RETAIL ENERGY CODE

This document is classified as **WHITE**.
Information is for public, unrestricted dissemination and publication.

REC ISSUE GROUP
MEETING NOTES

DATE	**10 February 2023, 10:00**
LOCATION	**By teleconference**

1 INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting of the REC Issue Group (RIG).

The Chair confirmed the agenda, asking for any 'AOB' to be raised at this time. The Chair highlighted four items were due to be discussed in AOB.

AOB Items were as follows:

1. Plot Addresses and EV Charging Points
2. REC Change's goes in to support code modification and short lead times (x2)
3. Non-Domestic suppliers raising Erroneous Transfer's but not biscuit files

It was also raised that the meeting papers were not available to download prior to the meeting, so attendees were not aware of the agenda.

2 DATA CLEANSE UPDATE

2.1 DATA CLEANSE ISSUE LOG

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of the Data Cleanse Issue Log, the slide pack for this can be found here.

The Lead Analyst advised Change C3-40032 has been drafted to include issues DC1, DC2 and DC4 (as listed on the RIG Data Cleanse Issue Log) and is available to view on the REC portal. A summary of the Change Proposal can be found on slide 8 of the meeting slides, which can be found here. The Change also includes amending the classification of the Data Cleanse Documents to Category 3. The consultation for this Change Proposal is due to go live 10 February 2023 and will remain open for 2 weeks. Any comments from parties can be raised from the Consultation. The hope is for this Change to go live on 10 March 2023.

Additional Issues log updates below:

DC3 - Currently being worked through with the DCC. It was noted there is no standard practice around plot address amendments, EVCP is often used, but this isn't mandated. There could be a question as to whether the development of a set of rules would be beneficial.

One AOB item was raised around plot addresses and EV Charging Points. A RIG member mentioned they have several EV Charging Points that are showing as plot addresses, but they can't be cleared or given a Post Office address. Some EV Charging Points do have UPRN's, which does help in assigning them to a recognised address reference. The RIG member explained they would explore this option.

Another RIG member highlighted there had been a lot of work carried out during the CSS program, around setting up a set of expected values to be used in the first line of an address. At the time, these were seen more as guidance rather than mandatory, but they could be codified. Another option is that if a plot address is correct, when a flow is sent to the DNO, it is made clear in the additional information that the address is valid, but it is not in Royal Mail.

DC5 – The previous discussion clarified that E3 was the correct exemption code to be used in this situation. The description will be amended to make it clearer.

DC6 – The Supplier for the relationship does not match the Supplier for the MPAN in approximately 1/3 of cases. A RIG member noted EES shows which Supplier created the MPAN relationship, but if the Supplier has changed since then, EES will not update. The Code Manager are investigating further before deciding on whether a Change Proposal needs to be raised.

DC7 – Will need to contact the raiser of this issue to obtain further information from them.

2.2 DATA CLEANSE UPDATE

This was covered off on slides 10-12 in the meeting slides, which can be found here.

3. APRIL 2023 REC RELEASE AND METERING CODE OF PRACTICE CONSOLIDATION

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of the R0047 – Consolidated Metering Code of Practice and Metering Audit Scheme. It was noted that Wilcock, who have been appointed as the Auditor, have their own Communication and Engagement plan. Further information can be found on slide 15 of the meeting slides here.

4. CODE ROAD MAP

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of the Code Road Map, this was covered off on slides 17-38, which can be found here.

A RIG member referred to R0032, which sets out the new data items being introduced as part of MHHS. The data items need to be populated into MHHS, meaning that it is the responsibility of the REC to arrange this with parties. Parties have not seen a plan from the REC for this change, as in who is expected to populate this data ready for MHHS, when it needs to be populated and how.

Action: The Code Manager to investigate, in relation to R0032, who is expected to populate the data items ready for MHHS, when it needs to be populated and how.

A 'post go-live plan' was not included as a stage for a Change Proposal in the Code Road Map, which could be added on. It is important that post go-live elements of a change are picked up and parties know what is expected of them.

A RIG member raised a point around the geolocation of addresses, specifically referring to the costs associated. While the external information could be very useful, it could be expensive for parties to process, especially if there is no market wide agreement for the data or product.

A RIG member highlighted a gap in the SOLR (Supplier of Last Resort) process, whereby it does not include export MPANs. This means that customers with an export MPAN, are not automatically switched to the appointing SOLR, they are left until they do something. The SOLR process is defined by Ofgem, but work can be done on this. Now the MPID is reallocated to the appointed SOLR, there could be export MPANs registered to the MPID, but there is no obligation to do anything with it. This will need to be considered for the SOLR process.

A RIG member raised a point around cross code changes, specifically relating to data flows or data items and how these are communicated to parties. These could be changes which are not REC driven but are being led by another code relating to the data specification. Under the MRA (Master Registration Agreement), there was complete transparency and visibility of any changes relating to data flows, which does not feel to have carried across to the REC. The information relating to these changes seem to be communicated late. A few examples were provided by RIG members of cross code changes which they felt had not been communicated as they would have expected them to be.

Action: The Code Manager to investigate at what point after approval of a Change Proposal, the pre-release created.

If you have an associated change for a different code, you can raise a separate change to align them, which makes it a lot easier for parties. In the instance of P375, this was originally a BSC (Balancing and Settlement Code) change but became a REC change due to needing to create a new market participant role. The data specification changes were under the governance of the BSC, but the market participant role will have REC impacts too. The BSC and RTS are currently engaging on data specification changes, they are now working under a different model to how they used to work under the DTC. The BSC are looking at introducing a process for changes to BSC owned data item and data flow scenarios within the data specification.

A RIG member raised a concern around changes, which are not BSC or REC documentation changes, but where there is change to the REC data specification, as these could cause major system impacts. Until now, any data specification changes have been associated to the BSC CP (Change Proposal).

Action: The Code Manager to put a summary process together for how changes are put into the data specification and present at the next RIG meeting.

A RIG member asked if the Code Road Map is in line with the Ofgem Code Governance review. It was confirmed that has not been specifically looked at, but the hope would be that they interlink when necessary.

5. RIG ISSUE UPDATE

5A THEFT INCENTIVE SCHEME – REINTRODUCTION OF SCHEME LOCK OUT DATE

The Code Manager Lead Analyst noted this has been added into CP-0091.

5B EES API SPECIFICATION

The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised that the EES Service Provider have agreed that extra wording in the API Specification would be useful, which could lead to a change.

5C SHOULD SHIPPERS AND SUPPLIERS HAVE THE SAME VIEW IN GES?

The Code Manager Lead Analyst highlighted that this was left for parties to provide feedback if they had any views on this issue. A RIG member advised they have had an issue with changing from a Shipper to a Supplier view, where they are missing the meter read history. This has already been raised with the REC via their OAM.

5D DNO B CODE ESCALATIONS

The raiser of this issue advised that the D126 they receive from a DNO, on certain occasions can be very brief. Some D126 flows stipulate a duplicate job, meaning a previous MEM (Metering Equipment Managers) may have issued them a D135 but not them, which is not particularly useful as they cannot progress to a conclusion. Sometimes, they do not receive a response from the DNO at all, or a response that states they cannot resolve. The raiser wondered if there was a formal procedure, both in the dataflow process, or a subsequent process.

A RIG member noted that under MOCOPA (Meter Operation Code of Practice Agreement), there used to be a DCUSA (Distribution Connection and Use of System Agreement) guidance document around the D126 and D135 and the site visit codes which could be used. This described each code in detail and gave advice around the process. They were not too sure what has happened to that document since the transition to the REC. It could just be a case of finding that document and uploading it to the REC Portal.

Another RIG member highlighted there was a section on the DCUSA website, which mentions the scenarios of sending the D135. Another RIG member asked if they had reached out to the DCUSA Secretariat, to ask them to raise this at one of their working groups. This will be followed up at the next RIG meeting to see if the party found any relevant information and whether this can be signposted on the REC Portal.

5E R0021: QUESTIONS WITH IMPLEMENTATION

The Code Manager Lead Analyst highlighted that a RIG member raised several questions around R0021 – Allowing REC accredited MEMs to de-energise and re-energise supply points independent of the Supplier.

The RIG member noted it is quite difficult to see from the REC portal what the final changes (solution) being made for R0021. It would be a lot easier for parties if there was a section in the portal, advising what they need to implement as part of a change.

R0021 relates to the scenario that, if a MEM de-energises a MPAN in the morning but re-energises it again in the afternoon, Suppliers do not need to know anything, as the energisation status has remained the same at the end of the day. But if the Meter Point has a Smart Meter attached, this could cause challenges when Market Wide Half-Hourly program is launched.

Another instance is if the energisation status remains de-energised, the Safe Isolation Provider (SIP) has an obligation to notify all the relevant parties that the energisation has changed. It is not clear if the SIP should inform the MEM, the Supplier, or both. If the SIP only notifies the Supplier, there is no industry agreed process for the Supplier to tell the MEM that the energisation status has changed. It is not appropriate to send this information via Email or SDEP (Secure Data Exchange Portal).

A RIG member noted they have tried to contact the REC directly regarding the final solution for R0021, as there are big gaps in the process. The Change team are planning to hold a webinar in March 2023 on R0021 and the implications, the date is yet to be confirmed. A RIG member highlighted a new 'approved change' box could be added to the REC portal and within that, there would be all of the documentation in one place. This would help identify things sooner and let parties know what they need to implement. It was also suggested that dates would be really useful on documentation, currently there is a list of documents but you do not know what the date of each one is, you cannot see a timeline on it.

6. AOB

Two of the four items of AOB raised at the start of the meeting were covered off as the meeting took place, therefore only two more items of AOB are to be discussed at this point.

A RIG member raised they have seen an example of where a Non-Domestic Supplier has raised an Erroneous Transfer (ET) , but they refused to complete the biscuit file. They are only sending over an email, with no fixed template, which is lacking detail which then delays the ET being completed. Another RIG member mentioned they had seen the same and highlighted that there is a gap in the process which needs to be investigated. All the Schedules in the REC, link back to DTN flows. Parties have processes within their system to automatically do things when receiving a data flow. If they do not receive that data flow, the process becomes very manual.

Non-Domestic Suppliers are not obligated to send specific flows, from an ET perspective. Concerns were raised previously, around if it should be voluntary in some aspects. There are sections of the REC Schedules where Non-Domestic Suppliers are not mandated to follow these processes.

This will be raised as a new issue and can be discussed further in the interim and at the next RIG meeting.

A RIG member raised another AOB item, specifically relating to a smart meter being registered against the incorrect MPAN, which also makes the GSP area incorrect. This is not as simple a process as it once was, and the RIG member asked if anyone else had experienced the same issue. A solution was offered, whereby the MEM could remove the meter and then re-install it on the new MPAN.

6. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

No further business was raised.