

Operational Advisory Group (OAG)

07 June 2022 meeting

Minutes



Operational Advisory Group

Minutes of 07 June 2022 meeting

Attendees

OAG members and guests

- ◆ Ashley Connors, Wholesaler
- ◆ David Buchan (DB), Retailer
- ◆ David Moss, Retailer
- ◆ Deborah Bennett, Wholesaler
- ◆ Federico De Gobbi, Wholesaler
- ◆ Frances Lickley, Retailer
- ◆ Heather Lamb, Wholesaler
- ◆ Ian Bolton, Wholesaler
- ◆ Jeremy Lunn (JL), Wholesaler
- ◆ Jon Fuller (JF), Wholesaler
- ◆ Julie-Ann Anderson, Wholesaler
- ◆ Laura Morgan, Wholesaler
- ◆ Matt Garfield, Wholesaler
- ◆ Nicola Spiller, Wholesaler
- ◆ Noel Bradley, Wholesaler
- ◆ Onkar Singh, Wholesaler
- ◆ Paul Baker, Retailer
- ◆ Rosie Rand, Wholesaler
- ◆ Simon Gibbard, Wessex

MOSL

- ◆ Evan Joannette (EJ) – Chair
- ◆ Julie Serle (JS)
- ◆ Kenny Awotorebo
- ◆ Monica Falasca
- ◆ Oliver Robins
- ◆ Lisa-Ann Lott (LAL) - Notes

Meeting notes

1 Welcome

EJ welcomed members and confirmed agenda.

EJ confirmed currently building 'just' a G2 but still exploring the possibility of an all-encompassing Trade Effluent process.

2 Code clarity around follow-on processes

EJ invited JF to run through thoughts on the proposed solution in respect of follow- processes and the code drafting supporting this.

JF queried with members the need to consider raising a new ORID or continue with an existing ORID e.g., for Ops Terms processes such as unplanned change to services leading to investigating a faulty meter which could further lead to a replacement meter or a meter exchange. Do we require a new ORID or continue with current and where would each apply, what are the conditions?

Members noted need to consider customer impact in particular where non-primary charges exist and need to consider future proofing and future solution.

Members recommended modular approach to follow-on processes as an extension to all other applicable processes.

JF shared strawman of conditions/thresholds which had been earlier shared via email.

Members generally agreed strawman however suggested 5 business day timeline to raise follow-on processes instead of 2 days in the interests of reasonability. Members generally agreed strawman should reflect overall principles with examples, ensuring examples are clearly an indication and not an exhaustive list.

JF made amends direct during meeting reflecting feedback from members including examples to illustrate the principles.

Outcome: OAG agreed this is worth pursuing as possible code rules. Further amends to be made, DM and RR volunteered to review via email and then circulate revised draft to members before reviewing by Code Advisory Group (CAG) with intention for recommendation to include in Operational Terms or OSD0701.

3 C5/C6 form

EJ confirmed C5/C6 is currently planned to be included within Phase 6.

JS ran through an up-to-date plan for C5/C6 beginning by highlighting the timeline for sign off on any process to provide clarity on why processes are discussed so far in advance. JS noted the extensive Business Requirements Document which is created as a first step.

JL requested MOSL provide a quick email poll of OAG members where any changes to build plan are required to ensure OAG members are still broadly in agreement.

JS displayed current 'as is' process flow for C5 (deregistration of SPID or change to service components C5 Wholesaler raised, C6 retailer raised element)

JS displayed 'to be' suggested process detailing investigations should be complete beforehand.

Members expressed desire to retain current OPS SLA to enable appropriate review of submissions by Retailer as changes are irreversible in many instances. Retailer members noted need for codes to reflect the need for agreement between the Wholesaler and Retailer prior to the transaction completing to ensure deregistration does not occur in error. Members also noted need to track where a challenge has occurred.

Members generally agreed C5/C6 should not be raised until investigations are complete and trading party is confident appropriate process can be actioned. One member noted that this could cause them extra admin as they'd have to store information in another system to track WIP. However, other members said this was typically for bilaterals as the evidence base was being built up. Additionally, where a site visit was required liaison between the wholesaler and retailer would be needed.

JS enquired if site visit module is required for a C5 – members noted site visit only required if Retailer queries the deregistration with approximately 5% of requests requiring site visits.

Members recommended a data item to indicate if further investigation required at start of process to enable all potential C5s to be added within the hub to prevent data being recorded outside the hub whilst investigations were undertaken where Wholesalers want to prevent utilising separate systems.

Members noted requirement for multiple site visits if necessary and codes should reflect the ability to attend site for more than one visit, in particular where challenges occur.

Members noted deregistration can be back dated to market opening thus the effective from date couldn't just be the date the bilateral is raised (like for gap sites). Members also highlighted if not able to back date Retailers could be charged for a site where no customer exists for onward charges.

Members noted where paired supplies Wholesalers will only deregister once initiating Wholesaler has completed their deregistration and could then form a follow-on process e.g., a water Wholesaler deregisters and the paired Wholesaler deregisters the sewerage SPID.

Members confirmed where water and sewerage SPIDs are both to be deregistered are two ORIDs required and requested opportunity to include both SPIDs where applicable in a similar vein to H1.

JS to review the above and revert in respect of validation of second SPID.

Where single supply (one Wholesaler) for both water and sewerage only one notification should be sent by the hub not one for each. Additionally, where only the water or the sewerage SPID is to be deregistered should ensure not linked to prevent both being deregistered where only one is required.

Members requested 'change of use' to be separate reason to 'premises not eligible'.

EJ asked members if they'd support consistency in end-to-end SLA across processes and thus 25 days instead of 22 days. OAG members concurred.

JS to review OAG suggestions and revert at next meeting.

4 AOB/Next steps

EJ recommended weekly cadence of meetings till end of July due to time pressures to ensure processes included in the hub for end of November delivery. Members generally agreed to updated cadence.

Action: MOSL to update meeting invites.

Next main meeting Tuesday 14 June 2022.

5 ACTIONS

1. MOSL to update OAG meeting invites