

Minutes of Code Advisory Group (CAG)

Meeting [79]

23 May 2025

MS Teams

Status of the Minutes: FINAL

MEMBERS PRESENT

Daniel Proctor	DP	CAG member	Peter Strain	PS	CAG member
David Seymour	DS	CAG member	Sian Forward	CG	CAG member
Jon Fuller	JF	CAG member	Robert Hetherington	RH	Ofwat
Noel Bradley	NB	CAG member			

MOSL ATTENDEES

Evan Joannette	EJ	MOSL (Chair)	Monica Falasca	MF	Observer
Janet Judge	JJ	MOSL (Presenter)	Sauda Dickinson	SD	MOSL (Notes)
Aneesa Rahman	AR	MOSL (Legal)			

APOLOGIES

Paul Baker	PB	CAG member	Sarah Harrison	SH	CAG member
------------	----	------------	----------------	----	------------

1. Welcome and Agenda

EJ welcomed members and provided an overview of the agenda.

2. MPF supporting documents

Document	Notes	Recommendation
CSD0002	<p>JJ noted that some definitions moved to WRC Schedule 1 document or referenced in other documents.</p> <p>JJ noted the changes made to Section 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Point 3.1.3a had been amended to state 'where applicable', following CAG feedback Point 3.2.2 had been amended to reference 'the Central Systems or a Market Operator administered process' as suggested during the last CAG meeting. <p>JF advised noted wording on point 3.2.2, 'are not processed by Trading Parties in time', and advised that creates some contradiction.</p> <p>NB suggested amended wording to 'are processed by trading parties after the reporting period has ended'.</p> <p>EJ suggested reframing the wording to make it clear that anything not received in a timely manner, would fail.</p> <p>EJ advised that MOSL will review the wording and advise.</p> <p>JF queried whether point 3.3 used the word 'may' to state that all KPIs are subject to a performance standard but that not all are subject to a charge.</p> <p>EJ advised that wording was set for futureproofing to not that KPIs could have performance standards, but that some might not have. MOSL to review the requirement for performance standards and advise.</p> <p>NB suggesting having the wording reflect that all charges are associated with KPIs.</p>	Information

	<p>JF queried the wording on point 3.3.1, noting that it may be an obvious statement and could possible be removed to cut down code wording.</p> <p>DS advised that the statement reads as though the charge increases with each fail, and that the first sentence may not be needed.</p> <p>CAG members agreed to have point 3.3.1 removed.</p> <p>JJ noted the suggested changes to Section 4.</p> <p>JF queried whether Self-Supply should be included in the title 'Retailer KPIs'.</p> <p>NB advised that a self-supplier is a Retailer and will therefore be covered under the 'Retailer' wording.</p> <p>MOSL to review the defined term on what a Retailer is and ensure self-supply is included.</p> <p>JF required whether there was a defined term for basic, smart and non-smart meters.</p> <p>JJ advised that there may not be a defined term for non-smart meters, but that point 4.2.2c notes that the meter type must not be a SMARTAMI and by default any other meter will fall under the M01 metric.</p> <p>JF suggested having the point made under 4.2.2c, moved to the opening statement under point 4.2.1, to reference the split in SMARTAMI up front.</p> <p>EJ noted that addition of data item numbers and queried views from CAG on whether they were useful to add.</p> <p>CAG members agreed to include data item numbers where possible.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>JF suggested amended 4.2.1 to include ‘expressed as a percentage of the total number of meters’.</p> <p>JJ noted that the language around ‘bi-annual read meters’ has been amended to ‘twice-yearly read meters’, to provide better clarity, as previously discussed.</p> <p>DP advised that both terms are used in CMOS.</p> <p>EJ noted that a reference to biannual will be added to the definition of ‘twice-yearly’.</p> <p>JJ noted that, for better consistency, references to ‘read window’ have been amended to ‘SLA period’.</p> <p>JF suggested having clearer wording on point 4.2.2b, to clarify that the meter read date is within the SLA period.</p> <p>MOSL to review the wording on 4.2.2b.</p> <p>JJ noted, following previous feedback, the section on inclusions has been removed with the rationale that everything not stated in the exclusions would be assumed to be included.</p> <p>NB suggested ‘permanently disconnected be removed from point 4.2.6b as already covered under 4.2.6a.</p> <p>DS noted that SPERR’d is also just a type of deregistration.</p> <p>CAG advised that 4.2.6b could be amended to state, ‘the SPID relates to the meter is deregistered’.</p> <p>DS advised that the point on deregistered meters may not be needed as a meter needs to be removed to be deregistered.</p> <p>SF agreed that references to deregistered meters do not need to be included as the meter needs to be removed to</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>be deregistered, therefore, point 4.2.6a already covers deregistered meters.</p> <p>CAG suggested that point 4.2.6b could be removed.</p> <p>NB queried whether it was fair to expect a retailer to acquire a meter read where the meter has been moved over from a previous retailer in the last month of the reporting period.</p> <p>EJ advised that MOSL will review if this matches build requirements.</p> <p>EJ queried whether it was possible to have a meter without a metering service component raised against it, referencing abandoned meters.</p> <p>DS advised that it is not possible, and the meter would have a metering supply.</p> <p>SF advised that you could have an active meter against a SPID but have the wrong service component against it, which would be a wholesaler error and should be an exclusion for retailers.</p> <p>CAG members agreed that it is technically possible to have a meter without a metering service component, but that it would be as a result of a data error and does not warrant being outlined in the code.</p> <p>EJ suggested amending the wording on ‘related’ SPID to ‘associated’ SPID.</p> <p>PS suggested adding TCORR data transaction alongside the meter installation or exchange data transaction exclusion.</p> <p>MOSL to review the TCORR data transaction requirements are wording.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>JF noted concern around the wording of 4.2.6f, as the retailer will be held responsible for a read if a meter is accidentally missed and backdated by the wholesaler.</p> <p>EJ advised that MOSL will review the requirements and wording of 4.2.6f with the digital team and advise.</p> <p>DP noted that the processes listed under 4.2.7 may change in the future following the review on skip codes under the RWG good practice guide.</p> <p>MOSL to review the wording on 4.2.11, to possibly amend 'report run' to 'reporting period of 10 business days'.</p> <p>JJ noted that addition of the word equations for the performance and charges calculations.</p> <p>PS queried whether the 'number of meters that have no exclusion reason' + 'number of meters that have an exclusion reason' just equals 'total number of meters'.</p> <p>JJ clarified that it must be 'total number of meters that have an exclusion reason and have been read'.</p> <p>MOSL to review the equation wording of 4.2.12 for better understanding and simplification.</p> <p>JJ noted that no changes were made to the wording in Section 5, which is the code drafting submitted as part of the BR-MeX code change.</p>	
--	---	--

3. Any Other Business (AOB)

MF advised that during the testing of Bilaterals Phase 15, feedback raised by MOSL and trading party testers has prompted changes required to ensure that processes and functionalities work as initially intended.

To promote, challenge and lead the operation and evolution of the market for the benefit of business water customers.



MF provided an overview of the expected agenda for next week's scheduled CAG meeting, highlighting that the main documents to be reviewed for **Bilaterals** includes CSD0601 Parts A and B, and OSD0703 to provide clarifications on the transactions of certain processes.

EJ advised that MOSL audit highlighted end triggers in CSD0601 should be included in the SLA tables of CSD0002 to ensure better clarity, and will be brought forward to the CAG for review.

EJ closed the meeting.

The next scheduled meeting: Friday 30 May 2025