

## SUMMARY POLICY ISSUES PAPER – FOR DA DECISION

Title of Paper	<b>Work Package 1 – Advance Registrations and Dual Fuel Switch</b>		
Issue Ref	Advance Registrations - BPD i35 Dual Fuel Switch - BPD i12	Date: 4 July 2016	
Issue Owner / Author	Jenny Boothe / Harshini Samarakoon		
Discussed at User Group	Advance Registrations - 23 March 2016 Dual Fuel Switch - 25 January 2016	Discussion at EDAG Group	Advance Registrations - 18 April 2016 Dual Fuel Switch - 11 February 2016
Issued to DA	Dual Fuel Switch - 29 February 2016	Discussion at DA	11 August 2016

This paper requests DA agreement to update the design baseline to incorporate its decisions in relation to advance registrations and dual fuel switching. This update to the business processes has been documented in Casewise and is shown in the accompanying documentation

### Summary and recommendations

#### Advance Registrations

- A configurable advance registration period of a maximum of 28 calendar days before the switch date.
- Only one pending registration is allowed during the advance registration period until a switch is complete.

#### Dual fuel switch

- 'One fail / all fail' option for suppliers to choose, under which all the linked requests would be rejected by the CRS and returned to the supplier for action.

### Analysis

#### Advance Registrations

- This policy decision has been integrated into Casewise and is shown as a timed event, symbolised by a clock, which sits between steps 1.3.3 and 1.4.1.1.

#### Dual fuel switch

- This policy decision has been integrated into Casewise at step 1.3.1.1, Validate Registration Request. The steps listed between 1.3.1.2 and 1.3.1.7 are all the

checks that must be met for both gas and electricity for a dual fuel customer in order to satisfy 1.3.1.11 and advance to validation status.

## Stakeholder Feedback

The User Group (July) noted how the two policies had been reflected within the business process maps. The general view was that these were accurately reflected and meet the desired outcome of the policy positions.

EDAG members also believed that the policy positions were accurately reflected within the business processes. Two members felt that the assessment against the Design Principles needed minor amendments (*now made and reflected below*)

## Recommendation to DA

DA are requested to:

1. Agree that the customer switching business process accurately reflects the advance registration and dual fuel policy outcomes, and
2. Agree that the updated business processes are appropriate to be included in the Blueprint Baseline 1.

## DA Decision Log

Date of DA Meeting	11 August 2016
Decisions (from Ofgem website)	The Design Authority unanimously agreed that the previously approved policy decisions on dual fuel switches and advanced registrations had been accurately reflected in the updated Switching Scenario 1-7 process maps.
Notes	•

## Appendix 1 – Advance registrations decision against design principles

Design Principle	Similar period to current rules (28 days)	One registration allowed
Impact on consumers		
1. Reliability for customers	Unlikely to affect reliability	As reliable as any other switch
2. Speed for customers	Unlikely to affect switching speed	Unlikely to affect switching speed
3. Customer Coverage	All customers covered	All customers covered
4. Customer Switching Experience	Unlikely to directly affect switching experience	Unlikely to directly affect switching experience
Impact on industry		
5. Competition	Should be little impact – lower risk customers of not paying bills after registration request is accepted. compared to A3	No impact – same across electricity and gas
6. Design – simplicity	Suppliers will have to withhold registrations for contracts agreed far in advance	Same as current arrangements
7. Design – robustness	No obvious impact.	Same as current arrangements
8. Design – flexibility	Should accommodate all switching scenarios – though may need to build in flexibility to change based on operational experience	Should accommodate all switching scenarios
Impact on delivery, costs and risks		
9. Solution cost/benefit	No obvious impacts	Similar rules to current process
10. Implementation	Should be straightforward	Should be straightforward

## Appendix 2 – Dual fuel switch against design principles

Design Principle	Automatic 'one fail/all fail'
Impact on Consumers	
1 Reliability for consumers	Customer wanting dual fuel switch could be further delayed and may abort the switch and further disengage from the market.
2 Speed for consumers	Places greatest pressure on supplier to correct errors and resubmit
3 Consumer coverage	No differential impact
4 Consumer experience	**Customer, with agreement with the supplier can determine how their dual fuel switch is progressed.
Impact on Market Participants	
5 Competition	Customer frustration could lead to disengagement from the market
6 Design Simplicity	Additional functionality will need to be built into the CRS so it can identify the related metering and can act upon the appropriate failure triggers
7 Design – robustness	More complex to build as requests have to be held until 'all clear'
8 Design – flexibility	Suppliers required to conform to single approach
Impact on Delivery, Costs and Risks	
9 Solution cost/benefit	Small level of additional complexity
10 Implementation	Small level of additional complexity

\*\* Change suggested by EDAG

