

Operational Advisory Group (OAG)

24 May 2022 meeting

Minutes



Operational Advisory Group

Minutes of 24 May 2022 meeting

Attendees

OAG members and guests

- ◆ Andrew Hewett (AH), Wholesaler
- ◆ Ann Hunter, Wholesaler
- ◆ Ashley Connors, Wholesaler
- ◆ David Buchan (DB), Retailer
- ◆ David Moss, Retailer
- ◆ Deborah Bennett, Wholesaler
- ◆ Federico De Gobbi, Wholesaler
- ◆ Frances Lickley, Retailer
- ◆ Jacqueline Hardy, Wholesaler
- ◆ James Sands, Wholesaler
- ◆ Jeremy Lunn, Wholesaler
- ◆ Lauren Walsh, Retailer
- ◆ Matt Garfield, Wholesaler
- ◆ Nick Butt, Retailer
- ◆ Noel Bradley, Wholesaler
- ◆ Paul Baker, Retailer
- ◆ Peter Fell, Wholesaler
- ◆ Rosie Milsom-Dyer, Wholesaler
- ◆ Simon Gibbard, Wholesaler
- ◆ Suzannah Maddock, Wholesaler

MOSL

- ◆ Evan Joanette (EJ) – Chair
- ◆ Julie Serle (JS)
- ◆ Mayuresh Tamboli
- ◆ Lisa-Ann Lott (LAL) - Notes

Meeting notes

1 Welcome

EJ welcomed members and confirmed agenda main focus of completing review of customer form for the G process. EJ also confirmed announcement relating to proposed super G process would be covered during the meeting.

2 Super G process update

EJ provided members a brief synopsis on the proposal by MOSL, and OAG members' affinity, for a Super G process. The intention was to build a single process that accommodated the current various processes (G2, G3, G5 & G6) that managed trade effluent consents. However, EJ noted that the G2 SLA would be indistinguishable in the SLA engine and thus all processes would have an OPS charge applied to them. This scupper the efforts to build a super G process, and MOSL would have to revert to a standalone G2 process. In its phase 5 delivery, there would be potential for C2/C3 to be included.

JS noted due to the low volumes of G5 & G6 would push these deliverables into future phases.

Members noted the SLA does not work as it states 'not before' 2 months on the G3 variation process and thus members would have been content with a combined process.

Members noted that regardless of a super G process, an improved customer form could be used and can use the same form for all processes outside of the hub and this would future proof for when processes are added to the hub and further noted this would not make a material difference to customers.

OAG members pushed back on the proposal, considering the enthusiasm and work already completed on G2. MOSL would socialise the message about the Super G process with pathfinders to establish preference between all G process and C2/C3 given the time constraints for the build.

A member noted that this decision could have been shared earlier with OAG, even if via email to allow OAG members to brainstorm ideas ahead of the OAG meeting.

OAG members strongly pushed back on not building a super G process and proposed that MOSL considers if the G2 OPS was valuable. In fact, it may be more advantageous for an SLA to be added to the other processes, bringing all four in line, even if none are an OPS. MOSL could consider waiving OPS until such time as the SLA engine is more sophisticated. Members also noted the MPF reform may impact the situation in future i.e., the MPF reform may remove the OPS from G2. IT would be short-sighted not to build a super G for an OPS that may not exist in a year anyway. Furthermore, members noted that breaches against the G2 OPS were uncommon and was therefore not a process liable to be failed without an OPS.

OUTCOME: OAG strongly supporting that MOSL pursues the idea of a Super G Trade Effluent process.

Members noted if the ability to add additional interim SLAs into G2 this may be useful.

JS highlighted G2 requirement of no SPID function which will be displayed as G2 (a) with SPID and G2 (b) without a SPID.

Members raised the requirement of 'SPID required' tick box on any no SPID process e.g., where a full consent is required.

3 G Process customer form review

JS ran through the remaining sections of the form from section 9 (health & safety) onwards.

Members requested EA permit details in the site area of the form as opposed to the health & safety area.

Members generally agreed section 9 should remain and should be simplified e.g., combining 9.1 & 9.2 and providing a free text field as opposed to tick boxes to provide more detail.

Members generally agreed sections 10 & 11 should be moved to follow current section 4 and requested greater information be supplied for section 10 e.g., customer detail and be mandatory to complete reason for termination.

MOSL noted section 12 will be updated to reflect multiple signatories such as in the case of joint ventures.

Sections 13 to remain as current.

Section 14 to be moved to earlier in the form and remain as current.

MOSL to update the form and share at future meeting

4 AOB/Next steps

EJ noted low volume processes could all be added to the hub with an overall generic form to package those together may be able to be included should the super G process not be built. Members noted G processes unlikely to fit into this 'mop up' as too specialised.

EJ to revert to MOSL Bilaterals Programme re OAG feedback on Super G. EJ confirmed should this be the case. EJ noted that if this did go ahead, it would need to be socialised to the MPC due to the OPS.

Action: MOSL to send out questions relating to C5/C6 form for review by members prior to next meeting.

Next main meeting Tuesday 7 June 2022.

5 ACTIONS

- 1. MOSL to send out questions relating to C5/C6 form for review by members prior to next meeting.**