

Change of Supplier Expert Group (COSEG): Meeting 3

Minutes of the third meeting of COSEG.	From	Ofgem
	Date and time of Meeting	1 July 2013 10:30-15:00
	Location	Ofgem, 9 Millbank

1. Welcome and introduction

- 1.1. A full list of attendees is set out in Appendix 1. The materials presented at the meeting are published on the Ofgem [website](#).
- 1.2. The Chair, Andrew Wallace (AW), welcomed members to the meeting.

2. Review of minutes and actions from last meeting:

- 2.1. AW reviewed the minutes from the last meeting on 10 June.
- 2.2. In relation to point 2.20 in the draft minutes, one attendee requested that a change be made to the last sentence "They noted that in the telecommunications market, the responsibility is on the customer to be aware of their contractual position when deciding to switch and ~~that they have to pay their debt if they want to switch~~ will often result in early termination charges". There were no further comments and the minutes were agreed.
- 2.3. Action 1a). AW updated on Ofgem's action to provide any publically available information on outstanding debt. The most up-to-date Ofgem report had been published in Oct 2012 entitled "Domestic suppliers' social obligations: 2011 annual report" (Ref 131/12). An updated report was due later this summer. AW noted that the reported long term trend in the numbers of customers in debt was decreasing but that the average level of debt had increased. The report did not cover the age profile of the outstanding debt.
- 2.4. Action 1b). ENA provided a graph on multiple objections per supply point in the electricity market for the period 1 June 2012 to 1 June 2013. This showed that just over half of objections made were at sites where there was more than one objection in that year. A handful of sites had been objected to more than 20 times. Some COSEG attendees thought that these may be non-domestic sites. ENA agreed to provide information on any differences between the frequency of multiple objections at domestic and non-domestic sites.

Action: ENA
- 2.5. Action 1c). Suppliers had an action to provide further detail on the role of manual processing in supporting their ability to object to customer transfers. They were also asked what elements of current manual processes could or should not be automated. AW reported discussions with several suppliers that objections in the domestic market and non-domestic market could be automated. Several suppliers had indicated that this was dependent on investment on systems and that the costs should be taken into account.
- 2.6. One attendee said that manual processing was required to access whether any change of tenancy flag was valid. They were concerned that this may not be possible to automate. AW asked whether suppliers assumed that the change of tenancy flag was spurious if the customer had not indicated that they were moving premises.

- 2.7. One attendee suggested that the group should give further thought to change of tenancy issues. One attendee suggested that this issue should be linked to Ofgem's work on brokers (TPIs). AW agreed to review change of tenancy at a later COSEG meeting.
- 2.8. Action 2a). AW said that Ofgem had initial discussions with National Grid Transmission (NGT) on any potential impacts of reducing or removing the gas confirmation window. These had indicated that there may be some limited impacts on line pack, but that these were not considered to be material. Their view was subject to further analysis being undertaken by Xoserve. NGT has commented on the potential impacts for the losing supplier's ability to balance their positions if there were very fast transfers. AW noted that Ofgem would be assessing this as part of its impact assessment.
- 2.9. Action 2b). AW reported that the rate of ETs between the Big 6 varied from around 0.7% to 1.5% over the last year. The Customer Service Returner rate also varied between parties and might indicate some differences in classification. There were also some limited variations between the reported reasons for ETs.
- 2.10. Action 4a). In relation to the action on Ofgem to provide more details on switching process in banking sector, AW noted an offer from an external company, Vocalink, to present to the group experience from the banking industry. The group welcomed this offer and agreed that this would be a useful exercise.
- 2.11. Action 4b). Energy-UK reported that it was still working with its Australian counterpart to provide information on the switching process in that market and will report at a later meeting.
- 2.12. Action 5b). AW reported that the data provided by the Big 6 suppliers on missing reads in the gas and electricity markets varied considerably and he was concerned that the data may be spurious or that the request had been interpreted differently by parties. Energy UK agreed to review the missing read data with its members and provide a commentary on the quality of the monthly data submissions to Ofgem.

Action: Energy UK

3. CoS data - update

- 3.1. There were no further updates on COS data for the meeting. AW noted that the COS data presented at the last COSEG meeting represents information that Ofgem has received from Big 6 suppliers. Ofgem had only undertaken limited validation on this data and therefore any inferences should be considered within this context.

4. Reform options - Erroneous Transfers

- 4.1. Nigel Nash (NN) provided a recap on the reform options discussed during the last meeting (see minutes of COSEG2 [here](#)).

Selecting the wrong MPxN to transfer

- 4.2. One member said that the main cause of ETs was poor data. The group agreed that there were likely to be higher risk areas for ETs, for example flats and conversions.
- 4.3. Energy UK had provided analysis on 39 cases of ET to Ofgem following a request at COSEG2. The highest root cause of ETs (16/39) was "supplier manual error" (ie when that is when the supplier picked the wrong customer to transfer). The second highest category was "poor industry data" (14/39). AW noted that this category included where there is incorrect data on central systems and when it was not clear from central data what the correct site was (eg naming conventions for flats) and the supplier had chosen the wrong option. The remainder of the sample (9/39) related to "wrong data

provided by broker or customer". Examples were provided whereby the customer had provided incorrect information when they signed up through web comparison sites.

- 4.4. One attendee said that it was likely that supplier could improve their performance and reduce ETs. Another attendee said that it was often difficult to spot an ET until it had occurred. They doubted that suppliers could completely eradicate all problems causing ETs.
- 4.5. AW said that the variation of the ET rate across suppliers suggested that some improvements could be achieved by sharing good practice. AW noted that the greater potential impact of ETs for customer with a smart meters meant that a step change in performance across all suppliers was needed.

Discussion on ET reform options

- 4.6. One attendee suggested that Option 1 (verification of the MPxN) could be part of the overall toolkit used by suppliers to prevent ETs but noted that it would only be fully possible once smart meters had been rolled out to every customer. One attendee suggested that this option could be introduced closer to the end of the roll out.
- 4.1. One attendee questioned if verification measures using the smart meter would always offer the best solution and suggested that further work could be undertaken with brokers to ensure that they are capturing accurate customer data. They suggested that this could be covered in the confidence code.
- 4.2. AW asked the group whether they thought that customers should be asked to provide more information on switching websites. Some members noted that this will be complicated for customers and might result in a decrease in the propensity to switch. AW added that more efforts could be introduced to help customers double check the information that they enter into the website. One attendee noted that currently customers are not made aware of how important it is to get the right address in CoS process. AW added that the data entry page on the website could be accompanied by a message to emphasise that incorrect information would slow the transfer and could lead to someone else's supply being erroneously transferred.
- 4.3. Reviewing the particular concerns about remotely reconfiguring smart meters on COS as PPM devices, NN suggested that PPM customers could be asked to make a PPM payment before their emergency credit ran out to ensure that the customer was aware of their new payment terms. NN referred to the proposed RMR "standards of conduct" and noted that the duty of care element could be relevant here.
- 4.1. In relation to the proposal under Option 1b (Customer Information Number (CIN) to be sent to the IHD or alternative customer access device), one attendee was concerned that this would require the customer to be at home. They added that it was important to avoid asking customers to be present to verify a code before a transfer can proceed. They said that using such a code would take time to become everyday practice but was common practice in the mobile markets with the use of porting authorisation codes (PAC).
- 4.2. One attendee suggested replacing the term "ESCo" in Option 1 by "supplier" to avoid confusion on the use of that term which was being used more in relation to parties that were not licensed by Ofgem.
- 4.3. In relation to Option 2 (increased regulation) NN asked whether there were concerns that customers would imply that an ET had occurred when this was not the case in order to receive compensation. The group considered that the value of the compensation available would have to be appropriate so as to not incentivise this outcome. One attendee said that compensation should not be available when a

customer had provided the incorrect data. Ofgem took an action to provide information compensation arrangements in the banking sector for example if a direct debit was changed incorrectly.

Action: Ofgem

4.4. Energy UK took an action to provide information on whether and when suppliers currently provide compensation to customers that have been erroneously transferred.

Action: Energy UK

4.5. One attendee noted that increasing regulation will not achieve the best outcomes as most of the current root causes of ETs are out of the market actors' control. AW argued that greater incentives might bring about benefits, for examples, they may affect how data is captured through various sales channels and the efforts that suppliers undertake when seeking to ensure that they select the correct premises to transfer.

4.6. AW suggested that suppliers could share best practice and in particular how they deal with multiple premises (eg flats) at a particular location.

4.7. One attendee noted that Xoserve run PAF updates for the address data held on their registration system every three months to reduce the likelihood of ETs. Shippers are also able to send through address updates. One attendee said that that there should be more clarity for suppliers on how to deal with address data quality issues.

4.8. One attendee asked whether certain types of customers may become more expensive to serve if new rules were introduced. For example, reducing ETs may require greater resource to serve customers in flats where locating the correct meter is more challenging. This could be an unintended consequence of increased regulation.

4.9. On option 3 (improving the process for returning ET'd customers), AW noted that there would be a discussion on allowing electricity suppliers to withdraw registrations at a later COSEG. AW asked whether there were any specific aspects of smart metering, in particular the setting up of security keys, that would warrant changes to the current arrangements. The group considered that there were not any additional issues and that a customer would still need to be returned through the transfer process. One attendee said that a quicker transfer process could help reduce the impact of ETs.

4.10. NN asked whether the ten day lock-out period affects suppliers' ability to repatriate customer quickly, which might constrain some of the benefits of faster switching for customers that had been ET's. Attendees confirmed that this is the case.

4.11. In relation to non-domestic customers, AW asked whether regulation, including compensation arrangements were more challenging to develop. One attendee said that for non-domestic customers, they spend a lot of time untangling ETs which actually turn out to be mis-selling. One attendee mentioned that the micro-market needs to be considered further in parallel with domestic customers.

4.12. NN noted that further discussions were required on the reasons for suppliers picking the incorrect MPxN and that Ofgem would follow-up with suppliers. The group agreed that a further discussion on the ET option is not required at this stage.

5. Reform options - Centralising registration services

5.1. Robyn Daniell (RD) presented slides on Ofgem's initial thoughts on centralising registration services

5.2. AW said that Ofgem's thinking was that the Option 1 (DCC taking on responsibility for a centralised registration service) governance arrangements would be under the SEC.

The group asked for a further option (Option 1b) to be added to consider the DCC taking on the responsibility for a centralised registration service but for the rules around registration to remain under the governance of the MRA/UNC.

Action: Ofgem

- 5.3. Another attendee asked whether Option 1 would be impacted by non-domestic suppliers not being obliged to sign up to the DCC. Ofgem responded that suppliers could opt out of the DCC but not the SEC. The group noted the advantage of this option that there would be a licensed entity that had a requirement to deliver the centralised registration service and that these obligations could be directly enforced by Ofgem.
- 5.4. On Option 2d (SEC Panel procures a centralised database from a third party), one attendee asked who the obligation to provide centralised services would be on. Ofgem confirmed that it would be a function of SEC to put in place the centralised registration service and up to the SEC Panel to discharge. Another attendee noted that Option 2d was a favourable as it improved competition.
- 5.5. One attendee felt that Option 3 (centralising electricity registration services only) undermines the basic principles under Option 1 and 2 on aligning arrangements. Ofgem queried whether Option 3 was viable or should be discarded. There was agreement from the group to remove Option 3 and not consider it further.
- 5.6. One attendee raised the question of dual fuel switching and whether it would be an option to align the two fuel registration systems and have one registration flow for both fuels. AW noted that this was an argument for having the arrangements governed under a single code.
- 5.7. Ofgem asked the group to consider what benefits, in addition to alignment of processes and economies of scale and scope could be delivered by centralisation. NN noted that a central registration service may be able to better manage increasing demands to hold data items (for example on agent ID, records of installed equipment and FITs details) and the benefits were likely to evolve over time.
- 5.8. Ofgem noted the current role of shippers in managing gas registrations and asked whether this would be a barrier to centralisation. This issue being that shippers were not parties to the SEC. NN noted that shippers and supplier were often the same legal entity but that this was not always the case. One option was for gas suppliers to take on the role of updating registration systems. A shipper could then access the information they needed from registration system for example on change of supplier or other changes to registration data. Rather than having shippers as a discrete category under SEC governance, this may not be needed if shippers could access the data that they require acting as an ESCo. If the supplier wanted the shipper to send the flows to the registration systems on its behalf then it could do so as an agent.
- 5.9. RD closed the session by noting that we would provide a further evaluation of options at the next meeting and asking the group to identify any further options and assess the options against the evaluation criteria for discussion at the next COSEG meeting.

Action: COSEG

6. Reform options - Cooling off period

- 6.1. AW presented slides on the introduction of new EU rules on cooling-off periods and their proposed transposition into GB law by mid 2014. The main question that Ofgem wanted to explore with the group was the interaction between the cooling-off periods

and the transfer process. In particular, how transfers within the cooling off period should be undertaken for customers that wanted a very fast transfer.

- 6.2. Paul Huffer (PH) clarified that, under the new cooling off rules it was anticipated that the customer would need to give their express agreement to be charged for supply of energy during the cooling-off period.
- 6.3. AW reviewed two scenarios for activity during the cooling off period and asked for views from the group. In scenario one, a customer's request to transfer was successfully halted when they cancelled the contract. AW asked if a loss notification to the old supplier, that was subsequently cancelled, was a reason to terminate the existing contract with the customer. One attendee said that this may depend on contract with customer. Others drew the analogy to the current objections process. Under this process a loss notification would have been received but the customer continues on the same contractual terms. AW asked attendees to further reflect on this scenario so that this could be further discussed at the next meeting.
- 6.4. In scenario 2 the customer's request to cancel the contract comes after the transfer can be stopped. In discussions on Option 2b (customer returned to, and continuously billed by, the previous supplier on same contractual terms), attendees noted that settlement and network charges would be paid by the previous supplier in the electricity market if the current Customer Service Returners process was used. However, in the gas market the new supplier would have charges for the period of supply. It was considered that meter point reconciliation under Project Nexus was likely to address this issue for gas.
- 6.5. Several attendees noted that the current Customer Service Returners process was expensive to administer.
- 6.6. One attendee felt that if there was a genuine benefit in having quick transfers, then Option 2b may be worth pursuing. There was general agreement that this option was the "right" option for consumers but that there were still complexities which needed to be thought through. For example, what if the customer does not want to return to Supplier A but wants to go to a completely different supplier (Supplier C). Ofgem agreed to summarise and circulate this additional scenario and asked the group to give further thought to this scenario and the options it presented.

Action: Ofgem

- 6.7. One attendee highlighted that you cannot roll back the consumption recorded on the meter even if you send customer back. The customer may therefore be confused about the readings that they were able to obtain from the meter. In effect there would be a gap in the consumption data available from the customers IHD unit for the period that they were with the other supplier.
- 6.8. One attendee felt that whether a customer returns to previous supplier under original contract or deemed contract terms (Option 2b or 2c) would depend on the terms in the original contract. Another attendee said that the customer may be able to return to their previous supplier on original contract terms if the previous supplier was able to contact the customer and agree to those terms. Otherwise they would have to be on a deemed contract.
- 6.9. One attendee asked whether there was any data on consumer demand for an express transfer during the cooling-off period. They considered that demand might be low and confined to specific instances, for example on change of tenancy. Ofgem noted that its Consumer First Panel research had found that while customers are confused about the market there was an appetite from some for quicker switching and switching within the cooling off period.

- 6.10. Another attendee was concerned about the potential impact on debt collection under option 2d of customers cancelling contract and moving to a new supplier. They questioned if an interim supplier, who sends a bill to a customer for the energy supplied for short duration was going to be able to chase up the small payment if it went unpaid. It was suggested that this risk should be captured in the analysis of the options against the evaluation criteria.
- 6.11. Another attendee asked whether the new cooling-off rules require suppliers to offer to supply customers during the cooling-off period. AW responded that suppliers did not have to offer this. However, suppliers could also not be prohibited from doing so and it was therefore right to review this matter. The group discussed that it would be for the suppliers to make a business decision to offer very fast transfers to customers within the cooling-off period.
- 6.12. AW asked whether non-domestic customers were offered cooling-off periods. The EU Directive would not apply to non-domestic customers but a cooling off period could be offered on a voluntary basis. The group's response was that it was very rare.
- 6.13. One attendee felt that a cooling-off period for micro-businesses may be desirable. AW clarified that requiring a cooling off period for micro-businesses was not within the scope of this work.
- 6.14. AW also mentioned the data request for suppliers to provide data on number of customers who terminate their new supplier contracts within the cooling-off periods and noted that Ofgem has only received one response to date.
- 6.15. AW closed the session by asking the group to identify any further options and assess the options against the evaluation criteria for discussion at the next COSEG meeting.

Action: Suppliers

Action: COSEG

7. Reform options - Gas nomination

- 7.1. AW reviewed the options for LSP shippers accessing the data that they required to transfer a customer currently provided through the Supply Point Nomination process.
- 7.2. Attendees noted that reason for the high number of Supply Point Nominations sent by shippers (3.75million in 2012) was that they were sent by multiples shippers bidding for each customer.
- 7.3. On Option 1 (shorten response times), one attendee clarified that, where no referral was required, the average response time was around 20 minutes. There may therefore be limited practical benefit in reducing the timescales for response in the UNC.
- 7.4. On Option 2 (web-based shipper look-up service), one attendee noted that the Supply Point Offer returned by Xoserve included a calculation of the transportation charges for that site. It was noted that it should be possible to replicate this calculation for a fixed period and provide access to the relevant transportation charges to shippers via an online look-up service.
- 7.5. On Option 3 (greater use of the Supply Point Enquiry Service), one attendee clarified that the Supply Point Enquiry Service provides the same data available in a Supply Point Offer but can only do so for Large Supply Points. The initial view of the group was that Option 3 did not add any benefits when compared to current arrangements.
- 7.6. AW asked whether there was a need to retain the current arrangement for a shipper to include the Supply Point Offer reference code in a subsequent Supply Point

Confirmation flow. Attendees felt this it had limited benefits but questioned whether it could be retained on a voluntary or an elective basis for those who wanted the additional certainty that they had the relevant information on transportation charges. The group agreed to consider this as a fifth option and Ofgem agreed to summarise this option for the group and circulate for consideration at the next meeting. Steve Nunnington agreed to check with gas transporters whether there was a need to retain the Supply Point Offer reference code in Supply Point Confirmations made for LSP sites.

Action: Ofgem, Xoserve

- 7.7. On Option 4 (only allow DM referrals once the transfer has completed), this was not supported by the group as it was likely to create a risk for shippers that they were not able to meet their contractual requirements.
- 7.8. One attendee queried whether there would be different change of supplier rules for different parts of the market. For example, are next day transfers required for very large customers who typically have contracts negotiated well in advance of the proposed transfer date. The view was that, subject to costs and the requirement for additional processes for some parts of the market (e.g. referrals for DM sites) the transfer process should be the same and as unobtrusive as possible. It would then be for suppliers and shippers to organise the transfer timescales in response to customer demands.
- 7.9. One attendee asked who would provide this service if registration services were centralised. Ofgem noted that this could be an additional function of the DCC. Alternatively, it may be a service that stays with gas transporters given that much of the data provided related to the capacity and other characteristics of the specific network connection.
- 7.10. AW closed the session by asking the group to identify any further options and assess the options against the evaluation criteria for discussion at the next COSEG meeting.

Action: COSEG

8. Data quality

- 8.1. AW noted that at the next COSEG meeting, Ofgem would be looking at what changes should be made and tools that could be used to address the broad issues with data quality that market participants were experiencing. To assist with its analysis, Ofgem first wanted to make sure it had identified the main problem areas.
- 8.2. The group agreed with Ofgem's initial view that the three main problem areas for data quality were; address data, meter technical details, and accuracy of consumption data.
- 8.3. One attendee noted that there were data issues on the classification of customers as domestic or non-domestic. For example, it was common for a builder to fail to register a change of use at a supply point such as a pub being converted into flats.
- 8.4. The group did not feel that there were any other main problem areas. They also considered that data quality would get better with smart meters.
- 8.5. AW asked whether there was the opportunity for cleansing address data during site visits linked to the installation of smart meters. This was thought to be beneficial but the group was unclear how such an approach could be required across all suppliers.
- 8.6. Xoserve advised that it was undertaking a data cleanse in advance of the UK Link update and welcomed input from the group on where it should focus this work.

9. Wrap up, AOB and date of next meeting

- 9.1. AW reviewed the work plan with the group and advised that the main topic at the next meeting would be on metering data and support for metering markets and centralising registration services. Other agenda items may be pushed back to later meetings to give time for these discussions.
- 9.2. AW also noted that Ofgem was compiling a list of outstanding issues for the 9 September meeting. This included revisiting objections and the change of tenancy flag, removing registration requests for electricity and information requirements for customers.
- 9.3. On AOB, one attendee asked why the work plan has a question mark around the discussion of security keys and billing standards. AW said that these topics had now been scheduled for discussion and agreed to remove the question marks.
- 9.4. AW thanked attendees for their contributions. The next meeting of the COSEG would be held on 22 July at Ofgem's offices in London.

DRAFT

10. Summary of actions

	Action	Responsible	Due by/Status
1	CoS data		
	a) Provide data on multiple objections per supply point in the non- domestic electricity market.	ENA	22 July COSEG
	b) Provide information on missing reads in the electricity and gas markets, including a commentary on the quality of existing monthly data submissions to Ofgem by the Big 6.	Energy-UK	22 July COSEG
2	Reform options: Erroneous Transfers		
	a) Provide information on whether and when suppliers currently provide compensation to customers that have been erroneously transferred.	Energy UK	22 July COSEG
	b) Provide information compensation arrangements in the banking sector eg. if direct debit changed incorrectly.	Ofgem	22 July COSEG
3	Reform options: Centralising registration		
	a) Summarise and circulate the additional option for reform related to centralising registration identified during the meeting for COSEG members to consider for the discussion on 22 July. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The additional option (Option 1b) relates to the DCC taking on responsibility for centralised registration services but retains governance within existing codes rather than moving this to the Smart Energy Code (SEC). 	Ofgem	Actioned
	b) Consider reform options for centralising registration (excluding Option 3 which was discarded by the group), identify any further options and assess against evaluation criteria.	COSEG members	22 July COSEG We would welcome any early feedback by 12 July that we could collate, make anonymous and circulate with the papers for the 22 July meeting.
4	Reform options: Cooling-off period		
	a) Summarise and circulate the additional option for reform related to cooling-off period identified during the meeting for COSEG members to consider for the discussion on 22 July. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ This additional option (Option 2d) provided the customer with a choice on who to move to if they cancelled their contract during the cooling off period. The customer could choose to be returned by the new supplier – Supplier B – to their previous supplier – 	Ofgem	Actioned

	Supplier A - (as described under Option 2b and Option 2c). Alternatively, the customer could choose to move to an alternative supplier – Supplier C. If the customer chose to switch to Supplier C then it was expected that they would remain on a deemed contract with Supplier B until this transfer took place.		
	b) Consider reform options for customer transfers during the cooling-off period, identify any further options and assess against evaluation criteria.	COSEG members	22 July COSEG We would welcome any early feedback by 12 July that we could collate, make anonymous and circulate with the papers for the 22 July meeting.
	c) Provide data on number of customers who terminate their new supplier contracts within the cooling-off periods. Data is requested for the last two years and disaggregated into timeframes (e.g. cancellation 1, 2, 3 etc days into cooling off period).	Suppliers	22 July COSEG
5	Reform options: Supply Point Nomination		
	a) Review with gas transporters whether there is a requirement to retain the Supply Point Offer reference code in Supply Point Confirmations made for LSP sites.	Xoserve	22 July COSEG
	b) Summarise and circulate the additional option for reform related to Supply Point Nomination identified during the meeting for COSEG members to consider for the discussion on 22 July. ➤ The additional option (Option 5) was to make the inclusion of the Supply Point Offer reference code elective in the Supply Point Confirmation process for LSP sites. Shippers would be able to use the Supply Point Nomination process if they wished (either as now or via a web-based enquiry service) and could include the Supply Point Offer reference code in any subsequent confirmation request. This may increase confidence that the shipper had the correct transportation rates.	Ofgem	Actioned
	c) Consider reform options for Supply Point Nomination, identify any further options and assess against evaluation criteria.	COSEG members	22 July COSEG We would welcome any early feedback by 12 July

		that we could collate, make anonymous and circulate with the papers for the 22 July meeting.
--	--	--

11. Appendix 1 - Attendees

- | | |
|------------------------|--|
| Andrew Wallace (Chair) | Ofgem |
| Alex Travell | E.ON |
| Andy Baugh | Npower |
| Ashleye Gunn | Which? |
| Gethyn Howard | GTC UK, representing AiGTs and CNA |
| Hannah Mummery | Consumer Futures |
| Hazel Cotman | Energy Networks Association |
| Jackie Street | Hudson Energy, representing the Supplier Forum |
| Jon Spence | Elexon |
| Julian Anderton | Energy UK |
| Kevin Woollard | British Gas |
| Lorna Mallon* | Scottish Power |
| Martyn Edwards | SSE |
| Nicholas Taylor | DECC |
| Paul Gath | ElectraLink |
| Paul Saker | EDF |
| Steve Nunnington | Xoserve |

* via teleconference

Ofgem:

Grant McEachran, Nigel Nash, Kristen Ross, Rowaa Mahmoud, Shona Fisher, Chiara Redaelli, Paul Huffer, Si Tze Wong.

Apologies:

- | | |
|-----------------|--|
| Joanne Ferguson | Northern Gas Networks, representing GDNs |
| Andy Knowles | Gemserv |
| Tony Thornton | Gemserv |
| Gareth Evans | ICOSS |