RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

REC ISSUE GROUP
MEETING NOTES

DATE	**14 March 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 two further AOB items being raised at this time. Later in the meeting, RIG noted the following AOB items:

- Performance Assurance dashboards in the REC portal
- Issue with oversized fuses
- Issues with disconnections

2 PERFORMANCE ASSURANCE UPDATE

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of the Performance Assurance update, which can be found on slides 4-19 of the pack here. This was split into a variety of different sections.

Data Cleanse:

The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained sprint 3 will be completed at the end of March. They informed Members that parties are required to submit an 1810 file on the REC portal, which will enable them to track the volumes within the CDSP reports.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained the volumes within the new MTD reports are increasing, and work will be carried out in sprint 4 to try and lower the volumes. There has also been a big increase in the volumes within the Invalid Topline DNO report. Discussions have taken place with a DNO, and it was agreed the increase has been due to a timing issue with the data, therefore the volumes should decrease for next months reporting. There has also been an increase in the Energised No Meter Excluding New MPANs reports.

A RIG member raised a point regarding ESME ID's for Export MPANs. They highlighted the ESME ID is attached to the Import MPAN, with the Export MPAN currently showing zeros. If a party notes the same ESME ID for both the Export and Import MPAN, it will fail. The RIG member asked if this would be a valid exemption, or would they just be left as zeros. The Code Manager Lead Analyst agreed to investigate this issue and obtain the wording in the code around this scenario.

Action: RECRIG_25_0314_02_01 – The Code Manager to investigate what to do in the scenario of not being able to submit the same ESME ID for Export and Import MPANs.

A RIG member mentioned another issue they are encountering is, when it's not necessarily that a meter has been removed and then re-installed, but the wrong ESME ID has been attached to the wrong meter. This is causing the update to the ESME ID to be rejected, but a party is unable to search the correct

ESME ID in ECOES. The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised a different exemption can be created for this particular scenario, to show the volumes and then a report can be run and sent to parties to provide them with the correct ESME ID's.

Action: RECRIG_25_0314_02_02 – The Code Manager to add a new exemption in for the scenario of the wrong ESME ID being attached to the wrong meter.

A RIG member asked if the records haven't changed from a previous months submission, would a party need to submit the same 1810 report into the portal the following month. The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised the same 1810 report would need to be submitted, except for the CDSP reports.

Sprint 4:

RIG members were asked to provide input regarding Report Prioritisation, which can be found on slide 7 of the pack here. The Code Manager Lead Analyst informed Members any issues they encounter through the duration of data cleanse sprint 4, RIG is the best forum to raise these issues.

The next section was an update on the Theft Detection Incentive Scheme (TDIS), which can be found on slides 9-11 of the pack here. No comments were received on TDIS.

Party Annual Ratings:

Slides 13-16 of the pack here. A RIG member asked if any consideration has been given to the introduction of a more balanced score approach across the annual ratings. They mentioned currently, a party is only as good as their worst category score. The Code Manager Lead Analyst informed Members there are two different approaches being considered, one being a single rating for all parties against a number of different areas. The other approach could be to share more detailed information around a parties score in each area, which will provide more than just a single rating. The Code Manager Lead Analyst highlighted the biggest area they are looking at improving is energy theft.

The last section is an update on the latest Performance Assurance quarter, which can be found on slides 18 & 19 of the pack here.

A RIG member noted there had been a 75% increase since the last quarter on Delay in Switch Meter Read Dispute Resolution and asked if this could be something to do with a Data Collector recently exiting the market. The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked the RIG member to provide further details of this and the Code Manager can investigate.

Another RIG member supported this presentation, explaining sharing this information with parties on a quarterly basis can be extremely useful. It's always good to hear what areas of the market are performing well.

3 CUSTOMER INFORMATION PROVISION D0225 AND D0302

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of Customer Information Provision in D0225 and D0302 flows, which can be found on slides 21 - 23 of the pack here.

A RIG member mentioned the D0302 includes different customer information than a D0225. They highlighted they have had some internal discussions on this topic and their concern is the validation of the email address of a PSR customer. There could be a GDPR issue with inputting an email address on a D0225 flow, email addresses aren't always secure. The RIG member expressed their concern with this approach.

Another RIG member advised communicating with customers through emails isn't always the best approach. They explained particular PSR customers can be elderly, therefore they wouldn't be set up with an email address.

Another RIG member highlighted they had been experiencing this issue. They noted in certain scenarios they are receiving incorrect customer phone numbers, in some instances the contact number not having eleven digits, therefore validation will need to be implemented to ensure contact numbers have eleven digits when being provided. Another RIG member agreed with this point, expressing the need for better data quality.

Another RIG member commented the need to understand the scale of the problem will be beneficial, as it could end up being an expensive piece of work for parties.

RIG members were invited to provide further feedback on this topic, by emailing kev.duddy@recmanager.co.uk, RECRIG@recmanager.co.uk, or through their OAM.

4 SECURE DATA EXCHANGE PORTAL – CHALLENGE LOCATING CASES

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of Secure Data Exchange Portal – Challenge Locating Cases, which can be found on slide 25 of the pack here.

A RIG member confirmed they have been experiencing this issue and they have needed to develop their own internal reporting, to monitor SDEP cases. They noted this has been raised at previous SDEP workshops. The Code Manager asked for the RIG member to share examples with them, which can then be shared with the Technical Services Provider.

RIG members were invited to provide further feedback on this topic, by emailing carl.dennis@recmanager.co.uk, RECRIG@recmanager.co.uk, or through their OAM.

5 METERING EXPERT PANEL – OPERATIONAL METERING FORUMS

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of Metering Expert Panel – Operational Metering Forums, which can be found on slides 27-29 of the pack here.

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

6 DNO TRAINING REQUIREMENTS FOR METERING OPERATIVES

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of DNO Training Requirements for Metering Operatives, which can be found on slides 31 & 32 of the pack here.

Several RIG members mentioned that RIG maybe the wrong forum to raise this topic in, however they agreed to investigate internally to identify if the issue is being experienced.

Another RIG member asked if this has recently been raised by Meter Operators, as it could be related to an issue they are currently having with lack of capacity. The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained this was raised around a month ago, with a couple of discussions taking place since then. The RIG member noted in certain scenarios they could be waiting a month or two for an engineer to be available to conduct meter work on site.

The Code Manager agreed to close this as a RIG issue and to raise it at another industry forum.

7 AOB

7.1 PERFORMANCE ASSURANCE DASHBOARDS IN THE REC PORTAL

The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised that requests have been made to restrict user permissions on the REC portal. They advised currently that if a user has Performance Assurance dashboard access, they are able to access the PA, SMIS and TDIS dashboards. If a party requests for their users to have access to a particular dashboard, but not all of them, they can contact enquiries@recmanager.co.uk.

A RIG member asked whether it was possible for parties to be sent a report containing a list of their Users and whether they have access to the dashboards already. The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained there is no reporting functionality in the REC portal, however a list of users can be provided to parties, upon request.

Another RIG member mentioned it would be beneficial if when a notification is triggered through the REC portal, for example if a file has been uploaded to a parties Performance Assurance area or if a PAT has been issued, that only the Contract Manager and the alternate receive the notification. Currently, these types of notifications are sent to a high number of users, who have the Performance Assurance role, and it can cause confusion and frustration.

7.2 ISSUE WITH OVERSIZED FUSES

A RIG member raised an issue they are facing, regarding non AMR meters that need replacing, with new metering, however the installations have been aborted. This was due to the Distribution whole current cutout fuses are rated above 100 amps, with the meters they want to install being 100 amps. They explained they have reached out to five different Meter Operators on this issue; however they specified the cutout fuses need to be downgraded to 100 amps, or upgraded to a transfer of supply. The RIG member asked if any other Suppliers have encountered this issue and if they can provide guidance on how this could be resolved.

Another RIG member highlighted it is the responsibility of the DNO to arrange for a fuse to be downgraded. If a Meter Operator identifies that over-sized fuses have been installed on a 100 amp whole current supply, the customer needs to contact their DNO to resolve. The customer may need to arrange for an electrician to attend site, to see if they can get anything downgraded in the property to match the 100 amp.

7.3 ISSUES WITH DISCONNECTIONS

A RIG member raised an issue they are facing, regarding demolished or derelict properties and arranging for them to be disconnected. They mentioned they have contacted the DNO to arrange for a property to be disconnected, however the DNO have requested a certificate or notification of demolition. They highlighted in certain instances they are unable to obtain this information, which causes an issue with proceeding with the disconnection. The RIG member asked if any other Suppliers have encountered this issue and if they can provide guidance on how this could be resolved.

Another RIG member asked if this issue has been raised through DCUSA IWG. They explained there is a lot of DNO representation at that working group and it may be beneficial to discuss this issue there.

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