

# Minutes of the Metering Committee Meeting 13

12 April 2022 | 09:30 – 14:00 | Via MS Teams

Status of Minutes: **APPROVED**

## MEMBERS PRESENT

Steve Formoy	SF	Chair*	Shaun Kent	SK	Ofwat Representative*
Angela Brown	AB	Wholesaler Member	Mark Doherty	MD	Retailer Member
Clare Garland	CG	Alternate Wholesaler Member	Paul Heron	PH	Retailer Member
Michelle Thompson	MT	Wholesaler Member	Ben Kershaw	BK	Retailer Member
Mitchell Yeoman-Boldry	MYB	Wholesaler Member	Claire Stanness	CS	Retailer Member

*\*Non-Voting Members of the Committee*

## OTHER ATTENDEES

Simon Bennett	SB	MOSL Presenter	Alex Cowie	AC	MOSL Secretariat
Adrian Smith	AS	MOSL Presenter	Oli Robins	OR	MOSL Presenter
Hannah Allardice	HA	MOSL Presenter	Gareth Forrester	GF	PA Consulting Presenter
Ivy Mandinyenya	IM	MOSL Observer	Marc Tritschler	MT	PA Consulting Presenter
Florentina Monea	FM	MOSL Observer			

## APOLOGIES

Emma Birch	EB	Wholesaler Member	Claire Yeates	CY	Retailer Member
Kevin McCalliskey	KM	Wholesaler Member	Christina Blackwell	CB	Customer Representative Member
John Davies	JD	MOSL Representative*	Martin Hall	MH	MOSL Market Improvement Lead

## 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 EB, CY, CB, KM, MH and JD and that CG was standing in as EB’s alternate.
- 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 15 March as an accurate record of Committee Meeting 12.
- 2.2. It was agreed that the following actions could be closed: A12\_01; and A12\_03.
- 2.3. It was agreed that the following actions would remain open: A12\_02; and A12\_04.

## 3. Enhancing Metering Technology

- 3.1. The Committee noted that the Enhancing Metering Technology report had been launched at a webinar on 6 April, which was attended by 82 people from a good range of the various segments of the report's target audience, and that the engagement phase was now underway.
- 3.2. The Committee briefly reflected on the webinar, and the following points were noted:
  - Artesia, CY and the MOSL team did an excellent job of summarising the report and presenting it back.
  - Committee members had received positive feedback from colleagues who had attended the launch.
  - There was a high-level of engagement for attendees and it was encouraging to see a number of additional interested parties in attendance in addition to trading parties.
  - It might have been beneficial to give more prominence to what trading parties are being asked to do with the report.
  - It would be important now to follow up and understand whether and how trading parties have used the report (and in particular the cost-benefit analysis) in order to understand its impact. It was suggested that this was something that could be followed up on in the engagement phase with trading parties being asked whether they intended to use the report in building a case for enhanced metering technology over the next asset management period and then at a later point to be asked whether they had actually used it.
  - Members were highly supportive of taking the same approach to the launch of the Roles and Responsibilities report as was used with the Enhancing Metering Technology.
- 3.3. The Chair outlined the next steps which would be for the MOSL team to work on a follow up survey and targeted engagement with Wholesalers in water-stressed areas.
- 3.4. The Chair thanked Committee members and the MOSL team for their input into the report.
- 3.5. The Committee thanked Artesia for the delivery of the report and CY and MH for their work on the project.

## 4. Roles and Responsibilities

- 4.1. The Committee welcomed an update from GF on the progress of the roles and responsibilities work which highlighted the responses received from Committee members to the initial draft of the report and an initial view of the key messages which should be pulled out in the executive summary.

4.2. The Committee discussed the key messages, noting that:

- Work being undertaken to reform the Market Performance Framework offered a significant opportunity to increase the strategic levers for change available coming out of the Roles and Responsibilities work.
- It would be imperative for the report to deliver a strong call to action that clearly emphasises the imperative for change. The report should also aim to deliver the message as simply as possible and emphasise the amount of trading party input received.
- It would be important to ensure that the report demonstrates that customer benefit is at the heart of the evaluation (including impact on the cost of living) and that this is clearly drawn out in the messaging.
- The messaging should draw out that getting roles and responsibilities right is crucial to enabling the market to function, minimising costs and reducing barriers to entry.
- It might be beneficial to include the present state in the options to illustrate the potential cost of doing nothing in this area as well as some context on how the market has ended up in its current position.
- It would be important to bring out how this work links to enhanced metering technology, and that if metering technology moves on then roles and responsibilities need to move with it to maximise opportunities to leverage data. The knock-on effects of failing to act if metering technology moves on but roles and responsibilities stay with the status quo could also be brought out.
- Part of the sell for change in metering roles and responsibilities would rest on decision-makers buying into a vision for the market that embraced enhanced metering technology. However, there is a risk that an operational focus might lead to people dismissing the benefit of changing the status quo if they are focussed on the short term.

4.3. The Committee discussed the routes to change, noting that:

- Clearly setting out the direction of travel and landscape in terms of enhancing technology is fundamental to making the case for any change to metering roles and responsibilities. Without setting this out legitimate questions could be raised about the imperative for making any changes.
- It would be helpful to include a high-level cost-benefit analysis for each of the options.
- It would be beneficial to bring the case for change for each of the options included to life by setting out the key things that each would need to address to be viable (e.g. interaction with a technology roadmap, stages of the Wholesaler smart metering journey and timings). Additionally, it would be beneficial to include additional detail on the governance steps that each option would need to go through to be enacted.
- It would be beneficial to add additional clarity on the difficulty level to implement each option as some would be far easier to implement than others. Suggested categories were options that required: primary legislation; Code change; long-term changes; medium-term changes; and short-term changes. It was suggested that PA Consulting

engage with Ofwat, and DEFRA if possible, to consider the regulatory impact of each of the options.

- It would be helpful to provide further clarity on the funding implications for each option including whether there are any PR24 implications.
- It would be helpful to flag which of the options might require additional views from the meter vendor market to progress.
- It would be worth considering whether potential timeframes for the various options impact on the business case for enhancing metering technology.
- Market appetite for each of the options would be a key aspect of the post-launch engagement phase.

4.4. GF thanked Committee members for their input on the first draft of the report and it was noted that the deadline for providing further comments on the first draft would be extended to close of business on 13 April.

4.5. The Committee thanked GF and PA Consulting for their work.

**GF left the meeting**

## 5. Metering Committee Effectiveness Review

5.1. The Committee received a brief overview of the findings of the effectiveness review provided by SF which noted that the Committee was generally seen to be highly effective and had settled into its role well and was adding value to the market.

5.2. The effectiveness review recommendations were:

- Secretariat to amend Committee Terms of Reference and provide to members for comment before proposing changes for approval by the Strategic Panel (n.b. action to wait until after Strategic Panel Priority Outcomes and Committee mandates finalised).
- MOSL to review governance and operation of Quick Start and other projects and present proposals back to the Committee for comment and approval (aim to bring this back in May/June). This should include the interaction between the project groups and the Committee.
- MOSL to look at scheduling of new phase of projects and schedule to try and ensure an even spread of work across the year and Secretariat to look to ensure that appropriate time is allowed for Committee member input sought ex-Committee.
- Spread of work amongst Committee members to be considered when allocating sponsors for new phase of projects.
- MOSL to develop a map of how the Committee's work programme fits together and supports its overall objective to get more timely and accurate consumption data and reads into the market (including KPIs/metrics).
- Chair and Secretariat to keep agenda under review to ensure that the purpose and ask of the Committee is clear in relation to each agenda item and encourage external expertise to be brought into Committee discussions as appropriate.

- Chair and Secretariat to keep meeting paper pre-read requirements under review and try to ensure that members are allowed sufficient time to review ahead of meetings.
- Secretariat to circulate a note to members on use of alternates.

5.3. The Committee:

- **APPROVED** the recommended actions.

## 6. Metering Committee KPIs and Priorities

### Metering Committee KPIs

- 6.1. The Committee received a briefing from SF which noted the Strategic Panel's desire to set KPIs for each of its committees as well as recent feedback from the Code Change Committee that it had struggled to see the context and customer impact from recent Committee-generated change proposals and that it wanted to see clear impact metrics for future change proposals. SF outlined a draft structure for Committee KPIs that used a pyramid of metrics to create a line between each aspect of the Committee's programme and high-level market outcomes with a focus on customer benefit.
- 6.2. It was noted that the KPIs could be used to agree a programme of future projects with a clear line of sight between interventions and customer outcomes, measure the impact of those projects and provide a high-level overview of the metering programme's overall impact on the market.
- 6.3. The Committee briefly discussed the proposed KPI structure, noting that they were fully supportive of the proposals. It was agreed that the Chair and MOSL team would work up the proposals in more detail and present back to the Committee for further comment before providing an update on the proposed KPIs to the Strategic Panel ahead of its July meeting.

### Metering Committee Programme FY22/23

- 6.4. SB reiterated the proposed new projects list presented by Martin Hall at the March Committee meeting and presented an indicative view of the programme timeline, noting that final timings would need to be confirmed with project sponsors and be mindful of any potential pinch points that could place excessive demands on Committee members for input ex Committee.
- 6.5. The proposed projects were:
- Metering Roles and Responsibilities Phase 2;
  - Meter Assurance
  - Data Interoperability;
  - Review of Relevant Metering Technology;
  - Customer and Societal Benefits;
  - Sharing Consumption Data Phase 2;
  - Read Rejections Phase 2;
  - Transfer Reads Phase 2;
  - Standard Meter Location Data and What3Words;

- Visual Read Definition;
- New Connections and Meter Installation Guidance;
- Meter Reading Standards.

6.6. The Committee:

- **AGREED** the proposed programme for FY22/23.

6.7. The Committee discussed next steps for the projects and the allocation of project sponsors, noting the following key points:

- MD expressed an interest in sponsoring the Meter Reading Standards project. MT also expressed an interest in being involved in this project.
- AB expressed an interest in sponsoring the Standard Meter Location Data and What3Words project but noted she would not have the capacity to start work on this until after the end of May. CS also expressed an interest in being involved in this project.
- MT expressed an interest in sponsoring the New Connections and Meter Installation Guidance project.
- PH expressed an interest in sponsoring the Visual Read Definition project.

6.8. It was noted that there might be some benefit from those who have previously sponsored Quick Start Projects sharing their insights with Committee members who would be sponsoring projects for the first time.

6.9. It was agreed that the next steps would be for SB and MH to follow up with project sponsors to agree the scope and timeline for each project.

**ACTION A13\_01**

## 7. CPW087 Post-Implementation Review

7.1. The Committee received an update from OR on the use of Wholesaler reads following the implementation of [CPW087 'Ability for Wholesalers to Add Meter Reads'](#) ("CPW087") in November 2020. It was noted that the change had been seen to deliver benefits to the market that exceeded the cost of implementation. However, it had been observed that use of Wholesaler Reads varies considerably and the benefits are driven by a small subset of highly engaged parties. OR observed that CPW087 had the potential to deliver greater benefits to the market if similar engagement could be encouraged across more parties.

7.2. The Committee discussed why variation in use of Wholesaler reads had been observed and what the blockers on uptake by Retailers were, noting the following key points:

- It would be worth undertaking additional analysis to understand whether meter location data is updated when Wholesaler reads are submitted. Where a long-unread meter has been read by a Wholesaler it would be beneficial to look at how they could enter this data into CMOS.
- A Committee member noted that where a Wholesaler updates the meter location it would be completed using T/TCORR113 in the free descriptor field and that a Retailer can then adopt and change meter location description using a T160.R. They further

noted that not all Wholesaler reads require a location change and that they are sometimes captured where the Wholesaler visits for another reason, such as a vacant site visit.

- One retailer had experienced an issue with their internal systems that had stopped them using Wholesaler reads as much as they otherwise would have.
- Wholesaler reads that are inconsistent with expected consumption levels are not verifiable as they don't have a photo attached.
- Where Retailers reject a Wholesaler read, a bilateral is raised with the Wholesaler and it might be useful to undertake some analysis of the data available through the bilaterals hub.
- An example was given of how a commercial agreement around Wholesaler reads in place between a Wholesaler and a Retailer had enabled high uptake as the Retailer was able to rely on the reads provided. Where no commercial arrangement exists it was noted that it can be hard to rely on the Wholesaler reads provided. An opportunity was identified for MOSL to help support Retailers on how they get ready to use Wholesaler reads once they are received in order to ensure that they are timely and avoid bad data being entered into the market.
- Some Retailers take the same approach to validating Wholesaler reads as any other read and have seen significant benefits from making use of Wholesaler reads such as reduced costs and lower skip levels.
- A potential opportunity was identified for MOSL to look at the application of MPS fines where Wholesaler reads are used, as under the current rules Retailers are fined where a Wholesaler read is late.
- One Retailer noted a potential lack of awareness on the part of Wholesalers as a potential blocker to higher levels of uptake.

7.3. The Committee expressed a high degree of support for this work and a number of Committee members volunteered to engage further with MOSL to share their experience of using Wholesaler reads and the hurdles they had encountered. It was agreed that OR, SB, MH and SF would look at how to take this forward.

#### **ACTION A13\_02**

7.4. OR thanked the Committee for its input and noted that the next steps would be for this feedback to be incorporated into the post-implementation review and presented to the Code Change Committee.

## 8. [Data Correction Transaction \(TCORR\) Change Proposal](#)

8.1. The Committee noted the paper on the proposed TCORR change proposal circulated in advance of the meeting.

## 9. [Tabled Updates](#)

9.1. The Committee noted the various tabled update papers circulated in advance of the meeting.

10. AOB, including reflections from the meeting

10.1. The Committee reflected on the meeting.

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