

Minutes of the Performance Assurance Committee Meeting 02 (Public)

18 December 2024 | 09:30 – 15:00

Via MS Teams

Status of the Minutes: FINAL

MEMBERS PRESENT

Claire Whyley	CW	Independent Chair	Jesse Wright	JW	Wholesaler Representative
Lindsey Fussell	LF	Independent Member	Ben Kershaw	BK	Retailer Representative
Keith Richards	KR	Independent Member	Andrew Smith	AS	Retailer Representative
Adam Boyns	AB	Customer Representative	John Spreadbury	JS	Retailer Representative
Sam Dawson	SD	Wholesaler Representative	Shaun Kent*	SK	Ofwat Representative
Tanya Sephton	TS	Wholesaler Representative	Sarah McMath*	SM	MOSL CEO

**Non-Voting Members of the Committee*

OTHER ATTENDEES

Sam Webb	SW	MOSL Presenter	Nichola Sampford	NS	MOSL Secretariat
Adam Richardson	AR	Panel Secretary	Axelle Saada	ASa	MOSL Presenter

APOLOGIES

--	--	--	--	--	--

CLOSED SESSION

1. Welcome and Introductions

- 1.1. The Chair welcomed everyone to the Performance Assurance Committee (“Committee”) meeting and noted that TS would only be in attendance for parts of the meeting (and not available from the beginning), that KR would be leaving the meeting and returning and that SM would join the meeting at 10:45. These entrances and exits will be noted in the minutes.
- 1.2. The Chair reminded Committee members of the requirement to act impartially and not in the interest or as a representative of any organisation or individual. If Committee members believed they had an actual or perceived conflict they should declare this at the start of the meeting or before an agenda item.
- 1.3. It was confirmed that the meeting was quorate.

2. Trading Party 1

- 2.1. The Committee noted updates on the trading parties discussed at PAC1 and handed over by the Market Performance Committee beginning with an update on Trading Party 1. Trading Party 1 is currently escalated to Strategic Panel, with the Committee responsible for monthly monitoring its performance. Trading Party 1 was escalated to Strategic Panel monitoring in December 2023.
- 2.2. SW explained the options within the escalation framework to the Committee along with the reasons for which Trading Party 1 was originally escalated to the Market Performance Committee (MPC). The lack of engagement from Trading Party 1 with MPC was discussed. SW confirmed that Trading Party 1 has recently appointed a new Contracts Manager.
- 2.3. The Committee considered the various options open to it; escalation to Ofwat, continuing with Strategic Panel escalation or de-escalating Trading Party 1 to PAC monitoring. The Committee considered the issues around performance against current metrics, the current plan issued by Trading Party 1 and how Trading Party 1 is performing against its plan. In the

past month, this has been complicated by its main retailer closing a backlog of complaints on the system that has impacted Trading Party 1's performance against the Market Performance Standard (MPS) 7 (Meter Disconnection and Reconnection) metric. In the papers, SW detailed what the performance would have been without this drop in performance outside of Trading Party 1's control.

- 2.4. More widely, the Committee considered the volume of bilateral task requests as, in this case, the volume of tasks is lower than it is for other Wholesalers. The Committee expressed an interest in receiving information such as volume of tasks and perhaps location information that would help contextualise the information on performance of trading parties, where possible.
- 2.5. The Committee will get an early view on whether Trading Party 1 is on track with its current plan (which is due to be completed in March 2025) at PAC03 in January 2025.
- 2.6. Following discussion, the Committee:
 - **AGREED (Unanimously)** to continue with Strategic Panel monitoring for Trading Party 1
- 2.7. The chair thanked SW for the update.

3. Trading Party 2

- 3.1. The Committee noted update on Trading Party 2. Trading Party 2 has been under Focussed Monitoring with the MPC for just over a year. Trading Party 2 is currently at the bottom of the Wholesaler performance table. Trading Party 2 is a small Wholesaler and it has a very small team.
- 3.2. In the Summer of 2024, MPC requested that Trading Party 2 provide it with a plan of how it would address the performance issues as performance levels were improving at a very slow rate and in some cases, against certain metrics, had dropped. Usually a plan is only put in place when a Trading Party is escalated to formal monitoring by the performance committee. In this case, SW has been monitoring the plan and reporting back on progress, which remains slow.
- 3.3. The Committee considered the fact that Trading Party 2 has been very engaged in the process and that it has a very small team. It noted that performance could be impacted by escalation

as it could increase the workload for an already small team. However, the Committee also noted that escalation could bring this situation to the attention of the wider business. Formal escalation would include Trading Party 2 being named on the MOSL website (but with no details about the reasons for escalation).

3.4. Following discussion, the Committee:

- **AGREED (Unanimously)** that Trading Party 2 should be formally escalated to PAC Monitoring
- It was further agreed that SW would draft a letter to Trading Party 2 and circulate this initially to the Chair and then to the rest of the Committee for comment before sending this to Trading Party 2. Trading Party 2 would be invited to a future meeting to discuss its plan with the Committee.

ACTION: PAC2_01

3.5. The chair thanked SW for the update.

4. Trading Parties in MOSL Focussed Monitoring

4.1. The Committee noted update on trading parties in MOSL focussed monitoring.

4.2. Trading Party 3 received a Letter of Concern in July 2022, escalated to Focussed Monitoring on its performance against the Market Performance Standards (MPS) and Long Unread Meters (LUM) metrics. Trading Party 3 had some IT issues that have now been resolved. It is working with its Wholesalers in a pre-agreed and prepared way to address issues around old meter reads and customer impact (including mitigating the risk of bill shock) has been explained to SW.

SM joined the meeting

4.3. The Committee expressed concern about the length of time that Trading Party 3 had been under Focussed Monitoring. It was agreed that underperformance against the LUMs metric is probably the measure that demonstrates the most customer impact in holistic reporting. It was noted that CCW receive a large amount of complaints from Trading Party 3 customers. The Committee noted that bill shock, particularly for smaller businesses, could result in a company ceasing to trade. The Committee noted that there was work underway auditing

estimation methods for bills undertaken by MOSL and CCW. The Committee was reminded that the performance tables it is seeing are based on a three month summary of performance, meaning that, if there is a large dip in performance in one month, this could impact standings.

- 4.4. The Committee felt that it needed more detail from Trading Party 3 on how it is going to address the various areas of underperformance. The questions raised around gap sites and the delays in getting meter readings for these (gap sites are sites that have been identified as a site that should have been in the market but currently are not), whether bilateral requests were being held back for cost reasons and how or whether Trading Party 3 could demonstrate that it is mitigating the risk of impact on customers. SW will send her questions to the Committee to review and it will consider next steps at the next meeting.

KR left the meeting

- 4.5. Following discussion, the Committee:

- **AGREED (Unanimously)** to continue with Focussed Monitoring for Trading Party.

- 4.6. Trading Party 4 received a Letter of Concern in March 2024 and the MPC reviewed this in October 2024. Trading Party 4 was escalated to Focussed Monitoring on its performance on meter reading and specifically LUMs. SW explained that this Trading Party has lost a large portfolio (around 3000 SPIDs) to another Retailer and is now in a different peer comparison category (but remains at the bottom of the table). Most of the meters that transferred to the new Retailer were not identified as LUMs.
- 4.7. Trading Party 4 had worked well in dealing with its issues with one Wholesaler (Severn Trent Water) and is now working closely with its meter reading contractors to address issues with meter readings generally and LUMs specifically across all regions. It is also raising bilaterals to address meters that are broken and cannot be read. There was a specific issue with a member of staff not inputting reads correctly.
- 4.8. With the change of where Trading Party 4 sit within the market, it may be that, given the proportion of Long Unread Meters is likely to increase, Trading Party 4 will appear to have even worse performance against that metric. SW will look to contextualise any issues with how its data appears over the coming months now that Trading Party 4 has moved to a different category of Retailers.

- 4.9. Following discussion, the Committee:

- **AGREED (Unanimously)** to continue with Focussed Monitoring for Trading Party 4.

4.10. Trading Party 5 was escalated following a Letter of Concern in August 2023. Trading Party 5 is proactive in providing information on how issues are being addressed and will be addressed in the future. There have been improvements in its performance, but it remains second from bottom in the table. It has had challenges with submitting data on time. It has had a similar experience to Trading Party 1 with its main retailer closing a backlog of complaints on the system and this has impacted its performance against the MPS7 metric and SW gave an illustration in the papers of what performance would look like if this hadn't happened.

4.11. Previously Trading Party 5 had issues with getting meter reads into CMOS but this process has now been automated. Its Legacy Long Unread Meters (meters that have not been read since market opening) and LUMs are reducing in numbers.

4.12. Following discussion, the Committee:

- **AGREED (Unanimously)** to continue with Focussed Monitoring for Trading Party 5.

4.13. The chair thanked SW for the update.

5. Tabled Updates and Review of Holistic Performance and Escalation Decisions

5.1. The tabled updates provided in advance of the meeting were raised. Updated versions will be sent in the paper pack every month. The reason this is circulated with the focussed reports on individual trading parties is to give the Committee some context; having a measure of the market as a whole can highlight trends that are causing issues.

5.2. The Letters of Concern process was explained to the Committee. No new Letters of Concern were issued last month. The process was refined by the MPC for smaller Trading Parties and SW explained that if a smaller Trading Party triggers a Letter of Concern, she will contact the Trading Party to discuss the issues and find out what the Trading Party in question is planning to do to address issues and mitigate customer impact.

5.3. The Committee noted that, within the updates, that Trading Party 2 is switching from Low Volume Interface (LVI) to High Volume Interface (HVI) which will automate processes, meaning the PAC should see an improvement in performance fairly quickly.

6. Conflicts of Interest

KR and TS joined the meeting

- 6.1. The Committee reviewed the Conflicts of Interest Guidance detailed in the Terms of Reference, and discussed whether to draft standalone guidance, raising the following key points:
- 6.2. Committee members acknowledged the importance of dealing with Trading Party members' conflicts of interest appropriately. Members felt these must be managed carefully and clearly declared but the Committee should not be tied a position whereby, at the mention of a Trading Party members' employer, that Committee member should recuse themselves. It was acknowledged that the combination of signed release letters and declarations of interest forms assist in identifying and declaring potential perceived or actual conflicts of interest. It was also noted by the Committee that the case-by-case approach was best as the decisions around whether a Committee member should recuse themselves from discussions were not binary. The Committee agreed that, at the point of decision (whether a member had recused themselves from the prior discussion or not), a member from a Trading Party about whom there was a decision of any kind, should recuse themselves from voting on a decision.
- 6.3. Where pairings occur between the employers of Trading Party representatives, noting these on the securely held Register of Interests (held by the Market Operator's Secretariat) would assist in identifying where these conflicts could impact on decision making. Members should be proactive about declaring possible conflicts of interest to the Secretariat to maintain transparency.
- 6.4. It was agreed that if observations or issues raised by members that can be linked to their employment should be tested across the market as a whole (either within the committee or, if appropriate, using tools such as audit) to ensure that individual members are not unduly influencing the direction of travel with regards to performance management.
- 6.5. Following the discussion, the Committee:
 - **AGREED (Unanimously)** to put together supplemental, working practice guidance building on the Conflicts of Interest Appendix within its Terms of Reference, specifically addressing the issue of voting. A paper setting out a draft of this will be presented to the Committee at PAC03 in January 2025.

ACTION: PAC02_02

- **AGREED (Unanimously)** to the Market Operator's Secretariat recruiting a pool of alternates for the Committee to assist where Conflicts of Interest arise (and other situations where a member may not be able to attend a PAC meeting).

ACTION: PAC02_03

7. Questions raised at PAC01

- 7.1. The Committee discussed issues/questions raised at PAC1, specifically the Statement of Approach. A question was raised about what scaling of performance tools meant. It was noted that in this coming year, scaling is mainly about the scope and approach of audits, taking into account the number of trading parties involved in the process as well as the topic. This may have an impact on which tools are used to monitor performance and/or incentivise performance.
- 7.2. As part of the MPF Reform, there are other elements for the PAC to utilise. These include whether to create Additional indicators, which of the KPIs to publish publicly, whether or not incentive charges should be increased by inflation and whether MPF standards should be varied. At present, a lot of what we look at is relative. Under the new MPF, the proposal is to use (more widely) minimum performance standards, meaning the focus of the committee would be on those trading parties who are performing below the threshold of the minimum performance standards. The Committee will need to weigh up flexing the framework with giving the market consistency and targets that are not constantly changing.
- 7.3. The Risk and Issues Tracker is a document that is owned by the MOSL Board and the PAC do not endorse this document (it is MOSL's view of the risks and issues in the market). This document can be used by the Committee to guide decision making. The major risks identified by MOSL will be discussed in more detail at the in-person meeting in March along with the suggestion by a committee member at the first meeting of some routes to resolution. MOSL will continue to take into account new risks and issues that are identified by the Committee and if there is something that the Committee identify within any given year, an interim Risk and Issues Tracker may be issued by MOSL. If the Committee do not agree with the risks and issues identified by MOSL, this can be flagged within minutes of the Committee meetings.

- 7.4. There were some questions about the audit scope and approach and the distinction between planned and targeted audits. More information was added to the Statement of Approach about background risks that are driving the thinking behind the audits. When the annual audit plan and individual audits are discussed with the Committee, these risks will be discussed in more detail.
- 7.5. A question was raised about balancing the new framework with the existing framework. The existing framework is within code and the existing framework applies whilst the new framework is in shadow. It was noted that MOSL do not anticipate the new KPIs that will be monitored in shadow “pull against” any existing KPIs. While performance may differ, improvement in one regime should see improvement in the other (or at least no reduction in performance).
- 7.6. The question of regional variation and the new MPF was raised. The Committee noted that there are some factors that have more significant impact to performance that vary in different regions, the proportion of sites with internal meters (making them harder to read) and the pace of smart meter rollout were given as examples. In the future MPF, each of these are separated into distinct standards, and each trading party will be measured in each area. This will iron out regional differences and the Committee will need to consider this with regards to the current MPF performance. The future picture will be clearer.
- 7.7. A question about the clarity of the current metrics was raised. One of the aims of the new MPF is to provide more meaningful KPIs from a customer perspective and this is something that the Committee can take into account when considering the public peer comparison data to share.
- 7.8. A question was raised about whether the current format for publishing data about trading party performance is mandated and how the data is assured. The format isn’t currently mandated and there is flexibility that would benefit the Committee in the future. The accuracy is tied to the assurance work around performance charges which links to the Market Operator Performance Assurance work covered later in the agenda.

OPEN SESSION

MEMBERS PRESENT

Claire Whyley	CW	Independent Chair	Jesse Wright	JW	Wholesaler Representative
Lindsey Fussell	LF	Independent Member	Ben Kershaw	BK	Retailer Representative
Keith Richards	KR	Independent Member	Andrew Smith	AS	Retailer Representative
Adam Boyns	AB	Customer Representative	John Spreadbury	JS	Retailer Representative
Sam Dawson	SD	Wholesaler Representative	Shaun Kent*	SK	Ofwat Representative
Sarah McMath*	SM	MOSL CEO	Tanya Sephton	TS	Wholesaler Representative

**Non-Voting Members of the Committee*

OTHER ATTENDEES

Sam Webb	SW	MOSL Presenter	Axelle Saada	ASa	MOSL Presenter
Adam Richardson	AR	Panel Secretary	Evan Joannette	EJ	MOSL Presenter
Nichola Sampford	NS	MOSL Secretariat	Peter Strain	PS	Castle Water Observer
Angela Day	AD	MOSL Presenter	Ray Akakpo	RA	MOSL Presenter

8. Welcome and Apologies

- 8.1. The Chair welcomed attendees to the open session and noted that no apologies had been received.
- 8.2. The Chair reminded Committee members of the requirement to act impartially and not in the interest or as a representative of any organisation or individual. If Committee members believed they had an actual or perceived conflict they should declare this at the start of the meeting or before an agenda item.

8.3. It was confirmed that the meeting was quorate.

9. Market Operator Compliance

- 9.1. The Committee received an introduction to MO Compliance (this is an internal document shared with PAC members for information) and presentation of latest information. It was noted that the Committee will receive regular (quarterly) updates on compliance and any related issues. AD explained that this will be presented in a standard format and that questions, observations and feedback are welcome.
- 9.2. The Committee noted the presentation from RA detailing the suggestions for improvements from the internal audits and the non-compliance with the codes and associated actions. There was one non-compliance reported that is ongoing relating to the code change [CPW157 Data Retention Beyond Seven Years](#) that was presented to the Code Change Committee in December. It is highly likely that this non-compliance will remain open until the progression and (if required), implementation of the code change.
- 9.3. The second non-compliance related to the fact that MOSL are required to publish the details of Trading Parties defaulting on their market operator charges. The list is now published on the MOSL website and the non-compliance has been closed (in November 2024).
- 9.4. The Committee noted the Internal Audit Plan for 2024-25 that was endorsed by the MPC. The internal audits for the first two quarters have been completed and the Quarter 3 audit cycle is in progress. The Committee noted the plans for Quarter 4: CMOS Change Management and Controls, MPS Settlement, MPF Assurance Testing and Data Assurance Service.
- 9.5. The Committee noted that no non-compliances have been identified through the internal audits this year. Nine opportunities for improvement have been identified and details of the audit findings and progress against actions (including any overdue actions) are provided to the MOSL Board Audit and Risk Committee.
- 9.6. AD confirmed that Deloitte would like to attend PAC03 to present its audit plan. Deloitte was appointed as auditor for MOSL in June 2024. AD also confirmed that the Internal Audit Plan for 2025-26 will be presented to the Committee in January for feedback before taking this to the MOSL Board Audit and Risk Committee.

- 9.7. The Committee was interested to find out more about the planning for cyber attacks and it was agreed that this could be added to the PAC Forward Plan, potentially for the in-person meeting in March.

ACTION: PAC02_04

- 9.8. The Committee was interested to know about the opportunities for improvements mentioned in the paper. For the Interim Supply Allocation and Customer Data Provision, MOSL is looking at how it collects data and improving processes for collecting this data so that it is able to retain and to ensure the data is in a usable format. For the IT Access Control and Identity Management, MOSL is looking at access management for its internal applications and what improvements can be put in place to enhance how it restricts and control access. Most of this work is about tightening up on documentation and processes. Another example was from the MPF Programme internal audit and resulted in a tightening up of the Terms of Reference for the MPF Steering Group where references were made to a previous independent member who no longer sat on the committee.
- 9.9. The Chair thanked AD and RA for the presentation.

10. Market Audit

- 10.1. The Committee received a presentation of the process to create the Annual Trading Party Audit Plan.
- 10.2. The Committee noted the process, including how the areas of audit and the planned audits are selected. Whenever a planned audit is run, the selection criteria will be set out in the statement of work. The Committee will have the opportunity to comment on the statement of work before endorsing an audit.
- 10.3. The Committee expressed interest in what would happen if it did not approve an audit plan. AS clarified that MOSL would seek the endorsement of the Committee for audits rather than approval, but that MOSL would prefer to carry out audits with that endorsement in place. The process is that a detailed paper, setting out the audit plan, rationale and scope will be shared with the Committee for endorsement or comment and if there were comments rather than endorsement, AS could work these into the audit plan and bring it back for endorsement at a later meeting.

- 10.4. The Committee was interested in finding out about the prioritisation within the audit work. AS confirmed that the risk scores on the Risks and Issues Tracker play a big part in this prioritisation work and the likes of improvement programmes, code changes and other work going on in the market also forms part of the consideration around prioritisation to see if there is any synergy with any audit planning.
- 10.5. It was confirmed that trading parties are obligated under the code to cooperate with the Market Operator Audit function.
- 10.6. The Chair thanked AS for the update.

11. MPF Reform Update

- 11.1. The Committee received an update on the MPF Reform Programme.
- 11.2. The Committee noted that the MPF Reform Programme is starting to plan for its next Consultation with the market in early Spring 2025. The Committee will receive an update on this at the next meeting in January.
- 11.3. The build for the metrics for cyclic reads is progressing well and Programme is working with Ofwat to ensure that the work on BR-Mex – Business and Retail Measure of Experience – metrics (due to be implemented in April 2025) is on track. A piece of parallel work looking at the reasons why meters are not being read recently closed its call for responses and the response rate was good.
- 11.4. The Programme briefed the Waterscan Self-Supply network on the forthcoming changes; as a group, self-supply retailers will be much less impacted by MPF Reform, but they still found it useful to receive a MOSL brief on upcoming changes.

KR joined the meeting

- 11.5. The Code Change Committee received a teach-in about the metrics for BR-Mex ahead of the Code Change Committee meeting in February where this code change will be presented. Ofwat will determine which metrics will be included as BR-Mex metrics will be included and EJ gave a brief explanation of these. The PAC noted that the Ofwat final determinations were due to be published on 19 December 2024. The Programme team is currently ensuring that the metrics are ready for implementation in April.

KR left the meeting

- 11.6. The Committee was interested in hearing more information about skip codes consultation and whether this would be shared with it. EJ confirmed that as it affects performance, any skip code change stands a good chance of needing Committee visibility in due course. EJ will be presenting more about performance and charges to the Performance Advisory Group (PAG) in its coming meetings.
- 11.7. The audit and risk around MPF Reform delivery was discussed. AD returned to the meeting and shared that this was considered alongside the Market Operator responsibilities for supporting central functions for the market as well as the specific delivery of the MPF Reform work. The annual report is where the Corporate Risk Register is detailed, and the MOSL Board Audit and Risk Committee review this. As part of MOSL's internal processes, it has a monthly Portfolio Board where each individual programme's risk register is monitored. Specifically for the MPF Programme, there is a threefold approach to the assurance of the Programme. There is an internal test team that will test the design. Internal audit will then carry out an end to end assurance review, with Market Operator auditor Deloitte carrying out assurance work on the measures and the framework.
- 11.8. With the implementation of the PAC, there are places on the MPF Steering Group that are drawn from the Code Change Committee and (previously) from the MPC. Members will be approached to offer a chance to sit on this Group.
- 11.9. It was confirmed to the Committee that all of the new metrics in Phase One of the MPF Reform work has been through the checks with PAG and will be implemented for shadow reporting in April. Design documents for some have already been released and others are in progress. Phase Two has not begun the design process yet, and consideration will be given to any metrics that deliver two outcomes (as has been the case with Phase One).
- 11.10. Ofwat confirmed that it would be clear about the metrics being included under the BR-Mex umbrella and how these will work.
- 11.11. The Chair thanked EJ for his presentation and AD for returning to answer specific questions.

12. Statement of Approach and Market Performance Review Report

- 12.1. The Committee received an update on the paper sent ex-committee. The Committee noted that there may be further tweaks to the version circulated to incorporate it into the MOSL

business plan. The Committee also noted that a number of changes were made to the original version sent to incorporate suggestions made by members of the Committee.

- 12.2. It was noted that the Committee's first year will be transitional in nature and that it will be managing the move from the current framework through shadow to the implementation of the metrics (November 2025).
- 12.3. With regards to the Statement of Approach, this is a high-level view on the way that MOSL and the Committee will utilise the various tools available in the coming year that it refers to. This will take into account the risks and issues but also historic performance to form this "snapshot" of the planned approach. The Committee expressed its gratitude for taking on the comments and suggestions made ex-committee.
- 12.4. The Market Performance Review Report (MPRR) will be a report that will be a report that gives a wider view, looking back at the performance since the last report was issued and providing some context for the future. This may include input from the Strategic Panel on what it would like the Committee to focus. It will also set out when the next MPRR will be produced. This replaces the Annual Market Performance Review (AMPR) and it may be issued on an annual basis in the early stages, but has deliberately set out in code to move to a longer cadence as this will give more opportunity to monitor the progress of improvement (as evidence of material improvements may not be as easy to see annually). It is anticipated that the first MPRR will be produced in Summer 2026.
- 12.5. It was acknowledged by the Committee that this will continue to provide visibility of the performance of the market. It agreed that transparency will be important for the committee going forward. In this sense, having some more reporting that covers the whole market as part of the papers that the Committee look at will be a useful tool to share with the market and customers.
- 12.6. The Chair thanked AR for his verbal update.

13. Tabled Updates

- 13.1. The Committee noted the Tabled Updates paper circulated in advance of the meeting detailing progress on the Committee's workstreams and metering-related projects.
- 13.2. The Committee received a brief update on the last meeting of the Code Change Committee.

- 13.3. The Forward Plan (particularly in relation to MPF Consultation 5) was discussed and it was agreed that this would be looked at in terms of future agenda setting. It may be that this will be dealt with in the Committee's face to face meeting in March.
- 13.4. The CCW paper was shared with the Committee before the meeting and AB explained the scope of the quarterly report and confirmed that he was happy to take any questions on this either within the meeting or ex-committee via email.
- 13.5. The Committee was interested if there was any shift in the types of complaints, or if that had been consistent. AB confirmed that billing and charges accounted for the majority of complaints, centring around the disputes around billing. There are also administration-related complaints is the second biggest category of complaints and that has not fluctuated much. The volumes of complaints have gone up and down over the years.
- 13.6. The Committee noted that CCW received feedback from retailers once a month but the reasoning for quarterly reporting is to provide the retailers time to provide some assurance for those figures, meaning that there is a extra month's "lag" for the figures to come through on the quarterly reporting. There is one final round of checking to give the extra level of assurance before this is shared with the Committee and published on CCW's website.

14. AOB incl. Reflections on the Meeting

- 14.1. The Committee was asked if there was any other business to discuss and it was confirmed that there was none.
- 14.2. The Committee reflected on the meeting.

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