MOSL
MARKET OPERATOR SERVICES LTD

Operational Advisory Group (OAG)

4 November 2021 meeting

Minutes

Operational Advisory Group

Minutes of 4 November 2021 meeting

Attendees

OAG Members and Guests

- Tom Wells (TW), Wholesaler
- Andrew Hewitt (AH), Wholesaler
- Paul Baker (PB), Retailer
- Jon Fuller (JF), Wholesaler
- Sian Forward (SF), Wholesaler
- Ashley Connors (AC), Wholesaler
- David Moss (DM), Retailer
- David Buchan (DB), Retailer
- Onkar Singh (OS), Wholesaler
- Helen Bennett (HB), Wholesaler
- Matthew Garfield (MG), Wholesaler
- Jenny Ansell (JA), Wholesaler
- Suzannah Maddock (SM)
- Lisa Molyneux (LM)

Apologies

- Lewis Orr (LO), Retailer
- Madeleine Moores (MM), Retailer
- Patricia Quintana (PQ), Wholesaler
- Kat Grimley (KG), Wholesaler
- Deborah Morton (DMo), Wholesaler
- Gavin Shirtcliffe (GS), Wholesaler
- Laura Morgan (LM), Wholesaler
- Rosie Rand (RR), Wholesaler
- Michael Floyd (MF), Wholesaler
- Frances Lickley (FL), Retailer
- Julie-Ann Anderson (JAA), Wholesaler
- Rebecca Watson (RW), Wholesaler

MOSL

- Evan Joanette (EJ) – Chair
- Chris Dawson (CD)
- Matthew Weaver (MW)
- Mayuresh Tamboli (MT)
- Monica Falasca (MF)
- Oliver Robins (OR)
- Julie Serle (JS)
- Lisa-Ann Lott (LAL) – Secretariat

MOSL
MARKET OPERATOR SERVICES LTD

Meeting notes

1. Welcome, Minutes and Actions

EJ welcomed members and confirmed agenda.

2. Customer queries: F5, F4 and G1 efficiencies

CD updated the group on the F5 process in respect of bringing it more closely in line with MVP rather than MVP++. Key improvement has been retained e.g., Wholesaler ability to request has been retained. A customer site visit module, has not been retained. Site visit information will have to be captured in comments on the service request.

JF queried the usefulness of 'Premise Type' as the valid set is a very limited list of business types. MT confirmed this is not a CMOS data item. EJ queried if any OAG members on the call used the field. None found it useful. EJ proposed that removing it would provide build efficiencies as long as it wasn't used in earnest in another process. AC noted field is useful to determine site sensitivity. Other OAG members stated that this same information now available via the customer information module which will be submitted with each service request.

OUTCOME: OAG members support removing of "premise type" field from the F5 submission transaction

ACTION: MOSL to confirm no unintended knock-on on other processes if the premise type field is removed from F5 submission transaction.

CD ran through the 'Complete Transaction T222.W'. OAG members confirmed whether some fields ought to be required or optional.

DM enquired if indicating a follow on ORID affected the auto-closure of an F5 service request. JS confirmed it did not. No F5 would auto-close.

JF queried whether MOSL has reconsidered if site visit module could be included in the F5 process as he felt it was a key part of F5 and needed to be included to be consistent with C1. EJ confirmed that MOSL did discuss it, but the rationale shared with OAG at the last meeting would stand; the site visit module would not be included as part of F5 when it's implemented. Otherwise, F5 would veer into MVP++ and there was currently no mandate from TP budget holders for this. EJ recommended members escalate to their Finance teams for discussion at MOSL business plan stage thus releasing further funding for additional functionality. As there would be no defined site visit module in the F5 process, EJ recommended that any relevant site visit notes would be captured in the service request comments.

OUTCOME: Some members of the OAG feel that the site visit module should be included in F5. MOSL's view is that this is MVP++ and not deliverable under current timetable and budget.

CD demonstrated the process flow for F4 and G1 noting the similarities in process flows with F5 as these processes were all, in effect, customer contact processes about different topics. CD explained the possible development efficiencies if F4 and G1 were built in parallel with F5.

SF queried where the wholesaler state transitions would be the same as the Retailer ones. CD & MT confirmed they would be.

JF noted if F4, F5 and G1 all utilise the same background design, they too would lack the site visit module. EJ confirmed that would be the case. DM noted that more generic processes like F3 could be used as a site visit proxy. JF noted that this would mean multiple service requests would need raising rather than one.

JF suggested that for these processes, it might be beneficial for an over data item called 'Customer informed of outcome'. CD confirmed that for all three processes, data item D8259 achieves this already.

CD queried if data item required 'if wholesaler has closed request, retailer not required to follow up'. A retailer member confirmed a carbon copy of the resolution/response to the customer would be required from the Wholesaler. JF confirmed if complaint received direct, they would want to deal with complaint in full and inform the relevant retailer, it would then be the retailers' decision whether to follow up once resolved. Members agreed if codified each side must supply full carbon copies of correspondence.

EJ queried if process flows are as similar as MOSL believe them to be. OAG members generally agreed that the development alignment should be sought for these three processes. However, many members would be concerned if they were all implemented the same time due to the resources on their side to integrate three processes at once, regardless of how similar they were.

OUTCOME: OAG supportive of parallel development of F5, F4, and G1 although some members proposed that it would be more efficient for TPs that they are implemented in a staggered manner.

OUTCOME: TPs propose coding is strengthened to make it a requirement that carbon copies of any Wholesaler responses to customers for F5, F4 or G1 should be attached to the service request.

CD asked if auto-close need to be turned off for all three processes? CD explained that not including it at implementation for F4 and G1 could speed up their build.

A member queried whether C1 auto-closures (when built) might give a better picture of the requirement. Some TPs noted that some C1s in the hub were already "stuck" at info requested. On balance, OAG view was that auto-closure should be on for F4s and G1s. EJ noted from the conversation that this sounded like a desirable, rather than necessary function.

OUTCOME: OAG members indicated a preference for F4 and G1 auto-closure but this was not a showstopper for implementation, and it could be added later.

CD asked if there was scope to align the 10 BD SLA for F4 to the 8 BD SLA for F5.

Members noted GSS implications against F5 and the industry tendency to prioritise F5 over F4. Creating a more stringent F4 SLA could impact the quality of F5 delivery. The Chair queried how many F4 SLAs were met and some OAG members acknowledged they don't track them. However,

other members noted that relaxed attitudes about F4 were not a good reason to set unrealistic SLAs that would be routinely failed just to bring alignment to the processes.

A member raised concerns around trade effluent, the technical responses/actions required and bringing that SLA to 8 BD. Another member noted that customer commitments are routinely made on the basis of SLAs and therefore failing them would lead to poor customer service. Another member noted if SLAs were being failed routinely, it would only bring about inefficiency as it would increase resubmitted service requests.

OUTCOME: OAG member feedback does not support alignment of F5, F4 and G1 SLAs at this time.

CD asked if there was value in introducing a F4.W which isn't currently in the code?

Members discussed. Agreed it would be valuable as long as F4.W was optional rather than mandatory. There were many OAG members who agreed that a lot of enquiry-type contact to the Wholesaler is better if it's quickly forwarded to the retailer as it has nothing to do with the Wholesaler and is NOT a bilateral process. EJ agreed that the proposed design of F4 would make F4.W entirely optional.

OUTCOME: OAG members support creation of F4.W.

EJ queried if F6 could also fit as a query-type process along with F5, F4, and G1. Many members confirmed it could also be a candidate for parallel development.

3. G process queries & gap site C02 form

CD asked members if they supported code change to change TE SLAs from "months" to "Business Days?" (i.e., 2 months to 40BD).

Many TPs noted this was a hang up from statute and that a month is not a set period of time as some months are 30 days others are 31. Most members supported a change to BD as long as the number of days kept them on the right side of the 2 months in the Water Industry Act.

OUTCOME: OAG members agreed MOSL should investigate changing code language around SLAs from "months" to "business days" if it still allows for compliance with the Water Industry Act as far as TE is concerned.

JF reminded the group of its previous consideration of various processes that have either 20 or 22 BD SLAs. There is OAG desire to bring those into alignment in due course.

CD asked if there should be a Wholesaler SLA for G5 & G6 at step 2? There isn't one currently.

OAG members generally agreed there should be an SLA. DB confirmed Wholesalers could leave customers left paying fixed charges for a discontinued/termination connection. CD suggested an OAG sub-group could review.

OUTCOME: OAG support exploration of G5, G6 Wholesaler SLA at step 2.

CD asked if the codes are clear enough that a customer can have a different TE retailer and different sewage retailer?

A member confirmed it is not uncommon for a SPID to have two retailers as one may be on short term consent and one long term. MT confirmed CMOS only technically allows for one sewerage retailer therefore requirements will need to be reviewed to ensure two can raise a process against a SPID. OAG members agreed the codes need clarification around this point.

OUTCOME: When reviewing the G processes further, code clarification should be considered for dealing with scenarios where there is both a short and long term TE retailer at a single SPID.

CD queried the Gap site C/02 form at section 2 where the form asks:

'Registration of a new water services supply point where there is an existing water services supply point at the eligible premises please provide the SPID for the existing water services supply point'

CD asks if this is needed? Do Wholesalers have multiple SPIDs on one premise?

Several members confirmed that historical premise set-ups often have multiple SPIDs, but most prefer that newly registered premises are set up was just one SPID. On balance, the OAG confirmed that question was still relevant. One member noted that a YES answer could highlight illegal connection.

4. AOB

EJ confirmed return to regular Tuesday schedule from next meeting.

Next OAG meeting is scheduled for 16 November 2021

5. ACTIONS

5.1 **MOSL to confirm no unintended knock-on on other processes if the premise type field is removed from F5 submission transaction.**