

Minutes of the Metering Committee Meeting 18

06 September 2022 | 09:30 – 13:00 | Via MS Teams

Status of Minutes: **APPROVED**

MEMBERS PRESENT

Steve Formoy	SF	Chair*	Christina Blackwell	CB	Customer Representative Member
Mark Doherty	MD	Retailer Member	Angela Brown	AB	Wholesaler Member
Paul Heron	PH	Retailer Member	Kevin McCalliskey	KM	Wholesaler Member
Ben Kershaw	BK	Retailer Member	Rosie Rand	RR	Wholesaler Member
Claire Stanness	CS	Retailer Member	Michelle Thompson	MT	Wholesaler Member
John Davies	JD	MOSL Representative*	Mitchell Yeoman-Boldry	MYB	Wholesaler Member

**Non-Voting Members of the Committee*

OTHER ATTENDEES

Simon Bennett	SPB	MOSL Presenter	Alex Cowie	AC	MOSL Secretariat
Adrian Smith	AS	MOSL Presenter	Ivy Mandinyenya	IM	MOSL Observer
Dean Marshallsay	DM	Artesia Presenter	Joanne Barnes	JB	Anglian Water Observer
Abu Rashid	AR	MOSL Presenter	Giles Fox	GF	Artesia Presenter

APOLOGIES

Shaun Kent	SK	Owat 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 and that CB would join the meeting at 1045.
- 1.2. The Chair and the Committee also welcomed RR as a newly appointed wholesaler member of the Committee.
- 1.3. The Chair noted that the item on Project AMIDST would be moved to later in the agenda to allow JB to attend and that the Read Rejections update would be postponed to the October meeting.
- 1.4. 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.
- 1.5. 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 09 August as an accurate record of the meeting.
- 2.2. It was agreed that the following actions would be closed: A16_03 and A17_01.
- 2.3. It was agreed that the following actions would remain open: A11_03 and A16_04.

3. UKWRC PR24 Round Table Feedback

- 3.1. The Committee noted a verbal update from SF on the series of roundtables organised by MOSL and UKWRC with trading parties and other stakeholders on PR24.
- 3.2. SF noted that the potential impacts on the role of the Committee could include:
 - involvement in the development of a national metering strategy;
 - further work with Ofwat on how a data interoperability standard could be introduced;
 - developing its work on roles and responsibilities to ensure that final PR24 proposals can incorporate future changes to metering roles and responsibilities; and
 - reassessing the business case for enhanced metering technology developed by Artesia in the light of WRMP draft submissions.
- 3.3. The Committee discussed the UKWRC PR24 round table feedback, noting the following key points.
 - The interdependencies between the strategic themes, and in particular roles and responsibilities, and the rest of the Committee's work would require further consideration to ensure that projects were correctly phased and leveraged.
 - The idea of a national metering strategy would need careful consideration if it were to be made to work in practice and would likely need to be more aspirational than directive given the relatively limited number of smart meter manufacturers a present and current commodity supply issues. It would also be important to ensure that the supporting infrastructure was in place and working effectively to make larger-scale smart meter roll outs impactful and challenges that had been experienced elsewhere in this regard were noted.
 - There was a potential unintended consequence of the roles and responsibilities work with water companies unsure of what direction to take as part of PR24 while they are unsure of the outcome. It would be important to ensure that this did not undermine the impact of the enhancing metering technology or data interoperability work as part of a push for more smart meters within PR24.
 - It would be important to factor future demand and the potential demand-side impacts of resource-intensive green industry projects currently being promoted by the government were noted. As such, while smart metering would likely provide a number of customer benefits, it would not be enough to address future water shortages in isolation.

- There would be some benefit to exploring a smart metering good practice guide through the Retailer-Wholesaler Group. This could emphasise that the most important aspect of smart metering is what you do with the data. This good practice guidance could be picked up off the back of the data sharing standardisation workstream and be picked up as part of the wider stakeholder engagement.
- How to ensure that the best use of the data generated by smart metering, including how customers were able to access and use the data, would be important and could potentially be picked up at the tail end of the data sharing standardisation work.

4. Data Sharing Standardisation

- 4.1. The Committee received an update from GF on the progress of the stakeholder engagement programme noting the status of the engagement programme and some of the key emerging themes and questions from that engagement.
- 4.2. The Committee briefly discussed the stakeholder engagement work undertaken by Artesia, noting that:
- it would be beneficial for Artesia to include the following in their stakeholder engagement programme:
 - the self-supply community as well as Waterscan;
 - Major Energy Users Council members; and
 - additional suppliers drawn from the Metering Committee’s supplier spreadsheet.
 - It would be useful for Artesia to include a question on how the adoption of a common data sharing standard could be encouraged or enforced within the stakeholder engagement questions.
- 4.3. The interaction between any attempt to encourage use of or enforce a common data sharing standard and any national metering strategy was noted and should be considered as part of the ongoing management of the Committee’s programme of work.
- 4.4. The interaction with the roles and responsibilities workstream was also noted and it was agreed that it would be beneficial for the MOSL team to ensure that Artesia were briefed on other relevant projects and workstreams.

5. Roles and Responsibilities Phase 2

CB joined the meeting

- 5.1. The Committee noted an update from AS on the feedback received in relation to the three potential paths for taking forward and developing the roles and responsibilities options.
- 5.2. It was noted that there was clear feedback from the Committee that the balanced approach would be the best path. The next steps would therefore be for an outline business case to be developed for the six options, from both a customer and a market perspective, along with a draft implementation plan.
- 5.3. The Committee discussed the proposed approach, noting the following key points.

- While there had been some questions raised around the wholesaler reads option, general feedback was that the market was happy for this to be developed for further consideration.
- Although, the data platform option is focussed on how and who should provide any potential future data platform, the interaction between this option and the data sharing standardisation workstream was highlighted along with the importance of making sure that the thinking here was not developed in isolation. It was also noted that depending on developments in other workstreams, this option might need to be developed at a faster pace than others.
- The potential number of Code changes required to implement any of the options were likely to be very large and substantial business case planning would be required to make sure the market is behind any future changes before they are implemented.
- It would be worth considering whether there are any interim actions that can be taken to deliver benefit to the market in advance of any final decisions or recommendations coming out of the project.
- It would be important to look at what could be done to mitigate the risk of trading parties not investing in smart meters or taking other action as they await the outcome of this work. Additionally, conversations with Ofwat and DEFRA should encompass whether there is an opportunity to allow any flexibility in PR24 to pick up the cost of any changes to metering roles and responsibilities.

5.4. Following discussion, the Committee:

- **AGREED** that it was appropriate to proceed with the balanced approach.

5.5. AS thanked Committee members for their feedback and noted that MOSL would communicate out to the market that the Committee had decided to proceed with the balanced approach.

6. Project AMIDST

6.1. The Committee received an update from MT on the initial findings and conclusions of Project AMIDST, a Market Improvement Fund (“MIF”) project that aims to investigate how AMI smart meter read data can be automatically entered to the Central Market Operating System (“CMOS”) by creating an online pathfinder platform that can be used by wholesalers to directly share available AMI data in a standard format, amongst other capabilities.

6.2. The Committee discussed the initial findings and conclusions, noting the following key points:

- There was significant crossover between the findings and recommendations of Project AMIDST and several quick start projects and it would be important to ensure that these were taken forward in a coordinated way.
- While the application interface required some in-house development, MOSL had also developed a universal API that could be picked up and used by any wholesaler to put reads into CMOS.
- There were very clear benefits to enacting the recommendations from this project and ensuring that wholesaler smart meter reads were able to be transferred into CMOS and

to be settlement effecting. However, depending on the approach taken this might involve a very complex set of Code changes to make possible.

- The interim recommendation from Project AMIDST was likely to be that wholesalers connect into MOSL’s universal API immediately and for retailers to pick up any actions at that point ahead of any Code changes that would make the reads settlement effecting.
- Where wholesaler reads were submitted using the universal API this does not prevent the retailer from entering their own read aligned with the billing cycle.
- The project’s current thinking was to recommend that where a wholesaler read was rejected, the retailer picks up the read rejection with the customer.
- It might be beneficial for the next phase of the work to include building in a read rejection code that allows the retailer to identify why a wholesaler read has not been used to be settlement effecting.

6.3. The Chair thanked MT for her presentation and noted that a subsequent update and discussion on the final findings and next steps was expected at the October Committee meeting ahead of the Project AMIDST report’s publication.

7. QSP 8 Transfer Reads

7.1. The Committee received an update from CS on the progress of the transfer reads quick start project. It was noted that the transfer read dispute bilateral process has been lodged with the Bilateral project but will not get looked at until early 2023 and that research has been carried out by MOSL which confirmed that retailers have not taken up the additional time to read and submit the transfer readings, opting for estimating the transfer read instead. As a result the project team’s plan was to undertake a survey of retailers on their processes to understand how uptake could be improved.

7.2. CS detailed the proposed survey questions and invited comment and feedback from the Committee. Detail from slides

7.3. The Committee discussed the survey questions, noting the following key points:

- It would be beneficial to add a question on what trading parties’ current blockers to getting transfer reads are or to amend question 6 (“in your view how should the transfer read process change to benefit customers?”) to ask how the transfer read process should change to remove barriers and provide benefit to customers.
- It might be helpful for the consultation to spell out in brackets what CPW087 and CSD0105 (2.5.8) actually entail as respondents may have heard of the change but not recognise the references.

7.4. The Chair thanked CS for her presentation and work in driving this project forward.

8. Tabled Updates

8.1. The Committee noted the Tabled Updates paper circulated in advance of the meeting detailing progress on the Committee’s workstreams and metering-related projects.

9. AOB, including reflections from the meeting

- 9.1. The Committee noted the paper outlining suggestions for improving the smart meter exchange process to minimise disruption to customers who use data loggers provided by Demeter in advance of the meeting.
- 9.2. The Committee discussed the proposals noting the following key points:
 - Customer data loss where a smart meter was installed to replace a meter with a working logger installed was acknowledged as a historical issue in the market, although it was felt that this was now widely recognised in the market and that a number of wholesalers had put processes put in place to minimise any future occurrence at present. However, the risk of future occurrence would be increased by planned smart meter roll outs and, as there was a direct impact on customers, establishing a quick start project to look at this should be considered.
 - The root cause of the issue was a lack of available data and/or miscommunication between customers, third party providers, retailers and wholesalers. It would likely be beneficial to establish a central register, either on CMOS or elsewhere, to provide a live view of where data loggers or limpets have been fitted.
- 9.3. It was agreed that improving the smart meter exchange process to minimise disruption to customers who use data loggers should be added to the list of potential quick start projects for consideration in the next financial year.
- 9.4. The Committee noted and briefly discussed an update on a potential delegation of authority to it in relation to the annual and tri-annual reviews of various CMOS parameters. It was agreed that further work by the MOSL team was required to understand where these reviews were best placed.
- 9.5. The Committee reflected on the meeting.
- 9.6. There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting.