

Performance Assurance Committee Minutes
Tuesday 13 December 2016
Consort House, 6 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3QQ

Attendees

Les Jenkins (Chair)	(LJ)	Joint Office
Lorna Dupont (Secretary)	(LD)	Joint Office
Andy Clasper	(AC)	Transporter Member
Angela Love*	(AL)	Shipper Member
Colette Baldwin	(CB)	Shipper Member
Fiona Cottam	(FC)	Observer, Xoserve
Fraser Mathieson*	(FM)	Transporter Member
Gregory MacKenzie	(GM)	Shipper Member Alternate
John Welch	(JW)	Shipper Member Alternate (non voting)
Jon Dixon	(JD)	Ofgem
Lisa Saycell	(LS)	Shipper Member
Mark Jones	(MJ)	Shipper Member
Rachel Hinsley	(RH)	Observer, Xoserve
Richard Pomroy	(RP)	Transporter Member
Shanna Key*	(SK)	Transporter Member
Tricia Quinn*	(TQ)	Ofgem

Apologies

Hilary Chapman	(HCh)	Transporter Member
Mitch Donnelly	(MD)	Shipper Member

*via teleconference

Copies of non-confidential papers are available at: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/PAC/131216

1. Introduction and Status Review

LJ welcomed everyone to the meeting.

1.1 Confirm Quorate Status

The meeting was declared quorate.

1.2 Apologies for absence and note of Alternates

John Welch for Edd Hunter (Shipper Member, non-voting).

Greg MacKenzie for Mitch Donnelly (Shipper Member)

Fraser Mathieson for Hilary Chapman (Transporter Member)

1.3 Review of Minutes (08 November 2016)

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

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

FC reported that the OJEU Notice had been issued in November (a little later than first anticipated, due to the volume of associated documentation that had to be provided) and that prospective vendors had 4 weeks in which to respond. On publication of the notice Xoserve then reviewed the timeline. FC outlined the process, noting that the prequalification process will start prior to Christmas and conclude in January 2017, and that it was anticipated that a Preferred Bidder would be in position by early April 2017; only at the end of the process would identification/notification of the successful appointment be made. This was expected to occur towards the end of June 2017.

AL confirmed that she would update the Implementation Approach/Plan to reflect the dates. Members were asked to note that only limited information would be available from this point forwards to maintain the confidentiality requirements of the procurement process. Further updates on progress made will be provided when appropriate; it was agreed that this agenda item will remain as a 'place holder' until such time as Xoserve has any relevant information to impart.

FC also reported that she was in the process of obtaining non-disclosure agreements from the prospective members of the evaluation panel that will be assisting Xoserve in this process. The Xoserve contact (Lorraine Owen) will be scheduling appropriate evaluation panel meeting dates and hopes to have a programme in place by the end of this week.

3. Performance Assurance Framework (PAF) Document for the (Gas) Energy Settlement Performance Assurance Regime (Framework Document)

LJ displayed the draft document on screen for members to review the recent amendments.

3.1 Document 5 amendments (Members' confidentiality letter – see Action PAC0604)

RP explained his proposed amendments to Document 5. Other perceptions of what might be explicitly stated were briefly discussed (e.g. does it assume all documents are deemed to be confidential; should there be an explicit emphasis on the demonstration of relevant expertise, etc), and it was suggested that all members review the wording and provide comments to RP for consideration in advance of the next meeting.

Action PAC 1201: Performance Assurance Framework (PAF) Document - All members review the wording in Document 5 and provide comments to RP for consideration in advance of the next meeting.

3.2 Risk Rating Scale

In response to Action PAC 1102, AL had concluded, following discussions with JW, that it would be most appropriate to proceed with a volume related proposal. It was understood that this was what was done in the electricity market. She noted that if the same financial reference point is used, then the financial risk is driven by volume anyway. She also noted that if a financial assessment is used then there could be significant changes in SAP, which would mean that risk could shift category quite frequently.

AL also noted that this might have to be revisited in the event other, non volume-related areas came into the scope of the PAF. LJ suggested that it would be entirely reasonable to add a further impact scale to the risk mechanism as required.

Throughput and Financial Risk

In response to Action PAC 1103, JW gave a presentation setting out the analysis undertaken (using historic System Average Price (SAP) prices) when comparing throughput and financial risk as potential bases for a risk rating scale.

It was noted that prices as demonstrated by SAP trends in the last four years have fluctuated, while trending towards decreases. The PAF Document currently included a

scale based on financial risk (energy values in relation to gas price variations). JW observed that the fluctuation in gas prices could affect the level of energy underlying any risk scale based on financial values. A table demonstrating how differences in the average SAP price over a number of periods can affect the amount of energy that is required to qualify for a particular band of risk was then displayed, and the facility to readily breach bands was discussed.

A table was then displayed, that illustrated a theoretical scale based on lower and upper GWh throughput measures. JW explained the figures, observing that this was an illustration and not a risk model. A brief discussion ensued, with the recognition that currently there was no real sense of what the actual numbers should be, but adjustments could be made in the future. The Top 15 Industry Settlement Risks as identified in the Engage Settlement Risk Report were then displayed in a table, and JW explained the figures associated with each. He had converted risks into energy values (using typical average SAP from the period) and applied a rating based on volume only. He noted that the Engage model seemed to propose a range of risk based on one LDZ, and some risks would be based on more than that.

A table proposing a second theoretical scale based on lower and upper GWh throughput measures was then displayed, together with the Top 15 Industry Settlement Risks as identified in the Engage Settlement Risk Report. JW explained that these could be shown in financial terms for orientation only. The ratings obtained through this version were discussed. FM observed that this one seemed to provide a better spread of risks.

It was believed that the 15 settlement risks identified by Engage seemed to cover a reasonable spread and offered a good starting point.

JW summarised that in the last 4 years, SAP prices have peaked at above 3p and below 1p at specific times. Fluctuations in gas prices mean a financially scaled risk model is vulnerable to changes in how much underlying energy makes up a risk 'event'. In his view using a throughput scale would offer stability to the amount of energy required when measuring a settlement risk. LJ suggested that, in effect, a given risk could move from 'medium' severity to 'high' and back again due to price volatility and not actual materiality changes. This would be undesirable. It would be expected that whatever scale was used it would be monitored and reviewed for continued fitness for purpose.

AL observed that if the PAF evolves to address aspects beyond settlement and there becomes a need to extend risk assessment to other areas that are not volume related, e.g. Change of Supplier, then there might be some difficulties in applying a consistent scale, but that was looking to the future.

The options were then discussed and the strength of controls that could be applied to control the risk. LJ suggested a single rating would be sufficient (on a current view basis); it could continue to be reviewed. LS agreed with using throughput, but believed that an eye should be kept on the financial side as well to provide a more holistic context.

Members decided unanimously that the throughput version (including an indicative value at risk) should be employed, and that the second scale should be adopted.

LJ suggested that the PAF Framework Document reference this approach, and then a Risk Approach Framework document could be provided separately.

LJ thanked JW for his contribution to this area of work.

REVISED Action PAC 1103: *PAF Framework Document* – JW to provide a risk rating scale based on throughput, and suggested amendments to the current section wording; and also provide a separate Risk Approach document.

3.3 Terms of Reference (ToR)

In response to Action PAC 0804d, AL had provided an amended ToR, referencing composition of membership, voting rights and meetings. The proposed revisions were discussed and LJ made further amendments on screen to reflect agreed changes.

Further revisions were required and TQ undertook to provide other relevant information to AL for consideration. Additional amendments will be made as appropriate, with a view to finalising the PAC ToR at the January 2017 meeting (submission to January 2017 UNCC for approval).

3.4 Finalising the PAF Document for UNCC approval

Progress on the refinement of the PAF Document was discussed. Noting that there were outstanding actions in relation to the provision of revised content it was agreed that the objective should be to finalise the PAF Document at the February 2017 PAC meeting with the intention of submitting it to the February 2017 UNCC for its consideration and approval.

4. Review Implementation Approach/Plan

AL had provided a draft Plan with some suggested/provisional dates against some of the identified activities (where known) for review.

The PAC reviewed the activities and dates line by line, and AL noted the amendments, new additions and removals as the discussion progressed.

Budgeting

Budgeting was discussed, it being concluded that the PAC's working assumption is that anything outside of the core contract would be channeled through the CDSP arrangements/process. The raising of Change Orders was discussed; there was a need to understand how PAC was to access further funding as necessary, without being subservient to other bodies whose processes/decisions may cause delay to necessary actions that need to be taken to minimise community exposures.

Risk Methodology

Reference was made to the foregoing discussions at 3.2, above. LJ believed there was a need to review and validate the information regarding the risks identified in the Engage Report. JW indicated this would form part of the work that would be prepared for the February meeting.

Risk Reporting

It was suggested that references to Modification 0520A should be replaced with the specific UNC paragraph references (e.g. TPD V 16.1.3).

LJ advised that Modification 0520A's implementation date would be changing.

Incentives

This was discussed. JD observed that it was conceivable that a different model might be required to address each risk, and that PAC should be looking at developing an 'armoury' upon which it could draw when necessary. He suggested considering existing models already in operation across other industries.

The 15 risks identified by Engage could be assessed to see if each requires enforcement, and how it should be enforced (an incentive or other tool/mechanism).

Reference was made to the electricity regime. GM offered to present information and explain how this was managed/risks were controlled, at the March 2017 meeting.

Action PAC 1202: Electricity Incentive Regime - GM to prepare and present information on this at the March 2017 meeting.

JD added that by March he hoped to be able to acquire pertinent incentive regime information from other Regulators/sources.

It was suggested that UNC should be looked at to ascertain what was driving any existing controls; outdated tools/mechanisms could be stripped out and replaced with the new requirements when these were established to be appropriate. PAC needs to assess what still works and priorities any changes, bearing in mind it will have to accommodate any CMA

mandates.

It was agreed that in March the PAC should start to look at what was possible and should begin building a library of potential (adaptable) solutions to performance issues, drawn from all sources.

Communications

It was noted that Settlement risk/performance generally affects Shippers, and that other parties were likely to experience indirectly any impacts/effects relating to this. Impacts that could potentially affect a wider perspective, and any identified extended implications could be highlighted by Ofgem to relevant parties if necessary.

JD suggested providing an annual report to PAF stakeholders. CB suggested providing something like a 'dashboard'.

LJ reminded that a Workplan was needed – see Action PAC 1003 - with a future looking budget (Q1 2017); the dashboard (i.e. PAC to develop a dashboard of industry performance) was seen to be good idea.

It was suggested that this section be renamed 'Communications and Strategic Direction'.

Performance Assurance Committee - month-to-month activity

AL indicated that this was now out of date since providing the draft, and that she would review/update prior to next meeting. The PAC passed over this section without discussion.

Additional Section 9 Horizon Scanning

It was suggested that a new section '9 Horizon Scanning' be added to the Plan, to consider industry developments that might lead to PAF risks; and to assess those risks identified and devise appropriate treatment/courses of action.

JD made some additional observations relating to Data Quality, Unidentified Gas (UG) and Theft of Gas, in relation to the work programme/activities that PAC might be considering for the coming year.

Data Quality is a significant performance assurance issue. Ofgem was looking at this as part of the Switching Programme, and there were concerns that work might be overlapping with other groups who may be looking at this, albeit potentially from other perspectives. There was a distinct danger that different groups might be looking at similar issues. He suggested that PAC would be well advised to first review and establish where it believed the boundaries might lie when considering work in this area.

A similar suggestion was made in respect of Unidentified Gas. JD advised that PAC needed to understand the work of the AUGGE and establish the boundaries. Theft was being covered under a different code, and again PAC will need to understand what was going on in that area of work.

Bearing this in mind, JD indicated he would be happy to set up and facilitate meetings between the various groups to broaden the understanding of where focus might coincide or diverge.

LJ added that PAC could expect to see a report from the Distribution Transporters, on the effectiveness of their (NTS) offtake meter appraisals. This was being produced in the near future.

General

LJ thanked AL for her contribution to this area of work.

Action PAC 1203: *Draft Project Plan - AL to update the Plan items and produce a high level timeline to show potential programme of work assigned to each Quarter.*

5. PARR Schedule Reports

RH advised the provision of these was delayed; see Action PAC 0806 at 8, below.

6. UNC Standard of Service (SoS) Report

RH gave a presentation, providing an overview of the SoS Report, which came into being in 2003 (prior to the Uniform Network Code).

The report details performance against the TSLs (Transportation Standards and Liabilities) as set out in the *Network Code Modification Report 0565 -Transco Proposal for Revision of Network Code Standards of Service* (implemented and effective on 01 October 2003). Some standards refer to Xoserve performance indicators, while others refer to those of the Transporters.

Details of the various standards and the associated liabilities were described, and RH explained the purpose of the 'shadow log'. A discussion ensued, during which it was queried whether some of the standards were no longer relevant or valid obligations, in particular TSL 5 and 6, TSL 9a and b, and TSL 10a and 10b. It was clear that the currency of the report had not been reviewed for a long time and there were concerns that not all elements that might require change would have been assessed and addressed through Project Nexus UNC text changes.

Action PAC 1204: *SoS Report - RH to confirm that the standards included in this report are relevant/valid obligations (or that reassessment/removal is required).*

PAC members believed that the SoS Report required an urgent review for continued relevance, and that it needed to be baselined against the text being provided under Project Nexus. It was agreed that a reassessment of the SoS Report should be the main focus for the January meeting, to establish in particular:

- Does the activity referred to in each standard still take place (pre/post Nexus);
- Is the standard being measured still relevant/appropriate;
- What is the intent/purpose of the measure, and how should it be discharged.

RP suggested that the standards that related to CDSP performance should be reviewed by the DSC contract committee leaving those that related to Transporter performance to PAC.

7. Issues List

LJ briefly summarised the current issues.

PAC001 - See discussions at 3.1, above.

PAC002 - Update due May 2017.

PAC004 - Linked to Action PAC 1003.

PAC005 - See discussions at 3.3, above; linked to Action PAC 0804d (action closed at this meeting).

No new issues were raised.

8. Review of Actions Outstanding

PAC 0602: *PAC Terms of Reference* - All Members to consider who their standing Alternate should be and procure and provide to the Designated Person (the Joint Office) the relevant documentation to support appointment(s) as an Alternate.

Update: It was noted that 4 Members had not appointed/provided details of standing Alternates. **Closed**

PAC 0604: *'Performance Assurance Framework Document': Document 5* - DNOs to develop a Confidentiality Agreement for incorporation into Document 5 and review the existing content of Document 5 and the definition (page 5, Section 1).

Update: See discussion at 3.1, above. **Closed**

PAC 0804a: *Framework document* - CB to produce a draft section on the Budgeting process, and provide to the Joint Office by 30 December 2016.

Update: Deferred to the next meeting (10 January 2017). **Carried forward**

PAC 0804d: *Framework document* - AL to produce a draft section on the Membership (including voting rights for Shippers and Ofgem) and adaptations to statements in the associated documentation (e.g. endorsements) and provide to the Joint Office by 02 December 2016.

Update: See 3.3, above. **Closed**

PAC 0806: *Pre Nexus* - RH to produce a schedule of reports against the PARR (from Modification 0520A) setting out availability and delivery.

Update: RH had been advised that she might get the reports in mid-December but explained that, for various reasons, she believed this was more likely to be pushed back to January or February 2017. LJ emphasised that PAC needed to have sight of these reports as soon as possible. **Carried forward**

PAC 1003: *Issue PAC004 Annual Industry Workplan and Budget Statement* - JD to prepare and submit a draft insertion for inclusion in the Framework Document.

Update: TQ had provided a list of items, some of which overlapped with those on the Plan provided by AL. TQ briefly outlined each item. LJ noted that this validated AL's work, and reiterated that PAC needed to inform the industry of PAC's programme for the year. He suggested this should give an elevated view, clarifying what is to be addressed and why, and how it might be anticipated to be delivered. This could also provide an audit trail as to why PAC is/is not doing something. He suggested that the PAF Document should contain the formal obligation to produce on an annual basis an industry communication that sets out the PAC programme, and gives an idea of anticipated costs, for the year. LS offered to draft an appropriate piece for inclusion in the PAF Document, and it was agreed to amend this Action PAC 1003 to include this. JD and TQ will continue to review the output from the CMA that may inform PAC's work.

REVISED ACTION PAC 1003a: *Issue PAC004 Annual Industry Workplan and Budget Statement* - JD/TQ to review the output from the CMA and communicate items of relevance to PAC's work; and

ACTION PAC 1003b: *Issue PAC004 Annual Industry Workplan and Budget Statement* - LS to prepare and submit a draft insertion 'Forward Workplan and Budget' for inclusion in the Framework Document.

Carried forward

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

Update: Ongoing; deferred. **Carried forward**

PAC1101: Xoserve to provide an updated PAFA Evaluation Panel ToR to be published and proposed timetable/dates.

Update: Provided PAFA Evaluation Panel ToR version 1.0 (approved) and published on website (<http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/PAC>). **Closed**

PAC1102: *PAF Framework Document* - AL to consider the risk rating scale based on financial values and provide a suggested amendment to the current section wording.

Update: See AL's comments at 3.2, above. **Closed**

PAC1103: *PAF Framework Document* – ~~JWM/J~~ to consider JW to provide a risk rating scale based on throughput and suggested amendments to the current section wording; and also provide a separate Risk Approach document.

Update: A presentation was provided; see discussion at 3.2, above. This action was then reworded. **Carried forward**

PAC1104: *PAF Framework Document* - Xoserve (RH) to establish if the EQR Templates are already part of the CDSP process and if the framework can simply refer to the relevant documents rather than replicating and maintaining parallel changes.

Update: RH had discussed this internally, and the internal view was that the process set out in the PAF Document was shorter, and perhaps better left as is. LJ then queried if Modification 0565 would allow this (i.e. a shorter process) and a discussion ensued. The original need for including in the PAF Document was clearly understood, but it was questioned if a shortened process was acceptable should the Templates remain the same or be different? Could they be taken out and placed in a separate document? LJ observed that whilst there was no desire to have a bespoke process just for PAC and the PAFA, it needed to be clarified what was acceptable. There were concerns that in having to adhere to a long process (and be in effect subservient to hierarchical progression through other bodies, a position in which the PAC should not find itself) might have a negative effect on the work and abilities of the PAC to enact whatever was required, to address shortcomings/reduce exposure on behalf of the industry, in a timely manner.

RH will revisit this and provide an update at the next meeting. **Carried forward**

9. Agree Key Messages and Next Steps

9.1 Key Messages

Performance Assurance Framework Administrator (PAFA)

- OJEU notice has been published with a deadline for expressions of interest by 14 December (see <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/PAC>)
- From this point forwards, limited progress information will be available due to procurement activities.

Implementation Plan

- Range of activities have been identified encompassing establishment and initial review of PAF-scope activities over the coming 12-18 months.

Framework

- A refresh of the Framework Document is progressing
- Updated Terms of Reference on track for approval at UNCC in January 2017
- Framework Document expected to be submitted to the UNCC for approval in February 2017.

9.2 Next Steps

Items scheduled for the next meeting (January):

- Terms of Reference - *Review and submission to UNCC for approval*
- Performance Assurance Framework Document for the (Gas) Energy Settlement Performance Assurance Regime” (Framework Document) - *Continue review (finalise in February)*
- Review Implementation Approach/Plan
- Review UNC Standards of Service Report - *Main focus for January meeting*
- Procurement of a Performance Assurance Framework Administrator (PAFA) - *Progress update if appropriate*
- Review of Actions Outstanding
- Agree Key Messages and Next Steps.

10. Diary Planning

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

2017 Meeting Programme

Time/Date	Venue	Programme
10:30, Tuesday 10 January 2017	Room LG8, Energy UK, Charles House, 5-11 Regent Street, London SW1Y 4LR	See 9.2, above. The main focus will be to review UNC Standards of Service Report.
10:30, Tuesday 14 February 2017	Consort House, 6 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3QQ	To finalise the “Performance Assurance Framework Document for the (Gas) Energy Settlement Performance Assurance Regime” (Framework Document) <i>Other items to be confirmed</i>
10:30, Tuesday 14 March 2017	Room LG8, Energy UK, Charles House, 5-11 Regent Street, London SW1Y 4LR	Review of the risks described in the Engage report <i>Other items to be confirmed</i>
10:30, Tuesday 11 April 2017	Consort House, 6 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3QQ	<i>To be confirmed</i>
10:30, Tuesday 09 May 2017	Room LG8, Energy UK, Charles House, 5-11 Regent Street, London SW1Y 4LR	<i>To be confirmed</i>
10:30, Tuesday 13 June 2017	Solihull	<i>To be confirmed</i>

10:30, Tuesday 11 July 2017	Rooms LG5/6 combined, Energy UK, Charles House, 5-11 Regent Street, London SW1Y 4LR	<i>To be confirmed</i>
10:30, Tuesday 08 August 2017	Solihull	<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	<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	<i>To be confirmed</i>

Action Table (as at 13 December 2016)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
PAC 0602	29/06/16	2.	<i>PAC Terms of Reference</i> - Members to consider who their standing Alternate should be and procure and provide to the Designated Person (the Joint Office) the relevant documentation to support appointment(s) as an Alternate.	AL, CB, LS and RP	Closed
PAC 0604	29/06/16	3.	<i>'Performance Assurance Framework Document': Document 5</i> - DNOs to develop a Confidentiality Agreement for incorporation into Document 5 and review the existing content of Document 5 and the definition (page 5, Section 1).	DNOs	Closed
PAC 0804a	31/08/16	4.	<i>Framework Document</i> - CB to produce a draft section on the Budgeting process, and provide to the Joint Office by 30 December 2016 .	CB	Prior to 10 January 2017 Carried forward

Action Table (as at 13 December 2016)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
PAC 0804d	31/08/16 <i>(reworded 08/11/16)</i>	4.	<i>Framework Document</i> - AL to produce a draft section on the Membership (including voting rights for Shippers and Ofgem) and adaptations to statements in the associated documentation (e.g. endorsements) and provide to the Joint Office by 02 December 2016.	AL	Closed
PAC 0806	31/08/16	5.	<i>Pre Nexus</i> - RH to produce a schedule of reports against the PAR (from Modification 0520A) setting out availability and delivery.	RH	Prior to 10 January 2017 Carried forward
PAC 1003a	10/10/16 <i>(reworded 13/12/16)</i>	6.	<i>Issue PAC004 - Annual Industry Workplan and Budget Statement</i> - JD/TQ to review the output from the CMA and communicate items of relevance to PAC's work.	Ofgem (JD/TQ)	Prior to 10 January 2017 Carried forward
PAC 1003b	13/12/16	8.	<i>Issue PAC004 - Annual Industry Workplan and Budget Statement</i> - LS to prepare and submit a draft insertion 'Forward Workplan and Budget' for inclusion in the PAF Document.	PAC Member (LS)	Prior to 10 January 2017 Pending
PAC 1004	10/10/16 <i>(reworded 08/11/16)</i>	7.	<i>PARR Schedule 2 Reports</i> - Xoserve to collate report development questions/recommendations for review by PAC at a future meeting.	Xoserve (RH)	Prior to 10 January 2017 Carried forward
PAC 1101	08/11/16	2.	Xoserve to provide an updated PAFA Evaluation Panel ToR to be published and proposed timetable/dates.		Closed
PAC 1102	08/11/16	3.	<i>PAF Framework Document</i> - AL to consider the risk rating scale based on financial values and provide a suggested amendment to the current section wording.	PAC Member (AL)	Closed
PAC 1103	08/11/16 <i>(Reworded 13/12/16)</i>	3.	<i>PAF Framework Document</i> – Provide a risk rating scale based on throughput, and suggested amendments to the current section wording; and also provide a separate Risk Approach document.	PAC Member (JW)	Prior to 10 January 2017 Carried forward

Action Table (as at 13 December 2016)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
PAC 1104	08/11/16	3.	<i>PAF Framework Document</i> - Xoserve (RH) to establish if the EQR Templates are already part of the CDSP process and if the framework can simply refer to the relevant documents rather than replicating and maintaining parallel changes.	Xoserve (RH)	<i>Prior to 10 January 2017</i> Carried forward
PAC 1201	13/12/16	3.	<i>Performance Assurance Framework (PAF) Document</i> - All members review the wording in Document 5 and provide comments to RP for consideration in advance of the next meeting.	ALL Members	<i>Prior to 10 January 2017</i> Pending
PAC 1202	13/12/16	4.	<i>Electricity Incentive Regime</i> - GM to prepare and present information on this at the March 2017 meeting.	PAC Member (GM)	<i>Present on 14 March 2017</i> Pending
PAC 1203	13/12/16	4.	<i>Draft Project Plan</i> - AL to update the Plan items and produce a high level timeline to show potential programme of work assigned to each Quarter.	PAC Member (AL)	<i>Prior to 10 January 2017</i> Pending
PAC 1204	13/12/16	6.	<i>SoS Report</i> - RH to confirm that the standards included in this report are relevant/valid obligations (or that reassessment/removal is required).	Xoserve (RH)	<i>Prior to 10 January 2017</i> Pending