RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

REC METERING EXPERT PANEL
MEETING MINUTES

MEETING	**RECMEP_24_0814**
DATE	**14 August 2024, 10:00**
LOCATION	**By teleconference**

Attendee	Representing	Initials	Role
Steve Brand	Code Manager	SB	Committee Chair
Steve Mulinganie	Suppliers	SM	Committee Member
Paul Abreu	Network Operators	PA	Committee Member
Tracey Saunders	Network Operators	TS	Committee Member
Geoff Huckerby	MEMs	GH	Committee Member
Eric Fowler	MEMs	EF	Committee Member
Lee Walker	BSC	LW	Observer
Shaun McRaith	Ofgem	SMR	Observer
Paul Witton-Dauris	Code Manager	PFWD	Head of Change
Caroline Freimuller	Code Manager	CF	Change Analyst
Bradley Mercer	Code Manager	BM	Secretariat

1. INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed attendees to the REC Metering Expert Panel (RECMEP) meeting.

2. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

RECMEP Members were invited to provide comments on the Draft Minutes of the meeting held on 10 July 2024. There were no comments, and the minutes were approved as an accurate reflection of the meeting.

3. REVIEW OF ACTION LOG

BM provided Members with an overview of the below actions on the Actions Log:

RECMEP_24_0710_01: Code Manager to investigate the most appropriate route for escalation on the MEM certification issue.

BM advised that he had escalated this matter within the Code Manager team for further action. BM confirmed that the Register had been amended to no longer include the date of certificate expiry, to avoid confusion when that date was in the past.

GH asked for clarification on what would happen to a party whose certificate had expired; BM advised that he was informed that the party would be removed from the register. PA advised that without an expiry date DNOs would have to check the register daily to endure that MEMs were licensed to work on their equipment. SM agreed with the point highlighting that the solution had not really addressed the issue and asked that it was looked in to again to solve the route cause of the issue.

BM agreed to keep the action open and to raise the issue within the Code Manager once again, the Chair agreed to support **– Open.**

4. METER PRODUCT UPDATE

RT provided Members with an overview of the request to update the Meter Product Data (MPD), RT advised that the request was to add 20 new products to MPD. RT advised that in the initial submission some of the model codes exceeded the maximum permitted length of 10 so had failed Code Manager validation, however, an updated submission had been made. RT advised that the Code Manager would be making an update to the industry facing guidance to prevent submissions being sent exceeding the permitted length in the future.

RT advised that EF had provided a comment in advance of the meeting related to the values on the model code which had been used in the submission. EF asked if the final number on the Model Code the maximum flow Q value was. RT advised that the last number corresponded to the normal value rather than the maximum flow value. EH advised that some of the Meter Products on MPD had used a slightly different protocol and suggested that it may be confusing. RT advised that there was no consistent naming convention, and the Model Codes usually related to the name plate on the Meter.

RT asked if there were rules around the name plate, SM advised that there was not, and he believed that it was an issue that there is not a standard convention. RT asked if it was something which MEP members wished to raise as an issue.

The Chair advised that he had investigated creating an agreed name plate naming convention in the past and highlighted that British Standards do identify what information should be on a name plate but there was not a consistent approach to how the data was presented. The Chair advised that the other issue is that there is no direct match between what is recommended in the serial numbers and what is used within the Data Flows.

Members discussed whether to raise the item as a formal issue and highlighted that the introduction of Hydrogen to the market could be a good opportunity for standardisation. The Code Manager agreed to begin investigations and raise at the upcoming Operational Metering Forums.

Members noted the MPD update and:

- **AGREED** unanimously to approve the addition on the 20 Meter Products.

ACTION: RECMEP_24_0814_01: Code Manager to investigate a standard format for Meter nameplates.

5. UPDATE ON R0170 – WITHDRAWAL OF STIRG FROM REC GOVERNANCE UPDATES

CF provided Members with an update on the progression of R0170. CF advised that on 06 August 2024, the Code Manager presented the Change Report (For Consultation) with the minded to position to recommend rejection of the change, and progress with the Category 3 solution to the REC Change Panel (RECCP). CF confirmed that unanimous approval was provided agreeing that the Change Report contained enough information for R0170 to move to the consultation phase of the change process. CF added that unanimous approval was also obtained for the red-lined version of the RECMEP Terms of Reference drafted by the Code Manager to support the Category 3 solution.

CF advised that the Code Manager had come to its minded to position based on the 12 responses to the Impact Assessment. CF provided Members with an overview of the responses advising that generally MEMs and Suppliers were against the change due to losing their voting rights and that DNOs were in favour of the change. CF advised that the consultation for R0170 was currently live on the Portal and encouraged Members to provide their views on the change.

CF reminded Members that the solution for R0170 was seeking to remove the STIRG from REC Governance and incorporate it into the Energy Networks Association (ENA) governance and had been raised by PA. CF advised that the Category 3 solution had also been raised by the ENA as a compromise to keep the STIRG within REC Governance, the Category 3 solution was to make a change to the RECMEP Terms of Reference to allow for bespoke voting arrangements on the document whereby changes would only pass if there was unanimous agreement from the directly impacted Networks and MEM Members. CF advised that the Electricity Operational Metering Forum could be used to review any proposed changes prior to presentation at the RECMEP. CF confirmed that the Category 3 solution had been reviewed by the lawyers who were comfortable with the change.

SM expressed opposition to the Category 3 change and the Code Managers minded to position advising that it was bad governance to make a change to the voting arrangements to accommodate a single document. SM advised that the proposed voting arrangements meant that every change could be vetoed by either the MEM or the DNO Member. SM advised that the DNO could require a change to the document to remain compliant and that could be effectively

vetoed by the MEM Member. SM advised that the Category 3 solution did not solve the issue and highlighted that the STIRG should have never been under REC governance in the first place.

PA advised that he and the DNO community believed that the best place for the document was under the governance of the ENA as the document provided guidance on the asset by the asset owner. PA added that it was not an ideal situation at present where the asset owner could be dictated by asset users on how to manage their equipment. PA advised that it was useful to have MEMs involved in the management of the document as they were working on the assets, however, did not feel that it was appropriate that they could dictate to DNOs how to manage their asset.

PA advised that when the document was transferred to REC, RECMEP Members had failed to recognise the nuance of the RECMEP voting arrangements which gives a vote to Suppliers and tips the balance. PA highlighted that this created a risk for DNOs. PA advised that R0170 had been raised to correct this balance and was not surprised at the volume of IA responses from MEMs as they have the opportunity currently to motivate and influence DNO asset management policy through the RECMEP. PA advised that to avoid R0170 going to appeal the DNOs had come up with an Category 3 solution which they believed was a compromise. PA reiterated that DNOs preferred option was R0170. PA advised that this was similar to the arrangements under MOCOPA which on the whole worked well in practice.

PA advised that he recognised that the change to the voting arrangements was a change to the status quo of REC. However, he believed that this was preferable than going to appeal although he was not entirely comfortable with the change, it was preferable to the current arrangements with the document.

TS advised that she was in support of R0170 and reiterated the point that there should not be a governance situation where DNOs could have their asset management policy dictated to them by other parties. TS advised that the Category 3 change provided asset users with too much power in the management of the document. TS asked how the Code Manager had come to its minded to position given that the document came in to the REC governance almost by accident.

CF advised that the thinking behind the minded to position was based on the arrangements under MOCOPA prior to REC go-live where MEMs had voting rights on changes to the STIRG in much the same way which was being proposed through the Category 3 change. CF added that under the REC all parties had the right to appeal changes to the Authority and this would be lost if the document was under ENA governance. CF advised that the Code Manager agreed that the DNO was the assert owner but also recognised the impact of any changes to the document on the day-to-day operations of MEMs and believed that due to this impact it was appropriate that MEMs retained voting rights on the STIRG.

TS asked if there was a way that under the ENA governance it could be assured that any changes to the STIRG were subject to MEM review. CF advised that this was included within the solution for R0170. CF confirmed that the solution stated that for any changes to the document to be binding under the REC the proposed changes had to be subject to a review/consultation by MEMs. CF advised that several respondents to the IA including Suppliers had advised that they would only be comfortable with that approach should MEP have to approve the document rather than just review.

PA advised that he believed that the issue boiled down to parties not wishing to lose control of the document which they did not have in the past. PA advised that under MOCOPA MEMs were not able to propose a change to the document which DNOs were not in support of, and this would be effectively the same under ENA governance. PA advised that he was particularly concerned with the IA response received from one Supplier as it backed up all of the worries held by DNOs around their asset management policy.

GH advised that R0170 had been discussed with Members of the Association of Meter Operators and there had been many concerns raised by the MEMs around the change. GH highlighted that many of the concerns raised were around the loss of the right of appeal. GH advised that he believed the document should stay under REC governance to afford MEMs the right of appeal.

GH advised that with the Category 3 there was the opportunity for all parties involved in the STIRG processes to work collaboratively and come to agreement on changes which he believed was good governance. GH advised that although the process worked well under MOCOPA it was flawed in that there was not an appeals process for any changes under the Code.

SM asked how it was possible under the REC for the change and the Category 3 to have the same proposer. SM advised that he would have expected R0170 to run its course in the change process before an Category 3 solution was changed. CF advised that the Category 3 solution was not a formal alternate as it was raised on the RECMEP ToRs which are Category 3 document which was subject to a different change process.

PA advised that he was uncomfortable with the Category 3 solution and that as he understood it was the Code Manager that had offered the solution to the ENA as a compromise. PA advised that the ENA did not really know which solution could be a compromise and that the Code Manager had developed the change to the ToRs and suggested it to the ENA as a potential route forward.

SM asked for clarification on who raised the Category 3 as it had been stated earlier that PA had raised the solution. PA advised that RO170 had been raised by the ENA following previous discussions at RECMEP regarding the STIRG. PA advised that the response from Suppliers and MEMs had been expected by the ENA and that they were astounded when they were informed of the Code Managers minded position on R0170. PA advised that the DNOs had then discussed how to come to a solution and had agreed that they would be comfortable with the document remaining under REC governance as long as DNOs could not be outvoted. PA advised that the DNOs were willing to make the compromise although they were not entirely comfortable with it to prevent a situation where they could be outvoted on their asset management policy.

CF advised that she could understand that the Code Managers minded to position could have come as a surprise to the ENA and DNOs. However, the Code Manager had made it clear that RECMEPs suggestion would be taken into consideration, but the views of the wider industry would also be taken into account.

CF confirmed that two options had been provided to the Code Manager by the ENA and the Code Manager had provided a view on which one they felt was the most appropriate and

subsequently drafted the legal text for the ENA. CF stated that the Code Manager did not raise the Category 3 solution. SM asked whose name was attached to the Category 3 CP. CF confirmed that as the RECMEP ToRs were owned by the RECCP, it was the RECCP which was listed on the Category 3 CP. PA advised that he was very uncomfortable with the Category 3 solution and advised that he would take R0170 to appeal should it be rejected at the RECCP.

SM advised that during the development of R0145 legal advice had been provided which suggested that it was not appropriate for the STIRG to remain as a Category 3 document under the REC and asked if this was still the case. CF confirmed that a legal review had been carried out on the Category 3 proposal which had stated that it was fine to stay as a Category 3 document and agreed to share with Members following the meeting.

POST MEETING NOTE

The Legal advice provided for R0145 was it "would be sensible" for the STIRG document to become a Category 2 as it is "more significant than is typical of a REC Category 3 document" due to compliance being required under CoMCoP. This guidance was provided but it was never said that the document legally had to be a category 2.

Also, as that change has been rejected by RECMEP the Code Manager has no plans to re-raise it as this time. If RECMEP now feel it should be a Category 2, we are happy for RECMEP or one of its members to raise the change.

Legal have confirmed they have no concerns with this category 3 change. They had sight of the legal text put in front of Change Panel before Panel approved it, and were happy with the text proposed by the Code Manager to support the change. We will consider the views raised by RECMEP members alongside the views of Change Panel and all consultation responses to the category 3 change.

The Code Manager would also like to make it clear that because C3-0091 is not a true alternate solution, it is possible for R0170 to continue along it's change path and be implemented after C3-0091 is implemented if required.

6. INDUSTRY ISSUES AND CHANGE TRACKER

6.1 R0105 - REVIEW OF ONAGE SLAS

CF advised that R0105 was currently at Consultation, with a closure date of 30 August 2024. The Code Manager has previously issued a Party IA during which we received positive feedback on our proposed approach to retain the ONAGE SLA at 2WDs, and therefore to ultimately recommend rejection of the Change. CF advised that assuming that similar feedback was received during the Consultation, the Code Manager would likely issue a FCR to RECMEP that recommends that the Change be rejected.

6.2 R0150 - ON-SITE AGGREGATION AS A METHOD TO FACILITATE THIRD PARTY ACCESS (BSC P455)

CF advised that the cross-code Change (where the BSC are the lead code) was approved the RECMEP meeting in May 2024, with the RECMEP implementation being dependent upon the BSC Modification P455 gaining Authority approval.

CF informed Members that the Code Manager was still waiting upon the Authority decision for P455, as such R0150 will not be included in the August 2024 release. CF advised that the Code Manager would now seek to implement R0150 as part of the Standard REC November 2024 release, if P455 approval has gain approval before the beginning of November 2024.

7. AOB

RECMEP Members were invited to provide AOB, there was no AOB, and the meeting was closed.