RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

NON-CONFIDENTIAL CONSOLIDATED IMPACT ASSESSMENT RESPONSES

R0121 - SDEP REVIEW IMPROVEMENTS (1) - PROCESS TYLES

On 26 January 2024 the Code Manager issued a Party Impact Assessment to industry to seek feedback on R0121 SDEP Review Improvements (1) - Process Types.

The purpose of this document is to consolidate the responses and for the Code Manager to answer any questions raised within those responses.

DOCUMENT VERSION	1.0
RESPONSE TYPE	NON-CONFIDENTIAL
DATE ISSUED	01/03/2024
RESPONSIBLE COMMITTEE	Technical Expert Panel
LEAD ANALYST	Elise Handy

DATE IMPACT ASSESSMENT ISSUED	26/01/2024
RESPONSE DEADLINE	16/02/2024

Question 1:	Do you have any comments on the proposed solution?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Scottish Power Energy Networks (Distribution Network Operator)	We are supportive of the intent of the proposed solution, however would note that we receive a number of SDEP Queries in relation to PT0030 - Address Management (Elec.) - General Query • Where parties are asking if we have received the flow (this is not the correct use of this SDEP) • Requesting a response to a D0381, when a response has already been sent. • challenging when we have advised that the flow has not been completed correctly, we can only accept/reject based on the info in the flow. If the town/building number are in the wrong field, we cannot accept. We would request that there is clear guidance on when escalations are to be used.	Thanks for your comments. The Code Manager will provide clear guidance on how the SDEP should be used.
ENGIE (Energy Supplier)	We welcome the addition of new process types to SDEP as this will enable more queries to be allocated correctly to the most appropriate user and lead to shorter resolution times.	Noted, thank you.
Brook Green Supply (Energy Supplier)	We are supportive of the proposed solution and think centralising processes and communication is a good idea. SDEP will also be able to ensure that the messages between parties are kept secure.	Noted, thank you.
British Gas (Energy Supplier)	We Believe the proposed types (Missing Read General Query for gas and elec & the Missing Read Escalation for gas and elec) are very similar to those we already have for Disputed Reads so would be beneficial if the wording of the new Process Types below could specify	Thanks for your comments. The accompanying guidance and proposed legal text changes will seek to make clear the Process Types to be used in each scenario

	they are for chasing a missing DR agreed read D86 (elec) / URN (gas) only.	rather than flow types being referenced within the titles.

Question 2:	Do you agree the proposed solution addresses the problem statement? If not, please provide details?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Scottish Power Energy Networks (Distribution Network Operator)	We believe that proposed solution addresses the problem statement in the areas relating to DNO. We cannot comment on areas relating to other parties related to DNO	Noted, thank you.
ENGIE (Energy Supplier)	Yes.	Noted, thank you.
Brook Green Supply (Energy Supplier)	N/A	-
British Gas (Energy Supplier)	Agree that more specific user types will help suppliers update the right queries to the right dept. This should help speed up replies and leave less ambiguity when raising queries.	Noted, thank you.

Question 3:	Would you prefer to utilise the user scripting solution or manually populate your company users against the Process Types?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Scottish Power Energy Networks (Distribution Network Operator)	I cannot see any reference to this in any of the documentation (perhaps this should have been included in the papers to detail the options). More information if required to assess this.	Thanks for your comments. Further information on the user scripting solution will be available to Parties as part of the implementation activity.
ENGIE (Energy Supplier)	We would like the scripting option to be available with manual as a back-up (particularly for small adjustments).	Noted, thank you.
Brook Green Supply (Energy Supplier)	N/A	-
British Gas (Energy Supplier)	Yes	Noted, thank you.

Question 4:	If you do wish to utilise the user maintenance script solution, will two weeks be enough time for you to identify teams, provide permissions information and populate the spreadsheet template to be used in the user maintenance scripting?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Scottish Power Energy Networks (Distribution Network Operator)	No details have been provided on the documentation (that I can see) in relation to this. More information is required to assess if the timescale is achievable.	Thanks for your comments. Further information on the user scripting solution will be available to Parties as part of the implementation activity.

ENGIE (Energy Supplier)	We would prefer one month simply due to the general level of work requests with our operational teams.	Noted, thank you.
Brook Green Supply (Energy Supplier)	N/A	-
British Gas (Energy Supplier)	Yes	Noted, thank you.

Question 5:	Do you identify any benefits to your business including cost savings and more effective problem resolution through the implementation of the proposed solution? If yes, please provide details and/or approximate cost savings.	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Scottish Power Energy Networks (Distribution Network Operator)	We have not identified any benefits in this solution	Noted, thank you.
ENGIE (Energy Supplier)	The creation of the missing read type will benefit our business by enabling swifter resolution of queries which are likely to be impacting billing accuracy. Resolving these queries will have a positive impact on receipt of revenue and cashflow, and also reduce costs associated with complaints arising from them.	Noted, thank you.
Brook Green Supply (Energy Supplier)	N/A	-
British Gas (Energy Supplier)	This Benefit will be seen over time as the process becomes more efficient.	Noted, thank you.

Question 6:	What lead time would be required for your business to implement the proposed solution? Please provide justification.	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Scottish Power Energy Networks (Distribution Network Operator)	We would require a lead time of 3 months to allow any additional resource to be sourced and or trained	Noted, thank you.
ENGIE (Energy Supplier)	Six months, to enable the population of the script template and train users.	Noted, thank you.
Brook Green Supply (Energy Supplier)	N/A	-
British Gas (Energy Supplier)	N/A	-

Question 7:	What support will your organisation require from the Code Manager to ensure your teams are able to respond to these new Process Types? E.g. guidance document, webinar etc.	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Scottish Power Energy Networks (Distribution Network Operator)	Support would be required in the form of clear guidance documentation, a webinar run through would also be useful.	Thanks for your comments, the SDEP guidance is to be reviewed across all the current SDEP Change Proposals. The Code Manager will look to progress a webinar as a support tool for implementation.

ENGIE (Energy Supplier)	A guidance document is a must have with a Webinar as an option.	Noted, thank you.
Brook Green Supply (Energy Supplier)	N/A	-
British Gas (Energy Supplier)	We agree a Webinar and training documentation would provide the correct level of support.	Noted, thank you.

Question 8:	Do you agree with the Code Manager's approach for the red-lined legal text? Please provide details.	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Scottish Power Energy Networks (Distribution Network Operator)	Yes.	Noted, thank you.
ENGIE (Energy Supplier)	We have not reviewed the legal text.	Noted, thank you.
Brook Green Supply (Energy Supplier)	N/A	-
British Gas (Energy Supplier)	Theft General Query both Gas and Electricity, MPxN's need to be mandatory information, this would be needed to identify the supply to be investigated. Also, we believe this should be mandatory for Crossed Meters.	Thanks for your comments. The field itself is not proposed to be mandatory as there is only space for one MPxN. Users may wish to use an attachment instead.

Question 9:	Would a targeted implementation date of August 2024 be appropriate for your organisation? If not, please provide reasons.	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Scottish Power Energy Networks (Distribution Network Operator)	Yes.	Noted, thank you.
ENGIE (Energy Supplier)	Yes.	Noted, thank you.
Brook Green Supply (Energy Supplier)	N/A	-
British Gas (Energy Supplier)	Yes.	Noted, thank you.

Question 10:	Do you have any other comments relating to this Change Proposal?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Scottish Power Energy Networks (Distribution Network Operator)	Additional comments identified in Q1.	-
ENGIE (Energy Supplier)	We particularly welcome the creation of the new Missing Read process type; the use of this PT to separate out missing and disputed reads needs to be well-trained out across the industry.	Noted, thank you.

Brook Green Supply (Energy Supplier)	N/A	-
British Gas (Energy Supplier)	Could we please request that Missing MTDs General Query should be in scope for this change. The currently end up in a whole host of incorrect pots.	This Process Type is in scope of this Change Proposal and was incorporated from R0006.