RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

REC ISSUE GROUP
MEETING NOTES

DATE	**11 October 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 confirmed one AOB item was raised prior to the meeting, with a further three AOB items being raised at this time. Later in the meeting, RIG noted the following AOB items:

- R0201 – Creation of a Tool to Manually Correct ERDS/CSS Discrepancies
- Discrepancies between Deregistration and Disconnection Dates
- SDEP Escalation Process
- REC Engagement Day

2 ACTIONS LOG

The Chair provided attendees with an update on the below actions:

RECRIG_24_0809_07_01 - The Code Manager to investigate providing a list of Unique Identification Letters for MEM seals.

The Chair advised this was also discussed at the last MEP meeting and it was agreed a list of Unique Identification Letters for MEM seals should be published. The Chair explained that work is underway to add this to the correct part of the Party Register and that when complete an update on publication will be provided at a RIG meeting.

3 DATA CLEANSE SPRINT 3 UPDATE

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an update on Data Cleanse Sprint 3, which can be found on slide 7 of the pack here.

A RIG member asked for confirmation, that if they didn't receive a revised invalid topline report for sprint 3, does that mean they don't have any to cleanse. The Code Manager Lead Analyst confirmed this to be the case.

However, some reports had been published but have since been revised. This has led to some Parties no-longer having reports to address. The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised that a communication will be sent to Contract Manager's and Alternates, with a slightly different message for Parties who had had a initial report, however do not have a revised report. They highlighted this is to ensure clarity and no misunderstanding. They elaborated it may be worth parties keeping an eye on this over the course of the sprint, as the numbers could differ month to month.

Another RIG member asked what the difference was between sprint 3, and the original invalid top line report. The Code Manager Lead Analyst commented the old meter top line had been filtered down to remove the items which wouldn't be present as part of MHHS. The RIG member mentioned the guidance didn't clearly seem to define what the difference was between the old and the new.

Another RIG member highlighted the file name doesn't match the documentation. They also highlighted the reports should have been issued on Monday 07 October, however they didn't receive theirs until Tuesday 08 October. The RIG member asked if these reports can be issued on time in the future. The Code Manager Lead Analyst apologised for the report being issued slightly later on this occasion.

Another RIG member highlighted that DNO's have been set a target of an 80% reduction on the invalid combinations, due to PC or SSC. They asked if the requirement is for DNO's to amend the LLFC, so it becomes valid with the PC and SSC. The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised the DNO topline report is based on items, where the issue appears to be with the LLFC. They mentioned one scenario would be, if the LLFC is incorrect, then that would need to be updated. They advised of another scenario, whereby there is an assumption in the reports around which data item is incorrect, and if the DNO's believe the LLFC is correct and the invalidity comes from another data item, then they will need to work with the Supplier to resolve it. The Code Manager Lead Analyst commented if DNO's start to identify this scenario, it would be useful to have a discussion at future RIG's to ensure parties are working together to try and resolve it. The RIG member highlighted they will look at ways the data can be bulk cleansed, however if they identify certain things which aren't in the best interest of customers, then they can bring it back to RIG for discussion.

Another RIG member asked if the energised no meter report is the same energised no meter report that was part of sprint 2. The Code Manager Lead Analyst confirmed this to be correct. The RIG member asked if the invalid MAP ID is a separate report, and if they've not received one, it means they don't have any to cleanse. The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained whilst sprint 2 made great progress against both the Invalid Top Line and Energised no Meter reports, it wasn't able to get them all the way down.

Another RIG member mentioned their MOP's have said that part of the guidelines state in order to update all meter locations, a CSV file can be sent to the DNO. They noted the first DNO they reached out to weren't aware of this and weren't able to accept the CSV. They elaborated the DNO wanted to be sent the D0312's, however the D0312 resets the data in their system. The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked which guidance document stated the process of sending in a CSV, as they didn't think the Data Cleanse guidance document stated that. The RIG member confirmed they will dig out that guidance document and share it with the Code Manager.

Another RIG member advised the Data Cleanse guidance document states to populate the new location field via the D0312 data flow or IF 005 for MHHS migrated meter points. The RIG member confirmed there is no mention of doing this through a CSV file in the guidance document.

Another RIG member noted the MHHS programme has it's own data cleanse work stream, and asked how sprint 3 aligns with the MHHS data cleanse date. They highlighted parties are undertaking a lot of work in the MHHS programme to really focus on data cleanse for migration, and it's not quite clear what date this needs to be completed by. The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained the sprints aren't specific to the MHHS programme. They advised they are working with the MHHS programme to understand where there is activity, whether it makes sense to put through this sprint process but has a relevance to the programme, but the programme isn't actively doing work around it. They elaborated they do engage with individuals from the Cleanse Working Group to inform them on the things they intend to work on. They further elaborated they spoke to them this week around the new MTD items to ensure there was no overlap.

Another RIG member commented that a lot of the cleansing for ESME ID's and the fallout from the bulk upload is all targeted for late this year, however it's not tied to any milestone within the programme. They

explained part of the conversation at the next MHHS working group, will be to tie a date to a milestone in the plan, meaning it will no longer be an arbitrary date. They mentioned under REC, there is a cleansing guidance document which states the categories and the guidance on how to work them. They suggested using the ESME ID report and the subcategories within that report, to publish a report that parties work from and state what needs to be done for each of them, this will help parties understand what they've got to do, rather than having to guess what might need to be done. The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised it's important to differentiate between parties having the data and it won't load, and parties not having the data at all. The RIG member commented that the outcomes form the next MHHS Data Cleanse Work Group will alleviate a lot of the concerns that have just been raised by other RIG members.

Another RIG member asked if the D0312 rejection code V, duplicate ESME ID has been raised as an exemption. The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained that there is an ability to submit an exemption file, to state this data item cannot be cleansed. Another RIG member commented the need for a REC change to be raised to fix this issue and for it to be implemented as soon as possible. The Code Manager Representative explained an issue around this is currently being worked on. They noted several parties have highlighted it and a significant number of examples have been passed on to the Technical Services team within the REC, to work with St Clements. They highlighted they have also approached a DNO who has quite a high proportion of errors in this area, and they are investigating internally before providing feedback to the Code Manager.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst highlighted when the Energised no Meter and Invalid MAP ID report data has been split between the MEM and the Supplier, the data they receive as part of the reconciliation, includes a flag, to state is there a supply mismatch between the MEM and the CDSP. They explained conversations are taking place with Xoserve to understand how they have applied the logic. They advised as a result of this, currently they only include items in the supply report if the flag states there isn't a disagreement.

Another RIG member highlighted some of the reports are already six months old from April, and the guidance suggests that parties should essentially refresh the data, to identify what has been resolved or not. They mentioned parties do not receive a refresh from the CDSP at the same time, which means they're unsure if it's going to be aligned with what the CDSP hold. They explained it feels like the effectiveness is reduced if the CDSP refresh isn't received too. On a separate point, they also mentioned they have received the MEM/Supplier mismatch report and there is a column within it which highlights the Supplier. They asked if that shows the current registered Supplier, or at least the registered Supplier back in April from a CDSP point of view.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst noted in an ideal world, they would like to refresh the view regularly, however they don't currently hold all of the data to allow them to do that. They advised the end goal is to have the ability to regularly refresh the view and MEM's can then share the file with the Code Manager and they could reconcile on a monthly basis. They commented there is enough evidence to show there is value in moving this forward. They explained if they do receive the additional data, they need from the CDSP, they will be able to give a view of who the current MEM and Suppliers are. They highlighted once MEM's start cleansing the data, they can use the RIG as a forum to discuss any issues or patterns they are discovering.

The Chair thanked RIG members for their input which formed this discussion.

4 DATA CLEANSE UPDATE

The Code Manager Lead Analyst highlighted the Energised no Meter report was worked on as part of sprint 2 and progress was made by Suppliers in reducing the number in the pot. They advised the volumes within this report are now at 9400. They noted there will be a subset of Suppliers who will be participating as part of this report cleansing in sprint 3, continuing from sprint 2.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained the volumes within the Invalid MAP ID report have reduced dramatically since the start of the sprint. They mentioned the current volume is 224, and again there will be a subset of Suppliers who will be participating as part of this report cleansing in sprint 3, continuing from sprint 2.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst highlighted a new report will be introduced as part of sprint 3, which is the Invalid Topline DNO (S3) report. They commented the total value within this pot currently sits at approximately 50,000, however the focus is to try and reduce this by 35%, meaning there are just under 18,000 to cleanse.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of the MEM and Supplier CDSP reports. They explained the only difference between these reports is whether the flag is stating correct or incorrect Supplier. They noted there are a couple of big groups which form a big chunk of the difference.

5 CHANGE ISSUES UPDATE

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of the Change Issues Update, which can be found on slides 10-12 of the pack here.

A RIG member asked if further updates are provided, can the title of the issue be provided too. The Code Manager Lead Analyst confirmed the titles of the issues will be provided at further updates. They explained going forward, the plan is to provide smaller updates on issues that have progressed since the previous updates.

6 AOB

6A CREATION OF A TOOL TO MANUALLY CORRECT ERDS/CSS DISCREPANICES

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of AOB item Creation of a Tool to Manually Correct ERDS/CSS Discrepancies, which can be found on slide 15 of the pack here.

No comments were raised by RIG members on this AOB item.

6B DISCREPANICES BETWEEN THE DEREGISTRATION AND DISCONNECTION DATES

A RIG member mentioned they had it raised to them by one of their Operational teams, that one agent they use is pushing back on mismatches between the deregistration and disconnection dates in EES. They highlighted their understanding is the deregistration date is the date parties send the deactivation request to CSS, therefore their not sure how the deregistration and disconnection dates would match. They commented they've only seen both dates on extremely rare occasions. The RIG member asked if other RIG members had experienced this issue and if they see instances of both dates matching.

Another RIG member mentioned they haven't been having issues regards to the registration date. They noted an issue they are having is, when they receive the disconnection notice, they can challenge it and if it was deemed the MPAN was disconnected in error, it's the responsibility of the DNO to reconnect it, they are receiving pushback on that. The RIG member highlighted under the REC, it states parties get

time to look at the disconnection request and determine whether you agree with it or not before proceeding with the deregistration, the dates aren't ever going to match.

The Chair mentioned if any other RIG members identify any examples of this, they can contact their OAM for investigation.

6C SDEP ESCALATION PROCESS

The Chair explained a few issue queries have been raised through the RIG mailbox on interpretation and use of the processes, since they were updated. They advised the queries were resolved by explaining the process and highlighting the steps that are now involved. They noted the training documents and user guides are going to be republished with the notes from the RIG meeting today. They encouraged RIG members to let their internal teams know there has been a change to the guidance.

6D REC ENGAGEMENT DAY

The Chair advised an in-person REC Engagement Day has been arranged for 06 November. They noted the session will be online too; however, the option is there for parties to meet their OAM's and the wider REC team. They highlighted interest has been high and there will be presentations across the Code Managers, with RECCo also being in attendance. They explained for anyone who is interested, they can sign up through the weekly bulletin or through their OAM.

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