

Operational Advisory Group (OAG)

3 October 2023 meeting

Minutes



Operational Advisory Group

Minutes of 3 October 2023 meeting

Attendees

OAG members and guests

- ◆ Andrew Hewett (AH) - Thames
- ◆ Charlotte Miles (CM) - Thames
- ◆ Daniel Proctor (DP) - Waterplus
- ◆ David Buchan (DB) - Castle
- ◆ David Moss (DM) - Castle
- ◆ Helen Bennett (HB) - Southern
- ◆ Jeremy Lunn (JL) - Thames
- ◆ Karen Hardaker (KH) - UU
- ◆ Michael Floyd (MF) - UU
- ◆ Nick Butt (NB) – Conservaqua
- ◆ Onkar Singh (OS) - Thames
- ◆ Pam Nash (PN) - CNC
- ◆ Paul Baker (PB) – Business Stream
- ◆ Rebecca Watson (RW) - Portsmouth

MOSL

- ◆ Chris Dawson (CD) – Chair
- ◆ Monica Falasca (MF)
- ◆ Jacquelyn Gibson (JG)
- ◆ Miles Robinson (MR)
- ◆ Sam Webb (SW)
- ◆ Lisa-Ann Lott (LAL)

Meeting notes

1 Welcome

CD welcomed members and confirmed the meeting agenda consists of one main item – Phase 14 prioritisation. CD confirmed feedback will be requested following the meeting on the proposals.

2 Update on current position

CD ran through all phases delivered thus far from C1 through to the proposals for possible enhancements which are being introduced at the meeting for feedback.

CD confirmed CPW 139 C & D will be delivered in December, F & G in March 2024 which is phase 12 and phase 13 will be delivered in June 2024 and the additional deliverables will be later in the year at a date yet to be determined.

JG noted phase 14 is not guaranteed and members need to provide their input and prove the value of any potential enhancements in order for phase 14 to go ahead.

CD confirmed phase 14 will require approvals from the steering group and code change committee and will require evidence in order to be included within the business plan.

CD noted three items are on the 'musts' so far: -

- 1) Single sign-on to align the Bilateral Hub with myMOSL
- 2) Extended retention period
- 3) Wholesaler to wholesaler transfer

3 Phase 14 prioritisation

JG provided an overview of the present position in regard to proposed groupings for future deliverables noting these will be provided for feedback following the meeting.

JG highlighted list has been reviewed to ensure no duplication or inclusion of suggestions already incorporated into the Hub or the next phases.

JG provided examples of some of the suggestions included within the groupings such as the ability to login as a team leader and assign/allocate workflows.

JG noted reporting had five ideas which had been proposed and each of these can be voted on/scored individually.

JG ran through details of the feedback spreadsheet which will be provided to members for their replies noting both market benefit and customer benefits will be scored/described to enable prioritisation.

JG highlighted trading party comments can also be provided as additional information/details e.g., mandatory fields etc

JG confirmed benefit scoring runs from 5 to 1 with 5 being the highest benefit score e.g., high market and/or customer benefit. JG highlighted score can also be 0 to indicate where no value or desire for idea to be taken forward.

JG further noted any score of 1-5 will require evidence/comment to justify the benefit.

MR emphasized the more information which trading parties can provide in the description fields the better.

MR noted one part will be the scoring and this will be considered alongside the potential customer benefits thus information such as total savings would be useful.

Following discussion members agreed they would prefer sight of the full list in the first instance to provide feedback on any additional items – this will be provided by MOSL on Tuesday 3 October for response by COB Friday 6 October. A revised list will then be circulated for scoring/comment to be returned by COB Friday 13 October.

JG highlighted scoring/comment is requested per trading party not per OAG member.

CD confirmed final deadline coincides with MOSL Business planning in November, intention therefore to bring the list back to the group on Tuesday 17 October and to engage with the Code Change Committee.

PB enquired if the review will only be by OAG members and expressed concern other representatives at trading parties would not have the opportunity to review.

PB noted the need to ensure coverage for both wholesaler and retailer preferred requirements and used the example of escalations which retailers have requested.

CD agreed to reach out to other non-OAG members for feedback/scoring to ensure an even spread of replies.

JG recommended members do not reply in isolation and include their colleagues within the scoring process.

CD highlighted those requirements which are not included in Phase 14 will have to be picked up during BAU and this is envisaged to be a similar process as used for CMOS.

MR noted prioritisation will also be shared with the Steering Group on 16 October however this will be supporting the proposal to deliver a phase 14 noting that it is within the original budget envelope.

JL requested the list be sent out for review and additions, then updated and resent for scoring. Following discussion members generally agreed to this approach and **MOSL agreed to send the list following the meeting with a request for feedback/additions by COB Friday 6 October, any additions would be incorporated, and the list resent for scoring by COB Friday 20 October.**

OS raised the recommendation of auto-closure on complaints as they often remain open despite having been actioned. JG queried if this could instead be a flag to retailers to review and close where no further action is pending. OS confirmed could be either but there is a need to ensure actioned complaints are closed.

4 AOB

CD advised members of recommendation from Code Advisory group in regard to miscellaneous process grouping and aligning F1, F2, F3 and F6 with F4 i.e., notifying only when an interaction requires a reply from retailers and wholesalers to simply retain information to allow retailers to request information at any other time.

Retailer members generally agreed would still prefer to receive all notifications but in a consistent format perhaps as an attachment albeit would be useful to distinguish between those that require a response/action.

DM recommended differentiating between those notifications of actions which may affect settlement and/or customer bills and those which do not i.e., a low impact tag.

Retailer members noted they filter the data themselves and may offer value add services as a result of information provided.

5 ACTIONS

NO	Action required	Action by	Action Date