

Minutes of the Performance Advisory Group 12

22 November 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
Jamie Davies	JD	Castle Water	Richard Varley	RV	Southwest Water
Wendy Monk	WM	Wave	David Morris	DM	Waterplus
Trevor Nelson	TN	Business Stream	Sarah Scott	SS	Veolia
Emily Jerrome	EJ	Water2Business	Jon Fuller	JF	Wessex Water

OTHER ATTENDEES

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

APOLOGIES

Andrew Smith	AS	Castle Water	Claire Yeates	CY	Waterscan
James Higgins	JH	MOSL	Neil Pendle	NP	Waterscan
Elena Vaccarino	EV	PwC	Ben Gough	BG	PwC
John Gilbert	JG	MOSL			

ACTIONS FROM MEETING(S)

NO	Action required	Action by	Action Date
12/01	AS to update the template prior to issuing to members for review.	AS	25/11/2022
12/02	AB to send to MOSL details of categories of CCW complaints.	AB	07/12/2022
12/03	MOSL to review PAG meeting timetable for January/February with likelihood for 2-week slippage	MOSL	07/12/2022

1	Welcome
1.1	The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting, noted apologies and confirmed the agenda.
2	Actions from previous meeting
2.1	The Chair confirmed 11/01 remains open as reviewing consultation and PAG feedback.
2.2	11/02 (review CV.18) remains open as still under review
2.3	10/02 and 10/05 also remaining open until PAG13 (workshop) held
2.4	09/01 & 09/02 also remaining open for PAG members to respond
2.5	01/04 to remain open throughout future consultations
3	Review progress to date
3.1	The Chair noted the progress made to date.
3.2	Chair detailed the additional lines added to the Gantt chart highlighting they cover the interventions and metrics mapping to activities and cost effectiveness.
4	Workshop requirements inc pre-read
4.1	The Chair reminded members of the work complete thus far, highlighting the PAG endorsements and sharing details of the documents.

4.2	<p>Chair shared the oversight of the content for the upcoming workshop confirming the prioritised list of activities, longlist of Metrics and longlist of Intervention Types already exist. Noting, before drilling down from the Intervention types into Tools, the need to shortlist the Intervention Types and Metrics to provide a short list of Possible Tools to review.</p> <p>TN enquired why the programme is taking the approach of longlisting metrics and intervention types as opposed to activities first.</p> <p>Chair confirmed first agenda item of PAG13 will be a review of the consultation feedback and the PAG feedback on the activities selected for the MPF prior to drilling down on the metrics and tools.</p> <p>TN further enquired if the review of the activities shortlisting requires more time. Chair acknowledged PAG members may want more time however highlighted information from consultation etc. will provide guidance to shorten the timeframe.</p> <p>TN further commented once activities confirmed, then decide upon risks and following this the metrics and interventions. Noting activities may not be able to be narrowed solely by risk scores.</p> <p>AR noted not anticipating every one of 35 activities will be included nor every risk. 24/26 activities currently anticipated to be included and reviewing against consultation feedback. Currently priorities into 3 'buckets', really high priority activities that should probably be for inclusion, activities at the bottom of the list which will not be for inclusion and edge cases of possible activities for inclusion.</p> <p>AR noted not feasible to workshop every activity, nor every risk, metric or intervention with the PAG as would take multiple meetings. Intention to review methodology with the PAG and MOSL to then apply and revert to PAG with worked up examples.</p> <p>TN noted the need for rigor in the process however acknowledged this may not be possible as a PAG to review each and every activity.</p> <p>Chair continued and confirmed those items to be covered in the workshop: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify what Candidate Metric can be used with Candidate interventions Identify the appropriateness and cost effectiveness Shortlist the appropriate interventions and metrics for each activity <p>Prior to the above the activity final listing will be reviewed based on the consultation feedback</p> <p>At the end of the workshop the tools will be introduced in order to begin the process for those.</p> <p>Chair confirmed PAG members will be split into 4 groups (3 people per group) and one activity will be provided to each group in advance of the workshop alongside the template for review.</p>
-----	--

Chair noted no requirement to work together as a group, preferably work as individuals and feedback at the workshop.

Chair highlighted MOSL have prefilled parts of the template and are simply asking for review and provide comment on the relevant metrics and intervention types.

Chair confirmed no comments or feedback required before the workshop.

Chair explained the criteria for the activities that had been chosen: -

They cover retailer and wholesaler activities and cover activities within the three strategic outcomes. They also represent a similar amount of work and to make it balanced have excluded any activities that have more than six suitable intervention types or more than 10 suitable metrics to ensure no one PAG member has a significant workload.

Chair displayed the activities and groups, UWE.4, CV.5, GS.8 and GS.6

Name	Group	Activity	W/R/O
Adam Boyns	1	UWE.4	O
Emily Jerrome	1	UWE.4	R
Richard Varley	1	UWE.4	W
Andrew Smith/ Jamie Davies	2	CV.5	R
Jon Fuller	2	CV.5	W
Sarah Scott	2	CV.5	R
Claire Yeates/Neil Pendle	3	GS.8	R
Kate Russell	3	GS.8	W
Trevor Nelson	3	GS.8	R
David Morris	4	GS.6	R
Michael Rathbone	4	GS.6	W
Wendy Monk	4	GS.6	R

Chair confirmed the post workshop work to be undertaken by the PAG highlighting not realistic to go through all 26 activities in the workshop hence the requirement to seek endorsement on the methodology approach at the workshop.

Chair further confirmed all PAG members will have opportunity to review all activity templates prior to PAG 14 during January 2023.

TN raised the timeframe for review of the 26 activities may be too short and not all activities may require review as may not be included. TN further commented 26 activities should be shortlisted

further as not likely to all be included. AB echoed the concerns raised by TN as requires more time for review in particular given time of year.

Chair noted PAG members comments and enquired should we review less activities or provide more timeframe for the review.

EJ agreed with TN and added would prefer to review number of activities and look for greater timeframe to review each.

SF thanked members for feedback and noted could potentially group activities by intervention type for easier review.

MR noted maybe streamlined however large number of OPS/MPS/API measures at present and need to consider whether all such activities should be included in an MPF. MR further noted will require further discussion within PAG meetings to establish which activities to include.

TN further noted the small number of working days over Christmas/New Year period and the challenge of working to the timeframe.

GM enquired what is driving the timeframe. Chair confirmed consultation 2 is a driver of the timeline and its likely content, currently planned for late Jan/early Feb however likely to be later. Chair also confirmed the desire to maintain the high pace of work already exhibited by the Programme.

MOSL to review timeframes based on PAG feedback

TN enquired what outputs were being sought from the PAG members by 11 January.

Chair confirmed MOSL seeking review of the activity templates and comment, should members be comfortable with the methodology and can sign off this is sufficient however if members want to review/comment deeper this is an option.

AS ran through the template and the methodology noting endorsement of the methodology will be sought at PAG13 (workshop)

AS confirmed each template gathers the information already endorsed by PAG (candidate metrics, candidate intervention types and their suitability) and the remaining things to assess are the intervention types costs.

AS noted the MOSL view that the suitability of an intervention depends on the metrics that can be used. Where insufficient data and robust enough metrics are unable to trigger an intervention they would not be suitable for the given activity. Thus, the need to map metrics and intervention types and to establish a sense of the intervention type costs.

AS highlighted similar table created for metrics costs and suitability with a RAG rating explanation.

AS displayed an example of the template for GS.1, noting the activity is detailed at the top, then the endorse candidate metrics followed by the intervention types which were high or medium suitability.

AS explained seeking to add a cost RAG rating to each template. AT this early stage simply seeking to rate each cost against each other e.g., peer comparison is cheaper than a rectification plan which is cheaper than an audit.

AS further highlighted also seeking to match the relevant metrics for each intervention type within the templates.

AS noted SF's earlier comment with regard to several metrics could potentially inform several activities and intervention types.

GM enquired if scores are in relation to one metric or a group of metrics. AS confirmed grouped average score. GM noted could lose cost benefits in the averaging of scores. GM further noted need to look at each individual metric for suitability costs as averaging could alter approach.

Chair noted this approach is being applied as a tool to identify before moving to the next stage. AS confirmed there will need to be another iteration to review in more depth.

Following discussion members generally agreed to a 'middle ground' approach of a primary metric to make the assessment with ancillary/secondary metrics to support the primary one.

AS to update the template prior to issuing to members for review.

WM raised having CCW complaints as a single metric not being sufficient, this requires more granularity. AS confirmed the intention to have more granularity and requested AB send details of available data to MOSL, noting this may require further review once metrics established.

AB to send to MOSL details of categories of CCW complaints.

DM noted the level of granularity of the data for a metric will also potentially have an effect on the cost to supply.

Chair confirmed high-level consultation feedback will be provided at PAG13 (workshop) alongside the activities as at present noting there may be at least a dozen activities which the PAG will want to review in more depth.

AS confirmed can provide some templates earlier should the methodology be endorsed at PAG13 (workshop)

PAG members generally agreed additional 2 weeks needed to review the activities based on the assumption of 26 activities and noted 19 January clash with MPC. Members generally agreed w/c 23

	January would be sufficient timeframe to review the templates however likely to be 1 February and an extended meeting.
5	Any other business
	MOSL to review PAG meeting timetable for January/February with likelihood for 2-week slippage
	The Chair thanked everyone for their comments and attendance and closed the meeting.