

# Minutes of the Metering Committee Meeting 11

15 February 2022 | 09:30 – 12:30 | Via MS Teams

Status of Minutes: **APPROVED**

## 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	Paul Heron	PH	Retailer Member
Kevin McCalliskey	KM	Wholesaler Member	Ben Kershaw	BK	Retailer Member
Michelle Thompson	MT	Wholesaler Member	Claire Stanness	CS	Retailer Member
Mitchell Yeoman-Boldry	MYB	Wholesaler Member	Claire Yeates	CY	Retailer Member
John Davies	JD	MOSL Representative*			

*\*Non-Voting Members of the Committee*

## OTHER ATTENDEES

Martin Hall	MH	MOSL Presenter	Alex Cowie	AC	MOSL Secretariat
Florentina Monea	FM	MOSL Presenter	Ivy Mandinyenya	IM	MOSL Presenter
Adrian Smith	AS	MOSL Presenter	Simon Bennett	SB	MOSL Observer
Huw Comerford	HC	MOSL Observer			

## APOLOGIES

Shaun Kent	SK	Ofwat Representative*			
------------	----	-----------------------	--	--	--

## 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 SK.
- 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 approved the minutes of the Metering Committee meeting held on 11 January as an accurate record of Committee Meeting 10, subject to confirmation from CB that she had no further comments.

### **ACTION MC11\_01**

- 2.2. It was agreed that the following actions could be closed: A10\_01; A10\_02; A10\_03; A10\_04; and A10\_06.

## 3. Strategic Metering Review Progress

### **BK joined the meeting.**

- 3.1. The Committee welcomed an update from JD on the progress of the Strategic Metering Review, who highlighted the recent engagement with the Strategic Panel at its January meeting. JD noted that during their discussion the Strategic Panel had:

- indicated their support for the programme of work and in particular the two strategic themes;
- asked that the Committee present back at future meetings on its progress in delivering benefits into the market through its work programme;
- detailed their desire to create a market vision for metering and have the Committee work to KPIs supporting this vision;
- requested the Committee prioritise an additional quick start project looking at asset health and asset assurance; and
- recommended the Committee developed its own understanding of what customers want from metering.

- 3.2. JD also noted that Mike Keil, the CCW representative on the Strategic Panel, had offered CCW's assistance in working with the Committee to undertake some research to better understand customer views on metering.

- 3.3. The Committee thanked JD for his update and discussed the Strategic Panel's feedback that it would be useful to work with CCW to understand more about what customers want from metering and the suggestion that the Committee establish a project looking at asset health and assurance, noting the following points:

#### Customer views

- When gathering customer views on what they want from their meter services it would be important to note that whilst a collated view might be presented, customer views could be segmented by Wholesaler region and that pulling out these differences and feeding back to Wholesalers would be useful.
- It was suggested that it might be possible to include a targeted metering-related question in the B-Mex survey pilot to generate some data on customer views. However, it was noted that the B-Mex pilot was not expected in the near future.

- It was suggested that the Committee could coordinate a customer panel to get feedback on what customers would like to see from metering services and it was agreed that CB would take this away for discussion with Mike Keil and other CCW colleagues and present back on some ideas at a future Committee meeting.

## ACTION MC11\_02

### Potential asset health and assurance project

- A number of Committee members are involved in large scale projects at their companies looking at broken meter issues. CS and EB volunteered to be involved in any future project group and EB volunteered to act as sponsor for a future project in this area.
- It shouldn't be assumed that all of the zero consumption meters in the market are broken meters. A number of them may be meters at derelict premises where the customer has yet to decide what to do with the building. Given this, it is important to understand what Trading Parties can do to resolve this issue (e.g. could they initiate de-registration of these kind of meters) as part of any project looking at this.

## 4. Enhancing Metering Technology

- 4.1. The Committee received an update from CY on the progress of the Enhancing Metering Technology workstream noting that a new draft of the Report had been circulated to members in advance of the meeting.
- 4.2. The Committee received a briefing from AS on proposed plans for the next steps on communicating the Report and engaging with Trading Parties and regulators to ensure that the Report lands as effectively as possible.
- 4.3. It was emphasised that it was now crucial to move away from iterating the report, which now needed to be closed off and to move towards a focus on how to extract maximum value from it and think about what comes next.
- 4.4. The Committee were asked for their views on:
  - Whether the report helps Wholesalers in preparing their WRMP and PR24 submissions.
  - Whether Wholesaler Committee member's companies planned to include NHH smart metering investment in their WRMP and PR24 submissions.
  - Whether the report is helpful to Retailers in respect of making the case for investment in add-on metering technology.
  - Whether there were any significant gaps in the report or areas where further work was required.
  - Whether they had any feedback on the communications plan or additional ideas on how to maximise the impact of the report.
- 4.5. Committee members provided feedback on the areas requested and following key points were noted:

Whether the report helps Wholesalers in preparing their WRMP and PR24 submissions

- Wholesaler Committee members were generally supportive that the report would be useful in preparing WRMP and PR24 submissions. However, it was noted that how useful the report was would depend on where in their smart meter roll out journey a Wholesaler was as there is no new information for those already well advanced in their thinking.

Whether Wholesaler Committee member's companies planned to include NHH smart metering investment in their WRMP and PR24 submissions

- Wholesaler members expected smart metering investment to be included in WRMP and PR24 submissions, although variations in where different Wholesalers were in their smart meter roll out journeys were noted alongside differences in approach and timeline for proposed smart meter roll outs.
- It was agreed that it would be a useful exercise to map the approach to smart meter investment being proposed in each Wholesaler region, which would help to highlight the challenges being faced by Retailers.

**ACTION MC11\_03**

Whether the report is helpful to Retailers in respect of making the case for investment in add-on metering technology.

- Retailer members were generally supportive of the report as being useful in making the case for investment in add-on metering technology, although the extent to which Retailers were dependent on the approach being taken by Wholesalers (including how they planned to communicate data generated by enhanced technology) was noted.
- In addition to a more general point about the importance of ensuring Retailers were able to take reads from any smart technology installed by Wholesalers, how technology would port from one Retailer to another in the event of a customer switching (especially where different technologies are used) was raised as a blocker to investment in add-on technology. Although it was noted that it was not necessarily expected that the report would address this issue and that it might form part of further subsequent work to build on the report.
- It was noted that an additional substantial piece of work on data standard specifications for add-on technology would add value in the market and facilitate smoother switching, access to data and a more seamless customer experience.

Whether there were any significant gaps in the report or areas where further work was required.

- It was noted that the purpose of the report is to lift up conversations around the case for smart metering technology to a strategic level and not to drill down into all of the details around what comes next. Members noted that, in this context, the report works well in making a high-level case for smart meter roll out across the market and acting as an engagement tool for bringing Trading Parties together and opening discussions around how to do this.

- It was suggested that it would be helpful to add more clarity to the report around what Trading Parties are being asked to do with it and to frame the business case in the light of this request.
- It was noted that the report was light in terms of data requirements for smart meter read technology and that this would be an important area to cover in terms of next steps for the Enhancing Metering Technology strategic theme.
- It was suggested that it would be crucial for the success of smart meter roll outs to establish what Wholesalers should do with the data generated once the smart meters were in the ground.
- Stranded assets were an area noted as a potential additional workstream for the Committee to consider as part of a future programme of work in support the Enhancing Metering Technology strategic theme.
- It was noted that Artesia had updated the business case following feedback from Committee members and that a revised version of the business case would be circulated.
- It was noted that the report should acknowledge potential GDPR issues around enhanced metering technology, including access to data and removing the ability of the previous Retailer to read a meter after a customer has switched.

*Whether they had any feedback on the communications plan or additional ideas on how to maximise the impact of the report.*

- The Committee were fully supportive of the comms plan and in particular the proposal to hold a webinar to launch the report, which members felt would be a really useful engagement tool.
- It was noted that the Committee should look to use the insight gained from Trading Party interviews undertaken during the consultation phase to drive the next phase of the work.
- It was noted that time would be required to address the interdependencies between the Roles and Responsibilities and Enhancing Metering Technology Strategic Themes before any potential Metering Conference.

4.6. SF and CY reminded Committee members that final feedback required by Thursday 17 February.

4.7. CY and AS thanked Committee members for their feedback.

## 5. CPW128

5.1. The Committee received a briefing from BK and FM on the feedback received from the CPW128 consultation, noting that there had been a high level of engagement and ten additional suggested alterations to or builds on the solution. BK noted that a little more time was required to process the feedback and provide a proposer's position.

5.2. It was noted that Committee members were asked to provide feedback on the proposed changes by close of business on Friday 18 February. FM outlined that in order to meet a December 2022 implementation date, the 1 March post-Panel wash up session would then be used for a full

discussion of the consultation feedback and sign off on the DRR would be at the 15 March Committee meeting.

- 5.3. The Committee noted that a number of the additional suggestions received were not necessarily alterations to the solution but potentially complimentary suggestions that could be taken forward as additional changes after the proposed solution had been implemented. The Committee further noted that it was not necessary to tie together any of the proposed additions with the proposed solution, and that trying to include any of them would delay the implementation of the solution, the benefit of which had been identified and defined, by a minimum of six months without necessarily delivering any additional benefit to the market.

## 6. Transfer Reads QSP - CPW130 update

- 6.1. The Committee received an update from CS and IM on the progress of the Transfer Reads Change Proposal ([CPW130 'Transfer Reads Estimated Reason Codes'](#)), noting the consultation response and key points raised.

- 6.2. The Committee discussed the CPW130 consultation response, noting that:

- While the CPW130 and CPW120 change proposals had formed a joint consultation, the changes themselves would stand alone and that feedback on CPW120 was not a part of the Committee's considerations on CPW130.
- Trading Parties had expressed very high level of support for CPW130 during the consultation phase.
- With regards to feedback that changing the list of codes would not make any difference to the operation of the market as the issue was not the sufficiency of the existing codes but the fact they were not used, it supported the proposer's view that this point would be addressed by the publication of supporting communications on the definitions of each of the new estimated reason codes and guidance around how they were used. It was also noted that the purpose of the change proposal was to better understand the use of estimated transfer reads and the reasons behind them and that there would be monthly monitoring of the use of the new estimated reason codes through a dashboard post implementation.
- With regards to the feedback on the frequency with which Retailers were unable to obtain a visual transfer read which indicated a range between 30% and 50%, the Committee noted the high rates of estimated transfer reads and that the feedback indicated that the primary driver for this was the frequent inability to gain access to premises.
- With regards to feedback that increasing the number and clarity of estimated reason codes would not address the current problem of NA being used by default for estimated transfer reads because whether they would be effective was dependent on how they were used and would require guidance and potential review, the Committee agreed with the proposer's view that the proposed definitions and guidance and monthly post-implementation monitoring of the use of estimated transfer read codes would address these points.
- Trading Parties had generally indicated that CPW130 would provide increased transparency, clarity and better customer services when it comes to billing and did not

indicate any concerns around costs if CPW130 was implemented (although one Trading Party indicated there would not be any benefits or impacts from the change).

- With regards to feedback that CPW130 and CPW120 should not use the same set of reason codes in CMOS on the basis that the same set of codes should not be used for two distinct operational processes and different circumstances where a meter is being repaired or replaced compared to when an existing meter remains, the Committee agreed that this commentary was directed more to the CPW120 proposal and did not necessitate any changes to CPW130.
- With regards to feedback from three respondents that CPW130 and CPW120 should not use the same set of reason codes in CMOS on the basis that an additional code should be included to allow a Wholesaler to enter a final read as an estimate to indicate an exit scenario, the Committee agreed that this commentary was directed more to the CPW120 proposal and did not necessitate any changes to CPW130.
- With regards to feedback from a respondent who disagreed with the proposed list of estimated reason codes on the basis that: NAP should be removed as well as NA; other should have to be annotated denoting that no read was attempted to disincentivise its use; and further codes were required to cover off the main reasons why premises cannot be accessed (e.g. premises closed or access denied), the Committee noted that it had discussed the reason codes to be included at length, acknowledged the need to draw a limit to the number included and viewed the list currently proposed as sufficient and that there would be not additional benefit to extending the list.
- With regards to feedback from a respondent who disagreed with the proposed list of estimated reason codes on the basis that cannot locate premise was a key omission from the proposed list along with vacant property and that NAP should allow Trading Parties to identify whether access was refused by the customer or if access was not physically possible, the Committee noted that it had discussed the reason codes to be included at length, acknowledged the need to draw a limit to the number included and viewed the list currently proposed as sufficient and that there would be not additional benefit to extending the list.
- It would be important to communicate the findings of the monitoring of the use of estimated reason codes to the Market Performance Framework Reform Working Group so that they can consider how to incentivise the use of accurate reason codes.
- Trading Parties had provided feedback that CPW130 would result in increased visibility and transparency of market data, improved data insight, drive improvements to the quality of consumption data in the market which would result in greater accuracy and confidence in the market, provide greater visibility on the issues and volume of issues that prevent the ability to read a meter, and that benefits to customers could result from action taken off the back of data generated by CPW130.

6.3. It was noted that the definitions and guidance that sat alongside the introduction of the new reason codes, and how these were communicated, would be critical to their success. It was agreed that CS, SB and HC should work together to look at the timeline for the production of the definitions and guidance documents to ensure that they would be ready to be communicated to Trading Parties to accompany the potential introduction of the new estimated reason codes (including allowing time for any Ofwat review of the associated definitions and guidance).

#### **ACTION MC11\_04**

- 6.4. The Committee agreed to recommend to the MPF Reform Working Group that they look at the use of skip codes coming out of this change as part of their work.

#### **ACTION MC11\_05**

- 6.5. The Committee noted an overview of the next steps and timeline for CPW130 and it was agreed that the DRR feedback deadline for the Committee would be extended from 4 March to 11 March 2022.

## 7. New QSP Identification

- 7.1. The Committee noted an update from MH on the New Project Capture and Prioritisation process including the areas currently scored as highest priority by Committee members.
- 7.2. Some Committee members noted that they would welcome the opportunity to revisit their individual scoring and prioritisation and that the Committee as a whole should undertake a detailed review of the areas identified as high priority to ensure that the right work is taken forward.
- 7.3. It was agreed that MOSL should review the proposed projects to check whether any have previously been taken forward and failed and if so, why they had previously failed.

#### **ACTION MC11\_06**

- 7.4. The Committee noted an overview of Project Looking Glass provided by SB.

## 8. Tabled Updates

- 8.1. The Committee noted the various tabled update papers circulated in advance of the meeting and the request for feedback on the Roles and Responsibilities strategic theme slides circulated by PA Consulting was flagged to Committee members.

## 9. AOB, including reflections from the meeting

- 9.1. It was noted that, going forward, Committee papers and documents would be shared via the Committee SharePoint site unless there was a specific reason to take a different approach. In light of this, AC reminded members of the importance of ensuring that they have access to the SharePoint site and asked any members still struggling to access the site to contact him directly.
- 9.2. The Committee reflected on the meeting.
- 9.3. There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting.