RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

REC ISSUE GROUP MEETING NOTES

DATE	**13 June 2025, 10:00**
LOCATION	**By teleconference**

1 INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed attendees to the June meeting of the REC Issue Group (RIG) and confirmed the agenda.

The Chair confirmed that no 'Any Other Business' (AOB) items were raised prior to the meeting, with one AOB item being raised at this time. Later in the meeting, the RIG noted the following AOB items:

- Findings From MHHS Data Cleansing

2 PERFORMANCE ASSURANCE UPDATE

The Code Manager Lead Analyst informed Members that there is a Performance Assurance webinar scheduled for 02 July 2025. They highlighted this is a quarterly webinar and parties will have the opportunity to raise any topics they would like to be discussed.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst presented an update on Data Cleanse activity and advised that the energised no meter volumes have slightly increased over the last few months and suggested that a potential reason for this could be the push in the programme to replace Radio Tele Switch (RTS) meters. They asked RIG members to monitor these volumes during sprint 4 and the Performance Assurance team will also be reviewing these volumes.

A RIG member advised that the no meter pots provided as part of the Data Cleanse reporting do not include whether an MPAN is in a relationship or not. They noted that the data can be pulled from EES, however it doesn't pull the other MPAN. They suggested that having the other MPAN would be very useful and help with data cleansing, as they aren't easily able to obtain that data. The RIG member also suggested that RTS meters arent the sole cause for the issue they are encountering, however it is increasing the numbers.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst highlighted that for the purpose of the RIG conversation; the trend is going in the wrong direction. They noted this could be for a number of reasons and it will be reviewed as part of the mid review for sprint 4. They advised that for those Parties that are not able to decrease their numbers in their pots, the Code Manager will engage with them to understand why the volumes aren't decreasing and if it's due to not having enough data to work them, that can be investigated.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst informed Members that the missing MAP ID gas reports are starting to be cleansed as part of sprint 4. They advised MAP's have sent through additional data and there have been instances of two or more MAP's effectively claiming the same meter, which haven't been included in the volumes. They highlighted this has been investigated and a resolution has been proposed.

A RIG member highlighted that it is difficult to work on some data cleanse reporting if they are are not able to engage with other parties in the industry. They are heavily reliant on other parties sending them their data to help with the cleanse. The Code Manager Lead Analyst advised this will be considered during the review of sprint 4. The RIG member suggested that there should be a big drive to cleanse this

data, as parties having incorrect data not only impacts them, but it also impacts the Consumer. The RIG member questioned the collaboration with parties for the data cleanse process.

Another RIG member highlighted previous documentation always stated who the responsible party would be. They noted if an MPAN appears on two reports for two different parties, the documentation would state that the parties need to interact and who the lead party is. The Code Manager Lead Analyst mentioned the guidance does state who needs to kick off the process, however there could be a situation whereby the party who needs to start the process doesn't have all of the required data and needs another party to provide them with additional data.

Another RIG member explained a MEM is currently unable to send the updated MAP details directly to the CDSP, as there is no scenario variant for it. They mentioned they have to send the details over to the Shipper and they send it into the CDSP. They proposed a Change Proposal could be raised to add in the additional scenario variant to ensure a MEM can directly update the CDSP.

It was noted there is a discrepancy in the REC around the scenario variants for a MEM sending in data to the CDSP. REC Schedule 14 shows this scenario variant, however the Digital REC and Data Specification doesn't.

Action: RECRIG_25_0613_02_01 – The Code Manager to investigate the discrepancy in the REC regarding the scenario variant to allow a MEM to send date directly to the CDSP.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst informed Members that an issue has been raised to look at getting the CDSP reports run more frequently. They advised currently it is only run on an annual basis.

3 IMPORT/EXPORT MPAN PAIR REQUESTS

A RIG Member provided an overview of Import/Export MPAN Pair Requests, found on slide 6 of the slide deck.

A RIG member highlighted the REC Schedule states that if the request is for a new connection, it should be referred to the DNO. They mentioned Suppliers do not request new connections on a new property, they can only request a new import MPAN if it's an additional MPAN to an existing property. The raiser of this issue explained in their own context; these requests won't be on new builds. They also noted that the issue is that the export Supplier is not engaging during the process, and the process will stall due to there being no clear guidance.

The Code Manager representative suggested that it could be useful to add a line into the REC Schedule stating the Smart Export Guarantee (SEG) Licensee should be raising the request for the new export MPAN.

Another RIG member noted that a guidance document could be created to help with this process, or the drafting in the REC Schedule would need updating to be made clearer.

The Chair agreed to engage with the RIG member who raised this issue to discuss the next steps.

4 REAL TIME SETTLEMENT METHODOLOGY (RTSM)

Correla provided an overview of Real Time Settlement Methodology, which was provided as a pre-meeting paper.

The Presenter advised that the plan is for them to hold their own sessions in the future, providing parties with updates on how the RTSM is progressing. The Chair confirmed they would be happy to have Correla

return to future RIG meetings; however the Code Manager would help promote engagement with parties if Correla decide to hold their own sessions.

5 CROSSED METER/ADDRESS ESCALATION PROCESS REVIEW

The Code Manager provided an overview of Crossed Meter/Address Escalation Process Review, found on slide 9 of the slide deck.

A RIG member noted they had been experiencing a similar issue with crossed meter resolution, specifically where other parties are not intending to conduct a site audit. They advised the other parties just intend on sending an email, which doesn't resolve the situation. They highlighted it has a detrimental impact to the Consumer if industry systems aren't updated with the correct information.

Another RIG member supported these views, mentioning there could be an opportunity to review the crossed meter process. They highlighted there is guidance on the crossed meter process, but it may need to be reviewed to ensure it is still relevant and up to date. They advised this could help ensure that Consumer cases are resolved quicker and not having to involve the Ombudsman. Several RIG members agreed with these comments.

The Code Manager Lead Analyst explained they will liaise with the party who raised this issue and will work with them, to develop and raise a REC issue. They advised further updates will be provided at future RIG meetings.

6 AOB

6.1 FINDINGS FROM MHHS DATA CLEANSING

A RIG member highlighted whilst conducting their MHHS data cleansing, they have seen a high incident of IDNO's setting up new connections as CT's, when they are not CT sites. They explained this could cause issues further down the line, as MHHS isn't expecting smart on a CT site. They just wanted to make RIG members aware of this point, with the MHHS program potentially reaching out to IDNO's to understand what may have gone wrong in the process.

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