

Minutes of Panel Meeting 20

26 June 2018 | 10:30 – 16:30

MOSL, 4th floor, 16-18 Monument Street, London, EC3R 8AJ

Status of the Minutes: Final

MEMBERS PRESENT

Jim Keohane	JK	Chair	Richard Moore (via teleconference)	RM	Panel Member (Unassociated Retailer)
Mike Brindle	MB	Panel Member (Associated Retailer)	Mark Holloway	MH	Panel Member (Wholesaler)
Wendy Monk	WM	Panel Member (Associated Retailer)	Howard Smith	HS	Panel Member (Wholesaler)
Helyn Mensah (via teleconference)	HM	Panel Member (Independent)	Dylan Freeman	DF	Panel Member (Wholesaler)
Nigel Sisman	NS	Panel Member (Independent)	Christina Blackwell (via teleconference)	CB	Affiliated Panel Member (CCWater)
John Vinson	JV	Alternate Panel Member (Independent)	Dan Mason	DM	Affiliated Panel Member (Ofwat)
Trevor Nelson	TN	Panel Member (Unassociated Retailer)	Chris Scoggins	CS	Affiliated Panel Member (MOSL)
David Siddall (via teleconference)	DS	Alternate Panel Member (Unassociated Retailer)	Adam Richardson	AR	Panel Secretary

OTHER ATTENDEES

Elliot Bird	Meeting Secretary	Mihai Ciurba	Presenter (MOSL)
Harry Osei-Tutu	Presenter (MOSL)	Rebecca Mottram	Presenter (MOSL)
Abu Rashid	Presenter (MOSL)	Don Maher	Presenter (Anglian Water)
Samir Rahim	Presenter (MOSL)	Antoine Schmidt	Observer (Thames Water)

APOLOGIES

Nicola Smith	Panel Member (Associated Retailer)
Simon Wilshire	Panel Member (Associated Retailer)
Elsa Wye	Panel Member (Independent Member)



1. Welcome and Introductions

Purpose: For Information

- 1.1. The Chair welcomed Panel Members to the meeting.
- 1.2. The Chair passed on the apologies of Elsa Wye, Simon Wilshire and Nicola Smith who were unable to attend the meeting.
- 1.3. The Chair also welcomed John Vinson and David Siddall to the meeting who were acting as alternates for Elsa Wye and Nicola Smith respectively.

2. Minutes and Outstanding Actions

Purpose: For Decision

2.1. **Minutes**

- 2.2. The Panel agreed to the accuracy of the minutes from the previous meeting, subject to a number of comments received by Panel Members prior to and during the Panel meeting.
- 2.3. The Panel also requested that the Secretariat's post-Panel Members feedback minutes be circulated to members before the paper day of the subsequent meeting. The Panel agreed that the first set of minutes would be issued for review on the second Friday after the Panel meeting. This would allow Panel Members 5 Business Days to submit any comments on the minutes by the following Friday. The Secretariat would then provide a revised change-marked version of the minutes as late paper, 5 Business Days before the next Panel meeting, for approval at the meeting.
- 2.4. A Panel Member also requested that when Panel Members comment on the minutes they "reply to all" rather than bilaterally, so that Panel Members are aware of all suggested changes.
- 2.5. Additionally, a Panel Member suggested that a vote be held at the beginning of Panel meetings to approve minutes in future. However, after discussion, it was suggested that the Terms of Reference reflect that the minutes require "formal agreement" at the beginning of each Panel meeting.

2.6. **Actions**

- 2.7. The Panel agreed to close 2 actions (**A19_03** and **AS_03**) following an update provided by the Panel Secretariat.
- 2.8. A number of actions that were due to be closed (**A09_01**, **A09_03**, **A16_03** and **A16_05**), relating to the MPOP, have remained open due to the circulation of the document being delayed until mid-July.
- 2.9. A Panel Member raised concerns that a number of Panel and committee actions were being delayed and that the Panel and committees should have access to resources required to complete their functions. If this resource is limited and therefore delays are being created, then this could create issues for the wider market.
- 2.10. Panel Members were also concerned about the Market Performance Operating Plan (MPOP) and actions related to it in the Panel Action Log. Panel Members expressed concern that the code obligation to seek expert input from the Panel and industry was not being sufficiently met. The Panel



requested having an early look at the MPOP. Panel Members highlighted more general concerns around the extent of secretariat support available to the MPC, in particular with MPOP development but also other workstreams such as the review of Market Performance Charges redistributions considered by Change Proposal [CPM008 “Redistribution of Market Performance Charges”](#).

- 2.11. Panel Members felt that there should be a more collaborative approach to developing the MPOP with Trading Parties, and that they should be consulted on it.
- 2.12. A Panel Member requested that a resource plan for MOSL be made available to indicate how MOSL is planning to resource the Panel and the Committees. This was recognised by other Panel Members who felt this had been an ongoing issue and needed to be addressed.

ACTION 20_01

3. Ofwat Update

Purpose: For Information

- 3.1. Dan Mason (DM) the Affiliated Panel Member from Ofwat provided an update on Ofwat’s activities since the previous Panel meeting.
- 3.2. DM highlighted that Ofwat had published 2 code Change Proposal decisions for [CPW026 “Removing SPID Version Design”](#) and [CPW036 “G/02 Form Amendments & G/03 Temporary Consent Form”](#) which had both been approved for implementation.
- 3.3. DM also highlighted that Ofwat had published a report titled [“Out in the Cold”](#), which considered the response of Wholesalers and Retailers during the “Beast from the East” weather incident previously in the year. Also highlighting that the Ofwat worked closely with CCWater, who carried out the research which informed the report. CCWater’s research into customers’ experiences of the water supply interruptions following the ‘Beast from the East’ had revealed that business customers suffered from poor communication from their wholesale water company; inadequate emergency water and inadequate compensation that didn’t cover their losses.
- 3.4. DM reported that Ofwat had published an [enforcement notice about proposed action to be taken against Thames Water](#) around the management of its leakage performance.
- 3.5. DM explained that the [Ofwat Credit Report, produced by KPMG](#), had been published recognising that the Panel has already discussed the initial findings at the June 2018 Panel meeting. DM also agreed to circulate the slides to be presented at the meeting to Panel Members following the Panel meeting.

ACTION 20_02

- 3.6. Ofwat are due to publish their “state of the Market” report in early July
- 3.7. Panel Members requested an update on Ofwat’s investigation into customers who have been changed to forward billing by their supplier. Ofwat explained that this issue is currently being considered by Ofwat and that work in this area would be in parallel to other upcoming pieces of work, including Ofwat’s review of Retailer margins as part of its review of the Retail Exit Code.



- 3.8. The Panel also requested clarity from DM on whether it would receive formal instruction from Ofwat to investigate the credit issues and recommendations raised in the Credit Report. DM explained that the report, and Ofwat's accompanying narrative that was published alongside the report, was intended to instruct the Panel to undertake the tasks assigned to it, and that Ofwat was not planning to issue any further, formal instruction to the Panel. The Panel Secretary also highlighted that it had already begun looking into these issues on the Panel's behalf.
- 3.9. The Panel noted that, although the Credit Report does request Panel input on the recommended changes to aspects of the credit framework, it would also need to consider its own priorities given their limited resources and thus could not commit to pursuing credit as a priority without a review of Panel priorities.
- 3.10. The Panel **NOTED** the presentation from Ofwat.

4. Update from MOSL

Purpose: For Information

- 4.1. Chris Scoggins (CS) provided an update on the key activities at MOSL which included the publication of [the annual market review](#) and the publication of the market improvement strategy. Additionally, CS highlighted that the Business Strategy was currently being discussed with the Board and would be published in August 2018.
- 4.2. CS reported that analysis into the cost savings of moving to Southampton would save £7.4 million over the next 10 years. He also highlighted that the relocation plans are being finalised and would be communicated to MOSL Members over the next month.
- 4.3. CS reported that Market Performance Standards Charges were run for the second time and that invoices had been circulated. It was also highlighted that these charges were re-run as an anomaly was identified and corrected for the April period.
- 4.4. Panel Members requested clarity on the anomaly described, given that they had heard assurance from MOSL and PwC that there were no defects in the system. It was highlighted that the error that occurred was related to an occurrence which did not exist in the test environment and was relatively minor in materiality.
- 4.5. Panel Members highlighted that the communication issued did not specify the cause of the anomaly or its materiality. Panel Members also highlighted that, although the issue may seem relatively minor in terms of materiality, it was still important because incorrect charging can have serious implications from an auditing perspective.
- 4.6. Panel Members requested a briefing note be circulate to Panel Members explaining how the anomaly occurred, how it was resolved and why it had escaped testing. Subject to the briefing note, Panel Members suggested it may be beneficial to have this added to the July meeting agenda, if the Panel had any further queries.

ACTION 20_03



- 4.7. CS also reported that Market Operator compliance was being reviewed and the report for the fourth quarter of 2017/18 was being discussed by the MPC in the upcoming meeting and would be published online following that meeting.
- 4.8. Panel Members requested that MOSL share its Market Issues Log with the Panel and the wider industry for transparency.

ACTION 20_04

- 4.9. CS also highlighted that Scottish Water Regulator WICS had begun reviewing self-supply licenses.
- 4.10. It was reported that Smarta Water have now gained market entry and that Blackpool CC and Utility Bidder were nearing completion.
- 4.11. CS detailed that the User Forum were preparing a change proposal (to be tabled by ST) on volume transfers

5. Monthly Committee Updates

Purpose: For Information

- 5.1. The Panel was provided with a monthly update on the activities of the Panel Committees, which have met since the May 2018 Panel meeting.
- 5.2. The Chair of the MPC provided an update on the activity of the Committee highlighting that they had held an additional meeting to discuss the CPM008 Change Proposal re-assessment. The Chair also noted that the plan for this review would be agreed by the Committee in July. The Chair also highlighted that CPM008 was consuming extensive resources
- 5.3. The Chair of the MPC also provided an update on the Operational Performance Standards (OPS) Working Group, which intended to review the OPS to introduce charging for at least a subset of those standards. Work had been delayed due to delays in setting up a group to define standards and standardisation and its initial slow progress. The Chair of the MPC expressed the aspiration that this Working Group would be conducting significant work in defining standards and necessary guidance to ensure standardisation of OPS reporting to be reported to the July MPC meeting.
- 5.4. The Chair of the MPC raised some concerns around the governance arrangements for the OPS Working Group. The Panel Secretary clarified that the [Terms of Reference](#) for this sub-group was published on the MOSL website and noted that the group was established at the request of the MPC. The Panel requested that the MPC and the Panel Secretariat ensure that this Working Group was clearly established and operated as sub-group of the MPC under formal Panel governance. The Panel noted that MPC had not yet confirmed the ToRs and encouraged it to do so if evidence of the Working Group's progress was sufficient ahead of the July MPC meeting.
- 5.5. The Chair of the GDPR Issues Committee also raised another governance issue with that Committee, around difficulty of agreeing minutes for publication with Committee Members. The Panel agreed to raise an action for those Members to be contacted formally by the Panel to provide their agreement on the minutes.

ACTION 20_05



- 5.6. An update was provided on the Trading Disputes Committee (TDC), which highlighted that the Committee had met the previous week to review the responses received from a Request for Information (RFI) it had circulated on a draft Change Proposal. This draft Change Proposal was seeking to amend the materiality threshold of raising disputes and raising corrective runs. The intention is for this Change Proposal to be raised in the August Panel meeting.
- 5.7. The Committee also agreed that an industry webcast would be held to facilitate industry questions.
- 5.8. An update was also provided on the Trade Effluent Issues Committee, which highlighted the Committee was making good progress on plans to resolve issues going forward including the provision of training, guidance and the progression of Change Proposals.
- 5.9. The Panel **NOTED** the contents of this paper.

6. Change Report

Purpose: For Information

- 6.1. The Panel considered the Change Report that covered the change activity which occurred between 16 May 2018 and 12 June 2018 on Change Proposals.
- 6.2. The Panel Secretariat highlighted that a communication to the Authority on behalf of the Panel had been circulated to Panel Members for agreement, and that Panel Members had requested it be discussed at today's meeting.
- 6.3. One Panel Member raised concerns that it appeared that change to the market codes were being driven by operational capacity, which has performance implications on the market. Panel Members agreed and highlighted that in future it was important to ensure that there is certainty around implementation throughout the change process.
- 6.4. One Panel Member suggested that the Panel should strengthen their governance, scrutiny and control over timescales of releases, both codes and system, the Panel is accountable. There was support for this from Panel Members. The Panel Secretary agreed to discuss the matter outside of the meeting prior to the next meeting. One thought was that the Panel establish a subcommittee for CMOS and associated market systems.

ACTION 20_06

- 6.5. The Chair recognised the comments raised by the Panel Member and highlighted that MOSL had not had an appreciation of CGI's right to make a late change to the delivery timetable, which is why in future they would aim to assure clarity and provide as much information as possible in the early stages of a change.
- 6.6. Panel Members highlighted a number of amendments to be made to the Change Budget section of the Change Report, which the Panel Secretariat agreed to address following the meeting.
- 6.7. The Panel noted that release 4.5 was missing in the overview, and the Panel Secretariat agreed to amend this so that it was included in future versions of the Change Report.
- 6.8. The Panel **NOTED** the contents of this paper.

7. Initial Written Assessment: CPW037 – Error Codes Updates

Purpose: For Decision

- 7.1. Further to the Panel’s deliberations in the last Panel meeting about CPW037 the Panel considered a Change Proposal that sought to remove the Error/Return Code Set table from CSD 0301: ‘Data Catalogue’ and introduce a reference to a separate document which contains the Error Codes.
- 7.2. The Panel queried if the solution should specify that the Panel was required to approve updates to the error codes list, particularly in cases where updates might be required outside of scheduled releases. Some Panel Members felt that requiring Panel to approve changes would unnecessarily delay the process. Others felt that the opportunity should not be missed to introduce a lighter governance approach that would avoid recommendations needing to be approved by Ofwat, but which might involve some Panel scrutiny ahead of any publication of revised error code lists where those changes were not directly resulting from system releases.
- 7.3. A Panel Member suggested that, instead of being required to approve any changes, the Panel could be notified of changes occurring in the future. This would allow the Panel to scrutinise these changes where it felt appropriate and indicate if the number of changes is increasing and further scrutiny is required.
- 7.4. The Panel agreed that the Change Proposal should be amended to require the Panel to be notified of any changes, as well as Trading Parties at the same time.
- 7.5. The Panel also suggested it would be useful in future to do a post implementation review of system changes. It was suggested that this could take the form of a report on how successful the changes were and how it could have been improved. It was agreed that this would be included in the discussions around system release governance, discussed in the previous section (6.4).
- 7.6. The Panel:
 - **AGREED** to recommend implementation of CPW037 to the Authority for approval, subject to minor amendments agreed in the meeting; and
 - **AGREED** the proposed implementation approach and implementation date of 5 Business Days following the Authority decision.

8. Draft Recommendation Report: CPW010 – Emergency Contact Details

Purpose: For Decision

- 8.1. The Panel considered a Change Proposal that allowed Trading Parties to bilaterally agree arrangements to facilitate the transfer of contact details from Retailers to Wholesalers, in the case of an unplanned Events or Incident.
- 8.2. The Panel was informed of the content of the change, which was to allow mutual agreements to be put in place for Wholesalers to access customer contact details that Retailers have collected, for the purpose of contacting customers in relation to unplanned incidents. The presentation highlighted that currently the code does not allow for a proactive approach to this, and the proposed change is a



potential solution that is beneficial to both Parties. The change should also encourage better outcomes for customers because of the improved service that Wholesalers can operate.

- 8.3. The Proposer highlighted that data protection had been raised as an issue during the changes development, but an external legal organisation had conducted a privacy impact assessment (PIA) which found no concerns with the Change Proposal. This was providing that, in accordance with GDPR, the minimum amount of data was collected and stored. This advice also highlighted that annual updates, in years where there are events, should be sufficient for the contact information to be considered up to date.
- 8.4. Panel Members agreed with the principle of the change and the significance of the issue it was trying to address but expressed some disappointment that the proposal they had been presented with seemed modest. One Panel Member requested clarity on why a solution around mutual agreements had been developed when there should be a statutory responsibility for Wholesalers to collect this data and meet its statutory obligations.
- 8.5. The Proposer highlighted that this change allowed this issue to be addressed in a proactive way, where previously the only option was reactive. However, they also highlighted that the requirement for mutual agreement was the main requirement in order to secure Retailers' agreement with the solution.
- 8.6. The Panel agreed that, although this change would not necessarily completely resolve the problem, it was an improvement on the current baseline.
- 8.7. The Panel:
 - Unanimously **AGREED** to recommend implementation of CPW010 to the Authority for approval; and
 - Unanimously **AGREED** the recommended implementation date on:
 - 28 September 2018, if Authority approval is received by 31 August 2018; or
 - 1 December 2018, if the Authority decision is received by November 2018.

9. Review of Volume Estimating Caps

Purpose: For Decision

- 9.1. The Panel considered a paper that set out analysis of metering information and provides a recommendation, based on the analysis, on whether a Change Proposal is needed to update the Volume Estimating Caps to more suitable values.
- 9.2. MOSL highlighted that CSD 0207 requires the Panel review the Volume Estimating caps annually (both the Ycap and the Icap¹), to determine whether they are still set at an appropriate level.

¹ The ycap is the cap on estimates created by the Yearly Volume Estimate (YVE) and the icap is the cap on estimates created by the Industry Level Estimate (ILE).



- 9.3. MOSL provided a presentation, highlighting the interaction of these caps on the estimation process for customer bills, explaining how the cap determines the highest possible amount an estimate can be for a customer. The customer will then be billed the lowest amount of either their metered consumption, or that derived reflecting the Ycap and the YVE or the Icap and the ILE.
- 9.4. The presentation to the Panel also highlighted that there were currently around 500,000 cases of meters where Yearly Volume Estimates (YVEs) did not exist. In the absence of meter reads, these meters would settle on estimates calculated using the Industry Level Estimate (ILE).
- 9.5. A Panel Member raised concerns that currently their organisation was facing issues with how YVE's were being used, which could also be reflective of other similar organisations too. Specifically, the Panel Member highlighted how YVE's can be set by Retailers at a potentially unrealistically low level, which would then be used as a basis for estimating bills as it would be the lowest amount out of the customers metered consumption, and the Ycap and Icap based estimates. This could lead to significantly inaccurate Wholesaler-Retailer billing, and even possible customer billing and is therefore a critical issue to address.
- 9.6. The Panel agreed that MOSL should do some investigation work to determine whether an issue exists around Retailer's use of YVE's, as the Panel would find it difficult to decide on whether the caps are appropriate without understanding if settlement is being distorted by YVEs.
- 9.7. The Panel agreed that this further assessment on YVE's described needed to occur before a vote could be taken. The Panel suggested that this further assessment could involve an industry workshop or engagement with industry specialists, should be a "top down" strategic review and the Panel also wanted further understanding of the interaction with MPoP.
- 9.8. The Panel raised an action for MOSL to investigate the use and possible misuse of YVE's currently in the market and their implications on RF and estimating caps.

ACTION 20_07

- 9.9. The Panel:
 - **DEFERRED** its decision on the volume estimating caps; and
 - **AGREED** to undertake a piece of work to investigate the industry's use of Yearly Volume Estimates and how this may interact with the existing volume estimating caps.

10. [Draft Panel Plan](#)

Purpose: For Decision

- 10.1. The Panel considered the draft Panel plan, which had been developed with the support of a Panel sub-group (NS, HS and TN) following discussions at the Panel strategy workshop. This plan set out the 3 strategic priorities for 2018/29, and the current view of focus areas, proposed resolutions and timeframes for the next 24 months. The plan also included an operational plan of the key business as usual activities for the Panel, as set out in the code, at the Panel sub-groups request.
- 10.2. The Panel Secretariat explained that the intention of the plan is for it to be reviewed every 6 months so that new risks and issues that come into awareness can be captured.



- 10.3. The Panel Secretariat explained that the Panel plan highlighted nine focus areas which the Panel Secretariat categorised by three headings, which were:
- Promote effective competition;
 - Reduce friction in the market and enable the market to operate efficiently; and
 - Embed good working practice and efficiency into market code governance.
- 10.4. These nine focus areas described also included recommendations of programmes of work for the Panel.
- 10.5. The Panel Secretariat asked the Panel to either agree the Panel Plan for wider publication or to wait until the publication of the Market Performance Operating Plan (MPOP) and review it in reference to the contents of that document. If the latter was chosen, the Panel Secretariat estimated that it would be able to provide the two documents for the Panel's review for the July meeting Panel meeting.
- 10.6. The Panel agreed that it would be important to review the MPOP before agreeing to the Panel Plan as it would need to see a list of priorities for the defined focus areas.
- 10.7. Panel Members highlighted that, although the focus areas and work streams within them were useful, it was important that the Panel could prioritise these tasks due to its resourcing constraints. One Panel Member argued that the promoting competition focus seemed to be lower priority than the other focus areas, given that levels of market entry in the market are currently at a relatively high level and that changes to this would likely have small benefits to customers ultimately. By comparison, priority should be placed on those areas that could have the biggest impact on customers. The Panel Member drew specific attention to matters associated with developer services which needed to be addressed as it was a distraction from dealing with the priority of addressing process and data issues in relation to end customers. Developer services were already available and could already be provided by retailers.
- 10.8. Panel Members agreed that the fundamental priority should be meters, specifically meter asset and reading information, as it underlies everything else in the market, and will have an impact on Wholesalers, Retailers and ultimately customers. Following this point, the Panel agreed to the following criteria for prioritising Panel focus areas:
- Impact on customers;
 - Accuracy of settlement; and
 - Meter information (including meter reading).
- 10.9. The Panel agreed that the current version of the Panel Plan should be published as a Working Draft and circulated to Trading Parties for comments, and suggestions on priorities.

ACTION 20_08

- 10.10. The Panel also recognised issues around resourcing for MOSL and the Committee Secretariat. CS noted MOSL had sufficient operation budget to cover resourcing.



10.11. Panel Members also suggested that consultancy support could be used to aid in specific Panel related tasks, such as developing the MPOP or investigating Developer Services.

10.12. It was suggested that, in order to develop the list of priorities for the Panel Plan as discussed earlier, the Panel sub-group could be reconvened to discuss possible priorities.

10.13. The Panel:

- **AGREED** to review the contents of the Draft Panel Plan following the publication of the MPOP; and
- **AGREED** to publish the Draft Panel Plan on the Panel page of the MOSL website.

11. Overview of RF Run

Purpose: For Information

11.1. MOSL provided an education presentation on RF settlement runs to the Panel. The RF settlement run is the final scheduled settlement run for an invoice period.

11.2. MOSL explained how the RF run prevented the related invoice period's settlement charges from being amended as the corresponding system generated read ('G read') would crystallise volumes for the period. In the case of the February RF run, this invoice period will be Market Opening (April 2017). In instances where the customer's meter has not been read for the 16 months prior to 1 September 2018, which is when RF April 2017 will be executed, the system will generate a G read. This read is generated by CMOS using the normal volume estimation methods², except that it cannot be amended following its generation. Once the G read is generated and placed into a meter's read profile, any differences between a following meter read and that G read would be reconciled across later settlement periods than those that has subject to RF. This has raised concerns over cash flow issues if the G read estimate is largely different from a subsequent meter read.

11.3. The Panel reflected on discussions at the last Panel meeting regarding the planned introduction of functionality (in CMOS release 4.5) that would allow Trading Parties to remove any G reads generated as part of the RF settlement run process. This was being progressed based on feedback from Trading Parties that requested this functionality, noting MOSL's view that there is no code requirement to prevent G reads being amended.

11.4. MOSL also confirmed that this would not allow Trading Parties to just remove G reads indefinitely, as a new G read would be estimated in the following month in absence of a subsequent meter read submission.

11.5. A Panel Member raised concerns that this change to G reads has not had a full analysis conducted across Trading Parties and that there was a lack of code protections on governance with changes to this and potentially other data items like YVEs. MOSL noted the point raised by a Panel Member and MOSL highlighted that this change has not been objected to in any industry forum.

² Normal estimations are based upon the meter's read history or YVE/ILE, whichever provides the lowest estimate.



- 11.6. Some Panel Members clarified that they did not fundamentally disagree with the proposed functionality but were concerned that further analysis was still required before it was implemented; particularly around the materiality of the issues described and the potential unintended consequences of the change.
- 11.7. Panel Members queried whether the RF run was a strict deadline, or whether it could be delayed. MOSL clarified that it was currently obligated by the codes to complete the RF run as agreed. As a code requirement, variation to the settlement timetable would require a code change to be approved by Ofwat. In order to affect final reconciliation for April 2017, this change would need to be implemented by the end of August 2018 and would therefore need to be progressed on an urgent basis if deferral was felt to be required.
- 11.8. The Panel noted that, in early August 2018, MOSL is planning to process the RF run for March 2017, which would create G reads for 1 April 2017. Effectively, this will lock in consumption up to that point and create the opening market read for meters where no subsequent meter reads are available. The Panel noted that it is this crystallisation on 1 April 2017 that warrants a fast track consideration of whether RF run deferral was desirable.
- 11.9. To support a deferral decision on the RF run, the Panel agreed that it would require further analysis from both MOSL and Trading Parties. The Panel raised an action to send a letter to CEOs of MOSL Members to explain the implications of the RF run and G reads and seek feedback so as to inform a decision on the deferral of the RF run. An action was raised for the Chair of the Panel to contact CEOs as described.

ACTION 20_09

11.10. The Panel **NOTED** the presentation from MOSL.

12. Process for raising non-Code changes

Purpose: For Information

- 12.1. Due to time constraints, this agenda item was deferred to a later date, and an action was raised for any slides on the topic to be circulated to Panel Members following the meeting.

ACTION 20_10

13. Any Other Business (AOB)

Purpose: For Information

- 13.1. DM highlighted that there would be no Ofwat attendance at the July meeting.
- 13.2. There was no further business and the Chair closed the meeting.

CLOSED SESSION



14. Trading Disputes Nominations and approval.

Purpose: For Information

14.1. The Panel considered the nominations received to replace the departing Retailer member on the Trading Disputes Committee.

14.2. The Panel:

- **APPOINTED** Patrick McCart as member from the nominations received to the Trading Disputes Committee; and
- **NOTED** that MOSL will seek a confirmation letter and employer release letter for the newly appointed committee member.

Actions:

ACTION 20_01 A resource plan to be provided to the Panel, to explain how MOSL intends to resource the Panel and Committees on an ongoing basis.

ACTION 20_02 DM to circulate the slides to be presented at the meeting on the Ofwat Credit Report to Panel Members following the Panel meeting.

ACTION 20_03 Circulate briefing note to Panel Members on the issues with the MPS charging, how it was resolved and how it missed testing.

ACTION 20_04 Market Issues Log be shared with the Panel and Trading Parties to allow for further feedback and review.

ACTION 20_05 GDPR Issues Committee Members to be contacted formally by the Panel to provide their agreement on the Committee meeting minutes.

ACTION 20_06 Panel Secretary and Mark Holloway to consider approach to Panel input to releases and release governance.

ACTION 20_07 MOSL to Investigate the use and possible misuse of YVE's currently in the market and their implications on RF and estimating caps.

ACTION 20_08 Panel Secretary to publish the current version of the Panel Plan as a Working Draft and circulate it to Trading Parties for comments, and suggestions on priorities.

ACTION 20_09 Chair of the Panel to contact Trading Party CEO's to inform them of the potential financial implications of g-reads and the RF run, as well as the proposed change to g-reads in CMOS Release 4.5.

ACTION 20_10 Slides on the non-code change process to be circulated to Panel Members following the meeting.



The next Panel meeting is scheduled for: **24 July 2018, 10:30 – 15:30, at:**

ETC Venues

8 Fenchurch Place

London

EC3M 4PB

The nearest tube stations are Monument, Bank and London Bridge.