RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

REC ISSUE GROUP
MEETING NOTES

DATE	**12 January 2024, 10:00**
LOCATION	**By teleconference**

1 INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting of the REC Issue Group (RIG).

The Chair confirmed the agenda, asking for Any Other Business (AOB) to be raised at this time. The Chair highlighted that five AOB items was raised prior to the meeting, with three further AOB items being raised at this time. Later in the session, RIG members noted the following AOB items for discussion:

- D0189 Flow – Data Item DI50274/J0554 Total Debt
- Access to SDEP – GT's
- Installer Skills and Competencies for Comms Hub Only Exchange Activity
- PPM Levelisation
- Market Share Target
- Proposed Changes to the Theft Detection Incentive Scheme
- R0082 – Formalising the Submission of PPMIP Unallocated Transaction Report Files
- R0155 – Change of Tenancy

2 DATA CLEANSE UPDATE

2A DATA CLEANSE SPRINT UPDATE

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an update on the Data Cleanse sprint, which can be found on slides 6 and 7 of the pack here.

The reports to be included in Data Sprint 2 were discussed, with some members questioning the appropriateness of considering some MTC related reports.

The Code Manager representative explained that these reports had been suggested by the MHHS project as the REC has been identified as the better vehicle for Data Cleanse in these areas.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked if any RIG members were interested proposing reports to be included in future sprints, they can contact their OAM.

3 R0037 – PREPAYMENT CREDIT BALANCE & DEBT TRANSFER PROCESS

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an update on R0037 – Prepayment Credit Balance & Debt Transfer Process, which can be found on slides 10-14 of the pack here.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst noted conversations had taken place with Ofgem, and they could see the benefit in it mirroring the DAP threshold. They elaborated the wording being used would be that it mirrors the DAP threshold in the license, the figure wouldn't be written. They further elaborated if the threshold changes, this means a separate change wouldn't need to be raised.

A RIG member asked if ET's are not being proposed to go through the pass back process, how would the credit be passed back through. The Code Manager explained that if a Supplier loses a customer via an ET, the ET is completed via a registration so this process will be triggered again so all balances will move back to the losing supplier. The Code Manager Lead Analyst highlighted this will be included in the legal text.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked RIG members what process they think should be followed if the customer has more than £500 credit on their meter. A RIG member noted leaving money on a meter would achieve Ofgem's objective. They elaborated a particular amount could be left on the meter, and then the customer will receive the leftover balance via their final bill/

A RIG member raised a point around the adjustment of the customers meter balance. They explained that the adjustment messages haven't been used very successfully in the past. They further elaborated the adjustment messages were used for the EBSS amount, but they were used multiple times by the DCC, and this resulted in adjustments happening more than once. The RIG member expressed their concern around a Supplier adjusting the customers balance, at the time they are about to lose control of the meter.

Another RIG member commented the limit needs to be set high enough to cover the standard changes a customer receives. They noted if a customer is changing Supplier with more than £500 on their meter, it will be more of an anomaly, rather than standard.

4 R0109 – ALIGNING ELECTRICITY AND GAS TIMESCALES REQUIRMENTS FOR SHARING METER TECHNICAL DETAIL INFORMATION

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an update on R0109 – Aligning Electricity and Gas Timescales Requirements for Sharing Meter Technical Detail Information, which can be found on slide 16 of the pack here.

A RIG member mentioned that going forward, a lot of smart meter information will not be relying on the D0149 and D0150 flows. They elaborated other data flows will be more important and relied upon under MHHS. The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised that's why the question around whether to progress with this now or wait until MHHS has been implemented has been included in the RFI. The RIG member commented as things shift to smart and different flows will be implemented, this becomes slightly redundant. They elaborated the preference would be to wait until MHHS has been implemented, before clarifying if this can be progressed.

Another RIG member highlighted there were no change documents relating to this on the REC portal. The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised they will investigate this and ensure the change documents relating to this change are uploaded to the portal quickly.

Action: The Code Manager to upload the change documents relating to R0109 to the REC portal.

Another RIG member asked if the equivalent process for gas is 2 working days, rather than the 3 working days specified.

Action: The Code Manager to confirm whether the equivalent process for gas is 2 or 3 working days.

5 R0157 – REMOVAL OF A FAX AS A CODE COMMUNICATION METHOD

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an update on R0157 – Removal of a Fax as a Code Communication Method, which can be found on slide 18 of the pack here.

A RIG member mentioned there are a few data items which are classed as personal data, and therefore cannot be shared by email. They elaborated the REC documents will need to be checked to confirm if they refer to sending personal data by fax.

Action: The Code Manager to investigate if the REC refers to sending personal data by fax.

No further comments were raised on this agenda item.

6 AOB

6.1 D0189 FLOW – DATA ITEM DI50274/J0554 TOTAL DEBT

The RIG member provided an overview of D0189 Flow – Data Item DI50274/J0554 Total Debt, which can be found on slides 21-23 of the pack here.

The Code Manager representative mentioned this is one of the data items being used to build the new flows for R0037. They elaborated it would be beneficial to have a definitive answer on this, as the assumption is this is a positive total debt.

The Chair confirmed this will be re-visited at the next RIG meeting, giving members the opportunity to feedback once they have been spoken to their internal teams.

Action: The Code Manager to speak to the PPMF and see if they can raise this at their next meeting.

6.2 ACCESS TO SDEP – GT'S

The RIG member asked if there was any historical reason why Gas Transporters do not have access to SDEP. They further asked if RIG members would have any objections if a change proposal is raised, to allow GT's to have access to SDEP. They advised it would be easier for GT's to upload any photos and ask any queries using SDEP, rather than the traditional email approach.

The Code Manager representative explained it was developed under the MRA previously that GT's shouldn't have access to EES, which in turn means they can't access SDEP. They elaborated this could be added to RECCo's forward work plan, as this isn't the first time it's been raised, with concerns around how the data is being shared. They further elaborated this could help with Performance Assurance, if they are not receiving responses from their queries, they've got evidence of what's been sent and how it's been left unanswered.

Another RIG member mentioned gas Suppliers have access to SDEP crossed meters. They elaborated if GT's have access to that too, they can be looped in on any information they may require. They further elaborated there might be a solution, whereby GT's can have access to SDEP, without having access to EES.

The Chair agreed to ask the EES Service Provider on how easily this change could be implemented in EES and SDEP. The Chair confirmed they will feedback to the RIG member and then decide on how best to progress with this.

6.3 INSTALLER SKILLS AND COMPETENCIES FOR COMMS HUB ONLY EXCHANGE ACTIVITY

The RIG member provided an overview of Installer Skills and Competencies for Comms Hub Only Exchange Activity.

The RIG member advised to use fully skilled meter installers for this work will incur a significant cost. They explained the expectation is to use a workforce who aren't necessarily fully skilled or fully competent, in terms of qualifications. They advised the

key from a REC perspective, is around the competencies and skills of the workforce that Suppliers may want to use, in order to carry out Comms hub Only Exchange Activity. They elaborated when carrying out this work, there is no requirement to pull the cutout fuse.

A RIG member asked if Elexon have been liaised with. They advised a lot of the rules around who can or can't work on a meter sits under Elexon and under settlement. They mentioned it would be beneficial to contact Elexon and ask them if they are happy with this approach.

Another RIG member highlighted if this was to be codified, it could sit under the CoMCoP. They noted an end-to-end review is currently taking place on it, and if a change proposal is required, it can be included as part of that. They elaborated a Working Group starts on 15 January 2024, running until October 2024 and this will be a good place for it to be discussed.

Another RIG member mentioned issues have been occurring around CHF replacement, specifically the sending of the DCC commands. They explained although the physical part of this work may seem straight forward, issues are occurring from engineers who work with smart meters. They noted the need to ensure the right people are working on this and carrying out the work properly.

The RIG member advised the expectation is the agents carrying out this work are a contractor of the relevant Supplier. They noted the need to understand the impact and requirements, with the ideal way of this being through the CoMCoP process.

Another RIG member highlighted DCUSA may need to add something to their CODE around this, specifically specifying all aspects and who the work can be carried out by. They mentioned some Suppliers may want to use fully qualified MEM's to carry out this work.

The Chair explained the meeting paper covering this agenda item is available on the REC portal here and any comments or questions can be sent directly to jason.stevens@engage-consulting.co.uk.

6.4 PPM LEVELISATION

The RECCo representative provided an overview of PPM Levelisation, which can be found on slides 27 and 28 of the pack here.

The RECCo representative explained a survey would be issued soon in which Parties would be able to signal their readiness for the introduction PPM.

No other comments were raised on this item.

6.5 MARKET SHARE TARGET

The RIG member asked what the REC considers as a reasonable percentage against the market. They noted in an ideal world the volumes in each report will be zero, however that isn't achievable. The Code Manager representative explained the reports included in the sprint are the number one priority. They elaborated there isn't a specific target number, it's just ensuring that no massive spikes are identified in any of the pots, and seeing a general downward trend over time in the other pots.

6.6 PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE THEFT DETECTION INCENTIVE SCHEME

The RECCo representative provided an overview of the Proposed Changes to the Theft Detection Incentive Scheme, which can be found on slides 30-33 of the pack here.

A RIG member commented there needs to be a wide review of the theft process and how theft can be tackled going forward. They mentioned it goes further than setting targets, a really large-scale review at a holistic level needs to happen. The RECCo representative confirmed a piece of work is being carried out to identify the feasibility of having a dedicated police unit, specifically looking at energy related theft. They elaborated the end-to-end processes on theft are also being investigated, to address any gaps or provide additional guidance. They further elaborated there are a range of initiatives in progress that will be set out on the Forward Work Plan and in separate theft documentation.

6.7 R0082 – FORMALISING THE SUBMISSION OF PPMIP UNALLOCATED TRANSACTION REPORT FILES

The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised a recommendation has been made to add the additional items into the PPM Unallocated Transaction report files. They explained PPMIP's have been notified and the only thing left is to agree on an implementation date. They elaborated a Impact Assessment will be issued shortly, with a variety of different of dates for parties to choose from.

No comments were raised on R0082 by RIG members.

6.8 R0155 – CHANGE OF TENANCY

The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised a number of workshops have been arranged for R0155, which is relating to the non-domestic Change of Tenancy process. They mentioned the Supplier only workshop has been arranged for 25 January 2024, with a TPI only workshop arranged for 01 February 2024.

No further business was discussed. The Chair thanked members for their input and closed the meeting.

The next meeting is scheduled for 09 February.