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_0115**
DATE	**15 January 2026, 10:00**
LOCATION	**By teleconference**

Presenter	Representing	Initials	Role
Glenn Sheern	REC Code Manager	GS	Chair
James Hardy	REC Code Manager	JH	Lead Analyst
Jonny Moore	REC Code Manager	JM	Operations Consultant
Lorna Mallon	REC Code Manager	LM	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. There were apologies received from Paul Witton-Dauris.

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 04 December 2025. 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

JH provided attendees with an update on the Issue. JH explained that after extensive industry engagement, no REC Code changes were identified as necessary, and the Code Manager have

decided that I0172 will not progress into a formal Change Proposal. The work completed on updating process maps and guidance documents has been deemed sufficient to resolve this Issue. JH added that all address-management elements raised under I0172 will be handled under I0200, which links into the wider Address Management improvement work.

JH added the materials reviewed and updated under I0172 would be made easily accessible on the REC Portal. They asked all parties to provide any final items for review by end of January, ahead of the February Change Issues Group meeting.

JH noted that one area of the new connections process that had not been covered in detail under I0172 was crossed meters. At present, it is the Code Manager's understanding that the crossed-meters process function correctly, but parties require further guidance or clarity on the process. JH advised that they are happy to cover crossed meters under I0172 or a separate REC Issue. They asked parties to provide feedback on any issues in this area by 05 February by contacting change.management@recmanager.co.uk or james.hardy@recmanager.co.uk.

A Supplier representative highlighted persistent problems on new housing developments and asked if there were any DCUSA changes planned. They mentioned examples such as installers connecting meters to the wrong plot or engineers being misdirected by builders. They proposed a solution for Distribution Network Operators (DNOs) to attach a permanent tag to the cable or cut-out showing the Meter Point Administration Number (MPAN) or unique identifier. This would allow engineers to confirm the correct plot even if site directions are wrong and is like practices used in Scandinavia. A Metering Equipment Manager (MEM) representative agreed that this problem is widespread on new connections sites, particularly multi-dwelling sites. They suggested that ryefield boards could also be tagged, as these are often located separately to the cut-out.

A Supplier representative advised that relevant discussions had taken place in DCUSA last year, involving both connection issues and generators on new builds. LM added that some of the aspects raised were previously discussed as part of I0172. However, certain issues were seen to have reduced or ceased, so were de-scoped at that time. They clarified that no formal DCUSA change had been raised regarding cable tagging. An Electralink representative added that they would take this back to DCUSA for review.

Multiple members welcomed the review into crossed meters. One Supplier representative noted that they had already submitted an Issue via the REC Portal on gas address amendments and crossed meter-related queries. They emphasised the current industry inconsistency in how such queries are handled. Another member agreed that issues are frequent and added that they would collate examples from operational teams and send them to the Code Manager.

5. I0296 - REGISTRATION ID REQUIRED FOR MHHS APPOINTMENTS

JM provided attendees with an overview of the Issue. JM advised that the Central Switching Service (CSS) Registration ID is mandatory in IF031 to appoint MHHS agents and migrate metering points. However, the item is optional in the IF031 message structure, creating a mismatch with Supply & Meter Registration Service (SMRS) design. Suppliers cannot appoint agents or migrate MPANs unless they already know the CSS Registration ID. They only receive

the ID via the Energy Allocation Service (EAS) and switching files if the MPAN has previously gone through a CSS-managed switch. Missing CSS Registration IDs could block MHHS migration and threaten milestone M15.

JM advised that Elexon is progressing a BSC Change Proposal to make the Registration ID mandatory in IF031. They advised that the REC Code Manager are currently considering two options:

Option 1: Code Manager-run Interim Process (short-term fix)

The Code Manager would provide Registration IDs for MPANs that have not gone through a CSS switch. These could be issued on request or bulk-upload. This option would be fast to implement and help to unblock the current migration waves.

Option 2: EAS System Change (long-term fix)

EAS would publish the Registration ID for all MPANs. This is a more robust permanent solution, but would require technical change to the EAS, so a longer implementation time. An impact assessment is also required for this option.

JM advised that due to the migration urgency and already large EAS backlog, the Code Manager strongly prefers Option 1. However, they asked attendees if they supported this stance, or whether an alternative solution should be sought. Attendees responded that they would prefer a quicker solution and backed Option 1.

A Supplier representative asked about the reason behind the missing Registration IDs. JM responded that there were two main potential causes. Some IDs were never provided during the CSS initial load in June 2022, or some Suppliers did not upload the original dataset in 2022 and therefore lost the information.

The Supplier representative asked about GDPR compliance. JM responded that Suppliers may need to provide lists of MPANs missing their IDs, so there is a need to agree a secure method to exchange MPAN lists. No addresses or customer details would be shared—only market data. JM added that the Code Manager would explore this area in further detail now that Option 1 had received support.

6. I0297 - METER MANUFACTURERS MAKE AND TYPE NOT POPULATED IN SMRS

JM provided attendees with an overview of the Issue. JM advised that through MHHS Early Life Support, it was identified that the Manufacturer / Make / Type field should be populated in the MTD data sent to SMRS, but legacy SMRS systems do not hold this data. Also, for MHHS-migrated smart meters, the traditional D0150 / D0268 flows are no longer used, so the data won't be passed through during migration. This risks data being lost during the MHHS migration process. While it will not block migration, losing this data might impact some Supplier and metering processes.

Several attendees highlighted that the existing data is already highly unreliable. One explained that The field in question is a free text box with no validation, and Suppliers see a lot of inconsistent descriptions. JM acknowledged the issue and suggested a change could be included as part of a solution for this Issue or raised as a separate Issue.

Another attendee added that they have received over 250 different ways of describing a smart meter in that field, despite there being only around 10 different models. They added that some MOPs overwrite unknown data with their own defaults and data can degrade as appointments change. The smart meters already provide far more structured data from CPL and ASM files, serial numbers and via meter type. The attendee questioned whether the field provides any meaningful value, but if the data is wanted by industry, it should be codified, not free text.

JM outlined several options to attendees to potentially resolve this issue.

Option 1: Pre-migration Population:

- Using Electralink's DTS MTD history to populate SMRS before migration.
- The timing would need to be considered with MHHS Migrations currently in flight. Should this be ASAP or post Migration? There are risks around each approach.

Option 2: Post-Migration MHHS update:

- MHHS could provide a mechanism to update SMRS after migration using smart-device-held data.

Option 3: Redesigning the Field:

- Convert the free-text field to a codified, validated data item, possibly using smart-device-held data.
- An attendee suggested leveraging Elexon's Outstation Approval List for advanced meters.

Option 4: Removing the Field Entirely:

- Given richer smart meter data exists elsewhere, does that make this field redundant?

JM asked whether the industry considers this a material issue requiring urgent resolution. Several attendees responded that they do not use the field and rely on smart meter data instead. JM suggested a next step of issuing a Request for Information (RFI) to gather wider industry views. If those views echo the sentiment of the Change Issues Group, the urgency can be reduced, and work can focus on redesigning/removing the field.

7. CODE MANAGER ISSUE TRACKER UPDATE

JH provided attendees with an update of several Issues currently being progressed by the Code Manager. The full list of updates is available to view on the meeting slides on the REC Portal.

8. AOB

The Chair invited attendees to provide AOB.

LM provided an update on I0290 – Legacy Data Item API Service to attendees. LM advised that I0290 has been raised by a market participant who believes they still need access to certain legacy data items, at least temporarily and possibly on an ongoing basis. These data items include Profile Class, Measurement Class and Standard Settlement Configuration/Time Patter Regime (SSC/TPR). LM added that these fields were removed intentionally under MHHS. The Code Manager does not want to undermine MHHS by reintroducing them unless there is a genuine, justified business need. Electralink have confirmed that a solution is technically achievable via the Data Transfer Services Agreement (DTSA), funded through REC. Before any further work takes place the Code Manager is looking to under the appetite for this data. A short RFI will be issued on 16 January, running for two weeks and asking three questions to establish likely uses and support. LM confirmed that the Code Manager will progress the Issue if market participants can respond showing have a business case to provide a mechanism to access these legacy data items on a temporary basis.