RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

REFERENCE	RECCHIG_24_0801_05
STATUS	FOR DISCUSSION

I0180: CLARITY ON USE OF ON HOLD FOR SWITCHING ISSUES, INCLUDING THE OBLIGATIONS OF CSS USERS

BY GEMMA DIXON

1 PURPOSE

The purpose of this paper is to provide the Change Issues Group with a summary and recommendation of I0180: *Clarity on use of on hold for switching issues, including the obligations of CSS Users.*

This submission was accepted by the Code Manager on 03 June 2024. This submission was raised on behalf of the Switching Operator.

The purpose of this discussion would be to ensure the submission is understood and to obtain feedback on the Issue and recommendation for progression.

2 BACKGROUND

Within the Central Switching Service system, many Switching Incidents are on hold waiting for resolution**.** The CSS Service Desk team have a process to chase every three days, escalate and make phone calls. However, the incident cannot be closed until confirmation is received from the end-user and any information is verified within their own systems. There are issues engaging with Suppliers within the incident management process, issues with the correct contact details being held and that tickets are assigned to an individual person rather than an organisation.

The Switching Operator puts these tickets on hold, which is an approved business process from the Switching Programme. This is not reflected in the obligations on SDSPs or other REC Service Providers, where there is no on hold concept. Further there are no obligations on CSS Users to respond in a timely basis. This means that the REC obligations do not reflect current practice, and many tickets remain open much longer than necessary.

Note. This does not apply to DNOs and SDSPs with service desks and is more specifically, Energy Suppliers.

3 VOLUMES AND IMPACTS

As of 18 July 2024, these incidents currently make up 58% of the overall Incidents open in CSS.

4 PROPOSAL

The Code Manager currently have two proposals:

Option 1

- Establish the on-hold concept.
- Establish an obligation on Energy Suppliers to respond to these on hold messages.
- Establish performance assurance of Energy Suppliers that consistently do not respond to messages (which will require reporting on this behaviour).
- Please note that this is only intended on tackling poor performance and will allow for some human error / delays.

Option 2

Define an approach to provide CSS Users with an SLA to respond to incidents placed on hold and then close down after an agreed period of no response.

- CSS Service Desk chase xx times
- If no confirmation from named contact within xx days, SO close the Switching Incident.

Criteria put forward from the SO:

Meets	Doesn't meet
✓ The Incident is over 60 days old ✓ Has had a work note entered into the ticket asking for an update ✓ An email has been sent requesting the ticket to be updated ✓ A phone call has been made to make the party aware ✓ The incident hasn't had an update for over 15 working days (Mon-Fri) ✓ No contact from any nominated officials	✓ Is not a P1-2 ✓ Is not a Certificate request / issue ✓ Is not related to a change ✓ Is not related to a problem ✓ Is not awaiting a data fix ✓ Does not have child/parent tickets

Note. Once a Switching Incident is closed – it can still be viewed. There will still be an audit trail.

Other REC Change Proposals R0080 and R0096 currently in flight should reduce the volumes of missing messages which lead to the proactively raised incidents from Landmark.

5 NEXT STEPS

The Change Issues Group is invited to share views and feedback on the submission which will be incorporated by the Code Manager in the development of this Issue, and the SO during their Impact Assessment.

6 ACTIONS

Change Issues Group Members are invited to:

- **NOTE** the contents of the paper; and
- **DISCUSS** their feedback.