

DRAFT Minutes of the External Design Advisory Group (EDAG) meeting**Meeting 1 – 14 January 2016****Attendees**

1. A list of attendees is available in the appendix.

Welcome and introductions

2. Angelita Bradney (AB) introduced the meeting. She said that the Switching Programme was a once in a generation opportunity to improve the switching process for consumers and spoke of the challenge ahead for the switching programme and the complex issues that EDAG would be asked to advise on.
3. AB spoke to the slides 3 to 10 (published on the Ofgem website) which provided an overview of the Switching Programme's objective, purpose, scope, and governance. She noted that a Programme Director was being recruited.
4. In response to a question on independent supplier representation AB said that several independent suppliers and representatives had put themselves forward for workgroups. Ofgem would also provide briefings at Cornwall and ICOSS meetings as well as at the Ofgem and DECC Independent Supplier Forum.
5. Ofgem agreed to publish a list of the members of each of the workgroups in the Switching Programme.

Action: Ofgem

6. In response to a question from Nick Salter (NS), Ofgem confirmed that cooling off arrangements and provision of registration information to Xoserve to support nomination and allocation of gas was in scope of the programme.

EDAG Terms of Reference

7. Andrew Wallace (AW) reviewed slides 11 to 14. He said that EDAG was not a decision-making body, but would operate in an advisory capacity. Workstream leads, the Design Authority and the Switching Programme Board could ask for its views. EDAG was expected to review products and policy questions before they were sent to the Design Authority for decision. If EDAG could not reach consensus its views would be collated and sent to the Design Authority for its consideration.
8. In response to a question from Rosie McGlynn (RM), Ofgem confirmed that it had undertaken a programme validation review at programme initiation and that gateway reviews were expected to allow the programme to move between phases.

9. RM also asked that appropriate consideration was given to the 'unhappy path' in the Business Process Design Workstream.
10. Ofgem agreed to consider EDAG members' request for sight of relevant programme management materials such as the PID, the programme validation review summary and product descriptions. Jason Brogden (JBr) noted that it may not be appropriate to provide the PID as this was developed the previous year.

Action: Ofgem to provide an update at the next EDAG meeting

11. Mike Harding (MHa) asked whether there was a dedicated 'home' for all project documents. AB said that some workstream documents are held on Huddle but for transparency, EDAG documentation would be published on a dedicated area on the Ofgem website (see [here](#))
12. Ofgem agreed to review requests from EDAG members to publish, on the Ofgem website, an overview of each workstream's progress.

Action: Ofgem

13. Ofgem agreed to consider requests from EDAG members to provide more clarity around the scope of the Design Authority (DA), specifically on its approval role.

Action: Ofgem

14. NS asked whether monthly EDAG meetings would be sufficient to review the volume of material expected. AB said that this would be kept under review and that Ofgem would publish a forward work plan for EDAG so that members could better understand what and when issues would be brought them for review.

Action: Ofgem

15. Dee Drew (DD) requested assurance that business process development was focused on delivering the best experience for consumers. AW confirmed that this was a key design principle for the programme. This was also set out in version 2 of the Target Operating Model.

16. RM said that it was important that workstreams did not simply replicate existing arrangements and were fully exploring the potential of adopting new IT and ways of working.

17. EDAG discussed preferences over meeting dates and Ofgem agreed to set out future dates so that parties could hold these in diaries. The forward work plan was thought to be important so that parties could plan for attendance at specific meetings.

Action: Ofgem

18. AW highlighted a requirement in the EDAG Terms of Reference for any meeting attendees to notify Ofgem if they, or any of the companies that they represented, intended to bid in relation to the new Central Registration Service (CRS). Ofgem would then consider what, if any, action should be taken.

19. RM questioned whether EDAG was intended to allow members to represent a constituency and for these wider views to be sought for EDAG discussions. It was confirmed that this was the case and that papers would be sent five working days in advance of meetings to allow this to happen.

Overview of the Blueprint Phase

20. AW reviewed slides 15 and 16 on the Blueprint Phase. He explained that the programme was adopting a baseline approach to provide a clear basis for information collection, consultation and decision making.
21. AW noted that the Business Process Design Workstream was developing an end-to-end switching process that would document how the arrangements would work for all customers, including any differences between types of customer.
22. AW requested views on the sequencing of activity in workstream plans. Ofgem would reflect on this and return to a future EDAG with a consolidated programme plan showing dates and the critical path. AW said that workstream activity in the Blueprint phase would take place in parallel. The Detailed Level Specification Phase was also expected to start before the Blueprint Phase had fully concluded.
23. AR raised a concern about the potential for a switching RFI at the end of the year as this was when other RFIs (eg on smart metering) were expected to be made. AW said Ofgem would discuss its high-level proposals for the RFI at a future EDAG meeting to better understand industry requirements.
24. Workstream leads then summarised plans and work to date.

Business Process Design (BPD) Workstream

25. Jenny Boothe (JBo) spoke to slides 17 to 19, identifying that this workstream was designing the CRS and switching business processes as well as defining the functional/non-functional requirements of the CRS. She described the main work areas for business process design as being; customer switching, meter point life-cycle, user/party life cycle, and enquiries and reporting. The workstream was also examining the required solution architecture which would describe how these business processes would be delivered.
26. JBo noted that, for customer switching, 57 different scenarios had been identified that would be modelled. These accounted for variations in customer and meter type configurations.
27. NS queried the definition of 'User' and how access to the CRS was to be policed. JBo explained that developing the arrangements for access and use of the CRS is an activity for this workstream and that these arrangements will take account of data sharing and privacy rules.
28. Eric Graham (EG) raised the issue of lock-outs and the role of cooling-off. JBo said that the team would examine the interplay between cooling-off and lock-outs and whether lock-outs were needed to protect data integrity in a rapid switch environment.

29. EG questioned whether the move to half hourly electricity settlement is within the scope of BPD. AB said that the CRS design would incorporate flexibility to allow it to more easily respond to new initiatives such as HH settlement. JBo said that these issues are considered at a work package level, as opposed to during individual scenarios.
30. David Crossman (DC) asked whether the BPD workstream was designing a process for next-day or faster switching. JBo said that the team was working to develop a next-day switching process but exactly what that meant in practice was still being considered.
31. JBo noted the dependencies between the BPD Workstream and the other workstreams. In particular, the emerging solution architecture will impact on the commercial, regulatory and delivery arrangements.
32. EDAG requested visibility over the policy deliverables, as being able to see clearly what is being delivered and when can help EDAG plan. This suggestion was echoed across the group.
33. Alex Travell (AT) enquired about a risk and issues log and if there was one for the workstreams and the project as a whole. AB said that Ofgem are developing an external facing risk and issues log for the programme and workstream specific issues logs.
34. RM highlighted the importance of getting input from the Information Commissioners' Office (ICO) and the government's national technical authority for information assurance (CESG) before the first design baseline is finalised.

Delivery Strategy (DS) Workstream

35. Barry Coughlan (BC) spoke to slides 20 to 22 on the DS workstream. He said that the focus of the work was on transition strategy, governance implementation and assurance, along with the migration approach from legacy systems to the new switching arrangements.
36. Hazel Ward (HW) enquired about the timing of activities within this workstream. BC said that work was beginning now to narrow down options and feed into the cost assessment at the end of this year. He said that more detailed activity, eg the design of the testing strategy would take place during the DLS phase.
37. NS asked about the links between the DS and BPS Workstreams, eg on solution architecture, and wanted to know how the activities were allocated between the two groups. AB said that Ofgem would come to a future EDAG showing the consolidated programme plan and that this would help clarify this question.
38. BC spoke about the lessons learned from other big industry changes such as NETA and BETTA which are being used to inform decisions about the delivery of faster switching.

Commercial Workstream

39. Pooja Darbar (PD) spoke to slides 23 to 25 on the Commercial Workstream. The focus of the work will be on procurement, price control and charging arrangements for the CRS.

40. PD noted that the plan was presented with an assumption that DCC's CRS procurement would be subject to an ex-ante price control, and that this was currently the subject of a live consultation so did not prejudice the final decision on the appropriate form of price control for this activity.
41. David Crossman (DC) questioned DCC's role in the procurement exercise. AW said that DCC has been set-up as a procurement body with CRS provision in mind. Jonathon Bennett (JBe) said that DCC would undertake a competitive procurement to appoint the CRS provider.
42. EDAG asked how and when charges for the CRS would fall on users. PD responded that part of the Commercial Workstream and consultation will be on the timing and methodology of the charges, which will cover the Design, Build and Test and Live Operation phases of the switching programme.
43. One member of EDAG noted that existing networks price control arrangements did not take into account the transfer of registration services from networks to the DCC.

Regulatory Design (RD) Workstream

44. Jon Dixon (JD) spoke to slides 26 to 28 on the RD Workstream. The regulatory design team will focus on designing and assessing the governance arrangements, including licences and industry codes.
45. RM asked if the SEC would be the key industry code that would be impacted by the RD Workstream. JD said that SEC will be the focus, consistent with the Target Operating Model, but that the workstream would also consider the impacts on other codes and conduct a gap analysis to confirm whether SEC meets, or could be adapted to meet, all of the requirements.
46. Tom Chevalier (TC) asked about the scale of the changes to the codes and how this would affect the RD Workstream. JD said that there is a large volume of text to work through, but that this is in part owing to duplication across codes. The RD team is looking to simplify arrangements.

Switching Programme Design Principles

47. AW introduced draft design principles that would guide decision making for the switching programme and requested EDAG views.
48. Eric Graham (EG) said that ensuring a high quality switching experience for consumers was essential. If it was poor this would be shared with peers and family, and it would have a lasting impact on market engagement.
49. Natasha Hobday (NH) commented that including "customer expectation" in the design principles may not be ideal, as many customers have low expectations of the switching process.
50. EDAG asked if the design principles should set targets for the level of, or resolution of, problems. AW said that the intention was for the design principles to be aspirational and provide direction rather than set out specific targets.

51. In relation to principles 1 (Reliability for consumers) and 4 (Switching experience) AT noted that there was some cross over in the customer communication requirements. AW agreed to consider whether to explicitly reference consumer billing, in particular whether the new arrangements should help to facilitate timely and accurate change of supplier billing.
52. In response to a question on whether design principle 3 (consumer coverage) should explicitly mention that the new arrangements covered all customer, AW said that this was already covered by the scope of the programme. He agreed to consider if any further changes we required.
53. EDAG suggested that the word customer should be used in the design principles to reference instances where there was a direct contractual relationship with a supplier. Where the impacts were likely to be felt more widely, eg for other occupants at a premises, the term consumer should be used.
54. EDAG questioned why design principle 2 (Speed for consumers) required the switch to be as quick as possible. It was suggested that it should be capable of being quick but should reflect consumer requirements. AW agreed to amend the design principles to reflect this point.
55. EDAG asked for simplicity to be brought out more explicitly in the design principles.
56. EDAG said that design principle 8 (Solution cost/benefit) was not sufficiently clear that it took into account costs. AW said that was the intent but agreed to reflect on whether this needed to be more explicit.
57. In response to a question about accuracy of the switch, AB said that design principle 6 (Design - robustness) required the end-to-end system to be technically robust which should ensure accuracy of the switch.
58. Justin Andrews (JA) noted that many of the suggestions from EDAG may already be covered in the intent of the drafting of the design principles. He suggested that a more detailed explanation for each principle may give comfort that all of the relevant points had been considered.
59. AW thanked EDAG for its comments and asked for any further views to be sent to Ofgem. He agreed to consider further the points made with a view to taking an updated version to the Switching Programme Board for agreement.

Action: Ofgem

AoB

60. AB asked the group to forward any comments about the first meeting and how they wanted future meetings to run to Ofgem for consideration. NS suggested that the agenda was explicit on what areas EDAG members were expected to provide views on.
61. Patrick Whitehead said that DECC would shortly be publishing draft legislation aimed at facilitating Ofgem's ability to deliver the switching reforms. DECC would be pleased to receive the views of stakeholders when the draft clauses are published.

62. The next meeting will take place at Ofgem's offices on 11 February. The following meeting had been scheduled for 15 March.

END

Attendees

Eric Graham – TMA
Dee Drew – EDF
Justin Andrews – Elexon
Rosie McGlynn – Energy UK
Gavin Jones – Tech UK
David Crossman – Haven Power
Richard Sweet – Scottish Power
Tom Chevalier – AMO
Patrick Whitehead – DECC
Mike Harding – Brookfield
Adam Carden – SSE (also representing SPAA)
Tabish Khan – British Gas
Hazel Ward – Npower
Joanna Ferguson – Northern Gas Networks (representing ENA)
Daniel Walker-Nolan – Citizens Advice
Alex Travell – E.ON (also representing SECAS and MEC)
Jon Bennett – DCC
Andrew Humby – Utiligroup
Natasha Hobday – First Utility
Alison Russell – Utilita
Peter Seymour – Laurasia
Martin Hewitt – UK Power Networks (representing ENA)
Nick Salter – Xoserve
Colin Hollins – CNG
Leyton Jones – OVO
Gareth Evans – ICOSS
Angelita Bradney – Ofgem (Chair)
Andrew Wallace – Ofgem
Chris Spedding – Ofgem
Jo Thrower – Ofgem
Pooja Darbar – Ofgem
Jon Dixon – Ofgem
Jenny Boothe – Ofgem
Barry Coughlan – Ofgem
Fatima Zaidi
Jason Brogden – Ofgem programme assurance consultant

Apologies

Ed Reed – Cornwall Consulting

Summary of actions

No.	EDAG meeting	Action	Responsible party	Update	Status
1	EDAG 1, 14 Jan 2016	Ofgem agreed to publish a list of the members of each of the workgroups in the Switching Programme	Ofgem	To be published on Ofgem website 4 Feb 2016	Open
2	EDAG 1, 14 Jan 2016	Ofgem agreed to consider EDAG members' request for sight of relevant programme management materials such as the PID, the programme validation review summary and product descriptions.	Ofgem	Papers to be provided to EDAG on 4 Feb for discussion at EDAG 2	Open
3	EDAG 1, 14 Jan 2016	Ofgem agreed to review requests from EDAG members to publish, on the Ofgem website, an overview of each workstream's progress.	Ofgem	Monthly highlight report to be provided to EDAG. First report to be published on 4 Feb 2016.	Open
4	EDAG 1, 14 Jan 2016	Ofgem agreed to consider requests from EDAG members to provide more clarity around the scope of the Design Authority (DA), specifically on its approval role	Ofgem	To be presented to EDAG 2 on 11 Feb 2016	Open
5	EDAG 1, 14 Jan 2016	Ofgem to publish a forward work plan for EDAG so that members could better understand what and when issues would be brought them for review	Ofgem	To be presented to EDAG 3 on 15 Mar 2016	Open
6	EDAG 1, 14 Jan 2016	Ofgem agreed to set out future dates so that parties could hold these in diaries	Ofgem	Dates to Dec 2016 included on agenda for EDAG 2	Closed
7	EDAG 1, 14 Jan 2016	Ofgem to consider points made on Design Principles with a view to taking an updated version to the Switching Programme Board for agreement	Ofgem	Updated version of Design Principles agreed by Switching Programme Board on 25 Jan 2016	Closed