

A stylized illustration of a person with dark skin, curly hair, and glasses, wearing a blue shirt and a purple top. The person is holding a document titled "Your water bill". The background is a teal and light blue geometric pattern.

MOSL

Market Performance Framework (MPF) Reform

Consultation 5

High level quantitative feedback

14 March 2025

About Consultation 5

- Consultation 5 ran from 17 February to Friday 7 March 2025
- The consultation sought stakeholder feedback on proposals for:
 - Phase 1 KPI performance standards and charges (see table)
 - The performance charge cap
 - The Performance Assurance Committee (PAC) to be able to adjust performance standards for a KPI within a given tolerance (i.e. +/- 5%) a maximum of once in any given 12-month period
- This document provides a first view of the response rate and quantitative responses
- The following documents will be issued on Thursday 17 April:
 - Stakeholders' feedback and MOSL's responses
 - A compilation of stakeholders' verbatim comments
 - Key themes that are being raised
- **The results will also be presented at an event in London on Thursday 24 April 2025 (invitations being issued via email)**

Phase 1: priority KPIs

Cyclic Meter Read KPIs

M01 Cyclic meter reads performed within SLA (biannual/ monthly)

M02 Proportion of smart meters read

M19 Cyclic non-market meter reads performed within SLA (biannual or monthly)

Transfer meter read KPIs

M04 Proportion of transfer meter reads performed/ submitted within SLA

M06 Lateness of overdue transfer meter reads

M09 Proportion of transferred SPIDs with estimated reading

Notes

- The following slides include the responses to Consultation 5's quantitative questions (ranked 1-5) only
- The quantitative results are intended as a guide and will be assessed in combination with related feedback and comments
- Not all respondents answered every question
- Percentages quoted are based on the proportion of stakeholders that responded to each question
- Percentages may not total 100% in all instances due to rounding
- The ranking with the highest/joint-highest response is highlighted for each question
- Stakeholders' qualitative feedback, and MOSL's responses, will be issued on Thursday 17 April

Respondents (21 in total)



Wholesalers	Consultation			Retailers	Consultation			Other	Consultation		
	3	4	5		3	4	5		3	4	5
Affinity Water	✓	✓	✓	ADSM	-	✓	-	CCW	✓	✓	✓
Anglian Water	✓	✓	✓	Business Stream	✓	✓	✓	The Energy Consortium	✓	-	-
Dŵr Cymru (W)	✓	✓	✓	Castle Water	✓	✓	✓				
Northumbrian Water	-	✓	✓	Clear Business Water	✓	✓	-				
Portsmouth Water	✓	✓	✓	Dŵr Cymru (R)	✓	✓	-				
SES Water (W)	✓	✓	-	Everflow	✓	✓	✓				
Severn Trent	✓	-	-	Nottingham CC - self supply	-	✓	-				
South East Water	✓	✓	✓	Pennon Water Services	✓	✓	✓				
South Staffs Water	✓	✓	-	Sefton Council (self-supply)	✓	✓	-				
South West (inc Bristol)	✓	✓	✓	SES Business Water (R)	✓	-	-				
Southern Water	✓	✓	✓	Water2Business	✓	✓	✓				
Thames Water	✓	✓	✓	Waterscan	-	✓	✓				
United Utilities	✓	✓	✓	WaterPlus	✓	✓	✓				
Wessex Water	✓	✓	✓	Wave	✓	✓	✓				
Yorkshire Water	✓	✓	✓								
Totals	14	14	12		11	13	8		2	1	1

Section 2: Performance Standards

Cyclic meter reads

Section 2: Proposed MPF performance standards

Cyclic meter read KPIs

To what extent do you consider that the standards for the following KPIs are set at an appropriate level to incentivise good outcomes for all customers for...

Q No	Metric	Stakeholder	Responses	Rating				
				1 Strongly oppose %	2 %	3 Neutral %	4 %	5 Strongly support %
2.1	M01 – Cyclic meter reads performed within SLA (non-smart meters) <i>Explanation: the performance standard retailers would be required to meet when reading traditional (not smart) meters on a routine ('cyclic') basis.</i>	All	Total: 19	16	5	37	32	11
		Wholesalers	11 (58%)	9	-	27	45	18
		Retailers	7 (37%)	29	14	57	-	-
		Other (CCW)	1 (5%)	-	-	-	100	-
<p>Oppose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 43% of retailers 'oppose/strongly oppose' the proposal 9% of wholesalers 'strongly oppose' the proposal <p>Neutral</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 57% of retailers are neutral 27% of wholesalers are neutral <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No retailers support the proposal 63% of wholesalers 'support/strongly support' the proposal CCW supports the proposal 								

Section 2: Proposed MPF performance standards

Cyclic meter read KPIs

To what extent do you consider that the standards for the following KPIs are set at an appropriate level to incentivise good outcomes for all customers for...

Q No	Metric	Stakeholder	Responses	Rating				
				1 Strongly oppose %	2 %	3 Neutral %	4 %	5 Strongly support %
2.3	M02 – Proportion of cyclic meters read (smart meters) <i>Explanation: the proportion of smart meters retailers have read within the agreed timescales.</i>	All	Total: 19	26	5	42	16	11
		Wholesalers	11 (58%)	18	-	55	18	9
		Retailers	7 (37%)	43	14	29	-	14
		Other (CCW)	1 (5%)	-	-	-	100	-
<p>Oppose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 57% of retailers 'oppose/strongly oppose' the proposal 18% of wholesalers 'strongly oppose' the proposal <p>Neutral</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 29% of retailers are neutral 55% of wholesalers are neutral <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 14% of retailers 'strongly support' the proposal 27% of wholesalers 'support/strongly support' the proposal CCW supports the proposal 								

Section 2: Proposed MPF performance standards

Cyclic meter read KPIs

To what extent do you consider that the standards for the following KPIs are set at an appropriate level to incentivise good outcomes for all customers for...

Q No	Metric	Stakeholder	Responses	Rating				
				1 Strongly oppose %	2 %	3 Neutral %	4 %	5 Strongly support %
2.5	M19 – Cyclic non-market meters read within SLA (biannual or monthly) <i>Explanation: the proportion of non-market meters wholesalers have read within the agreed timescales</i>	All	Total: 18	11	22	22	33	11
		Wholesalers	11 (61%)	9	36	27	18	9
		Retailers	6 (33%)	17	-	17	50	17
		Other (CCW)	1 (6%)	-	-	-	100	-
<p>Oppose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 45% of wholesalers 'oppose/strongly oppose' the proposal 17% of retailers 'strongly oppose' the proposal <p>Neutral</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 27% of wholesalers are neutral 17% of retailers are neutral <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 27% of wholesalers 'support/strongly support' the proposal 67% of retailers 'support/strongly support' the proposal CCW supports the proposal 								

Section 2: Performance Standards

Transfer meter reads

Section 2: Proposed MPF performance standards

Transfer meter read KPIs

To what extent do you consider that the standards for the following KPIs are set at an appropriate level to incentivise good outcomes for all customers for...

Q No	Metric	Stakeholder	Responses	Rating				
				1 Strongly oppose %	2 %	3 Neutral %	4 %	5 Strongly support %
2.7	M04 – Proportion of successful transfer reads <i>Explanation: the proportion of meter reads the incoming retailer has carried out successfully when a customer is transferring to a new retailer.</i>	All	Total: 19	-	5	16	26	53
		Wholesalers	11 (58%)	-	9	18	18	55
		Retailers	7 (37%)	-	-	-	43	57
		Other (CCW)	1 (5%)	-	-	100	-	-
<p>Oppose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No retailers oppose the proposal 9% of wholesalers 'oppose' the proposal <p>Neutral</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No retailers are neutral 18% of wholesalers are neutral CCW is neutral <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100% of retailers 'support/strongly support' the proposal 73% of wholesalers 'support/strongly support' the proposal 								

Section 2: Proposed MPF performance standards

Transfer meter read KPIs

To what extent do you consider that the standards for the following KPIs are set at an appropriate level to incentivise good outcomes for all customers for...

Q No	Metric	Stakeholder	Responses	Rating				
				1 Strongly oppose %	2 %	3 Neutral %	4 %	5 Strongly support %
2.9	M06 – Lateness of missing transfer meter reads <i>Explanation: how late (i.e. how long after the SLA) the incoming retailer takes a meter reading for the customer that is switching to them.</i>	All	Total: 18	-	-	28	22	50
		Wholesalers	10 (56%)	-	-	30	20	50
		Retailers	7 (39%)	-	-	14	29	57
		Other (CCW)	1 (6%)	-	-	100	-	-
Oppose <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None Neutral <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 14% of retailers are neutral 30% of wholesalers are neutral CCW is neutral Support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 86% of retailers 'support/strongly support' the proposal 70% of wholesalers 'support/strongly support' the proposal 								

Section 2: Proposed MPF performance standards

Transfer meter read KPIs

To what extent do you consider that the standards for the following KPIs are set at an appropriate level to incentivise good outcomes for all customers for...

Q No	Metric	Stakeholder	Responses	Rating				
				1 Strongly oppose %	2 %	3 Neutral %	4 %	5 Strongly support %
2.11	M09 – Proportion of actual transfer meter reads <i>Explanation: the proportion of actual (rather than estimated) meter reads an incoming retailer takes when a customer is switching from their current retailer.</i>	All	Total: 18	17	28	22	22	11
		Wholesalers	10 (56%)	-	10	40	40	10
		Retailers	7 (39%)	43	43	-	-	14
		Other (CCW)	1 (6%)	-	100	-	-	-
	<p>Oppose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 86% of retailers 'oppose/strongly oppose' the proposal 10% of wholesalers 'oppose' the proposal CCW opposes the proposal <p>Neutral</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 40% of wholesalers are neutral <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 14% of retailers 'strongly support' the proposal 50% of wholesalers 'support/strongly support' the proposal 							

Section 3: Performance Charges

Cyclic meter reads

Section 3: Proposed MPF performance charges



Cyclic meter read KPIs

To what extent do you consider that the proposed charges for the following KPIs are more appropriate than the current framework's Market Performance Standards in incentivising good outcomes for all customers?

Q No	Metric	Stakeholder	Responses	Rating				
				1 Strongly oppose %	2 %	3 Neutral %	4 %	5 Strongly support %
3.1	M01 – Cyclic meter reads performed within SLA (non-smart meters) <i>Explanation: the performance standard retailers would be required to meet when reading traditional (not smart) meters on a routine ('cyclic') basis.</i>	All	Total: 20	15	15	20	30	20
		Wholesalers	12 (60%)	8	8	17	33	33
		Retailers	7 (35%)	29	14	29	29	-
		Other (CCW)	1 (5%)	-	100	-	-	-
		<p>Oppose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 43% of retailers 'oppose/strongly oppose' the proposal 16% of wholesalers 'oppose/strongly oppose' the proposal CCW opposes the proposal <p>Neutral</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 29% of retailers are neutral 17% of wholesalers are neutral <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 29% of retailers 'support' the proposal 66% of wholesalers 'support/strongly support' the proposal 						

Section 3: Proposed MPF performance charges



Cyclic meter read KPIs

To what extent do you consider that the proposed charges for the following KPIs are more appropriate than the current framework's Market Performance Standards in incentivising good outcomes for all customers?

Q No	Metric	Stakeholder	Responses	Rating				
				1 Strongly oppose %	2 %	3 Neutral %	4 %	5 Strongly support %
3.3	M02 – Proportion of cyclic meters read (smart meters) <i>Explanation: the proportion of smart meters retailers have read within the agreed timescales.</i>	All	Total: 18	22	17	22	28	11
		Wholesalers	10 (56%)	20	-	30	30	20
		Retailers	7 (39%)	29	29	14	29	-
		Other (CCW)	1 (6%)	-	100	-	-	-
<p>Oppose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 58% of retailers 'oppose/strongly oppose' the proposal 20% of wholesalers 'strongly oppose' the proposal CCW opposes the proposal <p>Neutral</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 14% of retailers are neutral 30% of wholesalers are neutral <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 29% of retailers 'support' the proposal 50% of wholesalers 'support/strongly support' the proposal 								

Section 3: Proposed MPF performance charges



Cyclic meter read KPIs

To what extent do you consider that the proposed charges for the following KPIs are more appropriate than the current framework's Market Performance Standards in incentivising good outcomes for all customers?

Q No	Metric	Stakeholder	Responses	Rating				
				1 Strongly oppose %	2 %	3 Neutral %	4 %	5 Strongly support %
3.5	M19 – Cyclic non-market meters read within SLA (biannual or monthly) <i>Explanation: the proportion of non-market meters wholesalers have read within the agreed timescales</i>	All	Total: 19	26	21	21	11	21
		Wholesalers	12 (63%)	33	25	25	-	17
		Retailers	6 (32%)	17	17	17	33	17
		Other (CCW)	1 (5%)	-	-	-	-	100
<p>Oppose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 58% of wholesalers 'oppose/strongly oppose' the proposal 34% of retailers 'oppose/strongly oppose' the proposal <p>Neutral</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 25% of wholesalers are neutral 17% of retailers are neutral <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 17% of wholesalers 'strongly support' the proposal 50% of retailers 'support/strongly support' the proposal CCW strongly supports the proposal 								

Section 3: Performance Charges

Transfer meter reads

Section 3: Proposed MPF performance charges



Transfer meter read KPIs

To what extent do you consider that the proposed charges for the following KPIs are more appropriate than the current framework's Market Performance Standards in incentivising good outcomes for all customers?

Q No	Metric	Stakeholder	Responses	Rating				
				1 Strongly oppose %	2 %	3 Neutral %	4 %	5 Strongly support %
3.7	M04 – Proportion of successful transfer reads <i>Explanation: the proportion of meter reads the incoming retailer has carried out successfully when a customer is transferring to a new retailer.</i>	All	Total: 18	11	11	22	17	39
		Wholesalers	10 (56%)	10	10	20	10	50
		Retailers	7 (39%)	14	14	14	29	29
		Other (CCW)	1 (6%)	-	-	100	-	-
<p>Oppose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 28% of retailers 'oppose/strongly oppose' the proposal • 20% of wholesalers 'oppose/strongly oppose' the proposal <p>Neutral</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14% of retailers are neutral • 20% of wholesalers are neutral • CCW is neutral <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 58% of retailers 'support/strongly support' the proposal • 60% of wholesalers 'support/strongly support' the proposal 								

Section 3: Proposed MPF performance charges



Transfer meter read KPIs

To what extent do you consider that the proposed charges for the following KPIs are more appropriate than the current framework's Market Performance Standards in incentivising good outcomes for all customers?

Q No	Metric	Stakeholder	Responses	Rating				
				1 Strongly oppose %	2 %	3 Neutral %	4 %	5 Strongly support %
3.9	M06 – Lateness of missing transfer meter reads <i>Explanation: how late (i.e. how long after the SLA) the incoming retailer takes a meter reading for the customer that is switching to them.</i>	All	Total: 18	6	-	28	28	39
		Wholesalers	10 (56%)	-	-	30	20	50
		Retailers	7 (39%)	14	-	29	29	29
		Other (CCW)	1 (6%)	-	-	-	100	-
		<p>Oppose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14% of retailers 'strongly oppose' the proposal • No wholesalers oppose the proposal <p>Neutral</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 29% of retailers are neutral • 30% of wholesalers are neutral <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 58% of retailers 'support/strongly support' the proposal • 70% of wholesalers 'support/strongly support' the proposal • CCW supports the proposal 						

Section 3: Proposed MPF performance charges



Transfer meter read KPIs

To what extent do you consider that the proposed charges for the following KPIs are more appropriate than the current framework's Market Performance Standards in incentivising good outcomes for all customers?

Q No	Metric	Stakeholder	Responses	Rating				
				1 Strongly oppose %	2 %	3 Neutral %	4 %	5 Strongly support %
3.11	M09 – Proportion of actual transfer meter reads <i>Explanation: the proportion of actual (rather than estimated) meter reads an incoming retailer takes when a customer is switching from their current retailer.</i>	All	Total: 19	11	11	26	16	37
		Wholesalers	11 (58%)	9	9	18	18	45
		Retailers	7 (37%)	14	14	29	14	29
		Other (CCW)	1 (5%)	-	-	100	-	-
	<p>Oppose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 28% of retailers 'oppose/strongly oppose' the proposal • 18% of wholesalers 'oppose/strongly oppose' the proposal <p>Neutral</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 29% of retailers are neutral • 18% of wholesalers are neutral • CCW is neutral <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 43% of retailers 'support/strongly support' the proposal • 63% of wholesalers 'support/strongly support' the proposal 							

Section 4: Other questions

Section 4: Other

Q No	Metric	Stakeholder	Responses	Rating				
				1 Strongly oppose %	2 %	3 Neutral %	4 %	5 Strongly support %
4.1	Performance Assurance Committee (PAC) To what extent do you support the proposal for the PAC to be able to adjust performance standards for a given KPI up or down by 5 percentage points once in any given 12-month period?	All	Total: 19	11	11	16	47	16
Wholesalers		11 (58%)	-	9	-	64	27	
Retailers		7 (37%)	14	14	43	29	-	
Other (CCW)		1 (5%)	100	-	-	-	-	
	<p>Oppose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 28% of retailers 'oppose/strongly oppose' the proposal • 9% of wholesalers 'oppose' the proposal • CCW strongly opposes the proposal <p>Neutral</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No wholesalers are neutral • 43% of retailers are neutral <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 29% of retailers 'support' the proposal • 91% of wholesalers 'support/strongly support' the proposal 							

Section 4: Other

Q No	Metric	Stakeholder	Responses	Rating				
				1 Strongly oppose %	2 %	3 Neutral %	4 %	5 Strongly support %
4.3	Performance charge cap To what extent do you agree that the cap on total performance charges does not need to be updated prior to implementing the Phase 1 KPIs?	All	Total: 19	16	16	5	5	58
		Wholesalers	11 (58%)	-	18	9	9	64
		Retailers	7 (37%)	29	14	14	-	43
		Other (CCW)	1 (5%)	100	-	-	-	-
	<p>Oppose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 43% of retailers 'oppose/strongly oppose' the proposal • 18% of wholesalers 'oppose' the proposal • CCW strongly opposes <p>Neutral</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14% of retailers are neutral • 9% of wholesalers are neutral <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 43% of retailers 'strongly support' the proposal • 73% of wholesalers 'support/strongly support' the proposal 							

MOSL

mpreform@mosl.co.uk

Your water bill

