RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

SPECIAL REC ISSUES GROUP – SDEP CHANGE PROPOSALS
MEETING NOTES

DATE	**18 August 2023, 10:00**
LOCATION	**By teleconference**

1 INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed attendees to this special meeting of the REC Issues Group (RIG), which was arranged to consider the group of open Change Proposals that relate to SDEP.

The Chair confirmed the agenda, asking for Any Other Business (AOB) to be raised at this time. The Chair highlighted that no AOB items were raised prior to the meeting, with no further AOB items being raised at this time.

2 SDEP REVIEW BACKGROUND

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of the SDEP Review Background, which can be found on slide 3 of the pack here. No comments were raised by RIG members at this time.

3 R0121 – SDEP USAGE AND PROCESS TYPES

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of R0121 – SDEP Usage and Process Types, which can be found on slides 5-21 of the pack here.

General Query Process

The first part of this discussion was around the Contract Manager general query process and RIG members were invited to provide feedback.

A RIG member noted they have previously used the Contract Manager process for general flow formatting queries, but now the FRS data cleanse has been re-labelled as a general data issue case, they predominantly use that process. They elaborated that this takes the workload off the Contract Manager.

Another RIG member highlighted they find that occasionally this process is used as default, due to parties not knowing where to raise the query. They elaborated that this makes it difficult to ascertain what the query is, without opening it. The RIG member

noted it would make things easier if the queries weren't titled Contract Manager, and it specifically stated whether it was a meter exchange or disputed read. This will give users an idea of the type of query which has been raised, which will save time in looking through and then having to re-allocate cases to the right team to address them. Several RIG members agreed with this point raised.

Another RIG member advised that when managing the Contract Manager queue, they notice escalations are being raised with just the SDEP reference. They elaborated that not all Contract Managers will have access to SDEP, due to the difficulty of assigning process types. It would be useful if further information was provided. If a Contract Manager isn't assigned every process type, they can't search on that, as it won't return any data. Several RIG members noted that if a Contract Manager is assigned all the process types, then the list of cases becomes unmanageable. They noted that assigning all process types slows SDEP down.

Another RIG member highlighted the majority of their escalations are received by email, with a quoted SDEP reference. They asked what the relationship is between SDEP and the Operational Contacts list, and which takes precedence in terms of escalations. The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised SDEP is used when personal data of consumers needs to be exchanged, and there is no other secure route of doing so. Any communication exchanges not involving personal data can be completed using the Operational Contacts list.

Another RIG member mentioned when they are assigned SDEP cases as the Contract Manager, they don't want to assign them to another user, but other users can't view them, unless they are given access as an owner. They elaborated that it would be beneficial for users to be able to view cases, but not necessarily be assigned to them. The RIG member noted they need to export the information to give to another SDEP user, or provide them with access to Contract Manager escalations. This presents a risk, as the case is assigned to them, instead of the Contract Manager.

Another RIG member highlighted they have had to move away slightly from the Operational Contacts list, as it generates a high volume of emails. They elaborated that they are proactively asking other Suppliers to raise cases as a Contract Manager escalation through the two queues. This enables key personnel in the business to be allocated to these queues, who then work on them. The RIG member confirmed this has been working well, as this gives other Suppliers visibility of the progress.

Another RIG member mentioned a MPAN is classed as personal data, therefore nothing meaningful can be communicated outside of SDEP. They elaborated that SDEP was introduced, due to be it being secure, auditable and everything is in the one place. They further elaborated that email address lists don't then need to be maintained. If they want to communicate with another Supplier, they can send it through SDEP, and know it's

received. The RIG member advised in certain situations, where they haven't received a response from the Contract Manager for a period of time, they will then use the Operational Contacts list. They highlighted that when using SDEP, the Contract Manager has the ability to filter by only Contract Manager cases. This enables Contract Managers to ignore particular cases, but have access to them if needed.

Another RIG member mentioned they use the filter on SDEP every day, which helps with the volumes of cases received. They elaborated that, when the initial REC Consultations were issued on escalations, they were against the removal of one of the escalation levels. With this escalation level being removed, it meant queries go much faster through the Operational teams to the Contract Manager and it is slightly harder to manage these types of cases. The RIG member mentioned they have considered raising a Change Proposal, but it depends on member feedback as to whether they would find it useful. Another RIG member noted that the escalation level wasn't removed, it was turned into a Code Manager escalation. They elaborated the Code Manager isn't resourced to chase parties for individual escalation levels, therefore this is an issue. They confirmed this escalation is not being used by Suppliers, as it is only used by the REC Performance Assurance team to log and use for their review of parties' performance.

Another RIG member commented that within the original process type, there is an escalation route using a bell icon. They elaborated that they receive several Contract Manager escalations without that escalation step being used in the first instance. This would change the case from Amber to Red, when it reaches final escalation.

Another RIG member noted that SDEP will take an escalation and convert it into a Contract Manager case. They elaborated that this may assist the Contract Manager, as it will provide them with all the information they require, to help them resolve an SDEP case.

No further comments were raised on the Contract Manager general query process. The Chair thanked attendees for their input on this discussion.

REC Documentation

The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked RIG members if they had any thoughts on how it could be made more explicit in REC Documentation how and when Process Types should be used in SDEP. A RIG member mentioned it might be a better consumer experience, if any guidance documents on how to use SDEP can be found in the system itself. They elaborated there could be a download function, which enables users to access the guidance documents. Currently, you need a REC portal account to access SDEP documentation, and parties may not want every member of staff to have a REC portal account to allow them to access the guidance document. Several RIG members agreed with this point raised.

The next question the Code Manager Lead Analyst asked RIG members, was their preference on where to hold the additional detail.

A RIG member noted the SDEP guidance didn't need to be any different to any other REC process. They elaborated that the Schedule could reflect that instead of sending a data flow to a Supplier, a message will be sent through SDEP. It's a process that isn't going to change frequently, if at all, meaning updating the Schedule will provide clarity to all parties. Several RIG members agreed with this point raised.

Another RIG member highlighted their preference would be for the user guide to be updated with the guidance, rather than creating another document.

Another RIG member mentioned the user guide can provide examples of the particular scenarios. They elaborated that it's important to have a REC Schedule and a user guide, but their preference would be to hold the additional detail in the Schedule.

General Queries and Escalations

The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked RIG members if they have experienced the scenario of an escalation being raised which follows on directly from a general query.

A RIG member noted several of their escalations move from general query to escalation, usually due to the case not being responded to within the SLA. They elaborated that other cases they receive may be invalid, due to the incorrect process type being used. The teams who are being assigned the process type are unable to answer the query. The RIG member mentioned it could be useful if these cases would be flagged as invalid. Another RIG member noted that when they receive a SDEP case with the incorrect process type, they respond to the sender noting the case has been raised incorrectly and ask the Supplier to raise the case again, with the correct process type, then archive the query.

Another RIG member noted if a disputed read is raised and a rejection is received, the Supplier wouldn't immediately send an escalation, without trying to ascertain further information. They elaborated that they would send a general query, to discuss it in further detail, but if the other Supplier hasn't responded within the SLA, they would then raise an escalation.

Another RIG member mentioned that most general queries do not have an SLA, and until they have an SLA, you cannot go from general query to escalation. They elaborated that there is no obligation to answer a general query in a certain amount of time.

Another RIG member advised that there will be instances when a Supplier has raised a general query and they won't receive a response. Following on from that, the Supplier will raise an escalation and if they don't receive a response within the SLA, they will raise it as a Contract Manager query. They elaborated that this causes issues, whereby there are 3 live cases and there is uncertainty around which case the Supplier will use to add in the

extra information. It was noted that there's no obligation in the Schedule to respond to General Queries.

Another RIG member highlighted that in addition to defining changes to SDEP, this could potentially result in consequential changes to the REC. They elaborated that if the system is going to change, there will need to be context added into the codified Schedule. The Code Manager Lead Analyst agreed that some of the terminology may need to be updated in the REC Schedule.

Another RIG member asked if there is a way of adding a note on to a SDEP case. They elaborated that in scenarios where a case has been opened due to limited information, they will need to notify the other Supplier that the case has been raised incorrectly. They further elaborated it would be useful to then mark the case as unread. The Code Manager Lead Analyst noted a recommendation has been raised, with regards to setting up a list of statuses, including returning cases as unread, which will be progressed. The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked if this would be used to flag internally that the case might be for a colleague, or to send back to the Supplier who raised the case advising them the case has been raised incorrectly. The RIG member advised if a SDEP case is raised with the incorrect process type, they would put a note on the case advising it's been raised incorrectly. They elaborated they would inform the Supplier they have archived the case and it's up to the Supplier to raise a new case with the correct process type.

One attendee suggested that if a D0300 had been rejected several times, a note could go into that data flow stating that an SDEP query had been raised, as a way of stopping the D0300 / rejection loop. A RIG member noted that Suppliers shouldn't need to send a data flow to let other Suppliers know an SDEP case has been raised. They elaborated that this could potentially impact Suppliers and Data Collectors. Another RIG member advised that several Suppliers have closed down their phone lines, meaning data flows might be required to contact other Suppliers to let them know an SDEP case has been raised for them. It was noted that it is a requirement for Suppliers to have a phone line available for certain queries, this forms part of the CFSB Schedule.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst noted the need to investigate how to avoid duplicating information for the same issue, or to link them, across a general query and escalation.

Data Retention

The next question the Code Manager Lead Analyst asked RIG members was, does losing the attachments to SDEP Communications which have been deleted cause a negative impact on them. A RIG member highlighted this doesn't cause a data retention issue, however when a query hasn't been responded to, it causes a query resolution issue.

3.1 NEW PROCESS TYPES

3.1.1 ADDITIONAL PROCESS TYPE – MISSING READ

The Code Manager Lead Analyst noted that currently there is not a dedicated process type for missing reads. The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked what are the processes and scenarios that are currently triggering missing reads.

A RIG member noted in electricity, there are missing and disputed read flows. They elaborated that both contain a code which differentiates between the two, which enables parties to deal with them. The purpose of this was to split the SDEP case into two halves. The RIG member advised under the MRA, there used to be MAP08, which would have been transitioned to REC Schedule 30, to cover both processes.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst noted if this will sit on the D300 flow, there would be SLAs and an obligation on Suppliers to send.

A RIG member mentioned there shouldn't be a separate use case, a flag could be added within the new case to indicate if it's a disputed or a missing read. Another RIG member disagreed with this suggestion. They elaborated that if there is just a flag within the case that differentiates them, there would be no way of splitting that queue to direct the two scenarios to different teams, therefore it needs to be two separate Process Types.

3.1.2 ADDITIONAL PROCESS TYPE – MULTIPLE SUPPLIER REPORT

The next question the Code Manager Lead Analyst asked RIG members was, how often do parties raise queries on Multiple Supplier Reports (MSRs) and how they are raised currently.

A RIG member mentioned they would have to check with their internal misdirected payments team. They elaborated that these cases are not visible in the Contract Manager queue, therefore the assumption is they are raised on the misdirected payments process type queue within SDEP.

Another RIG member highlighted the volumes are not high with these cases, however they are received through the MDP query route and are handled by a dedicated team. The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked if escalations are being raised for MSRs. The RIG member advised that MSRs do not carry a specific SLA, but are handled in a timely manner, to avoid escalations.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked if MSRs should be separate process types. RIG members mentioned their keenness on having separate process types for MSRs.

3.1.3 ADDITIONAL PROCESS TYPE – ADDRESS MANAGEMENT

A RIG member highlighted it might be useful to have an escalation route for address management. They elaborated that the scenario for an escalation could be, if they want to agree a specific date with another Supplier to co-ordinate an address amendment, but the

other Supplier misses that date as the General Query has not yet been reviewed. It could be a case of agreeing on why the escalation route needs to be introduced. The RIG member mentioned the query might be responded to within the SLA, but it might take a longer period of time to agree a date and conclude.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised the process isn't currently in the CFSB Schedule, which means any escalation would be to be separately provided for. They elaborated they might bring it back to the group and try to ascertain a cost benefit analysis.

3.1.4 ADDITIONAL PROCESS TYPE – THEFT

A RIG member advised they currently receive instances of theft process types through a dedicated mailbox, however using the portal would provide increased security. They elaborated that it would potentially help with the standardisation of the information being received, with DNO pictures becoming more common, this will facilitate the data sharing.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked parties to liaise internally and provide further feedback on whether a theft process type in SDEP would help assist engagement and issue resolution.

Action: RIG members to provide further feedback on whether a theft process type in SDEP would help engagement and issue resolution.

3.1.5 ADDITIONAL PROCESS TYPE – CROSSED METERS (DNO)

A RIG member highlighted they think the DNOs should be given access to the Crossed Meter Resolution Portal, which will allow them to check if a particular (potential) crossed meter instance had already been discovered. They elaborated that this would mean that DNOs won't be raising SDEP cases unnecessarily. If the DNOs can't find the information in the crossed meters portal, they can raise SDEP cases to Suppliers accordingly. Several RIG members agreed with this approach.

Another RIG member asked if there is a DNO Operational Contact list available for parties to access. The Code Manager confirmed there is a DNO-MEM Operational Contact list available on the REC Metering Hub on the REC portal.

Action: The Code Manager to share a link to the DNO-MEM Operational Contact list on the REC Metering Hub.

Another RIG member noted this could be an opportunity to help the DNOs understand what a true crossed meter issue is. They elaborated that there are occasions whereby they are sent queries which aren't true crossed meter issues. It might be useful if DNOs and Suppliers work together to build guidance to support them with crossed meters, in addition to DNOs gaining access to the crossed meters portal.

A RIG member noted they wouldn't want their joiners and engineers to have access to update the crossed meters portal. They elaborated that they haven't been closely involved with smart meters for a long time. The preferred option would be for the engineer to call the office and report from site, rather than them going into the office and updating the information held on the crossed meters portal. Another RIG member highlighted DNOs having access to the portal wouldn't replace phone calls, it would just be another method of communication.

Another RIG member mentioned the scenario they have experience of with crossed meters is, when a customer contacts them and notes they are in dispute with a Supplier over an address update. They elaborated that after investigating, they identify there is an issue with either a duplicate address, or with the meter on site. The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked the DNO RIG members what their thoughts were on having direct access to a system to report that for investigation. DNO RIG members confirmed it would be useful to have access, as it would provide them with the relevant information to help them in conversations with the customer.

Another RIG member advised raising escalations by telephone is an immediate source of communication, but there is no audit trail. The Code Manager Lead Analyst noted currently, these types of disputes can only be raised by telephone, as this is the way the REC was written.

3.1.6 ADDITIONAL PROCESS TYPE – MISSING MTDS

A RIG member noted the missing MTDs should be more of a MEM to MEM query in SDEP. They elaborated that the proposed solution intends to require Suppliers to raise it with one another, for them to go to their losing MEM to confirm it back via SDEP. They confirmed they didn't agree with the proposed solution for the missing MTDs process type, as the failure point was with the MEM.

Another RIG member asked if this would disappear when Market Wide Half Hourly (MHHS) is introduced. The Code Manager Lead Analyst confirmed this was the case for a large part of the market, therefore this process type might have a limited life span. The RIG member mentioned there will be a data cleanse undertaken on missing MTDs, which will help start MHHS on a relatively clean slate.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked RIG members what the best approach is for obtaining a MTD, if they are not received as part of the D0170. A RIG member confirmed usually the MEM teams would phone the old MEM to establish the MTD. They elaborated that if that doesn't work, they will arrange a site visit at the property.

3.1.7 ADDITIONAL PROCESS TYPE – SMART METERING COMMUNICATION ISSUES

A RIG member mentioned under MHHS, the system will enforce that it's the same MEM and Data Service Provider for both MPANs. They elaborated that it would just be the one party looking after the meter. Another RIG member highlighted that BSC Modification P459 has been raised to enable different agents to be appointed to smart meters, for import/export.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst thanked RIG members for their input and asked them to contact the Code Manager for any further thoughts.

4 PROGRESSION OF SDEP CHANGE PROPOSALS

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of the progression of SDEP Change Proposals, which can be found on slides 23-25 of the pack here.

A RIG member noted that with regard to R0124 (SDEP Review Improvements (4) – Reporting), a workshop had previously been held and various suggestions were made on how the reporting could be enhanced. They asked if the intention was to hold another workshop. The Code Manager Lead Analyst confirmed that this will potentially be discussed at other RIG meetings, where parties will be engaged with and able to provide feedback.

Another RIG member asked if they wanted to propose that MEMs are provided with access to SDEP, would they need to raise a Change Proposal. The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised that was discussed as an aspect of the solution for R0006. They elaborated that the proposer didn't agree with that approach. It's likely that R0006 will be withdrawn and the Supplier solution, which is favoured by the proposer, will be incorporated into R0121. The solution to R0006 could then be adopted by another proposer, if they were still in favour of progressing that with the MEM solution. The RIG member confirmed they will wait for R0006 to be withdrawn and then adopt it.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst mentioned that RIG members can contact the REC Change Team to ask questions or provide feedback on the SDEP Change Proposals.

The Chair thanked attendees for their input on the discussions and closed the meeting.