RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

REC ISSUE GROUP
MEETING NOTES

DATE	**14 February 2025, 10:00**
LOCATION	**By teleconference**

1 INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed attendees to the February 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 confirmed one AOB item was raised prior to the meeting, with no further AOB items being raised at this time. Later in the meeting, RIG noted the following AOB items:

- I0233 – Introduction of an Energy Theft Unit under the REC

2 PERFORMANCE ASSURANCE UPDATE

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of the Performance Assurance update, which can be found on slides 4-18 of the pack here. This was split into a variety of different sections.

The first section was TDIS Updates, which can be found on slide 6 of the pack here. No comments were raised by RIG member.

The next section was Mid-Sprint Review and PAT's approved by PAB, which can be found on slides 8 and 9 of the pack here. The aim of this discussion was to obtain RIG members feedback regarding CDSP reports given limited progress, with the annual nature of this data hampering cleansing by Parties and impedes Code Manager tracking.

A RIG member mentioned it could be beneficial to have a separate session, specifically on CDSP reports. They mentioned their organisation has been working on a number of exemptions, however the numbers within the reports are not decreasing. The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained Parties should submit an 1810 Exemption report, to enable the data cleanse activity they have undertaken to be reflected.

Another RIG member expressed their support for changing how frequently the CDSP reports are run. They suggested it should be plausible to run them on a quarterly basis. Several RIG members agreed with this proposal. The Code Manager Lead Analyst informed Members a REC issue will be raised, to propose the CDSP reconciliation reports are ran more frequently than on an annual basis.

The next section was Report Updates, which can be found on slide 11 of the pack here.

A RIG member highlighted there has been an inclusion of a new field called the 'load date' on a number of the data cleanse reports. They advised some of the dates populated in these new fields seem to be incorrect. The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked for any examples to be sent into the Code Manager for investigation. The RIG member asked what the format of the dates are. The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised it should show a British date format, however if it is different, this will be updated going forward.

The next section was Potential New Switching Risk Measures, which can be found on slides 13-16 here.

A RIG member explained some parties have good working relationships with Third-Party Intermediaries (TPI's), who are responsible for a high number of customer switches. They asked how parties who have commercial agreements with TPI's will be monitored. The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised Members proposed new measures were identified when investigating other switching related matters. They advised that how Parties operate in practise will be considered during this activity.

Another RIG member noted R0155 is putting a lot of Performance Assurance pressure on parties, and any topics relating to Change of Occupier should be included within the performance management of R0155. They highlighted there shouldn't be anything additional that Parties would be required to complete. The Code Manager Lead Analyst informed Members this will be taken into consideration during the activity.

Another RIG member advised that before the implementation of the CSS, there were detailed objection flags, which would help provide parties with high level reasons for objections. They noted these have disappeared since CSS went live, which makes reporting quite difficult. They suggested that this may be an opportunity to conduct a wider piece of work on how the CSS could record objections. The Code Manager Lead Analyst noted a REC Issue may have potentially been raised to add back objections reasons into CSS.

Action: RECRIG_25_0214_02_01 – The Code Manager to investigate whether a REC issue has previously been raised to add back objection reasons into CSS.

Later in the meeting, it was noted that I0214 – Multiple Switch Requests Increasing Objection Rate had been raised. REC parties have informed the Code Manager that they are seeing multiple registration attempts on individual MPxNs.

Another RIG member highlighted they carry out their due diligence, when it comes to switching Consumers, however parties are very reliant on the information provided to them by Consumers. If the information provided to them is incorrect, this could result in an Erroneous Switch. The Code Manager Lead Analyst informed Members the expectation is not for there not to be any Erroneous Switches, however parties need to investigate them as they occur.

Another RIG member mentioned before future PAT's are issued by the Code Manager to parties, the REC Schedule may be required to be updated, as it is open for interpretation and it's not explicit on what is required from both Suppliers to resolve an Erroneous Switch. The Code Manager Lead Analyst informed Members I0237 has been raised, to conduct a review of the Erroneous Switch process. They invited RIG members to provide feedback on how the wording in the Schedule can be made clearer, to help resolve issues they are facing.

The last section was on R0155 – Change of Occupier: Evidentiary Standards and Timescales, which can be found on slide 18 of the pack here.

A RIG member mentioned Ofgem are planning to issue a Non-Domestic RFI to Suppliers at the end of February, for completion by end of May 2025, and have stated they will be developing the reporting to meet REC requirements once the data required is confirmed. They suggested that the proposed Assurance activity to assess readiness for go-live was too early. They noted the data hasn't been provided to parties yet, therefore would only be able to provide a high-level response.

Another RIG member asked why PAB were so intent on this activity being carried out. The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained they are aware parties do have concerns with how this process is carried out within the industry, and that poor performance leads to a bad Consumer experience.

3 CONFIDENTIAL VS ANONYMOUS RESPONSE EDUCATION PIECE

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of Confidential vs Anonymous Response Education Piece, which can be found on slides 20 & 21 of the pack here.

No comments were raised by RIG members on this agenda item.

4 ISSUES UPDATE

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of Issues Update, which can be found on slides 23-28 of the pack here.

A RIG member mentioned it would be useful if there was a separate drop down option for issue log on the REC portal. The Code Manager Lead Analyst agreed to take this feedback on board.

5 AOB

5.1 I0233 – INTRODUCTION OF AN ENERGY THEFT UNIT (ETU) UNDER THE REC

The Code Manager Lead Analyst informed Members a new issue has been raised, I0233 to introduce an Energy Theft Unit under the REC. They advised the theft unit will be provisioned by the City of London Police. They explained as RECCo conducted a Consultation on this previously, the hope is the Code Manager will carry out a shortened Consultation period.

RIG members can view the initial responses to the Consultation here.

No further business was discussed. The Chair thanked attendees for their input and closed the meeting.