RETAIL ENERGY CODE

This document is classified as **WHITE**.
Information is for public, unrestricted dissemination and publication.

R0092 – DCC SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENTS FOR THE SWITCHING INCENTIVE REGIME

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

MEETING	**R0092_03**
DATE	**10 August 2023, 15:00**
LOCATION	**Via teleconference**

Attendee	Representing	Initials
Tina Pearce	Code Manager (Chair)	TP
Elise Handy	Code Manager (Lead Analyst)	EH
Anton Moden	Code Manager	AM
Caroline Milner	Code Manager	CM
Michael Taylor	Code Manager	MT
Samantha Briggs	Code Manager	SB
Sidni Renmiu	Code Manager	SR
Vaishnavi Sharma	Code Manager	VS
Graham King	C&C	GK
Sarah Mower	C&C	SM
Cordelia Grey	Data Communications Company (Proposer)	CG
Debbie Walker	Data Communications Company (Proposer)	DW
Edgar Mokwunyei	Data Communications Company (Proposer)	EM
Ekta Sareen	Data Communications Company (Proposer)	ES
Gary Stuart	Data Communications Company (Proposer)	GS

DRAFT

Jenny Bridges	Data Communications Company (Proposer)	JB
Leo Brown	Data Communications Company (Proposer)	LB
Mark Riley	Data Communications Company (Proposer)	MR
Tim Dunning	Data Communications Company (Proposer)	TD
Jacquie Barton	DNO representative	JBa
Molly Haley	GRDA	MH
Sharon Dudley	GRDA	SD
Jonathan Hawkins	RECCo	JH
Ben Atkinson	Supplier representative	BA
Carl Dennis	Supplier representative	CD

1 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair (TP) welcomed attendees to the third R0092 work group meeting. Apologies were received from Cathy Mullis and James Johansen (E.ON Next).

2 MINUTES FROM THE LAST MEETING

No comments were received on the minutes of the previous meeting and the minutes were approved.

3 OUTSTANDING ACTIONS

GS provided updates on the below actions.

1506_01: The Code Manager to reconcile any differences identified through proceedings of the R0092 workgroup between the REC obligations and performance assurance reporting. Members from the DCC and REC Performance Assurance noted that no further work on this was pending, and the action was closed.

2906_01: DCC to provide an explanation on why there was a wider distribution of mean hourly response times at lower volumes within the May data for asynchronous messages. GS advised that where there is an hour with many messages, any outliers or missed SLAs has less of an impact on performance level reporting. Where there was an hour with only ten messages, and an SLA was missed, this hour may have failed its performance level. If the DCC is measured daily, outliers wouldn't affect the overall system performance in the same way. MT queried the knock-on impacts of delayed response times for other Switching Data Service Providers (SDSPs). The group must be cognisant that outliers have material

impacts especially around gate closure. LB confirmed that impacts to other SDSPs may be seen if response times were reaching five to six minutes, however, these timescales are not expected to be reached. It would be more in the realm of two to three seconds.

Note for Impact Assessment activity - JH highlighted that an important part of the Impact Assessment activity should be at what point the outlier would impact users of the service i.e., if an outlier took X minutes or seconds, what impact would that have?

2906_02: DCC to provide the number of times the service needed to scale to over 8 instances in May for inbound messages and excluding gate closure. JH noted that this action stemmed from a conversation that when a large volume comes in, there was a slight delay (seconds) in response. GS advised that when the system was originally set-up, it was done so with four scaling instances available. The system now permanently has been scaled from four to eight instances. Eight instances are the optimum number for the current solution, it could be scaled up to 16 but eight provides the best value for money. JH queried whether switches returning to normal volumes would require the system to scale up more frequently. GS advised that there is a DCC Capacity Team who continually forecasts volumes to ensure any increases are factored in and addressed prior to it becoming an issue. In future, the DCC may need to increase the number of instances. MT queried the cost implication of moving to the next level of scaling instances available and what would the cost benefit analysis of that look like. GS advised that there is an upper and lower limit of 15% already built into the pass-through costs from Azure. Whilst the DCC is budgeting and forecasting appropriately, this is sufficient. If the DCC always moved to 16 instances, this could be wasteful, and this cost may be passed onto REC Parties. LB noted that 1,001,876 switches were processed within May 2023. This is compared with 11,000,000 since June 2022 and includes genuine switches as well as internal migrations.

2906_03: DCC to request information from Landmark on how long the acknowledgement time out period is. At the last work group, it was queried what the timeout period was. GS advised that the maximum wait for an acknowledgement is 100 seconds and then a retry interval of a further 20 seconds. That retry then occurs another time (140 seconds). If there is still no acknowledgement, this will then drop to the back of the queue. This retry would be attempted every hour for the next 12 hours. This retry process is removed from the live to ensure it doesn't clog up a channel or an instance and helps keep the system moving. It was queried how this process interacts with a gate closure target and whether the retry period should be completed again at gate closure. *Note for Impact Assessment activity – It would be beneficial to get an understanding from the GRDA and DNOs whether this impacts their gate closure processes and whether this was a reasonable level of risk.*

MT raised that some of this was being investigated under R0081 – CSS Market Message Retry Strategy. A derogation was requested, and a change raised to test out different ways to handle the retry mechanism. One solution was proposed to increase the frequency to potentially once every half an hour or a longer retry period, however the latter may result in further challenges.

2906_04: DCC to provide data on inbound tickets as opposed to proactively raised incidents from Landmark. LB presented data from April, May and June and noted that July figures would look different due to the Priority 1 incident.

This data showed that the majority of incidents (76%) are raised by Parties to the DCC. 58% of incidents raised by Parties were related to CSS messages and 9% were validation errors. It

DRAFT

was clarified that this data is for the resolution of the incident and that these figures do not incorporate any of the stops whilst DCC is waiting for a market participant to respond, however, if it is assigned to a SDSP, the clock will still tick as it will be assigned in either a “new” or “in progress” state. This is because when assigning to a market participant, this is assigned to a single lead contact and SLAs cannot be balanced in the same way.

GS noted that the 100% target on this SLA is the concern. The DCC doesn’t want to compromise on the quality of the response so that may mean that an incident needs to be open longer, particularly for more complex issues. The incident must be fixed properly.

JH added that the DCC raised, and market participant raised incidents could be treated differently as ultimately the SLA is there for the protection of users of the service.

GS also referenced the possibility of an exemptions process, however providing this detail means the use of approximately six engineering working days. This is why a potential relaxation of a 100% target would be a preferable way forward.

SD advised that as a Service Provider, Xoserve has 100% target levels and that if there is a relaxation for one Service Provider, then this should be aligned especially as one Service Provider’s targets may impact another. SM from the EES Provider echoed the same concerns and JH highlighted that there are many REC Service Providers with a 100% target. ES requested confirmation of whether other Service Providers are subjected to the same level of performance charges as the DCC. CD noted that Suppliers have a financial impact where consumers are not switched within the required timeframe.

4 NEXT STEPS

- The DCC to take work group input and create an outline of DCC’s updated proposals. These to be circulated by 24 August 2023.
- Book in an extended work group for the first week of September and cancel the next planned meeting for 24 August 2023. This may be in person or online depending on the group’s preferences.
- Within the extended session, negotiate the proposals with the aim to come to an agreed recommendation to be taken forward into Impact Assessment.

5 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There was no further business and TP closed the work group.

DRAFT