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_0507**
DATE	**07 May 2026, 10:00**
LOCATION	**By teleconference**

Presenter	Representing	Initials	Role
Paul Witton-Dauris	REC Code Manager	PWD	Chair
Florentina Monea	REC Code Manager	FM	Lead Analyst
James Hardy	REC Code Manager	JH	Lead Analyst
Jonny Moore	Retail Energy Code Company	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.

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 02 April 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. I0200 - REVIEW OF THE REC'S ADDRESS MANAGEMENT SERVICE

JH provided attendees with an overview of the Issue. JH advised that I0200 was raised due to persistent address data quality issues which have resulted in large volumes of unmatched

Meter Point Location (MPL) and Retail Energy Location (REL) addresses, reduced from approximately 2.8 million to 2.4 million, still presenting significant ongoing risk. Poor address data quality continues to contribute to delayed or Erroneous Switches, billing errors, Consumer detriment, and increased operational inefficiency for industry Parties.

JH outlined the Centralised Registration Service (CRS) Improvement Plan, noting that in December 2024 Ofgem confirmed that the Data and Communications Company (DCC) would retain licence and Code responsibilities for CRS. DCC and RECCo subsequently delivered a joint improvement plan, including a dedicated address data quality workstream. To avoid duplication and unintended consequences, I0200 was placed on hold in June 2025 while that work was completed. With the improvement plan now concluded, I0200 is being taken off hold to address residual and systemic issues that sit outside the CRS delivery scope but remain within REC governance. JH noted and thanked the DCC for their hard work and cooperation on this area as part of the work on the CRS Improvement Plan in the past year.

JH noted that while I0200 was on hold, further address management issues were identified across multiple areas of the REC change landscape. These include Issues raised through other Change Proposals and Reviews such as I0172 - End to End New Connections Process Review, I0237 - Erroneous Switch Review, R0266 - REC Data Specification, R0283 - Annual Address Management Plan Updates, and I0314 - Crossed Meters Process: Clarification and Support. As a result, the scope of I0200 has been expanded to address broader address data quality, standardisation, and data-sharing issues across both gas and electricity, while seeking to minimise divergence between fuels where possible. JH noted that the Issue has been retitled "Review of the REC Address Management Service", reflecting this broader scope. JH took attendees through a proposed scope for I0200 but added that it is still open to additions up until the first I0200 working group meeting, and asked attendees to reach out to add topics by contacting change.management@recmanager.co.uk.

JH advised that Change Panel had approved an update to the I0200 Proposal Plan, with a solution development phase planned until November. This will include working group meetings and any required Service Provider impact assessments once a solution has been proposed. JH added that any "quick wins" that are identified can be raised and progressed separately through the REC Change Process, noting similar success with the Erroneous Switch Review.

JH asked attendees if they would prefer to keep discussions on I0200 in the Change Issues Group or set up a separate working group. Attendees agreed that a separate working group was the best option. JH agreed, noting previous feedback supporting a separate working group. They advised that this working group will be set up and communications will be circulated to Parties on how to register interest.

5. I0273 - SHARING OF SSC AND TPR INFORMATION FOR MHHS SMART AND ADVANCED METERS

JH provided attendees with an update on the Issue. JH advised that I0273 is looking at the sharing of Standard Settlement Configuration (SSC) and Time Pattern Regime (TPR) information for smart and advanced meters under Market-wide Half-Hourly Settlement (MHHS).

I0273 was raised because the MHHS design does not mandate the use of SSCs or support register-level TPR data for smart and advanced meters. Industry feedback has highlighted that this creates gaps in data availability for specific settlement scenarios, leading to operational issues and potential consumer detriment.

JH advised that an Information Request issued in February sought to understand the scale of the issue, whether SSC information is still required in certain settlement scenarios for smart and advanced meters, whether existing population and validation rules remain appropriate, and whether a mechanism is needed to communicate register-level TPR information. Following responses and initial consideration at the Metering Expert Panel (MEP), I0273 was placed briefly on hold to allow further discussion with Ofgem. These discussions were necessary to clarify what elements sit within the scope of the REC and I0273, and whether any aspects should instead be progressed through the MHHS programme or affect the MHHS business case. JH added that it has been agreed that I0273 should proceed solely within the REC Change process and that there is no impact on the MHHS business case. I0273 will come off hold, subject to approval of the update to the Proposal Plan at MEP this month. They also confirmed that I0303 - Potential Consumer detriment for Smart Economy 7 will be addressed as part of the scope for I0273 rather than progressing as a separate Issue.

JH advised that the long-term plan is to mandate the use of SSCs for smart meters only. This approach limits the scope to cases where SSCs remain operationally relevant and manageable for industry parties. It was noted that not all advanced meters have SSC or TPR data, particularly where meters have been historically traded Half Hourly, and therefore a universal solution for all advanced meters is not considered viable. Impacted stakeholders will be engaged throughout solution development, with the Issue progressing through the standard REC Change process, including party impact assessments and consultation.

JH added that it is recognised that this enduring solution will take time to develop. To support ongoing issues and mitigate potential consumer detriment, RECCo will publish interim guidance to support the industry during the MHHS migration period. This guidance is intended to be published as soon as possible, no later than this month, and is designed to promote consistency and reduce negative impacts ahead of the enduring solution. The guidance will not pre-empt or replace the final solution. JH advised that the interim guidance will be published on the REC Portal and communicated via the Change Issues Group and REC bulletins.

JH advised that the interim guidance will set expectations that, where technically and operationally feasible, parties should continue to send and receive SSC data using existing market messages and avoid withholding SSC data where recognised data flows support its exchange. For metering points already migrated to MHHS, SSC data should not be removed from the Supply & Meter Registration Service (SMRS) if currently populated, as retaining this information supports continuity and reduces the risk of data gaps during migration.

An attendee asked whether I0273 would address traditional current transformer (CT) meters and queried whether this would require a separate change if advanced meters were excluded. JM responded that a change had recently been agreed to allow traditional CTs into MHHS, and that this approach does not require changes to Meter Technical Details (MTDs). Instead,

relevant information will be communicated via existing market arrangements (including flows linked to SMRS).

An attendee raised a question about new connections, noting that SSCs are not populated via D0205 for MHHS new-build metering points. JM explained that SSCs for new connections would be populated using the relevant existing market message IF-025 Market Message 'Supplier Updates to Registration', which is already mandatory for traditional meters. The anticipated direction of travel under I0273 is that this would become mandatory for smart meters as well. Where a smart meter is installed after the point of connection, the SSC would be updated using the existing process, consistent with how traditional meters are currently handled.

An attendee welcomed the confirmation that interim guidance would be published and asked about next steps, including whether a dedicated working group would be set up and what the indicative timetable might be. JH confirmed that no separate working group is planned for I0273; instead, stakeholder engagement and updates will be progressed through the Change Issues Group. The Code Manager will develop the solution and consult stakeholders via party impact assessment and consultation.

6. R0290 - LEGACY DATA ITEM API SERVICE

JH provided attendees with an overview of the Change Proposal. JH explained that R0290 looks to introduce a new API provided by ElectraLink, which REC Parties and TPIs would be able to sign up as a user of at no charge. The API would provide the last held value for some Data Items for Market Half-Hourly Settlement (MHHS) Metering Points, including Profile Class, Standard Settlement Configuration (SSC), Time Pattern Regime (TPR), Measurement Class and Meter Timeswitch Code. The API is a temporary solution and is proposed as being in place from 26 June 2026 until MHHS Milestone M16 (currently 02 July 2027).

JH advised that as part of the solution, there will be a new Schedule (Legacy Data Item API Schedule), new defined terms within Schedule 1 and an addition to the Access Agreement within Schedule 9. Costs for the solution have been estimated between £512,000-577,000, between ElectraLink, and the Code Manager.

JH advised that the Code Manager's minded to position is to recommend the Change Panel to reject this Change Proposal. This is because the problem does not impact as many MHHS Metering Points as originally thought, as the Data Items are optional rather than removed, meaning it currently accounts for around 4% of MHHS migrated Metering Points, rather than 100%. JH added that the proposed solution is temporary, the Code Manager has been unable to accurately establish how many Parties and TPIs would register to become a Legacy Data Item API User, and part of the use case (Reverse Migration) would become redundant at MHHS Milestone M14 (currently 28 October 2026). Any Party who wishes to receive this data can contract separately with ElectraLink to receive it.

JH explained that the consultation for R0290 opened on 29 April, closing for responses on 21 May, with the vote on Final Recommendation scheduled for the Change Panel meeting on 02 June. JH added that the Code Manager will not be able to accept late responses to this

consultation, as the Change Report must be published the first working day after the consultation closes.

7. ERRONEOUS SWITCH REVIEW

JH provided attendees with an overview of the ongoing Erroneous Switch (ES)Review, which was initiated to undertake an end-to-end assessment of existing arrangements for handling ES. The review was first raised due to concerns that the current approach is outdated, has not been substantively reviewed for several years, and has not kept pace with the introduction of faster switching or the MHHS arrangements. It has been identified that the current process creates operational inefficiencies and consumer harm, including delayed or incorrect resolution of ESs, inconsistent handling of domestic and non-domestic scenarios, unnecessary repeated switch events, inaccurate billing, and erosion of consumer confidence.

Examples of issues identified include parties rejecting ES requests simply to meet REC response time obligations or incorrectly accepting requests due to insufficient time to complete checks or manage system data latency. In some cases, ES resolutions are handled outside of industry systems, weakening performance assurance and increasing the risk of consumers being switched multiple times unnecessarily. There is also confusion around which processes apply for different supplier types, misaligned escalation timelines, and an escalation process that is currently ineffective.

JH added that to address these concerns, a dedicated ES Review working group was established under I0237 in September 2025. There were seven meetings up until March 2026 and the group undertook a detailed end-to-end review of the ES process. JH thanked the members of the working group for their input. The group examined how the process operates in practice, identified weaknesses and inconsistencies, and explored opportunities to improve clarity, align obligations and rejection reasons, and reduce consumer detriment. Suppliers shared practical experience, which helped inform the recommendations.

The outputs of the working group were intended to inform changes to Schedule 30, associated legal drafting, market messages, and operational guidance, with the overarching objective of ensuring ESs are resolved quickly, accurately and consistently, while minimising unnecessary switching activity and billing errors. The working group recommendations have been split into three related workstreams to allow quicker implementation of simpler improvements while a more complex technical solution is developed:

- I0237 will now focus on a technical solution, specifically looking at how ESs are progressed through the Central Switching Service (CSS). Initial high-level CSS process maps have been developed, but these remain subject to change as the technical solution is refined.
- R0313 proposes amendments to clause 4.5 of Schedule 30, reducing the ES timeframe from 24 months to 12 months. This aligns code requirements with evidence-based operational practice, reduces unnecessary process overhead, and simplifies Supplier obligations. Data gathered through the working group supports this change. R0313 is currently under review by REC Legal and is expected to be discussed at the June

Change Issues Group. Although it is a change proposal, it will still go through a full change process including party impact assessment and consultation to confirm there are no unintended system or consumer impacts. An implementation date of November 2026 is currently targeted, subject to change process outcomes, and it will not be implemented later than any solution delivered under I0237.

- R0322 covers a set of clarifications and housekeeping changes arising from I0237. This includes correcting terminology (for example, "customer" to "consumer" and "transfer" to "switch"), updating ES reason codes and descriptions (including dual-fuel scenarios), clarifying when the ES flag should and should not be used, and ensuring market messages accurately reflect current market practice. R0322 is in a similar position to R0313 and will also proceed through party impact assessment and consultation due to its impact on data items. A November implementation is currently targeted, again no later than any solution under I0237.

The Proposal Plan for R0313 is expected to be published imminently and will be taken to Change Panel on 19 May, with a proposal plan for R0322 to follow in the coming weeks. It was noted that scope may move between the three items as work progresses, depending on timing, stakeholder feedback and outcomes of impact assessments and consultations. An attendee asked if the problem statements allow for this. JH responded that the Code Manager is comfortable that this is the case but would be happy to reconsider if concerns were flagged at party impact assessment. The attendee raised concerns over the number of different ES Issues being progressed. JH responded that the Code Manager will strive to keep the Proposals aligned on progression, with a targeted joint implementation date in November 2026. They advised that a joint party impact assessment is likely to reduce capacity for parties providing feedback.

JH noted that a further ES Issue is expected to be raised shortly. This additional Issue will focus specifically on performance assurance reporting for ESs. A key gap has been identified in current reporting arrangements: Data Transfer Network (DTN) reporting does not provide MPXN-level data upfront and instead requires individual ES permissions before MPXNs are shared. In contrast, CSS reporting already provides monthly MPXN-level data, meaning that end-to-end monitoring of the ES process cannot currently be carried out consistently at MPXN level across central systems.

The working group identified this as a potential "quick win", as improving reporting would significantly enhance visibility and effectiveness of performance assurance without requiring wider process changes. The proposed solution is to mandate MPXN-level data for all ES performance assurance reporting. The change would also include housekeeping updates to remove redundant data flows from erroneous switch reporting requirements.

This item will be progressed separately from the other ES change proposals, as it relates purely to performance assurance. Discussions with RECCo are ongoing, and the issue or change proposal is expected to be raised in the near future. Once raised, it will follow the standard REC change process, including opportunities for stakeholder feedback through consultation and impact assessment.

8. I0228 - ECOES API FOR EXPORT MPAN CREATION AT SCALE

JH provided attendees with an overview of the Issue. They explained that an Information Request was issued on 2 April and is due to close on 08 May. The purpose of the Information Request is to establish the long-term business-as-usual use case for an API to support bulk export MPAN creation, beyond one-off activity such as new developments or Feed In Tariff (FIT) migrations.

JH advised that Suppliers are being asked to provide:

- The number of export MPANs created between 2023 and 2025 that were not related to new developments or FIT
- Where possible, a breakdown by Distribution Network Operator (DNO) and by month, to understand how frequently the bulk MPAN creation process is required in BAU scenarios,
- Qualitative feedback on experiences of the bulk MPAN creation process, including any additional information requirements from DNOs, operational pain points, and whether there are material differences between DNOs.

An attendee asked whether Smart Export Guarantee should be excluded as well as FIT. LM clarified that the request is primarily trying to distinguish ongoing BAU activity from one-off cleansing or migration activity. While FIT-related data does not have to be excluded, the Code Manager are aware of a recent ramp up in migrating over from FIT, so separating it where possible is helpful in understanding underlying demand.

9. R0321 - DNOS CREATE EXPORT MPANS FOR NEW HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS

JH provided attendees with an overview of the Change Proposal. They explained that R0321 is looking at whether DNOs should create both import and export metering point records where they are aware that a new connection will export electricity (for example, in new housing developments).

JH took attendees through the proposed legal text. R0321 proposes introducing an amendment to Schedule 27 3.1D. The proposed amendment would require that, where a DNO is aware a site will export electricity, the DNO must:

- Create a record for a new import metering point, and
- Also create a record for a corresponding export metering point,
- Enter both records in the Electricity Retail Data Service (ERDS) and send them to the CSS Provider in accordance with the Schedule 27 interface table.

The key change is the explicit requirement to create an export metering point record upfront, rather than relying on later bulk or ad-hoc export MPAN creation.

A party impact assessment for this change proposal was issued on 07 May and will remain open until 01 June.

An attendee queried whether the proposal would require a broader review of the logical disconnection process, given that export MPANs may be created where export capability is not ultimately used. LM clarified that a review of the logical disconnection process is not within the scope for I0228. However, if parties believe the logical disconnection process needs review, this could be raised as a separate issue. LM acknowledged that there is already a significant volume of export MPANs sitting unregistered.

An attendee highlighted operational concerns around monitoring and managing unregistered export MPANs, noting uncertainty over whether they should be logically disconnected and the additional workload associated with disconnecting and later reinstating them. The attendee added that Suppliers are required to verify exports, and creating export MPANs upfront—before receiving installer certification or documentation—could place Suppliers in a risky position by implicitly deeming connections safe when that may not yet be confirmed. LM noted this links closely to a separate Issue, I0228 - ECOES API for Export MPAN Creation at Scale being progressed to address inconsistencies in DNO requirements for export evidence and how assurance should be handled across the industry. Another attendee echoed the concerns around verification in the export MPAN process.

The attendee asked about specific definitions for developments, in particular the distinction between G98 and G99 classifications, noting that they would adopt a different process for each one. LM noted complications around this Change Proposal and noted that it is far from finalised, despite the proposed legal text. They encouraged attendees to include any concerns in their party impact assessment responses, and the Code Manager will look to collate these responses and bring R0331 back to a future Change Issues Group meeting.

10. I0318 – INTRODUCTION OF CONSUMER CONSENT SOLUTION

HF provided an update on the ongoing Consumer Consent Solution project. They advised that the CCS Design Consultation had closed on 25 March, and RECCo have published the non-confidential responses. HF added that RECCo are preparing a formal consultation to be published around the end of May. The next Engagement Webinar will also be held at this time to share key themes and insights from the consultation. Any interested parties should contact committees@recmanager.co.uk.

HF advised that the CCS Solution Group meetings continue to take place on a fortnightly basis, with focus on a particular topic each meeting. HF advised that any interested parties should contact consumerconsent@retailenergycode.co.uk or register their interest on the RECCo website. The most recent meetings have focused on Tariff Interoperability and User Experience, and the minutes are publicly available on the REC Portal. The next Topic Solution Group meeting is scheduled for 21 May and will focus on the Customer Experience Guidelines.

HF added that further information can be found on the Consumer Consent Hub on the REC Portal.

11. CODE MANAGER ISSUE TRACKER UPDATE

FM 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.

12. AOB

The Chair invited attendees to provide AOB. There were no items raised, and the Chair closed the meeting.

The Chair encouraged attendees to submit any feedback on how the Change Issues Group could be improved for future meetings by emailing committees@recmanager.co.uk.

For any parties wanting to ask a question on a current REC Issue, they can contact change.management@recmanager.co.uk.