

# Minutes of the Market Performance Committee Meeting 43

29 October 2020 | 9:30 – 15:15

Held via Videoconference (Microsoft Teams)

Status of the Minutes: **FINAL**

## MEMBERS PRESENT

John Gilbert	JG	Interim Chair	Gerard Lyden	GL	Wholesale Committee Member
Neil Pendle	NP	Alternate Retailer Committee Member	Jesse Wright	JW	Wholesaler Committee Member
Trevor Nelson	TN	Retailer Committee Member	Michael Rathbone	MR	Wholesaler Committee Member
Don Maher	DM	Wholesaler Committee Member	Andrew Smith	AS	Retailer Committee Member

## OTHER ATTENDEES

Samantha Webb	SW	MOSL Presenter	Luke Austin	LA	MOSL Presenter
Matt Labrum	MLa	MOSL Presenter	Pam Nash	PN	MOSL Observer
Alexandra Piper	AP	MOSL Presenter	Markus Lloyd	ML	MOSL Presenter
Georgina Mills	GM	Ofwat Presenter	Ethan Fleming	EF	Secretariat
Adam Boyns	AB	CCW Presenter	John Vinson	JV	Independent Supporting Member
Annabel Parson	AP	Satori	Giles Naylor	GN	Satori
David Gardener	DG	MOSL Presenter			

## APOLOGIES

Claire Yeates	CY	Retailer Committee Member	Darren Hayes	DH	Ofwat
Pamela Taylor	PT	Independent Supporting Member			

## 1. Housekeeping/Welcome and Introductions/Apologies and Agenda

### Purpose: For Information

- 1.1. Apologies had been received from PT.
- 1.2. NP had been nominated as an alternate for CY.
- 1.3. The meeting would be observed by AP and GS of Satori Board Review who were undertaking a review of Panel effectiveness.
- 1.4. A redrafted agenda had been circulated before the meeting to allow for more time to discuss the introduction of market performance charges.

## Minutes and Actions

### **Purpose: For Decision**

- 1.5. JV and PT should be recorded in the other attendee's section.
- 1.6. Subject to this amendment and the minutes were approved as an accurate and correct record of the previous meeting.
- 1.7. The colour coding on the action tracker had now been updated.
- 1.8. MOSL presented the actions to be closed namely: 39\_07, 41\_05, 41\_06, 42\_01, 42\_03, 42\_07, 42\_09, 42\_11.
- 1.9. Action 41\_09 - A summary of the Covid work by the MPC had been circulated via email with a number of comments received from members. The redrafted note would be recirculated and would include the latest update on Covid unwinding. Clarity over the actions of the subgroup and the Covid 19 transition group would be included as would comment about the distinction between properties that had become Covid vacant and those who had become vacant for standard reasons and the need to assure both. There was also a Panel action to provide feedback on Covid work and this should be included in the same note. The redrafted note would be circulated for feedback. This action would remain open.
- 1.10. Action 42\_05 would be discussed under the agenda. Following this discussion, it was agreed to retain this action as open based on the feedback received.

## 2. Updates

### CCW

- 2.1. AB reported that there had been a rise in non-household complaints with 307 complaints in total which was an increase from the same period in 2019 however was 15% less than the same period in 2018. The increase in complaints would appear to be due to the market catching up post-Covid with TP's contacting customers again and increasing debt recovery efforts. The provisional figures for October suggested that this spike was already beginning to decrease.
- 2.2. In relation to the customer journey there had been no complaints relating to entry and exit, in metering and consumption there had been an increase across all categories within this. Estimated billing had seen a small increase in relation to estimations made in lockdown or did not reflect the change in usage post lockdown. The disputed liability category remained the largest category.
- 2.3. A member asked if complaints related to meter read frequencies or not being able to gain reads. AB responded that this appeared less of a cause with complaints relating to estimations due to reads not being taken which could suggest they were not frequent enough. Some complaints related to estimated bills being received when a meter read had been submitted but not yet processed.
- 2.4. Complaints in asset maintenance remained low with delays in meter replacement with the SLA not being met. One complaint related to a customer disputing the readings from a meter and as such disputing the accuracy of the meter. Due to the low numbers no trends were available.
- 2.5. A member asked if the issue was found to be wholesaler related was it recategorized as such. AB confirmed this should be the case if wholly wholesaler related but often complaints resulted from both the retailer and wholesaler. The CCW system only allowed a complaint to be categorised to one TP with no mixed category and the assessment of designation and recategorization could be improved. One member supported all asset maintenance designation to be with wholesalers as they owned the assets.

- 2.6. The committee noted that usually TP names would not be included on the data presented from CCW. Several members supported having visibility of this data although this may have to be done in closed session.
- 2.7. A member noted that the retailer owned the customer relationship and a customer would not complain to a wholesaler. It was more important to understand the number of complaints and what trends and common frictions could be identified without looking at individual cases. Another member supported this and that individual names were not required unless trends were attributable to individual parties or the level of complaints were significantly higher for a certain TP.
- 2.8. A member expressed concern that reporting did need to record whether complaints were against a wholesaler, retailer or mixed. There was reputational risk to being named by CCW and so reporting should be accurate and the supporting language clear.
- 2.9. The MPC agreed that unless there was a clear trend available a TP should not be named.
- 2.10. Switching complaints had seen a small increase but was largely in line with pre-Covid and overall was not a high level of complaints.
- 2.11. A number of complaints did not fit clearly into the customer journey and were largely related to administration and debt recovery. Administration complaints may be the timeliness of responding to customers, the quality of advice or administration errors on the account. This had increased as customers were making more contact with their retailer due to Covid. Debt recovery had seen large increases attributable to post lockdown debt recovery efforts resuming with this expected to increase. Although administration complaints were less than metering, they had increased at a fourfold rate.
- 2.12. Operational complaints had increased slightly with complaints relating to sewerage and the cause of flooding.
- 2.13. The Chair asked if the committee wished to undertake a deep dive review of any of the areas detailed at the next meeting. The committee confirmed that they did not feel this was appropriate at this time.
- 2.14. A member noted that at the recent Panel meeting the CCW representative had reported that they were writing to Ofwat to amend the Customer Protection Code of Practice to protect customers in regional lockdowns. AB confirmed that this was to reflect regional restrictions and that debt recovery complaints were increasing with customer being pursued for debts which they were in a poor position to settle. The temporary vacancy flags had previously ensured some protection against this. A consultation was likely to be needed on this. This was currently focussed on the customer/retailer relationship and not apply to retailer/wholesaler charges.
- 2.15. AB confirmed that CCW would be undertaking further work to determine if there was a correlation between regional lockdowns and increased complaints.

### MOSL – Market Performance

- 2.16. AP reported that OPS performance had fallen but was comparable to a pre-Covid level, MPS performance was in a similar situation and therefore overall performance was satisfactory.
- 2.17. The tasks volumes in MPS were greater than the six-month pre-Covid average by 1%. Performance against all areas of the customer journey were increasing in task volumes with asset maintenance remaining the lowest.
- 2.18. OPS tasks volumes were 14% below the six-month pre-Covid period however in September there had been an additional 1700 tasks indicating an increased performance. Disconnections remained low for market exit with market entrance tasks rising. Although performance was trending down it remained above the pre-Covid average. The level of deferred tasks had

decreased with 25% of tasks completed in September having previously been deferred with deferral rates decreasing as tasks volumes increased.

- 2.19. MPS18 performance had previously been overly high and likely due to a proportion of the meters being declared as Covid vacant which had artificially inflated it.
- 2.20. A member asked about the possibility of mapping regional deferral rates against local lockdown measures. MOSL reported that deferrals could not be traced to the month of deferral based on the information MOSL gathered. The deferral rate reported was when tasks that had previously been deferred were completed. Due to this the information could only be presented against wholesaler areas and not specific lockdown areas. The MPC agreed that despite this and noting the possibility of an unknown lag time from when the task was deferred, the committee still wished to see the data to see if any trends could be identified. It was noted that as part of Covid wholesalers were required to record deferrals and PFM's may have further information that MOSL could use to track them.

**ACTION: 43\_01**

- 2.21. ML reported that settlement figures were trending upwards to the pre-Covid levels but was expected to level off based on expectations around the UK economy and a second wave of Covid. Only 6000 vacancies from Covid had been moved to assured with the level of vacancy likely to drop as retailers continued to make more contact with customers. The data could be segmented in a variety of ways if it would help to give insight to the MPC.
- 2.22. It was noted that the biggest self-supplies were largely breweries that had AMR meters fitted. Readings had been validated in the period and reporting was based on actual and not estimate.
- 2.23. The MPC agreed that the data could be segmented in a number of ways that may provide insight. This could include the geographical spread of SPID's across the country, the type of business, size of businesses and meter reads against actual reads. MOSL reported that it may help with business continuity for retailers to identify trends in sectors that they were dominant in. The MPC agreed that MOSL should continue to investigate what benefits there were to splitting by different segments and to report back on what insights were possible.

### 3. Market Performance

#### Reintroduction of Market Performance Charges

- 3.1. SA reported that this had been discussed at Panel and MOSL were discussing it with TP's and would welcome MPC views on the implementation of MPS charges in November. The data gathered to date was from a variety of sources to attempt to understand the market in broad terms.
- 3.2. In October the recommencement of internal meter reads took place. The designation of internal/external meter definitions remained broad and was based on the data in CMOS. Around 70% of meters in the market were marked as external, noting that even an external meter could be difficult to read if a premise was closed. Split into Covid risk segments meters in high or very high tiers were responsible for a quarter of market consumption.
- 3.3. There was no central sight of skip rates by MOSL and the market had been sampled to gain an understanding. One retailer indicated 75% skip rate on internal meters with 75% of these due to Covid. This appeared to be an outlier with other retailers indicated a 10-20% skip rate. A pre-Covid skip rate was not available.
- 3.4. The committee noted that this was a fast-moving area with a lot of active changes.
- 3.5. A member noted that wholesalers could defer tasks due to lack of access, but retailers could not. They would support plans based around the Covid tiers in place with charging resuming

based on the tiers or for an overall plan to be developed if a national lockdown was introduced. It currently appeared likely that more areas would increase tiers, or a national lockdown was put into effect.

- 3.6. A member reported that they were not clear on if tier three restrictions inhibited MPS requirements. The committee should reach a provisional conclusion noting that this would have to be kept under review.
- 3.7. A member supported not reintroducing the charges as this would seem to ignore that the Covid positioning was worsening with more restrictions and lockdowns being put into place.
- 3.8. A member noted that if charges were not introduced there was a need to maintain incentives such as through YVE's.
- 3.9. A member supported reintroducing charges as meter reading was essential for billing a customer accurately and the longer they were deferred the larger the issues became. TP's should work together to find solutions and the charges would continue to pressure the market into responding.
- 3.10. A member noted that lockdown measures could mean individuals employed or living in those areas were unable to take reads as it was deemed as non-essential work. Although they did support the importance of meter reads this would appear to ignore the reality of restrictions.
- 3.11. Several members agreed that meter reads remained of utmost importance but appeared that on some occasions currently they were impossible to gather. The messaging of any communications should continue to highlight the importance of meter reads but recognise the unique situation the market was in.
- 3.12. The Chair summarised that overall support was for further consideration to be given to reintroducing charges, noting one member supported immediate reintroduction.
- 3.13. The committee noted that no charges would be levied until December and there was further time for data to be collected to decide and devise a series of options. The practicalities of meter reads in higher tiers needed further understanding as did the auditing and assurance of skips.
- 3.14. The MPC thanked MOSL for the data and asked to be kept updated in between meetings as required.
- 3.15. The committee agreed it would be useful to have a series of plans with different triggers for each plan. The plans could cover a number of different measures such as YVE's, temporary vacancies, the delay of charges, each predicated on the possible different situations.

### Covid Unwinding

- 3.16. ML reported that temporary Covid vacancies had been reduced significantly with 4100 unassured vacants left to resolve. Of this amount 1500 were unable to be switched for a variety of reasons which had been legitimised by CPW107. The remaining number required addressing by retailers by moving them to occupied or providing assurance. One retailer was responsible for the majority of these with the remaining retailers having less than 100 each. Each vacancy had to be dealt with on a manual basis and MOSL would facilitate further recategorization under CPW107 with this work to be completed by end of November.
- 3.17. Fewer assured vacancies had been seen than expected and this was expected to increase as customers declared insolvency to their retailers.
- 3.18. A member asked if CPW107 included the effective from data exemption. MOSL confirmed that it covered those after the 1<sup>st</sup> August 2020.
- 3.19. A member asked what could be learnt from this for the future. MOSL responded that it was important to recognise that mitigating circumstances should be defined in advance and more exploration at an earlier stage of the unforeseen aspects/issues. As the measures had been

implemented quickly there were a lot of unseen ramifications and unintended consequences that could have been addressed by laying out the unwinding measures at the design stage.

### 6 monthly League Tables

- 3.20. The MPC noted that although this was not required to be closed session the tables were currently embargoed and should not be shared by members. MOSL would ensure this was appropriately marked on agenda items in the future.
- 3.21. MOSL would circulate full updated tables after the meeting for comment. **ACTION: 43\_02**
- 3.22. SW reported that there had been consideration to publishing the tables due to lockdown and Covid implications however there had been public commitments to releasing league tables every six months. The tables would be published with prose highlighting that this was in an exceptional period. Due to this the planned style changes had not been implemented. The tables now included First Business Water as they had increased their SPID numbers. The charges had been removed as charging had not been in effect and no invoices issued.
- 3.23. A member noted that the value in publishing peer comparison reports during a report was questionable.
- 3.24. Retailers performance in wholesale areas was seen as important for customer choice. This would allow them to choose based on best performance in a wholesaler area. The focus was not on self-supply or wholesalers in retail areas.
- 3.25. An embargoed copy of the tables would be circulated to TP's five days before public release to allow the correction of any errors.
- 3.26. Members asked for early sight of this information in future iterations and to confirm that the appropriate prose was included in relation to Covid.
- 3.27. The MPC asked that the MPS average for wholesalers be included in a new column. **ACTION: 43\_03**
- 3.28. AB asked that an explanation of market terms or a link to explanations be included when published.
- 3.29. The MPC thanked MOSL for the regional tables and felt that these added considerable value, insight and knowledge even in a period where the overall value of the work was limited.

### 4. MO Compliance Update

- 4.1. DG reported that there were no changes to the compliance obligations with no new findings and no issues resolved.
- 4.2. The first area of noncompliance was in relation to the requirement to deposit CMOS data every month. This was not an effective method of maintaining data and data was currently backed up daily to an Azure server. This was an interim solution until the move to cloud servers was complete. At this point a code change would be raised to reflect this.
- 4.3. The MPC requested that the CMOS explanation be added to future reports and to include a timeline of the proposed move and code change to become compliant. This would allow the committee to be aware of any delays and assist where needed.
- 4.4. Two items related to the MIMP and due to this disbanding, the need to review documents and establish a schedule for the future.
- 4.5. The Code currently required capital expenditure in MOSL to be distributed over several years. As capital expenditure in MOSL to date had been small the cost of doing so would exceed the benefits. This would be kept under review based on MOSL's forecast capital expenditure. Alternatively, a change proposal could be raised but had not been due to the cost implications. The MOSL board had agreed to keep this item under review. The MPC noted that with large

upcoming spends in relation to bilaterals this should be reviewed and dates for review included in the future and by whom. Alternatively, if it was a minor change it should be raised as a housekeeping change and progressed through the Panel with the lowest possible resource input.

- 4.6. In relation to query handling the Code stated that all enquiries had to be logged and a MOSL were working to implement a query management solution in the long term.
- 4.7. A member asked if assessment methodology had been changed or the status of changing this. DG confirmed that the same methodology was still in use whilst the new methodology was devised. This may expose new risks and further work would be taken into reviewing the obligations.
- 4.8. The payment deferral audit had mandated that an audit should be carried out. The audit had taken place however after the month's deadline had passed. The MOSL team had decided to report it as a non-compliant until the end of the year for transparency.
- 4.9. The MPC requested that all areas of non-compliance have clear mitigation plans to include predicted closure dates.

## 5. Ofwat Update

- 5.1. Ofwat reported that six code changes had been approved in the past month with more remaining. They were also considering two proposed changes to the Customer Protections Code of Practice. The MPC was asked to note the retailers were required to offer Covid-19 payment plans until the end of the financial year unless directed otherwise.
- 5.2. Ofwat had presented a revised bilaterals timetable at the Panel. A call for inputs in relation to bad debt commitments would be made in November with a consultation in the new calendar year.
- 5.3. Ofwat was supportive of the Strategic User Forum and Rachel Fletcher would be presenting at the next CEO forum.

## 6. Market Improvement

### Activity Update

- 6.1. LA reported that the review of Workstream C to reflect any possible changes due to Covid had increased scope to include a holistic view of MPOP. MOSL had determined that no additional Covid activity was required.
- 6.2. The overall delivery of MPOP was 57% against an expected completion rate of 84%. This was largely due to delays in Workstream B.
- 6.3. The first phase of MPOP was to understand the issues and understand the data quality available. Several RFI's had been issued or would be issued shortly to inform this. The temporary building supply had been delegated to RWG. CGI had been commissioned to review vacancy occupancy transactions and to improve the usability of read rejections. The YVE review should have been completed but had been delayed due to Covid work.
- 6.4. Resources were being reallocated to deliver Workstream B and ensure it maintained its new timelines and ensure the right priorities were being addressed and there were no further slippages. The consumption data sharing proposal was more related to sharing meter reads rather than consumption data. This combined with the difficult to read meters work would be covered by the strategic metering review.
- 6.5. The scope of the transfer reads work was proposed to be expanded and put on an MPF roadmap position. Currently agreement for a transfer read was done offline/outside of the market. Previous ideas on different approach had been discussed by subgroups and would

benefit from a holistic view with a more detailed view presented at the next MPC. The MPC agreed to this proposal.

- 6.6. Workstream A would have been completed if not for the slippages to YVE and vacancy incentive analysis and would be completed in the upcoming months. The new connections proposal would be completed in the MPOP cycle to be a better standard than expected. The deregistration of long term vacants had been delayed due to resourcing and would be now completed in mid-January.
- 6.7. The PIPs implementation had been delayed in favour of integrating it into the Covid 19 strategy to assist TP's.
- 6.8. Estimation had been considered under settlement and although delayed would overdeliver from what was originally expected.
- 6.9. MOSL had reviewed the risks associated with Covid and more generally and identified long unread meters and vacancy with work already planned to address these. Liquidity challenges was not within the scope of MPOP and should be retained by the Panel. The completion of the bilaterals project would have an impact on performance and would need to be integrated although a MPOP improvement project would not be required.
- 6.10. MOSL did not view any new Covid 19 risks within MPOP however would continue to monitor the COVID framework and adjust if required in the performance team. LA sought approval of the MPC that they were content with the Covid activity detailed.
- 6.11. A member commented that although there was a Covid monitoring framework in place this appeared backwards focussed than enough monitoring of future potential situations. MOSL reported that MPOP was not designed as a reactive tool however had expanded to include Covid items as they fitted into existing categories of work. Covid risks and issues remained but should no longer reside in MPOP.
- 6.12. The Chair agreed that Covid risks remained however in the scope of MPOP there were some measures to cover known Covid risks and that these should not be adjusted in MPOP. If there were additional risks MOSL should monitor them but not within the MPOP plan and resources.
- 6.13. The MPC agreed with the approach outlined.
- 6.14. A member asked for clarity on the colour coding of the workstreams and if resource capacity was an issue as it appeared varied in the reports. It was explained that green indicated items that were on track but not complete, amber was slippage against progress but with a recovery plan and red indicated slippage with no recovery plan. Completed items were marked in blue. Resources had been reduced due to Covid work and redeploying a member of the team to the bilaterals project. This lack of resource had since been rectified.
- 6.15. A member asked that consideration should be given towards defining measures and metrics to ensure accountability and measuring success. This would allow decisions to be made if metrics were not reaching targets. LA agreed to take this forward and would raise suggestions at future meetings for discussion
- 6.16. The MPC endorsed the current timeframes and priorities of MPOP 2020/21.

### New Connections RFI

- 6.17. MLa reported that following the MPC41 discussion further inputs had been received from TP's on the shape of the RFI. The inputs were grouped into three areas:
  - Inaccurate and incomplete data causing issues for retailers billing developers;
  - The current procedures adding costs to all TP's;
  - The current process having a detrimental effect on customers both household and non-household.



- 6.18. The committee noted the preliminary questions split into wholesaler and retailer areas. The RFI would be finalised by the 6<sup>th</sup> November to be distributed on the 9<sup>th</sup> November for responses by early December. This would allow the responses to be presented in mid-December. Any further comments from the MPC were invited via email.
- 6.19. A member commented that the questions were focussed on what the issues were with the current process and asked that the questions be asked against proposed solutions such as wholesalers being solely responsible and how this would impact working with developers.
- 6.20. The CCW representative asked the MPC to note that CCW would be able to provide responses from a customer basis. The issues on customers could be strengthened in the questions.
- 6.21. The MPC asked that MOSL ensure that enough notice was given for RFI's. There were a considerable number being issued that took a significant amount of resource by TP's. The Chair would discuss this with the MOSL SLT.

**ACTION:43\_04**

### MPOP Planning for the Next Six Months

- 6.22. This had been addressed under an earlier agenda item.

### MOSL's Vacancy Strategy and Next Steps

- 6.23. A more detailed presentation would be made at the next meeting outlining the approach to reducing vacancies.
- 6.24. The removal of long term vacants which had shown no consumption for six years would remain in the market if still eligible, but the Code change proposed would facilitate the removal of those that were no longer eligible to be in the market. New criteria may be required for vacants with consumption and the overall definition of vacancy in the Code may require amendment. Investigations suggested the true level of vacancy in the market should be at around 10-12%.
- 6.25. A member noted that they would view a good market as having a vacancy of 7-8% with other vacancies be short term only.
- 6.26. Another member reported that due to speculative building efforts new connections may go vacant whilst a customer was being sought which could lead to long delays. Some long term vacants should no longer be in the market whilst other may need to be recorded as occupied.
- 6.27. Often vacancy was used with new connections/gap sites when the customer couldn't be found or onboard. Costs for onboarding could be substantial especially in the event of customers judged to have a bad debt risk or when it was known the customer was likely to change soon. These factors worked to reduce the incentives for onboarding and moving from vacant.
- 6.28. Vacancy was important to monitor to help understand leakage rates and wholesaler charges. If vacants that were no longer eligible to be in the market were removed this would assist in dealing with the remaining vacants.
- 6.29. A member noted that if there was a risk associated with onboarding new customers then the proposal for wholesalers to undertake this work could impact them negatively. It could be an issue for the Strategic User Forum to address. Wholesalers could assist with it however they were unable to change the flagged designation.
- 6.30. It was noted there may be some legitimate use of water in a vacant property, it was important meter reads were undertaken to inform data on leakage.
- 6.31. The MPC noted that Covid vacants were expected to fall to zero.

- 6.32. A member noted that if the data set was expanded and released then this could inform the work of specialist third parties who could challenge vacancies. This would require the risk of the wrong premises being low and accurate UPRN and VOA data to be in place before being shared.
- 6.33. In relation to base consumption of vacants an API would be introduced to track this and determine if reads had been taken. An API would initially be used for its ease of introduction. The benchmarking from an API could then be used to inform if a chargeable standard and the additional resource this required to be put into place.
- 6.34. A member asked if other industries could give an indication of what a good level of vacancy looked like in the market. MOSL reported that may be difficult due to the strict definition in place that was not used elsewhere.
- 6.35. The MPC asked for future presentations to include where responsibilities may be amended, where the Code was not helpful and how to ensure the right incentives were in place and if any current ones were wrong.
- 6.36. The vacancy sub-group had discussed the vacancy definition but had not reached a conclusion, this had affected the vacancy challenge process. It had been recognised that the definition was problematic and did not reflect working practice, this should be addressed by the sub-group and the RWG. A member recommended that this work also include the vacancy challenge process and what evidence may be needed for assurance.
- 6.37. A member asked if any insights on this could be seen from the Scottish Market. It was clarified that a change in policy in Scotland allowed landlords or landowners to be charged. This had shared the burden of the costs of Scottish water without increasing charges. To enable this change in the English market would require the SUF to take a view and present to Ofwat/Defra due to legal differences between the markets.

### MPF Vision Refresh

- 6.38. LA reported that he was seeking a view on if the MPC thought the MPF was still fit for purpose and what its future should be. Several items were underway that overlapped such as the MPF roadmap, bilaterals, MPOP and the strategic metering review all seeking to improve the market. It was MOSL's responsibility to ensure all were integrated with each other.
- 6.39. The original road map had a clear phase one to review and sanitise data and agree metrics, review incentives including financial, reputational and interventions. Previous work had also identified that TP's were sometimes held to account for items they did not have full control over and the approach should be to tailor the approach to interventions that were risk based. Qualitative measures of performance and the use of clear systems had also been identified.
- 6.40. On reflection MOSL had concluded that the data cleanse was not a short-term project and should be a long-term ongoing project. This did not preclude identifying measures and reasons for them.
- 6.41. Many of the pieces of work benefited from moving to standalone project to being focussed on the customer journey.
- 6.42. There was a need to ensure that the MPF was updated for bilaterals. Although an MPC member was also a member of the Steering Group a more active link was required. A sub-group may be required to discuss what new measurements in relation to this might be.
- 6.43. Several members commented that the MPF appeared to have become large and overly complex and not focused on clear goals and outcomes. Progress had often been slow and target delivery dates could be made better use of.
- 6.44. MOSL would review the MPF internally and report back on any changes as required for endorsement.

## 7. Workplanning

- 7.1. Programme B on timely consumption data required further investigation for redress. Strategic metering review had seen a positive adjustment to date with the MOSL team confident to bring it forward. The MPF workstream was rated a red as metrics had not yet been agreed and a workshop would be held shortly to agree what was appropriate.
- 7.2. A member noted that they had submitted comments on scope and membership via email.

## 8. AOB

### MPC Strategy Day

- 8.1. A planning meeting would be held with several members, Ofwat and CCW in November to plan the agenda for the meeting.

### MPC Chair

- 8.2. The Chair reported that the Panel Chair was aware of their interim status and was working to appoint a permanent chair for the MPC.

### RMEX

- 8.3. MOSL reported that only a small number of responses had been received on the week of the deadline and the decision had been made to extend it to give TP's more time. TP's had been contacted and confirmed that they had been working to submit on the deadline date and the lack of responses so far did not indicate that they would not be submitting at all. Members concurred with this. Due to extended deadline date the publishing of the results would be delayed by two weeks.
- 8.4. Members asked that MOSL ensure that all surveys and RFI's closed at a consistent time in the day.
- 8.5. Members expressed support for the spreadsheet that was issued with RMEX that allowed for internal collation of answers.
9. Members thanked MOSL for publishing the public papers on the website in good time.