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_1205**
DATE	**05 December 2024, 10:00**
LOCATION	**By teleconference**

Presenter	Representing	Initials	Role
Paul Witton-Dauris	REC Code Manager	PWD	Chair
Lydia Bentley	REC Code Manager	LB	Lead Analyst
Lorna Mallon	REC Code Manager	LM	Subject Matter Expert
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 07 November 2024. HF advised that no comments had been made prior to the meeting. There were no comments, and the minutes were approved as an accurate reflection of the meeting.

4. I0198 – GAS MEMS MOVE TOWARDS A SINGLE INTERFACE FOR KEY MARKET MESSAGES

LB provided attendees with an overview of the issue, which was raised by the REC Performance Assurance (RPA) team who have undertaken studies on how the quality of data within the gas market could be improved. LB advised that these studies concluded that the gas market data fidelity may be improved by reducing the frequency of missed Market Messages sent by Metering Asset Managers (MAMs) to one another and to other REC parties.

LB advised that Schedule 14 – Metering Operations allows for MAMs to send Market Messages through either the Data Transfer Network (DTN), via email or through the Information Exchange (IX). The Proposer of this Issue raised I0198 with the long term suggestion of aiming to reduce the number of permissible communication methods down to one for all MAMs. LB noted that this would be a long-term goal, and that the scope of I0198 is limited to exploring an interim "stepping-stone" solution. LB advised that this Issue had been raised with a suggestion for this interim solution in the form of a communication method register, where MAMs would register their preferred communication method.

LB asked attendees several questions, including whether a communications register would be useful, whether this should be mandated, and how best to capture each MAM's preferred communication method(s) and backups.

A Supplier representative advised that they were more concerned about how an individual MAM receives data than how they send it, adding that Supplier will need to build their systems around this information. They added that it may be more beneficial to split Domestic and Non—Domestic communications than listing backup methods, as for example one attendee suggested that email should not be used in the domestic market for General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) reasons. LB responded and noted that the communication methods used for sending and receiving flows by MAMs may be different, and they would have to look into it further.

A MAM representative advised that they would support the adoption of a single communication method. They added that previously the costs of this change proved too expensive, particularly the smaller parties, but noted that with Xoserve making IX cloud-based, this cost may have reduced and could be considered again. The Chair responded that they could speak to Xoserve about this further. A Supplier representative queried whether a potential migration to IX could be impacted by Xoserve's ongoing Trident project. An Xoserve representative responded that a cloud-based IX is already available and they would be happy to provide estimated costs of migration to REC parties.

MAM and Supplier representatives advised that if there are lots of different Market Messages to be listed in a potential communications register, then it could be useful, but added that the size and scope of the issue needs to be determined, as they have not experienced many shortcomings regarding communications. They added that communication methods are often specified in contracts between Suppliers and MAMs. A Code Manager representative responded that a working group had been formed and established several actions to address the issue of data degradation, of which this issue forms part of. They added that several papers

had been presented to the REC Issues Group (RIG) before being raised. LB advised that these papers will added to the portal page for I0198.

A MAM representative advised that a communications register would be useful for including contact details, particularly for backup communication options. A Supplier representative queried whether this register could be linked to the existing REC Operational Contacts list, or whether MAMs could be added to this list as it is currently Supplier only. LB responded that this had not been considered yet but is an option the Code Manager can investigate further. A Supplier representative advised that there was a contact list with MAMs included. A Code Manager representative advised that this is on the metering hub and that they have sent out to parties for any updates to the list.

A MAM representative advised that a communications register would need to be made mandatory for REC Parties to keep updated, as previous versions have fallen out-of-date very quickly in the past.

A Supplier representative advised that an existing change has been raised to get MAMs added to the SDEP although unsure on its status. LB responded that they would investigate this existing change further.

A Supplier representative suggested that a Request for Information could be useful to help consolidate some of the issues mentioned in this meeting and focus on what this issue needs to deliver in its solution. LB responded that they would look into this option further and added that they may request some data from parties to support the development of this issue.

A Supplier representative noted the ongoing data cleanse exercise being undertaken by Xoserve and involving the Market Messages between Suppliers and MAMs. They suggested that a potential solution could be used to reduce the frequency of such data cleanses going forward.

LB suggested that following the feedback from attendees, the biggest use of a communications register could be for contact between MAMs as part of a change of supply process, rather than between MAMs and Suppliers. They added that they will provide an update on the ongoing development of this issue in the new year.

5. I0214 – MULTIPLE SWITCH REQUESTS INCREASING OBJECTION RATE

LB provided attendees with an overview of the Issue which had been discussed at RIG before being raised. LB advised that a Non-Domestic Consumer would agree a Supply contract with a proposed new Supplier, who will attempt to register a Meter Point Administration Number (MPAN). LB added that another Supplier will place an Objection against an MPAN following Registration and will send Objection communications to the Consumer. LB advised that due to the automated process of this scenario, this can result in non-stop communications between the Non-Domestic Suppliers to the Consumer, which creates a poorer Non-Domestic Consumer experience.

LB presented some solution options to attendees:

Supplier Side Options:

LB advised that one option includes setting a daily limit on the number of Registration attempts per Supplier. They added that another option is introducing an escalating timescale between individual Registration attempts, for example having to wait one hour after one attempt, two hours after the second attempt. LB added that a combination of the above options could also be utilised.

Central Switching Service (CSS) Side Options:

LB advised that one option is using flags within the CSS to identify switch requests made against supply points with outstanding Objections and prevent the Registration request from progressing to a point where a second Objection is triggered.

LB asked attendees for feedback on the Issue, noting that it is in early stages and the solution options have not been finalised. LB asked attendees if their organisations have been seeing this problem, noting that this is also arising in the domestic market where Consumers are changing from non-Domestic to Domestic.

A Non-Domestic Supplier representative advised that Objections will spike at certain time of the year to allow for their main contract rounds and queried whether the Code Manager had considered that. A Code Manager representative advised that this had been considered, but Performance Assurance had seen high levels of Objections throughout the year, not just around the contract rounds. They added that this data was more focused on microbusiness customers.

A Non-Domestic Supplier representative noted that there are several ongoing changes which may have an impact on reducing Objection rate and advised that they would be against any other changes going through until then, adding that Suppliers have invested significantly in automating these processes. LB responded that a cost-benefit analysis will be done for any potential solution prior to any decisions being made. They noted that it may be costly for Non-Domestic Suppliers and will not force through a solution with high costs without sufficient reason but advised that intangible benefits such as Consumer experience are considered as part of any cost-benefit analysis.

A Code Manager representative advised further on the data collected by the RPA on Objection rates and added that feedback received by both the gaining Suppliers and Third Party Intermediaries (TPIs) has suggested the current process is inefficient and time-consuming.

A Supplier representative advised that any solution would need to consider the complexity of the non-Domestic Supplier market, particularly differentiating between larger and microbusiness Suppliers. LB agreed and added that any solution will be targeted.

A Supplier representative suggested that given individual MPAN requests are being Objected to multiple times, the Suppliers involved should be looking into these cases and feeding back more information so that the root cause can be identified before the Code Manager introduces any REC solution. A Code Manager representative responded that they would be happy to receive more data surrounding this problem to better inform this issue and any future solutions.

LM advised that the Objection reasons have never been in Code, it is only in Gas for Non-Domestic Objections, and it is kept between the Consumer and the Supplier, although the Consumer can inform the other Supplier in the scenario if they wish to.

Supplier representatives advised that they would in support of limiting the multiple Registration attempts of the Supplier, as they should be aware there is a valid Objection and working with the Consumer to resolve this. LB responded that any solution will likely place obligations on the gaining Supplier rather than the losing Supplier. A Code Manager representative suggested obligating the gaining Supplier to inform the Consumer that an Objection has been received, to improve communications between all involved parties. LB responded that this could be looked into, but was concerned that this could add to the excessive communication the Consumer currently receives in this scenario.

A Supplier representative queried whether the Objection rate could be amended to reflect the percentage of MPAN Registrations being objected to, rather than including all the Objections to the multiple Registrations of individual MPANs. They added that the Objection rate may be driven up by current market trends and that any solution must be enduring and not just a reaction to any of these trends. LB responded that the Code Manager will investigate updating the Objection rate data.

6. I0215 – SCHEDULE 40 SWITCH METER READING PROBLEMS – REJECTIONS AND TIMINGS

LB provided attendees with an overview of the Issue which had been discussed at RIG before being raised. LB advised that the Code Manager is investigating how Suppliers engage with the D0300 Market Message and associated REC processes. LB added that this investigation includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- D0300's sent in response to a missing D0086
- Escalations raised around missing D0300 responses.
- Whether Schedule 30 – Resolution of Consumer Facing Switching & Billing Issues successfully reflects actual Supplier practice in relation to the D0300.
- Whether RPA activities surrounding the D0300 Market Message (and therefore the PARC also) successfully reflect Supplier practice.

LB asked attendees for feedback on this issue, whether their organisation has encountered issues relating to the D0300 process and if so, would they have any examples or data to support the Code Manager's investigation. LB added that this issue is at a very early stage and any feedback would be welcomed to help with development.

A Supplier representative said that for any D0300 rejection messages, the Market Message gets rejected from their internal system and a query case will be raised and sent off to a Supplier through the SDEP process. They added that those flows should not be sent in the first place, and there is validation available on DTN which would prevent it. They added that it could be worth communicating to parties about DTN having enhanced validation available. A Code

Manager representative asked if the system will flag if the flow is valid but has been sent to the wrong Supplier. The Supplier representative responded that the system will perform catalogue validation, but not business validation like wrong Supplier so that would have to fixed manually.

LB thanked attendees for their feedback in the meeting and added that they would be happy to receive any further questions or thoughts on any of the three issues discussed. They advised attendees to email any further feedback to Lydia.bentley@recmanager.co.uk.

7. AOB

The Chair invited attendees to provide AOB.

LM asked attendees if they felt it would be beneficial to bring a paper to the next meeting on when to flag consultation responses as confidential or anonymous, noting that some recent consultation responses had been flagged incorrectly. Attendees agreed that this would be useful.

HF advised that there would not be an I0200 Workgroup following this meeting, with the next meeting to be scheduled but likely to be in January 2025.

HF advised that there will be a workgroup for I0189 – Voice of the Consumer on 12th December 2024. Any interested parties should contact change.management@recmanager.co.uk to sign up to attend future Workgroup meetings.

HF advised that the January 2025 Change Issues Group meeting will be held on 9th January, with meeting apers to be published on 2nd January.

The Chair asked attendees if Change Issues Group meetings should be extended to 2 hours going forwards. Attendees agreed and the Chair confirmed meetings will be extended from January onwards.

The Chair asked attendees if they believed setting up a dedicated email address for the Change Issues Group would be beneficial. Attendees agreed and the Chair confirmed this would be set up in due course.