RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

REC ISSUE GROUP
MEETING NOTES

DATE	**08 August 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 one AOB item was 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.

- D0312 Rejection Code V (Duplicate ESME ID)
- SDEP Attachments
- ET Standing Charges
- Updated SDEP User Guidance

2 ACTIONS LOG

RECRIG_24_0712_02_01 – The Chair to raise the issue of de-energising a disconnected meter as a formal REC Issue.

The Chair explained this was raised as a REC issue, following on from last months RIG meeting. The Chair advised the issue has been recorded, a number (I0191) has been allocated and a change analyst has been assigned to it. The Chair highlighted progression updates will be provided when required.

A RIG member noted if an MPAN is showing as disconnected, the MPAN can be deregistered. They advised if the MPAN is showing as deregistered, it will give the Supplier the choice to either deregister or resurrect the MPAN. They highlighted it is set out in the REC that when a Supplier is notified of a disconnection through a DTC flow, the Supplier needs to determine it's a valid disconnection notification and then send the deregistration request.

Another RIG member explained they had been successful in deregistering a number of MPAN's recently through CSS, however they have discovered there are no timings stated on how long it should take to resolve a dispute. They advised other attempts to deregister MPANs had been rejected by CSS, however this was due to old supplies which had been migrated, CSS holds the wrong registration number. Another RIG member highlighted the REC Schedule doesn't have defined timescales in deregistering MPAN's and stated a timescale could be potentially introduced.

Another RIG member commented R0095 had previously been raised to allow DNO's to reinstate disconnected MPAN's. The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained this change was put on hold due to overlaps with the MHHS programme.

3 DATA CLEANSE UPDATE

The Code Manager Lead Analyst noted there are 2051 MPANs left within the AR3A report, and it is now starting to reach a steady state. They highlighted the AR3C report has been showing a steady increase since April 2024. They advised that increase had continued from July to August, with the number of MPANs within this report now 772, from 649. They explained the MTC 3A Unflagged report has been increasing on a monthly basis since May 2024, and the number of MPANs in this pot is now 1,633.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst highlighted data cleanse sprint 2 will be closing shortly. They advised the report will be run from the first week of September, using the data provided from the end of August.

4 PERFORMANCE ASSURANCE OPERATING PLAN

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of the Performance Assurance Operating Plan (PAOP), which can be found on slides 8-11 of the pack here. The aim of this discussion was to gain insights from RIG members on the PAOP, before presenting it to REC PAB for approval.

A RIG member asked what will the specific areas of focus be for energy theft. The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised a paper was published as part of the pre-meeting papers, which outlined their focus for energy theft. They asked RIG members to provide feedback on the proposed activities.

A RIG member noted the meeting paper refers to the current approach to address data improvement owned by the DCC as ineffective. They mentioned a code change is being raised; to propose this becomes part of the successful data cleanse process and as part of it, the Code Manager will be reaching out to Parties on a quarterly basis. They asked if the central services will be contacted. The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained the switching address quality plan will continue to be in place; however the switching operator doesn't have any levers to incentivise parties to improve their data quality. They highlighted monthly reports will be issued to allow parties to act proactively and uncleanse data items which are incorrect. They advised REC issue I0200 has been raised, which details this proposal and will be progressed through the REC change route.

The RIG member asked what the incentives might be and if there are going to be SLA's implemented for address data quality. The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained that they will look across the industry to see which address quality reports need to be prioritised, then set targets for parties to cleanse the data. They highlighted the data will be tracked and where parties are not demonstrating progress, a discussion will take place to understand what is preventing them from achieving the targets. They elaborated if these parties don't actively engage, then escalation paths will be applied.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked if RIG members can provide feedback on the PAOP before 14 August.

5 PREPAYMENT INCORRECT MODE CHANGE UPON SWITCHING

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of Prepayment Incorrect Mode Change Upon Switching, which can be found on slide 13 of the pack here.

A RIG member advised it is an industry wide issue which needs to be investigated.

No further comments were raised by RIG members on this agenda item. The Chair asked if RIG members find any examples of this issue, to email them to the Code Manager to help with the investigation. The Chair noted an examples provided can be discussed at the next RIG meeting.

6 MULTIPLE SWITCH REQUESTS IMPACTING CONSUMER EXPERIENCE AND PARTY EXPERIENCE

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of Multiple Switch Requests Impacting Consumer Experience and Party Performance, which can be found on slide 15 of the pack here.

A RIG member commented they had seen a similar issue to this in the past, however they would have to investigate internally to identify if this issue is arising.

Another RIG member mentioned it causes a Performance Assurance issue, whereby instances arise of multiple registration attempts. They noted it doesn't leave much other choice than to apply multiple objections, which can give a false impression of a high number of objections. They highlighted it needs to be taken into account for the Performance Assuance metric.

Another RIG member mentioned CSS could have something within it's system to identify switches that have an objection against it, meaning it can't accept the switch. They highlighted it would go back to the Supplier who made the request to switch it again. The Code Manager Lead Analyst commented the objection window for domestic is one working day and for commercial it is two working days. They asked would a potential solution be to increase the objection window. The Chair highlighted if this is progressed to become an Issue, this option can be investigated as a proposed solution.

Another RIG member mentioned the proposed solution could include a combination of a limit of the number of registration attempts, and an escalating timescale between each attempt. They elaborated the time between attempts two and three could increase, which would help remove the multiple registration attempts each day. Several RIG members agreed with this approach.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained it could be that the consumer who has moved into the property, hasn't contacted the incumbent Supplier. They advised the incumbent Supplier may not know there is a change of tenancy at a property. Several RIG member agreed with this point.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked if RIG members think there should be an objection reason included in the objection market message from CSS. A RIG member mentioned GDPR potentially stops putting information in the data flow, such as the customer being in debt, which they wouldn't have given the party consent to share.

The Chair confirmed enough information has been provided by RIG members to progress with this Issue.

7 IMPORT & EXPORT INDICATORS FOR MAP'S

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of Import & Export Indicators for MAP's, which can be found on slides 17 & 18 of the pack here.

A RIG member mentioned the rental charges appear to vary, depending on whether it is an import or export meter.. They noted more often that not, the import MPAN would have been created first, meaning the export MPAN will sit parallel to the import MPAN and have a larger number. They advised by default if it's the same meter serial number with 2 MPAN's, the higher number will be the export MPAN. They commented this solution would not require a code change and be a much simpler fix.

The MAP representative advised the challenge with that approach would be the loss of the ability to resolve a legitimate exemption. They mentioned resolving this issue will address the problem around import and export MPAN's, which is a growing challenge due to more import and export MPAN's being deployed on a weekly basis. They explained this issue may continue to grow, which is why a more industry flow led solution would be preferred, rather than potentially building a MAP asset management systems.

A RIG member commented that the D0303 is sent by the MEM, and on appointment should the Supplier be told whether it's an export MPAN. They highlighted just changing the D0303 may mean the MEM doesn't have the data he needs to be able to make that determination. The MAP representative mentioned there may be significant upstream changes that may need to happen with this issue, including MEM and Supplier interaction.

A RIG member mentioned MAP's have access to the import and export data through the Data Access Matrix and asked why they couldn't look in ECOES for this data. The MAP representative explained they do use ECOES on an individual basis, however it isn't overly scalable. They highlighted if they receive an export meter serial number notification, it creates an exception in their asset management platform, which isn't entirely automated and requires users to go in and triage. The RIG member commented the ECOES API could be used for this exact issue. The MAP representative noted each individual MAP would need to ensure their systems are connecting their asset management platforms to the ECOES API, which could be an expensive solution, rather than changing a parameter on the D0303 flow and how it's interpreted. The RIG member advised that the easiest solution would be to access the ECOES API, which holds the import or export identifier. They elaborated this would be an easier option, rather than changing the content of a data flow, which will be quite costly for more parties who aren't impacted by the issue.

Another RIG member advised if the import or export flag is going to be added to the D0303 flow, how many other consequential changes will be needed needs to be investigated. They mentioned the import and export indicator isn't linked to any data flows, as per the EMAR data specification. Another RIG member highlighted it might just appear in MPRS for MPRS to be able to populate registrations.

Action: The Code Manager to initiate a meeting with several RIG members to discuss how the issue of Import & Export Indicators for MAP's can be progressed.

8 AOB

8.1 D0312 REJECTION CODE V (DUPLICATE ESME ID)

A RIG member mentioned at a previous RIG, it was discussed that MEM's were having D0312's rejected with a code V, which references a duplicate ESME ID. They highlighted that this appeared to be due to an old removed meter having the same ESME ID. They advised that the Code Manager had asked RIG members to provide examples to help with the investigation. They explained that it is still an issue which needs to be resolved. The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised there has been a change in personnel looking into this from another part of the Code Manager, which has delayed the investigations. They commented RIG members have sent in a small number of examples; therefore, it may prove difficult to identify the root cause with St Clements.

Action: The Code Manager to provide a more thorough update on the D0312 Rejection Code V (Duplicate ESME ID) issue at the next RIG meeting.

8.2 SDEP ATTACHMENTS

A RIG member mentioned a debt resolution case was raised to them in SDEP, where photos were sent between two Suppliers. They highlighted this then caused issues later on, when their team went back to access the photos. They advised the communication was archived and it showed there were attachments uploaded to the case, however the photo attachments were no longer available for users to view. They explained they were told this was how SDEP was designed, with photos only be accessible up to thirty days, before they are deleted. They noted the only viable solution is now they need to contact that Supplier and ask them to upload the photos to SDEP again. They asked if any RIG members had noticed this previously.

Another RIG member mentioned they had never seen an attachment disappear from an archived case in SDEP. They commented it might be easier going forward if users download any attachments which are uploaded to SDEP cases. They elaborated this will ensure even if anything gets deleted, possibly by mistake, users will still be able to access it from their downloads.

The Code Manager Representative highlighted this could have been an anomaly and may need investigating. They asked whether the RIG member can send in the SDEP reference, and this will be investigated with SDEP Service Provider.

No other RIG members reported to have come across this issue.

Action: The Code Manager to investigate how the photos were removed from this particular SDEP case.

8.3 ET STANDING CHARGES

A RIG member raised a point around the standing charge element of ET's and asked other RIG members how this forms part of their processes. Another RIG member commented the standing charge would be billed by the losing Supplier.

Another RIG member highlighted the subject of ET's had previously been discussed at RIG, specifically around the levelisation of the requirements for domestic and non-domestic ET's. They noted an update hadn't been provided recently and asked if an update can be provided. The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained this has been delayed, due to the SME's wanting to undertake a full review. The RIG member asked how they can obtain a view of requirements that have been put on the back burner, meaning they can be monitored. The Chair and RIG members agreed the RIG issues Log would be a good way of enabling members to monitor previously raised RIG issues.

Action: The Code Manager to update the RIG Issues Log with recent issues that have been raised by RIG members.

8.4 UPDATED SDEP USER GUIDANCE

The Code Manager Lead Analyst mentioned several RIG members may have received the updated SDEP User Guidance, in relation to R0121 and the new process which are being implemented. They asked RIG members to provide feedback on the user guidance, specifically around anything that needs to be added to it. They advised RIG members can provide feedback by contacting the Code Manager.

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