RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

REC ISSUE GROUP
MEETING NOTES

DATE	**08 March 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 no AOB items were raised prior to the meeting, with one further AOB item being raised at this time. Later in the meeting, RIG members noted the following AOB item.

- Lessons Learned Exercise

2 MHHS UPDATE

The RECCo representative provided an overview of the MHHS Update, which can be found on slides 5-7 of the pack here.

A RIG member highlighted that they were struggling with the Energy Market Data Specification, specially around the market messages having fields that aren't populated. They suggested that previously it was advised certain fields weren't changing as a result of MHHS, which is why they haven't been included. The RIG member suggested that it is difficult to know whether certain fields aren't populated because they are missing or if they are not being changed by MHHS. They noted data specifications and market messages are used a lot by industry, therefore it's essential for the requirements to be made clear. The RECCo representative asked the RIG member to include this in their consultation response and from there, RECCo will liaise with the REC Code Manager on how this can be progressed.

Another RIG member noted in the Metering Operations section of the REC, it mentions that DNO's can remove meters, for safety reasons. They elaborated during a previous consultation; it was raised that DNO's do not carry out this work and that the DNO would remove the cut outs, but the MOP would need to replace the meter. They expressed their surprise this statement hadn't been removed. The RECCo representative explained previous responses to consultations will be looked through and worked on with the Code Manager. They advised this specific point would have been taken through the business-

as-usual process, as it wouldn't be impacted by MHHS, and updates will be provided accordingly.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised a meeting paper was circulated to RIG members with the pre-meeting papers, which pulls out key information for parties who are struggling to navigate or understand the MHHS qualification requirements.

A RIG member highlighted they found the Pre-Qualification submission webinar useful, and asked when the qualification documents will be published. The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised this had been published prior to today's meeting and agreed to put a link in the meeting chat, for parties to access.

3 DATA CLEANSE UPDATE

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of the Data Cleanse Update, specifically highlighting three reports.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained that the AR3A report, which considers MTC's in the unrelated range, has seen a small decrease in the pot number. In February 2024, the pot was showing 2,690, this has reduced to 1856. The AR3C report shows unrestricted SSC's with an active relationship flag. They advised there has been a downward trend starting from October 2023, with the pot now showing 623 meters. They noted with the MTC 3A unflagged report, there has been a sharp decline from January 2024, with the pot now showing 1,248.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised that data cleanse sprint two was now live and will be running until 30 August 2024. Parties who are eligible to take part in sprint two, would have receive their report in the REC portal. They advised the snapshot of the data will be taken on 06 September 2024, which will be used to determine parties compliance against the targets set out in the sprint.

4 PARTY ASSURANCE QUARTERLY UPDATE

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of the Party Assurance Quarterly Update, which can be found on slides 10-12 here.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised a meeting paper was circulated to RIG members with the pre-meeting papers, which sets out the Performance Assurance activities which had been carried out in the last quarter.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked if RIG members experienced issues if other parties do not follow the REC Switch Meter Read process. A RIG member commented they do find that parties may not always use the DTN, therefore instead of receiving the D300 or gas flow, the first opportunity they see it will be on SDEP. They highlighted this is a concern,

as it's almost gone straight through to the escalation phase before having the opportunity to action. They elaborated there is no obligation on parties to use the DTN, which can cause problems. They further explained that their system has been set up to complete automatic checks on receipt of the D300 flow, to ensure it passes validation, therefore having to use SDEP for this process causes more work. They mentioned having an alternative to the flow will be beneficial.

Another RIG member asked if Xoserve will be engaged with, in relation to the gas data flows. The Code Manager Lead Analyst confirmed there had been previous engagement with Xoserve, especially in a previous working group held in November 2023.

Another RIG member highlighted it might be beneficial if the reporting was split into the two sets of fuels. The Code Manager Lead Analyst confirmed this feedback will be taken on board.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked RIG members if there are any instance areas where higher rates of domestic objections cause their organisations issues. A RIG member mentioned they have seen instances of this around customer debt. They advised there has been more of an increase of customers wanting to switch Supplier, however it's been objected to due to a balance being outstanding on the customers account. They noted the reporting shows the volume of cases, however it doesn't show the rejection codes as to why the rejection was raised. The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised this feedback will be taken on board and going forward, before issuing any PAT's on this, an investigation will be carried out between the Code Manager and the party to identify the number of objections.

Another RIG member commented their organisation finds it difficult to reconcile their view of losses and objections to what is in the REC reports. They asked if it would be possible to publish more detail around the methodology being used to calculate the REC figures so they replicate the figures. They further elaborated this will help parties investigate discrepancies in the numbers between their reporting and the REC's reporting. The Code Manager Lead Analyst suggested parties access their dashboards on the REC portal, which provides them with MPAN level data to help them with the risk drivers.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked RIG members if there are any reasons that it would not be appropriate for a smart meter installer to provide a demonstration of the equipment they have installed to the customer. A RIG member mentioned it could be more relating to whether the customer remembers the demonstration when the survey is sent out. They noted the customer being spoken to during the survey, could be different to the customer who was on site when the meter was installed. The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised this will be factored in when the figures are being looked into.

The Code Manager representative explained the SMIS survey is important in reflecting the customers experience, to identify if anything needs to change. They mentioned the SMIS survey doesn't cover various options of trying to identify who the customer on site was. They highlighted the plan is to work out whether the SMIS survey needs to be improved, or if another type of survey needs to be implemented. They advised this will be investigated, with the minimum solution being the SMIS survey is updated to be made more sense.

5 ERRONEOUS SWITCH RESOLUTION PROCESS DISCUSSION

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of the Erroneous Switch Resolution Process, which can be found on slides 14-15 here. The aim of this discussion was for RIG members to highlight any concerns with REC Schedule 30 and how the code is written. Following any feedback, these issues will be explored to identify if any additional guidance was required to better explain how parties should interact with one another.

Several RIG members agreed to discuss this with their internal teams and feedback to the Code Manager over the next two weeks. Potential changes will be presented to RIG in April.

A RIG member raised a concern around the Erroneous Switching reporting and the data available in the risk driver. They mentioned they had received inquiries from the PAB, and their view of their Erroneous Switching performance is different to what's being recorded under the REC. They noted alongside this piece of work, the reporting needs to be updated to give a true reflection of the customer journey. The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised changing the way the REC is written will lead to PAB being able to develop the risk drivers. They elaborated the disputed reads process is written into Schedule 30, with the risk drivers being written off the back of it, however Schedule 30 misses several nuances of the process.

Another RIG member noted the two-day timeframe written into the REC around an erroneous switch loss, doesn't give parties enough time to investigate with the customer. The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained this fed into the derogation put into place previously, around extending that timeframe. They commented the proposal was to extend the timeframes all to eight working days, as it doesn't disadvantage the customer to take more time with the investigation. They mentioned the disadvantage to the customer is the party sending an incorrect objection, just to ensure the obligation is met and then having to go through the process anyway.

Another RIG member asked if a good test of the rules in CFSP Schedule, would be to delete certain rules and identify the impact on the customer and look at the underlying causes

of what feeds into the ET process. The Code Manager Lead Analyst agreed to take this feedback on board, and it will form part of the investigation.

Another RIG member explained they would be supportive of removing the prohibition on suppliers using robots on EES. They noted the need to interrogate the rationale for that prohibition being put in place. The Code Manager Lead Analyst highlighted it might be easier to have an agreement top use a bot to operate on SDEP to close cases, rather than allowing a bot to use EES individually. They elaborated it could be helpful to parties to allow a bot to run overnight to pull out any new SDEP cases, provide them in a worksheet and allocate to their internal teams. The RIG member confirmed they would be supportive of this approach.

Another RIG member commented whether a bot should have it's own login details to EES. They mentioned if it should, it then becomes subject to the daily caps of how many things it could do, to ensure it doesn't overload the system. The Code Manager Lead Analyst mentioned potentially having to make the bots operate at human speed, however all of this can be developed in future.

Another RIG member highlighted these would need to be raised as separate changes, to ensure one isn't prevented from being implemented because of the other.

6 R0147 – PREPAYMENT LEVELISATION UPDATE

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of R0147 – Prepayment Levelisation Update, which can be found on slide 17 here.

No comments were raised on this agenda item.

7 HOW DOES THE REC MANAGE RGMA WITH REGARDS TO IGT PARTIES

The RIG member mentioned after looking at the RGMA baseline data under the REC, it doesn't seem IGT's are a party to the RGMA. They elaborated they have looked at the IGT UNC space, and there is a specific IGT RGMA guidance document, however it states it's not governed by a party or a binding contract. They asked how or who governs IGT RGMA activity.

Another RIG member mentioned in the Metering Operations Schedule, there is a list of parties who mandatorily adhere to it, and gas transporters are on the list. They asked if the definition of gas transporters under the REC encompass IGT's. The Chair advised IGT's are parties to the REC, therefore the rules in the REC do apply to them. They commented there are inconsistencies between the IGT UNC and the REC, which have been discussed

and are in the process of being worked through. They asked for specific areas of concern to be raised and will be progressed as a RIG issue.

8 CSS/MPRS ALIGNMENT ISSUES

The RIG member noted they have seen instances of CSS and MPRS being misaligned as to who the Supplier is for a particular MPAN. They highlighted when a cancel switch request is submitted close to gate closure, and the secured, inactive and cancelled registration status change notifications come through at the same time, CSS and MPAS seem to misalign. They explained CSS will show the MPAN with the old Supplier, while MPAS will show the new Supplier. They commented neither CSS nor MPAS are prepared to take responsibility of the issue.

Another RIG member asked how they became aware of the issue, as this could potentially help with understanding if it's a big issue in the industry. The RIG member commented they have seen instances where the Supplier for an MPAN on EES is not the Supplier they thought it was.

Another RIG member asked whether the REC could potentially obtain a data request to identify the extent of this issue. The Chair confirmed this will be investigated and asked if any examples can be provided to help with the investigations.

9 UPDATING ESME ID

The RIG member provided an overview of Updating ESME ID, which can be found on slides 21-22 of the pack here.

Another RIG member mentioned for scenario one, there will be multiple D0312's being sent, one to remove the meter and then another one to install the meter at the correct property. They asked if the party were waiting to send the second D0312, until they have had the first D0312 accepted. The raiser confirmed this was the case, and they are also sending the second D0312 a period of time after to try and rectify, however they are still experiencing the same issue. The RIG member noted this seemed like an MPAS issue, if the party had received an acceptance that the meter has been taken off, at the point the ESME ID should disappear. They elaborated following that, the party should be able to send another D0312 with the same ESME ID.

Another RIG member advised updating the ESME ID is a time-consuming process and needs to be looked at, with a view of making it better.

The Chair noted the need to understand the extent this issue was causing parties, and then an investigation can be carried out to work on a solution. They mentioned RIG members can feedback to their OAM.

The RECCo representative noted this was discussed as part of the MHHS data cleanse, where a number of parties raised this as a concern. They noted the need to understand whether this is an SMRS issue, rather than an ERDS issue. They highlighted this looked to be affecting the metering side, not the registration data. They elaborated any solution for this may well be under the BSC remit, rather than the REC.

10 AOB

10A LESSONS LEARNED EXERCISES

A RIG member raised a general point around lessons learned exercises. They mentioned as part of the metering working group, there were previous discussions around how long it was taking to progress change proposals under the REC. They noted a key part of the critical friend process was ensuring due diligence is done to help propose change to the code. They asked if a lessons learned had been completed around workload and how a backlog of work will be managed in the future.

The Code Manager representative highlighted a task force team was set up in the REC change team, to look at the backlog of changes and identify how to progress with them. They advised a change improvement project has also been run alongside, to work on all of the areas associated to change. They elaborated a new Change Schedule will be published soon.

No further business was raised. The chair thanked attendees for their input and closed the meeting.