

UNC Performance Assurance Committee Minutes
Tuesday 14 September 2020
Via Microsoft Teams

Attendees

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

Shipper Members (Voting)

Alison Wiggett	(AW)	Corona Energy (from 12:00)
Carl Whitehouse	(CW)	Shell
Karen Kennedy	(KK)	British Gas
Lisa Saycell	(LS)	Gazprom
Louise Hellyer	(LH)	Total Gas
Sallyann Blackett	(SB)	E.ON
Sean Cooper	(SC)	Npower (from 11am)

Transporter Members (Voting)

Alex Travell	(AT)	BU UK (not present between 12:30-14:00)
Leteria Beccano	(LB)	Wales & West Utilities
Sally Hardman	(SH)	SGN

Observers/Presenters (Non-Voting)

Amelia Gallini	(AG)	Xoserve/CDSP
Fiona Cottam	(FC)	Xoserve/CDSP
Martin Attwood	(MA)	Xoserve/CDSP
Sara Usmani	(SU)	PAFA
Shelley Rouse	(SR)	PAFA
Shiv Singh	(SS)	Cadent

Apologies

Mark Bellman	(MB)	Scottish Power
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE

Copies of non-confidential papers are available at: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/pac/140920

1. Introduction

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

RH noted that Shiv Singh (SS) had been invited to today's PAC meeting as an observer in a non-voting capacity in order to prepare to move from his role as alternate PAC Member to his role from 01 October 2020 as replacement Transporter PAC Member, replacing Sally Hardman

Further to discussions last month, RH suggested that the PAC Terms of Reference (ToR) should be adjusted to allow standing alternates to observe meetings whilst the primary member is present for training purposes.

Karen Kennedy (KK) and Carl Whitehouse (CW) supported this change. CW explained the difficulties new Members and Alternates would have actively taking part with little/no experience of the Committee. It was anticipated that when an appointed Alternate is to attend as an Alternate with voting rights, they would be fully briefed by the member before representing the member to ensure they are able to support the decision-making process.

PAC discussed the ability for Alternates to attend meetings whilst the member is present, the possible frequency of this happening and the capacity in which they would be attending.

Sallyann Blackett (SB) suggested where a member is knowingly not going to be present for a future meeting their Alternate should be invited to the prior meeting. This suggestion was welcomed and encouraged by all members. PAC discussed if the arrangement for Alternates to attend should be restricted to help them familiarise themselves with proceedings only and for this not to be an open arrangement to attend all meetings. Lisa Saycell (LS) expressed concern about the potential number of attendees and if larger numbers would risk slowing meetings down. KK noted that the Alternate member should only be observing, rather than contributing, and questioned if it mattered how many Alternates were in attendance.

PAC members supported the amendment to the ToR to allow Alternate members to observe meetings and approved SS observing in his capacity as a new member taking up his role next month.

RH agreed to amend the current ToR and provide an amended document with a suggested change for approval next month.

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

RH wished to take this opportunity to heartily thank all retiring members, Sally Hardman, Mark Jones and Sean Cooper for their contributions.

1.1 Apologies for absence

Mark Bellman, Shipper Member.

Mark Jones, Shipper Member.

1.2 Note of Alternates

None advised.

1.3 Quoracy Status

The Committee meeting was confirmed quorate.

1.4 Approval of Minutes (11 August 2020)

The minutes from the previous meeting were approved.

1.5 Approval of Later Papers

RH advised of the late papers published in support of providing visual updates, these were accepted.

2. Monthly Performance Assurance Review Items

2.1 Risk & Issues Register Review (PAFA)

Shelley Rouse (SR) confirmed there was no further update to the Risk & Issues Register. An informal sub-group meeting was held on 01 September which finished a review of all the risks, an update was not available for today's meeting however an update had been published on Huddle and will be provided in detail at the October meeting.

2.1.1. UIG (Risk and Issues Tracking)

Fiona Cottam (FC) confirmed that there was nothing specific to update PAC for this month for Unidentified Gas. FC suggested if there are any enquiries or feedback, Xoserve welcomed these via the UIG Taskforce email box account (<mailto:UIGTaskForce@xoserve.com>).

PAC agreed to remove UIG as a standing agenda for PAC as industry updates are being provided at other UNC Workgroups.

2.2 PARR Report Review - Dashboard update (PAFA)

SR provided the Shipper Performance Analysis 'PARR Dashboards' update. PAFA supplied the following observations for this section:

- **COVID-19 MODIFICATION: PARR REPORTING**

- The Performance Assurance Framework Administrator (PAFA) presented the impact of UNC modifications 0722 and 0723 on the market.
 - No real impact of utilising either modifications has been seen in the PC3 and PC4 markets, with read performance in line with the average seen prior to the implementation of the modification. Additionally, there have been no major changes in the number of sites.
 - As expected there continues to be no impact on read performance in PC1 and PC2.

- **SHIPPER PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT PLANS**

- The PAC were presented with the updated improvement plans for all 11 Shippers.
- Although all Shippers were not able to provide timeframes, the PAFA have been working closely with Shippers and their CAMs to provide these to the PAC by the October PAC meeting.
 - Of the Shippers that provided timeframes, the PAC were concerned with Tallinn. More specifically, they were concerned with their performance and improvement plan for PC3.
 - The PAC have advised the PAFA to contact Tallinn and inform them that they should not be moving sites into PC3 until they are confident they have the equipment required to comply with UNC. This also applies to all Shippers operating within PC3.

New Action PARR September 01: PAFA to liaise with CAMs and follow up with those Shippers that have not provided timeframes with their improvement plans and/or not provided plans.

New Action PARR September 02: PAFA to contact Tallinn and inform them that they should not be moving sites into PC3 until equipment is installed and they are in a position to submit reads.

- **SHIPPER PERFORMANCE: TRANSFER READ PERFORMANCE**

- The PAFA presented statistics on Shipper Transfer Read Performance to the PAC. The data extracted from the DDP, whereby the logic is in line with code at D+10 instead of the legacy reports which show the statistics at D+5.
- Over the course of 2020, the average shipper transfer read performance has been c. 28% - significantly lower than the level of 90% outlined in the Uniform Network Code (UNC). Based on the data, all Shippers are performing at a low level.

Post Meeting Note: Obligation to be discussed at the October Meeting – to check there is a 90% obligation, 90% related to the former charge for read estimation.

- PAC members discussed the impact of poor Shipper Transfer Read Performance on gas settlement and agreed that there is very little impact. Committee members agreed that this should be low priority for the PAC as it does not impact gas settlement and is of high priority from a supplier perspective.
- A suggestion was made to raise a Modification, but members agreed that further analysis was required on the number of reads and the transfer read performance. This is a topic which will be taken to the informal sub-group for further consideration.

New Action PARR September 03: Further discussions on this area to be held at the PAC sub-committee and to be brought back to a future PAC meeting, should action be required.

2.3 PAC Annual Review

SR confirmed that the PAC Annual Review had been circulated via email for members to consider, some comments have been received and incorporated into the document. SR wished to follow up the provision of the document by seeking approval from PAC members that this could now be published to the wider industry.

Some members asked if more time could be provided to review the document as they also hadn't had time to fully digest the document. FC apologised for also not having time to fully review the document. The Committee considered whether to defer the approval until October's PAC meeting, approve it at the 29 September informal sub-group meeting or seek approval via email.

PAC considered the impact on the reporting timetable if approval was deferred until October's meeting. Consideration was given to whether the 29 September informal sub-meeting would be well attended enough and whether it would need to be convened as a formal PAC meeting to support the approval. PAC further discussed the option of approving the Annual Review via email as this was the preferred option if it needn't be approved at a formal PAC meeting.

RH agree to consider the ability for PAC to approve the Annual Review Document via email and asked PAFA to forward the document again to all members including Joint Office for this to be examined.

New Action 0902: Joint Office (RH) to consider the ability to approve the Annual Review Document via email before the October meeting.

2.4 Review of Outstanding PARR Actions

PARR August 01: PAFA to issue a Performance Improvement Request to Shipper Washington for read performance across Product Class 1 and 2.

Update: Request sent. **Closed.**

PARR August 02: PAC members have requested the PAFA issue performance observation letters to all Shippers in PC 3 and the poorest 5 performers in PC 4 that have no meters recorded.

Update: Letters sent. **Closed.**

PARR August 03: PAFA to arrange a series of sub-group meetings to discuss the requested issues

Update: Meeting plan and topics shared. **Closed.**

2.5 Covid-19 Reports (short notice papers)

FC confirmed Xoserve had not provided a Covid-19 report this month, explaining the overlaps in reporting at other Workgroups and information published.

RH referred to the information provided in relation to Modification 0726 Liquidity Relief Scheme for Shippers at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/DNCovidReliefScheme>. FC confirmed that the August figures would not be available until late September. Leteria Beccano (LB) asked what information is shared with the two Credit Committees for Liquidity Relief to better understand the number of Shippers taking up relief.

The Committee considered the ongoing review of Covid-19 Modification performance monitoring, the available information and if PAC needed to keep the item on the agenda.

Alex Travell (AT) challenged what should PAC be monitoring, with the limited information available.

LS expressed it was difficult for PAC to determine what should be monitored without knowing how the Government is going to adjust to developments. It was acknowledged it was difficult for the industry with the limitations of systems, the ability to monitor industry activity and changes in behaviour within the timescales available/needed.

FC confirmed that the Distribution Workgroup are considering if the industry have got the right Modifications in place, the effectiveness of recent Modifications and potential ongoing requirements. The Distribution Workgroup were of a view that the Modifications will still apply where they refer to the 'COVID-19 period'.

KK believed PAC should be considering how Covid-19 is impacting performance, with more and more restrictions coming into play and recent Government restrictions that will impact Shipper ability to meet performance targets at certain times and within certain areas.

It was recognised there was difficulty with monitoring performance without system changes and the availability of activity flags. Recognising the timescales required to incorporate systemised monitoring, PAC understood the industry had to make changes in the time available but it would be worth the industry now considering if there would be value making further enhancements if the impact of Covid-19 continues into next winter 2020/21.

It was agreed that the Covid-19 item should remain on the agenda to provide an opportunity for PAC to discuss and keep track of Covid-19 developments.

SR enquired if the UNC Modification Panel had a view. RH confirmed that Panel have been provided with an update on the ability to monitor performance from PAC and the importance of having permission to obtain the correct and relevant data. RH confirmed there was muted response to the points raised.

2.6 AQ at Risk Update

FC provided an update on the AQ at risk confirming the volume had reduced from the previous month from 57 TWh down to 56 TWh. All Classes except Class 4 have improved slightly since August. FC reported a circa 11% of the LDZ Portfolio were overdue a meter reading.

FC confirmed that the 56 TWh is equivalent to around 4.5m typical domestic properties, that haven't had a meter reading within standards. FC went on to explain the top 11 Shippers had 51% of the total at Risk, and in each case, there was a clear top 2 or 3 Shippers in terms of AQ.

Sean Cooper (SC) asked if the impact on the market had been communicated to the top 2-3 Shippers. SR explained that PAFA cannot target performance directly for AQ at Risk, as these are not formal PARR Reports, however PAFA can target the read performance. SR clarified that contact in the past for read performance has been undertaken but performance improvement plans are not in place.

The reporting for Modification 0672S - Target, Measure and Report Product Class 4 Read Performance, was discussed and what measurements would be reported. It was understood that the report would provide the percentage of AQs without an accepted meter read.

KK asked if the criteria and measurement had changed in the development of the Modification. FC confirmed the definitions are set out in the Modification. KK was concerned there were some gaps in capturing information on meter read frequency and the Modification reporting does not take into account meter read frequency, she believed there was a disconnect. KK was concerned about understanding the statistics from the Modification reporting and how the information will change slightly from the reporting received now.

The Committee also considered Modification 0692S - Automatic updates to Meter Read Frequency, which had been appealed. Louise Hellyer (LH) believed a further Modification had been raised with similar if not the same elements which had not been appealed.

SR asked PAC about the performance of monthly reads and PAFA seeking performance improvement plans. SB welcomed PAFA reporting.

2.7 EUC09 Count by Class Update

FC provided clarification on the recent changes to the format of the statistics for Supply Points above class 1 threshold which are not in Class 1 as at September 2020. FC confirmed these will be monthly reports using the "solar moon" codes format for this month.

FC provided a table reporting a count of the Supply Points reporting 15 sites meeting the criteria for Class 3&4, 9 in class 2. This was data was then presented in terms of kWh.

AT asked for those sites which have been corrected if there was any further analysis which could be undertaken to measure how well (or badly) the profile was working to understand the implications on settlement accuracy. FC offered to undertake some further analysis.

FC asked if there was any further comments or queries, PAC would like considered. RH suggested colour coding the report to provide an indication of improvements, if worsening or staying the same.

LH thanked FC and welcomed the change in format and asked if the number of sites and AQ information could be brought together, and how best PAC could recognise if there has been a change in sites, even in a scenario where 2 sites are lost/gained by comparison with the AQ.

FC confirmed she would look at adjusting the layout of the report table and provide a further update next month. Referring to item 3.1 FC asked if the report format was in a position to be approved by UNCC. Please see item 3.1.

2.8 AQ Calculation Error Update

Sean Cooper (SC) provided a brief overview and explained the need for more analysis on Shippers not adjusting AQs to reflect meter readings. He challenged what action needs to be taken by PAC.

SR confirmed this is an item on the risk register and is due for discussion at the 29 September's informal sub-group meeting. It was agreed to defer further discussion to allow an update to be provided from the informal sub-group.

2.9 Open / Meter By-Pass Update

It was understood that from the recent numbers of Open Meter By-Pass reported, there was still concern on how many Meter By-Pass statuses were correct and that a review of these should take place. However the feasibility of this with Covid-19 and access availability needs to be considered.

SC asked how PAC was going to facilitate a desk top review of sites without having to gain access and if there was an appetite for PAC Shipper members to test the water by encouraging checks within their organisations. The Committee considered PAC Shippers trialling a desktop exercise but questioned this approach when already committing resources to PAC to identify areas of concern and if a desktop exercise is considered to be of benefit it should not only apply to PAC Shipper members.

SC challenged how PAC was going to take this issue forward, what was the best approach and how best to engage the industry.

The Committee considered the input from the Xoserve Customer Account Managers (CAMs). FC confirmed CAMs are undertaking an exercise to engage with Shippers and raise awareness of the issue.

SR confirmed that PAFA do not have access to Meter By-Pass reports, this is not part of PARR, explaining consideration had been given to providing PAC this ability via the Data Delivery Platform (DDP), however, this was considered a low priority for DDP.

FC reported the last statistics suggest there are 12,500 meters with a by-pass, with around 20 shippers, having 153 Open By-pass flags, more than half appear to be with 5 shippers. RH suggested if any of the top 5 Shippers were PAC Member Shippers, perhaps contact should be made offline.

SC suggested the first step would be for Shippers to ascertain if the meters registered as open are flagged correctly to test how many could be closed.

SR enquired if some of the sites could be inherited and if it will be known that a by-pass is in situ. LS believed there is a flag within the transfer file therefore Shippers should be aware.

RH asked if PAC need more data to encourage a trial and if this topic is on the Risk Register. SR confirmed this is recorded as a risk.

It was suggested that there should be an Account Management meeting to address that these exist and need checking with a report on when a remedy will be provided. FC agreed to put together some slides to present at the CAMs Account Management meeting to remind Shippers what the obligations are, to raise awareness and encourage an investigation of a percentage suggesting this is undertaken in descending order of the highest AQ or those not visited for the longest period to consider the most at risk sites first. FC recognised this would be a voluntary exercise.

FC agreed to further consider the approach and recommend a targeted review of sites.

Amelia Gallini (AG) recognised there may be a mixed reaction from Shippers depending on resource constraints and ability to visit sites. KK suggested a desk-top exercise may provide a sense of scale of the issue along with an update on the ability to visit sites recorded as open which may be hindered. It was agreed there was more than one way to tackle this issue.

PAC considered the need to understand the significance of the issue, and to communicate the benefits to Shippers of reviewing this due to the costs associated.

New Action 0903: CAMs to encourage Shipper Constituencies to review/audit sites with a recorded Open Bypass and to provide a response to the CDSP.

2.10 Theft of Gas Update

FC confirmed that the monthly Theft of Gas Reports are provided on the Joint Office website at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/theft>.

RH wished to note that the Shrinkage Forum (where Theft of Gas is discussed) has not been well attended by Shippers.

SC asked about the overlaps with Shrinkage and Measurement Errors. FC explained that the Shrinkage Calculation only considers Transporter's Theft, not downstream theft, and clarified that Shipper theft will not be discussed at the Shrinkage Forum

No further discussion.

3. Matters for Committee Attention

3.1 PARR Modification 0690S – Reduce qualifying period for Class 1 (Decision)

Further to discussing the EUC09 Count by Class Update under item 2.7, PAC considered the required UNCC approval for the reporting format under Modification 0690S - Reduce qualifying period for Class 1. FC provided a paper on the proposed changes for Modification 0690S reporting. This was reviewed by the Committee.

The Committee considered waiting to review the further enhanced reporting format before seeking the UNCC's sign off to include the report in PARR. It was agreed that the enhancements would be considered next month before submitting the report layout to the UNCC.

3.2 PAC Budget Spend Update

Update deferred. FC confirmed that a more definitive update is anticipated in October.

3.3 Standards of Service Liabilities Report (information only)

The Standards of Service Liabilities report was provided for information. No questions were raised.

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

4.1 Modification 0664 - Transfer of Sites with Low Valid Meter Reading Submission Performance from Classes 2 and 3 into Class 4.

RH confirmed that this Modification is being considered by the UNC Modification Panel on Thursday 17 September 2020, following the provision of the Workgroup's Supplemental Report and Variation Request. It was hoped Modification 0664V would be agreed as a result of the meeting, with a likely final consultation to follow.

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

RH wished to note a request from the 0674 Workgroup for PAC to pre-approve the updates to the PAF Document. Version 4.3 of the document had been provided for review by Mark Bellman.

Referring to Action 0801, RH enquired if PAC members had reviewed the provided document and fed back any concerns to the 24 August Workgroup Meeting.

SR confirmed on behalf of Mark Bellman that all changes to the documents have been made in line within Workgroup 0674 discussions and clarified that Mark Bellman would like to provide confirmation when submitting the Workgroup Report to the UNC Modification Panel that PAC have pre-approved the PAF Documents. SR explained Mark's main aim is to ensure PAC provide the Workgroup with any concerns.

It was noted there is one further Workgroup Meeting being held on 23 September 2020.

SR provided a high-level overview of the recent structural changes to the PAF Document.

RH wished to understand if any PAC members had any concerns with pre-approving the PAF Document as this was outside of the normal process, expressing that if there are any concerns these need to be fed into the Workgroup.

CW was in support of the intention of both the document and the Modification itself and confirmed if he had any concerns these would be fed into the 0674 Workgroup rather than via PAC.

RH referred to the most notable change being the introduction of a Performance Assurance Objective. SR believed this objective was referred to in the PAC ToR and was moving into the UNC.

LB understood there maybe a new template being added to the PAF Document and that she needed time to catch up on this, including looking at the legal text in preparation for the next Workgroup meeting,

KK confirmed her regular involvement in the Workgroup through its development and confirmed support for the Modification.

SC echoed his support of the intentions and spirit of the Modification and understood that Mark Bellman as Proposer of Modification 0674 wanted to make sure there was no fundamental concerns about the Modification, and if there are any elements which PAC would not be able to approve.

FC confirmed Xoserve's involvement in the Modification development process and assisted with the development of the document so there were no surprises in terms of Xoserve.

RH asked if members would like to undertake a formal vote to provide Mark Bellman with the assurance he was looking for. It was noted that it was not normal practise or within the current governance approach to formally vote to accept changes to a document ahead of the Modification being approved for implementation.

LB explained due to leave over the summer period although she remained in support of the Modification, she was unable to provide definitive support without reviewing all the documents in their latest iterations. LB noted that the Modification is still being amended and noted it was currently at v14.0.

SC understood Mark Bellman wanted endorsement of the changes, direction of travel and wanted to be made aware if there were any fundamental concerns.

Sally Hardman confirmed her support for the intention of the Modification.

RH suggested if PAC did not want to take a formal vote then perhaps PAC would like to provide a statement in the minutes which could be used in the 0674 Workgroup Report. The Committee unanimously agreed to provide a statement that PAC members supported the intention of the Modification and had supported development, attending meetings.

RH provided the following suggested statement for the minutes and Workgroup Report:

PAC Members support the intention of Modification 0674 and have been active in supporting the Workgroup Assessment of the Modification since it was raised. This includes the documents created and modified as part of the Modification, for example the Performance Assurance Framework Document v4.3.

PAC undertook a formal vote to approve the above Statement. Sallyann Blackett was not present to provide support at the time of taking a vote.

The following members provided positive support for the statement: Sally Hardman, Alex Travell, Sean Cooper, Louise Hellyer, Lisa Saycell, Karen Kennedy and Carl Whitehouse.

Leteria Beccano was not able to provide positive support at this stage until she had reviewed the documents.

4.3 Modification 0691S - CDSP to convert Class 2, 3 or 4 meter points to Class 1 when G1.6.15 criteria are met

RH confirmed that the Final Modification Report was considered by the UNC Modification Panel in August and had been sent back to Workgroup as new issues had been raised in the representations received. A further Workgroup meeting had been arranged for 29 September to discuss the issues raised.

4.4 Modification 0730 – COVID-19 Capacity Retention Process

It was confirmed that this Modification had been referred to the Distribution Workgroup for assessment and that the Workgroup Report is due to be presented to the October UNC Modification Panel.

4.5 Any Other changes

SR wished to note she had been in a dialogue with Jon Dixon, from Ofgem and had been asked if PAC would be supportive of PAFA becoming involved with the Retail Energy Code (REC) board.

AT recognised the benefit and importance of building relationships but wished to note the different levels of involvement with the REC board and Suppliers.

No objection was advised for PAFA meeting with the REC board.

AT acknowledged the overlaps in meter reading performance and involvement of assurance activities with Shippers and Suppliers and the benefit of working collaboratively. He understood the desire to looking for alignment and efficiencies despite the different drivers for Suppliers and Shippers.

5. Review of PAC Outstanding Actions

0801: PAC Members to review the updated PAF Document v4.1 which includes Documents 1 and 4 and refer any feedback/questions to the 24 August 0674 Workgroup Meetings

Update: See item 4.2. A number of PAC members confirmed their attendance. **Closed.**

0802: PAC informal sub-group to consider the Market Breaker Read analysis and what the next steps should be and PAFA (SR) to consider what information can be presented using Moon names.

Update: It was anticipated that this needed to be deferred until the 29 September informal subgroup meeting with an update for this action at the formal PAC meeting in October. **Carried Forward.**

0803: CAMs to contact top 10 Shippers with regards to raising awareness of Market Breaker Reads.

Update: AG confirmed that CAMs have been including this in their scheduled updates with their customers. SR confirmed some performance improvement. AG confirmed some Shipper contact, no training issue had been identified. Further discussion will take place at the informal subgroup. **Closed.**

0804: Xoserve (FC) to clarify the UNC obligations for Market Breaker reads and what obligations there are for updating the AQ.

Update: FC confirmed there was nothing in code to obligate action on AQ correction/updates for Market Breaker reads, explaining a Market Breaker may just mean the meter reading is wrong. FC referred to TPD Section G2.3.22 where AQ corrections are permitted. However, the obligation to submit valid meter readings is not satisfied until a read is accepted so the Section M read obligations would not be met. KK believed Shippers can be working in one of two ways, and there would be a need to understand what approach is being taken by Shippers as one way of working would be more visible than the other. KK explained one approach may be to submit all meter readings and allow the system to flag potential problems whereas the other approach could be to screen reads before submission and then not to submit reads that could trigger a flag. KK explained one process makes the market breakers visible the other approach doesn't. It was noted that Shippers could be holding back genuine market breaker reads to prevent changes to AQs, it was the subsequent action when identifying a market breaker read which was important. It was agreed that more information was needed from the CAMs and this would be considered further at the informal sub-group. **Closed.**

0805: PAFA (SR) to undertake a DDP gap analysis and identify any data items not available.

Update: See item 6.1. Gap analysis undertaken. **Closed.**

0806: Xoserve (FC) to consider and provide how each of the PAFA proposed data items will be (or going to be) delivered with timescales.

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

0807: Xoserve (FC) to confirm when current CDSP historical PARR reports (10) will be available on DDP for PAFA

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

0808: DNs (LB/SH) to provide PAC an outline of the Measurement Error process, including the OAD obligations and the required reporting.

Update: See item 6.2. **Closed.**

0809: Xoserve (FC) to provide confirmation of any invoices issued for the current live errors (NO013, WM016 and WN003)

Update: FC confirmed that there were 3 open Measurement Errors and provided a brief overview of their status:

NO013 – the Measurement Error Report (MER) had been published, this was a small error with a value of 1.8 GWh.

WM016 – was with Cadent, this is an embedded entry and Cadent are in the process of preparing the MER.

WN003 – the draft MER has been provided to National Grid for validation/processing.

Please also see item 6.2. **Closed.**

0810: Xoserve (FC) to confirm if an XRN is available for each DDP Story / Report change.

Update: FC confirmed that the agreed approach is to update the existing XRN4876 with a full list of the User Stories to allow these to be tracked. An updated version of XRN4876 will be provided at the next meeting. **Carried Forward.**

6. Any Other Business

6.1 PAFA Access to Data

Referring to Actions 0805, 0806 and 0807, FC provided the background and the concerns raised about the availability of data to meet PAC's expectations.

FC provided an overview of the Scope of PAFA access to data referring to the Data Disclosure Request which was approved at the May 2020 DSC Contract Management Committee. FC went on to provide the timescales following the approval of when PAFA will be provided the data as this would not be available immediately. FC provided a list of reports that are now included in the PAFA view on Data Delivery Platform (DDP) and which reports were not yet available to PAFA.

LS asked if the Winter Annual Ratio (WAR) Band Submission and Calculations would fall back into the Xoserve prioritisation. FC confirmed this would be the case.

SR enquired about the future of PAC-only reports and their prioritisation.

KK believed in terms of priorities, it is not clear how PAC reports are prioritised.

SC understood there was a session looking at priorities and what appeared to come out of this, was that Shipper priorities may not align with PAC/PAFA's priorities. He believed there needed to be better correlations and balance when considering conflicting priorities.

FC confirmed there are separate sprints undertaken for Transporters and IGTs and that Xoserve are considering PAFA having a dedicated sprint in early 2021.

SC suggested there needed to be a decision on whether this is an acceptable position to be in and what actions are available. SC expressed and PAC Members agreed that PAFA have to have access to data and was keen to look at other alternatives.

FC confirmed that the vast majority of reports are available from DDP and understands the disappointment. FC explained that Xoserve are considering if data extracts can be provided outside of DDP so these are still available through different routes. This will be a rolling programme.

SR confirmed that the User Stories are providing the extra information not available via DDP. SR shared PAFA's gap analysis (see Action 0805) detailing what data items were available, what information is available on the Data Permissions Matrix (DPM) or included on the Data Request Report (DRR).

PAC considered the mapping of data items and the differences. It was suggested a definitive list needs to be formulated. SR suggested the informal sub-group spends some time cross matching the lists and following this up with a further DRR.

RH enquired about the data extracts. SR stressed that PAFA are not concerned about the format of exactly how they get data as long as they get the data they need to fulfil their role.

FC believed that the next steps are to make sure the right activities are in place for a dedicated PAFA led sprint, and to take away delivering User Stories outside of DDP.

LS asked how Xoserve are making sure of priorities and where these are. SC explained that there is a DDP User Group which is just starting up that looks at priorities and ratifies inputs from different forums. SR asked if there would be benefit PAFA attending these meetings to ensure PAC/PAFA priorities are considered.

SC wanted recognition that PAC and PAFA are customers of DDP in its own right. It was recognised that the status of PAC will be clearer with the introduction of Modification 0674 - Performance Assurance Techniques and Controls.

SC reiterated the need for Xoserve to consider 'how the cake is sliced up' and stressed that 'PAC and PAFA need their own slice'.

RH suggested it would be worthwhile escalating this issue within Xoserve. LS believed Xoserve are actively looking at the way forward. FC confirmed Xoserve are looking forward and what tactical solutions there are to ensure Xoserve can provide data to PAFA.

<p>New Action 0904: Xoserve (FC) to consider and review how it can meet PAC/PAFA data requirements in the short and longer term.</p>

RH supported PAC being provided data by any means possible. FC acknowledged that some work was required to make this available and understood the frustrations.

RH asked Xoserve to provide an update on the timescales or confirmation of data provided.

KK suggested inviting the DDP project lead to the next PAC meeting.

6.2 Measurement Error Register

Sally Hardman (SH) provided a presentation on the UNC Obligations for the reporting of Measurement errors, clarifying why Measurement Errors occur. RH thanked SH for the information which was very helpful. SH also outlined the Meter Validations undertaken confirming the frequency of these and what other controls DNs have in place, which included maintenance checks, audits and reports to Ofgem.

SH wished to note that not all Offtakes are of a large volume and as part of the RIIO-1 consultation, some DNs proposed a replacement programme for Orifice meters and now all the DNs have a programme of continued replacement.

SH confirmed that the DNs currently provide the audit reporting schedules to Joint Office for industry publication and the Validation Reports are published at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/MeteringValidations>. It was understood these were previously provided to PAC for visibility.

PAC considered the availability of the Validation Reports and considered if PAC should be doing more with the available report and whether this should remain on the risk register. It was believed that the validation Reports used to be provided to PAC but at some point were removed.

Post Meeting Note: Committee Members agreed to cease publishing the Meter Validation Reports for PAC in June 2019.

SH gave an example of a recent SGN Measurement Error which had occurred due to a landslide damaging the meter and surrounding pipework. So to avoid a community losing gas supplies, the meter had to be by-passed whilst a replacement meter was sourced.

SH explained the difference between types of Measurement Errors and the process followed dependent on the estimated volume for the error. SH confirmed all errors are notified to the Joint Office for visibility and explained the process and handoffs before an error can be closed. The presentation can be viewed here: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/pac/140920>

Shiv Singh (SS) confirmed that Cadent are looking to replace 18 of the old turbine meter sites with ultrasonic meters during RIIO-2. SS believed there were 50 Offtake sites over the 4 Cadent Networks.

SH gave a brief breakdown of the reporting statistics, confirming over 8 years the volume of errors has been quite low and the number of occurrences was low.

Referring to the Measurement Error Register at <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/MER>, FC believed there was a total of 225 Offtake Meters, from the available information provided in the look-up tab.

Following the presentation PAC considered what it should be looking at in terms of Measurement Errors. Alex Travell (AT) asked if something material occurred how would this be flagged to PAC. It was noted that the Joint Office issues emails to its whole industry list as Measurement Errors are issued to notify all errors and again sends further emails at different stages as more information comes available on the error, until the Measurement Error is reconciled.

6.3 Closure of XRN4876 (DDP user stories)

Further to the discussions under item 6.1, FC confirmed that Xoserve had taken an action to update the existing XRN4876 with a full list of the User Stories to allow these to be tracked. An updated version of XRN4876 will be provided.

6.4 PAC Membership Letters (Document 5 amendment and signing)

RH wished to note that having issued the PAC Membership Letters for members to re-sign it had been highlighted to the Joint Office that a reference in Document 5 did not tie up in the UNC due to an amendment to the UNC in 2017.

It was understood for those that had signed the current version (January 2017) of the PAC Membership Letters these were not time limited and would still stand. However, the Document 5 letter needed to be updated and it was considered prudent for all members and alternates to resign the letters once Document 5 had been reviewed and amended. There was not a requirement to resign the letters at this point in time, unless an older version had been signed and not replaced.

RH agreed to review whether all members have provided a signed copy of the current version and where the Joint Office do not have a current version of the letter for each member these will be requested.

New Action 0905: Joint Office (RH) to review all signed PAC Membership letters to ensure these are the current version, and request replacement letters for any letters that need to be replaced.

6.5 Change of Transporter Representative

See item 1.0. No further discussion.

6.6 PAC Alternates (Nomination, Letters, Observing)

See item 1.0 and 6.4. No further discussion.

7. Next Steps

7.1 Key Messages

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

8. Diary Planning

8.1 2021 meeting dates

Discussion deferred.

Post Meeting Note: The 2021 Diary Planning Options were published on 11 August 2020 at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/PAC/140920>. PAC members are advised to review the publication and provide a view at the October meeting on the option of moving all PAC meetings to the 4th Tuesday in the month, 2 days before the Distribution Workgroup. This option was previously supported by PAFA as this would allow PAFA to provide an additional month's analysis.

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 13 October 2020	5pm Monday 05 October 2020	Teleconference	Standard Agenda
10:00, Tuesday 10 November 2020	5pm Monday 02 November 2020	Teleconference	Standard Agenda
10:00, Tuesday 14 December 2020	5pm Monday 04 December 2020	Teleconference	Standard Agenda

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

PAC Action Table (as at 14 September 2020)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
PARR Report Actions:					

PARR Aug 01	11/08/20	2.2	PAFA to issue a Performance Improvement Request to Shipper Washington for read performance across Product Class 1 and 2.	PAFA (SU)	Closed
PARR Aug 02	11/08/20	2.2	PAC members have requested the PAFA issue performance observation letters to all Shippers in PC 3 and the poorest 5 performers in PC 4 that have no meters recorded.	PAFA (SU)	Closed
PARR Aug 03	11/08/20	2.2	PAFA to arrange a series of sub-group meetings to discuss the requested issues.	PAFA (SU)	Closed
PARR Sep 01	14/09/20	2.2	PAFA to liaise with CAMs and follow up with those Shippers that have not provided timeframes with their improvement plans and/or not provided plans.	PAFA (SR)	Pending
PARR Sep 02	14/09/20	2.2	PAFA to contact Tallinn and inform them that they should not be moving sites into PC3 until equipment is installed and they are in a position to submit reads.	PAFA (SR)	Pending
PAC Actions 2020:					
PAC 0801	11/08/20	4.2	PAC Members to review the updated PAF Document v4.1 which includes Documents 1 and 4 and refer any feedback/questions to the 24 August 0674 Workgroup Meetings.	PAC Members	Closed
PAC 0802	11/08/20	5.0	PAC sub-group to consider the Market Breaker Read analysis and what the next steps should be and PAFA (SR) to consider what information can be presented using Moon names.	PAC Members / PAFA (SR)	Carried Forward
PAC 0803	11/08/20	5.0	CAMs to contact top 10 Shippers with regards to raising awareness of Market Breaker Reads.	CAMs	Closed
PAC 0804	11/08/20	5.0	Xoserve (FC) to clarify the UNC obligations for Market Breaker reads and what obligations there are for updating the AQ.	Xoserve (FC)	Closed
PAC 0805	11/08/20	6.1	PAFA (SR) to undertake a DDP gap analysis and identify any data items not available.	PAFA (SR)	Closed
PAC 0806	11/08/20	6.1	Xoserve (FC) to consider and provide how each of the PAFA proposed data items will be (or going to be) delivered with timescales.	Xoserve (FC)	Closed
PAC 0807	11/08/20	6.1	Xoserve (FC) to confirm when current CDSP historical PARR reports (10) will be available on DDP for PAFA	Xoserve (FC)	Closed

PAC 0808	11/08/20	6.2	DNs (LB/SH) to provide PAC an outline of the Measurement Error process, including the OAD obligations and the required reporting.	DNs (LB/SH)	Closed
PAC 0809	11/08/20	6.2	Xoserve (FC) to provide confirmation of any invoices issued for the current live errors (NO013, WM016 and WN003)	Xoserve (FC)	Closed
PAC 0810	11/08/20	6.4	Xoserve (FC) to confirm if an XRN is available for each DDP Story / Report change.	Xoserve (FC)	Carried Forward
PAC 0901	14/09/20	1.0	Joint Office (RH) to provide a proposed amendment to the PAC ToR to allow PAC Alternates to observe meetings.	Joint Office (RH)	Pending
PAC 0902	14/09/20	2.3	Joint Office (RH) to consider the ability to approve the Annual Review Document via email before the October meeting.	Joint Office (RH)	Pending
PAC 0903	14/09/20	2.9	CAMs to encourage Shipper Constituencies to review/audit sites with a recorded Open Bypass and to provide a response to the CDSP.	Xoserve CAMs (FC/AG)	Pending
PAC 0904	14/09/20	6.1	Xoserve (FC) to consider and review how it can meet PAC/PAFA data requirements in the short and longer term.	Xoserve (FC)	Pending
PAC 0905	14/09/20	6.4	Joint Office (RH) to review all signed PAC Membership letters to ensure these are the current version, and request replacement letters for any letters that need to be replaced.	Joint Office (RH)	Pending