

Performance Advisory Group (PAG) 45

Location: MS Teams

Date and time: 25 July 2024, 1000 - 1200

Status of minutes: FINAL



Meeting Minutes

Market attendees

Name	(Initial)	Role/Organisation	Name	(Initial)	Role/Organisation
Claire Stanness	CS	Wave (R)	Julie-Ann Anderson	JAA	Ses
Clare Garland	CG	United Utilities	Emma Elmes	EE	South East
Daniel Proctor	DP	Waterplus (R)	Mike Rathbone	MRa	Severn Trent
David Morris	DM	Waterplus (R)	Paul Baker	PB	Business Stream (R)
David Moss	DMo	Castle (R)	Peter Strain	PS	Castle (R)
Emma Elmes	EE	South East	Rebecca Gale	RG	Waterscan
Gerard Lyden	GL	Thames (W)	Shakima Fagan	SF	Everflow (R)
Gillian Bladen	GB	South West (W)	Shaun Kent	SK	Ofwat (O)
Harriet Eames	HE	Yorkshire	Syndiso Bango-Dube	SBD	Waterscan (R)
Jacob Head	JH	Water2business	Tim Brewer	TB	Wessex (W)
Jamie Davies	JD	Castle (R)	Trevor Nelson	TN	Business Stream (R)
Jon Fuller	JF	Wessex (W)			

MOSL Attendees

Name	(Initial)	Role	Name	(Initial)	Role
Chris Dawson	CD	Chair	Lisa Connell	LC	Observer
Oliver Robins	OR	Presenter	Luke Coyle	LCo	Observer
Evan Joannette	EJ	Presenter	Miles Robinson	MR	Observer
Amy English	AE	Observer	Monica Falasca	MF	Observer
Flo Monea	FM	Observer	Nichola Sampford	NS	Observer
Huw Comerford	HC	Observer	Sam Webb	SW	Observer
Janet Judge	JJ	Observer	Sauda Dickinson	SD	Notes
John Gilbert	JG	Observer	Simon Bennett	SB	Observer

1.	Welcome & update
	<p>CD welcomed all members to the meeting and confirmed the agenda.</p> <p>CD reminded attendees that minutes and slides are all published on the MOSL website for review and comment via mpfreform@mosl.co.uk</p>
2.	Bilaterals Metrics
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M18 Proportion of SLAs for bilateral requests completed on time • M15 Average lateness of failed SLAs for bilateral Requests <p>OR walked through the agenda, as on slide 7.</p> <p>OR walked through PAG input, as on slide 8.</p> <p>OR presented a reminder of the high-level metric journey, as on slides 9 and 10.</p> <p>OR presented a reminder of the MPF Principles, as on slide 11.</p> <p>OR presented Bilateral Request KPIs Overview, as on slide 13.</p> <p>OR presented desired outcomes and further PAG feedback from PAG, as on slide 14.</p> <p>OR thanked members for the feedback from the last PAG meeting.</p> <p>OR presented problem statements (current OPS), as on slide 15.</p> <p>OR presented other factors to consider and further PAG feedback from PAG 43, as on slide 16.</p> <p>DM readvised that requirements to update systems such as CMOS and the bilateral hub need to be considered, for example references at the end of closing a ORID.</p> <p>OR advised that discussed will be picked up with the quality of request outcome discussion.</p> <p>GL referred to the new multi-phase approach for the MPF programme and advised that perhaps we could have some sort of prioritisation for M15 & M18 within that phased approach.</p>

OR advised that perhaps MOSL would share a view of where everything sits in terms of the plan.

OR presented **other metrics required to support M18 & M15**, as on slide 17.

OR advised that KPIs will be focused on before additional metrics.

TN advised that if we're not working on the additional metrics, we probably won't see delivery soon enough.

TN enquired whether the additional metrics from the bilateral hub could be passed on to another team to work up.

OR advised that the MPF team are constantly talking to the Bilat team because phase 14 will deliver a lot of the hooks needed for the additional metrics to work. So, it might not take a lot of time to implement the additional metrics up once the new reporting functionality is in place.

EJ advised that PAG consider what the code would allow if KPI-adjacent things become available through another programme and whether there would be restrictions around the use of that for PAC.

CS enquired whether vacance has been discussed as part of the bilateral process and how they're going to be monitored as part of these KPIs.

OR advised it could possibly be added to the list of other metrics to support and MOSL would take it away to discuss.

JD referred to the statement presented that M18 and M15 should acknowledge the legitimacy of deferrals and enquired why there isn't a similar statement and set-up for retailers.

CD advised MOSL will take JDs point away for discussion.

OR presented **potential M18 design**, as on slide 18.

OR presented **potential M15 design**, as on slide 19.

JF enquired whether average lateness will be aggregated in a total performance score or be represented individually against each process type.

OR advised that it would depend on who's looking at it and that MOSL would pick up that conversation.

GL advised that there could be a solution to allow both a granular view and summarised view.

JL advised that there are inconsistencies among wholesalers around customer contact.

JL further flagged that there has been an increase in issues around internal and remote reads being closed as unread and retailers would be penalised on that.

OR advised that JLs point could be picked up when talking about the exceptions and different scenarios to account for.

OR further advised that we need to make sure we have access to the data to shed light on these issues.

OR presented **should M18 and M15 cover in-flight or closed requests and time-out closures**, as on slides 21.

OR presented **should M18 and M15 cover in-flight or closed requests and F5 closures**, as on slides 22.

OR presented **should M18 and M15 cover in-flight or closed requests and F5s open**, as on slides 23.

JF advised all OPS are tracked as they close and meet the end criteria and noted that it is currently difficult for Wholesaler to forecast performance for the following month.

JF further advised a preference for moving to when the endpoint criteria are met.

OR advised that JFs point was one of the options still to come in the presentation today.

GL enquired what currently happens in terms of OPS, whether it is based on when the wholesaler task is completed or added to performance and penalties once closed.

OR advised that it doesn't go into performance reports and or penalties until the request itself is closed

SW advised that the decision whether you pass, or fail is captured at the time it is completed but the reporting and charges applicable happens once it's been closed.

GB agreed with JF that it is difficult to forecast performance and advised that if it is changed to report on completion, then there would be potential for resubmissions and cancellation of the whole process, which would not be ideal.

GB further advised that yet-to-close F5s currently fall outside performance which is the most important process where there is customer dissatisfaction.

GB further enquired whether in F5, there needs to be an obligation to close it manually and have an API to make sure it's done.

OR advised that some of the options still to be presented today might draw out some preferences and questions as to how we treat it.

JF advised the first pass for KPI should be counted and thereafter the discussion can be had around whether we count a second pass of that KPI with resubmission.

OR presented **options for M18 and M15 cover in-flight or closed requests**, as on slide 24.

OR presented **Scenario: SLA completed on time**, as on slide 25.

OR presented **Scenario: SLA completed late**, as on slide 26.

OR presented **Scenario: SLA not completed**, as on slide 27.

OR posed the question **does either option create sufficient incentive for wholesalers to complete an SLA once already late? Is there a viable alternative**, as on slide 28.

JF enquired why, regarding average lateness, there is a disconnect on option 2 presented between capturing the miss and the associated charge.

OR clarified that the performance and charge would both happen together, but that both happen only after the SLA has been complete.

JF noted a preference for the SLAs to come through in the month when they're completed together with the charge.

OR provided further clarification on option 2.

CD confirmed slide 27 was to be updated and republished.

DM advised that each option would not fall under simplicity for reporting and charging purposes and that the aim of not having auto-close on complaints was so that the original complaint could be updated.

DM further advised that low impacting issues should be resolved within 15 business days and hit as a resubmission and high impacting issues should go straight to escalation.

DM noted that we could align with every other process for more simplicity.

CD enquired whether DM would then prefer **option one**, and then just to reinstate the auto-close for F5.

DM confirmed and noted that it poses the question of how relevant today's resubmissions are, and that resubmissions should count for low impacting.

CD advised that how we distinguish between resubmissions and escalations is still to be worked through at the OAG.

GL advised **option two** would be the best option.

GL agreed with DM about reintroducing auto-close for F5s and advised that auto-closure on F5s would provide certainty on closure and would close one vulnerability.

GL further advised that with **option two**, on completion it shows performance and penalties so that you know immediately.

GL noted that a point to take away would be that once the SLA window is passed, even if not completed, could you start measuring late days, against open and completed tasks.

OR advised point to be taken away around what happens if it's not completed.

GB advised there is not enough incentive for overdue tasks to be completed or closed on time other than to do right by the customer.

CD advised that there is the incentive that when the wholesaler does eventually close it, they will be hit with a heavy penalty.

GB advises that sometimes mistakes happen that could result in the task not being closed and advised that maybe a more frequent measure is needed to incentivise closures.

OR advised that neither option presented today addresses the fact that the SLA could be forgotten and not completed until it's too late.

OR further advised that MOSL would take the point away and investigate how it could be managed and if there is an alternative option to flag tasks that aren't complete but already over the SLA

SK advised leaning towards **option 2** and raised concerns for the fact that wholesalers may miss the SLA and receive a heavy penalty down the line and advised that if M18 and M15 are included in BR-MeX, it could exacerbate the penalty.

SK further advised that the extent to which SLAs are missed and not completed could be separately monitored to understand the extent to which it is happening.

OR advised that the key question is whether the knowledge that there could be a heavy penalty if you forget about these things, enough on itself to incentivise completion.

OR further advised MOSL would take the discussion offline and encouraged PAG members send through any views offline.

OR raised the point that there seemed to be a preference for **option two**, perhaps exploring how F5 could be introduced.

EJ advised that perhaps F5 has run its course, and it may be time to review.

EJ further advised other solutions would be to have the retailers manually close more Bilaterals sooner or to have additional metrics for how long it takes to close service requests down.

TN advised that the task should be reported as not completed as soon as it is over the SLA days.

TN further advised we are looking at two metrics at the same time, measuring slightly different things, and may perhaps need two different KPIs – one to measure if it was done within the stated time and one to measure how long after the stated time it was done.

OR advised it would be a point for MOSL to discuss and perhaps we could be looking more at the expiry of the SLA window being a trigger.

JF agreed that we might need two different KPIs and advised that perhaps a more immediate incentive is needed as opposed to just looking at the average around lateness.

JL advised that where you may have raised a verification, it's taken that time SLA to do the verification and not actually start the work and then a second bilateral is started to fix the issue – that is just one SLA but we'll be registering two different ones.

OR advised that is perhaps where the additional metric could come in because it's showing the total time including the time taken on a resubmitted request.

DM further noted that there's nothing in place to show the start point and end point of the customer journey and advised reasonable time frames could be put in place to measure multiple submissions against the one single supply point to rate performance.

GL advised that there's a need for a lot of investigation first in terms of the underlying causes of resubmission before we start thinking about that as a multiplier factor for wholesaler performance.

DM advised there are data items and values to the effect that we could categorise what the offence of the resubmission is, and it's a matter of organising and evaluating what changes need to take place in downstream systems that have the data.

OR presented **how should M18 and M15 treat High and Low Impacting Requests**, as on slide 29.

JF advised that if a time scale is agreed between a wholesaler and retailer, it should be written in the guidance that you cannot defer for that.

GB raised the point that perhaps there needs to be a way of indicating in the bilaterals a low impacting and high impacting request.

OR advised that it's probably a bilateral hub question, about where we go with this rather than it being M18 and M15 specific.

CD to take GBs question away for investigation.

GL advised it might not be worth spending too much energy categorising into low impact and high impact and that design wise for M15 and M18, that's just one version of deferral, so, you don't need to do anything different.

DM noted there was a confusion between low impacting requests and high impacting requests that customers requested and raised concerns about having a data item where the customer request could potentially be deprioritised.

OR noted that there were a few things for the bilateral team to look at.

OR further confirmed that PAG members were saying that in terms of M18 and M15, these deferrals are treated like any other deferral, or they don't count towards the days that they're going to M18 and M15.

DM advised that the other point of raising this in terms of low impacting requests is also the compounding impact on other metrics.

GL noted that the hub doesn't allow you to defer to a set timeline, so, you need to re-defer tasks every month effectively, which is a lot of manual effort especially with a bulk project.

OR advised the action point would be passed on to CD.

OR presented can **M18 and M15 reflect the quality of request outcome**, as on slide 30.

GB raised the point around previous discussions about insufficient resubmission reason codes.

OR noted that would be one for the bilateral team to investigate.

DM advised there is a CMOS updated flag that could possibly be added to close out request types with a secondary field with conditions and advised that for further inquiries we could add extra data items for resubmissions.

CD noted that would be one for the bilateral team to investigate.

PB agreed with DMs point and advised it is possibly an argument for **option 1**.

JF agreed that more data around resubmissions into bilaterals is needed and it's possibly something to be discussed at OAG.

TN advised that there might be gaps assessing accountability right from the very beginning and we can't keep on building additional tools and metrics because the initial KPI doesn't necessarily do what we need it to.

GL provided an opposing view to TN and advised that there isn't an accountability issue and that we're talking about improving towards a level of perfection and that the basic metric and tool we have in place align to those accountabilities

TN advised we should be trying to measure the full end to end process, not just the bilateral request part.

EJ advised that updating CMOS isn't happening after bilaterals are raised but that hasn't been raised as a priority for a metric and the right answer may be that there are still APIs.

DM advised if it's an obligation to update CMOS as something closes, why not make it mandatory within systems and have a logical approach.

OR presented **what to do with resubmissions**, as on slide 31.

OR confirmed feedback received offline.

OR posed the question whether these SLAs should be included in performance and charging.

JF reiterated the point that there isn't enough data as to why resubmissions are happening because the codes don't give enough information, and raised the point whether you should go into a KPI if there's not an understanding of what's happening.

JF further advised that counting second passes of completed KPIs could inflate numbers.

GB advised there isn't enough information to be able to launch this into part of M18 and M15.

GB further advised that as a wholesaler you can request further information, as a retailer, you can only add a comment and that doesn't flag up as requiring any sort of intervention.

CD advised that that's because that's been dealt with as part of the additional information.

JL advised that there isn't enough information to go on and there are many inconsistencies across resubmissions both from wholesalers and retailers, and that there needs to be some standardisation in place.

CD raised the point that members noted there is not enough information to make a judgement and raised the question to PAG members as to what information is missing for them to make the call.

No immediate response from any PAG members.

OR acknowledged that possible inconsistencies in the process is making it difficult to decide whether these SLAs should be feeding performance and charging.

OR further advised that we need to understand a lot more what's going on here and that might be provided by setting up an additional metric that just focuses in on this piece. But that in terms of M18 and M15, this might not be something that we feed into the into the pot.

JF enquired whether we could put this question into phase two instead, so everyone has more time to work on it and understand what is needed.

EJ advised that a bilateral review was done and created some new SLAs and we've been charging on those and noted that there shouldn't be a difference here that makes this not workable.

JD noted there possibly needs to be exploration of what data can be created or brought in to provide better clarity, for assigning blame, when something does go wrong and enquired if this is something that should be an API.

	<p>JL enquired whether, having looked at the data, there were any behaviours identified that we should focus on and create a measure against.</p> <p>OR noted that it is difficult to spot those behaviours and there hasn't been much time spent on analysing the underlying reasons.</p> <p>OR presented what to do with repeat submissions, as on slide 32.</p> <p>GB noted that we might be getting into the danger of applying quantitative measures to things that are qualitative.</p> <p>OR advised that audits need to pick up some of those actual qualitative reasons</p> <p>OR presented what to do with cancellations, as on slide 33.</p> <p>CD advised we would present the rest of the slides and complete the discussion at the next PAG meeting on 31 July, as we were out of time.</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>Consultation 4</p>
	<p>EJ reminded members and attendees there was about a week left for Consultation 4 as it ends on 2 August.</p> <p>EJ reminded members that questions could be noted on the circulated Word form and the digital form.</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Upcoming PAG workshop(s) & AOB</p>
	<p>CD provided an overview of the upcoming PAG meetings for July.</p>