

Meeting notes & actions.

Discussion points.

Presentations from Citizens Advice and Energy Ombudsman

- Refer to slides 6-45 of the CJF16 slide pack.
- A few observations below.
- There is strong demand for switching advice, with over 40k page views last year – an increasing trend.
- Switching accounts for between 7% and 10% of the total number of complaints (around 350 per month) – Erroneous Transfers account for the largest number of these.
- There are a number of problem areas including:
 - Debt is a concern – Covid debt build-up and Debt-hopping (potential).
 - Prepayment meter customers – already have less choice and can save less money when switching.
 - There is a risk around communication – accuracy of message important within the confines of differentiation. Use of plain, simple language important.
 - There are engagement challenges – including a broad range of vulnerabilities, digital exclusion.

Topic for discussion – Vulnerability/PSR

- Consideration of Risks 18 & 19 from the Risk Register.
- It was noted that ‘we’ need to remember that faster switching needs to be at the pace the consumer wants, for example to meet the needs of the non-tech savvy and the vulnerable. How do we ensure that this recognised in Supplier performance measures?
- ***Risk 18 – There is a risk that the DNO and the gaining Supplier may hold different information about a customer (vulnerability)***
 - There was a view expressed that nothing will change in this respect, as a result of the implementation of Faster & More Reliable Switching.
 - Gas and Electricity processes (to reset or not PSR related information at a Change of Supplier event) differ and are not changing as part of FMRS.
 - **Action: Risk to be closed.**
- ***Risk 19 – There is a risk that engagement challenges with vulnerable customers increase due to the perception of increased barriers.***
 - Clearly potential for an increased impact to customers who are digitally excluded.
 - **Action: To further discuss when the Forum considers the topic of ‘Communication’ and Unhappy Path consumer journeys.**

Topic for discussion – Switch Processing

- Consideration of Risks 12, 15 & 24 from the Risk Register.

- *Risk 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 Date validation (e.g. SR6.23) at various stages in the journey.
- Post meeting update – it was confirmed that ‘a Service Request (SR)6.23 is sent to the comms hub/Smart meter (SMETS2) when a Supplier gains a customer. It applies the Suppliers certificates to the meter, which allows the Supplier (and only that Supplier) to communicate with the meter.’ For Electricity this is normally sent after midnight and for Gas after 5am, if it is sent before this it will be rejected by DCC as the new Supplier will not be registered as the assigned supplier.
- It was noted that this may also link across to Risk 24.
- **Action:** *Keith Foster (DCC) took an action to take this risk back to the programme for comment.*
- *Risk 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.
- Following discussion, there was agreement that this risk could be closed as the requirement for the provision of Metering Agent flows are the responsibility of the Supplier and any impacts should be picked up as part of individual Business Readiness activities.
- **Action:** *Risk to be closed.*
- **Action:** *The Chair to confirm latest feedback from Ofgem on approach to considering any reduction to the Standstill Period post implementation.*
- Post-meeting update: An update from Ofgem was circulated to CJF members by email on 6 July, which included the following statement: ‘We don’t yet have a developed approach to the review of the standstill period post go live, but it is one of the things that we will look to develop over the next few months. The questions you’ve set out here will be very useful in helping us to focus on the questions to which suppliers are keen to have early answers.’
- *Risk 24* – There is a potential risk associated with outages and traffic management by the DCC.
- **Action:** *Keith Foster (DCC) took an action to take this risk back to the programme for comment and also a question raised about the start of the ‘Gas Day’.*

Topic for discussion – Erroneous Transfers

- Slide 50 provided a view of ET reason descriptions for Electricity between April 2020 and March 2021.
- The selection of an incorrect MPAN has by far the highest reason percentage at 73%. The introduction of the Retail Energy Location seeks to address issues associated with incorrect MPxN’s
- being selected.
- It was noted that the Data Working Group had discussed (earlier that day) some use cases relating to the use of the REL.
- From these discussions it was apparently clear that there are currently inconsistencies between the DES and ECOES solutions in terms of how they are presenting back information. An action has been taken away by Ofgem to look into this.
- It was noted by one forum member that the REL is very much a contentious point for Suppliers at the moment.

- There was some discussion about the current REL match rate achieved and how this maps against the Business Case. Noted that work is continuing by the programme to increase the match rate.
- This topic can be linked to Risk 26 (access to and use of the REL).

Topic for discussion – Opening Meter Reads

- Consideration of Risks 16 & 21 from the Risk Register.
- *Risk 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.*
- *Risk 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.*
- Noted that these risks are particularly relevant when there are multiple switches occurring and various elements of the process overlap.
- One forum member noted that there is an inherent risk of legacy meters that exacerbates the risk of billing issues.
- A question was raised about the scope of E2E testing and if there is any destruction testing planned by the programme around multiple switch requests overlapping.
- **Action:** *Keith Foster (DCC) took an action to take these risks back to the programme for comment*

PCW/Supplier Forum update

- An update was provided to the CJF on the latest progress of the PCW/Supplier Forum and future work plan.

Risk Register

- There were no new Risks raised for inclusion on the register.

AOB

- There were no items of AOB raised.
- The next meeting (CJF17) is scheduled for Wednesday 18 August.