

UNC Performance Assurance Committee Minutes
Tuesday 15 August 2023
via Microsoft Teams

Attendees

Kate Elleman (Chair)	(KE)	Joint Office
Mike Berrisford (Secretary)	(MiB)	Joint Office

Shipper Members (Voting)

Alison Wiggett	(AW)	Corona Energy
Andy Knowles	(AK)	Utilita Energy
Claire Louise Roberts	(CLR)	ScottishPower
Graeme Cunningham	(GC)	Centrica
Louise Hellyer	(LH)	Totalenergies Gas & Power
Paul Murphy	(PM)	ESB Generation & Trading (Alternate)
Sallyann Blackett	(SB)	E.ON
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	SEFE Energy Ltd

Transporter Members (Voting)

Jenny Rawlinson	(JR)	BU UK
Sally Hardman	(SH)	SGN
Tom Stuart	(TS)	Northern Gas Networks (Alternate)

Observers (Non-Voting)

Anne Jackson	(AJ)	PAFA/Gemserv
Deborah Sherlock	(DS)	CDSP – <i>for item 3.1 only</i>
Fiona Cottam	(FC)	CDSP
Helen Bevan	(HB)	PAFA/Gemserv
Michele Downes	(MD)	CDSP
Paul Orsler	(FC)	CDSP
Peter Ratledge	(PR)	PAFA/Gemserv
Sandi Bradshaw	(SBr)	CDSP – <i>for item 3.1 only</i>

PAC meetings will be quorate where there are at least four Shipper User PAC Members and two Transporters (DNO and/or IGT) PAC Members with a minimum of six PAC Members in attendance.

Please note these minutes do not replicate detailed content provided within the presentation slides, therefore it is recommended that the published presentation material is reviewed in conjunction with these minutes. Copies of papers are available at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/PAC/150823>

1. Introduction

Kate Elleman (KE) welcomed all parties to the meeting noting that Deborah Sherlock and Sandi Bradshaw from the CDSP would be in attendance (*to cover off item 3.1*), as per previous PAC agreement.

KE outlined that due to the large number of matters to consider, items on the meeting agenda would be considered on a '*by exception*' basis for the main part.

It was then noted that some PAC Members (1x Shipper and 2x Transporters) would be leaving the meeting around midday, after which we would no longer be quorate, and therefore any decisions would be undertaken during the first part of the meeting.

1.1 Apologies for absence

Anthony Dicicco, Shipper Member
Ellie Rogers, CDSP
Tracey Saunders, Transporter Member

1.2 Note of Alternates

Paul Murphy for Anthony Dicicco
Paul Orsler for Ellie Rogers
Tom Stuart for Tracey Saunders

1.3 Quoracy Status

The Committee meeting was confirmed as being quorate (at the commencement of the meeting).

1.4 Approval of Minutes (18 July & 24 July 2023)

The minutes from the previous meetings were approved.

1.5 Approval of Late Papers

None to consider.

1.6 Review of Outstanding Actions

PAC0601: *Reference Request for Information (RFI) Analysis – PC3 & PC4 Meter Reading Submission* – CDSP (FC) and PAFA (AJ) to consider refining the provided information and how best to incorporate this into suitable training materials.

Update: KE advised that an update is due at the 12 September 2023 meeting. **Carried Forward**

PAC0602: *Reference Performance Assurance Techniques (PATs)* – Joint Office (KE) to investigate potential Code and PAFD interactions along with potential UNCC referral requirements.

Update: KE provided a brief overview of the three documents (*UNCC Interaction with PAC, Disputes definitions and General Terms Section A*) provided in support of this action during which she pointed out that the UNCC can no longer cease the PAC.

Focusing on the '*Disputes*' definitions, F Cottam (FC) pointed out that she still feels that this topic resides in the wrong place within the PAFD and should in essence be a separate paragraph in its own right – in short, it is not a Performance Assessment Technique (PAT) that PAC would ever undertake.

When A Jackson (AJ) indicated that she believes that the matter relates to parties being able to dispute the actions of another party that has a potentially detrimental impact upon them, KE suggested that as we are due to go out to tender for PAFA services, this could be addressed as part of the tender scoping exercise.

Closed

PAC0701: *Reference Performance Plans – Entry / Exit Criteria* – All PAC Members to consider that information provided in the presentation and provide any views / comments back at the August meeting ahead of consideration of the Entry requirements at the same meeting.

Update: In referring to his email, KE thanked S Mulinganie (SM) for providing a response confirming it discussed later in the meeting during consideration of item 3.2 (Annual Review 2023) below.

A further update will be provided at the 12 September 2023 meeting. **Carried Forward**

2. Monthly Performance Assurance Review Items

2.1 PARR Report Review – Shipper Performance Analysis (*by exception only*)

Pete Ratledge (PR) referred to the PAFA Dashboard and the ‘*Shipper Performance Analysis*’ presentation, which is made available ahead of the meeting, and confirmed that there was nothing to report on an exceptions basis.

PAFA supplied the following observations for this section:

SHIPPER PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

- **AQ Read Performance for MOD 0672 by Shipper – June Stats:**

PAFA provided an update indicating that some statistics for June and reported in August were not accurate. This was due to a system issue in June 2023 which led to Shipper provided meter reading data not being loaded into central systems correctly. This led to AQ Read Performance (UNC MOD 0672) reporting statistics (monthly with Smart and monthly without (w/o) Smart) being impacted for the month of June 2023.

PAFA has utilised June 2023 AQ Read Performance Statistics in the Holistic Performance Matrix (HPM) and in respect of overall Class 4 performance, on average affected Shipper parties have dropped -2 points in performance, however, this has not caused any new parties to hit or fall below the 25 point Performance Improvement action criteria.

The CDSP is seeking to remedy the issue for the June 2023 AQ Read Performance.

- **Holistic Performance Assurance Matrix (HPM):**

PAFA provided an update in terms of the output of the HPM in the four Product Class categories and also provided an update in respect of Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs).

- No new parties have hit or fallen below the Performance Improvement Plan criteria.
- One Shipper issued with a request for a PIP for PC2 and PC3 is in communication with PAFA regarding combining both plans and will issue for review at September PAC.
- Three other Shippers issued with plan requests within PC3 have now submitted these plans by the proposed submission deadline. One Shipper has yet to submit their plan and a chaser has been sent.
- One Shipper issued with a plan request within PC4 have now submitted this plan by the proposed submission deadline.

- **Stranded Supply Points:**

CDSP provided an update in regard to the main affected party to confirm that they are still in the process of setting themselves up as a Shipper and they are aware of the obligations and are looking to remedy the situation.

- **RFI Update – Product Classes 3 and 4:**

PAFA presented final analysis statistics on the RFI for Product Classes 3 and 4 Meter Read Submission which was issued to Shippers in April/May 2023. Discussions were undertaken by PAC on the next actions to take and the best approach to take to communicate final findings back to the parties that provided RFI responses. It was suggested that a PAC sub-group be formed made up of members from PAC, PAFA and the CDSP. PAC Committee Member volunteers were identified, and the Sub-group agreed to discuss further and feedback findings at September 2023 PAC meeting.

New Action PAC0801: *Reference PAC Sub-Group RFI Analysis & Feedback Assessment* – PAFA (AJ), CDSP (FC) and PAC Committee Member volunteers to hold a PAC Sub-group meeting to discuss next steps from the RFI analysis and feedback findings at September 2023 PAC meeting.

- **Ofgem Letters:**

PAFA presented two draft letters for PAC consideration:

1. a letter to the industry from PAC regarding Ofgem’s intention to engage further with the PAC to better understand the issues around performance assurance matters, and
2. a letter to Ofgem from the PAC on confidentiality and other obligations as a PAC Member.

One PAC Member highlighted a sentence within the first letter which read ‘Ofgem will be attending PAC meetings from time-to-time and as a PAC member, will be viewing industry performance statistics on a monthly basis’, and requested the wording be amended to read ‘will have access to’, rather than ‘will be viewing’. There were no further views or objections raised from PAC Members so PAFA will look to issue the letters.

2.1.1. Stranded Supply Points - Monitor

FC advised that ‘*Acorn Peach*’ are still actively working towards becoming a Shipper and that their portfolio size is circa 800 Meter Points and the risks involve both missing reads and the associated AQ.

SM advised PAC Members in attendance that an update had been provided at EBCC on 14 August 2023 – in short, there is little that PAC can do at this time to address the settlement concerns that remain until such a time as the Meter Points are transferred or meter readings obtained.

When KE enquired whether there would be any benefit in PAC writing to Acorn Peach to advise of their concerns, FC reiterated that the matter is being progressed as quickly as possible.

When SM advised that this is a ‘*Deed of Undertaking*’ related matter, it was agreed to keep this standing PAC agenda item for the time being and to also monitor closely any EBCC developments going forward.

2.1.2. RFI Update – Product Classes 3 & 4

H Bevan (HB) provided an onscreen review of the ‘*Request for Information (RFI) Analysis – PC3 & PC4 Meter Reading Submission*’ presentation during which the key discussion points were captured (by exception), as follows:

Response Analysis – slide 6

When SM suggested that all that would potentially be needed to address the issues is to raise a new UNC Modification that seeks to 'strip back' the (current) PC3 limitation on the grounds that the information provided clearly demonstrates an opportunity to make progress against the level of rejections being observed, P Orsler (PO) advised that the matter is being considered (as part of agenda item 238.6 b)) at the 17 August 2023 UNCC meeting.¹

In noting that historically PAC has often questioned the value of the UNC targets, AJ explained that industry parties are often unaware that they are under performing until PAC chases them.

SM suggested that whilst the Performance Framework has clearly delivered improvements, the lack of clear (performance) indicators prevents the raising of a suitable UNC Modification to address these issues at this point in time.

AJ went on to voice her concerns that without the existence of the UNC targets, it would be extremely difficult to determine whether the performance of parties is what it should be – in short, it is about delivering and ensuring performance assurance. This was a point supported by other parties in attendance.

Referencing the two (2) Ofgem letters to be considered under item 2.1.3 below, KE suggested that this is a positive step from Ofgem in providing active support to the PAC going forwards.

G Cunningham (GC) went on to propose that the (current) UNC targets were established during a monopolistic period in the gas industry when resources were available to obtain meter readings, and that those times have changed as the market has moved towards a more competitive market, therefore a view on measurable and achievable targets is now needed.

A Knowles (AK) provided an overview of the equivalent electricity market performance model and citing targets of 99% and 97% are often achieved by participants, which leaves him wondering why the gas market participants struggle to meet their respective performance targets, at which point SM responded by pointing out that the 'fuels' are fundamentally different and that in his opinion the electricity statistics are not necessarily accurate.

In looking to summarise the discussion so far, KE noted the following:

- Rightly or wrongly PAC should assess performance based on the UNC requirements;
- Engage with UNC Request Workgroup 0851R to request that they consider industry wide performance;
- Read rejection trend is 'linked' to Winter Consumption Variance, and
 - UNC Validation Change (post UNCC) will be in place October 2023.

SM went on to suggest that having engaged with industry and requested the information we have received good feedback and therefore PAC should go back to responders and look to help them to move forward (i.e. around target thresholds etc.) by advising them of our (PACs) proposed solutions.

In referring to the 76% and 57% rejections figures provided on slide 6, GC wondered whether PAC is confident that these can be improved upon and suggested that perhaps a 'deep dive' exercise might prove beneficial – KE suggested that this could be considered as part of the forthcoming proposed workshop / sub-group event.

When KE enquired whether we have a clear grasp of the PC3 to PC4 equipment change issues and how these are impacting upon performance, SM suggested that if there is a 'limit' specified within Code that is potentially contributing to the problem, it needs resolving. FC explained that she suspects that there is a 'system traffic' aspect involved, and as a consequence, care is needed to avoid a knee jerk reaction – another item to be considered at the workshop / sub-group event.

In noting that the problem could have also simply been related to 'a moment in time', PO suggested that perhaps PAC should observe matters once the (validation) change has gone in.

When asked whether it would be preferable for PAC to engage with parties through the workshop / sub-group meetings, SM suggested that as PAC posed the questions via email, then that should be the preferred route in which to provide a positive response back to industry.

Whilst considering how best to move forward, AJ pointed out that she does not think that PAC have resolved all the performance issues. Acknowledging the point, SM wondered whether an initial 'targeted' response to parties might prove more beneficial.

When AJ suggested that it looks like PAC are asking the PAFA to draw out some conclusions and feedback, KE indicated that parties outside of the PAFA such as the CDSP (FC and PO) would also need to assist the PAFA to ascertain the appropriate conclusions (inc. providing 'socialised' information to feedback to parties).

In noting that this matter naturally links into outstanding action PAC0601, it was agreed to expand the existing action whilst also ensuring the matter is considered within the forthcoming workshop / sub-group meeting.

Next Steps – slide 9

L Hellyer (LH) queried whether changing tolerance levels would improve rejection rates, to which FC responded by reiterating that the revised version of the validation rules would be considered at the 17 August 2023 UNCC meeting, which would change the (existing) tolerance levels.

In recognising that the information provided is extremely helpful, SM enquired what PAC are expecting in terms of progressing matters for each item, to which FC remarked that Request Workgroup 0851R are looking at read provisions (such as the 25BD trigger etc.).

When SM referred to the PC3 29% value for class change, A Wiggett (AW) suggested that this might be related to an issue around estimated transfer reads (i.e. class changes between PC3 and PC4 and provision of suitable transfer read information) – PO pointed out that a Change has been approved by the DSC Change Management Committee that has now rectified the problem.

2.1.3. Ofgem Letters

Access to Confidential PAC Materials via the GPAP Letter

When AJ provided a brief overview of the proposed content of the letter, KE noted that once the letter has been sent to Michael Walls of Ofgem the Joint Office would ensure that any subsequent PAC meeting invites include him in the distribution listing, in order to reinforce the need for Ofgem proactive involvement in the PAC.

Performance Assurance – Ofgem Engagement Letter

When SM suggested that the reference to 'viewing' industry information (in the first statement) should be amended to read as 'have access to', AJ agreed to undertake the change.

AJ also advised that the letter would only state facts and not include any inferences.

In noting that a specific PAC vote is not required, KE requested that should any PAC Members have any concerns or suggestions they raise them with AJ in the first instance.

2.1.4. Performance Plans – Entry / Exit Criteria

In sharing the email onscreen that was kindly provided by SM ahead of the meeting, KE advised that the matter would be considered in more detail at the 12 September 2023 PAC meeting especially as there is related information included within the Annual Review 2023 presentation later in this meeting.

Please refer to item 3.2 discussions below for further information.

2.2 Risk & Issues Register Update (by exception only)

Peter Ratledge (PR) provided a brief overview of the August 2023 Risk update explaining that there was nothing to report on an exceptions basis.

PAFA supplied the following observations for this section:

Performance Assurance Committee (PAC) Members were presented with an update in respect of seven risks all focused on meter reading performance related risks. The Performance Assurance Framework Administrator (PAFA) noted that a symbol, representing a tick and shield, had been added to any slides which shows a positive change in Shipper performance.

The PAFA presented the following, for their attention:

- **PC3 Reads:** PR reported a decrease in Value at Risk (VAR) by 6% across June 2022 - June 2023. Read performance and the average number of sites across the year has increased whilst the associated AQ of the sites is relatively static. The marginal increase in read performance is the primary factor for the slight decrease in energy impact of the risk.

The risk rating in the register is 4 (higher priority). PAFA will continue to monitor read performance and the risk will be reviewed at next refresh point (November 2023).

- **PC4 Monthly Reads:** PR reported a decrease in Value at Risk (VAR) by 20% across May 2022 - May 2023. Read performance, the average number of sites and the associated AQ of affected sites has increased. The increase in read performance is the primary factor for the slight decrease in energy impact of the risk.

The risk rating in the register is 5 (highest priority). PAFA will continue to monitor read performance and the risk will be reviewed at next refresh point (November 2023).

- **PC4 Annual Reads:** PR reported a decrease in Value at Risk (VAR) by 32% across May 2022 - May 2023. Read performance across the year has increased, whilst the number of sites and the associated AQ has decreased significantly which is reflected in the decrease in energy impact of the risk.

The risk rating in the register is 5 (highest priority). PAFA will continue to monitor read performance and the risk will be reviewed at next refresh point (November 2023).

- **AMR Monthly Reads:** PR reported a decrease in Value at Risk (VAR) by 6% across May 2022 - May 2023. Read performance across the year has increased, whilst the associated AQ of sites has decreased. The combination of which is the reason for the decrease in energy impact of the risk.

The risk rating in the register is now 2 (lower priority). No immediate actions are required at this juncture due to the decrease in respect of the VAR. This will be reviewed at next refresh point (November 2023).

- **AMR Annual Reads:** PR reported an increase in Value at Risk (VAR) by 180% across May 2022 - May 2023. Read performance across the year has decreased, whilst the associated AQ of sites has increased substantially. The combination of which is the reason for the increase in energy impact of the risk (which is of marginal value).

The risk rating in the register is now 2 (lower priority). No immediate actions are required at this juncture due to the marginal VAR. This will be reviewed at next refresh point (November 2023).

- **Rejected PC4 Annual Reads:** PR reported a decrease in Value at Risk (VAR) by 27% across May 2022 - May 2023. Rejected read volumes, associated rejection values, the number of sites and the AQ of SPs have all decreased. The combination of these factors is the reason for the decrease in energy impact of the risk.

The risk rating in the register is 3 (medium priority). No immediate action is required due to the substantial reduction in VAR. The risk will be reviewed at the next refresh point (November 2023).

- **Rejected PC4 Monthly Reads:** PR reported an increase in Value at Risk (VAR) by 5175% across May 2022 - May 2023. Rejected read volumes, associated rejection values, the number of sites and the AQ of SPs have all increased. The combination of these factors is the reason for the substantial increase in energy impact of the risk.

The risk rating in the register is 3 (medium priority). No immediate action was recommended due to the identified impact of UNC Modification 0692S Automatic updates to Meter Read Frequency, however PAFA are keeping a close eye on this risk. It will be reviewed at the next refresh point (November 2023).

Any questions/feedback on the content of the slides presented, please email PAFA@gemserv.com.

2.3 Transporter Performance Monitoring (*by exception only*)

KE confirmed that there was nothing to report on by exception in relation to this agenda item, except to say that an update from Cadent is expected to be provided at the 14 November 2023 PAC meeting.

When asked whether Cadent had approached the PAFA to consider the matter, AJ advised that they had not at this time, but regardless any update would be heavily dependant upon their Milestone Plan.

3. Matters for Committee Attention

3.1 PAFA Contract Tender Update

** PAFA Representatives left the meeting **

CONFIDENTIAL MEETING

3.2 Annual Review 2023

** PAFA Representatives left the meeting **

KE opened discussions by advising that the presentation had been published ahead of the meeting to allow PAC time to consider the content.

AJ provided a high-level overview of the '2023 Annual Review' presentation during which the key items were noted (by exception), as follows:

Annual Review 2023 Timeline – slide 2

AJ pointed out that historical response rates had been poor, but last year's endeavours (utilising SILO) was a big improvement.

KE suggested that there are three key considerations, comprising a 'teach in', development for 2024 and Xoserve Workshop for new contract services provisions (not including potential tendering parties though). Responding, AJ advised that these could easily be accommodated within the plan – at the end of the day, the plan is PAC's plan and not the PAFA's.

AJ suggested that PAFD timings might be an issue.

Risk Mitigation Work 2022/23 – slide 6

When AJ explained that the PAFA views the holistic performance (matrix) as a mechanism to mitigate performance risks, both LH and SM suggested that the wording needs to be tweaked to better identify individual performers.

Focus for 2023/24 – slide 8

AJ suggested that the 'engagement' element could include procurement and role of the PAFA aspects following 0674V implementation. She went on to highlight that industry feedback on 0674V and PAFD has raised concerns over fitness for purpose.

KE also suggested adding a reference to Ofgem engagement.

Industry Structure – slide 16

When asked whether PAC Members are broadly happy with the proposed structure, it was agreed that this would probably be better served via an offline discussion. KE suggested including a reference to the PAFD.

SM pointed out that if this is deemed to be PAC's annual report then it needs a PAC Chairperson foreward and executive summary adding and stripping out of any references to Gemserv logo's and references – this was agreed by AJ.

New Action PAC0804: <i>Reference the Annual Review 2023 Report – PAFA (AJ) to update the report to reflect feedback provided by PAC Members.</i>

3.3 PAFD Update / Review Approach

KE noted that this item had been largely 'covered off' under consideration of items 3.1 and 3.2 above.

3.4 PARR Report

In providing a brief overview of the latest round of changes to the '*Performance Assurance Reports Register – Appendix 1 Version 5.2 (Appendix to PAFD v5.0)*' document, FC pointed out that as PAC 'owns' this document there would be no other ratification required to approve the changes.

FC focused attention on the change marked text within the document before PAC were asked to undertake a formal (caveated) vote to approve the changes for immediate effect (as agreed at previous PAC meeting(s)) without approving the PAFD itself which would invoke a 3 month lead time.

Vote: Approval of changes to the Performance Assurance Reports Register – Appendix 1 Version 5.2 (Appendix to PAFD v5.0)		
Shipper Representatives	Voting Count	For/Against
Alison Wiggett	1	For
Andy Knowles	1	For
Claire Louise Roberts	1	For
Graeme Cunningham	1	For
Louise Hellyer	1	For
Paul Murphy	1	For
Sallyann Blackett	1	For
Steve Mulinganie	1	For
Total	8	For
Transporters Representatives	Voting Count	For/Against
Jenny Rawlinson	1	For
Sally Hardman	1	For
Tom Stuart	1	For
Total	2	For
Voting Outcome: Unanimous vote to approve the Performance Assurance Reports Register – Appendix 1 Version 5.2 (Appendix to PAFD v5.0) changes		

4. Update on Potential Changes to Performance Assurance Reporting and PARR

4.1 Shrinkage Model

In the absence of D Morley it was agreed to defer consideration of this item until the 12 September 2023 meeting.

4.2 Review of New Modifications

KE provided a brief overview of the current batch of UNC Modifications with a potential interest for the PAC.

Modification 0855

SM provided an overview of the (SEFE) Modification during which it was noted that:

- SEFE is in essence the ‘sponsor’ of the Modification;
- It allows the CDSP to insert an estimate at the ‘CSS Registration Date’;
- Contains settlement impacts;
 - PAFA is of the view that this was initially a low level of risk to settlement, but now involves circa 83k sites;
 - Risk to be formally included on the Risk Register;

- Reflects lack of / missing SCC communications and contact with incorrect parties;
- includes a meter reading party 'mismatch' preventing readings being successfully submitted;
- Sites with incorrect information assigned to them will not closeout correctly;
- Review of D Addisons draft template raises the question as to whether this involves a single or multiple components;
 - It has the potential to become a serious industry impact depending upon the parties involved (i.e. power stations / generators etc.);
 - Views on how the industry has historically approached instances such as this raise further concerns;
 - It was agreed to keep this as a single incident and not break it down into smaller component pieces;
- Random occurrences are continuing which UNC Modification 0836 is looking to mitigate;
- Whilst Daily Metered site issues are being resolved there is a real risk that 'generic' messages are still not getting through to their correct recipients;
 - Unique sites (circa 70) are not included in the CSS Registration;
 - PC1 Daily Read is not an issue;
 - PC2 are being recorded against Shipper (in)correctly resulting in potential settlement issues;
 - PC2, 3 and 4 sites would be unknown until the site is transferred;
- Risk remains although the underlying cause will not be repeated as it is a known known;
- Whilst the CDSP are not receiving all notifications it remains unclear whether Suppliers are getting the notifications;
- From a risk process perspective PAC should;
 - Continue to monitor the situation;
 - Acknowledge that some aspects of the risk are beyond its control;
 - Recognise that some technical file issues remain unresolved;
 - Accept that their role (PAC) will be potentially determined by UNC Modification 0855 considerations – PAC to take an active interest;
 - Recognise that there are also elements of retrospective risk involved;
- Poor communications from the DCC compounded the problems (they can only tell MPRNs);
 - Self service mechanisms helped parties to mitigate their issues;

Concluding the discussion it was agreed to add a new risk to the Risk Register.

5. Any Other Business

5.1 User Representative Appointment Process

KE provided an update of the 'Panel & UNC Sub-Committees Update' process confirming that all 9 PAC Shipper Member positions had been filled and names would be provided at the 12 September 2023 meeting.

5.2 CSS P1 Incident Impact

It was noted that this item has a potential impact on settlement.

6. Key Messages

Published at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/pac/summarykeymessages>

7. Diary Planning

Further details of planned meetings are available at: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/events-calendar/month

Time/Date	Paper Publication Deadline	Venue	Programme
10:00, Tuesday 12 September 2023	17:00 Monday 04 September 2023	Teleconference / Face-to-Face	Standard Agenda
10:00, Tuesday 17 October 2023	17:00 Monday 09 October 2023	Teleconference / Face-to-Face	Standard Agenda
10:00, Tuesday 14 November 2023	17:00 Monday 06 November 2023	Teleconference / Face-to-Face	Standard Agenda
10:00, Tuesday 12 December 2023	17:00 Monday 04 December 2023	Teleconference / Face-to-Face	Standard Agenda

PAC Action Table (as of 15 August 2023)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
PAC0601	13/06/23	2.2	<i>Reference Request for Information (RFI) Analysis – PC3 & PC4 Meter Reading Submission</i> – CDSP (FC) and PAFA (AJ) to consider refining the provided information and how best to incorporate this into suitable training materials.	CDSP (FC) & PAFA (AJ)	Carried Forward Update due Sept
PAC0701	18/07/23	2.1	<i>Reference Performance Plans – Entry / Exit Criteria</i> – All PAC Members to consider that information provided in the presentation and provide any views / comments back at the August meeting ahead of consideration of the Entry requirements at the same meeting.	All	Carried Forward Update due Sept
PAC0801	15/08/23	2.1	<i>Reference PAC Sub-Group RFI Analysis & Feedback Assessment</i> – PAFA (AJ), CDSP (FC) and PAC Committee Member volunteers to hold a PAC Sub-group meeting to discuss	PAFA (AJ), CDSP (FC) &	Pending

			next steps from the RFI analysis and feedback findings at September 2023 PAC meeting.	PAC Members	
PAC0802	15/08/23	3.1	<i>Reference PAFA Contract Mod 0674 Impact Assessment Version 2 document</i> – Joint Office (KE) to look to undertake an ex-Committee vote to approve the variation document.	Joint Office (KE)	Pending
PAC0803	15/08/23	3.1	<i>Reference New Tender Contract Requirements</i> – Joint Office (KE) to look to set up a separate PAC Sub-group meeting to consider new tender requirements based on the latest PAFD (inc. 0674V) provisions + some additional items.	Joint Office (KE)	Pending
PAC0804	15/08/23	3.2	<i>Reference the Annual Review 2023 Report</i> – PAFA (AJ) to update the report to reflect feedback provided by PAC Members.	PAFA (AJ)	Pending