

Feedback on the presentation from Sue Cropper BGT:

Shipperless sites

Agree with this and would welcome clarity in code that confirms a shipper can apply a deemed contract if they were the previous shipper but have withdrawn in error. The shipper will be charged for the period and on that basis I assume they would then be entitled to recover from the end user the value of the gas taken. If the person has not been paying for gas for the whole period will the rules around back billing apply in that residential customers could not be charged >12 months. This would need to be made clear.

Would we need to differentiate between PTS and SSP shipperless categories. I believe that in SSP (different meter found scenarios) the customer may well have had negotiation will an alternative shipper for a meter installation. Needs consideration, possibly based on analysis of the SSP MPR's.

Unregistered

Again agree with the policy principles and that as a last resort disconnection of supply should be an option, also that customers can be charged for gas consumed. If conducted by the GT, monies recovered could be used to offset the cost of the process and if in excess of spend be allocated as credit to RBD.

Option 1 seems a logical approach and although there are issues to be decided in terms of timescale and vulnerable customer, also the practicalities of setting up the process by the GT, they seem surmountable. With option 2, I would suggest, the biggest hurdle will be "how to choose the SoFR".

In addition to the above it seems clear from some of the workshops that I have attended that re-communicating the rules around MPR creation and withdrawal would be beneficial.