



Minutes of the Market Performance Committee

Meeting 34

29th January 2020 | 10:00 – 15:30

Held at White Building, 1-4 Cumberland Place, Southampton, SO15 2NP

Status of the Minutes: Final

MEMBERS PRESENT

Elsa Wye	EW	Interim Chair	Wendy Monk	WM	Retailer Committee Member (Dial-in)
Mike Brindle	MB	Retailer Committee Member (Dial-in)	Jesse Wright	JW	Wholesaler Committee Member
Claire Yeates	CY	Retailer Committee Member	Trevor Nelson	TN	Retailer Committee Member
Matt Garfield	MG	Alternate Wholesaler Committee Member (Dial-in)	Gerard Lyden	GL	Wholesaler Committee Member (Dial-in)
John Vinson	JV	Independent Supporting Chair	Mike Rathbone	MR	Retailer Committee Member

OTHER ATTENDEES

Darren Hayes	DH	Ofwat Presenter	Pam Nash	PN	MOSL Representative
Steve Arthur	SA	MOSL Presenter	Georgina Mills	GM	Ofwat Presenter (Dial-in)
Markus Lloyd	ML	MOSL Presenter	Evan Joannette	EJ	MOSL Presenter
Samantha Webb	SW	MOSL Presenter	Rob Curry	RC	MOSL Presenter
Milo Halford	MH	MPC Secretary	Alexandra Piper	AP	MOSL Presenter
Luke Austin	LA	MOSL Presenter	Chris Chiorean	CC	MPC Secretary
Fabrizio Zamburlin	FZ	MOSL Representative	Adam Boynes	AB	CC Water Representative
David Garner	DG	MOSL Presenter	David Gandee	DG	PwC Presenter
Chris Thomas	CT	PwC Presenter			

APOLOGIES

Don Maher	DM	Wholesaler Committee Member			
-----------	----	-----------------------------	--	--	--



1. Welcome and Introductions

Purpose: For Information

- 1.1. The Chair began by welcoming the members of the Market Performance Committee and introducing attendees in the room and on the phone.
- 1.2. The Chair made some introductory comments highlighting the importance of the visibility of meeting materials and meeting paper day, planning and prioritisation, working 'smarter' to improve focus on core deliverables and efficiency of meetings, whilst not losing sight of the MPC's group responsibilities.
- 1.3. The Chair recognised and appreciated the wealth of accumulated knowledge in the room and the hard work that had been done to date. She asked members to remember that they were the representatives of the market and as such the MPC needed challenge to itself to progress the issues whilst leaving their specific Trading Party 'hat' at the door. The Chair also highlighted that it would be helpful to increase the line of sight between Panel and the MPC, notwithstanding the fact that some MPC members also sat on the Panel. It was recognised that it would be helpful to use plain English and avoid jargon when coming to decisions. The Chair proposed to schedule a brainstorming session during the next MPC session regarding the IPRP process to pool ideas to improve the process to compliment MOSL's information gathering on the issue.
- 1.4. The Chair received positive feedback regarding her thoughts throughout the room.

2. Minutes and Outstanding Actions

Purpose: For Decision

- 2.1. The Chair went through the minutes from the previous meeting of the MPC. They were approved with no changes.
- 2.2. The Chair acknowledged and expressed appreciation for MOSL's efforts to meet the deadlines for uploading MPC materials to SharePoint. The Chair set the expectation that all MPC materials would be ready by 'Paper Day' in February to allow MPC members to digest the documents before the meeting.
- 2.3. One MPC member asked whether MOSL were intending to exclude G4 standards from reporting or remove them from the codes for the remainder of the 19/20 financial year. One MOSL representative noted that the Trade Effluent Issues Committee's (TEIC) recommendation is for them to be removed in their current condition. One MOSL representative recommended that both G4 standards (G4a and G4b) as well as G2 should be reviewed to determine whether they should remain part of OPS and that this review should be conducted as part of the MPF roadmap. One MPC member raised concerns over the lack of oversight when excluding standards from reporting, but agreed to the recommendation. It was also noted that this review should input into the Annual Market report.

ACTION: MOSL to consult the codes regarding how the removal of OPS standards should take place and why.

A34_01

- 2.4. One MPC member asked why the G2a standard was not reported as part of the Standard Pack of Slides. MOSL answered that this was a decision taken in 2019. The original reason had not been recorded. G2a will be included going forward.

ACTION: MOSL to include G2a in the reporting of OPS in the Standard Pack of Slides.

A34_02

- 2.5. MOSL informed the MPC that guidance on the OPS bulk upload process is being developed by the Market Design team and MOSL should be able to present an update during the MPC in March.
- 2.6. When discussing the action A30_07 (related to the actuals vs estimates analysis) MOSL shared that they will revisit this in February to discuss the effect and materiality of the issue. One MPC member inquired as to how MOSL determines that a read submitted as an actual was an estimate. MOSL responded that they are using a risk-based analysis where they can determine whether a read is likely (or not) to be an estimate.
- 2.7. Regarding the action A32_02 (related to moving the Annual Market Performance Report (AMPR) publishing date from April to July), MOSL stated that they are code-obligated to publish the AMPR by end of April 2020 and they have concluded that delaying the publication date of the AMPR would not benefit the market. Furthermore, publishing the AMPR on the 27th of April would ensure a joined up view of MPOP and Market Improvement.
- 2.8. Following the presentation from the trading party in December's MPC, MOSL has scheduled a meeting with them during the first week of February to provide an in-depth view of their performance and proposed IPRP. MOSL confirmed that everything was on course in relation to the 16th February submission date and that the new plan would be reviewed at the February MPC.
- 2.9. One MPC member suggested that dates of correspondence and updates should be recorded within the Action log to provide a clearer picture of the timelines around issues being discussed. One MOSL representative (SA) recommended a discussion around the way confidential information is handled in documents such as minutes, action logs and meeting material as there needs to be a balance between transparency and confidentiality; both should be informed by a policy approach which would be clarified by MOSL.

ACTION: MOSL to start recording dates of correspondence and updates with Trading Parties as they relate to items on the Action Log to support development of a clear audit trail.

A34_03

- 2.10. Actions to remain open: A29_05, A30_05, A30_07, A31_04, A31_05, A32_01, A33_06, A33_07, A33_08
- 2.11. Actions to be closed: A32_02, A32_03, A33_01, A33_02, A33_03, A33_04, A33_05, A33_09



3. Ofwat Update

Purpose: For Information

- 3.1. An Ofwat presenter announced that the period of purdah was now finished and that Ofwat had published their final decision around PR19 and CPM018. They stated that they are in favour of MOSL's business plan and the MPF Roadmap.
- 3.2. The Ofwat presenter noted, with concern, the increasing trend in Trading Parties (TPs) bypassing MOSL and corresponding directly with Ofwat on issues relating to change proposals.
- 3.3. The Ofwat presenter informed the MPC that the responses to the review of incumbent support for effective markets responses will be published over the next week. The final findings of the review will be published in March/April. One MOSL representative wanted to know whether any delays are expected to which the Ofwat presenter confirmed that there were no expected delays.

4. MPS/OPS Performance Update

Purpose: For Information

- 4.1. MOSL presented the main insights from the new 53-page performance pack. A MOSL presenter noted that while the performance pack does not currently include a summary section, that it is currently in development and asked members to provide any suggestions that they may have. The Chair brought attention to the new overview document which complimented the monthly performance report and asked members to provide any feedback.
- 4.2. The MOSL presenter drew the MPC's attention to the impact on MPS and OPS performance when the biggest outliers are removed. Removing a single TP could create a 5% improvement in performance. A MOSL presenter outlined the improvements in MPS 18 and posited that an IPRP was in place for two of the strongest performers. This was counterbalanced by the example of a TP that is not doing so well whilst on an IPRP for MPS 18. The associated Portfolio Manager informed the MPC that the performance issues around Nov/Dec were mainly due to issues related to the Christmas period, such as staff taking over other people's roles. The Chair enquired whether this should be viewed as a one off event, the PFM confirmed this to be the case.
- 4.3. One MPC member inquired as to whether that particular TP will be subjected to higher scrutiny when assessing issues with their performance (as part of their IPRP) The MOSL presenter responded that they had not yet taken a deep dive into their performance issues, but they might if performance issues continue. One MPC member noted that Automated Meter Reads (AMR) can significantly improve MPS performance, potentially giving an AMR enabled TP an advantage over others who are reliant on visual and estimated reads. Inclusion of AMRs may, therefore, skew the bi-annual performance league tables to give an overly positive view and mask areas of poor performance. Another MPC member replied that



this behaviour is what every TP should be aiming for. A MOSL representative stated that he felt this discrepancy should be called out.

ACTION: MOSL to investigate how they can better highlight significant deviations in TP reporting which may cause differences or potential distortions in reported performance.

A34_04

5. IPRP Update

Purpose: For Information

- 5.1. MOSL presented the IPRP monitoring update and acknowledged the complexity of the current process, terminology and number of IPRP's. The MOSL presenter noted that while the summaries are very useful in gleaning the current position, an amended approach might be needed in order to increase understanding of the IPRP process.
- 5.2. The MOSL presenter gave a walkthrough of the process of IPRP monitoring and the lifecycle of a IPRP from Flag, to IPRP and then out of IPRP. There was a clarifying discussion about the mechanics of an IPRP, during which the Chair asked whether the 11 IPRP's referred to in the cover sheet were where the TPs had extended their plans themselves. MOSL responded that TPs can request an extension to their own plans if they deem it useful and that it was their understanding that was the case in the 11 referred to.
- 5.3. One MPC member suggested that the resubmission option for an IPRP may be very useful for underperforming TPs as the 20 Business Day (BD) deadline to submit an IPRP might not be enough time initially to conduct appropriate root cause analysis. One MOSL representative noted that the shorter timeframe is mainly due to restrictions around the codes.
- 5.4. MPC members asked for clarification around the triggers for different actions which was explained by MOSL members. One MOSL representative noted that before an IPRP is requested there is generally a long period of underperformance, which means that TPs are not taken by surprise with IPRP decisions. One Ofwat presenter noted that the only concern they have with the IPRP process is the prioritisation of certain issues over others.
- 5.5. There was a discussion between MPC members as to the clarity around terms used within the IPRP process. MOSL assured the MPC that the IPRP process is still in active development and is undergoing review and any suggestions on how MPC members would find it clearer are welcome. An MPC member confirmed that Trading Parties do generally understand the IPRP graphs presented.
- 5.6. One MOSL representative presented the situation of a TP which is currently on an IPRP and is undergoing a post-plan review of performance. He explained how, with performance taken out of context, this TP might have stayed on an IPRP extension due to several troughs of performance. He cited that MOSL has been in frequent contact with the TP's Portfolio Manager (PfM), who had explained that



the TP was implementing a new IT system which has impacted their performance. He explained that MOSL takes the context of under performance in consideration when making decisions related to IPRPs.

- 5.7. MOSL then presented some examples of TPs on IPRPs which were de-escalated. One MPC member enquired as to why one example was de-escalated when it still tracked below their previously submitted plan and somewhat below the market mean. A MOSL representative explained that the TP had made a significant improvement in performance which, although leaving it below planned targets, brought it above the mean threshold target. Keeping the TP on an IPRP after such a positive improvement, albeit under their planned performance would not have been a prudent use of the TP and MOSL's resources. The TP's ongoing performance would be monitored over the next three months.
- 5.8. One MPC member suggested that a particular example would make a good case study of what happens when a TP is de-escalated when their performance is still not consistently above the mean.

ACTION: MOSL to track the progress of case study and to provide updates to the MPC.

A34_05

- 5.9. One MPC member noted that if performance is tracked against the market mean, then half of the tracked TPs will by definition be below the metric. A MOSL representative agreed that this is an issue with the current metric and shared that MOSL is looking at possibly introducing a threshold level of performance.
- 5.10. One MPC member noted that while a TP on an IPRP can help focus their employees to handle task failures and drive performance over the duration of the IPRP, the most important part of the IPRP is whether there were any lessons learned by the TP which would remain with the TP after the end of the IPRP.
- 5.11. MOSL informed the MPC that a new reporting system is being implemented for the IPRP process which is more selective, informed, and collaborative and should allow for better reporting in the future.
- 5.12. The Chair recommended a sharing exercise of thoughts and suggestions on Sharepoint amongst MPC members during February in order to have a more structured brainstorming session in February and asked as many MPC members as possible to participate. MPC agreed all round.

ACTION: MOSL to set up a document on SharePoint where MPC can raise questions and suggestions for improvement about the IPRP process and MOSL can ask members questions to help prepare for the February brainstorming session.

A34_06

6. MPOP Updates A and B

Purpose: For Information

- 6.1. A MOSL presenter gave an update of MPOP A & B, showing the trend information for Long Unread Meters (LUM) and Vacancies. He stated that there had been a consistent downward trend in LUM since September, the first sustained fall in the rate of LUM for this FY. Significant reductions were attributed to specific efforts from Castle, Wave, and WaterPlus.
- 6.2. Two MPC members shared their appreciation for the papers released by MOSL regarding MPOP A & B.
- 6.3. MOSL shared a detailed insight paper with the MPC. This paper outlined several observations around the market-level situation around Vacancy and the biggest areas of risk around which vacant properties are likely not vacant. This paper also outlined recommendations for how to tackle these issues and mitigate the risk of erroneously vacant premises.
- 6.4. A member voiced a concern that the recommendations from the Vacancy papers didn't actually put the onus of resolution on anyone, and that the market is too big to have such broad statements. He reminded the MPC that while the identification of wrongly vacant supply points is important, it is equally important to identify who will have to deregister these supply points. Another member highlighted that while Retailers intuitively have the responsibility to deregister supply points for settlement reasons, Wholesalers, as part of their license, have to ensure they have adequate knowledge of how water is used and where leakages happen.
- 6.5. One MPC member suggested that feedback from the Pairing Improvement Plans (PIPs) for Vacancy and Long Unread Meters should be shared with the appropriate working groups. MOSL responded that this could be brought to the working groups in Feb/March. MOSL will then feedback to the MPC with findings.
- 6.6. Two MPC members raised that certain groups of vacant properties (e.g., those with consumption) generally receive more focused effort which could mask other issues which can also cause vacant properties.
- 6.7. MOSL presented their recommendations on tackling the vacancy situation but warned that these efforts alone will not be enough to solve the entire issue. More insight will be required to further understand the problem and make further recommendations for change. MOSL also presented the timeline for future vacancy work.
- 6.8. A MOSL representative introduced a new API that enables monitoring of LUMs at a pairing level. He showed a graph which uses a forecasting function to determine future performance based on past trends. He highlighted that if a Pairing Improvement Plan were to be effective, performance would be better than the forecast, which is based on the past trends.
- 6.9. The MOSL representative also noted that future actions may include formal intervention activities from MOSL but that the trigger and contents of these actions is to be decided by July 2020. MOSL will present and consult with the MPC regarding possible intervention activities before putting these in place. One MPC member asked MOSL to be cautious about what agreements are set within the plans, as he felt

that Wholesalers obligations were dependent on the meter reader contracts. The MOSL presenter responded that they will be created with input from the Retailer and Wholesaler involved, so that listed actions will have been agreed and factored in. The MPC member went on to say that the example provided made the Wholesaler responsible for sorting out meter reading contracts because meters are Wholesalers' assets. The MPC member highlighted that any intervention should be formulated in the 'spirit' of the PIP's as they had been submitted on a voluntary basis by Trading Parties.

Action: MOSL to develop an intervention strawman paper to come to the May/June MPC meeting.

A34_07

- 6.1. An MPC member asked whether MOSL were going to analyse all PIPs and aggregate them in order to forecast the state of LUM in the future. He wanted to know the ramifications of such a forecast being substantially far away from the MPOP targets set out, and what actions MOSL plans to make. He also stated, as an unassociated retailer, that it doesn't address all his issues and is therefore only part of the problem. MOSL responded that due to the more granular level of these plans it would be impossible to aggregate them to market level but that they would monitor CMOS reductions in LUM which would relate to actions within the PIPs and decide if intervention actions are necessary.
- 6.2. A CC Water representative asked what the impact of gaining an actual read for a LUM might be on the customer. As an example, he suggested that a meter which was read after a period of being long unread might materially alter the rate of consumption and thus a customer bill. A customer who had been underbilled for a period during which the meter reading had been estimated by a Yearly Volume Estimate or Industry Level Estimate, might suffer bill shock when the meter was eventually read and consumption was found to have been significantly under-estimated. A MOSL representative pointed out that this might equally go the other way and the customer might be in line for a credit payment. Similarly the Unplanned Settlement Run which might arise from a read could make the Retailer liable for an unexpected bill.

7. MPOP C Update

Purpose: For Information

- 7.1. A MOSL representative presented an update relating to the MPF Roadmap and stated that the delivery of the MPF Roadmap would be presented via a series of projects and workstreams. He highlighted three primary areas: Measures & Metrics, Data Quality, and Accountability. The MOSL presenter emphasised that these areas reach further than just the MPC and any specific MPOP strand of work. He also noted the strict deadlines which regulate the work around these programmes, and it is likely to be similar in relation to the Bilaterals Project. It was recommended that the agenda item would be renamed MPF roadmap going forward.
- 7.2. One MPC member outlined that there had been a number of recommendations from the meeting of the Operational Standards Working Group (OPSWG) last year, many of which need to be implemented into the new bilaterals initiative. He noted that work needed to commence quickly to ensure that they



receive the focus they need in the bilaterals project. A MOSL representative noted that there are long-standing OPS reporting issues which would benefit from input from a forum of the industry.

- 7.3. The Chair asked at what stage the bilateral project would be in April, to which a member announced that a Request For Information (RFI) has been sent out to better establish what is necessary.
- 7.4. The Chair asked a member if he could assemble the OPSWG again (potentially with him as Chair) to which he stated there was potential for phone-based meetings but was unsure of timeline as could not speak for the rest of the group.
- 7.5. The MPC member raised another point around Bilateral portal capabilities and how any shortcomings in OPS reporting can be identified reasonably quickly. He noted that these issues need to be incorporated into the early stages of the project. The member asked if any Trading Parties would like the opportunity to input into the items that the OPSWG identify as necessary for change.

ACTION: JW to write a summary of the OPSWG paper on their future recommendations for OPS to be circulated to MPC by 7/2/20.

A34_08

ACTION: JW to present to the MPC in March a list of recommendations from the OPSWG regarding OPS Reporting

A34_09

- 7.6. One MOSL Representative noted that there are other groups already such as the Operations Action Group (OAG) dealing with similar matters who could assist with these issues. The Chair agreed that it would be beneficial if original members of the OPSWG could work alongside OAG and the Wholesaler Interface Group. Another MOSL Representative suggested that we take the learnings from the OPSWG and feed them into the OAG which is already a defined working group.
- 7.7. There was a discussion between MPC members and MOSL representatives regarding how the OPS Reporting will evolve around the Bilaterals project. It was noted that we cannot allow the Bilaterals project to be a closed avenue which would not allow for later improvements to OPS Reporting.

8. CPM018 update

Purpose: For Decision

- 8.1. CPM018 relates to the redistribution and use of MPS/OPS charges.
- 8.2. The MOSL presenter noted that the CPM018 fund needs a more identifiable name and recommended the 'Market Improvement Fund'.
- 8.3. The MOSL presenter identified at least four project workstreams which might require the MPC's attention and input: Governance Development, Financial/Procurement governance, Communications, and Training & Induction.

- 8.4. In relation to Governance Development, the MOSL presenter suggested that the MPC could support by helping define the fund eligibility and project selection criteria as well as develop the application process/forms and guidance documents. The Chair inquired why the MPC were asked to help with some parts of the workstream but not others. The MOSL presenter stated that this was a first cut and it may well be that there are extra areas where the MPC could help. The Chair noted that a subgroup meeting had been set up and clarified that there seemed to be a working assumption at Panel that MPC would be involved in the development of the Project Governance Framework Document but not necessarily the management of the fund allocation as that was Panel's remit in the first instance.
- 8.5. One MPC member noted that the default position of the Market Improvement Fund is to redistribute all charges, unless a project is chosen.
- 8.6. The Chair responded that Ofwat had outlined an expectation in the CPM018 decision document that a significant proportion of the funds could be allocated to projects. It was agreed that MOSL would draft a paper clarifying the delegation of the PFG to MOSL and the MPC which go to Panel in February.
- 8.7. An MPC member stated that the timeline for delivering this was very tight, to which MOSL agreed.

ACTION: MOSL to draft paper to confirm MPC delegation issue from Panel for February Panel.

A34_10

9. PwC Audit Update

Purpose: For Information

- 9.1. The Chair welcomed the two speakers from PwC.
- 9.2. PwC presented some of the detail from the two primary focus areas of their NHH Market Audit: Vacancy and OPS. The presenter stated that the primary topic for this presentation will be around Vacancy.
- 9.3. PwC noted that they are due to assess Settlement and Market Assurance around the middle of February with MOSL.
- 9.4. PwC presented an update from their review of Vacancy data. They have visited four Trading Parties (two Retailers, two Wholesalers) in order to get a clear view of the market picture. They investigated approaches and root causes of failures from each TP.
- 9.5. They noted that the New Connections process caused significant issues as the teams dealing with these processes are generally different from teams dealing with other processes. Information flow between different teams and different Trading Parties has been quite poor and has caused a poor quality of information to reach the retailer. One MPC member asked if Self-Lay providers were included as part of this review. A PwC presenter confirmed that they were not included, but that does highlight the complexity of the issues.
- 9.6. There was a discussion as to whether enough customer information was provided when new SPIDs are entered into the market. One MPC member stated that this was not always the case as sometimes the developer themselves would not have the necessary information at an early stage as they might be



working for a larger company with many developments going on and customer data may not be available.

- 9.7. PwC noted that there are many examples of premises which could be identified as having an incorrect 'vacant' marking (e.g. a pub with a Facebook page) and acknowledged that wholesalers are making an active effort to help retailers find billable customers. They also noted the difficulty of staying on top of vacant properties due to the shelf-life of such information, especially with rental properties which might change customers regularly.
- 9.8. One MPC member noted that Retailers and Wholesalers should be considered as having an equal stake in terms of incentive to correctly identify vacant properties. This is because Wholesalers' licenses depend on knowing the true rate of use of water, leakage levels, and other information which is affected by vacancy.
- 9.9. One MPC member requested that actions around vacancy and LUM be 'triaged' and for the owner of the next action to be recorded.

ACTION: MOSL to 'triage' actions around MPOP A & B by consolidating the list of actions from working group recommendations, and in the case of vacancy, PWC actions with clear responsibility for the owner of the action. The triage list to be presented to February/March MPC.

A34_11

- 9.10. PwC presented an update from their audit of the OPS process from the first three Wholesalers they visited. They found a high level of compliance with guidance (~94%). The exceptions were low impact interpretation issues which were not material in volume or cost. PwC recommended that some guidance around the OPS process might need clarification.
- 9.11. One MPC member asked if there could be issues caused by misinformation between different bodies within MOSL. A MOSL representative replied that these issues are not due to inter-personal issues, but rather gaps in the guidance which need clarification. One member noted that queries to MOSL around OPS should be tracked and recurring issues might be recorded in an FAQ-type document.
- 9.12. One MPC member stated that this was exactly what the MPC was looking for from the OPS audit and thanked PwC for their work.

10. Quarterly MO Compliance update

Purpose: For Information

- 10.1. A MOSL presenter gave an update of the MO Compliance over the last quarter.
- 10.2. He stated that MOSL has found 3 new areas of non-compliance and removed 2, bringing the total up to 9. He emphasised that this does not mark a decrease of MO Performance, but rather an increase in MO analysis of their obligations. He also stated one of the new areas related to previously erroneously reported compliance.



- 10.3. The MOSL presenter noted that MOSL had failed to publish the minutes of Board meetings since January 2019. This was due to concerns over confidentiality and that full and frank discussions could not be had if minutes would be shared in their entirety. One MPC member noted that since they work for the benefit of the market these minutes should be shared with market participants. He argued that even if these were inadequate for the public, they should still be available to market participants. The Chair suggested that it may be appropriate to wait until after the Board had reached an agreement on the issue.
- 10.4. The MOSL presenter stated that he was looking to remove individual obligations in the Code Subsidiary Documents (CSD), and for there to be only one obligation: to be compliant with the whole document. This would simplify matters; if MOSL were compliant in 11 out of 12 areas of a CSD then they would be considered non-compliant with that CSD (as opposed to mostly compliant).
- 10.5. The MOSL presenter went through current areas of non-compliance, providing a background on times and dates along with resolution timelines.

11. MOSL Workplan run through

Purpose: For Information

- 11.1. MOSL presented a proposed plan for future MPC work, detailing requirements and person-hours necessary to achieve key deliverables. It was clarified that this was an estimated roadmap and may be subject to change.
- 11.2. MPC members confirmed that they understood the coding of different cells and what each part indicates.
- 11.3. Some MPC members asked whether the resource requirements were specific to Retailer/Wholesaler groups, as the table would suggest, or whether there was some flexibility around it. The MOSL representative confirmed that this was not specific to a TP type and the Chair suggested that we remove the separation of Retailer/Wholesaler from the table.
- 11.4. One MPC member inquired as to whether this list was finalised or if other items could be later added. The Chair agreed that this should be a live working document that updates over time, as needs change and develop. A MOSL representative confirmed that they are ready to add other items as necessary.
- 11.5. The MOSL representative presented the roadmaps for different strands of work: the IPRP review process, AMPR, RMEX, Bilaterals, MPF Roadmap, and the MPOP projects.

ACTION: MPC members to let Market Performance know if they wish to be part of any of the workstreams before the next MPC (in February).

A34_12

- 11.6. TN volunteered to help with the IPRP review process. JV also indicated a willingness to help with IPRPs.
- 11.7. CY and MR both indicated that they would be unable to help individually, citing previous obligations, but between the two of them they will discuss whether they have the bandwidth to help with the AMPR.

The MOSL representative suggested that involvement from Ofwat in the AMPR (in addition to the MPC) would be helpful.

12. Any Other Business

Purpose: For Discussion

- 12.1. The Chair stated there was a lively discussion around IPRPs at Panel the previous day, and that Panel members want increased visibility of the process. The Panel have requested a presentation around IPRP insight and judgement calls. Martin Mavin will support from a Northumbrian Water perspective at the February Panel. She noted that she had also requested a slot for an update on the CPMO18 PFG document..
- 12.2. One MOSL representative asked MPC members for their thoughts on the MPOPs and next steps as he would like MPC input before ideas around MPOP become too crystallised. He noted that he would like some time in the February MPC agenda to discuss any notes from the MPC members.
- 12.3. SA took an action to circulate a briefing note for MPC decision, suggesting that the final precision review be de-scoped from the 19/20 market audit relating to TP Compliance. No suggestions have been tabled for this final precision review to-date, the review was being held as a 'tbc' element of this year's audit. MPC members expressed a willingness to de-scope this item from the audit and realise cost savings (approx. £40k) subject to MOSLs briefing note.

ACTION: SA to produce a paper and circulate it to the MPC looking at options for the audit.

A34_13

- 12.4. A CC Water representative noted that they are working on the categorisation of complaints against Retailers and Wholesalers and should be able to present something by next month. One MOSL representative asked if it were possible to relate their findings to our current numbers around OPS F5. The conclusion was reached that it was not possible at this point but maybe in the future, with the Bilateral Solution in place.
- 12.5. One MOSL representative mentioned that MOSL was producing a paper to the SLT on the reduction of obligations and asked whether any member of the MPC wanted to help support that paper. He mentioned that MOSL can decide how to report their compliance, but as it is reported the MPC it may be helpful to have their input. It was decided that the MPC would sign-off on the work done by MOSL.

ACTION: MOSL to come back with an information paper to the March MPC detailing the removal of the individual obligations referred to above.

A34_14

- 12.6. One MPC member thanked the Chair for their excellent first session as interim chair. This was echoed by other members around the room.



List of new actions recorded:

- A34_01: MOSL to consult the codes regarding how the removal of OPS standards should take place.**
- A34_02: MOSL to include G2a in the reporting of OPS in the Standard Pack of Slides.**
- A34_03: MOSL to start recording dates of correspondence and updates with Trading Parties as they relate to items on the Action Log to support development of a clear audit trail.**
- A34_04: MOSL to investigate how they can better highlight significant deviations in TP reporting which may cause differences or potential distortions in reported performance.**
- A34_05: MOSL to track the progress of a case study and to provide updates to the MPC.**
- A34_06: MOSL to set up a document on SharePoint where MPC can raise questions and suggestions for improvement about the IPRP process and MOSL can ask members questions to help prepare for the February brainstorming session.**
- A34_07: MOSL to develop an intervention strawman paper to come to the May/June MPC meeting.**
- A34_08: JW to write a summary of the OPSWG paper on their future recommendations for OPS to be circulated to MPC by 7/2/20.**
- A34_09: JW to present to the MPC in March a list of recommendations from the OPSWG regarding OPS Reporting**
- A34_10: MOSL to draft paper to confirm MPC delegation issue from Panel for February Panel.**
- A34_11: MOSL to 'triage' actions around MPOP A & B by consolidating the list of actions from working group recommendations, and in the case of vacancy, PWC actions with clear responsibility for the owner of the action. The triage list to be presented to February/March MPC.**
- A34_12: MPC members to let Market Performance know if they wish to be part of any of the workstreams before the next MPC (in February).**
- A34_13: SA to produce a paper and circulate it to the MPC looking at options for the audit.**
- A34_14: MOSL to come back with an information paper to the March MPC detailing the removal of the individual obligations referred to above.**

The next MPC meeting is scheduled for 26th February 2020

Location: **One America Square, 17 Crosswall, London, EC3N 2LB**