# Performance Advisory Group (PAG) 92

**Location:** MS Teams

**Date and time:** 18 June 2025, 1000 - 1130

**Status of minutes:** FINAL

# Meeting Minutes

### Market attendees

| Name | (Initial) | Role/Organisation | Name | (Initial) | Role/Organisation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Adam Boyns | AB | CCW (O) | Mattthew Garfield | MG | Anglian (W) |
| Andrea Burnett | ABu | Northumbrian (W) | Michael Gadd | MGa | United Utilities (W) |
| Daniel Proctor | DP | Water Plus (R) | Michelle Thompson | MT | Anglian (W) |
| Emily Jerome | EJe | Water2Business (R) | Noel Bradley | NB | Yorkshire (W) |
| Gerard Lyden | GL | Thames (W) | Pam Nash | PN | C&C (O) |
| Gillian Bladen | GB | Southwest (W) | Paul Baker | PB | Business Stream (R) |
| Greig Jardine | GJ | Business Stream (R) | Paul Walmsley | PW | Yorkshire (W) |
| Harriet Chappell | HCh | Yorkshire (W) | Robert Hetherington | RH | Ofwat (O) |
| Jacob Head | JH | Water2Business (R) | Sarah McCulloch | SM | United Utilities (W |
| Jamie Davis | JD | Castle (R) | Sian Forward | SF | Northumbrian (W) |
| Jon Fuller | JF | Wessex (W) | Sindiso Bango-Dube | SBD | Waterscan (R) |
| Jordanna Lo | JL | Business Stream (R) | Stephanie Tucker | ST | Severn Trent (W) |
| Julie-Ann Anderson | JAA | SES (R) | Tom Wells | TW | Southern (W) |
| Lewis Campbell | LC | Castle (R) | Victoria Milton | TM | Southwest (W) |
| Mark Howell | MH | Water Plus (R) | Wendy Monk | WM | Wave (R) |

### MOSL Attendees

| Name | (Initial) | Role | Name | (Initial) | Role |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Miles Robinson | MR | Chair | Janet Judge | JJ | Observer |
| Amanda Plumb | AP | Presenter | John Gilbert | JG | Observer |
| Oli Robins | OR | Presenter | Katy Woodhouse | KW | Observer |
| Huw Comerford | HC | Presenter | Sam Webb | SW | Observer |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Adam Richardson | AR | Observer | Sauda Dickinson | SD | Notes |
| Amy English | AE | Observer | Toby Hunt | TH | Observer |
| Evan Joanette | EJ | Observer | | | |

| 1. | **Welcome & update** |
|---|---|
| | MR welcomed all members to the meeting and confirmed the agenda.<br>MR reminded attendees that agenda, minutes and slides are published on the MOSL website for review and questions and comments to be sent via mpfreform@mosl.co.uk.<br>MR presented the MPF Programme progress overview.<br>MR presented the MPF Programme delivery plan overview. |
| **2.** | **Charge Reporting** |
| | OR presented **MPF Charging Report - concept**, as on slide 8.<br>OR presented **MPF Charging Report – proposed outline**, as on slide 9.<br><br>JF advised that there has been a disconnect between reports and invoices, querying alignment of the timescales to have both on the same day.<br><br>OR advised that the charge report and invoices should come out at a similar time. OR will review the timeline and advise.<br><br>GB queried whether the shadow reports will reflect zero charges or an indicative charge, noting a preference to have a view of an indicative charge of a real-life situation.<br><br>In the chat, SW confirmed that the reports will show the charge, but these will not be invoiced throughout the shadow period.<br><br>OR presented **MPF Charging Report – example of content**, as on slide 10.<br><br>OR noted that the first set of charging reports would be available before the August CCC meeting, and that only the task level performance report will be available next Monday, 23 June.<br><br>GL queried whether the reports would include all information needed for trading parties to calculate charges themselves. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | OR confirmed that the report is built to do the calculations for trading parties, but that all the information will be included for trading parties to do their own calculations.<br><br>EJ advised that MOSL is currently working on the dashboards so transfer reads, too.<br><br>**During the AOB section:**<br>OR queried whether PAG members preferred receiving the reports before the invoices.<br><br>SW advised that the codes stated that invoices must be sent for performance charges *by* business day 15 and charts and reports need to be shared by business day 16, noting that it is not always possible to align them depending on when the data is received and uploaded but that **MOSL would review and advise if it can be changed.**<br><br>**PAG members noted a preference for receiving the reports before the invoices, to allow to time to check the report data before receiving and having to pay the invoice.**<br><br>GB advised that if invoices have a 30-day settlement, having one day difference between receiving the report and invoice should not present a problem. |
| **3.** | **Update on Deferral Metrics (M16/M17)** |
| | AP presented **Summary of feedback (M16/M17)**, as on slides 13-14.<br>AP presented **Options Considered**, as on slide 16.<br>AP presented **Data to Consider**, as on slide 17.<br><br>JF suggested a potential split in deferral numbers between those that are still performed within the SLA and those that exceeded the SLA.<br><br>In the chat, PB suggested considerations around customer impact, whether deferrals are having a negative impact on end customer experience.<br><br>MT advised that the deferral codes are broad, suggesting the addition of sub-headings to further break down deferral reasons.<br><br>AP highlighted that a conclusive decision around deferrals being a metric has not yet been finalised, the problem needs to be better understood to enable a solution that addresses the issues or drives performance.<br><br>GL noted support for the proposed approach and queried whether the upcoming audit would include in the deferral reason codes. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | AP confirmed that the upcoming audit would include the reason codes for deferrals, and that the reason codes will be included in the operational reports that are being delivered by the bilaterals programme later this year.<br><br>SW advised that the reason codes would be used as part of the analysis and selection criteria and be included in the findings reports.<br><br>AB noted support for option three, agreeing that considering customer impact and SLA breeches should be a starting point. AB queried the timelines established for the work on deferrals.<br><br>MR advised that requirements and data considerations with be shared with the digital team before understanding the potential timescales, noting that there have been considerations around aligning the deferral work delivery with the audit planned to be published by August.<br><br>JL noted support for option three, and advised that there needs to be considerations around instances where a deferral had been cancelled or rejected and not resolved, looking into the follow-on activity of why it was not resolved and the customer impact.<br>In the chat, SF suggested it may be worth including analysis on deferral followed by a timeout or whether the process is a retailer or wholesaler process.<br><br>In the chat, TW queried whether it be useful to also include how many site visits were done, using activity statuses, as multiple site visits may also have an impact on the customer especially if appointments are required.<br><br>EJ queried that if deferrals were not a KPI or additional metric, and was just a deferral report, whether it be valid enough to be considered by the PAC if there was a performance issue found.<br><br>GL advised that the problem statement needs to be defined before deferrals can be established as a KPI or API.<br><br>JD queried whether it was possible for the PAC to initially have a view of the deferral report and then have an opinion on whether it should be an API or recommend it be a KPI.<br><br>MR advised that the PAC would play a role in maintaining and making decisions on the list of additional metrics.<br><br>JD advised that there should be considerations around whether performance can be clearly reported on if a problem is identified. Suggesting that an industry report should initially be created, then it could become an API and then potentially recommended to be a KPI.<br><br>AP advised that all feedback would be considered and reviewed. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | EJ suggested that a walk-through discussion between MOSL and volunteer trading party members on deferral issues experienced may be useful. **A few PAG members on the call volunteered to be included in this potential discussion.** |
| **4.** | **SmartAMI definition change update** |
| | HC presented an **overview** of the SmartAMI change proposal, as on slide 20.<br>HC presented the **proposed solution**, as on slide 22.<br>HC presented the **detailed proposal**, as on slide 23.<br>HC presented the **assessment approach**, as on slide 24.<br>HC presented the **change proposal timeline**, as on slide 25.<br><br>**HC advised that an email will be sent to PAG members offline with details on the change proposal and contact information for members to provide additional feedback to MOSL on the definition change.**<br><br>JD advised that part of the concern around the SmartAMI definition request was around issues faced when an AMI meter cannot be read remotely and then needs a visual read, and queried whether the change proposal included guidance around when a smart meter stops transmitting and could be relabelled in CMOS or whether the meter will stay labelled as SmartAMI even when not transmitting a read.<br><br>HC advised that there is guidance in the documentation around Smart meters going down for short periods, but that there would be a further discussion around this guidance in the Metering Committee (MC).<br><br>GL advised that it is important to understand the misclassifications and miscalculations which initially triggered the concerns around the need for a definition, and noted that the proposed definition needs to be consistent with Ofwat documentation around smart meters and needs to be light touch to future proof for changing technology and guide meter classification.<br><br>HC noted that all feedback received from the different groups will be considered and discussed with the MC to ensure it is fit for purpose. |
| **5.** | **Upcoming PAG workshop(s) & AOB** |
| | MR provided an overview of the upcoming workshops.<br><br>JD suggested including discussions, at a future PAG meeting, around M11 potentially not being a KPI. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | MR advised that internal discussions are being had around M11 and that issues will be discussed and addresses with the Data Assurance Working Group, noting that a **high-level update could potentially be brought to the PAG** after discussions with the Working Group.<br><br>GL advised that, as the MPF programme has done, the data programme should consider linking the problem statement to the customer impacts, benefits, risks and issues, and focus on what the metric is actually going to address.<br><br>As no other AOBs were raised, MR closed the meeting. |