RETAIL ENERGY CODE

This document is classified as **WHITE**.

Information is for public, unrestricted dissemination and publication.

I0196 SOLUTION DEVELOPMENT WORKING GROUP
MEETING MINUTES

MEETING	**I0196WG_25_1029**
DATE	**29 October 2025, 14:00**
LOCATION	**By teleconference**

Presenter	Representing	Initials	Role
Lydia Bentley	REC Code Manager	LB	Chair
Anne Jackson	REC Code Manager	AJ	Subject Matter Expert
Harry Firth	REC Code Manager	HF	Secretariat

Full attendee list available upon request.

1. INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed attendees to the I0196 Solution Development Working Group (WG) 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 DRAFT MINUTES

The Chair asked attendees for any comments on the draft minutes from the previous meeting. No comments were received, and the minutes were approved.

4. SOLUTION DEVELOPMENT

The Chair advised that the WG would be discussing all six solution options that were established at the previous meeting.

4A. METERING ASSET: DATA TRANSFER PROCESS WEAKNESSES

AJ introduced the topic by outlining issues in the transfer of meter asset data between parties, where data is potentially lost or changed during the various steps of the data transfer process. They added that the goal is to identify where these breakdowns occur, understand why they happen, and find ways to improve accuracy and reliability. DW (SEFE) raised concerns about communication gaps between Meter Asset Managers (MAMs) and Meter Assets Providers (MAPs), particularly regarding asset ownership and data flows. BA (E.ON) described operational challenges with read validation, especially during supplier switches, which often result in incorrect meter data and rejected readings.

The WG discussed the impact of faster switching on data accuracy and the difficulty in resolving rejections due to limited resources. BA (E.ON) highlighted that incorrect initial data could lead to cascading errors, including billing inaccuracies and mismatched asset appointments. They suggested introducing override flags for final meter readings to allow valid readings to pass through. BA (E.ON) added that another way to reduce manual intervention would be to improve rejection handling and root cause identification. The Chair responded that they would investigate potential code changes to support override flags and improve validation transparency. AJ suggested that Supplier responsibilities for validating data before submission to CDSP should be clarified, and that more validation responsibility should be shifted to Suppliers to reduce rejection volumes.

4B. APPROACH TO VALIDATION

BA (E.ON) raised concerns about the automatic application of the Time Zone Indicator (TZI) and the lack of notification when this occurs. DA and JB (Xoserve) provided historical context, explaining that the current validation logic was designed to prevent market-breaking errors but may now be too rigid. There was discussion on introducing automatic notifications to ensure transparency, and DA (Xoserve) added that the CDSP would look into feasibility.

The WG discussed whether CDSP should reject flows with missing or incorrect TZI values or notify suppliers when auto-corrections are applied. The Chair emphasised the need to identify actionable solutions that balance operational efficiency with data integrity.

BA (E.ON) suggested that rejecting flows would allow suppliers to correct data proactively, rather than relying on post-submission fixes. DA (Xoserve) noted that some override mechanisms already exist but may not be widely understood or applied. The WG discussed the potential solution to develop guidance documentation to clarify validation rules and override options. The Chair agreed to explore developing this guidance to support industry understanding.

DA (Xoserve) advised that they would be keen to explore any ongoing validation issues in further detail. The Chair encouraged Suppliers to submit specific validation issues to the REC Code Manager via change.management@recmanager.co.uk, and these issues would be specifically discussed at the next WG meeting.

4C. ROLE OF DATA CLEANSE ACTIVITY

There was general agreement amongst attendees that a data cleanse would be beneficial, but it must be paired with efforts to address root causes., and to ensure the current problems do not build up again following a data cleanse. It was noted that cleansing without addressing underlying process issues would result in temporary improvements only. The WG agreed that in the event of a data cleanse going ahead, the cleanse should be aligned with process improvements to prevent recurrence of data issues.

There were initial discussions on the scope of a potential cleanse, whether the cleanse should target billable attributes only or include all data items. The WG also began discussing enforcement mechanisms. BA (E.ON) emphasised the need for full industry participation to ensure consistency and effectiveness. PE (npower) suggested that the data cleanse is codified in the REC to ensure mandatory participation across all parties. AM (REC Code Manager) confirmed from an RPA perspective that performance monitoring and enforcement mechanisms are in place to support such initiatives.

The Chair suggested that they would bring more information on the potential scope and technical details of a potential data cleanse for further discussion at a future WG meeting.

4D. DIGITAL DATA REPOSITORY

AJ proposed creating a digital version of the historic meter attribute book to support validation and data accuracy. The repository would serve as a single source of truth for meter attributes, helping parties validate data and fill in missing fields. The WG agreed that such a tool could improve data quality and reduce rejections. A poll was conducted, receiving nine votes, and received unanimous support for committing to develop a repository. The Chair advised that they would begin scoping the feasibility analysis for the repository, including initial consideration of GDPR as part of any design.

DW (SEFE) raised concerns about cost and responsibility for maintaining the repository. The Chair clarified that developing such a repository would involve new obligations and regulatory considerations, including mandatory data submissions for parties. AJ added that this poll was conducted to measure industry support for an initial exploration of a repository, which would include cost benefit analysis.

4E. INCORRECT RECIPIENTS – MAMS

The Chair advised that this option had been raised at the last meeting, whether data Item mismatches may stem from Review of Gas Metering Arrangements (RGMA) Market Messages being sent to incorrect MAM recipients. They asked attendees whether they agreed this was a prevalent issue and for suggestions on a potential solution(s).

DW (SEFE) described scenarios where MAMs continue to perform work after a Supplier switch due to lack of notification. BA (E.ON) noted that faster switching complicates appointment accuracy and can result in data being sent to the wrong party. JB (Xoserve) referenced recent code changes intended to mitigate this issue.

The WG discussed whether flows from de-appointed MAMs should be accepted if they performed the work and whether Suppliers should be required to cancel jobs upon losing a site. The Chair suggested reviewing existing code provisions to determine if further changes are needed, in particular clarifying supplier obligations in the code to prevent misdirected flows.

4F. REJECTION OF MAM CHANGE OF APPOINTMENT STATUS

The Chair advised that this option has been raised at the last meeting, focussing rejections in response specifically to MAM appointment and de-appointment RGMA flows.

DA (Xoserve) emphasised the importance of managing standing data during change of supplier events. PE (npower) argued that MAMs should be allowed to exit the market if Suppliers fail to de-appoint them, noting that current processes may unfairly trap MAMs in the market.

The WG discussed how data pushes during Supplier changes could be used to purge outdated data and improve appointment accuracy, and whether these pushes could be utilised further. There was agreement that Supplier obligations to maintain accurate MAM appointments need to be clarified and enforced to prevent long-term data issues. The Chair agreed to explore code changes to support proactive data management during supplier switches, and AM (REC Code Manager) committed to bringing reporting insights to the next meeting.

5. MEETING TIMINGS

The Chair confirmed that the provisional date for the next meeting is Wednesday, 26 November 2025, with the exact time to be confirmed. The Chair confirmed a scheduling poll will be issued to confirm availability.

6. AOB

The Chair invited attendees to provide AOB. None was raised and the Chair closed the meeting.

RETAIL ENERGY CODE

ACTIONS LOG

ACTION REF.	ACTION	OWNER(S)	ORIGINAL TARGET (ACTUAL TARGET)	UPDATE	STATUS
I0196WG_25_1029_01	Xoserve to explore feasibility of introducing automatic notifications for the existing validation systems.	Xoserve (David Addison)	26 November 2025		Open
I0196WG_25_1029_02	Chair to explore development of guidance documentation to clarify validation rules and override options	Chair	26 November 2025		Open
I0196WG_25_1029_03	Chair to explore potential Code changes on introducing Supplier obligations to maintain accurate MAM appointments	Chair	26 November 2025		Open
I0196WG_25_1029_04	Code Manager to provide reporting insights on how data pushes during Supplier changes could be used to purge outdated data and improve appointment accuracy	RPA (AM)	26 November 2026		Open