

Minutes of the Metering Committee Meeting Six

14 September 2021 | 10:00 – 12:30 | Via MS Teams

Status of Minutes: **FINAL**

Present

Members	Abbreviation	Role
Steve Formoy	SF	Chair – MOSL
Claire Yeates	CY	Retailer Committee Member
Ben Kershaw	BK	Retailer Committee Member
Mitchell Yeoman-Boldry	MYB	Wholesaler Committee Member
Emma Birch	EB	Wholesaler Committee Member
Paul Heron	PH	Retailer Committee Member
Kat Grimley	KG	Wholesaler Committee Member
Angela Brown	AB	Wholesaler Committee Member
Louise Rutherford	LR	Alternate - 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
Alexander Cowie	AC	MOSL (Secretariat)
Florentina Monea	FM	MOSL
Simon Bennett	SB	MOSL
Markus Lloyd	ML	MOSL
Adrian Smith	AS	MOSL
George Monea	GM	MOSL

Apologies		
Mark Doherty	MD	Retailer Committee Member
Claire Stanness	CS	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 CS and it was confirmed that the meeting was quorate.

2. Minutes and Actions from Previous Meetings

- 2.1. The Committee approved the minutes of the Metering Committee meeting held on 10 August 2021 as an accurate record of Committee meeting 5.
- 2.2. It was agreed that the following actions could be closed: A03_01; A05_01; and A05_02.

3. Change proposal lessons learnt

- 3.1. The Chair introduced the item and recapped the discussion at the Committee's post-Panel wash up session.
- 3.2. The Chair summarised the key takeaways from post-Panel wash up discussion from the session as: ensuring that the process change proposals had been through with the Committee, including challenges raised, was emphasised; being extremely clear on the problem statement and how the solution addresses it; needing to circle back with Committee members who aren't able to attend meetings to ensure their views on change proposals approved in Committee are captured; encouraging Committee members to canvass opinion on the proposed change within their organisations and to feed these back to the Committee; playing devil's advocate on change proposals and understanding where Panel challenge might come from; and making the pros and cons identified by the Committee prominent right up front in any proposal.
- 3.3. A Committee member who also sits on the Panel noted that they felt that the draft recommendation report for [CPW118 'Minimum Meter Read Frequency' \("CPW118"\)](#) did not evidence the customer benefit it was assumed it would drive. The Committee member also echoed the importance of Committee members going back to their companies to discuss change and bringing that broader perspective back to the Committee discussion as well as any potential avenues for additional stakeholder engagement. The Committee member also noted that while the [CPW118](#) change proposal did get unanimous support from the Committee to go to Panel, this was more reflective of the Committee's view that the right thing to do, given the resource that had gone into the proposal, was to move it on to Panel and not that they uniformly supported the proposal itself.
- 3.4. A Committee member noted that it was really important for the Committee to look at the original rationale for change proposals and keep going back to them as the proposal developed to ensure that the solution addressed the original issue that had been raised.
- 3.5. JD noted that the original drive for the change was to reduce costs in the market by reducing minimum read frequency for low/no volume supply points. So, the original premise was very different from the change that ended up going to Panel. JD also noted that he was nervous about the evidence requirement mentioned as sometimes this was impossible to demonstrate before you are able to collect the data that would come once the change is in place.
- 3.6. The Customer representative emphasised the importance of getting customer evidence and that the earlier issues were raised and discussed the better the evidence that could be gathered.

4. Strategic Themes Update

- 4.1. CY introduced the update noting that the purpose was to update the Committee on the progress with the Pre-Qualification Questionnaire ("PQQ") and tender process.
- 4.2. CY noted that the timeline had been amended to allow further time for the selection of the consultants and negotiation of the contract. CY stated that the small changes made to the timeline had not impacted the proposed completion date, although this was reliant on the consultant being able to start on the expected date.
- 4.3. CY provided an overview of the PQQ responses, noting that there were six responses to the PQQ and that five had been taken through to the tender stage. CY outlined the Sub Group's thinking on which consultant's had been progressed to the tender stage.

- 4.4. CY noted that the Invitation to Tender (“ITT”) was issued on 3 September 2021 and that responses were expected by 20 September 2021. There had been a question from one consultant on then indicative budget. CY noted that MOSL had responded to this enquiry and indicated that there was not an indicative budget, that bids would be assessed on the basis of value for money and bidders should allow some scope for negotiation.
- 4.5. CY stated that MOSL would issue the ITT responses to Committee members once they were received and that it was proposed that a single Sub Group meeting would be held to review the ITT submissions on 22 September and decide who to take through to interview. SF, MH, EB, KG, MT and AB indicated that they would like to attend this meeting. CY indicated that a note would need to go out to Committee members not present at the Committee meeting inviting them to the Sub Group meeting on 22 September.

ACTION MC06_01

- 4.6. CY stated that interviews would be held on 23 October at the MOSL office in Southampton. JD and MH indicated that they would like to attend the interviews. EB noted that she would like to join but would need to dial in as she would not be able to get down to MOSL’s Southampton office in person.
- 4.7. CY noted that the team would need to capture all the questions the Committee would like asked on 23 September at the meeting on 22 September.
- 4.8. It was agreed that CY would send out invites to a debrief meeting on Tuesday 28 September following the interviews.

ACTION MC06_02

- 4.9. CY asked MH to let the candidate consultants who were taken forward to interview that it was likely the result of the project award would be communicated to them on 28 September.

ACTION MC06_03

- 4.10. CY thanked the Committee for their ongoing engagement and support.

BK left the meeting.

5. Updates on Quick-Start Projects

Quick Start Project Timings Overview

- 5.1. MH gave an overview of the expected timelines and process for each live Quick Start project. MH noted the timings of upcoming CMOS releases and how these interacted with timings of CMOS-affecting changes.
- 5.2. The Chair thanked MH and noted that Quick Start Project 3 ‘Review Meter Read Rejections’ and Quick Start Project 8 ‘Transfer Reads’ were currently scheduled to go to the Panel in October.

Quick Start Project 1 – ‘Accesses and Sharing of Existing Consumption Data’

- 5.3. MYB provided an updated on Quick Start Project 1 ‘Access to and Sharing of Existing Consumption Data’. MYB noted that the last month had been focussed on engagement and getting ready to take the change proposal to the Panel in October. MYB noted that an engagement letter had been sent out to Trading Party CEOs and that he had a speaking slot at the September User Forum and where Trading Parties would be updated. MYB also noted that it was anticipated that an

email would go to contract managers by the end of September with the data sharing agreement attached for review and signing.

- 5.4. MYB noted that the data would be passed to the Leeds Institute of Data Analytics for Analytics (“LIDA”). MYB noted that a bid to the Market Improvement Fund for further resource to extend the planned six-month scope of LIDA work.
- 5.5. MYB stated that the data sharing agreement was with various Project members’ legal teams for review and sign off.
- 5.6. MH noted that CMOS data could be shared to get the project up and running and SF noted the opening of the window for bids to the Market Improvement Fund.

Quick Start Projects 5 ‘Standardised Skip Codes’ and 6 ‘Hard to Read Meters’

- 5.7. In CS’s absence SB updated the Committee on Quick Start Projects 5 and 6.
- 5.8. With regard to Quick Start Project 5 ‘Standardised Skip Codes’, SB noted that it will use the MOSL and Retailer-Wholesaler Group skip code list to replace the existing reasons for estimate field in the Transfer Reads data entry. SB noted that this would be implemented in November and that once it was rolled out, they would start to look at every other estimated read that goes into the market and whether the list could be applied more broadly.
- 5.9. With regard to Quick Start Project 6 ‘Hard to Read Meters’, SB noted that the plan was first to define what was categorised as a hard to read meter and to develop a solution flow chart. SB also noted that a risk assessment for hard to read meters was under consideration.
- 5.10. The Chair stated that given the earlier ‘lessons learnt’ discussion it might be useful to consider the origins of these projects and to revisit the purpose of the proposed changes.
- 5.11. SB described the origins of Quick Start Project 5 as being from the original Request for Input and was designed to identify why meters are being skipped.
- 5.12. SB noted that Quick Start Project 6 had originated as a way to identify what the issue was and why some meters were being classed as hard to read and what this meant.
- 5.13. KG asked whether there would be delays around CMOS changes and whether the Guidance that was introduced would be mandated. SB noted that Transfer Reads already had the reason for estimate field and that the options in this field were being reviewed and updated because generally n/a was being entered here. SB further clarified that the guidance would not be mandated but would be promoted as best practice.

Quick Start Project 8 ‘Transfer Reads’

- 5.14. On CS’s behalf SB outlined the progress of the transfer reads Quick Start Project, noting the four priorities agreed by the Committee at its August meeting. SB described the next actions for the Project as being to: go out to consultation on extending the transfer read capture time around the agreed transfer date; and to obtain data since the extension of the transfer read window following [CPW078 ‘Priority Performance Regime Changes’](#).
- 5.15. JD noted that a number of Projects were due to go out for consultation and asked how these consultations would be coordinated. SB noted that the consultations were relatively short but that the timing of them would be reviewed and considered. The Customer representative noted

that the Quick Start Project 8 Working Group was conscious of the need to schedule consultations in a way that avoided overloading Trading Parties.

- 5.16. SB noted that the consultation questions are planned to be agreed on 22 September and that it was expected to be issued in October. SB further noted that CS had reached out to a number of Trading Parties outside of the Committee to support the work of Quick Start Projects 5, 6 and 8 and invited Committee members who were interested to join any or all of the Projects.

ACTION MC06_04

- 5.17. FM noted that there were four potential change proposals associated with Quick Start Project 8 and that a number of the Committee's Quick Start Projects were converging on significant milestones at a similar time. FM noted that, as a result, there was the possibility that MOSL resources would be squeezed and that the Committee might need to review the Quick Start Project change proposals and come to a view on prioritisation.

Quick Start Project 3 'Read Rejections'

- 5.18. In BK's absence it was noted that a significant amount of analysis had been undertaken already on Quick Start Project 3 and that the team were eager to progress this as swiftly as possible as they moved towards Gate 1 in October.
- 5.19. A Wholesaler Committee member noted that they had engaged with their settlement team as well as other Wholesalers and that BK had been picking up Retailer Trading Party engagement. The Committee member noted that a lot of data had been gathered but that the working group had to really revisit and provide clarity on the purpose of the change and how it addressed a specific problem. The Committee member further noted that there was also, possibly, the opportunity to tweak the proposal to achieve much greater impact. Given this the Committee member stated that they did not want to rush this proposal to Gate 1 at a stage when it had not been fully worked through and the potential positive impact maximised.

6. Potential new Quick-Start Projects

- 6.1. MH outlined the problem statement for a potential non-market sub meter Quick Start Project, noting that it had been raised as an issue by a Wholesaler Trading Party.
- 6.2. MH noted that the potential solutions for consideration could include: removing the application of an MPS18 penalty for non-market sub meters; requiring the Wholesaler to read non-market meters more frequently; allocating the responsibility for reading both primary and sub meters to a single Trading Party rather than splitting the responsibility between Retailers and Wholesalers; introduce a requirement to fit a Automated Meter Reader or Automated Meter Infrastructure for both primary and sub meters; or to introduce a requirement to separate the supplies to primary and sub meters.
- 6.3. MH then asked the Committee for their feedback and in particular asked Committee members to voice an opinion as to whether the issue was sufficiently material to require a new Quick Start Project.
- 6.4. Several Committee members queried whether this was a market issue or specific to one Trading Party. It was agreed that this should be something considered as part of the strategic themes as it fit in well with review of roles and responsibilities and smart metering as there were potential

efficiency gains, but that this was not a major issue in the market and therefore did not require a new Quick Start Project.

- 6.5. JD noted that this might be something that could be communicated and considered by the Market Performance Framework Review (“MPF Review”) Working Group.

Trade Effluent

- 6.6. MH asked the Committee for views on whether Trade Effluent should be considered as a potential Quick Start Project. SF added that this might be something that Committee members could discuss internally and come back to at the next meeting.
- 6.7. A Committee member noted that the percentage of long unread meters at their organisation was particularly high for Trade Effluent meters. Another Committee member noted that there were broad market issues around Trade Effluent but that this might not be something for a Quick Start Project and was more of a strategic theme.
- 6.8. It was agreed that Committee members would go back to their organisations for further input and report back at the next meeting.

ACTION MC06_05

ML joined the meeting

7. Metering-Related MPF Review

- 7.1. ML outlined what the MPF is, how it is operated, the MPF Review process and the rationale for the MPF Review.
- 7.2. ML noted that the MPF had not changed a great deal since market opening and that the MPF Review was initiated in 2019 and an initial road map defined. ML described the main feature of the MPF Roadmap as targeting metrics aligned with customer outcomes, incentives that better reflect costs and benefit and to introduce a risk-based and tailored approach to market interventions. ML noted that the Market Performance Committee (“MPC”) had delegated oversight authority for the operation and development of the MPF from the Panel and described the MPC two current strategic priorities as being to deliver a holistic approach to Retailer and Wholesaler performance reporting and to drive the MPF Review.
- 7.3. ML noted the crossover organisationally between the MPF Working Group and the Metering Committee and encouraged discussions within organisations to facilitate the alignment of the MPF Review and the Metering Committee’s work.
- 7.4. ML noted areas of crossover between the Committee’s Quick Start Projects and the MPF Review, highlighting meter read frequencies and meter read responsibilities as key areas of crossover and noted where the MPF Review had already incorporated the findings of the Metering Committee’s Quick Start Projects. ML further noted that it would be useful for the MPF Review to be able to use the Metering Committee to sense check how the cost of reading meters balanced against proposed financial MPF incentives.
- 7.5. ML set out that going forwards the MPF Review would provide a regular update to the Committee on metering-related items.
- 7.6. The Chair thanked ML for his presentation and invited comments from the Committee.

- 7.7. A Committee member asked whether there had been discussions around coordinating the MPF review work with the Bilaterals programme. ML stated that it was an iterative process and that interim changes to the MPF would be included if they were raised by Bilaterals or the Market Performance Operating Plan and improved existing MPS or OPS measures.
- 7.8. Potential interdependencies and timing issues were discussed, and it was emphasised that it would be important for the Committee to feed its findings into the MPF Review particularly around the strategic themes.

8. AOB, including reflections from the meeting

- 8.1. The Committee reflected on the meeting.
- 8.2. There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting.