

## OAG G2 Subgroup Meeting 19<sup>th</sup> July 10:00-12:00 MS Teams

Notes and high-level requirements captured.

The group briefly discussed the required next steps at high level.

It was agreed that the group would complete their review of the process flow and complete any outstanding actions. The outputs would then be passed to the MOSL project team to evaluate and propose a strawman. The subgroup would reconvene at this point to review the proposal before presenting the strawman back to main OAG.

The group walked through the steps of the annex process flow of the Operational Terms

### Steps 1 and 2

It was discussed and agreed that all applications for a consent should follow the same process and have a retailer. One member raised whether it was also applicable to one day activities with no SPID. See action below.

The group revisited the previous discussion of an opt in for retailers willing to take on new customers for trade effluent consents. The group suggested that the opted in retailers could be a selectable item in the LVI.

The group expressed interest in the process steps for a customer to select a retailer to be similar to the steps of process C2.

It was identified in the current annex diagram that there is an error in that not all routes require the retailer to sign the application. The group agreed this was not true and that on all occasions the retailer should sign the application.

The group discussed the existing accept/reject process of OSD0701 and whether any automation in the accept or reject could be utilised. After review, it was agreed that the existing functionality was sufficient.

The group further reinforced the need for a digital platform for customers to edit consent forms. The group raised a new requirement that any edits should override previously submitted data.

Requirements:

The ability to select opted in retailers from a list in the LVI.
The ability for the retailer to sign the consent form when the customer applies direct in all circumstances.
The ability for an updated consent form to overwrite the data previously entered.

*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??*

### Step 3

The group discussed the need for asking the retailer/customer to provide more information. It was agreed that an SLA is required for more info requests but not an auto reject of process for G2.

Requirements:

The ability to use the functionality of the more info process in OSD0701 with a G2 specific configuration to not have the time out function enabled but still have an SLA.
--

## Step 4 and Step 5

No required changes. Develop AS-IS.

## Step 6

The group reviewed the requirement of a wholesaler to provide an indicative decision after 30 days. It was confirmed that this was a requirement of the code and not the WIA.

The group discussed the value of this step and whether it was still relevant. It was agreed that the whole of step 6 was no longer required based on the fact that wholesalers should be keeping retailers informed as applications progress and indication is not binding and could misinform.

Requirements:

Removal of step 6 from the code.
----------------------------------

## Step 7

The group discussed the outcomes of a consent decision. One member suggested for reporting that it might be worth separating consent approvals into approved and approved with conditions for a reporting metric. It was agreed that this was not required as a metric.

The group discussed the communication of the consent decisions and how this should include all parties.

It was discussed as part of variations, that the owners of the premise should also be notified in addition to the customer applying. This data is captured in the current versions of the form. A suggestion was made to have the ability to add additional recipients when applicable.

Requirements:

The ability to select other contacts within the form data as additional recipients for the consent decision message.
--

The ability to manually type an additional recipient for the consent decision message.
--

## Step 8

The group discussed the previous design choices of the hub in the combination of OPS standards and MPS/MDS standards. The group agreed that the 60 calendar day time to issue a consent decision could be combined with the 2 BD requirement of a wholesaler to notify the MO. It was noted that whilst supported that this conflicted with the WIA of 2 calendar months.

The group identified a problem with the scenario when there is no SPID and the above. The code currently states that the wholesaler should notify the MO within 5 BD of the creation of the SPID but there is currently no timescale given for the time taken to create the SPID.

Requirements:

No system requirements at this time. Potential config requirements to follow.

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

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

*In addition, confirmation on actual days to be configured. In the WIA it is stated as 2 months. Is 2 months from a system config 59,60, 61 or 62 days. Combining the 2 months and the MDS 2 business days may not be possible as one is calendar days and one is business days. It might not be as straightforward as 60+2.*

## **Step 9**

The group discussed the steps that could occur beyond a decision in particular the appeal process. It was agreed that the hub did not need to cover these steps.

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

*Unless a referral has been made under Step 4 above, if, within the two (2) Month time period set out under Step 8 above, the Wholesaler has failed to give its consent, has refused to give consent, or has imposed conditions which the Non-Household Customer or the Retailer, on behalf of its Non-Household Customer, does not wish to accept, the Non-Household Customer may appeal the Wholesaler's actions or omissions, for example to the Authority under section 122 of the Water Industry Act 1991. The Wholesaler and the Retailer shall ensure that any necessary information is provided to each other and to the Non-Household Customer in respect of that appeal, and that the Market Operator is notified of any changes in accordance with the Market Terms to any information previously provided.*

## **Deferrals – Most steps**

It was discussed by the group initially that deferrals shouldn't take place. Through further discussion it was established that deferrals could apply when the wholesaler cannot proceed due to reasons outside its control. It was suggested that an amber warning could be provided if a user raised a deferral in the LVI against a G2 process.

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.