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_25_0910** |
| **DATE** | **10 September 2025, 10:00** |
| **LOCATION** | **By teleconference** |

| Attendee | Representing | Initials | Role |
|---|---|---|---|
| Steve Brand | Code Manager | SB | Committee Chair |
| Martin Brailsford | Meter Equipment Managers (Electricity) Representative | MB | Committee Member |
| Dean Berry | Meter Equipment Managers (Gas) Representative | DB | Committee Member |
| Steve Mulinganie | Energy Suppliers Representative | SM | Committee Member |
| Tracey Saunders | Gas Transporters (GTs) Representative | TS | Committee Member |
| Warren Lacey | Distribution Network Operators (DNOs) Representative | WL | Committee Member |
| Caroline Freimuller | Code Manager | CF | Senior Change Analyst |
| Lydia Bentley | Code Manager | LB | Senior Change Analyst |
| James Hardy | Code Manager | JH | Senior Change Analyst |
| Bela Ashworth | Code Manager | BA | Change Analyst |
| Francine Peyroux-Sissoko | Code Manager | FPS | Change Analyst |
| Lorna Mallon | Code Manager | LM | Regulatory Specialist |
| Brogan McNess | Code Manager | BMc | Secretariat |
| Glenn Sheern | Code Manager | GS | Regulatory Specialist |
| Lee Walker | Elexon | LW | Observer |
| Shaun McRaith | Ofgem | SMc | Observer |

## 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 09 July 2025. The Draft Minutes were approved by the Members.

## 3. REVIEW OF ACTION LOG

The Code Manager updated Members that there are currently two outstanding actions on the actions log at this time.

BM advised that the **RECMEP_25_0813_02** (The MEP Members to review the STIRG document and provide clear instructions for formatting corrections. The REC Change Team to assist with implementation ahead of February 2026 release) would be kept open until February 2026 to allow Members to review the STIRG document and request changes before the release.

SB acknowledged MB's observations and confirmed that the team would review the formatting issues. He noted that while the legal text had already been approved, formatting inconsistencies often arise during updates, and the action would remain open to ensure accuracy.

MB added that he had identified several obvious formatting issues and noted Member concerns about images that had been moved or removed in previous versions. He committed to reviewing and feeding back in due course.

GS offered to assist MB in finalising the document once the review was complete.

SB mentioned that Energy and Utility Skills Register (EUSR) had raised questions about the clarity of some images, suggesting that some may have been removed due to poor quality. MB agreed, stating that sourcing high-quality images is challenging, especially when scenarios cannot be easily replicated in controlled environments.

WL recalled that when the document was first created over a decade ago, there had been difficulty obtaining good photographs. He suggested that Members may now have access to better images and that this could be a good opportunity to update the visuals.

BM advised that the **RECMEP_25_0813_03** (The Change Analyst to prepare and present a high-level implementation plan for R0198, detailing engagement with parties and proposed digital enhancements, at September 2025 Meeting.) was proposed to close.

LB provided an update later in the meeting, confirming that digital enhancements would be explored in line with the planned redevelopment of the REC Portal. LB noted that the implementation timeline allows sufficient time to work with the new portal provider to incorporate desired functionalities. LB also explained that success measurement would be assessed holistically alongside related changes (RO195–RO199), with the view that the combined impact may be greater than the sum of individual changes.

RECMEP Members **NOTED** and **APPROVED** to propose to close **RECMEP_25_0813_03.**

## 4. METER CONFIGURATION TABLE

RECMEP Members were provided with an update regarding the Meter Configuration Tables.

BM clarified that the Meter Configuration Tables are still set to be released in line with MHHS Milestone M8, so will be available for parties to pick up from the REC Portal on the 22 September 2025.

RECMEP **NOTED** the update.

## 5. INDUSTRY ISSUES AND CHANGE TRACKER

RECMEP Members were provided with an overview of the REC issues and changes including an update on two items within the change tracker that impacted the Panel.

JH confirmed that the first working group meeting for CP196 Review of Metering Asset Data Transferred from MAMs to CDSP is scheduled for 17 September 2025, with invitations already sent. The group will focus on developing a solution to enhance obligations around RGMA rejections. JH invited any additional interested parties to contact the Change Management team to join.

JH then updated Members on CP271 Clarification of ASPAMI & EMO Accession Requirements, which is due to be presented to the Change Panel on 16 September 2025. Subject to approval, the issue will be assigned to the Metering Expert Panel and will enter consultation on 19 September 2025.

JH provided a broader overview of CP197 Metering Fault Process, which has been split into electricity and gas workstreams due to differing processes and stakeholder expertise. Three working group sessions have been held so far, focusing on identifying problematic metering jobs, process responsibilities, and impacts across meter types. The Code Manager is now drafting potential obligations and solution requirements, which will be presented at the next meetings in October 2025. SM noted positive feedback from his team and asked about the October meeting date, which JH confirmed would be communicated by the end of the week. Finally, JH presented an update on I-0240 Data Alignment of Meter Information Through MHHS Migration. A draft scenario guidance document has been created, outlining five migration scenarios and providing actionable instructions for REC parties handling MPANs during incomplete or failed metering jobs. The first draft received feedback from the MHHS programme team, and a second version is due to be published imminently. JH asked RECMEP Members to review the document and provide feedback by the end of September 2025, ahead of the Change Issues Group meeting in early October. The final version is expected to be published before the MHHS release in November, with the first impacted cases anticipated around Christmas 2025.

RECMEP **NOTED** both the overview and the update.

## 6. METERING HUB UPDATE

RECMEP Members were provided with an update on the Metering Hub including the plans of a six monthly review of outdated bulletins.

SB informed Members that documents GER.1 and GER.5, previously hosted on the ENA website, had also been displayed on the Future Engineering Networks (FEN) website following integration into IGEM. However, when uploaded to the Metering Hub, the links to the documents

failed to work. SB contacted FEN, who confirmed the documents had been temporarily removed due to lack of formal sign-off. FEN intends to reinstate the documents soon, noting that they remain in ENA format, had no changes and have not yet been reformatted as FEN documents.

GS provided further updates on behalf of RB. Firstly, GS reported that progress on CP152 (audit question updates) was going well, with the revised questions now framed as evidence-based statements rather than simple yes/no queries. These are currently undergoing refinement. Secondly, GS shared insights into Metering Hub visitor analytics. Following earlier improvements to the site, unique visitor numbers peaked at 207 unique users in March 2025, before declining to 137. Despite the drop, this remains significantly higher than the pre-improvement baseline of 72, indicating sustained engagement. RB continues to explore further enhancements to maintain and grow usage.

SB raised the need to formalise the review and storage process for technical bulletins, noting that no emergency, health and safety, or technical bulletins had been received recently. He suggested this may be an area requiring procedural clarity.

WL confirmed that a brief had been issued by Scottish Power Energy Networks, but it was unrelated to REC or metering. He explained that due to internal processes, such briefs are automatically sent to REC. WL proposed that REC should first verify the relevance of incoming briefs with the originating party before escalating them to the Metering Hub and Metering Expert Panel. SB and GS agreed this was a sensible approach.

RECMEP **NOTED** the update.

## 7. R0216 - REC CHANGES TO TIE IN WITH DCP419

RECMEP Members discussed R0216 REC changes required to align with DCP419.

RECMEP were provided with a comprehensive update regarding Change Proposal R0216, which proposes the introduction of a new obligation for Energy Suppliers, MEMs, SIPS, and CMRMs to notify DNOs of planned works on Electricity Smart Meters that may result in de-energisation or Communications Hub (CHs) changes where they have one or more Working Days' notice.

CF explained that the change is intended to address concerns arising from obligations on DNOs within the Ofgem RIGs, which require DNOs to contact Consumers upon receiving Power Outage Alerts (AD1s) from Electricity Smart Meters. These alerts can be triggered by planned works such as meter exchanges or communications hub replacements, resulting in unnecessary and potentially confusing contact with Consumers who are already aware of the planned outage.

CF advised that the proposed solution includes changes to Schedule 14 – Metering Operations and the introduction of a new Market Message containing MPAN, appointment date, and optional additional information. This message would be required to be sent at least one Working Day prior to the appointment date. Same-day appointments (such as emergency appointments) would be excluded from the scope of this CP.

CF confirmed that the legal text had been reviewed by REC legal advisors and consulted on with industry parties.

Two alternative solutions were considered but descoped:

- An API-based solution, which was descoped due to lack of industry support and cost concerns. CF noted that while some Parties preferred the API over the Market Message, it often came with the caveat it was only if one had to be implemented and their true preference would be neither solution.
- A SEC-based solution involving changes to DCC alert behaviour, which was discounted by the DCUSA working group due to likely complexity, timescales and cost. CF confirmed the Code Manager had taken the decision not to explore the SEC solution any further following the feedback from the DCUSA Working Group, but that any Party who was interested could raise this with the SEC directly.

CF presented the cost-benefit analysis and explained that the estimated industry implementation cost was between £1.9M and £14.8M, with the estimated annual savings between £9K–£1.6M annually per DNO region, depending on current practices. CF acknowledged the range of these costs/benefits were broad, and the Code Manager expected the true costs/savings to lie somewhere in the middle.

CF also presented intangible benefits including improved consumer experience, reduced reputational damage to industry and an awareness of planned works for DNOs, and intangible costs including Communication Hubs replacement agents and same day appointments being unable to be in scope and Consumers who experience a genuine power outage on the same day as a DNO being notified of a planned appointment not being contacted.

CF explained that the Code Manager felt the impact on all three REC objectives was neutral as there were both costs and benefits from implementing the CP.

SM challenged the Code Manager's assessment that the impact on the REC objectives was neutral, questioning the cost-benefit that clearly sits in the negative, cannot be neutral, instead must be a negative. CF responded that many of the benefits were difficult to quantify, such as the improvements to the Consumer journey, and therefore the Code Manager had determined the impact as neutral across all REC objectives as they did not feel they could categorically call it positive or negative. CF further clarified the Code Manager would usually expect at least one REC objective to be positively impacted to recommend approval of a Change Proposal, neutral impact was not sufficient.

WL raised concerns about a statement in the impact assessment suggesting a DNO was not complying with RIGs. CF clarified that the statement was included in a public Party impact assessment response received in March 2025 and had been publicly available for six months. WL requested that the submitting DNO be made aware of this, which the Code Manager took an action to do.

CF provided a summary of the consultation responses and confirmed that all respondents to the consultation agreed that this change should be Authority Determined. Following consultation, the proposed implementation date was amended to June 2026 (previously February 2026), allowing six months post-approval for system changes. CF noted that previously REC CPs with a recommendation of rejection had not included a proposed implementation date but confirmed Ofgem had requested that changes recommending

rejection include an implementation date in case the Authority chooses to approve them. CF also confirmed that an additional benefit has been added to the report post consultation, as suggested by a Party response.

TS suggested improving future consultation summaries by including a column that clearly indicates whether each response supports or opposes the proposal. This would help members quickly assess the overall sentiment without needing to read through each response in detail. CF agreed to take this away for discussion within the Code Manager.

MB raised concerns about the absence of cancellation flows in the proposed solution, warning that without accounting for replans, cancellations, or same-day changes, there is a risk of inaccurate notifications and missed appointments. CF responded that the obligation to resend the proposed Market Message when a planned appointment was cancelled was excluded following feedback from Parties, who indicated this would provide even more work for the Parties required to send the Market Message and that DNOs would not necessarily find this information useful. CF added that as the legal text requires the Market Message to be sent a minimum of one Working Day in advance, Parties may choose to batch messages for efficiency rather than sending them when the appointment is booked. If Parties do choose to do this, it should mean if a cancellation is received more than one Working Day in advance, this would not impact the DNO or Consumer.

RECMEP **NOTED** the update and, in line with the Code Manager recommendation, voted to recommend that the Authority;

- **REJECT** the proposed change solution;
- **REJECT** the proposed implementation approach and
- **REJECT** the proposed implementation date of 26 June 2026.

*[The breakdown of how each member voted can be found in Annex 1.]*

## 8. AOB

### GAS OPERATION MEETING FORUM

RECMEP Members were informed of the upcoming Gas Operation Metering Forum (G-OMF) would be held on the 10 September 2025 starting at 2:00 PM.

RECMEP **NOTED** the reminder.

### OCTOBER MEP 2025

The Chair informed Members that he would be unable to chair the October 2025 Meeting and that his Alternative Glenn Sheern would be taking his place in his absence.

RECMEP **NOTED** the update.

## Next meeting date: 8 October 2025

RETAIL ENERGY CODE

## ANNEX A – VOTING TABLES (R0216)

Do you agree with the Code Managers recommendation to reject the proposed change solution?

| Attendee | Representing | Vote |
|---|---|---|
| Martin Brailsford | MEMs (Electricity) | Approve |
| Dean Berry | MEMs (GAS) | Approve |
| Steve Mulinganie | Energy Suppliers | Approve |
| Tracey Saunders | GTs | Approve |
| Warren Lacey | DNOs | Reject |

Do you agree with the Code Managers recommendation to reject the proposed implementation 'Big Bang' approach?

| Attendee | Representing | Vote |
|---|---|---|
| Martin Brailsford | MEMs (Electricity) | Approve |
| Dean Berry | MEMs (GAS) | Approve |
| Steve Mulinganie | Energy Suppliers | Approve |
| Tracey Saunders | GTs | Approve |
| Warren Lacey | DNOs | Reject |

Do you agree with the Code Managers recommendation to reject the proposed implementation date of 26 June 2026 to the Authority?

| Attendee | Representing | Vote |
|---|---|---|
| Martin Brailsford | MEMs (Electricity) | Approve |
| Dean Berry | MEMs (GAS) | Approve |
| Steve Mulinganie | Energy Suppliers | Approve |
| Tracey Saunders | GTs | Approve |
| Warren Lacey | DNOs | Reject |

WL advised that the reason for recommending the CP for approval rather than rejection is, in his view, the last REC Objective (To drive continuous improvements and efficiencies in the

operation of the REC and the central systems and communication infrastructures it governs.) would be positively impacted from the implementation of this CP.