RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

REC CHANGE ISSUES GROUP
MEETING MINUTES

MEETING	**RECCHIG_24_0704**
DATE	**04 July 2024, 10:00**
LOCATION	**By teleconference**

Presenter	Representing	Initials	Role
Andy Knowles	REC Code Manager	AK	Chair
James Hardy	REC Code Manager	JH	Lead Analyst
Elise Handy	REC Code Manager	EH	Lead Analyst
Bradley Mercer	REC Code Manager	BM	Alternate Secretariat

Full attendee list available upon request.

1. INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed attendees to the REC Change Issues Group (CIG) meeting. BM advised that apologies had been received from Harry Firth (Committee Secretary).

2. CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA

The Chair invited any additional items of business for consideration during the meeting, but no items were raised.

The Chair informed attendees that there would not be a discussion on R0096 - *CSS Message Regeneration Functionality* as per the agenda due to additional work being required on the change following feedback from the REC Technical Expert Panel (RECTEP).

3. APPROVAL OF THE PREVIOUS MINUTES

The Chair invited attendees to provide comments on the draft minutes from the meeting which took place on 06 June 2024. There were no comments and the minutes were approved as an accurate reflection of the meeting.

The Chair advised that going forward the minutes of the RECCHIG would be anonymised, comments and statements from attendees would be attributed to the party type of the

individual rather than their initials. Attendees confirmed that they were supportive of the proposed change.

4. I0168: CLARIFY AND STRENGTHEN CRS PROVIDERS' REQUIREMENTS (MSI BEST PRACTICE DOCUMENT)

JH provided attendees with an overview of the issue advising that it was a review of the P1 Switching Issue which had occurred in 2023. JH advised that a number of recommendations had been made by RECCo to mitigate the impact of a similar issue in the future. JH confirmed that those recommendations were being progressed through I0168. JH provided attendees with an overview of the discussions on I0168 at the previous RECCHIG meeting highlighting that RECCHIG attendees had expressed a desire for the outcomes of the review to be incorporated into a Major Switching Incident (MSI) Best Practice Document for the Switching Operator rather than extensive changes to Schedule 26.

JH advised that the Code Manager had completed a strawman of the MSI best practice document which had been shared with attendees ahead of the meeting, JH added that once approved the document would be a Category 3 document. JH invited attendees to provide comments and feedback on the strawman.

A DCC representative advised that the drafting was on the right track however, had some comments around the terminology used within the document and requested that the term incident within the document should be replaced with MSI which would make the document explicitly clear that it was only applicable to P1 and P2 incidents.

A DCC representative made reference to the comms listed in 2.3 of the document, they confirmed that the DCC would be able to provide the non-technical description for REC parties however, they would not be able to provide comms to the consumer. A DNO representative agreed with DCC not sending comms to the consumer and highlighted that the DCC's responsibility should be to ensure that parties had a clear understanding of the issue to communicate to their customers. Attendees agreed with the statement. The Chair advised that the Code Manager would redraft section 2.3 to be absolutely clear on the distinction of roles related to comms.

A dcc Representative drew attention to section 2.4 of the document around impact assessments. Attendees were advised that it would be very difficult for the DCC to quantify the costs for P1 or P2 incident for the party or consumer as they did not have access to tariff information. A DCC representative offered to support with the drafting of this section of the document ex-committee.

JH provided attendees with an overview of the change process under the REC for Category 3 documents. JH advised that the Category 3 document would be owned by the Code Manager who would have to raise any changes to the document following engagement. JH confirmed that any changes to the document would be subject to an industry consultation.

A DCC representative asked for context around what would be expected from the DCC in relation to the second bullet point under section 2.6 (Switching Service Management Policies

and Procedures). JH advised that the wording had been taken from the RECCo recommendations and advised that he believed that this would incorporate what was set out in Schedule 26. A RECCo representative advised that at the time of the P1 incident there was a lack of defined roles and responsibilities across the board and the clause had been added to ensure that they were clearly defined if a P1 or P2 was to happen in the future. The RECCo representative added that the RACIs within the DCC Runbooks would be the policies and procedures.

A DNO representative advised that under section 1.2 of the document impacts were called out for Suppliers and asked if the DNO impacts could be added to the list as well. JH agreed to investigate a change to the wording.

JH advised that the next steps for the strawman would be to take away all of the points raised at the meeting and make amendments. JH informed attendees that the document would then be shared with attendees for review prior to being presented at the September 2024 RECCHIG meeting.

5. R0099 – CSS END USER OBLIGATIONS

EH informed attendees that many Central Switching Service (CSS) incidents could not be resolved without proactive engagement from the end user. EH confirmed that currently there was not any direct obligations on CSS Users to engage with the incident resolution process, or to provide up to date contact information. EH advised that this was currently leading to the CSS System Operator struggling to resolve incidents in a timely manner. EH advised that R0099 was seeking to place obligations on CSS Users to provide this information.

EH advised that the Code Manager had developed some options for the resolution of the issue:

Option 1 – Obligations within the Code

EH advised that one option was to add new terms to Schedule 1 and Schedule 28 to obligate parties to have up to date contacts on Service Now. EH advised that a concern with this option was that REC did not own Service Now and as such legal advice would need to be sought. EH advised that this may also be difficult to performance assure.

Option 2 – REC Contract Manager

EH advised that if a contact on Service Now was unresponsive the CSS System Operator would default to contacting the REC Contract Manager to resolve any issues. EH advised that this could also be the trigger for the Contract Manager to ensure that the contacts listed on Service Now were up to date. EH confirmed that this would not require a Code change.

Option 3 – New Operational Contact

EH advised that there was the possibility of adding a new operational contact to the REC Operational Contacts List for handling CSS incidents. EH highlighted that this would mean that parties would need to have both the REC Operational Contacts List and Service Now up to date. EH confirmed that this would not require a Code change.

EH advised that there were a number of questions for parties to consider around the progression of R0099:

- Considering the Primary and Secondary contacts in ServiceNow, is your organisation using third parties to resolve Switching Incidents? If so, how much influence do you have to ensure they regularly review their contacts?
- Are these contacts the REC Contract Manager or someone internal to your organisation? If so, do you have internal processes to ensure these are updated including when staff members are on holiday or absent?
- When the Switching Operator cannot find the appropriate contact, could/should it default to the Contract Manager? (these are contacts where the Code Manager is certain it is up to date).
- Or do you believe there is a specific Operational Contact from your organisation (not the Contract Manager) required for Switching Incidents?
- Do you believe there should be a stronger Code obligation for these contacts to be populated and up to date?

A Supplier representative advised that they were happy for the CSS System Operator to contact the REC Contract Manager regarding CSS issues. The Supplier representative highlighted that there was an issue with the assigned REC Contract Manager in that different people had to be assigned to different MPIDs and it may be the case that somebody could be contacted who did not necessarily work on that side of the business. An IDNO representative advised that there was a similar process within the DCUSA for contacting Contract Managers and expressed support for Option 2. Attendees expressed their support for Option 2.

Commented [BM1]: Do we want to differentiate to this level? Or just put DNO?

6. I0186 – NON-DUAL-FUEL GAS PSR CUSTOMER

JH provided attendees with an overview of the new REC Issue which had been accepted by the Code Manager on 26 June 2024.

JH advised that the majority of domestic customers in the UK are 'dual-fuel' customers. This 'dual-fuel' position has supported the industry improvements to Priority Services Register (PSR) data flows by allowing previous divides to be overstepped in terms of data flows between energy types.

JH highlighted that there was a problem where a customer who has both fuel types, also has two suppliers and they want to register upon the PSR. JH advised that this was always a 'known' gap shared with our regulator when the many improvements were implemented across the PSR and considered to be something that would be addressed at a later date. This 'gap' means that without the dual-fuel link, currently data flows do not complete across energy types via the supplier data flow triggers.

JH confirmed that this Issue aims to allow non-dual-fuel customers who register upon the PSR, to have their PSR data flow across energy industry data flows to mean that all parties are aware of any PSR Needs Codes, allowing us all to provide equal access to our services and support.

JH advised that it was intended that this will be achieved via the utilisation of existing processes and systems, and through an initial pilot that will take place for a minimum of three months between participating companies before extending this to the whole industry.

A DNO representative advised that the Issue made sense to progress and that customers should only have to provide PSR data to a single party who would then share the information with relevant stakeholders. A DNO representative advised that this had been looked in to in the past under legacy governance and there had been an issue with the consent to share the information however, this restriction had been lifted. A Citizens Advice representative expressed their support for the progression of this issue. JH confirmed that the Code Manager would continue with its investigation into the issue and development of a solution.

7. AOB

The Chair invited attendees to provide AOB. There was no AOB and the meeting was closed.