RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

REC CHANGE ISSUES GROUP - I0314 SOLUTION DEVELOPMENT WORKING GROUP
MEETING MINUTES

MEETING	**RECCHIG_26_0604 – I0314_01**
DATE	**04 June 2026, 11:00**
LOCATION	**By teleconference**

Presenter	Representing	Initials	Role
Paul Witton-Dauris	REC Code Manager	PWD	Chair
Florentina Monea	REC Code Manager	FM	Lead Analyst
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. They advised that this session would be the first I0314 Solution Development Working Group.

2. I0314 - CROSSED METERS PROCESS: CLARIFICATIONS AND SUPPORT (SOLUTION DEVELOPMENT WORKING GROUP)

FM provided attendees with an overview of the Issue. FM advised that I0314 was raised following feedback received from stakeholders as part of I0172 End-to-End New Connections Process Review relating to inconsistent application and varied understanding of the Crossed Meter process across Parties. FM advised that this is the first meeting of the I0314 solution development working wroup, with attendees agreeing to this approach at the April Change Issues Group meeting.

FM advised that an Information Request was issued from 10 April to 8 May, receiving nine responses. These responses were analysed and grouped into 10 key themes. The session is focused on reviewing these themes, prioritising “quick win” actions identified from the feedback, with more complex, long-term process improvements to be addressed in subsequent sessions.

The first theme discussed concerned the reactive identification of Crossed Meter scenarios. Responses indicated that issues are typically identified reactively, often triggered by billing

disputes, customer complaints, new build issues, site visits, or data discrepancies. This reactive approach leads to prolonged billing errors, increased complaint volumes, longer resolution times, and higher operational costs for suppliers.

To address this, respondents suggested introducing a proactive approach through a guidance document developed by the Code Manager. This would include a set of trigger indicators (e.g. unusual consumption reads, repeated address mismatches, duplicate meter serial numbers) to help Parties identify potential Crossed Meter issues earlier. The guidance could also include diagnostic steps, such as incorporating photographic evidence from site visits or customer submissions into investigations.

Support was received from attendees for a guidance document. An attendee supported the introduction of a checklist-style guidance but emphasised it should not require all listed evidence to be present, instead ensuring that some appropriate evidence is gathered as part of investigations. They further noted that the guidance could help ensure that when Crossed Meter investigations are raised between Parties, a minimum level of evidence has already been gathered, reducing unclear or insufficiently evidenced queries.

An attendee asked how the guidance would be managed and accessed. FM explained it would likely be both centrally stored and distributed, aligned with existing approaches to guidance documents, and would include version control with ongoing updates based on feedback.

An attendee queried whether the checklist would be used operationally, for example by call centre agents handling customer queries. FM confirmed this was an intended use case, with the guidance supporting frontline staff by prompting targeted questions and helping identify potential Cross Meter scenarios earlier. The attendee also asked whether reporting or data analysis (e.g. identifying duplicate meter serial numbers across properties) would form part of the solution. FM clarified that such enhancements were out of scope for the immediate “quick wins” and could be considered as longer-term actions.

FM introduced the second theme on the subject of evidence, highlighting that responses showed inconsistency across Parties in what is considered “sufficient” evidence when investigating Crossed Meter cases. Challenges raised included unresponsive consumers, limited property access, difficulties completing burn tests, and varying expectations between Parties, all of which contribute to delays, friction, inconsistent outcomes, and increased consumer detriment.

As a potential quick win, FM proposed that the guidance document should include a recommended “minimum evidence pack” to improve consistency. Suggested elements included photographs, address validation checks, and clearer escalation pathways where evidence cannot be obtained. It would also outline acceptable alternatives to burn tests, such as engineer visits, CLA reports, or trace and label activities.

FM reiterated that this would remain non-mandatory guidance rather than an obligation, with the aim to provide recommendations to reduce inconsistencies between Parties.

An attendee supported the checklist approach but suggested including a reminder of Supplier obligations, particularly ensuring that updates are made not only to internal systems but also to industry systems. They highlighted ongoing issues where Crossed Meter problems persist

when customers Switch Suppliers due to incomplete updates. FM agreed this was a valuable addition and confirmed it would be incorporated as a quick win, while noting that broader process or system improvements could be explored as longer-term actions.

FM introduced the theme of communication fragmentation, noting that multiple Secure Data Exchange Portal (SDEP) threads, portals, and escalation messages are causing loss of context, manual rework, and delays. This results in prolonged case resolution, duplicated effort, missed updates, and increased disputes and complaints. A proposed action was to standardise communication templates within SDEP to improve consistency and clarity during cross meter investigations. However, FM acknowledged this may be more complex than a typical "quick win" and sought views on whether it should remain in scope or be deferred.

Feedback indicated some caution. An attendee noted that implementing standardised templates in SDEP may not be straightforward or quick. LM suggested that, given ongoing system replacement work and known limitations (particularly differences between electricity and gas processes), it may be more effective to defer this and align improvements with the new system's capabilities. Additional comments highlighted existing discrepancies between fuels and access limitations for certain Parties, such as Gas Transporters. The proposal is better suited as a longer-term initiative and should be considered alongside broader system and process improvements, rather than being pursued immediately as a quick win.

FM outlined issues with the current two-party messaging model when Crossed Meter cases involve multiple Parties. Feedback highlighted that coordinating across more than two Suppliers is difficult, often requiring parallel conversations, which leads to delays, duplicated effort, and inconsistent updates and decision-making.

As a short-term action, FM proposed including worked examples within the guidance to demonstrate how multi-Party coordination can be managed effectively. They invited members to provide real case examples and practical tips to support this.

FM addressed to the theme of confusion between address issues and Crossed Meter scenarios. Responses to the Information Request indicated widespread inconsistency in when to treat a case as an address change versus a Crossed Meter issue, particularly in complex situations such as plot-to-postal discrepancies. This confusion can lead to incorrect processes being followed, data inaccuracies, and extended resolution times.

Proposed actions for the guidance included setting clearer decision points between address and Crossed Meter processes, defining recommended evidence for plot-to-postal scenarios, and clarifying when Distribution Network Operator (DNO) involvement or address changes are appropriate. Attendees supported the need for this, with examples raised highlighting the operational complexity and reinforcing the value of clearer guidance. An attendee raised an example of Scottish flats. LM responded that Scottish flats are within the scope for I0200 Review of the REC's Address Management Service, noting significant crossover between that Issue and I0314.

FM introduced the theme of response timeliness and update expectations, noting that feedback highlighted gaps in communication, including unanswered queries and a lack of regular

progress updates between parties. This creates uncertainty, delays, and inefficiencies in resolving Crossed Meter cases.

As a proposed quick win, FM suggested including guidance on expected update cadence, including providing updates even where there is no change in progress, and offering recommendations on when escalation may be appropriate. This would also incorporate reminders around existing obligations, such as adherence to SLAs, maintaining accurate contact details, and ensuring cooperation between Parties.

An attendee supported the concept but cautioned that timelines are often dependent on customer engagement, which can delay progress. They suggested that escalation mechanisms, including potential REC involvement to coordinate multi-party cases, could be helpful where progress stalls. FM clarified that the intention is not to introduce strict SLA-based escalation triggers, but to encourage transparency through regular updates, even where progress is limited.

An attendee raised that the usefulness of this proposal would depend on the level of detail provided, particularly regarding update frequency. FM confirmed that more detailed proposals would be developed and brought back to the group for further review.

Due to time constraints, FM summarised the remaining themes. FM highlighted ongoing inconsistencies between gas and electricity processes, particularly affecting dual fuel customers, which can lead to differing outcomes, delays, and billing impacts. Specific issues included the gas process not always being treated as mandatory and ONUPD flows not consistently actioned. As a quick win, they proposed providing clearer guidance on what steps are mandatory versus non-mandatory across fuels, alongside clarity on timescales and accountability for key processes. Broader code alignment was noted as a more complex, longer-term activity.

FM also identified gaps in data visibility, where Parties experience difficulty accessing address histories, extracting data, or evidencing root causes. These limitations increase manual effort and slow investigations. As an immediate action, FM proposed including guidance on what should form a standard case data pack to support investigations.

FM confirmed that these remaining themes would be explored in more detail at a future session, while the previously discussed areas would be developed further into a more detailed guidance structure.

3. AOB

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