RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

I0197 WORKGROUP 4
MEETING MINUTES

MEETING	**I0197 WORKGROUP 4**
DATE	**22 October 2025, 14:00**
LOCATION	**Via Teams**

Presenter	Representing	Initials	Role
James Hardy	REC Code Manager	JH	Chair/Lead Change Analyst
Tim Newton	REC Code Manager	TM	Subject Matter Expert
Vaishnavi Campbell-Sharma	REC Code Manager	VCS	Solution Lead

Full attendee list available upon request.

1 INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed attendees to the I0197 Workgroup meeting. They introduced the REC Code Manager team working on this Issue.

2 CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA

The Chair invited any additional items of business for consideration during the meeting, but no items were raised.

3 MEETING MINUTES

VCS confirmed the Code Manager would take the group through both electricity and gas, summarise what work had been done by the Code Manager, the feedback received from industry so far and what proposals the Code Manager plans to take forward.

VCS provided the background of I0197 for any new participants to the I0197 Working Group. VCS confirmed this REC Issue had been raised by REC Performance Assurance due to a lack of coverage of reporting on fault resolution through central sources (such as the DTN or IX) as communication methods are not mandated.

To overcome this challenge, a MEM Request for Information (RFI) was held in 2023. This received a low response rate, which indicated issues in relation to operational processes. Anecdotal feedback was also received from Parties, particularly smaller Energy Suppliers, about challenges they faced managing agent performance. This led discussions at the REC Performance Assurance Board (PAB) and to four Issues being raised, of which I0197 was one (the others being I0195, I0196 and I0198).

VCS confirmed I0197 is looking at non-emergency meter fault investigation and resolution processes for both Electricity and Gas. Feedback from Parties received to the Information Request to I0197 was summarised as:

- Gaps exist in both the Electricity and Gas processes.
- For Electricity, the process lacks clarity, standard categorisation and has resourcing challenges (for example, the manual checking required of D0001 and D0002 flows).
- For Gas, there is a lack of a REC-defined process and standardised communications flows.
- There is a need for standard categorisation, improved data quality, enhanced communication between Parties and clearer responsibilities which can be enforced.
- Delays can lead to issues for Consumers and has negative impacts to billing and Settlement.

VCS went on to iterate that any solution would be mindful of meter type, fuel and Consumer type as it had particularly been called out that standardisation may not be as appropriate for larger I&C Consumers with complicated Sites compared with Domestic Consumers (for example). A Working Group Member also highlighted the need to be mindful of Guaranteed Standard of Payments (GSOP) and how this work could interact with those obligations.

A Working Group Member also said they would want to see differences between meters which are faulty vs non-communicating. This was seconded by another Working Group Member.

A Working Group Member queried why the session had been merged rather keeping Electricity and Gas separate. VCS confirmed it was to provide an update on both sides of the Issue after a pause in Working Groups for the past two months, and that the Working Group had has multiple new members sign up recently, so the Code Manager wanted to provide a comprehensive update.

A Working Group Member queried if I0196 (Review of Metering Asset data transferred from MAMs to the CDSP) was continuing as a Gas only Issue. VCS confirmed yes, and that of the four Issues raised only I0197 was a dual fuel Issue.

VCS provided an update of insights gathered so far by the Code Manager as:

- The current process for Electricity (D0001s and D0002s) is manual and hard to track. For Gas it can be difficult for Parties to share information, agree action or resolve issues due to the differences in how Parties may choose to communicate (e.g. some use the DTN, some the IX, some email etc.).
- There are data quality issues that need to be addressed. Examples provided included incorrect/incomplete Meter Technical Details (MTDs), data being shared out of sequence resulting in errors and Metering Equipment switching Energy Supplier or MEM before commissioning is complete.
- There is an opportunity to clarify obligations for communicating updates in a timely manner.

- There can be barriers to arranging Site visits or accessing the Site once arrived, so the process must consider factors beyond the MEMs control. Any targets set should not be impossible and assigned to the correct Party.

VCS opened the floor to Working Group Members, specifically calling out the following questions:

- To what degree does your organisations experience resonate with the challenges we covered?
- Are there any other blockers your organisation faces that we have not captured?
- What do you see as the Energy Suppliers obligations to enable the MEM to take timely actions?
- What, if any, should be the DNO or GT obligations?

A Working Group Member raised there needs to be a distinction between MEM and Energy Supplier actions when there is a direct contract between the MEM and the Consumer (for example, the Energy Supplier should not need to provide Consumer contact details in this scenario).

A Working Group Member raised that not all MAMs use the IX, so this needs to be considered throughout solution development.

A Working Group Member raised for Electricity, there is no way for the MOA to contact the Energy Supplier when they need assistance and suggested improvements may be required to the D0005 to support this.

VCS provided a summary of what a solution may look like, including:

- Legal text – clearly defined obligations to establish accountability.
- Technology enabled solutions – new methods of communications between Parties, particularly for escalations, with the ability to monitor progress/performance at Party and Market level.
    - Examples provided included the REC Secure Data Exchange Portal (SDEP) or the potential to scrap the D0001/D0002 process and replace it with something else.
- Supporting resources – highlighting existing support available under the REC to help unblock issues (e.g. the REC Operational Account Managers (OAMs)).

VCS highlighted that any proposed solution, including legal text, will go through the REC Change Process and be available for Parties to comment on at impact assessment and consultation stages.

A Working Group Member queried what governance around the obligations could look like if a Party is not compliant with said obligations. VCS confirmed this would go through the prioritisation of retail risks exercise done by REC Performance Assurance, and if determined to be required could be routinely monitored. This could include the requirement for Parties to submit regular reports to Performance Assurance.

A Working Group Member queried if these should all be obligations on the Energy Supplier who would then contracts with requirements with the MEMs, rather than obligations on MEMs. VCS confirmed it would likely obligations on both Parties, as there are expectations that MEMs would take steps within a certain timeframe. The REC would set a minimum standard of what is expected for Parties, with room for Energy Suppliers and MEMs to set stricter SLAs in their contracts if they wished.

VCS confirmed there will likely be an obligation around evidence retention to differentiate between when a Party has not taken the steps it is required to do so in the correct timeframe vs when they have attempted to take these steps and hit blockers outside of their control.

4 NEXT STEPS

The Chair confirmed that the Code Manager will now start looking at drafting potential solution options. These would be brought back to the Working Group for review and comment, likely under separate sessions for Electricity and Gas. This is expected to be before the December holiday period, with party impact assessment opening in the new year. A poll will be circulated by the Code Manager with suggested

The Chair confirmed how Working Group Members could contact the Code Manager in the meantime with any other feedback or comments they wished to submit.

5 AOB

VCS confirmed the slides would be published after the session with the notes taken/added to them during the Working Group.

The Chair invited attendees to provide AOB. None was raised.

6 DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

A poll will be circulated by the Code Manager with proposed dates for the next Working Group sessions.