

UNC Performance Assurance Committee Minutes
Wednesday 06 January 2021
Via Microsoft Teams

Attendees

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

Shipper Members (Voting)

| | | |
|-------------------|------|-----------------------|
| Carl Whitehouse | (CW) | Shell |
| Graeme Cunningham | (GC) | British Gas Alternate |
| Lisa Saycell | (LS) | Gazprom |
| Sallyann Blackett | (SB) | E.ON |

Transporter Members (Voting)

| | | |
|----------------|------|----------------------------------|
| Andy Clasper | (AC) | Cadent Alternate |
| Richard Pomroy | (RP) | Wales & West Utilities Alternate |

Observers/Presenters (Non-Voting)

| | | |
|-----------------|------|--------------|
| Charlie Hayley | (CH) | Xoserve/CDSP |
| Claire Rymarz | (CR) | Xoserve/CDSP |
| David Newman | (DN) | Xoserve/CDSP |
| Fiona Cottam | (FC) | Xoserve/CDSP |
| Harfan Ahmed | (HA) | Xoserve/CDSP |
| John Welch | (JW) | Gemserv/PAFA |
| Karen Kennedy | (KK) | Xoserve/CDSP |
| Martin Attwood | (MA) | Xoserve/CDSP |
| Mudassar Naveed | (MN) | Xoserve/CDSP |
| Murali Shaga | (MS) | Xoserve/CDSP |
| Neil Cole | (NC) | Xoserve/CDSP |
| Nikki Lindsell | (LD) | Xoserve/CDSP |
| Sara Usmani | (SU) | Gemserv/PAFA |
| Shelley Rouse | (SR) | Gemserv/PAFA |

Copies of non-confidential papers are available at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/pac/060121>

1. Introduction

Rebecca Hailes (RH) welcomed all parties to the meeting, noting to PAC members that a Workgroup Meeting was being held on 07 January 2021 to discuss Modification 0674 - Performance Assurance Techniques and Controls, and urged PAC members to attend the meeting as changes were being discussed affecting the PAFD Document.

1.1 Apologies for absence

Alison Wiggett, Shipper Member
Mark Bellman, Shipper Member
Louise Hellyer, Shipper Member
Oorlagh Chapman, Shipper Member
Alex Travell, Transporter Member
Leteria Beccano, Transporter Member

Shiv Singh, Transporter Member

1.2 Note of Alternates

Graeme Cunningham for Oorlagh Chapman

Andy Clasper for Shiv Singh

Richard Pomroy for Leteria Beccano

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 Later Papers

No prior meeting documentation provided.

2. Data Discovery Platform (DDP) Dedicated PAC Sprint

2.1 Miro Familiarisation

David Newman (DN) provided a link to Miro and familiarisation with the interactive software to allow PAC Members to prioritise the DDP Sprint runs.

2.2 PAFA stories - Confirm outstanding queries

DN provided an overview of the Sprint Plan explaining that each Dedicated Sprint cannot include changes with an aggregate 30 point 'complexity' value. DN clarified that the points are not linked to time or effort, they are an estimate of the complexity of the change, based on Xoserve current understanding of the User Story and may change during the development process. DN confirmed each Sprint will be 2 weeks long, noting that the Sprint does not result in a live release, developments will be released to live once signed off. DN confirmed each Sprint will run immediately after the last sprint.

Nikki Lindsell (NL) wished to note when reviewing the User Stories within Miro, the User Stories highlighted in yellow required further clarification and that not all User Stories would have a rating. NL suggested initially moving all User Stories with the highest ratings into the 1st Sprint.

PAC members reviewed the 24 User Stories and utilised the Miro interactive tool to provide a view of what should be included in Sprint 1 Plan, Sprint 2, and what needed to be re-planned into a 3rd Sprint.

A number of initial questions/clarifications were requested for:

DDP-390 and **DDP-391**, originally rated with a high priority. DN clarified that the rating 5/20 related to the potential range in the change and if this needed to be a monthly snapshot or a historical view. DN explained the User Story currently reads as a monthly snapshot which would be rated 5 for complexity, however a historical view would increase the complexity and would change the rating to 20. A number of Members expressed a preference for having historical data. Harfan Ahmed (HA) asked if an aggregated view or MPRN level view was required. Richard Pomroy (RP) also enquired if the Class would also need to be reported. The Committee further considered the granularity of the reports. DN/NL noted the need for further clarity on User Stories 380 and 391 to better understand the requirement and potential ratings.

It was noted that for **DDP-400**: Replacement Read analysis had inadvertently been duplicated in Sprint 1 and Sprint 2. Shelley Rouse (SR) suggested developing the DDP-400 story with the rating of 5 and adding the granularity later. DN confirmed Xoserve would re-consider the rating of this change.

The Committee briefly discussed Modifications 0672, 0690 and 0691 and the reporting requirements for these Modifications. It was initially believed DDP-390 was related to UNC Modification 0672S - Target, Measure and Report Product Class 4 (PC4) Read Performance. However, DN believed this was a different report. DN asked for clarification on the enhancement to the existing reporting and the different categories including the Product Class.

Shelley Rouse (SR) explained that when the original requirement was written, the report was based around Modification 0672 and that the next stage would be to add more granularity for meter device types. Karen Kennedy (KK) wished to note a concern with the alignment and interpretation of reporting, the different combinations and the need to take into account meter read frequencies. DN clarified that the existing read performance will include additional metrics.

Nikki Lindsell (NL) asked about the priority of Meter Assets. It was suggested these are moved to Proposed Sprint 2 after Sprint 1.

In relation to DDP-391 Murali Shaga (MS) wanted to understand if PAC needed a report on the number of reads provided for an annual read frequency site, i.e. the number of reads submitted for the site rather than a report on the performance of successfully submitting an annual read. Sallyann Blackett (SB) suggested this should be reported/recorded as one read to capture the site has met its read class requirements. The Committee considered the potential for multiple read rejections which may provide insight into the attempts to submit reads and if this needs to be considered. KK suggested the detail provided in the reporting should be the most recent read/rejection information, explaining the added complexity of trying to report/record each submission/rejection which could potentially skew the read performance provision data. The Committee recognised the importance of understanding the detail behind rejections and why a read may have not loaded. Lisa Saycell (LS) suggested this report is about the attempt to provide a read i.e. a read was submitted and accepted or a read was submitted and rejected.

DN provided the detail behind the User Story **DDP-380**. KK wished to understand what this report was trying to achieve and what PAC Members wanted visibility of for Product Class 1 (PC1) and Product Class 2 (PC2). Shelley Rouse (SR) believed that there was a need to understand the materiality of sites not being read. NL also believed there was a link to UNC Modification 0672. KK challenged what the report was going to be used for, the need to understand the risk to settlement and what the Committee was trying to achieve from the report. LS believed the main aim is to build a picture of the gap between allocation and estimation and understanding the volume of gas at risk. Harfan Ahmed (HA) explained what information can be provided in terms of AQ and volume for the reads.

2.3 Prioritisation of 24 stories

The Committee considered which of the 24 User Stories should be prioritised into Sprint 1.

Upon discussion and further clarification of the changes, it was agreed that the following User Stories should be planned within the scope of Sprint 1:

DDP-390: Meter Read Performance (split by Class; MRF; AQ; MPRN Counts), classified with High importance and a Complexity Rating of 5.

DDP-391: Meter Read Performance (accepted vs rejected), classified as High importance and a Complexity Rating of 5 or 20.

DDP-395: No Reads - Outdated AQs due to lack of reads (i.e. AQ at risk), classified as Medium importance with a Complexity Rating to be determined.

DDP-396: Rejected AQ Corrections, classified as High importance with a Complexity Rating to be determined.

DDP-397: Successful AQ Corrections (volumes and direction of movement), classified as High importance with a Complexity Rating to be determined.

DN noted that the aggregate value of the 5 User Stories had a rating just over 30 points. The Committee considered which of the 5 changes could be rolled over into Sprint 2 if it wasn't possible to complete all 5 changes. It was suggested DDP-397 could be deferred to Sprint 2.

DN reassured the Committee that User Stories not programmed within Sprint 1 would still be undertaken, these would just roll over until all changes have been made.

It was noted that DDP-391 required some further clarity and Xoserve agreed to confirm what would be delivered for this change.

DN clarified that Xoserve would raise a Business Evaluation Report (BER) for formal submission to the DSC Change Management Committee to approve the contents of Sprint 1. Some concern was expressed about the possibility of the DSC Change Management Committee being able to reject/delay the required PAC Reporting changes. DN reassured PAC that the changes are not constrained by the DSC Change budget and the BER was a formality to provide the DSC Change Committee visibility of the changes being made within the DDP dedicated PAC Sprint.

RH enquired if all anticipated Sprints would be funded with the estimated £75k PAC budget. DN anticipated the budget being able to accommodate all changes. Richard Pomroy (RP) clarified if any additional budget was required due to inefficient funds this would require approval from the DSC Change Management Committee.

PAC sought further clarification from Xoserve on the budget spend for each Sprint. DN confirmed quantification will be provided within the BER for each Sprint.

The Committee considered which of the remaining 19 User Stories should be prioritised into Sprint 2. Upon discussion and further clarification of the changes it was agreed that the following User Stories should be planned within the scope of Sprint 2:

DDP-379: Estimated consumption by shipper/month for Class 1 & 2 sites, classified as Low importance with a Complexity Rating to be determined.

DDP-383: No Meter Recorded - View of AQ (MPRN & Product Class level), classified as High importance with a Complexity Rating to be determined.

DDP-387: Age profile of sites with no asset (Meter removed & Meter never installed), classified as Medium importance with a Complexity Rating to be determined.

DDP-394: No Reads - associated AQ by MRF, classified as Medium importance with a Complexity Rating to be determined.

DDP-399: Replacement Read analysis (to identify possible gaming), classified as Low importance with a Complexity Rating to be determined.

DN reiterated that Sprint 2 will run immediately after Sprint 1.

Graeme Cunningham (GC) wished to understand the detail of the budget spend for each Sprint expressing concern that he wouldn't want to see PAC run out of budget before important changes have been made. RP clarified additional budget can be requested through the DSC Change process.

RH requested that PAFA attends the next DSC Change Management Committee to ensure PAC was represented.

It was agreed that the remaining 14 User Stories would be moved to the next round of priority considerations (Sprint 3 – Backlog):

DDP-380: Allocated vs Settled volumes for Class 1 & 2 sites, rated as Low importance.

DDP-381: View of AQ at risk for Class 1 & 2 sites, rated as Low importance.

DDP-382: Check read performance analysis for Class 1 & 2 sites, rated as Low importance.

DDP-384: No Meter Recorded - Meter removed vs Meter never installed, rated originally as High importance.

DDP-385: No Meter Recorded - Meter removed vs Meter never installed (incl. dataflow summary), rated originally as High importance

DDP-386: Age profile of unregistered sites with failed registration attempt(s), rated as Low importance.

DDP-388: Transfer reads (accepted vs rejected), rated as Low importance.

DDP-389: Transfer reads (utilisation of Shipper Agreed Reads), rated as Low importance.

DDP-392: Meter Read Performance - Meter Mechanism (Smart; Credit etc), rated originally as High importance.

DDP-393: Meter Read rejections - Count by reason with associated AQ, rated originally as Medium importance.

DDP-398: AQ associated to sites with std corr. factor above non-std CF threshold (i.e. AQ at risk), rated as Low importance.

DDP-400: Replacement Read analysis (see impact on AQ & Reconciliation), rated as low importance.

DDP-401: Meter By-Pass - PAFA dashboard (incl. of Isolation status).

DDP-402: Meter By-Pass (total split by Open / Closed status)

2.4 Understanding of New / Additional stories

David Newman (DN) provided an overview of 5 Additional Requirements, these were:

Additional Requirement 1: SP8 Aggregated Supply Points

Additional Requirement 2: SP8 PC3 EUC01 Reporting

Additional Requirement 3: 2B.12 NDM Sample Data

Additional Requirement 4: 2B.13 WAR Band Reporting

Additional Requirement 5: 2B.14 Class 2,3,4 sites with an AQ above the Class 1 threshold

The Committee discussed these to gain a better understanding of the requirements and their potential priority. It was agreed further discussion would be required offline to agree how these can be captured within future prioritisation discussions and sprints. It was suggested a further 2 meetings maybe required to agree the remaining priorities.

DN went on to provide a further 3 additional requirements, these were:

Additional Requirement 6: Transfer Read Performance

Additional Requirement 7: 2b.11 AQ Reports (% query)

Additional Requirement 8: 2B.15 Class 4 AQ Read Performance (UNC Modification 0672)

These were provided for visibility of other changes in the pipeline.

2.5 Prioritisation of New / Additional stories against the 24 agreed stories

See item 2.4. No further discussion.

2.6 Next Steps

DN confirmed following today's discussions, Xoserve would need to undertake some User Story rescoring, provide some further clarifications, and provide updates on actions he had noted. DN confirmed his intention to provide a brief update at next week's PAC meeting which would include a confirmation of the agreed PAC Sprint priorities.

It was agreed that further meetings would need to be planned to prioritise Sprint 3, and possible workshops to allow BETA testing.

2.7 Granularity of DDP reports - Discussion

DN confirmed an email had been sent to PAC Members regarding the granularity of DDP Reports.

John Welch (JW) reported that some work had been undertaken to compare/link the DDP reports with the current PARR Reports, noting some PARR reports are still outstanding, and there remained a need to consider the different levels of granularity. JW provided an overview of the number of current and potential filters.

DN recognised the need to provide more granularity and the requirement to land on a view on where the gaps are.

3. Any Other Business

None raised.

4. Next Steps

Xoserve to confirm Actions and Agreed priorities.

PAC to consider planning further dedicated PAC Sprint Meetings.

5. Diary Planning

5.1 2021 meeting dates

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

| Time/Date | Paper Publication Deadline | Venue | Programme |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| 10:00, Tuesday 12 January 2021 | 5pm Monday 04 January 2021 | Teleconference | Standard Agenda |

For details of the informal sub-group meetings and topics please contact the PAFA directly.
PAFA@gemserv.com