

Operational Advisory Group (OAG)

1 December 2020 meeting

Minutes



Operational Advisory Group

1 December 2020 meeting - minutes

Attendees

OAG Members and Guests

- ◆ Jon Fuller (JF) Wholesaler
- ◆ Matthew Garfield (MG) Wholesaler
- ◆ Deborah Morton (DeM) Wholesaler
- ◆ Paul Baker (PB) (Retailer)
- ◆ Sian Forward (SF) Wholesaler
- ◆ David Seymour (DS) Wholesaler
- ◆ Jenny Ansell (JA) Wholesaler
- ◆ Kat Grimley (KG) Thames Water
- ◆ Madeleine Moores (MM) Retailer
- ◆ Patti Quintana (PQ) Wholesaler
- ◆ Ashley Connors (AC) Wholesaler
- ◆ Sam Dawson (SD) Wholesaler
- ◆ David Buchan (DB) Retailer
- ◆ Sarah Harrison (SH) Retailer

MOSL

- ◆ Evan Joannette (EJ)
- ◆ Chris Dawson (CD)
- ◆ Daniel Plumbley (DP)
- ◆ Ivy Mandinyanya (IM)

Agenda

- ◆ Review standardised OPS-type reporting
 - Naming convention
- ◆ Review two non-chargeable SLAs
- ◆ Query on accredited entity login
- ◆ AOB
 - Mailing lists
 - OAG membership

Meeting notes

1. Review standardised OPS-type reporting

🔹 Overview

CD explained that Bilateral Hub will facilitate OPS reporting and eventually bring in-house at MOSL. Would need to amend OPS section of CSD0002 but would be similar in concept to the centralised reporting from CMOS of MPS. OAG asked to confirm it would expect new centralised reporting from MOSL to feature in CSD0002 as described by Chris.

Outcome

OAG. No objections raised

KG questioned if the MPC is looking at the OPS and MPS measures

EJ expects a full review of OPS would happen as part of market performance framework review and Bilaterals programme is not currently looking to change any chargeable OPS measures ahead of C1 implementation

CD we are not proposing to change any of the OPS however we are changing who is obligated to do the reporting.

CD explained that we are currently proposing that we would build in over 24 reports handling 55 data items for performance reporting. Also looking at jeopardy reports. But members can still feed in suggestions.

PQ will we put to one side the deeper dive reports for more day to day incident management?

CD we are proposing a level filter right into individual requests with export capability. Don't know the system yet though.

CD presented spreadsheet that outlines data items and reports that will be incorporated into bilateral reporting. Positive feedback from members. Will be sent to members for comment with the deadline is for the next meeting.

ACTION: OAG members to feedback data or report suggestions by 15 December

🔹 Naming convention

CD went through the SLA naming convention proposing a new fundamental naming convention in the format C1.n, where n is a number (see slide deck). **EJ** asked OAG to confirm they are okay with the fundamental concept of each SLA having a reference?

Outcome

OAG concurs

SF Giving all the SLAs is a key for measuring. But why use the C1 1.1 format when we've already got C1A, C1B. Why not C1C or C1F?

CD explained that we realised any SLA subsets would become complicated as we'd have to use alphanumeric/ Roman numeral names. Pure numbers would be easier.

PQ proposing a prefix before C1. Otherwise could lead to confusion between the process, form and now the OPS measure. Could have C1 with a letter W&R as prefix. **PB** concurs.

PB proposed that the SLA could have a reference that referenced the step in the process Scotland used that naming convention. **JF** concurs and proposed using the annex diagram numbering. **EJ** asked Paul to send examples agreed with Patti in terms of having W&R to distinguish wholesaler and retailer.

ACTION: Paul to send MOSL example of process/ steps used in Scotland to define SLA names

2. Reviewing two non-chargeable SLAs

CD Requirement in step 5 that wholesaler should notify retailer in 10 days. Either they have the plan or need more time. Is that second 10 days really being used?

SF. Plan development can often take the additional 10 business days.

SD Our organisation can also go to the line of those extra 10 business days as well especially if it's a particularly complex. Sometimes transactions we are going to do in the market need a corrective run on Rf and if they do, is there anything we can do to prevent the need for that, and it usually involves quite extensive communication with Retailer. We've got one underway at the moment and where we need multiple departments involved and once we've got feedback from most departments then we need to work out what the market transactions are. It takes long to communicate across the whole business and resolve things and work out what your plan is to get in the market. **DeM** concurs, but their organisation will try to notify findings and issue correction plan within 10 days. Rushing introduced possibility to make mistakes.

DB from a retailer's perspective the extra 10 BD is not an issue, but the initial report needs at least a light touch update to say to expect a plan. Currently, they sit in the dark not knowing what comes next. **PB** concurs. Retailers need to know the outcome and understand why 10 more days required in complex scenarios. **MM** and **SH** also agree.

CD we may put an extra decision point at step AE. A light touch notification of what's going on and you'll be in touch within the next 10 business days.

KG we've got Section 7 in the form which is the wholesaler response. Any other update from the wholesaler could just appear here.

PB just knowing what the outcome of these requests is important even if nothing was found on site or no transactions required that's something we want to be able to report on. Supports a change to allow more info to come as part of that form response.

3. Query on accredited entity login

EJ suggested that as we develop B processes, MOSL development team needs to know if we need special user credentials for Accredited Entities (AEs). **EJ** requested views from members on how they approach letting AEs access current systems.

PB would have to take away to think how it would work in practice at their organisation.

General preference would be to avoid re-keying in information that AEs already have.

MM, SH and **DB** concur.

EJ how do wholesalers tend to manage third party access?

MG we set them up as Anglian Water employees if they're contracted.

DS Accredited Entity Panel at Lloyds could incorporate any data entry requirements into their scheme if market codes can't compel the AE.

Outcome

OAG. Group would need to think this through more how AEs would access their systems. On balance these third parties seem to appear as members of the contracting companies.

4. AOB

- EJ encouraged OAG members to sign up to mailing lists to make sure they get any bilateral-related updates.
- Lots of OAG interest, but only six are currently members. In future, to give the group a wider mandate EJ proposing to make recurring guests into formal members. Anyone who would prefer not can let him know.

5. Actions:

1. OAG members to feedback data or report suggestions by 15 December (OAG members)
2. Send MOSL example of process/ steps used in Scotland to define SLA names (PB)