Guidelines document Performance Assurance Reporting Template Guidance Document

This is one of a series of Performance Assurance Documents Governed under the Uniform Network Code, which support and maintain the Energy Settlement Performance Assurance Regime.

The Performance Assurance Framework is limited to activity downstream of the Local Distribution Zone. Gas transported through the National Transmission System (NTS) and supply points connected to the NTS are excluded from the arrangements created by this Guidelines document.

Version History

Version	Date	Reason for update
0.1	18 January 2015	First draft
0.2	22 March 2015	Second Draft: Changes to original list of reports following comments from workgroup; inclusion of further reports.
0.3		

Development of Rules

1 The requirement to publish the "**Performance Assurance Reporting Template Guidance Document**" document is specified in Section [xxx] of the Transportation Principal Document (TPD) of the Uniform Network Code (UNC). This section also provides for the document to be published and revised from time to time. The provision reads:

"1 Each Document shall be kept up to date and published by the Transporters on the Joint Office of Gas Transporters website
2 The Rules set out below meet the Gas Transporter's obligation to prepare Guidelines, while the Document Control Section records changes which have been made to the Guidelines. The document is published on the Joint Office of Gas Transporters website, www.gasgovernance.co.uk

3 These guidelines can only be modified in accordance with the requirements set out in paragraph 12 of Section V of the UNC Transportation Principal Document, which reads as follows:

"UNIFORM NETWORK CODE – TRANSPORTATION PRINCIPAL DOCUMENT SECTION V – GENERAL

12 GENERAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO UNC RELATED DOCUMENTS

12.1 Purpose

The purpose of this Section is to establish generic governance arrangements in respect of the following UNC Related Documents (each a **"Document"** and collectively the **"Documents"**):-
a) Network Code Operations Reporting Manual as referenced in Section V9.4;
b) Network Code Validation Rules referenced in Section M1.5.3;
c) ECQ Methodology as referenced in Section Q6.1 .1(c); and
d) Measurement Error Notification Guidelines for NTS to LDZ and LDZ to LDZ Measurement Installations as referenced in OAD Section D 3.1.5
e) the Allocation of Unidentified Gas Document referenced in Section E10.1.1
f) the Customer Settlement Error Claims Process Guidance Document referenced in Section E1.3.10.

12.2 Publication Requirements

Each Document shall be kept up to date and published by the Transporters on the Joint Office of Gas Transporters website.

12.3 Modifications

Should a User or Transporter wish to propose modifications to any of the Documents, such proposed modifications shall be raised through the normal UNC Modification Process.

12.4 Approved Modifications

12.4.1 In the event that a proposed modification is approved by the relevant UNC Panel or relevant Authority, the modification shall be implemented.

12.4.2 Each revised version of a Document shall be version controlled and retained by the Transporters. It shall be made available on the Joint Office of Gas Transporters website."

Contents

General

The Performance Assurance Workgroup has developed these report templates to support the production of industry Performance Assurance Reporting.

Report Criteria

Estimated Reads

Report title	Use of Estimated Reads within a Shippers Portfolio
Report reference	1.1
Purpose of report	To compare shipper use of Estimated Reads used for Settlement Reconciliation
Expected interpretation of report results	The report is expected to show per month, by Shipper the use of Estimated Reads, used within their portfolio, split out by Product Class 1 – 2.
Report structure (actual report headings and description of each heading)	Month PC1 & PC2 Shipper short code Percentage of Estimated Reads submitted, against total reads submitted Industry average
Data inputs to the report	Estimate Read count / Total Read count per shipper
Number rounding convention	Round up to closest whole number
History e.g. report builds month on month	Monthly reporting
Rules governing treatment of data inputs (the actual formula / specification to prepare the report)	Record where a D-7 estimate is used in Class 1 and 2 – this is used where the DMSP (Class 1) or Shipper (Class 2) fail to provide a read for the day[1].
Design questions awaiting a response	
Frequency of report	Monthly
Sort criteria – alphabetical, ascending etc	Shipper names alphabetically
History/Background	Source - Engage Consulting Gas Market Settlement Risk Quantification report
Additional comments	
Estimated development cost	
Estimated ongoing cost	

Example report

Use of Estimated Reads within a Shippers Portfolio				
Shipper Shortcode	Meter reading date month			
	January	February	March	etc
ABC	22%	28%	11%	
DEF	82%	76%	94%	
GHI	56%	67%	78%	
AverageAll Shippers	50%	60%	70%	

Meter Reads

Report title	Number of meter reads accepted onto UK Link each month as a percentage of the Shipper's portfolio
Report reference	1.2
Purpose of report	To compare shipper read acceptances
Expected interpretation of report results	1) To understand current "performance" 2) To increase performance
Report structure (actual report headings and description of each heading)	Month Shipper short code Percentage of accepted reads for the period Industry average
Data inputs to the report	Shipper short code, portfolio size (meter points), number of accepted reads, date of accepted read
Number rounding convention	Data presented to 4 decimal places
History e.g. report builds month on month	The report will show rolling 12 months data
Rules governing treatment of data inputs (the actual formula / specification to prepare the report)	UNC M 3.3.4 (b) meter readings may be provided by the 25th Supply Point Systems Business Day after the Meter Read Date. To provide for the UNC rule, this report is prepared two months in arrears, e.g. January read performance is reported towards the end of March. The portfolio size is measured as at the last day of the relevant month.
Design questions awaiting a response	How are Class 1, 2 and 3 reads to be treated? Are supply points connected to the NTS included? Are estimated opening readings, must reads, customer reads included?
Frequency of report	Monthly
Sort criteria – alphabetical, ascending etc	Alphabetical by Shipper Short Code
History/Background	Source - Engage Consulting Gas Market Settlement Risk Quantification report
Additional comments	
Estimated development cost	Awaiting resolution of the design questions
Estimated ongoing cost	TBC

Example report

Number of meter reads accepted onto UK Link each month as a percentage of the Shipper's portfolio				
Shipper Shortcode	Meter reading date month			
	January	February	March	etc
ABC	22%	28%	11%	
DEF	82%	76%	94%	
GHI	56%	67%	78%	
AverageAll Shippers	50%	60%	70%	

Correction Factors of zero

Report title	Correction Factors of zero
Report reference	1.3
Purpose of report	To compare the use of correction factors of zero with Product Class 1 and Product Class 2 older than 6 months
Expected interpretation of report results	The report should identify the percentage of correction factors of zero within a shipper portfolio.
Report structure (actual report headings and description of each heading)	Month Shipper short code Percentage of assets with a correction factor of zero Percentage of assets a correction factor of zero used as default Industry average
Data inputs to the report	Correction factors of zero / Correction factors per shipper, which are older than 6 months old
Number rounding convention	
History e.g. report builds month on month	
Rules governing treatment of data inputs (the actual formula / specification to prepare the report)	
Design questions awaiting a response	
Frequency of report	
Sort criteria – alphabetical, ascending etc	Alphabetical by Shipper Short Code
History/Background	Source - Engage Consulting Gas Market Settlement Risk Quantification report
Additional comments	
Estimated development cost	
Estimated ongoing cost	

Example report

Correction Factors of zero				
Shipper Shortcode	Meter reading date month			
	January	February	March	etc
ABC	22%	28%	11%	
DEF	82%	76%	94%	
GHI	56%	67%	78%	
AverageAll shippers	50%	60%	70%	

AQ re-submission performancer

Report title	AQ Re-submission Performance
Report reference	1.3
Purpose of report	To compare shipper use of the AQ re-submission process
Expected interpretation of report results	The report should identify when a meter read is rejected and report what percentage are accepted and re-submitted [2]
Report structure (actual report headings and description of each heading)	Month Shipper short code Percentage Rejected Percentage Re-submitted and accepted Industry average
Data inputs to the report	
Number rounding convention	
History e.g. report builds month on month	
Rules governing treatment of data inputs (the actual formula / specification to prepare the report)	
Design questions awaiting a response	
Frequency of report	
Sort criteria – alphabetical, ascending etc	
Additional comments	
Estimated development cost	
Estimated ongoing cost	

Example report

Shipper Shortcode	Meter reading date month			
	January	February	March	etc
ABC	22%	28%	11%	
DEF	82%	76%	94%	
GHI	56%	67%	78%	
AverageAll shippers	50%	60%	70%	

Read Factors

Report title	Read Factors
Report reference	
Purpose of report	
Expected interpretation of report results	1)
Report structure (actual report headings and description of each heading)	
Data inputs to the report	
Number rounding convention	
History e.g. report builds month on month	
Rules governing treatment of data inputs (the actual formula / specification to prepare the report)	
Design questions awaiting a response	
Frequency of report	
Sort criteria – alphabetical, ascending etc	
Additional comments	
Estimated development cost	
Estimated ongoing cost	TBC

Example report

Shipper Shortcode	Meter reading date month			
	January	February	March	etc
ABC	22%	28%	11%	
DEF	82%	76%	94%	
GHI	56%	67%	78%	
Average	50%	60%	70%	

No asset (meter) attached

Report title	No asset (meter) attached
Report reference	
Purpose of report	
Expected interpretation of report results	1)
Report structure (actual report headings and description of each heading)	
Data inputs to the report	
Number rounding convention	
History e.g. report builds month on month	
Rules governing treatment of data inputs (the actual formula / specification to prepare the report)	
Design questions awaiting a response	
Frequency of report	
Sort criteria – alphabetical, ascending etc	
Additional comments	
Estimated development cost	
Estimated ongoing cost	

Example report

Shipper Shortcode	Meter reading date month			
	January	February	March	etc
ABC	22%	28%	11%	
DEF	82%	76%	94%	
GHI	56%	67%	78%	
Average	50%	60%	70%	

Shipper Transfer Read Performance

Report title	Shipper Transfer Read Performance[3]
Report reference	
Purpose of report	To identify the performance by Shipper of the submission of opening meter readings. The failure to provide an opening meter reading will result in the use of a UK Link calculated estimated reading.
Expected interpretation of report results	Understanding performance across all Shippers Improve performance
Report structure (actual report headings and description of each heading)	Shipper, month, monthly performance (% of opening reads provided)
Data inputs to the report	All change of shipper events within the period and the acceptance of an opening read from the new Shipper
Number rounding convention	Percentage performance to 2 decimal places
History e.g. report builds month on month	Report builds month on month
Rules governing treatment of data inputs (the actual formula / specification to prepare the report)	Re-confirmations are excluded from the reported data.
Design questions awaiting a response	None
Frequency of report	Monthly
Sort criteria – alphabetical, ascending etc	Alphabetical
History/Background	Xoserve Data Quality Workgroup
Additional comments	
Estimated development cost	None – already developed and provided to Ofgem
Estimated ongoing cost	No direct cost to Shippers, included in services provided on behalf of GTs

Example report

	Transfer read performance by Shipper			
Shipper Shortcode	January	February	March	etc
ABC	22%	28%	11%	
DEF	82%	76%	94%	
GHI	56%	67%	78%	
AverageAll shippers	50%	60%	70%	

Meter Reading Submission

Report title	Read Submission Performance Target Monitoring
Report reference	
Purpose of report	To compare shipper read submission to target performance levels as set out in UNC.
Expected interpretation of report results	To understand whether shippers are meeting the expectations of UNC. Shippers to use the report to improve processes. Low performance levels across many shippers might indicate a systematic problem with Nexus.
Report structure (actual report headings and description of each heading)	See below.
Data inputs to the report	
Number rounding convention	Percentage, to two decimal places.
History e.g. report builds month on month	The report is produced monthly, giving time for the read submission deadline to pass, e.g. for daily or monthly meter reading products and frequencies performance relating January will be reported in early March; for annual read frequencies the report will also be produced monthly, the performance relating to the 12 months January 2014 to December 2014 will be reported in early February 2015.
Rules governing treatment of data inputs (the actual formula / specification to prepare the report)	Percentage of MPRNs by shipper and meter reading and product where target has been met.
Design questions awaiting a response	Should the report be aligned to the AQ month rather than the calendar month, so month end would be the AQ cut-off date?
Frequency of report	Monthly
Sort criteria – alphabetical, ascending etc	
History/Background	
Additional comments	
Estimated development cost	
Estimated ongoing cost	

Meter Reading Product	1	2	3	4	4	4
Target	97.5% of reads submitted daily by 11am on GFD+1	97.5% of reads submitted by end of GFD+1	90% of daily reads submitted each month.	Reads submitted for 90% of MPRNs with a monthly read frequency each month.	Reads submitted for 70% of SSP MPRNs with an annual read frequency in each 12-month period.	Reads submitted for 90% of LSP MPRNs with an annual read frequency in each 12-month period.
Deadline for read submission after read date.	5 calendar days	5 calendar days	Month + 10 calendar days	7 calendar days	25 calendar days	14 calendar days

Shipper A	95%	95%	90%	90%	70%	90%
Shipper B	98%	98%	80%	80%	40%	80%
Shipper C	30%	30%	100%	100%	90%	100%
All Shippers	85%	85%	90%	90%	70%	90%

Meter Reading Validity

Report title	Meter Reading Validity Monitoring
Report reference	
Purpose of report	To assess quality of shipper meter reading provision.
Expected interpretation of report results	To understand whether shippers are meeting the expectations of Nexus. Shippers to use the report to improve processes. Low performance levels across many shippers might indicate a systematic problem with Nexus.
Report structure (actual report headings and description of each heading)	See below.
Data inputs to the report	
Number rounding convention	Percentage, to two decimal places.
History e.g. report builds month on month	The report is produced monthly, giving time for the read submission deadline to pass, e.g. performance relating January will be reported in early March.
Rules governing treatment of data inputs (the actual formula / specification to prepare the report)	
Design questions awaiting a response	
Frequency of report	Monthly
Sort criteria – alphabetical, ascending etc	
History/Background	
Additional comments	
Estimated development cost	
Estimated ongoing cost	

	Reads where logic check failed as a % of submitted readings.	Reads rejected due to incorrect application of market breaker or override flag as a % of submitted readings.	Product 3 only - missing reads as a % of submitted reads.	Number of consumption adjustments for DM sites	Replacement reads submitted as a % of reads submitted.	Check reads provided as % of expected check reads.
Shipper A						
Shipper B						
Shipper C						
All Shippers						

AQ Calculation Rates

Report title	Rolling AQ calculation monitoring
Report reference	
Purpose of report	To provide a health-check on the rolling AQ calculation.
Expected interpretation of report results	Where a meter reading has been submitted in a month, it would be expected that the AQ would also be recalculated for most MPRNs (with the exception of new sites, sites with no reading history, etc.).
Report structure (actual report headings and description of each heading)	See below.
Data inputs to the report	
Number rounding convention	Percentage, to two decimal places.
History e.g. report builds month on month	The report is produced monthly, giving time for the read submission deadline to pass, e.g. performance relating January will be reported in early March.
Rules governing treatment of data inputs (the actual formula / specification to prepare the report)	
Design questions awaiting a response	Should the report be aligned to the AQ month rather than the calendar month, so month end would be the AQ cut-off date?
Frequency of report	
Sort criteria – alphabetical, ascending etc	
History/Background	
Additional comments	
Estimated development cost	
Estimated ongoing cost	

Product	1	2	3	4	4	4	All
Reading Target	97.5% of reads submitted daily by 11am on GFD+1	97.5% of reads submitted by end of GFD+1	90% of daily reads submitted each month.	Reads submitted for 90% of MPRNs with a monthly read frequency each month.	Reads submitted for 70% of SSP MPRNs with an annual read frequency in each 12-month period.	Reads submitted for 90% of LSP MPRNs with an annual read frequency in each 12-month period.	MPRNs where an AQ has been uncalculated for more than 12 months each month
AQ Expectation	97.5% of MPRNs have a new AQ calculated in each month.	97.5% of MPRNs have a new AQ calculated in each month.	90% of MPRNs have a new AQ calculated in each month.	90% of MPRNs have a new AQ calculated in each month.	5.8% of MPRNs have a new AQ calculated each month.	7.5% of MPRNs have a new AQ calculated each month.	
Shipper A							
Shipper B							
Shipper C							

All Shippers	_	_	_	_	_	_	_

Reconciliation Performance

Report title	Reconciliation Performance Target Monitoring
Report reference	
Purpose of report	Where a meter reading has been submitted a reconciliation should occur for products 3 and 4.
Expected interpretation of report results	
Report structure (actual report headings and description of each heading)	See below.
Data inputs to the report	
Number rounding convention	Percentage, to two decimal places.
History e.g. report builds month on month	The report is produced monthly, giving time for the read submission deadline to pass, e.g. performance relating January will be reported in early March.
Rules governing treatment of data inputs (the actual formula / specification to prepare the report)	
Design questions awaiting a response	Should the report be aligned to the AQ month rather than the calendar month, so month end would be the AQ cut-off date?
Frequency of report	
Sort criteria – alphabetical, ascending etc	
History/Background	
Additional comments	
Estimated development cost	
Estimated ongoing cost	

Product	3	4	4	4	3 and 4
Reading Target	90% of daily reads submitted each month.	Reads submitted for 90% of MPRNs with a monthly read frequency each month.	Reads submitted for 70% of SSP MPRNs with an annual read frequency in each 12-month period.	Reads submitted for 90% of LSP MPRNs with an annual read frequency in each 12-month period.	MPRNs where a reconciliation has not occurred more than 12 months each month
Reconciliation Expectation	90% of MPRNs are reconciled in each month.	90% of MPRNs are reconciled in each month.	5.8% of MPRNs are reconciled in each month.	7.5% of MPRNs are reconciled in each month.	_
Shipper A	_	_	_	_	_
Shipper B	_	_	_	_	_
Shipper C	_	_	_	_	_
All Shippers	_	_	_	_	_

Meter Reading Process Healthcheck

Report title	Meter Reading Process Healthcheck
Report reference	
Purpose of report	To provide an overview of the effectiveness of the meter reading process
Expected interpretation of report results	A high proportion of reads requiring the use of the override flag and AQ correction process would indicate that the meter reading validation tolerances might need review.
Report structure (actual report headings and description of each heading)	See below.
Data inputs to the report	
Number rounding convention	Percentage, to two decimal places.
History e.g. report builds month on month	The report is produced monthly, giving time for the read submission deadline to pass, e.g. performance relating January will be reported in early March.
Rules governing treatment of data inputs (the actual formula / specification to prepare the report)	
Design questions awaiting a response	
Frequency of report	
Sort criteria – alphabetical, ascending etc	
History/Background	
Additional comments	
Estimated development cost	
Estimated ongoing cost	

Meter Reading Product	1	2	3	4
MPRNs on each Product				
Readings Accepted				
Readings Rejected				
Readings Accepted with Override flag				
Use of AQ correction process for market breaker reason.				

Nexus Accuracy

Report title	Nexus Accuracy
Report reference	
Purpose of report	To monitor the allocation scaling adjustment and reconciliation scaling adjustment.
Expected interpretation of report results	If the allocation and reconciliation processes are working effectively, the scaling adjustments would be small and consistent.
Report structure (actual report headings and description of each heading)	Report of daily values of allocation scaling adjustment and reconciliation scaling adjustment by LDZ. Report produced daily with D+5 values.
Data inputs to the report	
Number rounding convention	
History e.g. report builds month on month	
Rules governing treatment of data inputs (the actual formula / specification to prepare the report)	
Design questions awaiting a response	
Frequency of report	Daily.
Sort criteria – alphabetical, ascending etc	
History/Background	
Additional comments	
Estimated development cost	
Estimated ongoing cost	

Blank template

Report title	
Report reference	
Purpose of report	
Expected interpretation of report results	
Report structure (actual report headings and description of each heading)	
Data inputs to the report	
Number rounding convention	
History e.g. report builds month on month	
Rules governing treatment of data inputs (the actual formula / specification to prepare the report)	
Design questions awaiting a response	
Frequency of report	
Sort criteria – alphabetical, ascending etc	
History/Background	
Additional comments	
Estimated development cost	
Estimated ongoing cost	

Example report

Shipper Shortcode	Transfer read performance by Shipper			
	January	February	March	etc
ABC	22%	28%	11%	
DEF	82%	76%	94%	
GHI	56%	67%	78%	
Average	50%	60%	70%	