

Performance Assurance Report Register

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	2 April 2015	Third draft: Changes to original report criteria
0.4	28 April 2015	Forth draft: Remove Changes to Development of Rules
0.5	1 June 2015	Amendments following Xoserve comments
0.6	1 July 2015	Amendments following discussion with Xoserve.
0.7	13 July 2015	Amendments following Xoserve comments
0.8	01 August 2015	Amendments following Xoserve comments
0.9	02 September 2015	Amendments following PAW comments
0.10	21 September 2015	Amendments following PAW discussions.
0.11	23 September 2015	Amendments following comments from Xoserve

12.1 Publication Requirements

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

12.2 Modifications

Should a User or Transporter wish to propose modifications to any of the Documents, such proposed modifications shall be raised in accordance with the Modification rules. .

12.3 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.....	4
Report Criteria.....	5
Estimated Reads.....	5
Standard Correction Factors for sites >732 MWH.....	7
No meter information recorded on the supply point register	9
No meter information recorded on the supply point register, and data flows received by Xoserve	11
Shipper Transfer Read Performance	12
Meter Reading Submission.....	13
Meter Reading Validity.....	15
AQs that haven't been revised within industry timescales	17
MPRNs that haven't reconciled within industry timescales.....	20
MPRNs where no read received for 1, 2, 3 or 4 years, including estimated transfer readings.	22
MPRNs where no read received for 1, 2, 3 or 4 years, excluding estimated transfer readings.	23
Meter Reading Process Healthcheck.....	24

General

The Performance Assurance Workgroup has developed these report templates to support the production of industry Performance Assurance Reporting. National Transmission sites are not captured by these reports.

Report Criteria

Estimated Reads

Report title	Estimated Reads used for gas allocation.
Report reference	1.1
Purpose of report	The purpose is to monitor the risk identified by Engage in the independent study around use of estimated reads for products 1 and 2. http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/pa/IndRiskStudy "30 January 2015 Gas Market Settlements Risks Quantification Section 2", Page 8, "Engage recommend that a performance measure is implemented to target the number of estimates used for MPRNs in products 1 and 2"
Expected interpretation of report results	The report is expected to show per month, by Shipper where estimated reads have been used for initial gas allocation, 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 Reads where estimate used Industry average
Data inputs to the report	Product Class, Date, 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.
Design questions awaiting a response	
Frequency of report	Monthly
Sort criteria – alphabetical, ascending etc	Shipper Short Code alphabetically
History/Background	Source - Engage Consulting Gas Market Settlement Risk Quantification report
Additional comments	
Estimated development cost	
Estimated ongoing cost	

Estimated Reads used for gas allocation Product Class 1				
Year 20xx				
Shipper Short Code	January	February	March	
ABC	0	0	0	

DEF	1%	1%	0	
GHI	0	3%	0	
Average	1%	2%	0%	

Estimated Reads used for gas allocation Product Class 2				
Year 20xx				
Shipper Short Code	January	February	March	
ABC	0	0	0	
DEF	2%	5%	1%	
GHI	0	0	8%	
Average	1%	2%	4%	

Standard Correction Factors for sites >732 MWH

Report title	Standard Correction Factors for sites >732 MWH
Report reference	1.2
Purpose of report	This is intended to monitor a risk identified by Engage in the independent study. See page 9 of Engage document, reference above. Meters on MPRNs with an AQ greater than 732 MWh should have a specific correction factor, rather than the default of 1.02264. It is the shipper's responsibility to notify Xoserve of the correct correction factor.
Expected interpretation of report results	Shippers will update the default correction factor with a correction factor that better reflects the sites characteristics.
Report structure (actual report headings and description of each heading)	See below. The report is produced monthly and is a snapshot at a point in time. The report shows shipper short code and a count of MPRNs with a potentially incorrect correction factor.
Data inputs to the report	Count of MPRNs with AQ > 732 MWh where the correction factor is 1.02264. Shipper Short Code. EUC band.
Number rounding convention	Rounded to whole number
History e.g. report builds month on month	Monthly
Rules governing treatment of data inputs (the actual formula / specification to prepare the report)	
Design questions awaiting a response	None
Frequency of report	Monthly
Sort criteria – alphabetical, ascending etc	Alphabetical by Shipper Short Code
History/Background	
Additional comments	
Estimated development cost	
Estimated ongoing cost	

Example report

Count of MPRNs with AQ > 732 MWh where the correction factor is 1.02264, EUC Band 04 .				
Shipper Shortcode	Month			
	January	February	March	etc
ABC	22	28	11	
DEF	82	76	94	
GHI	56	67	78	
All shippers	160	171	183	
Count of MPRNs with AQ > 732 MWh where the correction factor is 1.02264, EUC Band 05				

<u>Shipper Shortcode</u>	<u>Month</u>			
	<u>January</u>	<u>February</u>	<u>March</u>	<u>etc</u>
<u>ABC</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>11</u>	
<u>DEF</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>94</u>	
<u>GHI</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>78</u>	
<u>All shippers</u>	<u>160</u>	<u>171</u>	<u>183</u>	

Count of MPRNs with AQ > 732 MWh where the correction factor is 1.02264, repeat for EUC Bands 06, 07, 08 and 09.

<u>Shipper Shortcode</u>	<u>Month</u>			
	<u>January</u>	<u>February</u>	<u>March</u>	<u>etc</u>
<u>ABC</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>11</u>	
<u>DEF</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>94</u>	
<u>GHI</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>78</u>	
<u>All shippers</u>	<u>160</u>	<u>171</u>	<u>183</u>	

Notes:

It was discussed at PAF whether a correction factor which is less than the default value would be more indicative of a problem, due to the relationship between the correction factor and the pressure of the gas supply. Further investigation also revealed that the correction factor was dependent on the pressure at the meter, after the regulator, and height above sea level, neither of which are available, so the value of the correction factor has not been used as a grouping in the reports.

No meter information recorded on the supply point register

Report title	No meter information recorded on the supply point register.
Report reference	1.3
Purpose of report	To provide a view of no assets attached within the industry and to compare instances between shipper portfolios and to track the data historically
Expected interpretation of report results	The report should identify the percentage number of meter points where no asset is attached within a shipper portfolio.
Report structure (actual report headings and description of each heading)	Month Shipper short code MPRNs with no meter attached Industry average
Data inputs to the report	Broken down by product class EUC Band , number of meter points with no asset attached divided by total meter points within a shipper portfolio
Number rounding convention	Round up to closest whole number None.
History e.g. report builds month on month	Monthly
Rules governing treatment of data inputs (the actual formula / specification to prepare the report)	The portfolio size is measured as at the last day of the relevant month. Industry average calculated as total registered industry MPRNs with no asset attached / total registered industry MPRNs New connections where it is less than 6 months after the confirmation effective date and meters removed in the last 6 months are excluded from the reporting.
Design questions awaiting a response	None
Frequency of report	Monthly
Sort criteria – alphabetical, ascending etc	Alphabetically by Shipper Short Code
Additional comments	
Estimated development cost	
Estimated ongoing cost	

[No meter information recorded on the supply point register, EUC Band 01](#)

Year 20xx				
Shipper Short Code	January	February	March	
ABC	0	0	0	
DEF	1%	1%	0	
GHI	0	3%	0	
AverageTotal	1%	2%	0%	

No meter information recorded on the supply point register, EUC Band 02 ~~No asset (meter) attached Class 2~~

Year 20xx				
Shipper Short Code	January	February	March	
ABC	0	0	0	
DEF	2%	5%	1%	
GHI	0	0	8%	
<u>AverageTotal</u>	1%	2%	4%	

No meter information recorded on the supply point register, repeat for EUC Bands 03 to 09 ~~No asset (meter) attached Class 3~~

Year 20xx				
Shipper Short Code	January	February	March	
ABC	0	0	0	
DEF	0	0	0	
GHI	0	0	0	
<u>AverageTotal</u>	0	0	0	

~~No asset (meter) attached Class 4~~

Year 20xx				
Shipper Short Code	January	February	March	
ABC	10%	12%	4%	
DEF	1%	1%	0	
GHI	5%	3%	2%	
<u>Average</u>	3%	4%	2%	

Note: analysis by Xoserve showed that the numbers of MPRNs with no meter attached are relatively small enough to make a percentage measurement inappropriate.

No meter information recorded on the supply point register, and data flows received by Xoserve

Report title	<u>No meter information recorded on the supply point register, and data flows received by Xoserve</u> No Asset (meter) attached, and data flows received by Xoserve
Report reference	1.4
Purpose of report	To provide a view of where Xoserve do not hold a record of a meter but where data flows have been received, the implication being that a meter is actually present.
Expected interpretation of report results	The report should identify the percentages <u>show a count</u> of meter points where no asset is attached on industry systems, but industry flows suggest activity at the site.
Report structure (actual report headings and description of each heading)	Month Shipper short code MPRNs with no meter attached, where a dataflow has been received. <u>Industry average EUC Band</u>
Data inputs to the report	Broken down by product class <u>EUC Band</u> , number of meter points with no asset attached. divided by total meter points within a shipper portfolio
Number rounding convention	Round up to closest whole number
History e.g. report builds month on month	Monthly
Rules governing treatment of data inputs (the actual formula / specification to prepare the report)	The portfolio size is measured as at the last day of the relevant month. <u>Industry average calculated as total registered industry MPRNs with no asset attached / total registered industry MPRNs</u> New connections <u>where it is</u> less than 6 months <u>after confirmation effective date</u> and meters removed in the last 6 months are excluded from the reporting.
Design questions awaiting a response	None
Frequency of report	Monthly
Sort criteria – alphabetical, ascending etc	Table format is as 1.3 above. Alphabetically by Shipper Short Code
Additional comments	
Estimated development cost	
Estimated ongoing cost	

Shipper Transfer Read Performance

Report title	Shipper Transfer Read Performance
Report reference	1.5
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 by Shipper Short Code
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

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

Meter Reading Submission

Report title	Read Submission Performance Target Monitoring
Report reference	1.6
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	Supply Meter Point Class, Date, Meter reads, MPRNs in a shipper's portfolio.
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 to January will be reported as at the end of February (i.e.in early March if Xoserve have a month-end data extract) ; 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)	<p>Percentage of MPRNs by shipper and meter reading and product where target has been met. For example percentage of SSP sites in Product Class 4 where a read has been received in the preceding year.</p> <p>Daily Reads – Transporter provided 97.5% by 11am Daily Reads – Shipper provided 97.5% Daily Reads - 90% Provided within month Monthly Reads – 90% monthly sites received read a within month Annual Reads – 70% SSP Sites receive a read within year Annual Reads – 90% LSP Sites receive a read within year</p> <p>The portfolio size is measured as at the last day of the relevant month.</p>
Design questions awaiting a response	
Frequency of report	Monthly
Sort criteria – alphabetical, ascending etc	Alphabetically by Shipper Short Code
History/Background	UNC Mod 520 – PAF Reporting spreadsheet
Additional comments	<p>This report is to record Transporter and Shipper compliance with Section M of the UNC.</p> <p>For example Monthly Read sites 3.1.7 . Quarterly Read sites 3.4.1 Annual Read sites 3.4.2, for not less than 90% of the number of Monthly Read Meters which are Relevant Supply Meters for the whole of the month. And 3.5.2 For the purposes of paragraph 3.5.1(b) the relevant percentage is: (a) where the Annual Quantity of the Supply Point in which the relevant Supply Meter Point is comprised does not exceed 73,200 kWh (2,500</p>

	therms), 70%; (b) except as provided in paragraph (a), 90%.
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
Report Details	(Number of daily reads provided by the Gas Transporter in the month by 11am on GFD+1) divided by (Number of MPRNs in shippers portfolio multiplied by number of days in the month)	(Number of daily reads provided by the shipper in the month by end of GFD+1) divided by (Number of MPRNs in shippers portfolio multiplied by number of days in the month)	(Number of daily reads provided by the shipper in the month) divided by (Number of MPRNs in shippers portfolio multiplied by number of days in the month)	Percentage of MPRNs in Shipper's portfolio which have had a read in the last month.	Percentage of MPRNs in Shipper's portfolio which have had a read in the last 12 months.	Percentage of MPRNs in Shipper's portfolio which have had a read in the last 12 months.
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	1.7
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	Total number of reads submitted in a month, reads rejected due to the various reasons given in the table below. Consumption adjustments. Replacement reads. Check reads and expectation of check reads. Reason why read was rejected.
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)	Percentage of reads where logic check accepted against shipper portfolio.
Design questions awaiting a response	
Frequency of report	Monthly
Sort criteria – alphabetical, ascending etc	Alphabetically by Shipper Short Code
History/Background	UNC Mod 520 – PAF Reporting spreadsheet
Additional comments	
Estimated development cost	
Estimated ongoing cost	

	Reads where logic check* failed as a % of submitted readings.	Products, 2, 3 and 4. Reads rejected due to incorrect application of market breaker or override flag as a % of submitted readings.	Number of consumption adjustments for DM sites	Replacement reads submitted as a % of reads submitted.	Check reads provided as % of expected check reads, i.e. report if it is more than 12 months since the last check read (or date of installation)
Shipper A					
Shipper B					
Shipper C					

All Shippers					
--------------	--	--	--	--	--

* "Logic check" is the term used in the Nexus BRDs for the validation of the data in the U01 records, prior to the validation of the reading value itself. These are the rejection reasons detailed in the U02 responses. Examples are: "Non opening read received outside the read receipt window", "Meter Serial Number on the read does not match that held by Transco", "Meter Point Status is dead, updates are not allowed", "Meter Read does not have the expected number of digits", "Meter was removed on the read date provided", "The System User providing the read is not responsible for the Meter Point". This list is not exhaustive, and is intended to identify the point in the process that the rejection occurs.

[Note that the columns in the above report all measure different things, there is no direct connection between the columns.](#)

AQs that haven't been revised within industry timescales

Report title	AQs that haven't been revised within industry timescales
Report reference	1.8
Purpose of report	To report those MPRNs which have not been updated with a new AQ in the expected timescales.
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.). Any MPRNs with AQs that haven't been calculated for a period are out of date and present a risk to settlement.
Report structure (actual report headings and description of each heading)	See below.
Data inputs to the report	Latest AQ recalculation date. Count of MPRNs in shippers' portfolio.
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)	Percentage of AQs calculated against shipper portfolio. The portfolio size is measured as at the last day of the relevant month.
Design questions awaiting a response	
Frequency of report	
Sort criteria – alphabetical, ascending etc	Alphabetically by Shipper Short Code
History/Background	UNC Mod 520 – PAF Reporting spreadsheet
Additional comments	
Estimated development cost	
Estimated ongoing cost	

Product	1		
AQ not calculated for more than	1 month	4 months	12 months
Shipper A	1.00%		
Shipper B	2.00%		
Shipper C	3.00%		
All Shippers	2.00%		

Product	2		
AQ not calculated for more than	1 month	4 months	12 months
Shipper A			
Shipper B			
Shipper C			

All Shippers			
--------------	--	--	--

Product	3		
AQ not calculated for more than	1 month	4 months	12 months
Shipper A			
Shipper B			
Shipper C			
All Shippers			

Product	4, monthly read frequency		
AQ not calculated for more than	1 month	4 months	12 months
Shipper A			
Shipper B			
Shipper C			
All Shippers			

Product	4, LSP, annual read frequency		
AQ not calculated for more than	3 months	12 months	24 months
Shipper A	-	-	
Shipper B	-	-	
Shipper C	-	-	
All Shippers	-	-	-

Product	4, SSP, annual read frequency		
AQ not calculated for more than	3 months	12 months	24 months
Shipper A	-	-	
Shipper B	-	-	
Shipper C	-	-	
All Shippers	-	-	-

Product	4, LSP, annual read frequency	
AQ not calculated for more than	12 months	24 months
Shipper A	-	
Shipper B	-	
Shipper C	-	
All Shippers	-	-

Product	4, SSP, annual read frequency	
AQ not calculated	12 months	24 months

for more than		
Shipper A	-	
Shipper B	-	
Shipper C	-	
All Shippers	-	-

[Note: due to concerns around inadvertently revealing shippers' read strategies, the "3-month" category was removed from the annual read frequency tables above.](#)

MPRNs that haven't reconciled within industry timescales

Report title	MPRNs that haven't reconciled within industry timescales
Report reference	1.9
Purpose of report	To report those MPRNs which have not reconciled in the expected timescales.
Expected interpretation of report results	Where a meter reading has been submitted in a month, it would be expected that reconciliation would also be recalculated for most MPRNs (with the exception of new sites, sites with no reading history, etc.). Any MPRNs where reconciliation hasn't occurred for a period are settling to estimates, and present a risk to settlement. This only applies to MPRNs on products 3 and 4.
Report structure (actual report headings and description of each heading)	See below.
Data inputs to the report	Latest reconciliation date. Count of MPRNs in shippers' portfolio.
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)	Percentage of reconciled MPRNs against shipper portfolio. The portfolio size is measured as at the last day of the relevant month.
Design questions awaiting a response	
Frequency of report	
Sort criteria – alphabetical, ascending etc	Alphabetically by Shipper Short Code
History/Background	UNC Mod 520 – PAF Reporting spreadsheet
Additional comments	
Estimated development cost	
Estimated ongoing cost	

Product	3		
Reconciliation hasn't occurred for more than	1 month	4 months	12 months
Shipper A			
Shipper B			
Shipper C			
All Shippers			

Product	4, monthly read frequency		
Reconciliation hasn't occurred for more than	1 month	4 months	12 months
Shipper A			

Shipper B			
Shipper C			
All Shippers			

Product	4, LSP, annual read frequency		
Reconciliation hasn't occurred for more than	3 months	12 months	24 months
Shipper A	-	-	
Shipper B	-	-	
Shipper C	-	-	
All Shippers	-	-	-

Product	4, SSP, annual read frequency		
Reconciliation hasn't occurred for more than	3 months	12 months	24 months
Shipper A	-	-	
Shipper B	-	-	
Shipper C	-	-	
All Shippers	-	-	-

Product	4, LSP, annual read frequency	
AQ not calculated for more than	12 months	24 months
Shipper A		
Shipper B		
Shipper C		
All Shippers		

Product	4, SSP, annual read frequency	
AQ not calculated for more than	12 months	24 months
Shipper A		
Shipper B		
Shipper C		
All Shippers		

[Note: due to concerns around inadvertently revealing shippers' read strategies, the "3-month" category was removed from the annual read frequency tables above.](#)

MPRNs where no read received for 1, 2, 3 or 4 years, including estimated transfer readings.

Report title	MPRNs where no read received for <u>1, 2, 3 or 4 years</u>
Report reference	1.10
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	Latest read acceptance date. MPRNs on shipper's portfolio. This report includes estimated transfer readings.
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)	For the shipper's portfolio on the day the report is run, count of MPRNs with reads accepted by Xoserve in <u>1, 2, 3 or 4 years</u> , divided by total MPRNs in the shipper's portfolio, expressed as a percentage.
Design questions awaiting a response	
Frequency of report	Monthly
Sort criteria – alphabetical, ascending etc	Alphabetically by Shipper Short Code
History/Background	UNC Mod 520 – PAF Reporting spreadsheet
Additional comments	
Estimated development cost	
Estimated ongoing cost	

Example report:

No read received for more than	<u>1 year</u>	<u>2 years</u>	3 years	4 years
Shipper A	10%		5%	2%
Shipper B				
Shipper C				
All Shippers				

MPRNs where no read received for 1, 2, 3 or 4 years, excluding estimated transfer readings.

<u>Report title</u>	MPRNs where no read received for 1, 2, 3 or 4 years
<u>Report reference</u>	<u>1.10</u>
<u>Purpose of report</u>	To assess quality of shipper meter reading provision.
<u>Expected interpretation of report results</u>	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.
<u>Report structure (actual report headings and description of each heading)</u>	See below.
<u>Data inputs to the report</u>	Latest read acceptance date. MPRNs on shipper's portfolio. This report excludes estimated transfer readings.
<u>Number rounding convention</u>	Percentage, to two decimal places.
<u>History e.g. report builds month on month</u>	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.
<u>Rules governing treatment of data inputs (the actual formula / specification to prepare the report)</u>	For the shipper's portfolio on the day the report is run, count of MPRNs with reads accepted by Xoserve in 1, 2, 3 or 4 years, divided by total MPRNs in the shipper's portfolio, expressed as a percentage.
<u>Design questions awaiting a response</u>	
<u>Frequency of report</u>	Monthly
<u>Sort criteria – alphabetical, ascending etc</u>	Alphabetically by Shipper Short Code
<u>History/Background</u>	UNC Mod 520 – PAF Reporting spreadsheet
<u>Additional comments</u>	
<u>Estimated development cost</u>	
<u>Estimated ongoing cost</u>	

Meter Reading Process Healthcheck

Report title	Meter Reading Process Healthcheck
Report reference	1.11
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	See table below.
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)	Percentage of reads where override flag used
Design questions awaiting a response	
Frequency of report	Monthly
Sort criteria – alphabetical, ascending etc	
History/Background	UNC Mod 520 – PAF Reporting spreadsheet
Additional comments	
Estimated development cost	
Estimated ongoing cost	

	Product Class			
	1	2	3	4
MPRNs on each Product				
Readings Accepted				
Total Readings Rejected				
Readings rejected due to failure of “logic checks” (as defined above)				
Readings rejected due to shippers' incorrect application of read validation rules.				
Readings Accepted with Override flag				
Use of AQ correction process for market breaker reason.				