



Minutes of the Market Performance Committee Meeting 39

1st July 2020 | 10:00 – 16:00

Held at Teleconference (Microsoft Teams)

Status of the Minutes: Final Draft

MEMBERS PRESENT

John Gilbert	JG	Interim Chair	Wendy Monk	WM	Retailer Committee Member
John Vinson	JV	Independent Supporting Member	Jesse Wright	JW	Wholesaler Committee Member
Pamela Taylor	PT	Independent Supporting Member	Mike Rathbone	MR	Wholesaler Committee Member
Trevor Nelson	TN	Retailer Committee Member	Don Maher	DM	Wholesaler Committee Member
Claire Yeates	CY	Retailer Committee Member	Gerard Lyden	GL	Wholesaler Committee Member

OTHER ATTENDEES

Darren Hayes	DH	Ofwat Presenter	Adam Boyns	AB	CCW Representative
Steve Arthur	SA	MOSL Presenter	Markus Lloyd	ML	MOSL Presenter
Samantha Webb	SW	MOSL Presenter	Lisa Connell	LC	MOSL Presenter
Matt Labrum	ML	MOSL Representative	Luke Austin	LA	MOSL Presenter
George Kelly	GK	MOSL Presenter	Pam Nash	PN	MOSL Representative
Liz D’Arcy	LD	MOSL Presenter	Milo Halford	MH	MOSL Representative
Fabrizio Zamburlin	FZ	MOSL Representative	Alexandra Piper	AP	MPC Secretary
Adam Richardson	AR	Observer, MOSL	Nick Butt	NB	Observer, Conservaqua
Michelle Burns	MB	Trading Party Representative	Michele Marshall	MM	Trading Party Representative



Jill Thorpe	JT	Trading Party Representative			
-------------	----	------------------------------	--	--	--

APOLOGIES

--	--	--	--	--	--

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.
- 1.2. Matt Labrum introduced himself as MOSL’s new Market Performance Operating Plan Lead for Workstream A. Adam Richardson, MOSL’s Market Design Director, introduced himself stating that the secretariat service that MOSL provided was being updated and they were observing the meeting to see how it flows before introducing the new secretariat services. MOSL introduced Nick Butt who was linked to Conservaqua as a new un-associated Retailer. The Chair reminded all participants that two closed sessions were taking part today and all observers must leave the call during those sessions.
- 1.3. The new Chair of MPC invited feedback on their role from MPC members and gave an overview of how to raise questions appropriately.
- 1.4. The Chair gave the MPC an update from Panel. The first item was the proposed change to remove the requirement of the MPC to have two un-associated and two associated Retailers as members. Four Retailers would still be part of the MPC. This change was approved by the Panel. The second item was the appointment of a fourth Retailer member of the MPC. The Panel appointed Andrew Smith from Castle Water to join the MPC, starting from MPC 40.
- 1.5. A member asked if MOSL would take an action to give the newest member of MPC an onboarding experience to ensure they were aware of the latest activities of the MPC. The Chair stated that they believed a meeting was already set up but if not then this would be implemented. Matt Labrum also expressed an interest in having an onboarding experience.

ACTION: MOSL to provide an onboarding meeting for the latest member of MPC and Matt Labrum.

A39_01

2. Minutes and Outstanding Actions

Purpose: For Decision

- 2.1. MOSL presented the outstanding actions.



- 2.2. Actions to be closed: A32_01, A35_03, A35_05, A36_08, A37_01, A37_03, A37_04, A37_05, A37_06, A37_07, A38_01, A38_02, A38_03, A38_04 and A38_06.
- 2.3. MOSL asked if there were any questions from the MPC on the closed actions.
- 2.4. Regarding A36_08, an independent member stated the action was to introduce an API whereas the update provided stated that it would be considered in the consultation rather than introduced. MOSL agreed that there was a risk the action could be lost and the wording should be changed. MOSL stated that they would reopen the action.
- 2.5. Regarding 35_05, a member provided an update stating that the MPC members involved had presented to the OAG and there would potentially be a following action on a future OPS system linked with the new bilaterals system. MOSL agreed to update the comments and re-open the action. The Chair confirmed that regular updates on bilaterals and the inclusion of OPS when discussing bilaterals could be provided to MPC given their work on bilaterals. The next update could be provided as soon as next month. It was noted that the new Chair was also leading the bilateral programme and would ensure MPC requirements were recognised in the programme.
- 2.6. Regarding 38_04, a member requested to keep the action open until the end of the meeting to ensure that the MPC were happy with the content provided in today's meeting. MOSL agreed.
- 2.7. Regarding 38_01, an independent member requested a more detailed update. MOSL stated that they had reached out to the Trading Party on their use of the COVID vacancy flag, but they would reopen the action and come back with a more in-depth update on the action.
- 2.8. An independent member asked how the Trading Parties were chosen for the PwC audit. MOSL stated that they had chosen Trading Parties based on the outlying data. PwC had received the data last week and the audit would start with a meeting on 2nd June 2020. The member asked if the compliance statements lead MOSL to add any other Trading Party to the audit. MOSL stated that they had not, and the compliance statements would match up with the outlying data.
- 2.9. MOSL provided an update on the Actions still open:
- 2.10. A34_14 – MOSL to email MPC ahead of the next meeting. The paper would be part of July's MPC.
- 2.11. A36_01 – MOSL and PwC were working together to audit the impact of COVID on the market, particularly the use of vacancy flags, with a goal completion date in July 2020.
- 2.12. A37_02 – The switching data would be included in the COVID update.
- 2.13. A37_08 – A change proposal was still required to change the wording in Code to ensure compliance.
- 2.14. A37_09 – A change proposal was still required to correct the wording of CPM0018, affecting the redistribution of charges.
- 2.15. A38_05 – MOSL to send invites to MPF Roadmap meetings.



- 2.16. A37_02 – An independent member stated that the comment referenced new data on switching but this data could not be found. MOSL clarified that the data only became available this week but that the information provided to MPC had been updated this morning and would be presented in today's meeting.
- 2.17. MOSL confirmed that all comments on the minutes from MPS 38 had been incorporated into the final version that was shared with the MPC on Paper Day. The MPC signed off the minutes without further changes.

3. Ofwat Update

Purpose: For Information

- 3.1. An Ofwat representative provided an update on Ofwat's activities in the past month. Ofwat had issued a consultation and decided that Trading Parties could continue to use the COVID vacancy flag until the end of July. Ofwat will hold another consultation in July to discuss several market issues including whether the measures to address liquidity challenges and bad debt should be extended (suggesting Autumn for the potential extension on bad debt measures), the unwinding process of the deferral of payments, whether the use of the COVID vacancy flag should be extended, and the timings around reinstating MPS and OPS charges.
- 3.2. The Ofwat representative stated that Ofwat were considering stopping the use of the COVID vacancy flag at the end of July but will ask the market how long the flag should be kept for as part of the consultation. The representative stated that Ofwat were very aware of local lockdowns and want to consult whether the Market Code can adapt to these geographical challenges.
- 3.3. The representative stated that the consultation would be published on July 9th and allow one week for responses, ending at 5pm on 16th July 2020. The final decisions would be issued by Ofwat on 30th July 2020.
- 3.4. A member of MPC asked if Ofwat would issue any code changes in relation to the recovery of usage during the period of COVID vacancies. The representative stated that Ofwat were considering whether code changes were necessary for this and it would be captured in the consultation.
- 3.5. The Chair asked if the final decisions would contain the timescales for any planned activities such as unwinding the deferral of payments. The representative confirmed that timescales would be included.
- 3.6. A MOSL representative stated that some Trading Parties had raised concerns about local lockdowns during the COVID pandemic. They asked if MOSL should still recommend that Trading Parties use the COVID vacancy flag until the end of July. The Ofwat representative confirmed that Trading Parties could continue to use the flag up until this point for now, and that July's consultation would consider if the codes can accommodate for local lockdowns.
- 3.7. The Chair thanked Ofwat and encouraged all Trading Parties to give feedback during the consultation. The Ofwat representative expressed how dynamic the changing landscape was, and Ofwat would continue to take this on board.

4. CCW Update

Purpose: For Information

- 4.1. A CCW representative updated the MPC on customer complaints for Quarter 1 2020.
- 4.2. For June 2020, there were 180 customer complaints for the non-household market which was a 60% increase from May 2020 and 40% lower compared to June 2019.
- 4.3. Provisional figures for Q1 2020 showed a 45% decrease in complaints compared to Q4 2019, and a 55% decrease from Q1 2019. However, the representative acknowledged that the contact numbers during Q1 2020 were around 50% lower compared to the same time last year. This followed an ongoing decrease in contact numbers but the representative felt confident that the lower contact numbers were influenced by COVID after experiencing a substantial decrease in numbers. Therefore, the decrease in the number of complaints was likely impacted by COVID.
- 4.4. The representative stated that there were an additional four complaints relating to COVID during June. Two of these related to shared supply premises not being turned to vacant. The other two were for customers being billed despite having a vacant premise.
- 4.5. The representative said that CCW would ensure their internal message was clear and always updated regarding the criteria for vacant premises, what customers should expect from billing when they were marked as vacant, and the potential evidence required to prove vacancy status. CCW were also keen to work with Trading Parties to ensure the messages that they share regarding vacancy were consistent and clear. CCW have shared their key principles on what should be contained in the guidance distributed by Trading Parties.
- 4.6. The Chair asked the MPC if they would like to see the key principles from CCW. Several members expressed an interest in seeing CCW's key principles.
- 4.7. The CCW representative clarified that their key principles document was not linked with PwC audit. They also clarified that CCW had very few COVID-related complaints and even fewer complaints from customers stating they were being billed when vacant. CCW had no indication that these complaints were relating to a particular Retailer but stated the difficulties in gaining robust insight when the number of complaints was so low. An independent member requested that CCW obtain as much detail as possible on COVID complaints to help the committee analyse any potential issues.
- 4.8. A member of the MPC told the CCW representative that OPS data suggested that complaints from Retailers to Wholesalers had reduced by circa 40% across the market between January and April 2020.
- 4.9. The CCW representative confirmed that CCW's pilot phase of their Testing the Waters research took place. They plan to assess whether they should proceed with full research piece in the future, given fewer numbers of customers contacting CCW due to the ongoing pandemic.
- 4.10. The Chair asked if there were any Trading Parties who were exceptional when informing customers and could be used as a good example to the market. The representative stated that CCW have noticed good and informative messaging from Trading Parties to customers regarding customers marked as vacant

due to the pandemic. They also noted that larger incumbent Retailers have been extremely helpful and provided clear messaging on their websites for their customers.

- 4.11. A member of MPC asked if CCW's updates were too largely focused on the negative news such as complaint figures, rather than the positive news such as clear messaging. They asked that the updates given to MPC should be more balanced. CCW agreed to share more information on positive trends in the market with the MPC in the future.
- 4.12. Regarding the Testing the Waters research, MOSL suggested that CCW could try working with wider customer representing groups within the utilities sector. CCW confirmed they were keen to work with wider groups and already had plans to communicate with these organisations to find further insight.
- 4.13. A member of MPC requested that CCW share with MOSL how successful the contact rate was for the pilot of Testing the Waters as it may provide insight on the COVID impacts on business and vacancy levels.. An independent member also requested more information on what CCW were researching.
- 4.14. The Chair and CCW agreed that a longer slot next month should be provided.

ACTION: CCW to have a longer slot at the next MPC to update on the success of their "Testing the Waters" pilot and their research so far.

A39_02

- 4.15. The Chair requested only MPC members, independents and MOSL representatives stay on the call in preparation for the next session. The Chair confirmed CCW and Ofwat representatives could remain on the call.

5. Water Plus PRP Mid-Point Presentation and Questions from MPC (Closed Session)

6. Post Water Plus MPC Discussion (Closed Session)

Purpose: For Discussion

Purpose: For Information

- 7.1. MOSL provided an update on MPOP 2020/2021. The consultation had been completed and the final Market Performance Operation Plan (MPOP) for 2020/2021 was published on 30th June 2020. MOSL thanked the MPC for their input and insight.
- 7.2. MOSL confirmed all resources were now allocated and Matt Labrum would be the Project Lead for Workstream A.
- 7.3. MOSL stated they would develop monthly reporting for MPC, with each MPOP workstream having separate updates including their key deadlines. The purpose would be to give the MPC confidence that MPOP goals were being met and to communicate the requirements of the MPC to ensure MPOP progresses.

- 7.4. MOSL reported that for June and July, the largest focus of MPOP would be on COVID monitoring and intervention, as well as the Pairing Improvement Plans. MOSL gave a high-level update on what they would be working on in July which covered all Workstreams (A, B and C).
- 7.5. A member of the MPC had a question regarding MOSL's statement that there might be a better solution instead of the Code change for vacancy occupancy verification as part of Workstream A. They asked if the solution would consider Retailer-to-Retailer challenges as well as Wholesaler-to-Retailer challenges. MOSL stated the better solution would consider challenges in both relationships and may be incorporated as part of Bilaterals rather than using Code changes however MOSL were still in discussions around the solution and this has not yet been confirmed.
- 7.6. A member of the MPC stated that a lot of the MPOP activities overlap with the RWG. MOSL clarified that several members of MOSL visit the RWG and they were keen to discuss with the RWG and get them more involved with MPOP this year.
- 7.7. The Chair thanked MOSL for the clear presentation of timelines and clarified that no decisions were needed from the MPC yet.

7. Long Unread Meters Paired Improvement Plan Approach

Purpose: For Decision

- 8.1. MOSL recapped the activities undertaken as part of MPOP last year, stating that there was a consistent decrease in LUMs last year and also increased collaboration within the market. They stated that before the introduction of the COVID vacancy flag, the reduction in vacant premises was small and this was partially due to the intricacies in unravelling the root causes of vacancy.
- 8.2. With regards to LUMs, this year MOSL plan to prioritise the LUMs that have the largest market impact by meter size and consumption first.
- 8.3. When reducing the number of vacant premises, MOSL plan to target vacancies with consumption first however they recognised the difficulty when working on vacancies as the market recovers from the effects of COVID.
- 8.4. An MPC member referenced vacant premises with consumption, stating that there may be difficulties understanding how many vacant premises were recording consumption because there were no incentives to get meter reads for vacant properties. MOSL agreed and stated that their current data on this was small but does show vacant premises with consumption and these would be the first premises targeted. The member suggested that there should be a focus on creating an incentive to get meter reads for vacant properties. MOSL stated that they would look at introducing targets to tackle vacancies and tools that create incentives could be introduced at that point in the future.
- 8.5. An MPC member stated that they were heavily supportive of the PIPs but that the instigation and involvement in the plans was not as effective as it could have been last year. The member asked that the messaging around the PIPs and the benefits they provide should be clearly defined and communicated



to Trading Parties this year, otherwise the PIPs might not give MOSL and the MPC the benefits they hoped for. MOSL agreed and stated they would take this onboard when they re-launch the PIPs.

- 8.6. MOSL confirmed that Trading Parties on PIPs would be held to account if they commit to certain actions in certain timeframes. A member of the MPC raised that PIPs should not be confused with IPRPs, otherwise the PIPs would lack ambition if Trading Parties believed there was a threat of escalation for not meeting targets.
- 8.7. MOSL specified the success criteria for PIPs and identified the next steps, which included working with the MPC subgroup to agree the final PIP template.
- 8.8. A member of the MPC asked if the PIPs could monitor progress against the market targets any sooner than the current planned start date of October 2020. MOSL stated that they want to understand the impact of COVID on the market first and that the market targets would be unreachable if they were used to measure progress too early when COVID was still impacting Trading Parties. MOSL also stated that the targets needed to be sensible to encourage real improvement as last year some intangible targets resulted in plans that were too ambitious and unachievable, therefore MOSL felt that measuring against the market targets shouldn't be brought forward.
- 8.9. The Chair summed up discussions around the room, stating that any acceleration of the PIPs would be appreciated by MPC however the need for focused targets that drive improvement was also very important.
- 8.10. MOSL asked the MPC to approve the approach of the PIPs outlined in section 3.1 of the paper submitted to MPC, and the success criteria of the PIPs outlined in section 3.3. of the paper.
- 8.11. The Chair asked members to vote on section 3.1. All seven members voted in favour and therefore approved the approach of the PIPs.
- 8.12. The Chair asked members to vote on section 3.3. Six members voted in favour and therefore approved the success criteria of the PIPs.

8. Removal of Private Meters from MPS Standards (Proposed Change)

Purpose: For Decision

- 9.1. MOSL stated that a proposed change would remove private meters from the MPS standards.
- 9.2. For MPS 9, MOSL highlighted that the standard could either be removed entirely, or the charges for MPS 9 could be set to zero and this would still require Trading Parties to submit reads.
- 9.3. For MPS 10, 11 and 15, MOSL presented the wording changes required to CSD 0002 which generally involved the removal of words specifying "Private Water".
- 9.4. An independent raised that for MPS 15, the proposed wording needs to reflect that "Private Trade Effluent" was referring to the trade effluent meter, not trade effluence itself.



- 9.5. MOSL discussed that this will be raised as a separate change proposal rather than as part of the MPF Roadmap. An MPC member raised that MOSL should capture the importance and purpose of this change within the MPF Roadmap.
- 9.6. A member of the MPC stated that they were not supportive of the change because private water and private trade effluent meter reads were important reads needed in the market. They stated that meter reading was still the responsibility of the Retailer. They argued that the proposed change would remove incentives to get these reads in the market and this would prevent accurate billing. The member argued that for private trade effluent meters specifically, the Trading Parties may have full control of the meter.
- 9.7. MOSL clarified that, for MPS 9, setting the charges to zero would retain the obligation to take the read and also prevent charging where Trading Parties did not have full control over the meter. MOSL stated that for MPS 10 and 11, the wholesalers were still obligated to submit all meter reads. With regards to MPS 15, the changes would obligate Retailers to insert private water and private trade effluent meter reads in most cases except where defined in the code change.
- 9.8. The Chair asked if any comments were raised on the paper. The Chair recognised that an independent member had asked several questions on the document and asked MPC if they would prefer to make a decision on the change at a later date. Three MPC members agreed verbally and via the teleconference chat that seeing the consultation on the change would be beneficial to the MPC.
- 9.9. The Chair requested MPC members ask questions on the document on SharePoint as soon as possible and asked the presenters to come back next month when the MPC would decide on the change. The presenter requested all comments should be submitted on the document within the next week. The Chair agreed that this was reasonable.

ACTION: MPC to add comments to the change proposal paper within the next week (by close of business 8/7/20). GK from MOSL to then come back to the MPC to re-present the change.

A39_05

9. COVID Impacts, Market Impacts, Vacancy Audit and Performance Impact

Purpose: For Information and Discussion

- 10.1. MOSL raised that the slides had been shortened due to the time constraint, but the full slides had already been made available to the members of MPC.
- 10.2. MOSL reported that as of June 15th, vacant premises in the market had stabilised at 34.7% which was a 17.8% increase since March 17th. MOSL reported that in the past two weeks, there had been a small decrease in the number of vacant premises.
- 10.3. MOSL reported that 23.8% of meters that had a reduction in their YVE since the 16th March were associated with a premise that had also been switched to vacant.
- 10.4. MOSL also reported that meter reads had increased by 25% between April and May 2020.



- 10.5. With regards to consumption, MOSL stated 7.7k meters were marked with the COVID vacancy flag and had received 2 reads since the 17th of March. Around 2,000 of these showed consumption that was more than 5% of their previous pre-COVID consumption.
- 10.6. A member of the MPC commented that MOSL were very focused on the monitoring of consumption for meters marked with the COVID vacancy flag. They expressed concern that other areas may require more attention rather than meters reporting consumption greater than 5% of their pre-COVID rate. The MPC member raised that it would be difficult to know when the consumption took place, particularly in the future as meters stop using the COVID vacancy flag. The member raised that MOSL were reporting a very negative outlook on the market and placed blame on Retailers when the issue was more complex, and there were difficulties for Retailers estimating when the consumption took place. The member believed that MOSL should report and focus on larger market issues.

ACTION: MOSL to see if it is possible to look at consumption against non-vacant sites, investigating if this is less than the YVEs and if this gives any further market insight.

A39_06

- 10.7. An Ofwat representative noted the low use of the vacancy flag in a particular region. MOSL identified two Retailers had much lower use of the vacancy flag but they were working with these Trading Parties to understand the reasons for this. MOSL also raised that both Trading Parties identified would be part of the audit. MOSL shared that one of the Trading Parties was particularly cautious on their use of the flag.
- 10.8. A CCW representative stated that it would be useful to know how far over the 5% consumption limit these premises were. An MPC member stated that the majority of their Trading Party's premises marked as vacant appeared to be closed but were using around a third of their normal consumption. They raised an example that golf courses had higher rates of consumption compared to normal due to the dry weather, despite being closed due to the pandemic.
- 10.9. An MPC member raised that a problem had previously been flagged to MOSL to investigate, where if a Retailer inserts two meter reads when the property was marked as vacant then that period of consumption cannot be charged for. MOSL clarified that this only applied if Wholesalers did not charge for vacant consumption.
- 10.10. The room discussed that the unravelling of the vacancy flag needed to be considered carefully to prevent large increases in bills for some customers and a loss of revenue for some wholesalers. A member asked for greater visibility on the impacts. MOSL asked the Wholesaler members of the Committee for more visibility on their approach using the vacancy flag and requested they raise any areas of concern or reassure the MPC. A member of the MPC suggested that a request for vacancy data from all wholesalers should be issued.



- 10.11. The MPC discussed the use of the vacancy flag for certain customers and the appropriateness of the vacancy flag. The Chair summarised, stating that MOSL would like more detailed information from Trading Parties and their approach on using the flag, and also that there was a suggestion that MOSL should ask all Trading Parties, taking care when selecting the appropriate questions to extract data that would give MOSL an insight on the use of the vacancy flag.
- 10.12. MOSL presented the market switching figures up to May 2020. Pre-COVID, there was a small decrease in switching rates. MOSL reported that switching was around 6-11k per month but post-March there had only been around 2k switches per month. MOSL recognised there were only 3 main Retailers taking part in switching.
- 10.13. MOSL presented data on which customer sectors were using the COVID vacancy flag. Trying to gather this data lead MOSL to realise that the customer segmentation data in CMOS was not consistent and unable to be used. MOSL have since started using the customer name and address data to find out the industry of the customer using other databases such as using Standard Industry Classification (SIC) Codes. MOSL stated that 68% of water SPIDs had now been matched to a customer segmentation type. MOSL clarified they were still developing this dataset on customer segmentation and were reaching out to Trading Parties with high levels of customer segmentation data to compare MOSL's dataset with the Trading Parties' dataset. An independent member questioned the level of confidence in MOSL's data compared to the Retailers' own datasets.
- 10.14. An MPC member asked if SIC codes would be used to unwind the vacancy flag. Another MPC member stated that their Trading Party had used SIC codes to mark premises as vacant and were using the same methodology with government guidelines to remove the COVID vacancy flag. They stated that they wrote to the customers who were allowed to reopen stating that the vacancy flag would be removed within two weeks unless the customer provided reason and evidence that they were not reopening.
- 10.15. MOSL asked for approval that they are undertaking a good approach to unwind vacancy.
- 10.16. MOSL clarified that the SharePoint slides were the most recent and updated version of information. MOSL also clarified that the detailed slide on YVEs had been removed due to the time constraints.
- 10.17. The Chair raised that COVID reporting covers many topics. The slide pack that went out to MPC members was substantial and the MPC should share any thoughts on the slide pack with MOSL prior to the meeting in future. An independent member raised that the slide packs should contain more insightful commentary on market trends or key market issues as this would help the MPC structure their questions.

ACTION: The Chair, LD and SA to discuss how to include more insight in the COVID-19 reporting section. This should take into account comments that the packs MOSL provide could contain more insightful commentary on market trends or key market issues.

A39_07

10. MPC Workplanning Session

Purpose: For Discussion

- 11.1. MOSL confirmed that all subgroups had now been established and the key commitments were understood by all members involved.
- 11.2. MOSL stated there was an MPOP subgroup but questioned if this should be replaced with a total of three MPOP subgroups for each workstream.
- 11.3. MOSL presented recent subgroup activity, including the dates of their last meeting and their output, as well as the dates for the next meeting.
- 11.4. MOSL asked if there were any questions. A MOSL representative clarified the work of the MPF Roadmap subgroup, asking if the subgroup would prefer to be split into two groups to focus on two key areas (transition guidance and focusing on developing the MPF). Another MOSL representative raised that the previous guidance they had published required a larger group in order to meet tight deadlines. The first MOSL representative stated that they agreed a larger group was beneficial at that time but the transition guidance was now more general and could be better suited to a smaller subgroup. They clarified the transition guidance would come back to the MPC.
- 11.5. A MOSL representative asked the MPC subgroup members if they were happy to have additional meetings to cover the transitional guidance work and the work on the MPF each month or if they would rather split the subgroup in half due to the additional work required. A subgroup member stated that having a larger group to capture multiple viewpoints would be beneficial. Another member of the subgroup agreed that having one group covering all areas would be preferred. As there were no objections raised, the Chair summarised that one group would be the preferred option.
- 11.6. MOSL presented future subgroup activities that would take place.
- 11.7. MOSL asked if the format used today was a suitable presentation for the MPC each month to have an overview of subgroup activity. MOSL also asked if the milestones and key dates felt appropriate or if the MPC members felt that the milestones should be moved.
- 11.8. The Chair approved of the format and suggested the members of the subgroups agreed on the appropriate milestones in their respective groups. The Chair recommended the milestones should use a RAG status to quickly assess if they were on track or in danger when presenting to the MPC. The Chair invited MPC to share their views in response to MOSL's questions.
- 11.9. A member of MPC asked if the plans were different to a version of the plans shared last year. MOSL stated that this was simply a summary of the subgroup work and wanted to ensure the MPC were happy with the workload and how MOSL intended to summarise subgroup work when presenting to the MPC.
- 11.10. The Chair clarified that all slides presented to MPC should be clear on what decisions were required of MPC.



- 11.11. MOSL presented on the recent work of the MPF subgroup. MOSL stated that redundant elements of the MPF had been considered and the bilateral transactions data would provide good insight for the MPF subgroup going forwards.
- 11.12. The future activities for the subgroup would be to create a basic view on the customer journey and investigate how a framework could be incorporated into the customer journey. MOSL stated they were keen to give consideration on where the accountabilities should lie.
- 11.13. MOSL presented a brief view on the customer journey from when they enter the market and when they exit the market, highlighting areas that were most important to customers.
- 11.14. MOSL stated they would share the high-level view of the customer journey with MPC by July 3rd. MOSL plan to develop the initial proposal for the market metrics, as based on the customer journey, to be shared with the MPC at the end of July.
- 11.15. A member of MPC asked if MOSL had considered the recovery of charges. The member clarified that if charges for consumption were not recovered from a customer, then after a few years these charges would be recovered from all market customers by increasing the cost of water usage and this would negatively impact all other customers. MOSL stated that this had not been considered, suggesting the MPF subgroup should pick this up. Another MPC member supported the view that the recovery of charges should be considered as part of the customer journey.
- 11.16. The chair stated MOSL should come back with an update from the MPF subgroup next month.
- 11.17. MOSL presented on the recent work of the Metering Strategic Review. MOSL suggested that the MPC should review the slides and contact LC from MOSL directly if they had any questions.
- 11.18. MOSL briefly updated MPC stating the subgroup had defined objectives, high-level scope areas, desired outcomes, and a high-level timeline for completion. MOSL stated that the Panel had approved the work for the Metering Strategic Review on two conditions: first, the removal of “improved Trading Party profitability” as a desired outcome and secondly, the addition of “reduction in customer complaints” as a desired outcome. The MPC subgroup would meet the Panel subgroup, ultimately going back to Panel on August 25th for approval.
- 11.19. The MPC had no immediate questions but were welcomed to email MOSL.

11. Any Other Business

Purpose: For Discussion

- 12.1. The Chair stated there were three AOB items.
- 12.2. The first item related to AMR and their impact on MPS 18. The member who raised the AOB item suggested that they would hold a meeting with MOSL offline and come back to the MPC next month. MOSL agreed.



- 12.3. The second item was a request from the previous Interim Chair of the MPC who asked if the MPC members would provide feedback on their leadership as Chair.
- 12.4. Thirdly, a member of the MPC suggested that the MPC start at 9:30am while the meeting was being held online with members working from home. No members voiced an objection.
- 12.5. The Chair recommended that small five – ten minute breaks should be added to the MPC, suggesting one in the morning and one in the afternoon.
- 12.6. A member of the MPC asked if the Chair would pass on a request to the previous Interim Chair, asking that they provide feedback on how the Market Performance Committee works and if it could be improved.
- 12.7. The Chair asked if anyone in the room had any other business.
- 12.8. An independent member asked that their comments on the Monthly Performance Report be addressed for next time.
- 12.9. MOSL stated that the original date for the MPC (July 29th) will go ahead, and potentially an ad hoc Panel meeting may take place on July 28th.
- 12.10. The meeting was closed.

12. New Actions

A39_01 MOSL to provide an onboarding meeting for the latest member of MPC and Matt Labrum.

A39_02 CCW to have a longer slot at the next MPC to update on the success of their “Testing the Waters” pilot and their research so far.

A39_03 SA to give the MPC an overview of the reassurance process.

A39_04 The Chair requested that a letter be drafted to Water Plus within 24 hours of this meeting and sent to MPC members for any final changes. The letter should thank the Trading Party for presenting to the MPC but also express the MPC’s concerns on the Trading Party’s performance to date. The Chair should express the MPC’s concerns on the durability of the Trading Party’s forecasted June performance given performance to date, and for this reason the MPC would extend the monitoring of the performance issue but not the PRP itself. The Chair should communicate that if the Trading Party significantly missed its PRP milestone performance for June (87%) then the MPC would refer the performance issue to the Panel for escalation. Also, if the Trading Party missed its milestone performance for July in any sense then the MPC would refer the performance issue to the Panel for escalation. Finally, the Chair should raise that due to the significant system fixes planned for August 2020, the MPC may request that the Trading Party undertake reassurance in the future.



A39_05 MPC to add comments to the change proposal paper within the next week (by close of business 8/7/20). GK from MOSL to then come back to the MPC to re-present the change.

A39_06 MOSL to see if it is possible to look at consumption against non-vacant sites, investigating if this is less than the YVEs and if this gives any further market insight.

A39_07 The Chair, LD and SA to discuss how to include more insight in the COVID-19 reporting section. This should take into account comments that the packs MOSL provide could contain more insightful commentary on market trends or key market issues.

The next MPC meeting is scheduled for **29th July 2020**

Location: **To be held via Teleconference (Microsoft Teams)**

DRAFT