RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

SPECIAL REC ISSUES GROUP – SDEP II CHANGE PROPOSAL R0122

MEETING NOTES

DATE	**20 October 2023, 10:00**
LOCATION	**By teleconference**

1 INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed attendees to this special meeting of the REC Issue Group (RIG), which was arranged to consider the SDEP II Change Proposal R0122.

The Chair confirmed the agenda, asking for Any Other Business (AOB) to be raised at this time. The Chair highlighted that no AOB items were raised prior to the meeting, with no AOB items being raised at this time.

2 R0122 – USEABILITY, LOOK AND FEEL AND REPORTING

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of R0122 – Useability, Look and Feel and Reporting, which can be found on slides 2-37 of the pack here.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst presented slide 6, which highlighted the full set of statuses being proposed for progression.

A RIG member noted manual unread is a new function, therefore when this is issued as a Change Proposal, it needs to be in blue and automated. They elaborated this will make it clearer for the wider audience who wouldn't have been involved in the discussions. The Code Manager Lead Analyst confirmed this will be highlighted in blue in the Change Proposal.

A RIG member mentioned for the Response sent status, users can see that by which party sent the last message in the chain. The Code Manager Lead Analyst agreed but advised the proposal is referring to having a status which would show up in reports or filters. The RIG member noted if any of this work becomes too onerous and needs to be scaled back, this is more of an enhancement, rather than a urgent requirement. Another RIG member commented that filtering on statuses would be really beneficial for them. The Code Manager Lead Analyst confirmed this would be used when a party would expect a response from another party.

Another RIG member highlighted that certain responses received automatically re-open up an archived SDEP case although a response isn't required. They further elaborated these tend to show on the reporting as 'exceeding response time'. The RIG member asked whether a function can be built into SDEP, whereby it automatically ignore these instances, or it doesn't re-open a case on receipt of these responses. The Service Provider representative advised it's quite difficult to specify something that's text related. They elaborated it could be more of a process issue, rather than a system issue. RIG members agreed that unnecessary responses need to be stopped, in order to prevent cases from re-opening.

Another RIG member stated cases that are showing as unread or unsolved status should not be auto archived after 30 days. Several RIG members agreed SDEP cases shouldn't be automatically archived if they haven't been solved. Another RIG member mentioned their main concern is how quickly SDEP cases are archived. They elaborated that parties should respond within that amount of time, but if they don't, the cases shouldn't be archived. They further elaborated if both parties have got an SDEP case showing the status of 'solved', these cases should be automatically archived.

Another RIG member noted when they log into SDEP to perform a Contract Manager escalation about an existing communication, they have to raise a new communication. They elaborated in that new communication, they note the MPAN/MPXN or SDEP reference, but it then creates a new duplicated SDEP record. They asked if SDEP can be updated for a Contract Manager escalation to be actioned on the original record, rather than created a duplicate record. The Code Manager Lead Analyst confirmed this was discussed at a previous workshop and there is a solution being progressed. They elaborated the solution is to allow parties to copy across the necessary records and duplicate them, to prevent the date having to be re-entered.

Another RIG member mentioned that a general query can't be escalated in SDEP. They elaborated most parties will then raise a Contract Manager escalation, referencing the general query. They further elaborated by raising a duplicate case, there may be two open cases. Another RIG member commented some of their staff couldn't access the Contract Manager queries, therefore they had to change the access rights within their system. They elaborated this was to enable users to forward the SDEP cases onto the correct staff.

Another RIG member highlighted that in the SDEP user guide, it states users should open up a new case. Another RIG member agreed that SDEP has been set up in a way which encourages duplication. They elaborated in certain scenarios there could be an escalation, a Contract Manager escalation, and a Contract Manager email, with users doing one of each, which causes a lot of confusion. The Service Provider representative mentioned the easiest solution could be to give parties the option of escalating general queries, as there currently isn't a function in SDEP for his. The Code Manager Lead Analyst noted the way the REC is written, an escalation can only be raised if an SLA has been missed or if there

has been an unsatisfactory response, as defined in the CFSB Schedule. They elaborated there is no obligation to respond to a general query.

Another RIG member explained there needs to be continuity in SDEP cases. They elaborated if a SDEP case needs to be escalated to the Contract Manager, there needs to be a way of just forwarding the original case on to them, similar to emails so as not to lose the history.

Another RIG member commented that there isn't a way to escalate incoming SDEP cases from Suppliers. They elaborated if they've responded to an SDEP case and then the other Supplier hasn't responded to confirm they are satisfied with the response given, the only option is to archive the case, instead of escalating it back to the Supplier. Several RIG members agreed this is an issue. Another RIG member highlighted if the SDEP user guides are going to be updated, can it be noted what should be escalated and what should be kept as just chasers. RIG members noted in certain scenarios, Suppliers will raise an SDEP case asking them to agree on something, they respond to the case confirming the agreement, but then the initiating Supplier doesn't respond on the original case. They elaborated this causes an issue which impacts their customers.

Action: The Code Manager to investigate if there could be a way parties are able to escalate an incoming SDEP case.

A RIG member mentioned prior to a case being assigned as 'Solved', they would prefer if the status could be 'Null' or 'Nothing'. They elaborated the status showing as 'Unsolved' could cause confusion. They further elaborated if the SDEP case has been raised due to information needing to be updated in EES, the Supplier who received the case would send the flow and mark the case as 'Resolved'. The RIG member explained the confusion could arise on what the expectation is for each individual process. They elaborated some scenarios may need to be behavioural changes, rather than process changes.

Another RIG member noted the idea of, when a case has been marked as 'Solved', the other party receives a notification to confirm its been solved. They elaborated this could work if the user who has raised the case, is automatically assigned as the owner. Another RIG member mentioned currently if a user raises a case, they have to access the case and assign it to themselves. They elaborated certain SDEP cases may not have an owner, and if the user who created the case has now left the business, it won't be reassigned and will be deleted.

Another RIG member commented once a user has assigned themselves as an owner of a SDEP case, they receive an email notifying them they've assigned themselves as the owner of that case. They elaborated this email shouldn't be triggered. Another RIG member highlighted these emails are useful when a user is assigning a SDEP case to another user, but agreed when a user is assigning themselves to a case, the email doesn't

need to be triggered. They elaborated it would be even more useful if the owner of a case is pre-populated.

Action: The Code Manager to investigate whether emails can stop being triggered in scenarios where a user has set themselves as the owner of a SDEP case.

Another RIG member mentioned it would be useful if on a particular day of the week, SDEP users received an email to notify them now many assigned queries they have. The Code Manager Lead Analyst confirmed a user can set up the frequency of their notifications and this is demonstrated in the user guide, but it might not be for every notification.

Another RIG member noted a solved SDEP case shouldn't be instantly archived, as another user may want to access the case and take a look. They elaborated an idea could be that cases are automatically archived after a defined period of time, giving parties enough time to resolve it before it being automatically archived.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked RIG members for their thoughts on it being made mandatory that SDEP cases can't be marked as archived, unless both parties have marked it as 'Solved'. A RIG member agreed with this, however asked if it would be possible to move the timeline for a case to be archived. They elaborated in certain scenarios, a month is too soon to be auto-archiving. Another RIG member mentioned the timescales for auto-archiving may have been suggested by the Lawyers, when the process was being reviewed.

Action: The Code Manager to investigate the timescales for auto archiving SDEP cases.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked RIG members for their thoughts on it being kept possible that if both parties have solved a case and it's showing as archived, it could be unarchived if a user sends a message. A RIG member commented if a user unarchives a case, they need to send a message to ensure it unarchives for the other party. No other comments were raised on this.

Another RIG member asked when marking a case as 'In Progress', is that to tell the other Supplier the case is being worked on. The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised proposal is currently that the other party would be unable to see if a case has been marked as 'In Progress'. They elaborated the way this requirement is drafted, the 'In Progress' status was a way of letting colleagues know internally the case was being worked on. The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked RIG members for their thoughts on if the other party should be able to see if a case is 'In Progress'. A RIG member was supportive of this idea; however, the reasoning needs to be valid, and it's not being used just as an easy marker to give parties more time. Another RIG member agreed with this comment. Another RIG member mentioned was there a risk of users clicking into a SDEP case, just to simply mark it as being read.

Another RIG member highlighted the option to archive a case from the front screen seems redundant. They elaborated cases can be archived from inside of the case, users can note the case has been completed and then archive it. They further elaborated this will create more room to have a space to inform users on what the status of the case is. Several RIG members agreed they usually archive a case from the inside of a case, to ensure they are archiving the right case.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked RIG members if they used tags. A RIG member mentioned users can't see what the tags have been set to, unless they access the case. The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised the tags are unique to the company group within SDEP. They elaborated users may use tags for putting in multiple MPANs, rather than having more statuses.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst noted a previous request had been made to clear individual filters. They elaborated if users have set two or three filters and just wanted to switch one, users could change the one individual filter and can clear all filters without navigating screen. The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked RIG members for their thoughts on this proposal. A RIG member noted it currently works differently for company group filters. They elaborated when a party has been selected, users can't unselect it, they just have the option of adding another party.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst noted the proposals to add to the list of filters and to amend the way the filters operate. The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked RIG members for their thoughts on this. A RIG member commented when a user applies a filter, SDEP doesn't change the number of line items to the number of items which have been returned by the filter. Several RIG members agreed with this comment.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked RIG members for their thoughts on the additional filters. A RIG member was supportive of the proposal to filter by MPID, as this would help decrease the number of incorrect escalations received. RIG members agreed this additional filter by MPID would be very useful for organisations with multiple MPIDs. Another RIG member was supportive of the idea of adding in an additional filter for escalatable. No RIG members raised any comments around the idea of adding in an additional filter by escalation level. A RIG member was supportive of the idea of adding in an additional filter by new statuses, emphasising being able to filter on unsolved cases would be beneficial. Another RIG member was supportive of all the proposed additional filters.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked RIG members for their thoughts on having a view of the time left to respond on the display view. A RIG member mentioned they had previously suggested putting the number of cases in the bell icon. Another RIG member noted it would be useful to mirror what is on the crossed meter portal.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked RIG members for their thoughts on having visibility of the company group, even if users are raising a case at MPID level. A RIG member

commented most processes are MPID driven and there doesn't seem to be a need to see the organisation too. Another RIG member highlighted having visibility of the organisation would be beneficial, especially in cases of SOLRs; it could remain visible within individual communications, if not on the Communication List view.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked RIG members for their thoughts on whether if a party escalates an SDEP case to the Code Manager, should the other party be notified of that. A RIG member mentioned it might prompt the other party into trying to resolve the case a lot faster. The Code Manager Lead Analyst confirmed if there is an escalation process type, the display bell will change colour from level one to level two. They elaborated escalating to the Code Manager is outside of SDEP, meaning there is no bell icon currently.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked RIG members for their thoughts on whether all users should see the dashboard, or only those with certain permissions. A RIG member asked if Suppliers could assign permissions to their users internally. The Code Manager Lead Analyst mentioned there could be a more flexible approach, whereby users can see everything in SDEP or only specific information.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked RIG members for their thoughts on which screens should the dashboard be visible on. A RIG member proposed having it visible, but there could be a hide option for users who don't need to see it. Several RIG members agreed with this proposal. Another RIG member mentioned the dashboard could go underneath the search bar, which is consistent with the MPAN request screen.

No other business was discussed. The Chair noted another session will be arranged to pick up the subject of SDEP reporting.

The Chair thanked attendees for their input and closed the meeting. The Chair confirmed the next meeting of the RIG was scheduled for 10 November 2023.