

Minutes of the Metering Committee Meeting 14

10 May 2022 | 09:30 – 13:30 | 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
Yvonne Ryan	YR	Alternate Wholesaler Member	Paul Heron	PH	Retailer Member
Michelle Thompson	MT	Wholesaler Member	Ben Kershaw	BK	Retailer Member
Kate Russell	KR	Alternate Wholesaler Member	Claire Stanness	CS	Retailer Member
Rob Waddle	RW	Alternate Wholesaler Member	Claire Yeates	CY	Retailer Member
Shaun Kent	SK	Ofwat Representative*	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	Adrian Smith	AS	MOSL Observer
Abu Rashid	AR	MOSL Presenter	Marc Tritschler	MT	PA Consulting Presenter
Florentina Monea	FM	MOSL Observer	James Hulse	JH	LIDA Presenter
Ivy Mandinyenya	IM	MOSL Observer			

APOLOGIES

Emma Birch	EB	Wholesaler Member	Mitchell Yeoman-Boldry	MYB	Wholesaler Member
Kevin McCalliskey	KM	Wholesaler 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 EB, MYB and KM and that YR, KR and RW were standing in as their alternates respectively.
- 1.2. The Chair noted that agenda item 7 ‘Delivery Role of the Committee’ would be postponed until a future Committee meeting pending further internal discussions at MOSL on potential options for streamlining the Quick Start Project process, particularly where it related to a Code change proposal.

- 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 agreed to approve the minutes of the Metering Committee meeting held on 12 April ex-Committee, with a deadline of close of business on Friday 13 May for any comments to be provided to Secretariat.
- 2.2. It was agreed that the following actions would remain open: A11_03; A12_02; A13_01 and A13_02.

3. Strategic Metering Review Programme Progress Update

- 3.1. The Committee noted a verbal update from JD on feedback received from Trading Parties and other interested parties on the metering programme. In particular, JD noted that the Enhanced Metering Technology report had been extremely well received and a lot of support had been voiced for a piece of work that defined a standard for meter data (and that this should be for the sector and not just for the non-household market). A number of organisations had reached out to offer support for this work. JD noted that he had recently started sharing information on the progress of the Roles and Responsibilities strategic theme and that the options had generated a lot of engagement and reaction. It was noted that there was significant support for the approach of exploring a range of the available options, including combinations of options.
- 3.2. JD noted that MH had presented on the Enhanced Metering Technology report to the Strategic Panel. The Strategic Panel were very supportive of the work and the data standardisation proposals but also wanted to understand more about plans for smart meter roll out. MT noted that further insight on smart-meter-roll-out plans would also be helpful for understanding where the Committee should go with phase 2 of the Roles and Responsibilities work as well as how Project AMIDST could be taken forward.
- 3.3. JD further noted that the Strategic Panel requested that the Committee worked to articulate more clearly how enhanced metering technology would benefit customers (noting that smart metering still has some bad press with consumers) and noted that the Committee shouldn't rule out customer or retailer-led investment in metering technology as this has had some success in the energy sector. It was noted that CCW would be working with MOSL on a project to demonstrate the customer and wider societal benefits of smart metering.

4. Roles and Responsibilities

MTr joined the meeting.

- 4.1. The Committee noted a brief update from MT on the progress of the Metering Roles and Responsibilities report, including the process used to refine the proposed options for further exploration, the key issues and why the options had been ranked as presented in the updated draft report.
- 4.2. The Chair thanked MT and PA Consulting for their ongoing work on the report and outlined that the Committee was now being asked to provide feedback on their view of the option rankings as presented and what the key messages they would like to see presented to the market were.

4.3. The Committee discussed the option rankings and key messages, noting that:

- While there would be differences in member views, there was widespread support for the option rankings and that the most important thing now was to move forward with the report, socialise it and get wider trading party feedback.
- It would be beneficial to bring out more on the customer benefits of the options in the options prioritisation slide as the driver for this work is to deliver a net benefit for the market and in particular the customer.
- The options slide should make clear that the top ranked options were those that must be explored, not that they must be implemented, and it would be helpful for the slide, or the report more generally, to make clear recommendations on what the next steps are in terms of option exploration.
- The Performance Improvement and Smart Metering options were connected and would likely need to run in parallel if taken forward, as it would be difficult to make progress on Performance Improvement without Smart Metering. Additionally, it would be important to move quickly into what trading parties would need to put into AMP8 if the Smart Metering option was progressed.
- There would be an opportunity to bring the work being undertaken by Project AMIDST into any assessment of the feasibility of wholesalers providing reads before responsibility was moved. An interim phase of work was mooted that would continue to focus more on this and to remove the rules that prevent wholesaler reads from being settlement affecting.
- Undertaking a smart metering roll out in the non-household market in isolation from the household market would not be cost effective and calling this out explicitly would help drive the smart metering agenda as a whole.
- Depending on what was taken forward and when, the Integrated / Independent Meter Ownership and Data Service option might be an interim step rather than simply a fall-back option.

4.4. It was noted that the launch plan for the Roles and Responsibilities report would be broadly similar to that taken with the Enhancing Metering Technology and would involve a launch webinar prior to the release of the report before a consultation phase. AS outlined plans for a more formal survey of industry than was used with Enhancing Metering Technology.

4.5. MTr thanked the Committee for its input and noted that the next steps would be for him to take the feedback away and work through an update of the report with MH before it comes back for final sign off. It was noted that the Committee would be asked to sign off an accompanying press release at the same time as the report. Once signed off the report would be presented to the Strategic Panel at their July meeting.

4.6. The Committee thanked PA Consulting for their work on the report.

MTR left the meeting.

5. Data Standardisation

- 5.1. The Committee noted a brief overview from MH setting out the scope of and approach to the proposed work on data standardisation, which was part of phase 2 of the Enhancing Metering Technology Strategic Theme set out in the Artesia report.
- 5.2. MH noted that the aim of the work was to specify a standard for data that enables trading parties to effectively share meter reading and consumption data within the market. It was noted that the focus of this project was on granular consumption data (between quarter hourly or hourly data) but that it could also include meter readings and other data.
- 5.3. MH observed that the assumption was that data standardisation would be most impactful at the point at which data reaches a Trading Party's meter data management system or possibly when it reaches the supplier's head-end system.
- 5.4. MH set out a long list of potential issues central to defining the scope of the work. These included:
 - Whether the project should include data from loggers and AMI meters and AMR meters.
 - What point in the meter data collection process should be targeted for standardisation.
 - Whether there are existing formats/protocols/APIs that could be used or evaluated.
 - Whether a central data sharing platform was essential or optional.
 - What lessons could be learnt from the energy market.
 - How to cope with large data volumes from smart meters or loggers.
 - The likely requirements that would be placed on trading parties and the relative costs and benefits.
 - Whether and when it might be appropriate for data to be shared with customers.
 - Whether any GDPR issues would arise and how these could be addressed.
 - The mechanism through which any new standard could be introduced.
- 5.5. The Committee briefly discussed the proposed scope and approach to the data standardisation work, and the following points were noted:
 - Understanding where there are any existing formats and protocols or other work being undertaken in this area as well as gaining a deeper understanding of what the requirements are should be included in the scoping of the project.
 - It would be worth considering whether there was an opportunity to influence open protocols at either the meter or communications infrastructure level, although affecting this might be challenging and would likely require a coordinated initiative from the wider water industry as a whole.
 - The project should develop a data standard that applies across all technology types, accepting that existing installations may not meet the future target.
- 5.6. MH outlined the next steps which would be to talk to market stakeholders on the issues, prepare a brief for potential consultants, circulate the brief to the Committee for comment. A project sponsor and sub group would also need to be set up and MH would then work with them to

finalise the relevant documents and go out to tender. It was noted that the project brief would be presented to the Committee for approval at its June meeting.

ACTION A14_01

- 5.7. SF noted that this is a piece of work that would really benefit from a range of committee members inputting through a sub group and MT and YR volunteered to be involved.

6. Review of Relevant Technology

- 6.1. The Committee noted a brief overview from MH setting out the scope of and approach to the proposed work on a review of relevant technology, which was part of phase 2 of the Enhancing Metering Technology Strategic Theme set out in the Artesia report.
- 6.2. MH noted that the aim of the work was to determine the characteristics of metering technology solutions that meet market requirements and to examine whether a process can be designed that would prevent retailer investment in metering technology becoming a stranded asset where the customer switches retailer. The anticipated benefits would include providing clarity to trading parties and suppliers on workable technology solutions and to increase retailer confidence to invest in technology solutions.
- 6.3. MH observed that it would be useful to agree classification of meter technology ahead of undertaking the work.
- 6.4. MH set out a long list of potential issues central to defining the scope of the work. These included:
- Establishing clarity the configurations and definitions of potential solutions.
 - Assessing both AMR and AMI solutions.
 - Establishing what data is required.
 - Establishing the level of data accuracy that was required.
 - Establishing a definition for technology resilience.
 - Considering whether data analytics services should be included.
 - Understanding the causes of stranded assets.
- 6.5. SF noted that would be helpful to get views on prioritisation from Committee members.
- 6.6. The Committee briefly discussed the proposed scope and approach to the review of relevant technology, and the following points were noted:
- The project should not deprioritise/descope meters or supply points where customers have proactively invested in technology at their own expense and should take into consideration the impact of the costs of investment in technology by trading parties potentially being passed on to customers.
 - It would be beneficial for the project to map the customer experience with regards to metering technology and ensure that service levels improve alongside enhancements in technology.
- 6.7. MH outlined that the next steps which would be to develop a proposed programme of work, circulate to the committee for comment and discuss and agree at a future meeting. It was also

noted that a project sponsor and sub group would need to be established, and that because of the linkages between the work this could potentially be the same as the data standardisation sponsor and sub group.

ACTION A14_02

7. Data Sharing

- 7.1. SB introduced the session, noting the background to the project and that JH was the lead data scientist at LIDA who had undertaken the analysis.
- 7.2. JH provided an overview of the analysis undertaken noting that the aim of the work was to develop NHH water-use benchmarks by customer type to: (i) devise water saving targets, and targeted conservation advice; and (ii) identify potential pipe leakage.
- 7.3. The Committee briefly discussed the work undertaken by LIDA, noting the following key points:
 - The Committee were hugely supportive of the work undertaken by LIDA and could see its potential benefit to the market.
 - There was the potential for further work in this area based around greater volumes of data that would enable the analysis to build in additional customer segmentation analysis. This additional work could potentially help with targeted water conservation advice or services and other demand-side management activities.
 - It would potentially be beneficial for any individual/group undertaking further analysis to have access to additional information on the types of premises alongside the raw data.
 - The provision of sub metering data would be beneficial for further analysis if it was possible to make this available.
- 7.4. The Committee thanked JH and LIDA for their work, noting the huge value generated from a relatively limited data set.

8. MIF Project Update

- 8.1. The Committee noted a brief verbal update from SF on the progress of round two of funding for Market Improvement Fund projects. It was noted that the MIF Selection Panel had agreed a proposed shortlist of projects for approval and that this list had been discussed by the Strategic Panel the previous day and that applicants would be informed of the outcome of their bids on the coming days. However, while SF noted that some of the bids received might be relevant to the work of the Committee, it would be inappropriate to provide more detail at this stage before applicants had been informed of the outcome and that a further update would be provided in due course.

9. CPW087 Post-Implementation Review

- 9.1. The Committee received an update from AR on the use of Customer reads following the implementation of [CPW109 'Changing the Constraints on Customer Reads'](#) ("CPW109") in June 2021. 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.

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

- Retailers are generally undertaking programmes to promote the use of customer reads, however dangerous or hard to read meter locations are an obvious example of where this would not be appropriate.
- Retailer members reflected that they had seen good uptake, but that Covid had acted as a brake on this as there were an increased number of empty premises.
- Overall, the Committee expected the number of customer reads coming into the market to rise as customer engagement and education programmes supporting customer read uptake continued to raise awareness.
- Retailers generally undertake the same validation process with customer reads received as they do with any other read, so the risk of poor data or unintended consequences was low.
- Some trading party members flagged instances where settlement teams had asked for customer reads to be removed as they were causing issues with settlement and it was agreed that it would be beneficial to investigate the number of customer reads that had been removed from the market.
- The Committee questioned why uptake numbers looked so low in the data presented, especially when compared to their experience at their own organisations. It was posited that there may be an issue around how customer reads are classified when they are entered into CMOS and it was agreed that AR would share retailer member trading party customer reads with those retailer members directly so that they could arrange for them to be checked and confirmed internally.

ACTION A14_03

9.3. AR thanked the Committee for its input and noted that, in addition to the action identified to verify the customer read data with retailer members, the next steps would be for this feedback to be incorporated into the post-implementation review and presented to the Code Change Committee.

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.