RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

REC ISSUE GROUP
MEETING NOTES

DATE	**13 December 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 two AOB items were raised prior to the meeting, with no further AOB items being raised at this time. Later in the meeting, RIG noted the following AOB items:

- January RIG Meeting
- RECCo Engagement Survey

2 ACTIONS LOG

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

RECRIG_24_1108_03_01 – The Code Manager to investigate whether the process of a meter operative updating an unknown meter location is stated in the REC or any other code guidance.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst stated this subject will be discussed further at the RECPAB meeting on 17 December 2024. They mentioned the current view is the code requires the meter location field to be populated in a data flow as a mandatory data item. They highlighted paragraph 2.29 of the Metering Operation Schedule includes a list of parties and the data items they are responsible for populating. They informed RIG members although there isn't anything explicit which states the meter location must be populated, there is enough in the code to show that data must be correctly populated.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained if this particular scenario causes parties to not hit their data cleanse targets, then a review will be conducted at the conclusion of the sprint to see what actions are required.

3 DATA CLEANSE UPDATE

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an update on Data Cleanse, which could be found on slides 7 and 8 of the pack here.

A RIG member asked if these new data cleanse reports have only been uploaded to the REC portal for Suppliers. The Code Manager Lead Analyst confirmed this to be the case.

Another RIG member highlighted for the previous MAP ID cleansing, two versions of the reports were sent to Suppliers, one report showed the current Supplier, and the other report showed the Installing Supplier. They asked why this approach wasn't being taken for the new MTD reports. The Code Manager Lead Analyst stated if parties want the reports split up, that's what can be done. The RIG member noted

the target should be against the installing Supplier, not the current Supplier. Several RIG members agreed with the approach of having the reports split into two different categories.

Action: RECRIG_24_1213_03_01 – The Code Manager to investigate whether the new MTD reports can be split into two different categories, one for the current Supplier and the other for the installing Supplier.

A RIG member asked if the action is on the installing Supplier, however that Supplier is no longer registered to the meter, how will they be able to take the remedial action. They also advised they are working on the assumption that if a Supplier isn't issued with a report, they don't have any exceptions to work. Lastly, they noted for previous sprints, they were given six months to cleanse the reports, and questioned why Suppliers are only receiving three months to work through these new reports. The Code Manager Lead Analyst confirmed if Suppliers have not been issued with the reports, they do not have any to work through. They explained these reports will probably form part of sprint four, but potentially a tighter set of targets will be introduced. They stated if the majority of Suppliers are struggling to hit the targets, it would show that the targets were too tight. A RIG member highlighted that a previous MOP or Supplier can send in a D0312 to MPRS to update the data, and explained there are certain rules around what MPRS will accept, however the data flow can still be sent.

A RIG member noted if any reports show instances of the ESME meter location not being populated, they need to be raised at RIG meetings, as this is a fault with MPRS validation. They highlighted their system was historically built using the EMAR, and the valid data sets shows meter location 'F' (unknown) is a valid data set. They highlighted it is also valid in the gas industry. The Code Manager Lead Analyst suggested RIG members bring any feedback on their experience of working these reports back to RIG in the future, to promote a group discussion on how best to progress.

A RIG member stated they had seen instances, whereby the LLF is correct for a particular GSP group, however the Supplier items are incorrect. The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained in these instances, the normal process would be to raise with the Supplier through SDEP.

A RIG member highlighted if they have exceptions that need to be looked at by a Supplier, they would raise these through SDEP. They highlighted their main concern is getting involved in continuous chasing and escalating to ensure they are being resolved. They commented a suggestion was to raise it once, leave until the end of the sprint and RECPAB would then do a mop up exercise. The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised rather than setting up an exemption over the course of the sprint, as part of the sprint wrap up, the numbers received back from parties will go into a separate pot to be worked on.

A RIG member highlighted the benefit of adding a column into the reporting to show an aged column. They noted this will be helpful for parties to identify the newer MPANs that have been added to the report, meaning the older MPANs can be worked on first. Several RIG members agreed with this view and the Code Manager Lead Analyst advised this can be added into the reports.

A RIG member mentioned they have seen instances of Suppliers trying to update meter combinations to preserve tariffs. They explained it's not for them to dictate to Suppliers what the meter combinations need to be. They stated some form of training might be needed for Suppliers on the requirements are for a valid member combination. They elaborated they thought the numbers on their reporting was quite high, considering they have started to update the data before the December deadline. They stated there are several MPANs on the report which they believe have been updated, however they will conduct a further investigation. The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised for the RIG member to contact them if they believe the numbers on their report are incorrect.

A RIG member explained they had seen instances, whereby a Supplier has requested for an export MPAN to be raised, however the MPANs have been registered with import MTC's, Profile Classes and SSC's. They suggested further investigation should take place before any cleansing of these MPANs can start. The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked if any other RIG members had seen instances of this and if

they had, what has been their approach to working these. A RIG member advised they have seen a few instances of this involving the same Supplier, with their intention being to raise an SDEP case with that Supplier to see if there is an issue with their process.

4 TDIS UPDATES

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of TDIS Updates, which can be found on slides 10 & 11 of the pack here.

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

5 LATEST INSIGHTS ON PERFORMANCE IN LAST QUARTER

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of Latest Insights on Performance In Last Quarter, which can be found on slides 13-16 of the pack here.

A RIG member asked whether the objection statistics in the dashboard are under review. The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised they are under review, and they are looking to identify any trends in the objection data.

Another RIG member stated I0214 has been raised, which is on objections and multiple registration attempts. They explained this change was currently going through an initial assessment, but parties will be given the opportunity to feed into this change as it progresses.

6 SUPPLIERS WHO DEAPPOINT UNQUALIFIED METER OPERATOR AGENTS (MOA)

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of Suppliers who de-appoint Unqualified Meter Operator Agents (MOA), which can be found on slide 18 of the pack here.

A RIG member asked where the responsibility of qualification with regards to Meter Operator sits. The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised it's a REC requirement. The RIG member asked who would be responsible for allowing a qualification to lapse, if a Meter Operator still has a meter portfolio. The Code Manager Lead Analyst noted some of these parties did not transition to a REC party when the REC went live. They stated for parties who are trying to exit the market, the REC Code Manager are proactively working with them to ensure their portfolio is handed over, prior to them exiting the market. The RIG member asked what the ramifications will be for Suppliers who still have any of the unqualified MOA's appointed for their MPANs by 31 December 2024. The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained a PAT such as a management assertion technique could be applied but considering the volumes are fairly small, the hope is that the issues can be resolved without the need for a PAT to be considered.

A RIG member asked if they hadn't had recent contact, can they assume they don't have any MPANs in their portfolio with the unqualified MOA's registered. The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised parties would have received a recent notification if they do, therefore if parties haven't been contacted then they won't have any MPANs in their portfolio registered to these MOA's.

7 REC PROCESS MAPS

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of REC Process Maps, which can be found on slides 20-26 of the pack here.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked RIG members if they were aware of the REC process maps. A couple of RIG member stated they were aware of them; however, this showed most RIG members were not aware of them. The Code Manager Lead Analyst mentioned the idea is to promote them a bit more. They asked the RIG members who were aware of them, what they use them for. A RIG member highlighted they use the process maps to look at a visualised version of a process, rather than the text version of a process. They mentioned if the process is complex, it proves tricky to see the visual process on one screen and it might require some formatting.

Another RIG member highlighted the reason why the process maps aren't widely used could be due to parties preferring to access the REC Schedules. They advised the clarity of the wording in a Schedule might be more useful than a process map.

Another RIG member stated previously they would navigate to the REC Schedules, however after seeing how the process maps are displayed, their preference would now be to access the process maps. They advised this would be if they needed to have a quick look at a step in one of the REC processes, however if more clarity is needed, they can access the REC Schedules. They elaborated it would be useful if both the process maps and the Schedules were published in the same area of the REC portal. Several RIG members agreed with this view.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst asked if RIG members want to provide further feedback on the REC process maps, they can email the REC Technical Enquiries mailbox.

8 AOB

8.1 JANUARY RIG MEETING

The Chair explained the January RIG meeting is currently scheduled for 10 January 2025. They stated the plan is to keep that date in the diary, as it follows the sequence of the meetings being held on the second Friday of the month. They highlighted meeting invitations will be sent to members in due course and that the paper day will be 06 January 2025.

8.2 RECCO ENGAGEMENT SURVEY

The Chair highlighted RECCO have issued their annual engagement survey. They advised a link to the survey will be provided in the weekly bulletin and can be found on the RECCo website. They stated parties have until 20 December to respond to the survey.

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