RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

REC CHANGE ISSUES GROUP
MEETING MINUTES

MEETING	**CIG_24_0606**
DATE	**06 June 2024, 10:00**
LOCATION	**By teleconference**

Attendee	Representing	Initials	Role
Andy Knowles	REC Code Manager	AK	Chair
James Hardy	REC Code Manager	JH	Lead Analyst for I0168
Claire Hemmens	RECCO	CH	Proposer for I0168
Jo Hargreaves	Centrica	JHA	Attendee
Colin Payne	Engie	CP	Attendee
Lee Stone	E.ON Energy	LS	Attendee
Paul Rocke	REC Code Manager	PR	Attendee
Bryan Heap	ENWL	BH	Attendee
Jacqui Barton	National Grid	JB	Attendee
Clare Hannah	Imserv	CHA	Attendee
Paul Bedford	Drax	PB	Attendee
Victoria Burkett	SSE	VB	Attendee
Carl Dennis	REC Code Manager	CD	Attendee
Sandra Langan	REC Code Manager	SL	Attendee
Helen Bennett	Joint Office	HB	Attendee
Glenn Sheern	REC Code Manager	GS	Attendee
Harry Firth	REC Code Manager	HF	Secretariat

Note: Full attendee list available upon request

1. INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed attendees to the REC Change Issues Group (CIG) meeting.

2. CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA

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

3. APPROVAL OF TERMS OF REFERENCE

Attendees were invited to provide comments on the Terms of Reference for the Change Issues Group. The Terms of Reference were unanimously accepted by the Attendees.

4. OPTIONS FOR I0168: CLARIFY AND STRENGTHEN CRS PROVIDERS' REQUIREMENTS

As the Lead Analyst for I0168, JH provided Attendees with an overview of the issue, and a recap of the timeline of events following the P1 Switching Incident on 06 July 2023. JH informed the group that RECCO had completed a post-incident review with the REC Code Manager, and several recommendations have come out of this review, to limit the risk ohf other major switching incidents in the future.

JH took Attendees through five recommendations that have come out of the post-incident review and invited comments on each one. JH invited comments on each recommendation and the suggestion of other recommendations, adding that each recommendation would be reviewed before being finalised as part of the eventual change proposal.

JH invited DCC representatives to comment on the recommendations, but no DCC representatives were in attendance although they had been invited.

CH informed Attendees that there are recommendations the DCC have been delivering and further recommendations that RECCO and the REC Code Manager have been working on beyond the five presented at the meeting.

JHA noted that there is currently a consultation out from Ofgem which is looking at the future of the CRS Provider and queried how the recommendations would apply if DCC were no longer the CRS Provider. CH responded that if those proposals go into Code, they will be obligations on any future CRS Provider.

1. Root Cause Communication Outcome (Review Ref. T007)

This recommendation advised that the DCC should deliver clear, accurate timely information on the incident root cause as soon as possible, to allow impacted parties to proactively manage the incident and prepare a resolution.

CP noted that the P1 Switching Incident was identified on 6th July, but wider stakeholder engagement did not begin until 12th July, during the regular meeting of SOIF rather than a separate dedicated incident meeting. CP added that there needs to be faster communication to affected parties and this should not necessarily be delayed by identifying the root cause. CH responded that as part of the actions on the DCC, one is ensuring a specific incident group may be formed if a future incident goes beyond the P1 four hours resolution window.

LS added that the lack of frequent engagement on the development of a resolution for the P1 Switching Incident. They asked whether Xoserve were in attendance. PR advised that Xoserve had provided short notice apologies for the meeting.

CP asked what recommendations should be added into Code, rather than forming an action plan against future switching incidents. CH responded that the change proposal hopes to have a balance of both approaches, noting another recommendation on maintaining policies and procedures. JH invited Attendees to raise any missing issues that should be added into Code as part of a future change proposal.

BH suggested the adoption of a Best Practice approach to establish the expected actions and behaviours in the event of a future incident, with the option of adding these practices to Code if they are not followed going forwards. CP agreed and suggested that it may be a simpler solution than undertaking the change process, noting that the issue is specifically with incident management rather than switching as a whole.

BH added that the first and fourth recommendations were the most crucial in identifying whether an incident will be longer than four hours. They stressed the importance of providing that information to the affected parties, so the industry is aware of the incident's position as quickly as possible

JB added that there are two separate areas with providing initial communications on the incident to the industry and creating a group to create a resolution, and the importance of gathering the relevant experts for this group. These requirements for forming an incident group may fit best as an expectation within a potential Best Practices guide, suggesting that there had been a lack of understanding from the DCC regarding the P1 Switching Incident. CH responded that as part of a separate action the DCC were working on to ensure the correct personnel would attend a specific incident meeting going forwards. CH added that further training of DCC staff could be undertaken so they understand the wider implications on the industry which could help to inform better initial solutions to present to this group. BH agreed and added that the best personnel within these groups will be crucial for viewing the entire impact of an incident, which would allow for a quicker solution.

CHA advised that the Market-wide Half Hourly Settlement Programme (MHHS) issued a service management strategy document earlier this year, looking at the behaviours of all central services providers in the new arrangements. CHA added that CSS and the P1 Switching Incident is mentioned in this document and asked if the document has been consulted to ensure it is in line with any potential solution. CH responded that the strategy document has been consulted, and any recommendations taken forward are conscious of this report. CH added they will continue to ensure that any change proposal lines up with the MHHS Strategy document.

The group noted that a UNC mod exists to enable CDSP to make retrospective changes following a comment from the group that the incident initially caused mismatched dates which have since been corrected.

2. Switching Operators' End-Consumer Communication Outcome (Review Ref. IM013)

JH advised that this proposal recommends a new requirement for the DCC to provide end consumer appropriate information for both REC and Non-REC parties used to determine communication and action for their consumers. JH advised that there is no solution for how this requirement would look and invited ideas from CIG Attendees.

CD added that at the time there was frustration amongst the parties at the lack of clear, concise communication made available for consumers. CD added that for the first 5-6 weeks, it was a struggle to communicate with consumers as it was unclear what the consumer impact was and suggested that the DCC should have provided a clear message for every party to use. VB agreed.

BH raised comments on the specific incident group needing to identify and communicate it strategy for each incident and the role of the group chair would play, noting that this individual may benefit from a degree of operational separation.

CP asked about how this solution fits in with the Service Provider contacts between RECCO and DCC, suggesting that there must be service levels in these contracts that should result in penalties or incentives if not met. CH responded that the Code is the contract between RECCO and DCC and defines the service levels that the CSS provider and switching operator will need. CP asked that the CRS service provider contracts would be updated through Code modification. CH responded that this is their expectation but would ask the DCC for confirmation.

BH added that for these service provider contracts, a future incident similar to the P1 Switching Incident would be an extraordinary circumstance falling outside of the usual SLAs which require parties to meet their usual obligations and added that this best practice guide would be primarily to get back to those normal obligations as soon as possible. CH responded that they are trying to ensure that the REC ensures that in the event of extraordinary circumstances, there are still expectations, with the provision of key information being pivotal.

SL suggested that in the event of a future incident, consumers will require a core message from the whole industry and suggested that further mapping out and testing could be required on the communications element of any action plan. CH responded that this was captured during the initial review process, particularly with a delay and audience of this type of messaging being delivered and suggested developing some examples of communications.

3. Switching Operator, Switching Incident Impact Assessment Outcome (Review Ref. IM015)

JH advised that this recommendation is to clarify the DCC's broader obligation to assess an incident's impact on the wider Switching Arrangements (set out in REC Schedule 26) to ensure

that they facilitate the most effective, efficient overall Switching industry solution to be implemented.

JB advised that in their experience the DCC had interpreted some of the schedules differently to the rest of the industry and suggested that the best practice approach may be more optimal than codifying the changes.

4. Incident Wide Switching Impact Assessment Outcome (Review ref. IM017)

JH advised that this recommendation is to clarify that if a Major Switching Incident is not going to be resolved within the defined Service Levels of four hours, then the DCC should determine the impact on compliance with REC end-to-end Switching Arrangements, and work with Ofgem and Code Administrators to identify cross-code impacts when managing an incident and developing a solution.

JH invited attendees from other Codes to comment on this recommendation. HB responded that from a UNC perspective it would be useful to have more clarification on the DCC's involvement in determining cross-code impacts and encouraged more interaction with the other Codes.

LS and CH agreed that it would be beneficial to have communications in place with representatives on other Codes, even if to confirm if there are no expected cross-code impacts.

5. Refresh and testing of Switching Operator's (SO) incident related policies, processes and procedures, to ensure they remain fit for purpose Outcome (review ref. COM022)

JH advised that this recommendation is to clarify requirements on the DCC to periodically review its policies, processes and procedures on Switching Incident Management, Switching Service Management, up-to-date contact lists and assessment of incident resolution hierarchy.

The Chair suggested that this recommendation would suit a best practice guide approach. BH agreed, adding that the regular review process for both RECCO and the DCC is important to optimise the incident management process. BH agreed with the recommendation of capturing which processes worked well and which processes did not, and then whether RECCO need to modify these processes or raise a change. CH responded that the DCC and RECCO both did a lesson learned in response to the P1 Switching Incident and asked BH whether RECCO should be involved in similar review processes in the future. BH agreed as they suggested the DCC may review it from a narrower perspective.

Next Steps

JH informed the Attendees that they intend to bring back this issue to the next CIG meeting on 4th July. They added that they would review the feedback received in this session, looking at the different approaches of codifying and best practice guides as well as potentially refining the five recommendations, with the potential to bring some straw man ideas for some of them.

The Chair added that they will look into the best practice guide further, in particular in how it will tie to the Code, what obligations will be required, and start to draw out what this document would look like. The Chair thanked the Attendees for their contributions in the session.

5. AOB

PR advised attendees that there is a Change Improvements Webinar taking place on 20th June. GS advised Attendees that R0167 is formalising the use of issues, and the Change Issues Group was established separately by the REC Code Manager.