

TRAS DCP 271 – PROCESS AND COSTS OF PROVIDING ADDITIONAL HUNTER FACILITIES

Company	Confidential/ Anonymous	1. Do you understand the intent of the CP?	TEG Comments
E.ON Energy	Non-confidential	Yes – to allow Suppliers to purchase additional Hunter logins if required.	Comment noted.
Western Power Distribution	Non-confidential	Yes.	Comment noted.
SSE	Non-confidential	Yes.	Comment noted.
-	Anonymous	Yes.	Comment noted.
SP	Non-confidential	Yes, we understand the change relates to the procurement of additional Hunter Licenses and the fees associated with purchasing them through DCUSA and how this is then relayed to Suppliers.	Comment noted.

Company	Confidential/ Anonymous	2. Are you supportive of the principles of the CP?	TEG Comments
E.ON Energy	Non-confidential	Yes – it allows flexibility for Suppliers to have enough logins to support their individual business models.	Comment noted.
Western Power Distribution	Non-confidential	Yes	Comment noted.
SSE	Non-confidential	Yes	Comment noted.

-	Anonymous	Yes	Comment noted.
SP	Non-confidential	Scottish Power would like to express concern at the way the amount of licences issued from March next year will be calculated. It is our belief that the Big 6 should retain their current quota of licences. We feel that assumption that FTEs are working full time on TRAS leads, may not be the case. FTEs are multi-functional and may not be solely working on work associated with TRAS/Hunter. We therefore prefer all of the clerical team to have access unless there is a function for the licences to be shared among the employees.	The TEG are aware of the issue and discussions are ongoing on finding a suitable solution. This issue will be treated separately than the proposal of the CP.

Company	Confidential/ Anonymous	3. Do you have any comments on the draft legal text?	
E.ON Energy	Non-confidential	<p>Yes – Appendix 4 text.</p> <p>e. where it refers to inform the party; should this be the SPOC/Contract Manager at each party? Ensuring it goes to the right people in organisations which could reduce the possibility of invoice challenges/disputes.</p> <p>f. what happens if I inform the Secretariat on 31st March I require 10 logins – will they be ready for 01/04 implementation or does there need to be a cut-off point in March to ensure logins are created for parties in time.</p> <p>g. What if a Supplier requests a login mid-way through the year – are these still priced the same or will costs be apportioned? It is clear from a cancellation point of view but not creation of logins.</p>	<p>The TEG agreed to amend the legal drafting to ensure that:</p> <p>(e) the contract manager will be informed;</p> <p>(f) that the cut off date for request of logins will be the 10th business day of March (subject to agreement with Experian); and</p> <p>(g) costs will be apportioned according to the date that the request is fulfilled (subject to agreement with Experian).</p>

Western Power Distribution	Non-confidential	No.	Comment noted.
SSE	Non-confidential	No.	Comment noted.
-	Anonymous	No.	Comment noted.
SP	Non-confidential	No.	Comment noted.

Company	Confidential/ Anonymous	4. Do you consider that the proposal better facilitates the DCUSA objectives? Please give supporting reasons.	TEG comments
E.ON Energy	Non-confidential	DCUSA Objective 4 and SPAA Objective C – it promotes efficiencies because it allows parties to purchase additional logins to assist with their individual working practices rather than a fixed number which gives process flexibility.	Comment noted.
Western Power Distribution	Non-confidential	We agree with the Working Group in that this CP will better facilitate General Objective 4 by introducing the ability for Suppliers to purchase additional Hunter facilities. There is no homogeny in the internal structure of Supplier company working arrangements. The opportunity to procure additional Hunter facilities will aid Suppliers who have different internal teams that need access to Hunter to carry out their licence obligations.	Comment noted.
SSE	Non-confidential	This CP will better facilitate General Objective 4 by introducing the ability for Suppliers to purchase additional Hunter facilities.	Comment noted.

-	Anonymous	Yes the proposal introduces a process to enable Suppliers to procure additional hunter licences and transparency on costs between parties and the TRAS Service Provider. This will help Suppliers further to meet their Licence Obligations.	Comment noted.
SP	Non-confidential	This CP will better facilitate DCUSA General objective 4	Comment noted.

Company	Confidential/ Anonymous	5. Are you supportive of the proposed implementation date?	TEG comments
E.ON Energy	Non-confidential	Yes	Comment noted.
Western Power Distribution	Non-confidential	Yes	Comment noted.
SSE	Non-confidential	Yes	Comment noted.
-	Anonymous	Yes	Comment noted.
SP	Non-confidential	Yes	Comment noted.

Company	Confidential/ Anonymous	6. Do you have any other comments on the DCP 271?	TEG comments
E.ON Energy	Non-confidential	No	Comment noted.
Western Power Distribution	Non-confidential	No	Comment noted.
SSE	Non-confidential	No	Comment noted.
-	Anonymous	Yes, the issue where Suppliers have received more than the allocated number of Hunter User logins will need to be resolved with processes in place to check and monitor this before invoicing takes place. Although TEG has agreed that the costs for the licences are competitive we still have concerns on how high these are, but fully support the call for an annual review to ensure the process for allocating and charging for the user log ins is transparent.	The TEG have noted the concerns raised and this issue will be progressed separately.
SP	Non-confidential	Not at this time	Comment noted.

CPD 16/338 - PROCESS AND COSTS OF PROVIDING ADDITIONAL HUNTER FACILITIES

Company	Confidential/ Anonymous	1. Do you understand the intent of the CP?	TEG comments
----------------	------------------------------------	---	---------------------

Utility Warehouse	Non-confidential	Yes, I understand this is to introduce the process for requesting additional hunter facilities with charges applied to the individual Supplier requester.	Comment noted.
E.ON Energy	Non-confidential	Yes – to allow Suppliers to purchase additional Hunter logins if required.	Comment noted.
-	Anonymous	Yes	Comment noted.
SP	Non-confidential	Yes, we understand the change relates to the procurement of additional Hunter Licences and the fees associated with purchasing them through DCUSA and how this is then relayed to Suppliers.	Comment noted.

Company	Confidential/ Anonymous	2. Are you supportive of the principles of the CP?	TEG comments
Utility Warehouse	Non-confidential	Yes	Comment noted.
E.ON Energy	Non-confidential	Yes – it allows flexibility for Suppliers to have enough logins to support their individual business models.	Comment noted.
-	Anonymous	Yes	Comment noted.
SP	Non-confidential	Scottish Power would like to express concern at the way the amount of licences issued from March next year will be calculated. It is our belief that the Big 6 should retain their current quota of licences. We feel that assumption that FTEs are working full time on TRAS leads, may not be the case. FTEs are multi-functional and may not be solely working on work associated with TRAS/Hunter. We therefore prefer all of the clerical team to have access unless there is a function for the licences to be shared among the employees.	The TEG are aware of the issue and discussions are ongoing on finding a suitable solution. This issue will be treated separately than the proposal of the CP.

Company	Confidential/ Anonymous	3. Do you have any comments on the draft legal text?	TEG comments
Utility Warehouse	Non-confidential	Not with current text, but further notes for consideration highlighted in question 6	Comment noted.
E.ON Energy	Non-confidential	<p>Yes – Appendix 4 text.</p> <p>e. where it refers to inform the party; should this be the SPOC/Contract Manager at each party? Ensuring it goes to the right people in organisations which could reduce the possibility of invoice challenges/disputes.</p> <p>f. what happens if I inform the Secretariat on 31st March I require 10 logins – will they be ready for 01/04 implementation or does there need to be a cut-off point in March to ensure logins are created for parties in time.</p> <p>g. What if a Supplier requests a login mid-way through the year – are these still priced the same or will costs be apportioned? It is clear from a cancellation point of view but not creation of logins.</p>	<p>The TEG agreed to amend the legal drafting to ensure that:</p> <p>(e) the contract manager will be informed;</p> <p>(f) that the cut off date for request of logins will be the 10th business day of March (subject to agreement with Experian); and</p> <p>(g) costs will be apportioned according to the date that the request is fulfilled (subject to agreement with Experian).</p>
-	Anonymous	No	Comment noted.
SP	Non-confidential	No	Comment noted.

Company	Confidential/ Anonymous	4. Do you consider that the proposal better facilitates the SPAA objectives? Please give supporting reasons.	TEG comments
---------	----------------------------	--	--------------

Utility Warehouse	Non-confidential	Objective C; as this most supports the change proposed	Comment noted.
E.ON Energy	Non-confidential	DCUSA Objective 4 and SPAA Objective C – it promotes efficiencies because it allows parties to purchase additional logins to assist with their individual working practices rather than a fixed number which gives process flexibility.	Comment noted.
-	Anonymous	Yes the proposal introduces a process to enable Suppliers to procure additional hunter licences and transparency on costs between parties and the TRAS Service Provider. This will help Suppliers further to meet their Licence Obligations.	Comment noted.
SP	Non-confidential	This CP will better facilitate DCUSA General objective 4	Comment noted.

Company	Confidential/ Anonymous	5. Are you supportive of the proposed implementation date?	TEG comments
Utility Warehouse	Non-confidential	As this will be charged per operational year from 1 April to 31 March, the implementation date would be best aligned to charging period.	This change is due to be implemented in November and this change will be aligned with the charging period.
E.ON Energy	Non-confidential	Yes.	Comment noted.
-	Anonymous	Yes	Comment noted.
SP	Non-confidential	Yes	Comment noted.

Company	Confidential/ Anonymous	6 Do you have any other comments on the CPD 16/338?	TEG comments
Utility Warehouse	Non-confidential	<p>Preferable itemised invoicing on additional hunter licenses for processing and separation of costs</p> <p>Agreed Hunter license reporting for total industry number following implementation of CP16/338</p> <p>Legal text C (ii) – perhaps the inclusion of £2500 for a block of three (3)?</p> <p>Legal text point (f) – include set date/time in the month of March by which Suppliers must put forward their requests e.g. last Thursday of the month</p> <p>Inclusion of a dispute process e.g. where a license is unusable (due to provider technical issues) for the period of over a month, can the cost of 12 months minus 1 month be disputed?</p>	<p>It will be checked internally whether itemised invoicing on additional hunter licences for processing and separation of costs can be implemented. An update will be given at the next TEG.</p> <p>Experian will be asked regarding the inclusion of £2500 for a block of three.</p> <p>It has been agreed that a cut of date of the 10 business day in march will be the cut-off date for which requests must be made (subject to agreement with Experian).</p> <p>The TEG consider that a dispute process is already included under the Experian contract.</p>
E.ON Energy	Non-confidential	No.	Comment noted.

-	Anonymous	Yes, the issue where Suppliers have received more than the allocated number of Hunter User logins will need to be resolved with processes in place to check and monitor this before invoicing takes place. Although TEG has agreed that the costs for the licences are competitive we still have concerns on how high these are, but fully support the call for an annual review to ensure the process for allocating and charging for the user log ins is transparent.	The TEG have noted the concerns raised and this issue will be progressed separately.
SP	Non-confidential	Not at this time	Comment noted.