RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

REC METERING EXPERT PANEL
MEETING MINUTES

MEETING	**RECMEP_25_0611**
DATE	**11 June 2025, 10:00**
LOCATION	**By teleconference**

Attendee	Representing	Initials	Role
Steve Brand	Code Manager	SB	Committee Chair
Paul Abreu	Network Operators	PA	Committee Member
Jonathan Rand	Meter Equipment Managers	JR	Alternate Member
Steve Mulinganie	Energy Suppliers	SM	Committee Member
Rebecca Griffiths	Retail Energy Code Company	RG	Subject Matter Expert
April Harbour	Code Manager	AH	Change Analyst
Lydia Bentley	Code Manager	LB	Senior Change Analyst
Caroline Freimuller	Code Manager	CF	Change Analyst
Lorna Mallon	Code Manager	LM	Regulatory Specialist
Holly Law	Code Manager	HL	Change Delivery and Release Manager
Harriet Truss	Code Manager	HT	Senior Change Analyst
Glenn Sheern	Code Manager	GS	Regulatory Specialist
Brogan McNess	Code Manager	BMc	Secretariat
Tina Pearce	Code Manager	TP	Observer
Lee Walker	Ofgem	SMc	Observer
Shaun McRaith	Elexon	LW	Observer

1. INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed attendees to the REC Metering Expert Panel (RECMEP) meeting.

2. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

RECMEP Members were invited to provide comments on the Draft Minutes of the meeting held on 14 May 2025. The Draft Minutes were approved by the Members.

3. REVIEW OF ACTION LOG

The Code Manager updated Members that there were two proposed to close actions at this time.

GS provided an update on the action **RECMEP_25_0409_03** 'The Code Manager to provide an update on how the Meter Hub and Bulletins guidance will be produced and managed'. GS explained that it was deemed inappropriate to remove bulletins without confirming their validity. As a solution, each bulletin will include a review-by date, specified by the submitter. The team will then follow up with the submitted when that date is reached to confirm whether the document remains valid.

The Chair flagged that there was ongoing conversations regarding the action **RECMEP_25_0409_04** 'The Chair requested that all Members review the outstanding bulletins and return to RECMEP with recommendations of which bulletins/documents could be archived'. with it being taken to Service Termination Issue Reporting Guidance (STIRG) for further discussion. PA advised that it was reported at STIRG and that examples were shown of outdated bulletins from SP Energy Networks and UK Power Networks. PA asked those Distribution Network Operators (DNOs) to review and request withdrawal of irrelevant bulletins. PA also emphasised that irrelevant bulletins discourage Meter Equipment Managers (MEMs) from reading important ones. PA suggested clearer messaging on the Portal about relevance to meter operators. PA warned that if DNOs do not act, RECMEP would take action to clean up the content.

RECMEP **NOTED** the update and;

- **APPROVED** the closure of all outstanding actions.

4. SUB-COMMITTEE VOTING GUIDANCE

RECMEP Members were provided with an overview of the Sub-Committee Voting Guidance.

GS clarified that the short guidance note was to help sub-committees understand how to vote and provide reasons for their decisions and that the guidance was based on what is already in the REC. SM questioned whether it was possible to approve a change proposal but reject the proposed implementation date. GS confirmed that voters can approve a change but reject the implementation date. GS also explained that voters can also suggest an alternative date and provide reasons for their position.

RECMEP **NOTED** the update.

5. R0152 REVISION TO THE CONSOLIDATED METERING CODE OF PRACTICE (COMCOP)

RECMEP Members were presented with an update regarding the identified issues to the R0152 CoMCoP prior to being asked to vote on the proposed solution, implementation date and approach.

CF clarified that the Change Proposal aimed to revise the CoMCoP and to improve clarity, reduce duplication, and make audits easier to pass while not changing any obligations on Parties. CF noted that of the three committee members present in the meeting, two were closely involved in the Working Group. As such, CF offered to move directly to questions rather than provide a summary if MEP members wished.

SM supported the change proposal itself, however, expressed concern that the 13 weeks proposed between approval and implementation is insufficient for smaller Parties to adapt to such a significant structural change. SM advised that larger Parties may cope due to more resources, but smaller ones might struggle to meet the new requirements in time. SM advised that rushing the implementation could lead to non-compliance and audit issues. SM suggested a pragmatic approach and flexibility for smaller Parties. JR questioned why the proposed implementation date was a Friday, and CF clarified that all REC implementations occur on Fridays, hence the proposed 12 September 2025 date. CF explained that audits scheduled before around 02 October 2025 would still use the old version of the audit questions due to the questions being provided 15 Working Days before the audit is due to start, and that the new CoMCoP would make audits easier and clearer. CF confirmed that as part of release activities, it is possible to have the Operational Account Managers (OAMS) reach out to affected Parties to confirm they are aware of the proposed changes to CoMCoP and audit.

JR confirmed that there is a direct impact to his company due to their audits falling around the recommended implementation date. JR expressed concern regarding the workload of switching audit evidence formats and that smaller MEMs might not be aware of the change. HL reassured RECMEP Members that the release activities would include webinars, direct outreach and support from the OAMs. HL also confirmed that the number of impacted Parties would be manageable for the OAMs to reach out to directly. SM argued that repeating the legacy audit would be easier for most Parties than adapting to a new format on short notice. CF noted that the longest lead time requested during impact assessment or consultation was three months, with one Party even requesting a June implementation.

JR and SM stated they have had conversations with smaller Parties who are concerned about the 13 week lead time between approval and proposed implementation date. CF expressed disappointment that JR and SM did not encourage these Parties who needed more time to respond to the consultation. SM responded post meeting that parties are free to engage with Energy Suppliers bilaterally and it is also the Parties responsibility to respond to consultations. RG argued that the new audit format is clearer and easier and clarified it was unfair to assume Parties would struggle without evidence. SM again clarified that his concerns were based on direct conversations with MEMs.

SM questioned the auditor-driven timeline, saying it prioritises system constraints over stakeholder readiness. CF clarified that while 13 weeks was the minimum time required for the Metering Scheme Auditor to make the required changes, if Parties had responded to the impact assessment requesting a longer lead time than this, that would have been considered and factored into the proposed implementation date. CF again stated that no Party who responded to the impact assessment requested more than three month lead time.

PA supported the change and the proposed timeline but acknowledged smaller Parties might struggle, however, thought the change is necessary and beneficial. PA believed the timeline was reasonable and the change was worth the effort.

RECMEP **NOTED** the update and;

- **APPROVED** the proposed change solution unanimously;
- **APPROVED** the proposed implementation approach unanimously; and
- **REJECTED** the proposed implementation date of 12 September 2025 (with PA voting to approve, and SM and JR voting to reject).

Following the rejection of the proposed implementation date, CF confirmed that the Code Manager would need to discuss next steps internally. CF requested JR and SM to confirm what release timescale they would be comfortable with. Both JR and SM indicated they would be comfortable approving a 07 November 2025 release. CF added that if the Code Manager decided to revise the proposed implementation date, this could potentially be approved as an ex-committee vote, avoiding a delay until the July MEP meeting.

6. C3-0129 – UPDATES TO THE STIRG DOCUMENT

RECMEP Members were provided an update made to the STIRG Document.

CF clarified that a quick legal text change related to the STIRG document needed to be made. CF stated that there were two issues with the document, one being that the link to the MOCoPA website was outdated and would redirect users to an irrelevant website. The second issue being the general need to update references from MOCoPA to the REC Metering Hub. CF clarified that the outdated link had already been removed to prevent users from clicking on it, and the ask today was for the MEP to approve the legal text changes from MOCoPA to the REC Metering Hub. CF clarified that with the approval of the RECMEP the updated document would be published on the Portal by Friday 13 June.

RECMEP members **NOTED** and;

- **APPROVED** the proposed change solution.

7. R0198 METERING ASSET MANAGER (MAM) COMMUNICATION METHOD REGISTER UPDATE

RECMEP Members were provided an update on the R0198 Metering Asset Manager (MAM) communication method register.

LB clarified that the change proposal aims to create a register that records which communication methods are used by MAMs and Suppliers for sending Review of Gas Metering Arrangement flows. This is intended to help resolve missed market messages and improve data accuracy across the industry. LB informed the RECMEP that the register will be hosted on the REC Portal and will allow Parties to indicate primary and backup communication methods. LB advised that the solution has been iterated upon via the Change Issues Group, with feedback including the addition of of primary/backup preferences, expansion to include Supplier communications (to cover edge cases like Consumer-appointed MAMs) and consideration of pre-filling the register before go-live.

SM raised a concern about how the register would handle Parties that act as both Supplier and Shipper. LB confirmed that the register is scoped to Supplier-to-MAM interactions only. SM discussed whether Parties should be bound by what they declare in the register. LB explained that currently, the obligation is only to complete the register, not to be bound by it and that the register will be posed as a consultation question with 15 days to answer it. SM warned that making it binding could lead Parties to limit their declared methods, reducing the register's usefulness.

LB informed the RECMEP that this item will be returning to MEP in July 2025 to discuss the consultation outcomes and final vote.

RECMEP **NOTED** the update and;

- **APPROVED** the publication of a Consultation on the proposed solution.

8. MARKET-WIDE HALF HOURLY SETTLEMENT UPDATE

RECMEP Members were provided a Market-Wide Half Hourly Settlement update, which included the overview of the new Metering Guidance documents for the MEP, MHHS Code Drafting and Expedited Change Process.

HT introduced three new Category 3 guidance documents being developed to support MHHS implementation:

1. **Sharing Metering Asset Data** – Covers changes to the systems and processes for sharing Meter Technical Details (MTDs) under MHHS and for non-MHHS metering points.

2. **Change of Market Segments** – Explains the transition from "measurement class" to "market segment" as the key categorisation for metering points.

3. **Meter Operator Agent (MOA) Appointments** – Reflects the new metering service structure and use of DIP market messages.

HT informed that both the Sharing Metering Asset Data and Change of Market Segments are ready to go to consultation at the end of the week, with the MOA Appointments document will follow slightly later. HT confirmed the documents will be brought back in July 2025 for approval. HT confirmed that documents will be included in the REC Change Bulletin and flagged in the REC MHHS Bulletin.
SM asked how these would be flagged to MHHS project teams within businesses. HT reassured that they would be shared across all relevant channels, including the the MHHS programme newsletter, The Clock, and encouraged Members to flag them internally.

HT updated the panel on R0241, which includes incremental changes to MHHS code drafting. The changes have been endorsed by the Cross Code Advisory Group (CCAG) and directed by Ofgem. HT advised the Change Report will be considered by the Change Panel on 17 June and then will go to consultation. HT informed the release is scheduled for 22 September 2025, with a recommendation made to Ofgem for approval expected by 17 July 2025.

HT explained that a new Issue Resolution Group is being proposed to handle urgent cross-code issues during early life support and migration. This group would include code bodies and industry representatives and recommend urgent changes for fast-track implementation. HT confirmed that these changes would still go through REC governance but may require shortened notice periods.

RECMEP **NOTED** the update.

9. INDUSTRY ISSUES AND CHANGE TRACKER

RECMEP Members were provided an overview of the REC issues and changes including an update on three items on the change tracker that impacted the Panel.

RECMEP members **NOTED** both the overview and the update.

10. METER CONFIGURATION TABLES

RECMEP Members were provided with an update regarding the Meter Configuration Tables.

AH advised RECMEP that both the REC and Elexon had issued joint communications through the MHHS programme regarding the Meter Configuration Tables with only a small number of comments being received from both the MDD circular and the Code Manager channels. AH clarified all questions received were already addressed in the guidance document that had been circulated.

AH clarified that the next webinar is scheduled for Wednesday 9 July 2025 from 11:30 AM to 12:30 PM to provide further clarity and engagement with plans to reissue the original communications from AH via the MHHS Clock (the programme's newsletter) to ensure broader visibility. AH informed that there is a push to get more Parties to subscribe to the distribution list, as uptake has been low.

RECMEP **NOTED** the update.

11. AOB

Spelling and Formatting Issues on the CoMCoP documentation:

JR identified some minor issues in the CoMCoP document (e.g. spelling, grammar, and Excel search box functionality). JR questioned who should be sent the email with the recommendations. HL responded that such issues fall under housekeeping and should be sent to HL. HL confirmed they would be included in the July 2025 release.

Paul Abreu's Departure:

PA announced this was his last RECMEP meeting as he would be leaving at the end of June 2025. The Chair thanked PA for his incredible service and contributions to the industry and the panel.

Eric Fowler Resignation :

The Chair noted that Eric Fowler had also resigned due to changes in consultancy support. The Chair acknowledged Eric's valuable contributions to the industry and the MEP.

Upcoming Gas Operation Metering Forum (G-OMF) Session:

The Chair reminded attendees about the G-OMF session scheduled for 2:00 PM that afternoon. It would include a presentation from Fife College on hydrogen training.

Workshops on Change Process:

HL mentioned that REC is running workshops with various panels (including the Change Panel) to improve early engagement in the change process. HL advised a session will be arranged for the MEP after new members join. HL invited suggestions on topics or improvements for collaboration.

Next meeting date: 11 June 2025

ANNEX A – VOTING TABLES (R0152)

Do you agree with the Code Managers recommendation to recommend approval of proposed change solution?

Attendee	Representing	Vote
Steve Mulinganie	Energy Suppliers	Approve
Paul Abreu	Network Operators	Approve
Jonathan Rand	MEMs	Approve

Do you agree with the Code Managers recommendation approval of proposed implementation approach?

Attendee	Representing	Vote

Steve Mulinganie	Energy Suppliers	Approve
Paul Abreu	Network Operators	Approve
Jonathan Rand	MEMs	Approve

Do you agree with the Code Managers recommendation to recommend approval of proposed implementation date of 12 September 2025 to the Authority?

Attendee	**Representing**	**Vote**
Steve Mulinganie	Energy Suppliers	Reject
Paul Abreu	Network Operators	Approve
Jonathan Rand	MEMs	Reject