RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

REC ISSUE GROUP
MEETING NOTES

DATE	**12 April 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 three AOB items were raised prior to the meeting, with two further AOB items being raised at this time. Later in the meeting, RIG members noted the following AOB items.

- Data Cleanse
- RIG Attendance
- Energisation Status Updates
- Rebranding of the RIG
- MHHS Code Freeze

2 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 with the AR3A report, which is looking at MTC's in the unrelated range, there has been a slight increase from last month. They mentioned since March 2024, it has increased from 1,856 to 2,136.

The second report highlighted was the AR3C report, which is unrestricted SSC's with an active relationship flag. The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained there has been a downward trend from January 2024, and it is now showing 499 volumes in the pot.

The last report highlighted was the MTC 3A Unflagged, which shows sites with related MTC's, but the flag is not set. The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised there has been a downward trend since January 2024, and it is now showing 1,131 volumes in the pot.

3 DATA CLEANSE SPRINT 2 UPDATE

The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised a meeting paper was circulated to RIG members with the pre-meeting papers, which sets out the Data Cleanse Sprint 2 update, specifically around the energised meter point, no MSN report.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst highlighted a RIG member had approached them directly and based on their own analysis, they had differing results as part of their reporting. They explained the first difference was the inclusion of disconnected MPANs, within the RIG members report. They mentioned disconnected MPANs will not be migrated as part of the MHHS programme.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst raised a few discussions points for RIG members and asked if there was a need to cleanse disconnected MPANs. They also asked if this identifies a separate data cleanse requirement, of a disconnected MPAN that is nonetheless showing as energised. The last discussion point was whether Suppliers would want to receive details of disconnected MPANs that meet the energise meter point / no MSN criteria.

A RIG member mentioned for any disconnected MPAN which still has the Supplier details listed in EES, it could be that the Supplier hasn't finished the deregistration process. They noted showing these MPANs will highlight to parties there is a potential gap in the process. They commented the need not to exclude them, but whether a separate report is required will be a discussion for REC PAB. Several RIG members agreed having a report of disconnected MPANs that meet the energise meter point / no MSN criteria would be beneficial.

Action: The Code Manager to investigate the creation of a data cleanse report showing disconnected MPANs that meet the energise meter point / no MSN criteria.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst highlighted this will be taken away and considered as a separate reporting item. They explained it wouldn't be considered as part of the energised no MSN report, however it can have it's own separate report. They noted guidance will be implemented alongside this new report.

The Code Manager representative asked RIG members if there was any other criteria which needs to be looked at, as part of this. A RIG member highlighted there would be no need to filter on any other criteria, other than any MPANs that have been terminated. They noted this will give the parties the ability to investigate what's happened in these particular scenarios. Another RIG member supported this point, explaining they have seen all of the different variations, and they wouldn't want the report to be restricted in any way.

3.1 DATA CLEANSE AOB

A RIG member explained they have identified an issue, whereby they've got 2 MPANs they think should be related and need to be bought back together. They mentioned customers may have switched and are not engaging with pulling the supplies back together. They advised given the volumes have remained fairly static since the REC went live, they don't see a benefit in continuing to work these reports. They elaborated resources could be better utilised in working other reports that have more of an impact on the industry.

The Code Manager Representative agreed to look at the volumes and discuss internally within the Code Manager, before proposing a solution to PAB. They explained positive confirmation may be required from parties, to show they have attempted to contact the customers for an outcome.

Action: The Code Manager to investigate the volumes involved with this report and discuss internally a solution, before proposing this to PAB.

4 INVALID TOPLINE REPORT – POTENTIAL SUPPLIER REGISTRATON ISSUE

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of Invalid Topline Report – Potential Supplier Registration Issue, which can be found on slide 7 of the pack here.

A RIG member agreed to investigate this internally within their business to identify the volumes involved and how much of an impact it is causing.

Another RIG member noted SDEP queries have been raised relating to this, but they are not answered consistently.

The Code Manager Representative explained R0121 is implementing a number of new process types. They mentioned the user guide will be rewritten, and this SDEP process type will be added to the list to be included. They advised the draft wording will be bought to RIG to review.

Action: The Code Manager to add this SDEP process type to the list of changes included in R0121.

Another RIG member commented they would be happy to investigate any specific examples relating to their party, to try and identify what's happened in these particular scenarios.

5 RELATED METER POINT ASSOCIATIONS

The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised a meeting paper was circulated to RIG members with the pre-meeting papers, specifically around an issue identified in Schedule 28.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst went through the discussion points and asked RIG members who they think should be resolving issues where the RMP statuses are different for MPANs in active relationships.

A RIG member explained this isn't just an MPAN only issue, it affects gas too. They elaborated they have seen scenarios of two-meter points not necessarily being the same, however they are being created as the same, due to the MPRN belonging to the Gas Transporter. The Code Manager Representative mentioned related MPANs is an electricity only concept, and asked if this was a different issue. The RIG member advised the issue for them appears to be how the REL is maintained and how these changes are being updated in the REC. The Code Manager Representative agreed to pick this up with the RIG member and work on a plan on how this can be progressed.

Action: The Code Manager to liaise with the REC member on this issue and work on a solution.

Another RIG member explained Section 1.1 of Schedule 28 is quite clear, in stating it's for the Electricity Supplier to create and maintain the relationship. They mentioned the DNO carries out validation along the process. The Code Manager Representative noted the DNO's validate a number of the rules set out in section one, but this point is set out in section two, the validation rule doesn't exist at the moment. The RIG member asked what the volumes involved were. The Code Manager advised the volumes are very small at the moment.

6 GAS MEMS

The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised a meeting paper was circulated to RIG members with the pre-meeting papers, specifically around Gas MEM's.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst gave an overview of the paper and asked RIG members if there is anything specific, they think should be included in the scope of this work.

A RIG member asked if conversations with Xoserve have taken place. The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained they have predominantly spoken to the PAFA representative in the UNC, however Xoserve have been engaged with also.

Another RIG member asked if the annual gas portfolio reconciliation can be added as a separate point, adding it needs to be looked at. The Code Manager Lead Analyst confirmed this will be added into the wider piece of work.

Another RIG member asked if MEM to MEM communication has been looked at. They mentioned it could be useful for MEMs to have an involvement in this. The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised they had an interview with a MEM and the insight they gave was really useful. They noted to continue keeping MEMs involved in this will be important. They elaborated the MEM-to-MEM communication will be covered under the proposed solutions, which covers communications in general for all party types.

Another RIG member asked if IGT's have been included in any previous discussions. The Code Manager Lead Analyst mentioned IGT's were engaged with as much as other party types, but they can be contacted.

7 CSS/MPRS MISALIGNMENT ISSUES

The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained the Service Providers have been liaised with on this issue. They highlighted a few more examples have been received since the last RIG meeting, however it would be useful if more examples can be shared with the Code Manager. They elaborated this will help highlight the issue with the Service Provider and it will allow them to identify where this issue sits.

A RIG member highlighted an issue they have recently identified, specifically around a pair of related MPANs, the CoS has been completed on one end, but the other CoS is still pending, and the supply start date was a week in the past. They mentioned it looks as though CSS has not progressed and there is a gap in the process. The Code Manager Lead Analyst they will work with the RIG member and their OAM to investigate this.

The RIG member mentioned when they have raised the CSS/MPRS misalignment issues previously, CSS and MPRS haven't taken accountability for the issue and have advised they have followed their processes correctly.

8 SCHEDULE 30 POTENTIAL CHANGES – ERROENOUS SWITCH RESOLUTION

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of Schedule 30 Potential Changes – Erroneous Switch Resolution, which can be found on slides 13 & 14 of the pack here.

A RIG member agreed with the proposed solution; however the escalation point will need to be assessed. They noted if this is amended, then the escalation shouldn't start ahead of the initial request.

Another RIG member highlighted a Supplier wouldn't always receive the market message within the eight-working day timescale. The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained the timescale begins when the customer has made contact. The RIG member mentioned the need to investigate the data REC PAB receive from CSS. The Code Manager Lead Analyst noted they had started the initial stages of the review recently, looking at the Electralink

data reports and what has been highlighted. They elaborated after this investigation; recommendations will be put forward.

Another RIG member mentioned any proposed solution will not make all of the industry happy, and from their view it would be more beneficial to use a standardised format to receive the ret flows. They elaborated although they have access to the DTS, they might not initiate it for gas ret flows.

Another RIG member commented for domestic sites, emails is not an appropriate communication route, due to GDPR. They mentioned it will either have to through the DTS or SDEP, as the information being communicated could include customers names and MPANs. Another RIG member agreed with this approach; however, they stated the need to be clear on how they will be communicated through SDEP. They explained they have seen scenarios, whereby these have gone straight through to an escalation point, without having the chance to look at it initially. They elaborated all parties need to understand what the journey will look like for these communications, if the proposed solution is SDEP, rather than the DTS.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst mentioned the need to have this process detailed in the Schedule, to set out to parties how it should be worked. They noted it would involve parties retrieving a file from an SDEP case, but once they have the file, they can work on it the best way for their systems. They highlighted once this is in the change process and down the impact assessment route, feedback will be gathered from parties.

Another RIG member mentioned paper SAR's and asked if they could be included in scope of this change. They noted it could be a similar issue, where parties are using the DTN for gas messages. The Code Manager Lead Analyst agreed to add this in scope. The RIG member commented there could be an issue in getting non-domestic gas Suppliers to sign up to and use the DTN. The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained the titles of the SDEP cases would need to be prescriptive, helping parties to identify them. The Code Manager representative advised this will be picked up under the bigger piece of digitalisation work being undertaken. The Chair agreed this should be picked up after the meeting and an update can be provided at the next RIG meeting.

Another RIG member mentioned the reporting timings need to be aligned with the statutory instruments guaranteed standards, as that has a definition of working hours.

9 SMART METER INSTALLATION SCHEDULE 16 – SURVEY QUESTIONS

The RIG member provided an overview of Smart Meter Installation Schedule 16 – Survey questions, which can be found on slide 16 of the pack here.

A RIG member agreed that the survey questions need updating, however they stated the questions shouldn't be in the REC itself. They mentioned their preference would for them

to be added as a category 3 document, meaning there is governance around having to change them. The Code Manager representative noted in a previous Performance Assurance webinar, ideas were gathered on how this could evolve. They commented DESNES are really keen on understanding this, therefore if the questions were changed or removed, they would want comfort it still covers their key points.

The Code Manager representative mentioned an option would be to broaden it to make it more about metering activities, to understand customer performance under all metering activities. They noted another possibility could be to undertake a broader piece of research into what's working for customers or not. They explained this would need to be progressed gradually, with the first step being to address CoMCoP.

The RIG member noted Suppliers should be engaged with for any changes that are being made, and any feedback should be taken on board. They noted the conversations take place between the customer and the Supplier directly, and they see the general results.

RIG members raised the point around in certain scenarios, particularly in the non-domestic market, the account holder may not be the person who was on site at the time of the smart meter installation. They agreed the wording of the questions need to be updated to reflect this.

10 DCC UPDATE

The DCC representatives provided the DCC Update, which can be found on slides 18-42 of the pack here.

The DCC representative explained this update is usually provided to industry through the Switching Operator Forum (SOIF), but they were keen to expand to other industry forums.

A RIG member asked why this was entirely electricity focused and if gas data quality will be worked on at a later date. The DCC representative noted this would have been added to the annual plan, but agreed to investigate when the gas market will be reviewed. The RIG member noted solutions could be implemented in the electricity market, which cause problems in the gas market.

Another RIG member noted for the new RMP Quality, the DCC will be meeting with REC PAB to identify how it could be improved. They asked id this a closed meeting with DCC and REC PAB or will it be open for other parties to attend. The DCC representative explained they have a regular slot at REC PAB on a quarterly basis, where they provide a similar type of update and the DNO representative at REC PAB is aware of these conversations taking place. They explained with the New RMP Quality, a conversation will initially take place at REC PAB around the progression and once that's been identified industry will be involved.

Another RIG member raised a point around address mismatches, specifically around scenarios which are out of the Suppliers control. They explained in regards to new connections, they are told to register the MPAN to where they were told the address is going to be, however during the progression of the new connection being built, the Supplier may be told they can't register the MPAN to the address. They asked if this scenario is considered in the analysis being taken to REC PAB. The DCC representative explained a session was held recently, where stakeholders were invited to discuss improve elements of the source of data. They advised the point raised by the RIG member was discussed and is taken into consideration from the source of the data.

11 AOB

11.1 RIG ATTENDANCE

A RIG member raised a point, around Xoserve having the ability to dial into future RIG meetings, regardless of the agenda items. They commented previously Xoserve were told they can apply for permission to attend based on the agenda items. They elaborated particular agenda items may not look like they impact Xoserve, however having them attend will help them monitor the issues arising in the industry and how they can be resolved. The Chair agreed it could be useful for Xoserve to attend certain parts of RIG meetings in the future, however they will have internal discussions before inviting them.

11.2 ENERGISATION STATUS UPDATES

Another RIG member raised a point, around seeing instances of delays to Suppliers updating the energisation status. In the registration system. They noted the timeframe for this is usually 5 working days, however some instances seem to have taken a lot longer than that to update. They highlighted their intent is to obtain an extract from the registration system. They asked if the RIG was the correct forum for this issue to be discussed. The Chair asked the RIG member to contact the Code Manager with the detail and it will be added to the agenda for the next RIG meeting.

11.3 REBRANDING OF THE RIG

The Chair raised a point, around the creation of an additional working group, where REC changes and issues will be discussed. They mentioned this could result in a name change to the RIG. They noted the proposal is for the RIG to be rebranded to the REC Operational Group, to better reflect areas of discussion and maintain the current Terms of the Reference.

A RIG member supported this idea, with the RIG being very restrictive on what can be discussed. They explained under the MRA, industry meetings used to last all day,

however the RIG meetings are only in the diary for three hours and often it runs out of time for everything to be discussed. The Code Manager representative advised the attendee list for the new REC change group will not be restrictive.

Another RIG member offered an idea that both groups will meet on the same day. They mentioned both groups could have very similar attendees, and it would be useful to have the continuous flow of information through them. The Chair thanked the RIG member for this point and agreed to take it on board.

Another RIG member raised a point around not needing to change the name of an existing work group. They mentioned if RIG meetings continue, but suddenly the meetings are completely different, parties may not wish to attend. The Chair thanked the RIG member for this point and agreed to take it on board.

Another RIG member mentioned in most cases, changes are raised to fix a current issue. They highlighted the progression of an issue to a change should be kept at the same working group. They commented if an issue is raised by a RIG member, but the RIG member is unable to attend the meeting, the issue should be taken off the agenda. They noted if the Code Manager isn't familiar with the issue that has been raised, they usually have to take questions away and come back to the next meeting. They elaborated the purpose is to have the right experts discussing the issue before a change is raised, and then a better change will be drafted and taken through the process. The Chair noted the first point, and the Terms of Reference may need to be updated, as it currently states the Code Manager would represent the RIG member on their issue.

11.4 MHHS CODE FREEZE

The Code Manager representative raised a point, around changes which will be impacted by the MHHS code freeze. They mentioned the raiser of the proposals have been spoken to, and the list is available on the portal. They highlighted that six change proposals are currently impacted, which will have their implementation dates delayed by MHHS, and updates will be provided to the affected working groups.

No further AOB was discussed. The Chair thanked attendees for their input and closed the meeting.