

UNC Performance Assurance Committee Minutes

Tuesday 18 July 2023

via Microsoft Teams

Attendees

| | | |
|-----------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Kate Elleman (Chair) | (KE) | Joint Office |
| Mike Berrisford (Secretary) | (MiB) | Joint Office |

Shipper Members (Voting)

| | | |
|-----------------------|-------|--------------------------------------|
| Alison Wiggett | (AW) | Corona Energy |
| Andy Knowles | (AK) | Utilita Energy |
| Claire Louise Roberts | (CLR) | ScottishPower |
| Graeme Cunningham | (GC) | Centrica |
| Louise Hellyer | (LH) | Totalenergies Gas & Power |
| Paul Murphy | (PM) | ESB Generation & Trading (Alternate) |
| Sallyann Blackett | (SB) | E.ON |
| Steve Mulinganie | (SM) | SEFE Energy Ltd |

Transporter Members (Voting)

| | | |
|-----------------|------|-----------------------------------|
| Jenny Rawlinson | (JR) | BU UK (10:30 onwards) |
| Sally Hardman | (SH) | SGN |
| Tom Stuart | (TS) | Northern Gas Networks (Alternate) |

Observers (Non-Voting)

| | | |
|------------------|------|---------------------------------|
| Anne Jackson | (AJ) | PAFA/Gemserv |
| Deborah Sherlock | (DS) | CDSP – <i>for item 3.1 only</i> |
| Ellie Rogers | (ER) | CDSP |
| Fiona Cottam | (FC) | CDSP |
| Helen Bevan | (HB) | PAFA/Gemserv |
| Neil Cole | (NC) | CDSP |
| Peter Ratledge | (PR) | PAFA/Gemserv |
| Rachel Clarke | (RC) | PAFA/Gemserv |

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.

Please note these minutes do not replicate 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 papers are available at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/PAC/180723>

1. Introduction

Kate Elleman (KE) welcomed all parties to the meeting noting that Deborah Sherlock from the CDSP would be in attendance (*to cover off item 3.1*), as per previous PAC agreement.

KE went on to remind parties that items on the shortened meeting agenda would be considered on a '*by exception*' basis for the main part.

It was then noted that some PAC Members would be temporarily dialling off the meeting at around 09:30, in order to participate in a P1 solution issues (inc. settlement aspects) meeting, before rejoining as soon as possible thereafter.

1.1 Apologies for absence

Anthony Diccio, Shipper Member

Tracey Saunders, Transporter Member

1.2 Note of Alternates

Paul Murphy for Anthony Dicicco

Tom Stuart for Tracey Saunders

1.3 Quoracy Status

The Committee meeting was confirmed as being quorate.

1.4 Approval of Minutes (13 June 2023)

A Jackson (AJ) sought clarification on what would be expected of the PAFA in respect of drafting the *'Ofgem Active Interests Communication Letter'* PAC Members noted that the request relates to the potential impacts of Ofgem's statutory rights to request information and how they would be granted access to this via the GPAP portal - in short, the letter is intended to advise ALL industry parties of this fact.

When concerns were voiced that due to a lack of Ofgem attendance at PAC meetings, Ofgem could lack the 'background context' on important matters, AJ advised that the PAFA would look to liaise with Ofgem as and when required to ensure that they (Ofgem) obtain a better understanding on any GPAP information they may access.

S Mulinganie (SM) suggested that it may be beneficial to clearly advise Ofgem of any potential limitations around what they can or cannot do with the information (in-line with PAC Members Terms of Reference and Confidentiality Agreement requirements etc.).

AJ advised that she would now look to prepare a draft letter for consideration at the August 2023 PAC meeting.

The minutes from the previous meetings were approved.

1.5 Approval of Late Papers

None to consider.

1.6 Review of Outstanding Actions

PAC0601: *Reference Request for Information (RFI) Analysis – PC3 & PC4 Meter Reading Submission* – CDSP (FC) and PAFA (AJ) to consider refining the provided information and how best to incorporate this into suitable training materials.

Update: In referring the previous discussions undertaken at the June 2023 meeting, P Ratledge (PR) provided a brief recap on the background to RFI's and the various learning opportunities at which point F Cottam (FC) suggested that there might be potential training requirements going forward.

PAC Members in attendance agreed to carry forward the action with an update due at the 12 September 2023 meeting. **Carried Forward**

PAC0602: *Reference Performance Assurance Techniques (PATs)* – Joint Office (KE) to investigate potential Code and PAFD interactions along with potential UNCC referral requirements.

Update: KE apologised and explained that she had been unable to progress the resolution of this outstanding action, PAC Members in attendance agreed to carry forward the action with an update due at the 15 August 2023 meeting. **Carried Forward**

PAC0603: *Reference the PAFD v5.1 changes* – CDSP (ER) and PAFA (AJ) to consider when to implement the changes and provide an update at the July 2023 meeting.

Update: In noting that multiple UNC Modifications have the potential to impact upon the PARR reports (as per agenda item 4.1 below), E Rogers (ER) also pointed out that the ‘go live’ timings for implemented Modifications can also have a direct impact upon the PAFD.

ER reminded parties that PARR updates are presented to the PAC for approval after which, should they be approved, they are forwarded to the Joint Office for publication and where appropriate this is aligned with any associated Modification ‘go live’ dates.

A Jackson (AJ) suggested that perhaps the current approach whereby the PARR Reports are appended within the PAFD could be changed and each document managed as a separate entity on the grounds that amendments to the main PAFD are ‘normally’ completed in a phased manner whereas amendments to the PARR Reports tend to be a more dynamic affair. PAC Members agreed to consider a more holistic approach to releasing PAFD and PARR releases at the August meeting.

AJ also noted that this matter potentially links in with the consideration of the PAFA Contract Extension discussions, FC wondered where that left PAC in respect of the latest round of PARR Report updates. Responding KE suggested that in terms of the PARR Report updates it should be ‘business as usual’ whilst consideration of the more holistic approach aspects could / should be undertaken in due course.

PAC Members agreed the action could now be closed. **Closed**

2. Monthly Performance Assurance Review Items

2.1 PARR Report Review – Shipper Performance Analysis (*by exception only*)

Pete Ratledge (PR) referred to the PAFA Dashboard and the ‘*Shipper Performance Analysis*’ presentation, which is made available ahead of the meeting, and confirmed that there was nothing to report on an exceptions basis.

PAFA supplied the following observations for this section:

SHIPPER PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

- **UNC MOD 0654S – NDM Sample Data Analysis:**

PAFA provided an update regarding the NDM Sample Data Analysis.

Following the implementation of UNC Modification 0654S – Mandating the provision of NDM Sample Data, on 1st March 2019, Shipper parties with portfolios of over 25,000 Supply Points (SPs) are obligated to provide the CDSP with daily sample data for PC3 and PC4 in April and October of each calendar year.

PAFA highlighted that there has been a notable drop in submission performance since April 2022 with 8 Shipper parties having made no file submissions in April 2023. PAFA recommended that these Shipper parties are contacted via formal PAC letter to request acknowledgement that a required data submission will be made in October 2023. PAC voted in favour of a letter to be issued.

- **Stranded Supply Points:**

The CDSP confirmed that its Customer Experience team is currently dealing with these sites and affected parties, with the largest affected party looking to get set up with a supplier in July 2023.

- **Performance Plans – Exit Criteria:**

PAFA presented an update on Ceasing Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs) and looked at considerations and options for when a Party should come off a PIP. Discussions were undertaken by PAC on the strategic considerations and the challenges presented. A decision was made for parties to review the presentation material and consider any further options for discussion at the August PAC meeting.

| Vote: Reference UNC Modification 0654S Provisions - Issue Formal PAC Letters to Shipper Parties Requesting Acknowledgement that a Required Data Submission will be made in October 2023 | | |
|--|---------------------|--------------------|
| Shipper Representatives | Voting Count | For/Against |
| Alison Wiggett | 1 | For |
| Andy Knowles | 1 | For |
| Claire Louise Roberts | - | Not present |
| Graeme Cunningham | 1 | For |
| Louise Hellyer | - | Not present |
| Paul Murphy | - | Not present |
| Sallyann Blackett | 1 | For |
| Steve Mulinganie | - | Not present |
| Total | 4 | For |
| Transporters Representatives | Voting Count | For/Against |
| Jenny Rawlinson | - | Not present |
| Sally Hardman | 1 | For |
| Tom Stuart | 1 | For |
| Total | 2 | For |
| Voting Outcome: Unanimous vote to issue letters to Shippers | | |

2.1.1. Stranded Supply Points - Monitor

KE advised that whilst there was no specific update for this meeting the subject matter had been touched upon during consideration of item 2.1 above and would remain as a ‘standing’ agenda item going forward.

2.1.2. RFI Update – Product Classes 3 & 4

AJ advised that the PAFA is looking to undertake some banding analysis based on RFI grading with a view to providing an update at the 15 August 2023 PAC meeting.

2.1.3. Performance Plans – Entry / Exit Criteria

AJ provided an overview of the ‘*Ceasing Performance Improvement Plans (PIPS)*’ presentation (focusing on Exit aspects only) during which the key points were noted (by exception) as follows:

Considerations – slide 3

AJ pointed out that PAC are currently unable to apply financial penalties on parties.

Options Considered – slide 4

AJ reminded those in attendance that parties who only meet 4 of the 5 metrics on the Holistic Matrix are NOT meeting their UNC performance requirements.

In respect of predicting future performance plan progression, assessment will be based around a trajectory style indicator.

PAC Member Input – slide 5

AJ noted that the statements numbered 1 and 2 'link in' with the final bullet point statement on the preceding slide 4.

In considering the utilisation of a 'holding mechanism' for disputed PAT / Plans, KE pointed out that this technique had been utilised by the PAC recently and had worked well. When AJ wondered whether there would be benefit in formalising the process and including it within the PAFD going forward, KE suggested that PAC could look at the levels of disputes and how best to interpret these.

FC went on to suggest that perhaps it would be beneficial to have a separate '*Disputes Section*' within the PAFD as currently this resides under the '*PAC Processes and Techniques*' banner which is confusing.

Noting the comments being put forward, KE suggested that perhaps there would be benefit in conducting a separate Workshop to review PATs at some point in the future.

PAC Member Input Cont. – slide 6

When KE noted that any continuous improvements link into PACs overall ambition to observe industry wide performance improvements, AJ reminded everyone in attendance that this might still not result in poorer performing parties actually reaching their UNC performance target requirements.

Further Areas of Consideration – slide 7

KE suggested that the information provided within the presentation raises some interesting points (especially in relation to culture and potential cost benefits etc.), some questioned whether PAC are really making a difference. Responding, S Blackett (SB) indicated that she believes that PAC are making a positive difference as can be demonstrated by (Shipper) performance improvements witnessed in recent times.

PR suggested that smaller industry parties might struggle to financially support their proposed performance improvements, SB observed that should that be the case, they (the parties concerned) should not have signed up to the Uniform Network Code (UNC) and in turn, this exposes weaknesses in Ofgem's approvals process for new signatories.

When P Murphy (PM) suggested that these matters also relate to performance reporting and basic Shipper performance criteria aspects, KE noted that the equivalent Electricity market already utilises financial penalties and that perhaps it would be beneficial for the Gas sector to also consider adopting something similar.

S Mulinganie (SM) observed that whilst the electricity approach is more visible, he still has doubts around whether it makes a significant difference. He also warned that should PAC advocate adopting a financial penalty based model, they (the PAC) would need to ensure that they are squeaky clean in order to avoid incurring criticism.

A Knowles (AK) indicated that whilst he believes that PATs are fine and that PAC achieve small gains, they lack wider market penetration.

It was agreed to reconsider whether there would be value in undertaking PAT Workshops (to consider matters such as disputes, PIP suspension process and cost benefit assessments (inc. counter arguments)) at the August 2023 PAC meeting – as a forerunner, PAC Members are asked to consider the information presented within the presentation and feed back any views / comments back at the August meeting ahead of consideration of the Entry requirements at the same meeting.

New Action PAC0702: *Reference Performance Plans – Entry / Exit Criteria* – All PAC Members to consider that information provided in the presentation and provide any views / comments back at the August meeting ahead of consideration of the Entry requirements at the same meeting.

2.2 Risk & Issues Register Update (*by exception only*)

Peter Ratledge (PR) provided a brief overview of the June 2023 Risk update explaining that there was nothing to report on an exceptions basis.

PAFA supplied the following observations for this section:

- Performance Assurance Committee (PAC) members were advised that due to a change in the meeting times the Risks and Issues Register Update agenda item was by exception for this month. As there were no significant issues to highlight no updates were provided, however, the presentation is available for review here.
- The presentation highlights seven risks for July 2023:
 - **No Meter Recorded**
 - 33% increase in Value at Risk across 2022-23 due to the increasing volume of SPs with no meter recorded.
 - The Risk Rating in the register is 2 (lower priority).
 - The CDSP are proactively working with Shipper parties whereby dataflows are being submitted and no meter is recorded.
 - **Incorrect Read Factor**
 - 34% increase in Value at Risk across 2022-23 due to the increasing volume of SPs with an associated Incorrect Read Factor.
 - The Risk Rating in the register is 3 (medium priority).
 - PAFA would advise Shipper parties to review instances with a view to taking remedial action.
 - **Meter Asset (Combined)**
 - 33% increase in Value at Risk across 2022-23 – Combining both risks of ‘No Meter Recorded’ and ‘Incorrect Read Factor’ has resulted in an increase.
 - The Risk Rating in the register is 3 (medium priority).
 - **NDM Sites at DM Threshold**
 - 8% increase in Value at Risk across 2022-23 due to an increase in the average number of SPs in both ‘Met’ and ‘Not Met’ categories and an increase in the average associated AQ across categories.
 - The Risk Rating in the register is 4 (High Priority).

- **PC1 Reads**
 - 35% decrease in Value at Risk across 2022-23 due to an increase in Read Performance and number of sites and a decrease in the average AQ.
 - The Risk Rating in the register is 5 (highest priority).
- **PC2 Reads**
 - 32% decrease in Value at Risk across 2022-23 due to an increase in Read Performance and number of sites and a decrease in the average AQ.
 - The Risk Rating in the register is 4 (high priority).
- **Smart Meter Exchanges**
 - 5% increase in Value at Risk across 2022-23 due to a slight increase in terms of the average number of exchanges within the reporting period.
 - The Risk Rating in the register is 1 (lowest priority).

Any questions/feedback on the content of the slides presented, please email PAFA@gemserv.com.

2.3 Transporter Performance Monitoring (*by exception only*)

KE suggested that there was nothing to report on by exception in relation to this agenda item, PR advised that other than offline email discussions, he also had nothing new to add.

It was agreed that PAFA (PR) and the JO (KE) would discuss the Measurement Error Reporting (MER) process offline.

3. Matters for Committee Attention

3.1 PAFA Contract Extension Discussion

KE provided a brief introduction before handing over to D Sherlock (DS) to provide an overview of the 'PAFA renewal 2024/25 0674V PAFD' presentation.

Opening discussions, DS requested that any PAFA Representatives present should dial off the meeting whilst confidential discussions are undertaken, and they are then subsequently requested to rejoin the meeting at a later point.

** PAFA Representatives left the room **

PAC Members reviewed the information provided within the presentation during which the following salient points were noted (by exception), as follows:

Required changes from PAFD relating to 0674V – slide 2

- PAFD reference (7.1 & 7.2) noted.

PAFA will Champion UNC Modifications on behalf of PAC – slide 3

- Due to contractual requirements actual costs cannot be provided, only a 'range' of costs available;
 - The slide indicates that the PAFA have not been able to provide costs on the grounds that they are unclear as to what is required;
 - Alternative parties might also struggle to identify and provide costs;

- Currently the PAFA do not provide a 'Champion' based function (i.e. direct involvement in driving Modifications forward and fulfilling such a role on behalf of PAC);
- PAC believes that provision of a form of indicative costings would be beneficial;
 - If further clarification could be provided, it is expected that the PAFA could / would be able to provide indicative costings, and
- Care needed to potentially avoid creating a 2-tiered contract arrangement;
- PAC supports finding a 'sponsor' to raise new UNC Modifications to look at Modifications that affect settlement risk and thereafter request that the PAFA champion it as a service offering;
 - Costs to complete this task to be requested from the PAFA even if there are question marks over the level of detail at this time, and
 - PAC believes this is a 'cradle to grave' process for championing a Modification.

PAFA will update the PAFD as required – slide 4

- Consensus support for Xoserve / CDSP updating the PARR Reports and the PAFA updating the PAFD, and
 - PAC noted and indicated that they would be comfortable with the additional costs associated with the proposed approach.

Liaison with Industry Parties – slide 5

- Discussions with the PAFA (Gemserv) on costing aspects have taken place with the Xoserve / CDSP seeking a 'fixed cost' based assessment, and
 - The slides indicate that the PAFA have not retained historical costing data and might struggle to provide a fixed cost assessment.

Current costs for PIP's raised and invoiced for since 2021 – slide 6

- Perceived lack of evidence around the outcome of plans (i.e. individual Shipper tracking of read performance improvements etc.) remains a concern, and
- Administration cost information is seen as beneficial although a mechanism to assess cost v's benefits.

RFI – slide 7

- Whilst not part of 0674V provisions, this information is provided for information purposes;
- A variation request will be needed to include the additional (RFI related) costs as this is not currently part of the contract 'core services';
 - PAC Members challenged this on the grounds they perceive this to be part of 'business as usual' processes;
 - The costs of previous PAFA RFI work have been absorbed by the PAFA;
 - PAC believe that care is needed to avoid the PAFA charging for each and every future RFI as these are fundamentally seen as 'core service' provisions;

- Questions were asked as to whether 0674V provisions had significantly changed what is being asked of the PAFA;
 - Some parties wondered how much would an equivalent provision from the CDSP actually cost?;
 - Concerns voiced that extreme care would be needed in approaching a change in the information provision (i.e. Correla / CDSP expanding its current role) as this is a commercial service arrangement;
- It was pointed out that 'RFI' is not a term defined within the PAFD, but is referred to under Section 7 liaison with parties;
 - Concerns remained around a perceived 'imbalance' between core and RFI service provisions;
 - It was pointed out that RFI is more than simply writing out to parties and includes aspects such as invoicing, collation and assessment of information etc., which the PAFA believes goes beyond core contract provisions, and
- It was noted that apart from RFI the information examined so far could / would form part of a new Tender Core Contract Scope.

Next steps – slide 8

- Referring to bullet 4, it was noted that the PAC now owns the PAFD;
- Referring to bullet points 1 and 2, it was noted that the difference between the two relates to the PAFA role or attending or championing Modifications;
- Some PAC Members felt unable to support bullet 2 proposals as it 'feels' like an evolution of the current contract whereby the PAFA would be able to charge for what they perceive to be additional (RFI) service provisions;
- It was noted that if PAC declines to extend the current PAFA contract (for a final year) then any new Tender would include 0674V and RFI service provision requirements;
 - If the 'core service' requirements are defined better, the result could be an improved service provision;
 - Current PAFA (Gemserv) contract would end circa 03 July 2024 if not extended;
 - Parties are asked to note that if the existing PAFA contract is not extended then a replacement for the GPAP portal would be needed;
- Further clarification from the PAFA on its view of the RFI question could result in the PAC being better informed regardless of whether it opts to extend the current contract or invoke a new tender;
 - It was agreed that PAC should communicate its concerns surrounding RFI proposals (and potential additional cost going forward) to the PAFA making it clear that PAC could always decline to extend the current contract, and seek a response;
 - It was debated whether a 2 week (PAFA) response window would be appropriate;

- It was noted that should PAC opt to invoke a new tender process this runs the risk of having no GPAP portal until such a time as a new PAFA is installed, although the CDSP could provide an 'interim' information provision, if required;
- It was noted that care would be needed to avoid potentially 'timing out', even though PAC recognises that it would potentially struggle to make an informed decision one way or another at this meeting;
- DS to look to commence work on scoping out any potential new tender requirements in case these are subsequently needed;
- It was noted that the Procurement Process Guidance specifies a 12 month timeline normally, which means we are already eating into that window as of 03 July 2023;
- PAC are asked to note that if the existing PAFA contract is renewed this would exclude any 0674V provisions and therefore a potential contract variation would be required to include these;
 - Care would be needed when trying to retrofit 0674V provisions into the existing PAFA contract;
- PAC Members supported the establishment of an Extraordinary PAC meeting for Monday 24 July 2023 in order to make a decision on whether to extend the current PAFA Contract or invoke a New Tender Process (*please refer to item 7 discussions later in the meeting for more details*);
 - PAC are seeking a view from the PAFA on two areas of contention, namely provide a view on RFI provision including the core services v's additional cost argument (referring to PAFD 7.1 and 7.2) and provide a cost for providing a UNC Modification 'Champion' style support provision (a role similar in context to that undertaken by ICoSS), and
 - A response on the two areas of contention to be provided by the PAFA no later than close of play on Friday 21 July 2023.

** PAFA Representatives re-entered the room **

In welcoming back the PAFA Representatives to the meeting, KE provided a summary of the discussions undertaken in their absence and requested that the PAFA provides the following information by close of play on Friday 21 July 2023:

1. Costings for the provision of a 'Champion' Modification Service provision (similar in style to the one provided by ICoSS), including 'birth to death' process support, and
2. Referencing the PAFD (Sections 7.1 and 7.2), PAFA to provide an explanation as to why they believe that providing RFI's incur additional costs over and above their 'core service' provision.

Responding to the request, AJ explained that as far as item 1 is concerned she believes that the PAFA was not asked to provide this information as they were only ever asked to provide Phase 1 related information and costings – however, she would be happy to provide as requested.

Moving on to the issue of item 2, AJ indicated that if it is deemed that RFIs do in fact fall under PAFD 7.2 provisions, the PAFA would welcome more clarity around this matter as Gemserv believe that the 'original' scope (did not include plans and report writing etc.) of the contract has now changed (expanded) with the inclusion of provisions associated with UNC Modification 0674V. She asked parties to note that the fixed costs for providing the PAFA service were based on the original PAFD and these did not include the additional 0674V requirements – the PAFA is now working at risk regarding some service provision aspects.

AJ went on to indicate that she would look to define what 'liaison' means to the PAFA (Gemserv) and clarify how 0674V had impacted upon this, and therefore 'triggered' the additional RFI requirements and associated costs.

R Clarke (RC) indicated that from a PAFA (Gemserv) perspective a 'time and materials' (with a capped timeline and cost) approach would be preferable.

When asked whether the PAC would require a PAFA Representative to attend the Extraordinary PAC meeting scheduled for Monday 24 July 2023, PAC Members responded by suggesting that that might not be necessary but having a representative 'on standby' ready to respond to any additional questions that might come out of the meeting would be helpful.

SM confirmed that the primary aim of the meeting would be to undertake a vote to either extend the current PAFA Contract for a (final) year, or invoke a new Tender Process. AJ explained that the discussions and questions she has previously been asked have related to 0674V provisions being part of the extended 2024/25 contractual arrangements (i.e. additions to the existing contract). In noting the points, SM reiterated that from a PAC perspective the key principle for extending the current contract arrangements are championing Modifications and resolution of the RFI issue, as he believes the consequence of ongoing contractual discussions are beyond this requirement.

AJ confirmed that she would be answering the PAC request based on the contract 'as now'.

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

4.1 Draft PARR Report for IGT Modification 159V Changes

Introducing this item, ER provided a quick overview of the rationale behind the proposed changes citing previous discussions where the Change of Shipper (CoS) matter left parties uncomfortable (from an under-performing perspective) – in short, do we need to retain the Change of Shipper (tables) information as it has no impact on actual Shipper performance.

When asked, ER was unable to clarify why the IGT159V Workgroup had considered the matter to be an issue in the first instance. When it was suggested that it might have something to do with the (reasonable) pause period that can occur at the CoS stage, FC explained that whilst the pause reflected process constraints it is not something that Suppliers have any control over and furthermore, it is not really a PAC monitoring matter anyway.

When asked whether the proposal to exclude Change of Supplier from the IGT Must Read reporting means that the CDSP is suggesting that those events would not trigger a pause to the Must Read process, as set out in IGT UNC 159, FC responded by explaining that it does not change any of the underlying business rules. FC clarified that the business rule 'pause' would continue to exist in practice, it is simply that the PARR Report would not show it. KE questioned that if the information does not 'drive' PAC to consider something then is it needed?

PAC Members in attendance were then requested to undertake a vote to approve the exclusion of the *'IGT sites which have changed Shipper where the must read trigger has been delayed (for 80 SPSBDs since the Change of Shipper – including where there is a SoLR change)'* tables from the PARR Report once IGT Modification 159V is implemented.

| Vote: Approval to exclude the <i>'IGT sites which have changed Shipper where the must read trigger has been delayed (for 80 SPSBDs since the Change of Shipper – including where there is a SoLR change)'</i> tables from the PARR Report once IGT Modification 159V is implemented | | |
|--|---------------------|--------------------|
| Shipper Representatives | Voting Count | For/Against |
| Alison Wiggett | 1 | For |
| Andy Knowles | 1 | For |
| Claire Louise Roberts | 1 | For |
| Graeme Cunningham | 1 | For |
| Louise Hellyer | 1 | For |
| Paul Murphy | 1 | For |
| Sallyann Blackett | 1 | For |
| Steve Mulinganie | 1 | For |
| Total | 8 | For |
| Transporters Representatives | Voting Count | For/Against |
| Jenny Rawlinson | 1 | For |
| Sally Hardman | 1 | For |
| Tom Stuart | 1 | For |
| Total | 3 | For |
| Voting Outcome: Unanimous to approve exclusion of the tables from the PARR Report | | |

4.2 0812R – Question from Distribution Workgroup

KE explained that following consideration at the March 2023 meeting she had provided PAC feedback to the Review Group Chairperson on the question(s) it had asked PAC to consider (i.e. Must Read process), as per Action PAC0306.

Since providing the information the Review Group Chairperson has challenged the information provided citing a misalignment between the PAC meeting minutes and the email that KE had provided to them.

In considering the content of the original email response provided to the Review Group Chairperson regarding whether Transporters are the appropriate party to provide the Must Read service, some PAC Members questioned whether the matter falls under the PAC role in the first instance and that we should now respond to the Review Group stating as such.

It was also pointed out that this proposed PAC position on the matter is not a 'die in a ditch' moment for PAC, as the matter will be discussed again in more detail once a formal UNC Modification is raised.

Concluding discussions, KE advised that she would now look to follow up the initial response to the Review Group Chairperson and outline PAC’s current position – this position being that the Performance Assurance Committee does not believe they have the vires to answer this question.

4.3 0851R – Request for PAFA to attend DWG

KE explained that the Distribution Workgroup have requested that the PAFA formally attends the Review Group meetings on behalf of the PAC to help to contribute to, and support, the development of this new Review Group Report.

PAC Members in attendance were then requested to undertake a vote to approve the PAFA attending the 0851R Review Group- meetings on behalf of the PAC.

| Vote: Approval to Request that the PAFA Attends the 0851R Review Group Meetings on behalf of the PAC | | |
|---|---------------------|--------------------|
| Shipper Representatives | Voting Count | For/Against |
| Alison Wiggett | 1 | For |
| Andy Knowles | 1 | For |
| Claire Louise Roberts | 1 | For |
| Graeme Cunningham | 1 | For |
| Louise Hellyer | 1 | For |
| Paul Murphy | 1 | For |
| Sallyann Blackett | 1 | For |
| Steve Mulinganie | 1 | For |
| Total | 8 | For |
| Transporters Representatives | Voting Count | For/Against |
| Jenny Rawlinson | 1 | For |
| Sally Hardman | 1 | For |
| Tom Stuart | - | Not present |
| Total | 2 | For |
| Voting Outcome: Unanimous to approve the PAFA attending the 0851R Review Workgroups on behalf of the PAC | | |

5. Any Other Business

5.1 PAFA Workshop

PR explained that the PAFA had received a number of requests from Shipper parties seeking further clarity around the PARR data and holistic matrix aspects, and as such the PAFA are proposing to conduct some Workshops to facilitate the information exchange – PAC approval to host the Workshops is required.

PR went on to explain that there would be no additional costs involved as it is proposing that the Workshops are hosted virtually via the Teams platform sometime in September 2023.

When asked PAC Members indicated that they believe there would be value in hosting the Workshops and support the proposed Teams based approach as it would support the broader learning aspects. It was also noted that this would be an ‘Information Sharing’ session rather than a ‘Workshop’.

PAC Members in attendance were then requested to undertake a vote to approve the PAFA hosting a series of Virtual PAFA Information Exchange and Learning Sessions.

| Vote: Approval for the PAFA to host a series of Virtual PAFA Information Exchange and Learning Sessions | | |
|--|---------------------|--------------------|
| Shipper Representatives | Voting Count | For/Against |
| Alison Wiggett | 1 | For |
| Andy Knowles | 1 | For |
| Claire Louise Roberts | 1 | For |
| Graeme Cunningham | 1 | For |
| Louise Hellyer | 1 | For |
| Paul Murphy | 1 | For |
| Sallyann Blackett | 1 | For |
| Steve Mulinganie | 1 | For |
| Total | 8 | For |
| Transporters Representatives | Voting Count | For/Against |
| Jenny Rawlinson | 1 | For |
| Sally Hardman | 1 | For |
| Tom Stuart | - | Not present |
| Total | 2 | For |
| Voting Outcome: Unanimous to approve the PAFA hosting a series of Virtual PAFA Information Exchange and Learning Sessions | | |

5.2 User Representative Appointment Process

KE provided an update of the ‘Panel & UNC Sub-Committees Update’ process focusing attention on the lack of PAC nomination numbers (out of 9 places available, 3 nominations have been received to date) before requesting that **ALL** PAC Members ensure that their respective SPoCs look to submit a formal Nomination Request for this year’s appointments process.

KE went on to advise that she would issue a reminder email to PAC Members following the meeting and once all nominations are received and processed, she would look to split appointments into a 1yr / 2yr split.¹

Concluding discussions, KE pointed out that the **Nominations Deadline is Friday 21 July 2023**.

6. Key Messages

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

7. Diary Planning

PAC Members agreed to undertake an **Extraordinary PAC Meeting** (*inline with item 3.1 above*) to undertake a vote on whether to extend the current PAFA Contract on **Monday 24 July 2023 at 12:30 to 14:00**.

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

| Time/Date | Paper Publication Deadline | Venue | Programme |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|
| 12:30, Tuesday 24 July 2023 | 17:00 Friday 21 July 2023 | Teleconference | Standard Agenda |
| 10:00, Tuesday 15 August 2023 | 17:00 Monday 07 August 2023 | Teleconference / Face-to-Face | Standard Agenda |
| 10:00, Tuesday 12 September 2023 | 17:00 Monday 04 September 2023 | Teleconference / Face-to-Face | Standard Agenda |
| 10:00, Tuesday 17 October 2023 | 17:00 Monday 09 October 2023 | Teleconference / Face-to-Face | Standard Agenda |
| 10:00, Tuesday 14 November 2023 | 17:00 Monday 06 November 2023 | Teleconference / Face-to-Face | Standard Agenda |
| 10:00, Tuesday 12 December 2023 | 17:00 Monday 04 December 2023 | Teleconference / Face-to-Face | Standard Agenda |

PAC Action Table (as of 18 July 2023)

| Action Ref | Meeting Date | Minute Ref | Action | Owner | Status Update |
|------------|--------------|------------|---|-----------------------|---|
| PAC0601 | 13/06/23 | 2.2 | <i>Reference Request for Information (RFI) Analysis – PC3 & PC4 Meter Reading Submission</i> – CDSP (FC) and PAFA (AJ) to consider refining the provided information and how best to incorporate this into suitable training materials. | CDSP (FC) & PAFA (AJ) | Carried Forward Update due Sept |
| PAC0602 | 13/06/23 | 3.4 | <i>Reference Performance Assurance Techniques (PATs)</i> – Joint Office (KE) to investigate potential Code and PAFD interactions along with potential UNCC referral requirements. | Joint Office (KE) | Carried Forward Update due Aug |
| PAC0603 | 13/06/23 | 4.1 | <i>Reference the PAFD v5.1 changes</i> – CDSP (ER) and PAFA (AJ) to consider when to implement the changes and provide an update at the July 2023 meeting. | CDSP (ER) & PAFA (AJ) | Update provided Closed |

¹ Please note: the Joint Office issued a 'Performance Assurance Committee Nominations for 2023/2024 Gas Year' email to PAC Members on 18 July 2023.

| | | | | | |
|---------|----------|-----|--|-----|----------------|
| PAC0701 | 18/07/23 | 2.1 | <i>Reference Performance Plans – Entry / Exit Criteria</i> – All PAC Members to consider that information provided in the presentation and provide any views / comments back at the August meeting ahead of consideration of the Entry requirements at the same meeting. | All | Pending |
|---------|----------|-----|--|-----|----------------|