

## Minutes of the Metering Committee Meeting 57

16 December 2025 | 09:30 – 12:00

Via MS Teams

Status of the Minutes: Approved

### MEMBERS PRESENT

Spencer Mattia	SM	Chair*	Angela Brown	AB	Wholesaler Member
Jordanna Lo	JL	Retailer Member	Michelle Thompson	MT	Wholesaler Member
Jamie Davies	JD	Retailer Member Alternate	Rosie Rand	RR	Wholesaler Member
Cillian Mccarthy	CM	Retailer Member	Mitchell Yeoman-Boldry	MYB	Wholesaler Member
Ben Kershaw	BK	Retailer Member	James Mackenzie	JM	Customer Representative Member
Steve Formoy	SF	MOSL Affiliate Member*			

*\*Non-Voting Members of the Committee*

### OTHER ATTENDEES

Chris Dawson	CD	MOSL Presenter	Toks Talabi	TT	MOSL Secretariat
Elliot Smith	ES	MOSL Presenter	Louis Brennan	LB	MOSL Observer
Liz D’Arcy	LDa	MOSL Presenter	Adrian Smith	AS	MOSL Observer
Kye Smith	KS	Wholesaler Observer	Lee Millward	LM	Wholesaler Observer
Mark Whitall	MW	Retailer Observer			

## APOLOGIES

Kevin McCalliskey	KM	Wholesaler Member	Paul Heron	PH	Retailer Member
Sindiso Bango-Dube	SBD	Retailer Member			

## 1. Welcome, Apologies and Compliance

- 1.1. The Chair welcomed everyone to the Metering Committee (“Committee”) meeting and noted that apologies had been received from SBD.
- 1.2. The Chair drew attendees’ attention to the MOSL recording policy and reminded members that, in line with section 5.7 of the Market Arrangements Code (“MAC”), they were to act impartially and not in the interest or as a representative of any organisation or individual.
- 1.3. It was confirmed that the meeting was quorate.

## 2. Minutes and Actions from Previous Meetings

- 2.1. The Committee agreed to approve the minutes of the Metering Committee meeting held on 21 October 2025 as an accurate record of the meeting.
- 2.2. The Committee agreed that the following actions could be closed: A55\_01 & A55\_02.

## 3. Smart Meter Read Hub (SMRH)

- 3.1. The Chair provided an update on the status of the Smart Meter Read Hub, with the following key points provided:
  - A second working group meeting was held the previous week and the outcomes of that are currently under review.
  - The consultation on the User Draft Agreement has been completed. A webinar will be setup to review this before updating the agreement and reissuing. MOSL will then start reviewing a privacy notice.
  - The MOSL Team is preparing a set of FAQs following some Trading Parties’ (“TP”) requests, which will be published online once completed.

- Six TPs have signed up to be early adopters. The MOSL Team will be reaching out to them shortly to co-ordinate some initial connectivity tests.
- Phase 1 of the development is nearing completion. MOSL was shown a demo recently which was very positive. MOSL will begin testing the SMRH after Christmas and communications will go out to the early adopters regarding next steps. Phase 2 will enter development in the new year.
- Discussions surrounding Third Party access issues have been held with OfWat and TPs.

There were no further discussions on this agenda item.

#### 4. Strategic Metering Programme Update

- 4.1.** CD stated that the programme is overall on track, with seven tasks completed and fourteen deliverables currently being worked on.
- 4.2.** The Committee was informed that the Strategic Settlement review is currently on hiatus due to limited MOSL resources but will recommence in January.
- 4.3.** The Settlement Strategy was presented to the Panel in November. The Panel's feedback was overall positive and they look forward to being presented with the refined version in March. Their recommendations included:
  - Elaborating on success factors.
  - Expanding upon what the future may look like
  - Factoring in customer back-billing risks.
- 4.4.** An update on No Flow was provided, and MOSL has suggested a possible interim solution that involves modifying the report for an end-to-end process. A decision will be presented to the Committee in January.
- 4.5.** The Committee was informed that there was a unanimous decision on 9<sup>th</sup> December from the Code Change Committee ("CCC") on Transfer Reads CPW159. SF flagged to the Committee that the concerns raised by Everwater and two other TPs – such as the relative accuracy of certain read estimates - were duly considered by CCC during the decision making process.

The Chair thanked CD for the update. There were no further discussions on this item.

## 5. Smart Metering Guidance Document

**5.1.** CD updated the Committee on the Smart Metering Guidance Document, stating that he foresees this document initially being fluid and requiring an update circa every six months. He outlined that the purpose of the document is:

- To provide a clear criteria for classifying a meter as “Smart AMI”;
- To establish performance standards;
- To establish a central reference for resolving issues with faulty Smart AMI meters.

**5.2** CD stated that, whilst not dictating its use, Clause 5.1.1 of the guidance currently encourages the use of bilateral transaction B5 for Smart AMI meters that have not provided a reading. This is not set in stone and will be reviewed.

**5.3.** CD ran through the changes that have been made to the document based on feedback received by the Committee. These include:

- Moving to a more question-based format to aid clarity and flow.
- Adjusted timings for when a Retailer should raise a Request.
- Refined the scenarios for greater consistency.

**5.4.** CD asked the Committee for feedback on three potential options proposed as to how long a retailer should wait before raising a bilateral for unread bi-annual/monthly meters. There were several discussion points on this:

- Several members of the Committee highlighted the importance of both the guidance and the retailer raising the bilateral distinguishing between a meter that is reading intermittently and a meter that has stopped reading entirely. CD noted that the guidance does currently state that if there are sufficiently consistent readings on a monthly basis then there is no need to raise a bilateral. A bilateral should only be raised once the specified number of days have elapsed since any reading at all was submitted – not since the day the meter reading was due. The Committee unanimously agreed with this option and recommended that the wholesalers in turn would need to be encouraged to do as much desktop analysis of the data available as possible before initiating a site visit once a bilateral had come through. In addition, it

was noted from a wholesaler's perspective that any bilaterals not aligned with the number of days since the readings ceased would likely be deferred. It is therefore essential that the individual responsible for initiating a deferral is made aware that the timing should be based on the days since the last reading was received. The Committee suggested that a template could be included within the template document that could be utilised in those circumstances.

- Regarding unread bi-annual meters, CD asked the Committee to confirm that they were happy with the current guidance regarding the bi-annual meters recommending a one-month period before raising a bilateral. There were no objections to this, but the point was raised that from an operational perspective if a retailer has monthly data available to them then they should still be encouraged to provide this; as this is a functionality incorporated within the SMRH.
- Regarding unread monthly meters, the Committee inquired as to whether the guidance permitted all options (A, B, and C) or if retailers were being specifically encouraged to adopt option B. Concerns were expressed that the Market Performance Framework (MPF) may require retailers to initiate bilaterals prematurely, potentially resulting in penalties if meter reads are not received promptly. Specific issues were raised regarding the timing for retailers to raise bilaterals when smart meter reads are missing, particularly for monthly meters. It was noted that under the current MPF, retailers might be compelled to act swiftly sometimes before it is warranted to avoid fines, especially when a read is missing near the end of the month. Suggestions were made that even waiting a week could still expose retailers to penalties, emphasizing that any guidance should account for the practicalities of expected read times and the consequent impacts on retailers. Additionally, questions arose about whether the risk associated with waiting longer periods (such as two weeks) is as significant as currently perceived, and further consideration was recommended to strike a balance between avoiding unnecessary bilaterals and minimizing the risk of fines. It was also proposed that the industry reconsider the read frequency for AMI (smart) meters, exploring whether alternative schedules beyond monthly or biannual intervals would better align with smart metering technology, and inquired whether this issue is under discussion.
- The Committee proposed that a two-week timeframe for monthly reads would be reasonable. This would create more certainty that the meter was faulty, enabling the wholesaler to be more pro-active after one week to check in whilst still having a

week's leeway remaining. Retailers can also verify there is some form of data available in the previous week in order to settle their market performance. CD agreed and recommended that the wording in the document is therefore changed to reflect ten consecutive days. The Committee expressed their approval for the ten-day period. SF added that if a ten-day period is decided on, the retailer should be advised to raise a bilateral sooner if their circumstances dictate t (e.g. they are close to an MPF charge). CD agreed to include this in the document.

- Concerns were raised regarding the development of the guidance document, particularly its perceived connection to the Market Performance Framework (MPF). Wholesalers highlighted apprehensions about a potential increase in bilateral deferrals, which could substantially impact their workload. Further discussion addressed whether the MPF is appropriate for smart metering, as it may introduce additional tasks for both wholesalers and retailers without effectively resolving core challenges. Committee members noted that wholesalers such as Anglian and Thames, who manage large portfolios of smart meters, might experience significant increases in bilateral activity should monthly reads become standard practice; this could place considerable strain on both wholesaler and retailer teams. While it was observed that only a small proportion of meters currently require monthly readings—providing some reassurance—it was cautioned that expanding monthly reads to more meters would present a significant operational challenge. CD responded to this that the movement from bi-annual reads to monthly reads has been deferred as a project until there is a stronger understanding of how the smart meter rollout will go. If and when this change does happen, the guidance would be updated.

5.5. The Committee raised the question as to whether Smart AMIs need to conform with the current two options for reading frequencies initially established for legacy meters, or if there is there one uniform frequency that all could align with (e.g. quarterly). CD responded that this was considered in the metering strategy discussion, but it was decided that there currently isn't enough data available to make that decision yet. This will be incorporated into the work Abu is currently doing though in regards to what the future will look like. The Chair added that the initial launch of the SMRH is not far away and so the data required for that decision will be available soon.

5.6 In reference to the scenario flow chat provided, the Committee recommended that an alternate word to "dispute" is used to describe a smart meter issue. CD agreed to update it to a more suitable word.

- 5.7 The Committee raised the issue of best practice should there be a major energy fault in particular area, leaving a large number of meters unread and causing a large amount of bilaterals to be raised. It suggested that in this eventuality, clear communication between the wholesalers and retailers would need to be encouraged to resolve it in the most effective way. CD agreed to go away and consider how best to reflect this scenario in the guidance.
- 5.8. CD asked the Committee for feedback on the proposed use of 'INFOREQD' as the default deferral code in the guidance. The Committee responded that 'INFOREQD' is a commonly used request for the retailer to action something so may not be the most appropriate, before proposing 'REGULAT' as a potential alternative, as well as asking how difficult it would be to create a new code. CD responded that a new code would be possible but that would delay the publishing of the guidance until mid-2026, which is not something MOSL are looking to do. It was proposed that MOSL undertake a data review to see which code was used the least, with a view to using that. The Chair agreed to undertake this.
- 5.9. CD informed the Committee that the revised version of the Smart Meter Guidance Document would be provided at least one week before MC58, with a view of obtaining final approval in MC58.

There were no further discussions on this agenda item. There was a 15-minute break in proceedings before the Committee returned for the next item.

## 6. Smart Metering Rollout Update

- 6.1. LDa opened the item by displaying the status of the visibility of data relating to the Targets, Plans and Actuals of both Smart Ready meters and Smart Enabled meters. There are currently two blind spots in this data:
- No current central view of Smart Enabled plans by postal geography or SPID. MOSL's understanding is that there should only be a small delay between Smart Ready plan dates and Smart Enabled plan dates.
  - No current central view of when meters become Smart Ready. CMOS only becomes aware when the meter becomes Smart Enabled.
- 6.2. LDa displayed the AMP8 cumulative targets per year per wholesaler, with an overall target of 66% of all non-household meters being Smart Meters by the end of AMP8 (2029/30) and all

wholesalers in England targeting having at least some smart meters in that period. However, it is currently unclear whether these targets relate to deploying Smart Enabled meters or Smart Ready meters.

- 6.3.** LDa displayed two geographical maps representing the current time frames for both Smart Meter Implementation and Smart Meter Completion rollouts per geographical area. These maps are now available on the MOSL website.
- 6.4.** LDa displayed the status of each wholesaler's provision of data to MOSL regarding Smart Meter Implementation. For those that have yet to begin implementation, LDa acknowledged they were going through procurement and planning exercises. Some are slightly behind schedule in terms of providing an update, but most have committed to doing so within the next month. Affinity Water will be providing an update in the next week, and Sutton & East Surrey Water have provided a verbal update. LDa expects the overall picture to look healthier by MC58.
- 6.5.** LDa informed the Committee that a new tab has been created on the Metering Dashboard that shows the trends of Smart Meter Enabling. A milestone of 10% of all meters being Smart Enabled was achieved this year. The tab also displays a breakdown of the percentage of meters that are Smart Enabled per postal sector.
- 6.6.** LDa displayed a table comparing the 1A Targets vs 3B Actuals. Overall, the CMOS data shows that the number of Smart Meters enabled across all wholesalers in 2024/25 was circa 7,000 less than the target provided for 2024/25 in AMP8. The AMP8 In-Year target for 2025/26 was circa 120,000, and if the number so far actually installed in 2025/26 is used to then calculate a monthly rate of installation, the forecast for 2025/26 as a whole shows a prediction of circa 39,000 smart meters actually installed – a deficit of circa 80,000 compared to the target. Several members of the Committee commented on this particular set of data:
- The Committee suggested that calculating a monthly average based on the data obtained so far is not necessarily a reliable formula as there are usually caveats in a wholesaler's delivery plan that may or may not apply to specific months. It also encouraged MOSL to establish once again whether the data available is based on Smart Meters Enabled or Smart Meters Ready before drawing too many conclusions. For example, Thames Water are currently introducing a new

technology that has caused a lag in data being sent; the 12,000 figure displayed for their CMOS in-year installs as of December 2025 is not accurate.

- AB informed the Committee that it took a while for Northumbrian Water to get some partners on board and are handling the follow up work that arose; they are hoping to hit their AMP8 In-Year targets for 2025/26 in the last three months of the year.
- KS informed the Committee that United Utilities have had a number of meters installed that are not yet showing as such in CMOS.
- CD reassured the Committee that the data currently being displayed/discussed was to aid and inform discussion and that MOSL did not have any intention of sharing it outside of the Committee.
- LDa informed the Committee that some wholesalers had flagged to her that they were facing specific challenges within the non-household market in regards to the smart meter roll out when compared to the household market. The latter would likely present a more positive picture. KS concurred that the non-household roll out had been a lot more difficult.

The Committee suggested that MOSL could track which meters had been installed via their serial numbers in CMOS, to help mitigate any lag in data being submitted, but also advised that it was perhaps best for MOSL and the Committee to continue working with the current data processes and see what the results are at the end of the year.

**6.7.** LDa asked the Committee if formally tracking this data after 2025/26 concludes would be a productive use of time and resources. The Committee responded that the data is useful for retailers to be able to foresee the number of transactions that will be coming in regarding metering exchanges. SF added that the Strategic Panel would find it useful for the Committee to provide them with an update on the rollout a suitable time after 2025/26 concludes.

**6.8.** There were two key next steps that arose from this item:

- MOSL will contact any remaining wholesalers who have not yet provided MOSL with their rollout plan.

- MOSL will reach out to Baringa to discuss the potential issues facing certain wholesalers with their rollouts. Baringa are currently working with OfWat on collating data on this so Baringa would be a useful initial source of information, especially in helping MOSL understand whether the delays primarily stem from installation or from updating CMOS. The Committee agreed that talking to Baringa would be useful.

There were no further discussions on this agenda item.

## 7. CPW162: Cyclic Read Skip Codes

**7.1.** ES introduced the item as an update on the consultation that took place in November on CPW162 and asked the Committee to note the results. ES reaffirmed that the purpose of CPW162 is to align the market as to reasons why meter reads have been skipped. CPW162 is set for CCC recommendation in February 2026. CWP162 involves two elements:

- The enabling transactions: TCORR182 (pre-existing) and T106 (new).
- The proposed list of skip codes.

**7.2.** ES displayed the results of the consultation in terms of overall market sentiment, which was very healthy. Of the 19 parties that responded (12 wholesalers, 6 retailers and the CCW), 79% agreed with the proposed list of skip codes, 73% agree that CMOS is the best or only place to host them, and 84% agree with the use of new and existing transactions.

**7.3.** ES displayed the list of skip code alterations that arose from the consultation, all of which will be fed back to RWG in January.

**7.4.** ES displayed the current cost to market estimates based on the consultation: 8 TPs have provided their estimates. 3 responded that the cost would be negligible/close to zero and 5 estimated a cost range of £500 > £100,000. MOSL have therefore calculated a top and bottom end estimate range overall of £266,700 > £355,600. The key cost drivers that arose were system upgrades, testing, market reading contract alterations, and integration with asset management systems. The cost to CMOS is currently estimated at £91,904, but more work will be done on these figures before they are presented to the CCC in February 2026.

**7.5.** ES asked the retailers within the Committee that have not yet responded to please send over their estimates by mid-January, and that an official email request regarding this will go out in

the next two days. The Committee raised the point that at this time of year a lot of suppliers rely on IT departments and third parties to provide them with cost estimates, so MOSL needs to factor this into the timeline of when to expect to receive them.

**7.6.** ES displayed the results of the consultation in terms of overall impact and alignment issues. 10 of the 19 respondents predicted low to no impact, 3 predicted medium-level impact and 6 predicted high impact. There was a market wide desire for the ability to provide photographic evidence when using a skip code. A critical enabler that was mentioned was that MVI/MHI access would be crucial to allow TPs the ability to process large volumes of transactions efficiently. The Committee noted that some retailers only use LVI and could therefore be at risk. ES responded that many of those retailers had fed back that the impact on them would be low, but that it's something worth raising with them again.

**7.7.** ES displayed the results of the consultation in terms of lead time and missed impacts. 14 TPs expect it to take 6 months or less to implement and 3 TPs expect it to take 12 months or more, with one citing more than two years. One impact that was raised often was the UI clarity in CMOS, so MOSL will be paying close attention to this.

**7.8.** ES displayed the timeline for next steps. MOSL are meeting with the RWG in January 2026; the CCC recommendation will take in February 2026; the OfWat decision would occur in June 2026, and if successful the code would be implemented in December 2026.

There were no further discussions on this agenda item.

## 8. AOB incl. Reflections on the Meeting

**8.1.** The Chair reminded the Committee that MC60 in March will take place in person at MOSL's head office.

**8.2.** The Chair introduced LB, who will be taking over as Secretariat for 12 months whilst TT is absent.

**8.3.** The Chair informed the Committee that there had been informal internal discussions at MOSL regarding the cadence of the Committee meetings. The Chair invited the Committee to contact him regarding their thoughts on the meetings taking place every 6 weeks or every 2 months.

8.4. JL suggested that adding a standardised list to CMOS of makes of meter would be beneficial. CD invited JL to contact him further on this.

8.5. The Chair thanked the Committee and closed the meeting.

## 9. Actions from the Meeting.

Action	Owner	Completion by
<p><u>Smart Metering Guidance Document</u></p> <p><b>ACTION 57_01:</b> CD to revise the guidance document based on the Committee’s feedback and circulate for review before MC58.</p>	Chris Dawson	January 2026
<p><u>Smart Metering Guidance Document</u></p> <p><b>ACTION 57_02:</b> The Chair to undertake a data review on which deferral code is the least used, in a view to proposing it’s use for un-read smart meter bilaterals.</p>	Spencer Mattia	January 2026
<p><u>Smart Metering Rollout Update</u></p> <p><b>ACTION 57_03:</b> MOSL to request rollout plans from any wholesalers who are yet to provide one.</p>	MOSL	January 2026
<p><u>Smart Metering Rollout Update</u></p> <p><b>ACTION 57_04:</b> MOSL to reach out to Baringa to discuss potential issues facing wholesalers with their NHH smart meter rollouts.</p>	MOSL	January 2026
<p><u>CPW162: Cyclic Read Skip Codes</u></p> <p><b>ACTION 57_05:</b> MOSL team to send an email to retailers requesting cost estimates for system changes</p>	MOSL	January 2026

related to skip codes, with a response deadline before the February CCC paper.		
--	--	--