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

NON-CONFIDENTIAL CONSOLIDATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES

R0210 - EVOLUTION OF THE CRS PERFORMANCE CHARGE

On 18 October 2024 the Code Manager issued a consultation to industry to seek feedback on the Preliminary Change Report for R0210.

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	18/11/2024
RESPONSIBLE COMMITTEE	PERFORMANCE ASSURANCE BOARD
LEAD ANALYST	LYDIA BENTLEY

DATE CONSULTATION ISSUED	18 October 2024
RESPONSE DEADLINE	08 November 2024

Question 1:	Do you agree the proposed solution resolves the problem statement? If not, please provide rationale.	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
National Grid Electricity Distribution Distribution Network Operator	Yes we agree that the proposed solution resolves the problem statement, however, we would highlight that we would disagree with the rationale that reducing the weighting to User Support is going to provide better Consumer outcomes and better operational effectiveness. As a user, a ticket is raised where there is an issue that requires a resolution, At the end of that ticket is a consumer who, for whatever reason, is experiencing issues in getting a supply switched. Any delay or failure to respond in a timely manner to achieve that resolution is causing customer detriment which is as high a priority as service availability.	Thank you for providing detailed feedback regarding the proposed weightings for the three performance measure groups. The Code Manager recognises that both Availability of the CRS and User Support are essential to deliver Consumer outcomes. As such, the performance measure groups have been calibrated to ensure the best possible balance between practical positive outcomes for the CRS Provider as a major REC Service Provider, as well as positive Consumer outcomes. As such, whilst the Code Manager values this feedback, on this occasion we will not move forward with it.
Scottish Power Energy Supplier	We agree that the proposed solution resolves the problem statement. We agree with the differential weighting between different Performance Measure Groups. We expect CRS Provider to modify its operations to better engage with the proposed framework.	Thank you.

Question 2:	Do you agree with the proposed legal text? If not, please provide rationale.	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
National Grid Electricity Distribution Distribution Network Operator	Yes we agree with the proposed legal text	Thank you.
Scottish Power Energy Supplier	Yes, we agree with the legal text.	Thank you.

Question 3:	**Do you agree with the proposed weighting for Service Availability, User Support and Responsiveness measures? If not, please provide rationale.**	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
National Grid Electricity Distribution Distribution Network Operator	We would disagree with the rationale that reducing the weighting to User Support is going to provide better Consumer outcomes and better operational effectiveness. As a user, a ticket is raised where there is an issue that requires a resolution, At the end of that ticket is a consumer who, for whatever reason, is experiencing issues in getting a supply switched. Any delay or failure to respond in a timely manner to achieve that resolution is causing customer detriment which is as high a priority as service availability.	See Code Manager response to Q1.
Scottish Power Energy Supplier	Yes, we agree with the proposed weighting for the service availability, user support and responsiveness measures.	Thank you.

Question 4:	**Do you agree with the Performance Charge percentages for each performance category? If not, please provide rationale.**	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
National Grid Electricity Distribution Distribution Network Operator	We would disagree with the rationale that reducing the weighting and Performance Charge percentages to User Support is going to provide better Consumer outcomes and better operational effectiveness. As a user, a ticket is raised where there is an issue that requires a resolution, At the end of that ticket is a consumer who, for whatever reason, is experiencing issues in getting a supply switched. Any delay or failure to respond in a timely manner to achieve that resolution is causing customer detriment which is as high a priority as service availability	See Code Manager response to Q1.
Scottish Power Energy Supplier	Yes, we agree with the performance charge percentages for each performance category. The service availability category should have the higher performance charge, due to the impact on the suppliers and their customers. It also makes sense for the user support performance category to have the second highest performance charge. It's been evident from the P1 incident that the service availability and support from the CRS providers are crucial for the management and the resolution of such incidents.	Thank you for your feedback. We recognise the importance of all categories of performance measures, and have proposed a balance of metrics to best provide an incentive for the CRS provider. The rationale for the breakdown has been that the most significant events, where there is a lack of availability, always directly relate to a loss of margin.

Question 5:	Do you agree with the proposed implementation date and approach? If not, please provide rationale.	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
National Grid Electricity Distribution Distribution Network Operator	Yes we agree with the proposed implementation date	Thank you.
Scottish Power Energy Supplier	Yes, we agree with the proposed implementation date and the approach.	Thank you.

Question 6:	**Do you agree with the Code Manager's assessment that the proposed solution and its resulting benefits support the case for change? If not, please provide rationale.**	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
National Grid Electricity Distribution Distribution Network Operator	Whilst we agree that a methodology is required to be developed to enhance the performance charge, we would disagree with the rationale that reducing the weighting to User Support is going to provide better Consumer outcomes and better operational effectiveness. As a user, a ticket is raised where there is an issue that requires a resolution, At the end of that ticket is a consumer who, for whatever reason, is experiencing issues in getting a supply switched. Any delay or failure to respond in a timely manner to achieve that resolution is causing customer detriment which is as high a priority as service availability.	See Code Manager response to Q1.
Scottish Power Energy Supplier	We agree that the proposed solution and its resulting benefits supports the case for change. We believe that this will lead to better Consumer outcomes.	Thank you.

Question 7:	Do you have any other comments relating to this Change Proposal?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
National Grid Electricity Distribution Distribution Network Operator	[-]	-
Scottish Power Energy Supplier	We don't have anything to add at this stage.	Thank you.