RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

REC ISSUE GROUP
MEETING NOTES

DATE	**14 June 2024, 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 Other Business (AOB) to be raised at this time. The Chair highlighted that one AOB item was raised prior to the meeting, with no further AOB items being raised at this time. Later in the meeting, RIG members noted the following AOB item.

- RIG Terms of Reference (ToR)

2 ACTIONS LOG

RECRIG_24 0510_13_01 – The Code Manager to investigate the removal of the CSV file format as a file type used on the REC portal.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an update on this action, which can be found on slide 6 of the pack here.

A RIG member asked if there had been any issues of converting Power BI files to CSV. The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised most of the issues raised by Parties seem to be Excel related, not Power BI.

3 PERFORMANCE ASSURANCE QUARTERLY UPDATE

The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised that a paper had been provided in the pre-meeting documentation for this agenda item.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst summarised the key items from the paper.

- A REC change has been raised to recognise that where, in the case of missing reads, a D0086 is received this is the closing point for the Switch Meter Read dispute. This will also be recognised in REC performance reporting. Whilst this change is being progressed the Performance Assurance team will pause reviewing and reporting performance on the impacted risk drivers to the PAB.

- Work is taking place on the Performance Assurance Operating Plan. A webinar was held in early June, during which Parties were are asked to provide feedback on what the focus of the REC Performance Team should be. A short survey is now open for those Parties that wish to provide additional feedback, closing date for responses is 14 June 2024.

    A RIG member commented the period to complete this survey was quite short. They asked if this had been publicised prior to it being raised at this meeting. The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained it was first publicised at the webinar; however, it had also been included in the REC weekly bulletins and on LinkedIn. They advised the initial feedback will form the first draft, which will be presented to PAB. They elaborated there will still be the opportunity for Parties to engage after that, through the weekly bulletins and other channels.

Action: The Code Manager to provide an update of the engagement plan to the next RIG.

4 DATA CLEANSE SPRINT 2 MID REVIEW

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an update of Data Cleanse Sprint 2, which can be found on slide 10 of the pack here.

A RIG member asked if the new energised/ no meter terminated pot had been amalgamated into the Sprint 2, along with the energised no meter, or if the numbers are being dealt with separately. The Code Manager Lead Analyst confirmed these reports are not part of Sprint 2, however they have been published in allow Suppliers to address issues in that category of report.

A RIG member advised that from a first look, the MPANs which appear on the reports all seem to be disconnected. They asked if this was deliberate. The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained the original nature of these reports were to have a subcategory to understand what MPANs are disconnected and the circumstances behind it.

It was also highlighted that the reports were requested to help the DNO, in a scenario where they have received the data flow to disconnect a MPAN, but the MPAN is still available to be switched on by CSS. They elaborated it is useful to see the volumes involved.

ARIG member advised when a Supplier is trying to de-energise a meter which is already showing as disconnected, they do receive rejections. They highlighted in this scenario; they would contact the Distributors or MEMs to try to understand how to register these as de-energised. Another RIG member advised they had seen instances of this scenario too. They asked if this scenario was referenced in any REC documentation. They elaborated having this scenario documented will help parties in resolving this issue.

Action: The Code Manager to investigate whether this scenario is documented under the REC.

5 DATA CLEANSE UPDATE

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of the volumes within the AR3A, AR3C and MTC 3A Unflagged reports.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised the volumes within the AR3A report have increased from 1899 in May, to 2066 in June. They highlighted the volumes within the AR3C report have remained steady, increasing from 651 in May, to 652 in June. They confirmed the volumes in the MTC 3A Unflagged report have increased from 999 in May, to 1448 in June.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst mentioned new functionality is being implemented into the data cleanse tab of the dashboard. They advised two additional lines will be added to show the age criteria of the reports.

A RIG member asked for the scenario of energised/ no meter, how are they being resolved. They asked if they are being de-energised or are they having meters attached. Another RIG member commented they had seen a mixture of the two. They explained a historical issue had been identified, where they were having meters fitted, which were automatically coming in with an end date. They highlighted these were sent to the MEM, and it was a system issue. They elaborated they've been able to identify issues specifically and bulk update them, however the majority of them have had to be manually updated.

6 R0121 – SDEP REVIEW IMPROVEMENTS (1) PROCESS TYPES

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an update of R0121 – SDEP Review Improvements (1) Process Types, which can be found on slides 13-20 of the pack here.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised that SDEP MAU's would have recently received a template for completion, if they wanted the User permissions to be set up by the SDEP Service Provider prior to go live. Several RIG members noted they are the named SDEP MAU for their organisation, however, hadn't received the template.

Action: The Code Manager to re-issue this communication to REC Contract Managers, including the template for setting up the SDEP user permissions.

A RIG member commented when an SDEP escalation is raised, it will progress to final escalation and if that hasn't been responded to or resolved, a Contract Manager escalation is raised. They highlighted there have been scenarios of duplication within the SDEP

portal, but there is no reference to that within the Contract Manager case. They elaborated different teams work different levels of the escalation process, meaning there could be a different response on the Contract Manager escalation to that on the original case. They also advised that the information recently issued by the Code Manager is different to what is currently in the SDEP user guide.

The Code Manager representative explained the difficulty of there being a level one escalation, which goes to an operational team, then level two is straight to the Contract Manager, as set out in the REC. They highlighted Contract Manager's do not have the time to work the Contract Manager escalations. They noted level three escalations are sent to the Code Manager, however when monitoring the volumes, they are low.

Another RIG member mentioned certain Contract Managers prefer to receive escalations through emails, and others prefer through SDEP. They noted whichever method of communication obtains the better and quicker response for the customer needs to be achieved. They highlighted the need for a different miscellaneous general communication process, rather than the case being raised to the Contract Manager. Several RIG members agreed with this point.

Another RIG member commented the Contract Manager escalation should be used as a prompt, letting them know that their team hasn't responded to the original SDEP case. They highlighted the Contract Manager can liaise with their team to work the original case and archive the escalation they have received. They mentioned the guidelines need to be very clear in how the REC want Contract Manager escalation cases to be worked, whether it's through an email or SDEP. They noted the proposed guidance states 'Contract Manager General Queries (CMGQ) should not be raised where this is an escalation process type available', and asked whether the CMGQ will not be used going forward.

Action: The Code Manager to confirm whether the guidance is proposing the CMGQ not to be used going forward.

Another RIG member advised that they prefer using the email escalation route, as trying to align an email and an SDEP case can be difficult. They explained provided no personal data is being shared and it's just a prompt to the Contract Manager, emails seem to be the most effective method.

Another RIG member expressed their concern of taking the Contract Manager escalation away, as it is one of the biggest areas of traffic through SDEP. They elaborated SDEP shouldn't lose its effectiveness, as it is useful from a customer journey perspective. They reiterated the need for the guidance to be very clear on what Suppliers are expected to do in this scenario.

Another RIG member believed the Contract Manager escalation SDEP route to be essential. They elaborated they support SDEP from a Data Protection perspective, but it needs to work better. Other RIG attendees supported this.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked RIG members if the guidance needed to specify the D0300 should have been sent first. A RIG member mentioned this can be used at the schedule for disputed reads, and for Suppliers to communicate with each other to agree on a read. They noted it usually runs after the initial D0300 or SAR request has been issued. They highlighted if one Supplier proposes an alternative, but this isn't able to be accepted with the customer, this engagement between Suppliers need to take place. They commented the Schedule needs to be updated to clarify this can be done through SDEP. They elaborated once the Schedule and SDEP are aligned, it will make this process clearer. They elaborated the escalation process can then be started if any of the queries haven't been responded to.

Another RIG member mentioned there is no SLA on general communications set out in the REC, meaning parties are not obligated to respond after a particular timeframe. They highlighted an SLA response time needs to be built into the process, to ensure they are being responded to. They elaborated if the disputed meter read process is going to be used more, it needs to be made clear it's not used before an escalation.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked RIG members if a gas escalation needs to include a reference to the UNC documentation containing the process. A RIG member advised Suppliers aren't obligated to under the UNC, shippers are. Another RIG member mentioned the guidance can reference a specific area of the UNC; however, it still needs to clarify the process Suppliers need to follow under the REC.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked RIG members if the guidance for Erroneous Transfer – General Query should specify that PT should only be used once an ET has been initiated, not as a check if an ET would be accepted or rejected. Several RIG members supported this to be added to the guidance.

7 R0169 – INTRODUCTION OF GATE CLOSURE NOTIFICATIONS

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of R0169 – Introduction of Gate Closure Notifications, which can be found on slides 22-26 of the pack here. The aim of this discussion is to understand if there is an appetite to subscribe to the broadcast message from CSS users and what the value would be for parties.

A RIG member asked if other Service Providers have been engaged with on this, as they may have a better view of how useful this could be. The Code Manager Lead Analyst agreed reaching out to other Service Providers would be beneficial to understand if they would use it.

Another RIG member commented this looks extremely technical, therefore operational teams may not be the best target audience.

Another RIG member asked if there are any associated charges if parties subscribe to the broadcast message. The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised there will be an associated overall cost for CSS to be able to develop the functionality. They elaborated the Parties may have their own development costs; however, it won't be a service parties specifically have to pay for.

8 SUPPLIER APPOINTMENTS TO INACTIVE MEMS

The Chair provided an overview of Supplier Appointments to Inactive MEM's, which can be found on slides 28-29 of the pack here. The aim of this discussions was to identify the process of how a Supplier is made aware that a MEM has exited the market and if the REC was able to provide a report to Suppliers on MEM's appointments for data cleanse activity, what frequencies would be the most useful.

A RIG member highlighted under the BSC; the weekly newscast letter listed the updates the BSC made to the MDD that month. They mentioned it might be beneficial to have a similar process under the REC. The Chair noted scenarios are showing the MEM's have exited the market, however the MPIDs are showing as live, and appointments are attached to them. They elaborated it takes time for the data cleanse activity to identify these.

Another RIG member mentioned it's much easier to identify MEMs who Parties work closely with, as they have a contractual relationship with them. They advised it's quite difficult to identify MEMs who are still active in the industry, who have closed down one of their MPID's. They commented the REC weekly bulletins could be useful to capture this information.

Another RIG member explained they receive a change update from the BSC and are made aware of whether an MPID has been end dated. They advised they use this information to update their internal systems. They commented this notification could be published into the REC weekly bulletins.

Another RIG member highlighted their organisation was currently in the process of withdrawing MEM MPID's. They explained having to get appointments removed by Suppliers is proving to be difficult. They mentioned the need for the guidance to be better, to ensure the process goes a lot quicker and smoother.

9 AOB

9.1 RIG TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)

The Chair advised that discussions had taken place at previous RIG meetings around the RIG Terms of Reference, and who can or cannot be a standing attendee. They highlighted

the current ToR state REC Parties are the standing attendees to the meetings, but other party types can request to attend if they are interested in a specific agenda item.

The Chair advised the notes from the last meeting included a call out for members to share their thoughts on whether the current ToR should be updated. They confirmed a number of responses were received, with the majority supporting maintaining the current ToR. They noted the current ToR will be maintained.

The Chair explained the Code Manager will undertake a review of all committees, which will include all aspects of the running of each committee.

No further business was raised. The Chair thanked attendees for their input and closed the meeting. The next meeting is scheduled for Friday 12 July.