

## Minutes of the Performance Advisory Group 10

26 October 2022 – 10:00 to 12:00

### MEMBERS PRESENT

Chris Dawson	CD	MOSL (Chair)	Adam Boyns	AB	CCW
Michael Rathbone	MR	Severn Trent	Kate Russell	KR	Yorkshire Water
Jon Fuller	JF	Wessex Water	Richard Varley	RV	Southwest Water
Wendy Monk	WM	Wave	David Morris	DM	Waterplus
Trevor Nelson	TN	Business Stream	Sarah Scott	SS	Veolia

### OTHER ATTENDEES

Adam Richardson	AR	MOSL	Axelle Saada	AS	MOSL
Janet Judge	JJ	MOSL	Georgina Mills	GN	Ofwat
Evan Joannette	EJo	MOSL	Lisa-Ann Lott	LAL	MOSL (Notes)

### APOLOGIES

Andrew Smith	AS	Castle Water	Claire Yeates	CY	Waterscan
Emily Jerrome	EJ	Water2Business	Neil Pendle	NP	Waterscan
James Higgins	JH	MOSL	Steve Formoy	SF	MOSL
Elena Vaccarino	EV	PwC	Ben Gough	BG	PwC

**ACTIONS FROM MEETING(S)**

NO	Action required	Action by	Action Date
10/01	CV.9 add more relevant examples (C1 for example)	AS	09/11/2022
10/02	More work is required to ascertain metrics around and regarding collaboration against CV11 (and others).	All/(AS, JJ)	07/12/2022 (Workshop)
10/03	WM noted on occasion Wholesaler policies do not enable backdating of allowances beyond the current financial year. JF noted ACoPS may move all Trading Parties to working from similar policies thus enabling a metric to be established against a known baseline.	AS	09/11/2022
10/04	Review how 'rejections' in the Bilateral Hub may be an area where Wholesalers and Retailers need to work together to lower number of instances and thus may be suitable for a metric on collaboration along with other similar processes where resolution can only be gained by collaboration.	AS	09/11/2022
10/05	Review order of workshop on 7 <sup>th</sup> Dec. Review Consultation first (to shortlist) and then move onto Metrics and Tools.	CD	07/12/2022 (Workshop)

Commented [CD1]: @Axelle Saada , @Janet Judge , @Lisa-Ann Loti Adding actions, can you check that you're happy with these as assigned some to you and expecting them?

Commented [AS2R1]: Yes all good, I just changed one word in action 10/04 but otherwise fine, I've already completed all 3 too

Commented [CD3R1]: awesome, thank you

1	<b>Welcome</b>
1.1	The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting and confirmed the agenda.
2	<b>Actions from previous meeting</b>
2.1	The Chair confirmed no outstanding actions noting no feedback received from members on UWE 6.
2.2	The Chair reminded members the minutes and agenda are available on the website.
2.3	The Chair confirmed members will be provided with a link to the PAG SharePoint when next pre-read pack is sent.

<b>3</b>	<b>Review progress to date</b>
3.1	The Chair noted still working on candidate metrics and tools.
3.2	The Chair also highlighted the continuing consultation period and final two webinars.
3.3	The Chair noted no further Steering Group feedback and highlighted the upcoming Steering group meetings.
<b>4</b>	<b>DISCUSSION: Endorses selected candidate metrics</b>
4.1	<p>AS took the members through feedback received on candidate metrics and thanked those who had responded for their time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AR asked for clarification on CV9 feedback.</li> <li>• TN noted whilst F4 &amp; F5 had been called C1 had not and as this represents a specific verification should be called out also.</li> <li>• GM observed a similar point, where key Bilaterals processes are called out then all relevant key Bilateral hub processes should be called out also. Members generally agreed to this approach.</li> <li>• JF noted if the above approach is taken should OPS be considered for all Trading Parties as opposed to solely Wholesalers given this is intended as a metric for good customer outcome.</li> <li>• AS agreed to note and update where appropriate in regard to the above in particular where Bilateral transactions exist. The Chair noted state transitions within the Bilaterals hub would enable accurate tracking of measures and to whom they relate.</li> <li>• GM noted the bottom up and top-down approach being applied to the review of the MPF should enable assignment of accountability for activities and desired behaviors on behalf of customers.</li> <li>• GM noted MOSL are best placed to provide any additional metrics through insights from the Bilaterals hub.</li> <li>• WM noted on occasion Wholesaler policies do not enable backdating of allowances beyond current financial year. JF noted ACoPS may move all Trading Parties to working from similar policies thus enabling a metric to be established against a known baseline. <b>AS agreed to add as a metric.</b></li> <li>• TN noted aspiration to create a metric regarding collaboration against CV11. AS noted difficult to codify but this does not preclude a metric being created or indeed an incentive.</li> <li>• TN highlighted current discussions regarding overall market metrics may be more appropriate for a collaboration metric as may not be feasible to create granular singular</li> </ul>

collaboration metrics. TN noted new applicants to the market may bring innovations which could be including within collaboration.

- JF noted 'rejections' may be an activity where Wholesalers and Retailers need to work together to lower number of instances and thus may be suitable for a metric on collaboration along with other similar processes where resolution can only be gained by collaboration. **AS agreed to add as a possible metric.**
- GM highlighted the need to decide whether sanctions/financial penalties would be the best approach to interventions as may not foster collaboration. **AS to note intervention tools will be difficult to create where collaboration is required.**
- KR highlighted where collaboration metrics are being sought such as for CV15 if only Retailers performance is being measured (R-MeX) there is no equivalence for Wholesalers.
- JF noted where new connections are being considered for metrics similar approach should be taken to gap sites.
- TN highlighted the need to take into account address itself as opposed to simply UPRN/VOA for new connections.
- WM highlighted for CV16 '...resolve associated issues' is on occasion particularly difficult and may require a metric to indicate if positive collaboration was being taken.
- GM noted may be considered more of a wider market issue and should be looked at wider than individual pairings of Trading Parties and would be difficult to incentivise.
- TN enquired if the results of CPW085 regarding Trade Effluent would be an activity which could be monitored and therefore incentivised, as rejections could be tracked.
- AS noted MOSL colleagues had highlighted the above and it had been added as a potential metric.
- TN noted the relationship with Strategic Panel priorities for the collaboration metrics to provide a market wide view such as the State of the Market.
- AS confirmed intent to include wider market metrics to establish how the MPF is progressing the market.
- KR noted in respect of GS.5 need to establish which is the most relevant category to utilise for R-MeX e.g., unplanned events.
- MR noted potential need for review of R-MeX to include different/additional questions to match to the requirements from the MPF.
- AS highlighted new metric created against RWG good practice guidance to cover the unplanned events and TE following feedback against GS.5
- GM enquired if Trading Parties seek feedback from customers when an unplanned events occurs which could be utilised to create a metric.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KR noted quality of responses could be utilised from R-MeX categories against GS.8</li> <li>• GM queried if the information was reactive or proactive which would influence the metric which could be produced.</li> <li>• GM queried definitions between GS.9 and UWE.7 JJ clarified GS.9 current basic meter requirements where as UWE.7 relates to customer requests for water meters and/or for a smarter meter and confirmed this has been considered in regard to candidate tools.</li> <li>• JF noted potential to measure GS.9 against B5, B3 and C1 to see how many notifications/verifications are requested against the Wholesalers holding of meters.</li> </ul> <p>Members agreed to ENDORSE the possible candidate metrics for exploration noting this is not closing down the opportunity to add other metrics should any be identified in future.</p>
5	<b>DISCUSSION: Endorses selected candidate tools</b>
5.1	<p>JJ reminded members PAG had previously endorsed the 11 intervention types and all possible intervention tools for exploration are now being complied. Noting the need for suitability, cost, appropriateness and relevance to certain metrics.</p> <p>JJ thanked members for their feedback and noted grouped into themes for review.</p> <p>JJ ran through the feedback.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GM noted will require further review once performance levels are known against the metric to establish outperformance. JJ confirmed will be an iterative process.</li> <li>• GM noted the value of league table/peer comparison as an incentive as no Trading Party would want to be at the bottom of a league table.</li> <li>• GM noted against UWE.7 whether sanctions would be appropriate as a toll for an activity where the desired action is performance above and beyond BAU and whether another tool/s would be more appropriate.</li> <li>• GM requested inclusion on review and further thinking on GS.9 and whether the tool/s should be included in the sanctions category. TN noted may require inclusion in PR24 due to high-level Wholesaler sanctions are at a market level. AR noted no answer at present to the question of what can happen under the MPF and what can happen under a license and if there is a gap between the two and noted this will need to be explored further as the MPF develops. GM agreed with AR's approach noting development of BR-MeX will be alongside the development of the MPF.</li> <li>• WM clarified Education may not resolve issues surrounding gap sites, in particular, where customers are loss making as no Trading Party will want to supply them.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TN noted need to review redistribution as a principle and consider what happens with any monies collected against the tools. Members generally agreed with TN.</li> </ul> <p>Members agreed to ENDORSE the possible candidate tools for exploration noting this is not closing down the opportunity to add other tools should any be identified in future and may be adjusted once certainty achieved on the metrics.</p>
<b>7</b>	<b>Any other business</b>
7.1	<p>Chair enquired if members attending MPF Webinar 3 requesting members who would agree to offer questions.</p> <p>The Chair took members through the high-level view of the upcoming meetings: -</p> <p>PAG 11 – Endorsement of candidate tools &amp; metrics</p> <p>PAG 12 – Pre-read for workshop</p> <p>PAG13/Workshop – single meeting in December of 4 hours - Chair requested members email confirmation noting workshop will be virtual</p> <p>PAG 14 – Wrap-up session from workshop and pre consultation 2</p> <p>TN highlighted need to refine activities prior to reviewing metrics and tools. Chair highlighted consultation feedback will include refinement of the activities.</p> <p>GM recommended reviewing consultation feedback as first agenda item at the workshop and move onto the tools &amp; metrics. Members generally agreed to that approach.</p>
7.2	The Chair thanked everyone for their attendance and closed the meeting.