend the February PAC meeting. This session would provide the Shipper an opportunity to explain why there has been no plan issued to the PAFA and the reasoning behind poor performance. The PAFA will advise the Shipper of this escalation request and should no response be received, the Shipper will be escalated to the Authority.
  - Committee members agreed with the general approach set out by the PAFA.
- **Shipper Performance: Read Performance – PC4 Monthly Targeting**
  - The PAFA presented additional data on read performance which included the reporting implemented with UNC672. Although the additional reporting (2B.15) shows a positive story with the amount of AQ being read, it also demonstrates that PC4 read performance is still significantly behind the code requirement of 90%.
    - The PAFA informed the Committee that performance improvement request letters for PC4 are expected to go to Shippers under cycle 1 (presented at the November 2020 PAC meeting) within the next week now that national lockdown measures have been lifted.
- **NDM Sample Data**
  - The second edition of the report relating to Modification 0654S was made available to the PAFA in November.
    - The report indicates that of the 37 Shippers eligible for submitting NDM Sample data, only 8 Shippers met the requirements. The remaining 29 Shippers had either not submitted data or data was provided which was not usable.

- Of the eight who had not supplied any data, two of these are withdrawing sites and in the process of winding down their portfolio. Four of these Shippers have previously had communications from the PAC, in the form of an observation letter, and communication from their CAM reminding them to submit the data. However, both prompts have been ignored and the PAFA have recommended further action to be taken on these Shippers.
  - The PAFA recommend more formal action in the form of a performance improvement letter as well as closer monitoring. PAC members agreed with the approach and have requested the PAFA to issue letters to the six Shippers.
- Committee members were also informed that there are twenty-one Shippers who submitted sample data, but a full sample was not provided or the data was not usable. There appears to be an education piece required on how to submit the data.
  - The CDSP informed the Committee that there is training made available to Shippers on how to submit and has been available since the implementation of the Modification.
  - The PAC have requested the CDSP/CAMs to understand the difficulties Shippers are having in submitting the data and feeding this back to the PAC once there is more information on the issue.

**New Action 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.

**New Action 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

**Post Meeting Note:** Links to supporting material for Shipper submission of NDM Sampling Shipper Data (UNC H1.6.11): <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/desc/>

- File format for submission: [File Format \(Third Party NDM Sample Data\) V8.0](#)
- Explanatory presentation with examples of failure reasons (updated November 2020): [Provision of NDM sample data UNC H1.6.11](#)

## 2.2 PAC Escalation Process

Shelley Rouse (SR) explained that following considerations last month with regards to the PAC escalation process, PAFA wished to consider what the Shipper sessions would look like. SR provided a PAFA Process Document and Presentation expressing the need for PAC to consider defining the process, and whether these Shipper sessions should be held separately or within the existing PAC meetings.

SR confirmed that process documentation had been written to include consideration of some of the framework suggestions made within Modification 0674 - *Performance Assurance Techniques and Controls*.

In consideration of the PAC Escalation Process SR presented a proposal for managing Shipper Sessions and using the escalation process as performance improvement technique.

SR noted the need to define the process for meetings and suggested these should include:

- The type of meeting to provide advice or presenting assurances.
- PAC's expectations from Shippers', including appropriateness of attendees
- PAC attendees, whether this should be a full PAC meeting or selected members
- Who should facilitate the meetings and how the sessions could be administered either by the Joint Office or PAFA
- Whether the sessions should be part of the PAC meeting or a separate session, taking into account the concerns with commercially sensitive data and the use of Teams
- Whether it was possible for Shippers to present anonymously and manage confidentiality.

SR explained the two different meeting types:

1. Escalation 'call in'. A session aimed at Shippers whose performance has not improved to a sufficient level following the provision of a performance improvement plan
2. Advice and support. A session aimed to provide support if PAC members, on receipt of a Shippers performance improvement plan, still require further clarity, or believe they may be able to offer advice or suggest improvements to the plan.

It was suggested to ensure an appropriate level of oversight and confidentiality that all PAC/Shipper improvement sessions should be held separately to the regular PAC meetings. If these were to be held on the same day as PAC, SR suggested that these should be an individually created meeting for participants to specifically dial into. SR explained the complexity of using online meetings and the visibility of individuals participating creating difficulties for anonymity and commercially sensitive discussions.

SR outlined the suggested invitation format (page 4), the expectations of the Shipper (page 5), ensuring appropriate attendance (pages 6-7), meeting administration (page 8), and online meeting etiquette (page 9). It was suggested these meetings required all PAC members in attendance. Commercial confidentiality was considered and how this could be managed, with minutes published via Huddle.

Lisa Saycell (LS) enquired about appropriate subject matter experts representing organisations, to ensure they have the right expertise and decision-making abilities. LS also suggested at the end of the session the agreements/actions should be summarised when concluding the meeting.

RH expressed concerns with regards to meeting quoracy and potentially limiting PAC members with a smaller quoracy requirement. It was suggested these sessions should be a full PAC meeting with all PAC members.

Alison Wiggett (AW) enquired about anonymity in meetings and how this would be controlled. Mark Bellman (MB) also wished to discuss the anonymity and the practicalities of ensuring this, and how PAC members decide which Shippers' performance should be discussed.

MB expressed some concern with the potential of PAC Member organisations being 'called-in' and a potential for a conflict of interest, with a PAC member pressing its own organisation for improvements. Carl Whitehouse (CW) emphasised, as PAC represents the industry it needs to have appropriate conversations to ensure performance areas are addressed.

Sallyanne Blackett (SB) wished to note organisations can identify their own performance levels measured against the publicly reported information, and as PAC Members there is an opportunity to highlight concerns internally, suggesting PAC members have a vested interest in their organisation's performance. This was not perceived as a conflict or a concern about using commercially sensitive data, as performance information is provided to Shippers routinely.

RH expressed a preference for the Shipper Session meetings being formal PAC meetings. SR understood there had been previous concerns about the Joint Office having access to commercially sensitive data and if it was appropriate in its role as a Code Administrator. RH suggested that it was important for these meetings to function properly, for PAC not to be subject to negative criticism and to ensure appropriate control and independence.

It was agreed that there were a number of elements that would need further consideration and that there needed to be a consensus on the way forward. It was suggested a view could be taken from the Uniform Network Code Committee (UNCC).

MB concurred with RH, believing that the Shipper Sessions should have full PAC membership attendance. A number of PAC members positively supported this approach and when asked there was no expressed concern from other PAC members about these meetings being supported by all members. Louise Hellyer (LH) offered a suggestion that for the Shipper sessions PAC members should be discouraged from utilising Alternates for continuity of discussion, but not withholding meetings if not all PAC members be present.



Graeme Cunningham (GC) as Oorlagh Chapman's standing Alternate expressed concern with this suggested approach. GC explained due to a timing issue with the UNC appointment process, and his appointment within British Gas, it was not possible for GC to be in position in time, therefore Oorlagh Chapman was nominated with GC appointed as the Alternate. GC stressed he wouldn't want to be excluded from the Shipper escalation meetings, particularly if the primary appointed Member may not be available for a period of absence. The Committee went on to consider primary Members participating in the Shipper Sessions along with observing Alternates. MB suggested where an Alternate attends a meeting, in capacity of their formal role of an Alternate, the Alternate would be considered to have full voting rights and will act as the Member. If, however an Alternate is in attendance in addition to the Member, this can only be an observing role and the Alternate would not be expected to actively participate in conversations unless invited to do so by the Chair. The Committee agreed an observing Alternate, in addition to the Member, is expected to be a silent observer.

Fiona Cottam (FC) enquired, if the meetings are facilitated by the Joint Office, if Joint Office staff would need to sign confidentiality agreements. It was suggested that the Joint Office should consider confidentiality agreements for staff to provide assurance and manage appropriate anonymity.

RH confirmed the Joint Office would need to consider this further, along with the administering meeting, the publication of meeting material and any ramifications for publishing minutes, meeting papers and use of Huddle.

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

Leteria Beccano (LB) enquired about the notice period for meetings, noting a discrepancy between the documents provided and if this should be a 3-week or 4-week notice period. SR suggested PAC should provide 4 weeks' notice.

It was anticipated, due to the sole nature of these meetings being limited to specific performance escalation topics with focused minutes (i.e. not reviewing standard PAC actions), the duration of meetings would not be expected to last more than 1 hour.

It was agreed further consideration of certain elements were required and further discussions would be held in January.

### 2.3 Review of Outstanding PARR Actions

**PARR November 01:** PAFA to contact Thimphu and Tallinn and provide both Shippers with feedback from the PAC, addressing concerns and proposed course of action.

**Update:** See item 2.1 Action undertaken. **Closed.**

**PARR November 02:** CAMs to work with Shippers to encourage the submission of meter reads.

**Update:** See item 2.1 Action undertaken. **Closed.**

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

John Welch (JW) provided two papers: a PAC Industry Update, outlining specific areas of note for PAC from relevant industry meetings and a Sub-Group update, outlining areas of work and potential ways of working. From the Sub-Group update JW gave a brief overview on the AQ Sub-Group (page 2) noting the number of various AQ Reports and next steps. JW also provided a brief update from the Theft Sub- Group (page 3) and the key next steps.

JW provided a high-level view of the more intuitive Read and AQ Reporting (page 4) and explained the various potential type of reports. JW provided a slide illustrating the existing Data Discovery Platform (DDP) reporting to provide an overview of the links between Existing PARR Reporting (page 5). JW provided a mock-up of the options for more accessible PARR Reporting (page 6), making performance clearer, with a more holistic and accessible PARR reporting for all. JW also provided a summary table mapping the PARR reports to existing PAC risks (page 7).

JW concluded the presentation with a slide of the potential ways forward (page 8): to link existing measures; rationalise and improve PARR reporting; maintain and improve granularity; and consider other settlement risks not currently covered.

JW advised that PAFA are working with Xoserve looking at risks and pulling a more holistic view together to present to PAC. MB and other PAC Members welcomed the level of analysis and quantification relating to the risks and granularity and hoped to see a plan from PAFA. SR explained that PAFA need to understand the scope of the DDP Planning meetings and advised that PAFA will be working with Xoserve on the ability to provide more accessible reporting.

## 2.5 AQ at Risk Update

No further discussion held to the AQ discussions held under item 2.1.

## 2.6 Market Breaker Read Analysis

No further discussion held to the Market Breaker Read Analysis discussions held under item 2.1.

## 2.7 Open / Meter By-Pass Update

In response to Action 1002 – for Xoserve to provide an Open/Meter By-Pass update including a snapshot of movements and a narrative of Shipper actions to progress, Martin Attwood (MA) provided a presentation and confirmed back in October 55 Shippers had been contacted to validate the meter By-Pass status and that progress updates had been received from approximately 14 Shippers. MA explained there was a common theme being reported that site visits are difficult to conduct in the current circumstances.

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

<b>Snapshot Date / Summary</b>	<b>July 2020</b>	<b>November 2020</b>	<b>December 2020</b>
Open By-Pass	153	149	149
Closed By-Pass	13,526	13,226	13,164
Total By-Pass	13,679	13,375	13,313

MA confirmed most of the by-pass investigations have indicated that the by-pass appears to have been rectified as a bi-product of a meter exchange, resulting in the by-pass being removed.

MB enquired if it was possible for Xoserve to report on the number of meter exchanges that have been recorded against a site with a previously flagged meter by-pass.

**New Action 1202:** Xoserve (MA) confirm if Xoserve system automatically removes Meter By-Pass as a result of a shipper processing a Meter Exchange.

MA wished to note a by-pass end date can be notified retrospectively when the update is provided by the Shipper. MB enquired if in this case it is possible to trace back if a consumption adjustment has been undertaken. MA explained the process for consumption adjustments are completely separate and he had some more information on this on page 5 of the presentation.

**New Action 1203:** Xoserve (MA) to provide confirmation that a consumption adjustment has been undertaken from closed meter by-pass.

MA confirmed that the Xoserve Customer Account Managers (CAMs) are keeping by-pass meters as a standing agenda item for future constituency meetings. MB asked if individual meetings are also taking place with Shippers. MA explained individual dialogue is being undertaken along with constituency meetings.

RH enquired if there was any correlation between the 55 Shippers contacted and other reported performance issues. It was explained that it would be possible to undertake a cross match for information purposes. However, caution was expressed about taking any further action for sites with a meter by-pass as this was not a standard PARR report, and cannot formally be addressed by PAC. SR believed if there was not a specific UNC requirement with regards to performance in this area the information cannot be used to target performance assurance plans. However, the information observed could be used to provide additional indicators as to the general performance of Shippers.

**New Action 1204:** Xoserve (MA) / PAFA (SR) to cross reference Shippers contacted in relation to meter by-pass with other known performance issues.

In response to Action 1101, MA reported the results of the case study on the 4 recently closed open by-pass MPRNs. A summary of the study was provided on page 5. MA reported that 3 of the 4 sites had had the meter by-pass removed due to a meter exchange, one of which was expected to have a consumption adjustment. There was one MPRN which had an open by-pass with no current Shipper.

MA noted that when the open bypass status is closed or removed a consumption adjustment should follow. Of the 4 sites studied and from the information available on UK Link, 2 consumption adjusted were expected but not received. MA noted if there is consumption on the site, it is for the Shipper to work this out and submit the consumption adjustment. MA did wish to note that the consumption adjustment is undertaken offline and not within UK Link, a potential loophole in the process.

LS enquired what sites can have a meter by-pass within the UNC, and if these are expected to be larger sites which need to maintain a supply, such as a nursing home or hospital. Referring to the 2<sup>nd</sup> site, from the study, PAC considered if this could be a moth-balled site. Further discussions were held on the age of sites with a meter by-pass, the possibility of the AQ being affected due to the lack of meter reads and the consequential impacts.

PAC considered a particular case where a meter by-pass had been fitted to maintain a supply to a site where the meter was unsuitable for recording the amount of gas passing through. It was suggested this case needed further investigation to ensure correct process has been followed.

SR enquired if a meter by-pass report should be added to PARR to include this within the performance targeting. The Committee considered the extent of the reporting, the process within the UNC and whether there was a need to consider the end-to-end process to assess if the UNC needed to be amended.

LS wished to note that metering equipment can be changed by the customer and this is not always in the control of Shippers. FC noted there are obligations within the UNC about the notification, file flows and circumstances for a Meter By-pass within UNC TPD Section M2.4.

SR suggested PAFA could look at the end-to-end process for a meter by-pass and provide a summary overview to PAC.

**New Action 1205:** Xoserve (MA) to look at the end-to-end process for a meter by-pass and provide an overview.

LH explained that under Project Nexus some work had been undertaken for adjustments which required a lot of manual focus, noting adjustments were required for varying reasons and in very individual circumstances requiring a case-by-case manual review. LH suggested the meter by-pass situation seemed to be similar, with some sites potentially having no impact to settlement.

It was agreed this still needed further assessment to better understand the impact of the issue, looking at the population of sites, the AQ at the beginning of by-pass, if the AQ has reduced, the age of the by-pass and potential gas volumes involved.

MB also suggested looking at meter exchanges and if there was a default for removing the by-pass flag once the meter is exchanged. It was also suggested identifying what meter types can have a meter bypass fitted and if an exchanged meter could still have the physical by-pass in place.



FC clarified that a meter by-pass is not an attribute of a certain meter, explaining the physical structure of by-pass from the outlet valve to pipework past the meter, resulting in the gas not flowing through the meter. This physical adaptation was possible for any meter type.

It was agreed with the new actions and some better understanding on the significance of this issue, PAC could move to reporting progress of this issue to quarterly.

## **2.8 Covid-19 Updates**

This item was not discussed – see Action updates 1104, 1105 and 1106.

RH noted that Modification 0730 - *COVID-19 Capacity Retention Process* was reporting to the UNC Modification Panel on 17 December for Panel to consider a Variation Request-

### **2.8.1. Use of the Isolation Flag during Covid-19 Update**

As above this item was not discussed – see Action updates 1104, 1105 and 1106.

### **2.8.2. Other Updates**

None

## **3. Matters for Committee Attention**

### **3.1 PAC/PAFA Access to Data**

Referring to Actions 1003, and 1103 FC confirmed a provisional meeting date of 06 January 2020 had been scheduled to allow further consideration of the User Stories and priority of changes for the dedicated PAC DDP sprint.

It was noted that the meeting would not be quorate without two Transporters attending.

LB and SS confirmed they had a clashing commitment with Workgroup 0646R also taking place on the same day, both agreed to organise an Alternate to attend PAC.

### **3.2 Proof of Concept User Story 387 - Age Analysis of No Meter**

FC confirmed an update on all three of the User stories 387, 396 and 397, Xoserve have reviewed outstanding User Stories outside of DDP as a workaround, however this needs more work.

FC confirmed that Xoserve are investigating an interim workaround, for User stories 387, 396 and 397, however this maybe over-run now by the dedicated sprint.

### **3.3 Proof of Concept User Story 396 - Rejected AQ Corrections**

MA provided a brief presentation on the DDP User Story 396 – Request for clarification, confirming that the DDP 396, relates to AQ Corrections 2B.8 and the number of corrections that are rejected with reason code T98, to monitor how many and why AQ corrections are being rejected by UK Link.

MA clarified that T98 is a Notification of AQ Fail to calculate code for a specific reason (for example wrong asset information) and C43 for example is a response code for an AQ Correction. MA explained there are a number of response codes and there is a report for AQ calculation failures.

PAC considered the AQ calculation failure reports, what reason codes can be used, what these codes relate to, and if PAC need to see them all. MA believed there were two reason codes for 2B.8. SR believed there was 4 reason codes and asked for this to be clarified.

FC wished to note that there are AQ failure reports and a team being established within Xoserve to look into AQ failure calculations. FC explained the reports currently available and what information C43 reports.

PAC considered the interactions with Modification 0746 - *Clarificatory change to the AQ amendment process within TPD G2.3 (formerly 0736A)*.

MA suggested removing T98 from this User Story, to allow the appropriate solution to be found rather than restricting the solution, as it was understood this did not relate to the monthly calculations.

### **3.4 Proof of Concept User Story 397 - AQ Corrections direction and volumes**

See 3.2. No further discussion.

### **3.5 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 sites had not been read since Project Nexus go-live. FC explained this is already on PAC's radar.

Some analysis has been undertaken and the Xoserve CAMs will be undertaking some work with Shippers to obtain more information to the 280k sites. FC explained there will be a focus on the on the top 10 Shippers with sites in EUC bands 8 & 9. Information is being reported to the industry and more details will be provided in January.

### **3.6 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>.

No further discussion further to item 2.4 above.

### **3.7 PAC Budget Spend Update**

FC confirmed that there is nothing to report at present. It was understood none of the £75k budget had been spent as of yet.

RH enquired how the DDP Dedicated sprint would be paid for and if this work will come out of the £75k budget. She was concerned that there should be no delay to information provision due to cost/budget approval uncertainty. SR noted some consideration may need to be taken of light of Modification changes.

**New Action 1206:** Xoserve (FC) to provide a PAC Budget spend update and confirm how the DDP Dedicated sprint will be funded.

### **3.8 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 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 had been considered by the UNC Modification Panel in October and had been referred back to Workgroup to consider new issues raised. A further variation is being considered with a request for an extension until April 2021.

### **4.2 Modification 0674 - Performance Assurance Techniques and Controls (MB)**

MB confirmed that a final Workgroup Meeting is due to be held on 07 January, with a report due to the 21 January 2021 Panel meeting. MB confirmed a further amended to the Modification is expected (Version 15) to undertake some minor changes.

RH asked if there are any anticipated impacts to the PARR Reports. MB explained that Modification 0674 will give a right for PAC access data that it reasonably requires to undertake its role. PAC members will still be subject to non-Disclosure Agreements, there will be a use of league tables, and the PAC Document will define what information will be available through PAC KPIs.

MB also wished to note that Ofgem had been asked about financial incentives payments, however Modification 0674 does not change the current position.

#### **4.3 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 were finalising the next steps to recommend a suitable implementation date.

#### **4.4 Modification 0730 – COVID-19 Capacity Retention Process**

Due to report to the UNC Modification Panel on 17 December 2020. No further discussion.

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

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

#### **4.6 Any Other changes**

Referring to item 2.4 JW noted that PAFA had published a PAC Industry Update and asked PAC to note specific recent industry developments from industry meetings/discussions, some of which had already been discussed today. JW wished to draw PAC's attention to the topics to be aware of, in particular Modifications 0734S, 0664V, 0736S, 0692S and the AUGS Sub-Committee.

It was agreed to have a standard agenda item to provide PAFA with an opportunity to provide updates from meetings they had attended.

JW provided an overview of the changes and an update from some of the recent industry meetings, PAFA have attended.

JW wished to flag XRN4941 and highlight that Xoserve is undertaking further analysis on the change request and impacts.

### **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:** This item was discussed under item 2.1, within PAFA's Dashboard presentation. It was recommended going forward that the Market Breaker update would be reported by exception. PAC Members agreed to this approach within the PAFA Dashboard update. **Carried Forward**

**0901:** Joint Office (RH) to provide a proposed amendment to the PAC ToR to allow PAC Alternates to observe meetings.

**Update:** See item 1.6. **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. PAC agreed this was an ongoing report requirement and the action would be left open to drive updates. **Carried Forward.**

**1004:** PAC Members to review the Cadent Offtake Meter Performance Report and agree ongoing reporting requirement from all DNs.

**Update:** See item 6.1. **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. **Carried Forward.**

**1102:** PAFA to attend and provide an update from the 16 November monthly Shipper User prioritisation meeting.

**Update:** JW provided a brief update from the November meeting, for the strategic changes, with the dedicated sprint meeting in January PAFA did not plan to attend further meetings. **Closed.**

**1103:** Xoserve (DN) to confirm/arrange meeting dates to undertake the PAC Sprint Planning, to review complexity and understand size and scale of changes required.

**Update:** See item 3.1. Meeting arranged for 06 January 2021. **Closed.**

**1104:** Xoserve to provide PAC with a progress update on isolations in December.

**Update:** FC confirmed following communications that 17 Shippers had replied, who had submitted 726 Isolations, 2 of these Shippers reported that they had submitted 20 Isolations under the scope of Modification 0723 of which 5 remained Isolated. The remaining 15 Shippers who responded confirmed they had not used the 0723 facility. FC reported that 31 Shippers had not replied had submitted 4,939 Isolations since 12 May 2020. **Closed.**

**1105:** Xoserve to provide a plan for ongoing monitoring of isolated sites, and how often reports will be run.

**Update:** FC confirmed that Xoserve have issued a second round of chase-up emails via the Customer Experience team and are currently extrapolating the responses. Data suggests that circa 150 Isolations since 12 May 2020 might be Covid-19 Isolations. On this basis Xoserve will continue monitoring with a plan to report two-monthly or quarterly, depending on responses.

RH enquired about the potential impacts of Modification 0730- *COVID-19 Capacity Retention Process*. FC suggested the implementation of Modification 0730 may result in different behaviours, with a continued focus on the 31 Shippers who have not responded. **Closed.**

**1106:** Xoserve to provide a view on the potential impact to settlement and allocation for isolated sites.

**Update:** FC confirmed that the list of 5,665 Isolations which was issued to Shippers for review had a total rolling AQ of 194m kWh a circa 0.03% of the total LDZ AQ. FC reported that the maximum exposure on an average day for the full list of sites will be 0.03% extra Unidentified Gas (UIG) although this would be higher under colder conditions, lower when warmer. However, circa 30m kWh could be removed from the impact assessment based on the responses to date and any under-allocation would be corrected once the site is re-established and valid meter reads are loaded. RH asked if Xoserve could forward this information to Ofgem in relation to Modifications 0723 and 0730. **Carried Forward.**

<b>New Action 1207:</b> Xoserve (FC) to provide an update on Isolations in January.
---

**1107:** PAC to review the risk of identified and unidentified Offtake Meter Errors and the need for ongoing Offtake Meter Performance Report (Action 1004).

**Update:** See item 6.1 below. **Closed.**

## 6. Any Other Business

### 6.1 Offtake Meter Validations Reports

Referring to Actions 1004 and 1107 JW wished to note that Xoserve have liaised with Cadent, to consider the risks and possible tweaks to the reporting that could be made.

JW noting the risks being relatively low, with a low number of errors, some of which are old but very small, with an established process for reconciliation it was recommended that PAC are provided with a 12-monthly review, with the standard regulatory reporting triggering a progress report for PAC.

It was noted that Cadent was the only Network providing a report specifically for PAC whereas the other DNs are providing the standard Meter Validation Reports which are routinely published at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/MeteringValidations>.

Shiv Singh (SS) reported that there is a programme in place under RIIO to improve the accuracy of reporting and reduce errors. SS suggesting going forward DNs could report to PAC by exception.

LB explained that originally there was an annual report, but around 2 years ago this moved to quarterly. LB wished to note that it's not just meters that can cause errors, it can be pressure, temperature and human error that can cause errors. LB noted that having looked at the report provided there is no consistency in the frequency of reports.

The Committee considered having a minimum annual PAC Report for Errors and then a report each time an error occurs. It was agreed that DNs should report to PAC to provide periodic assurance. PAC members supported the provision of an annual report from DNs.

SB noted the industry can see ones reported, more assurance is required on potential errors waiting to be found.

LB asked for the DNs to agree the month in which the annual report

**New Action 1208:** DNs to confirm which month the Yearly Offtake Meter Report will be provided to PAC.

## 6.2 Poor Shipper Performance and Anonymity

Discussed under item 2.2. No further discussion.

## 6.3 PAC Annual Review Response Summary

SR wished to note that PAFA had provided an update on the Annual Review for approval next month. The corresponding paper was published under item 2.2 entitled 2020 PAFA Annual review Response Summary. SR asked PAC members to review the document provided and provide any comments to PAFA to allow approval in January.

**New Action 1209:** PAC members to review the 2020 PAFA Annual Review Response Summary and send comments to PAFA to allow approval in January.

## 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](http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/events-calendar/month)

Time/Date	Paper Publication Deadline	Venue	Programme
10:00, Wednesday 06 January 2021	5pm Monday 24 December 2020	Teleconference	DDP Sprint Planning
10:00, Tuesday 12 January 2021	5pm Monday 04 January 2021	Teleconference	Standard Agenda
10:00, Tuesday 16 February 2021	5pm Monday 08 February 2021	Teleconference	Standard Agenda
10:00, Tuesday 16 March 2021	5pm Monday 08 March 2020	Teleconference	Standard Agenda

For details of the informal sub-group meetings and topics please contact the PAFA directly.  
[PAFA@gemserv.com](mailto:PAFA@gemserv.com)

**PAC Action Table (as at 14 December 2020)**

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
------------	--------------	------------	--------	-------	---------------



<b>PARR Report Actions:</b>					
PARR Nov 01	10/11/20	2.2	PAFA to contact Thimphu and Tallinn and provide both Shippers with feedback from the PAC, addressing concerns and proposed course of action.	PAFA (SR)	<b>Closed</b>
PARR Nov 02	10/11/20	2.2	CAMs to work with Shippers to encourage the submission of meter reads	Xoserve CAMS	<b>Closed</b>
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)	<b>Pending</b>
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)	<b>Pending</b>
<b>PAC Actions 2020:</b>					
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)	<b>Carried Forward</b>
PAC 0901	14/09/20	1.0	Joint Office (RH) to provide a proposed amendment to the PAC ToR to allow PAC Alternates to observe meetings.	Joint Office (RH)	<b>Closed</b>
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)	<b>Carried Forward</b>
PAC 1004	13/10/20	6.5	PAC Members to review the Cadent Offtake Meter Performance Report and agree ongoing reporting requirement from all DNs.	PAC	<b>Closed</b>
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)	<b>Carried Forward</b>
PAC 1102	10/11/20	2.8	PAFA to attend and provide an update from the 16 November monthly Shipper User prioritisation meeting.	PAC	<b>Closed</b>
PAC 1103	10/11/20	2.8	Xoserve (DN) to confirm/arrange meeting dates to undertake the PAC Sprint Planning, to review complexity and understand size and scale of changes required.	Xoserve (DN)	<b>Closed</b>

PAC 1104	10/11/20	3.2	Xoserve (FC) to provide PAC with a progress update on isolations in December.	Xoserve (FC)	<b>Closed</b>
PAC 1105	10/11/20	3.2	Xoserve (FC) to provide a plan for ongoing monitoring of isolated sites, and how often reports will be run.	Xoserve (FC)	<b>Closed</b>
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)	<b>Carried Forward</b>
PAC 1107	10/11/20	6.1	PAC to review the risk of identified and unidentified Offtake Meter Errors and the need for ongoing Offtake Meter Performance Report (Action 1004).	PAC	<b>Closed</b>
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)	<b>Pending</b>
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)	<b>Pending</b>
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)	<b>Pending</b>
PAC 1204	14/02/20	2.7	Xoserve (MA) / PAFA (SR) to cross reference Shippers contacted in relation to meter by-pass with other known performance issues.	Xoserve (MA) / PAFA (SR)	<b>Pending</b>
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)	<b>Pending</b>
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)	<b>Pending</b>
PAC 1207	14/02/20	5.0	Xoserve (FC) to provide an update on Isolations in January.	Xoserve (FC)	<b>Pending</b>
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)	<b>Pending</b>
PAC 1209	14/02/20	6.3	PAC members to review the 2020 PAFA Annual Review Response Summary and	PAC Members	<b>Pending</b>

			send comments to PAFA to allow approval in January.		
--	--	--	---	--	--