

Operational Advisory Group (OAG)

20 September 2022 meeting

Minutes



Operational Advisory Group

Minutes of 20 September 2022 meeting

Attendees

OAG members and guests

- ◆ Andrew Hewett
- ◆ Ashley Connors
- ◆ David Buchan
- ◆ Heather Lamb
- ◆ Helen Bennett
- ◆ James Sands
- ◆ Jennifer Mclean
- ◆ Jeremy Lunn
- ◆ Lauren Walsh
- ◆ Mary Porter-Chorley
- ◆ Matt Garfield
- ◆ Nick Butt
- ◆ Nicola Spiller
- ◆ Noel Bradley
- ◆ Paul Baker
- ◆ Sian Forward
- ◆ Tom Wells

MOSL

- ◆ Evan Joannette (EJ) – Chair
- ◆ Chris Dawson (CD)
- ◆ Justice Osazee (JO)
- ◆ Monica Falasca (MF)
- ◆ Oli Robins (OR) - Notes

Meeting notes

1 Welcome

EJ welcomed members and confirmed the agenda; to revisit the process grouping introduced at the previous meeting, focussing on *'Allowances & Assessments'* and *'Verification Processes'*.

2 Process grouping e.g., generic processes

'Allowances & Assessments'

CD introduced the proposed grouping for *'Allowance & Assessments'* as consisting of H1 *'Application for an allowance and/or volumetric adjustment or Wholesaler notice of review and/or change of allowance'*, H2 *'Application for a Contribution Offer in respect of installing a meter at an Unmeasured or Assessed Service Component'* and H7 *'Application for Vacancy Incentive Scheme Payment'*.

CD explained that the business requirements for H1 had already been reviewed by the group, and in principle, the process flows for H2 and H7 aligned better to this process than C1 under the proposed *'Verification Processes'* grouping. If agreed by OAG, the *'Allowances & Assessments'* grouping would likely form the first process delivery post CPW070/CPM043.

The OAG noted that in practice, this approach would see the SLAs being aligned to 25BDs, with each process being initiated by the same Data Transaction as per G2 (Merged). Varying use of Data Items would differentiate each individual process and permit process specific reporting. The accompanying code drafting would also require the submission of a customer form alongside the Request, in order to simplify Data Item requirements given MVP constraints and the low volume of H2 and H7 Requests observed across the market. The additional information Data Item could also be used to convey information not facilitated by existing H1 fields.

CD confirmed that the attachment process is currently dependent upon an ORID already being established. Therefore, attachments cannot be submitted alongside an initiating Data Transaction. It was suggested that this limitation may present a potential risk for processes under the *'Notification'* grouping.

ACTION: MOSL to confirm the practicality of allowing attachments to be submitted alongside initiating transactions (and add to the backlog if feasible and not already included).

The OAG worked through Form H/02 to determine whether any information could be conveyed through Data Items rather than an attached form. The group identified that only two sections (2 and 3) requested process-specific information, with everything else seemingly being covered by generic requirements and validations of the Bilateral Hub.

The group considered the benefit of creating bespoke Data Items for these sections (including clarity for users, reduced risk of rejections, and greater consistency with proposed benefits of the programme) against expected cost and usage, with the alternative being code drafting to prescribe the completion of the existing additional information field, or a simple footnote for the B1 process. The discussion concluded that because H2 was an extremely low volume process, with few Wholesalers actually

offering a contribution scheme (and others preferring to complete installations free of charge under B1 instead), a footnote for B1 (which had to be followed anyway in order to get to this stage) would be the most proportionate approach.

OUTCOME: OAG members observed that H7 could not be aligned to H1 in their current forms because the business requirements associated with the latter do not permit another (non-registered) Retailer to raise the ORID. This limitation would severely restrict the use of H7 and potentially undermine the Objectives and Principles of the Wholesale-Retail Code, with several Wholesalers confirming that the majority of H7 Requests are submitted by other, non-registered Retailers.

CD proposed that H7 could be descoped from the 'Allowances & Assessments' grouping and addressed through an entirely new process (C8), which, whilst yet-to-be-confirmed, would be homogeneous in concept with H7. Member suggested that any alternative approach should recognise that 1) H7 Requests are often delivered in bulk, and 2) some Wholesalers have teams in place to deal exclusively with H processes. CD noted that whilst merging multiple H processes might seem logical, the resultant process flow could be lengthy and complicated.

'Verification Processes'

CD introduced the proposed grouping for 'Verification Processes' as consisting of C4 'Missing Service Components identified by the Wholesaler or Retailer', C7 'Retailer requested amendment to VOA BA Reference or UPRN as a Supply Point', H3 'Review of charges at Unmeasured or Assessed Supply Points', H4 'Wholesaler notice of change in Tariff applied to a Service Component' and H5 'Retailer application for change in Tariff applied to a Service Component'. The OAG noted that C7 would be expanded to consider Premise Address amendments in addition to VOA and UPRN.

CD explained that the process steps associated with C4, C7, H3, H4 and H5 effectively aligned to those under C1 (particularly with regard to the proposing and challenging of plans/outcomes). The pre-requisites for grouping would be as per 'Allowances and Assessments', meaning that some significant changes to some existing SLAs would be required.

Members discussed the practicality of shortening or lengthening different SLAs in the grouping. It was suggested that C7 would likely need to retain its 25 Business Day SLA due to the complex investigation often associated with such Requests (for example around splits and mergers). However, any lengthening of other SLAs (for example, C4) to match this would represent a reduction in service. CD proposed that customer interest could be better served by aligning C4 with C1, and grouping C7, H3 and H4 together.

3 AOB/Next steps

An OAG member noted that it was observing unexpectedly low volumes of completed tasks pertaining to F5 in Bilateral Hub reporting due to Retailers failing to close completed F5 Requests in the Bilateral Hub. Members felt this was likely due to training issues and a potential lack of awareness that the time-out function does not apply to the F5 process. Though, there may be some instances where the Retailer would be waiting on customer feedback before closing the Request.

EJ confirmed that the Code Advisory Group (CAG) had recently endorsed stronger wording in OSD 0707 to clarify the requirement for Retailers to close completed F5 Requests (which would be subject to Code Change Committee recommendation in October) and suggested that MOSL confirm desired behaviour through market communications (and/or possibly User Forum). The OAG agreed these to be the logical next steps before examining the need for technical fixes such as bespoke reports.

The OAG noted that the CAG had also recently endorsed some CPW070g drafting amendments to deliver some new functionality in the Bilateral Hub, which had been necessary to cover the GDPR issue associated with the no-SPID processes (G2 and C3). These processes require the initiating party to specify the other Trading Party involved in the process, providing potential for an incorrect Trading Party to have access to sensitive information. The new functionality ensures that such visibility can be removed from the perspective of an incorrect Trading Party once the mistake has been realised.

The OAG discussed issues around identifying comments through the LVI, with members raising that manual navigation and identification was proving inefficient and resource intensive. These difficulties were resulting in out-of-hub communications and complaints from other Trading Parties, and ultimately poorer customer service. It was suggested that MOSL consider adding potential solutions (such as interface improvements or additional reports) as a matter of priority to the backlog.

ACTION: MOSL to agenda discussion on LVI feedback at a future OAG meeting.

4 ACTIONS

- 1. MOSL to confirm the practicality of allowing attachments to be submitted alongside initiating transactions (and add to the backlog if feasible and not already included).**
- 2. MOSL to agenda discussion on LVI feedback at a future OAG meeting.**