

OAG G2 Subgroup Meeting 06th August 14:00-16:00 MS Teams

Notes and high-level requirements captured.

Revisit of action items/further discussion points from previous meetings.

Action: OAG to pass matrix suggestion to RWG for further discussion/development.

It was confirmed that the matrix idea had been passed to the main RWG group for consideration. Support was given in response as a good concept however timing of any further work for RWG was still under review.

It was suggested by the group that the TEIC and Open Water websites could be good locations to house any information on this for both retailer and applicant benefit.

No further action or requirements required of the subgroup.

Status Closed.

Action: OAG to review and confirm application subtypes

The group reviewed the subtypes that had been previously identified at the meeting of 30/06 and no new additions were needed to the already captured requirement and subtypes.

No further action or requirements required of the subgroup.

Status Closed.

Action: OAG to further consider requirements for a SPID inline with existing guidance and eligibility rules.

OAG to provide rational for a suggested change to the 6 month application timeframe.

The group discussed this at length as to the appropriateness of the requirement for a SPID when one doesn't exist. The group discussed and acknowledged that if a SPID existed even for short term consents that the application can proceed as normal.

In the absence of a SPID, a number of discussion points were raised.

The requirement to be able to raise a G2 process without a SPID was still a valid scenario. The continued theme was that all applications would need to have a retailer either before application or a retailer selected as per previous requirements during the G2 process.

It was raised as a concern with an opt in process that retailers could be at risk of an auto allocation to an applicant who may default on the payment of application fees as there is no prior relationship/history potentially with the applicant. This was challenged that the premise of an opt in is that it is an accepted risk and retailers should not pick and choose. No immediate requirements came of this or further actions, but it was acknowledged that further conversation may occur on this as development of an opt in process continues.

A lot the issues discussed in this section came back to a review of the current requirements of the code for differing approaches based on the timeframe of the activity/consent.

Currently it is set out in the code that a SPID or DPID is not mandatory for consents that are under 6 months. The group supported that a code change to 12 months would help with the issues of no SPID etc.

Requirements:

Change of the market codes from 6 months to 12 months but retention of the DPID requirement as an option for wholesalers (Eg not mandatory but wholesalers can pursue a DPID if required for charging purposes).

Action: OAG to revisit discussion on 1 day discharges, applicants with no SPID and provide rationale as to inclusion in the process when there is no SPID. Possible eligibility discussion outside OAG??

The group discussed the scenario of extremely short term consents EG one offs, possibly only a day, low risk and no SPID to link the activity to.

It was discussed that whilst the desire is to push everything where possible through the hub that the market process, including the supported mandatory requirement for a retailer could be a substantial burden on the trader as the main concern in this.

This in the example of a demolished site (either not in the market, deregistered etc for development etc) and a trader providing a simple activity could be cumbersome and not in the interest of the trader.

It was suggested in this scenario that a burden in process could dissuade the trader in doing the right thing.

Other examples were cited for shared buildings with group maintenance and the trader was a single outfit and the only tangible address to use being one of a premise with multiple SPIDs.

There were no immediate requirements for the hub with this discussion point, but it was agreed that this was an important eligibility question to be resolved.

It was agreed that the RWG group for eligibility would be a good place to review.

Action: JF to raise eligibility question with RWG.

Action: OAG to further consider an SLA for SPID creation and when should SPID creation occur in the process.

The group discussed the timing of SPID creation where one is required.

It was agreed that the current stage in the process was suitable although it was acknowledged in particular for new builds/sites that this may be out of kilter with existing new connection processes. This could lead to pairing issues or excess SPIDs. No further actions or requirements were identified at this stage.

The group discussed that there is a gap in the current process that there is no SLA stated for the wholesaler to create a SPID and this causes complications with downstream SLAs that start from the completion of a SPID creation.

The group agreed that the process, if a SPID is required, should follow the steps of CSD101 new supply point registration including its SLAs and for the hub to facilitate the high level steps within the CSD process.

Requirements:

The ability for the G2 process to follow the steps of CSD101 and the applicable SLAs when a SPID is required.

The ability for a wholesaler to select SPID required yes/no prior to the SPID creation steps.

MOSL legal to review implications of configuring hub to 62 days for consent issue and notify of MO vs WIA obligation.

The group revisited the emerging concept of the bilaterals project to merge SLAs to measure end to end outcomes. The group agreed that the WIA obligation would still exist and any merge of SLAs should clearly remind trading parties of their existing obligations under the WIA.

Requirements:

MOSL project team to review change from a legal standpoint. EG differing timescales between market codes and WIA.

Edit to market codes to cover that any difference in specified timescales between the market codes and the WIA, that the WIA obligation still stands.

Action: OAG to confirm whether process should just be closed or whether kept open. Extract from ops terms provided for review.

The group discussed the complexities and the hard to define potential routes of a disputed decision in regard to a consent. The group agreed that there is no requirement to try to and facilitate any activity around this subject in the bilateral hub build.

No further action or requirements required of the subgroup.

Status Closed.

Action: OAG to review existing rules in the ops terms for deferrals to either agree as acceptable use for the G2 process or suggest additional edits for the ops terms specific to G2.

The group discussed the use of deferrals in the G2 process. It was agreed in similar themes to other processes that the new revisions of the code adequately covered the appropriate use of deferrals for go live.

It was acknowledged (supported by other groups looking at deferrals making similar observations) that until the bilaterals hub goes live and the industry gains a deeper insight into how deferrals are being used (move from summary numbers in OPS self reporting to a more granular level in the hub) that there is high potential for this area to be revisited at some point. G2 would be a consideration along with all other processes in any future discussions.

No further action or requirements required of the subgroup.

Status Closed.

Time out function – Revisited as a discussion point

The group had previously been adverse to the time out function applying in the G2 process (EG no action/reply of the retailer automatically leads to a rejected process after 15 days). It was mentioned that wholesalers have an active interest in applications that do not reach a consent decision and therefore may wish to pursue the application beyond a rejection/cancellation.

It was agreed that the normal rules and behaviour of the already specified timeout function in OSD701 could apply in G2 (nullifying previous requirement) on the proviso that wholesalers have access to a report to identify any applications subject to a time out rejection/cancellation so that they can further pursue the application if required.

Requirements:

The ability to view timed out G2 processes in a report. Note, this may be useful with appropriate filters (EG process type etc.) for all other Bilaterals processes.