

## UNC Performance Assurance Committee Minutes

Tuesday 29 January 2019

at Radcliffe House, Blenheim Court, Warwick Road, Solihull B91 2AA

### Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Mike Berrisford (Secretary)	(MiB)	Joint Office
Anne Jackson	(AJ)	PAFA
Billy Howitt	(BH)	PAFA
Carl Whitehouse	(CW)	Shipper Member
Dave Turpin	(DT)	Observer, Xoserve
Emma Smith	(ES)	Observer, Xoserve
Fiona Cottam	(FC)	Observer, Xoserve
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

Graham Wood	(GW)	Shipper Member
John Welch	(JW)	Shipper Member

\* via teleconference

Copies of non-confidential papers are available at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/pac/290119>

## 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 from February 2019 Alex Travell would be joining PAC as the IGT Member.

### 1.2 Apologies for absence

Apologies were noted as above.

### 1.3 Note of Alternates

None.

### 1.4 Review of Minutes (08 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 SR advised that she needed to provide feedback to JW regarding the matter, and mindful of his absence at this meeting, it was agreed to defer further consideration until the next 12 February 2019 Committee 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 explained that she would be meeting with Xoserve (ES and NC) later in the week to consider this matter and therefore requests that the action is deferred until the 12 February 2019 Committee meeting. **Carried Forward**

**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**

**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.*

**Update:** NC explained that since the 08 January 2019 meeting, he had revisited the the published information concerning SMART meter installations and concluded that the non-SMETS figures are not included within the BEIS data. As a rough guide, the 5.8 million SMART meters recorded on the Xoserve system equates well to the circa 5.7 million identified in the BEIS Q3 data set, which is reasonably close considering data alignment. Furthermore, it is anticipated that once the Q4 statistics are produced (which include smaller portfolio parties), the figures would improve (align) even more.

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

**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:** DT advised that Xoserve would be looking to provide a response to this action at the 12 February 2019 meeting. **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:** In noting that this is similar (related to) action PAC0103 above, FC advised that she would aim to provide some information to her colleague D Turpin after the meeting.

DT then advised that he would be looking to provide a response to this action at the 12 February 2019 meeting. **Carried Forward**

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

**Update:** Whilst Committee Members noted that an update on this action is not due until the 12 March 2019 meeting, FC referred to the Committee's previous views on anonymity (i.e. to retain the use of anonymised reports) before pointing out that Xoserve had received a request to 'map out' UNC parties within the Huddle system – some parties expressed concern around potentially releasing sensitive information without prior agreement and noted that once this particular 'genie' is let out, there would be no going back, even if the information concerned would be provided on a secure area of the Huddle system.

When asked, Committee Members agreed that this action could be removed from the March 2019 agenda, and the action closed. **Closed**

**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.

**Update:** In suggesting that this action is more to do with the sharing of links to where information resides, FC explained that she believes the action has been completed.

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

### 3. Monthly Review Items

Other than a brief verbal update on items 3.5 and 3.6 below, consideration of these various items was deferred until the 12 February 2019 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

#### 3.4 Ofgem Update

#### 3.5 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 related in the main, to sensitive information, only the key PAC decision items have been recorded within these minutes, as follows:

##### 3.5.1. 2A.5 Read Performance – 5 Month Review

The Committee noted the information as provided, with no adverse comments being put forward.

##### 3.5.2. 2A.5 Read Performance – Product Class 2

In noting the 0.00% returns for one of the parties, Committee Members recognised that in some instances, this can be because there might be missing reads within a whole month's worth of reads submitted, rather than zero read submission for the whole month – new report comparing expected vs actual reads would be provided from March 2019 onwards.

Committee Members suggested adopting a similar approach to the Product Class 3 performance letters exercise, noting that care would be needed to avoid 'double issuing' of the letters for related topics. It was also noted that there would be benefit in highlighting the potential UIG 'knock on' impacts on other industry parties.

Additional supporting information would be provided by Xoserve and the PAFA going forwards.

### **3.5.3. 2A.5 Read Performance – Product Class 3**

Committee Members noted that due to a lag in data analysis a clearer picture would be expected by March 2019.

It was noted that care would be taken to identify any new underperforming parties that have appeared since the initial letter exercise.

Responses to the initial letters have been largely positive with some underperforming parties moving their sites out of PC3 – it was suggested that this begs the question as to whether the industry is ready for PC3 and whether there is a need for an education exercise.

Might be value in highlighting the potential Ofgem escalation route.

PAFA will provide a summary of responses from letter recipients in due course.

Shipper specific letters would be issued where recipients of the initial letters failed to improve their performance or appear to have not taken any remedial action.

### **3.5.4. 2A.5 Read Performance – Product Class 4**

Committee Members noted the awkward nature of this report, especially when considering that annually read meters that are read at month 9 would not appear on this report as they were within the 12 months.

It was noted that Change of Supplier (CoS) statistics are catered for under this report, although care is needed around check reads and incoming Shipper obligations. Must reads might involve remote reading equipment and would be outside these obligations.

The current report is reflective of UNC Modification 0520A 'Performance Assurance Reporting' provisions. However, these might need to be re-visited to ensure they provide the information required.

Reference to UNC Modification 0638V 'Mandate monthly read submission for SMART and AMR sites from April 2018' Code provisions made and notice of the challenge of capturing sites that move from SMART to non-SMART at the CoS point.

Committee Members believe there would be additional benefit in obtaining a count of sites that have had a read every month for the past 12 months.

Committee Members recommended issuing 'observation' letters to indicate to industry parties (i.e. not just under performing parties) that performance is low in respect of this area – where a party has PC2 and PC4 performance issues, only one (1) letter would be issued.

**New Action: 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.**

### 3.5.5. 2A.10 Replaced Meter Readings

The PAFA is currently investigating this area (i.e. estimated reads replaced by actual reads etc.) in more detail.

In referring to the equivalent electricity market correcting reads process, Committee Members recognised that care is needed on the gas side to avoid dis-incentivising industry parties.

It was noted that industry parties' approach to the Gas year change could be reflected in these statistics.

In questioning the value behind the report, it was suggested that this relates more to reconciliation and UIG aspects rather than settlement, and as a consequence, provision of actual reads replaced by actual reads comparison might be an interesting exercise – it was noted that the previous focus was on movement.

A view of the % of portfolio analysis might also prove beneficial – responding SR indicated that she would look to add this to the report.

It was also suggested that a report on transfer reads might also prove beneficial.

Committee Members approved the issuing of a letter to the poorest performing party in order to ascertain a view as to why this might be an issue for them.

Concluding the discussions, SR advised that the next stage would be for the various industry parties involved to provide their respective Resolution Plans.

It is expected that a more detailed consideration of these performance analysis related matters / reports would now be undertaken at the 12 March 2019 meeting.

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

## 3.6 Review of PAC Related and New Modifications

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

Whilst noting the Proposer's (JW) absence, the Committee Members undertook a brief discussion around the modification during which ES advised that she had provided feedback to JW around possibly reporting aspects which he had agreed to consider. It was also noted that JW had previously indicated that he would be reconsidering what level would be suitable to 'pitch' the modification at.

DT explained that recent discussions with certain Shippers relating to Product Class movements, has raised the question around what potential drivers are incentivising industry parties to make commercial decisions (i.e. in examining a large AMR site that moved from PC 3 into PC4 that cited UIG impacts as being an underlying factor in making the decision).

Attention then switched to discussion of item 6.1 below.

**New Action 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.**

### 3.6.2. UNC Modification 0674 – Performance Assurance Techniques and Controls (MB)

Opening discussions, MB advised that he had spoken to both the PAFA (AJ) and Chris Warner of Cadent (CW) on how best to split the content of the modification (i.e. between within Code and outside of Code elements). CW has agreed to discuss the matter in more detail with Dentons lawyers to consider how this might be accommodated within development of the supporting legal text – it was noted that discussion with Dentons to date had been largely positive.

MB indicated that once a response has been provided by Dentons he would consider whether to amend the modification accordingly with the aim being to provide an updated version of the modification for consideration at the 12 February 2019 PAC meeting.

Moving on, MB provided a brief summary of how it is intended to create a more agile framework, whereby the elements within Uniform Network Code (UNC) set out the obligations and the associated procedures are contained within an ancillary document that can be updated more easily, as past experience suggests.

#### UNC elements

- principles-based obligation;
- performance assurance objectives;
- obligation to comply with PAC requests;
- obligation to pay ‘supplier charges’;
- obligation to meet performance levels specified by PAC;
- obligation to perform periodic review of PAF (details in PAF Documents);
- obligation for PAF proportionality (refer materiality assessment in PAF), and
- requirement to meet Entry Testing requirements (as specified in PAF Doc).

#### PAF Document

- performance assurance techniques available to PAC;
- appeals procedure;
- performance levels specified by PAC;
- supplier charges where applicable;
- PAC decision transparency;
- Procedure for periodic review of PAF;
- Methodology for materiality assessment;
- Role of CAMs and links with PAFA and PAC, and
- Entry Testing requirements & procedures.

MB explained that in short, the ‘tools’ for evaluating potential risks, methodologies and calculation mechanisms would reside within the ancillary document – in the meantime any comments would be gratefully appreciated.<sup>1</sup>

## 4. Annual Work Plan and Budget

<sup>1</sup> Post meeting note: an email was provided by ScottishPower (MB) outlining the items outlined above and subsequently circulated to Committee Members (by the Joint Office) during the course of the meeting.

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

It was agreed to defer consideration of this item in J Welch's absence until the 12 February 2019 meeting.

#### 5. Communications Plan

Consideration deferred until the 12 February 2019 meeting.

#### 6. Any Other Business

##### 6.1 Sites Moving Between Classes – Invoking a 12 Month Soft Landing (SK)

In providing the background to raising this matter, SK explained why she believes that the potential manipulation of the rules in order to avoid potential ratcheting and associated charges is a concern. – in short, the 12 month 'soft landing' clause prevented NGN from applying ratchet charges for parties that exceed their agreed SOQ.

Committee Members also noted that there are also potential (negative) settlement risk impacts associated with such behaviours.

Some parties felt that perhaps the industry perception is that if the UNC does not clearly state that a party cannot undertake a particular action, then it is acceptable to undertake such an action (i.e. there is a potential 'gap' in the UNC that is a hidden incentive to breach the UNC provisions and when one gap is filled, another is identified and exploited for commercial gain). Whilst the Committee Members were agreed that this is definitely NOT the way they would wish to see the industry operate they reluctantly accepted that perhaps there is not a perfect answer.

Committee Members then debated whether removing the 'soft landing' provision for parties moving sites into Product Class 2, would potentially make a difference to their (the parties in question) commercial behaviours – it was suggested that if a party is the same Registered User and are switching sites in and out of PC2 inside a 12 month (soft landing) period, then they (the party) do not get more than one (1) 'soft landing' grace period.

ES believes that JW is aware of issues such as this and is in the throws of incorporating (counter measures) BAU provisions within UNC Modification 0664 – ES also explained that she has discussed the option of not allowing entry into a Product Class until the user displays suitable levels of improvement (i.e. implications on freedom of choice elements).

It was felt that parties are potentially using the option to 'hide' from UIG impacts. In considering industry read performance in general (i.e. must reads etc.), it was suggested that perhaps introducing penalties in preference to simply moving sites into Product Class 4 might be a preferred option, on the grounds that it would also work towards addressing settlement related aspects.

##### 6.2 December Shipper Pack Issues (DT)

DT provided a brief overview of the late (provided on the day) Xoserve '*Customer Advocate Update*' presentation during which he explained that a manual error and additional process control mechanism related issues had resulted in four recent Xoserve Change Pack communications (for December 2018) not being delivered.

However, following improvements to the process controls and the addition of additional check points, the January 2019 Change Packs have been issued without any problems.

##### 6.3 Shipper Packs for PAFA – PAC to Consider (DT)

Attention was focused on an onscreen review of the blank *'Shipper Pack and Shipper Pack Glossary'* documents provided at the meeting, during which DT pointed out that the format of the various packs is basically the same for each Shipper with only the data being Shipper specific.

In referring to the various Meter Read elements of the *'Data Cleansing Priority Topics'* table, MB explained that the previous day's UIG Taskforce had included discussions on data cleansing aspects which begs the question whether or not there are any additional elements that could be added to the Shipper Packs. Responding, DT indicated that he would be more than happy to consider enhancing the information within the packs with items such as read rejection rates – as always, the key is having accurate asset data provisions. DT explained that Xoserve are also keen to understand how best to incentivise the industry and apply suitable charges, especially at the larger end of the market.

When asked how Xoserve undertakes and makes a judgement on what might be deemed as being potentially incorrect information, FC responded by explaining that assessment is largely based around a comparison of the 'standard value' across the industry. At this point SB informed the Committee that E.ON UK intends to raise a new Modification to consider the use of correction factors to seek compliance with the Thermal Energy Regulations following on from yesterday's UIG Taskforce discussions.

When asked for a view, DT explained that Theft of Gas figures (metrics) are often very difficult to interpret, especially as to whether or not, the position reported is either a 'good' or 'bad' position.

When asked whether Xoserve undertakes a comparison of reconciliation data against the equivalent SPAA information, FC explained that she has been discussing this aspect with JW – it was noted that a SPAA change had been raised to look to identify and report on Theft of Gas aspects.

Moving on to consider the *'Data Cleansing – Priority Topics'* supporting glossary (as provided at the meeting), DT explained that at one time the bulk of these were 'cleansing' related items that have now become 'for information only' type of items. He also added that there are some overlaps with various PAC reporting elements.

DT went on to explain that there are some ongoing issues around the provision of MPRN related data (i.e. granularity of information vs confidentiality), although as far as the PAC reports are concerned, it is only those parties who have received (performance) letters that are requesting provision of MPRN related data.

DT highlighted that during discussions with various parties over their performance issues, concerns have been raised related to potential discrepancies in the information provided within the Shipper packs and that provided within the PARR reports, which Xoserve are considering how best to address going forwards. The solution might possibly lie in a common data source being utilised for both purposes and a common approach to reporting.

When it was suggested that there might be value in undertaking a monthly review on a topic by topic basis in future, as this could also potentially align with UIG Taskforce outputs, DT provided a brief overview of potential streams of work. It was noted that there could be potential quick wins in Xoserve and the PAFA pursuing a common view on source data (and associated granularity of information) and a common approach to reporting. In referring to the DSC Change Proposal, DT suggested that the DSC Change Management Committee might need to consider what information would be appropriate for the PAFA to have access to.



In referring to data visualisation screens, DT pointed out that a recent Webex with the industry had considered what is provided, and where and what access controls might be required in terms of portal and data security. When it was suggested that care would be needed to ensure consistency of the information being provided, DT advised that Xoserve is employing a single team to consider the change pack and visualisation aspects and another team dedicated to considering the technical platform requirements.

Some Committee Members indicated that they would be disappointed if it turned out that the Xoserve / PAFA contract was too inflexible and thereby constrained any potential to make progress in this area – a point acknowledged by DT (who was of the view that the contract is flexible enough in its current state to enable suitable progress to be made).

It was suggested that the true test of progress being made would be realised when the PAFA is able to view Shipper pack information, in order for the PAFA to provide a more meaningful industry wide perspective. SR observed that this could also potentially reduce the PAFA workload and enable it to do additional 'up front' analysis.

It was noted that as a minimum, the contract should allow the PAFA to do what it needs to do in order to provide a suitable service to the PAC.

**New Action 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.**

DT advised that Xoserve believes that it still needs to examine and compare the Shipper pack and PARR reports to decide which might be the most appropriate source provision. Supporting this proposed approach, ES explained that Xoserve are also looking at how best to progress the PARR reporting output elements and active monitoring requirements going forwards – BH advised that he would liaise with ES outside of the meeting to discuss providing early visibility of the PARR Dashboards to Xoserve in order to help them (Xoserve) in the monitoring role going forwards.

The Committee noted that there are concerns in some spheres that the focus can sometimes be on the wrong areas and that it should be noted that industry parties also have a responsibility to manage their own positions and not simply become too reliant on the PAC Performance Reports – it was noted that there had been a positive industry reaction at the previous day's UIG Taskforce, with parties actively requesting help with resolving their respective performance related issues.

SB provided a brief explanation around how some parties might focus/manage its resources on the power (electricity) area as a consequence of the active Elexon performance management approach. Responding, FC pointed out that Xoserve adopts a slightly more cautious approach for the gas side, as their systems have not yet fully matured.

Concluding discussions, it was noted that 'inherited costs' from other industry parties (Shippers) remains a concern.

#### 6.4 CAM Update on Shipper Discussions (DT)

When DT suggested that this item had already been 'covered' under discussions on item 6.2 above, BF reminded parties that 'normally' UNC Committees do not undertake decisions on AOB items, and therefore any matter that PAC believes requires a decision should be added to the main body of the agenda and supporting information and decisions options provided.

In advising that he expects to provide more information at the 12 February 2019 meeting, DT explained that industry responses received to date had been largely positive and outlined what corrective actions they (the parties concerned) would be looking to undertake to resolve their performance issues.

One request for education and assistance (focusing on meter point registration and how to become a Shipper) in relation to the 'greenfield' sites process has been received, mainly as a consequence of a vacant site related issue. Xoserve are now working with the Shipper concerned in order to identify how best to resolve the concerns and what learning improvements could be made going forwards.

In considering what should be done when a party remains convinced that they do not have a performance issue (or simply look to ignore the fact) even though they have been issued a PAC letter, DT advised that Xoserve are proactively engaging with the whole industry (and not just those parties who have been issued a letter) to look to move forwards. When it was pointed out that a request for improved communications from and to Xoserve was made at the UIG Taskforce meeting, DT acknowledged the point and advised that Xoserve are considering the matter and at the same time liaising with the PAFA in order to gain access to the Huddle system.

In noting that most industry communications with Shippers are routed through Xoserve in the first instance, questions were asked as to how these might improve in future (especially to the benefit of the PAC). Responding, DT explained how Xoserve have engaged with those parties who have received performance letters – he agreed to liaise with the PAFA to provide an update at the 12 February 2019 meeting.

When MB pointed out that he is still awaiting provision of information (requested previously) from Xoserve that identifies Shipper 'X' has an issue due to reason 'Y', Committee Members suggested there would be value in having a monthly update going forwards.

**New Action 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).**

In referring to (ring fenced outstanding consumption adjustments etc.) read performance issues, DT provided a brief progress update during which it was noted that until Xoserve provides the information, the PAC are effectively neutered as to what decisions or recommendations they might make. At this point a request for more information was made by Committee Members.

**New Action 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.**

It was suggested that where Xoserve have engaged with parties (over their poor performance issues) and the parties have indicated they would be happy to let PAC have sight of the details and outcomes of the discussions, it would be beneficial to ensure that PAC are made aware of the situations as this could save PAC needlessly issuing letters in the first place.

## 6.5 XRN4779 UNC 0657S Adding AQ Reporting to the PARR Schedule Reporting Suite (ES)

Rather than focusing on the Change Proposal itself, ES provided a brief overview of the supporting 'PARR AQ reporting – Schedule 2B.11 (number to be confirmed by PAFA)' spreadsheet during which the following key points (only by exception) were agreed by the Committee:

- Report 1 – consensus is to provide the data on the last day of the month;
- Report 4 – consensus is this relates to a count of meter points that only goes back to the Project Nexus ‘go-live’ date of 01 June 2017.

#### **6.6 XRN4795 Amendments to the PARR (520a) Reporting (ES)**

As per item 6.5 above.

#### **6.7 Modification 0672 – Xoserve Analysis & PAC Considerations (MR)**

The Committee noted that this agenda item had been withdrawn ahead of the meeting and would be resubmitted for consideration at a future meeting.

#### **6.8 PAF Functions (JW)**

In providing a very brief onscreen review of the document and noting JW’s absence, BF pointed out that the document had been revised following the previous meeting and thereafter suggested that should anyone have any comments / feedback to contact JW directly.

#### **6.9 Adding New PAC Agenda Items (AJ)**

When asked what the preferred way of getting items added to the PAC agendas was, BF explained that undertaking a timely request and providing any supporting documentation in a timely manner (i.e. to the deadlines identified in the meeting notification emails and certainly no later than 5 business days prior to the meeting date) is sufficient.

During a brief discussion it was agreed to replace the existing ‘*Communications Plan*’ with a new agenda item entitled ‘*Matters for the Committees Attention/Decision*’ or similar words to that effect, and to remove both the existing ‘*Ofgem Update*’ and ‘*Project Update*’ items completely going forwards.

#### **6.10 Best Practice Communications (MB)**

When it was suggested that perhaps a News Bulletin relating to highlighting industry best practice communications and initiatives throughout the industry might prove beneficial, FC made reference to the UIG approach as a good role model – SR agreed to consider and provide a view at a future meeting.

### **7. Next Steps**

#### **7.1 Key Messages – PAFA**

SR provided a brief verbal overview of the draft Key Points from the previous meeting to be circulated by the PAFA after the meeting (including UIG and today’s PAC key messages) 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>

<b>Time/Date</b>	<b>Venue</b>	<b>Programme</b>
10:30, Thursday 12 February 2019	Elexon, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW	Standard Agenda

**PAC Action Table (as at 29 January 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)	<b>Carried Forward</b> (Update due 12 February 2019)
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)	<b>Carried Forward</b> (Update due 12 February 2019)
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)	<b>Carried Forward</b> (Update due 14 May 2019)
PAC 0102	08/01/19	2.	<i>Reference the (high level) BEIS Q3 Statistics</i> - Xoserve (NC) to look to provide more clarification on whether the non-SMETS related information is included (or not) in the BEIS Q3 statistics.	Xoserve (NC)	Update provided. <b>Closed</b>
PAC 0103	08/01/19	2.	<i>Reference the Count of Outstanding Consumption Adjustments as at 21/12/2018 (Pot 1 only)</i> - Xoserve (FC) to look to identify what contact has been made with Shippers and what if any, corrective actions have been put in place.	Xoserve (FC)	<b>Carried Forward</b> (Update due 12 February 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</i> - Xoserve (FC) to look to undertake an assessment of the Pot 2 nominations compared to allocations in	Xoserve (FC)	<b>Carried Forward</b> (Update due 12 February 2019)

			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.		
PAC 0105	08/01/19	6.2	<i>Reference Dispensing with Anonymisation</i> – Joint Office (BF/MiB) to ensure this matter is included on the March 2019 PAC Agenda.	Joint Office (BF/MiB)	Update provided. <b>Closed</b>
PAC 0106	08/01/19	6.3	<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.	Xoserve (FC)	Update provided. <b>Closed</b>
PAC 0107	29/01/19	3.5.4	<i>Reference 2A.5 Read Performance - Product Class 4</i> - 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.	Xoserve (ES)	<b>Pending</b>
PAC 0108	29/01/19	3.5.5	<i>Reference PARR Dashboard Reports</i> – All parties to consider whether there are any additional items they would like adding into the various reports.	PAC	<b>Pending</b>
PAC 0109	29/01/19	3.6.1	<i>Reference UNC Modification 0664</i> - 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.	PAC	<b>Pending</b>
PAC 0110	29/01/19	6.3	<i>Reference the Xoserve / PAFA Contract</i> – 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.	Xoserve (DT)	<b>Pending</b>
PAC 0111	29/01/19	6.4	<i>Reference Xoserve Industry/Shipper Communications Summary</i> – 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).	Xoserve (DT)	<b>Pending</b>

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)	<b>Pending</b>
-------------	----------	-----	---	-----------------	----------------