RETAIL ENERGY CODE

This document is classified as **GREEN**.
Information can be shared with other REC Parties.

I0312 WORKING GROUP
MEETING MINUTES

MEETING	**I0312WG_1407**
DATE	**14 July 2026, 11:00**
LOCATION	**On Teams**

Attendee	Representing	Initials	Role
Jon Hawkins	Retail Energy Code Company	JH	Chair; Director of Market Design
Bela Ashworth	REC Code Manager	BA	Secretary; Change Analyst
Glenn Sheern	REC Code Manager	GS	REC Regulatory Specialist
Aleksandra Maczka	REC Code Manager	AM	Working Group Member
Chelsea Evans	REC Code Manager	CE	OAM; Working Group Member
Jemma Johnson	Retail Energy Code Company	JJ	Working Group Member
Rebecca Griffiths	Retail Energy Code Company	RG	Working Group Member
Rebecca Bennett	Centrica	RB	Working Group Member
Georgina Watkins	Good Energy	GW	Working Group Member
Liz Kelf	Good Energy	LK	Working Group Member
Lee Walker	Elexon	LW	Working Group Member
John Greene	SSE	JG	Working Group Member
Ryan Parry	ESG Global	RP	Working Group Member
Bill Lester	AltHanCo	BL	Working Group Member
Kai Preston	Good Energy	KP	Working Group Member

RETAIL ENERGY CODE

1 INTRODUCTIONS

JH opened the meeting, and explained the focus of the session:

- Recap the working group's position on meter removal / de-energisation, meter installation / exchange and fault resolution;
- Discussion on change of energisation status;
- Discussion on change of feeder status and change of Market Segment.

2 REVIEW MINUTES AND ACTIONS OF PREVIOUS MEETING

No comments were received and no amendments were proposed to the draft minutes of the first session.

The Code Manager has an open action to draft the Impact Assessment.

WG members approved the minutes and actions of the previous meeting.

3 RECAP POSITION

3.1 METER REMOVAL / DE-ENERGISATION

JH gave an overview of slide 7 of the attached slide pack and provided a summary of the position reached from meeting 2:

- There is a majority view that where there is a shared Import/Export meter, the Export Supplier should not be able to permanently remove the meter and de-energise the Import Supply. This should remain the responsibility of the Import Supplier.
- The WG had previously raised that logical meter removal and de-energisation on the Export Supply may be required and this is a separate activity to permanent removal of the equipment. There should be a mechanism for the Export Supplier to request those MTDs are removed so the Export Supply can be logically disconnected.
- Where emergency de-energisation is required by the Meter Operator while on-site for a safety reason, this will still be required. This is a temporary measure while the site can be made safe and then re-energised appropriately. In this scenario, the Meter Operator would need to notify both Import/Export Suppliers of the de-energisation.

RB supported the position recap but also raised that there may need to be guidance on how the Export Supplier should communicate to the customer delays to meter requests. RB proposed standardisation of communications, particularly around use of SDEP and scenarios where the customer raises meter work requests with the Export Supplier, but the Export Supplier is unable to carry out the request.

I0312WG_1407_A01: The Code Manager to include in the Impact Assessment communications between Export Supplier and customers where the Export Supplier is unable to carry out the request, but can notify the Import Supplier to raise the request.

No further comments were raised.

3.2 METER INSTALLATION / EXCHANGE

JH provided an overview of slides 8-10. The proposed process maps for meter exchanges for both Export and Import Suppliers can be found in slides 9 and 10 respectively.

- The WG acknowledged that there are scenarios where the Export Supplier may wish to exchange an Import/Export meter and that many of these scenarios are likely driven by the Consumer/generator directly.
- There is a general view that an Export Supplier should be able to request meter exchanges where they hold a valid contract with the Meter Operator.
- Both the Import and Export Suppliers should notify each other of planned works prior to the planned date, with a mechanism to query or object. SDEP was considered as an option.
    - JH further noted the manual nature of SDEP and risk of operational burden for industry parties as the number of associated Export sites grow over the next few years.
    - Where there is a more automated mechanism available, such as the use of a DTN or DIP message, there may be more flexibility and allow Suppliers to automate notification of the job. However, there is still upfront design work to implement this mechanism.
- Where there is a failure, then the failure reason would need to be sent to both the Import and Export Supplier. JH raised the question of whether the MOA should notify the Import Supplier of the outcome if the meter exchange was unsuccessful, noting that the Import Supplier would be notified if the job was successful.

JG asked for clarification on whether the Supplier that raises the request has the final decision on whether the meter work goes ahead and whether they can ignore objections from the other Supplier. JH clarified that, currently, there is no proposed hard mechanism to object and prevent meter works from proceeding. Ultimately, the decision lies with the requesting Supplier to cancel the meter works.

LK noted that the process map suggests the Import Supplier has to request permission from the Export Supplier, whereas previous discussions suggested the Import Supplier would be the ‘lead Supplier’. By putting the onus on the Import Supplier to engage with the Export Supplier, there would be a significant change in behaviour and may not be well-received by Import Suppliers. LK also noted complications with change of Market Segment scenarios and how that might influence a Supplier’s behaviour.

RB agreed that the responsibility should only lie with the Export Supplier to notify the Import Supplier of meter requests.

I0312WG_1407_A02: The Code Manager to include in the Impact Assessment the requirement to notify the other Supplier of meter exchanges should only apply to the Export Supplier.

The WG recommended that this requirement should only apply to the Export Supplier and that the Import Supplier should only notify the Export Supplier of a meter works request where there is a change to the shared asset.

The WG recommended, where there has been a failure of the job, bearing in mind that the Export Supplier will not have been informed that the meter work was requested, there should not be a requirement to notify of a failure unless there is material impact or subsequent actions to be taken by the Supplier.

The WG also recommended that there should not be a requirement on either Supplier to provide a failure update for reasons such as no access or refused access.

I0312WG_1407_A03: The Code Manager to amend the process map to reflect this recommendation.

JJ raised that there may be circumstances in which the other Supplier should be notified of a failure update; if there are safety concerns, PSR issues, asset condition reports, or any other failure reason which may impact the meter, settlement or the customer. JJ noted there may be an obligation on the Meter Operator to share information on updates to PSR or anything that may affect the Consumer.

LK noted that asset condition reports would also be raised with the DNO. Under MHHS, the Meter Operator have contact details for both Suppliers, so there may be consideration for sending a copy of the report to both if subsequent actions need to be taken.

JH noted this may be a wider consideration around obligations of Meter Operators to provide such updates, but this is beyond the scope of I0312. Within I0312, it can be agreed that an Import Supplier would not need to be notified of failure reasons such as refused access.

I0312WG_1407_A04: The Code Manager to include in the Impact Assessment scenarios which trigger notification to both Suppliers (e.g., D0135/D0136, asset condition reports, safety concerns, tampering).

Following the WG's recommendation to only require the Export Supplier to notify of meter exchange requests, JH noted this would significantly reduce the volume of notifications and thereby more manageable for industry parties. There was a consideration of using SDEP to notify Import Suppliers, with the caveat that this is a manual process.

AM raised that REC Performance Assurance are currently doing a deep-dive review of SDEP to make it more user-friendly. There may be guidance issued as an outcome of the review.

RB provided their preference for an automated mechanism, considering that there will be increase in Export customers. Reliance on SDEP comes with the risk that there may be delays in raising meter work requests.

LK agreed with RB and noted that existing DTN flows could be considered as well. JH considered whether the DIP could be used as opposed to the DTN.

JG provided their preference for a new scenario variant, but this should be assessed as part of the impact assessment.

I0312WG_1407_A05: The Code Manager to include in the Impact Assessment consideration of the notification mechanism – proposals include use of DTN/DIP messages, or introduction of a new scenario variant.

The WG recommended that, where a query is raised, that can be raised through SDEP and require a manual response.

3.3 FAULT RESOLUTION

JH gave an overview of slides 11-12:

- The WG acknowledged that both the Import and Export Supplier would have an interest in a meter fault investigation being initiated by the other Supplier or Data Service.
- There may be scenarios where the Export Supplier may wish to initiate their own investigation if they hold a valid contract with the Meter Operator. Where they do not have a contract, the only way for the Export Supplier to deal with a suspected fault would be to notify the Import Supplier of the fault.
- Where there is a valid contract and the Export Supplier wishes to request a fault investigation with the Meter Operator, they can send a D001 flow to initiate the investigation.
- Where a fault investigation is initiated, both Suppliers should notify the other that an investigation has been raised, or the Data Service to notify both Suppliers. JH noted this may require a consequential change to the BSC.
- There would need to be a query mechanism for Suppliers to request additional information about the fault.
- Both Suppliers would need to be notified of the outcome of the investigation.

JH asked the group to confirm their recommendation on whether both Suppliers should notify the other that a fault investigation has been raised, or whether this should only apply in cases where the Export Supplier has initiated the investigation.

JG noted that it depends on whether the fault found impacted both Suppliers. JG proposed that the default may be to notify both Suppliers so they can determine impact.

JJ agreed with JG, where there is a suspected fault, it would be in the interest of both Suppliers to be aware. If there is a material impact to both Suppliers, then there is a decision to be made on who rectifies that issue.

I0312WG_1407_A06: The Code Manager to include in the Impact Assessment the proposal that if either Supplier were to initiate a fault, the other Supplier should be notified of the investigation being raised and the outcome of it.

The WG then considered the scenario in which the Export Supplier does not hold a valid contract with the Meter Operator but has identified a suspected fault. In this case, the Meter Operator would not have a responsibility to respond to the request to investigate. The Export Supplier would need to notify the Import Supplier for their consideration in investigating the suspected fault. JH asked the group whether there should be a response time for the Import Supplier to confirm if they are going to initiate a fault investigation.

LK confirmed this is a scenario that can occur. For example, if a smart meter has not been commissioned but is needed for the purpose of smart Exports, the Import Supplier may not want to commission the meter, and the customer has requested not to commission a meter. LK suggested there may need to be an obligation for a response from the Import Supplier to acknowledge the Export Supplier's request for work.

JH suggested a potential mechanism for this could be to use existing flows, such as a D0001, to initiate a request for a fault investigation, and a D0002 from the Import Supplier as a response. The WG agreed with this proposal.

I0312WG_1407_A07: The Code Manager to include in the Impact Assessment appropriate response time by the Import Supplier to acknowledge / respond to an Export Supplier's request to initiate a fault investigation.

JH clarified that where there is a suspected fault that impacts both Suppliers, there needs to be a mechanism to share that information and potentially resolve the fault for the Consumer. There may be obligations beyond the REC for the Meter Operator to inform the Import Supplier.

4 CHANGE OF ENERGISATION STATUS

JH walked through slide 14 of the attached slide pack. In the previous session, the WG had covered energisation (see I0312 Working Group 2 – Minutes v0.1) and agreed that only the Import Supplier should be able to request de-energisation.

JH noted that there four broad categories to why a supply would have been de-energised: at the customer's request; debt; theft; and safety. Most cases would have been initiated by the Import Supplier.

The WG agreed that, similarly to de-energisation, the Export Supplier should not be allowed to energise. The request must be made to the Import Supplier.

5 CHANGE OF FEEDER STATUS

JH walked through slide 16 of the attached pack.

- The REC Schedule 14 – Metering Operations provides a process required for multi-feeder site where the Energisation status is changed for a feeder. The feeder status is updated by the Meter Operator in the D0268.

- Where the change is notified, the Meter Operator will update the feeder status and confirm collection of meter readings with the Advanced Data Service (ADS).
- Updated D0268 should be sent to both Suppliers – the requirement is already within the REC Schedule 14, Paragraph 20, and will be included in the scope of Basic Associated Export MOA Services, should R0207 be approved.

The WG then considered the responsibility for requesting updates to feeder status and whether requests to update should be the responsibility of the Import Supplier. R0207 does not provide a requirement for the MOA to provide updates on the feeder status as part of the Associated Export MOA Services. JH also raised whether the WG need to consider ADS responsibility within the BSC or whether we can proceed with the recommendation that, where the ADS receives the D0268 on both the Import and Export Supply, the ADS would automatically look to retrieve meter readings for both.

LK noted that this scenario would more significantly impact Import settlements, so they would support the responsibility being solely on the Import Supplier to request updates to feeder status. The Export Supplier should be notified with any change to the feeder status as a consequence of any works carried out.

JG agreed with LK and that this would be in line with principles agreed under the change of energisation status section. JG also noted that there is a gap in the process and communications with DNOs and Meter Operators, where the DNO may not be aware of works needed until the Meter Operator investigates the failure and determines a feeder is down. JH noted that reviewing this process would not be within the scope of I0312 but welcomed WG members to raise a separate REC Issue/Change Proposal.

6 CHANGE OF MARKET SEGMENT

JH gave an overview of slide 18 of the attached slide pack.

- MHHS has introduced a new Market Segment and where a Supplier installs a new meter that would result in a change of Market Segment, the Supplier is required to appoint a new Metering Service in advance of the works taking place.
- The SMRA will hold the appointment request until updated MTD and Connection Type details are provided, at which point it will retrospectively appoint the new Agent.
- For shared Import/Export metering assets, the Import Supplier is responsible for appointing the new Agent.
- The WG has proposed that the Export Supplier should notify the Import Supplier of any request to exchange the meter. However, where the Export Supplier has notified the Import Supplier of this request, there is currently no requirement on the Import Supplier to appoint new Agents upon receipt of this notification.

WG members agreed that, where the work is driven by the Export Supplier and can lead to a change of Market Segment, the Import Supplier should be notified. LK noted it would be

valuable to set out within the REC the required next steps to be completed by the Import Supplier.

JG noted that changing of Market Segment can also lead to pricing and contractual changes for the Import Supplier. If there are any licencing or contractual reasons that prevent the Import Supplier from supporting the change of Market Segment, there needs to be an agreed resolution path for such exceptions.

I0312WG_1407_A08: The Code Manager to explore exceptions to change of market segment scenarios and a resolution path if the Import Supplier has licencing or contractual restraints.

7 NEXT STEPS, DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Action Item	Owner	Deadline/Notes
Draft Impact Assessment	REC Code Manager	Ongoing
Set up fourth working group meeting	REC Code Manager	Date TBC – BA noted WG preference for September.
Accept bilateral feedback from participants	REC Code Manager	Ongoing – feedback is welcome via Change.management@recmanager.co.uk

JH thanked attendees for their engagement and feedback. Members encouraged to reach out via email for further discussion or confidential input (see contact details in slide 21 of attached slide pack).