RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

REC CHANGE ISSUES GROUP
MEETING MINUTES

MEETING	**RECCHIG_25_1106**
DATE	**06 November 2025, 10:00**
LOCATION	**By teleconference**

Presenter	Representing	Initials	Role
Paul Witton-Dauris	REC Code Manager	PWD	Chair
Bela Ashworth	REC Code Manager	BA	Lead Analyst
Finn Deacon	REC Code Manager	FD	REC Technical Services
Francine Peyroux-Sissoko	REC Code Manager	FPS	Lead Analyst
James Hardy	REC Code Manager	JH	Lead Analyst
Jonny Moore	RECCo	JM	Operations Consultant
Lydia Bentley	REC Code Manager	LB	Lead Analyst
Lorna Mallon	REC Code Manager	LM	Subject Matter Expert
Maxime van Eyseren	REC Code Manager	ME	REC Technical Services
Tim Newton	REC Code Manager	TN	Subject Matter Expert
Harry Firth	REC Code Manager	HF	Secretariat

Full attendee list available upon request.

1. INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed attendees to the REC Change Issues Group (CHIG) meeting.

2. CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA

The Chair invited any additional items of business for consideration during the meeting. No items were raised by attendees.

3. APPROVAL OF THE PREVIOUS MINUTES

The Chair invited attendees to provide comments on the draft minutes from the meeting which took place on 02 October 2025. HF advised that no comments had been made prior to the meeting. There were no comments, and the minutes were approved as an accurate reflection of the meeting.

4. R0096 - CSS MESSAGE REGENERATION FUNCTIONALITY

FD provided attendees with a detailed overview of the Change Proposal. FD explained that since the Central Switching Service (CSS) go-live, there have been multiple incidents where the system failed to generate messages, resulting in switching process failures. These failures required manual intervention, which was inefficient and disruptive. FD advised that to address this, the proposed solution includes the implementation of a Workflow Tracking Ledger to monitor workflow states, a Workflow Regeneration Function to identify and correct mismatches, and a Failing-to-Resolve Ledger to provide real-time visibility into unresolved workflows.

FD elaborated on the technical enhancements of the solution, which include durable checkpoints via Cosmos DB orchestrator, migration to Service Bus Premium for improved resilience, fault injection testing using Chaos Studio, load testing with K6, and dual-region failover simulations. The design also incorporates lessons learned from R0080.

FD advised that the cost of the solution has increased from the original estimate of £400k–£534k to a revised total of £1.05 million due to the expanded scope and added resilience features. These additional benefits of the solution include near-zero data loss with a recovery point objective of less than two minutes, reduced market disruption through automatic recovery, cost avoidance by minimising manual reprocessing, improved transparency via dashboards and logs, and a future-proof architecture to prevent similar incidents.

A Supplier representative asked how many incidents occur per month that fall into these scenarios. A DCC representative responded that the issue is randomised and varies, with peaks of 10–15 incidents per month, though sometimes lower. They explained that the current workaround is manual and post-event, whereas R0096 would allow proactive identification and resolution.

A Supplier representative asked why this solution was not considered when the scope of CSS was built a few years ago. A DCC representative responded that the scenario was not envisioned during initial design. The Supplier representative then suggested that some of the cost of this should have been considered a couple of years ago. ME acknowledged the point and explained that the CSS has evolved significantly since the original Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA).

A Supplier representative suggested that it would be good to see examples of how the new features are going to prevent P1-type issues. The DCC representative explained that the self-heal functionality would identify and fix stalled workflows before impact, unlike the previous incident where issues were only discovered post gate closure.

A Supplier representative asked what the estimated cost to industry of the P1 incident was. ME said the figures were not immediately available but could be included in future consultation materials. An Xoserve representative offered to share ScottishPower's cost data as a proxy.

A poll was launched to determine whether attendees would want R0096 to go out for a Party Impact Assessment or straight to consultation. 57% (12) of the 21 votes supported R0096 having a Party Impact Assessment.

5. R0178 - IMPROVEMENTS TO CSS BUSINESS PROCESS LOGIC

ME provided attendees with a detailed overview of the Change Proposal. ME advised that R0178 addresses three key issues in CSS business logic: deactivation during an in-flight switch, deactivation of a cancelled registration, and duplicate MPXN entries in One Fail All Fail (OFAF) switches.

ME proposed two solution options. The technical solution involves amending CSS validation rules at an estimated cost of £370k. The non-technical solution includes updating legal text, issuing guidance documents, and monitoring compliance through the Performance Assurance team.

A Distribution Network Operator (DNO) representative asked if a technical solution is implemented, would that also feature in the reporting. ME responded that reporting is not in scope for the technical change. The DNO representative asked if the Code Manager would not necessarily know that suppliers are processing incorrect data without that reporting.

An Xoserve representative supported the technical solution, stating that decentralised validation across industry systems would be costly. They expressed concern about allowing Suppliers to deactivate registrations before switches complete, which could lead to unregistered sites and safety issues.

A Supplier representative questioned the number of incidents for some of the key CSS issues and queried whether if it was one or two parties causing them all. They suggested that the Code Manager work out how many parties are currently causing incidents and supported the non-technical solution if it is a low number of parties. ME responded that the data would have to be confirmed. The Supplier representative also commented on the differences between gas and electricity registration, suggesting gas should adopt electricity's continuous supplier model.

A poll was launched to gauge preferences between the technical and non-technical solutions. 71% (10) of the 14 votes supported the Code Manager developing the technical solution further.

6. I0172 - END-TO-END NEW CONNECTIONS PROCESS REVIEW

TN provided an overview of the domestic gas new connections process from the IGT perspective. They described the typical process, which involves developers appointing suppliers and shippers, agreeing on project summary reports, and installing meters.

TN identified several issues, including poor communication between parties, address mismatches, cross-metering, and data misalignment.

A Supplier representative mentioned an upcoming DCC workshop on address quality and suggested tagging MPXNs on infrastructure to prevent confusion. LM confirmed that registration for the workshop was still open.

A DNO representative stated that several of the identified issues could be resolved by following PSA/PSB processes correctly. They noted that another issue involving incorrect meter installation, is more complex and often caused by developer error.

A Supplier representative highlighted the challenges suppliers face when customers switch before resolution, especially when cross-metering occurs.

TN concluded by stating that further investigation into volumes and data flows would be conducted, and proposals for improvement would be developed following engagement with the DCC workshop.

7. I0262 - ADDITIONAL REGISTRATION DATA (GAS) UNDER SMART ENERGY CODE

LB presented attendees with an update on the Issue. They advised that I0262 is a cross-code change proposal to move the obligation for monthly smart meter data reporting from the SEC to the REC. The aim is to simplify gas transporter obligations and maintain operational continuity.

LB explained that the data in question is a monthly report sent by gas transporters via Xoserve to the DCC, detailing the number of supply points with smart meters. The proposal seeks to relocate this obligation to the REC without disrupting the existing data transfer mechanism.

An Xoserve representative supported maintaining the current delivery method to ensure continuity. A Supplier representative pointed out formatting corrections, noting that references to FTP should be updated to SFTP for accuracy. LB confirmed that continuity is a priority and welcomed further feedback.

8. I0275 - MHHS RELATED METERING POINTS ACROSS MARKET SEGMENTS

JM presented attendees with an update on the Issue. They advised that I0275 concerns MHHS-related metering points with relationships spanning multiple market segments. They explained that BSCP706 allows such relationships to default to the advanced segment, enabling MOA appointments without requiring a REC change.

However, validation rules currently prevent data service appointments in these scenarios. Elexon has agreed to investigate a change to address this issue. JM also noted that the transfer of MTDs for advanced segments is limited to D268 messages, which do not include meter register mapping. This issue will be addressed under IO273.

No objections were raised to the proposed approach.

9. CODE MANAGER ISSUE TRACKER UPDATE

JH provided attendees with an update of several Issues currently being progressed by the Code Manager. The full list of updates is available to view on the meeting slides on the REC Portal.

JH confirmed that 17 changes would be implemented in the November REC release. While most changes are non-technical, the release includes new SDEP screens as part of the solution for R0232. JH advised that updated documents will be available on the REC Portal by the end of 07 November.

10. RECCO ANNUAL STAKEHOLDER SATISFACTION SURVEY

The Chair reminded attendees about the annual stakeholder satisfaction survey. They encouraged everyone to participate and noted that the deadline had been extended to 18 November. A QR code was shared to facilitate access to the survey, and can be found in the meeting slides.

11. AOB

The Chair invited attendees to provide AOB.

An attendee requested that meeting slides be distributed earlier, ideally one week in advance. The Chair acknowledged the request and committed to improving the timeline for future meetings.

JM flagged a potential MHHS issue involving meter install dates that predate MPAN creation, which may require further investigation.