

# Minutes of the Metering Committee Meeting Nine

07 December 2021 | 09:30 – 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	Mark Doherty	MD	Retailer Member
Emma Birch	EB	Wholesaler Member	Claire Stanness	CS	Retailer Member
Kevin McCalliskey	KM	Wholesaler Member	Claire Yeates	CY	Retailer Member
Michelle Thompson	MT	Wholesaler Member	Shaun Kent	SK	Ofwat Representative*
Mitchell Yeoman-Boldry	MYB	Wholesaler Member	John Davies	JD	MOSL Representative*

*\*Non-Voting Members of the Committee*

## OTHER ATTENDEES

Martin Hall	MH	MOSL Presenter	Alex Cowie	AC	MOSL Secretariat
Simon Bennett	SB	MOSL Presenter	Dene Marshallsay	DM	Artesia Presenter
Florentina Monea	FM	MOSL Presenter	Giles Fox	GF	Artesia Observer
Ivy Mandinyenya	IM	MOSL Presenter	Adrian Smith	AS	MOSL Observer
Huw Comerford	HC	MOSL Observer			

## APOLOGIES

Ben Kershaw	BK	Retailer Member	Paul Heron	PH	Retailer Member
-------------	----	-----------------	------------	----	-----------------

### 1. Welcome and Apologies

- 1.1. The Chair welcomed everyone to the Metering Committee (“Committee”) meeting noting that apologies for absence had been received from BK and PH.
- 1.2. The Chair noted that it was KM’s first Committee meeting and welcomed him to the Committee.
- 1.3. 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.
- 1.4. 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 09 November as an accurate record of Committee Meeting 8.
- 2.2. It was agreed that the following actions could be closed: A06\_04; A07\_01; A08\_01; A08\_02 and A08\_03.

## 3. QSP3 Updating Volume Validation Tolerance – CPW128

- 3.1. The Committee received an update from FM on the progress of CPW128, noting that the Committee had approved the Problem Statement and Proposed Solution at its last meeting and the Change Proposal had been raised and passed Gate 1 at the November Panel.
- 3.2. It was further noted that the Committee were being asked for any final comments and feedback on the Consultation Note and for approval of the Note at this meeting.
- 3.3. The Committee discussed the CPW128 Consultation Note, noting that:
  - whilst no changes to the Consultation Note was required, further clarity around the impact on customers should be added in the Draft Recommendation Report, particularly around whether the proposed change would increase or decrease the risk of future bill shock; and

### **ACTION MC09\_01**

- whether to include additional historic reads (beyond the past three/four reads included in the current change proposal) had been considered by MOSL. However, when this was looked into by CGI, it became clear that there were diminishing returns and increased error risk from complexity and that the inclusion of three historic reads appeared to be optimal.
- 3.4. Following discussion, the Committee:
    - **AGREED** the Consultation Note.
  - 3.5. It was noted that the legal drafting that accompanied the Consultation Note had only recently been finalised and that FM would circulate this to Committee members following the conclusion of the meeting.

### **ACTION MC09\_02**

**FM left the meeting**

## 4. QSP8 Transfer Reads (PIP127 Change Proposal)

- 4.1. The Committee received an update from IM on the progress of the Transfer Reads Change Proposal, noting the response to the feedback from previous Committee meetings and the draft consultation questions.
- 4.2. It was noted that the plan for the Change Proposal was for the consultation to be issued in January, a summary of responses to be available for the February Committee meeting and the Draft Recommendation Report to come to the March Committee meeting before going to the Panel for approval later that month. It was further noted that the Transfer Reads Change Proposal

was now a joint change proposal alongside CPW120, which had emerged from the Bilaterals Programme and that the timelines for both changes had now been aligned.

- 4.3. The Committee were reminded that the purpose of this session was for them to provide initial comments on the draft Consultation Note and Questions and that further comments could be provided by email ex-Committee and at the January Committee meeting.
- 4.4. The Committee discussed the Transfer Reads Change Proposal and draft consultation questions, noting that:
- The purpose of this change was to get better data on the reasons why estimated transfer reads are used and not to directly reduce the use of estimated transfer reads and that the MOSL team should review the language used in the Consultation Note to ensure that the purpose was accurately reflected.
  - Similarly, the language used in the Consultation Note should make clear that the change is an enabler for improved levels of customer service but that it will not deliver improved customer service levels in and of itself.
  - If the change was approved and the new skip codes were introduced, it would be important for the Committee continue its work in this area by reviewing the reasons given for the use of estimated transfer reads over time and look at potential changes and/or guidance to address them.
  - It would be crucial for additional communications to Trading Parties to accompany the introduction of new skip codes to try and ensure that accurate reasons are entered and stop another default code emerging.
- 4.5. Additionally, the Committee noted that there was currently no meaningful penalty for Retailers who knowingly allow the customer experience to suffer by virtue of using an estimated Transfer Read. The Committee observed that there was the potential to improve Transfer Read performance by including it either in OPS/MPS reporting or within the new holistic reporting framework and noted that this had already been communicated internally within MOSL. It was further noted that this Change Proposal was only one part of the Transfer Reads QSP, with further interventions to come, and that MOSL plan to produce a dashboard as part of this work to monitor reason codes and cross check against the Bilaterals Hub.

#### Questions for Retailers

- Question 2 might benefit from the additional sub question “If you are unable to obtain a visual transfer read, what action do you then take?”. The purpose of this sub question would be to try and obtain some data on the extent to which customer transfer reads are allowed/encouraged by Retailers where they are not able to obtain a visual transfer read (as permitted by the Ofwat Code of Practice) without widening the scope of the change.
- Question 3 might be improved by changing “increasing the number of Estimated reason codes” to “increasing the number and clarity of Estimated reason codes” as this would reflect the desire to stop another one of the new codes becoming the default entry.

### Questions for Retailers, Wholesalers and Others

- Question 2 should include a request for additional as well as alternative estimated reason codes.
- It would be helpful to include a question asking for Trading Party views on the potential impact of the change on customers.

4.6. Following discussion, the Committee:

- **NOTED** the draft of the PIP127 Transfer Read Estimated Reason Code consultation questions; and
- **NOTED** PIP127 Transfer Read Estimated Reason Code timeline.

## 5. QSP6 Hard to Read Meters

5.1. The Committee received an update from SB on the Hard to Read Meters Definition and Guidance Document, noting that the feedback provided at the last Committee meeting and ex-Committee had been incorporated into the draft and that sign off on the Document was requested ahead of its upload on the MOSL website.

5.2. The Committee:

- **AGREED** the Hard to Read Meters Definition and Guidance Document.

5.3. It was noted that the Suppliers Matrix which had been distributed to the Committee was now available on the MOSL website.

## 6. QSP1 Sharing Consumption Data

6.1. The Committee received an update from MYB on the progress of QSP1 'Sharing Consumption Data' ("QSP1"), noting that Trading Party feedback had now been worked into the Data Sharing Agreement and that this was now ready to go for signing and had been shared with Contract Managers and that it was expected that data sharing would begin soon, although some chasing of Trading Parties would likely be required.

6.2. The Committee welcomed an update from JD that he had been advocating engagement with the Data Sharing work with the regional water resource planning groups and would continue to do so.

## 7. Strategic Themes Updates

### Roles and Responsibilities

7.1. The Committee received an update from CY on the progress of the Roles and Responsibilities work, noting that three consultants had responded to the revised ITT, all three were good candidates and that an appointment would be confirmed shortly after the next Sub Group meeting.

### Enhancing Metering Technology

**DM and GF joined the meeting**

7.2. MH updated on the progress of the Enhancing Metering Technology strategic theme, noting the progress being made by Artesia and that the Interim Report was due to be submitted by the

middle of the month and that this was an opportunity for the Committee to provide input ahead of that Report.

- 7.3. The Committee noted an overview of Artesia's findings to date, provided by DM, which highlighted their approach to stakeholder engagement, the potential benefits for each stakeholder and outlined the emerging strategies.
- 7.4. The Committee discussed Artesia's findings, emphasising that:
- The key deliverable from this project was the proposed metering technology strategy for the non-household market, including data standardisation. This would then feed into a discussion around how the strategy would be funded as part of a wider engagement piece.
  - More needed to be done to quantify the stakeholder benefits, better articulate the benefits to the Regulator and policymakers and to link to the data presented by Andrew Tucker (Thames Water) which stated that continuous flow meters represent 26% of non-household consumption.
  - When working up the stakeholder benefits case further thought needs to be given for how this would land internally with each stakeholder in making the case for smarter metering (e.g. what evidence would a Wholesaler need to make smarter metering a cornerstone of its PR24 submission).
  - When considering the state of existing meters, Artesia should be careful not to assume that better technology is resulting in better outcomes as existing meter read performance data would indicate that larger meters, which are generally better maintained, are not being performing better than smaller meters. As such it would be important to be able to make a cost/benefit case for enhanced meter technology leading to better meter read performance and what this means for customers.
  - Enabling cost efficiencies should be added to the list of aims.
  - Committee members were open to further engagement with Artesia to fill any information gaps ahead.
- 7.5. It was also noted that CCW had not held a separate session with Artesia and that one would be arranged.
- 7.6. Artesia confirmed that they would provide a rough draft of the Interim report and proposed strategy for discussion ahead of the next Sub Group meeting on 15 December and that if more time was required for stakeholder engagement in order to produce the Interim Report they would flag this to the Sub Group.

**DM and GF left the meeting**

- 7.7. The Committee reflected on the presentation and agreed that MH should engage with Artesia on behalf of the Committee to clarify the Committee's expectations in relation to the Interim Report and ensure that they would be met. It was also agreed that MH would establish whether further support and input from the Committee was required.

**ACTION MC09\_03**

## 8. New QSP Identification

- 8.1. It was agreed that due to time constraints, discussion of this agenda item should be delayed until the Committee's January meeting.

**ACTION MC09\_04**

## 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.