

UNC Workgroup 0812R Minutes
Review of Alternatives to “Must Read” Arrangements
Thursday 22 June 2023
via Microsoft Teams

Attendees		
Rebecca Hailes (Chair)	(RH)	Joint Office
Ben Mulcahy (Secretary)	(BM)	Joint Office
Aleksandra Cebo	(ACe)	EDF
Andy Clasper	(AC)	Cadent
Anne Jackson	(AJ)	Gemserv (PAFA)
Charlotte Gilbert	(CG)	BU-UK
Dan Stenson	(DS)	Brook Green Trading
David Mitchell	(DM)	SGN
Ellie Rogers	(ER)	Xoserve
Harry Hailwood	(HH)	Brook Green Trading
Helen Bennett	(HB)	Joint Office
James Lomax	(JL)	Cornwall Insight
Jenny Rawlinson	(JR)	BU-UK
Kathryn Adeseye	(KA)	CDSP (Xoserve)
Kevin Clark	(KC)	Utilita
Louise Hellyer	(LH)	TotalEnergies Gas & Power
Lee Greenwood	(LG)	British Gas
Mark Jones	(MJ)	SSE Energy Supply
Oorlagh Chapman	(OL)	Centrica
Richard Pomroy	(RP)	Wales & West Utilities
Sally Hardman	(SH)	SGN
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	SEFE

The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 21 September 2023.

Please note these minutes do not replicate/include detailed content provided within the material published, therefore it is recommended that the published material is reviewed in conjunction with these minutes.

Copies of all papers are available at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0812/220623>

1.0 Introduction and Status Review

Rebecca Hailes (RH) welcomed everyone to the meeting and gave a brief overview of the scheduled items for discussion.

1.1. Approval of Minutes (25 May 2023)

The minutes from the meeting held on 25 May 2023 were approved.

1.2. Approval of Late Papers

There were no late papers.

1.3. Review of Outstanding Actions

Action 0501: Rebecca Hailes (RH) to complete Workgroup Report for review at the next, and final, Review Workgroup in June.

Update: The Draft Request Workgroup Report for Workgroup discussion has been published by the Joint Office for WG to review (see Section 2.0).

Action closed.

2.0 Finalise Workgroup Report

RH confirmed that the Proposer, Richard Pomroy (RP) had provided some feedback. She advised the Workgroup of the intention to send the report to the July Modification Panel, and with this in mind, shared the report in detail with the Workgroup.

RP speculated how analogous IGT159's terms were regarding considering other reads, such as Smart, to which Ellie Rogers (ER) advised that it excluded Smart, AMR or Active DCC meters from the process which had been, until then, included in the IGT UNC Must Reads process.

Jenny Rawlinson (JR) agreed, stating that most of the changes introduced by IGT159 were improvements to the IGT Must read process, though as she was not close to the UNC process, she was not able to comment on how analogous they were.

Steve Mulinganie (SM) expressed his understanding that the challenge was why inclusions in the IGT UNC process are not considered applicable here, adding that the counterargument was that the IGT UNC inclusion was related to the different commercial basis. JR and ER agreed with this view.

The Workgroup reviewed the analysis of read volumes provided by the CDSP for the Review, and ER agreed to send RH a link to the figures for those Must Reads that initially failed to pass validation and of those the percentage that later passed due to manual intervention. This included a discussion between SM, ER and RH about reporting the impact of these reads successfully being uploaded on the £2m cost reported.

The Workgroup then considered providing a statement regarding where it was felt the responsibility for providing must reads should lie. ER commented that when she revisited the Workgroup minutes from the March 2023 meeting it seemed that the general view was that it should be moved to the CDSP, but later in the April and May meetings that position seemed to change but without any real clarity as to why this was the case. She acknowledged that the Performance Assurance Committee (PAC) did not provide a steer in this regard but was concerned there were still questions about how the CDSP could manage the process should this route for service delivery still be considered as a potential, giving as an example how the Transporters right to access facilitated obtaining meter reads, which was a power that the CDSP did not possess.

ER also suggested adding commentary about Solution Option 3b being considered the less efficient way of managing the process, and offered to provide text to this effect, RH agree to add descriptions of Solution options of 3a and 3b.

Anne Jackson (AJ) gave a view as PAFA that her understanding was that PAC did not provide a view on the best route forward, instead providing feedback on the role of PAC in the Must-read considerations, accepting its responsibility for the risk to Settlement of a lack of reads and recognised that Must Reads provided mitigation of this risk. She clarified that whilst PAC are interested in the data collated from parties collecting reads, including volumes of reads collected, read rejection reasons and the like, their view was that Shippers are responsible for how they approach their obligations, their subsequent actions and the results. In this context Must Reads is something that PAC might monitor but are not responsible for.

The Workgroup revisited the statement from the PAC Chair that was definitive about Transporters not being the correct party to be collecting Must Reads. This was followed by discussion of an apparent disparity between the PAC Chair statement and the minutes of the pertinent PAC meeting, with PAFA stating that there was not a record of an agreed PAC view that Transporters should perform the Must Reads process or not.

JR, whilst acknowledging PAFA's commentary on the PAC records, asked that if Workgroup Participants here were present at any PAC discussion of the matter, was it possible to record

their commentary on that discussion within the Workgroup Report in this meeting, providing the understanding as to the Transporter role was correct and there was scope for alteration in activities for the PAC.

AJ noted that the PAC remit and responsibilities are specified in the Performance Assurance Framework Document (PAFD), which can be changed, advising that PAC did not think Must Reads was its responsibility.

RH suggested that the Workgroup could ask PAC to add an item to their agenda to discuss this.

SM shared his view that the Workgroup should ask the PAC Chair about the apparent disparity between the Chair Statement and the PAC minutes, thinking it prudent to clarify for public record.

RP agreed, observing that the rationale to close this Review Group was due to the lack of progress but that it did not need to report back to the Modification Panel until September, so had the time and capacity to clarify this.

SM acknowledged the Proposer's comments affirmed his own view, and that the Review Workgroup should request that PAC consider the statement made in their next meeting and feedback to the Workgroup.

JR asked if the request was specifically regarding the minutes and the statement discrepancy, which SM confirmed, noting that the Workgroup cannot draw an explicit confirmation from the minutes, and thus needed to get a clear response from PAC, suggesting it be made the first item on the next PAC agenda.

New Action 0601: Joint Office (RH) to communicate Workgroup concern about disparity between PAC Chair Statement and PAC minutes to PAC for consideration and response.

3.0 Next Steps

The Workgroup is to review the anticipated response from PAC and any ensuing changes to the draft Workgroup Review Report.

4.0 Any Other Business

None

5.0 Diary Planning

Time / Date	Paper Publication Deadline	Venue	Programme
Thursday 10:00 27 July 2023	5 pm 18 July 2023	Microsoft Teams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review PAC response Consider WGR

Action Table (as of 22 June 2023)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
0501	25/05/23	1	Rebecca Hailes (RH) to complete Workgroup Report for review at the next, and final, Review Workgroup in June.	Joint Office (RH)	Closed

0601	22/06/23	2	Joint Office (RH) to communicate Workgroup concern about disparity between PAC Chair Statement and PAC minutes to PAC for consideration and response.	Joint Office (RH)	Pending
-------------	----------	---	---	-------------------	----------------