

Minutes of Panel Meeting 16

27th February 2018 | 10:30 – 15:30
4th floor, 16-18 Monument Street, London, EC3R 8AJ

Status of the Minutes: Final

MEMBERS PRESENT

Margaret Beels	MB	Alternate Panel Chair	Richard Moore (via teleconference)	RM	Panel Member (Unassociated Retailer)
Mike Brindle	MBr	Panel Member (Associated Retailer)	Mark Holloway	MH	Panel Member (Wholesaler)
Kirstie King	KK	Alternate Panel Member (Associated Retailer)	Howard Smith	HS	Panel Member (Wholesaler)
Wendy Monk	WM	Panel Member (Associated Retailer)	Dylan Freeman	DF	Panel Member (for Wholesaler)
Helyn Mensah (via teleconference)	HM	Panel Member (Independent)	Dan Mason	DM	Affiliated Panel Member (Ofwat)
Nigel Sisman	NS	Panel Member (Independent)	Chris Scoggins	CS	Affiliated Panel Member (MOSL)
Elsa Wye	EW	Panel Member (Independent)	Evan Joannette	CB	Alternate Affiliated Panel Member (CCWater)
Trevor Nelson	TN	Panel Member (Unassociated Retailer)	Adam Richardson	AR	Panel Secretary
Nicola Smith (via teleconference)	NS	Panel Member (Unassociated Retailer)			

OTHER ATTENDEES

Elliot Bird	Meeting Secretary	Chris Arnold	Presenter (MOSL)
Rebecca Mottram	Presenter (MOSL)	Steve Arthur	Observer (MOSL)
Abu Rashid	Presenter (MOSL)	Stephen Winnie	Observer (MOSL)
Mihai Ciurba	Presenter (MOSL)	Jon Vinson	Observer (Independent)
Michael Floyd	Presenter (United Utilities)	Paul Stelfox	Presenter (United Utilities)
Michael Robertson	Presenter (MOSL)		

APOLOGIES

Simon Wilshire	Panel Member (Associated Retailer)
Jim Keohane	Chair
Christina Blackwell	Affiliated Panel Member (CCWater)

1. Welcome and Introductions

Purpose: For Information

- 1.1. The Chair welcomed the Panel to the meeting.
- 1.2. The Chair extended apologies from Simon Wilshire, and informed the Panel that Kirstie King would take his place as an alternate Panel Member.

2. Minutes and Outstanding Actions

Purpose: For Decision

2.1. Minutes

- 2.2. The Panel agreed to the accuracy of the minutes of Panel meeting 15, including suggested amendments received prior to the meeting.

2.3. Actions

- 2.4. The Panel agreed to close 5 actions (**A14_02, A14_03, A14_04, A14_06, A15_01** and **A15_04**) from the previous meetings, based on the update provided by the Panel Secretariat.
- 2.5. The Panel agreed for a number of actions, relating to Panel branding and governance around CMOS releases, to remain open until the Panel strategy meeting in April 2018, where these items were to be discussed (**A08_05, A13_03** and **A14_01**).
- 2.6. The Chair requested an update on the actions which are currently open and have been for a number of months:
 - **A09_01**: Requested that MOSL provide analysis on the size of customers switching in the market. It was explained that MOSL was looking at a number of different options on how this could be determined. The Panel requested that analysis be provided even if it required some strong caveats. The Panel Secretary agreed to provide an update on the progress of this action in the May 2018 Panel meeting.
 - **A09_03**: Requested the MPC to monitor meter read submission data in the central system in order to determine whether any validation parameters need to be reconfigured or any further system controls were required. The Chair of the MPC confirmed that the MPC had planned to look at this but due to the current workload of the Committee an update would not be provided in the short-term.
 - **A12_01**: In recognition of the issues identified by the assessment of [CPW022 “New Connection Retailer Unknown”](#), the Panel requested that MOSL report on any other work arounds currently being used by Trading Parties that resolved issues in the central systems functionality. The Panel Secretariat advised that this item would be discussed at the April User Forum, and that an update would be provided at the May Panel meeting.

3. Update from Ofwat

Purpose: For Information

- 3.1. Dan Mason (DM) from Ofwat provided an update on the activities of Ofwat in the month since the previous Panel meeting, including the publishing of its [Forward Programme for 2018/19](#) for consultation.
- 3.2. DM provided an update on Change Proposals currently with the Authority, including the publication of the Authority decision to amend the implementation dates for [CPW022](#) and [CPW014](#) to align with the CMOS 4.0 release on 18th May 2018. In addition, the Authority decision to approve the implementation of [CPW027](#) was published on 26th February 2018. It was also noted that the Authority would publish its decision on the remaining Change Proposals later in the week ([CPW029](#), [CPM007](#), [CPM009](#)).
- 3.3. An update was provided on Ofwat's credit review, noting that a credit workshop with Trading Parties was held and KPMG would be publishing the findings report by the end of March 2018.
- 3.4. Panel Members requested that they could be provided with the minutes of the workshop which was raised as an action for DM.

ACTION 16_01

- 3.5. DM confirmed that the intention of the credit review was for Ofwat to determine its position once it had seen the report from KPMG. The report should indicate the scale of any issues and provide recommendations to Ofwat on how to address the issues identified.
- 3.6. DM also confirmed that Ofwat intend to arrange a request for information from Retailers on their credit costs, following suggestions from the credit workshop. However, it was also indicated that there may not be sufficient time to do this before KPMG's report and it may be undertaken following the publishing of the report.
- 3.7. DM also provided a summary of the Ofwat consultation on the proposed licensing regime changes as part of action **A15_01** from the previous meeting.
- 3.8. DM highlighted that Ofwat was also planning to consult on how license fees are calculated for Retailers later in the week.
- 3.9. The Panel **NOTED** the presentation from Ofwat.

4. Update from MOSL

Purpose: For Information

- 4.1. Chris Scoggins (CS) provided an update on the key activities at MOSL, including the Market Audit interim report that had been provided to the Panel and the MOSL response, noting that this would be discussed later on at the meeting.
- 4.2. CS provided an update for the Digital Strategy Committee (DSC), noting that at its recent meeting the Committee discussed bilaterals and the questionnaire it issued to assess the business impact of the current way bilaterals are operated. Responses were very supportive of finding improved approaches to bilaterals, and the DSC has begun to identify a number of options. DSC has also been looking at how

emerging technologies such as blockchain could be of benefit to the market, and work was underway to develop concepts for consideration.

- 4.3. At the February 2018 [User Forum](#), key items for discussion included current work on customer complaint reporting and [CPW033 \(Meter Effective to Date in the MDS METER Report\)](#). CS also highlighting that the March 2018 User Forum meeting was cancelled due to a lack of business raised by Trading Parties and the unavailability of presenters for industry-led items.
- 4.4. CS reported the ORWG decision to move the March 2019 release to May 2019 and the September 2019 release to November 2019. This was due to feedback from Trading Parties on avoiding times of key business activities and keeping the releases evenly spaced.
- 4.5. CS also provided an update on the Market Issues register mentioned at the previous meeting, explaining that MOSL was developing a view on all of issues it was aware of. It was noted that currently there were more than 30 issues on the list, and therefore there was still more work to be done before being brought to the Panel.
- 4.6. The Panel **NOTED** the presentation from MOSL.

5. [Change Report](#)

Purpose: For Information

- 5.1. The Panel considered the monthly update on the status and progress of code Change Proposals, and the activity which occurred between the 17th January 2018 and the 13th February 2018.
- 5.2. The Panel Secretariat highlighted a number of updates made to the Change Report, including that Appendix C had been updated to include the change budget for the current and next financial year, including the anticipated release costs for releases planned so far.
- 5.3. The Panel Secretariat also provided an update on a Panel Action from the January meeting (**A15_04**) in relation to MOSL estimating the MOSL days effort to support the assessment of a number of changes, including CPW019 (Alternative Eligible Credit). The estimated effort was noted as the following:
 - CPW019 – 90 days MOSL effort;
 - CPW013 (Meter Reading Validation) – 55 days MOSL effort;
 - GDPR changes (CPW029 & CPM007) – 115 days MOSL effort; and
 - Market Performance Standards Review changes (CPW030 & CPM008) – 210 days MOSL effort.
- 5.4. The Panel agreed that the concept of MOSL days effort was useful in evaluating the priority of changes and how much resource is needed to support the development of a Change Proposal. It was agreed that this would be discussed at the Panel strategy meeting.
- 5.5. The Panel **NOTED** the contents of this paper.

6. Initial Written Assessment: CPW033 – Meter Effective to Date Field in MDS METER Report

Purpose: For Decision

- 6.1. The Panel considered a Change Proposal that sought to introduce a new field into the MDS_METER report. This change would allow users of the report to quickly identify which meters are active and which meters are inactive.
- 6.2. The presenter highlighted that the change sought to allow the differentiation between active and inactive meters within the MDS_Meter report. The change had been raised to simplify the regular reporting completed by Trading Parties on meter data, which, as matters stood, would normally require complex data manipulation.
- 6.3. A summary was provided of the responses to the Request for Information (RFI), which included 18 respondents made up of 10 Wholesalers and 8 Retailers. This RFI found that there was widespread support for the change, with all respondents agreeing that the benefits of implementing the change outweigh any costs.
- 6.4. The presenter highlighted that the implementation costs received from the central systems service provider indicated a cost of £10,131. The presenter noted that the recommended progression of the change was to include it in the September 2018 CMOS 5.0 release, if the Authority decision was made by the end of March, otherwise it will be included in the May 2019 release.
- 6.5. The Panel agreed with the Proposer's recommendation that the change furthers the following Principles and Objectives of the codes:
 - Efficiency,
 - Transparency, and
 - Simplicity.
- 6.6. The Panel also confirmed that the change would further the objective of proportionality, based on benefits of implementing the change outweighing any associated costs.
- 6.7. At a Panel Member's request, it was clarified that the "to date" field was an exclusive date rather than an inclusive date, in line with other fields of a similar type in CMOS. Panel Member's requested if MOSL could ensure this was clear in the drafting. In response, MOSL clarified that this date would not be inclusive and that this is common across all date fields in the system, which is already clarified in other documentation.
- 6.8. It was also requested that future consultations consider how respondents might express the potential costs of not implementing a change, as there were respondents who tried to express this in the Request for Information but found it difficult to do so. MOSL agreed to include this as an additional question to future consultations.
- 6.9. The Panel:
 - Unanimously **AGREED** to recommend implementation of CPW033 to the Authority; and
 - Unanimously **AGREED** the recommended implementation date on:
 - 28th September 2018 if Authority approval is received by 31st March 2018; or

- March 2019 if Authority approval is received after 31st March 2018.

7. Draft Recommendation Report: CPW026 – Removing SPID version design

Purpose: For Decision

- 7.1. The Panel considered a proposal to remove the concept of SPID version from the market codes, which would result in all SPIDs having their version changed to version “1”.
- 7.2. The presenter reported that CMA and Scottish Water had been engaged, and that they agreed with the proposed change. Scottish Water did recognise that SPID versioning would have some benefits, although did not believe that the issue was significant enough to be of concern at this stage.
- 7.3. The presenter highlighted that one Trading Party had disagreed with the proposed change because the documentation did not have a data correction approach. In response to this concern, MOSL had included an approach in Appendix A of the draft Recommendation Report. This approach suggested amending the implementation to September 2018, to allow sufficient time to complete the data correction exercise.
- 7.4. The presenter explained that there was an issue with the Operational Terms, as currently a paired SPID being erroneously deregistered is not listed as a reason to deregister a SPID. MOSL advised that a Change Proposal be raised to the Operational Terms to clarify this, but as MOSL cannot raise Change Proposals to the Operational Terms, a Trading Party would have to raise the change.
- 7.5. A Panel Member highlighted that this Operational Terms issue could raise problems for some Wholesalers who were operating with a number of water only companies (WOC’s) in their area, because they would need to coordinate with them to remove any of their water SPID’s paired with the Wholesaler’s sewerage SPID’s. They also indicated that, without this change, the process of deregistering SPID’s in this instance would be very difficult to support across multiple organisations.
- 7.6. The Chair suggested that the changes to the Operational Terms may be required for Trading Parties to feel comfortable that the issues raised are being dealt with adequately. The presenter confirmed that there had not yet been any industry engagement on the changes, but advised that MOSL planned to provide guidance on de-registering SPIDs to support the change.
- 7.7. The Panel agreed for MOSL to develop guidance on de-registering SPIDs with support from three Panel Members that volunteered to work with MOSL.

ACTION 16_02

- 7.8. A Panel Member highlighted that it was important to consider the issue of erroneous deregistrations in the context of this change, as this change correct mistakes without addressing how they are prevented in future. Panel Members agreed an action be recorded to investigate the deregistration of SPIDs and highlight processes that may be introduced to reduce the risk of erroneous deregistration, which can then be discussed at the User Forum.

ACTION 16_03

- 7.9. MOSL confirmed that in the live build of the system, the SPID versioning functionality had not been built in. Therefore, this issue will only remain in historic data.

- 7.10. The Panel agreed with the recommendation of the proposer that the change furthered the Objectives and Principles of efficiency, transparency, simplicity, cost-effectiveness and security.
- 7.11. MOSL agreed to commence work on the rectification plan following the recommendation being made to the Authority, noting that any uncorrected data items will potentially lead to MPS charges for the relevant Trading Parties when they are implemented in April.
- 7.12. The Panel:
- Unanimously **AGREED** to recommend implementation of CPW026 to the Authority for approval; and
 - Unanimously **AGREED** the recommended implementation date on:
 - 28th September 2018 if Authority approval is received by 29th June 2018; or
 - March 2019 if Authority approval is received after 29th June 2018.

8. Draft Recommendation Report: CPW028 – Unpaired SPIDs

Purpose: For Decision

- 8.1. The Panel considered a Change Proposal to introduce additional functionality and enhance existing functionalities in order to support SPID pairing activities.
- 8.2. The Proposer explained that Unpaired SPIDs have been discussed at previous industry meetings such as the User Forum as a priority Wholesaler data issue, and there are currently around 450,000 unpaired SPIDs in the market.
- 8.3. The Proposer reported the two key elements of the Change Proposal, one of which is additional elements for the MDS Report and the other is sharing of meter information between Wholesalers, the latter element has a number of options for its implementation.
- 8.4. The Proposer outlined the 3 options suggested for the implementation of the Wholesaler data sharing, which had received cost estimates from CGI:
- **Option 1:** Functionality be added to CMOS to allow Wholesalers to give access to one another to agreed extracts of each other's SPID data. This option had central system implementation costs of £223,000, with an ongoing service cost of £80,000.
 - **Option 2:** Wholesalers to be given access to the entirety of each other's SPID data through CMOS. This option had central system implementation costs of £175,000, with an ongoing service cost of £80,000.
 - **Option 3:** Wholesalers to not be given system support to access each other's SPID data an instead required to manually transfer MDS reports. This option had central system implementation costs of £155,000 without an ongoing service cost, although it was highlighted this option would have a significant increase costs to MOSL that would have to support this report sharing.
- 8.5. The Proposer summarised the responses to the two consultation that had been taken on this change. The responses to the first consultation reported overwhelming support for Option 1. Option 2 was later developed with the intention of allowing the change to be introduced quicker. When the two options were consulted on there was almost an even distribution of votes for both. However, one Trading Party raised significant concerns with Option 2 in relation to data protection. This related to the release of personal data in relation to all supply points rather than data only being shared in

relation to those geographical areas where the wholesaler needed to see the data to resolve the SPID pairing. It was recognised that there is limited SPID data that amounted to personal data.

- 8.6. The Proposer noted that Option 3 had been provided to the Panel in recognition of the high implementation costs posed by the other two options. This option was a reduced scope option of Option 1, as the data sharing element had been removed.
- 8.7. The Proposer advised that the recommendation to the Panel was to recommend Option 1 to the Authority for approval, given the issues surrounding Option 2 on data protection and the lack of system support provided by Option 3 in terms of Wholesaler data sharing.
- 8.8. MOSL confirmed that CGI's estimates of the ongoing service costs were based on an increase in bandwidth allowance for CMOS and increased data space required for this change. The Panel therefore raised an action for MOSL to negotiate with CGI and challenge this cost.

ACTION 16_04

- 8.9. Some Panel Members raised concerns that a more complete option, such as Option 1, may run the risk of becoming obsolete in a number of months' time. If the problem is effectively addressed following the introduction of the change, the new functionality may no longer be required.
- 8.10. The Panel requested that MOSL work with its service provider to minimise the ongoing service costs, given its responsibility for ensuring cost efficiencies.
- 8.11. It was noted that, a benefit of Option 1 and Option 2 was that, through the direct access to CMOS, Wholesalers would have access to up to date information.
- 8.12. A number of Panel Members expressed their agreement with Option 1. The Panel requested that a progress report be provided in future to determine the speed at which the issue is being resolved. This progress report was raised as an action for MOSL by the Panel.

ACTION 16_05

- 8.13. The Panel:
 - Unanimously **AGREED** to recommend the implementation of Option 1 for CPW028 to the Authority for approval; and
 - Unanimously **AGREED** the recommended implementation date on:
 - 28th September 2018 if Authority approval is received by 30th March 2018; or
 - 17th May 2019 if Authority approval is received after 30th March 2018.

[9. Draft Recommendation Report: CPW030 & CPM008 – Review of Market Performance Standards](#)

Purpose: For Decision

- 9.1. The Panel considered a recommendation from the Market Performance Committee (MPC) on the review of Market Performance Standards (MPS).

- 9.2. MOSL highlighted that the Panel previously agreed the scope of the review in September 2018, and that the only addition since that agreement was the redistribution of charges element addressed in CPM008.
- 9.3. MOSL explained how the level of Retailer charges and thresholds (in retailer missed cyclical reads) had been altered throughout the review, as a result of feedback from Industry Consultations.
- 9.4. MOSL noted that Ofwat had raised some concerns around the proposed lowering of thresholds for meter reading MPS, noting that Ofwat had expressed it would prefer a higher threshold in order to drive further efficiencies and behaviours, but agreed it would consider a reduction with sufficient supporting evidence.
- 9.5. A Panel Member raised concerns that the standards proposed in CPW030 were more stringent than [Ofwat's code of practice](#), which required meters to be read once a year. In particular, the Panel Member felt it was disproportionate to align the Market Performance Charges to the current standards of two reads per year rather than one read per year (as included in Ofwat's Code of Practice) for lower consumption Supply Points, noting that the costs of meter reads and market performance charges were proportionally greater for these types of Supply Point. The Panel Member requested that the MPC should review whether the biannual meter read incentive (MPS18) is proportionate for lower consumption Supply Points. The Chair of the MPC explained that these standards were designed to incentivise a certain level of behaviour. Therefore, the MPC agreed it was appropriate to set targets that aligned with the market codes and which may be stricter than Ofwat's code of practice.
- 9.6. MOSL provided an update on the platform it was using to develop and report on the Market Performance Standards (MPS) charging. It was highlighted that assurance work had identified the reporting to be 99.96% accurate based on 173 test cases. It was also noted that eight Trading Parties had conducted their own testing. MOSL advised that it was confident the new platform would be ready for April 2018.
- 9.7. MOSL confirmed that the reported 99.96% accuracy of reporting was because of TCORR issues that affected over 1,000 SPIDs. However, it was highlighted that that actual materiality of this issues was lower than 0.04% and MOSL had provided a worst-case scenario estimate.
- 9.8. A Panel Member queried whether charges would be levied in the event that they arise through no fault of the Retailer affected. An example was provided of historic meter data provided by a Wholesaler that was incorrect, such as the most recent read being below the previous. It was noted that charges would be calculated as set out in the code and invoiced accordingly. The codes still require Trading Parties to pay the charge, even if they are disputing it. If a Trading Party does not pay an MPS charge MOSL would pursue it the same as non-payment of MO charges. A Panel Member requested that the MPC give further thought to the issue of one Trading Party's inaccurate data having adverse implications on the performance of another Trading Party.

ACTION 16_06

- 9.9. A Panel Member raised concerns over a Retailer's ability to dispute these charges. The Chair of the MPC agreed to work with MOSL to consider this matter.

ACTION 16_07

- 9.10. The Panel:

- Unanimously **AGREED** to recommend implementation of CPW030 to the Authority for approval;
- Unanimously **AGREED** to recommend implementation of CPM008 to the Authority for approval;
- Unanimously **AGREED** the recommended implementation date for CPM008 and CPW030 of 01 April 2018

10. Nominal Maximum Design Capacity Validation Review

Purpose: For Decision

- 10.1. The Panel considered a paper that set out the obligation under the codes for the Market Operator to review the values used in Nominal Maximum Design Volume validation on an annual basis. These validations control the maximum amount that can be input as a meter read, given the size of the water pipe. This paper sets out analysis of this validation and provides a recommendation on whether a Change Proposal is needed to update aspects of the algorithm.
- 10.2. MOSL highlighted that it was currently observing a very small number of rejections of this type.
- 10.3. MOSL confirmed that the current values were based on the largest daily flow a meter could read accurately then extrapolated across a year.
- 10.4. A Panel Member raised concerns around the data in the report that indicated 3000 entries failed validation and then were submitted past the validation. They agreed with the recommendation of the paper, but felt there was additional work required by the Panel and the MPC to review meter reading validation mechanisms (previously raised as action **A09_03**).
- 10.5. The Panel:
 - Unanimously **AGREED** no changes are required to the values in the Nominal Maximum Design Capacity table; and
 - Unanimously **AGREED** to review the Nominal Maximum Design Capacity table in the first quarter of 2019.

11. Market Audit

Purpose: For Information

- 11.1. MOSL summarised the key findings of the Market Audit and the MOSL response, that had been provided to the Panel for their feedback.
- 11.2. It was confirmed that Trading Parties had received individual reports setting the Market Auditor's findings with respect to their own organisations.
- 11.3. MOSL highlighted that the Market Operator and CMOS compliance audits were also underway and would be made available as an end of year report.
- 11.4. MOSL highlighted that the key issues of the market audit have been assigned to a number of Committees and groups.
- 11.5. Some Panel Members noted that the DSC does not operate within the Panel governance framework and expressed concern that the Panel should have better visibility and oversight of data quality issues.

- 11.6. A Panel Member highlighted that an action was raised at the User Forum for MOSL to provide a statement on what MOSL's involvement in improving market data would be from a strategic point of view, which the Panel Member felt was important to understanding this market issue.
- 11.7. Panel Members also raised concerns around the lack of reporting and communication between itself and the DSC and the risk in duplication of work that could create. MOSL re-affirmed that it would provide an update on the work of the DSC as a part of the MOSL update. It was also noted that, should the DSC identify a need for a change in the market rules, this recommendation would be progressed as a Change Proposal under Panel governance.
- 11.8. The Panel agreed that it was important to have clarity over the governance and accountability of industry groups that it manages, and raised an action for an update to be provided at a future Panel meeting of all the industry groups that meet formally and informally that MOSL is aware of.

ACTION 16_08

- 11.9. MOSL confirmed that the scope of future audits would be agreed by the Audit Committee, which would then provide the scope to the Panel for comment.

12. Monthly Committee Updates

Purpose: For Information

- 12.1. The Panel was provided with a monthly update on the activities of the Panel Committees, which have met since the January 2018 Panel meeting.
- 12.2. The Chairs of the Market Performance Committee (MPC) and Trading Disputes Committee (TDC) had nothing further to raise in the Committee update.
- 12.3. The Chair of the Trade Effluent Issues Committee (TEIC) highlighted that PwC had spoken to the Committee about their recommendations from the Market Audit, to ensure they were being addressed.
- 12.4. It was confirmed that a training plan was planned for publication in June 2018 relating to issues with understanding and use of CMOS around Trade Effluent (TE) services, and a guidance note had been drafted on how to complete TE consent applications.
- 12.5. The Chair of the Committee also highlighted that 3 Change Proposals were in final draft to address temporary consent issues and the Trade Effluent application forms. It was indicated that their changes would be discussed at the April or May Panel meeting, following the Committee seeking Trading Party feedback through Industry Consultation on the Change Proposals.
- 12.6. The Chair of the Committee also mentioned that a recommendation had been sent to the MPC for a new Operational Terms standard for Trade Effluent.
- 12.7. The Panel noted that, it was the Chair of the TEIC's final meeting and they thanked the Chair for her work with the TEIC. Additionally, the Panel noted that MOSL would appoint a new Chair of the TEIC, which was consistent with the Committee's Terms of Reference.

13. Any Other Business (AOB)

Purpose: For Information

13.1. The Panel Secretariat provided an update on a Panel action for MOSL to report on the progress of the work on Developer Services in preparation for its suspension being lifted in 2020 (as part of [CPW031 - Extending the new connection suspension period](#)). The Panel Secretariat agreed to circulate the slide presented that contained a timeline.

ACTION 16_09

13.2. A Panel Member raised a concern about the timeline proposed. They felt that the deadline in 2019 for resolution was far too late regarding the planning and budgeting implications this change implies for Trading Parties. The Panel Member suggested that certainty was required by October 2018.

13.3. There was no further business and the Chair closed the meeting.

Actions:

ACTION 16_01 Ofwat to circulate the minutes of the KPMG led credit workshop to Panel Members.

ACTION 16_02 MOSL to develop guidance, with volunteers from the Panel, on the deregistering of SPIDs.

ACTION 16_03 MOSL to investigate the scale of the issue of erroneously deregistered SPIDs and potential remedies, and discuss at the next User Forum.

ACTION 16_04 MOSL to speak to CGI to challenge the costs of change CPW028's implementation and ongoing service.

ACTION 16_05 MPC to monitor the number of unpaired SPIDs over the next 3 months and provide a progress update report to the Panel at the June meeting.

ACTION 16_06 MPC to investigate the potential charging implications that other members' activities may have on Retailers, through no fault of that Retailer.

ACTION 16_07 The MPC to develop a light-touch governance framework that manages the dispute of MPS charges.

ACTION 16_08 MOSL to provide a summary of formal and informal groups operating in the industry

ACTION 16_09 Circulate the slide presented on Developer Services during AOB of the Panel meeting.

The next Panel meeting is scheduled for: **27th March 2018, 10:30 – 15:30, at:**

MOSL Offices

16-18 Monument Street

London

EC3R 8AJ

The nearest tube stations are Monument, Bank and London Bridge.