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

FINAL MEETING MINUTES

MEETING	**R0092_06**
DATE	**19 January 2024, 11:00**
LOCATION	**Microsoft Teams**

Attendee	Representing	Initials
Samantha Briggs	Change Delivery Manager (Chair)	SB
Elise Handy	Code Manager (Lead Analyst)	EH
Anton Moden	Code Manager	AM
Caroline Milner	Code Manager	CM
Bradley Baker	Data Communications Company (Proposer)	BB
Cordelia Grey	Data Communications Company (Proposer)	CG
Ekta Sareen	Data Communications Company (Proposer)	ES
Gary Stuart	Data Communications Company (Proposer)	GS
Jenny Bridges	Data Communications Company (Proposer)	JB
Nigel Collins	Data Communications Company (Proposer)	NC
Debbie Walker	Data Communications Company (Proposer)	DW
Tim Dunning	Data Communications Company (Proposer)	TD
Leo Brown	Data Communications Company (DCC)	LB
Louise Burns	Ofgem	LBu
David Addison	GRDA	DA

Sharon Dudley	GRDA	SD
Claire Hemmens	RECCo	CH
Jonathan Hawkins	RECCo	JH
Mark Loveday	RECCo	ML
Mollie De Camp	RECCo	MD
Ben Atkinson	Supplier representative	BA

1 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair (SB) welcomed attendees to the sixth R0092 work group meeting.

2 MINUTES FROM THE LAST MEETING

The Chair (SB) explained that the minutes for the meeting held on the 12 January and 19 January would be shared with all attendees 5 working days after this final meeting.

3 RE-CAP ON KEY POINTS FROM MEETING ON 12 JAN 2024

BB noted that the DCC had requested synchronous responses to have a single measure with a daily frequency, with clarification needed on the 90th percentile calculations or a backstop measure at 6 minutes. BB added that the DCC required clarification on the 90th percentile calculation which would be sought from JH and AM.

For asynchronous responses, the Code Manager had suggested hourly measurements and a maximum average response time of three seconds with a ten-minute backstop. BB then explained that the DDC is requesting a daily measurement with an eleven-minute backstop for contingency.

Critical times were also discussed, and this was indicated to be between 16:00 to 17:00 plus or minus two hours depending on the maximum response time.

BB noted that gate closure was discussed at the previous meeting and to support any proposals, there may be a new Change Proposal raised by the DCC that would look to place an SLA on user behaviour around gate closure. The Code Manager stated that the DCC is obligated to process and release all messages within forty minutes of gate closure. However, the DCC feels that it is being unfairly measured on processes outside of its control.

JH asked if BB would be providing more detail on the revised Change Proposal during this meeting. BB stated that they didn't yet have anything further on the revised proposal but that red-lined legal text would be made available soon after the meeting.

JH stated that the Code drafting was to reflect the agreed solution and reiterated that we needed to get to a point of an agreed solution. JH maintained that there was a need to define the 90th percentile calculation and ensure this was clear and unambiguous, and he agreed there was a need to review the lower-level detail.

4 DCC'S FINAL PROPOSAL

Asynchronous Responses

JH highlighted that for the asynchronous responses, the principle of giving comfort to the users needed to be addressed either through a backstop, through the hourly measurement or through the 90th percentile measurement. JH noted it appeared that what the DCC was proposing is to remove the hourly measurement, introduce a daily measurement with an average of three seconds, based on the revised volumes that we got agreement on last week, and introduce an absolute backstop of eleven minutes for any message at any point through the month.

GS explained that the DCC reflected on this based on feedback about a backstop from DA at the previous meeting. It was noted that as the DCC understood it, a ten-to-eleven-minute backstop would be a good insurance point for Xoserve. Based on this, the DCC was proposing to have a daily measurement for asynchronous responses, a target measure of 100% but with an eleven-minute backstop. This was because the maximum recorded response time was 10 minutes and 40 seconds. It was hoped that having an eleven-minute backstop would meet expectations. It was queried how frequently the ten-minute time had been exceeded. It was clarified that it had only been exceed in a small number (in the tens) however, detail on why this timescale was exceeded could not be provided at the time.

JH noted that it was not correct to build the service levels on statistics from recent cases, however service levels were there to drive the right behaviours and seek to reduce instances of poor performance. It was important to understand what could be done to prevent a message taking more than 10 minutes to be responded to.

Gate Closure

GS reiterated that the DCC felt that the responsibility for measuring the end-to-end gate closure process is outside of their control. The DCC also acknowledged that the work group's concern was that not being measured end-to-end would be a risk to service delivery and that the exemptions process was there to ensure the DCC was not penalised unfairly.

The DCC's proposed solution was to report on the end-to-end process but not to be financially incentivised for it. It would only be measured financially up until the release of messages. There would be no changes proposed to the 40-minute response time requirement. However, where this was not accepted by industry, the DCC would need to support the exemptions process.

From a work group's perspective, the DCC still had a responsibility to improve and measure performance preventing gate closure issues occurring in the first place. LB noted that if there was a slow responder, the DCC would reach out to that market participant and offer support but did not feel that this was their role going forwards. There was a disagreement as there was the expectation that where there was a failure, the DCC should make Parties aware.

JH offered support to the DCC and to PAB in ensuring that genuine exemptions are reviewed and acted on accordingly.

AM highlighted that one of the outcomes of R0092 must be to clear up any errors and ambiguities regarding gate closure metrics.

Incident Management

GS stated that the service levels for P3 and P4 incidents with a 100% target was a major cause for concern for the DCC. One concern was that there were little P3s received, and one failure can have a severe impact on the DCC's performance. It was therefore proposed that there be a 90% fulfilment of this metric for resolution time. The proposal for P4s was to have a 95% fulfilment for resolution time.

There were concerns raised around some P3 incidents being categorised incorrectly. However, it was challenged that if an incident is accepted in a particular category, the associated service level was also accepted. It was also queried whether the data was correct as it was expected for there to be more incidents raised such as connectivity issues, message completeness issues etc within the period. It was also noted that some service desks may be incorrectly raising incidents in the wrong category.

JH queried that there needed to be further protections for users on any proposal and that a backstop should be provided within the red-lined proposals following the meeting.

Service Requests

GS highlighted that Service Requests were not in its supplier contracts and indicated that the DCC would also be looking to propose some changes to these metrics. It was clarified that the principle of a backstop should also be applied to these proposals.

5 SUMMARY AND NEXT STEPS

JH noted that red-lined legal text hadn't yet been seen and that Market Participants, once they see the final red-lined solution, may wish to raise an alternative and they need to be able to make that decision before any change report is issued.

EH summarised the actions needed which would allow the Code Manager to publish the Preliminary Change Report on the 20 February 2024.

a) DCC to share their proposal and red line text with the Code Manager by 26 January 2024.

b) Code Manager to review the red lined text the following week before sharing with the working group attendees.

c) Code Manager to share the red lined text offline with the working group attendees for them to provide immediate comments.

6 CLOSE

EH asked if there were any final comments before SB stated that there was no further business and closed the meeting.