

**UNC Workgroup 0812R Minutes
Review of Alternative to “Must Read” Arrangements
Thursday 23 March 2023
via Microsoft Teams**

Attendees		
Rebecca Hailes (Chair)	(RH)	Joint Office
Helen Bennett (Secretary)	(HB)	Joint Office
Andy Clasper	(AC)	Cadent
Anne Jackson	(AJ)	Gemserv
Ben Mulcahy	(BM)	Northern Gas Networks
Charlotte Gilbert	(CG)	BU-UK
Clare Manning	(CM)	E.ON
David Mitchell	(DMi)	SGN
Fiona Cottam	(FC)	CDSP
Hursley Moss	(HM)	Cornwall Insight
John R Harris	(JR)	CDSP
Kathryn Adeseye	(KA)	CDSP
Lee Greenwood	(LG)	British Gas
Martin Attwood	(MA)	CDSP
Oorlagh Chapman	(OC)	Centrica
Richard Pomroy	(RP)	Wales & West Utilities
Sally Hardman	(SH)	SGN
Tom Stuart	(TSt)	Wales & West Utilities
Apologies		
David Addison	(DA)	CDSP
Ellie Rogers	(ER)	CDSP

The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 21 September 2023.

Please note these minutes do not replicate/include detailed content provided within the presentation slides, therefore it is recommended that the published presentation material is reviewed in conjunction with these minutes. Copies of all papers are available at: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0812/230323

1.0 Introduction and Status Review

1.1. Approval of Minutes (23 February 2023)

The minutes from the meeting held on 23 February 2023 were approved.

1.2. Approval of Late Papers

There were no late papers.

1.3. Review of Outstanding Actions

Action 0903: Workgroup Chair (RH/EF) to ask PAC for evidence on the effectiveness of must-reads and the effectiveness on settlement accuracy: (Is there a benefit or value in the must-read service)

- If must-reads are successfully used, to what extent do they mitigate settlement risk?
- Are Transporters the appropriate party to provide the service?
- If they are not, who should provide the service

Update: The Chair of the Performance Assurance Committee (PAC) has provided the following response:

Question	PAC Response
Is there a benefit or value in the must-read service?	It is difficult to tell as PAC does not know how much of a deterrent the Must Read service is. If it was stopped, PAC would not know whether shippers would stop submitting reads as there would be no consequence.
If must-reads are successfully used, to what extent do they mitigate settlement risk?	Based on the numbers shared by Ellie Rogers (Xoserve data) it looks very low but again, PAC does not know whether the Must Read service is good at encouraging read submission.
Are Transporters the appropriate party to provide the service?	PAC agreed that Transporters are not the appropriate party as they have 'no skin in the game'.
If they are not, who should provide the service?	PAC being responsible [for the service] was discussed but this would have to be a service offered through the CDSP and the costs of providing that service are unknown. PAC did discuss a 'user pays' principle.
There are c47k meter reads that are failing validation: Does the c47k create a risk to Settlement?	Yes, any time we do not have a read it affects settlement. PAC did assume that these were 47k Must Reads so no other reads had been submitted.
Do the Failures (c47k) have any adverse impact on settlement?	Yes, same as above.
<p>PAC also discussed current read performance, which is poor and therefore ceasing the Must Read service entirely would detrimentally impact settlement.</p> <p>Modification 0664VVS – Transfer of Sites with Low Valid Meter Reading Submission Performance from Classes 2 and 3 into Class 4, was mentioned and it was generally believed that it will improve the read situation.</p> <p>CDSP also took away an action to look at how many Must Reads were initially raised that ended up delivering 57K successful Must Reads.</p>	

Based on the information provided by PAC, Richard Pomroy (RP) noted that out of the following options, Option 3 of the Scope appears to be the way forward for this Modification.

1. How is the Shipper held accountable in the event of a failure to meet their meter reading obligations:
 - a. is this left to the Performance Assurance Committee to action as they see fit; or
 - b. should there be a specific reference to the Performance Assurance Committee in case of breach (or would this be giving too much emphasis to this issue?);
2. Should there be some formal remedy mechanism in the UNC with which Shippers have to comply should a breach occur?
 - a. no arrangement required as PAC will address the breach (1 above); or
 - b. an obligation to make a special visit to obtain a read and whether there needs to be an ancillary document or subsidiary document supporting this obligation; or
3. **Some other arrangements such as central provision either mandated by the Code or at the discretion of PAC (however we need to ensure that any possible central provision does not affect any party's ability to offer a commercial meter reading service).**

Martin Attwood (MA) and Lee Greenwood (LG) agreed that Option 3 is the one that should be taken forward for this Request.

It was noted that if there was a central service, the PAC would not be able to contract as they are not a legal entity, therefore a central Must Read service would need to be procured via CDSP which could be automatically triggered on the same basis that the Transporter process is currently triggered, or if a Shipper is not performing.

MA clarified that Must Reads are triggered, depending on a site meter read frequency, for example, a monthly read site would trigger the Must Read process if a read has not been obtained by the end of month 4. The trigger occurs slightly before the window for the read is closed so MA noted that once a Must Read is generated if a meter read is submitted the following day, that process is not joined up at the moment and the requirement for the must-read is not overwritten automatically but currently sits in a backlog and CDSP are looking at automating this check as part of the CMS rebuild.

RP advised that he is trying to keep the scope of the review constrained and wanted to keep the following issues out of this review:

- Access issues,
- Incorrect addresses, and
- Reads failing validation.

LG noted that AMR and SMETs 1&2 sites do not enter the Must Read process as Code states these are at the discretion of the Transporter. There is an IGT Modification, (IGT159), that is currently in flight to enshrine that detail into the IGT UNC.

Fiona Cottam (FC) provided the following Code detail:

*M5.10.1 Subject to paragraphs 5.10.5 and 5.10.6, paragraph 5.10.2 shall apply in relation to a Class 2, 3 or 4 Supply Meter where, at the end of any calendar month, a Valid Meter Reading has not been submitted with a Read Date within: (a) except as provided in paragraph (b), the **preceding 4 months**; (b) in the case of a Class 4 Annual Read Supply Meter, the **preceding 24 months**.*

Charlotte Gilbert (CG) provided a link to XRN5036 – Updates to Must Read process: www.xoserve.com/change/customer-change-register/xrn-5036-updates-to-must-read-process/

Summary

Following the implementation of Modification 0692 – Automatic updates to the Meter Read Frequency, there will be an increase in the volume of must read Contacts generated including where a site has a Smart Meter or Advanced metering equipment in situ. These sites should have remote reading capability and therefore should not rely on the must read process. To ensure that the must read process is fit for purpose, the criteria should be updated to generate must read Contacts for required sites only.

Action 0903 Closed.

New Action 0301: Proposer (RP) to provide more detail around Option 3 and consider service level agreements as in IGT159, what detail would need to go into Code?

New Action 0302: Joint Office (RH) to update the Workgroup Report where the PAC response was considered, and Workgroup briefly discussed that Option 3 is the only viable option to take forward.

Action 0201: Joint Office to approach PAC for a view on the potential impact on Settlement that the removal of the Must Read process would have.

Update: See PAC response provided as part of Action 0903. **Closed**

2.0 Amended Modification

The Request had not been amended.

3.0 Issues and Questions from Panel

3.1. Does the process utilised in the IGT UNC work as an alternative arrangement?

This will be considered at a future Workgroup meeting.

4.0 Development of Workgroup Report

This will commence at a future Workgroup meeting.

5.0 Next Steps

RH confirmed the next steps:

- RP will provide a possible solution for Workgroup to consider.
- The CDSP analysis that is going to be presented to PAC in April is to be provided to this Workgroup on 27 April 2023.
- Cost and allocation of change funding to be considered.

6.0 Any Other Business

None.

7.0 Diary Planning

Workgroup meetings will take place as follows:

Time / Date	Paper Publication Deadline	Venue	Programme
Wednesday 10:00 03 May 2023	5 pm 24 April 2023	Microsoft Teams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider possible solutions for Option 3. • Consider the CDSP analysis presented to PAC. • Considered Cost and Allocation of change funding.

Action Table (as of 23 March 2023)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
0903	22/09/22	2.0	Workgroup Chair (RH/EF) to ask PAC for evidence on the effectiveness of must-reads and the effectiveness on settlement accuracy: (Is there a benefit or value in the must-read service) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If must-reads are successfully used, to what extent do they mitigate settlement risk? 	Workgroup Chair (RH/EF)	Closed

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are Transporters the appropriate party to provide the service? If they are not, who should provide the service? 		
0201	23/02/23	1.3	Joint Office to approach PAC for a view on the potential impact on Settlement that the removal of the Must Read process would have	Joint Office	Closed
0301	23/03/23	1.3	Proposer (RP) to provide a possible solution for Option 3.	Proposer (RP)	Pending
0302	23/03/23	1.3	Joint Office (RH) to update the Workgroup Report where the PAC response was considered, and Workgroup briefly discussed that Option 3 is the only viable option to take forward.	Joint Office (RH)	Pending