



Minutes of TDC Meeting 22

CONFIDENTIAL

20 March 2019 | 10:30 – 11:30 | Skype Teleconference

Status of the Minutes: Draft

MEMBERS PRESENT

Name	Role
Elsa Wye	Chair
Martin Mavin	Committee member (Wholesaler)
Paul Stelfox	Committee Member (Wholesaler)
Cleo Acraman	Committee member (Associated retailer)
Peter Strain	Committee member (Unassociated retailer)
Julian Tranter	Committee member (Wholesaler)
David Seymour	Thames Water Utilities (Presenter)
Ray Porter	Castle Water (Presenter)
Emma Taylor	MOSL (Observer)
Miles Robinson	MOSL (Presenter)
Hannah Allardice	MOSL (Meeting Secretary)

APOLOGIES

Name	Role
Richard Stanbrook	Committee member (Associated retailer)
Patrick McCart	Committee member (Unassociated retailer)
Carl Lees	Committee member (Unassociated retailer)



1. Welcome and Introductions

PURPOSE: FOR INFORMATION

- 1.1. The Chair welcomed members to the Trading Disputes Committee (TDC) meeting.
- 1.2. The Chair proceeded with the meeting, stating that as unfortunately the TDC did not meet quorum requirements that there would be an amendment to the Agenda order and that the amended draft Terms of Reference would be the first item, which would, subject to the approval of the Panel, allow the TDC to conduct some of its business at the meeting.

The Chair explained that under the current terms of reference, in order that the TDC meet quorum requirements there must be two wholesale members and three retailer members present. The proposed changes to the Terms of Reference would allow the same quorate level of 5 but with two wholesaler members and two retailer members but with the fifth member from either constituency, allowing greater flexibility in relation to the quorum rules and facilitating the status update to heard on TD044.

- 1.3. A committee member asked that since it was not part of the current terms of reference, would the vote be valid. The Chair responded that this was a fair comment and reminded members that any TDC decision on the TOR would also need to be approved by Panel as well. Committee members were satisfied with the proposal presented.
- ### 2. Terms of reference update

PURPOSE: FOR INFORMATION

- 2.1. With the quorum requirements agreed upon, the Chair proceeded onto the terms of reference update, allowing the committee to vote on whether the agreed amendments should be made to the TOR.
- 2.2. MOSL presented the updates to the committee. Referencing to slide seven of the slide pack, MOSL commented that there were three updates that had been made to the TOR document.
- 2.3. The first update that was recommended to the committee was under section nine, conflict of interest. Amendments had been made to use explicit wording to clarify the Chair's discretion in situations where appointed members shared a conflict of interest with an open trading dispute. The proposed changes would allow the Chair to decide if the member would be allowed to participate at the relevant discussions or votes.
- 2.4. The second update referred to section 6.4, minutes to meetings. As part of the current terms of reference, the TDC secretary is required to publish a Headline Report. MOSL recommended removing this, as the decisions and actions would be captured within the minutes.
- 2.5. The final update presented by MOSL, was to section 4, Quorum and Decision Making. The new quorum requirements would be made up of the following:
 - Two wholesale members
 - Two retailer members (previously three)
 - Plus, any member (wholesaler or retailer).



Once MOSL had finished presenting, the Chair asked committee members to share their thoughts and ask questions.

- 2.6. A committee member proposed adding clarity to the timelines for issuing minutes. If the headline report was being removed. MOSL confirmed that currently there was an SLA of 30 business days for minutes to be published. It was suggested that additional SLA may be added for the draft stages. The committee first suggested five business days from the TDC meeting. However, MOSL raised concerns that due to the amount of internal review required, MOSL would not be able to meet the five-day SLA. A member then suggested ten working days, to allow enough time for internal review. MOSL agreed with this suggestion that the SLA would be ten working days but would aim to get draft minutes sent to committee members within seven working days of the latest TDC meeting.
- 2.7. Another member asked if the TDC would publish further information to the market than released in TD044, for example statements explicit statements of reasoning and market lesson. The Chair noted that the committee would be conducting a review and lessons learnt discussion about the latest Trading Dispute (TD0044) when the dispute was formally closed but that point was duly noted in the minutes.
- 2.8. A member asked why the current quorum was a two to three split towards retailers. The Chair commented that this may be due to the terms of reference being created at market opening but that the composition of the market had changed in relation to retailers. MOSL agreed with this view and confirmed that they had moved away from specifying numbers of unassociated and associated retailers and merged them into a single retailer group. The committee agreed that the quorum requirements in the TOR needed to change due to the TDC current challenges to meet quorum requirements over the last few meetings.
- 2.9. The committee unanimously agreed on the TOR update. The provisional change is now subject to Panel approval.

MOSL to submit papers for next Panel meeting.

Action 22_01

3. Update in resolution plan

PURPOSE: FOR INFORMATION

- 3.1. Both Castle Water and Thames Water Utilities joined the committee to present the latest update on the resolution plan, regarding trading dispute (TD0044). Castle Water and Thames Water Utilities presented to the committee the latest update on correcting the data items affected by the YVE changes. The Chair informed the representatives that the committee was currently unable to vote due to not meeting quorum requirements and the decision would be decided via E-vote instead.
- 3.2. The representatives provided a sort summary on the latest update from the resolution plan.
 - The presenter confirmed that all of the capped and collared list YVEs had been changed to match the ILE value and had been adjusted in CMOS and would be updated as meter reads were received.



- The presenter then explained that in relation to the exceptional 395 SPIDs-after investigating both parties had agreed to these at the ILE value and would be updated as more information came to light.
 - After this, the presenters explained that 80% of SPIDs were collared at the original YVE value.
 - The presenters also confirmed that all values that had been adjusted had now been updated in CMOS.
 - The representative from Thames Water Utilities added that some meters were also being shown as unread and would be adjusted once actual reads had been added to them.
- 3.3. The Chair asked whether the committee or MOSL had any comments to add. No additional comments were made by committee members. It was expressed among the committee that members were happy with the plan Castle Water and Thames Water Utilities had created and expressed their satisfaction with the co-operation each trading party exhibited to rectify the dispute.
- 3.4. The Chair confirmed that the vote to close trading dispute (TD0044) would be moved to an E-vote. The Chair expressed appreciation of Castle Water and Thames Water Utilities for their hard work together, status updates and meeting participation that had taken place to rectify the issue. At the next TDC meeting, the committee will review the trading dispute process and the pathway of dispute TD0044 to identify areas of improvement and potential process refinements.

MOSL to submit E-vote to committee members to propose closing trading dispute (TD0044).

Action 22_02

4. Outstanding actions and review of previous meeting minutes

PURPOSE: FOR INFORMATION

- 4.1. The Chair asked whether members had any concerns regarding last month's meeting minutes.
- 4.2. Members raised no concerns and the minutes were approved by the TDC.
- 4.3. MOSL also presented to the committee on current actions left outstanding, starting with action 19_01. MOSL was asked to provide clarity on the cost of additional services if a trading party requested corrective settlement on individual SPIDs, where the total number of SPIDs was higher than the limit for one settlement run in CMOS. MOSL confirmed internally that there would not be any additional costs attributed to this. The Chair requested clarification on whether this would be a separate cost for each invoice period as well. MOSL confirmed that this was the case.
- 4.4. Actions 19_02 and 19_03 related to MOSL to acquire data for the decision on the changed proposal (DCP021). MOSL analysed the data received but advised members that there were constraints into the analysis, as trading parties currently only need to provide materiality calculations for unplanned settlement runs. It was agreed that the action could be closed.
- 4.5. Action 19_04 related to MOSL to send out the latest draft to all committee members prior to next TDC meeting.



- 4.6. Action 20_03 related to committee members to confirm if they would be staying on with the TDC for another next year. All current members have confirmed.
- 4.7. Action 20a_01 and 20a_02 related to MOSL to confirm that comms for TDC decision and TDC nominations were sent. All comms required for the TDC nominations and TDC decisions have been sent. Currently, MOSL have received some nominees from wholesalers but are still awaiting retailer nominees.
- 4.8. Action 20a_3 related to MOSL investigating on whether a value can be reverted to NULL in CMOS. MOSL confirmed that the YVE value is a compulsory requirement. There were some exceptions due to the data submitted for the initial market upload. If a YVE value had been submitted into CMOS this could not be changed back to NULL. MOSL confirmed they were happy to close this action off, as Thames Water Utilities and Castle Water resolution plan has found a different method to resolve the trading dispute (TD0044).
- 4.9. The last TDC meetings actions from 21_01 to 21_03 were also completed with MOSL. It was also confirmed by MOSL that the terms of reference state that committee members could have more than one alternate.
- 5.0. The Chair asked the committee if they had any additional comments they would like to provide. The committee had no additional comments to add regarding the actions.

5. Update on new trading party disputes

PURPOSE: FOR DECISION

- 5.1. MOSL provided an update on current trading disputes, confirming that no new disputes had been raised since the last TDC meeting.

6. Any other business (AOB)

PURPOSE: FOR INFORMATION

- 6.1. The Chair asked if any committee members had additional business to add.
- 6.2. The Chair confirmed that a follow up on the change proposal E-vote would be sent out, as not all committee members had submitted their vote.
- 6.3. It was also confirmed that an e-vote would be sent to all committee members for the closure of the trading dispute (TD044)
Action 22_03
- 6.4. MOSL also confirmed the next TDC meeting would take place on the 24 April 2019 and will send an invite to all committee members.
Action 22_04
- 6.5. With no further business to discuss, the Chair closed the meeting.

Actions:

- A22_01 MOSL to submit the terms of reference paper for next Panel meeting.**



- A22_02** MOSL to provide an E-vote to TDC (apart from Castle and Thames due to conflict of interest) if members agreed to close TDC dispute (TD0044).
- A22_03** MOSL to send follow up e-mail to TDC members who have not supplied and answer to the previous E vote regarding individual a SPID proposal.
- A22_04** MOSL to send TDC invite to committee for 24 April 2019

The next TDC meeting is scheduled for: **24 April 2019**