

<b>PAC Actions from November 2020 Meeting</b>					
<i>Ref</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Minute Ref</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Owner</i>	<b><i>Update to December 2020 Meeting</i></b>
1103	10/11/20	2.8	Xoserve (DN) to confirm/arrange meeting dates to undertake the PAC Sprint Planning, to review complexity and understand size and scale of changes required.	Xoserve (DN)	Meeting now arranged for January 6 <sup>th</sup> for sprint planning (invite issued by JO 30/11/20)
1104	10/11/20	3.2	Xoserve (FC) to provide PAC with a progress update on isolations in December.	Xoserve (FC)	<p><b>As at 11/12/20:</b></p> <p>17 Shippers have replied, who had submitted 726 Isolations. Of these, 2 Shippers reported that they had submitted 20 0723 Isolations, only 5 remain as Isolated.</p> <p>Remainder of Shippers who responded (15 Shippers) stated they did not use 0723 facility.</p> <p>Remaining 31 Shippers who have not replied had submitted 4,939 Isolations since 12<sup>th</sup> May.</p>
	10/11/20	3.2	Xoserve (FC) to provide a plan for ongoing monitoring of isolated sites, and how often reports will be run.	Xoserve (FC)	<p>We have issued a second round of chase-up emails (via the Customer Experience team).</p> <p>Extrapolating the responses above suggests that c. 150 Isolations since 12/05/20 might be COVID Isolations (although the 17 Shippers may not be representative of the remainder).</p> <p>On that basis we think this should be a two-monthly or even quarterly exercise, depending on responses from the remainder.</p>

<b>PAC Actions from November 2020 Meeting</b>					
<i>Ref</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Minute Ref</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Owner</i>	<b><i>Update to December 2020 Meeting</i></b>
PAC 1106	10/11/20	3.2	Xoserve (FC) to provide a view on the potential impact to settlement and allocation for isolated sites.	Xoserve (FC)	<p>The list of 5,665 Isolations which was issued to Shippers for review had a total rolling AQ of 194m kWh or c. 0.03% of total LDZ AQ.</p> <p>The maximum exposure on an average day for the full list of sites is 0.03% extra UIG – although this would be higher under colder conditions, lower when warmer. However c. 30m kWh could be removed from the impact assessment based on responses to date.</p> <p>Any under-allocation would be corrected once the site is re-established and valid meter reads are loaded.</p>