

Minutes of the Metering Committee Meeting Four

13 July 2021 | 10:00 – 12:00 | Via MS Teams

Status of Minutes: **DRAFT**

Present

Members	Abbreviation	Role
Steve Formoy	SF	Chair – MOSL
Claire Yeates	CY	Retailer Committee Member
Claire Stanness	CS	Retailer Committee Member
Paul Heron	PH	Retailer Committee Member
Ben Kershaw	BK	Retailer Committee Member
Mitchell Yeoman-Boldry	MYB	Wholesaler Committee Member
Kat Grimley	KG	Wholesaler Committee Member
Angela Brown	AB	Wholesaler Committee Member
Emma Birch	EB	Wholesaler Committee Member
Michelle Thompson	MT	Wholesaler Committee Member
Christina Blackwell	CB	Customer Representative (CCW) Committee Member

Other Attendees		
Shaun Kent	SK	Ofwat
John Davies	JD	MOSL
Martin Hall	MH	MOSL
Carol Sgamaro	CS	MOSL (Secretariat)
Alex Cowie	AC	MOSL (Secretariat)
Florentina Monea	FM	MOSL
Simon Bennett	SB	MOSL
Huw Comerford	HC	MOSL
Adrian Smith	AS	MOSL
Abu Rashid	AR	MOSL

Apologies		
Mark Doherty	MD	Retailer Committee Member

1. Introduction, Apologies and New Member Appointment

- 1.1. The Chair welcomed everyone to the Metering Committee (“Committee”) meeting. He noted that apologies for absence had been received from MD and that the meeting was quorate.

2. Minutes and Actions from Previous Meetings

- 2.1. The Committee approved the minutes of the Metering Committee meetings held on 15 June 2021 as an accurate record of the meeting.
- 2.2. In relation to action A03_01, it was noted that the presentation on the MPF incentives would be amended to reflect the feedback received from the MPC at their last meeting and would be shared with the Metering Committee in due course. This action would remain open.

3. Quick-Start Programme Progress

3.1. *CPW123 - Remote Read Type*

3.2. HC provided a brief summary of the consultation responses in connection with CPW123 - Remote Read Type, noting that as the consultation window had closed on 9 July, there had not been sufficient time for an in-depth analysis of the responses to be carried out.

3.3. HC further noted that it would be beneficial to hold an ad-hoc Committee meeting in July in order to allow for such analysis to be undertaken and presented back to the Committee for feedback and discussion. Thus, allowing sufficient time for the Committee's final view to be obtained on this change proposal at the August meeting and a Draft Recommendation Report to be presented to the Panel at its August meeting, if appropriate.

3.4. 14 consultation responses were received (including from 10 Wholesalers, 3 Retailers and from CCW). The respondents unanimously agreed that remote read types need to be updated.

3.5. HC explained that, when a high level impact assessment was undertaken, it was currently presented in two parts; namely part A – for the revising of codes for D3038; and part B – for the remote read flag to be removed and the renaming of the outreader ID.

3.6. The Committee noted that, due to the limited level of consultation responses, it was challenging to form a view on the potential advantages and disadvantages of this change proposal before the in-depth analysis of the responses had been carried out. However, The Committee provided an initial view based on the verbatim consultation responses.

3.7. The Committee requested that the cost-benefit element be considered for this change proposal in light of any potential detriment or benefit of removing the relevant remote read flag and whether it would warrant the proposed change.

3.8. One member noted that it may be sensible to include the renaming the meter outreader ID with Option A.

3.9. The Customer Representative member stated that it would be important to understand what this change proposal would ultimately mean in terms of benefit for the customer/customer impact (whether, for example, this change would improve customer service).

3.10. HC confirmed there had been some consultation responses regarding the impact on business, with Wholesalers stating that there would be a cost to remove the flag and, consequently, update systems. However, estimated costs had not been included in consultation responses.

3.11. JD noted that it would be useful to obtain the views of commercial meter reading organisations in relation to this change proposal.

3.12. Another member stated that it may be beneficial to consider making the relevant field non-mandatory, so as to allow each Trading Party to decide whether they would like to add the relevant flag or not, as opposed to removing it completely and whether such approach could potentially reduce costs incurred by Trading Parties as a result of this change proposal. JD confirmed that this could be explored.

3.13. *CPW118 - Minimum Read Frequency*

3.14. FM provided a brief summary of the consultation responses in connection with CPW118 - Minimum Read Frequency, noting that as the consultation window had closed on 9 July, there

had not been sufficient time for an in-depth analysis of the responses to be undertaken. Therefore, a high-level overview of the responses was provided.

- 3.15. FM noted there were mixed responses in relation to the transfer in ownership of the meter read minimum frequency data item from Wholesalers to Retailers, which meant that a specific view could not be formed on this point. FM agreed to reach out to some of the respondents to understand some areas raised as potential concerns and would then revert to the Committee with further details.
- 3.16. Members stated it would be beneficial to investigate whether it was possible to use the information already in the market to determine read frequency (i.e. using the data which was automatically calculated within CMOS) rather than having a specific ownership. A member added that, provided the correct MPS metrics could be obtained, the proposed approach would also drive continued quality.
- 3.17. FM noted that, as the change proposal seemed to contradict some of the priorities set out in the MPOP, she would arrange a couple of internal meetings to discuss this in detail.
- 3.18. In terms of operational and implementation costs, some respondents stated that system changes would be needed as a result of this change, while others stated such changes would not be required. Therefore, due to the mixed responses, it was not possible to determine the specific cost deriving from this change proposal at this point and that further analysis to assess any patterns within the responses would be undertaken ahead of the ad-hoc meeting in July.
- 3.19. In addition, respondents commented that there was a need to assess the impact of this change proposal in terms of any extra resources their business may require. FM would contact some of those respondents to obtain further details on what this may look like.
- 3.20. One member noted that it would be important to obtain an overview on costs incurred by MOSL. There was also a need to assess this change proposal against the objectives and principles set out within the Market Codes.
- 3.21. MH acknowledged that further work was needed in order to understand the process that Wholesalers use to determine both network leakage and customer leakage.
- 3.22. One member asked for a 'refresher' on why this change proposal had been raised in the first place. Another member noted that it was important to have an evaluation criterion assessing why some proposals were going forward, highlighting that there had been a large amount of time and resource spent with this change proposal.
- 3.23. In terms of next steps, FM confirmed that an in-depth analysis of the responses would be undertaken in time for the ad-hoc meeting in July, taking into account the feedback received from Members at today's meeting.
- 3.24. The Customer Member noted that CCW would work with MOSL to ensure that the research evidence deriving from the consultation responses had been assessed in detail and the conclusions from this was shared with the Committee.
- 3.25. JD noted that it was important to create a cost-benefit/business case based on the conclusions and views deriving from the analysis of the responses and then take a view at the next meeting on whether this change was worth pursuing.
- 3.26. *CPW 109 - Changing the Constraints on Customer Reads*

- 3.27. AR provided an update in relation to CPW109 - Changing the Constraints on Customer Reads, confirming that, on 28 June, Ofwat approved this change proposal, subject to one requirement. The requirement was for Retailers to provide details of their customer read validation requirements to MOSL, which would also be shared with Ofwat to enable monitoring of Retailers' approaches to validation.
- 3.28. AR explained that MOSL was proposing to carry out a short request for information (RFI) in August 2021, asking all retailers one question, namely "What validation practices they had in place to ensure that reads submitted to the Central Systems – in particular customer-supplied reads – were accurate and in line with expected usage."
- 3.29. The Committee confirmed that it was comfortable with the approach proposed by MOSL in relation to the RFI and the proposed single question.

4. Update on the Programme of Work

- 4.1 MH provided an update on the Programme of Work, confirming that an internal workshop had been held on 5 July to map links between the projects and various pieces of work, and any key areas of interdependencies between the strategic projects to ensure the various areas of work were running in a cohesive manner.
- 4.2 MH provided an overview of the areas of linkages, these included for example linkages between the strategic projects and quick start projects, and linkages between the strategic projects themselves.
- 4.3 It was noted that Metering Roles and Responsibilities was a critical project and that this project had key linkages with the strategic theme component projects, the Quick start projects and some of the external dependencies such as PR24.
- 4.4 MH went through the suggested next steps and proposed estimated timeline with the Committee. The suggested starting point was to create relevant sub-groups and agreeing the initial scoping studies for the Roles & Responsibilities and Enhanced Technology projects.
- 4.5 Following on from this, MH noted it would be important to introduce external consultant support and to determine the scope of their work.
- 4.6 Once the consultant work had been finalised, initial recommendations for next steps would be made, with the aim to design and implement detailed work packages between December 2021 and March 2023.
- 4.7 It was noted that the consultancy scoping work would be underpinned by a set of requirements, criteria and/or objectives from the Metering Review Programme (i.e., for example, allowing competition and innovation to flourish) as guiding posts for how the scoping work could be delineated and directed. These would also be linked to the objectives set out within the MOSL Business Plan.

5. Update on Progress by Sponsors

- 5.1. *Strategic Projects*
- 5.2. CY provided an update on the progress made so far on the Metering Roles & Responsibilities and Enhancing Metering Technology projects, noting that the dates for the relevant sub-group meetings would be scheduled in due course.

- 5.3. CY gave a brief outline of the proposed approach to the strategic themes, noting that the initial meeting of the sub-groups would aim to determine the meeting governance, and to approve the scope of the procurement for the scoping studies.
 - 5.4. In terms of communication and engagement, there would be an emphasis on ensuring that the work of the Metering Committee was well socialised to keep the industry informed throughout the various stages of the projects. In addition, there would be discussions in due course as to whether there should be a separate logo for the Metering Committee. These would be discussed initially via the sub-groups and reported back to the Committee at the appropriate time.
 - 5.5. *Sharing Consumption Data*
 - 5.6. MYB provided an update on Quick-start project number 1 (Access to and sharing of existing consumption data). He covered the main objectives of this project noting that it would make use of existing granular consumption data held by Trading Parties to support, for example, with formulating a view of average consumption across a variety of non-household sectors/customer segments.
 - 5.7. Anonymised data would be shared with LIDA (Leeds Institute for Data Analytics) who would aim to develop a view of average consumption for respective non-household customer segments and the results would be shared with Trading Parties and relevant groups to support informed initiatives across the industry.
 - 5.8. In terms of next steps there would be an initial meeting between the project sponsor and co-sponsors; this would aim, for example, to define methods of secure data sharing and storage, and to that end, MOSL would be drafting a data sharing agreement.
 - 5.9. Trading Party engagement would be required to understand the availability and granularity of the data held, subject to data sharing agreements. There would also be further engagement with LIDA, Yorkshire Water's Innovation Team with input from RWG water efficiency sub-group and Smart Metering Advisory Group.
 - 5.10. MH stated that one of the key aims would be to make the transfer of data as easy as possible with the support of MOSL with the drafting of the data sharing agreements.
 - 5.11. *Transfer Reads, Standardising of Skip Codes and Hard to Read Meters*
 - 5.12. Regarding Transfer Reads, CS noted that this would be the first project and that invites for an initial meeting with CB and CY had been scheduled with the aim primarily to agree the key areas, timeframe and key milestones for the project.
 - 5.13. The second project would be Standardising of Skip Codes and Hard to read Meters projects; these would run alongside one another and initial meeting invites would be scheduled in relation to these in due course.
 - 5.14. *Read Rejections*
 - 5.15. It was noted that an update on this project would be provided at the next meeting.
- ## 6. AOB, including reflections from the meeting
- 6.1. The Committee noted that, as the project's sponsors began to report back on progress and other metering related topic became more substantial (and requiring further discussions), it would be beneficial to extend the duration of the Committee meetings by thirty minutes.

6.2. There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting.