



Operational Advisory Group (OAG)

Date and time: 08 July 2024, 1430 - 1600

Status of minutes: FINAL

Meeting Minutes

OAG members and guests

Name	(Initial)	Organisation	Name	(Initial)	Organisation
Andrew Hewett	AH	Thames	Lee Mcfetridge	LM	Severn Trent
Anna Muskett	AM	Wessex	Madeleine Moores	MM	Pennon
Chris Williams	CW	Thames	Mary Porter-Chorley	MPC	South Staffs
Daniel Proctor	DP	Waterplus	Michael Floyd	MF	UU
David Buchan	DB	Castle	Pam Nash	PN	C&C
Emona Pepaj	EP	Thames	Paul Baker	PB	Business Stream
Jacob Head	JH	Water2Business	Rosemary English	RE	Southern
Julie-Ann Anderson	JAA	Ses	Sian Forward	SF	Northumbrian
Karina Soulynha	KS	Southern	Tracy Ware	TW	Portsmouth

MOSL

Name	(Initial)	Organisation	Name	(Initial)	Organisation
Chris Dawson	CD	Chair	Monica Falasca	MF	Observer
Jac Davidson	JD	Presenter	Sauda Dickinson	SD	Notes
Lisa-Ann Lott	LAL	Notes			

1.	Welcome
	CD welcomed everyone, introduced new members and gave an overview of the agenda CD highlighted MF & JD have some important AOBs at the end
2.	Phase 14
	<p>Increased visibility of "Add Comment"</p> <p>JD listed all changes made.</p> <p>JD advised changes to be delivered in September.</p> <p>JD noted that "mark as seen" flag is to be added to each added comment instead of a singular flag to mark all comments.</p> <p>CW enquired about a scenario where comments are moved to a new status and the flag will be lost.</p> <p>JD confirmed flag would be lost when comment is moved to a new status.</p> <p>CW suggested flag to left until comment has been read and resolved.</p> <p>JAA agreed with CW in meeting chat.</p> <p>RE raised concern that retailer would see the comment as unread.</p> <p>JD confirmed retailer would not be able to see the comment or flag.</p> <p>HB confirmed that the flag status would not matter as it is only for internal use.</p> <p>SF noted that this is a perfect solution, and it is what was needed.</p> <p>SF raised concern about potential misuse of the hub and the comment option. Comments might be used in place of a required transaction.</p> <p>CW raised concern about comments remaining open.</p> <p>PN advised she would discuss solutions with CW around his concern.</p> <p>Linking a no SPID ORID to a SPID</p> <p>JD talked members through now being able to link a SPID to an ORID.</p>

AH enquired if this would be a mandatory action.

PN advised that it would not be necessary for every case.

CD confirmed that it would be an optional field.

JD advised it serves as a tidying-up function.

JD advised the link option would be coming in December.

CD enquired if it was just a wholesaler transaction.

JD confirmed that it was.

Additional Attachment Functionality

JD ran through changes made to attachment functionality.

AH enquired whether emails with attachments could be attached.

JD confirmed emails with attachments could be attached.

AH enquired whether the attachments in the email would also be limited to the allowed formats.

JD to take AH's concern away and get back with an answer on the limitations surrounding email attachment formats.

Scenarios for Escalating a Service Request

JD referenced email that was sent out before meeting requesting members to share scenarios for escalations.

CD referred to the request as "permitted escalation reasons".

DM advised that deferral is a good example case.

DM also raised concerns that limiting escalations might be a step too far.

JD enquired if DM would prefer to just have some rules around escalations without a full restriction.

	<p>DM advised that they are more interested in acknowledging and seeing escalations and setting prioritizations/ impact classifications "low/medium/high impact". Trading parties can then respond by rejecting or actioning each escalation.</p> <p>DM mentioned how they categorize internally (Data issues and service issues).</p> <p>DM to send through a breakdown of categories for JD to look at.</p> <p>DM sent through a view of their internal categories in the meeting chat.</p> <p>PB advised that challenging a deferral is an example of an escalation.</p> <p>JD agreed that the solution would be to have rules added around how escalations should be handled and categorized.</p> <p>SF enquired if it would be both a wholesaler and retailer escalation process.</p> <p>JD to confirm that it was discussed to be both ways.</p> <p>CW suggested it should be retailer to wholesaler as well as retailer to retailer and wholesaler to wholesaler.</p> <p>JD advised that she, CD and MF would sit together to work it out.</p>
3.	AOB
	<p>H7</p> <p>JD recapped that H7 was the vacancy incentive scheme and whether that should go into the hub.</p> <p>JD advised that the only wholesaler who is currently opted-in will soon be opting out, therefore, there is not a strong enough reason for a business case to add the scheme to the hub.</p> <p>J2</p> <p>JD recapped rule I1 and I3 for disconnections and reconnections in the J2 process.</p> <p>JD advised the data items that were captured from I1 and I3 were mirrored.</p> <p>JD asked the members whether a disconnection read is a visual read or a remote estimate.</p>

	<p>DM confirmed it would always be a visual read.</p> <p>SF agreed that it would always be a visual read except where the metre is scratched or damaged and hard to read, the additional details section would then be used to state otherwise.</p> <p>JD asked members if the reconnection read needed to be captured.</p> <p>CW advised the reconnection read should be the same as the disconnection read.</p> <p>RE agreed that they would want to use the disconnection read on reconnection.</p> <p>CD noted that we might need some clarification in the code.</p> <p>CCW Feedback & Issues Raised</p> <p>JD talked through discussions had CCW had in a workshop with wholesalers and retailers and issues that were raised.</p> <p>JD raised concerns about the H1 form sometimes not being attached or mandatory fields not being completed or incorrectly completed.</p> <p>SF noted that there might be a need for training instead of hub changes.</p> <p>SF noted that not much can be done about fields being completed with incorrect information by people.</p> <p>SF suggested the need for validation preventing submission unless an attachment is added.</p> <p>RE noted that attachments are sometimes not received which results in the case timing out.</p> <p>JD noted the possibility of potentially add restrictions around submissions without attachments.</p>
--	--

	Actions	Action by	Action date