RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

REC ISSUE GROUP
MEETING NOTES

DATE	**10 May 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 two AOB items were raised prior to the meeting, with four further AOB items being raised at this time. Later in the meeting, RIG members noted the following AOB items.

- Theft Reporting
- R0037 – Prepayment Credit Balance & Debt Transfer Process
- D0205's
- CDSP Attendance at RIG
- R0094 – Clarify Obligations on Gas Meter Exchanges that occur close to CoS
- Supplier Vacancy on REC PAB

2 CODE ROADMAP

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of the Code Roadmap, which can be found on slides 5 & 6 of the pack here.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst mentioned the Code Roadmap had been previously published to give parties the full picture of the REC and the requirements, however feedback showed this wasn't as useful as initially intended. They advised a new Code Roadmap has been created, in a new format, which is available on the Digital Navigator.

No comments were raised by RIG members on this item.

3 ANNUAL RATINGS

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of the Annual Ratings, which can be found on slides 8-10 of the pack here. Following the presentation RIG members were

asked whether the Code Manager has missed anything in the criteria to be included in the Annual Rating, whether any items need to be changed, and if there are any further steps the Code Manager should take to engage with industry on these proposals.

A RIG member noted the theft target was made up of various segments in the scheme and asked for confirmation if the rating would be based on an aggregate score of all the targets, or for each segment. The Code Manager Lead Analyst confirmed it would be an aggregate score across all the segments a party would have a target for.

Another RIG member asked if a party had several minor or moderate weaknesses, would that equate to a rating of severe weakness. The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained that a Partys overall rating will be the set at the worst t performing category and will not be a form of calculation.

Another RIG member asked if the peer comparison will be anonymised or is it going to be named. The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised that ratings will be un-anonymised between peers and will not be publicly available. They further elaborated that the categorization of the peer groups is being developed and will be presented to parties at the Performance Assurance webinar, which is going to be held in June.

Another RIG member asked regarding the theft target, what the rationale was for 60%+ being no weakness. The Code Manager Lead Analyst highlighted it was based on the modelling of previous scheme years, in terms of achievements Suppliers made against their theft targets.

No further comments were raised by RIG members. The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked for any further feedback to be shared accordingly.

4 DATA CLEANSE UPDATE

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an update on three data cleanse reports, the AR3A, AR3C and the MTC 3A Unflagged reports.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst noted the AR3A report had seen a decrease from approximately 2100 to 1900 from April to May. They mentioned the volumes in this report had been consistently around 2000 since October 2023.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst highlighted the AR3C report had seen a consistent decrease since October 2023, from approximately 1600 to 657. They explained the volume did slightly increase from April to May, however it is still over half the volume it was previously.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained the MTC 3A Unflagged report had seen a decrease from approximately 3600 to 1000 since January.

No comments were raised by RIG members on this item.

5 RIG ACTIONS – PERFORMANCE ASSURANCE

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of RIG Actions – Performance Assurance, which can be found on slides 13-15 here.

Several RIG members noted around the discontinuing of 3B and 6B, this seems to be a sensible approach outlined by the Code Manager. They elaborated this will be a much better use of parties resources and REC PAB's time in monitoring these reports.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst agreed to take this proposal to the next REC PAB meeting and further updates will be provided to RIG in due course.

6 D0312 ESME ID DUPLICATION ISSUE

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of D0312 ESME ID Duplication Issue, which can be found on slide 17 of the pack here.

No comments were raised by RIG members on this item.

7 ERRONEOUS SWITCH CHANGE UPDATE

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an update on Erroneous Switch Change Update, which can be found on slides 19-20 of the pack here.

A RIG member mentioned it would make the process much smoother if a Supplier raised the ES flag in the first instance, then this will allow the system to initiate the switch.

Another RIG member commented this could be used as a refresher for all Suppliers on the circumstances for raising an ES flag and how they can do it. They elaborated this can then be communicated to frontline staff, who handle these types of queries.

Action: The Code Manager to liaise with other RIG members who are experiencing difficulty in using the ES flag when registering a supply and organise a refresh session.

8 CSS/MPRS MISALIGNMENT UPDATE

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an update on CSS/MPRS Misalignment Update which can be found on slide 22 of the pack here.

The Code Manager and RIG members agreed the AR3B report would be helpful in finding more examples of related MPANs being split across Suppliers. There are eight MPANs sitting in the AR3B report, which can help with the investigations.

The Chair confirmed RIG members can share any further examples they have with their OAM. They mentioned if any MPANs need to be shared, this can be done through the REC portal securely.

9 R0121 – SDEP REVIEW IMPROVEMENTS – PROCESS TYPES

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an update of R0121 – SDEP Review Improvements – Process Types, which can be found on slide 24 of the pack here.

No comments were raised by RIG members on this item.

10 PAYMENT METHOD LEVELISATION SINGLE/MULTI RATE DIFFERENTIATION

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of Payment Method Levelisation Single/Multi Rate Differentiation, which can be found on slide 26 of the pack here.

No comments were raises by RIG members on this agenda item.

11 R0105 – REVIEW OF ONAGE SLA'S

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of R0105 – Review of ONAGE SLA's, which can be found on slide 28-31 of the pack here.

No comments were raised by RIG members on this item. The Chair invited RIG members to liaise internally with their operational teams and provide feedback to the Code Manager accordingly.

12 SWITCHING INCENTIVE REGIME (SIR) SURVEY

The RECCo representative provided an overview of the SIR survey, which can be found on slides 33 and 34 of the pack here.

No comments were raised by RIG members on this item.

13 AOB

13.1 THEFT REPORTING

The Code Manager representative mentioned there has been a recent increase of parties uploading theft files using the 'other' file type option on the REC portal. They highlighted files uploaded under 'other' are not routinely monitored and should only be used when

specifically requested by the Code Manager team member. They advised the theft files should be uploaded under the relevant file type and if parties experience issues with the uploads, they can raise a Service Desk ticket, for the Performance Assurance team to support them in resolving this.

A RIG member questioned whether there is an issue with the file validation of the REC portal. They mentioned previously their theft files were successfully uploaded to the REC portal, however in recent times the files are being rejected, even when the same format is being used, they also noted that the error message from the portal only specifies one error at a time. They commented help with the errors would be beneficial in ensuring the files can be uploaded to the REC portal through the correct file type.

Another RIG member highlighted they have experienced issues with CSV files, when trying to upload them to the portal for other process types. They noted in the latest version of Excel, there are approximately five different versions of CSV, however it doesn't inform what one should be used. They advised there are no industry defined rules for CSV files, it's more of an obsolete format which delays data transfer. They commented the REC could potentially look to move away from asking parties to submit CSV files and use standard Excel files.

Action: The Code Manager to investigate the removal of the CSV file format as a file type used on the REC portal.

13.2 R0037 – PREPAYMENT CREDIT BALANCE & DEBT TRANSFER PROCESSES

The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained a RFI had been recently issued for R0037, which is open until the end of May. They mentioned R0037 was currently on hold due to the MHHS code freeze. They highlighted whilst R0037 cannot be progressed currently, the solution was being redefined and when the code freeze is lifted, there will be a complete solution which can be progressed. During the party Impact Assessment, several parties raised concerns around the financial risk associated with the proposed balance transfer limit. A revised limit (based on Party IA feedback) has been suggested and feedback is now being sought.

A RIG member noted R0037 was originally raised predominantly for domestic Suppliers, however it was flagged it could potentially impact non-domestic Suppliers. They commented a few questions on the RFI were regarding evidence and asked how evidence could be provided if they may not be sending the data flow and why this is needed when they haven't been asked to previously. The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained the CSS market messages will affect all Suppliers, even if they were not intending to use the

solution, as it affects the registration flows. The provision of evidence has been suggested to support RFI responses if possible.

The Chair confirmed the RFI has been uploaded to the Impact Assessments page on the REC portal, for parties to access and respond accordingly.

13.3 D0205'S

The RIG member advised they have seen examples of significant numbers of D0205's being sent through to them which is causing the MPRS batch run to completely stop. They noted they had received batches of 50,000 and 70,000 recently, which is higher than the limit set out. They asked if other RIG members were having similar issues.

RIG members were requested to liaise internally and confirm if they are having the same issue.

A RIG member mentioned the limit only applies to bulk change of agent requests, where there is an agreed process. They noted the limit was put in place to protect MPRS. The raiser explained the BSC is mandating Suppliers that they shouldn't be carrying out bulk change of agents during migration. They expressed their concern that MPRS will be overloaded with other industry processes.

The Chair confirmed the Code Manager will pick this up with the MHHS leads to see if they will be interested in adding this as a risk. They invited other RIG members to provide feedback to their OAM accordingly.

13.4 CDSP ATTANDANCE AT RIG

The RIG member mentioned they had previously asked whether the CDSP would be able to attend future RIG meetings as standard. They noted the CDSP exists under the gas transporters license to facilitate and manage the systems. They asked if any discussions had taken place since the last RIG on whether the CDSP can attend future RIG meetings.

The Chair explained that the RIG was originally created in response to REC Parties request for a forum where they could talk freely and openly on issues that were impacting them operationally. Therefore, the current Terms of Reference defines the RIG as for REC parties only. They also advised that the RIG is not a decision forum, items are debated but any changes are progressed elsewhere. They advised a discussion took place previously between the Code Manager, RECCo and RIG members and allowing any REC service provider (including CDSP) a seat and they voted against non-REC parties being able to have standing seating at RIG meetings.

The RIG member formally requested opening a discussion, on the Terms of Reference noting they should be updated to allow the CDSP to attend RIG meetings. They explained

having the CDSP attending RIG meetings will help them identify earlier which issues could cause an impact to their systems.

The Chair reiterated that the RIG is a non-decision making group and that nothing which is discussed at RIG can adversely impact the CDSP without going through the change process. The Chair also stressed that any non-REC Party can request to attend the RIG if an agenda item is of interest, agendas and meeting slides are provided 5 WD in advance of a meeting and are available on the REC Portal. Should an item be of interest to the CDSP they are able to request to attend.

The Chair also advised that a new group has been created called the Change Issues group, which will discuss REC Change proposals in more detail, the ToR for which will allow attendance from a wider audience including the CDSP and REC Service providers.

The Chair agreed to seek feedback from RIG members on the value of regular CDSP attendance at the RIG.

***Please can RIG members provide feedback on the remit of the RIG and whether they see value in the CDSP or other non-REC parties being able to attend future RIG meetings.**

13.5 R0094 – CLARIFY OBLIGATIONS ON GAS METER EXCHANGES THAT OCCUR CLOSE TO COS

The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained a consultation has recently been published for R0094. They mentioned the proposed solution will change the obligation on gas MEM's, as part of their requirements for Schedule 14. They encouraged engagement from any gas MEM RIG member on this consultation. They advised the closing date for the consultation is 31 May.

13.5 SUPPLIER VACANCY ON REC PAB

The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained the nomination period for the Supplier vacancy on the REC PAB closes on 10 may at 5pm. They noted if any RIG members would like to nominate a member of the industry for this position, to send the form into the Code manager by 5pm on 10 May 2024.

No further business was discussed. The Chair thanks attendees for their input and closed the meeting.