

**UNC Performance Assurance Committee Minutes**  
**Tuesday 08 January 2019**  
**at Elexon, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW**

**Attendees**

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Mike Berrisford (Secretary)	(MiB)	Joint Office
Alex Leyland	(AL)	Shipper Member Alternate
Anne Jackson	(AJ)	PAFA
Billy Howitt	(BH)	PAFA
Clare Cantle-Jones	(CJ)	Shipper Member Alternate
Emma Smith*	(ES)	Observer, Xoserve
Fiona Cottam	(FC)	Observer, Xoserve
John Welch	(JW)	Shipper Member
Lisa Saycell	(LS)	Shipper Member
Louise Hellyer	(LH)	Shipper Member
Mark Bellman	(MB)	Shipper Member
Neil Cole	(NC)	Observer, Xoserve
Sallyann Blackett	(SB)	Shipper Member
Sally Hardman	(SH)	Transporter Member
Sara Usmani	(SU)	PAFA
Shanna Key*	(SK)	Transporter Member
Shelley Rouse	(SR)	PAFA

**Apologies**

Graham Wood	(GW)	Shipper Member
Mark Jones	(MJ)	Shipper Member

\* via teleconference

Copies of non-confidential papers are available at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/pac/080119>

**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**

Alex Leyland for Graham Wood and Clare Cantle-Jones for Mark Jones.

**1.4 Review of Minutes (11 December 2018)**

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

## 2. Review of Outstanding Actions

**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 SR provided a brief overview of the '*Focus of future PAF Reviews*' document, parties debated whether or not it would be preferable to keep the Performance Metrics aspects as a separate document/set of supporting information.

Some Members advised that they would prefer to be provided with a high-level view of any performance movements (i.e. a comparison across various parties and performance obligations). Responding to the request, SR advised that she would look to provide a separate document with questions around PAC performance requirements whilst also providing an outline of how many Industry Performance related letters have been issued, and how these and any responses received to date are reflected in the change metrics – with the aim being to provide an outline plan of action by early May for consideration at the May 2019 meeting.

Thereafter, Committee Members agreed that this action could now be closed. **Closed**

**New Action PAC0101: Reference Future PAF Reviews - PAFA (SR) to look to provide a separate document with questions around Industry performance requirements whilst also providing an outline of how many Industry Performance related letters have been issued, and how these and any responses received to date are reflected in the metrics, with an outline plan of action to be provided by early May for consideration at the May 2019 meeting.**

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

**Update:** In providing an overview of the '*PARR Review: Proposed changes to the current Performance Assurance Report*' presentation, SR explained that, as yet the details within this document have not been discussed in any meaningful detail with Xoserve.

When asked, Committee Members agreed to undertake a review of the document at this meeting even though Xoserve have not yet been formally engaged on its specific contents – it was noted that whilst the first impressions of the document are positive, Members would also expect the PAFA and Xoserve to look to provide a supporting timeline and cost assessment in due course.

BF reminded those present that in order to enact these proposals, a PAC or UNC party sponsor would be required to present a supporting paper to the Uniform Network Code Committee (UNCC) for their subsequent approval. The UNCC would expect PAC to make a recommendation on the proposed document.

During an extensive discussion relating to the ten (10) reports, the main summary points have been captured, as follows:

1. Report 2A.1 – Estimated and check reads used for Gas Allocation and consumption adjustments PC1 and PC2

When a request was made to look to include Product Class 4 check reads to ensure that AMR (but not SMART meter) reads are captured, FC pointed out that Project Nexus introduced the concept of 'check reads' for Product Classes 3 and 4.

It was felt that there would be benefit in looking to sub divide this report into two parts, namely 2A.1(a) for Product Classes 1 and 2, and 2A.1(b) for Product Classes 3 and 4 where AMR is used to provide meter readings.

2. Report 2A.2 – No Meter recorded in the Supply Point Register

FC advised that as far as she is aware, age related information is provided with the Shipper pack communications. In pointing out that currently it is possible to track

Supply Meter Point related information on a monthly basis, FC enquired whether or not the Committee would want a more comprehensive view on the various age related information involved – care would be needed in identifying the required graduations (i.e. 3, 6, 9 or 12 months etc.).

When asked to clarify what this report relates to, FC responded by explaining that it represents registered sites where a Shipper is present, but no asset data has been assigned. She went on to point out that the report could also possibly highlight a lack of meter installation data that is potentially contributing to the Unidentified Gas (UIG) issue.

It was agreed to utilise the registration date as a basis for assessing the age related aspects.

3. Report 2A.3 – No Meter recorded in the Supply Point Register and data flows received by Xoserve

When FC explained that this report potentially highlights instances where UK Link holds an indication of a read submission, although no specific meter details are present.

In also pointing out that this (report) potentially involves C&D notifications and Read Submission Notice elements, FC believed that these elements are already covered within the Shipper pack communications.

4. Report 2A.4 – Shipper Transfer read performance

In questioning whether this report is still needed going forwards, Committee Members acknowledged that estimated reads could potentially impact more than two (2) parties and that the report is based around the concept of a ‘fair and equitable’ settlement based approach.

When it was suggested that it might be beneficial to continue to monitor this report area, SR suggested that provision of a more granular level of information, could ensure maximum benefit from the report output.

In noting that in essence the report enables PAC to identify and compare the expected number of estimated reads against the actual number received, Committee Members also believed that there are potential benefits in looking to target sites where an estimate read has been utilised, but no actual follow up read has been received thereafter.

When it was suggested that results are also potentially impacted by several factors such as accepted read performances, FC pointed out that in the last 12 month period, the number of estimated reads utilised in the system had not exceeded 60% - ultimately the provision of actual reads would benefit Aqs even being mindful of the fact that post Nexus WAALPs are utilised rather than ALPs to determine Aqs, which should usually give better read estimates.

It was noted that care is needed to avoid PAC inadvertently viewing commercially sensitive Shipper information, that the PAFA and Xoserve already have visibility of. In observing that this particular report is an ideal candidate for ‘anonymisation’, FC enquired whether or not the PAFA are proposing to include additional information within the PARR Reports, or is the aim to simply assist the PAFA to better interpret the information being provided. Responding, SR explained that the PAFA are not aiming to amend the information contained in the PARR Reports, and are simply looking to be in a position to make more informed views and recommendations to PAC.

5. Report 2A.5 – Read Performance

It was noted that work remains ongoing between Xoserve (ES) and the PAFA (SR) on the key aspects of this report, especially in order to ensure that the report better aligns

with the provisions outlined within the recent Change Proposal (i.e. read performance submission obligations) submitted by Xoserve.

6. Report 2A.6 – Meter Read Validity Monitoring

When SR suggested that provision of more granular information could prove helpful in order to better identify the total submitted reads versus failed reads (i.e. expressed as what 'x' percentage of what total), FC suggested that it might be advisable to include read 'check codes'.

7. Report 2A.7 – No Reads received for 1,2,3 or 4 years (excludes estimated transfer reads)

In considering the '*time since last meter read*' aspects, it was suggested that this is basically a question around at which point does the reads qualify for inclusion within the various reports.

When asked, FC explained that in examining the report itself it becomes clear that where the MPRN is present within the 3<sup>rd</sup> year column, it does not also show in the corresponding years 1 or 2 column – an aspect that perhaps needs further consideration in due course.

FC went on to advise that where a meter is not read for 1 year and 1 month for example, the data would not be displayed in the year 2 column and stays within the year 1 column until the anniversary date is activated.

In accepting that this report is less than ideal (i.e. being somewhat cumbersome in nature as it reports on all sites by EUC band for all product classes), FC pointed out that the main limitation reflects the fact that until the data age passes the 12 month mark, it is not always clear what the underlying issue(s) might be.

When asked whether or not in respect of this particular report, 'no reads' identifies that a Shipper has submitted a read that has subsequently been rejected, FC responded by advising such instances would be catered for under the other reports, rather than specifically this one. It was noted that in the main, this report is targeted towards a identifying parties that were poorly performing, although it was noted that it might be difficult for some Shipper systems to be interrogated to clearly identify a meter reading has been rejected.

8. Report 2A.8 – AQ Corrections

In noting that adding the '*direction of AQ movement and volumes involved*' into the PARR Report(s) and thereby providing 'whole industry visibility' would be a beneficial move, particularly to identify that AQ Corrections were both up and down. SR agreed to provide a refined version of the presentation for consideration at the March meeting.

9. Report 2A.9 – Standard Correction Factors for sites with AQ >732MWH

When SR explained that the PAFA are already receiving extensive information in relation to this report, FC wondered whether or not providing information around the ageing of sites may also prove beneficial. When BH suggested that this would help the PAFA in undertaking its assessment, FC suggested that a better understanding of the detail behind this metric would also be beneficial.

SB suggested that from a Shipper perspective, it is the length of time a site has been under their ownership (i.e. within their portfolio) that is an important consideration. Committee Members acknowledged that reconciling back (rearward correction) to a previous Shipper is one area of concern. In short, the process essentially relies on the previous Shipper raising a correction factor request – this was an area of great concern amongst Shippers during Project Nexus development discussions.

SR then reminded everyone that the Shipper Short Code (SSC) change related impacts apply across all reports.

10. Report 2A.8 – Replaced Meter Reads

When SR provided a brief outline of this report, it was recognised that whilst replacing a meter read should be viewed as a positive move, care is also needed in order to avoid disincentivising parties. The ability to identify ‘repeated poor performance’ is also seen as a very positive step although it is recognised that there is a balance to be found between one off occurrences and persistent re-occurrences and any associated behavioural implications.

Concluding discussions on the presentation, Committee Members agreed that this action could now be closed. **Closed**

**PAC1111:** *Reference draft SMART Meter Installations Potentially Impacting upon Settlement Risk – Xoserve (NC) to examine Xoserve’s SMART exchange portfolio data and compare this with UNC Modification 0632S information.*

**Update:** During a brief explanation of the figures provided in response to this action, FC explained that the information potentially highlights timing and Shipper exceptions – the question is whether Committee Members are comfortable with the information provided, or would they prefer more detail.

When it was noted that the DCC had recently released some SMETS meter (installation/commissioning) data, FC pointed out that the original action related to a concern with the AUGE data, and/or a potential fundamental hole in the information – however, this might simply be a timing issue (i.e. the AUGE is utilising older data).

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

Thereafter, a request was made for more clarification of the non-SMETS related information and whether this is included (or not) in the BEIS Q3 statistics.

**New Action PAC0102: Reference the (high level) BEIS Q3 Statistics - Xoserve (NC) to look to provide more clarification on whether the non-SMETS related information is included (or not) in the BEIS Q3 statistics.**

**PAC1201:** *Reference Resolution of the Consumption Adjustment Issue –Xoserve (FC) to look to provide an anonymised report of Shippers based on consumption adjustments related to their sites in time for consideration at the 08 January 2019 meeting.*

**Update:** FC provided a brief overview of the ‘Anonymised Report of Outstanding DM Consumption Adjustments as at 21/12/2018’ presentation during which she explained that Xoserve are one step removed from the DMSP and relevant Shipper relationship.

In considering the ‘DM Estimates Time-Line’ slide 4, information FC confirmed that the still outstanding MPRs belong to around six (6) particular Shippers. Concerns were voiced at the circa 18 months that it has taken to get to this resolution point.

Moving on to consider the analysis provided in the graph on slide 6, FC suggested that the information highlights the circular nature of the resolution processes, although she remains unsure as to how many have progressed to the ‘Billing’ stage, especially as this information may not reflect the very latest invoicing positions.

When MB observed that the ‘generic’ nature (status) of the information presented could be potentially misleading and is missing key information that would be useful to PAC, FC responded by acknowledging the point before pointing out that the information is pitched at a high level for the purposes of the presentation.

When asked how often Xoserve are chasing these outstanding consumption adjustments, FC explained that whilst it is not on a weekly basis, the matter formed part of a previous wider industry communications and engagement exercise. In making reference to the Ofgem (J Dixon) email relating to this matter that was issued some 12 months prior, MB suggested that the Committee needs to be mindful of the current circa 18 month lag and that perhaps the Committee should now be looking to proactively chase resolution of these outstanding

consumption adjustments – this proposed approach was supported by other Committee Members.

FC explained that during discussions between Xoserve and Shippers, it has become apparent that there is confusion between potential Pot 1 and Pot 2 overlaps. When asked whether Xoserve are actively engaged in discussions with the Shippers involved, FC explained that to her best knowledge Xoserve are not proactively chasing individual Shippers at this time, although she would be more than happy to liaise with her Xoserve Customer Advocate colleagues and provide a progress update to the Committee in due course.

**New Action PAC0103: Reference the Count of Outstanding Consumption Adjustments as at 21/12/2018 (Pot 1 only) - Xoserve (FC) to look to identify what contact has been made with Shippers and what if any, corrective actions have been put in place.**

Moving on to consider the analysis provided in the graph on slide 7, FC asked Committee Members to take the information provided with a 'health warning', especially around any potential materiality aspects, as these tend to only become truly visible when corrections (consumption adjustments) are actually undertaken. When asked whether a D-7 view would be more beneficial, FC responded by pointing out that this would be heavily dependent upon potential DMSP / Shipper resourcing capabilities.

During a brief consideration of the information provided in the graph on slide 9, FC advised that Xoserve track less information on these items. When asked whether there are any potential DMSP orientated issues associated with these Pot 2 sites not loading, SB suggested that the information provided on the Xoserve web site would suggest that these are predominately new sites, at which point FC added that some of these sites are now older than 12 months, as outlined on the following slide in the pack.

In considering the information provided on slide 10, FC suggested that the associated estimates might be fine, and that any meter point reconciliation might be picked up under 'business as usual' processes. Committee Members wondered whether or not they should look to pursue investigating any Shippers that have site settings assigned with a 'zero' value, and also whether there would be value in looking to assess instances where Shippers have nominated and have a significant difference to what they finally 'settled to'.

Moving on to consider the information provided on the final slide 11, an action was placed upon Xoserve (FC) to look to undertake an assessment of the Pot 2 nominations compared to Gemini allocations in order to look to identify any discrepancies with these sites and whether the issues have been flagged up to the respective Shippers, including whether or not, any site visits would be required.

**New Action PAC0104: Reference the Pot 2 sites not loading actuals as at 21/12/18 by Anonymous Shipper, Average Age (days) and Action Owner - Xoserve (FC) to look to undertake an assessment of the Pot 2 nominations compared to allocations in Gemini in order to look to identify any discrepancies with these sites and whether the issues have been flagged up to the respective Shippers, including whether or not, any site visits would be required.**

Thereafter, Committee Members agreed that this action could now be closed. **Closed**

**PAC1202: Reference Draft Work Plan and Budget Actions** – Shipper Member (JW) & PAFA (SR) to look to refine the Work Plan in time for consideration at the 08 January 2019 meeting.

**Update:** JW advised that he is aware that SR has been working on this action and has sent him a draft for review, he hopes to be able to provide an update at the 29 January 2019 meeting. **Carried Forward**

**PAC1203: Reference DSC Change Proposal XRN4790 Introduction of winter read/consumption reports and associated obligation (MOD0652)** – Xoserve (ES) and PAFA

(SR) to look to establish how best to incorporate the requirements into the PARR schedule going forwards.

**Update:** SR apologised for not being able to discuss this action with ES, and now hopes to be able to provide an update at the 29 January 2019 meeting. **Carried Forward**

**PAC1204:** *Reference PAC 2019 Meeting Schedule and PARR Reporting Tensions* – PAFA (SR) to look to identify their ‘paper’ days for the 2019 meeting schedule in time for consideration at the 08 January 2019 PAC meeting.

**Update:** During a brief discussion on the ‘*PAC 2019 Meeting Schedule and PARR reporting timing implications (PAC 1204)*’ paper, SR focused attention on the three dates within the table where the time for the data turnaround is deemed to be too short to enable PAFA to fulfil its remit – it was noted that the PAFA require circa 10 days to produce the reports.

In considering the various options i.e. move the PAC meeting dates for July, October and December or conduct additional teleconference meetings in those months, Committee Members settled initially on looking to move the July and October meeting dates to the 24<sup>th</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> respectively. At this point it was acknowledged that the December date might be more problematic due to the heavy industry wide meeting congestion.

LS suggested that meeting dates could be reviewed again once the proposed changes to reporting were implemented by Xoserve as this might mean the data is available earlier for PAFA use.

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

### **3. Monthly Review Items**

Other than a brief verbal update on item 3.3 from SR, consideration of these various items was deferred until the 29 January 2019 (*Development Items*) meeting.

#### **3.1 Risk Register Review**

##### **3.1.1. New Risks**

None raised.

#### **3.2 Issues Register**

##### **3.2.1. New Issues**

None raised.

#### **3.3 Project Plan**

SR provided a brief verbal update on the status of this item, highlighted that a number of milestones on the agreed project plan are to be reached in the coming months. The PARR review is underway (with the first stage presented at this meeting), with a target completion date for this of February 2019.

The Risk Model review is also underway, with all common data being updated. Furthermore, four (4) of the existing risks have been reviewed. SR then went on to explain that the PAFA are working closely with Xoserve to refresh the remaining risks with updated data, with the aim that the PAFA will present the updated model at a Risk Model review meeting on 19 February 2019 to be held at the Gemserv offices in London.

#### **3.4 Ofgem Update**

#### **3.5 Review of Monthly PARR Reports (inc. Dashboard Update)**

#### **3.6 Review of PAC Related and New Modifications**

#### **4. Annual Work Plan and Budget**

##### **4.1 Draft Work Plan and Budget Actions Update**

Consideration deferred until the 29 January 2019 (*Development Items*) meeting.

#### **5. Communications Plan**

Consideration deferred until the 29 January 2019 (*Development Items*) meeting.

#### **6. Any Other Business**

##### **6.1 Focus of Future PAF Reviews – BH**

It was agreed that this item had been sufficiently discussed under item 2 (Action PAC0925) earlier in the meeting.

##### **6.2 Dispensing with Anonymisation – FC/MB**

When MB posed the question as to why PAC believes it needs to retain anonymisation of reporting information during meetings going forward, an extensive debate was undertaken on the merits of either retaining anonymised information or not, with some Committee Members open to a change and others more inclined towards retaining anonymised information. It was noted that whilst both Xoserve and the PAFA have visibility on non-anonymised information in order to successfully discharge their responsibilities, PAC Members are entitled and able to view allowed non-anonymised information within the Huddle system.

It was noted that in certain circumstances, the PAC may need to discuss matters directly with the industry parties concerned.

Committee Members then debated whether or not 'declaring an interest' when viewing non-anonymised information would be a viable option with views again divided between those Members in favour and those against such an option – it was noted that in certain circumstances it might be difficult for Committee Members to know when, or when not to declare an interest and that should they do so, they would need to leave the meeting room to avoid inadvertently voting against a matter. BF pointed out that clarification would be needed on how and what Committee Members would actually be voting on under these possible circumstances.

One Committee Member reminded fellow members of their commitment to act as an independent person when signing their respective membership letters.

When FC pointed out that on many occasions there is sufficient information available to enable Committee Members to interpolate the information and identify individual parties, SR explained that the PAFA had actively undertaken a decision to avoid utilising non-anonymised data, as it felt this was potentially unfair, especially when bearing in mind that the low level dashboards are only provide to the Committee and not the wider industry.

In noting that the PAC was established in order to identify poor performance and drive improvement, some Committee Members felt that retaining anonymised information means that the Committee focuses its attentions on the data itself, rather than being potentially impacted and hindered by pre-conceptions on other industry parties and their behaviours. As a counter argument, it was also suggested that care would be needed to avoid establishing a system that reflects Committee Members personal weaknesses (i.e. external influences affecting Members views).

At this point SR advised that the PAFA are looking to provide cross Shipper comparisons based information going forwards, which might work to alleviate some of the concerns around the utilisation of anonymised information.



When BF pointed out that one of the original PAC proposals was for information to be accessible to all (industry) parties, SB remarked that there was a significant negative industry response (objection) to the suggestion.

When MB confirmed that his (tentative) proposal was only meant to apply to the dashboard information, Committee Members once again debated the merits of anonymised versus non-anonymised information, where upon FC reminding everyone that the non-anonymised provision satisfies a Code requirement.

JW wondered whether the consideration of anonymised versus non-anonymised information provision would be better served as part of the development of UNC Modification 0674 'Performance Assurance Techniques and Controls'.

In noting that interest in such matters might peak again in March when parties are due to formally respond to their respective poor performance letters, it was agreed to leave matters 'as-are' for the time being and review things again in six (6) months time.

**New Action PAC0105: Reference Dispensing with Anonymisation – Joint Office (BF/MiB) to ensure this matter is included on the March 2019 PAC Agenda.**

### 6.3 UK Link defects and issues – AJ

In raising this item, AJ explained that recent industry (poor performance orientated) feedback received by the PAFA would suggest that the UK Link system is potentially having an impact on parties' performances (for some parties there is a clear disjoint how information provided to them relates to what they can see within the UK Link system). To this end, the PAFA believe that it would be very beneficial if the Committee could have access to, and visibility of, any and all known UK Link system issues. Whilst the suggestion was supported by Committee Members, it was noted that care would be needed in the first instance to ensure that any highlighted issues are given a 'sense check' (i.e. report outputs could be inaccurate and/or user error is at the route of the problem).

Responding, FC explained that Xoserve already publishes a UK Link system issues listing and as far as the read reporting matter is concerned, Xoserve are already actively investigating the matter.

Committee Members felt that having visibility of any and all 'flagged' UK Link system issues would be beneficial on the grounds that it would enable them to make informed decisions. It was also noted that the reverse can be true insofar as PAC discussions can also flag up issues to the industry, that they (the industry parties) did not know about.

Responding to the discussions AJ indicated that the PAFA would look to include context(ural) based views around the various reports and any potential relationships to known UK Link system issues going forwards.

**New Action PAC0106: Reference UK Link defects and issues – Xoserve (FC) to discuss the concerns raised with the Xoserve Issues Managers, including how we might be able to compare any UK Link system issues to the PARR Reports.**

### 6.4 IGT PAC Membership - SK

When BF displayed the email provided during the course of the meeting onscreen, Committee Members briefly debated the concerns around a lack of an IGT Representative on the Committee and how this potentially exposes the Transporter quoracy aspects.

When SK focused attention on the highlighted statement in her email, BF gently reminded everyone of the process for nomination of an IGT Representative. BF then went on to inform those present that the AIGT had responded positively and indicated that it would look to nominate a representative as soon as possible.

Concluding the brief discussion, SK advised that the Gas Transporters are also looking to get their respective Alternate Members signed up asap.

## 7. Next Steps

### 7.1 Key Messages – PAFA

BH provided a brief verbal overview of the draft Key Points to be provided by the PAFA in due course and thereafter subject to formal approval at the next meeting, as follows:

- To be provided in due course.

## 8. Diary Planning

Further details of planned meetings are available at:

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

Time/Date	Venue	Programme
10:30, Tuesday 29 January 2019	Radcliffe House, Blenheim Court, Warwick Road, Solihull, B91 2AA	Standard ( <i>Development items</i> ) agenda

**PAC Action Table (as at 08 January 2019)**

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
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	Update provided. <b>Closed</b>
PAC 0928	26/09/18	4.4	PARR Reports review to be scheduled to ensure the reports meet PAFA requirements.	PAFA (NV)	Update provided. <b>Closed</b>
PAC 1111	20/11/18	3.1.1	<i>Reference draft SMART Meter Installations Potentially Impacting upon Settlement Risk – Xoserve (NC) to examine Xoserve’s SMART exchange portfolio data and compare this with UNC Modification 0632S information.</i>	Xoserve (NC)	Update provided. <b>Closed</b>
PAC 1201	11/12/18	2.	<i>Reference Resolution of the Consumption Adjustment Issue – Xoserve (FC) to look to provide an anonymised report of Shippers based on consumption adjustments related to their sites in time for consideration at the 08 January 2019 meeting.</i>	Xoserve (FC)	Update provided. <b>Closed</b>

PAC 1202	11/12/18	4.1	<i>Reference Draft Work Plan and Budget Actions – Shipper Member (JW) and PAFA (SR) to look to refine the Work Plan in time for consideration at the 08 January 2019 meeting.</i>	Shipper Member (JW) & PAFA (SR)	<b>Carried Forward</b> (Update due 29 January 2019)
PAC 1203	11/12/18	6.3	<i>Reference DSC Change Proposal XRN4790 Introduction of winter read/consumption reports and associated obligation (MOD0652) – Xoserve (ES) and PAFA (SR) to look to establish how best to incorporate the requirements into the PARR schedule going forwards.</i>	Xoserve (ES) & PAFA (SR)	<b>Carried Forward</b> (Update due 29 January 2019)
PAC 1204	11/12/18	6.6	<i>Reference PAC 2019 Meeting Schedule and PARR Reporting Tensions – PAFA (SR) to look to identify their ‘paper’ days for the 2019 meeting schedule in time for consideration at the 08 January 2019 PAC meeting.</i>	PAFA (SR)	Update provided. <b>Closed</b>
PAC 0101	08/01/19	2.	<i>Reference Future PAF Reviews - PAFA (SR) to look to provide a separate document with questions around Industry performance requirements whilst also providing an outline of how many Industry Performance related letters have been issued, and how these and any responses received to date are reflected in the metrics, with an outline plan of action to be provided by early May for consideration at the May 2019 meeting.</i>	PAFA (SR)	<b>Pending</b>
PAC 0102	08/01/19	2.	<i>Reference the (high level) BEIS Q3 Statistics - Xoserve (NC) to look to provide more clarification on whether the non-SMETS related information is included (or not) in the BEIS Q3 statistics.</i>	Xoserve (NC)	<b>Pending</b>
PAC 0103	08/01/19	2.	<i>Reference the Count of Outstanding Consumption Adjustments as at 21/12/2018 (Pot 1 only) - Xoserve (FC) to look to identify what contact has been made with Shippers and what if any, corrective actions have been put in place.</i>	Xoserve (FC)	<b>Pending</b>
PAC 0104	08/01/19	2.	<i>Reference the Pot 2 sites not loading actuals as at 21/12/18 by Anonymous Shipper, Average Age (days) and Action Owner - Xoserve (FC) to look to undertake an assessment of the Pot 2</i>	Xoserve (FC)	<b>Pending</b>

			<p>nominations compared to allocations in Gemini in order to look to identify any discrepancies with these sites and whether the issues have been flagged up to the respective Shippers, including whether or not, any site visits would be required.</p>		
PAC 0105	08/01/19	6.2	<p><i>Reference Dispensing with Anonymisation</i> – Joint Office (BF/MiB) to ensure this matter is included on the March 2019 PAC Agenda.</p>	Joint Office (BF/MiB)	<b>Pending</b>
PAC 0106	08/01/19	6.3	<p><i>Reference UK Link defects and issues</i> – Xoserve (FC) to discuss the concerns raised with the Xoserve Issues Managers, including how we might be able to compare any UK Link system issues to the PARR Reports.</p>	Xoserve (FC)	<b>Pending</b>