

This document is classified as **White** in accordance with the Panel Information Policy. Information can be shared with the public, and any members may publish the information, subject to copyright.

MP154 'CH Returns SLA Amendment' Request for Information responses Annex A

About this document

This document contains the full non-confidential collated responses received to the DP154 Request for Information.

Question 1: Is the current SLA for issuing the Communications Hub returns SR 8.14.3 adversely affecting you as a SEC Party?

| Question 1 | | |
|----------------|----------------|---|
| Respondent | Category | Response |
| OVO Energy | Large Supplier | Yes. The time scale is too short and can rarely be met. It does not consider the reality of the asset chain or the amount of time needed to return a CH to the DCC. |
| Scottish Power | Large Supplier | Yes |
| E.ON | Large Supplier | The full details are provided in the RED version of this document. |
| EDF | Large Supplier | The activity required to send the 8.14.3 within 5 working days of the comms hub removal doesn't fit within our timescales of activity that is required to unload and process the removed comms hub. The level of manual processing prior to triggering the 8.14.3 presents a barrier to meeting the current SLA |

Question 2: Approximately how many of your removed Communications Hub units have exceeded the current five working day limit between removal and sending the SR 8.14.3 between March 2020 and March 2021? You can provide volumes between dates of your choosing if that is easier, providing you specify the dates. What is this as a percentage of the total number of Communications Hubs removed for the same period?

| Question 2 | | |
|----------------|----------------|---|
| Respondent | Category | Response |
| OVO Energy | Large Supplier | 4862 OVO(S) CH units exceed the current five working day limit which is 95% of the removals between March 2020 and March 2021. 132 OVO CH units exceeded the five working day limit which is 43% of the removals between March 2020 and March 2021. |
| Scottish Power | Large Supplier | The full details are provided in the RED version of this document. |
| E.ON | Large Supplier | Any data we provide will be approximations, DCC will be able to provide the most accurate data on this as they control the SLA breaches and what is removed from the field. The full details are provided in the RED version of this document. |
| EDF | Large Supplier | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outside SLA – 6,293 Inside SLA – 15,957 <p>This equates to 39% outside of SLA.</p> <p>This reporting has come from the DCC as we do not record it. We believe it covers the correct period</p> |

Question 3: Do you agree with the proposed length of time to extend the Communications Hub returns SR 8.14.3 by?

| Question 3 | | |
|----------------|----------------|---|
| Respondent | Category | Response |
| OVO Energy | Large Supplier | Yes, we agree that 15 WDs is a pragmatic and sensible extension to make and will allow for more CHs to be returned in time. |
| Scottish Power | Large Supplier | No, we would prefer longer: i.e. 20 Working Days. |
| E.ON | Large Supplier | No – an extension from 5 days to 15 days does not provide us with any additional cover or security, or sufficient time to amend current processes to be more efficient. If the DCC's aim is to reduce the number of returns coming back to them that were 'No Fault Found' then we would need a much longer time. |
| EDF | Large Supplier | Yes, an extension to the current timescale of return is welcomed. However, clarity would be appreciated as to the impact missing these SLAs has. More detail provided in question 5 |

Question 4: Will your organisation incur any costs and/or realise any cost savings in implementing DP154?

| Question 4 | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------|---|
| Respondent | Category | Response | Rationale |
| OVO Energy | Large Supplier | Yes | As described in our response to Question 2, we would have many instances from being charged £47 per return to £7. This Modification makes perfect sense to us and is fully supported by us. |
| Scottish Power | Large Supplier | Yes | <p>The costs to implement the change would be minimal as the current 5-day limit was never written into our systems.</p> <p>We would only see cost savings in cases where the MOA has incorrectly populated the B0003 without including the details of the faulty exchanged hub. If the MOA populates the B0003 correctly, and within our timescales, then there may be enough time to populate the 8.14 Service Request to the DCC, even within the current 5-day timescale. Where they do not, however, we need to raise the flow on their behalf, which is where the 5-day SLA causes us to incur charges: i.e. by the time we realise there is a hub awaiting triage return, but the MOA has not populated the B0003 correctly, it is already non-compliant. The extra time would allow us to raise the flow on their behalf.</p> |
| E.ON | Large Supplier | No | As per Q3, the extension doesn't have any impact on current operations. |
| EDF | Large Supplier | No | We do not foresee any changes in delivering DP154 |

Question 5: Please provide any further comments you may have.

| Question 5 | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|
| Respondent | Category | Comments |
| OVO Energy | Large Supplier | None. |
| Scottish Power | Large Supplier | N/A |
| E.ON | Large Supplier | <p>While an extension would be welcomed, we don't feel an extension to 15 days delivers much more than the current SLA.</p> <p>The full details are provided in the RED version of this document.</p> |
| EDF | Large Supplier | <p>We need to understand the impact if the SLA is missed and we are not certain that we do.</p> <p>Currently, for SLAs that are missed, the responsibility for the CH falls to the supplier, although in many cases the CH was faulty. Returning the SR 8.14.3 late seems to negate the reason for the CH return.</p> <p>We do not feel that this is clearly laid out in the legal text and would like to be able to challenge those charges in the instances where the driver for the removal of the CH was that it was faulted, and the late return of the 8.14.3 is secondary.</p> <p>Therefore, we need clarity on whether we could challenge those charges in the instances where the removal of CH was due to a fault.</p> |