

## Operational Advisory Group (OAG)

15 November 2022 meeting

### Minutes

---



Operational Advisory Group

Minutes of 15 November 2022 meeting

## Attendees

### OAG members and guests

- ◆ Andrew Hewett
- ◆ Ashley Connors
- ◆ David Buchan
- ◆ David Moss
- ◆ Durga Gurung
- ◆ Heather Lamb
- ◆ Helen Bennett
- ◆ Jeremy Lunn
- ◆ Karen Hardaker
- ◆ Madeline Moores
- ◆ Nichola Spiller
- ◆ Noel Bradley
- ◆ Onkar Singh
- ◆ Pam Nash
- ◆ Paul Baker
- ◆ Rebecca Watson
- ◆ Sian Forward
- ◆ Tom Wells

### MOSL

- ◆ Evan Joannette (EJ) – Chair
- ◆ Chris Dawson (CD)
- ◆ Sam Webb (SW)
- ◆ Lisa-Ann Lott (LAL)- Notes

## Meeting notes

### 1 Welcome

EJ welcomed members and confirmed the agenda.

### 2 I Process feedback

CD introduced the slides relating to the I process.

A member (SF) noted the codes did not permit a Wholesaler to initiate the I7 process it would be a Retailer on behalf of an accredited entity trying to disconnect or for non-payment. The warrant event for non-payment disconnection is a Bilateral process as the Wholesaler would not be aware if payment had been paid. The Retailer must undertake all items on a checklist to ensure the warrant application will be successful with the Courts.

Other members proposed when reviewing the E processes to establish if other disconnection processes could be included within those such as Section 75 disconnections as they too featured warrants (thought these did not necessarily require payment insight from the retailer).

A member noted that there did not appear to be much practical value in the question 'has owner been contacted'. They noted WIA does not reference the site owner only the bill payer. Another member noted that in their experience, courts only asked about the liability of the bill payer (person paying for the supply) as opposed to site owner and was not aware of legal obligations in regard to advising the property owner, noting all disconnections in this respect are temporary disconnections. Discussion led to acknowledgement that in some rare cases, the owner of a building may well want to intercede if the alternative was a costly permanent disconnection to a property that would make it harder to reoccupy if the tenant left.

Members generally agreed questions 1-10a are all valid for inclusion however 10b-10d may not be needed.

Members noted the need to review the codes in relation to the need to visit/attend the premises to validate the ability to disconnect to take into account accredited entities.

**Outcome: Members generally agreed the I7 needed to be dealt with as a special case due to its complexity. Based on the feedback received, MOSL will diagram the process flow for disconnections including the special route for I7 process for review**

### 3 B10 re-mapping

CD introduced B10 noting it had been discussed for possible merger with B1 & B7 which would make it's additional to the hub more cost effective.

CD recommended adding the programme of work initiation rationale to Process D1 and remove B10 entirely. Inserting Wholesaler one-off SPID actions into B1 and B7.

A member noted B10 could be used for a significant number of jobs (approx. 10k p.a.) but also more specific work where a SPID was known and a schedule agreed with the customer.

Members generally agreed Process D1 would require rewording in an effort to accommodate programmes of work such as plan for replacement meters.

Another member noted an exception report detailing what hasn't been successful as opposed to notifications of singular requests upfront may be more useful. One report notifying of bulk programme of work followed by an exception report once works complete.

Members supported the idea of a pre-planned programme of works identifying what type of works e.g., smart metering programme followed by an exception report following works completed. Noting the need to be able to respond to the long-list upfront where works cannot go ahead. Retailer members noted need to ensure standardised template for Wholesalers to complete to provide the details, with excel file being sufficient format. Follow-on service requests could be raised on the back of this for exceptions.

## 4 AOB

CD raised some feedback that had been received from members be email.

CD highlighted member feedback received direct in regard to Past Termination Date on data item D8388 used in G2 merged process.

CD noted the requirement for past dated termination dates is greater than anticipated. CD asked members 'should the condition to prevent past termination dates be removed' noting it will affect the Consent Application Outcome field as well.

Members strongly supported a change to allow backdating and cited several credible example. One member noted that D4006 is a related data item used in deferrals but this should not be back dated. MOSL would look out for this.

CD noted a question from a member regarding customer digital signatures, in particular on Trade Effluent applications. The member wanted to confirm what type of signature is required by Wholesalers; digital, wet signature, jpeg embedded on pdf.

EJ noted MOSL legal team did not wish to restrict the ability for inclusion of different types of signature and a more formal agreement on guidance may have to be taken in another forum like RWG, but said that OAG could offer a quick sense check.

Wholesaler members generally agreed an embedded signature within a pdf would be sufficient as would a digital signature.

**OUTCOME: Members agreed that any further work to formalise the use of digital signatures could be done as a guidance document as opposed to creating a code requirement. Members recommended that if RWG does this work they consult widely to ensure the right TP experts are included.**

A member enquired if 'old forms' completed by customers prior to G2 merged go live will be accommodated following live date. EJ noted that codes expect old service request to be completed as per old rules. So G2 merged would be handled as C1 was...with some legacy applications likely to come through. CD confirmed new versions of the form will be live on 'go live' date for the hub however can be made available in advance to those trading parties who request them noting not technically valid until 29<sup>th</sup> November.

DB enquired if every line item must be completed with at list N/A to ensure form is materially complete? CD confirmed only relevant fields require completion. Members generally agreed line items did not require an N/A where that is the case and can be left blank where not applicable and should not be rejected on that basis.

DB further enquired where Wholesalers have a query will the Hub send a notification or will the Wholesaler email the Retailer or direct to the customer. Wholesaler members noted regardless of notification being actioned via the Hub should it be necessary the Wholesaler will contact the customer direct as TE consent provided direct to customer and is technically requested by the customer not the Retailer.

**DB requested if Wholesalers have drafted guidance on how to complete the form it is shared with other members.**

A member noted that the hub currently not recognizing excel files, EJ confirmed dev team working on fix and will be available at go-live on 29 November.

A member asked for confirmation on B5 regarding auto-close when a Wholesaler raises a query and the Retailer has not responded. CD confirmed no auto-close provides the option for Wholesaler to cancel, close or resubmit. This was by design. Other members noted that this was best as they would not want a request to close by default as they would likely want to go ahead regardless, and ultimately, they could cancel it if needed.

Next meeting

EJ noted member feedback that the next OAG meeting scheduled for 29 November, the same day as Phase 6 go-live and this would be difficult to manage.

**Action: MOSL to cancel the next OAG meeting and look to reschedule.**

## 5 ACTIONS

1. **MOSL to cancel the next OAG meeting and look to reschedule.**