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_26_0218**
DATE	**18 February 2026, 10:30**
LOCATION	**By teleconference**

Presenter	Representing	Initials	Role
Lydia Bentley	REC Code Manager	LB	Chair/Senior Lead Analyst
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 reiterated that the wider I0196 problem relates to mismatches between data items held by the CDSP, Suppliers/Shippers, and Meter Asset Managers (MAMs), and that internal analysis suggests unworked RGMA rejections are a significant contributor to those mismatches. The Chair noted that six solution options were brought to the October Workgroup but judged that covering six distinct lines of enquiry within limited time led to fragmented discussion, so this meeting intentionally narrowed discussion to three options, with emphasis on RGMA validation.

Per the agenda, the discussion topics were:

- Metering Asset Data Transfer: Process Weaknesses
- Approach to RGMA Validation
- Rejection of MAM Change of Appointment Status

4A. METERING ASSET DATA TRANSFER: PROCESS WEAKNESSES

The Chair introduced this item, noting that weaknesses in Metering Asset Data Transfer processes are a significant contributor to the I0196 issue, particularly where RGMA market messages are rejected, not received, or not acted upon, resulting in data mismatches between MAMs, Suppliers/Shippers, Meter Asset Providers (MAPs), and the CDSP.

Members discussed RGMA flows associated with ONUPD (MM40014) and MAP responses (MM40020), including notifications of MAM appointment and de-appointment, asset installation, and asset removal. It was noted that these processes are intended to maintain alignment between parties but are susceptible to failure at multiple stages.

Members queried whether these RGMA processes are particularly prone to rejection and misalignment. In response, it was noted that RGMA was originally designed on the assumption that MAM and MAP roles were undertaken by the same party. As these roles have diverged, associated processes and obligations have not fully evolved, resulting in ambiguity over responsibilities and uncertainty as to whether notifications have been received and actioned. AJ suggested that direct relationships between Suppliers and MAPs are now more common, and the flows are not working well in these situations.

The Working Group discussed potential causes of RGMA messages not being received. Members raised the possibility of gateway misalignment, for example where one party is configured to send via IX and another is only monitoring the Data Transfer Network (DTN). It was noted that such misalignment can result in messages never reaching the intended recipient. The chair asked whether REC should mandate alignment of communications methods between MAMs and MAPs or add clarificatory obligations around mutually intelligible communications. While members acknowledged that maintaining multiple gateways has cost and complexity implications, it was also agreed that gateway alignment represents a genuine operational risk. One member stated their organisation can send/receive via multiple methods, but they still experience missing removal notifications when others remove their meters. They suggested that this comes from either assets not being labelled correctly (which the member strongly disputed) or organisations not following processes correctly.

The handling of unsolicited RGMA messages was discussed in detail. Members asked whether Supplier systems accept and process unsolicited messages, and whether Suppliers should be obligated to respond or handle these messages. One member suggested that these unsolicited messages particularly occur where emergency or SLA-driven work has been undertaken, and these requests are often initiated following direct contact with a Supplier, with RGMA messages issued after completion to reflect the work carried out.

Members advised that some Supplier systems do not accept or process unsolicited messages, meaning legitimate work may not be reflected in central systems, leading to ongoing data mismatches. AJ discussed how to ensure these unsolicited notifications are recorded in the CDSP, as if Suppliers do not accept these notifications, they will essentially be lost.

Members considered whether Suppliers should be required to accept unsolicited RGMA messages. Members noted that acceptance may not always be appropriate, particularly where the receiving Supplier is no longer registered due to switching activity. A distinction was drawn between acceptance and response, with members noting that while acceptance may create risks in some scenarios, there may be merit in considering whether Suppliers should, at a minimum, be required to respond to unsolicited messages.

Members also raised questions regarding how MAMs identify the correct Supplier when issuing or responding to RGMA messages. It was noted that access to Supplier information varies by role, and that MAMs may only have visibility of Supplier details where they are currently appointed. During switching activity, this can result in uncertainty as to whether messages are being sent to the correct party, increasing the likelihood that valid notifications are not acted upon. The Chair suggested that increased visibility of information in the Gas Enquiry Service may help parties to keep up to date with the current Supplier/MAM/MAP. Another member noted that only appointed MAMs can see the relevant information on Xoserve's system as well.

4B. APPROACH TO RGMA VALIDATION

The Working Group discussed validation failures arising during switch read submissions, particularly where rejections occur due to incorrect or inconsistent Metering Asset Data.

Members queried how Suppliers resolve switch read rejections in practice, and whether CDSP data or MAM-provided data is treated as the source of truth. It was noted that no consistent approach is applied across the market, with different Suppliers adopting different practices. Members agreed that this inconsistency contributes to repeated rejection cycles and prolonged resolution.

The potential introduction or use of override mechanisms for final switch reads was discussed. Members asked whether override flags could reduce the incidence of failed switches. It was noted that while overrides may improve switch success rates and consumer outcomes, there is a risk that inappropriate use could embed incorrect asset data and undermine validation controls. Members agreed that override mechanisms cannot be considered in isolation from clearer articulation of validation responsibilities.

Members raised questions regarding Supplier responsibilities for validating Metering Asset Data prior to submission to the Shipper/CDSP. It was noted that current REC documentation does not clearly define how Suppliers are expected to validate asset data, what constitutes sufficient validation, or how validation responsibilities interact with those of MAMs, Shippers, and the CDSP. It was further noted that repeatedly querying MAMs for the same information may not provide additional value and can result in circular processes rather than resolution.

The Group discussed the volume of validation rejections experienced by parties. Members queried how organisations can identify which rejections should be prioritised where volumes are high. It was noted that high rejection volumes can make it difficult to focus effort on issues that would deliver the greatest overall improvement in data quality, leading to inefficient use of operational resources.

The Working Group revisited previous discussions on RGMA validation logic, including the balance between data integrity and operational efficiency.

Members queried whether market messages with missing or incorrect data should be rejected or automatically corrected. It was noted that while validation safeguards are necessary to protect data integrity, automatic correction without visibility can reduce transparency for Suppliers. Members agreed that lack of visibility around automated corrections makes it more difficult to diagnose the causes of rejections and ongoing data mismatches.

Specific discussion took place on the automatic application of round-the-clock indicators. Members asked what level of transparency Suppliers require when such values are applied or corrected automatically. It was noted that Suppliers need to understand when and why values have been amended, particularly given the complexity of round-the-clock logic and rollover inference.

Members queried whether validation issues are primarily limited to legacy meters. It was confirmed that smart meter reads are also being rejected. This was noted as a significant concern, suggesting that issues may arise not only from meter technology but also from data hand-offs between the DCC, Suppliers, Shippers, and the CDSP.

The Group discussed the availability and usability of guidance supporting RGMA processes. Members asked whether guidance exists that explains RGMA processes in clear, practical terms. It was noted that while REC documentation is technically accurate, it can be difficult to navigate and apply in practice, particularly for new entrants. Members recalled that older RGMA documentation had included scenario-based caveats and explanatory material, which are no longer readily available. It was agreed that the absence of such guidance contributes to inconsistent interpretation and data population. One member provided an example of older RGMA documentation, and the Chair asked the member to provide them with a copy. There was discussion on the literal use of optional fields in file formats, and the group noted the footnotes in the older RGMA document that provided extra guidance to industry parties on which information was mandatory to be included within data flows.

Navigation aids and tools were referenced during the meeting, including links to relevant schedules and the availability of a filterable Excel version of CoMCoP. While these were welcomed, members agreed that navigation tools alone do not address the need for clearer explanatory guidance.

Members also raised questions regarding traceability and accountability, specifically whether parties can readily identify which organisation submitted particular CDJ or C&D store files. It was noted that this is not currently clear and would require further investigation.

4C. REJECTION OF MAM CHANGE OF APPOINTMENT STATUS

The Chair noted that the rejection of MAM appointment and de-appointment messages remains an important topic, particularly in cases where outgoing MAMs are not correctly de-appointed and remain incorrectly active. Members acknowledged the importance of this issue but, due to time constraints, substantive discussion was deferred to the next Working Group meeting.

5. MEETING TIMINGS

The Chair confirmed that the next meeting will be scheduled for mid-March with the exact date and 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.