

Rachel Clark  
Programme Director, Switching Programme  
Ofgem  
10 South Colonnade  
Canary Wharf  
London  
E14 4PU

9 September 2019

Dear Rachel,

**Switching Programme and Retail Code Consolidation: Proposed changes to licences and industry codes**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this consultation. ScottishPower supports Ofgem's programme of reforms to deliver faster more reliable switching, which we see as central to improving customer engagement and competition in the retail energy market.

Our answers to the consultation questions are in Annex 1 to this letter (with the exception of Questions 1.3 to 1.5 and 4.4 to 4.4, to which we responded on 29 July). We would highlight the following points:

- **Plan and timescales for the switching programme SCR:** We share concerns expressed by the industry that the current version of the programme plan and associated timescales may not be sufficient to ensure the delivery of robust and effective switching arrangements which enhance the customer experience. One of the particular concerns is that smaller suppliers and non-supplier parties need to be brought more fully into the programme to ensure the new systems and arrangements are effective across the industry. Accordingly, we believe Ofgem should review the plan design and timescales to take account of these issues. Further detail will be provided by the industry in correspondence on this point.
- **Policy and process changes:** We understood the terms of reference for the REC Consolidation SCR are to migrate existing industry code regulations (notably SPAA, MRA & BSC) into the REC. Our review of the draft consolidated REC text has identified a number of instances of what appear to be policy changes or new obligations which are out of scope of this SCR. We are not opposed to such changes if they deliver consumer benefits and think a defined governance process should be devised to ensure these change proposals are managed effectively. For example, such changes could be progressed as REC modifications utilising the interim REC governance arrangements. Alternatively, modifications could be made to the existing codes (SPAA, MRA etc) and then migrated into the REC. We would welcome Ofgem's view on this.

- **Code simplification and rationalisation:** We support this as one of the guiding principles for establishing the REC. That said, it is important to recognise that much of the original industry code text was developed to facilitate complex but robust industry processes. In managing a simplification and rationalisation of industry codes it is necessary to identify text that is genuinely superfluous or redundant and therefore can be removed. An alternative approach could be to draft higher level and more accessible text into the core REC, and migrate the supporting detailed specifications to subsidiary documents, provided such subsidiary documents are subject to appropriate governance arrangements. We think both SCRs would benefit from inclusion of explicit reviews of original code text to identify what can be simplified and rationalised without the risk of losing critical technical details. An example of a simplification and rationalisation exercise was the Ofgem Supply Licence review (2005-2007).<sup>1</sup> This was led by an experienced industry legal expert and involved iterative workshops where the scope for rationalisation of licence conditions and redrafting into plain English were discussed and the resultant re-drafts reviewed.
- **Interaction with Ofgem/BEIS energy codes reforms:** it is important to keep both SCRs under review to ensure the resultant REC and associated governance arrangements are aligned with the potential reforms being contemplated by the review<sup>2</sup>. This approach should minimise the potential for disruption to the REC and Switching Arrangements as the conclusions of the Ofgem/BEIS review are implemented in the first half of the 2020s.

Should you wish to discuss any of these points further then please do not hesitate to contact me, Lorna Mallon ([lorna.mallon@scottishpower.com](mailto:lorna.mallon@scottishpower.com), 0141 614 1163) or Haren Thillainathan ([hthillainathan@scottishpower.com](mailto:hthillainathan@scottishpower.com), 0141 614 2007).

Yours sincerely,



**Richard Sweet**  
Head of Regulatory Policy

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/publications-and-updates/12807-supply-licence-review-final-proposals>

<sup>2</sup> Doc <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/reforming-the-energy-industry-codes>

**SWITCHING PROGRAMME AND RETAIL CODE CONSOLIDATION:  
PROPOSED CHANGES TO LICENCES AND INDUSTRY CODES  
- SCOTTISHPOWER RESPONSE**

**Chapter 1: REC Governance Arrangements**

**1.1: Do you agree that the mission statement and objectives encapsulate the functions of the code, can drive activity of the governance functions and assist decision-making on changes to codes?**

Yes, and we would recommend a minor change from:

“The REC will facilitate the efficient and effective running of the retail energy market, including its systems and processes. It will promote innovation, competition and positive customer outcomes.”

to:

“The REC will facilitate the efficient and effective running of the retail energy market, including its systems and processes. It will promote innovation and competition that creates positive customer outcomes.”

Without this change innovation and competition are defined as ends in themselves, whereas we believe should be a means to the end of delivering positive customer outcomes.

**1.2: Do you agree with our proposals on the initial and ongoing appointment of RECCo Board Members?**

Yes, we broadly agree with the proposals for the appointment of initial and ongoing REC board members. However, we disagree with the proposal not to codify the terms of reference for the Nominations Committee and the process they follow. We believe codification would be beneficial by ensuring good practice in corporate governance is adopted, eg requirements for the declaration of possible conflicts of interest by prospective board members. We would expect the terms of reference and nomination process to be codified in a manner allowing for modification in future where improvements in governance are identified. We also recommend a two-year term for ongoing members as standard.

**1.6: Do you agree with our proposals on the set-up of the REC Change Panel? Do you foresee any problems with these proposals?**

We agree with the proposed set up for the REC change panel. While we agree with the requirement for independent panel members, experience from other industry codes has shown that securing independent panel members with sufficient competence and knowledge can be costly. Given the acknowledged narrow role of the panel to taking decisions on modifications of lower importance that are not sent to the Authority, the REC board should ensure the costs of securing independent panel members are kept to efficient and proportionate levels.

**1.7: Do you agree with our proposals on the set-up of the PAB? Do you foresee any problems with these proposals?**

We support the creation of a Performance Assurance Board (PAB) function to underpin the REC. However, we think rather than designing the performance regime from scratch it would be more effective and efficient to utilise existing performance assurance regimes from the codes being consolidated into the REC. For example, the existing metering audit processes from the BSC and SPAA could be retained by the REC PAB. Taking this approach would allow the REC PAB to focus resources and attention on establishing assurance regimes for new processes and data categories that will be established under the REC. This would allow changes and improvements to be introduced over time, once the REC PAB is established and fully aware of all requirements, obligations and impacts on customers.

In line with our response to Question 1.6, we believe the REC Co. Board should be expected to ensure the costs of recruiting REC PAB members are kept at an efficient and proportionate level, especially for the required members external to the energy industry.

**1.8: Do you agree that the inclusion of the principles outlined (as included in the draft change management schedule) should address some or all of the problems associated with existing code governance?**

Yes, the principles should address at least some of the problems and this will improve over time. Going forwards, as improvements in the REC modification process are identified, we would expect the change management schedule to be reviewed and amended accordingly.

**Chapter 2: Delivery Approach**

**Question 2.1: Do you agree with our proposed choreography of the Retail Code Consolidation SCR, Switching Programme SCR and associated licence changes, including our proposals that the Switching Programme changes will be introduced as ‘dormant’ before being made ‘active’ following Authority direction?**

We support the new approach for the Consolidation SCR changes to be implemented by 1 April 2021 as this ensures delivery of the consolidation of existing codes into the REC whilst the implementation of the new switching processes and systems can be separately managed under the switching programme SCR. Further we agree with the approach to introduce the switching programme changes as “dormant” until directed to become “active” by the Authority, once the implementation timescales for the switching programme are confirmed.

**Question 2.2: Do you agree with the approach we have described for managing the delivery of the Switching Programme SCR and the Retail Code Consolidation SCR?**

The approach for managing the delivery of the Switching Programme and Retail Code Consolidation SCR appears reasonable. We can provide further comments in the Autumn 2019 consultation when we know the full impact of the consequential changes.

**Question 2.3: Do you have any views on the draft consequential changes to industry codes and work plans described in Appendix 5 that would help deliver the Switching Programme and Retail Code Consolidation SCRs?**

The draft consequential changes currently out for review have identified potential omissions and areas requiring greater clarification. We have concerns that the combined volume of the consequential changes, together with other draft text being put out for review under the switching programme, exceeds what can be given sufficient scrutiny by industry. We consider that this is another factor that necessitates a review of the Switching Programme plan and timescales as proposed in the covering letter.

We think it is also important to recognise the consequential changes may be impacted by other industry changes and reforms before the implementation of the switching programme. Accordingly, the switching programme SCR should have appropriate arrangements for keeping the consequential changes under review without unduly diverting industry resources.

**Chapter 3: REC Operational Arrangements**

**Question 3.1: Do you agree that the draft Registration Services Schedule meets the required standards set out in the Regulatory Design Principles? If not, please describe how you think it should be improved.**

To an extent, yes, we believe the Principles have been met. However, this is clearly an early draft and will change over time.

We have the following comments on the draft registration schedule.

<b>Clause</b>	<b>Quote</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Suggested changes / next steps</b>
1.3, 2.1 etc.	Energy Contract definition	There is a risk this could be misinterpreted.	Have one definition in Interpretation Schedule that is not open to interpretation
1.5(c)	Rejected	We understand this means the CSS will check for all possible rejections and not stop at the first one.	The clause should state this.
Sections 2.1, 2.2 and 3.1, 3.2	Opening clauses	Seem to be quite duplicative and therefore scope to remove the repetition	
11.3(a)	Settlement Parameters	Not defined anywhere	Have one definition in Interpretation Schedule that is not open to interpretation
11.4(c)	NOSI flow	The NOSI flow is currently only mandated for domestic customers but as it is drafted the clause suggests all NHH and non-domestic gas customers	We believe such a change would have to be progressed by the MRA & SPAA modification processes to ensure it is given due care and attention.

Clause	Quote	Comment	Suggested changes / next steps
13.3.1.2, 13.4.1, 13.4.1.2, 14.6.1, 14.6.6.1.2, 17	Agent appointment and de-appointment	This process needs to be reviewed as it is not clear what is happening here. We understand from engagement with the programme that the agent appointment process is not changing but this new step is being added. However, it has not been included in the consequential changes to current codes, thus creating ambiguity. The tables currently in the Schedule suggest this is the only agent appointment process. We do not believe this is correct.	If the drafting is correct, more detail is required as it impacts not only industry codes and systems but also individual commercial contracts

**Question 3.2: Do you agree that the draft Address Management Schedule meets the required standards set out in the Regulatory Design Principles? If not, please describe how you think it should be improved.**

While we agree that the draft Address Management Schedule, at a high level, meets the required standards set out in the Regulatory Design Principle, it is not done in a clear and consistent way. We note that the existing processes to allow a supplier to raise a request have not been included. For example, a lot of work has been done in recent years to improve the process in MAP 09 including the creation of a new flow to allow suppliers to suggest address changes and also the creation of a bulk query process. We would have expected both the gas and electricity processes to be copied over. If Paragraph 7 is intended to replace all existing processes to allow the CSS to manage the process as a hub, it does not clearly state that, and has not been included in the consequential changes.

**Question 3.3: Do you agree that the draft Data Management Schedule meets the required standards set out in the Regulatory Design Principles? If not, please describe how you think it should be improved.**

Yes, we agree that the draft Data Management Schedule meets the required standards set out in the Regulatory Design Principles. However, the gas and electricity tables are not in alignment as gas includes an additional option of dormant this could be extended to electricity in section 6.13 by including an entry for 'De-energised – Dormant'?

**Question 3.4: Do you agree that the draft Service Management Schedule meets the required standards set out in the Regulatory Design Principles? If not, please describe how you think it should be improved.**

Although we broadly agree with the draft Service Management Schedule it is not clear and consistent. It does not clearly define how incidents will be categorised, which will make it difficult for the supplier to manage their end-to-end business operations and customers' expectations effectively. Without this information it does not meet the required standards set out in the Regulatory Design Principles.

**Question 3.5: Do you agree that the draft Entry Assessment and Qualification Schedule meets the required standards set out in the Regulatory Design Principles? If not, please describe how you think it should be improved.**

We agree with most of the draft Entry Assessment and Qualification schedule but would request further clarification on the time that a supplier can remain 'dormant' without requalification.

**Question 3.6: Do you agree that the draft Resolution of Consumer Facing Switching and Billing Problems Schedule meets the Regulatory Design Principles? If not, please explain how the Schedule could be improved?**

To an extent, yes, we believe the Principles have been met. However, this is clearly an early draft and will change over time.

We have provided the following comments on the Schedule.

Clause	Quote	Comment	Suggested changes / next steps
1.3	Table providing overview of problems	Do not believe the examples are very helpful and could cause confusion.	If these are examples or possibilities they could be better placed in guidance document.
1.3	Debt assignment	Needs to clarify this only applies to pre-payment	
3.3	Involvement of MEM	Very few of the processes need involvement of the MEM.	Could say "where appropriate"
3.7	Information provided to consumer	While the drafting is correct for ETs and DAP as per the current processes, this creates new obligations for all other processes	We believe if such a change is required it should be progressed by the MRA & SPAA modification processes to ensure it is given due care and attention.
4	Escalations process	Need to recognise these are currently under review in both SPAA and MRA via the Secure Communications projects	Update once changes to MAP 10 and Schedule 10 are implemented.
5.7		There is no mention of the ETPAB. As this is an existing process we would expect to see it here or in the PAB section	
7.1(b)	Consumer waiting to be switched	We recognise and accept that this process does take place. However, until now it was not been a code obligation	We believe if such a change is required it should be progressed by the MRA & SPAA modification processes to ensure it is given due care and attention.
8	n/a	Resolving the Consumer billing has not been mentioned at all	
8.1	Energy Supplier		Should say the initiating Energy Supplier

Clause	Quote	Comment	Suggested changes / next steps
8.2	2 or more	Does this mean bilateral ETs will follow the flow process in the REC? They currently do not.	We believe if such a change is required it should be progressed by the MRA & SPAA modification processes to ensure it is given due care and attention.
8.5(c)	Rejection	The drafting is not clear. The MAP and Schedule are clear on rejections but it's not been copied over. There are issues with the current wording and interpretations so rejections need to work for all consumers, not just domestic (current rejection definitions do not recognise commercial agreements for non-domestic customers.)	We believe such a change would have to be progressed by the MRA & SPAA modification processes to ensure it is given due care and attention.
8.8	Further initiations	This step does not exist in the current ET process	
9	Definition of RET and D0301	Does not match other schedules	Should this be in the technical documentation?
9.1 – 9.6		Table is difficult to follow. Currently MAP10 and Schedule 10 can be included as training guides. This document does not appear to offer that	
9.7	Informing other supplier mistake	This appears to be a new requirement asking a supplier to correct another supplier's mistake	Delete requirement as all suppliers can check DES / ECOES
9.8	Disagreeing a rejection	As with 9.7 this is a new step and is not actually required as a supplier can simply re-initiate the ET	We believe such a change would have to be progressed by the MRA & SPAA modification processes to ensure it is given due care and attention.
Section C		Do not agree with removing the detail from the process. It developed that way to resolve misinterpretations so removing detail increases the risk again.	Use existing requirements
Section D		MIF 281, Crossed Meters is planned to establish a new, mandatory Crossed Meters process	Update once changes to MRA and new MAP are implemented.



Clause	Quote	Comment	Suggested changes / next steps
Section E		We struggle to understand how often does this happen? Why is it needed? Main source of resolution has to be the DNO / GT telling us which is correct but that step is missing	
Section F		Do not agree with removing the detail from the process. It developed that way to resolve misinterpretations so removing detail increases the risk again.	Use existing requirements

**Question 3.7: Do you agree that we have adequately captured the requirements of the ETCC within the draft Resolution of Consumer Facing Switching and Billing Problems Schedule, taking account of the existence of Guaranteed Standards of Performance that cover engagement with the consumer and resolution of erroneous transfers?**

To an extent yes however we believe the drafting as it stands is not as clear or complete as the ETCC. For example, there is no mention of the obligation that the contacted supplier has to raise the ET, ie giving the customer comfort that they just have to contact one supplier and the issue will be raised and resolved. We believe this is a key part of the ET process and should be included. Another example is the omission of the gaining supplier's inability to bill the customer – this has not been mentioned at all despite a key element step of resolving ETs.

Any proposal to include ETs for more complex sites needs detailed discussion, eg HH could be mandated at a measurement class letter, and similarly for daily metered sites. These have complex metering and billing arrangements that can be difficult to allow the old supplier to bill for the new supplier's registration period.

**Question 3.8: Do you believe there is merit in extending obligations relating to the resolution of Erroneous Switches, Crossed Meters, Switch Meter Read Problems and Duplicate Meter Points to micro-business consumers or should these requirements more generally apply to all Non-Domestic Energy Suppliers? For Switch Meter Read Problems, should the scope be extended to cover domestic and micro-business consumers who are settled on a Half-Hourly basis?**

MAP10 is already mandating ETs for all NHH customers, though we recognise there can be confusion in terms of the codes / rejections as these are domestic customer focused. Similarly, MAP08 does not mention a split for domestic or non-domestic customers. The work currently underway to mandate the MRA crossed meters process (which is not mandatory at this time) follows MAP08 and MAP10 and does not limit itself to domestic customers.

We believe the issue is actually within the gas market as some non-domestic suppliers are able to pick and choose which, if any, of the SPAA Schedules they chose to follow. We believe one of the key benefits of the REC will be the mandating all processes in a way that at the very least, mirrors those in the MRA.

As this Schedule includes DAP and misdirected payments, the obligations need to mirror those in the prepayment schedule which is currently mandating non-domestic.

**Question 3.9: Do you agree with our proposal to introduce a harmonise procedure for escalating delayed and disputed problem resolutions for all problem areas covered by the draft Resolution of Consumer Facing Switching and Billing Problems Schedule? If not, please explain how the approach for escalations could be improved.**

We agree in principal with this but believe that the Secure Communications work being carried out jointly by SPAA and MRA will achieve this ahead of go live and, as such, these sections should be amended to mirror the new requirements, once they are agreed.

**Question 3.10 Do you agree that the draft Prepayment Arrangements Schedule meets the required standards set out in the Regulatory Design Principles? If not, please describe how you think it should be improved.**

As with a number of other sections, while we agree with the principal of the draft, we believe it is introducing new steps and, as such, there is merit in having further discussion, particularly with non-domestic gas suppliers who are not currently SPAA signatories.

We also have the following comments and questions:

- We recommend the running order could be set out in a way to make it easier to remove legacy metering requirements at the end of the smart roll out. This would be smart – no issues, then smart with issues, followed by the same for legacy.
- PPMIPs are not a party to the REC so how will they be obligated? At the moment this is all covered off by commercial contracts so is not covered in the SPAA and MRA; we do not understand the need for it here.
- Schedule Clause 4.10 - We do not understand the assurance reporting. It is not in a MRA requirement. There are some SPAA requirements just now but these do not cover the end-to-end process. The drafting would require suppliers to amend their commercial contracts but does not explain the need for the process.
- Schedule Clause 4.11 - Contacts for many of these steps are currently not published. We believe this requires discussion at the current industry Expert Groups to make sure all suppliers are aware of the changes and requirements if needed.
- Schedule Section C - The MRA established earlier this year that there are no smart cards still in operation and reference to them has been removed from flows.

**Question 3.11: Do you agree that the draft Related Metering Point Schedule meets the required standards set out in the Regulatory Design Principles? If not, please describe how you think it should be improved.**

Generally, we agree the principles have been met but, do not understand why the MAP has not been lifted straight over. There is a large amount of detail in the MAP that has been written down for the first time. This was done to avoid re-creating the data issues we have just now. We believe the text in the MAP should be moved over.

- Mandating – MRA has agreed it needs to be mandated for HH as well and the MAP will be changing shortly. This should be update once changes to MRA and MAP are implemented,
- Schedule Clause 1.3 – detailing why MPANs can be related has missed the key fact that they are related for settlement and billing purposes. At the very least it should lift the MRA definition.

**Question 3.12: Do you agree that the draft Data Access Schedule meets the required standards set out in the Regulatory Design Principles? If not, please describe how you think it should be improved.**

Our preference has always been for a single, dual fuel system, while we recognise bringing the gas and electricity requirements into one Schedule, it does not provide a single system. There are large differences in the information available on the 2 systems and with the move to CSS we believe it provides the opportunity to have a consistent approach to data available for review. We would understand if the plan was to use the 2 existing systems for the time being but the overall aim would be to merge into one system in the medium to longer term.

We also have the following comments and questions:

- Schedule Clause 5 – A number of the Enquiry Service Users are electricity only at this time. If there is a move to including these in gas it needs a wider discussion.
- Schedule Clause 5(c) – The process is currently under review in the MRA as it is not GDPR compliant. We would not recommend rolling out a mirror image to that process at this time.
- Where is the prepayment transaction allocation process covered off? ECOES does this task and will need to continue, until smart meters rolled out.
- What will happen to the ECOES URS? Will both systems have similar changes processes as they don't just now?
- 3.58 – We appreciate the move to create an Enquiry Service Administrator but there is a need for more details, including any costs associated with it.

**Question 3.13: What changes would you make to best align the draft Data Access Schedule to the Energy Data Task Force recommendations?**

The changes we would make would be to have a centralised source to harmonise gas and electricity asset information, in order to achieve the Energy Task Force's recommendations 4: Coordination of Asset Registration and 5: Visibility of Infrastructure.<sup>3</sup>

Our preference would be for one dual fuel system with the same data available for both fuels. However, we recognise that at switch over this might not be possible but we believe it has to be a longer term aim.

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://es.catapult.org.uk/news/energy-data-taskforce-report/>

**Question 3.14: Do you agree that obligations should be placed on networks and suppliers to ensure that RECCo procures gas and electricity enquiry services and that obligations in the Gas Transporter and Distribution Licences can be removed?**

We cannot provide agreement or views without all the requirements, including the technical specification. If all are satisfactory then do not foresee any issues.

**Question 3.15: Do you agree that the RECCo should be able to appoint either the Code Manager, Enquiry Service operator or a third party to act as the Enquiry Service Administrator for the purpose of monitoring compliance and managing Data Access Agreements?**

We cannot provide agreement or views without all the requirements, including the technical specification. If all are satisfactory then do not foresee any issues.

**Question 3.16: Do you agree that the draft Interpretations Schedule meets the required standards set out in the Regulatory Design Principles? If not, please describe how you think it should be improved.**

It is a reasonable starting point, but there are many gaps and inconsistencies. For example, there are a large number of PP references but nothing for ETs, SARs, Green Deal or RGMA. It is clearly still a work in progress. Without carrying out a full review of the Technical Specification, we are unable to confirm if it meets the required standards set out in the Regulatory Design Principles.

**Question 3.17: Are there any other areas that you think should be covered in the REC to support the Switching Programme, other than those that will be included in the Technical Specification?**

Although we have reviewed all the available schedules without the Technical Specification and until the physical design is baselined, we are unable to confirm if all the schedules effectively achieve the outcomes described in the physical design documents. We suggest that Ofgem should include information on the principles and consumer outcomes to provide clarity on what each process is intended to achieve.

**Question 3.18: Do you have any additional comments on the drafting of any of the schedules, in particular in relation to whether they effectively achieve the outcomes described here and articulated in Design Baseline 4 or other programme documents?**

We have no additional comments on the drafting of any schedules other than the comments already made within this consultation. Once the Technical Specification has been made available we will be able to provide further comment.

## **Chapter 4: Retail Code Consolidation: SCR Scope, Process and Proposals**

### **Question 4.1: Do you agree that Ofgem should lead an end-to-end process to develop the code modifications to deliver retail code consolidation?**

Yes, and we would expect Ofgem to allow industry parties to have appropriate input and visibility of the change proposals being developed within the SCR.

### **Question 4.2: Do you agree with the proposed scope of the Retail Code Consolidation SCR? Do you think any additional areas should be in scope?**

Yes, we agree with the proposed scope of the retail code consolidation SCR.

### **Question 4.5: Do you agree that the GDA and Green Deal related provisions in the MRA should transfer to the REC?**

Yes, however there is a requirement on the Government publishing their future plans for Green Deal, following the Call for Evidence in November 2019.

### **Question 4.6: Do you think GDA parties should accede to the REC, or be engaged in governance through some other means?**

Yes, our preference would be for GDA Parties to accede and pay for Green Deal systems and processes. However, an alternative governance method could be using PAB and the existing Green Deal monthly monitoring reporting. However, as above this all depends on the Government as any changes to Green Deal volumes (increasing or decreasing) could impact any business case for change.

### **Question 4.7: Do you agree that the requirements currently held in SPAA Schedule 22 and the RGMA Baseline related to gas meter agent appointments and MDD should be mandatory for domestic and non-domestic suppliers? If not, why not?**

Yes, but Ofgem needs to recognise impacts on suppliers and their agents, so it would require a long lead in time for not only system changes but also revised contracts.

### **Question 4.8: Do you agree with our preferred option for governance of agent appointments and MDD, outlined as option 3 above?**

Yes, we agree with Option 3 as this option gives an opportunity to harmonise governance of gas and electricity industry processes. We would suggest that, while migrating parties such as meter operators from the jurisdiction of the BSC to the jurisdiction of the REC, we avoid compromising the interactions with the performance of other parties that will now be subject to separate codes, eg BSC data aggregators and collectors. In particular, it will be important to ensure REC parties such as meter operators are also accountable to other relevant codes. One way to achieve this in this example would be to require meter operators to be both REC and BSC parties. We are open to exploring alternative approaches that could achieve the same outcome.

**Question 4.9: Do you support our proposal for consolidating the metering CoPs into the REC?**

Yes, subject to understanding the details proposals for achieving this and how much complexity and cost will be involved.

**Question 4.10: Do you think MEMs should be parties to the REC?**

Yes.

**Question 4.11: Do you think changes to the metering Schedule(s) of the REC should be progressed through the Change Panel only, or should there be an additional MEM Panel?**

We believe the best and most efficient approach is to progress these changes through the change panel only, and this can be reviewed in future if problems are identified.

**Question 4.12: Which of the requirements within SMICoP, if any, should extend beyond the initial installation of the smart metering system?**

We note Ofgem's view that the SMICoP should be added to the REC as the rollout of smart meters will continue well beyond the code's establishment. However, we are not persuaded of any need to extend the role of the SMICoP beyond the initial installation of a smart meter, as it was only ever designed to cover this visit and, as such, would require significant revision to extend its vires to cover anything else. We are unclear as to what more could reasonably be asked of suppliers in this regard; after all, once the rollout of smart meters across the market is complete, all premises will have been subject to a tailored energy efficiency assessment and the metering systems presumably accepted as normal.

We also note that the consultation refers to 'meter replacement and other meter maintenance visits'; however, given that these meters will still be nowhere near the end of their life, it would seem premature to assume a role for the SMICoP when that time comes. And as for 'other maintenance visits', we are unclear as to what is envisaged: a fundamental tenet of the government's positive business case for smart metering was the reduction of site visits, and we would need to understand whether it is Ofgem's intention to now impose additional requirements that might lead to increased costs.

Nevertheless, we recognise that many aspects of the SMICoP could readily apply to other visits to customers' premises, and we would agree that the protections afforded by such elements of the code could be repurposed.

**Question 4.13: Which of the requirements within SMICoP, if any, should apply to installation of non-smart metering systems and other site visits required to carry out metering related work?**

Aside from those matters purely concerned with the installation of a smart meter (eg demonstration of the system), most of the SMICoP content could apply equally to most visits to customers' premises.

**Question 4.15: What are your views on our proposals for the governance and assurance of the SMICoP provisions once migrated to the REC?**

We broadly agree with the proposals for the governance and assurance of the SMICoP provisions once migrated to the REC. However, we are not convinced that it should be within the vires of the Performance Assurance Board to determine whether the role of the SMICoP should be extended. Rather, we would expect any such proposals to be subject to consultation with all stakeholders, before they are ever taken forward.

**Question 4.16: Do you agree with our proposal for incorporating PSR provisions in the REC?**

At a high level yes, but depends on reviewing the details when they are available. We would expect this proposal to be limited to migrating the current requirements and not changing the submitting and receiving parties of the associated information flows. One area for consideration remains the split between shipper and supplier, as the licence obligation is on the supplier but only the shipper can send the information to Xoserve.

**Chapter 5: Licence Condition Changes**

**Question 5.1: Do you agree that Appendix 4 accurately describes all of the changes that should be made to licences to support the effective operation of the new switching arrangements?**

Yes, in so far as we are currently aware.

**Question 5.2: Do you agree that Appendix 4 accurately describes all of the changes that should be made to licences to support Retail Code Consolidation?**

We agree the appendix describes the required changes but we need to be able to review the associated licence drafting to ensure the changes are implemented in practice.

**Question 5.3: Are there any changes to licences that, if not made prior to the switching arrangements going live, would inhibit the delivery of the Switching Programme?**

We have not identified any such required licence changes, to date. No we can think of at this time.

**Question 5.4: Do you think that we should remove licence obligations on GTs described in SLC 31 and DNOs in SLC 18 to provide one or more of the following services:**

**Enquiry services;**

Yes, as this is covered in the REC.

**Maintenance of a register of data associated with a metering point/supply point; and**

Is this covered in the REC? MPAS still has to keep a register of data for Settlements as does Xoserve.

**Customer enquiry service**

Yes, as this covered in the REC.

**ScottishPower**  
September 2019