

Minutes of the Market Performance Committee

Meeting 35

26th February 2020 | 10:00 – 16:00

Held at Cavendish Venues, 17, One Crosswall, America Square, London, EC3N 2LB

Status of the Minutes: Final

MEMBERS PRESENT

Elsa Wye	EW	Interim Independent Chair	Wendy Monk	WM	Retailer Committee Member
Michelle Burns	MB	Alternate Retailer Committee Member	Jesse Wright	JW	Wholesaler Committee Member
Claire Yeates	CY	Retailer Committee Member	Trevor Nelson	TN	Retailer Committee Member
Gerard Lyden	GL	Wholesaler Committee Member	Don Maher	DM	Wholesaler Committee Member
Michael Rathbone	MR	Wholesaler Committee Member	John Vinson	JV	Independent Supporting Chair

OTHER ATTENDEES

Darren Hayes	DH	Ofwat Observer	Georgina Mills	GM	Ofwat Observer
Steve Arthur	SA	MOSL Presenter	Liz D'Arcy	LD	MOSL Representative
Samantha Webb	SW	MOSL Presenter	John Vincent	JV	Independent Observer
Milo Halford	MH	MOSL Secretary	Steven Hobbs	SH	CC Water Representative
Luke Austin	LA	MOSL Presenter	Alexandra Piper	AP	MOSL Presenter and MPC Secretary
Markus Lloyd	ML	MOSL Presenter			

APOLOGIES

Mike Brindle	MB	Retailer Committee Member			
--------------	----	---------------------------	--	--	--

1. Welcome and Introductions

Purpose: For Information



- 1.1. The Chair began by welcoming the members of the Market Performance Committee and introductions around the room and noted Michelle Burns as an alternate for Mike Brindle.

2. Minutes and Outstanding Actions

Purpose: For Decision

- 2.1. Minimal comments or changes had been added in advance to the Minutes of the MPC from MPC 34. The Chair encouraged the room to read and add comments to the document before the next meeting and asked the room if any members present had any further comments on the document.
- 2.2. With regards to pages 1, 2 and 3, one member stated that they believed the action did not fully capture what was agreed in the meeting, asking MOSL to investigate the justification behind removing G4 standards from reporting, and for MOSL to consult the codes for clarification about removing the OPS standards. The MPC agreed this should be captured.

ACTION: MOSL to investigate the justification behind removing G4 standards from reporting, and to consult the codes for clarification about removing the OPS standards.

A35_01

- 2.3. Ofwat raised that the wording in section 3.2 should be changed from “MOSL” to “formal governance process”.
- 2.4. Ofwat also raised that the word “concern” should be removed from section 5.4 as Ofwat were not concerned on the matter but wanted to raise an issue as a suggested improvement to the process.
- 2.5. One member raised that the wording should be changed in action A34_08 near section 7.5. As it stands, the action states that the purpose of the OPSWG paper was to provide future recommendations but the MPC member stated that the true purpose of the paper was to feed information into the Bilaterals project, not to provide future recommendations.
- 2.6. With regards to section 11.7, the wording should be changed to reflect that CY and MR agreed that they would support the AMPR.
- 2.7. One member stated that they thought an action should have been captured in the AOB section of the minutes which was for MOSL to investigate is changes should be made to how performance is reported in the presence of AMR reads. MOSL stated that this will be discussed in AOB today.
- 2.8. Subject to the changes above, the MPC approved the minutes of Meeting 34.
- 2.9. MOSL presented an update on the outstanding actions.
- 2.10. The following actions would be closed: A29_05, A33_06, A33_07, A34_08/A33_08/A34_09, A34_01, A34_02, A34_03, A34_06 and A34_12



- 2.11. The following actions would be left open: A30_05, A30_07, A31_04, A31_05, A32_01, A34_04, A34_05, A34_07, A34_10, A34_11, A34_13 and A34_14
- 2.12. With regards to A30_07 (MOSL to present analysis and recommendations on addressing estimated reads entered as actual reads), MOSL stated that their Chief Architect would return to the MPC next month to provide further information.
- 2.13. For A31_05 (regarding CPM018, MOSL to produce a draft Project Selection and Governance Document with a sub-group of MPC and EJ from MOSL), the Chair asked the MPC to think about how frequently they would like to be updated and the types of updates they would like to receive.

ACTION: The information presented to Panel on 25th February 2020 regarding action A31_05 (MOSL to produce a draft Project Selection and Governance Document) should be circulated to all MPC members, as well as the meeting note produced MOSL.

A35_02

- 2.14. With regards to action A32_01 (call to discuss the effects of removing A Standards from OPS), an MPC member raised a point regarding different Wholesaler business practices and communication channels in relation to the new connection process. They went on to say that there may be some code changes required as when the market was created it was assumed that retailers would be heavily engaged in the process but the member felt that this was the case and potentially there was a lack of knowledge in the market.
- 2.15. Another MPC member raised that the issue could be delegated to the Vacancy Working Group (VWG). MOSL responded to say that they believe the impacts of removing A standards could reach further than vacancy and recommended against delegating the issue. A member raised that they felt it would be more insightful for the VWG to find the biggest impacts of removing A standards.

ACTION: MOSL to organise a call between TN, GL, ML and the MPOP team to discuss action A32_01 further. MOSL to feed and elaborate on action A32_01 (effects of removing A Standards) into the Vacancy workstream.

A35_03

- 2.16. A33_08, A34_08 and A34_09 were captured together (JW to capture feedback from the OPSWG for potential future changes to OPS that may not be feasible). JW raised that the front of the OPSWG paper provided a summary and specified that these are not recommendations that must be implemented for OPS, but are instead potential changes that could be implemented in the future. JW also raised that they would be unable to attend the next MPC to present but that he would do some further work on the paper and recirculate to MPC members.
- 2.17. A member raised that they were concerned around the future dates and plans for the Bilaterals project. A person present stated that members should raise concerns into the RFI for MOSL to capture. They went on to say that they had a concern of the high-level sign off held in panel and stated that this information should be presented to the steering group, as they felt the steering group lacked visibility of the work being carried out. MOSL clarified that the steering group would see this information at the



next meeting and clarified the dates for the next steering group meeting would be released late in the week.

2.18. JW asked that any questions on the OPSWG paper should be sent to JW by Monday 2nd February 2020 prior to reissue.

ACTION: MPC to send comments on OPSWG paper to JW by Monday 2nd March for JW to reissue to the members.

A35_04

2.19. The MPC agreed that they did not feel the need for the OPSWG and Bilaterals paper to come back to MPC for input, rather just for circulation. The Chair questioned whether as long as the OPSWG had continued involvement with JW as a link, then any work should only be fed into the MPC for information.

2.20. A member stated that the MPC needed to be very clear with the OPSWG on the scope of the working group. They also suggested that the OPS working group should work with the Bilaterals project.

2.21. There was a discussion as to whether it was worth reinstating the OPSWG. A member of MPC replied that it would need some new members as not everyone in the original group was still close to OPS.

2.22. MOSL suggested that an MPC member be placed in the Bilaterals project before the OPSWG was brought back together.

ACTION: The Chair of the MPC will discuss with John Gilbert how the MPC can feed information and system requirements into the Bilaterals project.

A35_05

2.23. A member asked if there was scope for the Meter Read Rejections Group and Skip Code Group of the MPOP work to take over action A37_07 to create a strawman paper on LUM API intervention, or to provide information to help create the paper.

ACTION: MOSL to provide an update on what the LUM MPOP working groups have been producing. MOSL to present the plans of the groups and provide insight of how their work fits into the MPOP. It was agreed that a 1-page update as part of the Standard Market Pack would be useful for information, as well as an update that includes the key deliverables and outputs of the projects.

A35_06

2.24. With regards to action A34_13 (MOSL to produce a paper and circulate it to the MPC looking at options for the audit), MOSL confirmed that the paper will be sent prior to the next MPC meeting and welcomed comment from MPC.

3. Ofwat Update

Purpose: For Information



- 3.1. Ofwat updated the MPC with the news that Tor Water had officially exited the market. Two Interim Supply Allocations had taken place and highlighted certain areas for improvement.
- 3.2. Ofwat stated that they aim to publish the findings from Project Rise (incumbent support for effective markets) in early-April.
- 3.3. Ofwat said that they will be working with MOSL to strengthen the existing self-governance model with a focus on strengthening the customer voice and encouraging innovation. They clarified the two organisations will take on different strands but are very much still in discussion with MOSL on this.
- 3.4. **Redacted due to confidentiality.**

ACTION: Redacted due to confidentiality

A35_07

- 3.5. An MPC member stated that they had read all the CEO responses that Ofwat had published and wondered why Ofwat decided that these letters indicated a need for the governance process to change. Ofwat responded saying that the responses indicated to them that the current self-governance model could work and did not require a full remake, but that some CEO letters indicated concerns over the governance process and that Ofwat had pre-existing concerns. Ofwat stated that the letters highlighted the need to strengthen, improve and streamline the governance process to help facilitate innovation.

4. Performance Update

Purpose: For Information

- 4.1. MOSL presented an update on the market performance figures for the month December.
- 4.2. A graph was presented showing that OPS performance had risen and MPS performance has fallen in December.
- 4.3. A slide was presented around MPS 15 performance and the potential effect of the charge amnesty introduced by MOSL, stating that they had seen a 25% increase in November from September.
- 4.4. A member asked why January data was not included in the graphs. The Chair stated that it had been agreed with MOSL that in order to allow MOSL the opportunity to have greater confidence in the robustness of the data and provide a greater level of insight that MOSL were introducing a one month lag in the figures presented, as the current system did not allow enough time to provide deep insight. However, any significant issues relating to the latest data would be provided by exception.
- 4.5. MOSL presented a large spike in TP3 fails in MPS 15 (reads submitted later than 60 business days after the read date), showing the 10 Trading Parties who submitted the most TP3 fails in November and December. MOSL clarified that the size of a Trading Party would impact the number of reads submitted. A person present mentioned that this data could also provide a good marker of when to reintroduce charges.
- 4.6. An MPC member clarified that there was currently no plan to re-introduce charges for MPS 15.



- 4.7. A member noted that poor MPS 15 performance does not necessarily impact the customer or their bills, as presumably the Retailer has the read and is able to produce a bill from it. The member clarified that MPS 15 models timeliness of communicating with CMOS, not taking the meter read.

ACTION: MOSL to produce and share analysis on the distribution of TP3 failures since removing the charges for MPS 15, comparing the changes after removing charges.

A35_08

- 4.8. A member asked whether MOSL had seen an increase in Unplanned Settlement Runs (USRs), to which MOSL confirmed and specified an increase in RF runs especially.
- 4.9. MOSL raised that they would like the MPC to have an open discussion around the best way to report and monitor performance in the run up to the production of MOSL's league tables. MOSL asked what was good practice when trying to capture a number of different realities and metrics.
- 4.10. One member raised that they had considered a single performance metric.

ACTION: MPC members to think about the best way to report and monitor performance in preparation for the next MPC. MPC members were asked to think about how MOSL and MPC should capture changes to the market, better metrics/data that MOSL could report on, including more narrative with reporting, and other general issues with reporting such as including AMR for example.

A35_09

5. Trading Party IPRP Plan Review (closed session)

Purpose: For Decision

- 5.1. **Redacted due to confidentiality.**

6. IPRP Review Workshop

Purpose: For Discussion

- 6.1. MOSL provided an update to the MPC on the current status of IPRPs.
- 6.2. **Redacted due to confidentiality.**
- 6.3. MOSL discussed the difficulties of counting who was on and who was off an IPRP as Trading Parties finish performing against their plan but may not be formally de-escalated until further information was acquired or a decision was made.
- 6.4. MOSL presented a case study where a Trading Party was performing poorly but performance had improved and discussed how MOSL would engage in talks with Trading Parties to find out the extent of the performance issues.
- 6.5. MOSL proceeded to introduce the IPRP Review Workshop and split the room into three groups:
- 6.5.1. Group 1: Criteria and Behaviours



6.5.2. Group 2: Process

6.5.3. Group 3: Principles, Impact and Reporting

- 6.6. The Chair asked the MPC to consider the higher level of question of what IPRPs were intended to achieve.
- 6.7. One MPC member stated that the process was used to get Trading Parties back on track and to identify market issues. Another member stated that it was about identifying issues early and improving customer experience. It was raised that it was for a specific performance issue for a specific Trading Party. The process should not be used on market issues and should be used to ensure Trading Parties fix performance issues but relies on the Market Performance Framework to be robust, work well and encourage improvements.
- 6.8. An Ofwat member added that it should be for substantial and systemic issues. An MPC member agreed, saying that it was for use at an individual Trading Party level and should ensure Trading Parties are held accountable and address their performance issues.
- 6.9. MOSL echoed the need to use IPRPs sparingly for exceptional cases only.
- 6.10. An MPC member clarified that IPRPs should not be used to improve the market as a whole, but to target the worst performers. Another MPC member added that market issues or issues caused by a retailer and wholesaler co-dependency should be tackled using a different method.
- 6.11. **Group 1: Criteria and Behaviours**
- 6.12. Group 1 had unanimous agreement that the IPRP process should use a threshold as the benchmark performance, rather than the current peer-level mean value. A member representing the group stated that they believed there should be hard rules that trigger an IPRP and criteria templates should be utilised to trigger plans, allowing MOSL to use less resources during the IPRP process. A tender style scoring process could be used by MOSL to more objectively assess the initial plan. They stated the only time an IPRP should not be implemented was when the Trading Party state that they expect their performance to fall and provide a plan to MOSL to explain the cause however, if the informal plan is not completed or performance does not improve then an IPRP should be triggered. They went on to say that Trading Parties on IPRPs should report in a standard way, for example RAG reporting on their performance to MOSL every month, rather than MOSL using flags. In relation to de-escalations, they believed only plans that met their target should be allowed to come off the IPRP. If they missed the target, the performance issue should go to the MPC to sign off. For newly issued IPRPs, MOSL should have the authority to sign them off but the IPRP template that the Trading Party is required to fill out should be very defined and specific, allowing MOSL to reject new plans based on sections not filled out correctly. There should also be a rule that in exceptional cases, if MOSL feel it is more appropriate, then the MPC will be allowed to sign off plans. These templates allow Trading Parties to fill out SMART performance rectification activities (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound). Looking at the process overall, they felt that MOSL should not lead the process as much and Trading Parties should not rely on MOSL to flag poor performance. A member in the group clarified that the



template should have a scoring matrix so that the template for the IPRP checks itself and identifies when a plan is not up to standard.

- 6.13. A member of MPC stated disappointment that there was no action for Trading Parties to share their improvement techniques with other market players. With standardised solutions shared, they believed it would be fairer for parties and help improve the market. A member replied that this commercial information was not in MOSL's hands to share and was a choice to be made by the Trading Parties themselves. The member asked why a company that had gone to extensive efforts to improve their business practice would want to provide this information to their competitor. The other member stated that they felt it was in the best interest of customers as they switch between organisations. A member of Group 3 stated that their group discussed that if a performance issue was escalated then MOSL could play a part in sharing good practice across the market.
- 6.14. **Group 2: Process**
- 6.15. A member of Group 2 presented that they believed the IPRP process should start with a request sent by MOSL to the Trading Party, then the Trading Party should have 15 business days to submit a high-level plan back to MOSL. MOSL should acknowledge receipt of the plan and provide feedback within 5 business days, stating any areas where more information would need to be required. Then, a further 15 business days later, the Trading Party must submit a firm plan with root cause analysis. MOSL would then have 10 business days to accept, reject or escalate. The plan duration should be flexible depending on the context and should be between 3-12 months. The group decided that successful completion must mean that you met your target and the party would then be de-escalated without any watchlist. If the target wasn't met, then MOSL could send letters of concern. During the lifecycle of the plan the Trading Party should regularly provide two RAG (red, amber, green) statuses, one on current performance and one on forecasted performance. A red status may lead to a reiteration of the planned milestones and activities within the timeframe. The member placed an emphasis on regular progress updates using this process so that mid-plan intervention could take place and avoid the need for extensions.
- 6.16. A member from Group 1 identified Group 2's mid-plan reiterations or reforecasting of milestones was similar to Group 1's monthly reporting to MOSL in that the purpose would be to stop the extensions of plans. The member from Group 2 agreed that this was the intention and agreed that a robust template for IPRPs was required.
- 6.17. A member from MOSL asked the room how they felt about a flexible timeframe decided on a contextual basis. They asked if the ability to specify the length of a plan would help stop repeated extensions. A member responded that the Trading Party could suggest how long they would need to be on a plan for, but MOSL should have the final say.
- 6.18. The Chair asked if the submission of an extended plan should automatically come to the MPC. Group 1 clarified that their group implied that by definition this would be the case because any missed targets would have to be signed off by the MPC.



- 6.19. A member asked if both groups were thinking of IPRPs in the context of individual MPF standards per performance issue, which both groups confirmed.
- 6.20. **Group 3: Principles, Impact and Reporting**
- 6.21. A member of Group 3 stated that their group had come to a different conclusion to the other two. They felt that IPRPs should be replaced with one large watchlist. Group 3 felt that IPRPs were solely the Trading Party's responsibility. The room responded that there was no disagreement to that, but the member of Group 3 stated that Group 3 wanted even less intervention from MOSL than the previous two groups had suggested and that the TP is solely responsible for fixing performance, not MOSL. They went on to say that IPRPs and PRPs (or their replacement) should be solely for Trading Party specific issues and not market-wide issues. However, at the PRP stage, control should be delegated to higher powers like MOSL and MPC as this highlights a stage where MOSL and the MPC have lost confidence in a Trading Party's ability to remedy their own problems. For the IPRP or its replacement, the representative stated that they believed the Trading Party should flag that there is a performance issue to MOSL and then provide some information about how they will be rectifying the issue. The PRP or escalated level will function as it does now. A template for plans would be provided but MOSL would not score or reject this plan. Group 3 then stated that potentially a Trading Party on a PRP should pay the costs of running PRPs back to MOSL. The Group specified that the MPF must be robust. Group 3 also reiterated an aim to reduce reliance on MOSL to allow the company to focus resources elsewhere, and clarified that they agreed that PRPs should be made public but less so for IPRPs.
- 6.22. **Full room discussion**
- 6.23. A member of MPC stated that if IPRPs were weakened or diminished then they would potentially become irrelevant and could be avoided by taking performance issues to a more formal level when necessary.
- 6.24. Another MPC member stated that these new IPRPs will take place after improvements are made to the Market Performance Framework as part of the MPF Roadmap.
- 6.25. Two groups agreed that resubmissions should not be accepted and a performance issue in that position should be escalated to a PRP. A member of the MPC disagreed and stated that Trading Parties need to be flexible and able to provide the confidence to MOSL or MPC that performance will improve.
- 6.26. One member stated that reporting every month against a set criteria would help Trading Parties identify and address issues quicker.
- 6.27. A MOSL representative summed up the session, stating that he heard three key themes: a need to get it right first time, a standardised template for IPRPs and frequent monthly reporting to prevent surprises further down the line, and less reliance on MOSL. They also raised that it seemed like the room felt a need for gravity behind IPRPs, and multiple chances should be replaced with escalations.
- 6.28. A member of the MPC added that Trading Parties should have a clear understanding of their obligations that they should provide information to MOSL each month if they were on an IPRP, and this should be submitted using a standard document.



- 6.29. A member added that Trading Party ownership and accountability over performance issues was a key theme they picked up from the workshop. Several other members agreed.
- 6.30. The Chair asked the committee if a best practice or guidance document specifying obligations, timeframes and consequences, along with standardised documents, would be useful to be produced at the end of the IPRP review. The MPC agreed.
- 6.31. A member warned the MPC that April, May and June performance will look odd as a result of the Priority Changes, subject to decision by the Authority, and IPRPs should be treated separately.
- 6.32. MOSL discussed the AMPR and the IPRP Review. They stated that the AMPR will be produced on the 17th April and that the document must past through MPC and Panel first.
- 6.33. The Chair asked if the AMPR and the IPRP Review are separate. The Chair went on to ask if there was scope to produce the IPRP Review as a separate document. MOSL clarified that doing the review as part of the AMPR will help set up the future changes. The Chair expressed concerns that the IPRP Review could be overlooked if presented as part of the AMPR. MOSL clarified that doing the IPRP Review separately would be appropriate and it would have its own timeline. Today's session would be captured by MOSL and brought back to MPC in the future.

ACTION: MOSL to provide an update on where they are in creating a plan on how to deliver the IPRP process review at the next MPC.

A35_11

7. MPF Roadmap Update

Purpose: For Information

- 7.1. MOSL provided a quick update on the MPF Roadmap.
- 7.2. MOSL specified that the underlying projects of MPOP, as captured in the AMPR, will run in line with the aims of the MPF Roadmap.
- 7.3. MOSL clarified that the MPF Roadmap is not yet published but is due to be made available very soon, potentially in March.
- 7.4. MOSL clarified that the next MPOP projects will not significantly change the MPF Roadmap.
- 7.5. MOSL clarified that MPOP will be a tactical 12-month plan that's targeted to achieve the goals of the MPF roadmap.

8. AMPR/MPOP Discussion

Purpose: For Discussion

- 8.1. MOSL summarised the paper submitted to the MPC on the AMPR.
- 8.2. MOSL presented the key elements of the AMPR and asked the MPC if they felt any important market milestones (for example, changes to MPS 15 charges) were not included, then they should inform MOSL.



8.3. The key elements, in no particular order, were:

Introductions,

Financial Breakdown,

Market Performance:

2019/2020 Business Plan,

MPS Performance,

Removal of MPS 15 charges,

OPS Performance, Introduction of League Tables, Introduction of KPIs, APIs, Charts and IPRPs,

IPRP Review,

Market Entry Review and the Isles of Scilly),

Settlement,

MPOP 2019/2020 Programmes A, B, C and D and Priority Changes,

MPOP 2020/2021 Programmes A, B, C and D.

8.4. Referencing MPOP Programme D, MOSL stated it would be a critical piece of work that underpins the work in Programmes A, B and C.

8.5. MOSL clarified they would also include a section on CC Water customer complaints, and that MOSL's own performance would be in the AMPR as a key element. They stated that reporting on their own performance was a key requirement of the AMPR.

8.6. A member suggested a section on the Market Audit should also be included and MOSL agreed to include a reflection on the Market Audit.

8.7. A member suggested that a section on the Market Audit of the OPS standards should be included alongside the OPS section.

8.8. The Chair sought confirmation that MOSL had reached out to MR and CY regarding their previous commitment to feed into the AMPR. MOSL responded that they had not organised this yet but it was a high priority. The Chair stressed the importance of doing this as soon as possible.

8.9. The Chair asked when the AMPR will go to the Board. MOSL specified the 18th of March. The Chair stated that CY and MR will represent the AMPR to the Board and that a session with MOSL should be held before the Board date to decide key messages.

ACTION: ML, CY and MR to hold a meeting before the 18th of March to decide the key messages of the AMPR.

A35_12



- 8.10. The Chair asked if the AMPR document would go to Panel. MOSL clarified that the MPC would sign off the document and see it 5 business days before April 1st (MPC Meeting 36). The Panel do not sign it off but can provide input.

9. MPC Planning Session

Purpose: For Discussion

- 9.1. MOSL presented a summary of the requirements of the MPC to support the MPF Roadmap. This defined the timeframes, the number of people required and the predicted commitment needed for each project.
- 9.2. The Chair asked MOSL to clarify which MPC members were part of which project.
- 9.2.1. IPRP Review: JV and TN.
 - 9.2.2. AMPR: CY and MR.
 - 9.2.3. MPF Q1 Measures: No volunteers yet.
 - 9.2.4. Bilaterals: - MOSL stated this may not require MPC input as it already had a large Trading Party presence and went on to say that keeping the MPC well-briefed would be sufficient.
 - 9.2.5. RMEX: GL, Retailer volunteer needed. MPC Alternate MB said they would ask if the MPC member MB would be interested.
 - 9.2.6. MPOP A: TN volunteered.
 - 9.2.7. MPOP B: WM volunteered.
 - 9.2.8. MPOP 2020/2021: DM, TN and JW volunteered.
 - 9.2.9. CPM0018 (reallocation / market improvement fund): No volunteers yet.
- 9.3. MOSL clarified that the MPOP A and MPOP B requirement was a higher level compared to other pieces of work around MPOP, identifying the new direction of MPOP A and MPOP B amongst other things.
- 9.4. MOSL also clarified that they are not requesting the MPC member to lead and take ownership of the pieces of work above, but to follow the work and report it back to the MPC.
- 9.5. An MPC member clarified that the initial phase of RMEX would be the most intensive part and that would last until May/June 2020 time.
- 9.6. The Chair stated it would be good to reproduce the project table with the names of the MPC members who are assigned to each project for a working record but also to highlight any gaps.

ACTION: MOSL to add the names of MPC members to the crib sheet for the sub-groups.

A35_13



- 9.7. The Chair stated that a longer piece on MPOP will be covered at MPC next month and that CC Water will also be presenting in an agenda slot.

10. Any Other Business

Purpose: For Discussion

- 10.1. A member raised that he felt there was potentially an emerging issue with MPS 18. They voiced concerns that MPS 18 might not be correctly reported when a customer switched to a Trading Party because the Registration Start Date was not always being used to restart the clock for MPS 18 time parameters and instead the Initiating Start Date (the meter read taken by the previous retailer) was being used instead. MOSL and a member of the MPC both raised that there were sometimes a few discrepancies in MOSLs calculations elsewhere. The member who raised the issue stressed the importance of making sure MOSL report correctly. A MOSL representative suggested that MOSL's Chief Architect could be given an extra 20 minutes to talk about this issue next month and The Chair said that this would be considered when creating the agenda. The member who raised the issue clarified that this was an emerging issue rather than a confirmed issue. A member of MPC raised that MOSL should investigate and then inform the entire industry, to which MOSL agreed and stated that this was what they had already planned to do.

ACTION: MOSL to investigate MPS 18 and potentially MPS 19 using Initiating Start Dates instead of Registration Start Dates to calculate failures and therefore impacting performance.

A35_14

- 10.2. **Redacted due to confidentiality.**

- 10.3. MOSL raised Automated Meter Reads (AMR), stating that they believed it was likely that Wholesalers had AMR reads but Retailers did not have access to the reads. MOSL asked if AMR should be included in reporting MPS 18 and MPS 19 performance when the AMR reads would inflate performance scores. MOSL reminded the MPC that MOSL are doing a review of meter reading already, but they will come back to MPC to discuss this issue. A member of MPC stated that they believed Wholesalers must share data to Retailers within 5 days, and they would appreciate if MOSL found the exact information in the Market Codes and presented it along with a quick explanation of "AMR" and "AMI".

ACTION: MOSL to confirm whether any change in the reporting fell into the scope of the MPF Roadmap piece.

A35_15

- 10.4. MOSL clarified that the Market Codes state that the MPC give expert input into the AMPR and that the Panel have delegated all AMPR work to the MPC. MOSL stated this information is from CSD0002 and MAC.
- 10.5. A member of MPC asked whether any decisions had been made in relation to the enduring Chair issue. The Chair stated that they would still be present in March and on the 1st of April (MPC Meeting 36) but could not give a view beyond that. MOSL clarified that the process to assign a new Chair had started.



10.6. MOSL asked that the MPC review the RWG Group questions before the next MPC, where the MPC will have to agree those questions. MOSL asked that the questions are circulated. A member of MPC clarified that the RWG have agreed the questions and they would be circulated to allow MPC members to review them at least 2 weeks before the next MPC meeting.

11. New Actions

A35_01 MOSL to investigate the justification behind removing G4 standards from reporting, and to consult the codes for clarification about removing the OPS standards.

A35_02 The information presented to Panel on 25th February 2020 regarding action A31_05 (MOSL to produce a draft Project Selection and Governance Document) should be circulated to all MPC members, as well as the meeting note produced by MOSL.

A35_03 MOSL to organise a call between TN, GL, ML and the MPOP team to discuss action A32_01 further. MOSL to feed and elaborate on action A32_01 (effects of removing A Standards) into the Vacancy workstream.

A35_04 MPC to send comments on OPSWG paper to JW by Monday 2nd March for JW to reissue to the members.

A35_05 The Chair of the MPC will discuss with John Gilbert how the MPC can formally feed information and system requirements into the Bilaterals project.

A35_06 MOSL to provide an update on what the LUM MPOP working groups have been producing. MOSL to present the plans of the groups and provide insight of how their work fits into the MPOP. It was agreed that a 1-page update as part of the Standard Market Pack would be useful for information, as well as an update that includes the key deliverables and outputs of the projects.

A35_07 Redacted due to confidentiality.

A35_08 MOSL to produce and share analysis on the distribution of TP3 failures since removing the charges for MPS 15, comparing the changes after removing charges.

A35_09 MPC members to think about the best way to report and monitor performance in preparation for the next MPC. MPC members were asked to think about how MOSL and MPC should capture changes to the market, better metrics/data that MOSL could report on, including more narrative with reporting, and other general issues with reporting such as including AMR for example.

A35_10 Redacted due to confidentiality.

A35_11 MOSL to provide an update on where they are in creating a plan on how to deliver the IPRP process review at the next MPC.

A35_12 ML, CY and MR to hold a meeting before the 18th of March to decide the key messages of the AMPR.

A35_13 MOSL to add the names of MPC members to the crib sheet for the sub-groups.



A35_14 MOSL to investigate MPS 18 and potentially MPS 19 using Initiating Start Dates instead of Registration Start Dates to calculate failures and therefore impacting performance.

A35_15 MOSL to confirm whether any change in the reporting fell into the scope of the MPF Roadmap piece.

The next MPC meeting is scheduled for **1st April 2020**

Location: **Microsoft Teams Teleconference Call**