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_0801**
DATE	**01 August 2024, 10:00**
LOCATION	**By teleconference**

Presenter	Representing	Initials	Role
Andy Knowles	REC Code Manager	AK	Chair
Andres Alvarez	RECCo	AA	Presenter
Gemma Dixon	REC Code Manager	GD	Lead Analyst
Sarah Jones	SJW Energy	SJ	Presenter
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 (CHIG) 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 04 July 2024. There were no comments, and the minutes were approved as an accurate reflection of the meeting.

4. I0179 - PROPOSAL FOR LIMITING QUERIES IN EES API CALLS (SINGLE API CALL WITH MULTIPLE QUERIES)

GD provided attendees with an overview of the new Code issue which was accepted by the Code Manager on 03 June 2024.

GD advised that the issue proposes a limit of queries permitted within a single EES API call. GD advised that APIs were designed to be used often for small amounts of data rather than infrequently for large volumes of data. GD advised that a recent investigation by RECCo and the EES Provider has shown some users are sending thousands of queries per API call. They added that there is correlation between these users and slower response times, as well as adversely affecting the performance of other users using API calls.

GD advised that a Request for Information was issued for I0179 and received 3 responses.

AA advised that RECCo hope to implement a limit of 1000 queries per API call, but not to limit the number of API calls per user. AA advised that this limit would help to prevent overwhelming the system and ensure consistent and reliable response times for all users.

A Supplier representative advised that a potential limit of 1000 queries would be too low, and there would be financial and time impacts, and added that they had not experienced any performance issues from regularly having over 1000 queries from an API call.

GD shared a chart with attendees showing the effect of multiple queries in one API call on performance, showing a direct correlation between more queries in a single API call and worsening response times. GD advised that the proposed limit of 1000 queries had been set as the impact to overall performance is more manageable.

A Supplier representative advised that their preference would be to have a higher limit of queries to reduce the volume of API calls required. They added that when previously in API calls with thousands of queries, they have not faced any performance-related issues. An EES Provider representative responded that when contacted by users regarding performance issues, it can be tracked directly back to these API calls, and it affects all users using the system rather than just the individual user with thousands of queries on one API call. They added that the optimal usage is one query per API call, and lots of calls with a small number of queries is quicker to process than a few calls with lots of queries.

AA advised that for GES API calls, it does not allow multiple queries per call, and the number of GES API calls are about double the number of EES API calls, with no impact on system performance.

A Supplier representative suggested that time will either be spent by the user splitting up the queries into individual requests, or the EES processing the single API call with lots of queries. They asked what other solutions have been explored to mitigate the performance risks aside from the query limit. An EES Provider representative advised that with the proposed limit, users would have to undertake some initial development to rewrite the scripting used for API calls. Once this scripting has been written correctly, Suppliers should be able to process their queries at the same time as before without risking overwhelming the system.

A Supplier representative suggested that some technical support from the EES provider in how to efficiently code their API call requests, would be useful. An EES provider representative agreed.

An Elexon representative advised that they were concerned whether this limit would affect their ability to check the migrated endpoint status of MSIDs in their system. An EES Provider representative responded that Elexon should not be limited by the number of MSIDs they are

able to check, but their scripts could be altered to ensure each request is sent through on a one-by-one basis, the optimal setup for API calls.

Next Steps

GD advised that they would start to produce the Change Report to take to the REC Change Panel, to seek approval of the Change Proposal Plan. GD added that some Coding guidance would also be made available alongside this Change. AA asked attendees for further detail on the content needed in this guidance document. The Chair suggested that attendees go away and provide feedback at a later date. AA and GD agreed.

5. I0180 - CLARITY ON USE OF ON HOLD FOR SWITCHING ISSUES, INCLUDING THE OBLIGATIONS OF CSS USERS

GD provided attendees with an overview of the new Code issue which was accepted by the Code Manager on 03 June 2024.

GD advised that within some Central Switching Service (CSS) incidents are placed on hold waiting for resolution, but these incidents cannot be closed without confirmation from the end user. GD advised that there is currently no obligation on CSS users to respond in a timely manner to these incidents, which mean some tickets remain open longer than necessary. GD advised that some of the specific issues include engaging with Suppliers, incorrect contact details being held, and tickets being assigned to individuals rather than an organisation.

GD advised that the Code Manager currently have two proposed solutions and encouraged attendees to provide initial feedback for both solution options.

Option 1

GD advised that Option 1 would establish the on-hold concept, establish an obligation on Suppliers to respond to these on-hold messages, and establish performance assurance of Suppliers that consistently do not respond to messages.

Option 2

GD advised that Option 2 would define an approach to provide CSS users with a time frame to respond to incidents and then the System Operator (SO) would close down after an agreed period of no response.

A Network representative advised that similar solutions have been discussed in previous forums, especially regarding why individuals' names or contacts are raising incidents rather than a generic service desk-type contact within the organisation. An RPA representative added that from a Performance Assurance perspective, it could be beneficial to establish a defined time to wait for a response and also an obligation for parties to maintain and update a CSS escalation contact in the event of no response. A REC Code Manager and GD responded that there are some active changes currently in process aiming to deal with the issue of outdated operational contacts, including R0080, R0096 and R0099.

The Chair suggested that many Suppliers will not have a service desk or generic contact because they are not obligated to, and that adding such an obligation would fall under Option 1.

A Supplier representative advised that they would prefer Option 2, suggesting it is a simpler solution and more focused on the key issue of closing CSS incidents. They suggested that failure for CSS Users to close tickets will already be captured in some performance assurance metrics, especially if linked to customer-raised issues.

Another Supplier representative expressed support for Option 2 but suggested that there could be an issue with closing incidents too quickly, adding that some tickets in the past have taken significant time to resolve. The Chair responded that it was their understanding that the DCC requires users to take an action to close an issue down, which sometimes does not happen as the User has already resolved the issue on the Customer side.

GD asked attendees if there were any concerns with the criteria for Option 2 set out by the Switching Operator. A REC Code Manager advised that from a performance assurance perspective, these criteria would need to be Codified, along with an obligation for the Switching Operator to retain evidence to validate the closing of incidents. GD responded that this would be covered off before the Code Manager Assessment.

The Chair asked attendees for opinions on Option 1 and created a poll for their preferred option, or whether they would prefer both options to be developed further at this stage. 55% voted that progressing both options were their preferred choice, 40% favoured Option 2 and 5% favoured Option 1. The poll suggested that the popular opinion was to keep moving forward with both options.

A REC Code Manager suggested the criteria for Option 1 would also need to be defined if implemented, to avoid any misuse. The Chair responded that the on-hold criteria is already established in the CSS contract, but the REC Code Manager advised that this has not been Codified.

Next Steps

The Chair and GD agreed that attendees were in support of both options being developed further, with further industry feedback being sought later on, ahead of a preferred option being selected and incorporated into a future Change Proposal.

6. ERDS CSS DISCREPANCIES (CR-045)

GD informed attendees that CR-045 was raised as a solution to an issue identified during the MHHS design but was rejected due to the limited time available before M10, the implementation of the MHHS system changes. GD advised that the issue has now been passed to Code bodies to implement, and this is a pre-submission, likely to be submitted as a REC Change following feedback at this meeting.

SJ provided attendees with an overview of the issue and some proposed solutions. They advised that CSS and ERDS discrepancies can arise where the secured active or cancellation notification is not issued by CSS or is not accepted by the ERDS. SJ added that where issues arise, there is currently no mechanism for Supplier registration data to be retrospectively corrected therefore manual correction is required.

SJ advised that DNOs use a tool to manually update Supplier Registration data, with about 100 manual corrections a month across all DNOs. They added that as the Supplier Registration is applied retrospectively, the effective from date is aligned across ERDS and CSS, with any correction captured through the next settlement run.

SJ advised that the MHHS design does not allow for retrospective correction of Supplier registration data and the existing manual correction tool is not available, so no mechanism to correct misalignments between ERDS and CSS.

SJ presented some proposed changes to attendees, including an addition to Schedule 11 to define the current mechanism for manual correction of Supplier Registration data, Schedule 14 and the ERDS Service Definition, and additions to Schedule 22 regarding the management of MOA appointments for MHHS metering points.

A BSC representative advised that the BSC are looking to raise and implement a similar Change alongside the REC, mainly to fix the alignment of settlements, with their proposal looking to pick up any missing data in the following settlement run.

An Energy Software Solutions representative advised that there may be another mechanism required to ensure the alignment of data within the central systems. SJ responded that this would be included within the Change once submitted.

An Energy Software Solutions representative asked about potential timescales for implementation. SJ responded that they were unsure at the moment but hoped to complete a Party Impact Assessment in September or October, in order to clarify issues around new event codes and testing. They added that they did not expect this change to require end-to-end testing. The Energy Software Solutions representative agreed, suggesting that a key issue with CR-045 had been testing on a market-wide scale.

Next Steps

SJ advised that they hoped to raise a new Change Proposal next week, following the feedback received today. They added that the BSC Change will also be progressed and aligned alongside the REC Change in the Cross-Code Steering Group.

7. AOB

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