

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.

Paper Reference:	TABASC_36_1511_08
Action:	For Decision

CSS Programme Director Letter

1. Background

In September 2018, Ofgem provided an overview of the CSS programme to TABASC. TABASC discussed:

1. implications of introducing a new source of address data;
2. lessons learnt during the smart meter rollout regarding address / registration data issues; and
3. retention of SFTP RDP interfaces.

This paper highlights requests made by the Switching Programme Director in the response dated 17 October to the TABASC Chair's letter dated 20 September and seeks input from TABASC.

2. Switching Programme Director Requests

This section records the question from TABASC to the CSS Programme Director and the response *in italics*. A request is made of TABASC at the end of each sub-section.

2.1 Lessons Learnt from Supplier Rollout

There was also a question of how the wealth of information gleaned from the Supplier rollout of Smart Meters would be utilised to benefit CSS since some valuable lessons have been learned?

The key information that the roll out of smart meters would provide is to provide another source of data to help identify which RMPs are serving a particular address. It is assumed that when smart meters are associated with a communication hub then these devices are serving the same premises. Having access to this information as smart meters are rolled out will help ensure that the REL is as accurate as possible given that the smart meter installer will have the consumer's address and should have the MPxNs that are to be associated with the communication hub.

It is understood that errors can be made where incorrect MPxNs are inputted into the comms hub. There is an expectation that there will be a number of checks made to ensure the correct data is linked together. However, where an error is made but is sent through to the CSS, there are other sources of data to support the quality of the REL and there is a requirement for the CSS to have an 'analytics' team that can investigate errors where they are identified.

If there are particular lessons from the Smart Meter rollout that you think would be useful for the Faster and more Reliable Switching Programme to benefit from we would, of course, be interested to learn.

Request from TABASC:

To discuss relevant input to the CSS programme regarding lessons learnt from the rollout, particularly regarding address data issues, validation and correction.

2.2 Retention of SFTP RDP Interfaces

As presented, it seemed that the existing SFTP RDP interfaces to DCC would have to remain because the CSS did not intend to include the status information of whether a Smart Meter was installed at an address on the new interface. **TABASC was advised that the CSS do not believe it to be within the remit of the programme to remove the old, largely unused interfaces (as a result of the migration to CSS).** However, TABASC members requested I write to you expressing concern over the decision and to ascertain whether it is possible to reconsider this aspect?

Whilst it is that case that we do not consider the SFTP RDP interfaces to be within scope of the programme, we are aware of the potential for cost efficiencies from the replacement of these interfaces by the CSS. At the time of the meeting the Programme was seeking cost information from DCC colleagues to determine whether there are any efficiency gains to removing the existing RDP interfaces and to use the CSS as the means to route smart meter installation data to the network operators. This information has now been received and will be analysed in due course. A meeting is being arranged with CGI, DCC and Ofgem to consider the implications to the faster switching arrangements and in particular the implications to the CSS design and the impact to procurement. Ultimately, whilst we are willing to include this within the CSS design if there is a strong argument for it, we do not consider the Programme to be solely responsible for the decision to remove the existing interfaces, and we would welcome your help in determining the appropriate governance for that decision.

Request from TABASC:

Three options appear to exist:

1. Retain the SFTP interfaces;
2. Replace the SFTP interfaces as part of CSS programme concurrent with inbound interfaces;
or
3. Replace the SFTP interfaces as part of a later Modification.

The only mechanism available under the SEC to change the interfaces is via modification.

As CGI, DCC and Ofgem are considering the implications of and efficiency gains in replacing the interfaces, TABASC is asked to deliberate whether they would support Ofgem if the CSS programme were to propose replacing the interfaces.

3. New Address Database

SECAS has, on behalf of TABASC, requested support from DCC to provide further understanding regarding aspects of the new address data source, including an understanding how it will be initially populated, used, whether it will align with other address data sources (either at initial load or over time), and processes that will be in place to update the data. TABASC will be updated in due course.

4. Recommendations

The TABASC is requested to **AGREE** responses to sections 2.1 and 2.1 and **NOTE** section 3;

Phillip Twiddy

SECAS Team

8 November 2018