

Minutes of the Market Performance Committee Meeting 42

1 October 2020 | 9:30 – 15:30

Held via Videoconference (Microsoft Teams)

Status of the Minutes: **FINAL**

MEMBERS PRESENT

John Gilbert	JG	Interim Chair	Gerard Lyden	GL	Wholesale Committee Member
John Vinson	JV	Independent Supporting Member	Jesse Wright	JW	Wholesaler Committee Member
Andrew Smith	AS	Retailer Committee Member	Michael Rathbone	MR	Wholesaler Committee Member
Trevor Nelson	TN	Retailer Committee Member	Don Maher	DM	Wholesaler Committee Member
Claire Yeates	CY	Retailer Committee Member	Wendy Monk	WM	Retailer Committee Member

OTHER ATTENDEES

Samantha Webb	SW	MOSL Presenter	Luke Austin	LA	MOSL Presenter
Steve Arthur	SA	MOSL Presenter	Pam Nash	PN	MOSL Presenter
Alexandra Piper	AP	MOSL Presenter	Markus Lloyd	ML	MOSL Presenter
Darren Hayes	DH	Ofwat Presenter	Ethan Fleming	EF	Secretariat
Adam Boyns	AB	CCW Presenter	Janet Judge	JJ	MOSL Presenter
Bernard Bradshaw	BB	Affinity	Miles Robinson	MR	MOSL Presenter
Georgina Mills	GM	Ofwat			

APOLOGIES

Pamela Taylor	PT	Independent Supporting Member			
---------------	----	-------------------------------	--	--	--

1. Welcome and Introductions

Purpose: For Information

- 1.1. Apologies had been received from Pamela Taylor.
- 1.2. The Chair welcomed JJ to the meeting who had recently join MOSL as the Market Improvement Lead.
- 1.3. The CCW presentation had been delayed until after lunch to allow for the CCW representative to be in attendance. A member from Affinity Water would be making a presentation on best practice.

2. Minutes and Outstanding Actions

Purpose: For Approval

- 2.1. A member raised a point of process that when an action was closed via an agenda item the end of the item should include reflection on if this closed the action, rather than members raising an issue as was minuted. The MPC agreed with this approach.
- 2.2. It was noted that 8.6 should include that this only affected the dominant retailer (incumbent/transferee) in the area or retailers that have opted in to be allocated to receive new connections.
- 2.3. MOSL presented the actions to be closed namely: 40_07, 41_01, 41_03, 41_04, 41_07.
- 2.4. In relation to 41_01 the MPC asked that the presenter of each item be made clearer on future agenda items.

ACTION: 42_01

- 2.5. In regards to 41_07 it was clarified that the proposer of the action agreed on the 1st September to close the action to allow resources to be deployed elsewhere. It would be placed on the issues tab on the action log to ensure it remained highlighted for the future.

3. Ofwat Update

Purpose: For Information

- 3.1. An Ofwat representative reported in relation to the State of the Market report that 58% of eligible business customers were now aware of the Market, which was an increase on previous years, awareness was highest amongst the large user sector. Satisfaction levels were stable although complaint levels were higher than at market opening albeit less than previous years with most issues relating to customer service. The take up of water efficiency measures had increased but remained low in the market overall. An increasing number of entrants to the market were self-suppliers, other new entrants were gaining more market share and customers. The customers in the market that saw the most benefits tended to be the most active participants.
- 3.2. Ofwat were asked their view on the increasing number of self-suppliers and the benefits and risks in relation to this. An Ofwat representative reported that it was viewed that they delivered efficiency and drove innovation in some areas but they were aware that the increasing number may become an issue in the future but were not planning to follow the route taken in the Scottish market at this time.
- 3.3. A member asked the MPC to note that even customers that did not switch could benefit from competition as retailers increased efforts to retain customers. An Ofwat representative agreed with this that switching data was not the only way to measure success and Ofwat were seeking more qualitative data in the future.
- 3.4. A member asked if Ofwat were planning a marketing campaign to increase awareness of the Market. An Ofwat representative confirmed that there was nothing pending with priorities focused on other areas, but this did not preclude engaging with customer segments in the future to increase awareness.
- 3.5. The MPC noted that most of customers were likely to have had billing arrangements change since market opening and requested that MOSL undertake an analysis to determine what percentage of customers would have moved retailers as the result of the market being opened and wholesalers transferring customers to new retailers, noting that this may not indicate awareness that they had a choice.

ACTION: 42_02

- 3.6. Ofwat were asked if it was possible to see a regionalized map of awareness levels across the market.

ACTION: 42_03

- 3.7. A member asked in relation to water efficiency at what point Ofwat may intervene as often the capital costs made it difficult for TP's to justify. An Ofwat representative reported that this was a pertinent issue

across government and may need regulatory incentive, but this should be balanced against the natural innovation of the market.

- 3.8. An Ofwat representative gave a brief history of Project Rise noting that it was focused on areas of friction in the market and both good and bad practice had been identified. Key themes included varying levels of support for the Market, retailer/wholesaler interactions and the need for TP's Boards to be involved beyond assuring compliance. Collaboration was a useful tool to support markets however too many TP's were wrongly using competition law to avoid this. Wholesalers needed to be more aware of their impact on end customers, including visibility of the market and performance improvement plans at Board level. The upcoming RMeX was seen as a positive step to improving this. Ofwat remained supportive of industry led governance but this needed strengthening and Ofwat were strongly supportive of MOSL's workstream in relation to this.
- 3.9. The RWG was viewed as an important part of improving performance and had produced a lot of best practice and policies and Ofwat would be looking for all TP's to display on their websites progress to implementing RWG policies, what wasn't being adopted and why. Ofwat was engaging with the RWG governance group to strengthen the role it plays and standardise/formalise its work. Ofwat wished the RWG to look at tariffs but acknowledged this was a large piece of work and that RWG was currently largely being operated on goodwill. The increased offer from MOSL to support the RWG was very welcome.
- 3.10. A member questioned if the support for RWG was due to it being the only group already in existence or if its approach was desirable, if its governance was strengthened the benefits of collaboration may be lost. There may also be benefits in forming a new group or using the Strategic User Forum or how it worked in conjunction with the Strategic User Forum. An Ofwat representative agreed that the collaboration in RWG was an important element that they would not like to see lost, due to the number of groups already in existence there was a reluctance to form a new group.
- 3.11. The MPC discussed what it could do to support the recommendations in RISE and agreed that RmeX and BmeX would be important tools to hold wholesalers to account and broaden visibility. Good performance should be rewarded and incentive to perform well were also important. Individual TP's were creating action lists from RISE and it was agreed that the MPC should undertake a similar exercise. A strategy session for before the end of the calendar year would be organized to focus on actions from RISE, what was an action for MPC, RWG or MOSL and the priorities.

ACTION 42_04

- 3.12. The MPC noted that over 100 hours of voluntary support had been given to the Bilateral project by TP's which may not have been previously recognised.
- 3.13. An Ofwat Representative noted that it was important that the service delivery report included consideration of the end user customer. Ofwat indicated that they would continue to look at ways to greater incentivise improvements in wholesaler performance. This might include using Ofwat's annual service and delivery report to highlight performance against R-MeX and B-MeX (once the latter incentive has been developed).
- 3.14. The Ofwat representative invited comments out of committee on the format of the report, initial feedback on the format had been positive.

4. Market Performance

Purpose: Discussion

- 4.1. MOSL reported that performance against OPS was in the mid 90's which was higher than average and MPS was in the mid 80's which was comparable to pre-Covid levels. There had been a fall in the MPS in July and August which had been expected as the priority changes in the SLA relating to MPS18 had previously increased performance. Task volumes remained a better indicator of market activity with total task volumes for MPS 7% below the pre-Covid average, in April task volumes had been down 59%. Task volumes in individual categories were increasing as meters could be accessed and companies resumed business. In the OPS disconnects were low and the low task volumes were causing fluctuations in

performance. Strong performance was being shown against deferred tasks as wholesalers worked through the backlog they were previously unable to complete.

- 4.2. A member asked if deferral volumes were dropping at different rates across the country due to local lockdowns/restrictions still in place. MOSL agreed to produce this information in reference to wholesaler areas and report back.

ACTION 42_05

- 4.3. Settlement as the total amount invoiced was a useful indicator of market activity, noting it was not a measure of consumption as tariffs effected settlement. Pre-Covid settlement was £210million and in August had been £173million which represented a rise from previous months but it was felt it was unlikely to return to the pre-Covid levels as business found new ways of working, did not return to previous operational activity and people worked from home. As new restrictions had been introduced since August settlement figures may reduce for the largest consumers such as breweries and hospitality.

5. Reactivating MPS/OPS

Purpose: For Discussion

- 5.1. MOSL reported that IPRP's had previously been paused, 10 TP's had been affected by this either coming on, mid-way through or coming off them. Consideration was being given to relaunching them, if incentives such as charges were to be introduced this would require a code change in November. The IPRP's could be reintroduced in the next financial year rather than at a binary trigger, a number of issues required consideration such as new API's, incentives and code change implications.
- 5.2. A member responded that they did not support a change until MPF had resumed for some time and to not amend individual elements. If things required code changes, they should be fed into the MPF and not be done in isolation. The MPC agreed with this approach.
- 5.3. A member asked the MPC to note that this was an opportunity to relate the triggers to the MPF as currently performance was being looked at against pre-Covid levels and the new "good" required defining. Once this was done MPC could work to drive behaviours to improve performance. Prior to Covid the triggers were linked to averages and a more strategic approach should be taken relating to where the market needed to go. MOSL agreed and that for some API's the average level was not currently available and the trigger would have to be created with this putting the application before the trigger to determine what the goal was. It was agreed a holistic approach was needed.
- 5.4. The MPC noted that previously a TP on an IPRP had submitted three times and if possible something should be put in place that if a TP had to resubmit it was escalated. This could be through a gated process and if MOSL had concerns then it could be elevated higher.
- 5.5. A member asked if the work so far could be split into fundamental issues to deal with under MPF and what was required for decision to reimplement IPRP's. This should include lessons learnt from recent experiences of those on IPRP's. The IPRP subgroups members also sat on the MPF subgroup and bring the two together would assist in this work.
- 5.6. A member asked what the timeline was for reintroduction and how rather than what was being introduced. If IPRPs were retriggered in current form from November, the IPRP would be running into the next financial year. The relationship with the financial year end was always going to occur as the plan worked on a six-month timescale. If under performance was occurring now, then MOSL would not have to wait for charges to return if they wished to trigger as performance had been monitored. The IPRP's could be launched and evolved over time.
- 5.7. MOSL agreed to reconvene the sub-group and work through the options presented to define the way forward and when and how to reinstate the former IPRP's or make new changes to launch them with amendments. On current timescales it was planned to reactive them in either form in January. By the next meeting a clearer timeline would be available with an idea of changes and the risks and benefits of this and what changes fitted more broadly into the MPF.

ACTION 42_06

- 5.8. MOSL reported that a change would be presented to the Panel in October in regards to MPS18 charging exclusions. When the change was made in April to amend the failure from 40 days and costs from 160 days to move it all to 200 business days with no charging for long unread meters, it was estimated that a spike would occur in July using the last point of failure as October 2019 and adding 200 days. The spike did not occur and was expected in August but did still not occur. Upon investigation it was found that instead of the last charged point of failure that last actual point of failure should have been used this would cause the spike to occur on the 31st October. As the 31st October was a Saturday the failures would occur on the next business day which was in November. As the MPS charges were resuming in November the wording required changing from July to November and was required before the 14th December. This could impact up to 23,000 meters however to date 8,000 of these meters had been read with the worst case scenario currently at 14,000 meters with a value of £146,000. This number could be expected to decrease as more meters were read. The SLT of MOSL were content with this amendment and that it was a complicated area that couldn't have been foreseen and would not unduly effect the market.
- 5.9. A member asked if the original solution was to remove the charges for the month or the individual day. MOSL responded that in the CSD's it stated July and they would provide clarity out of committee.

ACTION 42_07

- 5.10. MOSL reported that OPS charging would resume in October with invoices issued in November, MPS would resume in November to be invoiced in December. Staggering the resuming of the charges would allow for outstanding OPS tasks to be completed in time for MPS activities the following month.
- 5.11. One member asked with the deferment of MPS18 what the impact would be on long unread. With the delay until November it was important to be aware it would be a reduced driver of MPS and if MPS18 should be delayed for November. MOSL reported that long unread meters would remain deferred from MPS18 to lessen the shock to the market with all other MPS18 charges applying.

6. Vacancy effect on MPS 18/19 Charging

Purpose: Discussion

- 6.1. A member asked how Covid vacancies could impact previous MPS18/19 standards and how the unwinding would impact this. A large number of meters would have required reading during lockdown as they would be reaching the 200-day period with most meters requiring a read post 1st August.
- 6.2. MOSL responded that the vacancy flags paused the timings on the SLA and that once turned back on the countdown would resume. The run of the MPS next month would identify those that should have failed and revise MPS figures down. If Covid flags were removed retrospectively it would depend what month they were in to cause a failure, for MPS18 a failure would only occur when the next read was due. Retailers that had been slower in removing flags could have helped there MPS18 position, but this would depend on when they were due with any reads in April, May and June delayed by 60 days. Although standards would not be reactivated until future months an understanding of this was important for league tables and understanding the Covid impact. MOSL would produce a summary table for this impact and the dates when they would occur.

ACTION 42_08

7. Covid: Audit Work

Purpose: For Discussion

- 7.1. MOSL reported that the fortnightly reports on the unwinding had been issued and demonstrated where companies had moved premises. Not as many assured vacancies as expected had been seen, due to this audit options that had been discussed would be delayed until later in the year or other approaches used. Using the framework previously approved by the MPC had given the ability to look at YVE changes which had demonstrated an increased value with a lot of movement within them. Some vacancies had not been evidenced and may not be able to be evidenced as companies had entered insolvency. The Panel audit sub-group and Covid Transition Group would continue to discuss and monitor.

- 7.2. A member asked as TP's took different approaches to unwinding what the overall impact of the Covid vacancy was from a customer perspective. It was reported that currently it was not able to determine this due to a lack of visibility in high level reports. This would change as parties increased activity and gained more information around the premises statement.
- 7.3. A member asked if those with low YVE's may still have premises that aren't occupied, and this could be another option for PWC investigation. MOSL agreed that all data could be looked at and PWC directed as appropriate. There were known issues with deregistered SPID's that would never be able to be actioned as it no longer existed, but the size of this issue was not yet clear.
- 7.4. A member asked the MPC to note that beyond Covid sites declared vacant any site declared vacant during the period required evidence added retrospectively. Lessons learnt from this not being clear to all retailers should be considered. As the guidance was focused on temporary vacancy the usual vacancies in the period were not considered.
- 7.5. A member asked if the impact data would feed in from CCW. MOSL noted this for consideration out of committee.
- 7.6. The MPC asked in terms of incentivization what the decision point for MPC was and when it may need to do this. It was clarified that one incentive related to the deferral of payments and this was being examined by MOSL, the other incentives included the possible use of API's or a chargeable standard. These had not been taken forward and credit support levels had been flagged. Once the end of September position was clear it should be considered if anything more was needed.
- 7.7. A member reported that evidence from companies that had gone out of business in the period appeared minimal however anecdotally customers going out of business and reporting it to TP's appeared to be increasing. Clarification was asked on if a premise went Covid vacant, occupied and then normal vacant when would "evidenced" no longer be required. MOSL viewed that this would become an unassured vacant to avoid the need to not provide assurance for Covid vacancies, an end date for this needed to be set. TP's would need to do a system update if this was to become a permanent feature and clarity would be useful to avoid this.

ACTION 42_09

8. PIPs Update

Purpose: For Information

- 8.1. MOSL reported that PIP's would be reintroduced in the following month via contract managers and although not mandatory were recommended with guidance to support them.

9. 6 Monthly Publication of Performance League Tables

Purpose: For Information

- 9.1. MOSL reported that the league tables were due for publication at the end of the month, pre-Covid it had been planned to reformat them however they would be published in the same format on this occasion. This was a code mandated activity even though they may be of questionable value for the Covid period and this would be noted when issuing them. Future formats would provide more supporting information such as retailer performance in wholesaler areas which may help switching decisions.

10. Activity Update

Purpose: For Discussion and Endorsement

- 10.1. MOSL reported that previous comments from the MPC had been taken into account to highlight delays, reasons for them and what steps were being taken to resolve. Completion was at 46% of the project overall and future reports would include what the percentage should be.

- 10.2. Workstream A was broadly on track with some amendments to the scope of the deliverables. The data cleanse had been merged with the data quality which helped create efficiency and to ensure the Workstream remained on track.
- 10.3. The new connections RFI had been delayed due to the number of RFI's that were being issued. The temporary building supply was previously a part of the new connection work but had been removed from scope and passed to the RWG eligibility group with MOSL support. The vacancy occupancy was not appropriate for the Bilaterals project or the MPOP and investigation was taking place as to where it should occur and to refine it appropriately. MOSL asked for an SME from wholesalers and retailers to support the MOSL work in Vacancy Occupancy Challenge.
- 10.4. The deregistration of long term vacant had been delayed but was now being supported by additional MOSL resources to progress the code change. Although this had not been presented to MPC as much as other changes it had received scrutiny from a work group and the RWG. A MPC sponsor for the change would be useful.
- 10.5. Workstream B had been delayed but could benefit from synergies from the metering work being led elsewhere by MOSL. These benefits would reduce the delays which would be reported on at future meetings. The code changes for read projection was not in the original scope of the MPOP and was related to the CMOS validation rules and how to reduce unplanned settlement runs. This piece of work was required but was beyond the scope of MPOP and so should be removed as the resources for MPOP were challenging. A sub-group meeting to look at priorities and where it should sit would be convened. The items on the slide flagged as at risk had been resolved since the slide pack was produced.
- 10.6. The solution analysis may change to green imminently as MOSL awaited confirmation of resources to the solution found. This would take into account work previously discussed around transfer reads and measures and metrics and the level of detail required.
- 10.7. Several items in Workstream C had been completed as the MPOP elements were completed with the remaining items around business as usual. Vacancy incentives would be presented in the next month with the main route via vacancy with consumption. The YVE methodology review would be presented at the next meeting. The activity review of MPOP was beyond just Covid considerations, a subgroup would review the priorities within MPOP. There was no additional MPOP activity for Covid remediation.
- 10.8. It was noted in MPC39 targets were discussed for the measures that were being shown and MOSL were asked to update the MPC on this. MOSL reported a general move away from targets for individual items but the introduction of API's as a more effective method as it would be clearer and easier to manage for both TP's and MOSL. PIP's were more focused towards collaboration than an increased burden, noting insights for how they addressed activity was needed. A member commented that it was difficult to see progress and achievements and more metrics and targets were needed to hold to account. MOSL reported that the approach across MPOP was defining targets across the work undertaken rather than setting arbitrary targets at the start, RFI's would inform these targets based on reasonable activity. The MPC agreed that finite figure was not always the answer however potential metrics should be explored to see where positive progress was occurring.

11. Strategic Metering Review

Purpose: For Discussion and Endorsement

- 11.1. MOSL reported that phase two was presented to the Panel on the 29th September, with completed mapping, which allowed the Panel to agree a move to phase three. A deep dive had been undertaken to recognize the points of failure and where the journey impacted the priority areas and the impacts of this. Each journey had been mapped and assigned priority review areas. Each of the priority areas would be assessed against five factors and RFI's would be issued that went beyond just TP's and into other industry areas before presentation at the CEO Conference in November.
- 11.2. A member confirmed that the subgroup had challenged MOSL on the timescales and were content with the response, additional resources and the assurance that other groups were being utilized. The subgroup was waiting further clarity on phase three.

11.3. A member asked if the review was considering the issues of data logging (fitting and removing loggers etc). It was clarified that the titles for the journeys were broad and meter exchanges would form its own workstream with AMR a key part of the technology review.

11.4. A member asked for clarity on when solutions would begin to be identified and prioritised. It was reported that current timelines including subgroup discussions would start producing analysis at the end of October which could be circulated with a communications plan.

12. MPF Improvement Planning

Purpose: For Discussion and Endorsement

12.1. The MPF sub-group had recently met to refresh the vision and review progress, it had been agreed that it was an ambitious piece of work and data would not be resolved as quickly as first thought. Measures for accountability were being put into place with a summary of the first year for planning with future years implementation and validation. Activity had been grouped together to show where the same people were working on issues with MPF specific items around data mainly in MPOP Workstream A. A holistic view of each area and its metrics were required. It was possible MPS three and four were combined and included in the new connections review. It should also be considered if OPS and MPS should be separate and performance standards should be combined. The Bilaterals project would also require to be integrated into the MPF.

13. Data Cleanse Plan (RFI)

Purpose: For Discussion and Endorsement

13.1. MOSL reported that comments received so far would be incorporated in future drafts and invited more comments from members before issuing. It had been determined that resolving the data issue would not be a three-month exercise and would take time and some fundamental changes to systems, CMOS lacked data validation or end user verification. People that directly used the data were unable to confirm if it was accurate or useful. A technical solution to this on how data was shared and how external actors may access CMOS data was being investigated and how this could be integrated. Metering search providers were keen to share data but would require certification, an initial approach could be trialed before making it a mandatory requirement if it was workable. This would integrate metering search providers which would likely solve many issues around metering.

13.2. Customer premise data such as UPRN and VOA had a lack of completeness with the code requiring a reason for the lack of data however the reason given in over 90% of cases was "other" which although was code compliant did not appear to meet the spirit of the code. There were currently no incentives to retrospectively correct the data although in the near term a completeness metric for an API or chargeable standard for wholesalers to encourage work on this could be introduced. A heavy emphasis had previously been put on paid for data services, but this had been reassessed with clarification on what was required sought through an RFI.

13.3. A member commented that some organisations did not have the required data sets and would require investment in systems to be able to do this. Third party support for this was useful but often lacked the specifics and it was recommended that a cost consideration be included in the RFI.

13.4. A member asked the MPC to note that Yorkshire Water performed well in this area and it should be investigated why they were and why others lacked the data.

13.5. A member commented that public data had positive and negative implications and depended on where the master data was held. It was also not a complete solution to simply cleanse the data. Some TP's may already have paid for services that negated the need for MOSL to have them.

14. Occupancy Status Transaction Review

Purpose: For Discussion and Endorsement

- 14.1. MOSL reported that from examining the rejections it appeared that due to the system not being user friendly and a lack of understanding by TP's of the process, resulted in high rejections. Due to the high amount of Covid vacancies this had led to rejections as submissions could not be made more than two prior to the submission. The MPC noted the worst performer in this area and commented that this could be due to not understanding the Covid implications.
- 14.2. MOSL proposed requesting CGI make CMOS more user friendly with supportive guidance and also issuing an RFI to the industry to seek more insights. The MPC recommended that this work be compared to the code review work being undertaken by MOSL which may avoid the use of another RFI and overburdening TP's.

15. CCW Update

16. Purpose: For Information

- 16.1. A representative from CCW reported that complaints were rising with 292 complaints in August which was three times more than May, this was expected as businesses reopened. Initial numbers from September appeared to show a bottoming out of this but it was not yet clear or confirmed. Complaints had now been mapped against the customer journey and insights would be discussed with the sub-group. The majority of complaints related to billing and charging, disputed liability was when a customer did not feel they were liable for the bill received which may be due to a leak or the previous occupier bills. As these complaints were often made directly to CCW it was not always clear until investigation was undertaken and was a judgement by case handlers which may be recategorised later. It was clarified that the complaints were the total of complaints received.
- 16.2. The CCW representative confirmed that no complaints had been received in relation to the TP on a PRP.
- 16.3. A number of CCW's categories did not map clearly to the customer journey such as operational, debt recovery or administration and may require an amendment to the customer journey or to explore how else they could be categorized.

17. Trading Party Insight: Affinity Water

Purpose: For Discussion and Information

- 17.1. A representative from Affinity Water gave a presentation on registering new SPIDs to the market with the aim to get the property tradable as quickly as possible. The client customer was asked to nominate a retailer however often failed to nominate one. Affinity would allocate them to a retailer and ensure as much data as possible was shared. Often correspondence between all parties was lacking or incomplete and Affinity supported the wholesaler being able to submit all information rather than rely on emails. Affinity's process showed a high success rate overall although different TP's had different approaches.
- 17.2. A member asked if the information emailed was the same data as in CPW089. The Affinity representative explained it did however they supported a stronger measure as the contact details would not be in the billing which was a possible delay. Affinity supported wholesalers being responsible for the entire process to improve accountability and standardise the process. The RWG eligibility group wished to examine some of the physical issues of meters on new sites and the process overall. It was noted that at some point in the future the sub-group should consider if "Temporary building supplies" should remain an eligible SPID status in the market.
- 17.3. The MPC thanked Affinity for a useful presentation.
- 17.4. MOSL had previously proposed a change proposal to address this however had reassessed this to an RFI. The legal issues of wholesalers dealing with the end user required further assessment and discussion with Ofwat.
- 17.5. A member noted that when water was flowing then wholesalers could not charge and that the viewed that most of what was detailed was covered in CPW089. It was agreed that CPW089 was a positive change but not strong enough to totally address the issue.
- 17.6. A member noted that if amending the process would improve performance then this should be done.

- 17.7. A member noted that there was a comparison with gap sites that appeared appropriate. Another member disagreed due to flaws in the gap site process and there was a legal impediment to wholesalers charging. GDPR risks around data also required consideration. If CPW089 was augmented appropriately it could mean retailers were given all the information by wholesalers with the developers liable until a new customer was in place.
- 17.8. A member noted that the most important result was one that benefited the end customer and the enduring market.
- 17.9. The MPC endorsed hearing best practice from TP's to facilitate discussion and encourage innovation. Where possible it would be useful to see slide presentations in advance.

18. New Connections (RFI)

Purpose: For Discussion and Information

- 18.1. The committee agreed that an RFI would be beneficial and work to build and augment existing procedures without having to change legislation and could seek industry support for different solutions. The flow of information in CMOS could be amended without the need for legislation changes. MOSL would also investigate how many new SPIDs went vacant that had VOA or UPRN data provided.

ACTION 42_10

- 18.2. A draft RFI would be presented at the next meeting with support from the subgroup and Ofwat in the meantime.

19. R-MeX

Purpose: For Information

- 19.1. MOSL reported that the R-MeX was designed to measure and provide feedback on services provided by wholesalers to retailers and was a mix of quantitative and qualitative data. The questions had been formed by RWG facilitated by MOSL and would be sent out twice a year. Some wholesalers were issuing surveys to retailers already however this approach would ensure consistency. The R-MeX would be released on the 5th October and remain open until the 30th October, the results would be shared at the November MPC and released publicly on the 2nd December. The second survey would be released at the start of March with a similar timescale for results and release. The results of the surveys were planned to be released as their own publications and included in the annual market performance report. Ofwat had previously expressed a view that they supported a financial incentive in relation to R-MeX results. MOSL would review the operation of R-MeX to develop it further in the future, the learning from it would inform B-MeX. The completion rate of the survey would be provided at the October MPC meeting.

ACTION: 42_11

- 19.2. MOSL confirmed that discussion had taken place with the communications team to estimate a conversion rate and how many responses would be needed to form a useful data set. The publication would include an average score with more detailed results released to wholesalers. The presentation of the data and subsets of analysis were still being developed overall.
- 19.3. The MPC agreed that a single overall measure from the R-MeX that would allow a single league table to be published would be beneficial. The MPC noted that the R-MeX subgroup were examining ways to embed it in the MPF framework.
- 19.4. A member reported that their TP was working to bring the MPS/OPS data into one figure and would share their work so far out of committee.
- 19.5. The MPC questioned if a "M-MeX" for MOSL would be introduced. It was confirmed that it was planned to look at other similar surveys once R-MeX had been launched, contract managers had previously been surveyed and this could be expanded and help to form KPI's for MOSL.

20. Workplanning

Purpose: For Information

20.1. MOSL reported that the workloads of subgroup had been tracked since April and workloads for groups were now increasing such as IPRP and the innovation fund. As demand grew there would be need for more members and strengthening the membership. The RmeX group in particular may need to be reformed to a more general Mex group and two MPC members volunteered to become members of the group. A proposed approach was made for redefining the subgroups after this meeting in time for the next MPC.

21. Waterplus PRP

Purpose: For Information

21.1. MOSL reported that this had official ended with the August results at 96% which was above the milestone of 92%. Only 54 tasks were in this period and two tasks failed with steps immediately taken to prevent them failing in the future by locking down staff profiles. They would now be placed on the watch list for three months with a desire for them to stay in the high 90's for performance. This would require them to stay above the market average (74%) however if they began to fall steeply this would be elevated as appropriate with MOSL continuing with monthly meetings and only reporting by exception. Waterplus had demonstrated they understood the importance of performance and had shown lessons learnt from being on the PRP. Customer complaints typically lagged and may not manifest for some time.

22. December Meeting Date/Meeting Locations

23. Purpose: For Discussion

- 23.1. Members noted that all MPC dates had now been adjusted to the next day (Thursday) to remove the clash with the MOSL Board. Members discussed if the meeting should be moved to a different time in the month where performance data could still be received and to allow the MPC to report to Panel more efficiently. It was agreed to keep the meetings in the same week but with at least a days' gap to help with meeting preparation and the taking of annual leave. This should be reviewed in November with any changes to take effect from January.
- 23.2. It was agreed the December meeting should take place on the 17th December noting that performance data would not be available.
- 23.3. It was agreed that meetings should take place electronically until at least the end of the year.
- 23.4. Members asked that format of the meeting be adjusted for the winter months to allow for a longer break in limited day time.
- 23.5. The MPC requested the Chair seek feedback from Affinity on their presentation.
- 23.6. The MPC requested that the replacement of the interim Chair with a permanent Chair be progressed and the interim period should be kept as short as possible.
- 23.7. Several members volunteered to assist in preparation for the strategy session for RISE.

New Actions

In relation to 41_01 the MPC asked that the presenter of each item be made clearer on future agenda items.

ACTION: 42_01

The MPC noted that most of customers were likely to have to have had billing arrangements change since market opening and requested that MOSL undertake an analysis to determine what percentage of customers would have moved retailers as the result of the market being opened and wholesalers transferring customers to new retailers, noting that this may not indicate awareness that they had a choice.

ACTION: 42_02

Ofwat were asked if it was possible to see a regionalized map of awareness levels across the market.

ACTION: 42_03

A strategy session for before the end of the calendar year would be organized to focus on actions from RISE, what was an action for MPC, RWG or MOSL and the priorities.

ACTION 42_04

A member asked if deferral volumes were dropping at different rates across the country due to local lockdowns/restrictions still in place. MOSL agreed to produce this information in reference to wholesaler areas and report back.

ACTION 42_05

MOSL agreed to reconvene the sub-group and work through the options presented to define the way forward and when and how to reinstate the former IPRP's or make new changes to launch them with amendments. On current timescales it was planned to reactive them in either form in January. By the next meeting a clearer timeline would be available with an idea of changes and the risks and benefits of this and what changes fitted more broadly into the MPF.

ACTION 42_06

A member asked if the original solution was to remove the charges for the month or the individual day. MOSL responded that in the CSD's it stated July and they would provide clarity out of committee.

ACTION 42_07

Although standards would not be reactivated until future months an understanding of this was important for league tables and understanding the Covid impact. MOSL would produce a summary table for this impact and the dates when they would occur.

ACTION 42_08

MOSL viewed that this would become an unassured vacant to avoid the need to not provide assurance for Covid vacancies, an end date for this needed to be set. TP's would need to do a system update if this was to become a permanent feature and clarity would be useful to avoid this.

ACTION 42_09

MOSL would also investigate how many new SPIDs went vacant that had VOA or UPRN data provided.

ACTION 42_10

The completion rate of the survey would be provided at the October MPC meeting.

ACTION: 42_11