RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

REC CHANGE ISSUES GROUP – I0197 WORKGROUP 01 MEETING MINUTES

MEETING	**RECCHIG_25_19701**
DATE	**18 June 2025, 14:00**
LOCATION	**By teleconference**

Presenter	Representing	Initials	Role
James Hardy	REC Code Manager	JH	Lead Analyst/Chair
Lorna Mallon	REC Code Manager	LM	Subject Matter Expert
Vaishnavi Sharma	REC Code Manager	VS	Performance Assurance Lead
Harry Firth	REC Code Manager	HF	Secretariat

Full attendee list available upon request.

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

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

2. TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Chair invited attendees to provide comments on the proposed Terms of Reference for the Workgroup, which had been published with the pre-meeting papers. There were no comments, and the Terms of Reference were approved by the Workgroup.

3. PROGRESS AND ACTIVITIES TO DATE

The Chair provided the Workgroup with an overview of the Issue and all progress made to date. The Chair advised that I0197 was raised by the REC Performance Assurance team and the original scope looked to introduce a maximum timeframe Fault Resolution deadline to resolve issues around faulty meters. The Chair added that following initial assessment, this proposal was deemed unworkable, and the scope of the Issue was amended to introducing a new process to provide updates amongst impacted Market Participants during fault resolutions.

The Chair advised that an industry Information Request was issued by the Code Manager to gain an understanding of existing problems occurring during fault resolutions. The Chair added that 16 responses had been received from both gas and electricity Parties and thanked those in attendance who submitted a response. They advised that the Performance Assurance team reviewed all responses and have requested that this Issue focuses on establishing clear SLAs to cover both fuels and all meter types/market segments.

The Chair took the Workgroup through a list of identified gaps and problems in the current electricity and gas processes that were highlighted by the Information Request responses.

The Chair acknowledged the differences between the electricity and gas processes and advised that while the Code Manager would like to align the processes where possible, these processes will have to be tackled separately. They advised that the current plan will likely raise a separate Change Proposal for the electricity process, once the solution development has been completed for both fuels under I0197 and this Workgroup.

4. DEFINITION OF I0197

VS took the Workgroup through some of the feedback received from Parties as part of the I0197 Information Requests and other previous engagement. They advised of the significant gaps known in the processes for both fuels, and the need for standardised categorisation, improved data quality, enhanced communication flows, and enforceable responsibilities. They also noted the negative Consumer impact as delays in meter fault resolution impacts billing.

An attendee asked about the scope of the Issue, for example in the gas process whether the focus would be on the time taken for someone to attend to the meter issue in the first place or for the issue to be completely resolved. VS responded that they will be considering all steps of the process and breaking them down, so that if new obligations are introduced, they are designed based off any potential problems Parties might face keeping these obligations.

A MEM representative advised that categorisation of the meter fault is an important factor to include in the electricity process, as it will be the biggest indicator of how long the fault will take to resolve. They suggested that once these categories have been established, the Code Manager should form individual rules for each one. VS responded that they would look into this approach. Another MEM representative suggested that these categories should be based on meter type, for example advanced and smart meters. They added that the current process lacks distinction on identifying the specific meter fault. The MEM representative added that from their perspective that a lot of Domestic and Non-Domestic Consumers will be using the same meter type, which is why it would be preferred to base a category on the technology rather than the Consumer type.

A MEM representative suggested that it may be beneficial to separate out the gas and electricity processes as early as possible and there is not much potential for alignment. VS asked the Workgroup if they supported this immediate separation of the two processes. The Workgroup agreed that this was the correct approach. The Chair and VS responded that they would plan the future Workgroup meetings accordingly.

VS presented some key requirements to a potential solution identified by the Code Manager, including clearly defined obligations in the REC to establish accountability, improved communications methods between Parties and increased ability to monitor performance. VS added that existing support channels in the REC such as Operational Account Managers and the REC Issues Group should also be highlighted further.

An attendee noted that in the gas process, the Shipper would monitor the levels of meter fault resolutions as part of their commercial agreement with the Meter Asset Provider and asked if the Code Manager's suggestions would overlap with this. VS responded that the feedback

received in the Information Request was that this type of bilateral agreement between Shippers and MAPs was effective and added that introducing obligations into the REC would help to establish an industry-wide standard. They added that when this Workgroup takes a closer look at the gas process, they will discuss whether these bilateral agreements are sufficient.

An attendee asked about the potential increase in monitoring from the Performance Assurance team on gas meter fault resolutions, noting that if the meter was not producing reads, that issue would fall under the governance of the UNC. VS responded that the monitoring would focus on MEM performance, such as when they are notified of a fault, what steps they take to investigate and resolve the fault and the length of time taken.

An Energy Supplier representative advised that all organisation types need to be taken into consideration, noting that some Parties will act as both Energy Supplier and MEM, so the communication methods will be completely different than for two separate Parties. VS agreed that this would be important to consider, as well as the differences between the domestic and I&C markets. A MEM representative added that there are many different communication methods used between Parties, and if the Code Manager would be monitoring performance based off D0001 and D0002 flows, these would likely have to be standardised.

An Energy Supplier representative asked if the Code Manager had looked at a previous BSC Issue, Issue 112, which had raised similar problems. VS responded that the Code Manager had looked at this Issue previously and considered all of the feedback and discussions held under that Change.

5. REVIEW OF THE PROBLEM STATEMENT

LM took the Workgroup through the current I0197 problem statement and asked attendees for feedback. A MEM representative responded that the Code Manager had mistaken the main issue with the current processes, adding that more focus needs to be placed on the collection of meter data which impacts settlement, rather than mismatches in industry data. LM responded that the Code Manager needs to tie in with REC obligations, and it is important not to move out of scope and consider areas under BSC or UNC governance. They suggested that mismatches in industry data would also cause settlement problems. The MEM representative responded that this would likely be due a comms fault rather than a mismatch.

An Energy Supplier representative advised that in the gas process; mismatches can be common because of several factors, all of which can impact settlement. LM added that these mismatches also relate to central systems such as the Gas and Electricity Enquiry Services (GES and EES), which the Performance Assurance team use for reporting purposes.

An Energy Supplier representative advised that there is a difference between handling a faulty meter and a data mismatch. They added that both problems need addressing but should not be included within the same problem statement.

A MEM representative advised that settlement is an important issue as Data Collectors (DC) are monitored on this. They noted that the DC is often reliant on the MOP to resolve the Issue if there is a meter fault. VS responded that this may be worth including in the problem statement. LM noted the Cross-Code impacts as D0001 and D0002 flows are in the BSC and advised that they would flag this in the next Cross Code Steering Group meeting.

A MEM representative asked if the proposed changes are limited to Schedule 14 or if a wider scope is being considered, with potential changes in terms of communication flows. VS responded that the Workgroup would need to look at what the key requirements are for a solution and work from there but added that if the Workgroup recommended for the D0001/D0002 process to be scrapped, the Code Manager would investigate it, and there are no planned limits at the moment. The MEM representative responded that there will be significant change required to achieve an effective outcome, and that adding additional obligations in Code alone will not make a difference. VS agreed and added that all possible avenues will be explored.

The Chair thanked the Workgroup for their feedback and advised that the Code Manager would bring back a reworded problem statement or alternate options to the next meeting.

6. AOB

The Chair invited attendees to provide AOB. No items were raised by the Workgroup.

7. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

The Chair advised attendees that the Code Manager will be looking to hold Workgroup meetings every four to six weeks depending on availability, to ensure that there is regular engagement with Parties whilst having sufficient time to complete any actions that come out of the Workgroup. They added that they would send a poll of potential dates for the next meeting out to attendees later in the week. The Chair added that pre-meeting papers would be published five working days ahead of the Workgroup.