RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

REC CHANGE ISSUES GROUP
I0200 WORKGROUP MEETING MINUTES

MEETING	**RECCHIG_24_20001**
DATE	**07 November 2024, 11:30**
LOCATION	**By teleconference**

Presenter	Representing	Initials	Role
Andy Knowles	REC Code Manager	AK	Chair
Lorna Mallon	REC Code Manager	LM	Subject Matter Expert
Andrew Waghorn	REC Code Manager	AW	Performance Assurance 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) I0200 Workgroup meeting.

2. CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA

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

3. I0200 – IMPROVING ADDRESS MANAGEMENT TARGETS

LM reminded the group that setting up a separate workgroup for I0200 had been suggested by attendees of the September CIG meeting. LM advised that this first meeting would focus on enhancing the initial roadmap provided to attendees, with each subsequent meeting potentially focusing on developing each element of this roadmap.

AW presented to attendees an overview of the issue, including the main impacts and problem statement. AW advised that the next step would be trying to understand which organisation(s) would be best placed to tackle specific address challenges, such as identifying issues during switching or connection/metering. AW requested feedback from attendees on this, including if any organisations or scenarios had been omitted by the Code Manager.

A DCC representative asked about existing address management targets, specifying an SLA on address quality for the DCC. AW responded that they believed it was in the address matching plan, not specified in Code. AW advised that the address matching plan had been successful in increasing the quality of address matching but suggested that other measures or scenarios should now be considered to further reduce the number of unmatched addresses.

A Utility Consultant representative advised that it was estimated that 30-40% of their customers have incorrect addresses which causes issues, such as the customers being given contracts with these incorrect addresses or these switches being delayed trying to correct the address. They suggested the creation of a mechanism which would allow easier access between Suppliers and customers to fix these individual address problems at a quicker rate. The Utility Consultant representative added that a lot of these incorrect addresses are mismatched to a different incorrect address rather than unmatched. AW responded that mismatched addresses would not be included within the 2.8 million unmatched addresses and advised that adopting further measures could help set targets to reduce mismatched addresses.

An Xoserve representative advised that for mismatched addresses, the Retail Energy Location (REL) will not be able to move to the correct address unless the Meter Point Location (MPL) is correct. They added that the Code Manager will need to determine whether the Change will extend to amending both MPL and REL processes. Some attendees advised that they are able to update MPLs for customers using currently available mechanisms.

An Xoserve representative advised that they believed customers are not as reliant on REL as the REC would infer. The Chair asked whether this should be the main focus of the workgroup. LM and AW responded that I0200 was initially raised to improve the quality of matching through improvements to REL but that other targets may need to also be added into Code to further reduce the number of unmatched addresses.

LM and AW presented several steps that could be taken to reduce the number of unmatched addresses in the short and medium term, including identifying and marking addresses that will never match, or validating addresses that are correct but still do not “match”. They also mentioned defining timelines or SLAs for updating addresses following an issue being raised, and identifying the organisations to place these timelines on.

AW advised that longer term solutions are also being considered, such as improving the data process for addresses, including providing better information on the Electricity and Gas Enquiry Services (EES and GES) which would make it easier for organisations to track and respond to flagged address items

Attendees also highlighted issues they had found with different address matching databases, in particular certain commercial buildings. LM asked if the Ordnance Survey (OS) is ever incorrect and if so, what are the processes for managing that. A DNO representative advised that issues can arise but they have an address management software in place to check against any changes in UPRNs, although there is no set process or timeline for OS to update these addresses. AW suggested that establishing a timeline for these type of address issues to be solved will reduce the number of unmatched addresses.

A Supplier representative advised that having an address history should be considered as part of the solution. LM responded that having this information available to the appropriate party on EES/GES could help to resolve address issues quicker but noted that this would be a long term solution and had been raised at CIG as part of the I0172 discussions.

A Supplier representative suggested that timelines or SLAs could also be adopted for new connections and resolving any address issues that arise. AW agreed that a cycle time for resolution for new connections issues would be useful.

Next Steps

LM advised that they would look further into the short and medium term options presented at this meeting and would aim to delve into these further at the next meeting, for which the date will be confirmed later. LM and a DCC representative agreed to speak offline about the DCC providing information to the Code Manager to assist with this. LM confirmed that this issue will be kept separate from the main CIG meetings.

4. AOB

The Chair invited attendees to provide AOB. None was raised and the meeting was closed.