

Meeting notes & actions.

Discussion points.

### Proposed Work Plan

- There was discussion about the ten topic areas that have been identified as requiring further CJF discussion, further to the review of the Risks Register.
- A proposed work plan was reviewed and a number of amendments made to this plan further to comments made by forum members on prioritisation and ordering.
- The slide pack issued on 22 June contained an updated slide (slide 9) which details the revised work plan.
- This work plan will continue to be reviewed and will evolve as we progress through the topic areas.
- In order to allow sufficient time for discussion in the future, the July, August & September CJF meetings will each be extended to 3 hours duration.
- **Action:** *The Chair to issue revised calendar invites for these sessions.*

### Risks Closed

- The Chair provided the forum with an overview of the risks that have now been closed, refer to slide 10 of the slide pack for the details of these.

### Consumer switching experience example

- The example detailed within slides 11-14 of the slide pack was discussed by the forum, which generated many comments and observations.
  - Is it possible for Suppliers to establish 'recovery teams' to address consumer problems as they arise? Noted that there are already complaint process teams in place, but is there a quick fix solution that enables the marshalling of resources quickly?
  - It was mentioned that 'recovery processes' may be something that could be included within governance in the future (REC).
  - Questions were raised as to whether the problems encountered were down to process, data or system failure.
  - One view expressed was that a message should have been sent from the losing Supplier in relation to the PSR issues. Gaining Suppliers should ask the consumer about this.
  - One party advised that only a relatively small number of switches go through the process without some kind of problem.
  - Potential that the process was impacted by the switch and billing windows not being aligned.
  - It was noted that there should not be a need for the consumer to provide photos for opening read purposes for a smart meter.

- There are differences between gas and electricity rules when it comes to opening meter read windows, which adds complexity to the process. Noted that this has already been flagged within the PCW/Supplier Forum and a request for design clarity on this issue been sent across to Ofgem.
- Warm Homes Discount is also impacted by the time of year which drives the suppliers' responsibilities. Some discussion on whether complexities such as this are expected to be understood by the consumer. Reasonable for a consumer to expect elements such as this to roll across from Supplier to Supplier. Acknowledged that there is possibly a requirement for better consumer communication on this element.
- **Action:** *The Chair to ensure that the topic of Warm Homes Discount is discussed further by the CJF at a future meeting.*
  
- An observation was made that there are on occasion connectivity issues when seeking to obtain meter readings from smart meters – some concern about the unreliability of the process.
- A general comment was made that the key element of this consumer experience is poor communication. The success of the process is all about effective and timely communication. The consumer should not need to know about the detail and complexity going on in the background.
- Comment made that there are still large numbers of consumers that are 'digitally excluded'. Ongoing concern about interaction with vulnerable consumers and how can we improve communication with these consumers.
- Acknowledged that for this example, it took specific engagement with a 'friend' within the Supplier to resolve and get a sense of what was going on.
- All agreed that the 'normal' consumer will not have this kind of access or knowledge of how the switch process operates.
- Consumer expectations, at high level, are relatively simple, there should not be / do not want to be exposed to the energy industry/switch process complexities (or excuses).
- In the future consumers are being offered a quick, simple, hassle free switch – how will this be delivered in practice.

### Topic for discussion - Regulation

- An update was provided on the definition of 'Relevant Date' further to Ofgem's recent publication of updated, proposed Supply Licence changes for switching.
- The group considered associated risks 6, 9 & 22 from the Risk Register.
  
- On Risk 6 – Multiple change of supply events. There is a general, ongoing concern about the implications of multiple switch events occurring in quick succession, however, this risk is inherent within the programme design which will enable a consumer to switch their Supplier every five days should they wish to do so.
- Processes such as the provision of meter reads, provision of final bills, cooling-off, standstill period etc, will inevitably overlap when this scenario takes place.

- It will be the responsibility of Suppliers to deal with any processing complexities as they arise.
- **Action:** *The Chair to consider how this risk can potentially be depicted in diagrammatical form.*
  
- On Risk 9 – Standstill Period set to zero on go-live. Agreement that this is no longer a go-live risk as the regulatory policy stipulated by Ofgem on this subject sets the Standstill Period to five days. There is an ongoing concern about what the process will be for reviewing this value post go-live and it would be helpful to have a clear view from Ofgem on this is due course.
- The concerns within this risk related to serial switching and the opportunity for incremental small debt to build up, will be picked up under the topic of ‘Debt Hopping’.
- **Action:** *The Chair to close this risk and write to Ofgem seeking views on any indicative view they currently have on process and timeline for any change to the Standstill Period parameter/review post go-live.*
  
- On Risk 22 – Lack of clarity of the E2E Design, a concern was raised that there are still design clarity issues, with some of the regulations not being aligned with the wider design/REC schedule and a risk that there might be different interpretations by different parties.
- There is a requirement to revisit concerns when the Enduring Change of Supply (ECOS) architecture is more visible.
- **Action:** *The Chair to discuss this further with Keith Foster and Norma Wood and consider next steps.*

### Topic for discussion – Vulnerability / PSR

- This topic was not discussed and will be revisited at the July meeting.

### Other observations & Actions

- It was noted by a Supplier that there is a concern that PCWs may not have the bandwidth to make the changes needed for Faster Switching prior to go-live. The PCW/Supplier Forum has been established to mitigate concerns in this area, though ultimately any changes required/made between PCW and Supplier processes will be down to bilateral agreement between parties.
  
- When discussing the topic of Prepayment, there is a requirement to explore whether or not there is anything required in relation to reaching out to PPMIPs.
- **Action:** *The Chair to ensure inclusion within the Prepayment discussion.*
  
- A comment was made about the potential impacts to ‘Billing Windows’.
- **Action:** *The Chair to add this to a future agenda.*
  
- A Supplier asked whether the meeting was going to be recorded. There is a requirement to consider any GDPR/consent issues.
- **Action:** *The Chair to look into recording future meetings.*