

UNC Performance Assurance Committee Minutes
Tuesday 12 February 2019
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
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
Mark Jones	(MJ)	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

Alex Travell	(AT)	Transporter Member
Carl Whitehouse	(CW)	Shipper Member

* *via teleconference*

Copies of non-confidential papers are available at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/pac/120219>

1. Introduction and Status Review

1.1 Confirm Quorate Status

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

BF also advised that following receipt of an apology, Alex Travell would be attending PAC as the IGT Member from March 2019 onwards.

1.2 Apologies for absence

Apologies were noted as above.

1.3 Note of Alternates

None.

1.4 Review of Minutes (29 January 2019)

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

2. Review of Outstanding Actions

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: When JW pointed out that a presentation had been submitted for the 29 January 2019 meeting, the Committee agreed the action could now be closed. **Closed**

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: When SR explained that discussions had taken place with Xoserve (ES and NC) and the information had been incorporated in the presentation to be considered later in the meeting, the Committee agreed the action could now be closed. **Closed**

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.*

Update: Committee Members noted that an update on this action would be provided at the 14 May 2019 meeting. **Carried Forward**

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.*

Update: In the absence of her colleague D Turpin, ES explained that the majority of the work to date has focused on read performance and asset related issues even though the majority of impacted Shippers believe it is a DMSP matter.

It was noted that Product Class 1 involves direct DMSP submissions, whereas for Product Class 2 the Shippers Meter Reading agent provide the read to the Shipper who then submits it to Xoserve – both parties are notified of acceptance and/or rejection of the read.

When Committee Members debated whether this is really a DMSP versus meter asset issue, a request was put to Xoserve to provide a summary of the related issues in order to provide a level of visibility around this matter. Responding, ES advised that her colleague D Turpin is already engaging with industry parties to investigate and progress this matter.

ES then went on to provide a brief summary of the Morecambe Central improvements for which the supporting information had already been provided to the PAFA. SR pointed out that work with Xoserve remains ongoing.

FC then pointed out that during discussions with Harwich, it had come to light that they are experiencing some system issues that are preventing them loading their reads – this is also something that is being actively progressed with Xoserve assistance.

When a request was made for Xoserve to provide the information to the PAFA for them to then forward on to Committee Members, SR pointed out that the PAFA are already working towards improving communications.

ES added that Xoserve are also looking at delivering improvements in the alignment of PAC outputs and Shipper Communication Pack communications. **Carried Forward**

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.*

Update: FC apologised before explaining that little progress had been made on this action since the previous meeting. **Carried Forward**

PAC0107: *Reference 2A.5 Read Performance - Product Class 4 - Xoserve (ES)* to raise a DSC Change Proposal to look to split PC4 into monthly (inc. SMARTS to satisfy CMA requirements) and annual read meters.

Update: When SR advised that this action would be covered off under consideration of item X.X below, the Committee agreed the action could now be closed. **Closed**

PAC0108: *Reference PARR Dashboard Reports* – All parties to consider whether there are any additional items they would like adding into the various reports.

Update: When asked, the Committee agreed this action could now be closed. **Closed**

PAC0109: *Reference UNC Modification 0664* - All parties are requested to provide a view to the Proposer (JW) on a suitable potential level of content and areas of focus for the modification.

Update: When JW advised that this action would be covered off under consideration of item X.X below, the Committee agreed the action could now be closed. **Closed**

PAC0110: *Reference the Xoserve / PAFA Contract* – Xoserve (DT) to confirm what the current contract terms allow the PAFA to view in terms of Shipper pack related information and whether if needed, any contract changes could be progressed via the DSC Change Management Committee route.

Update: FC advised that she would look to provide a post meeting update for inclusion within these minutes after the meeting. **Carried Forward**

PAC0111: *Reference Xoserve Industry/Shipper Communications Summary* – Xoserve (DT) to look to provide a summary breakdown of communications with parties who have received a performance letter; what if anything has been done to identify a root cause; and what corrective actions might be undertaken (inc. an indication of associated timelines).

Update: It was noted that this is a 'generic' requirement (and links in to a monthly update) that is broadly related to outstanding action PAC0103 above for which Xoserve (ES) would be providing additional information in due course. **Carried Forward**

PAC0112: *Reference Outstanding Read Performance* – Xoserve (DT) to look to provide an update on what progress to resolve these has been made to date, and what if any, timelines are involved.

Update: It was noted that this action is also broadly related to outstanding action PAC0103 above. **Carried Forward**

3. Committee Matters

3.1 For Attention

3.1.1. Modification 0664 – Transfer of Sites with Low Read Submission Performance from Class 2 and 3 into Class 4 (JW)

JW explained that whilst progress on the Modification had temporarily halted, it had been the subject of discussions at the recent UIG Workgroup meeting.

In explaining the background to raising the Modification on behalf of the PAC, JW pointed out that one aim is to avoid barriers to Product Class movements whilst seeking to improve industry read performance.

An extensive debate was undertaken, during which the following key points were captured (by exception):

- Potentially involves significant system change;

- Modification is being refined to lessen the 'punitive' aspects;
- PAC still believe that there is merit in continuing to develop the Modification (on the grounds it introduces an 'entry test' mechanism), regardless of the fact that industry Performance Letters are already being issued;
- It was noted that UNC Modification 0672 would potentially introduce an enduring solution;
- Some Committee Members believe that charging Shippers would/could incentivise them to improve their read submission performances;
 - Partial charging for Product Class 2 and 3 sites might improve overall performance without the to force sites into Product Class 4;
 - In recognising the role of 'soft landing' provisions, care needed to find a successful balance between performance, financial incentives and barriers to Product Class movements;
 - Modification aims to take into account sites that either do not have SMART or AMR or are unable to obtain reads for a temporary reason;
 - It was suggested that perhaps focusing Shipper charges only for their sites that are under performing might be preferable to looking to charge across their whole portfolio, thereby potentially reducing the punitive impacts and avoiding providing rebates (which is seen as a perverse incentive to be avoided at all costs);
- It was noted that some of the UIG issues involve (NDM) unidentified gas profile related issues;
 - The threat of 'drawing' some of these sites back to DM from NDM (i.e. back to Product Class 2) might have traction;
 - It was suggested that the amount of unidentified gas in Product Classes 2 and 3 could be have a significant contribution to overall UIG;
- It was noted that there are potential AUGE impacts to consider which are due to be discussed at the next UIG Workgroup meeting;
 - Modification would be amended to take into account such discussions in due course;
- Modification would be considering both 'transfer of sites' and 'charging centric' based models, although perhaps leaning more towards a charging concept – once a decision is agreed upon, the title of the Modification would be amended accordingly;
- It was noted that there is always the option to escalate any persistent under performance issues to Ofgem, although it brings into question what they would consider to be important enough to warrant such an action;
- Whilst industry responses to the performance letters has been largely positive, there is no clear indication of an underlying systemic issue, rather the feeling is that the issues relate to weaknesses within the parties (internal) processes;

- At least one party has experienced system issues around converting their files and thereafter entering the information into the system;
- Some concerns remain around Shippers knowingly leaving issues alone (i.e. not undertaking the appropriate corrective actions);
- It was suggested that perhaps the performance' criteria for Product Class3 sites might be set too high;
- It was noted that excluding Product Class 3 sites, there remains issues with allocation and UIG reconciliation, although the UIG percentage of volume remains roughly the same;
 - It was suggested that one option would be to adopt a read on the last day of the month, whereby reconciliation value would essentially stay the same across the month;
 - UIG would still be 'shared out';
 - It was noted that not having all of the daily reads for Product Class 3 Supply Meter Point in a month would incur only marginal price related impacts, therefore should the target be relaxed;
 - In noting that the current UNC obligation is for a party to submit 27 out of 30 day's worth of reads for a site (i.e. 90% target), (as a minimum for settlement purposes), it was debated whether removing the 90% target across all Product Class 3 might prove worthwhile;
 - Care needed to avoid sending out the wrong message and incentivising parties to deliberately under-perform, on the grounds that there is a commercial/financial benefit to some in doing so;
 - Whilst a change in the target percentage value is feasible, the issue of UIG remains of paramount concern;
- The Committee Members requested vision of the industry responses for the under-performing Product Class 3 sites in order to be able to better assess how these compare across the average industry performance – it was noted that the 'outlying' parties are the one's that are not necessarily looking to address their performance issues;
- It is recognised that the issue essentially boils down to whether (under-performing) parties' sites should remain in Product Class 3, or whether PAC should look to establish incentives –to avoid parties potentially benefitting from their UIG;

Concluding discussions, JW advised that he would take the points raised into consideration when looking to amend the Modification in order to ensure that the solution easily converts into the legal text and look to provide a further progress update at the 12 March 2019 meeting.

3.1.2. Modification 0674 – Performance Assurance Techniques and Controls (MB)

Before handing over to MB to provide a brief progress update, BF explained that Panel have indicated that they are reluctant to keep deferring consideration of the Modification and expect to see some meaningful progress being made, before being formally asked to make a recommendation on the Modification to progress to Workgroup.

MB explained that during discussions with Transporters it had been apparent that more detail would need to be (re)inserted in the Modification in order to facilitate the successful provision of supporting legal text.

In short, the UNC obligational aspects of the Modification are starting to crystallise, which would establish the new PAFA and PAC document requirements going forwards.

In explaining that the Modification is now moving towards a 'principles' based prescriptive approach focused on minimising error and thereby avoiding increasing settlement and UIG errors; MB advised that that a UNC obligation supported by a PAC Assurance Framework Document would be a preferred option.

MB went on to explain that unfortunately it is highly unlikely that he would be reporting progress back to the February 2019 Panel. As a consequence, there are a couple of options available to him, namely withdraw Modification 0674 and raise a new modification in its place, or look to defer Panel consideration for another month until the March 2019 Panel meeting, which is his preferred option.

3.1.3. Standards of Service Liabilities Reporting (ES)

BF pointed out that the report(s) are published each month.

3.1.4. XRN4795 – Amendments to PARR (0520A) Reporting (ES)

ES provided a brief overview of the '*XRN4795 – Amendments to PARR (520a) reporting*', during which no adverse comments were forthcoming.

3.2 For Decision

3.2.1. Potential Additional Areas for PAC Focus to Help Address UIG (FC)

During an overview of the '*UIG Task Force Recommendations for Further Development at PAC*' presentation by FC, PAC attention focused on the main points outlined below.

Background slide

It was noted that the underlying theme relates to Xoserve proactively engaging with Shippers.

FC explained that at some point she would look to feedback PAC thoughts to the UIG Taskforce.

Summary of Topics and Recommendations slide

FC pointed out that the statements in italics represent Xoserve's initial stance on the respective items. In considering each (log) item in turn, the following observations/comments were discussed:

- 3.2.1 – involves around a dozen (out of a total of 24 sites) AQ calculations that exceed the threshold values:
 - Some parties might be 'holding back' until UNC Modification 0665 '*Changes to Ratchet Regime*' completes its lifecycle before making a decision on what action to take;
 - For some Xoserve utilises daily consumption data;
 - 0.4% relates to sites where Xoserve has the NDM data;
 - Represents a high score as far as Xoserve engagement is concerned;

- This item represents a potential 'quick win';
 - PAC supports progression of this item.
- 3.2.2 – related to tolerance failures;
 - Involves a potential impact on Shippers to undertake appropriate corrective actions;
 - May necessitate a more detailed investigation in due course;
 - It was suggested that the logic should be applied across the national portfolio;
 - It was recognised that there might be some potential (sub pots) that would need additional consideration;
 - FC to examine Xoserve 'Findings work' related data to potentially identify other possible pots (i.e. areas of focus etc.);
 - It was acknowledged that Asset level data at a national level might be difficult to obtain and assess;
 - Read rejections are covered as part of the PARR reporting;
 - Further analysis of read rejections needed to ascertain whether these are a significant factor or not;
 - PAC supports progression of this item, as per the Xoserve recommendation.
- 1 – relates to PC1 performance within the ranges of 80% (high) and 90% (low);
 - Related to both the earlier 0664 discussions and UNC Modification 0647 '*Opening Class 1 reads to Competition*';
 - PAC supports progression of this item, as per the Xoserve recommendation.
- 12.1 – it was noted that this item would be potentially 'covered off' by a new Modification once raised;
 - Relates to Shipper/MAM activity;
 - Actual UIG impacts unknown at this time;
 - Involves potential volatility related issues;
 - Majority of the sites involved reside at the top of the band;
 - No Xoserve Impact Assessment / Rough Order of Magnitude undertaken at this time.
- 12.3 – it was noted that this item would be potentially 'covered off' by a new Modification once raised;
 - This new topic is essentially the potential 'flip side' to item 12.1 above;
 - Involves circa 12k sites needing a Shipper update;
 - Concerns voiced as to how the system allows these instances to take place;
 - Care needed in changing conversion factors and how this potentially impacts both Xoserve and Shippers views on the same set(s) of data;

- No Xoserve Impact Assessment / Rough Order of Magnitude undertaken at this time.
- 3.2.8 – potentially ‘links in’ to item 3.2.2 above;
 - A closer look at the AQ corrections aspects would be needed;
 - This item represents a potential ‘quick win’;
 - PAC supports progression of this item, as per the Xoserve recommendation.

Concluding discussions, FC thanked parties for their contributions.

4. Monthly Review Items

4.1 Risk & Issues Register Review

None.

4.2 Review of Monthly PARR Reports (inc. Dashboard update)

During consideration of the ‘PARR Dashboards’ presentation attention focused on the smaller ‘Shipper Performance Analysis’ presentation that contains commercially sensitive information extracted from the Huddle system.

As a consequence of the fact that the subsequent discussions relate in the main, to sensitive information, only the key PAC decision items have been recorded within these minutes, as follows:

4.2.1. 2A.4 Shipper Transfer Read Performance

SR explained that this report focuses on circa 40 of the poorest performing Shippers (i.e. those with performance levels between 0 and 50%) of which the Committee could consider ‘targeting’ the worst performers (i.e. those on 0%).

When SR advised that this is an area of concern that the PAFA are developing with Xoserve via improved granularity of information etc., it was also noted that this is also the subject of a DSC Change Proposal involving potential budget implications.

It was requested that the PAFA should look to identify the Shippers with a factor of 0% and identify the number of sites involved.

New Action PAC0201: Reference Shipper Performance Analysis Report 2A.4 Shipper Transfer Read Performance – PAFA (SR) & Xoserve (FC/ES) to provide analysis for those Shippers with a 0% transfer read performance level and identify the number of sites involved as a precursor to issuing Performance Letters.

When SR went on to advise that early indications are that the March 2019 would be potentially a very large report, the Committee requested that the PAFA looks to provide a high-level summary of responses and support this with a ‘judgement call’ on where they (the PAFA) think the Committee should focus its attention. Responding, SR pointed out that even at a high-level, she expects that this would still be a large report (i.e. 20+ pages).

New Action PAC0202: Reference Review of Monthly PARR Reports (inc. Dashboard update) – Joint Office (BF/MiB) to ensure that this item is placed as early as possible on the 12 March 2019 agenda.

5. Annual Work Plan and Budget

5.1 Draft Work Plan and Budget Actions Update

JW provided a brief background explanation to the '*Gas Energy Settlement Performance Assurance Committee: Annual Work Plan and Budget 2018/19*' document submitted for the 29 January 2019 meeting.

During discussions the following key elements were considered (by exception):

2. Background

Compiled in response to an action and based around a previous similar document.

it was compiled in response to an action and is based around a previously similar document.

JW suggested that **Section 5** (Key item timeline table) was probably the most important aspect for the Committees attention and had been realigned to the project plan after undertaking offline discussions with SR. JW went on to advise that he would probably look to remove the reference to the '*Q1 2019 Industry consultation*' should the Committee decide that it is no longer needed.

JW pointed out that **Section 6** focuses on risk requirements and **Section 7** contains a typographical error in the last bullet date which should state '*Q1 2019*' and not '*Q1 201*' as is currently shown.

When it was pointed out that the reference to '*UNC Modification 0646*' contained in the table within **Section 8** should read as '*UNC Modification 0647*', JW agreed to correct this in a forthcoming amended iteration of the document.

9. Indicative Budget

Discussions centred around whether or not, the Committee believes that the £50k DSC budget provision for 2018/19 is sufficient, especially when considering this figure had already been exceeded by progression of a single change request.

When asked, JW agreed to differentiate between 'Gas Years' and 'Financial Years'.

When asked whether any changes to the PARR Reports would be 'covered' under the current £50k provision (which expires end of March 2019), SR advised that any changes would require a supporting budget 'uplift' request to facilitate.

It was noted that the 2019/20 PAC Budget had already been agreed by the Xoserve Board as it was in the business plan, therefore any additional reporting requirements would need to be approved (by unanimous vote) via the DSC Change Management Committee. However, should the Committee look to set aside a 'ring fenced' budget going forwards, it would potentially avoid having to seek full approval thereafter. SH confirmed the budget for 2019/20 had been increased from £50k to £75k.

It was pointed out that the UIG Taskforce requirements are funded via the BAU process – funding is in place for the taskforce up until the end of 2019.

ES went on to explain that the Business Plan for 2019/20 would be submitted for approval in February – the change budget is a healthy one with scope (at this time) for the Committee to drawdown a larger budget provision. During a brief debate it was suggested that a budget request of circa £200k for 2019/20 would be reasonable.

New Action PAC0203: Reference the 2019/20 PAC Budget Provision – Xoserve (ES) to request a £200k PAC budget provision.

During a brief discussion, the Committee concluded that based on the need to refine the timeline aspects of the document and the impending risk register and model consultation exercise, now is perhaps not the best time to release the information to the wider industry.

When BF questioned how in Year 2, the Committee would expect to demonstrate what had been done in order to satisfy the Year 1 work areas, it was suggested that a summary of Year 1 progress (i.e. what items had been completed and what if any, are to be carried over etc.) would be beneficial.

Moving on to discuss the more general matter of UNC Modification 0664, AJ enquired whether this is an 'incentive' style Modification, to which JW replied suggesting that this is not necessarily the case, as UNC Modification 0674 might take on that mantle. However, MB pointed out that he is not intending it to be specified in Modification 0674, as this focuses mainly on framework requirements (i.e. similar in nature to UNC Modification 0672). BF reminded everyone that there would potentially be three PAC related Modifications in the form of Modification 0664, 0674 and a new UIG related Modification, which is due soon.

When asked where in the timeline the PAFA Review (i.e. what was achieved) might reside, JW agreed to tweak the timeline to include this within Q1 (January to March).

BF then focused attention on whether the Committee should consider moving to a two (2) year election/appointment process in order to better align with the UNC Panel/UNCC timescales. Some concerns were voiced around how best to avoid a completely new set of Committee Members being elected with the associated loss of continuity and knowledge base involved being a major concern. It was suggested that as a minimum perhaps the Transporters should look to rotate their memberships on a staggered basis – a point acknowledged by both SH and SK. It was also noted that it is only Users that are elected to become PAC Members as the Transporters simply nominate their representatives.

It was suggested that perhaps a way to mitigate some of the concerns being voiced would be to restrict PAC Membership changes to a maximum of three (3) Users per term.

When asked whether a new UNC Modification would be required to initiate a move to a two year election/appointment process, BF responded by suggesting that it might not necessarily be the case, on the grounds that this is really a Uniform Network Code Committee (UNCC) Sub-Committee related matter, and as such, the User Appointment Process is defined within the User Guidance Document.

In noting that the current PAC Yearly Membership appointment process is out of step with Panel/UNCC processes, BF suggested that perhaps this is something that could be highlighted at Panel/UNCC level in due course.

New Action PAC0204: Reference a Change to the Current PAC Membership election/appointment process from 1 year to 2 years – PAFA (AJ) to draft a one page summary document for submission to the UNC Panel/UNCC in due course.

6. Best Practices (News Bulletin) Update

In introducing this new agenda item, BF explained that it has been added as a consequence of the discussions undertaken during the 29 January 2019 meeting.

During a brief discussion, the Committee suggested that provision of a 'flag' to Users requesting that they examine their 'reason codes' might provide a quick win resolution for some of the issues being encountered – perhaps the 'flag' could take the form of a glossary communication style of approach.

When it was noted that perhaps inclusion of a 'Tip of the Month' within the PAFA Key Messages statements might also prove helpful, FC advised that Xoserve have been compiling a list of 'How To's' for quite some time and she would ensure that this is provided to SR going forwards.

7. Any Other Business

None.

8. Next Steps

8.1 Key Messages – PAFA

SR 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.

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, Tuesday 12 March 2019	Radcliffe House, Blenheim Court, Warwick Road, Solihull B91 2AA	Standard Agenda

PAC Action Table (as at 12 February 2019)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
PAC 1202	11/12/18	4.1	<i>Reference Draft Work Plan and Budget Actions</i> – Shipper Member (JW) and PAFA (SR) to look to refine the Work Plan in time for consideration at the 08 January 2019 meeting.	Shipper Member (JW) & PAFA (SR)	Update provided. Closed
PAC 1203	11/12/18	6.3	<i>Reference DSC Change Proposal XRN4790 Introduction of winter read/consumption reports and associated obligation (MOD0652)</i> – Xoserve (ES) and PAFA (SR) to look to establish how best to incorporate the requirements into the PARR schedule going forwards.	Xoserve (ES) & PAFA (SR)	Update provided. Closed
PAC 0101	08/01/19	2.	<i>Reference Future PAF Reviews</i> - 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.	PAFA (SR)	Carried Forward (Update due 14 May 2019)

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)	Carried Forward (Update due 12 March 2019)
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 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.</i>	Xoserve (FC)	Carried Forward (Update due 12 March 2019)
PAC 0107	29/01/19	3.5.4	<i>Reference 2A.5 Read Performance - Product Class 4 - Xoserve (ES) to raise a DSC Change Proposal to look to split PC4 into monthly (inc. SMARTS to satisfy CMA requirements) and annual read meters.</i>	Xoserve (ES)	Update provided. Closed
PAC 0108	29/01/19	3.5.5	<i>Reference PARR Dashboard Reports – All parties to consider whether there are any additional items they would like adding into the various reports.</i>	PAC	Update provided. Closed
PAC 0109	29/01/19	3.6.1	<i>Reference UNC Modification 0664 - All parties are requested to provide a view to the Proposer (JW) on a suitable potential level of content and areas of focus for the modification.</i>	PAC	Update provided. Closed
PAC 0110	29/01/19	6.3	<i>Reference the Xoserve / PAFA Contract – Xoserve (DT) to confirm what the current contract terms allow the PAFA to view in terms of Shipper pack related information and whether if needed, any contract changes could be progressed via the DSC Change Management Committee route.</i>	Xoserve (DT)	Carried Forward (Update due 12 March 2019)
PAC 0111	29/01/19	6.4	<i>Reference Xoserve Industry/Shipper Communications Summary – Xoserve (DT) to look to provide a summary breakdown of communications with parties who have received a performance letter; what if anything has been done to identify a root cause; and what corrective actions might be</i>	Xoserve (DT)	Carried Forward (Update due 12 March 2019)

			undertaken (inc. an indication of associated timelines).		
PAC 0112	29/01/19	6.4	<i>Reference Outstanding Read Performance</i> – Xoserve (DT) to look to provide an update on what progress to resolve these has been made to date, and what if any, timelines are involved.	Xoserve (DT)	Carried Forward (Update due 12 March 2019)
PAC 0201	12/02/19	4.2.1	<i>Reference Shipper Performance Analysis Report 2A.4 Shipper Transfer Read Performance</i> – PAFA (SR) & Xoserve (FC/ES) to provide analysis for those Shippers with a 0% transfer read performance level and identify the number of sites involved as a precursor to issuing Performance Letters.	PAFA (SR) & Xoserve (FC/ES)	Pending
PAC 0202	12/02/19	4.2	<i>Reference Review of Monthly PARR Reports (inc. Dashboard update)</i> – Joint Office (BF/MiB) to ensure that this item is placed as early as possible on the 12 March 2019 agenda.	Joint Office (BF/MiB)	Pending
PAC 0203	12/02/19	5.1	<i>Reference the 2019/20 PAC Budget Provision</i> – Xoserve (ES) to request a £200k PAC budget provision.	Xoserve (ES)	Pending
PAC 0204	12/02/19	5.1	<i>Reference a Change to the Current PAC Membership election/appointment process from 1 year to 2 years</i> – PAFA (AJ) to draft a one page summary document for submission to the UNC Panel/UNCC in due course.	PAFA (AJ)	Pending