



# Consumer Journey Forum

CJF14 – 26 May 2021

---

# Competition Act Reminder

---

- In taking part in this meeting, participants are confirming that they have undergone relevant training to raise their awareness of, and ensure compliance with, applicable competition law, including the Competition Act 1998 and Articles 101 and 102 EC and that they will not discuss matters that would or might lead to any breaches of competition law.

# Agenda

---

Item	Topic
1	<i>Introduction &amp; meeting aims</i>
2	<i>Overview of the updated Terms of Reference</i>
3	<i>Review &amp; Progress CJF Risk &amp; Issue Log (as at 27 January 2021)</i>
4	<i>Discussion: Identification of topics for future CJF consideration</i>
5	<i>Update from early PCW/Supplier Forum activity</i>
6	<i>Diary Planning</i>
7	<i>AOB</i>

# 1. Introduction

---

- The Forum is being sponsored by the Retail Energy Code.
- The activity will be independently led and chaired by Graham Wood, supported again by DCC – Keith Foster and Julie Cordina.
- A revised Terms of Reference has been approved by the RECCo Board.
- The work of the Forum is expected to progress until the end of 2021, or until such time that the RECCo have developed their strategy for consumer engagement.
- Active participation and engagement with the work of this Forum is encouraged, and will be essential in ensuring that the Forum can positively progress the topics and issues that are important to Forum members and enable readiness for the go-live of FMRS.

# Meeting aims for today....

---

- Review the Forum's revised Terms of Reference.
- Review the last published version of the CJR Risks & Issues, dated 27 January 2021, and consider latest status and next steps for each
- Identify and discuss topic areas for future CJF consideration.
- Provide a high level overview on early progress of the PCW/Supplier Forum.
- Provide oversight of the meeting dates and start to develop a work plan for the next couple of months
- Finally, provide an opportunity for parties to raise any items of AOB

## 2. Forum Scope & Terms of Reference

---

- The CJF Terms of Reference have been updated and agreed with the RECCo Board.

# Objectives of the CJF

- 3.1 Provide an open and transparent forum for all Suppliers to discuss and identify key issues and common themes associated with Business Readiness, that need to be mitigated and addressed by Suppliers to enable successful programme delivery and effective consumer engagement – whilst maintaining an understanding that each consumer journey may be different.*
- 3.2 Provide transparent reporting of progress of the CJF to the programme Delivery Group and RECCo Board.*
- 3.3 Seek to ensure there is a fair representation of the different types and scale/size of supplier organisations within the industry to ensure that different perspectives are provided when ideas, decisions and the impact of decisions are discussed.*

# Scope, Deliverables and Roles & Responsibilities (1)

- 4.1 Consider and progress mitigations of the Risks & Issues Log, identified by the 2020 CJF activity and captured within the CJF Closure Report document, dated 27 January 2021.*
- 4.2 Discuss and progress any switching programme, consumer related topics or issues that arise from ongoing programme deliberations and Supplier activities to deliver against their Business Readiness requirements.*
- 4.3 Consider any relevant, consumer journey impacting topics or issues that arise during the switching programme UEPT & E2E Testing activities.*
- 4.4 Discuss and progress any appropriate topics or issues that arise from the PCW/Supplier Forum, which require or would benefit from focussed Supplier consideration, and the identification of any topics or issues that should be considered by the PCW/Supplier Forum.*

# Scope, Deliverables and Roles & Responsibilities (2)

---

- 4.5 Consider and progress essential elements from a consumer perspective which need to be factored into the base-line plan for Go-live.*
- 4.6 Escalate and/or make recommendations on programme impacting, consumer related topics and issues to the switching programme Delivery Group, as required.*
- 4.7 The CJF will maintain an up to date work plan.*
- 4.8 The CJF will maintain and manage a list of Risks and Issues relating to its scope and escalate these as necessary to the switching programme Delivery Group.*

### 3. Review & Progress CJF Risk & Issue Log

---

- The Final Report dated 27 January 2021 included a final version of the Risks & Issues Log and contained a total of 22 identified risks.
  - 11 were deemed as High Priority
  - 8 as Medium Priority
  - 3 as Low Priority
- A review of the Log is required to assess current relevance, prioritisation and the agreement of next steps.

# Risks to be escalated to Programme level – High Priority

27 January 2021

During the Consumer Journey Forum activity, a range of risks have been identified. Each risk has been assigned a priority status of High, Medium or Low.

ID	RISKS	IMPACT	NEXT STEPS
1	There is a risk that communications to consumers are not clear and all necessary information is not provided to them.	<p>This could result in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a poor consumer journey which could have financial implications for Suppliers in complaints handling/consumer contacts that were not foreseen as part of the delivery of the Programme;</li> <li>• dissatisfied consumers and unwanted switches occurring which could lead to additional Supplier costs in consumer contacts that were not foreseen as part of the delivery of the Programme;</li> <li>• consumers not understanding why switches have been unsuccessful;</li> <li>• the perception of switching as a hassle.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further consideration and progression required, potentially via future PCW/Supplier Forum or any other relevant programme working group.</li> </ul>
2	There is a significant risk associated with the lack of formal programme engagement with PCWs.	PCWs are involved in the critical, initial consumer touch-point for circa 65% of all switch events. The lack of formal engagement with PCWs creates a missed opportunity for ensuring a robust and efficient consumer experience, the requirement to ensure appropriate validation of consumer/industry data and accurate & consistent consumer communication. Essential to co-ordinate interactions between the PCW/Supplier(s)/Consumer in a next day switch world.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater engagement with PCWs is required to mitigate this risk. The formation of a PCW/Supplier Forum would enable detailed cross-party consideration.</li> </ul>
3	There is a risk that Suppliers would not be able to complete the billing process in time.	This could result in a financial impact on both ‘losing’ Suppliers (lost revenue) and consumers (cash management).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further consideration required by Suppliers and the programme to ensure that processes enable parties to meet their licence obligations with respect to billing.</li> </ul>
4	Debt-hopping is a risk with the new arrangements, and needs to be identified as an issue in operation.	This would be likely to result in increased costs for debt (either to recover or write off debt), increasing costs for all. We could see increased exit fees or additional risk mitigation measures by Suppliers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further consideration is required via an appropriate group to better understand the negative financial impacts to Suppliers and any potential mitigations.</li> </ul>
5	There is a risk that losing Suppliers cannot complete the objection processes in time.	This could result in a financial impact on ‘losing’ Suppliers that are unable to prevent consumers with large debts switching.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further consideration is required via an appropriate group to better understand the negative financial impacts to Suppliers and any process solutions.</li> </ul>

# Risks to be escalated to Programme level – High Priority

27 January 2021

ID	RISKS	IMPACT	NEXT STEPS
6	Multiple Change of Supply events, interaction with standstill, cooling off, overlay/legacy meters can cause huge complexities with the processes and different read windows.	This could result in increased costs from inaccurate readings/billing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further consideration is required via an appropriate group to further assess the potential complexities, impacts and any mitigations.</li> </ul>
7	There is a risk of misdirected payments if a Pre-payment device consumer invokes cooling off, the risk increasing if this is post a confirmed switch.	This could result in a poor consumer experience and exception processes being required.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration of this risk should be progressed via an appropriate industry pre-payment expert group to assess potential impacts and any mitigations.</li> </ul>
8	There is a risk that Erroneous Transfers may increase as a result of complex industry data processing (Xoserve, ECOES, third parties such as PCWs).	<p>This could result in higher costs as, from 01 May 2020, Suppliers must pay the customer an auto payment of £30 when an Erroneous Transfer has been identified.</p> <p>Data quality issues to be mitigated to an extent by data cleansing.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration of this risk should be progressed via an appropriate industry Erroneous Transfers expert group to assess potential impacts and any mitigations.</li> </ul>
9	There is a risk that if the Standstill period is set to 0 for Go Live, consumer behaviour may change and industry may not be able to manage serial switchers appropriately.	<p>This could result in a greater number of serial switchers and the opportunity for incremental small debt to build up.</p> <p>This could also result in potential settlement implications with such an uncertain customer base, which may be a particular risk with Third Party Intermediaries or auto switching sites.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The potential impacts of a low-value Standstill Period requires further consideration, along with the provision of a clear pathway detailing how decisions to amend the Go-live period value will be assessed and undertaken in the future.</li> </ul>
10	Faster switching with shorter supply periods (particularly for multiple switches in a short period of time) will result in an inability for suppliers to recover fixed costs over the lifetime of contracts (e.g. PCW charges, cost of sales)	This may result in tighter terms and conditions or higher termination fees being introduced across the market, unfairly treating some consumers over others and risking reducing consumer mobility.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further consideration is required via an appropriate group to better understand the negative financial impacts to Suppliers and any potential mitigations.</li> </ul>
11	With the closure of the Consumer Journey Forum there will no longer be a forum within the switching programme structure to specifically discuss and progress risks and issues associated with the consumer journey	This could result in valid consumer related risks and issues being side-lined or ignored, resulting in negative consumer impacts and experiences at go-live, potentially impacting the overall delivery of the business case.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration should be given by the switching programme to how consumer journey / consumer impacting risks and issues should be progressed for the remainder of the programme.</li> </ul>

# Risks to be escalated to Programme level – Medium Priority

27 January 2021

ID	RISKS	IMPACT	NEXT STEPS
12	There is a risk that the CSS processing takes too long to permit the processing of switch requests (SR) that are dependent upon Registration Data validation (e.g. SR6.23) at various stages in the journey.	This could result in some SRs failing unnecessarily under the new switching arrangements. Where SR6.23 fails specifically, the 'gaining' Supplier will not be able to communicate with the SMETS2 meter.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further consideration is required via an appropriate group to further assess and consider any required process solutions.</li> </ul>
13	There is a risk that issuing and delivery of physical Pre-payment devices will not be possible in the 5 day / 1 day switch scenario.	This could result in consumers not having devices available at the point of new supply.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration of this risk should be progressed via an appropriate industry expert group to assess potential impacts and any mitigations. Requirement to ensure switches can be completed in accordance with licence requirements.</li> </ul>
14	There is a risk that the new Supplier may not be able to reinstate the terms of the previous supplier during a Pre-payment meter switch with a SMETS1 Smart Meter.	This could result in a poor consumer experience where the consumer believed they had a Smart Meter and existing terms would be maintained.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration of this risk should be progressed via an appropriate programme or industry expert group to assess potential impacts and any required process solutions.</li> </ul>
15	There is a risk of incomplete or inconsistent Metering Agent flows and appointments if multiple switches occur in quick succession or if Standstill is set to zero.	This could result in complex exception processes being required resulting in supplier costs and poor consumer experience.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration of this risk should be progressed via an appropriate programme or industry expert group to assess potential impacts and any required process solutions.</li> </ul>

# Risks to be escalated to Programme level – Medium Priority

27 January 2021

ID	RISKS	IMPACT	NEXT STEPS
16	There is a risk on disputed / missing reads that need to be completed within a set window [70 days] within which there may be multiple switches.	Industry processing impact of accurately allocating Change of Supplier reads and consequential impact on consumer experience and customer billing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration of this risk should be progressed via an appropriate programme or industry expert group to assess potential impacts and any financial implications.</li> </ul>
17	There is a risk that consumers can switch before the 28 day period when discretionary credit can be considered debt, thus building up debt without objection as they go.	Supplier increase in debt provision, resulting in potential increase of tariffs and inequitable treatment of consumers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further consideration is required via an appropriate group to better understand the negative financial impacts to Suppliers and any potential mitigations.</li> </ul>
18	There is a risk that the DNO and the gaining Supplier may hold different information about a customer.	Missing essential information about a customer may result in a failure to provide the correct support.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration of this risk should be progressed via an appropriate programme or industry expert group to assess potential impacts and any required process solutions.</li> </ul>
19	There is a risk that engagement challenges with vulnerable customers increase due to the perception of increased barriers.	Communications are misunderstood or not acted on sufficiently early.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration of this risk should be progressed via an appropriate programme or industry expert group, and in liaison with customer groups, to assess potential impacts and any mitigations.</li> </ul>

# Risks to be escalated to Programme level – Low Priority

27 January 2021

ID	RISKS	IMPACT	NEXT STEPS
20	There is a risk that the Debt Assignment Protocol entry and negotiation processes are protracted and complex.	This could result in consumers being able to hop several times in new faster Switching environment, leaving a legacy of small debt with a number of 'new' Suppliers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Consideration of this risk should be progressed via an appropriate industry expert group to assess potential impacts and any financial implications.</li></ul>
21	There is a risk that Suppliers will not be able to meet their obligations for opening meter reads on legacy (dumb) meters in a shorter timeframe.	This could result in potential logistic issues relating to the appointment and arrangement for an MRA to attend and obtain an opening read and submit to the Supplier who submits it onto industry parties (Xoserve etc.).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Consideration of this risk should be progressed via an appropriate programme / industry expert group to assess potential impacts and any required process solutions.</li></ul>
22	Lack of clarity on the E2E design.	This is likely to manifest in delays to testing or increased operational issues. Identified by the Programme as a current issue and in the process of resolution, hence low priority.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ongoing consideration and awareness is required by the switching programme, on the status of design clarity, to ensure there are no impacts to testing or consequential programme delays.</li></ul>

# Issues Log

# 27 January 2021

Issue ID	Issue Description	Resolution
I001	Should there be standard guidance issued for customer communication from PCWs/TPIs/Suppliers for the new switching arrangements to give a consistent and good consumer experience	To be further considered and progressed during future PCW/Supplier Forum discussions.
I002	Need to configure walkthroughs to simulate real customer behaviour	Flow diagrams developed and Consumer Perspective slide developed – no appetite from Suppliers to progress further work on this.
I003	Need to assess and measure the hassle factor for customers - making the switch process hassle free is a key objective of the programme	Insights provided from recent Consumer Perspectives report.
I004	Lack of understanding of the future E2E Design approach by all suppliers	Included into requirement for E2E design document.
I005	Interaction between CJF and PCW Forum and things not to fall through the cracks	To further consider as and when a PCW/Supplier Forum progresses.
I006	Settlements	Currently outside the scope of the consumer journey work. To be considered individually by Suppliers.
I007	How to enforce PCWs validating customer/industry data up-front (e.g. address data, standstill period) to reduce exceptions and smooth the customer journey	To be further considered and progressed during future PCW/Supplier Forum discussions.
I008	There is inconsistent Design information within some Programme Design Artefacts; which means it is likely there will be inconsistent interpretations of those affected Designs and it makes it difficult for Participants to accurately translate those changes internally	Included into requirement for E2E design document
I009	Participants currently only have logical, disparate future state maps to work from; which do not specify Industry message sequencing or timing. This means currently Participants having to make development assumptions around message choreography. This risks re-work, testing issues and costs down-stream	Included into requirement for E2E design document
I010	There is a regulatory gap from the objection process linked to discretionary credit in the faster switching arrangements. Consumers can switch before the 28 day period when discretionary credit can be considered debt, thus building up debt without objection as they go	Linked to the Risk 17.
I011	Discussions taken at CJF6 made clear that the current view of cooling off, its triggers, the processes to follow etc. remain open to interpretation	Recent guidance issued by Ofgem. Draft Licence conditions have been consulted upon at the end of 2020.

# Risks to be escalated to Programme level – High Priority

26 May 2021

During the Consumer Journey Forum activity, a range of risks have been identified. Each risk has been assigned a priority status of High, Medium or Low.

ID	RISKS	IMPACT	NEXT STEPS	Status
1	There is a risk that communications to consumers are not clear and all necessary information is not provided to them.	<p>This could result in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a poor consumer journey which could have financial implications for Suppliers in complaints handling/consumer contacts that were not foreseen as part of the delivery of the Programme;</li> <li>dissatisfied consumers and unwanted switches occurring which could lead to additional Supplier costs in consumer contacts that were not foreseen as part of the delivery of the Programme;</li> <li>consumers not understanding why switches have been unsuccessful;</li> <li>the perception of switching as a hassle.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The PCW/Supplier Forum is considering Consumer Communication &amp; Engagement as part of its activities.</li> <li><b>Question:</b> Are there any additional elements that need to be considered by the CJF (that are not being progressed by the PCW/Supplier Forum)?</li> </ul>	Ongoing
2	There is a significant risk associated with the lack of formal programme engagement with PCWs.	PCWs are involved in the critical, initial consumer touch-point for circa 65% of all switch events. The lack of formal engagement with PCWs creates a missed opportunity for ensuring a robust and efficient consumer experience, the requirement to ensure appropriate validation of consumer/industry data and accurate & consistent consumer communication. Essential to co-ordinate interactions between the PCW/Supplier(s)/Consumer in a next day switch world.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greater engagement with PCWs is required to mitigate this risk. The formation of a PCW/Supplier Forum would enable detailed cross-party consideration.</li> <li><b>COMPLETE:</b> The PCW/Supplier Forum has been formed and is actively considering a range of topics and process issues associated with PCWs, alongside ensuring their greater, more general engagement with the programme.</li> </ul>	CLOSED
3	There is a risk that Suppliers would not be able to complete the billing process in time.	This could result in a financial impact on both 'losing' Suppliers (lost revenue) and consumers (cash management).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further consideration required by Suppliers and the programme to ensure that processes enable parties to meet their licence obligations with respect to billing.</li> <li><b>Question:</b> What further Forum consideration is required on this risk?</li> </ul>	Ongoing
4	Debt-hopping is a risk with the new arrangements, and needs to be identified as an issue in operation.	This would be likely to result in increased costs for debt (either to recover or write off debt), increasing costs for all. We could see increased exit fees or additional risk mitigation measures by Suppliers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further consideration is required to better understand the negative financial impacts to Suppliers and any potential mitigations.</li> <li><b>Question:</b> What further Forum consideration is required on this risk?</li> </ul>	Ongoing

ID	RISKS	IMPACT	NEXT STEPS	Status
5	There is a risk that losing Suppliers cannot complete the objection processes in time.	This could result in a financial impact on 'losing' Suppliers that are unable to prevent consumers with large debts switching.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further consideration is required to better understand the negative financial impacts to Suppliers and any process solutions.</li> <li><b>Question:</b> What further Forum consideration is required on this risk?</li> </ul>	Ongoing
6	Multiple Change of Supply events, interaction with standstill, cooling off, overlay/legacy meters can cause huge complexities with the processes and different read windows.	This could result in increased costs from inaccurate readings/billing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further consideration is required assess the potential complexities, impacts and any mitigations.</li> <li><b>Question:</b> What further Forum consideration is required on this risk?</li> </ul>	Ongoing
7	There is a risk of misdirected payments if a Pre-payment device consumer invokes cooling off, the risk increasing if this is post a confirmed switch.	This could result in a poor consumer experience and exception processes being required.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration of this risk should be progressed via an appropriate industry pre-payment expert group to assess potential impacts and any mitigations.</li> <li><b>Question:</b> Is further discussion required by the CJF or should this be considered elsewhere? If so, where?</li> </ul>	Ongoing
8	There is a risk that Erroneous Transfers may increase as a result of complex industry data processing (Xoserve, ECOES, third parties such as PCWs).	This could result in higher costs as, from 01 May 2020, Suppliers must pay the customer an auto payment of £30 when an Erroneous Transfer has been identified. Data quality issues to be mitigated to an extent by data cleansing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration of this risk should be progressed via an appropriate industry Erroneous Transfers expert group to assess potential impacts and any mitigations.</li> <li><b>Question:</b> Is further discussion required by the CJF or should this be considered elsewhere? If so, where?</li> </ul>	Ongoing

# Risks to be escalated to Programme level – High Priority

26 May 2021

ID	RISKS	IMPACT	NEXT STEPS	Status
9	There is a risk that if the Standstill period is set to zero for Go Live, consumer behaviour may change and industry may not be able to manage serial switchers appropriately.	<p>This could result in a greater number of serial switchers and the opportunity for incremental small debt to build up.</p> <p>This could also result in potential settlement implications with such an uncertain customer base, which may be a particular risk with Third Party Intermediaries or auto switching sites.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The potential impacts of a low-value Standstill Period requires further consideration, along with the provision of a clear pathway detailing how decisions to amend the Go-live period value will be assessed and undertaken in the future.</li> <li><b>Question:</b> What further Forum consideration is required on this risk?</li> </ul>	Ongoing
10	Faster switching with shorter supply periods (particularly for multiple switches in a short period of time) will result in an inability for Suppliers to recover fixed costs over the lifetime of contracts (e.g. PCW charges, cost of sales)	This may result in tighter terms and conditions or higher termination fees being introduced across the market, unfairly treating some consumers over others and risking reducing consumer mobility.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further consideration is required to better understand the negative financial impacts to Suppliers and any potential mitigations.</li> <li><b>Question:</b> What further Forum consideration is required on this risk?</li> </ul>	Ongoing
11	With the closure of the Consumer Journey Forum there will no longer be a forum within the switching programme structure to specifically discuss and progress risks and issues associated with the consumer journey	This could result in valid consumer related risks and issues being side-lined or ignored, resulting in negative consumer impacts and experiences at go-live, potentially impacting the overall delivery of the business case.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration should be given by the switching programme to how consumer journey / consumer impacting risks and issues should be progressed for the remainder of the programme.</li> <li><b>COMPLETE:</b> The CJF has been re-constituted.</li> </ul>	CLOSED

# Risks to be escalated to Programme level – Medium Priority

26 May 2021

ID	RISKS	IMPACT	NEXT STEPS	Status
12	There is a risk that the CSS processing takes too long to permit the processing of switch requests (SR) that are dependent upon Registration Data validation (e.g. SR6.23) at various stages in the journey.	This could result in some SRs failing unnecessarily under the new switching arrangements. Where SR6.23 fails specifically, the 'gaining' Supplier will not be able to communicate with the SMETS2 meter.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further consideration is required to further assess and consider any required process solutions.</li> <li><b>Question:</b> What further Forum consideration is required on this risk?</li> </ul>	Ongoing
13	There is a risk that issuing and delivery of physical Pre-payment devices will not be possible in the 5 day / 1 day switch scenario.	This could result in consumers not having devices available at the point of new supply.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration of this risk should be progressed to assess potential impacts and any mitigations. Requirement to ensure switches can be completed in accordance with licence requirements.</li> <li><b>Question:</b> What further Forum consideration is required on this risk?</li> </ul>	Ongoing
14	There is a risk that the new Supplier may not be able to reinstate the terms of the previous supplier during a Pre-payment meter switch with a SMETS1 Smart Meter.	This could result in a poor consumer experience where the consumer believed they had a Smart Meter and existing terms would be maintained.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration of this risk should be progressed to assess potential impacts and any required process solutions.</li> <li><b>Question:</b> What further Forum consideration is required on this risk?</li> </ul>	Ongoing
15	There is a risk of incomplete or inconsistent Metering Agent flows and appointments if multiple switches occur in quick succession or if Standstill is set to zero.	This could result in complex exception processes being required resulting in supplier costs and poor consumer experience.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration of this risk should be progressed to assess potential impacts and any required process solutions.</li> <li><b>Question:</b> What further Forum consideration is required on this risk?</li> </ul>	Ongoing

# Risks to be escalated to Programme level – Medium Priority

26 May 2021

ID	RISKS	IMPACT	NEXT STEPS	Status
16	There is a risk on disputed / missing reads that need to be completed within a set window [70 days] within which there may be multiple switches.	Industry processing impact of accurately allocating Change of Supplier reads and consequential impact on consumer experience and customer billing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration of this risk should be progressed to assess potential impacts and any financial implications.</li> <li><b>Question:</b> What further Forum consideration is required on this risk?</li> </ul>	Ongoing
17	There is a risk that consumers can switch before the 28 day period when discretionary credit can be considered debt, thus building up debt without objection as they go.	Supplier increase in debt provision, resulting in potential increase of tariffs and inequitable treatment of consumers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further consideration is required to better understand the negative financial impacts to Suppliers and any potential mitigations.</li> <li><b>Question:</b> What further Forum consideration is required on this risk?</li> </ul>	Ongoing
18	There is a risk that the DNO and the gaining Supplier may hold different information about a customer.	Missing essential information about a customer may result in a failure to provide the correct support.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration of this risk should be progressed to assess potential impacts and any required process solutions.</li> <li><b>Question:</b> What further Forum consideration is required on this risk?</li> </ul>	Ongoing
19	There is a risk that engagement challenges with vulnerable customers increase due to the perception of increased barriers.	Communications are misunderstood or not acted on sufficiently early.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration of this risk should be progressed, potentially in liaison with relevant customer groups, to assess potential impacts and any mitigations.</li> <li><b>Question:</b> What further Forum consideration is required on this risk?</li> </ul>	Ongoing

# Risks to be escalated to Programme level – Low Priority

26 May 2021

ID	RISKS	IMPACT	NEXT STEPS	Status
20	There is a risk that the Debt Assignment Protocol entry and negotiation processes are protracted and complex.	This could result in consumers being able to hop several times in new faster Switching environment, leaving a legacy of small debt with a number of 'new' Suppliers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration of this risk should be progressed to assess potential impacts and any financial implications.</li> <li><b>Question:</b> What further Forum consideration is required on this risk?</li> </ul>	Ongoing
21	There is a risk that Suppliers will not be able to meet their obligations for opening meter reads on legacy (dumb) meters in a shorter timeframe.	This could result in potential logistic issues relating to the appointment and arrangement for an meter reading agent to attend and obtain an opening read and submit to the Supplier who submits it onto industry parties (Xoserve etc.).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration of this risk should be progressed to assess potential impacts and any required process solutions.</li> <li><b>Question:</b> What further Forum consideration is required on this risk?</li> </ul>	Ongoing
22	Lack of clarity on the E2E design.	This is likely to manifest in delays to testing or increased operational issues. Identified by the Programme as a current issue and in the process of resolution, hence low priority.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ongoing consideration and awareness is required by the switching programme, on the status of design clarity, to ensure there are no impacts to testing or consequential programme delays.</li> <li><b>Question:</b> Are there still concerns about E2E Design clarity? If so, what elements require clarification?</li> </ul>	Ongoing

# 4. Identification of topics for future CJF consideration

## What topics would Forum members like to discuss at future CJF sessions?

- Some initial thoughts:
  - *Further focus on specific non-happy path consumer journeys?*
  - *Issues arising from the PCW/Supplier Forum that require some Supplier specific consideration?*
  - *Any topics arising from Supplier Business Readiness preparations?*
  - *Clarification of final licence condition wording/regulatory text & implications?*
  - *Repercussions for performance monitoring & the provision of consumer compensation?*
  - *Cutover arrangements – are there any consequences to consumers at this point?*
  - *Retail Energy Location considerations?*
  - *Further work on consumer perception?*
  - *Anything further on vulnerability?*
- June meeting – consideration of a recent non-happy path customer experience

# 5. Update from early PCW/Supplier Forum activity

---

- Strong, early engagement from both PCWs and Suppliers.
- Work plan established to deliver against the Terms of Reference.
- Forum structure designed to best consider the breadth of topic areas, within the limited time available:
  - **Main Forum (monthly)** – 2 meetings have already taken place, next meeting on 16 June
  - **Working Group 1 (Data Capture, Validation & Transfer)** – 5 meetings in total, second meeting taking place on 27 May
  - **Working Group 2 (Consumer Communication & Engagement)** – 5 meetings in total, second meeting taking place on 3 June
- A Forum Risk Register has been established.
- Importance of cross-forum awareness of activities and risks.

### **Meeting aims:**

- Focus on of Data Capture, specifically the capture of all required data items at the point of initial customer contact
- Understand current data capture arrangements. Identify changes required to facilitate faster switching.
- Consider whether there are differences in requirements depending upon the speed of switch.
- Address implications for vulnerable customers, i.e. the potential for customer detriment and opportunities to improve the process
- Map the high-level process /timelines for Data Capture, Validation & Transfer and consider against faster switching timescales.

### **Future meeting dates:**

- Thursday 27 May
- Friday 25 June
- Wednesday 28 July
- Wednesday 25 August

### **Discussion areas:**

- Auto-switching & customer consent
- Change of Tenancy information capture
- Accurate meter type information and related meters
- Market Sector indicators
- Warm Homes Discount information
- Differing switch speeds at point of transition
- Retail Energy Location
- Opening Meter Readings
- Misalignment of tariffs and meters
- Customer Requested switch dates

### **Key actions:**

- Review draft catalogue of data items (existing & new)for omissions and amendment (D1-001 & D1-002) (all)
- Consider if speed of switch has any impact on data capture requirements (D1-004) (all)
- Ensure consideration of topics: Auto Switching, Change of Tenancy and Standstill at a future working group meeting (D1-005, D1-006, D1-011) (Chair)
- Clarify rights and obligations for PCWs regarding the use of REL (D1-012) (Chair)
- Identify current shortcomings in aligning meter types and tariff choices (all)
- Clarify regulatory position on opening reads captured at the start of the switch process (D1-013) (Chair)
- Review questions posed on Vulnerable Customer/PSR considerations (D1-003) (all)

### **Outlook:**

- The next meeting will continue to discuss Data Capture and focus on Vulnerable Customer/PSR considerations, including the adoption of the standard industry data set for PSR.
- Change of Tenancy will be reconsidered: privacy issues, objections process, auto-switching etc., as will the role of PCWs in the credit vetting process and opportunities to capture Opening Meter Reads / Point of Sale Reads.
- Data validation remains a constant consideration, but will be the specific focus of the June meeting when it is planned to invite representatives from the providers of DES and ECOES.
- A separate meeting is being arranged on Retail Energy Location for PCWs.

### **Meeting aims:**

- Focus on the typical consumer journey, alongside consumer perceptions and expectations.
- Consider the typical consumer journey and how this will be impacted by both a five working day and next working day switch.
- Understand the critical points of consumer engagement, whether/how will this need to change.
- Consideration of what a customer may reasonably expect to experience.

### **Future meeting dates:**

- Thursday 3 June
- Thursday 1 July
- Wednesday 4 August
- Thursday 9 September

### **Discussion areas:**

- Typical consumer journey – existing (PCW & Supplier)
- Review of messaging examples
- Implications for Collective Switching?
- What medium do PCWs use for messages?
- Are the future rules on speed of switch mandatory?
- How will PCWs handle customer requests for switches being enacted up to 28 days later?
- Access to Supplier Terms & Conditions

### **Key actions:**

- Consumer requested switch dates – choice / no choice & information capture (C1-001) (all)
- Further consideration of messaging for consumers with traditional PP metering (C1-002) (Chair)
- Ensure that the comms needs of customers without internet access are not overlooked (all)
- Propose topics (but not wording) for ‘essential’ and ‘recommended’ customer messages, for future discussion (Chair)
- Clarification of Switch Speed licence obligations (C1-003) (Chair)

### **Outlook:**

- Explore PSR messaging and the switch journey from a customer perspective.
- Consider how engagement of auto-switching customers affected by the shorter timescales?
- Can any message or engagement content be defined / agreed as essential?
- What messaging should be provided and by whom relating to PP customers: traditional, smart?
- Examine how cool-off rights can be presented simply and consistently in the context of faster switching.

# 6. Diary Planning

---

# Future Meeting Dates

---

Date	Time	Meeting
<i>Tuesday 22 June</i>	<i>2pm</i>	<i>Consumer Journey Forum 15</i>
<i>Wednesday 21 July</i>	<i>2pm</i>	<i>Consumer Journey Forum 16</i>
<i>Wednesday 18 August</i>	<i>2pm</i>	<i>Consumer Journey Forum 17</i>
<i>Wednesday 22 September</i>	<i>2pm</i>	<i>Consumer Journey Forum 18</i>
<i>Wednesday 20 October</i>	<i>2pm</i>	<i>Consumer Journey Forum 19</i>
<i>Wednesday 17 November</i>	<i>2pm</i>	<i>Consumer Journey Forum 20</i>
<i>Wednesday 15 December</i>	<i>2pm</i>	<i>Consumer Journey Forum 21</i>

# 6. AOB

---