RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

GAS OPERATIONAL METERING FORUM
MEETING NOTES

MEETING	**GOMF_26_0610**
DATE	**10 June 2026, 14:00**
LOCATION	**By teleconference**

1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS AND SCOPE

The Chair welcomed attendees to the Gas Operational Metering Forum and reminded members that the Forum is an operational discussion forum, not a decision-making body. Any formal decisions will be escalated to the REC Metering Expert Panel (MEP).

2. AUDIT UPDATE

ED provided an overview of recent audit activity and non-conformance trends across Consolidated Metering Code of Practice (CoMCoP) Rev 2 and Rev 3, as well as technical audit activity up to the end of April. The majority of audits remain aligned to CoMCoP Rev 2 due to its annual audit cycle, with Rev 3 audits representing the current framework and gradually increasing in volume.

Across gas audits, non-conformances were noted but were generally not considered material or systemic. Under CoMCoP Rev 2, a higher volume of defects was identified across a larger number of audits, whereas CoMCoP Rev 3 demonstrated fewer defects overall, reflecting both the lower number of audits and early-stage adoption of the revised framework. All identified issues were reported as being addressed within normal resolution timescales, with no significant outstanding concerns.

Common areas of non-conformance included statutory and safety-related requirements, particularly around the reporting of RIDDOR-related obligations and electrical compliance (including PAT testing). In several cases, parties were unable to readily demonstrate evidence of compliance during audits, highlighting the need for improved documentation and visibility of records. These findings were consistent with previous observations that audit outcomes are often impacted by evidencing of existing processes rather than absence of processes themselves.

From a technical audit perspective, recurring issues were identified in relation to site-specific requirements, including the correct installation and security of shear bolts, ventilation of meter locations (particularly in multi-meter environments), and general site compliance conditions. Additional discrepancies were noted in documentation accuracy, including instances where job records did not fully align with site findings. All operational non-conformances raised through

technical audits were subsequently resolved, with photographic evidence provided to confirm remediation and enable formal closure.

It was also noted that technical audit structures are expected to evolve, with consolidation anticipated across audit categories to reduce overlap and improve consistency in application.

ED emphasised that recent changes to audit requirements now place greater emphasis on both technical compliance and organisational assurance, including company-level information such as insurance and accreditation. This has introduced challenges where operational staff may not have access to corporate documentation, and conversely, compliance teams may lack detailed understanding of technical requirements.

Members were encouraged to adopt a more integrated, team-based approach to audit preparation to ensure that both technical and organisational evidence can be effectively provided during audits. This approach is expected to support improved audit outcomes and reduce recurring non-conformances linked to evidencing gaps rather than actual compliance failures.

3. CHANGES TO ACS TRAINING

RH provided an update on the ongoing review and proposed changes to Accredited Certification Scheme (ACS) training, outlining both the original objectives and the current direction of travel following industry engagement.

It was noted that the initial review of ACS competencies identified a significant level of complexity, with approximately 80 competency modules currently in place. The original intent was to simplify and streamline these by combining competencies into broader categories, thereby reducing the number of individual assessments required. From a metering perspective, this included proposals to move towards three overarching assessment categories: domestic, non-domestic, and large non-domestic.

While this approach received support in principle, particularly from industry working groups (including representation from the metering community), progress has been constrained by resistance from certification bodies. It was acknowledged that existing delivery models have been in place for a significant period, and any structural changes present commercial and operational challenges. As a result, progress towards full consolidation of competencies has slowed and is not expected to be implemented in the near term.

Considering this, the approach has shifted towards enhancing the existing core competency framework rather than restructuring it entirely. This includes introducing additional content within the core ACS (CMA1) competency to improve engineers' understanding of appliances, particularly in the context of relighting appliances following metering activities. It was highlighted that current arrangements can lead to knowledge gaps, as appliance-specific understanding is typically only assessed where engineers hold the relevant module.

Examples were provided where additional baseline knowledge—such as that relating to warm air units and gas fires—may be appropriate for all engineers, even where they are not formally certified to work on those appliances. The intention is not to expand the scope of work for

engineers, but to improve awareness of appliance condition and behaviour, enabling earlier identification of potential issues before they escalate to unsafe conditions. This was noted as beneficial both for customer outcomes and for supporting engineers in demonstrating appropriate judgement.

It was further recognised that current arrangements may not adequately support engineers encountering older or less common appliances, particularly within the metering sector where such interactions are more frequent. As such, consideration is also being given to the development of Continuing Professional Development (CPD) materials and supporting training packages to enhance knowledge of appliance recognition and relighting practices.

KA raised questions around timelines, RH confirmed that any material changes to ACS frameworks are subject to a lengthy development and approval cycle, typically updated annually. Whilst full consolidation of competencies is unlikely in the near term, it is anticipated that incremental enhancements to core content could begin to be introduced from early 2027, subject to consultation and appropriate supporting training.

It was also confirmed that the long-term ambition to rationalise appliance-specific competencies remains under consideration. However, this is now likely to be progressed incrementally through expansion of core requirements, rather than immediate structural redesign.

4. LEGACY MEDIUM PRESSURE SUPPLY SITES

PD noted that the topic had been raised to broaden engagement beyond metering installer forums and to seek wider industry alignment. The focus of the discussion was on legacy meter installations involving medium pressure (MP) regulator configurations upstream of low-pressure meter installations, and the associated uncertainty regarding ownership, responsibility, and operational competence.

PD outlined a typical scenario whereby gas is supplied via an above-ground valve to a MP regulator, which then feeds a downstream emergency control valve (ECV) and low-pressure(LP) meter installation. The key issue identified was the ambiguity surrounding the demarcation of ownership and responsibility for the MP regulator, particularly in cases where it may be interpreted as either network infrastructure or part of the meter installation. Reference was made to relevant standards and guidance, including IGEM G1 and network guidance documents, which provide differing interpretations depending on the configuration and whether the installation is considered legacy.

It was highlighted that where the MP equipment is deemed to form part of the meter installation but remains upstream of the ECV, metering organisations may lack the appropriate competency and regulatory permissions (including Safety Case requirements) to carry out maintenance or intervention. This creates operational constraints and introduces risk where responsibility is unclear.

Members highlighted several operational impacts arising from these configurations. It was noted that many Meter Asset Managers (MAMs) are unable or unwilling to undertake work at

such sites due to competence limitations, resulting in customers having limited or no access to smart metering installations. This has led, in some cases, to customers switching suppliers to progress installations, potentially resulting in inconsistent approaches where responsibilities may be unknowingly assumed by incoming parties.

Further risks were identified where legacy configurations may not be clear at the point of site attendance. In some cases, operatives may encounter what appears to be a standard LP installation without visibility of upstream MP equipment. This raises the risk that meter exchanges are undertaken without full awareness of the configuration, potentially resulting in the unintended assumption of ongoing responsibility for equipment outside the organisation's competence. Concerns were also raised regarding data quality and the potential for MAMs to be appointed to sites without sufficient information to identify these configurations in advance.

Members echoed these challenges, noting that the issue is widespread and has persisted for some time without a clear, consistent industry resolution. It was emphasised that the lack of clarity around ownership and responsibilities, coupled with differing interpretations across network operators, is creating operational inefficiencies and a poor customer experience.

DM, a representative of SGN, acknowledged the issues raised and offered to review specific examples to support further investigation. Members agreed that providing worked examples and evidence would assist in progressing the issue. It was noted that resolution is likely to require improved communication and clearer definition of demarcation points between network and meter installation responsibilities. The potential development of a decision framework or matrix to support consistent interpretation was discussed.

Additional contributions highlighted that current guidance may require case-by-case discussions between MAMs, network operators, and customers to determine ownership. However, given the volume and variability of such installations, it was recognised that this approach is not scalable and that a more standardised industry approach would be beneficial.

The Chair summarised that, whilst no immediate resolution was identified, the discussion had been valuable in consolidating industry views and escalating the issue to a forum with appropriate representation. It was agreed that evidence would be collated and shared with DM, who will review and provide feedback to the Operational Metering Forum in due course, either directly or via REC governance channels. The REC Code Manager also confirmed that any updates could be circulated to members to ensure consistent dissemination of findings.

5. SCHEDULE 14 SLAS

HT provided an update on Service Level Agreements (SLAs) within Schedule 14 of the REC, noting that this review had been prompted by wider drafting and engagement activities undertaken as part of the Market-wide Half-Hourly Settlement (MHHS) programme. While MHHS is primarily electricity-focused, it has highlighted areas within the gas provisions of the REC where existing arrangements may benefit from further scrutiny.

It was explained that Schedule 14 includes a range of SLAs governing the timing of market interactions and notifications, including those between Meter Asset Managers (MAMs),

suppliers, and the Central Data Service Provider (CDSP). A specific area of focus is the presence of both “48-hour” and “two working days” SLAs within the gas-related provisions. Whilst these timeframes are broadly similar in intent, it was noted that they are not strictly equivalent, particularly when considering weekends and non-working days.

HT highlighted that most SLAs within Schedule 14 are aligned to a two working day timeframe. However, the 48-hour SLAs are typically associated with specific metering processes, including meter installation, removal, exchange or repositioning, and change of MAM events. These are generally linked to notification activities between MAMs and suppliers, including pre-notifications and post-event communications, as well as certain communications to the CDSP.

The purpose of the discussion was to seek initial industry views on whether the coexistence of these two SLA formats presents practical challenges or inconsistencies. Members were invited to consider whether the distinction between 48 hours and two working days is meaningful in practice, whether alignment would provide operational benefits, and whether this is an area that warrants further exploration through a formal REC Issue.

Initial feedback from members indicated that the existing SLAs are largely understood and embedded within current systems and processes and may therefore be functioning adequately in practice. However, it was also acknowledged that this may reflect historical acceptance rather than optimal design. On behalf of the AMO, MB confirmed that the matter would be taken away for wider consideration, with feedback to be provided on whether there are any material issues or opportunities for improvement.

HT noted that, given the volume of ongoing change activity across the REC, this topic may not represent the highest priority for immediate action. However, it was agreed that it is worthwhile to validate whether any improvements could be made, rather than assuming the current approach should remain unchanged.

It was confirmed that feedback from industry participants will inform next steps, including whether to progress the matter through a formal REC Issue or to retain the current approach. Members were invited to provide input following the meeting, and contact details were shared to facilitate this.

6. REC METERING HUB AND BULLETINS UPDATE

The Chair provided an update on the ongoing discussions with FEN (now part of IGEM) regarding the consolidation of gas network guidance documentation. The Chair explained that the gas network documents were being finalised into a FEN format.

7. IGEM UPDATE

DH provided an update on recent activity within the Institution of Gas Engineers and Managers (IGEM), noting that the most recent Gas Measurement Committee (GMC) meeting took place on 17 March 2026. DH confirmed that discussions were largely routine but highlighted several key developments relevant to metering and wider industry practice.

An update was provided on ongoing efforts to improve the IGEM document review process. It was noted that there is continued engagement with the IGEM Secretariat to introduce a requirement for concise summary documents to accompany standard reviews, clearly outlining key changes. Whilst this has not yet been formally implemented, work is ongoing to incorporate this into the review process to improve transparency and usability for stakeholders.

The Committee reviewed the results of the 2025 in-service testing programme, which covered approximately 20 different gas meter populations, including meters manufactured between 2010 and 2022. It was confirmed that all meter populations tested met the required performance standards, enabling them to remain in service for a further three-year period, through to 2028. This was noted as providing reassurance regarding ongoing meter accuracy across the installed base.

DH also highlighted developments at a European level, referencing a proposal under the Measurement Instruments Directive which may allow gas meters to display energy consumption directly, where technically feasible. It was noted that while energy information is currently available through associated devices (e.g. in-home displays), consideration is being given to enabling this functionality directly on meter indices.

Members were informed of upcoming standards activity, including a review of BS 746 (covering meter fittings), which is expected to commence this year. Interested parties were encouraged to engage via appropriate BSI channels where relevant.

DH explained work is underway to assess the impact of hydrogen blending on metering accuracy, particularly where volume converters rely on fixed gas composition assumptions. It was noted that this could result in inaccuracies within certain pressure ranges and may lead to future updates to relevant standards (e.g. GM5) should hydrogen blending be introduced more widely into the gas network.

An update was also provided on technical bulletins developed in collaboration with the Gas Safe Register. Technical Bulletin 127B, relating to the permanent removal of meter installations, has now been approved and will be published shortly. A second bulletin, addressing work on meter installations, was not approved in its current form and has been returned for further development, with feedback indicating a need for greater clarity regarding permissible activities based on competency and approval categories.

DH advised that revisions to IGEM GM8 (all five parts) have progressed beyond the review stage and are now advancing through the formal approval process, with publication expected following endorsement by the relevant IGEM technical committees.

8. NATIONAL ENERGY SYSTEM OPERATOR (NESO) – MAY INSIGHTS

The Chair summarised the National Energy System Operator (NESO's) May 2026 gas insights. The Chair noted that most of the gas supply originated from UK and Norwegian gas fields which accounted for 83% where 11% was withdrawn from storage and the remaining 6% was obtained through liquified natural gas (LNG) imports. 50% of gas was delivered to homes, offices, hospitals and other facilities through distribution networks and 26% was exported.

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The Chair asked members if they wished to raise AOB.

No AOB was presented by members.

Attendee	Initials	Company
Steve Brand (Chair)	SB	REC Code Manager
Presenters		
Eric Dodd	ED	Wilcock
Richard Harper	RH	IGEM
Harriet Truss	HT	REC Code Manager
Perry Duhig	PD	Calisen
David Harper	DH	Gastech Engineering Ltd.
Attendees		
Edma Hyskaj	EH	REC Code Manager
Martin Brailsford	MB	REC Code Manager
Joshua Nyambayo	JN	REC Code Manager
Rebecca Griffiths	RG	RECCo
Jemma Johnson	JJ	RECCo
David Mitchell	DM	SGN
Matthew Potter	MP	M Group Ltd
Phil Davies	PD	Imserv
Daniel Borg	DB	Mpaas
Luke Freeman	LF	AES Smart
Ian Wallace	IW	Utilita
Nik Wills	NW	Stark
Rachel Bridge	RB	Stark
Meg Wong	MW	Stark
Jason Doe	JD	Stark
Sean Sanders	SS	EDF Energy
Kemi Agunbiade	KA	National Gas
Jamie Burrows	JB	OVO Electricity Ltd
Paul Norman	PN	Octopus Energy