

Minutes of the Metering Committee Meeting 51

17 June 2025 | 09:30 – 12:15

Via MS Teams

Status of the Minutes: Approved

MEMBERS PRESENT

Spencer Mattia	SM	Chair*	Steve Formoy	SF	MOSL Affiliate Member*
Jordanna Lo	JL	Retailer Member	Michelle Thompson	MT	Wholesaler Member
Paul Heron	PH	Retailer Member	Rosie Rand	RR	Wholesaler Member
Sindiso Bango-Dube	SBD	Retailer Member	Mitchell Yeoman-Boldry	MYB	Wholesaler Member
Ben Kershaw	BK	Retailer Member	James Mackenzie	JM	Customer Representative Member
Angela Brown	AB	Wholesaler Member			
Jamie Davies	JD	Retailer Member (Castle Water Alternate)			

**Non-Voting Members of the Committee*

OTHER ATTENDEES

Chris Dawson	CD	MOSL Presenter	Amanda Hinde	AH	MOSL Presenter
Martin Hall	MH	MOSL Presenter	Toks Talabi	TT	MOSL Secretariat
Abu Rashid	AR	MOSL Presenter			

APOLOGIES

Kevin McCalliskey	KM	Wholesaler Member	Paul Heron	PH	Retailer Member
Cillian McCarthy	CM	Retailer Member			

Welcome, Apologies and Compliance

- 1.1. The Chair welcomed everyone to the Metering Committee (“Committee”) meeting and noted that apologies had been received from KC, PH and CM.
- 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 closed action A50_01. Feedback from RR, JL, and BK was incorporated into the Interim Guidance for Smart Meter Data Sharing (A50_02), which will be presented for final approval later in the meeting before publication on the MOSL website.
- 2.2. The Committee noted that there are no actions to remain open.

3. Smart Meter Read Hub (DSM) Update

- 3.1. CD presented an update on the full business case from the Strategic Panel, highlighting the following points:
 - The Committee was advised that the programme has been officially renamed the Smart Meter Read Hub.
 - Noted that the Strategic Panel unanimously approved the full business case, including the initial allocation on market performance charges and the delivery of the solution

as outlined. Additionally, the MOSL board confirmed their support for both the business case and MOSL's ability to deliver the programme.

- A brief update was given to clarify the plan for the Committee's benefit. CD noted that most members are likely already familiar with the framework, which will be implemented in two phases. The first phase involves the deployment of a standalone data sharing hub, facilitating direct data transfer between retailers and wholesalers by March 2026. This will enable seamless sharing of 'need to read' data. During this period, retailers will continue to handle standard CMOS reads as currently practiced, with no changes anticipated in phase one. The targeted completion date for the build is December, followed by implementation in March 2026, ensuring adequate time for testing and deployment.
- The Committee was advised that Phase Two of the project, referred to as the CMOS Interact Integration Phase, will involve integrating the hub with CMOS for settlement functions and enabling automated submission of meter readings into CMOS. The targeted completion date for this phase is April, with full implementation anticipated in 2026. It was also noted that alignment with the yet to be confirmed CMOS release dates is essential, however, the current projection remains for the release to take place within 2026.
- It was noted that the initial build cost for the Smart Meter Read hub is £1.2 million, with £840,000 already collected through market performance charges. The remaining amount is expected to be collected by August. It was noted that the annual operating costs are projected to be £216,000, increasing to £300,000 by 2030 to accommodate the expected rise in data volume. Additionally, these expenses will be funded through market operator charges and ongoing operational costs will be incorporated within the MOSL budget, thereby ensuring no direct charges to trading parties for accessing the hub.
- It was highlighted that the governance framework for the Smart Meter Read hub would include a review board, RAID logs, milestones, programme controls, senior engagement meetings, and detailed programme working sessions. Further, an advisory group called the Metering Advisory group will be established to gather detailed requirements for phase two. The steering group will consist of SLT, Ofwat panel members, CCW, wholesalers, and retailers. Communications will be sent out soon to invite Committee members to join the group.
- It was noted that the Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) has been completed, and the legal team is currently drafting documents for the market privacy notice and user agreements. CD stated that the draft documents for the market privacy notice

and user agreements will be shared with the market for consultation in July, giving trading parties early access to the documents.

- 3.2. SBD raised concerns regarding the projected costs and potential risks associated with the smart meter read hub, seeking clarification as to how these expenses would be managed and what implications they might have for future budgets. SF responded by explaining that the costs would be absorbed within the MO budget and that the project would be subject to close monitoring to mitigate any emerging risks. It was noted that the budget would be balanced by introducing efficiencies, thereby ensuring fairness for all trading parties. Subsequently, AB enquired about the technical aspects of data sharing. CD replied that the delivery partner would be confirmed in due course, and that the requirements-gathering process would involve consultation with trading parties. RR then questioned whether third-party access to the data would be available, CD clarified that third-party access was not included in the current phase of the smart meter read hub project. However, it was added that provision for third-party access would be considered in the future, with further discussion to be undertaken by both the Metering committee and the Strategic panel. The conversation then turned to the provision of 15-minute data sharing. AB and SF noted that implementation of this feature would depend upon demand from trading parties. SF stated that a decision regarding whether this service would incur a charge remained under consideration, with both market need and technical feasibility to be taken into account. AB also observed that increasing the frequency of data collection could potentially have an adverse effect on meter battery life. JL highlighted the requirement for wholesalers to retain control over access to 15-minute data from a technical perspective. JL explained that, in practice, wholesalers ought to be confident in sharing their data, but if, for instance, only three retailers had paid for access, then technical controls would be necessary to ensure that wholesalers could determine precisely which retailers were permitted to receive the data. JL further queried how such selective provision could be managed in practice. SF advised that all of these requirements would need to be addressed during the requirements gathering stage and confirmed that they should be incorporated into the overall planning.
- 3.3. CD advised the Committee on next steps advising that updates on phase 1 and 2 will be provided to the Committee over the coming months. CD and SF also discussed the formation of the Metering Advisory Group noting the first meeting is scheduled to hold in July. Also, SM informed the Committee that meetings will be held fortnightly and will function as an advisory group with the intention of including a broad range of participants. The group will

not have formal membership; instead, individuals are invited to attend and contribute their expertise at each meeting. The primary objective is to bring together subject matter experts to ensure that all requirements and obligations for each phase are gathered and considered.

- 3.4. The Committee was reminded where the [Full Business Case](#) and the detailed report on the [Data Sharing Mechanism Consultation](#) could be accessed. It was noted that the interim guidance would be published on the MOSL website shortly after the Committee's approval.

Interim Guidance

- 3.5. CD requested that the Committee provide final approval for the Interim Guidance. CD stated that the minor amendments were made to specify when the guidance would take effect. In particular, the guidance should indicate that it is to be followed from the date of publication until it is updated or withdrawn after a permanent solution is implemented. Additionally, the wording was also changed from "retailer to accept in CMOS" to "retailers to process into CMOS". After considering the changes, the Committee approved the final version of the [Interim guidance](#) which will be published on the MOSL website.

- 3.6. The chair thanked CD and SF for the update.

4. Strategic Metering Programme Update

- 4.1. The Committee received updates on the Strategic Metering program.
- 4.2. CD reported that for the level 0 projects, the data sharing and smart meter read hub objectives are now complete.
- 4.3. AR gave an update on the strategic review of settlement, reported the feedback received, and described the planned next steps. AR noted that after publishing the paper, stakeholders had three weeks to review and provide comments. In total, 15 responses were received: seven from wholesalers, seven from retailers, and one from CCW. Overall, the feedback was positive, with constructive challenges and valuable suggestions. AR reported that there was a general consensus on the importance of a longer-term settlement strategy. Respondents agreed that the objective to improve customer experience and charging was positive but considered it too narrow, recommending the inclusion of a broader range of market stakeholders, such as wholesalers, retailers, and wholesale billing. In addition, there was also general support for the strategy principles, including cost-effectiveness and

charging accuracy. However, the necessity of cost neutrality was questioned, and some suggested refining the principle of future proofing to focus on flexibility within the settlement process and engine. One respondent proposed adding governance and accountability to the strategy, which AR acknowledged as a valuable recommendation, highlighting the need to measure the effectiveness and robustness of the settlement process and engine in the future. Further, additional priority areas were raised included post RF and unplanned settlement runs, with eight responses addressing these topics and providing extensive feedback. Lastly, other areas of interest were self-serve settlement – how parties can input data into CMOS and potentially see charges recalculated ‘live’ – and reviewing the schedule of settlement runs from P1 to RF. AR also shared that eleven parties volunteered to join the working group, demonstrating strong engagement in shaping the strategy.

- 4.4. CD reported that the smart meter rollout is progressing well. It was noted that three dashboards are now live on the MOSL website: one that allows users to track when each wholesaler intends to commence, the status of smart meter reads, and the planned completion of those reads. Additionally, there is now a dashboard displaying the actual proportion of non-household meters that are currently smart, broken down by postal sector. A small table has also been included to illustrate the data provided by wholesalers. CD highlighted that LDA has engaged with all wholesalers, who are still expected to submit their data in the autumn. It was noted that efforts are ongoing to maintain momentum and ensure timely data submission, which is vital for improving the dashboards moving forward. CD expressed the importance of receiving all relevant wholesaler data by the end of the year, emphasising that this remains a key priority.
- 4.5. AR provided an update on CPW162, explaining that since the Code Change Committee’s acceptance in April, significant progress has been made. The team has been evaluating the proposed solution, which centres on adding skip code data into CMOS and the central markets. This has involved robust internal discussions, workshops, and thorough analysis of previous RFI responses. The legal drafting process has started to address necessary code changes. AR noted that a recent RWG Skips Code subgroup meeting, chaired by JD, focused on the benefits and potential applications of centralised skip code data. If there is market support, a consultation is planned for mid-July, with MOSL preparing to engage stakeholders on key points. The consultation will seek feedback on the perceived benefits of standardising and centralising skip code data, the appropriateness of housing this data in CMOS, governance, legal considerations, and the cost and impact to the market. AR emphasised

that CW162 is limited to establishing a mechanism for standardising and centralising skip code data, with further projects such as monitoring, auditing, and expanding data usage expected to follow separately. Consideration is also being given to the appropriate level of skip code detail to include in CMOS, ensuring usefulness without excess complexity, and whether features such as skip codes for smart meters or multiple skips per visit should be incorporated. Following the consultation and feedback process, the full business case and recommendations will be taken to the Code Change Committee between September and December. If approved by Ofwat, the earliest possible implementation would be December 2026, coinciding with the next available system release. The Committee inquired about the recent changes to skip codes, specifically regarding coordination with the PAG, instructions for handling skip codes, and the integration of skip code data with other data elements. These concerns were addressed, and it was noted that additional efforts will be necessary to develop best practices.

4.6. CD informed the Committee that the Interim Guidance would be published in June. CD noted that Continuous Flow is currently on hold, and that consultation for transfer reads is still scheduled to take place between 23rd June and 11th July. The Committee was asked to delegate the sign-off of the consultation questions to JL. It was further noted that there has been an update regarding NoFlow, with a new update now indicating disconnection status in the report. CD indicated that the committee will initiate a review of meter read obligations, commencing with CPW118. This marks the beginning of the process to assess possible modifications to the current meter read requirements.

4.7. The chair thanked CD and AR for their presentation.

5. CPW161

5.1. AH introduced the proposal for CPW161, designed to address the difficulties third parties encounter when requesting the installation of data loggers on customers' meters. The proposal, submitted by Demeter Water Solutions, was discussed in detail.

5.2. AH explained that Demeter Water Solutions, as a third party, is not formally recognised within the market codes. This lack of recognition leads to inconsistent treatment by wholesalers, resulting in delays and operational inefficiencies. Demeter Water Solutions often faces issues such as wholesalers not responding directly, miscommunication with retailers, and inefficient processes, all of which contribute to delays and decreased customer

satisfaction. AH provided several examples to illustrate these challenges. In one case, Demeter Water Solutions submitted a cable application to a wholesaler but was informed that the request must come via the retailer, causing unnecessary delay and confusion for the customer. In another instance, a meter breakdown led to the data logger ceasing to transmit data. When the wholesaler replaced the meter, they failed to reconnect the data logger, resulting in lost data for the customer. Further issues were highlighted, such as meters being incompatible with data loggers, which led to unnecessary meter exchanges and extra costs for customers. AH also noted problems during smart meter upgrades, with wholesalers removing existing data loggers without informing Demeter Water Solutions, thereby causing data loss and dissatisfaction among customers.

- 5.3. AH informed the Committee that MOSL had carried out informal interviews with seven wholesalers. It was observed that the majority of wholesalers agreed on the importance of delivering efficient water efficiency services to customers. However, there were inconsistencies in the manner different wholesalers addressed third-party requests. AH also noted that three data logger companies, some of which were retailers, had been interviewed informally. The findings revealed that some companies already had procedures in place for managing such requests, while others were uncertain about their processes, highlighting the need for clearer guidelines.
- 5.4. AH noted that, during the interviews, several wholesalers indicated it would be easier for them to monitor DL requests and notify retailers of such requests if the Bilateral Hub could be utilised. As such, the Committee was presented with two solutions:
- Code-Only Change: The first solution entails a change to the code only, imposing an obligation on wholesalers to communicate directly with customer-appointed agents, thereby ensuring requests are managed more efficiently.
 - Bilateral Hub Change: The second solution proposes a minor amendment to the Bilateral Hub, introducing a new data set for tracking third-party requests, which would facilitate improved monitoring and coordination between wholesalers and retailers.
- 5.5. MT also proposed that retailers could collaborate with third parties to streamline the process. However, AH pointed out that customers frequently fail to inform retailers of their intention to use third-party services, which can result in delays and miscommunication. Additionally, concerns were raised regarding potential further delays if retailers were

required to participate in the communication process, as this might introduce additional steps and complexity. RR also discussed the issue of unrequested loggers and emphasised the need for a process to track and manage such requests. It was further highlighted that ensuring third parties follow the correct procedures is of paramount importance. SBD raised concerns about a potential conflict of interest if third parties are obliged to liaise through retailers. There was also discussion about the necessity for third parties to comply fully with market rules and regulations.

- 5.6. The Committee discussed the update, with members providing feedback on the proposed solutions. Certain Committee members raised concerns regarding the practicality of the proposals, particularly in relation to the implementation and monitoring of new processes. There were further discussions about potential competition issues, as some members expressed apprehension that the proposed changes might provoke conflicts between retailers and third parties. The Committee highlighted the importance of clear guidelines and processes to ensure that third-party requests are managed efficiently and consistently across the market.
- 5.7. AH and CD requested that Committee members provide further feedback on the proposed solutions and related questions to ensure that all concerns and suggestions are thoroughly addressed ahead of the formal consultation in July. The input received from committee members will be incorporated to revise the proposal, addressing the issues and concerns identified during the meeting.
- 5.8. The chair thanked AH and CD for their update.

6. CPW118- Minimum Meter Read Frequency

- 6.1. The Committee received a review of CPW118, a proposal concerning changes to the minimum metered read frequency based on customer consumption. AR gave an overview of the proposal, including the analysis and stakeholder feedback.
- 6.2. AR summarised stakeholder feedback, noting that there was support for implementing consumption-based criteria, alongside concerns regarding the proposed 5,000 cubic meter threshold. AR highlighted that stakeholders expressed differing opinions on transferring responsibility for read frequency from wholesalers to retailers. It was noted that MOSL indicated that, for high consumption sites, moving to monthly read meters should enhance

bill accuracy and improve the likelihood of leak detection. CCW also expressed support for shifting biannual read meters to a monthly schedule and endorsed increased minimum requirements for high consumption meters, highlighting anticipated positive impacts for these customers.

- 6.3. AR advised the Committee that, following consultations with trading parties, four main points had emerged. Firstly, there was a majority preference for having the consumption criteria, with several parties noting that consumption should be a more accurate and representative indicator of read requirements that better reflects customer needs. Regarding the 5,000 cubic metre threshold, views differed. Some respondents suggested that commercial arrangements could be made with customers wishing for more frequent meter readings, whilst others felt that 5,000 cubic metres was an appropriate and sensible threshold. Regarding read frequency responsibility, the majority disagreed with transferring responsibility to retailers. Several parties emphasised that wholesalers own the meters and assets, have a better understanding of network usage, and could not see a clear or obvious benefit to retailers owning this data item in CMOS and the market codes. Finally, with respect to the annual meter read frequency, several concerns were raised. Parties commented that such a measure could incentivise a reduction in read frequency, potentially lowering costs, but ultimately resulting in negative customer impacts, for example, failing to detect leakages or issuing incorrect bills. As a result, this aspect was not included in the final solution presented to the panel.
- 6.4. AR provided feedback to the Committee, noting that the metering committee had also given their views and agreed that the final solution brought several benefits to the market. These included improved reconciliation of wholesale charges and settlement, an enhanced customer experience, increased opportunities for leak detection, and, fundamentally, a higher likelihood of accurate bills for non-household customers. This proposal was subsequently taken to the Panel (then referred to as the Panel, not the Code Change Committee), where it was subject to rigorous discussion. The outcome was nine votes against and four abstentions.
- 6.5. AR highlighted that Panel members were concerned about the increased costs to the market, referencing a ceiling of £650,000. There were also apprehensions regarding reduced customer choice, particularly if customers wished to arrange specific meter reading frequencies with their retailers. Varied perspectives emerged on the frequency of meter

readings: some Panel members welcomed the prospect of less frequent readings for sites with low volumes, as this would reduce the cost of meter reads, while others—including CCW—were not in favour of reducing the annual read frequency. Ultimately, while the Panel acknowledged the merits of the change, they did not consider that the increased costs to the market would be sufficiently offset by the benefits. AR mentioned that the change was recommended for rejection and noted that Ofwat ultimately rejected it following deliberation.

- 6.6. The Committee was advised that a brief investigation had been undertaken to ascertain whether meters were being read on a monthly or biannual basis, utilising public dashboards. Due to time constraints, it was not possible to carry out a detailed review of the underlying data. The approach involved examining the number of meters read monthly and biannually, as well as identifying the number of long-unread meters within each category. The results indicated 419 monthly-read meters and approximately 125,126 biannual-read meters, with long-unread meters excluded from these totals. For monthly-read meters, approximately 121,000 reads are submitted annually. In the case of biannual-read meters, around 4.82 million reads are submitted, despite only 2.27 million reads being expected if each meter were read twice per year. In summary excluding smart meters and those influencing reading rates the data suggests that biannual-read meters are, on average, being read four to five times per year. However, AR noted several caveats and assumptions, such as the potential impact of smart meters, and emphasised that this theory would benefit from further testing. This analysis was presented as a preliminary overview to estimate current meter reading rates.
- 6.7. The Committee was invited to provide feedback. JL noted that smart metering is likely to impact cost dynamics, particularly by reducing the need for manual reads across all regions. It was noted that implementing monthly manual reads remains challenging due to resource constraints, but the wider adoption of smart meters could help rebalance costs. JL suggested that annual reads for low consumption, biannually read meters may not be ideal, as single annual readings make comparison difficult. However, for vacant internal meters, an annual read could be more cost-effective, as there is no customer impact and less need for frequent checks. JL also highlighted the potential benefits of consulting customers, particularly large users, regarding the suitability of the 5,000-consumption threshold. It was suggested that overly frequent visits may inconvenience customers more than benefit them. In response to JL, AR advised that, as part of CPW118, CCW had undertaken a different type of survey since

such information had not previously been recorded. Feedback from this survey indicated that customers were not in favour of annual meter reading frequencies, as they preferred accurate billing. AR noted they were not party to these conversations and was unsure how the questions were framed, but it appeared the 5,000 cubic metre threshold had not been referenced. The general consensus seemed to be that customers valued more frequent meter reads to ensure accuracy in billing and payments, which was the rationale at the time. JL advised that it was important to consider seasonal customers, noting that their consumption typically spikes just before summer, followed by lower usage over the winter. SBD raised a question regarding the value and benefit of lowering the threshold, asking whether the investigation had gathered evidence on how such a change would significantly affect customer behaviour. SBD specifically queried if there was data supporting whether billing had been accurate for customers above the cap range, since these customers are typically prioritised by retailers. It was noted that such customers are likely to have loggers to monitor their consumption, making smart meters potentially less critical in these cases. SBD questioned whether there was sufficient evidence to determine if these customers had experienced bill shocks, suggesting that this was unlikely. AR responded that, while loggers might not have been mentioned explicitly in CPW118, it was a valid point that higher consumption customers are expected to have loggers or other measurement methods. This would ensure that both retailers and wholesalers are well-informed about usage. SBD also commented that, even for customers below the threshold, the market recognises that their level of engagement with both retailers and consumption monitoring remains significant. Thus, even in the absence of a monthly meter read, it is likely that a logger is in place and the engagement between customer and retailer is strong. Such arrangements contribute to a steady state in monitoring consumption and ensuring that bills are produced accurately within this framework.

- 6.8. RR emphasised that smart metering could provide valuable insights into its impacts and suggested fully utilising the extensive network of smart meters already installed. For example, Thames currently has between 50,000 and 60,000 non-household smart meters of various sizes and usage levels. These meters are already providing monthly reads into CMOS, meaning the data is readily available. RR proposed that MOSL should make use of this data to better understand the tangible benefits, such as identifying how many meters are registering continuous flow and quantifying the overall advantages. RR further noted that there are two main considerations: the retailer's responsibility to perform monthly manual

reads (which incurs significant operational costs), and the increasing potential for automated data collection as smart metering becomes more widespread. RR highlighted that during discussions on CPW142, it was decided not to impose a monthly reading obligation on wholesalers due to current challenges, including the risk of double charging and the targets already set regarding the percentage of connected meters a responsibility RR argued should remain with the wholesalers. RR concluded that, while the long-term impacts of smart metering on read frequency should be carefully considered, there is currently a wealth of available data. RR also recommended conducting an investigation and preparing a report on the advantages of leveraging existing smart meter data, with particular emphasis on read frequency and the identification of any instances of continuous flow.

ACTION:51_01

6.9. SF raised the possibility of introducing a monthly reading obligation for smart meters. SF wondered when there would be enough evidence to support this shift, noting that it might be too soon at present. The current metering strategy does suggest that, in the longer term, properties with smart meters should move away from the traditional binary requirement in favour of a monthly read schedule. SF also acknowledged concerns about switching to annual reads, especially since issues like leaks or changes in consumption might go undetected for longer periods. He questioned whether, for very low-usage meters particularly those expensive to read and forming the 'tail' after the smart meter rollout, there might be any willingness to move these to annual readings. Alternatively, do retailers remain opposed to converting any meters to annual reads? SF specifically welcomed views from retailers on this matter. JM expressed agreement with JL's point, noting some discomfort with shifting too far towards annual reads. JM believed this approach could create risks, such as undetected leaks, and observed that customers generally appreciated being billed based on more frequent readings. JM reflected that, in his experience, this was the prevailing sentiment. However, JM acknowledged there was merit in considering a change to read frequency for vacant sites, suggesting this could be further explored, particularly in connection with the outcomes of the data assurance project's pilot regarding central data items. JM advised that, if the project established a reliable set of rules for determining whether sites were occupied or vacant, with a strong confidence score, it might be worth revisiting the necessity of regular meter reads at vacant locations. JM concluded that this was an area requiring further consideration and proposed awaiting the findings of the data cleansing and assurance exercise before drawing firm conclusions.

6.10. SF, JL, and BK discussed the challenges of smart meter readings, particularly for very low-usage customers. SF noted that individuals outside the sector often question the logic of reading small consumers - those using significantly less than a typical household - more frequently than the households themselves. SF noted that the stance has mostly opposed reducing read frequency for these users but wanted to reconsider if there was interest in discussing changes for customers with annual usage as low as 50 litres. JL responded by emphasising that for the smallest users, the financial impact of issues such as leaks can be considerable. JL offered the example of a church, which, while a small consumer by industry standards, could face a significant bill if a leak occurred, given their typically low water usage. Therefore, JL argued, it is crucial to detect anomalies swiftly for low-usage customers, as a small increase could disproportionately affect them financially. BK added to this point, agreeing that low-usage customers with undetected leaks could see their bills escalate dramatically potentially rising from £50 to £5,000 over the course of a year. BK stressed that such scenarios would result in a poor customer experience. BK also raised concerns about the practicalities of responding to widespread meter failures. For example, if a mass outage occurred in a region and thousands of meters ceased to provide smart readings, it would be unfeasible for field teams to perform prompt manual readings for all affected customers. BK suggested that, at present, no party is truly equipped to handle such a large-scale disruption. It was noted that under the current division of responsibilities, retailers are assessed on their performance in reading meters at specified intervals, but there is uncertainty regarding whether this obligation should continue to rest exclusively with retailers.

6.11. The chair thanked AR for his presentation.

7. AOB incl. Reflections on the Meeting

7.1. JD introduced the RWG Skip Subgroup, which is tasked with reviewing metre reading obligations, supporting CPW162, and identifying methods to address skip issues. JD asked committee members to participate and provide feedback.

7.2. The Committee considered scheduling an in-person meeting for September or October. TT will confirm availability and coordinate the dates for all members' calendars.

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

8. Actions from Meeting

Action	Owner	Completion by
MOSL team to investigate and report on the benefits of utilising existing smart meter data, focusing on read frequency and identifying any continuous flow cases.	MOSL	