# RESPONSE to [**Consumer Consent Solution consultation**](https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/consultation/consumer-consent-solution-consultation)

# Date of submission: 4 Oct 2024

From:

Chameleon Technology (UK) Limited

Smart Energy services and devices supplier

Contact: [Tom Moore](mailto:tom.moore@chameleontechnology.co.uk)

To: Linsay Jones

OfGem

## Do you agree with these Design Principles? Would you recommend any additional Design Principles?

In summary, the design principles are reasonable but not complete, a key missing principle would be to maximise the accessibility and engagement of the service with as broad an audience as possible. To achieve this multiple dissemination channels via multiple customer-facing organisations should be employed, not just the traditional or new energy industry businesses. This key principle is also considered in this response.

For the existing design principles, the proposed approach described within the consultation likely fails the design principles in several ways


* Note should be taken here of the existing Smart Energy Code privacy framework and the various “DCC Other Users” that have worked for many years on methods to gather unambiguous consent as required by that code. It is essential to find ways to make consent management interactions an integral part of the customer journey while interacting with the organisation wishing to access their data. Enabling the consumer to understand the context and purpose of the consent given. Energy data is relevant not only for consumers to manage their energy bills, but for a broad range of purposes, from education, social housing, and elderly care to green finance, which are fundamental for the energy transition.
* The creation of a centralised service is something the energy sector has never achieved in a cost-effective or time-efficient way. The energy sector is not a sector known for its agility and flexibility in introducing systems. The requirements and dependency over any centralised component to the solution must be minimised if there is any hope of achieving an economic or efficient implementation.
* Consideration is not given in the consultation to access over the Smart Meter network and the right to retrieve data from the consumer meters directly. It is assumed as part of this consultation that mechanisms to authorise and access smart meter data directly via the infrastructure will be *unchanged* and still allow for the “Other User” role to access HH data and management of CAD devices.

## 2. Do you have a preference between the centralised, decentralised or hybrid models? Please elaborate.

As described in the response to question 1, a centralised solution is not viable mechanism from a consumer experience, consumer engagement, cost or time-efficient perspective and a fully decentralised solution creates problems in the provision of consistency for consumers concerning which organisations have access to their data (and to what data).

It is critical to balance the need for a solution that encourages multiple means of consumer verification together with the widest possible distribution and availability of the service to be used by as many consumers as possible.

The diagram below describes a hybrid approach that would facilitate this goal while minimising the requirement (and cost) of the centralised component.

Furthermore, if considering the proposed additional design principle of ‘accessibility and engagement’ the below diagram provides the opportunity for multiple organisations to engage with their own customer base, in a style of their choosing with a broad level of consistency in the underlying technical and legal mechanisms.

Although there are similarities between the approach described in the diagram and the Ofgem consultation, the diagram describes key additions which further engagement and participation by organisations and consumers.

* **Minimisation of Central System cost and complexity,**

This approach would require a simple technical implementation centrally accelerating implementation and reducing cost. The approach also enables any organisation to participate and present (in a design and UX of their choosing) consistent information to their consumers, authenticated in a manner which is familiar to that organisation’s customers. No new credentials for consumers to remember and no requirement for an energy industry central system to engage consumers (something that it has never achieved previously).

* **Broad engagement with multiple trusted identity providers**

(Trusted Identifiers) would enable consumers to authenticate using credentials they are already familiar with and may already use on a day-to-day basis. This approach is already being considered by the SSES Tariff Interoperability Working Group (TIWG) sponsored by DESNZ. We strongly suggest Ofgem utilising some of the principles being developed by TIWG. Energy Suppliers could easily act as a Trusted Identifier (where consumers use their existing login details for the energy supplier portal) but this also opens up the possibility that other organisations (such as Retail banks) could also provide identity services to their customers as an alternative mechanism.

We strongly recommend that regulation is used sparingly, and engagement is primarily encouraged through simplicity, ubiquity and value. Most Data Sources are already regulated in some form and requirements can be placed on them to engage with this new system. Trusted Identifiers can be verified using mechanisms similar to those which already exist in the **Smart Energy Code (section I)**.

Data Users must have extremely light verification processes such as the true identity of the organisation matches the identity presented to the customer. Any further verification or regulation is a duplication of the protections which already exist within general data protection regulation and would likely act as a barrier to entry for those organisations wishing to engage with energy data.

## 3. **Do you consider the security measures referenced in this section, including the access control measures, will meet the requirements of a consent solution holding consumer data? Which additional protections would you recommend?**

Using the approach defined within this response, it is unlikely that PII would need to be processed by any centralised system or by organisations which do not already process PII. Therefore, the security measures and protections proposed are likely superfluous and would only add cost, complexity and barriers to the success of the service. Existing GDPR requirements as sufficient, we do not need another bespoke set of requirements for a specific industry which will only act to disincentives and confuse new participants in the journey towards lower energy bills and carbon neutrality.

The proposed processes and verification in the consultation demonstrate theoretical principles and processes which, as with many other initiatives, can simply not be practically implemented. The design of these security mechanisms and measures must be performed by designers with implementation and operational experience. At present the design is, at best, naive and will (as a minimum) introduce a costly and complex mechanism for little actual value.

## 4. Do you consider these standards are sufficient parameters to ensure inclusivity, accessibility and interoperability for the consent solution? Which standards would you recommend?

As previously stated, the proposed approach in the consultation adds complexity and barriers to consumer engagement, the central delivery body should have oversight of the delivery of the centralised technical components of the service and over the overall mechanisms and parties supporting the service. In the alternative approach described in this response, no delivery body should dictate the requirements of the User Experience (UX) or User Interface as there will not be a single service provided by a single entity.

However, it might be advisable that the central delivery body creates a reference implementation that can be reviewed and used by other organisations wishing to engage in the mechanism.

## 5. Do you agree with the options assessment conducted by Ofgem? If not, why?

Of the 3 selected RECCO is the obvious choice however there are other organisations with significantly more experience and capability in the required areas that could and should have been shortlisted.

The issue with the shortlist is, that although they have experience in processing consumer data, none of the shortlist have experience in consumer engagement.

However, the approach proposed in this response could be delivered by RECCo.

### 6. Do you agree with Ofgem’s minded-to position that RECCo should be selected as the Delivery Body for the consent solution? If not, which of the three proposed organisations should be selected as the Delivery Body for the consent solution, and why?

Yes, we agree with the selection of RECCo as the delivery body.

However, DCC will need to play a key role in the definition and provision of any centralised component of the service (especially if the proposed approach outlined within this response is adopted) as well as an effective funding vehicle. SECAS has significant experience in consumer consent frameworks and government and should support RECCo. Electralink would also play a key role as a data provider utilising information flowing through their DTS together with DCC Other Users (as defined within the Smart Energy Code).

It is recommended Ofgem also consider the work TWIG is performing.

## 7. Do you hold any views as to how the proposed solution should be funded? Please consider the points regarding fairness raised in paragraphs 4.12–4.14 and Ofgem’s duty to consumers when providing your answer.

**DCC** already has an effective and efficient mechanism to fund data-related programmes within the energy industry. This was also the mechanism used to fund the Central Switching Service. It would be reasonable to utilise this model for funding and especially if DCC was selected to provide the centralised component of the solution.

## 8. Do you agree with our position to make sharing consent data with consumers (via the consent solution) an obligation for licensees?

It would be appropriate for all consumer data access to be registered within the central system. This would significantly aid transparency with consumers and should include any and all use of consumer data, such as:

o Supplier billing and related activities

o Settlement

o Energy Theft detection

o Distribution Network planning

..plus, we’re sure, many other purposes.

The energy industry historically has been a system which is difficult to comprehend by consumers for many years, this is an opportunity to drive transparency and control to the consumer and should not be wasted.

## 9. Do you consider SLC 0 an appropriate route for implementing these changes, or should Ofgem create a bespoke licence condition?

A bespoke licence condition is likely required.