RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

REFERENCE	RECCHIG_24_1205_06
STATUS	FOR DISCUSSION

I0215 - SCHEDULE 30 SWITCH METER READING PROBLEMS - REJECTIONS AND TIMINGS

BY LYDIA BENTLEY

1 PURPOSE

This paper aims to support the Code Manager in our initial exploratory work on understanding this Issue by fielding views and opinions from interested REC Parties.

2 BACKGROUND AND SOLUTION

Following a discussion at the REC Issues Group (RIG), the Code Manager is exploring the D0300 rejections process. Where a D0300 Market Message is received by a Supplier containing an alternative proposal for a Switch reading, the receiving Supplier, should they wish to reject this alternative reading, may respond with a further D0300 containing a rejection reason. Whilst the initial D0300 may be rejected due to disagreements about the reading itself, it may also be rejected for "technical" reasons, where the reading is not being queried, but supporting information within the Market Message is incorrect, such as a wrong recipient, or an incorrect format.

It has been suggested that the wording of Schedule 30 – Resoltuon of Consumer Facing Switching & Billing Issues is not sufficiently clear on how D0300 rejections relating to technical reasons are handled. To quote Schedule 30, paragraph 3.7, an escalation may be raised in respect of a D0300 rejection where:

> "*an Energy Supplier is not satisfied with the response received or is otherwise not satisfied with the steps taken to resolve the problem*".

As such, the suggestion given to the Code Manager during the discussion at the RIG is that technical rejections are being escalated unnecessarily. Schedule 30 affords Suppliers the opportunity to escalate where they are not satisfied with the D0300 rejection outcome. However, in the case of D0300 technical rejections, resolution is not possible in that individual instance due to the Market Message containing elements that are fundamentally incompatible with resolution, such as incorrect format.

It is the Code Manager's intention that a technical rejection of a D0300 is the end of the "journey" of that particular instance of the Market Message, and that the issue of the reading itself is raised in a second, separate D0300, following resolution of the technical failure reason in the initial Market Message. However, it is possible that the wording of Schedule 30 implies that technical D0300 failures are escalated, rather than being closed, with a second, corrected D0300 to follow. This potential misrepresentation of the escalation process also makes reliable monitoring of Retail Risk drivers 5.6 and 5.8 harder for the REC Performance Assurance (RPA) function as incidences of genuine escalations are masked by escalations raised due to the aforementioned issue.

3 QUESTIONS FOR THE CHANGE ISSUES GROUP

- Has your organisation encountered issues relating to D0300 rejections?
    - If so, do you have any examples or data to support the Code Manager in our investigation?
- It has been suggested that the wording of Schedule 30 – Resolution of Consumer Facing Switching & Billing Issues is not sufficiently clear enough to enable REC Parties to understand the D0300 rejections process resolution. Do you support this view?
- The Code Manager is considering changes to the PARC to allow better reporting on Retail Risk drivers 5.6 and 5.8 in respect of D0300 rejections.
    - Do you agree with the assessment that existing performance assurance in relation to the above is insufficient?
    - Are you supportive of amendments to the PARC to enhance D0300 rejection performance assurance?