

Settlement Performance Impacts to be included in Workgroup Reports:

Issues raised at panel:

⇒ **Consistency**

- **How will different PAFA analysts ensure a consistent evaluation across all mods?**
 - *PAFA to propose*

⇒ **Criteria**

- **What are the criteria against which impact on settlement performance will be assessed?**
 - *PAFA to propose*

⇒ **Timeliness**

- **How will we ensure that the process does not hold up a mod?**
 - *Consider whether PAFA commit to a turn-around time under their contract to XoServe?*

⇒ **Timing**

- **What will happen as the mod changes?**
 - *It is a high level assessment so PAFA need to review at the start (to guide workgroup discussion) and at the end (to assess whether there is a gap for PAC to address via another route)*

⇒ **Vires**

- **Is the sponsor receiving the assessment from PAFA or from PAC?**
 - *I suggest it should come direct from PAFA*
- **Is PAC voting on it?**
 - *No – I don't think PAC should need to be involved, other than PAFA reporting back to PAC on their findings/recommendations periodically*

⇒ **Cost**

- **Will PAFA be charging additional for this activity?**
 - *Gemserv / XoS to agree (but my view is not!)*

⇒ **Obligations**

- **Does it create any obligations on the sponsor?**
 - *No additional UNC obligations*

⇒ **Precedent**

- **Some discussion about whether every committee could have a section like this?**

- *That's for each Committee and Panel to consider but this is about raising the profile and starting a conversation on performance and settlement risk*

⇒ **Is it necessary**

- **Doesn't the sponsor already do this?**
 - *See last point*