RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

I0237 – TECHNICAL CHANGE WORKSHOP – MEETING 3
MEETING NOTES

MEETING	**I0237 TCW Meeting 3**
DATE	**22 July 2026 (10:00 – 12:00)**
LOCATION	**Via Teams**

Presenter	Representing	Initials	Role
Finn Deacon	REC Code Manager (CM)	FD	Chair / Solution Lead
Lorna Mallon	REC Code Manager (CM)	LM	Regulatory Specialist
Flo Monea	REC Code Manager (CM)	FM	Change Analyst
April Harbour	Retail Energy Code Company (RECCo)	AH	Market Design Lead

Full attendee list available upon request.

1 INTRODUCTIONS AND AGENDA (SLIDE 1-2)

Code Manager (CM) opened the third Technical Change Workshop (TCW) for I0237 – Erroneous Switch Review: CSS Solution. The purpose was to close remaining data-architecture points from TCW #2 and review the proposed Energy Supplier data-items table. The agenda covered Registration ID, REL address data, the Data Items table, the forward Supply Start Date and next steps.

2 CARRIED FORWARD CONTEXT FROM TCW #2 (SLIDES 3-4)

For context only, CM confirmed that four design assumptions from TCW #2 remained unchanged:

- following an accepted Erroneous Switch (ES) the subsequent re-Registration process should stay as close as possible to existing Switching arrangements;
- the re-Registration process will not allow for Objections, Annulments or Withdrawals;
- the Registration Pending Notification will carry the Erroneous Switch (ES) Resolution Indicator flag; and
- TCW #3 would concentrate on gaining an agreed consensus from representatives on the previously discussed design assumptions for the ES data architecture.

Design Assumptions	Action
TCW #2 positions were carried forward unchanged and were not reopened during TCW #3.	N/A

3 REGISTRATION ID

During TCW #2, Energy Supplier representatives expressed a desire for the Registration ID, which is a unique identifier generated by the CSS when a Switch Request is progressed, to be included within the data architecture for the proposed ES process.

Prior to TCW #3, CM asked Energy Supplier representatives to provide information about how they currently utilise the Registration ID within their organisation, if at all. Energy Supplier representatives advised that Registration ID is not currently visible in their operational systems. The TCW representatives and CM discussed whether the Registration ID Data Item would be materially valuable to them under the design for the ES process data architecture, or whether it would be more valuable to retain Data Item Losing/ Gaining Supplier Market Participant Identifiers (MPID) to allow for effective validation on an ES request. TCW representatives were content for Gaining and Losing Supplier MPID values to be used within the ES process data architecture to support the Supplier-facing identification and validation of the relevant active registration upon receipt of an ES initiation request.

The CSS System Operator representative explained that the CSS uses the Registration ID under existing business validation rules relating to Switch Requests. It was agreed that this should remain as a design consideration on whether the data Registration ID should continue to be utilised within the new ES Process. It was however noted that the CSS would be capable of conducting validation on other Data Items to identify the latest Registration, if necessary. It was suggested for this aspect to be included as part of the Service Provider impact assessment to allow the for a detailed assessment against this requirement.

The agreed design assumption is therefore to remove Registration ID from ES initiation and response payloads while allowing CSS to derive and use it internally for business validation procedures. Technical feasibility and the wider design will still be confirmed through service-provider assessment and later consultation.

Outcome	Action
Registration ID will not be utilised in the Supplier-facing ES process messaging.	CM to remove Registration ID from I0237 data architecture.
Gaining and Losing Supplier MPIDs will remain in the Supplier-facing payload.	N/A
The design consideration to retain use of Registration ID when the ES initiation request is	CSS systems operator to confirm technical capability of CSS to handle Registration ID to enable business rule validation

received by CSS and utilise this item to conduct business rule validation for active registrations.	procedures during REC Service Provider impact assessment.

4 REL ADDRESS DATA ITEM (SLIDES 7-8)

Energy Supplier representatives were asked to outline what key pieces of the REL Address Data Item they need to identify and conduct validation during the ES process that an address is accurate. CM confirmed that the full REL payload contains more information than is needed to conduct their validation on for the ES process, including the Unique Property Reference Number (UPRN) and location coordinates. TCW representatives considered the potential scale of use and the practicalities of facilitating the REL. A view was raised that, in most instances, Parties may first utilise the existing Enquiry Services to obtain the information required before considering any further action. Energy Supplier representatives considered address information useful for operational validation and confirmed that they would continue to validate addresses through their own processes and Enquiry Services.

It was discussed that there is value in ensuring that a dual-fuel consensus on address Data Items is used under the ES process, Representatives confirmed that under the current ES process they generally conduct validation on the first three lines of the address, and postcode. These could be based upon the same precedent of the existing REL address attributes, or another consideration would be to create a new set of address-based Data Items such as house number, street, town/county and postcode. It was agreed the CM would consider both options as part of the design and present at a future TCW.

Furthermore, it was the agreed consensus that the current design assumption is that the CSS will not conduct any validation on the address data utilised within the ES requests, it would simply pass the information across to the appropriate responding ES Supplier to allow them to conduct internal validation on.

TCW representatives supported a reduced REL-derived address, as this provides consistency across fuels, which doesn't appear under the current ES arrangements, and provisionally the first three address lines and postcode. The exact fields and terminology remain to be defined. Members agreed that relevant address components should be mandatory, but CSS should not validate the address.

Outcome	Action
A dual fuel address-based set of Data Items will be utilised during the ES process	CM to define potential options of address base items that could be used for the ES process and bring these for discussion at future TCW.
CSS will not conduct any validation on address-based Data Items during the ES process.	N/A

5 DATA ITEMES PROCESS: DATA ARCHITECTURE TABLE

Following the action for the CM to propose an updated position of the existing ES process data architecture table as taken during TCW#2, the table was provided to representatives ahead of TCW#3 for discussion during the workshop.

CM and TCW representatives reviewed the proposed data-items table line by line (see attached Excel). The table below details the key design assumptions which were captured duringTCW#3

Proposed Data Item	Proposed Rules	TCW #3 discussion points	TCW #3 ongoing design assumption
MPxN	- Cannot be updated thought the process - Mandatory field - Included in the E2E ES process messaging - Not included in the CSS response - Currently within G&E flows	TCW representatives agreed with the proposed Data Item rules.	MPXN will be utilised throughout the E2E ES process with appropriate rules set out in Proposed Rules column.
Erroneous Switch Reason for Return	- Mandatory field - Can only be updated by the Supplier that Gained the MPXN erroneously. - Included in the E2E ES process messaging. - Not included in the CSS response - Currently within G&E flows	One TCW representative enquired on the ability to amend this item during the process, if they are the Supplier who lost the MPXN erroneously. CM confirmed this should sit with the Gaining Supplier as they only they can confirm the reason for the ES. The rationale behind the Gaining Supplier only being able to amend this field is to allow the process to continue instead of receiving a rejection and re-starting the ES process	ES Reason for Return will be utilised through the E2E ES process with appropriate rules set out in Proposed Rules column. Further discussion on associated enumerations will take place in future TCW.

Proposed Data Item	Proposed Rules	TCW #3 discussion points	TCW #3 ongoing design assumption
Initial Consumer Contact Date	- Cannot be updated thought the process (defined at point of Initiation) - Mandatory field - Included in theE2E ES process messaging. - Not included in the CSS response - Currently within G&E flows	CM confirmed this is the date of first Consumer contact, or the date the Supplier initiating the ES request became aware, where there has been no Consumer contact. CM confirmed as part of the legal drafting activity, this clarification is to be included in the Data Item population rules.	Initial Consumer Contact Data will be utilised through the E2E ES process with appropriate rules as set out in the proposed rules column, additionally further definition of the Data Item population rule to be set out clearly within subsequent legal text drafting. Data Item
Supplier that gained the MPxN in error MPID	- Cannot be updated thought the process - Mandatory field - Included in the E2E ES process messaging - Not included in the CSS response - This currently sits within the current flow for Gas, but not for Electricity (see discussion point). - The design will include this Data Item in the ES messaging structure	CM confirmed that for Electricity, under the current D0301 (Erroneous Transfer Communication) flow the Gaining Supplier MPID is contained within the flow header and not specified as Data Items in the flow structure itself. The design assumption for I0237 is that the message(s) will contain the Gaining Supplier MPID in the message structure .	Name of this Data Item to be confirmed. The MPID will be utilised throughout the E2E ES process with appropriate rules as set out in the Proposed Rules column.

Proposed Data Item	Proposed Rules	TCW #3 discussion points	TCW #3 ongoing design assumption
Supplier that lost the MPxN because of the error MPID	- Cannot be updated thought the process - Mandatory field Included in the E2E ES process messaging - Not included in the CSS response - This currently sits within the current flow for Gas, but not for Electricity. - The design will include this Data Item in the ES messaging structure	. CM confirmed that for For Electricity, under the current D0301 (Erroneous Transfer Communication) flow the Losing Supplier MPID is contained within the flow header and not specified as a Data Item in the flow structure itself. The design assumption for I0237 is that the message(s) will contain the Losing Supplier MPID in the message structure.	Name of this Data Item to be confirmed. The MPID will be utilised throughout the E2E ES process with appropriate rules as set out in the Proposed Rules column.
Original Supply Start Date	- Cannot be updated though the process - Mandatory field - Included in the E2E ES process messaging. - Not included in the CSS response - Currently within G&E flows.	One TCW representative enquired whether it would be appropriate for CSS to validate against the Supply Start Date and the Losing/Gaining Supplier MPIDs or whether this validation should be done by the Supplier. CM noted that the expectation is that CSS would not conduct validation on this Data Item, and it would be expected that the responding Supplier would be able to validate upon this item. response would provide the Acceptance/Rejection and the Reason code.	Original Supply Start Date will be utilised throughout the E2E ES process with appropriate rules as set out in the Proposed Rules column.

Proposed Data Item	Proposed Rules	TCW #3 discussion points	TCW #3 ongoing design assumption
Accept / Reject ES indicator	- New Data Item proposed. Proposed value set to be determined. - Conditional field only available to be updated by the Supplier responding to the ES initiation. -	TCW #3 members were content with the proposal and the rationale provided by the CM.	Accept/ Reject ES will be utilised by the respondent Supplier to an ES request. Discussion on indicator values to be had in future TCW.
Rejection Reason	- New Data Item proposed. Proposed value set to be determined - Can only be updated by the Supplier responding to the ES initiation. - Conditional item that is mandatory when ES is Rejected. - Not included in the CSS response - Rejection Reason Data Item is proposed to be used for reporting purposes.	Members required clarity around the meaning of 'conditional'. CM clarified that this term is applicable when completing the legal text drafting for the EMDS. The field will not be present at the start of the process, rather it will be required following an ES request has been made as part of the response required (existing in the responding message as a mandatory field). .	Rejection Reason will be utilised by the respondent Supplier to an ES Request. Rejection Reason Enumerations to be discussed at future TCW. Data Item Enumerations to be agreed on a dual-fuel basis. Assurance/ Reporting obligations on Data Item to be discussed in future TCW. Data Item

Proposed Data Item	Proposed Rules	TCW #3 discussion points	TCW #3 ongoing design assumption
CSS Rejection Reason	- Utilise the existing CSS Standard Body Response message - Triggered back to Market Participant as a result of an accepted ES message within CSS.	TCW #3 members were content with the proposal. CM noted that a further TCW session will be Data Item. This message will be discussed in a future TCW.	Further discussion on response message to be discussed once ES process has been designed. For CSS rejections Error Code/ Title/ Descriptions to be drafted and aligned to business data validation rules.
Consumer Name	- Can be updated by the Supplier who lost the MPXN erroneously. - This will be a Mandatory field. - Not included in CSS response. - Currently within G&E flows	CM asked representatives if this item should have the option to be updated by the Supplier who lost the MPXN erroneously. Representatives agreed with this and confirmed the Supplier who lost the MPXN erroneously may require the ability update this Data Item during the ES process. This may be relied upon to when establishing Guaranteed Standards of Performance (GSOP) payments as well as for validating an ES has occurred. The Supplier who gained the MPXN erroneously can capture the Consumer Name in Additional Information Field when responding to an initiation.	Consumer Name will be utilised in the E2E ES process in line with Proposed Rules column. Consumer Name can be updated throughout the ES process by the Supplier who lost the MPXN erroneously, further discussion on what point within the process this is unchangeable. Supplier who gained the MPXN erroneously cannot update Consumer Name Data Item when responding to an initiation but can utilise Additional Information field to

Proposed Data Item	Proposed Rules	TCW #3 discussion points	TCW #3 ongoing design assumption
			support validation and resolution, population rules drafting to be inclusive of this scenario. Further design discussion to take place on the Security Protocols CSS will have in place to manage receipt of Consumer Name.
Consumer Email Address	- Can be updated by the Supplier who lost the MPXN erroneously. - This will be a Mandatory field. - Not included in CSS response. - Currently within G&E flows	CM confirmed this is an Optional Data Item as Energy Suppliers do not always have this piece of information. This may be used to support Supplier procedures as part of the GSOP payment.	Data Item Consumer Email address can be utilised in the E2E ES Process as described within the Proposed Rules column.
Additional Information	- Can be updated throughout the process. - This will be an Optional field. - Included in the E2E ES process messaging - Not included in the CSS response - Currently within G&E flows.	It was confirmed that the Supplier that gained in error response to the initiation can put Consumer Name in this field (CM to ensure this is covered in the legal text to reflect this). Members confirmed the need for this to be a free text field. Whilst Optional, guidance will be given that it is recommended that as much information is put in here as possible. No symbols to be included e.g. @, # etc	Additional Information can be utilised in the E2E ES process as described within the Proposed Rules column. Supplementary guidance will be made available to Parties to confirm how this field is utilised operationally.

Proposed Data Item	Proposed Rules	TCW #3 discussion points	TCW #3 ongoing design assumption
		CM took an action to confirm with ElectraLink on the character limits (Gas and Electricity) for this field. It was confirmed that CSS would not perform any validation against this Data Item, rather it would just 'pass it on'.	CSS will not conduct any validation on this field, however there may be aspect around character use and limitation within CSS that needs to validate in order to inform guidance.
Address	- Potential new Data Items - Can be updated throughout the process. - It will be a Mandatory field. - Included in the Initiation, Acceptance and Rejection - Not included in CSS response. - Currently, while address does form part of the G&E, the new requirements are different. Also G&E current requirements do not match.	CM confirmed the format will look at a reduced address set, provisionally focusing on the first three lines and postcode. Further information on this discussion point included under Section 4 of this document.	Confirmed as proposed with the caveat of the amendments covered in Section 4 of this document.
Forward Supply Start Date	- This would not be updateable - It will be a Conditional field (mandatory if Supplier Losing the Supply) - Included in the Initiation, Acceptance and Rejection	The exact value of number of working days is to be discussed at a future TCW. Values between 1-5 were discussed by members, but no conclusion was reached.	CM confirmed that they would raise this at a future TCW where

Proposed Data Item	Proposed Rules	TCW #3 discussion points	TCW #3 ongoing design assumption
	- Not included in CSS response. - It was agreed that this Data Item would be discussed further at a future TCW		

6 FORWARD SUPPLY START DATE

Following discussion at TCW#2, the CM took an action to provide potential options on how the forward Supply Start Date item could be managed under the ES Process.

Prior to TCW#3, the CM shared with TCW representatives a potential design approach as described within this section.

The design approach presented changed the intention of prescribing a specified calendar date, which could lead to re-registration failures, and instead was based upon the specification of a forward-looking number of WDs. This approach would mitigate unintentional failures or delays within the ES process and allows the CSS to calculate the calendar date to which the new Supply Start Date would become effective on.

The procedural elements of this design approach would enable the Supplier who had lost the MPXN in error to specify a notice period value (provisionally described as 1-5, aligned to the relevant WDs). This value would determine how quickly a re-Registration could take place following the completion of the ES process.

The approach considered that this Data Item value would be conditional and can be set at the point of either initiation or response to an ES request but once committed becomes unchangeable and can only be set by the Supplier who lost the MPXN in error. It would also be Mandatory for the Losing Supplier to provide this as part of an ES response. This is to ensure that where the ES progresses under the shortest resolution timelines there is no downstream impact to timelines and associated processes following a re-Registration, for example, Consumer communications, billing and settlement processes and Agent Appointments.

The design approach also considered that where an ES request does not receive a response, CSS would determine the forward Supply Start Date at a default value, based on appropriate conditions to be discussed with representatives during TCW#3 and future sessions. The design approach described that upon instances where no ES response had been received, and the acceptance of the ES is determined through non-response that the default for the forward-looking SSD determined would align to the minimum value.

During TCW#3 representatives agreed with the premise of the approach and that prescribing number of WDs over a calendar date could reduce unnecessary errors and failures within the ES process.

Discussion on appropriate minimum and maximum working days was also had. Representatives discussed that a minimum of 3WDs may be the most appropriate as this would allow minimal impact to downstream processes for both Domestic and Non-Domestic sites, this is to be discussed further in a future TCW to ensure that whatever threshold is applied it wouldn’t consequentially impact Parties obligations under the REC, or other Codes.

Representatives also discussed whether the maximum threshold (presented as 5WDs) should be flexible to allow consideration for more complex cases to be dealt with. The CM confirmed that if there were appropriate reasons to allow for flexibility on the maximum threshold these should be raised by Supplier representatives to ensure there was an appropriate business case. The CM furthermore confirmed that the current approach for a maximum 5WD threshold is to ensure that the initial use case around reduction of ES processing timelines is achieved.

A more specified in-depth discussion will be had in a future TCW on this item.

Design Assumption	Action
Use a Working-Day value rather than a Supplier-entered calendar date.	N/A
The Supplier that lost the MPXN in error may select a value from one to five WD when it initiates or responds; the value is then locked.	N/A
Further work to be done in a future TCW to understand if a “notice of pending loss” or equivalent confirmation message is needed	Code Manager to ensure that this design consideration is discussed at a future TCW.

A final discussion point was raised by the CM around how the forward-looking SSD defined would need to be complementary to the re-Registration procedures, specifically to look at how the current intervention window would need to be managed. A design assumption from previous TCWs is that there should be little to no change to the re-Registration process as a result of an ES and that there would be no intervention capability.

In order to ensure that appropriate timelines for re-Registration are kept intact, it was raised that whilst there would be no capability for a Supplier to intervene, the intervention window should remain to avoid downstream process impact. The CM asked representatives to consider this ahead of the next TCW where further discussion could be had.

7 DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

The Date and Time of TCW #4 will be confirmed separately. TCW#4 will focus primarily on Data Item Sequencing, and an agenda and slides will be shared ahead of time.