RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

REC CHANGE ISSUES GROUP – I0197 WORKGROUP 03 (ELECTRICITY)

MEETING MINUTES

MEETING	**RECCHIG_25_1970301**
DATE	**07 August 2025, 11:30**
LOCATION	**By teleconference**

Presenter	Representing	Initials	Role
Vaishnavi Sharma	REC Code Manager	VS	Performance Assurance Lead
James Hardy	REC Code Manager	JH	Lead Analyst / Chair
Lorna Mallon	REC Code Manager	LM	Subject Matter Expert
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 3 – Electricity specific session.

The Chair asked attendees for comments on the previous set of minutes from the I0197 Workgroup 2 – Electricity specific session. No comments were raised, and the minutes were formally accepted as an accurate recording of the meeting.

2. CAPTURING CONSIDERATIONS

The Chair outlined the structure of the meeting, which would focus on three key themes derived from previous feedback. These themes were designed to guide the discussion toward identifying challenges, dependencies, and potential solutions within the electricity metering process.

The Chair led the main discussion of the meeting, which was structured around four guiding questions:

- Who is responsible for resolving issues?
- What dependencies exist?
- What barriers prevent timely resolution?
- What should be considered when developing solutions?

Attendees discussed recurring problems with Data Collectors (DCs) raising D1 flows for meter faults that were not genuine. These flows were often triggered due to the DCs' inability to dial into meters, which stemmed from missing or incompatible protocols. The Chair confirmed that under BSCP 502, DCs are obligated to reject appointments if they cannot communicate with the meter, rather than raising unnecessary fault flows.

A MOA representative expressed concern about the long-term viability of codifying D-flows, especially in light of the Market-wide Half-Hourly Settlement (MHHS) design, which may eventually replace these flows. The Chair acknowledged this but suggested that interim improvements could still be valuable, particularly if the flows are retained for the foreseeable future.

The group agreed that better tracking and linking of D1, D2, and D5 flows would improve transparency. However, current DTN infrastructure does not support linking these flows effectively. The possibility of using DIP infrastructure to centralise and monitor flows was discussed as a future enhancement.

Participants raised concerns about incorrect Meter Technical Details (MTDs) leading to failed site visits. For example, engineers trained for single-phase meters were sometimes dispatched to sites with three-phase meters due to inaccurate data. The Chair noted that the D202 reconciliation process, which was being introduced, would help identify and correct such discrepancies. The first set of reports was expected by the end of the month and would be used to set improvement targets.

A Supplier representative highlighted issues with DNOs failing to notify Suppliers and MOAs of site disconnections or demolitions. Even when evidence was provided, DNOs were often slow to respond or failed to send the required D139 flows. The Chair acknowledged that audits typically focus on whether flows were sent, not whether they were timely or accurate in relation to actual site conditions.

The group discussed the possibility of requesting monthly disconnection reports from DNOs and cross-referencing these with D-flows to identify gaps. This would help ensure that disconnections are properly recorded and communicated.

Attendees described challenges in arranging site visits, particularly when TPIs were listed as site contacts. TPIs often could not provide access or confirm availability, and in some cases, were located overseas. The Chair and LM explained that current regulations do not allow for enforcement against TPIs, as they are not formally regulated. The group agreed to refer this issue to Ofgem for further consideration.

A MOA representative also noted that not all faults require site visits, and MOAs often prefer to attempt access without prior contact to expedite resolution. The Chair suggested that obligations could be framed to require MOAs to either contact the customer or attempt a site visit within a defined timeframe.

Other access-related issues included long notice periods, health and safety requirements, and the need for specialist equipment. The group agreed that fault resolution targets should include allowances for such uncontrollable delays. The Chair proposed developing best practice guidance to help MOAs navigate these challenges.

The discussion turned to cases where MOA-customer contracts did not include provisions for meter exchanges. Several attendees noted that this often led to delays, especially when customers were unwilling or unable to pay for replacements, and emphasised that under the Electricity Act, customers are legally required to maintain working meters. The Chair suggested that MOAs should ensure their contracts include minimum requirements for meter exchanges and delegated authority to carry out necessary work.

A MOA representative raised concerns about the inconsistent use of D302 flows, noting that some Suppliers send hundreds of flows with outdated or missing contact information. In some cases, Suppliers were using spreadsheets to share personal data, which raised significant GDPR risks. LM confirmed that D302 flows are not currently monitored in the Risk Register and agreed that a new Issue should be raised to review their structure and purpose.

The group discussed whether the D302 flow should be simplified or restructured to better serve agents and DNOs. It was agreed that mandating key fields and update obligations would improve the flow's usefulness and compliance.

A MOA representative highlighted problems with AMR meters being reclassified as "dumb" when communications fail, even though the meters themselves are still capable of advanced functionality. This leads to unnecessary replacements and confusion. They proposed allowing handheld communication types (HT/HP) for AMR meters, similar to the half-hourly process.

The Chair agreed that current classification rules should be revisited, especially in light of MHHS segmentation. The group discussed the implications of meter type changes on settlement and data collection and agreed that clearer guidance is needed.

The final topic addressed the lack of a formal fault handling process for Smets meters. A MOA representative explained that suppliers typically initiate faults, and agents follow instructions without visibility into the underlying issues. Unlike advanced meters, Smets meters do not allow for end-to-end testing by agents.

The Chair acknowledged that Smets fault processes are currently informal and self-invented. They agreed that formalising these processes would be important, especially as MHHS increases pressure for timely and accurate data collection.

3. NEXT STEPS AND DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Attendees reviewed and agreed on a set of follow-up actions to be taken before the next meeting. These included quantifying DC protocol issues, monitoring DNO disconnection performance, referring TPI contact issues to Ofgem, reviewing D302 update obligations, assessing the fitness of the D302 flow, exploring meter classification rule changes, and investigating the formalisation of Smets fault processes.

The next electricity working group meeting date was not confirmed during the session. The Chair confirmed that a poll will be circulated following the upcoming gas process session to identify a suitable date. Attendees were reminded of the gas session scheduled for 12 August.

4. AOB

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