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

REC CHANGE ISSUES GROUP – I0197 WORKGROUP 02 (GAS)

MEETING MINUTES

MEETING	**RECCHIG_25_19702**
DATE	**17 July 2025, 10:00**
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 2 – Gas specific session.

2. DEFINING 'METER FAULT'

VS initiated the discussion by asking participants to define what constitutes a meter fault in both domestic and non-domestic contexts. They asked what are the most common types of scenarios where you require meter investigation. A Supplier representative explained that investigations often begin with incorrect meter details or alerts from smart meters, which may lead to site visits or further technical assessments. Another Supplier representative added that remote upgrade failures and statutory exchanges also fall under this category, although the latter may be out of scope. Another Supplier representative noted that many of these highlighted issues are common across both Domestic and Industrial and Commercial (INC) sectors.

3. CATEGORISING METER FAULTS

VS led the Workgroup on discussions around categorising the types of meter faults. VS asked participants to identify which issues typically require desktop investigations and which necessitate site visits.

VS asked the Workgroup whether most of these investigations resolved through desktop work, or do they typically require a site visit? Supplier representatives responded that the majority of cases require a site visit, especially when the MEM lacks sufficient data. They added that while some MTD issues might be resolved remotely, many cases—especially those involving cross meters or physical faults—require site visits.

VS asked if there are any differences in fault types between domestic and non-domestic meters. Supplier representatives agreed that most fault types are common across both sectors, though some issues like prepayment faults are specific to domestic customers.

4. CAPTURING CONSIDERATIONS

VS led the Workgroup on a discussion on the broader considerations that impact meter investigations and fault resolution.

There were discussions on the responsibility for fixing any meter issues. Workgroup members noted that in domestic settings, suppliers typically manage the customer relationship and are responsible for coordinating fixes. In contrast, in the INC sector, Meter Asset Managers (MEMs) or Meter Asset Providers (MAPs) often hold direct contracts with customers, which can complicate coordination.

VS asked what challenges arise from emergency jobs handled by network operators. A Supplier representative responded that when networks respond to gas leaks and replace meters, suppliers are often not notified. This leads to data gaps and reliance on customers to report changes.

VS asked about any common barriers to quick resolution of metering issues. The Workgroup identified several barriers. Customer contact remains a significant challenge, particularly when proactive engagement is required. Engineer availability is another major issue, with regional disparities affecting response times. Material lead times, especially for bespoke I&C meters and converters, can extend to several weeks. Site access is also problematic, particularly in urban areas with parking restrictions or in secure industrial sites. Data quality issues, such as incorrect or missing updates following meter work, further delay resolution.

VS asked the Workgroup for any further considerations on solution development. Workgroup members suggested that any future solutions should focus on improving communication between all parties involved, enhancing data validation and reconciliation processes, and addressing logistical challenges such as engineer availability and material sourcing. There was also a call for better customer education, particularly around the use of bypasses and the benefits of smart meters.

A Supplier representative raised concerns about the CDSP reconciliation process. They criticised the process for not specifying which data items are mismatched, making it difficult to correct issues. They also noted that MEMs often don't receive install dates, leading to default values and mismatches. Another Supplier representative agreed and added that data quality varies significantly between MEMs, with smaller providers often lacking robust systems.

Additional technical challenges were discussed, including signal strength issues that prevent smart meters from functioning properly and the need for better follow-through after meter works to ensure data accuracy.

5. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

The Chair advised attendees that the Code Manager will be looking to hold the next Workgroup meetings in early August. They added that they would send a poll of potential dates for the next meeting out to attendees in due course. The Chair added that pre-meeting papers would be published five working days ahead of the Workgroup, and the minutes for this meeting will be published five working days after the meeting.

6. AOB

The Chair asked attendees for any further items to be raised. No items were raised and the Chair closed the meeting.