

UNC Performance Assurance Committee Minutes
Monday 05 November 2018
at Elexon, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Mike Berrisford (Secretary)	(MiB)	Joint Office
Anne Jackson	(AJ)	PAFA
Billy Howitt	(BH)	PAFA
Carl Whitehouse*	(CW)	Shipper Member
Emma Smith	(ES)	Observer, Xoserve
John Welch	(JW)	Shipper Member
Lisa Saycell	(LS)	Shipper Member
Louise Hellyer	(LH)	Shipper Member
Mark Bellman	(MB)	Shipper Member
Mark Jones	(MJ)	Shipper Member
Neil Cole	(NC)	Observer, Xoserve
Sally Hardman*	(SH)	Transporter Member
Sallyann Blackett	(SBa)	Shipper Member
Shanna Key*	(SK)	Transporter Member

Apologies

Graham Wood	(GW)	Shipper Member
Nirav Vyas	(NV)	PAFA
Rob Johnson	(RJ)	Transporter Member
Shelly Rouse	(SR)	PAFA

* via teleconference

Copies of non-confidential papers are available at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/pac/051118>

1. Introduction and Status Review**1.1 Confirm Quorate Status**

BF welcomed everyone to the meeting and declared the meeting as being quorate.

1.2 Apologies for absence

Apologies were noted as above.

1.3 Note of Alternates

None.

1.4 Review of Minutes (09 & 23 October 2018)

AJ apologised and explained that the suggested amendments to the 23 October 2018 meeting minutes, as put forward by her colleague Nirav Vyas, are incorrect and were essentially a result of a misunderstanding of the discussions undertaken at recent meetings.

During a quick onscreen review of the minutes in question, ES suggested that the new bullet point at the end of the list in item 2.1.1 was correct, although she did point out that there would be subtle differences between the information provided within the Shipper packs, and that contained within the PAC Reports due to timing issues.

Thereafter, the minutes of the previous meetings were approved.

2. Review of Outstanding Actions

PAC 250703: PAC Members to review the risk model and consider how the model should be developed for assessing PAC risks.

Update: When BF questioned the validity of this action, on the grounds that it is woolly and open in nature, JW explained that it is related to the Risk Methodology presentation.

The Committee agreed to close the action and replace it with a standing agenda item instead. **Closed**

PAC250705b: PAFA to review the risk register once the updated post-Nexus data is received.

Update: When it was suggested that the 20 November 2018 'target date' for provision of the updated data was still correct, NC confirmed that Xoserve expects to provide the information in time for consideration at the 20 November PAC meeting. BF pointed out that the cut off date for (timely) provision of the information ahead of the meeting would be close of play on Monday 12 November 2018 at the latest.

AJ then went on to advise that Xoserve and the PAFA expect to undertake a meeting (w/c Monday 12 November 2018) to review the data in more detail (i.e. historic versus up to date data alignment aspects etc.). Supporting his colleague, BH outlined that a verbal update would be provided at the 20 November 2018 PAC meeting which would then be followed up by further more detailed consideration at the 11 December 2018 PAC meeting.

When concerns were voiced that neither the PAFA or Xoserve seem to be taking clear responsibility for this matter, AJ confirmed that the PAFA would look to provide an update on data suitability at the 20 November 2018 PAC meeting. **Carried Forward**

PAC 250706: Draft modification to be developed for the September Panel to describe framework (Deadline for new modification is 07 September 2018).

To consider a document outside the UNC which includes appropriate controls that mirror the modification process for example in relation to consultation. Could also use a similar process as that used for the demand estimation process for profiles.

Update: MB explained that he has been working closely with the Joint Office (BF) on formal submission of the modification and is currently reviewing the feedback kindly provided by B Fletcher. MB then advised that he has submitted a (late) presentation for consideration later in the meeting.¹ **Closed**

PAC 250708: Xoserve to consider how data can be made more accessible to industry at an aggregate level by LDZ and Product Class to enable movements in volumes to be tracked. MB to provide Xoserve with a more detailed specification setting out the type of information required by industry.

Update: When MB advised that he had provided a more detailed version of the specification to Xoserve (Fiona Cottam) around a month ago, ES explained that consideration of reporting

¹ Please note: a copy of the supporting 'Performance Assurance Techniques & Controls' presentation, along with a copy of the change marked draft Modification were published on the Joint Office web site on 06 November 2018.

was be considered and that it would also form part of the outputs requested from the UIG Taskforce. **Carried Forward**

PAC 250711: PAFA to review the PRIDe Gas Model based on the comments received during the workshop held on 25 July 2018.

Update: It was agreed to close the action as it would be superseded by UNC Modification 0674. **Closed**

PAC0921 (260901): PAFA to provide a proposed plan / timescales for progressing with an incentive regime modification.

Update: Committee Members agreed to reconsider the action at the 11 December 2018 PAC meeting. **Carried Forward**

PAC0803: PAFA (NV) to document and provide information on the process of moving a PAC Related Risk to an Issue and how it will be defined and monitored.

Update: AJ apologised and explained that it appears that her colleague Nirav Vyas, had misinterpreted the action requirements, and that an update would be provided at the 11 December 2018 PAC meeting. **Carried Forward**

PAC0904: Joint Office (BF) to a) draft a high level resignation process which sets out how the process is closed and down and confirms to the Member what the member can/cannot do following resignation and, b) to include an agenda item for discussion at the 09 October meeting to review the draft resignation process and the Non-Disclosure Agreement.

Update: BF explained that whilst he has not had an opportunity to progress this action, he remains uncertain as to how parties would be held to account should they resign or be deselected, how would enduring obligations be taken forward when they leave their PAC membership, especially when considering how long any confidentiality clause provisions would be expected to last, as the information becomes out of date over time.

When AJ briefly explained how the Huddle system manages leavers via its termination process, BF suggested that perhaps what is needed is a Code of Conduct style approach (similar to the UNC Panel provision) for PAC membership.

It was agreed that adoption of a 'Standard Non-Disclosure Agreement' (NDA) could prove beneficial and that the subject would be revisited at a future development meeting.

Carried Forward

PAC0907: *Reference PAF Draft Risks 017D and 018D* - PAFA (NV) to look to re-evaluate the (draft) risks against the October 2018 AUGE information, once it has been published.

Update: When BF advised that updated (October) AUGE information and 12 October 2018 early engagement meeting materials had been published on the Joint Office web site the previous week, MB pointed out that the AUGE Impact Assessment information provides more confidence and appears to 'cover off' some of the Risk 018D aspects.

The Committee Members then agreed to reconsider the action at the 20 November 2018 PAC meeting. **Carried Forward**

PAC0910: *Reference PAF Draft Risk Register Low Level Process Flow Maps* - PAFA (NV) to prepare the specific risk low-level process flow maps for consideration at a future meeting.

Update: When AJ advised that this action would be covered off under consideration of the 'Risk Register Review Plan' presentation under item 4.5 below, the Committee Members agreed that the action could now be closed. **Closed**

PAC0911: *Reference PAF Risk Register* – All parties to review risks 001 – 015 and provide views on suitable steps for progressing these (current and next action flags etc.), including potential PAC owners.

Update: When CW explained that this relates to his previous concerns about Risks and Risk Register not being reviewed in a timely fashion, BF suggested that perhaps this potentially highlights that PAC should really be reviewing any outstanding Risks on a more proactive

and ongoing basis (i.e. at least every 12 months as a minimum) – in short, this should be seen as ‘normal’ PAC business. In acknowledging the point, AJ warned that care would be needed when looking to close any outstanding risks, as by their very nature, they can be dynamic.

The Committee Members agreed to reconsider the action at the 20 November 2018 PAC meeting. **Carried Forward**

PAC0912: *Reference PAF Risk Register* – PAFA (NV) to provide a Performance Assurance Technique For Risk Resolution document to highlight risk progression (i.e. a Workplan for next 12 months and learning paper for the Top 6 risks).

Update: When AJ advised that this action would be covered off under consideration of the ‘*Risk Register Review Plan*’ presentation under item 4.5 below, the Committee Members agreed that the action could now be closed. **Closed**

PAC0914: *Reference AUGÉ Indicative UIG Figures* – PAFA to evaluate how the AUGÉ indicative UIG figures could potentially impact on (draft) risk PACR017D.

Update: It was agreed that as this action is in essence related to action 0907 above, it could now be closed. **Closed**

PAC0916: *Reference PAC09 – Data quality and issues with the submission of readings result in higher levels and fluctuations in (UIG) Unidentified Gas* – Xoserve (FC) to ensure that an overview of the Ofgem letter is provided to PAC in due course.

Update: In noting that work remains ongoing, it was agreed to reconsider the action at the 20 November 2018 PAC meeting. **Carried Forward**

PAC0919: *Reference Resolution of the Consumption Adjustment Issue* – Ofgem (JD) to compose an industry letter / communication, outlining what remedial actions have been taken so far, in looking to resolve the consumption adjustment issue.

Update: The Committee Members agreed to reconsider the action at the 20 November 2018 PAC meeting. **Carried Forward**

PAC0922: PAFA (NV) to provide an update on the Project Plan with observations and any recommendations.

Update: The Committee Members agreed to reconsider the action at the 20 November 2018 PAC meeting. **Carried Forward**

PAC0923: All PAC members to review the published Project Plan with a view of providing updates on any required actions.

Update: The Committee Members agreed to reconsider the action at the 20 November 2018 PAC meeting. **Carried Forward**

PAC0924: JW to review the requirements of the PAC Workplan and Budget and provide an update at the 9th October meeting.

Update: When JW advised that this action would be covered off under consideration of the ‘*(Gas) Energy Settlement Performance Assurance Committee – Annual Work Plan and Budget 2018/19*’ presentation under item 4.5 below, the Committee Members agreed that the action could now be closed. **Closed**

PAC0925: PAFA and Xoserve to consider the focus of future PAF Reviews to ensure it captures PACs requirements and provide a proposal/view on how this could be structured (i.e. should it be a review of the framework or a review of the PAFA role).

Update: When AJ suggested that the AUGÉ Review Model could form the basis of one approach option, NC advised that his Xoserve colleague Fiona Cottam, had sent a copy to Nirav Vyas the previous week.

The Committee Members agreed to reconsider the action at the 11 December 2018 PAC meeting. **Carried Forward**

PAC0927: *Reference Risk Register* – PAFA (NV) and PAC (JW) to come up with an interim tool kit for PAC to follow.

Update: The Committee Members agreed to reconsider the action at the 20 November 2018 PAC meeting. **Carried Forward**

PAC0928: *Reference PARR Reports* – PAFA (NV) a review to be scheduled to ensure the reports meet PAFA requirements.

Update: When AJ advised that the PAFA and Xoserve would be looking to undertake a meeting to discuss this matter, Committee Members agreed to reconsider the action at the 20 November 2018 PAC meeting. **Carried Forward**

PAC1001: *Reference the 'Data Cleanliness Observation – Meter Correction Factors' letter* – PAFA (SR) to look to redraft the letter (and the list of persistent offenders) with a view to providing a copy to PAC members for approval via email.

Update: In noting that there might be some outstanding questions to address in regards to the two draft letters, AJ explained that they are fundamentally ready to issue, and could be issued later should PAC Members indicate that they are happy for them to be sent out. AJ reminded everyone that Xoserve has confirmed that from their perspective the data is sound.

Summarising, BF advised that the letters have been drafted based around the last PAC meeting discussions and are now ready to be issued – Committee Members indicated that they supported the issuing of the letters. **Closed**

PAC1002: *Reference the 'Data Cleanliness Observation – Meter Correction Factors' letter* – PAFA (SR) to look to issue letters to the Account Managers within the offending Shipper organisations, once approved by PAC members.

Update: In noting that this action is related to PAC1001 above, AJ explained that should Committee Members require, the letters (and tracker document) could be uploaded to the Huddle system - Committee Members indicated that they supported the uploading of the letters to the Huddle system. **Closed**

PAC1003: *Reference the 'PARR Dashboards - 2A.1 Estimated & Check Reads – Product Classes 1 & 2* – PAFA (SR) and Xoserve (DT) to liaise on the initial customer engagement approach strategy via the CDSP Customer Account Managers (inc. identification of a supporting process and timeline).

Update: When ES advised that this action had been completed and that monitoring would now be ongoing, Committee Members agreed that this action could now be closed. **Closed**

PAC1004: *Reference the 'PARR Dashboards - 2A.1 Estimated & Check Reads – Product Classes 1 & 2* - Xoserve (DT) to look to provide historical background data behind the PC1 and PC2 individual offending parties and what, if any, engagement Xoserve has already undertaken with them (i.e. intelligence gathering).

Update: When MB outlined the Xoserve role in respect of this action, Committee Members also noted that this action is related to PAC1008, and could therefore be closed. **Closed**

PAC1005: *Reference the 'PARR Dashboards - 2A.5 Read Performance* - Xoserve (FC) and PAFA (SR) to look consider how to ensure data is being consistently represented and to look to enhance it to include 'X' and 'Y' axis titles along with a supporting narrative (inc. background rationale for the data set, such as read anniversary etc.).

Update: When BH explained that they (the PAFA) are awaiting provision of next months Dashboard data whereupon PAC comments would be included, Committee Members agreed that this action could now be closed. **Closed**

PAC1006: *Reference the 'PARR Dashboards - 2A.8 AQ Correction by Reason Code* - PAFA (SR) to look to provide a new report identifying kWh movement directions, once UNC Modification 0660S is approved.

Update: ES explained that discussions around this matter had been undertaken within a recent UIG Taskforce meeting, whereupon some of the underlying data has revealed some really bad behaviours being witnessed.

In noting that AQ Correction represents the second biggest risk on the (PAC) risk register, BF enquired whether or not the PAFA intends to commence work on the draft (kWh movement directions) report before awaiting a formal decision on UNC Modification 0660S 'Amendment to PARR permissions to allow PAC to update with UNCC approval'. Responding, BH explained that this would be the case and that he would look to provide a verbal update on progress at the 20 November 2018 PAC meeting.

When parties briefly discussed whether or not there are potentially two component parts to this action (UIG Taskforce and PAFA element), MJ suggested that perhaps something along the lines of the pre-Nexus era BTU reports might provide a beneficial solution.

Committee Members agreed to reconsider the action at the 20 November 2018 PAC meeting. **Carried Forward**

PAC1007: Reference the 'PARR Dashboards - 2A.9 Standard CF AQ > 732,000kWh – EUC04 (Morecambe Central, Falmouth and Colwyn Bay) – Xoserve (FC) and PAFA (SR) to investigate the background behind the figures.

Update: When ES advised that the work had now been completed, Committee Members agreed that this action could now be closed. **Closed**

PAC1008: Reference the 'Customer Advocate Engagement' – Xoserve (DT) to consider how best to provide future (monthly) updates to the PAC, including nature and level of content.

Update: In noting that this action ties in closely with action PAC1004 above (which has now been closed), Committee Members agreed to reconsider the action at the 20 November 2018 PAC meeting. **Carried Forward**

PAC1009: Reference the 'Smart Meters (exchanges and read submission statistics)' – Xoserve (FC) to look to provide a high level comparison of the differences between the 0632S and BEIS reports at the 20 November 2018 PAC meeting.

Update: Committee Members agreed to reconsider the action at the 20 November 2018 PAC meeting. **Carried Forward**

PAC1010: Reference Data Cleanliness Observation Letters 2A.1 & 2A.9 - Xoserve (DT) to look to discuss the 2A.1 and 2A.9 reporting information and letters with their Shipper contacts in order to improve industry awareness.

Update: Committee Members agreed that this action could now be closed. **Closed**

PAC1011: Reference Estimated and Check Reads Letter 2A.1 - PAFA (NV) to look to set up and provide a list of persistent poor performers.

Update: When BH advised that the tracker has now been created, Committee Members agreed that this action could now be closed. **Closed**

PAC1012: Reference Estimated and Check Reads Letter 2A.1 (& 2A.9) – Xoserve (DT) to look to report back on reconciling the various performance report findings.

Update: When ES requested an extension in order to allow Xoserve more time to consider this matter, Committee Members agreed to reconsider the action at the 20 November 2018 PAC meeting. **Carried Forward**

PAC1013: Reference Estimated and Check Reads Letter 2A.1 – Xoserve (DT) to look to investigate all Shippers with a zero value and decide a strategy to manage these going forwards.

Update: When ES explained that she has now raised two Change Proposals for development via the DSC Change Management Committee route, Committee Members agreed that this action could now be closed. **Closed**

PAC1014: *Reference Estimated and Check Reads Letter 2A.1 – Xoserve (ES)* to prepare the draft associated DSC Change Proposal ensuring it includes a request for more timely performance reporting information provision and circulate for review by PAC Members ASAP, with a view to potential submission for the next DSC Change Manager’s meeting on 07 November 2018.

Update: As per action PAC1013 above. **Closed**

3. **New PAC Members Process**

The Committee Members agreed that this agenda item could now be removed going forwards.

4. **Development of Risk and Assurance Methodologies**

4.1 **Development – risk and assurance methodologies**

It was agreed that this item relates in part to the development of the draft PAC Modification – please refer to discussions on item 7.5 below for more details.

4.2 **Risk Model Methodology** (action reference PAC250703)

In providing a brief overview of the ‘*Risk Model methodology*’ presentation, AJ explained how new data would be run through the previous Engage model that was utilised to establish the main Settlement Risks prior to Project Nexus implementation, which the PAFA considers is suitable for managing post-Settlement Nexus risks.

In considering the ‘Background’ slide 3, JW pointed out that in relation to the first bullet point, a LDZ 1:20 event is a worst case risk, and wondered whether or not there is added value in also looking at a national level risk. Acknowledging the point, AJ suggested that perhaps it might be wiser to look to aggregate (amalgamate) up to a higher national level – however, the value of undertaking such an exercise was questioned by at least one party at which point AJ noted that what this is essentially a ‘tool’ to enable PAC to assess the level of risk involved. Furthermore, the proposed approach is consistent with the one adopted by Engage in the first instance and should PAC decide to change the model parameters, it would run the risk of going back to stage one and needing to reevaluate all risks.

When asked why it appears that nothing has actually changed since the Engage report was drafted, AJ responded by advising that the PAFA is awaiting provision of fresh data in order to accurately predict risk levels, although she does acknowledge that this could lead to a review of the underlying methodology – Committee Members supported leaving the methodology ‘as-is’ until the refreshed data is assessed.

AJ explained that the PAFA is of the opinion that the methodology is principally sound, and would like to review the fresh data before trying to assess whether or not the methodology is still relevant in its present form. When asked, Committee Members supported the setting up of a Methodology Review Workshop once refreshed (new) data is available.

When asked whether the (Engage) risk model is easily adaptable, AJ responded by indicating that whilst she believes it is. AJ then provided a brief explanation behind how you can set the various parameters within the model (i.e. the population pollution aspects etc.) in order to assess any potential impacts.

In quickly reviewing the ‘*List of risks*’ slide 9, AJ explained that re-evaluation of these existing risks, along with any new risks to be added, could/would be undertaken in due course.

<p>New Action PAC1101: <i>Reference Risk Model Methodology</i> – PAFA (AJ) to look to set up a methodology review meeting once the refreshed data has been made available and analysed.</p>
--

4.3 PRID(e) Model and PRID(e) Overview Document (action reference PAC250711)

In referring to the presentation provided at the 25 July 2018 PRID(e) Project Plan Workshop Day, AJ enquired whether or not Committee Members were happy with the title and level of content. Responding, JW advised that he was generally happy with the information provided concluding that it was 'fit for purpose' and successfully encapsulated the underlying principles.

4.4 Assurance Model Methodology (action reference PAC0910 and 0912)

Committee Members were satisfied that this agenda item had already been covered off during discussions on item 4.2 above.

4.5 Risk Register Review plan

During a quick review of the '*Risk Register Review plan*' presentation, attention was focused on '*PAF Risk Register review plan*' slide 4, whereupon PAC debated the merits of a March 2019 date to which the consensus was positive.

When asked what would be included in the review, AJ explained that she hopes that the PAFA would be able to provide a view on the data in December 2018, in order to enable PAC to review by February 2019 (i.e. data set evaluation exercise) and then follow this up with an industry consultation.

At this point attention switched to the draft high-level PAF Risk Register summary document (provided by JW), during which MB referred to a recently raised risk.

In reviewing the content of the document, AJ suggested that there might be another 'dimension' to some of the items. Responding, JW explained that he is not suggesting that the work that has already been undertaken to date is ignored, preferring instead to look to review prior to March 2019 in order to reinforce the list.

In referring to the '*Withdrawal of DM transporter obligation (Mod 0647)*' item, BF enquired whether or not this is suggesting that the modification solution would create a risk – some parties felt that this could be the case. BF went on to suggest that care would be needed if PAC are thinking of highlighting modifications, especially when these can be very dynamic in nature during the course of their respective Workgroup development.

Parties then debated the value of including a reference to PAC monitoring / reporting within the respective Modifications and/or Workgroup Reports on the grounds that this would highlight (and reinforce) the role of the PAC going forwards. However, it was also noted that care is needed to avoid inference that PAC might delay a modification progressing. BF suggested that perhaps what is really being identified is a need for a form of tracking mechanism.

Following a brief discussion, it was generally agreed that the Joint Office (BF) on behalf of the PAC should look to include a new agenda item (seeking a Panel view on changes to the Workgroup Report template to capture PAC monitoring / reporting aspects) for consideration at the 15 November 2018 Panel.

New Action PAC1102: Reference UNC Modification Workgroup Report Template PAC Change - Joint Office (BF) to ensure that a new agenda item for inclusion of PAC performance related impact assessment is added to the 15 November 2018 Panel agenda.

Concluding discussions, JW drew attention to his '(Gas) Energy Settlement Performance Committee: Annual Work Plan and Budget 2018/19' document before providing a quick overview of the content.

5. Responsibility Overview

JW provided a brief overview of his draft *'Performance Assurance Framework Function'* document focusing attention on the role of the various parties, the description of expectations and any dependencies.

Following a quick overview of the RACI (**R**esponsible, **A**ccountable, **C**onsulted, **I**nformed) slide, JW agreed to provide an accessible format version of the presentation for issue to PAC Committee Members, in order that they may review and provide comments / suggested amendments.

New Action PAC1103: Reference *'Performance Assurance Framework Function'* - npower (JW) to provide an accessible format version of the document to the Joint Office for distribution to PAC Members for review.

New Action PAC1104: Reference *'Performance Assurance Framework Function'* – All parties to review the document and provide comments / suggested amendments to JW direct.

6. Communications Plan

Consideration deferred.

7. Any Other Business

7.1 Review of the Performance Assurance Framework - All

Please refer to discussions on item 7.5 below for more details.

7.2 Smart Meters (exchanges and read submission statistics) - All

JW advised that work is ongoing on preparation of the draft modification proposal in time for PAC consideration at the 20 November 2018 meeting.

7.3 Consideration of the Ofgem Decision Letter for UNC0619/A/B – All

7.3.1. Undertake GAP Analysis when considering Modifications 0647, 0664 and 0685

When SK questioned whether or not these agenda items should remain going forwards, (especially in light of new UNC Modification 0665 - 'Introduction of suitable classification of Ratchetable Supply Points & ensuring accurate Capacity Allocations (SOQ)'), MB referenced the previous discussions around Product Class 1 incentive read performance and the fact that UNC Modification 0647 'Opening Class 1 reads to Competition' makes reference to the PAC monitoring and if required establishing a suitable incentive regime.

It was noted that PAC has also previously discussed whether or not additional modifications would be needed in due course in order to address a number of potential PAC actions/requirements, depending upon progress of UNC Modifications 0647, 0664 and 0665 – when it was suggested that perhaps this is a piece of work that the PAFA could possibly be involved in, MB made reference to the last paragraph in Ofgem's Modifications 0619/A/B decision letter² before agreeing to provide some background information to the PAFA in due course.

7.4 Draft (PAC) Performance Assurance Techniques & Controls Modification Consideration – MB

² Please note: a copy of the Ofgem Decision Letter for UNC Modification 0619/A/B can be viewed and/or downloaded from the Joint Office web site at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0619>

Introducing the item, BF enquired whether or not there are any potential (direct/indirect) impacts from the proposed modification on existing commercial agreements/arrangements, as if there are, in his view it begs the question as to whether or not the PAC should have visibility of such commercially sensitive information – the consensus was that the modification is suitable to progress on the basis of the current drafting in respect of this point.

7.4.1. PAC Mod Performance Assurance Techniques & Controls Overview Presentation

When MB apologised for the late provision of the presentation, BF reminded everyone present that the aim of good governance is to provide meeting materials in a timely fashion (i.e. as per the submission request date provided on the meeting email invitation).

When asked whether or not he had made any progress towards raising the draft Product Class 1 modification(s), JW responded by explaining that based on recent UIG Workgroup discussions (around targets and incentives methodology document)³, perhaps an Ancillary Document style approach might prove beneficial. BF pointed out that where any Ancillary Document is referred to in Code, it becomes a Code obligation.

It was recognised that whilst the DNs may have obtained a meter reading, the main issue stems from whether or not this is actually loaded into the (settlement) system. This is then compounded by subtle nuances between Code obligations versus post Nexus system validation versus read usage. To some degree the issue can be mitigated by Shippers ensuring that meter asset information is correct, although having stated that, a lack of a clear Product Class 1 incentive on Shippers remains a concern. When asked, ES provided a brief overview behind how the system works and the potential loopholes involved (i.e. the balance between reads versus loading versus subsequent validation etc.).

When MB enquired whether or not PAC believes that it should consider establishing an obligation on Shippers to ensure that reads flow through correctly into the settlement system, JW acknowledged the point and indicated that he would examine the UNC Modification 0635 provisions and look to include elements of these within his draft modification in due course.

In considering the *'Definitive list of must-meet metrics and mods to codify'*, (i.e. what data items would be needed etc.) MB wondered whether a risk register evaluation exercise would prove beneficial.

It was noted that the *'Risk register re-vamp'* would be discussed in more detail later in the meeting when reviewing the related presentation provided by JW.

JW advised that he has already started to consider the *'Review R&R, contracts & accountabilities'* aspects as part of the development of his draft modification.

MB then provided a brief explanation to support the *'Develop PAF process'* item before moving on to provide more detail behind the list of the main elements of the draft proposal outlined on page 3.

During discussions on the eleven items contained within the listing (A through to and including K), the following main points were captured (on a by exceptions basis), as follows:

³ A copy of the 31 October 2018 UIG Workgroup meeting minutes are available to view and/or download from the Joint Office web site at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/uig/311018>

- **A. Performance Assurance Objectives** – perhaps targets should be set inline with the underlying principles, rather than simply aiming to satisfy Code (prescriptive) objectives.

In general, PAC should be looking to incentivise parties to take care of their asset data, especially when portfolio rotation can be an issue - it was agreed that a 'principles' based objective would be beneficial in order to ensure that we cover off a parties failure to successfully manage their portfolio.

In noting that this also potentially ties in with item E (Performance Targets & Charges), MB indicated that he would look to incorporate the suggestion within the next iteration of the modification.

It was suggested that historically Code targets have been potentially misleading, and it is hoped that this new modification proposal would provide a wider industry perspective that should enable it to be easier to identify poor performing parties and the factors influencing in their poor performance – it was noted that there is a potential supporting role for PAC to help parties to resolve their issues. In short, the (new) framework should reflect the Performance Assurance objectives;

- **B. Performance Assurance Proportionality** – care is needed to ensure that PAC does not simply focus on failing parties and takes a wider holistic industry view into account;
- **C. Materiality Assessment** – related to objectives and proportionality;
- **D. Escalation Framework** – dependent upon triggers, reports and inter party discussions (i.e. Shippers, Xoserve and PAC).

A balance is needed between development and adoption of a gradual versus abrupt escalation mechanism (including identification of both UNCC and Ofgem supporting roles);

- **E. Performance Targets & Charges** – PAC to agree the basis for these elements, although it should be noted that this might not include incentive targets per se, as we could utilise a separate document that resides outside of Code.

It was noted that specific charges would not be included within the modification proposal, only the underlying principles behind them. Furthermore, it was acknowledged that further consideration around how any monies generated would be managed (i.e. rebates / redistribution aspects).

PAC also recognise that they need to consider the potential impacts of instances where poor performing parties (continually) ignore their performance issues and in short, make a commercial decision to continue to breach their performance targets – the concern is that the potential levels of any fines might not dissuade poor behaviors'. It was noted that this also links in to escalation aspects;

- **F. Scalability & Change** – PAFA to provide monthly updates to PAC on prospective areas of performance exposure and/or mitigation arising from any new UNC Modifications coming along;
- **G. Consequences** – it was recognised that this is essentially 'what it says on the tin', so to speak.

Potentially involves certification / re-certification of systems and processes etc. going forwards;

- **H. Review Cycle** – potentially involving monthly, quarterly and annual cycles, where necessary;
- **I. Preventive Controls** – PAC is of the view that industry education is a key element and that adoption of a market entrant test (similar to the electricity market model), would be potentially beneficial.

It was also noted that a re-qualification mechanism might also prove beneficial and is something that is already being considered for Gas Suppliers.

PAC believes that closer (communication) links between the UNC and the Retail Energy Code (REC) sector would also prove beneficial, whilst a better understanding and appreciation of aspects relating to the contractual arrangements between Suppliers and Shippers; and faster switching aspects (i.e. settlement risks etc.) also need to be furthered.

It was suggested that it would be beneficial for PAC to provide a response to the REC consultation, whereupon BF confirmed that a formal recording of votes would be needed.⁴

In pointing out that going forwards the expectation is that the SPAA would be absorbed into the REC, AJ provided a brief explanation around how Suppliers would undertake ‘switches’ in future (i.e. contractual arrangement aspects etc.) and how Shippers would then need to undertake the appropriate actions thereafter – this has a potential impact on gas settlement aspects. MB pondered whether or not, this highlights a need to look to consolidate the various Codes at some point in the future.

Discussions briefly focused on whether or not PAC actually has the power to vote on such matters and how it could avoid an Energy UK diluted response scenario. In reminding those present that faster switching would be instigated via an SCR (including a multi Cross Code umbrella aspect) and as a consequence, sits outside of the (direct) UNC process, BF went on to suggest that perhaps this would be a better route in to the process. He then outlined how he envisages the SCR consultation would be undertaken via a Cross Code modification.

PAC then undertook a formal vote on whether to write to the Authority (Ofgem) in order to provide comments on the establishment of a performance regime for the Retail Energy Code (REC) and highlight the need to be mindful of any potential impact on the REC from any of the other Codes.

Voting Outcome:	PAC to write to the Authority (Ofgem) in order to provide comments on the establishment of a performance regime for the Retail Energy Code (REC) and highlight the need to be mindful of any potential impact on the REC from any of the other Codes	
Shipper Member	Voting Count	For / Against
Carl Whitehouse	1	For

⁴ Post meeting note: an extraordinary PAC teleconference meeting has been arranged for 09:00 on Monday 12 November 2018 in order to look to formally approve the PAC Retail Energy Code Consultation response letter. Please see <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/pac/121118>

John Welch	1	For
Lisa Saycell	1	For
Louise Hellyer	1	For
Mark Bellman	1	For
Mark Jones	1	For
Sallyann Blackett	1	For
Transporter Member	Voting Count	For / Against
Sally Hardman	1	For
Shanna Key	1	For

PAC voted unanimously in favour of drafting a Retail Energy Code Consultation response letter;

New Action PAC1105: *Reference Retail Energy Code Consultation – PAFA (AJ) to draft a PAC consultation response (inc. settlement and meter reading aspects and a broad view on performance assurance and objectives) on behalf of PAC and circulate to Committee Members for views by no later than close of play on 08 November 2018.*

New Action PAC1106: *Reference Retail Energy Code Consultation – All Committee Members to review the PAC consultation response letter and provide views back to the PAFA asap.*

- **J. Disputes** – PAC discussed what any potential litigation mechanisms might be appropriate in the event that parties indicate that they are not comfortable with the level of fine(s) imposed upon them – it was noted that care is needed in addressing this area as in the past, summons might have been invoked within other market sectors.

When PAC noted that liquidation damages could also be potentially involved, BF suggested that this area is a difficult one to address as Code predominately involves a Transporter to Shipper relationship, that is subtly different to a Shipper to Shipper relationship.

It was acknowledged that perhaps it would be preferable to look to build in a consultation / appeals mechanism into the framework rather than running the risk of invoking litigation action.

When it was suggested that perhaps the PAC would need to consider adoption of a disputes style process, BF outlined how the current EBCC process (Transporter to Shipper) works. He once again warned that the PAC process remains subtly different (Shipper to Shipper). BF also reminded those present that PAC Members are appointed to act on behalf of industry constituents, rather than from an individual company perspective;

- **K. Budget** – in noting that the current PAC budget sits at circa £50k, Committee Members briefly debated whether or not this should be increased.

When ES pointed out that the 2018/19 Budget Plan is due to be considered at the December DSC Change Management Committee meeting (any new funding requests would take the form of a Change Proposal submission), BF advised that PAC would need to prepare a Workplan to acquire another funding provision – in essence the current £50k provision is a ‘contingency’.

7.4.2. Draft Modification Consideration⁵

In introducing the draft modification, MB confirmed that he would like to formally submit the modification for consideration at the 15 November 2018 Panel meeting and to this end, would welcome feedback from PAC colleagues. In noting that the (draft) modification had already been submitted and critiqued by the Joint Office and comments fed back to Mark, BF pointed out that in order to formally submit the modification for the November Panel it would need to be finalised (i.e. formally submitted by the Proposer in a finished state and allocated a number) by close of play on Wednesday 07 November 2018.

BF then reminded everyone that once the modification is formally raised and sent to a Workgroup by the Panel, it would not naturally return to the PAC for development purposes, as this is done within the Workgroup itself. It was noted that PAC Members are free to attend the ‘open’ Workgroup meetings anyway. When SB pointed out that past DESC related modifications had fed into, and out of PAC during their Workgroup development phases, BF pointed out that this new modification is subtly different as it proposes to introduce a new framework.

When it was suggested that perhaps PAC could look to tease out some non Code related elements from within the modification, MB reiterated that he remains of the opinion that there is an active role for PAC to play in reviewing the modification as it progresses through the Workgroup development phase of proceedings – in short, the modification is seeking to deliver a solution that PAC are looking for, and happy with. Supporting MB’s proposed approach, SB believed that there was value in PAC reviewing the modification and recording discussions.

PAC consensus was to aim to formally submit the modification to the November 2018 Panel meeting, and as a consequence, would be comfortable to defer some of today’s agenda items to enable a review of the draft modification to take place today.

BF warned that a careful approach is needed if that is the case, as any PAFA representatives should not be present during detailed discussions on the modification, as it (the modification) relates to PAFA contractual aspects and furthermore PAC is a ‘closed’ meeting. He observed that as Workgroup meetings are open forum, PAFA representatives would be more than welcome to attend – at this point the PAFA representatives left the meeting before an onscreen review of the draft modification was undertaken.

Upon presentation of the draft modification, SK enquired whether or not both herself and S Hardman would have some time to consider the document in more detail before providing feedback – MB responded in the positive explaining that he would welcome any feedback and would look to consider whether or not to amend the modification accordingly.

⁵ Please note: the PAFA representatives were not present during detailed discussions on the draft UNC Modification, due in part to potential conflict of interest concerns.

When asked, BF confirmed that historically PAC has not been required to vote on new PAC related modifications and that ultimately it is down to the Proposer as to whether or not feedback is included within the modification.

BF went on to point out that in referring to 'Transporters' within the modification, the Proposer (and PAC) should exclude National Grid NTS on the grounds that they (NTS) do not have any impact on, or involvement in, the settlement processes. In explaining why NTS do not have PAC membership, BF suggested that MB should simply look to amend the Solution Section to clarify the position.

SH voiced concerns that in involving Transporters and the CDSP within the modification, this potentially changes PAC powers.

During a quick review of Sections 1 (Summary) and 2 (Governance), NC confirmed that he would look to provide some background supporting information to MB direct.

In examining Section 3 – Why Change?, BF pointed out that the modification should really identify why the existing regime does not work.

Moving on to review the various items within Section 5 – Solution, discussions centred on '*F. Scalability & Change*', whereupon SK pointed out that the Class 4 read obligations modification Workgroup participants are keen to identify what would be done with any monies that are collected / generated. In referring to JW's proposed draft modification MB acknowledged that there is a recognised need to adopt a consistent approach.

Referencing the proposed PAFA and Xoserve roles, ES suggested that care would be needed to avoid a clash of roles (i.e. there needs to be two clear and specific roles identified). In response, MB challenged this view believing that this is not really a concern. However, SH pointed out that she also supports ES's concerns on this matter. MB then went on to explain how a similar model in the electricity market works. Concluding the discussion around this concern, ES explained how different parties engage (or not as the case may be) at different levels and points within the process, especially when identified as under performers.

7.5 PAFA Team Member Change

AJ advised that her colleague Nirav Vyas has moved to another role within the PAFA would no longer be working on PAC related matters and would be replaced by Shelley Rouse with Paul Rocke assuming the role of overall PAFA Manager. AJ confirmed that she would also be continuing in her support role to the PAC going forwards.

When asked about any work that was already in progress involving Nirav, AJ advised that Nirav would be formally handing over the reigns to Shelley who would then continue forwards with any 'in flight' work areas.

7.6 Enhancements to the PAC Agendas to align with DSC Change Management Committee template

In referring to the layout and approach provided for in the DSC Change Management Committee agendas (i.e. for information / for approval flags etc.), JW wondered whether or not there would be value in adopting a similar model for future PAC agendas in order to make it easier for participants to prepare for meetings.

<p>New Action PAC1107: Joint Office (BF/MiB) to evaluate how best to enhance the PAC agendas going forwards (including any potential pit falls) in a similar style to the DSC Change Management Committee agendas.</p>

8. Next Steps

8.1 Key Messages – PAFA

The following draft Key Points are provided by the PAFA subject to formal approval at the next meeting, as follows:

- To be provided in due course.

9. Diary Planning

Further details of planned meetings are available at:

<https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/events-calendar/month>

Time/Date	Venue	Programme
10:30, Monday 12 November 2018	Teleconference only	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Consideration and approval of PAC Retail Energy Code Consultation Response Letter</i>
10:30, Tuesday 20 November 2018	Radcliffe House, Blenheim Court, Warwick Road, Solihull, B91 2AA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Monthly Review Items</i>
10:30, Tuesday 11 December 2018	Radcliffe House, Blenheim Court, Warwick Road, Solihull, B91 2AA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>To be confirmed</i>

PRID(e) Action Table (as at 05 November 2018)

Action Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
PAC 250703	PAC Members to review the risk model and consider how the model should be developed for assessing PAC risks.	PAC Members	Update provided. Closed
PAC 250705b	PAFA to review the risk register once the updated post-Nexus data is received.	PAFA	Carried Forward (Update due 20 November 2018)
PAC 250706	Draft modification to be developed for the September Panel to describe framework (Deadline for new modification is 07 September 2018). To consider a document outside the UNC which includes appropriate controls that mirror the modification process for example in relation to consultation. Could also use a similar process as that used for the demand estimation process for profiles.	PAC Members	Update provided. Closed

PAC 250708	Xoserve to consider how data can be made more accessible to industry at an aggregate level by LDZ and Product Class to enable movements in volumes to be tracked. MB to provide Xoserve with a more detailed specification setting out the type of information required by industry.	Xoserve (FC)/ MB	Carried Forward (Update due 20 November 2018)
PAC 250711	PAFA to review the PRIDe Gas Model based on the comments received during the workshop held on 25 July 2018. Update: PAC members to review the updated PRIDe in Gas Model Workshop presentation which was republished since the 25 July 2018 workshop.	PAFA	Update provided. Closed
PAC 0921 (260921)	PAFA to provide a proposed plan / timescales for progressing with an incentive regime modification.	PAFA	Carried Forward (Update due 11 December 2018)

PAC Action Table (as at 05 November 2018)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
PAC 0803	06/08/18	2.2.2	To document and provide information on the process of moving a PAC Related Risk to an Issue and how it will be defined and monitored.	PAFA (NV)	Carried Forward (Update due 11 December 2018)
PAC 0904	03/09/18	2.2	To a) draft a high level resignation process which sets out how the process is closed and down and confirms to the Member what the member can/cannot do following resignation and, b) to include an agenda item for discussion at the 09 October meeting to review the draft resignation process and the Non-Disclosure Agreement.	Joint Office (BF)	Carried Forward (Update due 20 November 2018)
PAC 0907	11/09/18	2.1.1	<i>Reference PAF Draft Risks 017D and 018D</i> - PAFA (NV) to look to re-evaluate the (draft) risks against the October 2018 AUGE information, once it has been published.	PAFA (NV)	Carried Forward (Update due 20 November 2018)

PAC 0910	11/09/18	2.1.2	<i>Reference PAF Draft Risk Register Low Level Process Flow Maps - PAFA (NV) to prepare the specific risk low-level process flow maps for consideration at a future meeting.</i>	PAFA (NV)	Update provided. Closed
PAC 0911	11/09/18	2.1.2	<i>Reference PAF Risk Register – All parties to review risks 001 – 015 and provide views on suitable steps for progressing these (current and next action flags etc.), including potential PAC owners.</i>	All	Carried Forward (Update due 20 November 2018)
PAC 0912	11/09/18	2.1.2	<i>Reference PAF Risk Register – PAFA (NV) to provide a Performance Assurance Technique For Risk Resolution document to highlight risk progression (i.e. a Workplan for next 12 months and learning paper for the Top 6 risks).</i>	PAFA (NV)	Update provided. Closed
PAC 0914	11/09/18	2.1.2	<i>Reference AUGE Indicative UIG Figures – PAFA to evaluate how the AUGE indicative UIG figures could potentially impact on (draft) risk PACR017D.</i>	PAFA	Update provided. Closed
PAC 0916	11/09/18	2.2.1	<i>Reference PAC09 – Data quality and issues with the submission of readings result in higher levels and fluctuations in (UIG) Unidentified Gas – Xoserve (FC) to ensure that an overview of the Ofgem letter is provided to PAC in due course.</i>	Xoserve (FC)	Carried Forward (Update due 20 November 2018)
PAC 0919	11/09/18	6.	<i>Reference Resolution of the Consumption Adjustment Issue – Ofgem (JD) to compose an industry letter / communication, outlining what remedial actions have been taken so far, in looking to resolve the consumption adjustment issue.</i>	Ofgem (JD)	Carried Forward (Update due 20 November 2018)
PAC 0922	26/09/18	4.2.1	PAFA (NV) to provide an update on the Project Plan with observations and any recommendations.	PAFA (NV)	Carried Forward (Update due 20 November 2018)
PAC 0923	26/09/18	4.2.1	All PAC members to review the published Project Plan with a view of providing updates on any required actions.	PAC	Carried Forward (Update due 20 November 2018)

					2018)
PAC 0924	26/09/18	4.3.1	JW to review the requirements of the PAC Workplan and Budget and provide an update at the 9 th October meeting.	PAC (JW)	Update provided. Closed
PAC 0925	26/09/18	4.4	PAFA and Xoserve to consider the focus of future PAF Reviews to ensure it captures PACs requirements and provide a proposal/view on how this could be structured. (i.e. should it be a review of the framework or a review of the PAFA role)	PAFA / Xoserve	Carried Forward (Update due 11 December 2018)
PAC 0927	26/09/18	4.4	Risk Register - NV and JW to come up with an interim tool kit for PAC to follow.	PAFA (NV) / PAC (JW)	Carried Forward (Update due 20 November 2018)
PAC 0928	26/09/18	4.4	PARR Reports review to be scheduled to ensure the reports meet PAFA requirements.	PAFA (NV)	Carried Forward (Update due 20 November 2018)
PAC 1001	09/10/18	3.2	<i>Reference the 'Data Cleanliness Observation – Meter Correction Factors' letter</i> – PAFA (SR) to look to redraft the letter (and the list of persistent offenders) with a view to providing a copy to PAC members for approval via email.	PAFA (SR)	Update provided. Closed
PAC 1002	09/10/18	3.2	<i>Reference the 'Data Cleanliness Observation – Meter Correction Factors' letter</i> – PAFA (SR) to look to issue letters to the Account Managers within the offending Shipper organisations, once approved by PAC members.	PAFA (SR)	Update provided. Closed
PAC 1003	09/10/18	3.6	<i>Reference the 'PARR Dashboards - 2A.1 Estimated & Check Reads – Product Classes 1 & 2</i> – PAFA (SR) and Xoserve (DT) to liaise on the initial customer engagement approach strategy via the CDSP Customer Account Managers (inc. identification of a supporting process and timeline).	PAFA (SR) & Xoserve (DT)	Update provided. Closed

PAC 1004	09/10/18	3.6	<i>Reference the 'PARR Dashboards - 2A.1 Estimated & Check Reads – Product Classes 1 & 2 - Xoserve (DT) to look to provide historical background data behind the PC1 and PC2 individual offending parties and what, if any, engagement Xoserve has already undertaken with them (i.e. intelligence gathering).</i>	Xoserve (DT)	Update provided. Closed
PAC 1005	09/10/18	3.6	<i>Reference the 'PARR Dashboards - 2A.5 Read Performance - Xoserve (FC) and PAFA (SR) to look consider how to ensure data is being consistently represented and to look to enhance it to include 'X' and 'Y' axis titles along with a supporting narrative (inc. background rationale for the data set, such as read anniversary etc.).</i>	Xoserve (FC) & PAFA (SR)	Update provided. Closed
PAC 1006	09/10/18	3.6	<i>Reference the 'PARR Dashboards - 2A.8 AQ Correction by Reason Code - PAFA (SR) to look to provide a new report identifying kWh movement directions, once UNC Modification 0660S is approved.</i>	PAFA (SR)	Carried Forward (Update due 20 November 2018)
PAC 1007	09/10/18	3.6	<i>Reference the 'PARR Dashboards - 2A.9 Standard CF AQ > 732,000kWh – EUC04 (Morecambe Central, Falmouth and Colwyn Bay) – Xoserve (FC) and PAFA (SR) to investigate the background behind the figures.</i>	Xoserve (FC) & PAFA (SR)	Update provided. Closed
PAC 1008	09/10/18	5.	<i>Reference the 'Customer Advocate Engagement' – Xoserve (DT) to consider how best to provide future (monthly) updates to the PAC, including nature and level of content.</i>	Xoserve (DT)	Carried Forward (Update due 20 November 2018)
PAC 1009	09/10/18	9.2	<i>Reference the 'Smart Meters (exchanges and read submission statistics)' – Xoserve (FC) to look to provide a high level comparison of the differences between the 0632S and BEIS reports at the 20 November 2018 PAC meeting.</i>	Xoserve (FC)	Carried Forward (Update due 20 November 2018)
PAC 1010	23/10/18	2.1.1	<i>Reference Data Cleanliness Observation Letters 2A.1 & 2A.9 - Xoserve (DT) to look to discuss the 2A.1 and 2A.9 reporting information and letters with their Shipper contacts in order to improve industry awareness.</i>	Xoserve (DT)	Update provided. Closed

PAC 1011	23/10/18	2.1.1	<i>Reference Estimated and Check Reads Letter 2A.1</i> - PAFA (NV) to look to set up and provide a list of persistent poor performers.	PAFA (NV)	Update provided. Closed
PAC 1012	23/10/18	2.1.1	<i>Reference Estimated and Check Reads Letter 2A.1 (& 2A.9)</i> – Xoserve (DT) to look to report back on reconciling the various performance report findings.	Xoserve (DT)	Carried Forward (Update due 20 November 2018)
PAC 1013	23/10/18	2.1.1	<i>Reference Estimated and Check Reads Letter 2A.1</i> – Xoserve (DT) to look to investigate all Shippers with a zero value and decide a strategy to manage these going forwards.	Xoserve (DT)	Update provided. Closed
PAC 1014	23/10/18	2.1.2	<i>Reference Estimated and Check Reads Letter 2A.1</i> – Xoserve (ES) to prepare the draft associated DSC Change Proposal ensuring it includes a request for more timely performance reporting information provision and circulate for review by PAC Members ASAP, with a view to potential submission for the next DSC Change Manager’s meeting on 07 November 2018.	Xoserve (ES)	Update provided. Closed
PAC 1101	05/11/18	4.2	<i>Reference Risk Model Methodology</i> – PAFA (AJ) to look to set up a methodology review meeting once the refreshed data has been made available and analysed.	PAFA (AJ)	Pending
PAC 1102	05/11/18	4.5	<i>Reference UNC Modification Workgroup Report Template PAC Change</i> - Joint Office (BF) to ensure that a new agenda item for inclusion of PAC performance related impact assessment is added to the 15 November 2018 Panel agenda.	Joint Office (BF)	Pending
PAC 1103	05/11/18	5.	<i>Reference ‘Performance Assurance Framework Function’</i> - npower (JW) to provide an accessible format version of the document to the Joint Office for distribution to PAC Members for review.	Shipper Member (JW)	Pending
PAC 1104	05/11/18	5.	<i>Reference ‘Performance Assurance Framework Function’</i> – All parties to review the document and provide comments / suggested amendments to JW direct.	All	Pending

PAC 1105	05/11/18	7.4.1	<i>Reference Retail Energy Code Consultation</i> – PAFA (AJ) to draft a PAC consultation response (inc. settlement and meter reading aspects and a broad view on performance assurance and objectives) on behalf of PAC and circulate to Committee Members for views by no later than close of play on 08 November 2018.	PAFA (AJ)	Pending
PAC 1106	05/11/18	7.4.1	<i>Reference Retail Energy Code Consultation</i> – All Committee Members to review the PAC consultation response letter and provide views back to the PAFA asap.	All	Pending
PAC 1107	05/11/18	7.6	To evaluate how best to enhance the PAC agendas going forwards (including any potential pit falls) in a similar style to the DSC Change Management Committee agendas.	Joint Office (BF/MiB)	Pending