

Minutes of Panel Meeting 24

30 October 2018 | 10:30 – 16:15

MOSL Offices; 4th Floor; 16-18 Monument Street; London; EC3R 8AJ

Status of the Minutes: Final

MEMBERS PRESENT

Margaret Beels	MBe	Chair	Trevor Nelson	TN	Panel Member (Unassociated Retailer)
Mike Brindle	MBr	Panel Member (Associated Retailer)	Nicola Smith	NSm	Panel Member (Unassociated Retailer)
Wendy Monk	WM	Panel Member (Associated Retailer)	Mark Holloway	MH	Panel Member (Wholesaler)
Simon Wilshire	SW	Panel Member (Associated Retailer)	Howard Smith	HS	Panel Member (Wholesaler)
Helyn Mensah (via Teleconference)	HM	Panel Member (Independent)	Chris Scoggins	CS	Affiliated Panel Member (MOSL)
Nigel Sisman	NS	Panel Member (Independent)	Steve Hobbs (via teleconference)	SH	Affiliated Panel Member (CCWater)
Elsa Wye	EW	Panel Member (Independent)	Dan Mason	DM	Affiliated Panel Member (Ofwat)
Richard Moore	RM	Panel Member (Unassociated Retailer)	Adam Richardson	AR	Panel Secretary

OTHER ATTENDEES

Elliot Bird	N/A	Meeting Secretary	Neil Pendle	NP	Presenter (Waterscan)
Rebecca Mottram	N/A	Meeting Secretary	Shannon Dumbleton	N/A	Observer (MOSL)
Steve Arthur	SA	Presenter (MOSL)	Abu Rashid	N/A	Observer (MOSL)
Mihai Ciurba	MC	Presenter (MOSL)	Antoine Schmidt	N/A	Observer (Thames Water)
Samir Rahim	SR	Presenter (MOSL)	John Vinson	N/A	Observer (Alternate Independent)

APOLOGIES

Dylan Freeman	Panel Member (Wholesaler)
Jim Keohane	Chair
Christina Blackwell	Affiliated Panel Member (CCWater)



1. Welcome and Introductions

- 1.1. The Chair welcomed Panel Members to the meeting of the Panel.
- 1.2. The Chair passed on the apologies of Jim Keohane, Dylan Freeman and Christina Blackwell who were unable to attend the meeting.

2. Minutes and Outstanding Actions

2.1. Minutes

- 2.2. The Panel agreed to the accuracy of the [minutes from previous meetings](#) (23) following an update by the Panel Secretariat.

2.3. Actions

- 2.4. The Panel agreed to close 6 actions: **(P20_04, P23_01, P23_03, P23_04, P23_05 and P23_06)**
- 2.5. MOSL highlighted that an estimated figure for the cost of hosting Panel meetings in London had been provided as part of the Business Plan and subsequently discussed. The Panel agreed to discuss this further under Any Other Business.
- 2.6. MOSL confirmed the reduced unplanned settlement run charge of £750 would also apply to disputed runs.
- 2.7. MOSL confirmed that it had published the Market Issues log, as requested in **A20_04**, and that it was available in the [Market Performance area of the MOSL website](#).
- 2.8. Dan Mason (DM) highlighted that an action had been raised in the previous month for him to circulate the letter he sent to Associated Retailers and Wholesalers on Credit arrangements, however this action was already completed so it was not added into the action log.

3. Update from Ofwat

- 3.1. Dan Mason (DM) provided an update on activity of Ofwat, including:
 - The [letter published](#) to Wholesalers and Retailers on meter reading services in preparation for a call for input to be issued on measures of Wholesaler Performance. This was to end in late November.
 - The letter sent to MOSL that confirmed the final settlement run (RF-run) would commence in March 2019.
 - Decisions had been made to recommend implementation of [CPW043 'Drafting clarifications for CPW028'](#) and [CPW042 'Provisions of adding re-read flag into the MDS Meter Reads file'](#). Additionally, [CPW044 'Digital Certificates and Public Keys updates'](#) and [CPW045 'Updates to the Service Management Interface'](#) had entered Ofwat's internal governance process to be decided by the end of November.
 - A Change that Ofwat was progressing to its Customer Protection Code of Practice.



- A letter was written to Wholesalers and their Associated Retailers by Ofwat on their credit arrangements, specifically parent company guarantees, and responses had been received and were currently being reviewed.
 - Ofwat published [revised Wholesale charging rules](#) which were available on the Ofwat website.
- 3.2. A Panel Member requested clarity from DM on what the output from views provided on Wholesaler performance measures would be. DM highlighted that this feedback would likely cover a broad range of items and therefore contribute to a number of work streams.
- 3.3. DM also confirmed that this work had been taken on in addition to work undertaken by MOSL and the MPC to review the Operation Performance Standards (OPS). It was suggested that MOSL and Ofwat should aim to ensure these work streams complement each other, which was agreed.
- 3.4. A Panel Member sought clarity that [DCP010 'Wholesale Retail Code inconsistencies'](#) covered both charging and refunds, as they were currently unclear. DM recognised this issue and explained that the intention was to cover both, but that it would also be helpful if Trading Parties raised this in their responses.
- 3.5. A Panel Member requested clarity on whether there would be a consultation on Retailer performance measures, in the same way there was for Wholesalers. DM indicated that this was not currently the case but agreed to note this and feed it back to the Ofwat team.
- 3.6. An update was also provided on the current work being undertaken in relation to Developer Services, which highlighted the intention to gather feedback at the upcoming Developer Day and host a Panel sub-group in mid-November.

4. Update from CC Water

- 4.1. Steve Hobbs (SH) gave apologies for Christina Blackwell who could not attend today's meeting.
- 4.2. SH provided an update on the complaints that have been received by CCWater:
- Complaints from the first quarter (1 April to 30 June) had come more from micro business customers than small, medium or large business customers. The dominant type of complaints were retailer issues, charging and billing.
 - CCWater had seen a drop in these complaints for the first quarter but had seen an increase in these complaints for September.
 - Larger Retailers have dominated the complaint numbers with issues such as staffing. However, SH had seen the larger Retailers addressing these issues and therefore the trend should change for the final 2018 quarter. There had also been some issues with complaints being answered outside the timescales.
 - A significant number of complaints were being raised against new entrants. SH reported that this would be investigated further, and CCWater would be working with retailers to find the root cause analysis.
 - CCWater were committed to providing regular updates going forward.



- 4.3. A Panel Member requested clarity on whether there is anything the Panel can do to reduce the complaints around billing and processing such as, implementing a new process or changes to a central process. SH suggested that there were no issues in the market codes that he was aware of, and generally issues identified were at an organisational level.
- 4.4. A Panel Member suggested that there was a lack of clarity in the market codes around who is accountable for certain obligations, such as unplanned events, which then lead to customers receiving a poor quality of service in these areas. SH highlighted that in the past issues in this area had driven complaints, but performance in this area has improved with CCWater seeing a decrease in complaints from customers.

5. Update from MOSL

- 5.1. Chris Scoggins (CS) provided an update on activity of MOSL, including:
 - The MOSL Board meeting on 17 October 2018, the annual general meeting and market forum, which all focused-on business planning. CS spoke at this event, his [speech can be viewed on the website](#).
 - The draft business plan was shared with the Panel sub-group for initial comments and was issued to members the previous week. CS suggested that in future, MOSL would aim to start the process earlier, to allow more time for Panel review. Panel Members were supportive of this approach.
 - CS described feedback received from the discussion of the Business Plan at the CEO forum which included:
 - improving the pace of change through stratification of Change Proposals and self-governance;
 - changing the frequency of CMOS releases to allow for a greater pace of system change; and
 - the MOSL initiative to address industry concerns around bilateral communications.
 - CS highlighted that the proposed budget represented a 10% cost reduction from the projected budget in previous years and an overall decrease of 4%. He also indicated that it supports the proposed savings through the relocation plan.
 - CS provided an update on the fit out of the Southampton office currently underway, with a handover of the premises planned for 12 November 2018. Additionally, CS highlighted that MOSL was on track to begin working in Southampton from 13 November 2018.
 - The Market Performance team had received Data Improvement plans from all Trading Parties with over 2000 SPIDs and the [MPOP and Issues Register](#) had been published.
- 5.2. A Panel Member requested clarity on the process of providing feedback on the business plan. They highlighted that previously the Panel wrote a formal letter and asked whether this would be repeated.



- 5.3. A Panel Member provided a summary of points raised by the Panel sub-group on the business plan, which were that; it emphasises cost, rather than the value; does not provide sufficient information on managing the impact of the loss of expertise due to transition; it requires a better description of the allocation of costs ; and that it seemed to suggest MOSL would take a budget driven approach rather than giving MOSL the capacity it required to be proactive...
- 5.4. Panel Members suggested that the Panel sub-group could meet again to provide a Panel view on the business plan as a formal letter. An action was raised for Panel Members to provide their comments to the sub-group by Monday, 5 November 2018. A further action was raised for the sub-group to meet and draft a response early in the same week.

ACTION 24_01 and ACTION 24_02

- 5.5. A Panel Member raised concerns about the relocation to Southampton and the effect it could have on resourcing. CS recognised concerns raised by Panel Members but assured the Panel that these concerns have been noted and the risk seriously considered by the MOSL Board and the Executive team. He explained that MOSL were focusing on ensuring the quality of any new hires, due to the importance of getting the right people. MOSL also explained that it intended to have overlaps of resourcing to ensure the current workload is maintained while also managing knowledge transfer. It was also highlighted that a project to review MOSL's detailed process documentation was near completion.
- 5.6. A Panel Member sought clarification on whether the MOSL Board maintained a risk register related to MOSL's relocation. CS clarified that there is a Board sub-committee that manages the industry risk register. This risk register includes MOSL's ability to operate internally, its ability to meet obligations, and provide services, and MOSL's impact on the market and Trading Parties.
- 5.7. A Panel Member suggested that, in future, Committee Chairs could be more involved in the development of the Business Plan to address Panel Member concerns related to resourcing.
- 5.8. **Update on Bilaterals**
- 5.9. Samir Rahim (SR) provided an update on the progress of MOSL's investigation into solutions for issues with industry bilateral contacts.
- 5.10. SR explained that the development of the business case for the project was in progress and that MOSL was working with Trading Parties operational teams to refine the requirements of the solution.
- 5.11. SR also communicated the intention to engage with all MOSL Members to understand the cost benefit ratios and the potential benefits of the solution.
- 5.12. It was highlighted that there was a piece of work to be undertaken by a Panel sub-group to quantify the magnitude of required code Change Proposals to support a solution.
- 5.13. SR also explained that the final piece of work for the assessment would be to re-engage the shortlisted vendors or technical solutions and discuss a more detailed view of the requirements to understand a detailed cost position.



- 5.14. A Panel Member enquired whether the business case was dependent on the solution being implemented on a mandatory basis, which SR confirmed was not the case, though it would require significant take-up by TPs to be worth undertaking.
- 5.15. SR also clarified that the business case would consider the associated risks in relation to barriers to entry, the lifetime cost of the solution and potential future states of the market.

6. Monthly Committee Update

- 6.1. Nigel Sisman (NS) provided an update to the Panel as Chair of the MPC which focused on the delivery of the review to the Operational Performance Standards (OPS), which was being conducted by a separate Working Group of the Committee.
- 6.2. NS highlighted feedback received from the Water Retailer Council on the unfairness of having Market Performance Standards (MPS) charging, while there were no OPS charging in place despite issues with Wholesaler performance.
- 6.3. NS also reported that there were concerns as to whether the OPS review could be delivered in time for 1 April 2019, as it was meant to be presented to the November Panel meeting but had been delayed. Additionally, Trading Parties have indicated that they would require 3-months' notice for implementation which raised further time pressures.
- 6.4. NS highlighted that an assurance process was still required to ensure that the changes could be implemented across the Wholesaler community.
- 6.5. NS suggested that the Panel should consider its ways of working going forward particularly in placing reliance on volunteers from TPs being available to undertake the work and keeping them on track to enforce deadlines. The Chair suggested that this could be raised at the next Panel strategy meeting, which the Panel agreed.

ACTION 24_03

- 6.6. NS expressed repeated concerns with the level of resourcing made available to the MPC to complete project work, which were supported by members of the Panel. NS agreed to work with Steve Arthur (SA) towards a short-term plan to address issues raised.
- 6.7. Elsa Wye (EW) provided an update, as the Chair of the Trading Disputes Committee, on the Change Proposal being progressed by the TDC CPW046 'Changes to the Unplanned Settlement Process', which was on the Panel agenda. She highlighted that the introduction of individual SPID settlement run functionality had been removed from the proposal.
- 6.8. Adam Richardson (AR) provided an update as the Chair of the Credit Committee, from the Committee's first meeting which was held in the previous week. AR highlighted that the Committee had reviewed the proposed workplan, and the Committee agreed to accelerate the timetable. To this end, MOSL has begun developing a Change Proposal to address the transparency of Alternative Eligible Credit Support arrangements.
- 6.9. A Panel Member highlighted that there had been some confusion in the industry about the role of the Credit Committee, and some instances where organisations had postponed negotiations of credit



whilst waiting for outputs from the Committee. MOSL confirmed that the work of the Committee should have no impact on the negotiations of Trading Parties. It was suggested that an action should be raised to clearly communicate the role of the Committee and highlight that it should have no effect credit negotiations going forward, which was agreed.

ACTION 24_04

7. Change Report

7.1. MOSL provided an update on the Change Report which highlighted that:

- Release 5.0 was implemented in October and included 3 Change Proposals, [CPW028 'Unpaired SPIDs'](#), [CPW033 'Meter Effective to date in the MDS Meter Report'](#) and [CPW043 'Drafting Clarifications for CPW028'](#).
- 2 Requests for Information (RFIs) had been circulated to the industry on a Proposal for [DCP008 'Alternate Payment Terms'](#), and [DCP010 'Wholesaler Retail Code Inconsistency'](#).
- The report had been amended to make it clearer when changes were in-flight, in draft state or were pipeline ideas.

7.2. A Panel Member reiterated a previous concern of the Panel that a large number of Change Proposals are being progressed as draft Change Proposals and circulated through RFIs, as part of the pre-change process before being visible to the Panel. MOSL noted this was consistent with the Panels conclusions from its April 2018 workshop and had improved the speed of which changes were assessed. The Panel Member highlighted the potential risk of duplicating effort or extending timescales for change, when consultations and assessment are not pre-reviewed by the Panel should the Panel feel that subsequent work is required.

7.3. Panel Members subsequently agreed that this process could be reviewed at the January strategy meeting.

ACTION 24_05

8. Draft Recommendation Report: CPM008 - Redistribution of Market Performance Standards Charge

- 8.1. The Panel considered a Change Proposal that sought to introduce a performance-based redistribution into the MAC to apply from 2019/20 for all monies received from MPS Charges. The solution also proposes that the MPS Charges for 2018/19 would be redistributed based in equal measure on trading parties relative peer performance and trading parties market share.
- 8.2. NS explained that the MPC had taken on board Ofwat's comments that redistribution had to either be on a performance basis or not happen at all in order to provide a real incentive to those subject to charging. Therefore, the solution recommended by the MPC represented a compromise between its own views and Ofwat's.



- 8.3. DM commented that it was positive to see the work the MPC had undertaken and how the progression had changed since the previous review but stressed that the Ofwat decision would be based on the likely impact in terms of incentivising Trading Parties and the effect that would have on performance.
- 8.4. A Panel Member suggested that the charges collected could be used for data improvement initiatives, in line with the process in Scotland, such as to address the industries data quality issues. It was recognised that this was an attractive option, but that the MPC's recommendation took account of Trading Parties that had planned in their business plans for the money to be redistributed.
- 8.5. The Panel:
- **AGREED** to recommend implementation of CPM008 to the Authority for approval; and
 - **AGREED** the recommended implementation date of:
 - 3 December 2018 if Authority approval is received by 30 November; or
 - 29 March 2019 if Authority approval is received by 22 March 2019
- 8.6. One Panel Member explained that they had voted in favour because they believed the proposed solution was an improvement to the current codes but suggested that a different enduring solution should be sought in future to further improve incentives or provide funds for market improvement.

9. [Draft Recommendation Report: CPW046 – Changes to the Unplanned Settlement Process](#)

- 9.1. The Panel considered a Change Proposal that sought to extend the timescales for trading parties to request corrective settlement runs and reduce the materiality threshold required to request corrective settlement runs.
- 9.2. Neil Pendle (NP), the proposer of this change, provided a presentation to the Panel which highlighted that the existing process is unnecessarily onerous and adversarial.
- 9.3. MOSL reported that the expected impacts of the Change Proposal were minimal, but this did depend on the volume of additional re-runs that are requested. MOSL also indicated that they had no evidence to suggest the number of requests would change substantially.
- 9.4. A Panel Member requested clarity on the original intention behind the 10-day limitation on corrective settlement runs, in case this change was to incur any unintended consequences. MOSL explained that originally this was linked to the deadline to pay invoices, but instead the proposal would be that the invoice would be recalculated following the corrective run and refunds or further charges applied accordingly. In this regard, the way invoicing works would not change, just that a data item could be revised at a later date without requiring a dispute to be raised.
- 9.5. The Panel:
- Unanimously **AGREED** to recommend implementation of CPW043 to the Authority for approval; and
 - Unanimously **AGREED** the recommended implementation date of:

- 03 December 2018 if Authority approval is received by 30 November 2018; or
- 29 March 2019 if Authority approval is received by 22 March 2019.

10. Market Performance Update

- 10.1. Steve Arthur (SR) provided an update on Market Performance Operating Plan activities that had taken place in the last meeting and focused on the data improvement Plans received by Trading Parties in response to MOSL's request.
- 10.2. SA reported that plans had been requested from all Trading Parties, and the responses received covered 99% of all SPIDs in the market, with only the smallest Trading Parties not providing any plans and some who were planning to provide them at a later date.
- 10.3. SA highlighted that analysis had begun on the plans and had identified 4 main causes of Unread meters which plans were aiming to address. These were:
 - Meter reads not being scheduled correctly;
 - Meters with unknown locations that therefore cannot be read;
 - Difficulty in working with meter read providers to collect meter reads; and
 - Meter reads not being submitted into the system because of conflicting meter details.
- 10.4. SA also highlighted that the trajectories provided in the data improvement plans indicated that by the end of 2019 the proportion of unread meters will be slightly better than market opening levels, which raised concerns around whether the plans were sufficiently ambitious. However, SA also reported that other elements of the plans e.g. inaccurate and missing YVE's are estimated to be addressed on much quicker basis with the number of inaccurate YVE's aimed to be reduced by 90% by April 2019.
- 10.5. A Panel Member expressed their concerns with the proposed plans, particularly how much emphasis had been placed on addressing YVE's and in some cases using data to correct YVE's where they would not be required. Additionally, they highlighted that there were large differences between the median and the mean of the data, which would indicate that the larger respondents were proposing a much lower rate of improvement than the smaller players.
- 10.6. DM informed the Panel that Ofwat had not yet seen the plans, but that the proposed timelines were concerning, given that Trading Parties have a legal obligation to ensure the accuracy of their data.
- 10.7. One Panel Member expressed their view that Trading Parties could not determine what was ambitious, because there was no understanding of 'what good looks like'. One Panel Member requested clarity on whether MOSL aimed to provide comparative feedback to Trading Parties to address this and SA confirmed that MOSL had intended to provide feedback on this basis, indicating to organisation the comparative performance of other similar organisations.
- 10.8. A Panel Member enquired whether any plans had put forward plans to address the number of vacant premises that has become an issue recently. MOSL confirmed that this had not yet been addressed and was timetabled for early 2019 in line with the MPOP.



11. G-reads Removal Governance

- 11.1. The Panel considered options on how best to progress Change Proposal [CPW041 'G-read Removal Governance'](#), following the concerns raised by the Panel at the ad-hoc August Panel meeting (Meeting 21a). The presentation proposed a number of options for further work MOSL could undertake, ahead of bringing a proposed solution back to the Panel.
- 11.2. MOSL proposed 4 options for investigation to the Panel, and requested that the Panel gave an indication of which would be the preferred approach:
- **Option 1:** the previous form of CPW041 which had been consulted on, which includes governance arrangements and the use of a materiality threshold.
 - **Option 2:** the same functionality as the previously presented CPW041, but with lighter governance arrangements. Removing the requirement for unplanned settlement runs alongside every change, and no materiality threshold in place.
 - **Option 3:** withdraw CPW041 and leave G-reads as unremovable. Then use functionality to delete G-reads to facilitate Market Operator corrections where they are requested by Trading Parties. This would minimise implementation costs but lead to an ongoing operational impact on MOSL to facilitate these corrections and costs to Trading Parties to request corrections.
 - **Option 4:** withdraw CPW041 and introduce a new change to prevent any amendments to G-reads. This option was not recommended, in light of feedback from Trading Parties that suggest this functionality would be beneficial.
- 11.3. MOSL indicated that its preference would be to progress Option 2, as this was aligned with arrangements for deleting other settlement impacting data corrections through TCORR transactions. MOSL also indicated that Option 3 would likely be the most expensive option because of the operational impact of processing all the additional corrections and the coordination with CGI to activate and deactivate the G-read removal functionality. Option 2 would be the cheapest option, as it allows existing functionality to be maintained and minimises ongoing operational costs due to governance arrangements.
- 11.4. After a request of clarity from a Panel Member, MOSL also confirmed that it would aim to batch together any requested deletions to minimise costs but could not confirm the degree to which that would be possible.
- 11.5. Panel Members also queried what the consequences might be if a G-read is changed when the governance process is not followed, and the responsible party refused to change it back. MOSL explained that this could be raised as a Trading Dispute, in the event that both Parties could not agree on the solution and should be progressed as such.
- 11.6. The Panel expressed that its preference would be for MOSL to investigate Option 1 and provide further rationale for not including the further governance arrangements under Option 2.



12. Change Proposal Guidance for Proposers

- 12.1. The Panel **DEFERRED** this item to the next panel meeting due to time constraints. Panel Members agreed to review this guidance and provide comments prior to the next Panel meeting.

ACTION 24_06

13. Market Audit Panel Sub-Group Update

- 13.1. AR provided an update to the Panel on the first session of the Panel Market Audit sub-group, which aimed to review the progress of the audit.
- 13.2. The sub-group had concluded that it would be important for the Market Auditor to liaise with the Market Performance team to tie in the results with Trading Party data improvement plans, to avoid duplicated efforts.
- 13.3. Panel Members queried whether there was a formal record of this session, which MOSL confirmed there was not. In response, Panel Members suggested that some form a record could be made of Panel sub-group sessions as a point of efficiency to ensure Panel are aware of these groups discussions. The Panel Secretariat suggested that this could be included as an additional section in the Monthly Committee Update and the Panel agreed.
- 13.4. Panel Members requested clarity on whether MOSL had performance rectification plans related to compliance and the Market Operator audit. MOSL confirmed that it reported on compliance to the MPC which was also published on the website.

14. System Changes and Release Committee

- 14.1. The Panel **DEFERRED** this item to the next panel meeting to allow Panel Members to review additional materials that had been developed. MOSL also agreed to review and discuss this material with MH.

ACTION 24_07

15. Staggering of Committee Nominations

- 15.1. Rebecca Mottram (RM) provided the Panel with an approach to staggering the Panel and Panel Committee nominations. RM described the key principles of the proposed nomination process which were:
- Nominations for Committees should not occur at the same time as the Panel and should occur after the Panel have been appointed.
 - All new Panel and Committee Members should have two induction meetings before they are appointed.
 - At one of the early meetings following their appointment, the new Panel should appoint the new Committee Members.



- 15.2. RM presented the proposed timeline for Panel nominations, followed by the Committee nominations. It was proposed that the Committee nominations were placed on hold for a few months until the new Panel is appointed.
- 15.3. A Panel Member suggested that the opinions of the Chairs of the Panel Committees be sought, before committing to time scales of the nominations for these Committees.
- 15.4. Panel Members agreed with the proposal on Panel nominations but requested that further discussion be held on the timing of Committee nominations with the Chairs of those Committees.

16. Any Other Business (AOB)

- 16.1. Panel Members provided a note to MOSL indicating that its intention was to continue to meet in London, with the exception of January where there would be a trial meeting in Southampton. This would be continued until February where the new Panel can make its own decision on where it wishes to meet. However, until such time that it hears differently MOSL should assume the Panel and sub-Committee meetings would remain in London.
- 16.2. MOSL recognised the Panel's comments and highlighted that, in the presentation of the Business Plan at the CEO Forum, MOSL presented an estimate of the cost of holding meetings of the Panel and its Committees in London which was £250,000 a year.
- 16.3. Panel Members noted the cost figure provided by MOSL and asked whether a note could be provided to give a further understanding of those numbers.
- 16.4. Additionally, Panel Members explained that they had come to their decision and felt it was justified due to the potential impacts on attendance and interest in Panel and Committee positions if meetings were held in Southampton.
- 16.5. MOSL suggested that the Panel meet in Southampton in February, as this would be in line with the induction meeting of the new Panel and allow them to experience both locations. MH took an action to communicate with Panel Members so that the Panel can consider meeting arrangements for January and February.

ACTION 24_08

- 16.6. There was no further business and the Chair closed the meeting.

Actions:

- A24_01** Panel Members to provide comments to the Panel sub-group on the MOSL business plan by Monday 5 November 2018
- A24_02** Panel sub-group to meet in the week commencing 5 November 2018 to discuss feedback and draft a formal response from the Panel for the Panel to feedback on.
- A24_03** Panel to review its ways of working going forward, particularly in relation to assigning pieces of work to Trading Party volunteers, at the Panel Strategy Meeting in January.



- A24 _04** Provide guidance to Trading Parties on the role and purpose of the Credit Committee and emphasise the need for negotiations to continue as normal.
- A24 _05** Panel to review the Change Process, particularly the use of the Pre-Change Process and Requests for Information, at the Panel Strategy Meeting in January.
- A24 _06** Panel Members to provide comments on the Change Proposal guidance for Proposers prior to the next Panel meeting.
- A24 _07** Panel Secretariat to communicate with MH and review working document for composition of Systems and Releases Committee.
- A24 _08** MH to communicate with Panel Members to request Panel consider meeting options for January and February 2019.

The next Panel meeting is scheduled for: **25 November 2018, 10:30 – 15:30, at:**
MOSL Offices;
4th Floor;
16-18 Monument Street;
London;
EC3R 8AJ

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