
30th Technical Panel Meeting, 16 August 2012
Approved Minute

Present

James Bream (JB) - Business Stream
Jeremy Atkinson (JA) – CMA
Richard Lavery (RL) - Scottish Water
Kevin Ensell (KE) – Osprey
Brian Saunders (BrS) – CMA (TP Chair)
Amanda Hancock (AH) – CMA (TP Secretary)
David Walters (DW) – Commission
Jordan Dimmock (JD) – CMA (Graduate)

In Attendance

Emma Leckie (EL) – DWF Biggart Baillie

Apologies

Jessie McLeman (JMCL) – Scottish Water

1. Minute

The minute of the meeting of 14 June 2012 was approved.

2. Actions and Administrative Update

AH provided an update on the action log:

AH explained that AP203 will be discussed at item 7 of the agenda - Any Other Business. AP211 is ongoing and will also be discussed as an agenda item along with AP213, AP215, AP218, AP219 and AP220 which will also be discussed during the meeting.

AH advised that the rest of the actions namely: AP210; AP216; AP217; and AP221 had all been completed.

AH noted that Change Proposals M CCP106, M CCP108 and M CCP–CC087 had been withdrawn at or since the last Technical Panel Meeting. AH noted that M CCP106 and M CCP108 now forms part of M CCP104 and M CCP105 respectively. M CCP–CC087 was withdrawn at the last MPF meeting.

AH also noted that Change Proposals M CCP093, M CCP102 and OCCP038 had been agreed or implemented at or since the last Technical Panel Meeting. Change Proposals M CCP093 and M CCP102 were implemented in June and OCCP038 is to be implemented in August.

AH further noted that there had been no Commission Changes introduced or implemented since the last meeting.

AH noted that bulletin BU088 had been issued prior to the last Technical Panel Meeting but that it was being reported here as it was after the papers for the last TP were issued.

AH noted that Technical Panel Meeting dates up to February 2014 had been proposed and that these had now been set.

3. Change Proposals in Progress

MCCP095 – Trade Effluent Volume and Charging Calculations

AH noted that SW was asked at the last TP meeting to look at developing the proposal further. RL noted that since the last Technical Panel Meeting Scottish Water has worked with the CMA to develop the requirements of the proposal. RL outlined the main changes to the proposal. AH noted that at the last Technical Panel Meeting Scottish Water had requested this be included in the March release and queried whether this was due to charging reasons. RL noted that it would be best if the proposal was implemented at the start of a new financial year and this was because of charging issues in respect of the current method. BrS then asked if implementation could take place either this March or next March. AH noted that aiming for this March may be slightly rushed however if all members of the Technical Panel were content that everything had been captured then the earlier implementation date was possible. JA suggested a working group could be set up to further develop this proposal. AH advised that it was on the agenda for the Metering Working Group on the 22nd August. AH then noted that if the proposal were to be included in March 2013, then it would need to be approved today to be Impact Assessed. JA noted that the Impact Assessment might reveal that a March implementation was not feasible

BrS queried whether implementation could be in a September Release and still be effective for the whole of the financial year. Both AH and RL said that they did not believe this was possible. AH noted that the charging calculations would commence in April and that you cannot have two charging parameters in any given year. AH suggested that backdating may be a possibility. DW noted that the Commission would be concerned with this approach. BrS then noted that implementing would be a good thing to do however he would be uncomfortable in principal if the Technical Panel decides to do something before knowing the costs involved and that it would only be the value of transparency received. BrS noted that the Technical Panel can employ a draft release plan for March and asked if an Impact Assessment can be provided before the next Technical Panel meeting. AH stated that she thought this was possible. JA noted that CMA can look into the cost side of the proposal however the benefit side is more difficult. KE then noted the difficulty of calibrating costs and benefits. JA noted that many previous changes fell short in terms of the benefits delivered due to the lack of use. KE suggested that the Technical Panel may want to use historical context to aid the current decision. JA then suggested that a standing paper could be produced and noted that the CMA will try and have something prepared for the next meeting.

BrS declared that the Technical Panel should proceed with the draft March release plan, have an Impact Assessment done and circulate this together with proposed costs and timescales etc. Scottish Water should consider the benefits of this proposal which can be discussed when the outcome of the Impact Assessment is known.

AP222 CMA to forward MCCP095 to its Developer for Impact Assessment.

AP223 CMA to look at preparing a standing paper to assist with cost benefit analysis of Market Code Change Proposals.

AP224 Scottish Water to consider and prepare a brief for the next TP on the benefits of this proposal in order that they can be considered in line with the costs from Impact Assessment.

DW stressed that sufficient time must be available to allow for the actual logistics of implementation to take place together with the uploading of all of the data. BrS then noted that the time period available for doing so runs from now until the March 2013 implementation date and that there is no need to wait until all the rules are in place.

MCCP101 – Minor Validation and Error Message Improvements

AH confirmed that this finalised proposal was being presented to the Technical Panel for approval. JB queried on validation whether the supply points which were partial would lead to a rejection. AH said it would and the view is that it should be rejected. JB asked if there have been any circumstances where a fine had been imposed. AH stated that she did not believe so, but could not confirm for certain. BrS stated that JB should check internally and advise the CMA if there were any instances of this that required review. RL queried point UR7 of the proposal and the retrospective changing of dial digits. AH explained that if the digits are changed retrospectively and there are Meter Reads in the system that indicate a rollover has taken place, then the transaction will be rejected. RL stated that this was sensible control and that he would ensure Scottish Water picked up these rejections to resolve these issues.

On this basis, the TP were asked to approve this MCCP. BrS confirmed that the Technical Panel had approved the proposal and that implementation was expected in September 2012.

AP225 CMA to forward MCCP101 to Commission for consultation and approval.

MCCP103 – Retrospective Amendment of Transactions

AH noted that this proposal had initiated considerable debate at the previous Technical Panel Meeting and that Business Stream was to review the points raised at the last meeting. JB noted that one of the topics of debate was around which transactions could be amended retrospectively. JB noted that Business Stream had restricted the MCCP to three specific transactions, rather than across the board. JB further noted that there had been considerable debate about how far back these retrospections could occur. The Commission's view was that there should be a backstop, and they had previously suggested 8 months. This was to tie in with the current settlement timetable which would prevent changes after R3's and before RF. JB noted that Business Stream had considered this, but felt that any restriction on time would negate the benefits of the proposal.

JB noted that Business Stream's view was that it was better to get the data correct and then use the Settlement Process to work through any charging implications, and that the issue involved a balance of policy of settlement against getting the data correct and then, if necessary, use some other charging mechanism. DW stated that the Commission's view stood.

BrS then asked for clarification of Business Stream's underlying issue. JB stated that if there were a time restriction only about one third of the existing RAs would be eligible to be implemented, leaving two thirds of the data inaccurate. RL suggested a working group should be set up to develop the proposal further. JA stated that the change is about undoing the previous transaction, so there is no guarantee that you can make the retrospective amendment effective back to 2 years ago whatever the backstop date.

JB explained that it is only ever the last transaction that is undone as opposed to undoing multiple transactions. JB stated that making the amendment process a bit more difficult and restricting the process to a singular retrospective amendment is a good thing and improves data control. JB stated that some things will go wrong, if there is a genuine policy concern about the backstop then the proposal can be withdrawn but the Technical Panel should look at the pros and cons today.

JB then asked the Technical Panel if the timescale of the backstop is the issue as only one reading is likely to be missed, not more. BrS stated that this was not true for things like rateable value and suggested that the question was being asked the wrong way round and that the rules around settlement re-runs need to be understood before anything can progress with this proposal. JB questioned whether there would be instances where the data rectification had to go beyond 1 year and provided the example of an LP's customer being able to go back 5 years on their bill.

BrS suggested that resolving the issue depended on whether the Technical Panel considered an undo capability to be a good or bad thing and compared this with the procedures employed by the electricity industry. BrS suggested that if it is considered to be a good thing then it is a design and policy matter to be determined.

The matter was suspended and will be revisited following the Commission's settlement meeting on 13 September. JA suggested that whilst suspended it might be worth thinking about the costs and benefits and BrS suggested that the Technical Panel could consider a better way of dealing with the Retrospective Amendment process. BrS said there would be more information at the next Technical Panel Meeting. AH then asked if the Commission will have made a decision on the re-running of settlement between September and the next Technical Panel Meeting. DW suggested that it could do, but would depend on consensus of Participants. If there was a lack of agreement then they would need more time. DW stated that it would be unlikely that a final decision would be made before the next Technical Panel Meeting.

BrS stated that decision on the proposal be deferred and that the Commission will either provide an update or decision on the backstop date point and that JB would deliver more statistics in relation to benefits at the next Technical Panel Meeting.

AP226 Business Stream to work on providing more detailed benefits to be considered when the matter is next discussed.

MCCP104 – Changing Ownership of Meter X/Y Data and Meter Location Notes

AH stated that this proposal had incorporated MCCP108 and that Business Stream had been asked to further develop the user requirements. JB explained that the proposal had not been substantially changed from the last time, it had however been fleshed out slightly and hoped the CMA could take it to Impact Assessment.

BrS then asked the TP to vote on this proposal. The proposal was unanimously approved. AH stated that the proposal would be taken forward to be Impact Assessed. BrS then stated that the proposal would be subject to further approval following Impact Assessment and that it should return to the next Technical Panel Meeting with a cost benefit approach.

AP227 CMA to forward MCCP104 to Developer for Impact Assessment.

DW asked why the proposal had been marked as urgent. JB stated that it is urgent to Business Stream. David explained that there is a specific Market Code process for urgent matters and that this matter does not look to be an urgent matter. JB agreed and said he would amend the Change Proposal accordingly.

MCCP105 – Changing Ownership of Drainage Data and SEES Data

JB stated that Business Stream had discussed the proposal with the CMA and had combined this proposal with MCCP106. AH asked if Business Stream had looked at all chargeable elements as there appears to be some that have not been included. JB stated that they had, but they had decided not to include them as they felt best placed to retain ownership of these data items i.e. taps and troughs. JB stated that Business Stream considered which service elements Scottish Water were best placed to know, and which would require customer interaction and therefore remain with the Licensed Provider as they own the customer relationship. JB stated that caravans had been considered and included in the updated proposal.

RL pointed out that there was a typo at the bottom of page two. AH agreed to amend this before passing to the Developer for Impact Assessment.

BrS then asked the TP to vote on this proposal. The proposal was unanimously approved. AH then pointed out that if the proposal is to be included in the March Release, then it will need to be approved offline following Impact Assessment. BrS stated that an intervening meeting might be required. KE suggested that if it was being done offline then a schedule of costs and benefits will be required. BrS said he supported this, and JA advised that the CMA would endeavour to provide cost benefit data, but could not commit to having a full schedule before the next TP. BrS stated that this matter needs to be brought to telephone conference ASAP and that AH needs to speak to their Service Provider to undertake Impact Assessment and then feedback to the group.

AP228 CMA to amend typo and then forward MCCP to Developer for Impact Assessment.

MCCP107 – Moving Ownership of the Meter Dial Data

JB introduced the proposal and explained that it had initiated a greater degree of debate than the other proposals. JB proceeded to explain the amendments to the proposal. AH asked how Meter Readers identify that digits have changed. JB stated that the reader would have visibility of the number of dials that the meter should have, and could therefore identify the change. RL stated that if the meter dials were physically exchanged, the serial number of the meter would also change but that was not the scenario that he'd understood this proposal was to seeking to address. JB agreed that this would be a meter swap. AH asked if the wholesaler would therefore be best placed to identify any change in the dial

digits. BrS then asked if this was a change of the digits or merely identification that the digits have changed, or the discovery of an error. JB stated that this was the discovery of an error. Business Stream would not physically change the dials in a meter. DW asked if Business Stream would seek to change the meter serial number, JB confirmed they would not. DW then stated that he didn't see why Business Stream would want to change meter dial digits when they wouldn't change the serial number. JB stated that if there are incorrect serial numbers, there is no direct consequence to Business Stream. However, if digits identified are wrong, by the time they notify Scottish Water and then Scottish Water verify the details; Business Stream could have readings being rejected as a result.

JA asked if there was any data on the number of times this has occurred. JB said he could provide this. BrS stated that this should be a diminishing number and that he would be worried if this were the case for newly installed meters.

DW asked if Business Stream provided photographic evidence to Scottish Water as part of their Operational Code request would Scottish Water still do site verification. RL stated that they would probably not require verifying provided sufficient evidence was present. AH stated that if the existing process was updated then there would be no need to amend the Central Systems, and therefore the cost to the Market could be avoided. JB stated that it was much harder to manage the supplier than to be able to do something yourself, although accepted that the updated process would reduce the number of Meter Read rejections.

DW asked why the errors were not picked up earlier. JB stated that a number of them have been but there are a number of reasons why it doesn't happen as well as it should do. BrS stated that the existing Operation Code process does not work very well at present, or all errors should have been picked up. RL then asked if the issue is because the error in the digit is not picked up when the meter is read and suggested that if so, the new change is unlikely to resolve the issue.

BrS then asked the TP for approval to progress to Impact Assessment. The TP approved this, but requested that JB to provide additional information to clarify whether the issue is only an error in respect of old legacy meters and to inform a decision on whether to approve the request. RL added that Scottish Water may be able to contribute figures from their data to support this.

AP229 Business Stream and Scottish Water to provide data to the next TP on the number of instances of this specific issue to give confidence to the group that this is a legacy issue.

AP230 CMA to forward MCCP to developer for Impact Assessment.

4. New Change Proposals

MCCP110 – Allocation of New Supply Points

RL introduced this proposal and stated that Scottish Water has issues when a water application is received with no correlating sewer application however they are aware that one exists. The current process does not allow them to leave the LP field blank so that the sewer application is randomly allocated to an LP similar to the GAP Site process. AH commented that this proposal is looking to change the Central Systems to get around

Trading Parties failing in their obligations under the Operational Code, which is not cost effective to the Market, nor does it resolve the underlying issue. JB asked about instances where the connection has already been made and suggested that the situation is akin to a gap site. KE then asked for clarification as to whether a developer can develop a green field site without notifying Scottish Water. RL stated that he had experienced persistent problems with not receiving applications for the sewer connections when water connection applications are received. KE asked if the point at which you are made aware of the lack of sewer connection is when Scottish Water goes onsite to connect the water. RL said Scottish Water relies on developers for notification. KE questioned construction procedures and asked whether there was a process by which the developer is obliged to get in touch with Scottish Water prior to or during the development set up process. KE asked what incentives there are to encourage developers to do what is required during the pre construction phase and the adequacy of information made available to them. JB pointed out that many sites have different contracts for sewer and water connections. JB stated that the issue is structural and that the proposal was trying to treat the symptoms rather than cure the structural problem. JB suggested that both connections should be grouped as a pair. RL pointed out that there is an LP allocation process in the Gap Site allocation process which could be mirrored. AH re-iterated that this is feasible, but at a cost to the Market that is not necessary. JB suggested both connections could be allocated to the LP making the water application. DW stated that the Commission would not randomly allocate to LPs unless LPs had expressed a desire for such a process, and did not think the LPs would be happy with the random allocation process, both Business Stream and Osprey agreed.

DW further stated that the water LP has the option to disconnect the water if there is an issue with non payment of sewerage charges, however an LP that was randomly allocated a sewerage SPID would have no such measures and therefore ran the risk of bad debt with the customer. RL then suggested that an alternative approach would therefore be to amend the Operational Code process to clarify that in this scenario the sewerage SPID should be allocated to the water LP.

Given the lack of support from the TP, Scottish Water agreed to withdraw their proposal and submit an Operational Code change proposal to the next TP.

AP231 Scottish Water to withdraw MCCP110.

MCCP111 – Change in Notification to the CMA by Scottish Water

RL detailed the proposal which looked to align the Market Code with the Operational Code in relation to Processes 1-5 of the Operational Code, and further seeks to make changes to Processes 8-12 and 28 to align with Processes 1-5. AH stated that in terms of Performance Standards, using two trigger dates complicates the CMA's ability to monitor performance, may require changes to the Central Systems, and one date would make things easier. JB stated that applying 8 days to all transactions does not seem right, and noted that 5 days was agreed to at the time for work carried out by Scottish Water (with 8 days for work carried out by Accredited Entities). DW pointed out that 8 days is not technically correct and that the current Code is 5 +3. JB stated that an increase to 8 days for work carried out by Scottish Water adds an unnecessary delay. BrS stated that the Operational Code as noted in the proposal already provides for 8 days, however JB clarified that , it allows for 5+3 days meaning it could take less than 8 days if for example it only took 3 days to get the information to Scottish Water, then Scottish Water would have a further 3 days. BrS

stressed that consistency between the Market Code and Operational Code was required. BrS asked the Commission if this issue had been considered when the Operational Code was reviewed, both DW and RL said it was. BrS and AH both stated that the Central Systems would need to be changed if the CMA are to accurately report on performance with two varying time parameters involved, and if the Market Code is updated to align with the Operational Code, it will render the CMA non-compliant until the Central Systems changes are implemented. BrS further stated that the CMA recognised it had a no option but to change the rules in the Market Code to align the Market documentation. AH added that the CMA would need to look at documenting a manual work around process in order for it to comply with the Market Code in the interim. BrS then suggested that an Impact Assessment would need to be undertaken before this MCCP could be fully approved. The TP agreed to continue with development of this proposal.

AP232 CMA to progress MCCP111 to Impact Assessment

OCCP039 Updating the CMA, processes 8-12 and 28

RL introduced and outlined the proposal. BrS asked why this change was not grouped together with original meter changes in OCCP037. DW then asked why these changes are not being made next April alongside the other proposed changes relating to the Accredited Entity scheme. RL explained that the changes can be implemented in April 2013, but Scottish Water believe these changes drive better Data Quality and this is why they are looking to make the change in the interim. DW suggested that if it is part of the Accredited Entities scheme then it should be implemented with the rest unless Scottish Water can justify otherwise. RL stated that this change was not part of the Accredited Entities scheme, but that it is required to improve Data Quality. AH stated that there would be no cost to implement this proposal as it was simply a document update. JA stated that if the objective of the proposal is improved Data Quality, and if the Quality of Data will be improved between now and April then the proposal should be approved. RL stated that implementing the proposal now would give Scottish Water a better ability to pick up data errors and rectify within the required timescales. BrS pointed out that Scottish Water were going to receive the data in April anyway and therefore, if it is the right thing to do, it is the right thing to do straight away. AH asked the Technical Panel to vote on whether to approve the proposal in principal with RL to amend the outset stating that the change is for Data Quality purposes. The TP confirmed that it was happy to approve this proposal, subject to the removal of any reference to the Accredited Entities Scheme.

AP233 OCCP039 to be amended by Scottish Water and then forwarded to CMA.

AP234 CMA to forward OCCP039 to the Commission for consultation and approval.

MCCP112 Change in Effective Date Setting on T006.3 Transaction.

RL introduced the proposal and asserted that the change to the T006.3 is required to deal with the situation where the transaction takes place after the connection date and it is the date of the transaction that is used rather than the connection date. AH asked if everything had been captured in relation to the Connections process, questioning whether this would be an issue for the T006.4 for example. RL confirmed that he was not aware of any additional transactions that would be impacted, but asked whether the Impact Assessment of this transaction may pull out any additional work and if so, could it be included in this proposal. The TP were content with this approach and therefore approved the proposal to be taken forward to Impact Assessment. DW queried whether there would

be any text changes to the Market Code, RL confirmed that this may be the case, but would not be known until an Impact Assessment had been undertaken. AH stated that there should note a dependency on the Impact Assessment to complete the proposed redrafting of any CSD changes. The Impact Assessment only provides the technical solution for any proposed change which should be set out in the proposal. BrS asked the TP to approve sending this proposal for Impact Assessment, and the TP confirmed its approval. Scottish Water should look to propose draft CSD wording when the proposal is represented to the group.

AP235 CMA to forward M CCP112 to its Developer for Impact Assessment.

AP236 Scottish Water to provide Market Code and CSD wording to the Technical Panel at the next meeting in October.

5. Forward Plans

AH presented the CMA Issues and Forward Planning Report noting the changes to the Issues List as set out in Section 3 of the report. AH also commented that CMACPx112 would be picked up under AOB

JB asked what the point of certain issues on the Issues List. AH agreed that some issues are historical and noted that there was a previous attempt by the CMA to clean up the list however pressure was received from the Technical Panel not to remove items. AH added that if the Technical Panel is minded then AH will set up a meeting to go through them. JB stated that if they are on the list then they must be managed, however AH noted that where the issue is a Participant issue, they cannot be managed or progressed unless a Change Proposal is brought forward. JA suggested that the list should be categorised e.g. data, systems etc. BrS noted that there was an issue on Retail Bills which seemed odd but all others seemed relevant.

JB stated that the question is what is the industry doing about many of the issues and does the Technical Panel feel we are looking at/dealing with them?

BrS and AH both suggested subcategories to enhance the understanding of the report would be beneficial and that the CMA would endeavour to complete this for the next Technical Panel meeting.

AP237 CMA to categorise the Issues List in advance of the next TP Meeting.

6. Performance Statistics

CMA Business Indicators Report

AH presented the Business Indicators Report.

AH stated that there are a significant number of ERRAs outstanding and that the majority are coming from the Vacancy Incentive Scheme. AH further noted that these are not technically ERRAs as set out in the CSDs and as such, it is the intention of the CMA to remove them from this process moving forward. AH said there is a lack of feedback from Participants, and that over 600 are outstanding. CMA Business Indicators are in place to

monitor CMAs performance, in the case of ERRAs from application to completion. As the CMA has no part in the Vacancy Incentive Scheme, other than to filter applications at the outset, it is not practical to continue to monitor these through this process. AH stated that the CMA would keep a log of all applications it received should anyone require this information at a future date, which would then conclude the CMA's involvement. KE suggested that the Vacancy Admin Report would be a good place for these figures to be captured. Business Stream agreed. AH asked whether Scottish Water tracks the applications, RL said that they do. BrS asked if this is something the TP would be expected to manage, however DW stated it was not expect the TP to be managing a Scottish Water scheme. BrS proposed that this was no longer a Technical Panel Issue and therefore should be closed. The TP agreed. AH would ensure the CMA removed these statistics from the ERRA process moving forward.

AP238 CMA to remove the Vacancy Incentive Scheme applications from the ERRA process, and create a log to record these moving forward.

Performance Standards Report

AH presented the Performance Standards Report. AH commented CMACPx112 had been produced as a performance reporting error had been picked up by the Market Audit. This error has now been rectified, and AH confirmed that all Participants affected by this have now received updated Quarterly Reports. AH also confirmed that there were no charging implications as a result of this error.

7. Any Other Business

BrS asking if there was any other business to be raised not currently on the Agenda AH requested that Disaster Recovery be added.

Vacancy Admin Scheme Reporting

AH stated that the feedback at the last Technical Panel Meeting had been taken into account, and a revised draft was sent out to all Participants for approval. All Participants were happy with the proposed report. Scottish Water sent in a subsequent email seeking clarity on which data items falls into which categories, AH stated that this is set out within the documentation for the Scheme and therefore would only be duplicated so is not required. BrS agreed that this could be cross referenced and that if everyone is OK then the CMA will proceed to produce the report for the next Technical Panel. The TP approved the report format.

Disaster Recovery

AH stated that disaster recovery is in place for Central Systems however this has yet to be tested to ensure it is functional. The testing has been pushed back to the weekend of the 31st August and a Bulletin will be issued to all Participants confirming this. The Market will close down at 4pm on Friday 31st August, at which point the CMA will be triggering disaster recovery. The test will only involve HVI users as LVI users will not be impacted by any trigger of Disaster Recovery. Participants involved in the exercise will be notified at each stage in the process. The system will be back up and running on Monday however it may

not be until 10am at the earliest. This is due to the fact that any DNS transfer can take up to two hours to complete. The request will trigger at 9am on Monday and can take one to one and a half hours to power back up.

Action	Subject	Update
<i>From the minute of the 29th. meeting (14th June 2012)</i>		
AP211 CMA	Identify December as the next performance standards review date on the TP Agenda	Ongoing
AP213 SW	Contact the CMA and to identify key areas for development of MCCP095.	Complete
AP215 BS	Further develop the MC/CSD changes and Indicative User Requirements required for MCCP103	Complete
AP218 BS	Develop MC/CSD drafting and Indicative User Requirements for MCCP105 and for MCCP106, following meetings with the CMA	Complete
AP219 BS	Update MCCP107 with Indicative URs	Complete
AP220 SW	Draft an OCCP to set out a process for progressing changes to Meter Dial Data	Ongoing
AP221 CMA	Discuss the vacancy admin scheme report with parties and amend accordingly	complete
<i>From the minute of the 30th. meeting (16th August 2012)</i>		
AP222 CMA	CMA to forward MCCP095 to its Developer for Impact Assessment	
AP223 CMA	CMA to look at preparing a standing paper to assist with cost benefit analysis of Market Code Change Proposals	
AP224 SW	SW to consider and prepare a brief for the next TP on the benefits of MCCP095 in order that the TP can consider these, along with the costs from IA at the next meeting	
AP225 CMA	CMA to forward MCCP101 to Commission for consultation and approval.	
AP226 BS	Business Stream to work on providing more detailed benefits to be considered when MCCP103 is next considered by the TP	
AP227 CMA	CMA to forward MCCP104 to Developer for Impact Assessment	
AP228 CMA	CMA to amend typo and then forward MCCP105 to Developer for Impact Assessment	
AP229 SW / BS	SW and BS to provide data on the number of instances the issue of wrong dial digit occurs in order to give the TP comfort that this is a legacy issue.	

Action	Subject	Update
AP230 CMA	CMA to forward M CCP107 to its Developer for Impact Assessment	
AP231 SW	Scottish Water to withdraw M CCP110	
AP232 CMA	CMA to progress M CCP111 to Impact Assessment	
AP233 SW	SW to amend OCCP039 and then forward to the CMA	
AP234 CMA	CMA to forward OCCP039 to the Commission for consultation and approval	
AP235 CMA	CMA to forward M CCP112 to its Developer for Impact Assessment	
AP236 SW	SW to provide Market Code and CSD drafting for M CCP112 at next TP Meeting in October	
AP237 CMA	CMA to categorise the Issues List in advance of the next TP Meeting	
AP238 CMA	CMA to remove the Vacancy Incentive Scheme applications from the ERRA process, and create a log to record these moving forward	