

Minutes of Panel Meeting 41

31 March 2020 | 10:30 – 15:45

Telecon Only

Status of the Minutes: **Final**

MEMBERS PRESENT

Jim Keohane	JK	Chair	Mike Rathbone	MR	Panel Member (Wholesaler)
Mike Brindle	MBr	Panel Member (Associated Retailer)	Helyn Mensah	HM	Panel Member (Independent)
Chris Williams	CW	Panel Member (Associated Retailer)	Elsa Wye	EW	Panel Member (Independent)
Trevor Nelson	TN	Panel Member (Unassociated Retailer)	John Vinson	JV	Panel Member (Independent)
Nicola Smith	NS	Panel Member (Unassociated Retailer)	Mike Keil	MK	Panel Member (Customer Representative)
Claire Yeates	CY	Panel Member (Unassociated Retailer)	Sarah McMath	SM	Affiliated Panel Member (MOSL)
Julian Tranter	JT	Alternate Panel Member (Wholesaler)	Adam Richardson	AR	Panel Secretary
Martin Marvin	MM	Panel Member (Wholesaler)			

OTHER ATTENDEES

Steve Arthur	SA	MOSL (Presenter)	Christopher Wright	CWr	Presenter (Castle Water)
Scott Christie	SC	Credit Committee member (Presenter)	Antoine Schmidt	AS	Observer (Thames Water)
Huw Comerford	HC	MOSL (Presenter)	Pamela Taylor	PT	Observer (Incoming Independent Panel Member)
Stuart Boyle	SB	MOSL (Presenter)	Anne Heal	AH	Observer (MOSL Independent Board Member)
Ivy Mandinyenya	IM	MOSL (Secretariat)	Christina Blackwell	CB	Observer (CC Water)
George Kelly	GK	MOSL (Secretariat)	Evan Joannette	EJ	MOSL (Observer)
Charles Unvala	CU	MOSL (Observer)	Oliver Robins	OR	MOSL (Observer)
Amanda Hinde	AH	MOSL (Observer)	George Monea	GM	MOSL (Observer)

APOLOGIES

Mark Holloway		Panel Member (Wholesaler)	Dan Mason		Affiliated Panel Member (Ofwat)
---------------	--	---------------------------	-----------	--	---------------------------------

1. Welcome and Introductions

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed the Panel Members and all other attendees to Panel Meeting 41.
- 1.2 The Chair ran through the attendees' present and the agenda. It was noted that Ofwat could not attend and therefore there was no Ofwat update.
- 1.3 The Chair further noted that Martin Mavin (MM) would be able to join in the meeting only from 11:00am onwards.

2. Draft Recommendation Report: CPM022 Reducing Panel Quorum (Urgent)

- 2.1 Huw Comerford (HC) provided an overview of [CPM022](#) which was raised due to the fact that one of the two currently appointed Associated Retailer Panel Members was due to resign from the Panel on 31 March 2020. Repeated calls for Associated Retailer Panel Members had been unsuccessful in filling the vacant position. This meant the Panel would be unable to achieve quorum from April 2020 onwards.
- 2.2 The Panel was invited to agree with the proposed solution to remove the quorum requirement of two Associated Retailer Panel members and two Unassociated Panel members and replace it with a requirement for three Retailer Panel members (either Associated or Unassociated). The proposed implementation date was on or before 28 April 2020 to be in time for the next Panel meeting.
- 2.3 A Panel member questioned the link between CPM022 and the issues surrounding Panel quorum. The Chair confirmed that the paper set out to reduce the risk that Panel decisions could not be made throughout April if quorum could not be met due to illness/absence.
- 2.4 One member stated that they did not agree with the change proposal on the grounds that it did not address the wider question of a reduction in the number of Retailer Members attending the Panel. They felt the balance of Panel Member types should be maintained by potentially removing the distinction between Unassociated Retailer seats and Associated Retailer seats. Overall, they felt that if a change to quorum was to be made, it should be a short term, temporary solution for *only* for the minimum amount of time required to appoint the replacement identified in recent MOSL communications. They suggested the proposal should be timebound so that the quorum goes back to 'normal' as soon as possible.
- 2.5 The proposer, MOSL, considered that this proposal offered the minimum possible change given the urgency of the situation, rather than proposing changes in Panel composition. The importance of the Panel being able to make decisions over the next 6-8 weeks was paramount in light of the ongoing COVID-19 situation. It was agreed to proceed with the change and to include a 'sunset clause' for the end of May. MOSL would take the discussions on amending the legal drafting offline with HM.

ACTION: A41_01

- 2.6 The Panel:
 - **AGREED** (unanimous, 11 votes) to recommend to Ofwat the implementation of CPM022; and

- **AGREED** (unanimous, 11 votes) to recommend implementation three working days after Ofwat decision; and on or before 28 April 2020.

3. Draft Recommendation Report: CPM024 Housekeeping alignment of CPM020 with CPM023 (Urgent)

3.1 Stuart Boyle (SB) presented CMP024 which set out housekeeping changes to the Market Arrangements Code which were due to be amended to effect [CPM020 \('Priority Performance Regime Changes for April 2020'\)](#) but had been changed as a result of [CPM023 \('Suspension of Performance Standard Charges'\)](#) implemented on 23 March 2020. The housekeeping changes were necessary to preserve the intent of CPM023 to suspend Performance Standard Charges in March 2020, April 2020 and May 2020.

3.2 The Panel:

- **AGREED** (unanimous, 11 votes) to recommend to Ofwat the implementation of CPM024; and
- **AGREED** (unanimous, 11 votes) to recommend implementation on 1 April 2020.

4. Draft Recommendation Report: CPW094 Temporary Changes to Disconnections (Urgent Authority Timetabled Change)

4.1 The Panel considered CPW094 which sought to temporarily prevent Wholesalers from disconnecting Self-Supply Retailers for non-payment of charges during the COVID-19 pandemic.

4.2 It was noted that the intent of this change was to ensure the code provisions relating to Self-Supply Retailers were consistent with changes to the Customer Protection Code of Practice made by Ofwat.

4.3 One Panel member questioned the use of the word 'due' in the legal drafting; as the intent of the change seemed to them as if the Self-Supply Retailers will be obtaining 'free water' as a result of the change. MOSL confirmed that the charges payable would still be owed and had to be paid after the COVID-19 pandemic.

4.4 The Panel noted that this change sought only to remove the possibility for a Self-Supply Retailer to become disconnected for the period set out in the proposal and there would be no change to monies owed during this period or the payment terms.

4.5 A member questioned why Self-Supply Retailers could not pay any monies if they had them available and wanted to pay, and whether the language could be written less ambiguously. It was confirmed that the wording could be changed and that the Self-Supply Retailer indeed should pay monies owed if they are able to – payment or non-payment of owed monies would not have any bearing on the temporary ban on disconnection which this proposal aimed to introduce.

4.6 The Panel agreed on four elements concerning this change proposal:

- a. The proposal did not affect the willingness for Self-Supply Retailers to pay Wholesalers in respect of these charges which may be accrued.

- b. The proposal applied to just the narrow issue of disconnection.
- c. A further legal drafting check would be arranged by MOSL to ensure this change is focused on disconnection only.

ACTION: A41_02

- d. In reviewing the legal drafting, the wording in the market codes, and the Customer Code of Practice should be completely aligned.

ACTION: A41_03

4.7 The Panel:

- **AGREED** (unanimous, 11 votes) to recommend to Ofwat the implementation of CPW094; and
- **AGREED** (unanimous, 11 votes) to recommend implementation on 8 April 2020.

5. Minutes and Outstanding Actions

Martin Mavin joined the meeting.

5.1 The Panel approved the minutes for meeting 40.

5.2 The Panel agreed to close the following actions; A40_01, 04, 08, 09, 10, 12, 13, 14

6. MOSL Update

6.1 Steve Arthur (SA) presented a general business overview for MOSL in place of SM.

6.2 It was noted that MOSL would continue to focus on BAU activities; there was no major impact of COVID on the day to day business activities of MOSL.

6.3 SA outlined additional activities in relation to COVID-19. There would be a new suite of daily reports circulated for vacancy status rejections given the volume of these requests coming into MOSL over the next few weeks.

6.4 SA stated that there would be no new IPRP/PRP requests coming through but those already open should remain open. There would be discussions how this would continue over the coming months.

6.5 High level group meetings were noted to be continuing throughout the COVID-19 pandemic between MOSL and senior decision makers from DEFRA, Ofwat, Water UK and UK Water Retail Council. This group also included representatives from Wholesalers and Retailers.

6.6 SA flagged that there would be no MPOP update as per the original Agenda. Panel feedback on this discussion would be given in the April meetings.

6.7 Panel members requested visibility on who attended the high level group and the matters it had discussed.

ACTION: A41_04

- 6.8 A member noted and affirmed the importance of monitoring pre and post COVID performance with reference to IPRP and PRPs and how they would be managed over the coming months. EW stated that she aimed to update the Panel on this by week ending 12 April 2020.

ACTION: A41_05

- 6.9 SA updated Panel where timelines for work had been altered; it was noted that the annual report 'lookback piece' was still to be produced on time. R-MeX was to be deferred to later in the year so as to not to burden retailers now – this would be further discussed at the MPC meeting.
- 6.10 The Chair stated that any impacts on MOSL's business plan could be discussed at the Panel workshop, due to the impacts and implications of COVID-19 and the read-across between the MOSL business plan and the Panel plan.
- 6.11 One Panel member noted that there was a need as an industry to keep the market driving forward and was hopeful of this outcome from the MPC meeting discussion regarding IPRP/PRPs. Another Panel member recognised the challenges faced by Trading Parties due to COVID-19, and warned against unrealistic expectations that things will continue as BAU particularly as meter readings had all but ceased.

7. Committee Reports

Trading Disputes Committee (TDC)

- 7.1 JV reported there had been no new disputes and the TDC was raising a change proposal for a unified disputes process.

Trade Effluent Committee (TEIC)

- 7.2 EJ stated that the March meeting was the last TEIC meeting. Notwithstanding slight amendments to a miscellaneous guidance documents required by a few Committee members, the Committee was happy that the workplan was delivered and achieved what it set out to do. EJ noted there would be a 'mop up' session in April to tie up the loose ends, but this would not be a formal TEIC meeting. One Panel member questioned that as TEIC was winding down, what would happen to the outstanding work on the miscellaneous guidance notes. The member requested comfort that there would be no imbalance between Wholesalers and Retailers for decision making in this area of huge importance. EJ noted that there would be no imbalance between Wholesalers and Retailers with these final activities and all members were happy to see things through and volunteer their time to complete this work.

General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) Issues Committee

- 7.3 HM updated that the last meeting (26 March 2020) was cancelled due to lack of resource, unrelated to COVID-19. HM noted that the next meeting in April (30 April 2020) would address Data Subject Rights Requests continuing discussions in previous meetings.

Credit Committee

- 7.4 AR updated that a short teleconference was undertaken to address high level issues and questions in relation to the credit issue arising from CPW079 'Protections for Credit Support Security' that the Panel had requested the committee investigate. The Panel noted that CPW080 'Simplification of the Default and Termination Process' might not be brought to Panel at the end of April as there was further work to be done. This would be kept under review for the time being.

Market Performance Committee (MPC)

- 7.5 Elsa Wye (EW) updated on the work of this committee. There would be a meeting regarding the Market Performance responses to COVID-19 on the 1 April 2020. EW made reference to the the first formal escalation which did not receive any comments or questions from Panel but invited members to discuss this outside the meeting if any members felt it was needed.
- 7.6 The Chair confirmed that EW was covering the role of chair of MPC until the end of March 2020. While EW had enjoyed the role, she did not wish to continue this role beyond what was necessary. She would be happy to stay in this role to end of June 2020 until a new chair was appointed, and would revert to her role as Chair of Disputes Committee. The Chair noted that one question was whether this role could be split into two roles or chaired by MOSL.
- 7.7 The Panel considered there should be discussion between MOSL and EW to evaluate options moving forward. The Chair noted that one wholesaler and one retailer would be needed for this; one Panel member who is part of MPC and one not. TN offered to help with this.
- 7.8 The Chair would approach a selection of people who are currently part of the Panel for assistance and thinking through options for the MPC Chair moving forward, to select two members to assist the Chair in this decision-making process.

ACTION: A41_06

8. Change Report

- 8.1 Stuart Boyle (SB) provided an update on the Change Report.
- 8.2 SB informed the Panel that the consultation period for change proposals would be extended during the COVID-19 pandemic period.
- 8.3 A Panel member suggested some of the newly proposed changes should be accelerated to assist the market in light of COVID-19's impact on meter reading. SB noted that due to the fact these are CMOS affecting, MOSL was looking at May 2021 as the earliest implementation. MOSL confirmed it would explore options for earlier implementation of these new changes.

ACTION: A41_07

- 8.4 SB provided an update on amended Change Proposals. The Panel noted the reasons behind the delays and agreed to the new timelines for CPW067, CPW069 and CPW085.

- 8.5 A Panel member expressed some concerns about how the TEIC would be able to review CPW085 consultation responses as TEIC would be winding up. The Chair of TEIC informed the Panel that they would be meeting for the last time informally to tie up loose ends and in regards to CPW085 they had already reviewed responses in their last meeting.

9. Change Proposal Plan: CPM021 Panel Membership Voting

- 9.1 The Panel considered the Change Plan for [CPM021 'Panel Membership and Voting Rights'](#). This change sought to amend the membership of the Panel.
- 9.2 MOSL proposed that the Panel defer CPM021 due to the possibility that the scope of Ofwat's 'RISE' Project could overlap with the scope of CPM021. SB identified three possible outcomes of this change:
- Covered by 'RISE' and this change could be withdrawn
 - Progress and implement so 2021 Elections would not be required
 - Progress and reject so 2021 Elections would be required
- 9.3 The Chair asked for an update regarding the 'RISE' project, to which AR said that the timing of this work from Ofwat was affected by COVID-19 events, and that Ofwat updates on this had been deferred. It was suggested updates may not be likely until end of April/May 2020.
- 9.4 A Panel member suggested that this change proposal should be kept under review depending on the outcome of the new Associated Member joining the Panel.
- 9.5 The Panel requested MOSL to build CPM021 into the MOSL/Panel Business plan to determine if this proposal could be progressed between March and July 2020.

ACTION: A41_08

- 9.6 The Panel:
- **AGREED** to postpone further work on this change; and (Unanimous, 12 votes)
 - **AGREED** to review this change in July 2020. (Unanimous, 12 votes)

10. Draft Recommendation Report: CPW086 Unsecured Credit Allowance - Rebalancing

- 10.1 Christopher Wright (CWr) presented [CPW086 'Unsecured Credit Allowance – Rebalancing'](#). This change sought to treat a Credit Assessment Score of 10 as equivalent to a Minimum Credit Rating for the purpose of accessing an Unsecured Credit Allowance (UCA) of 40%.
- 10.2 Some Panel members questioned whether the Panel needed to seek expert technical advice in order to make a definitive decision as there might be unintended consequences.
- 10.3 A Panel member stated that they believed the issue highlighted in the proposal was not prevalent across the market, and one potential way to resolve this would be the full removal of any UCA based on credit rating. This would remove both the equivalence issue and the potential unbalance between UCAs. It was noted very few Retailers access the 40% UCA.

- 10.4 To a Panel member's question on whether this proposal had been sent to the Credit Committee, AR replied it hadn't, explaining that the Panel had noted in January 2020 that the change was straightforward conceptually and that it was unlikely there would be alternative solutions to the basic proposal. On this basis, the Panel had decided to proceed to industry consultation. AR noted that CPW086 was a standalone change proposal which should be viewed on its own merit. If further work was required, the Panel needed to be very clear on what questions had to be answered.
- 10.5 Some Panel members were supportive of the direction but were concerned that the proposal needed to be more holistic in regard to the overall credit rules.
- 10.6 The Chair noted that there were some recurring themes; the technicality of the paper, timing concerns (with respect to other credit issues and their implementation dates with the COVID-19 situation), and equivalence of ratings and scores.
- 10.7 The Panel asked if the Proposer still wanted to go ahead with the vote or withdraw to rethink the solution based on some of the Panel's concerns or if it should be remitted to credit committee. CW stated he was not minded to consider the proposed solution further and would prefer that the Panel vote on the Change Proposal.
- 10.8 The Panel:
- **AGREED** to recommend CPW086 to Ofwat for rejection (3 in favour, 2 against, 7 abstained)¹
- 10.9 Two Panel members that voted against felt that there was no evidence that Retailers were being discriminated against and there was insufficient evidence of equivalence in credit ratings and scores to justify the proposed remedy. One Panel member further felt that given the proposal had not been considered by the Credit Committee, any changes to credit arrangements made on a piece meal and narrow technical basis risked imbalance that the market needed to function effectively. They felt that the solution was not proportionate as it gave a large credit facility to existing Retailers without them having to do anything.
- 10.10 Of the seven Panel members that abstained, they did so on the grounds of inadequate technical evidence for increasing UCA. Two of the Panel members acknowledged that access to higher credit is a market issue, but the proposal did not provide sufficient evidence on how the proposed calibration of the UCA would help the market. One Panel member said that they would support a more level playing field but CPW086 has not provided the technical basis on why UCA should be increased for the top credit score. Two Panel members said that they would like more legal justification on whether the current difference in UCAs was a Competition Act issue.

Implementation Date

- 10.11 The Chair noted that due to the votes received CPW086 the proposal would be recommended to Ofwat for rejection but invited the Panel to vote on the implementation date.

¹ the qualifying majority of 'simple majority plus one vote' was not reached so the decision defaults to 'reject'.

- 10.12 Seven Panel members voted against, two voted in favour and three abstained from the initial proposed implementation dates of:
- 1 June 2020 if Ofwat approval is received by 10 May 2020.
 - 1st of the month at least 15 Business Days after Ofwat approval if approval is received after 10 May 2020.
- 10.13 Some Panel members felt that if CPW086 was approved by Ofwat, it would not be appropriate to implement it until the COVID-19 pandemic had ended. Others didn't feel comfortable voting on the implementation date if they abstained on recommending the change.
- 10.14 The Panel:
- **AGREED** to recommend 1st of the month at least 15 Business Days after Ofwat approval and subject to Ofwat having determined that the COVID-19 pandemic has been substantially resolved (10 in favour, 1 against, 1 abstained).
- 10.15 One Panel member voted for the original date of implementation as this was a period where Retailers needed access to cash and drew comparison to the Scottish market where requirements for pre-payment by Retailers have been removed during the COVID-19 pandemic. Another Panel member abstained as it was uncertain whether CPW086 would be better implemented in a business-as-usual context.

11. Draft Recommendation Report: CPW061 Unsecured Credit Allowance based on Payment History

- 11.1 Scott Christie (SC) presented [CPW061 'Unsecured Credit Allowance based on Payment History'](#) which sought to introduce a new route for Retailers looking to gain an Unsecured Credit Allowance (UCA) with their Wholesalers based on strong payment history.
- 11.2 It was noted that the majority of the industry respondents supported the change. There were some concerns from Ofwat and other respondents which had been addressed by the Credit Committee. SC continued to highlight that there were two solutions tabled - the Proposed Solution which allowed stacking of payment history UCA with other UCA subject to a maximum combined UCA of 40%, and an Alternative Solution that was non-stackable. SC explained that the Credit Committee was split on whether to recommend the Proposed over the Alternative solution.
- 11.3 A Panel member questioned whether there were any quantifiable figures as to what would be the change in credit amount, and the associated cost and risk of each solution. SC stated there was not.
- 11.4 The Panel:
- **AGREED** the CPW061 Proposed Solution facilitated the principles and objectives of the WRC better than current arrangements (11 in favour, 1 against);
 - **AGREED** the CPW061 Alternative Solution facilitated the principles and objectives of the WRC better than current arrangements (Unanimous);

- **AGREED** to recommend the Proposed Solution over the Alternative Solution to Ofwat for implementation (7 in favour, 3 against, 2 abstained)
 - **AGREED** to recommend, if implemented, an implementation date of 1st of the month with at least 15 Business Days after Ofwat approval and subject to Ofwat having determined that the COVID-19 pandemic has been substantially resolved.
- 11.5 The Panel Member that voted against the Proposed Solution stated that it would grant significant credit reductions to established Retailers without the need for them to make any change in behavior, performance, and risk profile. They further explained that the provision to achieve a 40% UCA through a stackable form of payment history UCA would introduce an incentive for timely payment (which is not the principal aim of CPW061 nor a key market need) and could also allow larger established Retailers to pick and choose where to optimise their financial position when experiencing cash flow difficulties. The Panel Member suggested that the Alternative solution would achieve the intended and proportionate benefits for new and smaller Retailers without any of these adverse effects.
- 11.6 Seven Panel Members voted in favour of recommending the Proposed solution over the Alternative solution to the Authority for approval, based on the arguments as set out in Section 5 of the Draft Recommendation Report.
- 11.7 Three Panel Members voted in favour of the Alternative Solution; one did so for the reasons outlined above, another on the basis that the arguments in favour of the Proposed solution were insufficient to refute Ofwat's concerns, and the third because they saw no evidence to suggest that a stackable PP UCA option would provide a greater customer benefit than a non-stackable PP UCA option.
- 11.8 Two Panel members abstained because they could not express a preference for one solution over the other.
- 11.9 The Panel considered that the implementation date should be changed to better reflect the state of play in the market with regards to the COVID-19 pandemic. Therefore, the Panel agreed to recommend that should the Proposed or Alternative solution to CPW061 be approved, it should be implemented on:
- the 1st of the month, subject to this being at least 15 Business Days after Ofwat's approval and after Ofwat's determination that COVID-19 pandemic has been substantially resolved.

12. Review of Rollover Detection Algorithm

- 12.1 The Panel considered the Review of the Rollover Detection Algorithm. The Panel noted that the Market Operator was obliged under the codes to review the Rollover Detection Algorithm (RDA) annually and make recommendations to the Panel on whether a change proposal should be raised to change aspects of the algorithm.
- 12.2 The Panel:
- **AGREED** no change is required to the Rollover Detection Algorithm (Unanimous, 12 votes);

- **AGREED** for MOSL to review the Rollover Detection Algorithm in the first quarter of 2021 (Unanimous, votes).

13. Review of ICAP and YCAP

- 13.1 The Panel considered the Review of the Icap and Ycap parameters used in volume estimation after the meter's latest reading (the 'meter post-advance periods'). The Panel noted that the Market Operator was obliged under the codes to review the caps annually and make recommendations to the Panel on whether a Change Proposal should be raised to amend either of them.
- 13.2 A Panel member questioned how this review would impact the vacancy change proposal ([CPW091 'Temporary changes to vacancy'](#)) which allows Retailers to use Yearly Volume Estimates (YVE) to cap forward estimates.
- 13.3 AR stated parties would need to take into account how the Ycap mechanism worked when setting YVE values in circumstances outlined in the guidance. If the Panel determined that a change was required to the Icap or Ycap value, depending on what the change was the guidance would be updated accordingly. The Panel noted the guidance was on the website.
- 13.4 The Panel:
- **AGREED** the volume estimating caps required no change; and (Unanimous, 12 votes)
 - **AGREED** to review the caps in the last quarter of the financial year 2020/21 (Unanimous, 12 votes)

14. Any other Business

- 14.1 Panel members questioned whether MOSL would be providing an update on its CGI contract and strategy as part of MOSL business plan objectives was to increase flexibility for dealing with change and that included CMOS releases. The Chair informed the Panel that this item was on the agenda for discussion by the Board of MOSL in April and John Davies would be providing an update at the April workshop.
- 14.2 A Panel member requested MOSL provide an update on what steps they are taking to react to the urgent Change Proposals approved over recent days and to identify unintended consequences and next steps as a result of those. The Panel asked how MOSL would be planning to return to BAU and the appropriate time for doing so. The Chair stated that the Board had the same question and it was agreed to defer to the April workshop so that the SLT could revisit the Panel plan and MOSL business plan to see what changes would be required.
- 14.3 Steve Arthur had spoken about monitoring being put in place and a series of aspects to that monitoring being rolling out. MOSL was looking at what the medium-term amendments might need to be and that was absolutely the focus of MOSL's attention for the next couple of weeks. The changes recommended the previous Friday had a short-term effect and everyone recognised the urgent need to provide certainty and clarity and MOSL continued to work closely with Ofwat.
- 14.4 The Chair thanked MOSL for the work that they had been carrying out on urgent changes in the last couple of days.

- 14.5 Some Panel members requested in the next meeting to have a status update to check if the market was behaving as expected as a result of these urgent changes and if anything needed changing.
- 14.6 The Chair reminded the Panel that he had sent an email about his departure as MOSL and Panel Chair. The MOSL board would be commencing recruitment of a new chair and this was an opportunity to separate the role of the Panel chair from MOSL. The March meeting had supported the separation of roles and Ofwat were also content with the idea.
- 14.7 A Panel member questioned whether the appointment of these roles should be undertaken by Ofwat instead of MOSL due to project RISE. The Chair stated that the Panel should appoint this role, as Ofwat did not have any involvement with the Panel chair.
- 14.8 The Panel noted work on what this change might look like was with AR. A paper would be presented to the meeting in April as there was limited time for this change to take place. Another Panel member stated that due to COVID-19 there was a need to be careful as everyone was quite swamped with workload.
- 14.9 The Panel noted this was Chris William's last Panel meeting and thanked him for his work. The Chair also thanked John Vinson for his work as a Panel Member and noted that he would revert back to an alternate independent Panel Member.

15. Actions

Action Number	Action
A41_01	Secretariat to add in sunset clause in CMP022 for the end of May 2020, correct drafting in MAC (retain word 'retailer' and remove word 'and') and review with HM.
A41_02	Secretariat to review legal drafting with respect to CPW094 to ensure the change is focused on disconnection
A41_03	Secretariat to request the wording of the code, and the code of practise in relation to CPW094 are completely aligned.
A41_04	Secretariat to provide updates to Panel members on visibility/transparency on how Panel groups are structured and who is involved in each group, as well as updates on Panel group decisions made 'elsewhere' so that the Panel don't make further decisions 'in a silo'.
A41_05	SA/EW to update Panel by 12/04/2020 on how the IPRP/PRP request process will change after meetings with the NPC regarding these requests
A41_06	Chair to approach Panel Members for assistance with moving forward on the MPC chair – ensure TN is consulted.
A41_07	MOSL to update Panel on negotiations with CGI and options for release flexibility.
A41_07	MOSL to include evaluation of CPM021 into MOSL/Panel Business plan to determine when this proposal could be progressed

