DRAFT Minutes of the External Design Advisory Group (EDAG) meeting

Meeting 3 –15 March 2016

Introduction

1. Angelita Bradney (AB) introduced the meeting and welcomed EDAG members. A list of attendees is available at the end of this document.

Minutes and Actions

2. Members approved the minutes to EDAG 2 without amendment.

3. AB reviewed the actions from the previous meeting and a summary is provided in the table at the end of these minutes.

SRO update

4. Rob Salter-Church (RSC) thanked organisations for their contributions to date at Switching Programme workgroups. He said that a new Programme Director had been appointed and would be in place from early April. He noted that progress had been made with DCC on procuring specialised resources to support the programme as well as regulating its revenues over the development period.

5. RSC provided an update on the new Switching Programme Delivery Group (SPDG) which will hold its first meeting in April. SPDG will focus on aspects of programme delivery including risks and issues. This will allow EDAG to focus on design and policy related issues.

Programme Plan

6. Janna Wooby (JW) reviewed the programme plan to Baseline 1. This included dates and a slight amendment to the critical path reviewed at the previous meeting. Consumer research requirements for the cooling-off policy decision meant that this was now on the critical path in parallel with objections policy.

7. Mike Harding (MH) commented on the inclusion of research on cooling-off in the plan. AB stated that consumer research on cooling-off has been factored into the plan as a policy position is needed on how cooling-off is incorporated in the design of the new switching arrangements.

8. JW explained that the delivery of Design Baseline 1 in December 2016 was based on assumptions that included a single review cycle for products at User Group and EDAG as well as the availability of EDAG and DA during the summer when many key deliverables are scheduled. To mitigate the risk associated with the plan, the Programme Board had agreed a contingency

window of two months for delivery of Design Baseline 1. If this contingency is used, the Design Baseline 1 will be delivered in February 2017. A forward look for meetings beyond June would also be shared with EDAG members to help mitigate some of these risks.

Action: Ofgem

9. EDAG discussed the various interdependencies in the plan and the possibility of multiple review cycles. Members generally supported the addition of a two month contingency window.

10. MH questioned whether the contingency window is the only source of mitigation against any delays. RSC said that the Switching Team would ensure that meeting papers are circulated in advance and were of high quality so that User Groups, EDAG and DA are able to engage with policy papers so that the single review cycle is effective. Mitigating action for risks is included in the programme plan paper previously distributed to EDAG and published for this meeting.

11. There was a discussion on the high likelihood of multiple reviews of some policy issues and a delay due to several interdependencies and the volume of workload in the Business Process Design (BPD) workstream. In response to a comment on the interactions between workstreams, Jason Brogden (JBr) noted that there is expected to be a high degree of interaction between the workstream as Blueprint design develops, but only the firm interdependencies between products are shown on the plan diagram for simplicity. The amount of parallel work was a risk that the Design and Impact Assessment Team (DIAT) would seek to manage by sitting across the workstreams and helping to manage delivery and review/approval of papers and products.

12. One attendee commented on dependencies between delivery strategy and business process design and questioned if parallel work could result in a mismatch between delivery mechanism and solution architecture. JBr clarified that the intention is to take delivery strategy work to a reasonable level for Design Baseline 1 so that it could inform the subsequent RFI. Further development would take place in the Detailed Level Specification phase once the solution architecture is clear. AB said that towards the end of the Blueprint phase, work for the Detailed Level Specification would also begin in parallel.

13. Tabish Khan (TK) suggested that if the need for multiple review cycles ever arises for one of the workgroups it would be preferable to increase the frequency of meetings of that group and raise issues early instead of waiting for the next meeting which could lead to delays. He also said that it is preferable to increase the frequency of BPD meetings now rather than wait towards the end of the year and try to squeeze the work programme to an extent that it is not workable.

14. Gavin Jones (GJ) suggested that there could be two Business Process Design groups that could work in parallel on different subsets of the workstream. To reduce the workload of the BPD workstream and the interdependencies involved, it would be preferable to have decisions on design issues and solution architecture earlier rather than later.

15. Colin Sawyer (CS) said that there were various interdependencies between advanced registration, cooling-off, lock-out and objections policy. The next BPD User Group meeting would

focus on the relationships between these issues and this would be reviewed for information and early views at the next EDAG meeting.

16. Colin Hollins (CH) commented that in case of a trade-off between delivery timing and quality, quality must be given precedence.

17. In response to a comment on PSR review, AB stated that it is an external dependency that is being monitored by the programme, but that policy is being developed by a different department in Ofgem.

18. AB reiterated that EDAG is a senior level design group and its focus was primarily on strategic design issues in the wider context of industry development and requirements. The new SPDG will focus on programme planning and delivery. The Programme Plan and Highlight Report will be provided to EDAG for information but would not be discussed as a standing agenda item in future EDAG meetings.

Customer Switching Scenarios 1 and 2 - Business Process Design

19. CS noted that in developing the switching scenarios, the published Target Operating Model is initial point of reference. Customer Switching Scenarios 1 and 2, which described the sunny day business processes for domestic smart dual fuel credit and PPM customer respectively, had been developed and reviewed by BPD Design Team and User Group. Their input had been accommodated in the version being presented to EDAG for review.

20. CS said that the BPD workstream was working on formalising the process of receiving comments from the User Group and reporting on how those comments had been addressed. He asked EDAG to encourage their User Group representatives to avoid making confidential comments where possible as it was important for the wider group to understand concerns.

21. MH said that the comments should be logged and shared even if the individual making them wants to remain anonymous.

22. There was a discussion on business process maps and the supplier activities shown in the diagrams. Some members pointed out inconsistencies in the process maps such as a misalignment between actions and actors in Switching Scenario 1 level 2 descriptions. GJ suggested that it would be helpful to identify trigger activities on the process maps.

Action: Ofgem

23. EDAG agreed that the new summary sheet provided alongside the business process maps was a helpful tool. CS highlighted two key issues relating to notification of supplier agent appointment and change of supplier read process that were discussed in User Group meeting and required EDAG engagement.

24. CS proposed that the gaining and loosing supplier would use the smart meter daily read log to obtain the COS reading and that process maps should be developed on this basis. The P302

process could be used as a contingency if DCC arrangements are proven to be not sufficiently robust. EDAG supported this view.

25. In relation to metering agents, the User Group had proposed that the steps to appoint metering agents should be moved from Process 1.5 - 'Post Switch Admin' and positioned with 1.3 – 'Register Switch'.

26. CS asked for views on the gaining supplier including metering agents in the registration request. This would trigger the agent appointment process. EDAG broadly supported this view and considered that agents should be in place at the point that a supplier took over responsibility for a site. This would be a contractual matter for suppliers to manage. GJ noted that in some cases data would need to be transferred between agents and Gareth Evans (GE) added that consumer data privacy issues also needed to be addressed.

27. There was some discussion about how a metering agent could reject an appointment and what would happen if this was after a switch. EDAG also noted that, for some small suppliers, there may be difficulties in securing MAM services at short notice to meet faster switching requirements. There are health and safety requirements to have a MAM/MOP in place to deal with physical issues with the meter.

28. EDAG advised that the erroneous transfer implications of this approach would need to be reviewed.

29. Nick Salter (NS) asked if the agent appointment process also applied to gas shippers. CS confirmed that the shipper could be appointed as part of the registration request and that the shipper could be notified by the CRS.

Query Log

30. AW introduced a new transparency mechanism, the Query Management Log which is a product developed to handle queries related to the programme. A manual and Query Reporting Template will be shared in the next EDAG meeting.

31. AW defined the scope of the Query Management Log and the process for logging queries. He stated that only material queries will be published on the external facing Query Log, the rest will be handled on a bilateral basis between query raiser and Ofgem.

32. One member stated that even if a query has a low materiality it might be useful for other parties to know about it. AW stated that only minor issues or clarifications may not be published and other useful information will be published. Ofgem reserves the right to use its judgement and discretion. One member suggested that it would be preferable to have more detail on materiality in the Query Management manual.

33. In response to a comment on flow of the query to workstreams, AW stated that workstreams will have separate logs for queries related to specific workstream issues.

34. One member stated that in case of large number of queries, it would be preferable to have them grouped by theme or category for the reader's convenience. AW said that Ofgem will look into developing a high level categorization mechanism to make searching easier for the reader.

35. TK questioned if this log precludes bilateral discussion and GE asked if workstream leads can still be emailed individually. AW said that this does not preclude bilateral discussions but formalises the process to make managing queries more systematic and that Ofgem would encourage all the external stakeholders to use this tool.

36. On a question on the impact of the log, AW stated that it became an important tool in the Smart Metering Programme and it will grow in importance as the Switching Programme progresses. The Query Management Manual and reporting template will be published prior to the next EDAG meeting.

Action: Ofgem

AOB

37. Next EDAG meeting will be on 18th April. Policy issues on CRS user life cycle and advanced registration will be shared for review and MPxN lifecycle would be provided for information.

End

Attendees

Gavin Jones – Tech UK
Peter Seymour – Laurasia
Dee Drew – EDF Energy
Jonathan Bennett –DCC
Collin Hollins – GNG
Gareth Evans – IcoSS
Eric Graham – TMA
Tom Chevalier – AMO
David Crossman – Haven Power
Alex Travell – E.ON
Nick Salter – Xoserve
Justin Andrews – Elexon
Martin Evans – Utiligroup
Tabish Khan – British Gas
Jeremy Guard – First Utility
Andy Baugh – Npower
Martin Hewitt – ENA
Joanna Ferguson – NGN
Richard Sweet – Scottish Power
Adam Carden – SSE
Nick Taylor – DECC
Patrick Whitehead –DECC
Dan Alchin – Energy UK
Daniel Walker-Nolan – Citizen's Advice
Mike Harding – Brookfield Utilities
Angelita Bradney – Ofgem (Chair)
Nigel Nash – Ofgem
Andrew Wallace – Ofgem
Janna Wooby – Ofgem
Ali Siddiqui – Ofgem
Fatima Zaidi – Ofgem
Jason Brogden – Ofgem programme assurance consultant
Colin Sawyer – Ofgem
Andrew Amato - Ofgem

EDAG action log

No.	EDAG meeting	Action	Responsible party	Update	Status
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	Summary of Programme Validation Review, Summary Assurance diagram and Highlight Report published 4 Feb 2016 here Product Descriptions for Baseline 1 and RFI published here.	Closed
12	EDAG 2, 11 Feb 2016	Ofgem will consider what further information can be provided within the Highlight Report to provide EDAG with greater visibility over risks and issues.	Ofgem	Highlight Report to be provided to future EDAG meetings. Further discussion on risks and issues to be managed by SPDG.	Closed
14	EDAG 2, 11 Feb 2016	Ofgem to consider giving EDAG access to Huddle.	Ofgem	Cost issue with providing Huddle access. Relevant papers to be published on Ofgem website which is being redesigned and made easier to navigate.	Closed
18	EDAG 3, 15th March 2016	Ofgem to include triggers for key activities in process maps	Ofgem		Open
19	EDAG 3, 15th March 2016	Ofgem to publish Query Management Log and reporting template prior to EDAG 4	Ofgem		Open
20	EDAG 3, 15th March 2016	Ofgem to share a forward look for meetings beyond June	Ofgem		Open