

Minutes of Panel Meeting 44

30 June 2020 | 10:30 – 15:30

Telecon Only

Status of the Minutes: **Final**

PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT

Jim Keohane	JK	Chair	Mike Rathbone	MR	Panel Member (Wholesaler)
Michelle Burns	MB	Panel Member (Associated Retailer)	Mike Keil	MK	Panel Member (Customer Representative)
Barry Hayward	BH	Panel Member (Associated Retailer)	Helyn Mensah	HM	Panel Member (Independent)
Trevor Nelson	TN	Panel Member (Unassociated Retailer)	Elsa Wye	EW	Panel Member (Independent)
Nicola Smith	NS	Panel Member (Unassociated Retailer)	Pamela Taylor	PT	Panel Member (Independent)
Claire Yeates	CY	Panel Member (Unassociated Retailer)	Dan Mason	DM	Affiliated Panel Member (Ofwat)
Mark Holloway	MH	Panel Member (Wholesaler)	Sarah McMath	SM	Affiliated Panel Member (MOSL)
Martin Marvin	MM	Panel Member (Wholesaler)	Adam Richardson	AR	Panel Secretary
Kristin Garrett	KG	Alternate for Michelle Burns (Items 7 and 8)			

OTHER ATTENDEES

Steve Arthur	SA	MOSL (Presenter)	John Davies	JD	MOSL (Observer)
Evan Joannette	EJ	MOSL (Presenter)	Andrew Johnson	AJ	MOSL (Observer)
Stuart Boyle	SB	MOSL (Presenter)	Ivy Mandinyenya	IM	MOSL (Minute Taker)
Charles Unvala	CU	MOSL (Observer)	Lisa-Ann Lott	LC	MOSL (Observer)
Chris Dawson	CD	MOSL (Observer)	Antoine Schmidt	AS	Thames Water (Observer)
Abu Rashid	ARa	MOSL (Presenter)	Christopher Wright	CW	Castle Water (Observer)
Huw Comerford	HC	MOSL (Presenter)	George Kelly	GK	MOSL (Minute-Taker)
Florentina Monea	FM	MOSL (Presenter)	John Vinson	JV	Independent (Observer)
Christina Blackwell	CB	Customer Representative (Observer)	Samantha Webb	SW	MOSL (Observer)
Steve Formoy	SF	MOSL (Observer)	John Gilbert	JG	MOSL (Observer)
Lisa Connell	LC	MOSL (Observer)	John Briggs	JB	MOSL (Observer)

1. Welcome and Introductions

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed the Panel Members and all other attendees to Panel Meeting 44.

2. Minutes and Outstanding Actions

- 2.1 Panel Members approved the minutes for the May Panel Meeting P43 .
- 2.2 AR noted that the following actions were to be closed:
 - 2.2.1 A40_11; A41b_01; A42_03; A42_04; A43_02; A43_03; A43_04; A43_05; A43_06; A43_07.
- 2.3 One Panel Member questioned A42_03 which related to vacancy assurance reporting under CPW096 and whether there was an update on these reports. SA responded that the redacted versions for the top 10 Retailers had been shared with Panel, and the auditor was working through the outliers. The Panel Member then questioned whether the length of one Trading Party's report compared to the others indicated there was inconsistency in the approach being taken by Retailers.
- 2.4 Another Panel Member suggested there could be some form of insight report produced by MOSL providing a summary of the assurance statements, picking out the key themes and where the gaps may be. They believed there was a gap in the level of reporting in the MOSL update in terms of vacancy and Yearly Volume Estimates (YVE's) and questioned how they would be able to apply this information as a sensible benchmark of market behaviours. They felt this gap ought to be filled by MOSL insight as a precursor to the PwC audit. SA noted that rather than a precursor, the information ought to be applied concurrently.
- 2.5 One Panel Member felt that this information was critical for market operation. They observed that over 30% of market supply points were marked as vacant, whereas Office for National Statistics (ONS) reports noted that economic activity at its lowest point was at 80%, thus there was an inconsistency which, in their view, caused significant issues. They felt the reports did not provide information to the Panel on the effectiveness or appropriateness of the rules.
- 2.6 Another Panel Member noted a clear action associated with [CPW091: Temporary Changes to Vacancy](#) for the Panel to obtain ongoing reporting and monitoring on this and they did not believe that this need was being fulfilled. They believed an action was required post CPW091 to ensure the reporting enabled the Panel to take a view as to whether there needed to be an update on guidance or a mandate to the MPC to intervene if appropriate. SA agreed to take this away as an action to pick up these points.

ACTION: A44_01

- 2.3 AR noted that the following actions were to remain open as they had due dates in the future:
 - 2.3.1 A29_06; A26b_04; A33_08; A36_04; A39_05; A41_08; A43_01.

3. Ofwat Update

- 3.1 DM provided an update from Ofwat.

- 3.2 DM described the scope and timing of the July consultation on liquidity. On the scope, he said that bad debt would not be included but the consultation would cover liquidity measures, whether or not to extend them and the use of vacancy flags, and how to unwind both measures. It would also include: the reintroduction of charges for Market Performance Standards, credit requirements in light of recent changes and any consequential changes to the Customer Protection Code of Practice. He also noted that questions covering the Castle Water change proposal¹ on credit would be covered in the consultation.
- 3.3 The consultation was to be released on Thursday 9th July 2020 for one week (closing on 16th July 2020) in order to enable any consequential code changes to the Panel on 28th July 2020 for decision by Ofwat by 30th July 2020. He noted these were tight timeframes toward the end of July 2020 by when decisions had to be made, which was the reason for the short consultation timescale.
- 3.4 On bad debt, DM stated that there would be a detailed Request for Information (RFI) for Retailers beginning 6th July 2020 on the level of bad debt and they would be given six weeks to respond.
- 3.5 DM then presented non-COVID related work. Another consultation would be released on the Interim Supply Code. Ofwat and MOSL had undertaken a lot of work on the interim supply process. This consultation was likely to be released in mid-July 2020 with a three to four-week timescale although this was still to be decided.
- 3.6 A Panel Member made a plea that the Interim Supply Code consultation be extended or put back due to potential respondents being very busy over the period and that the longer that they had to complete the consultation the better the responses would be. DM noted this, and that he would pass that message on.
- 3.7 DM confirmed that the State of the Market report would be published as normal in the summer probably in early August 2020, but it would look different from previous reports being more infographic, interactive and data focused.
- 3.8 The Panel noted that the findings and outcomes of Project RISE (Review of incumbent company support for effective markets) were to be published in early August 2020. DM noted the report would include a commentary on governance matters which would be of relevance to the Panel.

4. MOSL Update

- 4.1 SM presented this item. With Panel agreement, she took the presentation produced by SA as read and offered to take any questions on it offline via email.
- 4.2 SM presented an overview of MOSL's purpose, vision, and strategy. She noted that the MOSL board had considered these matters at the meeting held the day before the Panel.

¹ [CPW100: Revision to Credit Support Requirement under CPW095](#)

- 4.3 SM noted the economic climate that this work was being done in was different to the usual and delivering core services efficiently was a focus of the strategy.
- 4.4 SM noted that there was a clear line of sight between the strategic roadmap, and the existing 2020/2021 MOSL business plan.
- 4.5 She noted that a meeting to provide more detail on the strategic priorities as well as display where the Panel plan is integrated into the strategy could be scheduled if this was something that Panel Members would value. The Panel welcomed this offer and asked that a meeting be set up by MOSL to share the strategy in more detail.

ACTION: A44_02

- 4.6 One Panel Member questioned how MOSL defined its customer base. SM noted that MOSL's direct customers included Trading Parties, the Panel and other stakeholders and that the purpose statement focused on business customers as it was in their interests that the market should operate.
- 4.7 Another Panel Member questioned whether it was appropriate to incorporate the Panel plan with future MOSL business plans. The Panel Member noted that the Panel was a separate market governance body, which needed to be seen as independent of MOSL. They noted that while there were advantages in terms of efficiencies, there were issues in terms of perception and independence which they wished to explore. The Chair noted this was a matter that should be explored over the summer.
- 4.8 Panel Members considered the content of the MOSL Update slides and revisited concerns regarding the setting of vacancy flags under the provisions introduced by CPW091.
- 4.9 An observer noted new MOSL guidance on vacancy flagging and raised concerns regarding their perception that this involved significant retrospective changes of approach which could involve difficult interactions with customers. They felt there had been unheralded changes in the latest issue of the guidance and noted that whilst the examples in the guidance were illustrative, they questioned whether they could be used as unequivocal guidance with customers. Emphasis should be on correct billing and the new guidance could lead to a lot of customer complaints.
- 4.10 SA noted that the guidance was updated following Ofwat's consultation and subsequent determination regarding the extension to the vacancy flag rules. This determination re-iterated the focus of the provisions on premises with reduced consumption.
- 4.11 A Panel Member questioned the impact on the market of mismanagement of vacancy flags. It was not clear what was to happen next. They noted the audit could potentially show this had not been appropriately managed.
- 4.12 SA responded by stating that what happens next was COVID-agnostic, i.e. it was a continuation on the work completed on vacancy in 2019. This was giving an improved view of why premises are vacant and putting measures in place identify and address these premises as part of the performance framework.
- 4.13 The Panel agreed that:
 - 4.17.1 There would be weekly reports to the Panel on the development and progress of vacancy audit work.



ACTION: A44_03

- 4.17.2 Data analysis should be undertaken and reported back to the Panel by MOSL to assess reasonableness of vacancy flags in terms of the type of properties and how this cross related to the current vacancy position; and

ACTION: A44_04

- 4.17.3 MOSL should confirm the framework (by mid-July) for vacancy reporting, including the auditing of Retailer compliance statements.

ACTION: A44_05

- 4.17.4 Provision of an interim update session with Panel Members on the status of vacancy and the use of YVEs in the market and latest actions and updates prior to the next scheduled Panel Meeting (i.e. before 21 July 2020).

ACTION: A44_06

5. Committee Reports

Trading Disputes Committee (TDC)

- 5.1 EW provided an update from the TDC which last met on 20 May. She noted the June meeting was cancelled as there was nothing substantial to discuss. They confirmed that no new disputes had been raised and discussed at the May meeting.
- 5.2 [CPW092: Unified Disputes Process and Committee](#) was currently out for consultation, and the responses were to be reviewed at the next meeting.

General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) Issues Committee

- 5.3 HM noted that she did not have a substantive update apart from the last meeting was cancelled due to Panel Member illness and would therefore have been inquorate. A full update would be provided after this re-scheduled meeting.

Market Performance Committee

- 5.4 EW noted she was the outgoing Chair but had written the report for the Panel. JG was in post since 1st June 2020.
- 5.5 EW noted that it would be useful for JG to incorporate the MPC Workplan for Panel Members into the next report as a lot of time had gone into this.

ACTION: A44_07

Panel Chair Nominations Sub-Committee

- 5.6 EW gave an update on the progress of recruiting a new Panel Chair, following the current Chair's intention to step down at the end of his term of office (end of August 2020). The Panel noted that the short-listing meeting was to take place on the 6th July 2020 with a view for interviews being held 13-14th July 2020.

- 5.7 EW was aiming to provide nominations at the 21st July 2020 meeting. If this was not possible the Panel noted that this matter could be added to the ad-hoc Panel meeting on the 28th July 2020.
- 5.8 EW was in the process of setting up a call with Emma Kelso in order to fulfil the obligation to consult with Ofwat before bringing the recommendation of the sub-group to the Panel. She would liaise with MOSL's Company Secretary (AJ) on how best to advise the MOSL Board.

6. Panel Workstreams

Metering Strategic Review

- 6.1 CY presented on the Metering Strategic Review. She outlined the proposed objective and approach for the review.
- 6.2 The Panel noted that the proposed approach was to map out the entire metering journey to identify points of failure and opportunities for development. The journey mapping was proposed to begin in July 2020 with various collaboration from other Sub-Groups, Ofwat, CCW and external parties. CY noted this was not an exhaustive list and suggestions of other collaborations were welcome.
- 6.3 The scope of the prioritised review areas would be iterative to ensure the outputs of the metering journey mapping were fully exploited.
- 6.4 The Chair questioned whether the programme was appropriately resourced. CY confirmed she was confident in the resource to complete at least Phase two (which would investigate the issue and identify potential solutions). Resourcing would need to be re-considered at this point depending on the recommendations put forward as this would define the shape of the next phase of work.
- 6.5 Another Panel Member noted that they understood the reasoning but were uncomfortable with the point around profitability of trading parties as a stated desired outcome within the presentation. CY noted the workstream were keen to get Panel Member's views on this.
- 6.6 Another Panel Member sought clarity whether this review was combined the MOSL business plan and the Panel plan together. SM clarified this, noting her earlier point that there only be one plan in relation to strategic priorities over the course of the next three years. CY noted that the timeline was subject to change depending on the unwinding of COVID measures.
- 6.7 One Panel Member sought to add another desired outcome, whereby there would be a reduction in billing charges complaints and improved accuracy of consumption. CY was comfortable with adding in complaints, but the Sub-Group did not have visibility of billing so were uncomfortable with adding this context.
- 6.8 CY agreed to remove the profitability of trading parties outcome.

ACTION: A44_08

- 6.9 The Panel;
- **APPROVED** (unanimously) the objectives of the review.
 - **APPROVED** (unanimously) the scope of the review.

- **APPROVED** (unanimously) the outcomes of the review; and
- **APPROVED** (unanimously) the delivery timeline and approach of the review.

Code Review

- 6.10 MR presented on the Code Review. The overall objectives of the review were presented. MR noted that they were not looking to change the rules of how the Market works, just to simplify the rulebook and make it easier to understand.
- 6.11 The scope of the code review to include the MAC and WRC was noted. MR noted an Architectural Principles Statement was to be formed. This would be a 'template' for clear code drafting and structuring which would underpin future change proposals and, potentially, a re-working of the existing code documentation.
- 6.12 The Panel noted that this review was also split into three phases.
- Phase one – Identify rule book improvements.
 - Phase two – implement this improved rule book; and
 - Phase three – Amendments to Market rules.
- 6.13 It was noted that the Code Advisory Group (CAG) could be used and their terms of reference could be widened to include this review.
- 6.14 Another Panel Member questioned if the CAG group was to come in at a particular point in time within the three phases, or if they were going to undertake the 'leg work' due to the size of the project in the early phases. MR noted he believed the CAG were the right group to assist with some initial drafting but expected to call on the industry for assistance with consultations, and MOSL to assist with the redlining of changes.
- 6.15 The Chair requested AR to comment on.
- The extent of MOSL's capability to support the work.
 - The idea surrounding the use of the CAG and whether the proposer was seeking approval of this in the meeting; and
 - The co-ordination between the five workstreams.
- 6.16 AR commented MOSL would support the development of the Architectural Principles Statement. He noted implementation resource depended on the Architectural Statement of Principle and the extent to which there was an appetite for, and case for re-writing the existing market rulebooks. According to the proposed timetable, this was a matter for delivery in subsequent financial years. AR agreed that utilisation of the CAG was logical for this review.
- 6.17 In terms of co-ordination, AR agreed with the point raised above and it was for MOSL to manage the interactions between the groups.
- 6.18 The Panel.
- **APPROVED** (unanimously) objectives, scope and key deliverables; and
 - **APPROVED** (unanimously) the use of the CAG as a sub-group (subject to amendment of the terms of reference).

Market Governance

- 6.19 PT presented on Market Governance. She noted that the purpose of this workstream was to achieve a governance framework capable of defining strategic outcomes. PT noted this work stream was also broken down into three phases.
- The first phase was the 'discovery phase' which aimed to investigate how the Panel performs, and how the Panel engages with external stakeholders.
 - The second phase was the 'recommendation phase'.
 - The last phase was the 'implementation phase' in which arising code changes would be expected.
- 6.20 Initiation would be between July and August 2020, before moving onto the discovery phase between September and October 2020, recommendation between November and December 2020 and implementation from January 2021.
- 6.21 PT noted the Governance steering group would be responsible for obtaining Panel and MOSL agreement for the scope for and cost of the workstream.
- 6.22 One observer believed it was better to identify the barriers to more extensive participation early on. In discussions on [CPM021: Panel Membership Voting and Rights](#) there was marked agreement within the Panel that broader participation was more desirable, and they wished to stress this point.
- 6.23 PT responded that there was an extensive discussion on whether to align with CPM021 or not, and it was decided it was more efficient to consider CPM021 within the market governance review. She also noted that there had been discussion surrounding Project RISE, the update from DM previously suggested timescales would allow this to be factored in.
- 6.24 The Panel.
- **APPROVED** (unanimously) the approach; and
 - **APPROVED** (unanimously) a work stream steering group.

Open Data

- 6.25 TN presented on Open Data. He noted the objective was not for a full workstream, but rather 'data' would be an enabler to other outcome-based workstreams presented previously. The focus would be the improve quality, accuracy and timeliness of existing datasets.
- 6.26 JD noted that MOSL had considerable focus on improving market data. This was called out in the Market Performance Operating Plan (MPOP) and having this open data workstream stand separately did not make sense. He noted a large aim was to also enrich the data available.
- 6.27 One Panel Member questioned how 'data quality' was defined. JD stated this could be in terms of accuracy or completeness or any number of qualities as well as enrichment with other data sources.
- 6.28 Another Panel Member questioned how end customers would be engaged, and what open data might involve with regards to end customers.



6.29 TN noted that the small group of Panel Members that considered the objectives of this workstream wished to open this up to end customers after getting the basics right and ensuring Trading Parties are happy with the quality and completeness of the data before this was considered. CY noted CMOS must be the only version of the truth, whereas a lot of data was held in Trading Parties' systems but not within CMOS.

6.30 The Panel;

- **APPROVED** (unanimously) the scope and objectives; and
- **APPROVED** (unanimously) the approach.

Innovation

6.31 PT noted the workstream was not seeking approval at this stage. The scope was likely to be influenced by other workstreams, many of which are already addressing barriers to innovation.

7. MPC Terms of Reference

7.1 The Panel considered a change to the Terms of Reference to remove the distinction between Associated and Unassociated Retailers.

7.2 The Chair noted the proposed variation to the MPC terms of reference proposed to go straight to a vote.

7.3 SB noted one Panel Member was conflicted on this item. MB then left the meeting and KG joined as alternate.

7.4 An alternate joined the meeting for items 7 and 8 and the Panel Member then excused themselves.

7.5 Panel Members agreed the change was non-contentious and had no comments.

7.6 The Panel:

- **AGREED** to the changes to the MPC Terms of Reference (unanimous).

8. MPC Nominations (Closed Session)

8.1 The Panel considered three nominations for the Market Performance Committee (MPC).

8.2 The Panel agreed to:

- **APPOINT** Andrew Smith (Castle Water) to the MPC.

8.3 MB returned at this point, and KG left.

9. Draft Recommendation Report: CPM026 Panel Chair and Alternate (OPEN SESSION)

9.1 The Panel considered the Draft Recommendation Report for [CPM026](#). This change sought to expand the eligibility for the Panel Chairman and their alternate.

9.2 A Panel Member queried the legal drafting distributed and sought clarification of the Deputy Chair and Independent Panel Member voting rights.

- 9.3 AR noted that it was important to look at the change at two levels as it did two things in terms of the deputy chair concept. Firstly, it preserved the existing setup which allowed an identified deputy to stand in for the chair as and when required and that, in this circumstance, there would always be the provision for three Independent Panel Members to attend and vote at the Panel Meeting. The second part introduced additional provisions to mitigate the risk that the both the Panel Chair and their identified deputy were not available. In this situation, the Panel would appoint a temporary Chair from one of three Independent Panel Members present. This would cause a vacancy in the independent seats at that meeting, in which case, the stand in chair could appoint an alternate. It was noted that this 'step in' chair still must abide by the rules governing the chair.
- 9.4 One Panel Member noted the wording 'Chairman' and queried why a neutral term wasn't used. Panel Members agreed that MOSL should raise a separate, housekeeping change to replace Chairman with a gender-neutral term throughout the market codes.

ACTION A44_09

- 9.5 A Panel Member queried the experience of the current chair and deputy chair in terms of voting rights and the behaviour of the chair.
- 9.6 Another Panel Member confirmed that whether or not the chair should have a vote was discussed by the sub-group at great length. Currently the code allows the chair to have a vote. The sub-group had reached the conclusion that removing the vote would be a significant change that could remove the appeal of the role to prospective Chairs and would comprise a substantive change to the powers of the Chair, which was not the intent of this Change Proposal.
- 9.7 A Panel Member sought clarification on whether the Panel Deputy Chair was a standing nomination or nominated per meeting. Another Panel Member noted it could be either. The Panel Member had some observations on the legal drafting and terminology which was not consistent with the policy document. This would be dealt with offline
- 9.8 The Panel:
- **AGREED** to recommend to Ofwat that CPM026 should be implemented (unanimous);
 - **AGREED** the recommended implementation date of:
 - 28 August 2020 if Ofwat approval is received by 4 August 2020; or
 - 25 September 2020 if Ofwat approval is received by 2 September 2020; and
 - **AGREED** that a separate, housekeeping change should be progressed as soon as practicable to amend all references in the Market Arrangements Code from Chairman to Chair.

10. Draft Recommendation Report: CPM028 Aligning MOSL Board Governance with the Articles of Association

- 10.1 The Panel considered the Draft Recommendation Report for [CPM028](#) presented by FM. This change sought to align the MAC to a series of governance related changes that have been proposed for the MOSL Articles of Association. These resolutions would be discussed at the AGM in July 2020. The Change Proposal also sought to permit the MOSL Board to publish its minutes in a summary format.
- 10.2 The Panel noted the information presented by AJ regarding the MOSL board Quorum and Removal of Alternate Directors. AJ noted that the Board held a robust discussion on this change

before recommending it for a Panel Member vote at the AGM and presented the rationale for this change.

- 10.3 A Panel Member queried whether, in the absence of a director, that director had opportunity to defer an issue if they thought it was important for that issue to be dealt with when they were present. The Panel Chair observed that, in his experience as Board Chair, this would be custom and practice and that Board directors, having read the agenda and papers, would be able to make representations in advance of a Board meeting-.This could include a request to defer an item if appropriate
- 10.4 AJ confirmed that all MOSL Board Directors carry fiduciary responsibilities consistent with any company director and, however they are elected, must consider impact across the whole Market when they vote. He further noted the variety of specialisms within the board to add expertise to the Board. AJ also noted that, should a director be unable to attend a meeting but have strong opinions on a matter being put to the board, these opinions were often shared with other Board Panel Members directly, or via the Chair or Company Secretary in advance of the meeting to ensure they were taken into account in the Board's deliberations.
- 10.5 One Panel Member queried whether, in the event of a long-term illness of a board Member, they would be expected to stand down so that there could be an election - otherwise that constituency would be underrepresented during the period of the incapacity of that board Member. AJ noted that long term sickness was handled on a case by case basis but effectively arrangements would be made to replace the board Member.
- 10.6 FM presented the timeline of the Proposal and the rationale for the implementation date.
- 10.7 A Panel Member queried whether the option to have an alternate should be kept. AJ noted that there are pros and cons to allowing alternates. The Chair observed that retaining the alternates approach was deeply unappealing. In particular, alternate board Panel Members carried the same responsibilities and legal obligations as any other director of a company, but with little or limited input and oversight.
- 10.8 The Panel:
- **AGREED** to recommend to Ofwat that CPM028 should be implemented (unanimous);
 - **AGREED** to recommend an implementation date of 1 September, if Ofwat approval is received by 24 August 2020.

11. 2021 Panel Dates

- 11.1 The Panel considered the proposed dates for Panel meetings in calendar year 2021.
- 11.2 The Panel unanimously:
- **AGREED** to the proposed Panel meeting dates for 2021 (unanimous)

12. Provisions of Information

- 12.1 Under the Market Terms, MOSL must establish a summary list of materials/information it publishes to certain recipients which the Panel is required to approve 'from time to time'. The

previous approval was undertaken and presented in March 2019. The Panel considered the revised list, which included minor adjustments to existing entries and included new publications.

12.2 Some Panel Members reflected that the value of the Panel reviewing and approving this list was limited (noting that [CPW059: Changes to Review Obligations](#), had been raised to remove this obligation). One Panel Member felt that there may be benefit in a separate audit of the list to determine if there were any gaps. Other Panel Members were less convinced that an audit of the list would add value. Some Panel Members suggested that CPW059 be reconsidered and expressed a preference that this obligation be considered as part of the Market Governance review.

12.3 The Panel:

- **AGREED** the documents list subject to additions from Panel Members (unanimous)

13. Any Other Business

13.1 The Chair concluded there was no AOB and closed the meeting.

14. Actions

Action Number	Action
A44_01	SA to provide Panel with ongoing reporting and monitoring of CPW091, whereby the reporting enables the Panel to take a view as to whether there needed to be an update on guidance or a mandate to the MPC to intervene if appropriate
A44_02	MOSL to arrange a meeting with Panel Members for SM to further explain the strategic priorities of the MOSL roadmap and the link to the 2020/2021 MOSL business plan.
A44_03	The Panel agreed that SA was to report to Panel Members on a weekly basis regarding the development and progress of vacancy audit work.
A44_04	Data analysis should be undertaken and reported back to the Panel by MOSL to assess reasonableness of vacancy flags in terms of the type of properties and how this cross related to the current vacancy position.
A44_05	MOSL should confirm the framework (by mid-July) for vacancy reporting, including the auditing of Retailer compliance statements.
A44_06	SA to arrange a meeting with Panel Members to provide an update on actions; A44_03; A44_04; and A44_05 as well as inclusion on information on YVE's before 21/07/2020.
A44_07	JG to incorporate the MPC Workplan in the next committee report update for Panel Members.
A44_08	CY to remove the profitability outcome from the desired outcomes of the Metering Strategic Review
A44_09	MOSL to raise a change to de-gender references to chair separately as a housekeeping change.