RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

REC ISSUE GROUP
MEETING NOTES

DATE	**11 April 2025, 10:00**
LOCATION	**By teleconference**

1 INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed attendees to the April 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:

- 2025 Switching Incentive Regime Stakeholder Survey
- Parties Having Effective Telephone Lines

2 PERFORMANCE ASSURANCE UPDATE

The Code Manager Lead Analyst provided an overview of the Performance Assurance update, which can be found on slides 4-9 of the pack here. This was split into a variety of different sections.

Sprint 4:

Slides 7-8 of the pack here. The Code Manager Lead Analyst informed Members data cleanse sprint 4 commenced on 01 April 2025, and will finish on 31 October 2025. PAB have approved the sprint 4 targets outlined for the 4 reports. These reports are Energised No Meter, DNO Invalid Topline, Gas Invalid/Missing MAP ID and New MTD Items.

A RIG member mentioned that previously the timings for cleansing the new MTD items were similar to MHHS data cleansing taking place on similar data items. They commented this caused prioritisation issues, as there is only so much resource Parties can appoint on data cleansing activities. The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained they have engaged with the MHHS programme to define separate data cleanse time periods therefore there is not a duplication in data cleanse activity.

Another RIG member mentioned that in some scenarios; they struggle to obtain all of the relevant information required to update a missing MAP ID. They highlighted there is no contract in place between them and MAP Parties, therefore there is no obligation for them to receive that information, this makes obtaining the relevant information difficult. The RIG member asked how they could potentially escalate this within the Code. The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised that MAP's, although not REC Parties have been engaged with during this process and have shared their portfolios with the Code Manager, which will be helpful in resolving these types of queries. They noted that now the Invalid/Missing MAP ID reports form part of sprint 4, there will now be more scrutiny on the volumes and if during the sprint the volumes are not decreasing, the Code Manager will investigate why. They advised that Parties can raise any issues they are facing with their OAM or the Performance Assurance team within the Code Manager, who can help.

Another RIG member mentioned MAP's do not have access to SDEP and due to the reporting containing personal data, they cannot be shared through email. They asked what communication has been used to engage with MAM's and MAP's on this process.

Action: RECRIG_25_0411_02_01 – The Code Manager to investigate whether there is a MAM to MAM or MAM to MAP communication channel in the REC.

Another RIG member asked if the reports will be sent to the current and installing MAP. The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised MAP's are sending in their current portfolio data into the REC.

Performance Assurance Check-Ins 2025:

Slide 9 of the pack here. The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained based on feedback from the industry, starting on 01 April 2025, the Code Manager will rollout Performance Assurance (PA) Check-Ins for REC Parties. These will be held quarterly, biannually or annually based on Party reference and risk rating. The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised if Parties operate as more than one Party type, they will have the option to decide whether each Party type will be discussed under one Check-In, or separately.

3 POLICY METER EXCHANGES

The RIG member highlighted that their Party operates as MAM and a MAP in the energy industry. They explained there are scenarios where they have identified a meter needs exchanging and have raised this with the Supplier to confirm whether they want the meter to be exchanged, and in some scenarios the Supplier has said no, as it will form part of their smart programme. The RIG member asked the group for their views on whose responsibility it would be if there is damage caused to that meter by not completing the exchange, and what timeframes are in place for a Supplier to initiate the exchange.

Another RIG member highlighted they would prioritise safety over their smart meter programme, even if that means exchanging a legacy meter. They advised that they shared the view that this particular scenario isn't clearly defined by Code governance, and it could be useful to create obligations for meter safety.

The Chair asked members to investigate internally and provide any feedback to their OAM. The Chair noted they will ask for this to be on the agenda for the next G-OMGF meeting, for it to be discussed further.

4 REAL TIME SETTLEMENT METHODOLOGY (RTSM)

The Chair informed Members that agenda item 4 will no longer be discussed at today's meeting. The Party who raised it are unable to attend today's meeting. This item will now be added to May's RIG meeting.

5 AOB

5.1 2025 SWITCHING INCENTIVE REGIME STAKEHOLDER SURVEY

The RECCo representative provided an overview of the 2025 Switching Incentive Regime (SIR) Stakeholder Survey.

The RECCo representative informed Members that Ofgem established the REC SIR to allow industry to provide feedback on the Data Communications Company (DCC) performance incentives for its delivery of REC switching arrangement services. They highlighted that as a monopoly company providing services

to the energy market, the DCC is subject to regulatory Price Control. Each Regulatory Years Price Control is assessed by Ofgem.

The SIR Price Control element has two parts, one of which is performance against code defined service levels and is informed by PAB and managed by the PARC reporting. The other part is how successful the years engagement has been, which is comprised of two independent assessments from the DCC and RECCo.

The RECCo representative highlighted that obtaining feedback from Parties, on their experience of DCC's engagement performance is essential to a fully informed assessment. To gain Parties views, a two-week online survey will be conducted, starting from 29 April 2025 and finishing on 13 May 2025. Details will be communicated in the REC Bulletin, and the RECCo Newsletter.

The RECCo representative informed Members that Ofgem believe DCC's decisions should be informed by understanding its customer's needs. They want to understand how effectively DCC provided quality support and timely information.

No comments were raised by RIG members on this item.

5.2 PARTIES HAVING EFFECTIVE TELEPHONE LINES

The Code Manager Lead Analyst informed Members that Parties had noted that some Suppliers were not operating an effective telephone line to support the escalation process defined in REC Schedule 30, so may not be meeting their Supplier obligations. Some scenarios provided have been around long waiting times whilst trying to contact a Party, or the person answering the call not being empowered to make a decision, or they are not knowledgeable enough to offer support.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst suggested that this can result in consumer queries not being effectively resolved, with can then lead to consumers contacting the Energy Ombudsman. They asked if RIG members can engage internally and investigate whether they have an effective telephone service.

A RIG member mentioned this could be due to the volume of queries that Parties receive, and typically a phone call would be a last resort. They explained ideally the query would be resolved through a different channel, before it having to end up in a phone call.

Another RIG member mentioned it is important to have an audit trail between Parties when trying to resolve consumer queries so the use of SDEP is preferred. They noted this may take longer than a phone call, however if a query is taking a long time to be resolved, due to Party not engaging, the evidence of an audit trail is there if required.

Another RIG member highlighted Parties may find it easier to contact other Parties if they call at specific times. They advised Suppliers tend to receive more phone calls first thing in the morning and at lunchtimes, therefore avoiding those times of the day should decrease the waiting time. They noted it would be important to find the right balance between communication methods, as Suppliers calling each other a high number of times each day will cause a detrimental effect to their services.

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