RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

REC CHANGE ISSUES GROUP
I0189 WORKGROUP MEETING MINUTES

MEETING	**RECHIG_25_18906**
DATE	**12 June 2025, 10:00**
LOCATION	**By teleconference**

Presenter	Representing	Initials	Role
Caroline Freimuller	REC Code Manager	CF	Chair/Lead Change Analyst
Anton Moden	REC Code Manager	AM	Performance Assurance Lead

Full attendee list available upon request.

1 INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed attendees to the REC I0189 Working Group meeting.

2 CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA

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

The Chair informed attendees that this session would focus on some new survey questions being proposed by the Code Manager. The Chair added that the new questions in this session would focus on accurate meter data. They added that each question will be linked to specific parts of REC Schedules to clearly show the obligations.

3 I0189 – VOICE OF THE CONSUMER

CF presented an overview of the proposed new accurate meter data survey to attendees. The Chair advised that a separate Workgroup will be held for a discussion on the potential operating model (including centralisation) of the three proposed surveys, likely to be the final I0189 Workgroup meeting in July.

CF confirmed the Code Manager's intention to ensure the survey questions only cover areas under the vires of the REC, as this survey in particular could cover things under the Smart Energy Code (SEC) or Balancing and Settlement Code (BSC). This will be checked with the Cross Code Steering Group (CCSG) when legal text is available.

CF added that as the Code Manager predicts that the data from this survey will be less useful than that from the Switching or Prepayment surveys, the Code Manager is proposing this survey be done less frequently (every 6 months rather than every 3 months) and to a reduced number of customers (5% rather than 10% of an Energy Suppliers Consumer list).

A Supplier representative asked if these percentages were based on the number of Metering Points or number of Consumers, as for Non-Domestic particularly this can be very different. CF confirmed the intention is Metering Points and took an action away to ensure this was clear for previously discussed surveys as well.

A Supplier representative asked if again the intention was to exclude customers who has already received a survey in the past year. CF confirmed this and has added this to the proposal for the prepayment survey as previously discussed.

CF introduced the first question, asking whether Consumers had ever felt their Energy Meter was not accurately recording their usage. A Supplier representative raised concerns over this question becoming a catalyst for customers contacting their Energy Supplier. A Supplier representative suggested the question could be rephrased to “have you contacted your Energy Supplier about this in the past year” to add a time frame and make it a clearer yes/no question.

A Supplier representative queried the list of possible outcomes provided as multi-choice answers. CF responded that if the list stayed, they would be looking to Suppliers for more suggestions. A Supplier representative suggested this could be amended to “did you receive guidance and support on the issue you raised” and if yes, “were you happy with that support?” with a free text field only be provided for no.

A Supplier representative mentioned how few queries they get regarding meter accuracy, with even fewer leading to the discovery of a faulty meter and queried if there were enough cases to warrant this question. Several Energy Suppliers agreed, along with the Consumer Advocate of the REC Code Manager who added we needed to be careful that we didn’t add to the distrust already in place with Consumers and the Energy Market. It was agreed this question would be removed from the potential survey.

CF introduced the second question, asking whether Consumers had been contacted by their Energy Supplier to help confirm meter details (such as serial number or meter reading). A Supplier representative confirmed it would be unusual for them to make a bespoke contact for this issue, and it would normally be done as part of a different contact. They also queried whether a customer would remember this. This was agreed with by several Energy Suppliers. CF said they were unsure of this question when they wrote it and called out how often the meter serial number for gas in particular looks like a mismatch as Xoserve can sometimes hold a partial of what is on site. A Supplier representative asked whether for gas this issue was also dealt with by the annual CDSP reconciliation, to which AM confirmed it was not completely covered but was partially. It was agreed this question would be removed from the potential survey.

CF introduced the last question, asking whether Consumers ever reconcile the reading shown on their smart meter versus their energy bill. CF asked whether the group saw any value in sending a survey which now only consisted of one question and asked for feedback on whether the Code Manager had not written any questions that implied Suppliers have obligations they do not. They added that in previous calls, Citizens Advice had been keen for a survey which

asked about the smart meter journey post installation, but the Code Manager had concerns these weren't covered by the REC – they were either under the SEC or in Suppliers licence conditions.

A Supplier representative confirmed they liked this question the most, but agreed they did not see a benefit in having a survey with only one question. They confirmed there is a large industry focus on smart meter health currently, so this information may be covered elsewhere.

CF and AM confirmed it was possible for this survey to be expanded out to cover more questions on smart meter health, but again said they were keen not to imply Suppliers have obligations they do not. An example provided was does your in home display work, and if no have you contacted your Energy Supplier regrading fixing/replacing it, but the Code Manager is aware there is only an obligation on Energy Suppliers to do so within a year of install.

A Supplier representative queried how any questions could easily differentiate between a smart meter and the in home display, as it is a known problem across the industry that some customers confuse these. A Suppler representative said that they would be wary of overlap between this and the currently unknown post 2025 smart framework, which is expected to be consulted on shortly. The Code Manager agreed with these comments.

An overview was provided by AM which stated while this information would be useful, it is not as linked to a customer outcome as those surveys previously proposed by the Code Manager and has less clear measurable elements. The Code Manager has brought a proposal to the work group and has appreciated the discussion and feedback had within the group, but senses that the recommendation of the work group is to remove this potential survey from the solution of I0189. AM asked if that assessment was accurate and received affirmatives from most attendees.

Next Steps:

CF and AM thanked attendees for their feedback in this session. A Supplier representative thanked the Code Manager for listening to this feedback and being flexible in their approach to the solution when receiving feedback on what was not working.

CF confirmed that the next Working Group would likely be the last, is expected to be held towards the end of July and that it would focus on the proposed Target Operating Model for the surveys. CF confirmed a poll would be sent by the end of the week with proposed dates for the next Working Group.

CF confirmed that the Code Manager has a meeting in place with RECCo to discuss this before the Working Group and get their guidance on how this may be able to work practically.

4 AOB

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