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_0905**
DATE	**05 September 2024, 10:00**
LOCATION	**By teleconference**

Presenter	Representing	Initials	Role
Andy Knowles	REC Code Manager	AK	Chair
Anton Moden	REC Code Manager	AM	Presenter
Caroline Freimuller	REC Code Manager	CF	Lead Analyst
James Hardy	REC Code Manager	JH	Lead Analyst
Harry Firth	REC Code Manager	HF	Secretariat

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 THE PREVIOUS MINUTES

The Chair invited attendees to provide comments on the draft minutes from the meeting which took place on 01 August 2024. There were no comments, and the minutes were approved as an accurate reflection of the meeting.

4. I0200 - IMPROVING ADDRESS MANAGEMENT TARGETS

AM provided attendees with an overview of the new Code issue which was accepted by the Code Manager on 01 August 2024.

AM advised that having the wrong address can lead to a range of consumer issues, including switching, billing and meter reading problems. AM added that the Meter Point Location (MPL) and Retail Energy Location (REL) have been added to the Code to resolve this issue. AM advised that there had been progress resolving address data issues, but there is not currently a mechanism to establish Code level targets for address improvement, and there is still around 2.8 million unmatched addresses.

AM presented options to attendees to resolve this issue, advising that either one or a combination of these options could be implemented:

- Option 1: Create a mechanism for setting targets that are then performance assured
- Option 2: Continue with the current approach for new addresses, but a new approach for any longer running data issues, for example a specific data cleanse project to update addresses
- Option 3: Establish REC processes for REL address updates, for example an SLA to respond to unmatched address updates within a specific time period.

AM invited attendees to comment on whether there are other options that have not been considered, and how best to progress this issue.

A Supplier representative asked which different scenarios are MPL and REL addresses used. AM responded that the REL address was introduced to act as a billing address for contracts. The Supplier representative asked if the MPL and REL addresses would be the same for most domestic or micro business customers. AM responded that it would likely be the same.

An Xoserve representative advised that they have been looking into this issue, and particularly the fundamental address processes, including whether both MPL and REL addresses are required. AM responded that they had not considered not having an MPL or REL address before the meeting and added that an effective solution to reducing the number of unmatched addresses will likely require both a data cleanse and process changes.

A DCC representative asked whether any targets would require an incremental increase in the number of accurate addresses, would the targets be set on a quarterly or annual basis, and how the DCC's annual address quality plan could be impacted by any targets. AM responded that the address quality plan would likely be affected. AM referred to Option 1, advising that industry input would be required to set appropriate targets and combine these targets with any necessary process changes to allow for a long-lasting solution.

AM asked attendees whether a working group would be the optimal way to progress this issue. DNO and Xoserve representatives all supported a working group.

A Network representative advised that if any targets or incentives are put forward, this would have to align with current DCC reporting requirements and added that current monthly reports that they currently receive from DCC could also be amended to be more workable.

A Code Manager asked whether current reporting templates could be circulated, to help the wider industry understand what data is currently available. They also asked what other analytics could be provided to help progress this issue further ahead of a working group. A DCC

representative agreed to provide these templates to the Code Manager and would speak offline about providing any useful analytics to a working group.

A Code Manager advised that an item on new connections will be discussed at a future Change Issues Group meeting, noting the overlapping in the issues as some feedback had highlighted addresses as a key problem in the new connections issue. AM agreed, adding that it will be important to establish the most effective solution to I0200, whether it will be a change to the new connections process, or a process change on responses to unmatched addresses.

Next Steps

AM concluded that attendees had supported the formation of a working group to help progress this issue further. The Chair asked when AM would want the working group to begin. AM responded that although this is not an urgent issue, they hope to hold the first meetings before Christmas. The Chair added that the Code Manager would discuss this issue further with DCC prior to the beginning of this working group.

5. I0193 - ADD ENUMERATION VALUES TO THE DI51035 - COMMUNICATIONS PROVIDER DATA ITEM

CF provided attendees with an overview of the new Code issue which was accepted by the Code Manager on 18 July 2024.

CF advised that this issue was raised by Elexon, as they are removing the valid list of Communication Providers from the Market Domain Data (MDD) as part of the P442 solution. CF advised that for this list to be kept, it has been proposed that it is added as enumeration values to the DI51035 (J1709) Communications Provider Data Item. CF advised that this change is not proposing any changes to the current list.

CF asked attendees if they foresee any issues arising from this change, whether they believe a Party Impact Assessment is required, and a preferred release date between February and June 2025.

A Network representative asked that if any additional communication providers are required to be added to the list, would a formal change need to be raised, and where this change would be processed. An Elexon representative responded that a change would be needed to add a new value into the list. They added that a couple of initial additions may be required but would expect the list to remain static afterwards. CF added that a new communications provider would have to register with BSC and require a REC change to be added as an enumeration value. A Code Manager added that the list would take longer to update after the change as any amendments would be tied to one of the three scheduled REC releases every year.

A Code Manager asked whether a cleanse of the list can take place as part of this change, noting that a couple of the enumeration descriptions are outdated. An Elexon representative responded that they were not planning to make any amendments to the list to ensure the actual change has no party impact and can be implemented quickly. The Code Manager asked what impact would be caused by changing the enumeration description, as long as the enumeration

value was not changed. The Elexon representative responded that the list could be amended as part of the change or separately after this change has been implemented. The Chair suggested that this question could be asked as part of a potential Party Impact Assessment.

A Metering Equipment Manager asked why the list cannot be updated under MDD before the change takes place, and it would likely be easier using current processes. A network representative responded that the actual communication providers would have to submit a MDD form to make a change. An Elexon representative agreed and added that the parties' lack of interaction is why this list is being moved away from MDD. Another Metering Equipment Manager queried this as there were some generic enumeration values in the list not linked to a specific communication provider. The Elexon Representative responded that they would look into how these generic values were inserted, and whether Elexon are able to raise changes to the list themselves through the current MDD processes.

A DNO representative asked what the connection to P442 is with this change. CF responded that P442 is the change that is taking the list out of MDD and this change would not affect the progression of P442, it is to ensure this list is still held within the industry.

A Supplier representative asked there will be any impacts on Suppliers from this change. An Elexon representative responded that as the list is expected not to be amended as part of this change, there should be no party impact. They added that there should also be no impact if only the enumeration descriptions are updated.

A DNO representative asked whether the communication providers had to independently register to be included on the list. An Elexon representative responded that they believed they did.

Next Steps

CF advised that following feedback from the group, a Party Impact Assessment would be required for this change. The Chair added that Elexon would need to look into the MDD change process further ahead of the Party Impact Assessment to determine the appropriate options for updating the list.

CF polled attendees for their preference of release dates between February and June 2025 for this change. CF advised that a February release would mean a shorter time period between approval and implementation, but the date lined up with the implementation of P442, so the list would not be lost for a time period following its removal from MDD. Seven votes were received supporting a June 2025 release, seven votes placed had no preference on release dates, and four votes received supporting a February 2025 release.

6. ADDING CLARITY TO THE SMART METER INSTALLATION SURVEY TEMPLATES

CF provided an overview of the item, which is an action arising out of R0152 – Revision to the Consolidated Metering Code of Practice (CoMCoP) working group.

CF advised that the Smart Meter Installation Survey used to be held in the Smart Meter Installation Code of Practice (SMICOP) before it became a part of CoMCoP, but the questions did not move with it. CF advised that a separate change, R0177 is making this survey a separate Category 2 document.

CF advised that during discussions on the Smart Meter Installation Survey, an issue arose around the separate demographic questions asked which are not listed as official survey questions. These demographic questions sit separately to the other questions in a different tab in the survey.

CF asked attendees if the current templates make it clear these demographic questions must be asked, and should the questions be moved to sit with the other questions for additional clarity.

A Supplier representative asked if these survey questions are in Code and whether they need to be asked at all. CF responded that this falls under CoMCoP, with the survey being mandatory to all suppliers who do more than 10,000 installs a year.

The Chair asked if this would be a housekeeping change. CF responded that they would have to check with the Release Manager.

A DNO representative asked what the information obtained from these questions is being used for and added that it would be good to know to provide further clarity. An RPA Code Manager responded that they would find out and respond at a later date.CF added that they believed the information forms part of the quarterly public reporting published on the REC Portal. The RPA Code Manager clarified the information is provided to DESNZ, which CF fed back to the group via the chat. CF added that there may need to be a review on whether this information is made clear on the survey itself.

7. I0168 – CLARIFY AND STRENGTHEN CRS PROVIDERS REQUIREMENTS

JH provided an update on the issue which was discussed at the Change Issues Group meetings in June and July.

JH advised that following the recommendations of the Change Issues Group, the Code Manager is in the process of drafting a Switching Operator MSI Best Practice document, and a version was published for party feedback. JH advised that no comments had been received to date, which the Code Manager had taken as general approval of the document so far. JH advised that the document is still being updated, and any new drafts will continue to be uploaded to the REC Portal and encouraged any parties to provide comments.

JH advised that the Best Practice document will be a Category 3 document, although there will be references in Code to help with the performance assurance process of the Switching Operator role, and in the case of another major incident. JH advised that currently these references are proposed to be within the service definitions or Schedule 26. JH advised that this will be a consultation question but welcomed any comments on this matter from attendees.

JH advised that there will now be three additional recommendations from the RECCO review report included within the Best Practice document, as well as the original five recommendations:

- IM018 – Switching Operator's responsibilities to ensure appropriate guidance and instruction to Ofgem and Code Administrators
- IM019 – Switching Change Advisory Board roles and responsibilities
- T009 – Data captured as part of a Switch, or otherwise, to help prioritise in the event of an MSI (Switching Operator's potential to identify and prioritise certain customer groups).

JH provided attendees with a summary of these new recommendations and asked if there were any objections to these recommendations being included within the Best Practice document. There was no objection from attendees. JH advised that the Code Manager would begin drafting these additional recommendations.

JH asked attendees if there were any parties wanting a Party Impact Assessment for this change, noting that a previous call for party feedback had received no responses. JH added that no Party Impact Assessment would allow for a quicker change process, to help mitigate the risk of any major incident occurring. JH advised that once the full draft of the Best Practice document is available, a standard Industry consultation will be released.

An Xoserve representative asked what the potential differences would be between a Party Impact Assessment and Consultation. JH responded that there would be no difference for this Change Proposal. JH added that it would be subject to Change Panel approval, but if the Change Issues Group supported no Party Impact Assessment, it would be likely to go straight to consultation. JH advised that any party could leave comments on the Change Reports before it goes to the Change Panel.

A Network representative asked that if the draft document receives comments, how will any outcomes or updates be published. JH responded that they would update the REC portal regularly and is happy to provide more information in further updates to the Change Issues Group or in the weekly bulletin.

Next Steps

JH advised that the Change Proposal Plan will be presented to Change Panel on 17 September 2024, and the paper will be made available a week prior to the meeting. JH added that currently the proposed implementation date is in the February 2025 release, but JH also noted that there is a possibility that the Code Manager may explore the possibility of an earlier release to mitigate the impact of a future major incident.

8. AOB

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