RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

REC CHANGE ISSUES GROUP
MEETING MINUTES

MEETING	**RECCHIG_26_0205**
DATE	**05 February 2026, 10:00**
LOCATION	**By teleconference**

Presenter	Representing	Initials	Role
Paul Witton-Dauris	REC Code Manager	PWD	Chair
April Harbour	REC Code Manager	AH	Technical Services Lead
Caroline Freimuller	REC Code Manager	CF	Lead Analyst
Holly Law	REC Code Manager	HL	Change Delivery Manager
Harriet Truss	REC Code Manager	HT	Lead Analyst
Jonny Moore	REC Code Manager	JM	Operations Consultant
Tim Newton	REC Code Manager	TN	Subject Matter Expert
Harry Firth	REC Code Manager	HF	Secretariat

Full attendee list available upon request.

1. INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed attendees to the REC Change Issues Group (CHIG) meeting.

2. CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA

The Chair invited any additional items of business for consideration during the meeting. No items were raised by attendees.

3. APPROVAL OF THE PREVIOUS MINUTES

The Chair invited attendees to provide comments on the draft minutes from the meeting which took place on 15 January 2026. HF advised that no comments had been made prior to the meeting. There were no comments, and the minutes were approved as an accurate reflection of the meeting.

4. I0172 – NEW CONNECTIONS PROCESS REVIEW

TN provided attendees with an update on the Issue. TN explained that after extensive industry engagement, no REC Code changes were identified as necessary, and the Code Manager has decided that I0172 would be closed as resolved. The work completed on updating process maps and guidance documents will be made available via the REC Portal. TN added that all address-management elements raised under I0172 will be handled under I0200

TN noted that it is the Code Manager's understanding that the crossed-meters processes are generally effective when followed correctly, but repeated feedback suggested some parties have difficulties. TN proposed opening a new issue specifically to analyse crossed meter scenarios and assess whether small process tweaks or guidance is needed. There were no comments provided by attendees.

5. I0261 - ADDITION OF EXPORT FLAG IN D0303 FLOWS

CF provided attendees with an overview of the Issue. CF advised that I0261 may have been linked to I0230, both of which examined potential enhancements to the D0303 flow. Following a joint information request, Parties provided robust feedback which was reviewed by the Code Manager and the Proposer of I0261. The Proposer chose to take forward a solution which added a new Data Item to the D0303 flow.

Based on some stakeholder feedback, the Code Manager and Proposer revised the solution to introduce a new group containing the "Direction of Energy Flow" Data Item instead of an export flag. This Data Item will:

- Be mandatory only for Market-wide Half Hourly Settlement (MHHS) migrated MPANs, because Meter Operator Agents (MOAs) already receive the necessary information in other MHHS flows and can pass it through without additional derivation; and
- Remain optional for legacy MPANs, where there is currently no authoritative data source and deriving the value could create inaccuracies.

An attendee questioned why a proposed new group is being placed at Level 3 in the flow structure rather than aligned with the MPAN Core. AH responded that is currently positioned at Level 3 because it is a mandatory group for the Party Impact Assessment. If they can redesign it to be optional, but mandatory only for MHHS-migrated MPANs, then it could move lower in the structure. AH added that the current placement is driven by structural rules: the groups between MPAN Core and the proposed new group are optional, so the new group is simply being added at the end. The group can be moved higher if needed for clarity or flow-building ease. Feedback already submitted will inform potential repositioning and whether the group should become optional with a mandatory data item.

CF added that Legacy MOAs raised concerns that if required to populate the field for unmigrated MPANs, they risk sending values inconsistent with EES. Making it conditional avoids invalid or conflicting data. Over time, as MHHS migration progresses, the Data Item will

become mandatory for all MPANs, and a wider code review is expected post-migration to remove the conditional logic.

The attendee expressed their concern about conditional data design, particularly when conditionality cannot be validated in-flow. The risk to inbound data validation if a field is required but logic cannot identify when it applies. CF acknowledged this concern and reiterated that the conditional data is an interim solution only during the MHHS migration process.

6. APPROACH FOR ISSUES I0273, I0290 AND I0303

HT advised attendees that three issues have been raised to address concerns in relation to legacy data items that, while deprecated under MHHS for settlement, continue to be essential for Supplier operational processes, especially in relation to:

- Standard Settlement Configuration
- Time Pattern Regime
- Profile Class
- Measurement Class
- Meter Timeswitch Code

HT advised that the Code Manager approach for now is to maintain them as separate issues, due to their distinct focuses. HT confirmed however that the assigned analysts and subject matter experts are working together to minimise duplication and to consider opportunity to combine solutions if appropriate.

HT gave an overview of I0273, which is focussed on the SSC and I0303 which focuses on identifying Smart Economy 7 meters which used to rely on the Profile Class.

HT advised that an information request for I0290 - Legacy Data Item API Service has now closed. Responses will support development of the business case as to whether a REC-funded provision of a DTN solution can be supported.

HT noted that a joint information request for I0273 - Sharing of SSC and TPR Information for MHHS Smart and Advanced Meters and I0303 - Potential Consumer detriment for Smart Economy 7 will be issued the following week to streamline data gathering and avoid requiring parties to duplicate efforts.

An attendee asked whether I0273 and I0303 overlap with MHHS identified issues—specifically around traditional Current Transformer (CT) meters and Smart Meter designated premises. JM responded that I0303 was partly raised due to the traditional CT meter discussion. However, the scope of the Issue is broader: it looks at any situation where a meter in the Advanced or Smart Market Segment should have a Standard Settlement Configuration (SSC) populated. JM added that the Code Manager are examining, under I0273, when SSC should be populated, how to obtain required TPR information and scenarios where traditional meters end up in the advanced segment (e.g., CT arrangements, auto-moving related meters, non-comms situations). The work

aims to determine the correct data obligations and how parties receive the information needed to read meters appropriately.

The attendee asked whether Profile Class should continue to be retained as an identifier for designated premises since MHHS removes reliance on Profile Class for many purposes. JM responded that Ofgem is still interested in identifying designated premises that do not yet have a smart or advanced meter, because they must know when such meters ought to be installed. Therefore, Profile Class remains mandatory for traditional meters within the Smart or Advanced Market Segments. It only becomes optional for migrated MPANs after a Smart/Advanced Meter has been installed—once the obligation is fulfilled.

7. I0284 - UPDATES TO SCHEDULE 14 MEASUREMENT TRANSFORMERS COMMISSIONING TIMESCALES

CF provided attendees with an overview of the Issue. CF explained that Parties requested a review of the commissioning timescales due to concerns that once the historic Reconciliation Final (RF) window reduces from 14 months to 4 months as part of MHHS, the existing 80 Working Day commissioning timelines could cause crystallisation of incorrect settlement data if commissioning encounters delays.

CF advised that two options have been drafted by the Code Manager:

- Option A: Reduce end-to-end SLA to 70 Working Days
- Option B: Reduce SLA to 60 Working Days

CF confirmed a Party had contacted the Code Manager prior to the CHIG, confirming their suggestion that this not only required shorter timelines but better sequencing and dependency linkage between steps.

An attendee advised that Suppliers currently exercise judgement over commissioning status. For example, if the Distribution Network Operator (DNO) commissioned the primary asset and is trusted to have done it correctly, a Supplier may treat this as lower-risk. This risk assessment capability is important because the Supplier carries the settlement risk if commissioning issues persist. CF confirmed that no process changes are being proposed, only changes to timescales.

An attendee confirmed they had contacted the Code Manager to suggest that timescales need to be shortened, and more importantly, linked step-to-step, rather than all counting from energisation. This avoids early steps being completed quickly and later steps stalling, as would happen if all deadlines trace to a single anchor point (energisation).

The attendee also queried what event is the Supplier's trigger for knowing they must act to resolve defects or omissions. Another attendee added that Suppliers rely on receiving the D0384 flow. The absence of a flow should itself be a trigger. CF confirmed there is already a requirement for the MOA to send the D0384 within 5 Working Days of identifying a defect preventing commissioning. An attendee suggested reducing the D0384 timeframe to 3 Working Days, aligning it with Meter Technical Detail (MTD) exchange requirements and MHHS expectations. CF agreed this is sensible.

CF suggested that there seemed to be a consensus towards step-linked timescales. An attendee raised concerns that if timescales are too strictly tied to the DNO's commissioning event, delays by the DNO could block the MOA from conducting their secondary tests. Therefore, some flexibility is needed so that MOA work can progress even if the DNO is late.

8. I0304 - IMPLEMENTATION OF OFGEM-LED CODE MODIFICATION PRIORITISATION WITHIN THE REC

HL provided attendees with an overview of the Issue. HL explained that under the Energy Act 2023, Ofgem is introducing a harmonised prioritisation framework across all industry codes. This aims to standardise how Issues and Change Proposals are prioritised, ensuring consistent treatment across the market. A statutory consultation has concluded and publication of Ofgem's final decision is imminent.

Once Ofgem publishes its direction, the Code Manager will have 28 days to implement required changes in the REC. Legal text already drafted for Schedule 1 (definitions) and Schedule 5 (Change Management) will be inserted directly. Additionally, the Code Manager must update Change Proposal forms, Issue forms, and portal guidance, implement system changes to support the new prioritisation matrix and provide training and clarity for industry participants.

HL provided further detail on the new prioritisation framework. The new criteria, equally weighted, are:

- Alignment with Ofgem's strategic direction
- Importance (consumer value, market risk, regulatory commitments)
- Complexity (scale, interdependencies, systems/process impacts)

A critical procedural update is that proposers will now be required to complete an initial prioritisation assessment when submitting Issues or CPs.

An attendee suggested a full reconciliation of all live changes and issues with the prioritisation framework to determine whether each item is still needed, to identify if any have been superseded, become obsolete, or duplicate and to give industry a clear snapshot of what is currently open at the point the new arrangements take effect. They also supported the idea of a webinar to walk stakeholders through the upcoming changes and presented this reconciled list. HL responded that the Code Manager have already been asked to go back over all live Change Proposals and Issues and reprioritise them against the new criteria. They added that they were happy to provide this information in a webinar.

An attendee asked why it is necessary to raise a REC Issue, given Ofgem's prioritisation changes will be implemented directly using transitional powers. HL clarified that Ofgem will directly modify the REC for the required code text changes (Schedules 1 and 5). The REC Issue was raised not to enact the Ofgem change, but to coordinate consequential changes (forms, REC Portal pages, guidance documents etc.) and to keep all these related REC adjustments under one vehicle for transparency.

The attendee asked how consistency will be ensured across all 11 industry codes affected.

HL responded that coordination is happening through the Cross-Code Steering Group. Codes are sharing updates, attending joint sessions, and aligning where the prioritisation process needs consistent application. Once Ofgem issues the formal 28-day modification notice, all codes will implement their changes in parallel.

9. R0300 - AMENDMENTS TO D0312 TO ALIGN WITH BSC CP1622

HT provided attendees with an overview of the Issue. HT advised that BSC raised CP1622 following MHHS data cleanse work. It proposed changing SMRS validation rules for the number of displayed digits contained within the IF-005 message. The REC-equivalent legacy flow is D0312, meaning changes at BSC level have both technical and operational impacts within REC. Because the affected metering points are currently on the MHHS migration exclusion list, urgent resolution is required to avoid blocking migration.

HT advised that the Code Manager raised R0300 with a fully formed mirrored solution to CP1622. However, during initial assessment, REC identified unaddressed wider impacts in CP1622. The Code Manager formally responded to the CP1622 consultation with concerns and paused progression of R0300 pending BSC's response. The BSC has now paused its own decision, acknowledging the need for more cross-industry engagement. REC and BSC teams have agreed to work jointly to explore gaps and complexities, especially around migration impacts, validation consistency, transitional arrangements and data accuracy requirements.

HT advised that a Proposal Plan for R0300 has been submitted to Change Panel for approval. A joint industry workshop for R0300 and CP1622 has been scheduled for 05 February at 14:00, with invites extended to attendees from the Change Issues Group and MHHS Expert Group. HT encouraged any impacted stakeholders to attend.

10. CODE MANAGER ISSUE TRACKER UPDATE

HL provided attendees with an update of several Issues currently being progressed by the Code Manager, as well as the confirmed inclusions within the upcoming scheduled REC release in February. The full list of updates is available to view on the meeting slides on the REC Portal.

11. AOB

The Chair invited attendees to provide AOB.

HL advised that the Theft Issues Group will be integrated into the Change Issues Group going forward due to a reduced number of theft-specific Issues. Theft Issues will appear as a standing item in future meeting agendas. HL suggested that this standing item would be taken first so Theft specialists can join for that section only. Attendees agreed with this approach. If there are no theft items, attendees will be informed in advance. HL added that separate Working Groups can and will be created where additional time is required on Theft Issues, such as I0265 - Theft Calculator Usage and Suitability Assessment. The Theft Issues Group may be re-established if the volume of Theft Issues rises in future.