

Performance Assurance Committee Minutes

Tuesday 13 June 2017

at Xoserve Ltd, Lansdowne Gate, 65 New Road, Solihull B91 3DL

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Helen Cuin (Secretary)	(HCu)	Joint Office
Andy Clasper	(AC)	Transporter Member
Colette Baldwin	(CB)	Shipper Member
Fiona Cottam	(FC)	Observer, Xoserve
Fraser Mathieson	(FM)	Transporter Member
John Welch	(JW)	Shipper Member Alternate non-voting
Mark Jones	(MJ)	Shipper Member
Mitch Donnelly	(MD)	Shipper Member
Rachel Hinsley	(Rhi)	Observer, Xoserve
Shanna Key	(SK)	Transporter Member
Tricia Quinn*	(TQ)	Ofgem

Apologies

Angela Love	(AL)	Shipper Member
Ed Hunter	(EH)	Non-voting Shipper Member
Lisa Saycell	(LS)	Shipper Member
Richard Pomroy	(RP)	Transporter Member

*via teleconference

Copies of non-confidential papers are available at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/PAC/130617>

1. Introduction and Status Review

1.1 Confirm Quorate Status

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

1.2 Apologies for absence

See above table.

1.3 Note of Alternates

Fraser Mathieson for Richard Promroy; and
John Welch for Ed Hunter

1.4 Review of Minutes (11 April 2017)

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

2. Procurement of a Performance Assurance Framework Administrator (PAFA) - Update

FC confirmed that the designated stand-still period was coming to an end and negotiations have begun with the preferred bidder. The stand-still period will end on Monday 18 June and Xoserve will hopefully be in a position to conclude the contract by the end of June.

CB enquired once the PAFA has been appointed if the Joint Office will still continue to support and manage the Performance Assurance Committee (PAC) meetings. BF

confirmed the intention will be for the Joint Office to continue facilitating and supporting future meetings where the meeting content allowed it to do so.

3. Monthly Review Items

3.1 Risk Register Review *(on hold pending PAFA)*

Currently 'on hold' for consideration at future meetings.

3.2 Issues Register

BF briefly summarised the current issues:

PAC002 – Update due at either the July or August 2017 meeting. **Carried Forward**

PAC007 – See Item 3.6 and Action 0505. It was agreed that the established DSC Contract Managers would be approached to provide appropriate contacts for PAC and PAFA communications. This issue will be closed once the appropriate contacts have been established. **Carried Forward**

PAC008 - Update due October 2017. **Carried Forward**

3.3 Implementation Plan

Committee members agreed to defer consideration of this item and Action 0302 until the next meeting.

3.4 Assumptions Register

Committee members agreed to defer further consideration of this item, and to revisit the register once the PAFA has been established.

3.5 Ofgem Update

TQ confirmed that Ofgem (Jon Dixon) intends to provide an incentives presentation on 11 July. However, if JD cannot be present this will be provided at the August meeting.

TQ provided a brief status update on the Project Nexus governance and the enduring governance proposals. She confirmed that it is proposed that the Data Management Group (DMG) should continue in a similar format. Acknowledging that Xoserve have provided feedback about work overlapping with the PAC and potentially DSC Committees. Xoserve are therefore planning to provide proposals to ensure there are no overlaps between governance groups.

CB expressed concern about the potential mismatch of data relating to settlement risk and that the PAC does not want the focus to be conflicting or impacted group priorities. FM suggested that the DMG should come to the PAC and provide an update. CB understood that the DMG was established to support Pre-Nexus implementation data cleansing and that this group should fall away as the industry moved in top business as usual. She stressed the importance of supporting and contributing to the success and accuracy of settlement by focusing activities in the PAC. She believed if the industry want to look at regime based on performance metrics, data accuracy and settlement integrity the resources needed to be focused where the expertise has been placed within PAC.

TQ believed that the DMG could have a valid role in supporting the PAC. TQ recognised the need to avoid duplication of effort but nevertheless DMG could have a helpful role to play. MJ felt there may be a need for a group with a similar focus to DMG as they may filter data issues before they become an issue for settlement or PAC. CB expressed concern for the need to be focussed at an industry level and not to be hanging on to the cleansing activities of Project Nexus. It was stressed that the PAFA arrangement should drive the obligations and drive exception management. CB felt it was wrong to divide resources and split the focus.

BF explained the role of PAC with the PAFA to identify issues. MJ suggested that an operational forum could look at route causes for data and how to fix problems. CB suggested that DMG may have to be a sub-group of PAC to keep control of activity and resources.

BF believed along with the concerns of how this would work, there would also be concern with how the work would be funded and what value it would add for the DMG to continue. TQ confirmed that she would relay the concerns back to the DMG for a view.

CB expressed a preference to avoid two groups (PAC plus DSC Governance) trying to drive the DMG.

TQ highlighted that Elexon have issued a future emergency paper on Smart Metering and Settlement Risk, she suggested that PAC may wish to look at this paper. MD provided some background information and confirmed the paper is around the protocols of site transfers, data flows, frequency of reads, changing standards and measuring standards.

3.6 PARR Schedule 1 Reporting

FC confirmed that the confidential PARR Schedule 1 Reporting had been provided to committee members.

BF explained the difficulty of producing detailed minutes which captured reporting information when the reports are unseen by the Joint Office due to confidentiality and publication issues.

CB was keen to have a closed set of minutes which detailed any decisions, conclusions and actions that may not be public due to the level of detail. BF advised that high level discussions could be captured where these could be set out without identifying individual parties. However, closed minutes could not be produced by the Joint Office and that this may be a role for the PAFA.

FC agreed she can provide a brief update email with the details.

The meeting reviewed each of the Schedule 1B reports:

Report 1B1 - Standard Volume Correction Factors for sites with AQ > 732, MWH

FC confirmed that an increase in the AQ is the trigger to amend the Correction Factor. There is no soft-landing rule with this requirement; the Correction Factor should be amended as soon as the Supply Meter Point crosses the threshold. However, there are no liabilities associated with this. See Actions 0501 and 0502.

The reports illustrated some improvements with performance.

CB explained that this does have an impact on settlement, energy for the customer and the residuals will go into Unidentified Gas (UIG). FM concurred that this is important.

CB highlighted, what Nexus delivered in terms of data cleansing, has helped with reconciliation and settlement processes, however, there were still a high number of sites with standard Correction Factors when they should be site specific. FC also highlighted with rolling AQ, there is an issue where sites may be crossing the threshold (up and down) on a frequent basis.

FM believed there was a need to assess risk, agree materiality, and agree what key messages may be required for the industry as it affects allocation. He questioned what the committee wants to do with the information?

MD suggested that once the PAFA is live, the committee should be asking Shippers what is being done to address the situation and that it would be good to get a view. JW enquired if this approach could be facilitated by an email as it might be an issue that can be remedied by education rather than other types of incentive. MD believed

there wasn't anything preventing the committee asking Shippers to provide an update on what steps the industry is taking to address the problem.

CB pointed out within the provided report that all of the sites reported above 732,00 KWh should have a site-specific correction factor set rather than the standard correction factor. CB enquired if there were any obligations in the UNC to encourage the right behaviours. It was acknowledged that there is an obligation in the Thermal Energy Regulations. FM believed that although there is a legal obligation, this is not featured in the UNC, it is not a Code requirement as it is primary legislation.

MD noted there was a slight decrease in numbers which appeared to coincide with the April contract rounds, however the decrease may be unrelated. JW suggested that some data cleansing may have taken place in the lead up to Nexus implementation.

MJ believed that this would be a relatively easy process to correct as most would not require site visits. He suggested this could be a desk-top exercise and the MAMs needn't undertake a site visit if there is sufficient information about the meter installation and its location.

CB emphasised that this needs to be addressed as a customer could be under or over paying for their energy which is a double impact, on the consumer concerned and more generally on settlement.

The committee considered the Gazprom presentation provided by LS which outlined the high-level process for correction factor updates. CB enquired if this could be provided to all parties. MD and JW believed there would be value in educating Shippers.

The committee reviewed the process and agreed that the Shipper interactions were correctly reflected in the Gazprom presentation. Xoserve agreed to review presentation to ensure the process is reflected correctly for onward communication to Shipper representatives during stakeholder engagement meetings.

CB suggested in the interest of customer protection and the socialisation of costs, this needs to be addressed. The committee considered if Ofgem would have powers under the statutory requirement to address non-compliance with the Thermal Energy Regulations.

CB also suggested that a reminder to MAMs at an appropriate MAM CoP forum to reinforce the process, would be beneficial. The next MAM CoP board was scheduled for 20 July.

The committee discussed and agreed that this needed to be addressed initially with an education exercise to ensure all parties are aware of their obligations. It was also considered that once the PAFA was on-board they could be asked to formalise a letter asking Shippers to provide an update on the work being undertaken to address the issue.

Action 0601: Standard Correction Factors for sites with AQ > 732, MWH - Shippers to raise the issue at MAM CoP.

Action 0602: Standard Correction Factors for sites with AQ > 732, MWH - Xoserve to consider Gazprom presentation to ensure the process is reflected correctly for onward communication to Shippers.

Action 0603: Standard Correction Factors for sites with AQ > 732, MWH - PAFA to write out to Shippers for an update on actions being undertaken.

JW suggested that some of these sites might have pressure and temperature converters installed which may over-ride the need to have a site-specific correction factor. He explained that the correction factor for these sites would only be used if the converter failed and this would have a minimal impact on settlement and therefore is a lower settlement risk than first assumed.

MD wished to understand if the 2600 reported sites had converters on site, as the issue may not be as material if there were. However, he pointed out that this doesn't negate the obligation to have a site-specific correction factor set in the system should the converter fail.

CB asked if there was a report that could easily identify if these sites would have a converter installed.

Action 0604: Standard Correction Factors for sites with AQ > 732, MWH - Xoserve to establish if it is feasible to identify how many sites have a converter installed.

FC highlighted that 10% appear not to have the appropriate factors from the provided report and that there is a legal obligation to have a site-specific correction factor. She re-enforced the impact on settlement, and the plan of action to better educate Shippers, request PAFA to write out, consider if there is a corrector on site and the MAM CoP Board Agenda item.

Report 1B2 - No Meter Recorded in the Supply Point Register

FC explained the difference between Shipperless sites report and this report where the site has a registered Shipper but there is no meter attached. This prevents meter readings being loaded for the site. Shippers would be paying Transportation charges and gas would be allocated but there would be no meter reads feeding into settlement.

It was recognised that some of these sites may not be consuming gas or they may be frozen developments or those still in construction. Shippers will be incurring capacity costs and being allocated gas (based on the AQ). It was acknowledged that Shippers might be choosing to remain the registered Shipper despite there being no gas being consumed in the hope of securing the customer once a meter is fitted and that this is a commercial driver.

CB recognised that gas may not be offtaken. However, she believed there was a mechanism to identify if a site was consuming gas by using the C&D store for failed transactions.

FC explained that Shippers are being advised of the sites without meters. MJ noted that the numbers being reported were increasing month and month.

FM suggested there maybe a number of legitimate reasons for non-compliance.

MD suggested writing to Shippers to highlight that there is a significant number of sites without a meter attached and there are licence and Code obligations to provide meter asset details. He suggested that Shippers could be asked to assure the PAC that these are legitimate sites noting that there may be some exceptions.

FC highlighted that the 3 highest reported Shippers make up 2/3rds of the population.

It was suggested this could be another action for PAFA to inform Shippers. It was suggested that the DSC Contract Managers and operational contacts could be approached to provide the PAC/PAFA with an appropriate contact.

It was suggested that the provided contact should be accountable and have the right authority within the organisation. MD suggested some appropriate words for the nomination invitation to ensure the contact provided has the appropriate authority and will be responsible for providing views/updates.

It was suggested that an item could also be raised at the 14th June DSC Contract Management Committee meeting under AOB.

CB suggested that PAC members should engage with the contract managers and it would be good timing to obtain contacts in readiness for communications from the PAFA.

BF highlighted that key messages could be communicated through the monthly JO Newsletter. Although it was noted that there may not be a requirement for the PAC to issue key messages, it may be a useful option to trigger Shipper actions. BF confirmed that the Newsletter is published on the Joint Office website (at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/News>) and an email is issued to contacts registered to receive UNC updates however this may not include all of the appointed DSC Contract Managers.

It was suggested that the JO office should establish a DSC Contract Managers distribution list using Xoserve's recorded contacts.

Action 0605: JO to create a contract list containing all the DSC Contract Managers and issue an email for each organisation to provide an appropriate contact for PAC and PAFA communications.

Action 0606: DSC Contract Managers to provide a nominated PAC contact.

Action 0607: No Meter Recorded - PAFA to send request for update.

JW enquired about the figure provided within the report and if this was a count of numbers or if this was a percentage. FC explained that to keep the report anonymous it was a percentage as reported numbers would make it parties easily identifiable.

MD noted that the Top 3 accounted for more than 50% but this doesn't provide an indication relative to performance.

Report 1B3 - Shipper Transfer Read Performance

FC provided a percentage update of each Shipper's achieved performance.

FC confirmed that where N/A has been recorded this is where the Shipper has no new confirmations to measure.

FM clarified the percentage does not provide an indication of the risks to settlement as it is not known how many confirmations have been submitted.

CB believed that the switch activity shouldn't matter. This reported performance measure is the degree of whether reads have been submitted or not. This is not the failure rate this is the percentage achieved. It was clarified that each party should be aiming to achieve 100%. It was also recognised that there is a risk to settlement should performance reduce.

MD explained that without the raw data month on month the performance cannot be compared because the number of total confirmations is not known.

FM questioned what is the materiality, and does the report show what it needs to show? FC suggested for the next meeting that members should bring views on whether the reporting needs to be changed. If it was representative or not. It was acknowledged a modification may be required to change the report.

CB suggested that further information is requested for the report. It would be useful to show when switching is taking place who is ensuring transfer reads are obtained.

It was suggested that the committee could ask the PAFA to dig deeper into this element of the report to understand the risk better and if with the smart meter roll out this would improve. MJ suggested an overall average may be useful. JW confirmed and average is reported in the Shipper Pack.

MD concurred that the committee need to think what information PAC requires to put some context around the current information.

Action 0608: Shipper Transfer Read Performance - PAC members to bring views on what reporting changes need to be made.

Report 1B4 - No Reads received for 2, 3 or 4 years (includes estimated transfer readings)

FC provided a percentage update, split into bands of sites with no read.

SK highlighted that one party appears to have never had any reads. CB asked if these would fall into the must reads process at some point.

MD asked for clarification if the total number was an average or total market performance. FC confirmed this is market performance.

CB believed that the performance report was not as bad as anticipated and it appears that readings are getting in.

MD asked about one or two reported figures where 0% was reported. FC believed Xoserve does not include estimated reads.

MD believed the reported figures were in comparison to some of the CMA output.

4. Annual Workplan and Budget

In recognising that the first meeting with the PAFA is expected to take place in July 2017, Committee members agreed it would be useful to include PAFA views on the items to be included.

FM was keen to speak to PAFA and establish what is possible.

Bearing in mind outstanding actions 0302 and 0401, members agreed to feed views into a plan and agreed they would like a statement for PAFA.

MJ confirmed in relation to Action 0401 he had developed a 16-bullet point checklist of what he believes needs to be done to get the PAFA on-board. BF suggested a condensed version of this needs to be formulated for inclusion in the Annual workplan.

FM agreed to co-ordinate a Workplan to detail: What Performance Assurance is, what the industry is doing. He welcomed views from other members of what they would like to be in the Workplan and agreed to co-ordinate this activity.

CB asked to include the basis of reporting and what PAFA is doing in terms of the assessment of risks for settlement. She also suggested that PAC may also need to split up elements and be proactive on reporting to PAFA on how effective some processes are.

BF suggested at some point the PAC may need to re-valuate the risks and mitigating actions for each risk.

FM suggested that some quantification of risk would be helpful i.e., risks that need actioning now and relates to the DMG work, and low level things that have come out of Nexus and PAC will look at more significant issues/risks to settlement.

BF suggested that PAC may want to consider the Phase 2 PARR reports when they are made available later in the year. MD suggested the Workplan should capture: Where the PAC is now and its activities. Once PAFA is live, they will need to establish how emerging risks are identified and managed with the PAC.

FM agreed to draft an Annual Workplan for further consideration.

Action 0609: Annual Workplan and Budget to be produced.

5. Communications Plan

BF believed that the Committee had agreed to establishing appropriate contacts for onward PAFA and PAC communications by seeking contacts from the DSC Contract Managers.

6. Review of Actions Outstanding

PAC 1004: *PARR Schedule 2* Reports - Xoserve to collate report development questions/recommendations for review by PAC at a future meeting.

Update: RHi explained that there have been internal meetings undertaken with a view to providing an update in July. **Carried Forward**

PAC 0104: “Nexus Manual Workaround Report” - AL and RHi to bring to the next meeting for discussion.

Update: Subject to on-going discussions. **Carried Forward**

PAC 0302: *Reference the Implementation Plan (line 22) – AL* All parties to consider whether the high-level summary is sufficient or do we need a better industry engagement process (i.e. a communications plan based approach).

Update: Deferred. **Carried Forward**

PAC 0401: All members to consider what needs to be in the workplan: manual workarounds and the risks arising from them (AL), on-boarding the PAFA (MJ) and setting out the ‘stall’ for expectations/targets and how the framework will work (CB).

Update: See item 4.0. **Carried Forward**

0501: Shipper members to detail the process for updating a site-specific Correction Factor setting, including the role of various industry parties such as MAMs etc.

Update: BF presented LS’s update provided for this action. See Action 0502 and Agenda item 3.6. **Closed**

0502: Xoserve (RHi) to ascertain if there is a trigger to indicate the Correction Factor needs updating.

Update: Rhi confirmed that this *related to report 1A.1 Standard Correction Factors for sites with AQ > 732,000 KWh* - To ascertain if there is a trigger to indicate the Correction Factor needs updating.

Response: An increase in AQ should trigger an amended Correction Factor field so that it is site specific. There is no soft-landing with this rule as it is a legal compliance requirement, the ‘three crossing’ rule does not apply in this scenario; the Correction Factor should be amended as soon as the Supply Meter Point crosses the threshold (either way).

Additional Comments:

- All Correction Factors of zero have been cleansed through Nexus implementation.
- All Shippers are sent a list of the MPRNs with potentially incorrect Correction Factors in the monthly Shipper Performance Packs. This includes Supply Meter Points that have a site-specific Correction Factor but low AQ values.

The committee discussed the ‘three crossing’ rule. Some sites due to seasonal demand may frequently cross over either side of the threshold. The committee considered what the right thing would be to do for these sites. FM suggested that the site-specific correction factors for such sites would still be valid, as they would be more accurate than the standard factor. CB challenged that the Thermal Energy Regulation indicate that the standard correction factor is to be used for sites below 732,000 KWh. The committee recognised however the need to still comply with legislation and this was ultimately about customers paying the right amount.

It was agreed that it would be worth educating Shippers to ensure they are aware of their obligations and to ensure they understand the importance of the trigger which notifies them of the threshold AQ crosser. See Action 0501 and Agenda item 3.6. **Closed.**

0503: Xoserve (RH) to ascertain if there are reports produced for Shipperless and Unregistered that can be shared, if there are reports that reflect the work of UNC Modifications 0424 and 0425.

Update: RHi confirmed that this *related to report 1A.2 No Meter Recorded in the Supply Point Register* - To ascertain if there are reports produced for Shipperless and Unregistered that can be shared, if there are reports that reflect the work of UNC Modifications 0424 and 0425.

Response: The Shipperless and Unregistered (S&U) reports contain different information. The S&U reports feedback on sites that have been confirmed and are subsequently unconfirmed. The report requested through PAC includes Supply Meter Points whereby they are confirmed but have not been unconfirmed therefore the data is different. S&U focus on certain pots and Supply Meter Points, although PAC can review the information

Xoserve would want to avoid dual governance therefore the actions for PAC to take would be limited. See item 3.6. **Closed**

0504: Xoserve (RHi) to detail the Must-Read process with regards to ‘Forward to Shipper’ Contacts.

Update: RHi confirmed that this related to *related to report 1A.4 No Reads received for 2, 3 or 4 years*. - To detail the Must-Read process with regards to ‘Forward to Shipper’ Contacts.

Response: If a must read is unsuccessful it will return into the Must-Read process 80 days from the closure date of the previous unsuccessful Must-Read contact. Where an MRA is unsuccessful in their attempt to obtain a read on occasions they will provide information for the Shipper to update UK Link. In this instance, the Contact moves into the status called ‘forward to Shipper’. This occurs in circumstances such as:

Meter exchange	Domestic sites	Dials difference	Asset change
Faulty meter/ corrector	No Corrector on UKLink	Corrector removed	Demolished
Vacant	Removed meter	Insufficient address	Health and Safety
Meter blocked	Meter obstructed	Incorrect exit zone	

The contacts go into Shipper ‘action queues’ in CMS. These are visible when a User is logged in. Shippers should take the required action and can then select to clear the contact. If no action is taken within 20 days the Contact automatically closes.

Rhi confirmed that Xoserve do not currently report on the ‘Forward to Shipper’ Must Read performance.

The committee discussed the possibility that Shippers may not be clearing down the action queue to confirm action has been taken and these will fall back into the 80-day cycle.

The committee also considered attempts to gaining a reading. CB enquired about previous attempts to resolve the issue that have failed and the inefficiency of the current process, if sites fall back in the cycle and are re-investigated.

FM suggested there should be robustness in the process, and was keen to understand the inefficiencies and if there could be a better co-ordination of effort.

In context of the settlement risk this was not considered to be a significant issue due to the small numbers involved.

CB enquired if auto closures are reported on and if the volumes involved are high. RHi confirmed that the amount of auto closures is believed to be high. CB suggested that this may indicate the need for an education exercise to ensure parties are aware of the process.

It was agreed that this should be logged as a new issue and that committee members would consider the appropriate course of action. **Closed.**

New Action 0610: Unsuccessful Must-Read Process to be logged as a new issue and PAC members to consider an education exercise to improve the high volumes of CMS auto closures.

0505: Joint Office (BF) to raise a new DSC Contract Managers meeting agenda item to cover the nomination of PAC points of contact for information provision purposes.

Update: BF confirmed that an agenda item had been raised and discussed. It was agreed that the established DSC Contract Managers would be approached to provide appropriate contacts for PAC and PAFA communications. **Closed**

0506: Ofgem (TQ) to look to provide a brief two (2) slide presentation on incentives applied across different industry sectors (i.e. scaling factors and unidentified gas utilised in the gas market sector for incentive purposes etc.).

Update: TQ requested that this item is deferred until July/August. **Carried Forward**

7. Agree Key Messages and Next Steps

7.1 Key Messages

It was agreed that following Key Messages should be communicated:

- Procurement activities for the Performance Assurance Framework Administrator (PAFA) are on track.
- PAC Communications
 - The PAC will be writing to the DSC Contract Managers to seek nominated contacts for PAC and PAFA communications.
- Consideration of Performance Assurance Report Register (PARR) – Schedule 1:
 - A report has highlighted that there are sites which require a specific correction factor that have been given a standard correction factor. Shippers are urged to review their portfolios or contact their MAMs, to ensure site specific correction factors have been assigned to sites where applicable.
 - The PAC is requesting feedback on the process for updating correction factors.
 - Shippers are requested to review their “No meters recorded” report, as these are sites that are confirmed for which Shippers are paying for but no meter is recorded on site.

7.2 Next Steps

Standard agenda items will be required the July meeting (see diary planning table).

8. Any Other Business

8.1 Potential Meeting Clashes with the SPAA Executive

During a brief discussion around the potential date clashes between the PAC and SPAA Executive meetings due to changes in meeting dates, it was noted that moving the PAC meeting dates to earlier in the month could potentially compromise Xoserve’s ability to provide their reports in a timely manner.

CB emphasised the importance of optimising the provision of data and moving meetings to later in the month would result in reports being out of date. Some data could be 2 to 3 months old before it was being considered. She also expressed the importance of maximising Shipper attendance as it is the Shippers that are bearing the settlement risk.

The committee considered the timing of reports and future PAFA reports and the best time to schedule meetings in the month.

The committee considered the possibility of holding meetings on the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Tuesday in the month. MD expressed a preference not to hold meetings on the 1st Tuesday and he would be unable to attend.

Shipper members expressed a preference for meetings earlier in the month rather than later. However, Transporters preferred the later dates.

As an alternative date to the 11th July could not be agreed due to other members being unable to attend on other potential dates it was agreed to continue with a meeting on the 11th and re-consider future meetings dates in August.

The conclusion of the Committee members was to leave the PAC meeting dates ‘as-are’ for the time being and consider the timing of PAFA reporting to ascertain more suitable meeting dates.

9. Diary Planning

Further details of planned meetings are available at: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Diary

Time/Date	Venue	Programme
10:30, Tuesday 11 July 2017	Rooms LG5/6 combined, Energy UK, Charles House, 5-11 Regent Street, London SW1Y 4LR	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Procurement of a Performance Assurance Framework Administrator (PAFA) 2. Monthly Review Items <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Risk Register Review ○ Issues Register ○ Implementation Plan ○ Assumptions Register ○ Ofgem update ○ PARR Schedule 1 Reporting 3. Annual Workplan and Budget 4. Communications Plan 5. Review of Action 6. Agree Key Messages
10:30, Tuesday 08 August 2017	Solihull – location to be confirmed	<i>To be confirmed</i>
10:30, Tuesday 12 September 2017	Room LG8, Energy UK, Charles House, 5-11 Regent Street, London SW1Y 4LR	<i>To be confirmed</i>
10:30, Tuesday 10 October 2017	Solihull – location to be confirmed	<i>To be confirmed</i>
10:30, Tuesday 14 November 2017	Room LG8, Energy UK, Charles House, 5-11 Regent Street, London SW1Y 4LR	<i>To be confirmed</i>
10:30, Tuesday 12 December 2017	Solihull – location to be confirmed	<i>To be confirmed</i>

Action Table (as at 13 June 2017)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
PAC 1004	10/10/16 <i>(reworded 08/11/16)</i>	7.	<i>PARR Schedule 2 Reports - Xoserve to collate report development questions/recommendations for review by PAC at a future meeting.</i>	Xoserve (RHi)	Carried Forward

Action Table (as at 13 June 2017)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
PAC 0104	10/01/17 <i>(reworded 14/02/17)</i>	6.	"Nexus Manual Workaround Report" - AL to liaise with RHi and bring to the next meeting for discussion.	PAC Member (AL) & Xoserve (RHi)	Carried Forward
PAC 0302	14/03/17	6.2	Reference the Implementation Plan (line 22) – AL All parties to consider whether the high-level summary is sufficient or do we need a better industry engagement process (i.e. a communications plan based approach).	PAC Member (AL)	Carried Forward
PAC 0401	11/04/17	4.0	All members to consider what needs to be in the workplan: manual workarounds and the risks arising from them (AL), on-boarding the PAFA (MJ) and setting out the 'stall' for expectations/targets and how the framework will work (CB).	PAC Members (AL/MJ/CB)	Carried Forward
PAC 0501	03/05/17	3.6	To detail the process for updating a site specific Correction Factor setting, including the role of various industry parties such as MAMs etc.	Shipper Members	Closed
PAC 0502	03/05/17	3.6	To ascertain if there is a trigger to indicate the Correction Factor needs updating.	Xoserve (RHi)	Closed
PAC 0503	03/05/17	3.6	To ascertain if there are reports produced for Shipperless and Unregistered that can be shared, if there are reports that reflect the work of UNC Modifications 0424 and 0425.	Xoserve (Rhi)	Closed
PAC 0504	03/05/17	3.6	To detail the Must-Read process with regards to 'Forward to Shipper' Contacts.	Xoserve (Rhi)	Closed
PAC 0505	03/05/17	5.	To raise a new DSC Contract Managers meeting agenda item to cover the nomination of PAC points of contact for information provision purposes.	Joint Office (BF)	Closed

Action Table (as at 13 June 2017)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
PAC 0506	03/05/17	6.	To look to provide a brief two (2) slide presentation on incentives applied across different industry sectors (i.e. scaling factors and unidentified gas utilised in the gas market sector for incentive purposes etc.).	Ofgem (TQ)	Carried Forward
PAC 0601	13/06/17	3.6	Standard Correction Factors for sites with AQ > 732, MWH -Shippers to raise the issue at MAM CoP.	Shipper Members	Pending
PAC 0602	13/06/17	3.6	Standard Correction Factors for sites with AQ > 732, MWH - Xoserve to consider Gazprom presentation to ensure the process is reflected correctly for onward communication to Shippers.	Xoserve (FC)	Pending
PAC 0603	13/06/17	3.6	Standard Correction Factors for sites with AQ > 732, MWH - PAFA to write out to Shippers for an update on actions being undertaken	PAFA	Pending
PAC 0604	13/06/17	3.6	Standard Correction Factors for sites with AQ > 732, MWH - Xoserve to establish if it is feasible to identify how many sites have a corrector in situ.	Xoserve (FC)	Pending
PAC 0605	13/06/17	3.6	JO to create a contract list containing all the DSC Contract Managers and issue an email for each organisation to provide an appropriate contact for PAC and PAFA communications.	Joint Office	Pending
PAC 0606	13/06/17	3.6	DSC Contract Managers to provide a nominated PAC contact.		Pending
PAC 0607	13/06/17	3.6	No Meter Recorded - PAFA to send request for update.	PAFA	Pending
PAC 0608	13/06/17	3.6	Shipper Transfer Read Performance - PAC members to bring views on what reporting changes need to be made.	Shipper Members	Pending
PAC 0609	13/06/17	4.0	Annual Workplan and Budget to be produced	Shipper Member (FM)	Pending

Action Table (as at 13 June 2017)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
PAC 0610	13/06/17	6.0	Unsuccessful Must Read Process to be logged as a new issue and PAC members to consider an education exercise to improve the high volumes of CMS auto closures.	Shipper Members	Pending