

Minutes of the Metering Committee Meeting Eight

09 November 2021 | 10:00 – 12:30 | Via MS Teams

Status of Minutes: **FINAL**

MEMBERS PRESENT

Steve Formoy	SF	Chair	Christina Blackwell	CB	Customer Representative Member
Angela Brown	AB	Wholesaler Member	Ben Kershaw	BK	Retailer Member
Emma Birch	EB	Wholesaler Member	Claire Stanness	CS	Retailer Member
Michelle Thompson	MT	Wholesaler Member	Paul Heron	PH	Retailer Member
Mitchell Yeoman-Boldry	MYB	Wholesaler Member			

OTHER ATTENDEES

Shaun Kent	SK	Ofwat Representative	John Davies	JD	MOSL
Martin Hall	MH	MOSL	Alex Cowie	AC	MOSL (Secretariat)
Florentina Monea	FM	MOSL	Simon Bennett	SB	MOSL
Huw Comerford	HC	MOSL	Adrian Smith	AS	MOSL

APOLOGIES

Kat Grimley	KG	Wholesaler Member	Mark Doherty	MD	Retailer Member
Claire Yeates	CY	Retailer Member			

1. Welcome and Apologies

- 1.1. The Chair welcomed everyone to the Metering Committee (“Committee”) meeting. He noted that apologies for absence had been received from CY, KG and MD. 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 12 October as an accurate record of Committee Meeting 7.
- 2.2. It was agreed that the following actions could be closed: A06_05; A07_02; A07_03; and A07_04.
- 2.3. It was agreed that the following actions were ongoing and would remain open: A06_04; and A07_01.

3. QSP8 Transfer Reads

- 3.1. CS provided an overview of the progress of Quick Start Project 8 'Improving the Transfer Reads Process' ("QSP8"), outlining the problem, its impact on customers, retailers and meter read providers and an initial view on the root cause and the proposed solution. The presentation also highlighted how the proposed solution aligned with market objectives, its potential advantages and disadvantages for Retailers, Wholesalers and Customers.
- 3.2. CS noted that there had been a significant increase in estimated T Reads as a proportion of total T Reads over time and that since April 2019 93% of the time the reason given for entering an estimated read was 'no access'. It was suggested that the 'no access' reason code was being misinterpreted as 'not applicable' or 'not attempted'.
- 3.3. It was noted that the proposed solution for QSP8 and [CPW120 'Final Meter Reads where no Visual Read is available' \("CPW120"\)](#) were the same and that the MOSL team were working to ensure that the changes ran in parallel and supported one another.
- 3.4. The Committee provided feedback during and after the presentation, noting that:
 - Wholesalers should be included in the list of parties affected by the problem from a settlement and allowances perspective;
 - it would be hard to assess the potential impact on customer service and the customer journey before any change is implemented and its impact measured and that it might be beneficial to include impact on customers among the consultation questions;
 - potential bill shock for customers should be flagged as a possible disadvantage for the proposed change if it drives an actual read for the first time in a long period;
 - increased bilateral Submissions should be seen as a positive for Wholesalers as it allows increased levels of feedback on their assets;
 - the possibility for customers to undertake their own Transfer Reads should be considered as part of QSP8, although not necessarily within this part of the project;
 - it would be useful to provide further information on the definitions for the standard skip code list in order to try and minimise the misuse of the codes entered, particularly around the new 'No Transfer Read Attempted' code, and it would be important to land the supporting communications;
 - there would be value to enabling a comment field in support of the chosen reason for inputting an estimated transfer read; and
 - adding 'health and safety' to the skip code list should be considered.
- 3.5. Following discussion, the Committee:
 - **AGREED** the principle of replacing the existing 5 estimated reason codes with the proposed 12 (10 from the standard skip code list, plus two additions) and to use the same list for [CPW120](#); and
 - **AGREED** that a change proposal PIP127 should be prepared on this basis and that it should link in with the timeline for [CPW120](#).

4. QSP3 Read Rejections

- 4.1. FM and BK introduced the QSP3 'Read Rejections' Change Proposal, noting that this had now been allocated a change code and that the change would be taken forward as CPW128 'Updating Volume Validation Tolerances'. FM summarised the problem statement, proposed solution and timeline and noted that the Committee was being asked to approve both the problem statement and the proposed solution at this meeting.

Problem Statement

- 4.2. It was noted that there was a question around the supporting data for the proportion of read rejections that have passed Retailers internal checks quoted in the problem statement and it was agreed that the QSP team would review this and re-word to reflect underlying assumptions.
- 4.3. Several Committee members highlighted the importance of emphasising that the change was intended to align volume validation tolerances in CMOS with those used by Retailers and that the ultimate end goal was to reduce the rejections to a level where Retailers are able to look at and consider all rejections. It was noted that this would not be achieved entirely through this proposal but that it represented a step towards this end goal.
- 4.4. A Committee member asked for further information to be included in the problem statement in terms of the impact that this issue has on customers, particularly in terms of whether the proposed change could result in bill shock.
- 4.5. The Chair summarised the Committee's feedback as being to review and amend references to the percentage of rejections that have already passed Retailer's own checks and to pull out the key point around resubmission and emphasise that the current rules add cost to Retailers without providing the benefit to customers that they were intended to.
- 4.6. Following discussion, the Committee:
- **AGREED** the problem statement should be amended to reflect feedback from the Committee; and
 - **AGREED** that once the problem statement was amended it would be circulated and approved ex-Committee.

Proposed Solution

- 4.7. FM outlined the three elements of the proposed solution, noting that an additional element, which looked at additional historic reads, had been considered. However, a high-level impact assessment from CGI indicated that implementing this additional element would add a minimum of five months to the implementation timeline and add significant extra cost.
- 4.8. A MOSL observer noted that a significant part of the current problem was that at present consumption was only measured against the last read and that implementing the element of the change that enabled volume validation against additional historic reads was critical. The MOSL observer suggested that this element of the change proposal should be added back in and included in the detailed impact assessment before a final decision was taken on whether to include it in a Draft Recommendation Report. This position received broad support from Committee members.
- 4.9. A Committee member suggested that an additional change be included in the consultation suggesting a de minimus absolute volume threshold be included in the validation criteria. The

Committee member noted that based on initial analysis by their team, this would have a greater impact than the other suggested elements of the change.

4.10. Following discussion, the Committee:

- **AGREED** a further change should be made to the problem statement that includes reference to the number historic reads considered in the volume validation process as a significant part of the problem;
- **AGREED** that the proposed solution should be amended to include the additional element looking at additional historic reads; and
- **AGREED** that once the proposed solution had been amended it would be circulated and approved ex-Committee.

5. QSP1 Sharing Consumption Data

5.1. MYB updated on the progress of QSP1 'Sharing Consumption Data' ("QSP1"), noting that, in the absence of Trading Party data, MOSL and Yorkshire Water had provided some basic data sets to the Leeds Institute for Data Analytics. It was noted that the LIDA intern was in place for six months but that there might be the potential to extend the agreement with LIDA (even if not with the same intern) for an additional period if the initial results justified this, subject to funding.

5.2. MH emphasised that it was important for QSP1 to get the Trading Party data sharing agreements signed in order to progress and asked Committee members for comments on the process. It was suggested that it would help build momentum if Committee members were able to facilitate their organisations signing the data sharing agreement.

6. QSP6 Hard to Read Meters

6.1. CS presented an initial draft of the definition and guidance for hard to read meters and outlined the problem statement for QSP6 'Hard to Read Meters' ("QSP6"), its impact on Trading Parties and Customers, the root cause of the issue and the steps that QSP6 was taking to address the issue. It was noted that in addition to the 'Hard to Read Meters' definition and guidance document, QSP6 would also, separately, look to create a good practice hard to read meter flow process.

6.2. The proposed definition and guidance received positive feedback and general support from the Committee. Several Committee members provided additional suggestions for considerations that included all meters in carriageways rather than just those in carriageways with a speed limit of 50mph or higher; meters at locations which would require meter readers to interact with aggressive customers and meters at height. Committee members were asked to send any suggestions to SPB before the end of November.

7. New QSP Identification

7.1. MH introduced the session and noted that the purpose was to introduce a standardised process for the development of new QSPs by the Committee. MH described the proposed process as to establish a list on SharePoint that Metering Committee members could add to with a short description of the issue, these would then be discussed briefly in a standing agenda item at Committee meetings. If they pass this stage MOSL would then undertake a cost/benefit

assessment and a sponsor would be allocated. Projects would then be added to the Committee QSP programme.

- 7.2. The Chair suggested that the SharePoint document that captures the new QSP ideas should also allow space for a brief description of the issue and the benefits and include a standardised scoring system that enables prioritisation of ideas. A MOSL observer built on this point suggesting that existing QSPs should be included in this prioritisation ranking to ensure that energy remains focussed in the right areas. The Chair also expressed the view that this should be discussed by the Committee on a quarterly basis.
- 7.3. A Committee member suggested that it would be beneficial to capture all change proposals going through the Panel so that the Committee is able to identify areas for collaboration. Another Committee member added that the document should allow space to capture initial thoughts on the impact on Trading Parties and Customers, including the impact any change might have for Trading Parties on the holistic performance measures being used by the Market Performance Committee. The Ofwat representative expressed the view that Customer benefit should be receive additional weighting.
- 7.4. A Committee member suggested that change proposals that have been previously rejected by the Panel and Ofwat should be included for consideration and progressed if there is a clear rationale for doing so.
- 7.5. The Chair summarised the next steps as being for MH to come back to the next meeting and brief the Committee on use of the SharePoint tool including how scoring and prioritisation would be undertaken.

ACTION MC08_01

8. Strategic Themes Updates

Enhancing Metering Technology

- 8.1. MH updated on the progress of the Enhancing Metering Technology strategic theme, noting the progress being made by Artesia and the discussion at the workshop held on 3 November 2021. MH further noted that Artesia would provide a detailed presentation at the December Metering Committee meeting.

ACTION MC08_02

- 8.2. The Chair thanked MH for his update and proposed that we extend the next meeting by half an hour to allow more time for the Artesia presentation as well as other agenda items.

ACTION MC08_03

Roles and Responsibilities

- 8.3. MH updated on the progress of the Roles and Responsibilities strategic theme, noting that meetings had been held with three consultants and that a revised invitation to tender had been issued on 5 November. MH further noted that the deadline for submission of completed ITTs was 19 November and that a Roles and Responsibilities Sub Group meeting would be held on 25 November 2021 to select a consultant and that the timeline for the completion of work by the consultants was no later than the end of March 2022.

9. AOB, including reflections from the meeting
- 9.1. The Committee reflected on the meeting.
- 9.2. There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting.