UNCC AUG Sub-Committee
Friday 11 January 2019
at Radcliffe House, Blenheim Court, Warwick Road, Solihull B91 2AA

Attendees

Chris Shanley (Chair)	(CS)	Joint Office
Mike Berrisford (Secretary)	(MB)	Joint Office
Andy Gordon	(AG)	DNV GL
Carl Whitehouse*	(CW)	First Utility
Clive Whitehand	(CW)	DNV GL
Fiona Cottam	(FC)	Xoserve
Gareth Evans	(GE)	Waters Wye Associates
Imran Shah*	(IS)	British Gas
John Welch	(JW)	npower
Kirsty Dudley*	(KD)	E.ON
Luke Reeves*	(LR)	EDF Energy
Mark Bellman	(MB)	ScottishPower
Mark Palmer*	(MP)	Orsted
Neil Cole	(NC)	Xoserve
Rhys Keally*	(RK)	British Gas
Steve Mullinganie	(SM)	Gazprom
Tony Perchard	(TP)	DNV GL

** via teleconference*

Copies of all papers are available at: http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/uncc/110119

1.0 Introduction

In introducing the meeting, CS explained the rationale behind the recent Joint Office AUG meeting name change and how this also relates to various web page changes, which it is hoped will improve navigation and access to supporting information – a side effect being able to better differentiate between the Uniform Network Code Committee (UNCC) and this new UNC Sub-Committee.

1.1. Approval of Minutes (12 October 2018)

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

2.0 Recap of the 2019/20 Process Timetable

In providing a detailed review of *the 'AUG Technical Workgroup of UNCC – Proposed AUGS Walkthrough'* presentation, TP acknowledged that the title is possibly no longer applicable (please refer to the discussion on item 1.0 above for more detail).

In order to retain the relationship of the extensive discussions and the various pages within the presentation, a summary of the salient points is provided as follows:

Agenda (slide 2)

It was noted that both *'Theft Methodology Proposals'* and *'Shrinkage Model Outcomes'* would be covered elsewhere with the presentation.

Meeting Purpose (slide 3)

In referring to the (monthly) progress updates, concerns were voiced around a lack of transparency and notifications (i.e. no 'push' emails issued to flag up when the monthly updates are published). Responding to the concerns being voiced, CS highlighted that they were discussed at the last meeting but pointed parties in the direction of the new AUG web page layouts, which included a new dedicated page for these updates.[1]

After further discussion it was agreed the AUGE would look to provide a supporting narrative (to form the basis of a mailout (email) communication advertising the publication of the monthly progress updates. Thereafter, the Joint Office are to ensure that a mailout email (to the wider industry distribution listings) is issued in a timely fashion.

A brief debate ensued around potential publication dates during which the Joint Office was requested to also consider adoption of automated mailouts and providing RSS communication mechanisms going forwards. CS agreed to highlight this request as part of any further development of the JO website.

Project Overview (slides 4 & 5)

Whilst already working to the new UNC Modification 0639R processes, work remains ongoing around the contractual arrangements, which are mainly a simple tidy up exercise. FC explained that whilst she is not 100% certain whether Xoserve had signed onto the arrangements pre FGO, she is aware that there is a summary available on the 'restricted' Xoserve web pages.

As far as the draft timeline diagram on slide 5 is concerned, the Committee has now reached the *'Walkthrough meeting early Jan'* stage of the proposed process.

It was noted that should any parties have concerns, these are best addressed via a consultation response.

Project Status (slide 6)

When asked for a view on the meter asset and read data issues experienced, TP advised that he believes this to was related to a post Project Nexus imperial to metric conversion issue, which has now been resolved (in the main). He went on to point out that there had also been some issues with the CDSP data aspects, and that care would be needed in order to avoid potential double counting of CSEPs.

In was noted that post Project Nexus, non-standard sites related information includes LPG sites, which needs to be carefully considered (i.e. filtered out).

TP then confirmed that the SPAA theft data had already been received by the AUG Expert, and that on initial analysis, looks to be 'fit for purpose' – it was noted that this 'one off cut' of information will now be reviewed and refined going forwards.

Parties were asked to ensure that they (also) consider the separate theft methodology document when compiling their respective consultation responses.

Data Status – Outstanding Issues (slide 7)

When TP explained that whilst the bulk of the data had now been received, some outstanding issues remain, SM advised that he is unaware of any recent significant LDZ billing issues.

In considering *the 'Outstanding queries regarding meters with volume conversion'* bullet, reference was made to previous meeting discussions on Product Class 1 and associated percentages.

In considering the Scottish Independent Undertakings (SIUs) (i.e. Stranraer), it was suggested that the UIG figure of circa 30% may have an impact upon the actual annual (UIG) figures, and as a consequence needs double checking. Responding, FC explained that this might be a DM/NDM portfolio (pre to post Project Nexus) related issue and that she is in discussions with

[1] *Please note: the monthly progress updates can now be found on the Joint Office web site at: https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/aug/1920%20prog%20update*

Scotia in order to resolve the issue. It was also noted that this matter also potentially impacts upon the AUGEs view of historical UIG data.

New Action AUG0101: *Reference IGT CSEPs and SUIs* – Xoserve (FC) & AUGE (TP) to ensure that the UIG issues are considered and whether it reveals a new root cause that potentially impacts the UIG weighting.

When TP pointed out that the AUGE meter exchange dataset may not contain all read data at this present time, FC explained that Xoserve would provide the additional information in due course and that the information provided does contain two (2) readings per meter, so the problem might be related to a data extraction issue.

Analysis Summary (slides 8 & 9)

In providing a brief explanation behind the rationale for the new theft data analysis approach, AG advised that not only does the new data better reflect the population densities, a preliminary review has also been completed and the new data is already being utilised as part of the new approach - it was noted that going forwards how the information is accessed and utilised will be of paramount importance.

Parties then debated how examining the TRAS information provides a basis for a 'ranking mechanism' for potential theft of gas sites (i.e. ranging from the least likely to, up to sites that are most likely to). At the moment, the assumptions based on the data analysed to date, is that the patterns are steady and consistent over time, supported by any potential leads being utilised to 'target' those sites most likely to steal gas.

A debate ensued over the potential merits (or not) of the AUGE utilising the TRAS ranking scores in order to be in a position to better identify potential offending sites. When asked, KD provided a brief overview of the TRAS ranking model and pointed out that to date, this had not been officially passed to the CDSP or the AUGE (on the grounds that it is supplier generated data, it does not currently automatically pass through to either party) – it was acknowledged that this information might prove beneficial to the AUGE in undertaking their analysis going forwards.

In noting that it is unlikely that the (TRAS sourced) data would be available for inclusion within this year's analysis, it is expected to be available for the following year. Regardless of this fact, it is recognised that the information to be utilised to generate this year's analysis is a vast improvement over what has gone before.

In referring to the process flow chart on slide 27, AG pointed out that not only does this now include pseudo aspects, but also demonstrates that the potential relationship between the balancing factors and theft of gas aspects have been improved.

In briefly debating whether or not the scaling factors (provided later in the presentation) should be included within an updated version of the theft methodology document for this year, it was noted that there is a 'balance' between getting the information in place for this year and potentially running up against time constraints.

When asked, AG provided a brief background explanation to issue 14 highlighting that analysis of the (historical) information dating back to 2010, revealed that no DM thefts have been witnessed during the intervening period. However, it should be noted that the TRAS and Xoserve data sources do not necessarily align, with a potential difference in the order of a magnitude of 2 witnessed between the Xoserve and TRAS versions – FC explained that where shipper to supplier information is concerned Xoserve are one step removed in many cases resulting in the Xoserve data displaying fewer instances of theft, but involving more energy with the reverse being said of the TRAS equivalent data.

Concentrating on issue 14, when the question was asked on whether the assumption is the process remains the same (metering infrastructure), SM suggested that AMRs had already improved the data, thereby going someway to mitigating the majority of the concerns in this area.

In summary, it was agreed that industry parties should provide comments to the AUGE via the formal consultation responses, after which, the AUGE will assess the information before making any methodology changes, as this is seen as being primarily a timing related issue (i.e. simply a question of whether or not we utilise the new theft methodology in the current year, or from next year onwards) – in noting this matter relates to the six (6) page presentation provided ahead of this meeting, parties acknowledged that the final decision rests with the AUGE.

Moving on to review issue 25 as outlined on slide 9, TP explained the background to the work undertaken since the initial review meeting before pointing out that as far as the *'UIG from meter temperature is therefore zero'* bullet is concerned, this is simply based upon the AUGE's methodology. Whilst concerns were voiced that this apparent systematic error changes year on year, some parties suggested that the issue could easily be addressed by the fitment and utilisation of correctors, which is especially ironic as the government dumbed down SMART meters on cost grounds in the first place (i.e. had SMART meters been allowed to measure temperatures, they could have corrected themselves). Some parties believed that this may not be the correct forum within which to discuss this (primary legislation related) matter.

In referring to the assumed average temperature of 12.2C, TP explained that this is comprised of multiple temperature sources.

It was noted that the finding would now be shared with interested industry parties at the forthcoming 28 January 2019 UIG Taskforce Workgroup meeting.

In noting that the methodology has been developed and documented as an addendum to the main AUGS document, parties are asked to review the methodology as part of their consultation response.

UIG Taskforce Issue 12.2 (slides 10 to 14)

When the AUGE explained that they are trying to get a 'feel' as to what the industry believe are the underlying issues with Standard Conversion Factors, some questioned whether or not inclusion of 'billing' (i.e. customer billing related aspects) was appropriate, whilst others noted that parties are paying for kWhs of energy that they are then unable to fully recover due to primary legislation limitations / constraints. It was suggested that evaluating the matter in more detail would potentially lead to more accurate allocation of UIG (subject to the primary legislation constraints).

In considering the *'AQ Calculation?'* point it was noted that these 'pockets of energy' can factor upwards (escalate) and become very large, very quickly and that perhaps the answer lies in the better utilisation of suitable technology such as correctors etc.

In considering the *'National vs Local?'* point, parties noted that previous governmental policy was aimed at protecting consumers and therefore care would be needed around how energy is distributed (shuffled around) across industry parties. However, this was not a universally supported view with one party questioning the potential impacts implied by the statement, especially when considering the matter at an LDZ (averaged) level – it was noted that UNC Modification 0621 (and its associated alternate modifications) discussions relating to the re-distribution of costs are not necessarily appropriate in this instance as we are not advocating a re-distribution of costs on a geographical basis. FC explained how meter point reconciliation works towards better alignment of the various billing elements.

When FC pointed out that there are also potential LDZ to LDZ differences to consider, MB suggested that ensuring appropriate allocation of UIG between customer types within an LDZ is the concern, rather than differences between LDZs. When AG advised that the AUGE base their calculations and subsequent findings entirely on an LDZ basis and only when aggregating up does the information display as a 'National figure', MB again noted that it is the allocation of kWh error across EUC bands that is important, because this contribution to UIG is a structural factor.

When asked whether the AUGE would be calculating the UIG on an LDZ by LDZ basis going forwards, CW responded by advising that this would not be the case at this point in time,

before acknowledging that the matter would/could be re-considered again during the 28 January 2019 UIG Taskforce Workgroup discussions.

Moving on to the meter gas temperature survey, CW pointed out that for the purposes of the sample size requirements the aim would be to utilise the information from several hundred sites. He also noted that there can be a variation of temperature difference between inside and outside meter locations.

In considering the *'procurement of measurement equipment and installation'* point, parties observed that it is notoriously difficult to achieve customer buy-in to having equipment installed.

As far as the cost figure of circa £1m+ is concerned, this is largely down to the cost of the equipment and resource time involved.

Moving on to consider *'Option A'* on slide 13 which forms the basis of the AUGE's response to (MBs) concerns raised within the UIG Taskforce, MB noted that AUGE's statement "Does not resolve the level of UIG, just redistributes it" is exactly what AUGE's factors are intended to do with a structural UIG issue, until such time as the kWh-error can be eliminated from UIG by a technological solution.

In considering the continued use of the ALP/DAF scaling, FC pointed out that various factors are contributing to the negative UIG observed during the summer months which she believes should be carefully considered as part of the ongoing DESC year on year review process. Furthermore, recording temperatures at NDM sample sites could potentially reduce the 'uplift' factors.

It was noted that utilisation of actual temperatures for the AQ calculation (via standard correction factors etc.) results in a consumption style derivation and that the Dave Lander and Xoserve figures relating to this matter are closely aligned.

It was suggested that using the EUC Bands for daily read site volume conversion could be preferable to utilising Product Class 1 and 2 data.

It was recognised that as far as the *'Temperature Conversion for all sites'* bullet was concerned, there could be some potential meter standards compliance issues involved and that the various elements associated with the *'Separate Volume Conversion Error from UIG'* bullet point potentially serve to incentivise the use of correctors (i.e. the fitting of).

Analysis Summary (slides 15 to 17)

The information provided against Issues 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31 and 32 on slides 15 and 16 was taken as presented, during which MB questioned the statement on slide 9 *"UIG from meter temperature is therefore zero"* which suggests there is no UIG arising from the issue, which he noted was misleading and inconsistent with AUGE's slides from October 2018 which confirm that UIG would be 0.35% per degree different to the standard temperature – a point acknowledged by TP.

In considering the graphical information provided on slide 17, FC gave a health warning around how reconciliation phasing has a potential impact on proceedings.

A brief discussion took place relating to how moving scaling factors simply moves the energy around the various market sectors and how this potentially 'hides' elements associated with UIG impacts – it was noted that the role of the AUGE going forwards (once the UIG Taskforce closes) needs careful consideration and it is expected that this matter would also be considered at the forthcoming 28 January 2019 Taskforce Workgroup meeting.

Final UIG vs Initial UIG (slide 18)

The information provided was taken as presented with no adverse comments being voiced.

D+5 UIG: 1 Jun to 25 Dec (slide 19)

When asked, AG confirmed that looking at yearly data in isolation can potentially reveal large differences due in part, to the effect of weather variations.

FC explained that presently Xoserve does not have a clear view of how the level of reconciliation is actually going to pan out in the longer term – whilst Xoserve are tracking the amount of energy that is being reconciled, it is not necessarily being improved as this is the first run of this particular reconciliation exercise.

It was noted that the effect of the post October 2018 reads flowing the system is expected to have a significant bearing on matters and should be monitored closely. However, it was once again recognised that focusing on an individual years data does not necessarily provide a good representation of the prevailing position.

Attention then focused on the differences in the perceived levels of UIG (Ofgem cites 2% whilst the industry cites 4%), with questions asked around where the industry 4% UIG figure is originating – the AUGE 1.5% final UIG figure for the NDM sector is considered to be driving industry improvements.

Final UIG Estimation (for 2018/19) (slide 20)

In focusing on the graphical information, and specifically the *'line in the sand'* (2013/14), it was suggested that the energy involved should now be fully reconciled, whilst the equivalent energy for the 2014/15 period is partially reconciled at this time. It was also noted that the red border represents the five (5) years of data utilised to calculate the averages.

When asked to provide a view on Xoserve's thoughts relating to the UIG Taskforce reconciliation related investigations, FC responded by advising that reconciliation levels of 93-94% are a surprise, even though any re-reconciliation elements remain unknown at this time. However, forecasting when the final (actual) UIG figures would be available remains a challenge, especially as they represent (reflect) a case of 'diminishing returns'.

It was noted that the 28 January 2019 UIG Taskforce Workgroup meeting is expected to look to prioritise recommendations and unless the industry starts undertaking (some, if not all) of the recommendations, UIG is likely to stay around the 4% inwinter and -2% in summer levels observed to date.

CSEP Consumption (slide 21)

The information provided was taken as presented with no adverse comments being voiced.

Analysis Summary (slides 22 & 23)

It was noted that the various component parts (as outlined in the bullet points) for Issue 35 stem from a data related issue, whilst the analysis associated with Issue 37 remains ongoing into next year for what is hopefully just a temporary UIG issue.

It was then noted that both issues (39 and 49) are UIG Taskforce generated issues.

Summary of Methodology Changes (slide 24)

It was noted that the *'Proposed new approach to Theft Split'* would require further assessment, whilst the *'Volume Conversion Errors Resulting from Static CFs'* are already included within the calculation.

It is hoped that the *'Update of Consumption Methodology to Handle Post-Nexus Meter Read Data'* would have a minimal impact on figures.

Methodology Overview (slide 25)

The information provided was taken as presented with no adverse comments being voiced.

Total Unidentified Gas Estimation (slide 26)

The information provided was taken as presented with no adverse comments being voiced.

Forecast Unidentified Gas (slide 27)

The information provided was taken as presented with no adverse comments being voiced.

Forecast Unidentified Gas Components (GWh) (slide 28)

The information provided was taken as presented with no adverse comments being voiced.

Energy - Factors (slide 29)

The information provided was taken as presented with no adverse comments being voiced.

Population / Throughput Calculations (slides 30 & 31)

When asked, AG confirmed that the Product Class 4 split into both SMART and traditional meters is covered later in the presentation.

In examining the tabulated information, AG explained that the Non-Domestic information is comprised from a combination of sources (i.e. large suppliers and BEIS etc.).

When it was suggested that the underlying aim is to ensure that the information provided is as accurate as possible, GE pointed out that the information does not appear to take into account I&C installations and only part of the ICoSS data set. Responding, AG explained that is why there are both domestic and non-domestic graphs provided. Furthermore, for the purposes of the non-domestic graph, the AUGE have taken the 'Big 5' portfolio data and added the ICoSS data to that before extrapolating up from there.

Population Forecast by EUC and Product Class (slide 32)

The information provided was taken as presented with no adverse comments being voiced.

Throughput (AQ) Forecast by EUC and Product Class (slide 33)

When asked, FC confirmed that whilst it is correct to assume that the 09B information is all related to Product Class 1 sites, there are around a dozen (transient) Product Class 4 sites included as well, on the grounds that they have potential AQ aspects involved.

Shipperless / Unregistered Sites (slide 34)

The information provided was taken as presented with no adverse comments being voiced.

Shipperless / Unregistered Sites – Example Trend (slide 35)

It was noted that the information provided in the graph reflects the positive effects of the various UNC Modifications.

Shipperless / Unregistered Sites (slide 36)

The information provided was taken as presented with no adverse comments being voiced.

iGT CSEPs (slide 37)

AG explained that there is little change to the information as provided previously, other than the new data source needed aspects.

iGT CSEPs – Example Trend (slide 38)

The AUGE is actively looking for alternative data sources.

Consumer Meter Errors (slides 39 & 40)

AG explained that as far as the *'Under 1% of capacity – under read'* and *'Over 95% of capacity – over read'* points are concerned, the AUGE focused on population data to identify these.

Volume Conversion Errors (slide 41)

Information reflective of the fact that there are a huge number of meters operating within the band.

Shrinkage (slide 42)

When concerns were voiced relating to the fact that the Distribution Networks (DNs) had previously stated that they would continue basing their shrinkage predictions on a 'flat profile' due to the potential costs involved in changing to another approach, it was noted that the industry parties have no ability to challenge the Shrinkage Forum model and outcomes as it is a Transporter licence obligation – whilst this has been the subject of circular industry debate for some time now, it is perceived (by the industry) that rightly or wrongly, the Transporters view on Shrinkage is absolute.

It was noted that care is needed in considering an appropriate approach to resolving these concerns as previously there had been a potential breach of process insofar as a previous challenge was highlighted at a Shrinkage Forum meeting which was subsequently rejected at that meeting only to be re-raised at another forum in a vain attempt to progress the matter – this was wholly inappropriate.

It was suggested that as the RIIO II and Price Control discussions have opened, now might be an ideal time to re-approach the DNs (via the Shrinkage Forum) to seek a change in their views – to this end, if RK could attend the next Shrinkage Forum meeting scheduled to take place in either February or March 2019, and raise the issue, that would be potentially beneficial.

CW pointed out that the AUGE have previously been told (via a UNCC change) to keep out of the Shrinkage Factor and Forum discussions, on the grounds that it is a Transporter only shrinkage matter. When asked, CW confirmed that the AUGE could not substantiate the quoted University data – this potentially leads to a broader question around what the AUGE's future remit should encompass.

CSEP Shrinkage Calculation (slide 43)

CS pointed out that based on recent Shrinkage Forum discussions, nothing is expected to change in the forceable future.

Theft (slide 44)

The information provided was taken as presented with no adverse comments being voiced.

Theft Data (slide 45)

The information provided was taken as presented with no adverse comments being voiced.

Balancing Factor Split (slide 46)

Whilst the split is currently based on the old method, this might change going forward, subject to the feedback (if any) provided within consultation responses.

Unidentified Gas Factors (slides 47 & 48)

Focusing on the information provided within the table and specifically the EUC Band 3, Class 4 figure of 121.16, SM suggested that this was a surprising value given the difference in deployment of SMART and AMR compared to EUC Band 1 – in considering whether this infers that deployment of such equipment in EUC Band 1 is greater, AG responded by suggesting it does on the basis that the assessment relies on asset data that is provided to them (the AUGE). AG then went on to provide a brief explanation behind how the AUGE utilises flags and scaling in order to identify SMETS vs AMRs.

It was suggested that the differences between the results for EUC Bands 1 and 3 might also reflect the 'mandated' aspects alongside the asset data's potentially poor reporting of associated AMR information.

When it was suggested that there might be value in writing out to ICoSS to look to mandate the provision of AMR related data, AG pointed out that the new (SMETS) method of calculating should go a long way towards mitigating this issue.

Modifications & Industry Changes (slide 49)

CS pointed out that following consideration at the 17 January 2019 Panel meeting, UNC Request 0677R 'Shipper and Supplier Theft of Gas Reporting Arrangements' should also be added to the list.[2]

New Action AUG0102: *Reference Modification & Industry Changes Listing* – AUGE (AG) to ensure that any equivalent IGT Modifications are included on the UNC Modifications list.

[2] *Please note: a copy of UNC Request 0677R can be viewed and/or downloaded from the Joint Office web site at: https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0677*

Next Steps (slide 50)

CS pointed out that the consultation period actually closes on 21 January 2019 (and not 22 January 2019 as suggested) and thereafter the data would be sent to the AUGE on the 22nd.

CW then advised that the expectation is that the monthly update (and supporting notification) would be issued towards the end of January 2019, and then repeated again after the 15 February 2019 meeting.

3.0 Walkthrough of Draft AUG Statement and Table

Please refer to the discussions under item 2.0 above for more details.

4.0 Issues Status

Please refer to the discussions under item 2.0 above for more details.

5.0 Recommendations

Please refer to the discussions under item 2.0 above for more details.

6.0 Review of Outstanding Actions

AUG1001: Xoserve (FC) to liaise between the AUGE, PAFA and UIG Taskforce to arrange joint meetings for suitable information exchange.

Update: FC explained that a meeting between the various parties was undertaken on Wednesday 09 January 2019 and she expects to be in a position to provide a written summary in due course. **Closed**

AUG1002: Xoserve (FC) to raise the proposal of joint meetings with the AUGE, PAFA and UIG Taskforce in order to discuss the possibility of formalising a co-ordination process under the UNC.

Update: CS explained that the UIG Taskforce meeting on the 28 January 2019 would include representatives from the PAFA and AUGE and the output from the meeting should assist with co-ordinating supported recommendations. **Closed**

AUG1003: Xoserve (FC) to investigate if atmospheric pressure data analysis could be added into the scope of the UIG Taskforce proposals.

Update: FC confirmed that going forwards, atmospheric pressure data would be included within the standard conversion factors. **Closed**

AUG1004: Xoserve (FC) to organise a joint AUGE and UIG Taskforce meeting to discuss the weather sensitivity issue and share knowledge.

Update: FC advised that weather sensitivity related issues (and associated knowledge sharing) had been discussed at the joint meeting on 09 January 2019 (please see action AUG1010 update above for more details). **Closed**

AUG1005: Xoserve (FC) to write to the Transporters to request permission for the sharing of the derivation of LDZ gas temperatures for the period 1996-2000.

Update: FC advised that the Transporters had granted their permission to share the requested derivations and that thereafter the information was passed to the AUGE and utilised accordingly. **Closed**

AUG1006: AUGE to advise Gazprom (SM) on sample sizes required for the collection of temperatures from AMR devices.

Update: SM provided a brief background to why the initial temperature probe/sensor information was excluded from the AMR requirements. He went on to point out that as no one had provided feedback, the matter has not been progressed further. **Closed**

7.0 Any Other Business

None raised.

8.0 Next Steps

Parties in attendance supported the proposed next steps as outlined on page 50 of the *'AUG Technical Workgroup of UNCC – Proposed AUGS Walkthrough'* presentation, as follows:

- Consultation Period is open between 01 - 21 January 2019 (please note: data to be sent to the AUGE on 22 January 2019)
    - Parties to provide responses to AUG Expert as soon as practicably possible;
    - AUG Expert to provide written feedback to responses, and
    - Meeting to discuss feedback scheduled for 15 February 2019.
- AUG Expert to prepare Modified AUGS & Table by 05 March 2019
    - Table to be based on latest data wherever possible;
    - Including updated consumption calculations, and
    - Including Theft data.

9.0 Diary Planning

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

Workgroup meetings will take place as follows:

Time/Date	Venue	AUGS Statement
10:30 Friday 15 February 2019	Radcliffe House, Blenheim Court, Warwick Road, Solihull, B91 2AA	Detail planned agenda items. • Consideration of consultation responses and feedback • Consideration of AUG Expert responses

Action Table (as at 11 January 2019)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
1001	12/10/18	2.0	Xoserve (FC) to liaise between the AUGE, PAFA and UIG Taskforce to arrange joint meetings for suitable information exchange.	Xoserve (FC)	Update provided. **Closed**
1002	12/10/18	2.0	Xoserve (FC) to raise the proposal of joint meetings with the AUGE, PAFA and UIG Taskforce in order to discuss the possibility of formalising a co-ordination process under the UNC.	Xoserve (FC)	Update provided. **Closed**
1003	12/10/18	2.0	Xoserve (FC) to investigate if atmospheric pressure data analysis could be added into the scope of the UIG Taskforce proposals.	Xoserve (FC)	Update provided. **Closed**

Action Table (as at 11 January 2019)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
1004	12/10/18	2.0	Xoserve (FC) to organise a joint AUGE and UIG Taskforce meeting to discuss the weather sensitivity issue and share knowledge.	Xoserve (FC)	Update provided. **Closed**
1005	12/10/18	2.0	Xoserve (FC) to write to the Transporters to request permission for the sharing of the derivation of LDZ gas temperatures for the period 1996-2000.	Xoserve (FC)	Update provided. **Closed**
1006	12/10/18	2.0	AUGE to advise Gazprom (SM) on sample sizes required for the collection of temperatures from AMR devices.	AUGE	Update provided. **Closed**
0101	11/01/19	2.0	*Reference IGT CSEPs and SUIs* – Xoserve (FC) & AUGE (TP) to ensure that the UIG issues are considered and whether it reveals a new root cause that potentially impacts the UIG weighting.	Xoserve (FC) & AUGE (TP)	**Pending**
0102	11/01/19	2.0	*Reference Modification & Industry Changes Listing* – AUGE (AG) to ensure that any equivalent IGT Modifications are included on the UNC Modifications list.	AUGE (AG)	**Pending**