

**UNC Workgroup 0520 Minutes
Performance Assurance Reporting
Tuesday 24 February 2015
ENA, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF**

Attendees

Bob Fletcher Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Lorna Dupont (Secretary)	(LD)	Joint Office
Andrew Margan	(AM)	British Gas
Angela Love	(AL)	ScottishPower
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Colette Baldwin	(CB)	E.ON
Edward Hunter	(EH)	RWE npower
Emma Lyndon	(EL)	Xoserve
Jonathan Kiddle	(JK)	EDF Energy
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	DONG Energy
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE
Rachel Hinsley	(RH)	Xoserve

Copies of all papers are available at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0520/240215>

The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 18 June 2015.

1.0 Review of Minutes (13 January 2015)

The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted.

2.0 Guidelines Document: Performance Assurance Reporting Template Guidance Document

At the previous meeting AM had pointed out that whilst the modification is currently written to identify reports within the guidance document, he would also consider how any additional reports would be managed going forwards. He also advised that the reports contained in modification appendix would need to be amended in line with this guidance document.

AM outlined the background to the draft document, adding that it had been reviewed by Xoserve and that its comments had been taken into account. It was believed that because of issues relating to confidentiality of data, any updates to the final document would only be possible through the formal UNC modification process. EL drew attention to A Miller's comments made at the last meeting, whereby it was suggested that PAF Report could be made a defined term, and this would avoid the necessity of using the formal UNC modification process to request additional reports or request changes.

CB expressed concerns that this might be a sufficiently robust process to control report requests and would potentially be open to abuse. Some check would be required to assure that what was being requested was 'reasonable' - in terms of cost, value, purpose, beneficial use, etc. Reference was made to the Data Warehouse; it was noted this was Shipper level and not industry level data. EL confirmed this would not be in place for Day 1 following Nexus implementation.

It was suggested that once Nexus changes had settled down, then reports could be requested and be made available to all UNC parties. CB reiterated that she was more concerned about spurious requests, and that more formal governance would be better. BF observed that Modification 0520 defined the reports - governance of the regime would sit within the Framework set out in Modification 0506(A).

It was noted that the scale of risks might change once the actual data is run through the model and the reports are analysed. The model will ascertain the financial cost put onto the market. Use of data and model outputs/risk scaling was briefly discussed. It was probable that monthly report data would be required, and the accumulation of data over a 12 month period would give a much better picture.

It was questioned what obligations should sit within which modification, and it was suggested that Modification 0520 should be kept very simple, i.e. as the report modification. The Workgroup needed to think about the data aspects differently.

Attention was then focused on the document itself, and the report templates were reviewed and discussed, one by one.

It was suggested that each template should indicate the origin of the report request to provide an audit history.

Estimated Reads

It was suggested this required more detail to give it sufficient meaning. How would this report measure a) what was required to be known, and b) demonstrate compliance with any relevant UNC obligations? It was believed it would offer a comparative performance of Shippers and Transporters.

Meter Reads

This was another comparative report. It was questioned, what would this tell a reader, and what would be done with the information? Would it contribute to a better understanding? Does it improve settlement? What risk does it link back to? Is it to ensure compliance with the UNC, or what? CW commented that these reports are comparative, and not about meeting UNC obligations/requirements for reads. CB believed the criteria needed to be more detailed to be of any real use. EL pointed out that A Miller (Xoserve) was developing a report that may meet these perceived requirements.

Correction Factors of Zero

EL confirmed this report, (anonymised), was already provided by Xoserve; it could be made an industry report, subject to certain caveats/conditions.

AQ re-submission performance

Following a brief discussion, it was agreed this report should be removed from this document.

Read Factors

Following a brief discussion, it was agreed this report should be removed from this document.

No asset (meter) attached

Reference was made to Modification 0424 - was the scope of this report wider than that? The identification of a deficiency in a Shipper's process that presents a risk to the industry was discussed. It was agreed this needed more thought - what is to be counted and how the resulting information would be used.

Shipper Transfer Read Performance

This is currently provided to Ofgem, and will be provided post Nexus as a 'free' report. EL outlined the details. There were no financial risks or associated implications, and the Workgroup did not see any benefit in this report. Following a brief discussion it was agreed this report should be removed from this document.

Next Steps

AM asked if there were any additional reports that parties believe will be required? None were suggested.

AM will endeavour to bring back a revised document (to include Xoserve and Engage reports) to the Workgroup meeting on 24 March 2015.

3.0 Draft Amended Modification

A draft amended Modification had been provided for review. AM explained the changes made to the Business Rules, under Section 3, Solution.

4.0 Next Steps

A progress update will be given at the meeting on 06 March 2015.

5.0 Diary Planning

Further details of planned meetings are available at: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Diary

Workgroup meetings will take place as follows:

Time/Date	Venue	Workgroup Programme
10:30, Friday 06 March 2015	Energy Networks Association (Room 4 - Note: Maximum capacity 20 persons)	Workgroups 0483, 0506 and 0520.
10:30, Tuesday 24 March 2015	Energy Networks Association (Room 4 - Note: Maximum capacity 20 persons)	Workgroups 0483, 0506 and 0520. Workgroup Report 0483 due to 16 April Panel.
10:30, Wednesday 08 April 2015	31 Homer Road, Solihull B93 9PS	Workgroups 0506 and 0520.
10:30, Tuesday	Energy Networks Association	Workgroups 0506 and 0520.

21 April 2015	(Room 4 - Note: Maximum capacity 20 persons)	
10:30, Tuesday 05 May 2015	Energy Networks Association (Room 4 - Note: Maximum capacity 20 persons)	Workgroups 0506 and 0520.
10:30, Monday 18 May 2015	Energy Networks Association (Room 4 - Note: Maximum capacity 20 persons)	Workgroups 0506 and 0520. Workgroup Reports 0506 and 0520 are due to 18 June Panel.

Action Table (24 February 2015)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
-	-	-	-	-	-